

Sparse Generalized Canonical Correlation Analysis: Distributed Alternating Iteration based Approach

Jia Cai, Kexin Lv, Junyi Huo, Xiaolin Huang *Senior Member, IEEE*, Jie Yang

Abstract—Sparse canonical correlation analysis (CCA) is a useful statistical tool to detect latent information with sparse structures. However, sparse CCA works only for two datasets, i.e., there are only two views or two distinct objects. To overcome this limitation, in this paper, we propose a sparse generalized canonical correlation analysis (GCCA), which could detect the latent relations of multiview data with sparse structures. Moreover, the introduced sparsity could be considered as Laplace prior on the canonical variates. Specifically, we convert the GCCA into a linear system of equations and impose ℓ_1 minimization penalty for sparsity pursuit. This results in a nonconvex problem on Stiefel manifold, which is difficult to solve. Motivated by Boyd’s consensus problem, an algorithm based on distributed alternating iteration approach is developed and theoretical consistency analysis is investigated elaborately under mild conditions. Experiments on several synthetic and real world datasets demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm.

Index Terms—Sparsity, Generalized CCA, Distributed alternating iteration, reconstruction error

I. INTRODUCTION

CANONICAL correlation analysis (CCA), launched by [1], is a celebrated statistical tool for finding the correlation between two sets of multidimensional variables. The two sets of variables can be considered as two views of one object or a view of two distinct objects. The main aim of CCA is to find two sets of canonical variables (weight vectors) such that the projected variables in the lower-dimensional space are maximally correlated. Due to its efficiency of finding latent information, CCA has been widely used in many branches of signal processing and data analytics, including but not limited to, cross language document retrieval [2], genomic data analysis [3], and functional magnetic resonance imaging [4].

The work described in this paper is supported partially by National Natural Science Foundation of China (11871167, 11671171, 61977046), Science and Technology Program of Guangzhou (201707010228), Special Support Plan for High-Level Talents of Guangdong Province (2019TQ05X571), Project of Collaborative Innovation Development Center of Pearl River Delta Science & Technology Finance Industry (19XT01), Foundation of Guangdong Educational Committee (2019KZDZX1023). The corresponding author is Xiaolin Huang.

J. Cai is with School of Statistics and Mathematics, Guangdong University of Finance & Economics, also with Big Data and Educational Statistics Application Laboratory, 21 Chisha Road, Guangzhou 510320, Guangdong, P. R. China. Email: jiakai1999@gdufe.edu.cn.

K. Lv, X. Huang and J. Yang are with Institute of Image Processing and Pattern Recognition, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, also with the MOE Key Laboratory of System Control and Information Processing, 800 Dongchuan Road, Shanghai, 200240, P.R. China. Emails: {kelen_lv, xiaolin-huang, jieyang}@sjtu.edu.cn.

Junyi Huo is with School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, University Road, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, United Kingdom. Email: jh4a19@soton.ac.uk.

Both theoretical and algorithmic analysis of CCA have been widely investigated, see, e.g., [5]–[12].

However, a large portion of features are not informative for high-dimensional data in the field of data analysis. When the canonical variables involve all features in the original space, the canonical variates are usually not sparse. To interpret canonical variables in high-dimensional data analysis, sparsity is often introduced. Similarly, since the establishment of compressive sensing, sparsity has been found to be efficient in enhancing the performance of many learning methods, if a suitable sparse structure could be found. In the field of CCA, there have been many efforts to impose sparsity, which could not be obtained by the original CCA. For instance, the sparse penalized CCA algorithm [13], the penalized matrix decomposition approach based sparse CCA method [14], and the sparse CCA under primal-dual framework [15] have been developed. [16] selected the sparsest CCA solution from a subset of all solutions via the linearized Bregman method. [17] developed a precision adjusted iteration thresholding method to estimate the sparse canonical weights, while [18] investigated a two stage based sparse CCA method, where the first initialization stage was solved by Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM), and then a group-Lasso based method was utilized to find the sparse weights in the second refinement stage.

