

Nonlinear kernel-free quadratic hyper-surface support vector machine with 0-1 loss function

Mingyang Wu, Zhixia Yang*, Junyou Ye

Abstract—For the binary classification problem, a novel nonlinear kernel-free quadratic hyper-surface support vector machine with 0-1 loss function (QSSVM_{0/1}) is proposed. Specifically, the task of QSSVM_{0/1} is to seek a quadratic separating hyper-surface to divide the samples into two categories. And it has better interpretability than the methods using kernel functions, since each feature of the sample acts both independently and synergistically. By introducing the 0-1 loss function to construct the optimization model makes the model obtain strong sample sparsity. The proximal stationary point of the optimization problem is defined by the proximal operator of the 0-1 loss function, which figures out the problem of non-convex discontinuity of the optimization problem due to the 0-1 loss function. A new iterative algorithm based on the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) framework is designed to solve the optimization problem, which relates to the working set defined by support vectors. The computational complexity and convergence of the algorithm are discussed. Numerical experiments on 4 artificial datasets and 14 benchmark datasets demonstrate that our QSSVM_{0/1} achieves higher classification accuracy, fewer support vectors and less CPU time cost than other state-of-the-art methods.

Index Terms—kernel-free, 0-1 loss function, quadratic hyper-surface, support vector.

I. INTRODUCTION

SUPPORT vector machine (SVM) is one of the most popular and crucial machine learning methods based on the statistical learning theory and structural risk minimization principle. It was initially proposed by [1]. Since then, SVMs have been extensively studied and successfully applied in various domains, including text categorization [2], pattern recognition [3], image processing [4], and biomedical [5], etc.

For a given binary classification problem, SVM [1] aims to obtain a hyperplane to separate samples into two classes by solving a convex quadratic programming problem. As a key element in machine learning, the loss function is a non-negative real valued function used to constrain and guide model optimization. To enhance the performance of the model, various loss functions have been used in SVM-type methods. These methods include the least squares support vector machine [6], [7] (LSSVM), SVM with pinball loss [8], [9] (PSVM), SVM with ramp soft-margin loss [10]–[12] (RSVM), and SVM with non-convex robust and smooth soft-margin loss [13] (RSHSVM), etc. However these existing soft-margin SVMs based on other loss functions can be viewed as substitutes for the 0-1 loss SVM. Although the 0-1 loss function is an ideal

loss function, its application is limited, since it is discontinuous and non-convex. Recently, [14] proposed a SVM classifier via 0-1 soft-margin loss (SVM_{0/1}). Although the optimization problem is NP-hard problem [15], research shows that it can be solved directly. And by using the 0-1 loss function it can achieve strong sparsity and robustness. This drives the development of the 0-1 loss function. However, SVM_{0/1} can only obtain linear decision function and its application has limitations. Then, a nonlinear version [16] was proposed, in which the decision function is generated by a kernel function. It can handle nonlinear data, but may lead to overfitting and lack of interpretability. Additionally, it is challenging to select the appropriate kernel functions and corresponding parameters.

To overcome the above mentioned limitations, [17] developed a quadratic kernel-free nonlinear SVM based on the maximum margin idea, which paved the way for the development of the kernel-free trick. Subsequently, the soft-margin quadratic hyper-surface SVM [18] (SQSSVM) was proposed to improve robustness and classification accuracy. The purpose of SQSSVM is to find a quadratic separating hyper-surface to classify samples into two classes. Following this, [19] proposed the quadratic kernel-free least squares SVM. Furthermore, the kernel-free trick has also been used for semi-supervised [20] and unsupervised [21] learning. [22] proposed the kernel-free quadratic hyper-surface minimax probability machine (QSMMPM) for a binary classification problem. Additional classification methods based on kernel-free trick can be found in the literature [23]–[30]. Moreover, the kernel-free trick has also been applied to regression [31], [32] and clustering [33] problems. Therefore, the kernel-free trick plays a significant role in machine learning.

In this paper, we develop a novel kernel-free quadratic hyper-surface method with 0-1 loss function for the binary classification problem, namely QSSVM_{0/1}. It is constructed based on the kernel-free trick and inherits the advantages of 0-1 loss function. Specifically, the main contributions of this paper are as follows.

- QSSVM_{0/1} is proposed by utilizing the kernel-free trick, it avoids the difficulty of selecting kernel functions and corresponding parameters. It has better interpretability than the methods using kernel functions, since each feature of the sample acts both independently and synergistically.
- The 0-1 loss function is introduced to build the optimization problem to obtain better sample sparsity. By using the proximal operator of the 0-1 loss function to define the P-stationary point of the optimization problem, the non-convex discontinuity of the optimization problem due to

Mingyang Wu, Zhixia Yang and Junyou Ye are with the College of Mathematics and System Science, Xinjiang University, Urumqi 830046, China, (email:wmyang068@163.com; yangzhx@xju.edu.cn; yejymath@163.com).

*Corresponding author.

the 0-1 loss function is solved.

- The support vectors are defined, and all support vectors fall on the support hyper-surfaces. Additionally, the relationship between the optimal solution to the optimization problem and proximal stationary point is discussed. Under certain conditions, the proximal stationary point is the optimal solution.
- A working set is defined based on the information of the proximal operator of the 0-1 loss function. An iterative algorithm for solving the optimization problem of QSSVM_{0/1} is given on the working set. In addition, the complexity and convergence of the algorithm are explored.
- Numerical experiments are performed on 4 artificial datasets and 14 benchmark datasets. The experimental results show that our QSSVM_{0/1} has higher classification accuracy and fewer support vectors than most methods. Moreover, the computational speed of our QSSVM_{0/1} is fast.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II describes some symbols and reviews some related work for binary classification. Section III presents our binary classification method, QSSVM_{0/1}. Numerical experiments on the artificial datasets and benchmark datasets are shown in section IV. Section V concludes the paper.

II. RELATED WORK

In this section, we start with some notations and definitions, briefly introduce two classifying methods, SVM_{0/1} and SQSSVM.

A. Symbol description

Through this article, we use lower case letters to represent scalars, bold lower case letters to represent vectors, and bold upper case letters to represent matrices. \mathbb{R} denotes the set of real numbers, \mathbb{R}^n represents the n -dimensional real space, \mathbb{S}^n represents the $n \times n$ dimensional real symmetric matrix. For convenience, some operators are defined as follows.

Definition 1. *The half-vectorization operator of any symmetric matrix $\mathbf{W} = [w_{ij}]_{n \times n} \in \mathbb{S}^n$ is defined as*

$$\text{hvec}(\mathbf{W}) \triangleq [w_{11}, w_{12}, \dots, w_{1n}, w_{22}, \dots, w_{2n}, \dots, w_{nn}]^\top, \quad (1)$$

where $\text{hvec}(\mathbf{W}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{n^2+n}{2}}$.

Definition 2. *The matrix operator of any vector $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as*

$$\text{Mat}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \dots & x_n & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & x_1 & \dots & 0 & x_2 & \dots & x_n & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & x_1 & 0 & \dots & x_2 & \dots & x_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

where $\text{Mat}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \frac{n^2+n}{2}}$.

Definition 3. *The quadratic mapping operator of any vector $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as*

$$\text{qvec}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq [\frac{1}{2}x_1^2, x_1x_2, \dots, x_1x_n, \frac{1}{2}x_2^2, \dots, x_2x_n, \dots, \frac{1}{2}x_n^2]^\top, \quad (3)$$

where $\text{qvec}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{n^2+n}{2}}$.

B. SVM_{0/1}

SVM_{0/1} [14] is a variant of SVM based on the 0-1 loss function. Specifically, for a given training set

$$T = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)_{i=1, \dots, N} \mid \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, y_i \in \{-1, 1\}\}, \quad (4)$$

where N is the number of samples, $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ indicates the i -th training sample in the n -dimensional space, y_i is the label of sample \mathbf{x}_i . The task of SVM_{0/1} is to find the following hyperplane

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x} + b = 0, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Based on the idea of maximum margin and by introducing the 0-1 loss function, the optimization problem is constructed as follows

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}, b} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_{0/1}(1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i)), \quad (6)$$

where $\ell_{0/1}(\cdot)$ is the 0-1 loss function, its specific form is

$$\ell_{0/1}(1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i)) = \begin{cases} 1, & (1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i)) > 0, \\ 0, & (1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i)) \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

and $C > 0$ is a penalty parameter.

After acquiring the solution (\mathbf{w}^*, b^*) to the optimization problem (6), for a new sample $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, its label is either assigned to $+1$ or -1 , by the following decision rule

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \text{sign}(\mathbf{w}^{*\top} \mathbf{x} + b^*). \quad (8)$$

The optimization problem (6) can be rewritten as an equivalent problem with equality constraint, a fast alternating direction method of multipliers is introduced to solve it. Moreover, the computational complexity of SVM_{0/1} is low.

C. SQSSVM

For the training set T (4), the purpose of SQSSVM [18] is to solve the following optimization problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}, b, c, \boldsymbol{\xi}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y_i (\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{x}_i + c) \geq 1 - \xi_i, \\ & \xi_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $C > 0$ is a penalty parameter, $\boldsymbol{\xi} = [\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_N]^\top$ is a non-negative slack vector.

The optimization problem (9) is a convex quadratic programming problem. Both the primal problem and dual problem of SQSSVM can be solved, because they do not involve kernel function.

III. QSSVM_{0/1}

In this section, a binary classification method is presented, namely QSSVM_{0/1}. Then, a fast algorithm and some theoretical characters are proposed for it.

A. The optimization model of QSSVM_{0/1}

For the given training set T (4), we try to find a quadratic separating hyper-surface

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{x} + c = 0, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{S}^n$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Based on the 0-1 loss function and kernel-free trick, the optimization problem is constructed as follows

$$\min_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{b}, c} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_{0/1}(1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i)), \quad (11)$$

where $f(\mathbf{x}_i) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{x}_i + c = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $C > 0$ is a penalty parameter. The 0-1 loss function $\ell_{0/1}(\cdot)$ is defined in the equation (7). Fig. 1 shows the geometric




Fig. 1: The 0-1 loss function and hinge loss function

interpretability of 0-1 loss function and hinge loss function. They have loss values of 0, when the samples are divided exactly correctly, but behave differently when samples are divided incorrectly or fall within the margin. To be more specific, the loss values of these samples are always 1 for the 0-1 loss function, but increase with the increase of $1 - yf(\mathbf{x})$ for hinge loss function. Thus, the 0-1 loss function may be more robust compared to the hinge loss function.