In spite of great success, CCA and sparse CCA can only handle two datasets, which heavily limits the applications on multiview analysis and multi-modal learning. To overcome this problem, generalized CCA (GCCA) methods have been proposed. Among several attempts, tensor CCA [19], GCCA [20], weighted GCCA [21], scalable MAX-VAR GCCA [22] and Deep GCCA (DGCCA, [23]) have shown good performance to deal with multiple datasets. Similarly to CCA, suitably imposing sparsity on GCCA could improve the performance. But the sparsity pursuit method designed for CCA can not be readily extended to GCCA.

Simply coping the technique from CCA to sparse CCA is not applicable for GCCA. To the best of our knowledge, only [20] and [24] discussed sparse GCCA methods. Kang et al. [20] designed a sparse GCCA under the special constraints that the data matrices and the projected variables have multiple regression relationships, while Kanatsoulis et al. [24] discussed a primal-dual decomposition based ADMM GCCA approach for large-scale problems. Theoretical convergence is guaranteed by introducing Robinson’s condition, which requires the number of canonical components should far less than the number of samples or features. However, the performance of sparse GCCA is far from satisfactory in both sparsity and accuracy.

The aim of this paper is to establish a sparse GCCA method. The contributions of this paper are summarized as follows.

- We formulate GCCA into the form of linear system of equations, which serves as the basis for imposing sparsity. This leads to a nonconvex problem on Stiefel manifold.
- Based on the developed GCCA related equations and the model demonstrated in [25], we elegantly develop a novel sparse GCCA algorithm using augmented distributed alternative iteration method, which is a generalization of the consensus problem in [26].
- Theoretical consistency of the proposed algorithm is judiciously investigated via convex analysis related theory under mild conditions.
- Experiments on gene data and Europarl dataset demonstrate the effective and efficiency of the proposed method.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we give a brief review of CCA and GCCA. Section III devotes to the design of the new sparse GCCA and its solving algorithm. Section IV discusses the experimental results. Section V concludes the paper. The proof of the main results go to the appendix.

II. BRIEF REVIEW OF CCA AND GCCA

A. Canonical correlation analysis

In this section, we briefly review canonical correlation analysis (CCA). Let $x \in R^{n_1}$ and $y \in R^{n_2}$ be two random variables. Denote $X = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in R^{n_1 \times m}$, $Y = (y_1, \dots, y_m) \in R^{n_2 \times m}$. Without loss of generality, we assume both $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^m$ have zero mean, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^m x_i = 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m y_i = 0$. CCA solves the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{w_1 \neq 0, w_2 \neq 0} \quad & w_1^T X Y^T w_2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & w_1^T X X^T w_1 = 1 \\ & w_2^T Y Y^T w_2 = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

In Eq. (1), only one pair of canonical variables could be found. For more pairs, [16], [27] extended CCA to the following multiple CCA,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{W_1, W_2} \quad & \text{Trace}(W_1^T X Y^T W_2) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & W_1^T X X^T W_1 = I_\ell, \quad W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \ell} \\ & W_2^T Y Y^T W_2 = I_\ell, \quad W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times \ell}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where I_ℓ denotes the $\ell \times \ell$ identity matrix, ℓ also stands for the number of columns of W_i ($i = 1, 2$). When $\ell = 1$, Eq. (2) reduces to Eq. (1). Obviously, both CCA and multiple CCA could only deal with two datasets.

B. Generalized canonical correlation analysis

To detect the relations of multiple multivariate datasets (more than two), a generalized CCA that considers the sum of correlations was proposed by [28]:

$$\min_{W_i \neq 0, W_j \neq 0} \sum_{i=1}^{J-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^J \|W_i^T X_i - W_j^T X_j\|_F^2, \quad (3)$$

where F denotes the Frobenius norm of a matrix, and J stands for the number of views. However, Eq. (3) is a NP-hard problem. To efficiently study the latent information of multiple datasets, MAX-VAR formulation of GCCA was proposed [29]:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\{W_j\}_{j=1}^J, G} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^J \|G - W_j^T X_j\|_F^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & G G^T = I, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell \times m}$ is a common latent representation of the different views. In the literature, Eq. (4) is solved by selecting the principal eigenvectors of a matrix aggregated from the correlation matrix of different views, i.e., the rows of the optimal G are the eigenvectors of the following matrix,