In the optimization problem (11), the first term of the objective function aims to maximize the sum of relative geometrical margin between all samples and the quadratic hyper-surface, the second term of the objective function is the 0-1 loss function. Let $u_i = 1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i)$, then the optimization problem can be written in the form with the equality constraints,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{b}, c, \mathbf{u}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_{0/1}(u_i), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & u_i + y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i) = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{u} = [u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Using the symmetry of matrix \mathbf{W} , let $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \text{hvec}(\mathbf{W})$ defined by the Definition 1, then the above optimization problem can be transformed into the following equivalent form,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{b}, c, \mathbf{u}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 + C \|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{b} + c \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{1}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{M}_i = \text{Mat}(\mathbf{x}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \frac{n^2+n}{2}}$ defined by the Definition 2, $\mathbf{u}_+ = [(u_1)_+, (u_2)_+, \dots, (u_N)_+]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $(u_i)_+ = \max\{u_i, 0\}$, $\mathbf{1} = [1, 1, \dots, 1]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\mathbf{A} = [y_1 \mathbf{s}_1, y_2 \mathbf{s}_2, \dots, y_N \mathbf{s}_N]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times \frac{n^2+n}{2}}$, $\mathbf{B} = [y_1 \mathbf{x}_1, y_2 \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, y_N \mathbf{x}_N]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$, $\mathbf{s}_i \triangleq \text{qvec}(\mathbf{x}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{n^2+n}{2}}$ defined by the Definition 3 and $i = 1, \dots, N$.

B. Optimization algorithm

In this subsection, a fast algorithm is designed for the optimization problem (13), which is executed under the ADMM algorithm framework. However, the 0-1 loss function is not differentiable, the P-stationary point of the optimization problem is defined by using the proximal operator of the 0-1 loss function. In this way, the non-convex discontinuity of the optimization problem due to the 0-1 loss function is solved.

1) **First order optimality condition:** The optimality condition plays a crucial role in solving optimization problem. Next, we propose the proximal stationary point for the optimization problem (13) and analyze the relationship between it and local/global minimizer.

Now, by introducing a Lagrangian multiplier vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, the Lagrange function of the optimization problem (13) can be expressed as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} L(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}; c; \mathbf{u}; \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 + C \|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0 \\ & + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{b} + c \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{1}). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

For vector $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$, \mathbf{b} , scalar c , and vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, the following equations can be obtained:

$$\nabla_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}} L = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{M}_i^\top (\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \quad (15)$$

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{b}} L = \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{B}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \quad (16)$$

$$\nabla_c L = \mathbf{y}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \quad (17)$$

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} L = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{b} + c \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{1}, \quad (18)$$

Since the $\|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0 := \ell_{0/1}(\mathbf{u})$, the gradient of \mathbf{u} in the Lagrangian function cannot be calculated. Then we obtain the following equation

$$\text{prox}_{\gamma C \|\cdot\|_0}(\mathbf{u} - \gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \mathbf{u}, \quad (19)$$

where

$$[\text{prox}_{\gamma C \|\cdot\|_0}(\mathbf{v})]_i = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 < v_i \leq \sqrt{2\gamma C}, \\ v_i, & v_i > \sqrt{2\gamma C} \text{ or } v_i \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

and $\mathbf{v} := \mathbf{u} - \gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$. Formula (20) is the proximal operator of 0-1 loss function [14]. According to the above derivation process, the following definition can be obtained:

Definition 4. For a given $C > 0$, we say $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; c^*; \mathbf{u}^*)$ is a proximal stationary (P-stationary) point of the optimization problem (13), if there exists a Lagrangian multiplier vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and a constant $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{M}_i^\top (\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{0}, \quad (21)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*) + \mathbf{B}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{0}, \quad (22)$$

$$\mathbf{y}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = 0, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^* + \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{b}^* + c \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (24)$$

$$\text{prox}_{\gamma C \|\cdot\|_0}(\mathbf{u}^* - \gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*) = \mathbf{u}^*, \quad (25)$$

Further exploration shows that the P-stationary point is closely related to the local or global minimizer of the optimization problem (13). Let

$$\mathbf{D} := [\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{y}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (\frac{n^2+n}{2} + n + 1)}, \quad (26)$$

$$\mathbf{E}_i := [\mathbf{M}_i \mathbf{I}_n \mathbf{0}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (\frac{n^2+n}{2} + n + 1)}, \quad (27)$$

$$\mathbf{H}_i := \mathbf{E}_i \mathbf{D}^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}, \quad (28)$$

$$\mathbf{H} := \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{H}_i^\top \mathbf{H}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, \quad (29)$$

where the matrix $\mathbf{D}^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{(\frac{n^2+n}{2} + n + 1) \times N}$ is the generalized inverse of matrix \mathbf{D} , $i = 1, \dots, N$. Then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1. There are the following relationships in optimization problem (13),

(1) For a given $C > 0$, if \mathbf{D} is a full column rank matrix, such that the globally optimal solution is a P-stationary point with $0 < \gamma < \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{H})$.

(2) For a given $C > 0$, if $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; c^*; \mathbf{u}^*)$ is a P-stationary point with $\gamma > 0$, which is also a locally optimal solution.

The above Theorem 1 summarizes the optimality conditions of QSSVM_{0/1}, and its proof is shown in A.1.

2) **Support vectors of QSSVM_{0/1}:** Inspired by the significant role of support vectors in the training process, the support vectors of QSSVM_{0/1} are defined as follows.

Definition 5. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = (\lambda_1^*, \lambda_2^*, \dots, \lambda_N^*)$ is a Lagrangian multiplier vector of QSSVM_{0/1}, the input vector \mathbf{x}_i of the training sample (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) is called a support vector, if the corresponding component λ_i^* of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$ is nonzero, and otherwise it is a nonsupport vector.

The support vectors of QSSVM_{0/1} are derived as follows.

Firstly, let $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; c^*; \mathbf{u}^*)$ be a P-stationary point, thus it is a local minimizer of the optimization problem (13). According to the range of values of the variables in the formula (20), let

$$T_* := \{i \in \mathbb{N}_N : u_i^* - \gamma \lambda_i^* \in (0, \sqrt{2\gamma C}]\}, \quad (30)$$

and $\bar{T}_* := \mathbb{N}_N \setminus T_*$ be a complement of T_* . So, the formula (25) can be represented as

$$\begin{bmatrix} (\text{prox}_{\gamma C \|\cdot\|_0}(\mathbf{u}^* - \gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*))_{T_*} \\ (\text{prox}_{\gamma C \|\cdot\|_0}(\mathbf{u}^* - \gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*))_{\bar{T}_*} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{T_*} \\ (\mathbf{u}^* - \gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)_{\bar{T}_*} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

From this, we can obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_{T_*}^* \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\bar{T}_*}^* \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (32)$$

Due to that $u_i^* = 0$ in the index set T_* , and $\lambda_i^* = 0$ in the index set \bar{T}_* , the value of λ_i^* is

$$\lambda_i^* \begin{cases} \in [-\sqrt{2C/\gamma}, 0), & i \in T_*, \\ = 0, & i \in \bar{T}_*. \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

Secondly, put the formula (33) into (21) and (22), then the solution to the optimization problem (13) with respect to $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*)$ is indicated as

$$\begin{aligned} [\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*] &= -\left(\sum_{i=1}^N [\mathbf{M}_i, \mathbf{I}_n]^\top [\mathbf{M}_i, \mathbf{I}_n]\right)^{-1} [\mathbf{A}_{T_*}, \mathbf{B}_{T_*}]^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{T_*}^* \\ &= -\sum_{i \in T_*} \lambda_i^* y_i \mathbf{G}^{-1} [\mathbf{s}_i^\top, \mathbf{x}_i^\top]^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where $\mathbf{G} = \sum_{i=1}^N [\mathbf{M}_i, \mathbf{I}_n]^\top [\mathbf{M}_i, \mathbf{I}_n]$. Taking $\mathbf{u}_{T_*}^* = \mathbf{0}$ into the formula (24) to obtain

$$(\mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{b}^* + c^* \mathbf{y})_{T_*} = \mathbf{1}, \quad (35)$$

namely,

$$\mathbf{s}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^{*\top} \mathbf{x}_i + c^* = \pm 1, \quad (i \in T_*). \quad (36)$$

The above equation is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{b}^{*\top} \mathbf{x}_i + c^* = \pm 1, \quad (i \in T_*). \quad (37)$$

In fact, the Lagrangian multiplier $-\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$ is a solution to the dual problem of the optimization problem (13). Moreover, $\{\mathbf{x}_i, i \in T_*\}$ are standard support vectors (SVs), which are selected by the formula (31). More importantly, the formula (37) shows that all SVs fall on the support hyper-surfaces. This indicates that the SVs arrange orderly and may also lead to sparsity in the model.

3) **ADMM algorithm of QSSVM_{0/1}:** In order to solve the optimization problem (13), a new iterative algorithm based on ADMM algorithm framework is proposed.

The augmented Lagrangian function of the optimization problem (13) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L_\sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}; c; \mathbf{u}; \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 + C \|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0 \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{b} + c \mathbf{y}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{b} + c \mathbf{y}\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where λ is a Lagrangian multiplier vector, $\sigma > 0$ is a penalty parameter. Given the k -th iteration $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k; c^k; \mathbf{u}^k; \lambda^k)$, the solution framework is as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}^{k+1} &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} L_{\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k; c^k; \mathbf{u}; \lambda^k), \\ [\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1}; \mathbf{b}^{k+1}] &= \arg \min_{[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}]} L_{\sigma}([\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}]; c^k; \mathbf{u}^{k+1}; \lambda^k) \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}] - [\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k]\|_{D_k}^2, \\ c^{k+1} &= \arg \min_c L_{\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1}; \mathbf{b}^{k+1}; c; \mathbf{u}^{k+1}; \lambda^k), \\ \lambda^{k+1} &= \lambda^k + \eta\sigma(\mathbf{u}^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^{k+1} + c^{k+1}\mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where $\eta > 0$ is known as the dual step-size. The proximal term with respect to $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ and \mathbf{b} is

$$\begin{aligned} &\|[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}] - [\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k]\|_{D_k}^2 \\ &= \langle [\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}] - [\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k], D_k([\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}] - [\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k]) \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where D_k is a symmetric matrix. Each subproblem in the formula (39) is updated as follows.

step1. Updating \mathbf{u}^{k+1} :

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{u}^{k+1} \\ &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} C\|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0 + \lambda^{k\top} \mathbf{u} \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^k + c^k\mathbf{y}\|^2 \\ &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} C\|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0 + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}^k\|^2 \\ &= \text{prox}_{\frac{1}{\sigma}C\|\cdot\|_0}(\mathbf{v}^k). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where the third equation is derived from the Definition 3.2 [14] with $\sigma = 1/\gamma$, and $\mathbf{v}^k := \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^k - c^k\mathbf{y} - \lambda^k/\sigma$. According to \mathbf{v}^k , define a working set

$$T_k = \{i \in \mathbb{N}_N : v_i^k \in (0, \sqrt{2C/\sigma})\}, \quad (42)$$

and its complement $\bar{T}_k := \mathbb{N}_N \setminus T_k$, we have

$$\mathbf{u}_{T_k}^{k+1} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{u}_{\bar{T}_k}^{k+1} = \mathbf{v}_{\bar{T}_k}^k. \quad (43)$$

step2. Updating $[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1}; \mathbf{b}^{k+1}]$: the subproblem with respect to $[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}]$ in the formula (39) is

$$\begin{aligned} [\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1}; \mathbf{b}^{k+1}] &= \arg \min_{[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}]} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|[M_i \mathbf{I}_n][\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}]\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \lambda^{k\top} [\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}][\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}] + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}] - [\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k]\|_{D_k}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|\mathbf{u}^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} + [\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}][\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}] + c^k\mathbf{y}\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where $D_k = -[\mathbf{A}_{\bar{T}_k} \mathbf{B}_{\bar{T}_k}]^{\top} [\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]$. Setting the gradient of $L_{\sigma}([\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}])$ with respect to $[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}]$ to be zero, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^N [M_i \mathbf{I}_n]^{\top} [M_i \mathbf{I}_n][\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}] + [\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}]^{\top} \lambda^k \\ &+ \sigma [\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}]^{\top} (\mathbf{u}^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} + [\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}][\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}] + c^k\mathbf{y}) \\ &- \sigma [\mathbf{A}_{\bar{T}_k} \mathbf{B}_{\bar{T}_k}]^{\top} [\mathbf{A}_{\bar{T}_k} \mathbf{B}_{\bar{T}_k}][\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}] - [\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k] = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} &[\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]^{\top} [\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}] \\ &= [\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}]^{\top} [\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}] - [\mathbf{A}_{\bar{T}_k} \mathbf{B}_{\bar{T}_k}]^{\top} [\mathbf{A}_{\bar{T}_k} \mathbf{B}_{\bar{T}_k}], \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

it is equivalent to find a solution to the linear system of equations

$$(\mathbf{G} + \sigma[\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]^{\top} [\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}])[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}] = \sigma[\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]^{\top} \mathbf{d}^k, \quad (47)$$

where $\mathbf{G} = \sum_{i=1}^N [M_i \mathbf{I}_n]^{\top} [M_i \mathbf{I}_n]$, $\mathbf{d}^k := -(\mathbf{u}^{k+1} + c^k\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{1} + \lambda^k/\sigma)$.

Then $[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1}; \mathbf{b}^{k+1}]$ can be updated in the following ways,

- if $(n^2 + 3n)/2 \leq |T_k|$, the linear system of equations (47) can be directly solved by

$$\begin{aligned} &[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1}; \mathbf{b}] \\ &= (\mathbf{G} + \sigma[\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]^{\top} [\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}])^{-1} (\sigma[\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]^{\top} \mathbf{d}_{T_k}^k). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

- if $(n^2 + 3n)/2 > |T_k|$, the conjugate gradient (CG) method is used to solve the linear system of equations (47) for efficiency.

step3. Updating c^{k+1} : the subproblem with respect to c in the formula (39) is

$$c^{k+1} = \arg \min_c \lambda^{k\top} c\mathbf{y} + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|\mathbf{u}^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^{k+1} + c\mathbf{y}\|^2. \quad (49)$$

Setting the derivation of $L_{\sigma}(c)$ with respect to c to be zero, we have

$$\mathbf{y}^{\top} \lambda^k + \sigma \mathbf{y}^{\top} (\mathbf{u}^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^{k+1} + c\mathbf{y}) = 0. \quad (50)$$

Then c^{k+1} can be updated by

$$c^{k+1} = -\mathbf{y}^{\top} (\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{u}^{k+1} + \lambda^k/\sigma)/N. \quad (51)$$

step4. Updating λ^{k+1} :

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{T_k}^{k+1} &= \lambda_{T_k}^k + \eta\sigma(\mathbf{u}^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^{k+1} + c^{k+1}\mathbf{y}), \\ \lambda_{\bar{T}_k}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Steps 1-4 lead to Algorithm 1 for solving the optimization problem (13).

Algorithm 1 ADMM Algorithm

Input: Training set T (4), parameters C , σ and η , M_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, the maximum number of iteration steps K .

Output: The final solution $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k, \mathbf{b}^k, c^k, \mathbf{u}^k, \lambda^k)$ to the optimization problem (13).

Initialize $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^0; \mathbf{b}^0; c^0; \mathbf{u}^0; \lambda^0)$, set $k = 0$.

while The halting condition does not hold and $k \leq K$ **do**

 Update T_k as in (42).

 Update \mathbf{u}^{k+1} by formula (43).

if $(n^2 + 3n)/2 \leq |T_k|$ **then**

 Update $[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1}; \mathbf{b}^{k+1}]$ by formula (48).

else

 Update $[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1}; \mathbf{b}^{k+1}]$ by the CG method.

end if

 Update c^{k+1} by formula (51).

 Update λ^{k+1} by formula (52).

 set $k = k + 1$.

end while

C. The interpretability

After obtaining the solution to the optimization problem (13) with respect to $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{b}, c)$, the half-vectorization operator defined by Definition 1 can be used to invert the symmetric matrix \mathbf{W}^* . Consequently, for a unlabeled sample $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, its label is determined by the following decision rule

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^{*\top} \mathbf{x} + c^*\right). \quad (53)$$

Suppose that $(\mathbf{W}^*, \mathbf{b}^*, c^*)$ in formula (53) is the optimal solution to optimization problem (11), then the quadratic hyper-surface (10) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^{*\top} \mathbf{x} + c^* \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij}^* x_i x_j + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^* x_i + c^* \\ &= 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where x_i is the i -th component of the vector \mathbf{x} , w_{ij}^* is the i -th row and the j -th column component of the matrix $\mathbf{W}^* \in \mathbb{S}^n$, and b_i^* is the i -th component of the vector $\mathbf{b}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Each component of vector \mathbf{x} contributes to the quadratic polynomial function. Specifically speaking, when $i = j$, a larger value of $|w_{ii}^*| + |b_i^*|$ indicates a larger contribution from the i -th component of the vector \mathbf{x} . When $i \neq j$, the i -th and j -th components of the vector \mathbf{x} act synergistically on the quadratic term. Notably, when \mathbf{W}^* is a zero matrix, the quadratic hyper-surface degenerates into a linear hyperplane. Therefore, our QSSVM_{0/1} is more interpretable than methods with kernel functions.

D. Convergence and complexity analysis of QSSVM_{0/1}

Since we propose a kernel-free nonlinear method, it avoids choosing the kernel function and tuning the corresponding parameters. But when the sample dimensions are large, it may take more time than SVM_{0/1}. Nevertheless, it still obtains a convergence theorem of Algorithm 1. Moreover, the complexity of Algorithm 1 is analyzed in this subsection.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; c^*; \mathbf{u}^*; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$ is the limit point of the sequence $\{(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k; c^k; \mathbf{u}^k; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k)\}$ generated by Algorithm 1, then $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; c^*; \mathbf{u}^*)$ is a P-stationary point with $\gamma = 1/\sigma$ and also a locally optimal solution to the optimization problem (13).*

The proof of Theorem 2 is given in A.2. The above Theorem 2 states that if the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 has a limit point, then it is a P-stationary point and a locally optimal solution to optimization problem (13). Since the optimization problems (12) and (13) are equivalent, the following theorem are obtained,

Theorem 3. *Suppose that $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; c^*; \mathbf{u}^*)$ is a P-stationary point of the optimization problem (13), then $(\mathbf{W}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; c^*; \mathbf{u}^*)$ is a P-stationary point of the optimization problem (12).*

The computational complexity of each iteration of Algorithm 1 is analyzed as follows.

- Updating T_k by formula (42) needs the complexity $\mathcal{O}(N)$.
- Updating \mathbf{u}^{k+1} by formula (43), the complexity of its main item $(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^k)$ is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{Nn^2 + 3Nn}{2}\right)$.
- Updating $[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1}; \mathbf{b}^{k+1}]$ by formula (48) if $(n^2 + 3n)/2 \leq |T_k|$ and CG method otherwise. For the former, the main computations from $[\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]^\top [\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]$, $(\mathbf{G} + \sigma[\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]^\top [\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}])^{-1}$ with the computational complexities $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{n^2 + 3n}{2}\right)^2 |T_k|\right)$ and $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{n^2 + 3n}{2}\right)^\nu\right)$ with $\nu \in (2, 3)$, respectively. For the latter, the computational complexity of calculating $[\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]^\top [\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]$ remains the same as previous, and the computational complexity of the linear system of equations (47) calculated through the CG method is $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{n^2 + 3n}{2}\right)^2 q\right)$, where q is the number of distinct eigenvalues of $(\mathbf{G} + \sigma[\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]^\top [\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}])$.
- As for c^{k+1} , which is updated by the formula (51), the complexity of its main item $(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{k+1} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^{k+1})$ is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{Nn^2 + 3Nn}{2}\right)$.
- Similar to c^{k+1} , updating $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1}$ by the formula (52), its complexity is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{Nn^2 + 3Nn}{2}\right)$.

Therefore, the whole computational complexity of the Algorithm 1 is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{Nn^2 + 3Nn}{2} + \left(\frac{n^2 + 3n}{2}\right)^2 \max\{|T_k|, q\}\right)$.

IV. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, some experiments are used to verify the performance of our QSSVM_{0/1}. It is compared with other state-of-the-art classifiers, including SVM_{0/1} and KSVM_{0/1} using 0-1 loss function, and SVM classifiers with various loss functions, such as the hinge soft-margin loss (SVM), ν SVM [34], [35] with the hinge soft-margin loss (ν SVM), pinball soft-margin loss (PSVM), square soft-margin loss (LSSVM), ramp soft-margin loss (RSVM) and non-convex robust and smooth soft-margin loss (RSHSVM). Three different kernel functions are used, including linear, RBF and polynomial kernel functions. In addition, the QSSVM_{0/1} is also compared with two kernel-free methods, namely SQSSVM and QSPMP.