$$M = \sum_{j=1}^J X_j^T (X_j X_j^T)^{-1} X_j.$$

When $J = 2$, Eq. (4) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{W_1, W_2, G} \quad & \|G - W_1^T X_1\|_F^2 + \|G - W_2^T X_2\|_F^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & G G^T = I. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Recalling the constraints in Eq. (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|W_1^T X_1 - W_2^T X_2\|_F^2 \\ & = \text{Trace}(W_1^T X_1 X_1^T W_1 + W_2^T X_2 X_2^T W_2 \\ & \quad - W_2^T X_2 X_1^T W_1 - W_1^T X_1 X_2^T W_2) \\ & = 2\ell - 2\text{Trace}(W_1^T X_1 X_2^T W_2). \end{aligned}$$

Combining it with the triangle inequality

$$\|W_1^T X_1 - W_2^T X_2\|_F^2 \leq 2\|W_1^T X_1 - G\|_F^2 + 2\|G - W_2^T X_2\|_F^2,$$

one can find that the target function in Eq. (5) is a relaxation of that in Eq. (2).

III. SPARSE GCCA: MODEL AND ALGORITHM

A. New formulation of sparse GCCA

In this section, we will propose a sparse GCCA model and develop its solving algorithm. The basic idea is to convert problem (4) into a linear system of equations by considering the optimality conditions and employing singular value decomposition (SVD) technique. Specifically, according to

$$\begin{aligned} & \|G - W_j^T X_j\|_F^2 \\ & = \text{Trace}(G G^T - W_j^T X_j G^T - G X_j^T W_j + W_j^T X_j X_j^T W_j). \end{aligned}$$

We can take the derivatives with respect to W_j and obtain the optimality conditions as below,

$$X_j X_j^T W_j = X_j G^T.$$

Typically, X_j is a low rank matrix and there is redundancy in the above equation. Denote the reduced SVD of X_j as the following,

$$X_j = P_j \Sigma_j Q_j^T, \quad (6)$$

where $P_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j \times r_j}$, $Q_j \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r_j}$. Then we have $X_j X_j^T = P_j \Sigma_j^2 P_j^T$ ($j = 1, \dots, J$) and convert $X_j X_j^T W_j = X_j G^T$ into

$$P_j^T W_j = \Sigma_j^{-1} Q_j^T G^T, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, J,$$

which could be further written as

$$A_j W_j + B_j Z = 0, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, J,$$

with notation $A_j = P_j^T$, $B_j = -\Sigma_j^{-1} Q_j^T$ and $Z = G^T$. With these optimality conditions, we now formulate the sparse solution of the canonical variates W_j as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \|W\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^J \|W_j\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & A_j W_j + B_j Z = 0, \quad Z^T Z = I_\ell, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the ℓ_1 norm of a matrix is defined as the summation of the ℓ_1 norm of its columns, i.e., $\|W\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^J \|W_j\|_1$. Obviously, unlike Eq. (4), Eq. (7) imposes sparsity constraints to interpret canonical variables. On the other hand, from the Bayesian inference viewpoint, Eq. (7) could be considered as a MAP estimate of $\|W\|_1$ with Laplace prior under special constraints. Due to the constraint $Z^T Z = I_\ell$, problem (7) is a nonconvex problem on Stiefel manifold. Before addressing the convergence analysis, we present the following first-order optimality conditions.

Lemma 1: Denote $W^* = (W_1^*, W_2^*, \dots, W_J^*)$, let (W^*, Z^*) be a local minimizer of problem (7), for each fixed $j = 1, \dots, J$, then there exist Lagrange multipliers $\Lambda_{1,j}^* \in R^{r_j \times \ell}$, $\Lambda_2^* \in R^{\ell \times \ell}$, ($j = 1, \dots, J$) such that

$$\begin{aligned} A_j^T \Lambda_{1,j}^* \in \partial \|W_j^*\|_1, \quad \sum_{j=1}^J B_j^T \Lambda_{1,j}^* + Z^* \Lambda_2^* &= 0 \\ A_j W_j^* + B_j Z^* = 0, \quad (Z^*)^T Z^* &= I_\ell, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\partial \|W^*\|_1$ stands for the subdifferential of $\|\cdot\|_1$ at W^* .