The penalty parameter C for all methods is chosen from $\{10^{-7}, 10^{-6}, \dots, 10^7\}$, the parameter σ and the kernel parameter p of all involved kernel functions are chosen from $\{(\sqrt{2})^{-7}, (\sqrt{2})^{-6}, \dots, (\sqrt{2})^7\}$, the parameter ν of ν SVM is chosen from $\{0.1, 0.2, \dots, 0.9\}$, the parameter τ_1 of PSVM, the parameter μ of RSVM and the parameter κ of RSHSVM are all selected from the set $\{0.1, 0.5, 0.9\}$. The 10-fold cross-validation technology is used to select the optimal parameters of each method. In addition, all features of each dataset is scaled to $[-1, 1]$ to ensure that the features have similar scales. The number of maximum iterations $K = 10^3$, parameter $\eta = 1.618$. Numerical experiments were run on a laptop with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-5200 CPU @ 2.20GHz and 8GB RAM.




Fig. 2: Classification results on Example 1 and Example 1 with label noises or outliers

The P-stationary point is considered as a stopping criterion in the experiments, according to Theorem 1. We stop the algorithm when the point $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k; c^k; \mathbf{u}^k; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k)$ closely satisfies the conditions in formulas (21)-(25), namely,

$$\max\{\theta_1^k, \theta_2^k, \theta_3^k, \theta_4^k\} < \tau, \quad (55)$$

where τ represents the tolerance level, and the $\tau = 10^{-3}$ is set in the experiments. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1^k &:= \frac{\|\mathbf{G}[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k] + [\mathbf{A}_{T_k} \mathbf{B}_{T_k}]^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{T_k}^k\|}{1 + \|[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k; \mathbf{b}^k]\|}, \\ \theta_2^k &:= \frac{|\langle \mathbf{y}_{T_k}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{T_k}^k \rangle|}{1 + |T_k|}, \\ \theta_3^k &:= \frac{\|\mathbf{u}^k - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^k + c^k \mathbf{y}\|}{\sqrt{N}}, \\ \theta_4^k &:= \frac{\|\mathbf{u}^k - \text{prox}_{\gamma C_{\|\cdot\|_0}}(\mathbf{u}^k - \gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k)\|}{1 + \|\mathbf{u}^k\|}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

The numerical experiments are conducted on 4 artificial datasets and 14 benchmark datasets. For the experiments on artificial datasets, the visualization results are presented, the accuracy (ACC) and the number of SVs (NSV) are used to evaluate our QSSVM_{0/1}. For the experiments on benchmark datasets, the 10-fold cross-validation is repeated 10 times of each compared method, the mean value of ACC (mACC), the mean number of SVs (mNSV), and the CPU time are recorded.

A. Artificial datasets

In this subsection, the robustness, sample sparsity and effectiveness of our QSSVM_{0/1} are explored. Four artificial datasets are constructed in two-dimensional space, which are Example 1, Example 2, Example 3 and Example 4, respectively. Each artificial dataset consists of 300 training samples with 2-dimensional features. During the processes of drawing plot, the bold red “*”, blue “o”, green “o”, and bold black curve represent +1 class samples, -1 class samples, SVs, and hyperplanes or quadratic hyper-surfaces, respectively. The value of ACC or NSV is marked in each figure. Label noises or outliers are highlighted in magenta rectangular boxes.

Fig. 2 shows the visualization results of our QSSVM_{0/1} on original Example 1 and the Example 1 with label noises or outliers. It can be observed that the QSSVM_{0/1} is robust no matter adding label noises or some outliers.

The classification results of SVM_{0/1}, KSVM_{0/1}, SQSSVM, and QSSVM_{0/1} on the Example 1 are shown in Fig. 3.

The values of ACC of all methods are 1, and the smooth quadratic hyper-surface obtained by QSSVM_{0/1} approaches a straight line, but the hyper-surface obtained by KSVM_{0/1} is not smooth. In addition, our QSSVM_{0/1} has the lowest NSV.

Fig. 4 reveals the classification results of the SVM_{0/1}, KSVM_{0/1}, SQSSVM, and QSSVM_{0/1} on the Example 2. It is obvious that the ACC value of our QSSVM_{0/1} is higher than that of SVM_{0/1} and KSVM_{0/1}. The NSV of our QSSVM_{0/1} is fewest. Furthermore, the smooth quadratic hyper-surface of QSSVM_{0/1} is a parabola, but the hyper-surface of KSVM_{0/1} is overfitting.

The classification results of SVM_{0/1}, KSVM_{0/1}, SQSSVM, and QSSVM_{0/1} on the Example 3 are displayed in Fig. 5. It can be seen from Fig. 5 that the ACC values of QSSVM_{0/1}, KSVM_{0/1} and SQSSVM are all 1, and superior than that of SVM_{0/1}. Meanwhile, our QSSVM_{0/1} has sample sparsity, because it has fewer SVs. Moreover, a circle as the separating hyper-surface is obtained by our QSSVM_{0/1}, and it is smooth.

The classification results of SVM_{0/1}, KSVM_{0/1}, SQSSVM, and QSSVM_{0/1} on the Example 4 are shown in Fig. 6. It can be seen that the value of ACC of our QSSVM_{0/1} is better than that of the other methods. And QSSVM_{0/1} has an advantage over KSVM_{0/1} in terms of NSV. In addition, a hyperbola is obtained by QSSVM_{0/1} to separate samples, but the hyper-surface of KSVM_{0/1} is not smooth.

Overall, a flexible separating hyper-surface can be obtained by our QSSVM_{0/1}, such as the line, parabola, circle and hyperbola displayed in the above numerical experiments. Furthermore it has higher values of ACC and fewer SVs, so it has better effectiveness and sample sparsity on artificial datasets.

B. Benchmark datasets

In addition to experiments on artificial datasets, QSSVM_{0/1} is also compared with other methods on 14 benchmark datasets. The evaluation criteria mACC, mNSV and CPU time are used to verify the effectiveness, sample sparsity and efficiency of our method. Table I provides a basic introduction to the 14 benchmark datasets. It is sorted based on the number of samples.

1) **Comparing with 0-1 loss function methods:** On 14 benchmark datasets, our QSSVM_{0/1} is compared to 2 methods with 0-1 loss function, which are SVM_{0/1} and KSVM_{0/1}. The experimental results are represented in Table II, and the optimal results are shown in bold.




Fig. 3: The classification results on Example 1




Fig. 4: The classification results on Example 2




Fig. 5: The classification results on Example 3




Fig. 6: The classification results on Example 4

From Table II, it can be concluded that the mACC of our $QSSVM_{0/1}$ outperforms that of the other two methods on the 12 benchmark datasets. Meanwhile its value of mNSV is fewer than that of the other methods on most datasets, such as on the Glass, Heart-c, Bupa, Pima, Abalone and Waveform datasets, respectively. As for CPU time, our $QSSVM_{0/1}$ costs less time than $KSVM_{0/1}$ on most datasets.

2) **Comparing with other methods:** Next, we compare our $QSSVM_{0/1}$ with SVM variants using different loss functions, including the $SVM_{L/R/P}$, $\nu SVM_{L/R/P}$, $PSVM_{L/R/P}$, $LSSVM_{L/R/P}$, $RSVM_R$ and $RHSVM_R$. Here the subscripts L, R, P represent linear, RBF and polynomial kernel func-

tions, respectively. Additionally, the kernel-free classification methods SQSSVM and QSPM are used to compare with our $QSSVM_{0/1}$.

The numerical experimental results are displayed in Table III-Table VI. The symbol “—” indicates that the classifier does not possess the corresponding evaluation criterion, while “—” denotes that the respective method fails to produce classification results due to computational time limitations or insufficient memory. The optimal results are highlighted in bold.

Table III and Table IV present the results of the comparison results between $QSSVM_{0/1}$ and 16 other methods with respect

TABLE I: A basic information to 14 benchmark datasets

Datasets(Abbreviations)	Samples	Features	Classes
Caesarian(Cae)	80	5	2
Tae(Tae)	151	5	2
Glass(Gla)	214	9	2
Heart-c(Hea)	303	14	2
Bupa(Bup)	345	6	2
Australian(Aus)	690	14	2
Pima(Pim)	768	8	2
Banknote(Ban)	1372	4	2
Yeast(Yea)	1484	8	2
Winequality(Win)	1599	11	6
Wireless(Wir)	2000	7	4
Abalone(Aba)	2649	8	2
Waveform(Wav)	5000	21	3
Twonorm(Two)	7400	20	2

to the evaluation criterion mACC. From the results of these two tables, it can be concluded that our QSSVM_{0/1} has higher accuracy than that of other methods on most datasets. This demonstrates its effectiveness in solving classification problems.

The results of the 17 methods with respect to the mNSV evaluation criterion are illustrated in Table V and Table VI. By comparison, it is found that our QSSVM_{0/1} achieves the minimum value in terms of the mNSV on 6 datasets, which verifies the sample sparsity of our QSSVM_{0/1}.




Fig. 7: Three mean values of CPU time

Fig. 7 shows a line graph of the mean CPU time for each classifier. The labels “m1”, “m2”, and “m3” represent the mean CPU time on the former 7 small-scale datasets, the latter 7 large-scale datasets, and all datasets, respectively. It is worth noting that these three lines exhibit similar trends. Specifically, on the 7 small-scale datasets, the mean CPU time spent by our QSSVM_{0/1} is higher than that of the 5 methods, but lower than that of the other methods. On the 7 large-scale datasets, the mean CPU time spent by our QSSVM_{0/1} is higher than that of QSMPM and lower than that of the other methods. Across all datasets, our QSSVM_{0/1} spends a lower mean CPU time than that of the 15 methods. Overall, our

QSSVM_{0/1} achieves superior computational efficiency with less mean CPU time compared to most other methods.

In summary, the numerical experiments on 14 benchmark datasets indicate that our QSSVM_{0/1} not only achieves strong sample sparsity, but also obtains high classification accuracy. In addition, the mean CPU time costs of our QSSVM_{0/1} are relatively low. Therefore, our QSSVM_{0/1} is feasible and effective.

C. Parameter analysis

To explore the effects of parameters C and σ on the mean accuracy of our QSSVM_{0/1}, grid plots for 4 benchmark datasets are shown in Fig. 8, including Wireless, Australian, Banknote, Winequality datasets. Fig. 8 illustrates that the value of mACC tends to increase with increasing parameter σ when parameter C is fixed, while mACC is less sensitive to changes in the parameter C when parameter σ is fixed. These findings suggest that there is no need to spend too much time adjusting parameter C , and parameter σ usually takes a larger number.

D. Statistical analysis

In this subsection, Friedman test and post-hoc test are used to compare the performance of our QSSVM_{0/1} with other methods. The results of the Friedman test and post-hoc test for the two evaluation criteria, including mACC and mNSV, are presented in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10, respectively.

For different methods, the Friedman test judges whether the null hypothesis of no significant difference at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ is rejected. Then the post-hoc test is used to find out which methods differed significantly. To be specific, the Nemenyi test is used where the performance of two methods is significantly different if their average ranks over all datasets are larger than critical difference (CD), and the CD can be calculated by the following formula

$$CD = q_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{l(l+1)}{6h}}, \quad (57)$$

where l is the number of methods and h is the number of datasets.

Fig. 9 illustrates the Friedman test and Nemenyi post-hoc test on 14 benchmark datasets for our QSSVM_{0/1} and 2 methods with 0-1 loss function, which are SVM_{0/1} and KSVM_{0/1}. The Friedman test in terms of mACC rejects the null hypothesis, but does not reject the null hypothesis in terms of mNSV. This indicates that these methods have significant difference in mACC, while there is no significant difference in mNSV. For $\alpha = 0.05$, $q_\alpha = 2.3440$. Thus the formula (57) yields $CD = 0.8859$. Where the average ranks of each method are marked along the axis. The axis is turned so that the lowest (best) ranks are to the right. If there is no significant difference in the groups of methods they are connected by a red line. Statistically, our QSSVM_{0/1} has more advantages in terms of mACC than that of SVM_{0/1} and KSVM_{0/1}. For the evaluation criterion mNSV, QSSVM_{0/1} is not significantly different from SVM_{0/1} and KSVM_{0/1}.

The Friedman test and Nemenyi post-hoc test of our QSSVM_{0/1} and 16 other methods on 12 benchmark datasets

TABLE II: The classification results of our QSSVM_{0/1} and SVM_{0/1}, KSSVM_{0/1}

Datasets	mACC(mean±std)			mNSV(mean±std)			CPU time(s)		
	SVM _{0/1}	KSSVM _{0/1}	QSSVM _{0/1}	SVM _{0/1}	KSSVM _{0/1}	QSSVM _{0/1}	SVM _{0/1}	KSSVM _{0/1}	QSSVM _{0/1}
Cae	0.5925±0.0369	0.6425±0.0290	0.6488 ±0.0435	2.6600 ±0.5967	7.8800±0.2530	6.6300±0.4001	1.2667	1.0312	1.1981
Tae	0.7886±0.0186	0.7003±0.0779	0.8140 ±0.0113	10.8200±0.8364	7.0800 ±0.2530	9.5100±1.6031	1.2074	2.2761	1.0374
Gla	0.6250±0.0274	0.6016±0.0360	0.7255 ±0.0354	15.2400±1.5806	18.5100±0.6488	12.8200 ±0.3327	2.4617	5.2416	6.8001
Hea	0.9960±0.0115	0.9993±0.0021	1.0000 ±0.0000	23.5200±2.5459	30.2900±0.0316	22.3000 ±2.0499	1.9765	8.5582	23.2909
Bup	0.6711±0.0126	0.5547±0.0293	0.7043 ±0.0135	23.5600±1.0875	13.9400±0.9879	2.0000 ±0.0000	2.5974	9.9653	6.2541
Aus	0.8584 ±0.0060	0.8386±0.0122	0.8555±0.0027	28.4800±2.9253	21.7500 ±2.3524	35.4700±1.3630	4.4616	41.4978	31.1518
Pim	0.7625 ±0.0050	0.6747±0.0262	0.7467±0.0195	36.1600±1.7469	15.4500±0.9914	14.0000 ±0.0000	3.3384	51.6956	15.1415
Ban	0.9891±0.0018	0.9879±0.0038	0.9929 ±0.0023	10.8200 ±0.6250	108.9300±7.1824	44.9700±12.9220	0.7925	238.8360	6.7174
Yea	0.6815±0.0093	0.6863±0.0085	0.7073 ±0.0072	100.6000±8.5723	14.3600 ±1.3729	117.0700±5.5148	5.6410	217.7618	21.2895
Win	0.7226±0.0201	0.6834±0.0070	0.7236 ±0.0111	122.0600±5.0518	29.3200 ±2.1426	117.2800±5.8260	9.0902	267.3249	36.9722
Wir	0.9908±0.0025	0.9682±0.0134	0.9943 ±0.0013	15.9400 ±2.1767	22.1700±1.4960	108.5500±13.9954	1.8673	369.8753	15.9246
Aba	0.7623±0.0129	0.7221±0.0310	0.8143 ±0.0158	194.1700±16.9173	147.1700±5.4000	55.4100 ±15.8568	8.6815	1246.6851	14.8591
Wav	0.8395±0.0105	0.8746±0.0019	0.8874 ±0.0049	148.5300±4.9878	499.7900±0.1287	119.0000 ±0.0000	11.1868	2663.9963	652.9437
Two	0.9723±0.0137	0.9608±0.0022	0.9732 ±0.0007	99.1000±26.3912	23.8500 ±2.8289	227.5800±4.7719	24.5967	5550.9399	358.1596

TABLE III: mACC classification results (mean±std) on 7 small-scale datasets

Models	Cae	Tae	Gla	Hea	Bup	Aus	Pim
SVM _L	0.6250±0.0156	0.8031±0.0104	0.6590±0.0114	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.6847±0.0124	0.8551±0.0000	0.6511±0.0001
SVM _R	0.6438±0.0259	0.8015±0.0132	0.7619±0.0174	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7022±0.0106	0.8546±0.0031	0.7436±0.0040
SVM _P	0.6388±0.0375	0.8094±0.0161	0.7487±0.0166	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7279 ±0.0085	0.8658±0.0027	0.7720±0.0034
ν SVM _L	0.5750±0.0000	0.8071±0.0000	0.6449±0.0006	0.7976±0.0099	0.5797 ±0.0004	0.8604±0.0045	0.6510±0.0000
ν SVM _R	0.6000±0.0300	0.8104±0.0151	0.8146 ±0.0121	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7001±0.0197	0.8633±0.0042	0.7661±0.0062
ν SVM _P	0.5950±0.0340	0.8140 ±0.0123	0.7490±0.0087	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7272±0.0070	0.8568±0.0015	0.7773 ±0.0026
PSVM _L	0.5988±0.0309	0.8082±0.0007	0.6466±0.0143	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.6771±0.0175	0.8551±0.0000	0.7628±0.0045
PSVM _R	0.6325±0.0237	0.8140 ±0.0197	0.8000±0.0109	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7174±0.0057	0.8586±0.0042	0.7750±0.0042
PSVM _P	0.6250±0.0212	0.8099±0.0149	0.7434±0.0162	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7189±0.0088	0.8662±0.0037	0.7763±0.0028
LSSVM _L	0.6375±0.0228	0.8118±0.0098	0.6329±0.0116	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.6853±0.0072	0.8668 ±0.0043	0.6512±0.0008
LSSVM _R	0.5525±0.0407	0.8139±0.0100	0.7613±0.0152	0.8174±0.0000.71	0.7204±0.0090	0.8559±0.0017	0.7690±0.0038
LSSVM _P	0.5988±0.0314	0.8130±0.0120	0.7668±0.0124	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7262±0.0085	0.8648±0.0033	0.7688±0.0057
RSVM _R	0.6188±0.0340	0.8113±0.0175	0.7240±0.0160	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7003±0.0139	0.8551±0.0051	0.7531±0.0055
RSHSVM _R	0.5750±0.0000	0.8076±0.0005	0.7319±0.0103	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.6961±0.0104	0.8523±0.0042	0.7557±0.0005
SQSSVM	0.5925±0.0369	0.8079±0.0006	0.7324±0.0132	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7206±0.0110	0.8545±0.0017	0.7663±0.0037
QSMMP	0.6025±0.0293	0.6799±0.0189	0.7326±0.0123	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7124±0.0045	0.8565±0.0047	0.7424±0.0062
QSSVM _{0/1}	0.6488 ±0.0435	0.8140 ±0.0113	0.7255±0.0354	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7043±0.0135	0.8555±0.0027	0.7467±0.0195

TABLE IV: mACC classification results (mean±std) on 7 large-scale datasets

Models	Ban	Yea	Win	Wir	Aba	Wav	Two
SVM _L	0.9886±0.0007	0.6880±0.0000	0.7396±0.0028	0.9589±0.0302	0.8015±0.0007	0.8581±0.0010	0.9781 ±0.0003
SVM _R	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.6983±0.0052	0.7817 ±0.0053	0.9901±0.0004	0.8264±0.0039	0.8832±0.0025	—
SVM _P	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7213±0.0055	0.7469±0.0030	0.9926±0.0003	0.8299±0.0016	0.8951±0.0008	—
ν SVM _L	0.6146±0.0601	0.6880±0.0000	0.5347±0.0000	0.7500±0.0000	0.5280±0.0303	0.6686±0.0000	0.8432±0.0469
ν SVM _R	0.9856±0.0017	0.7359±0.0044	0.7461±0.0038	0.9900±0.0003	0.8376 ±0.0021	0.8923±0.0010	—
ν SVM _P	0.9956±0.0000	0.7301±0.0049	0.7516±0.0028	0.9941±0.0004	0.8272±0.0015	0.8918±0.0006	—
PSVM _L	0.9768±0.0017	0.6880±0.0000	0.6555±0.0058	0.9904±0.0005	0.8127±0.0016	0.8487±0.0070	0.9779±0.0003
PSVM _R	0.9993±0.0000	0.7373 ±0.0042	0.7748±0.0038	0.9910±0.0002	0.8374±0.0023	0.8882±0.0013	—
PSVM _P	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.6981±0.0055	0.7464±0.0033	0.9925±0.0004	0.8285±0.0009	0.8933±0.0013	—
LSSVM _L	0.9765±0.0005	0.6761±0.0030	0.7417±0.0022	0.9858±0.0006	0.8015±0.0014	0.8562±0.0013	0.9780±0.0004
LSSVM _R	0.9893±0.0004	0.6898±0.0045	0.7539±0.0021	0.9866±0.0002	0.8367±0.0012	0.8958±0.0010	—
LSSVM _P	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7132±0.0027	0.7472±0.0025	0.9937±0.0003	0.8301±0.0015	0.9001 ±0.0015	—
RSVM _R	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.7057±0.0029	0.7542±0.0025	0.9873±0.0046	0.8009±0.0016	—	—
RSHSVM _R	1.0000 ±0.0000	0.6880±0.0000	0.7123±0.0022	0.9931±0.0005	0.8308±0.0024	—	—
SQSSVM	0.9847±0.0001	0.7206±0.0020	0.7414±0.0035	0.9934±0.0002	0.8292±0.0014	0.8842±0.0023	—
QSMMP	0.9906±0.0013	0.6969±0.0029	0.7472±0.0019	0.9941±0.0006	0.8301±0.0010	0.8826±0.0013	0.9758±0.0003
QSSVM _{0/1}	0.9929±0.0023	0.7073±0.0072	0.7236±0.0111	0.9943 ±0.0013	0.8143±0.0158	0.8874±0.0049	0.9732±0.0007