Remark: The conditions stated in Eq. (8) are actually KKT conditions achieved by utilizing Lagrange multiplier method, and computing the partial derivatives with respect to W_j ($j = 1, \dots, J$), Z , $\Lambda_{1,j}$ ($j = 1, \dots, J$) and Λ_2 .

B. Sparse GCCA algorithm via distributed ADMM

To solve the proposed sparse GCCA (7), we in this subsection will develop an efficient algorithm, mainly in the framework of distributed ADMM. The augmented Lagrangian of (7) is

$$\begin{aligned} L_\beta(W_1, \dots, W_J, Z, \Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_J) &= \sum_{j=1}^J \|W_j\|_1 + I_{O_\ell}(Z) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^J \langle \Lambda_j, A_j W_j + B_j Z \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \|A_j W_j + B_j Z\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $O_\ell = \{Z^T Z = I\}$, $\Lambda_j \in R^{r_j \times \ell}$ ($j = 1, \dots, J$) are the Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the constraints $A_j W_j + B_j Z$ ($j = 1, \dots, J$). Here we reduce notational burden and remove the subscript 1 for $\Lambda_{1,j}$, $I_{O_\ell}(Z)$ is an indicator function defined as

$$I_{O_\ell}(Z) = \begin{cases} 0, & Z \in O_\ell, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Directly applying the classical iteration process of ADMM, we will have

$$\begin{cases} (W_1^{k+1}, \dots, W_J^{k+1}, Z^{k+1}) = \arg \min_{W_1, \dots, W_J, Z} \\ L_{\beta_k}(W_1, \dots, W_J, Z, \Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_J), \\ \Lambda_j^{k+1} = \Lambda_j^k - \beta_k (A_j W_j^{k+1} + B_j Z^{k+1}). \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

However, it is difficult to obtain W_j^{k+1} ($j = 1, \dots, J$) and Z^{k+1} simultaneously. Moreover, the existence of A_j and B_j with different ranks makes it more challenge and the orthogonality constraint $Z^T Z = I$ leads the problem non-convex. Generally, classical ADMM does not work and we need to employ the iteration idea stated in distributed ADMM with slight modifications.

First, we decouple the update of W_j^{k+1} ($j = 1, \dots, J$) and Z^{k+1} , i.e., L_{β_k} is optimized with the respect to variables W_j and Z one at a time, while fixing the others at their latest values. Mathematically, the above idea of updating the Lagrange multipliers could be written as,

$$Z^{k+1} = \arg \min_{Z \in O_\ell} L_{\beta_k}(W_1^k, W_2^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z, \Lambda_1^k, \Lambda_2^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k), \quad (10)$$

$$W_j^{k+1} = \arg \min_{W_j} L_{\beta_k}(W_j, Z^{k+1}, \Lambda_1^k, \Lambda_2^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k), \quad (11)$$

$$\Lambda_j^{k+1} = \Lambda_j^k - \beta_k (A_j W_j^{k+1} + B_j Z^{k+1}), \quad (12)$$

where $L_\beta(W_j, Z, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots, \Lambda_J)$ stands for $L_\beta(W_1, \dots, W_J, Z, \Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_J)$ with fixed W_i ($i \neq j$). In fact, Eq. (10) could be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{k+1} &= \arg \min_{Z \in O_\ell} \left\{ - \sum_{j=1}^J \langle \Lambda_j^k, A_j W_j^k + B_j Z \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\beta_k}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \|A_j W_j^k + B_j Z\|_F^2 \right\}, \\ &= \arg \min_{Z \in O_\ell} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^J \|A_j W_j^k + B_j Z - \frac{\Lambda_j^k}{\beta_k}\|_F^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall the global consensus problem [26],

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x_i - z = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which described an optimization problem under the constraints that all the local variables should agree. In fact, the constraints in Eq. (7) could be viewed as a weighted matrix version of those in Eq. (13). Z plays the role of a central collector. Therefore, motivated by consensus ADMM method discussed in [26], we propose the distributed alternating iteration based sparse gcca algorithm. We can achieve a new iteration formula for Z as indicated in Eq. (14). Since W_1^k, \dots, W_i^k ($i \neq j$), W_j^k

are fixed, and notice the definition of $L_{\beta_k}(W_j, Z, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots, \Lambda_J)$, we can further simplify Eq. (11) as

$$W_j^{k+1} = \arg \min_{W_j} \left\{ \|W_j\|_1 - \langle \Lambda_j^k, A_j W_j + B_j Z^{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\beta_k}{2} \|A_j W_j + B_j Z^{k+1}\|_F^2 \right\}.$$