Fig. 8: The mACC of QSSVM_{0/1} versus the parameters C and σ on 4 benchmark datasets

TABLE V: mNSV classification results (mean \pm std) on 7 small-scale datasets

Models	Cae	Tae	Gla	Hea	Bup	Aus	Pim
SVM _L	5.7900 \pm 0.5724	7.7300 \pm 0.7119	10.2700 \pm 0.5229	22.3900 \pm 0.6297	22.4700 \pm 1.0573	61.6700 \pm 0.7056	66.3400 \pm 2.1614
SVM _R	8.0000 \pm 0.0000	14.8700 \pm 0.1252	18.1500 \pm 0.4552	30.3000 \pm 0.0000	30.7200 \pm 0.5750	69.0000 \pm 0.0000	65.1100 \pm 0.3071
SVM _P	6.9100 \pm 0.2558	6.7600 \pm 0.3438	10.7700 \pm 0.8274	22.9800 \pm 0.3084	20.5600 \pm 0.9131	69.0000 \pm 0.0000	51.5000 \pm 0.6307
ν SVM _L	6.0700 \pm 0.5478	10.9000 \pm 0.0000	21.2300 \pm 0.3622	30.2700 \pm 0.0483	34.5000 \pm 0.0000	66.9900 \pm 0.4433	76.8000 \pm 0.0000
ν SVM _R	7.7000 \pm 0.1247	14.9900 \pm 0.0738	19.1600 \pm 0.3658	30.1800 \pm 0.1135	34.5000 \pm 0.0000	68.9900 \pm 0.0316	76.8000 \pm 0.0000
ν SVM _P	5.9100 \pm 0.3985	7.9800 \pm 0.4826	16.5900 \pm 0.8987	22.3200 \pm 0.4780	27.7800 \pm 0.3706	57.9900 \pm 0.1595	54.5900 \pm 1.8107
PSVM _L	8.0000 \pm 0.0000	15.1000 \pm 0.0000	21.4000 \pm 0.0000	30.3000 \pm 0.0000	34.5000 \pm 0.0000	69.0000 \pm 0.0000	76.8000 \pm 0.0000
PSVM _R	8.0000 \pm 0.0000	15.1000 \pm 0.0000	21.4000 \pm 0.0000	30.3000 \pm 0.0000	34.5000 \pm 0.0000	69.0000 \pm 0.0000	76.8000 \pm 0.0000
PSVM _P	8.0000 \pm 0.0000	15.1000 \pm 0.0000	21.4000 \pm 0.0000	30.3000 \pm 0.0000	34.5000 \pm 0.0000	69.0000 \pm 0.0000	76.8000 \pm 0.0000
LSSVM _L	8.0000 \pm 0.0000	15.1000 \pm 0.0000	21.4000 \pm 0.0000	30.3000 \pm 0.0000	34.5000 \pm 0.0000	69.0000 \pm 0.0000	76.8000 \pm 0.0000
LSSVM _R	8.0000 \pm 0.0000	15.1000 \pm 0.0000	21.4000 \pm 0.0000	30.3000 \pm 0.0000	34.5000 \pm 0.0000	69.0000 \pm 0.0000	76.8000 \pm 0.0000
LSSVM _P	8.0000 \pm 0.0000	15.1000 \pm 0.0000	21.4000 \pm 0.0000	30.3000 \pm 0.0000	34.5000 \pm 0.0000	69.0000 \pm 0.0000	76.8000 \pm 0.0000
RSVM _L	5.8600 \pm 1.0585	11.5000 \pm 0.6912	11.1500 \pm 0.4882	29.9900 \pm 0.1287	18.3600 \pm 0.8922	45.4200 \pm 1.1679	14.9500 \pm 1.6847
RSHSVM _R	7.8400 \pm 0.3373	12.7100 \pm 0.9445	15.5400 \pm 0.4427	25.2300 \pm 0.6075	30.1300 \pm 0.6395	44.6500 \pm 1.0416	62.1000 \pm 1.0934
SQSSVM	6.1700 \pm 0.2830	8.8100 \pm 0.4149	11.1600 \pm 0.5275	26.3600 \pm 0.5661	19.2200 \pm 0.5846	42.0200 \pm 0.7772	44.9300 \pm 0.8642
QSMPPM	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
QSSVM _{0/1}	6.6300 \pm 0.4001	9.5100 \pm 1.6031	12.8200 \pm 0.3327	22.3000 \pm 2.0499	2.0000 \pm 0.0000	35.4700 \pm 1.3630	14.0000 \pm 0.0000

TABLE VI: mNSV classification results (mean \pm std) on 7 large-scale datasets


Models	Ban	Yea	Win	Wir	Aba	Wav	Two
SVM _L	8.8500 \pm 0.1900	148.4000 \pm 0.0000	91.7900 \pm 0.8863	101.4200 \pm 0.2781	254.6600 \pm 2.1578	204.7700 \pm 1.0478	38.5200 \pm 0.9624
SVM _R	42.5200 \pm 0.4662	77.8400 \pm 1.5248	154.0000 \pm 0.4497	111.5200 \pm 0.3824	85.8700 \pm 1.9420	136.7500 \pm 1.6795	—
SVM _P	14.9700 \pm 0.3743	87.2100 \pm 1.1986	86.1200 \pm 1.0250	105.4600 \pm 0.5190	106.8000 \pm 0.8179	308.3100 \pm 1.4255	—
ν SVM _L	65.3700 \pm 5.8867	148.4000 \pm 0.0000	159.9000 \pm 0.0000	194.3400 \pm 6.4032	242.3100 \pm 2.7950	500.0000 \pm 0.0000	668.3600 \pm 0.2171
ν SVM _R	81.6600 \pm 1.6249	131.9800 \pm 1.0675	159.9000 \pm 0.0000	188.3400 \pm 7.9200	264.9000 \pm 0.0000	448.1600 \pm 6.9666	—
ν SVM _P	134.6900 \pm 4.2800	148.4000 \pm 0.0000	150.2400 \pm 4.8484	69.8400 \pm 4.1000	264.9000 \pm 0.0000	263.0600 \pm 1.0113	—
PSVM _L	137.2000 \pm 0.0000	148.4000 \pm 0.0000	159.9000 \pm 0.0000	200.0000 \pm 0.0000	264.9000 \pm 0.0000	500.0000 \pm 0.0000	740.0000 \pm 0.0000
PSVM _R	137.2000 \pm 0.0000	148.4000 \pm 0.0000	159.9000 \pm 0.0000	200.0000 \pm 0.0000	264.9000 \pm 0.0000	500.0000 \pm 0.0000	740.0000 \pm 0.0000
PSVM _P	137.2000 \pm 0.0000	148.4000 \pm 0.0000	159.9000 \pm 0.0000	200.0000 \pm 0.0000	264.9000 \pm 0.0000	500.0000 \pm 0.0000	740.0000 \pm 0.0000
LSSVM _L	137.2000 \pm 0.0000	148.4000 \pm 0.0000	159.9000 \pm 0.0000	200.0000 \pm 0.0000	264.9000 \pm 0.0000	500.0000 \pm 0.0000	740.0000 \pm 0.0000
LSSVM _R	137.2000 \pm 0.0000	148.4000 \pm 0.0000	159.9000 \pm 0.0000	200.0000 \pm 0.0000	264.9000 \pm 0.0000	500.0000 \pm 0.0000	740.0000 \pm 0.0000
LSSVM _P	137.2000 \pm 0.0000	148.4000 \pm 0.0000	159.9000 \pm 0.0000	200.0000 \pm 0.0000	264.9000 \pm 0.0000	500.0000 \pm 0.0000	740.0000 \pm 0.0000
RSVM _R	22.0800 \pm 0.7315	32.3300 \pm 14.4048	42.4200 \pm 1.5433	99.9900 \pm 4.2170	253.1900 \pm 3.4482	—	—
RSHSVM _R	8.7800 \pm 0.3994	141.6300 \pm 0.8447	159.8700 \pm 0.0483	9.2800 \pm 0.3293	92.2200 \pm 2.2330	—	—
SQSSVM	24.9600 \pm 0.3406	96.3200 \pm 7.3837	119.6200 \pm 1.0152	47.9200 \pm 0.3584	107.5600 \pm 1.2545	160.2400 \pm 1.5429	—
QSMPPM	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
QSSVM _{0/1}	44.9700 \pm 12.9220	117.0700 \pm 5.5148	117.2800 \pm 5.8260	108.5500 \pm 13.9954	55.4100 \pm 15.8586	119.0000 \pm 0.0000	227.5800 \pm 4.7719

Fig. 9: The Friedman test and Nemenyi post-hoc test of our QSSVM_{0/1} and SVM_{0/1}, K SVM_{0/1}

(excluding Waveform and Twonorm) are shown in Fig. 10. The Friedman test of the two evaluation criteria, mACC and mNSV, rejects the null hypothesis. Next, the Nemenyi post-hoc test is performed, for $\alpha = 0.05$, we know in terms of the mACC, $q_\alpha = 3.4580$, then the value of $CD = 7.1288$ calculated by formula (57). And in terms of mNSV, $q_\alpha = 3.4260$, the value of $CD = 6.6589$. It is fairly easy to obtain that our QSSVM_{0/1} ranks above average with respect to mACC and at the top with respect to mNSV. Therefore our QSSVM_{0/1} has better effectiveness and sample sparsity.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we develop a nonlinear kernel-free quadratic hyper-surface support vector machine with 0-1 loss function, namely QSSVM_{0/1}. It attempts to utilize a quadratic hyper-surface to divide the samples into two classes. By using the

Fig. 10: The Friedman test and Nemenyi post-hoc test of our QSSVM_{0/1} and other 16 methods

kernel-free trick, it reduces the computational time cost as it avoids choosing kernel functions and corresponding kernel parameters. And it has better interpretability compared to methods that use kernel functions. In addition, by introducing the 0-1 loss function to construct the optimization problem, our model achieves sample sparsity. Furthermore, according to the definitions of the P-stationary point and SVs, a new iterative algorithm based on the framework of the ADMM algorithm is designed to solve the optimization problem. It is worth noting that all SVs fall on the support hyper-surfaces. The relationship between the optimal solution to QSSVM_{0/1} and P-stationary point is analyzed in the theoretical analysis.

Numerical experiments indicate that our QSSVM_{0/1} achieves higher classification accuracy, fewer number of SVs and less CPU time cost compared to most methods.

In the future, to achieve feature selection, the L_1 -norm $\|\cdot\|_1$ sparse regularization items will be added to the method to improve the performance of it. In addition, the 0-1 loss can also be applied to kernel-free soft quartic surface SVM model [24] to achieve better classification performance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.12061071), the Research Innovation Program for postgraduates of Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region (No.XJ2023G019), and the Xinjiang Key Laboratory of Applied Mathematics (No.XJDX1401).

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Cortes and V. Vapnik, "Support-vector networks," *Machine Learning*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 273–297, 1995.
- [2] T. Joachims, "Text categorization with support vector machines: Learning with many relevant features," in *Machine Learning: ECML-98: 10th European Conference on Machine Learning Chemnitz, Germany, April 21–23, 1998 Proceedings*. Springer, 2005, pp. 137–142.
- [3] C. J. Burges, "A tutorial on support vector machines for pattern recognition," *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 121–167, jun 1998.
- [4] S. Ying and H. Qiao, "Lie group method: A new approach to image matching with arbitrary orientations," *International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 245–252, sep 2010.
- [5] X. Chen, R. Harrison, and Y. Zhang, "Genetic fuzzy fusion of svm classifiers for biomedical data," in *2005 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 1, 2005, pp. 654–659.
- [6] J. Suykens and J. Vandewalle, "Least squares support vector machine classifiers," *Neural Processing Letters*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 293–300, 1999.
- [7] D. Marquardt, "An algorithm for least-squared estimation of non linear parameters," *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 431–441, 1963.
- [8] X. Huang, L. Shi, and J. A. Suykens, "Support vector machine classifier with pinball loss," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 984–997, 2013.
- [9] M. Tanveer, A. Sharma, and P. Suganthan, "General twin support vector machine with pinball loss function," *Information Sciences*, vol. 494, pp. 311–327, 2019.
- [10] R. Collobert, F. Sinz, J. Weston, and L. Bottou, "Trading convexity for scalability," in *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2006, pp. 201–208.
- [11] Brooks and J. Paul, "Support vector machines with the ramp loss and the hard margin loss," *Operations Research*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 467–479, 2011.
- [12] L. Wang, H. Jia, and J. Li, "Training robust support vector machine with smooth ramp loss in the primal space," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 71, no. 13–15, pp. 3020–3025, 2008.
- [13] Y. Feng, Y. Yang, X. Huang, S. Mehrkanoon, and J. A. K. Suykens, "Robust support vector machines for classification with nonconvex and smooth losses," *Neural Computation*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 1217–1247, 06 2016.
- [14] H. Wang, Y. Shao, S. Zhou, C. Zhang, and N. Xiu, "Support vector machine classifier via $L_{0/1}$ soft-margin loss," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 44, no. 10, pp. 7253–7265, 2022.
- [15] B. Natarajan, "Sparse approximate solutions to linear systems," *Siam Journal on Computing*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 227–234, 1995.
- [16] J. Liu, L. Huang, Y. Shao, W. Chen, and C. Li, "A nonlinear kernel svm classifier via $L_{0/1}$ soft-margin loss with classification performance," *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 437, p. 115471, 2024.
- [17] I. Dagher, "Quadratic kernel-free non-linear support vector machine," *Journal of Global Optimization*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 15–30, 2008.
- [18] J. Luo, S.-C. Fang, Z. Deng, and X. Guo, "Soft quadratic surface support vector machine for binary classification," *Asia-Pacific Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 1 650 046, 22, 2016.

- [19] Y. Bai, X. Han, T. Chen, and H. Yu, "Quadratic kernel-free least squares support vector machine for target diseases classification," *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 850–870, 2015.
- [20] X. Yan, Y. Bai, S.-C. Fang, and J. Luo, "A kernel-free quadratic surface support vector machine for semi-supervised learning," *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 1001–1011, 2016.
- [21] J. Luo, X. Yan, and Y. Tian, "Unsupervised quadratic surface support vector machine with application to credit risk assessment," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 280, no. 3, pp. 1008–1017, 2020.
- [22] Y. Wang, Z. Yang, and X. Yang, "Kernel-free quadratic surface minimax probability machine for a binary classification problem," *Symmetry*, vol. 13, no. 8, p. 1378, 2021.
- [23] A. Mousavi, Z. Gao, L. Han, and A. Lim, "Quadratic surface support vector machine with l1 norm regularization," *Journal of Industrial and Management Optimization*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 1835–1861, 2022.
- [24] Z. Gao, S.-C. Fang, J. Luo, and N. Medhin, "A kernel-free double well potential support vector machine with applications," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 290, no. 1, pp. 248–262, 2021.
- [25] J. Zhou, Y. Tian, J. Luo, and Q. Zhai, "Novel non-kernel quadratic surface support vector machines based on optimal margin distribution," *Soft Computing*, vol. 26, no. 18, pp. 9215–9227, 2022.
- [26] Q. Gao, Y. Bai, and Y. Zhan, "Quadratic kernel-free least square twin support vector machine for binary classification problems," *Journal of the Operations Research Society of China*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 539–559, 2019.
- [27] Y. Tian, B. Bian, X. Tang, and J. Zhou, "A new non-kernel quadratic surface approach for imbalanced data classification in online credit scoring," *Information Sciences*, vol. 563, pp. 150–165, 2021.
- [28] Y. Tian, Z. Yong, and J. Luo, "A new approach for reject inference in credit scoring using kernel-free fuzzy quadratic surface support vector machines," *Applied Soft Computing*, vol. 73, pp. 96–105, 2018.
- [29] X. Yan, Y. Bai, S.-C. Fang, and J. Luo, "A proximal quadratic surface support vector machine for semi-supervised binary classification," *Soft Computing*, vol. 22, no. 20, p. 6905–6919, oct 2018.
- [30] Y. Tian, M. Sun, Z. Deng, J. Luo, and Y. Li, "A new fuzzy set and nonkernel svm approach for mislabeled binary classification with applications," *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 25, no. 6, p. 1536–1545, dec 2017.
- [31] J. Ye, Z. Yang, M. Ma, Y. Wang, and X. Yang, "ε-kernel-free soft quadratic surface support vector regression," *Information Sciences*, vol. 594, pp. 177–199, 2022.
- [32] Q. Zhai, Y. Tian, and J. Zhou, "Linear twin quadratic surface support vector regression," *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, vol. 2020, pp. 3 238 129, 1–18, 2020.
- [33] J. Luo, Y. Tian, and X. Yan, "Clustering via fuzzy one-class quadratic surface support vector machine," *Soft Computing*, vol. 21, no. 19, pp. 5859–5865, oct 2017.
- [34] B. Gmd and A. Smola, "New support vector algorithms," *Neural Computation*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 1207–1245, 2000.
- [35] N. Deng, Y. Tian, and C. Zhang, *Support Vector Machines: Optimization Based Theory, Algorithms, and Extensions*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2012.
- [36] B. Mordukhovich and N. Nam, "An easy path to convex analysis and applications." *Morgan and Claypool Publishers*, 2014.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A. PROOFS

A.1

Proof. (1) Suppose that the matrix D defined by formula (26) is full of column rank, there exists a generalized inverse matrix D^+ of D . Thus the constraint in optimization problem (13) can be represented as $\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{u} = A\tilde{\mathbf{w}} + B\mathbf{b} + c\mathbf{y} = D(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}; c)$, so $[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \mathbf{b}; c] = D^+(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{u})$. Based on this, the optimization problem (13) can be transformed as a minimizer problem only containing single variable \mathbf{u} ,

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{E}_i D^+(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{1})\|_2^2 + C\|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0, \quad (58)$$

where D, \mathbf{E}_i , are defined by formulas (26) and (27). Suppose \mathbf{u}^* is a globally optimal one to the optimization problem (13),

which is also a globally optimal solution to the optimization problem (58) when the matrix \mathbf{D} is full of column rank. Based on Lemma 3.1 in [16], denoting $L = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{H})$, and

$$g(\mathbf{u}) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_i(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{1})\|_2^2, \quad (59)$$

where \mathbf{H}_i, \mathbf{H} , are defined by the formulas (28) and (29) respectively, then we obtain $\nabla g(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{H}_i^\top \mathbf{H}_i(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{1})$. Therefore, by the Lemma 3.1 in [16] we have

$$\mathbf{u}^* = \text{prox}_{\gamma C\|\cdot\|_0}(\mathbf{u}^* - \gamma \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{1})), \quad (60)$$

for any $0 < \gamma < 1/\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{H})$. Next, let

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* := \nabla g(\mathbf{u}^*) = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{1}), \quad (61)$$

then $\text{prox}_{\gamma C\|\cdot\|_0}(\mathbf{u}^* - \gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*) = \mathbf{u}^*$ is proved.

Next, it follows from formula (61) that

$$\begin{aligned} -\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* &= \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{u}^*) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{H}_i^\top \mathbf{H}_i(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{u}^*) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{H}_i^\top \mathbf{E}_i \mathbf{D}^+(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{u}^*) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{H}_i^\top \mathbf{E}_i[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; \mathbf{c}^*]. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

It suffices to

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathbf{D}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{H}_i^\top \mathbf{E}_i[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; \mathbf{c}^*] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{D}^{+\top} \mathbf{E}_i^\top \mathbf{E}_i[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; \mathbf{c}^*] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}_i^\top \mathbf{E}_i[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; \mathbf{c}^*] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{M}_i^\top (\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*) \\ \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where $\mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{D}^+ = \mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{D} = [\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{y}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (\frac{n^2+n}{2} + n + 1)}$. By the above formulas, the following formulas can be obtained

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{M}_i^\top (\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{0}, \\ \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*) + \mathbf{B}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{y}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = 0. \end{cases}$$

Finally, the above conditions, the formula (60) and the feasibility of $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; \mathbf{c}^*; \mathbf{u}^*)$ lead to formulas (21)-(25). Therefore, the result (1) of Theorem 1 is proved.