Therefore, simple computation leads to

$$Z^{k+1} = \arg \min_{Z \in O_\ell} \left\{ \|\bar{W}^k + \bar{B}Z - \frac{1}{\beta_k} \bar{\Lambda}^k\|_F^2 \right\} \quad (14)$$

$$W_j^{k+1} = \arg \min \left\{ \|W_j\|_1 + \frac{\beta_k}{2} \|A_j W_j + B_j Z^{k+1} - \frac{\Lambda_j^k}{\beta_k}\|_F^2 \right\} \quad (15)$$

$$\Lambda_j^{k+1} = \Lambda_j^k - \beta_k (A_j W_j^{k+1} + B_j Z^{k+1}). \quad (16)$$

The key point is to effectively solve problem (14), which embody the central collector role of Z and to achieve the analytic expression for \bar{W}^k , $\bar{\Lambda}^k$, and \bar{B} . For different i , the number of rows of A_i , B_i , and Λ_i may be different. For the sake of clarity, we consider the augmented version of A_j , B_j and Λ_j ($j = 1, \dots, J$), i.e., rows with zero entries are added, such that A_j , B_j , and Λ_j all have r rows with $r = \max\{r_j, j = 1, \dots, J\}$. Let $\tilde{A}_j, \tilde{\Lambda}_j, \tilde{B}_j$ be the augmented version of A_j, Λ_j and B_j , respectively. Then $\bar{W}^k, \bar{\Lambda}^k$ and \bar{B} can be calculated as follows,

$$\bar{W}^k = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{A}_j W_j^k, \quad \bar{\Lambda}^k = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{\Lambda}_j^k, \quad \bar{B} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{B}_j.$$

For Eq. (14), we find that this optimization task is actually a Procrustes problem [30] and could be solved analytically as the following,

$$Z^{k+1} = U^k (V^k)^T, \quad (17)$$

where U^k, V^k are orthogonal matrices from the SVD of the matrix

$$\bar{B}^T \left(\frac{\bar{\Lambda}^k}{\beta_k} - \bar{W}^k \right) = U^k \Sigma^k (V^k)^T.$$

For Eq. (15), this optimization task is an ℓ_1 -norm regularized least squares problem, which does not have a closed-form solution. To avoid an exhaustive iterative process, we approximate it by linearizing the Frobenius norm term (for each fixed j) as below,

$$\min_{W_j} \|W_j\|_1 + \beta_k \left\{ \langle A_j^T (A_j W_j^k + B_j Z^{k+1} - \Lambda_j^k / \beta_k), W_j - W_j^k \rangle + \|W_j - W_j^k\|_F^2 / 2\delta \right\}, \quad (18)$$

where $\delta > 0$ is a proximity parameter. Then Eq. (15) can be approximately solved as

$$W_j^{k+1} = S \left(W_j^k - \delta A_j^T (A_j W_j^k + B_j Z^{k+1} - \Lambda_j^k / \beta_k), \frac{\delta}{\beta_k} \right), \quad (19)$$

where $S(x, \mu)$ is the componentwise soft-thresholding shrinkage operator defined as

$$S(x, \mu) = \text{sgn}(x) \odot \max\{|x| - \mu, 0\}$$

with \odot denoting the componentwise products of vectors or matrices. This update gives an approximate but closed-form solution for Eq. (15).

Now, we come to the following augmented distributed alternative iteration based sparse GCCA algorithm, as summarized in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Distributed alternative iteration based sparse generalized CCA algorithm (SGCCA).

Input:

Training data $X_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j \times m}$ ($j = 1, \dots, J$), parameter $\delta > 0, \rho > 1, \beta_{\max}$ and tolerance parameter $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$.

Output:

Sparse canonical variates $W = (W_1^T, \dots, W_J^T)^T$.

- 1: Compute reduced SVD for each X_j ($j = 1, \dots, J$) via Eq. (6).
 - 2: Let $W_j^0 = \Lambda_j^0 = 0, \beta_0 = \max(1/\|A_j^T B_j\|_\infty)$, ($j = 1, \dots, J$).
 - 3: **while** $\|\Lambda_j^{k+1} - \Lambda_j^k\|_F / \beta_k > \varepsilon_1$ and $\beta_k \|W_j^{k+1} - W_j^k\|_F / \max\{1, \|W_j^k\|_F\} > \varepsilon_2$ **do**
 - 4: Compute Z^{k+1}, W_j^{k+1} and Λ_j^{k+1} via Eqs. (17), (19) and (16), respectively.
 - 5: Update β_{k+1} by $\beta_{k+1} = \min(\beta_{\max}, \rho \beta_k)$
 - 6: **end while**
-

In Algorithm 1, all the updates have analytical expressions and work very efficiently. But its convergence can not be naturally inherited from classical ADMM, since the original problem (7) is non-convex and the update for Eq. (15) is inexact. Based upon Lemma 1, we can now give the theoretical convergence analysis.

Theorem 1: Assume that A_j is of full row rank for each fixed j ($j = 1, \dots, J$). Let $(W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k)$ be generated by solving subproblems (14) – (16) exactly and $\beta_{k+1} = \rho \beta_k$ ($\rho > 1$). Then, the sequence $(W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k)$ is bounded, and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_j W_j^k + B_j Z^k = 0 \quad (j = 1, \dots, J).$$

Moreover, any accumulation point $(W_1^*, \dots, W_J^*, Z^*, \Lambda_1^*, \dots, \Lambda_J^*, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^*)^T \Lambda_j^*)$ of $\{(W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^k)^T \Lambda_j^k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfies the KKT conditions (8). In particular, whenever $\{(W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^k)^T \Lambda_j^k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converges, it converges to a KKT point of problem (7).

Under mild conditions, any limit point of the iterative sequence generated by Algorithm 1 is a KKT point of problem (7). Based upon the convergence conditions of matrix series, we remove the ‘‘F’’ symbol and get the following convergence analysis for Algorithm 1.

Theorem 2: Let $\{(W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. For each fixed j ($j = 1, \dots, J$), assume that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \beta_k (W_j^{k+1} - W_j^k) = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\Lambda_j^{k+1} - \Lambda_j^k) / \beta_k = 0$. Then any accumulation point $(W_1^*, \dots, W_J^*, Z^*, \Lambda_1^*, \dots, \Lambda_J^*, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^*)^T \Lambda_j^*)$ of $\{(W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^k)^T \Lambda_j^k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfies the KKT conditions (8). In particular, whenever

$\{(W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^k)^T \Lambda_j^k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converges, it converges to a KKT point of problem (7).

The proofs of Lemma 1, Theorems 1 and 2 are given in the appendix.

C. Sparse GCCA with fixed G

If G is fixed, we can get a much simpler version for the proposed sparse GCCA. Denote $W_j = (\alpha_j^1, \dots, \alpha_j^\ell)$, $Z = (z_1, \dots, z_\ell)$, where the columns of $Z = G^T$ are the eigenvectors of the matrix

$$M = \sum_{j=1}^J X_j^T (X_j X_j^T)^{-1} X_j.$$

For each fixed i , we need to solve J problems:

$$P_j^T \alpha_j^i = \Sigma_j^{-1} Q_j^T z_i, \quad (i = 1, \dots, \ell).$$

To achieve sparsity of canonical variates, we establish the following model,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \|\alpha_j^i\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & P_j^T \alpha_j^i = \Sigma_j^{-1} Q_j^T z_i, \quad j = 1, \dots, J. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

To reduce notational burden and allow a slightly abuse of notation, we omit the index i, j in the sequel unless specified. As a classical ℓ_1 problem, there are lots of effective algorithms for Eq. (20), such as Iterative Shrinkage-Thresholding Algorithm (ISTA, [31], [32]), Least Angle Regression (LARS), subgradient descent. Here we utilize fast ISTA (FISTA, [33]). Let $v_1 = \alpha_0, t_1 = 1$. The update for the sparse GCCA with fixed G is given below,