(2) Suppose that $\Phi^* := (\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; \mathbf{c}^*; \mathbf{u}^*)$ is a P-stationary point of the optimization problem (13) and $\gamma > 0$, then there is a $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $(\Phi^*; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$ satisfies formulas (21)-(25).

Let Θ be the feasible region of the optimization problem (13), namely

$$\Theta := \{\Phi : \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{1}\}, \quad (64)$$

Moreover, $\|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0$ is lower semi-continuous at $\Phi^* \in \Theta$, then by the Proposition 4.3 of [36], there is a neighborhood $U(\Phi^*, \delta_1)$ of $\Phi^* \in \Theta$ with $\delta_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0 > \|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0 - \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall \Phi \in \Theta \cap U(\Phi^*, \delta_1). \quad (65)$$

Besides, $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2$ is locally lipschitz continuous, there exists a neighborhood $U(\Phi^*, \delta_2)$ of $\Phi^* \in \Theta$ with $\delta_2 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 - \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*\|_2^2 \right| &\leq 2C, \\ \forall \Phi &\in \Theta \cap U(\Phi^*, \delta_2). \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Denote $\delta := \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$, next, we prove that Φ^* is a local minimizer for the optimization problem (13). Namely, there exists a neighborhood $U(\Phi^*, \delta)$ of $\Phi^* \in \Theta$ with $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*\|_2^2 + C \|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 + C \|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0, \\ &\forall \Phi \in \Theta \cap U(\Phi^*, \delta). \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

For this purpose, let $\Gamma_* := \{i : u_i^* = 0\}$, $\bar{\Gamma}_* := \mathbb{N}_N \setminus \Gamma_*$. According to formulas (25) and (20) we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\sqrt{2C/\gamma} &\leq \lambda_i^* \leq 0, u_i^* = 0, \quad \forall i \in \Gamma_*, \\ \lambda_i^* &= 0, u_i^* \neq 0, \quad \forall i \in \bar{\Gamma}_*. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Based on these, a local region Θ_1 of Θ is considered, i.e.,

$$\Theta_1 := \Theta \cap \{\Phi : u_i \leq 0, i \in \Gamma_*\}. \quad (69)$$

The proof of inequality (67) is divided into the following two cases:

(i) $\Phi \in \Theta_1 \subseteq \Theta$ and $\Phi \in U(\Phi^*, \delta)$. It is to get that $\Phi^* \in \Theta_1$ by formulas (21)-(25). Then for any $\Phi \in \Theta_1$, we have

$$u_i \leq 0, i \in \Gamma_*, \quad (70)$$

$$\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{1}, \quad (71)$$

which and formula (24) suffice to

$$-\mathbf{A}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*) = (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^*) + \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}^*) + (\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{c}^*)\mathbf{y}. \quad (72)$$

The following chain of inequalities hold for any $\Phi \in \Theta_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 - \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*\|_2^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* - \mathbf{b}^* + \mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*\|_2^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*\|_2^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* - \mathbf{b}^*\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* - \mathbf{b}^*, \mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^* \rangle \\
&\geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* - \mathbf{b}^*, \mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^* \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(21),(22)}{=} -2(\tilde{\mathbf{w}} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*)^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* - 2\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\top*} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}^*) \\
&\stackrel{(72)}{=} 2(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^*)^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* + 2(c - c^*) \mathbf{y}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* \\
&\stackrel{(23)}{=} 2(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^*)^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* \\
&= 2(\mathbf{u}_{\Gamma_*} - \mathbf{u}_{\Gamma_*}^*)^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\Gamma_*}^* + 2(\mathbf{u}_{\bar{\Gamma}_*} - \mathbf{u}_{\bar{\Gamma}_*}^*)^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\bar{\Gamma}_*}^* \\
&\stackrel{(68)}{=} 2\mathbf{u}_{\Gamma_*}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\Gamma_*}^* \\
&\stackrel{(68),(70)}{\geq} 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Since $\|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0$ can only take values from $\{0, 1, \dots, N\}$, this together with formula (65) allows us to conclude that

$$\|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0 \geq \|\mathbf{u}_+^*\|_0, \quad \forall \Phi \in \Theta \cap U(\Phi^*, \delta_1). \tag{74}$$

Hence, for any $\Phi \in \Theta_1 \cap U(\Phi^*, \delta) \subseteq \Theta_1 \cap U(\Phi^*, \delta_1)$, then formulas (73) and (74) lead to

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*\|_2^2 + C \|\mathbf{u}_+^*\|_0 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 + C \|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0. \tag{75}$$

(ii) $\Phi \in (\Theta \setminus \Theta_1)$ and $\Phi \in U(\Phi^*, \delta)$. On the basis of $\Phi \in (\Theta \setminus \Theta_1)$, there exists $i_0 \in \Gamma_*$ with $u_{i_0}^* = 0$, but $u_{i_0} > 0$, which indicates that $\|(u_{i_0}^*)_+\|_0 = 0$, $\|(u_{i_0})_+\|_0 = 1$. By $\Phi \in U(\Phi^*, \delta)$ and formula (74) we have

$$\|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0 \geq \|\mathbf{u}_+^*\|_0 + 1. \tag{76}$$

This together with formula (66) obtains that for any $\Phi \in (\Theta \setminus \Theta_1) \cap U(\Phi^*, \delta)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*\|_2^2 + C \|\mathbf{u}_+^*\|_0 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 + C \|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0 - C \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 + C \|\mathbf{u}_+\|_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Combining formulas (75) and (77), we obtain that Φ^* is a local minimizer of the optimization problem (13) in a local region $\Theta \cap U(\Phi^*, \delta)$. Thus the conclusion is proved. \square

A.2

Proof. Since $T_k \in \mathbb{N}_N$, for sufficient large k , there is a subset $J \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ such that

$$T_j \equiv T, \quad \forall j \in J. \tag{78}$$

For simplicity, denote the sequence $\Psi^k := (\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^k, \mathbf{b}^k, c^k, \mathbf{u}^k, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k)$ and its limit point $\Psi^* := (\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*, \mathbf{b}^*, c^*, \mathbf{u}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$, namely $\{\Psi^k\} \rightarrow \Psi^*$. This also indicates that $\{\Psi^j\}_{j \in J} \rightarrow \Psi^*$ and $\{\Psi^{j+1}\}_{j \in J} \rightarrow \Psi^*$.

Taking the limit along with J of formula (52), namely, $k \in J, k \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_T^* = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_T + \eta \sigma \boldsymbol{\varpi}_T^*, \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\bar{T}}^* = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases} \tag{79}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varpi} := \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b} + c\mathbf{y}$, which derives $\boldsymbol{\varpi}_T^* = \mathbf{0}$. Taking the limit along with J of formula (43) and v^k respectively yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{v}^* &= \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^* - c^*\mathbf{y} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*/\sigma \\
&= \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^* - c^*\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}^* + \mathbf{u}^* - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*/\sigma \\
&= -\boldsymbol{\varpi}_T^* + \mathbf{u}^* - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*/\sigma,
\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

and thus,

$$\mathbf{u}_T^* = \mathbf{0}, \tag{81}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_{\bar{T}}^* = \mathbf{v}_{\bar{T}}^*, \tag{82}$$

$$\stackrel{(80)}{=} -\boldsymbol{\varpi}_{\bar{T}}^* + \mathbf{u}_{\bar{T}}^* - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\bar{T}}^*/\sigma, \tag{83}$$

$$\stackrel{(79)}{=} -\boldsymbol{\varpi}_{\bar{T}}^* + \mathbf{u}_{\bar{T}}^*. \tag{84}$$

These indicate that $\boldsymbol{\varpi}_{\bar{T}}^* = \mathbf{0}$, therefore, $\boldsymbol{\varpi}^* = \mathbf{0}$, where $\boldsymbol{\varpi}^* = \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^* + c^*\mathbf{y}$. Then we have

$$\mathbf{u}^* + \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^* + c^*\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{0}, \tag{85}$$

and $\mathbf{v}^* = \mathbf{u}^* - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*/\sigma$ by formula (80), which together with formulas (81), (82) and the proximal operator of 0-1 loss function [14] indicates

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{u}^* &= \text{prox}_{\frac{c}{\sigma} \|\cdot\|_0}(\mathbf{v}^*) \\
&= \text{prox}_{\frac{c}{\sigma} \|\cdot\|_0}(\mathbf{u}^* - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*/\sigma).
\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

Taking the limit along with J of formula (47) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathbf{G} + \sigma[\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T]^\top [\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T])[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*] \\
&= -\sigma[\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T]^\top (\mathbf{u}_T^* + c^*\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{1} + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_T^*/\sigma) \\
&= -\sigma[\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T]^\top (\boldsymbol{\varpi}_T^* - [\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T][\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*] + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_T^*/\sigma) \\
&= -\sigma[\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T]^\top (-[\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T][\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*] + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_T^*/\sigma).
\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

Formula (87) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{G}[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*] + \sigma[\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T]^\top [\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T][\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*] \\
&= \sigma[\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T]^\top [\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T][\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*] - [\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T]^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_T^*,
\end{aligned}$$

then,

$$\mathbf{G}[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*] = -[\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T]^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_T^* \stackrel{(79)}{=} -[\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}]^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*,$$

so, we have $\mathbf{G}[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*] + [\mathbf{A}_T \mathbf{B}_T]^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{0}$, namely,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{M}_i^\top (\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{0}, \tag{88}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{M}_i \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{b}^*) + \mathbf{B}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{0}, \tag{89}$$

Taking the limit along with J of formula (51)

$$\begin{aligned}
c^* &= -\mathbf{y}^\top (\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^* - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{u}^* + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*/\sigma)/N \\
&= -\mathbf{y}^\top (\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^* + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}^* - \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{u}^* + c^*\mathbf{y} - c^*\mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*/\sigma)/N \\
&= -\mathbf{y}^\top (\boldsymbol{\varpi}^* - c^*\mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*/\sigma)/N \\
&= -\mathbf{y}^\top (-c^*\mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*/\sigma)/N \\
&= (c^*\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*/\sigma)/N \\
&= c^* - \mathbf{y}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*/(\sigma N),
\end{aligned}$$

which indicates that

$$\mathbf{y}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = 0. \quad (90)$$

Based on the results of equations (85), (86), (88), (89) and (90), we can conclude that $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^*; \mathbf{b}^*; c^*; \mathbf{u}^*)$ is a P-stationary of the optimization problem (13), where $\gamma = 1/\sigma$. Then by Theorem 1 (2), it is a locally optimal solution to the optimization problem (13). Therefore, the proof is complete. \square