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_s = \arg \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \|\alpha\|_1 + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \alpha - (v_s - \frac{2}{L} (PP^T v_s - P\Sigma^{-1} Q^T z)) \right\|_2^2 \right\}, \\ t_{s+1} = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4t_s^2}}{2}, \\ v_{s+1} = \alpha_s + \frac{t_s - 1}{t_{s+1}} (\alpha_s - \alpha_{s-1}), \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

where $L = \|PP^T\|$ differs for a distinct view and t_s is the stepsize of iteration.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we carry out numerical experiments on both synthetic dataset and real-world datasets to evaluate the proposed sparse GCCA algorithm by comparing it with other algorithms. All the experiments are performed under Ubuntu 16.04 with python 3.7 in Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2620 v4 @ 2.10GHz and 128 GB of RAM.

A. Experiments on Synthetic dataset

First, we consider the proposed sparse GCCA (SGCCA) on synthetic data to evaluate its convergence, sparsity, and accuracy. Three matrices X, Y , and Z , are constructed as the following,

$$X = v_1 u^T + \epsilon_1, \quad Y = v_2 u^T + \epsilon_2, \quad Z = v_3 u^T + \epsilon_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{2000}, \underbrace{(-1, \dots, -1)}_{3000}, \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{5000}^T, \\ v_2 &= \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{10000}, \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{2000}, \underbrace{(-1, \dots, -1)}_{3000}^T, \\ v_3 &= \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{2000}, \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{12000}, \underbrace{(-1, \dots, -1)}_{3000}^T, \end{aligned}$$

and $\epsilon_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{10000 \times 100} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.3^2)$, $\epsilon_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{15000 \times 100} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.4^2)$, $\epsilon_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{17000 \times 100} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.5^2)$ are three random noise matrices. $u \in \mathbb{R}^{100}$ is a random vector with all entries drawn from the normal distribution, i.e.,

$$u(i) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad i = 1, \dots, 100.$$

Settings We randomly select half of the data for training and use the rest for test. This procedure is repeated 30 times and the average results are reported. GCCA is used as the baseline algorithm. We also consider weighted GCCA (WGCCA, [21]) with Gaussian initialization weights and DGCCA ([23]) with 100 epochs and batch size tuned by cross-validation. For the parameters of the proposed sparse GCCA algorithm, we set $\beta_{\max} = 10^4$, tolerance $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 10^{-5}$, and δ, ρ are tuned by cross-validation around one.

Results The aim of this experiments is to find a sparse decomposition structure, in which we could achieve high accuracy, high sparsity and thus good signal recovery performance. For all the considered algorithms, the reconstruction error is blow 0.01. The sparsity is shown by Figure 1, which depicts the results of average sparsity over 30 trials. Here, sparsity denotes the percentage of zero entries of a vector. The proposed GCCA algorithm has very prominent sparsity in the three views and the performance is quite stable.




Fig. 1. Average sparsity results over 30 experiments.

B. Experiments on Real datasets

Via experiments on synthetic data, we verify that the proposed sparse GCCA could indeed find the sparse structures. Here we present the experimental results on gene expression data.

1) Gene Expression Data:

Let us consider four real datasets from the gene expression database ¹. The details are explained below and the statistics can be found in Table I. In this case, we apply the proposed method to the application of classification problem. There are two views, one view is the data matrix X_1 , another view is the label X_2 .

- Leukemia: gene expression values for 72 samples (47 samples from patients with acute lymphoblastic leukemia, and 25 from patients with acute myeloblastic leukemia).
- Prostate: gene expression values measured by Affymetrix human 95Av2 arrays for 102 samples (52 prostate tumors and 50 nontumors prostate samples).
- Brain: 42 microarray gene expression profiles from five different tumors of the central nervous system.
- Lymphoma: 42 samples of diffuse large B-cell lymphoma, 9 observations of follicular lymphoma and 11 cases of chronic lymphocytic leukemia with the expression of 4026 well-measured genes. The total sample size is 62.

TABLE I

DATA STRUCTURES: DATA DIMENSION (n), NUMBER OF DATA (m), NUMBER OF CLASSES (K), NUMBER OF COLUMNS IN W_1 AND W_2 (ℓ).

Type	Data	n	m	K	ℓ
Gene Data	Leukemia	3571	72	2	1
	Prostate	6033	102	2	1
	Brain	5597	42	5	4
	Lymphomia	4026	62	3	2

Settings The preprocessing procedure for gene data is described in [34]. In the experiment, we choose ℓ as the rank of the matrix $X_1 X_2^T$. We compare the proposed sparse GCCA algorithm with GCCA, DGCCA and WGCCA methods by considering several indices: the correlations for training and testing, reconstruction error for training, sparsity of canonical variates and the classification accuracy for training and testing. The correlation is defined as

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \text{Trace}(W_i^T X_i X_j^T W_j),$$

and the reconstruction error is computed as

$$\frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^J \|W_j^T X_j - G\|_F^2,$$

while the classification accuracy is defined as the following:

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \delta(ol_i, pl_i)}{m},$$

where $\delta(y_1, y_2)$ is the indicator function that equals 1 if $y_1 = y_2$ and 0 otherwise. For a given sample point x_i , ol_i and pl_i are the obtained label and the provided label, respectively. Among those indices, sparsity and classification accuracy are the most important. We select 4/5 of the data for training and use the rest for test. The choices of the other parameters are the same as that described in the last section.

Results The detailed comparison results are shown in Table II, which contains the following criteria.

- **a1** denotes the correlation for training data.
- **a2** means the correlation for test data.
- **a3** stands for the reconstruction error for training.
- **a4** denotes the sparsity of canonical variate (related to the data matrix).
- **a5** means the classification accuracy using sparse W in training data.
- **a6** stands for the classification accuracy using sparse W in test data.

The best results are marked in bold. The proposed sparse GCCA algorithm is competitive with the other GCCA methods in accuracy related criterion and it performs remarkably in sparsity without much loss in classification accuracy.

2) *Cross-Language Document Retrieval:* In this section, we conduct experiments on Europarl parallel corpus ([35], Europarl for short), which is a collection of documents extracted from the proceedings of the European Parliament. It includes translated documents in 21 European languages: Romanic (French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Romanian), Germanic (English, Dutch, German, Danish, Swedish), Slavik (Bulgarian, Czech, Polish, Slovak, Slovene), Finni-Ugric (Finnish, Hungarian, Estonian), Baltic (Latvian, Lithuanian), and Greek. The main aim is to learn the latent representations of the sentences, which reveals the correlations of the same sentences in different languages (views).

Settings For Europarl dataset, we select three different types of language data (English, French, and Spanish), and obtain a bag-of-words representation using Term Frequency Inverse Document Frequency (TFIDF) approach, which is widely recognized as an efficient way in the document retrieval task. After removing numbers, stop-words (English, French, and Spanish, respectively), and rare words (appearing less than twice), we obtain distinct sizes of matrices for different type of language data, which is demonstrated in Table III. We compare the proposed sparse GCCA algorithm with GCCA, DGCCA and WGCCA methods for $\ell = 1$ by considering several indices: the correlations for training and test, reconstruction error for training, sparsity of canonical variates and average area under the ROC curve (AROC, [36]) for both training and test. We compute the Euclidean distance between every projected view and latent lower dimensional space, and sort them in an increasing order to match the most relevant document. We choose half of the data as training and use the rest for test. The parameters for the other methods are the same as that described in the previous section.

Results The detailed performance compared with other algorithms is reported in Table IV. The AROC results are shown in Table V. We evaluate AROC for each pair of languages in Table V, i.e., I denotes the retrieval results of English-French pair, II means the retrieval results of English-Spanish pair, III stands for the retrieval results of French-Spanish pair and null denotes average AROC results of the above three. These tables include the following criteria.

- **b1** denotes the correlation for training data.
- **b2** means the correlation for test data.

¹ <http://stat.ethz.ch/~dettling/bagboost.html>

TABLE II
COMPARISON RESULTS ON GENE EXPRESSION DATA.

Data	Criterion	SGCCA	GCCA	DGCCA	WGCCA
Leukemia	a1	0.9991	1.0000	0.4115	0.9773
	a2	0.9203	0.9143	0.6398	0.8971
	a3	7.53E-04	6.97E-17	0.0297	0.0037
	a4	0.9826	0.04621	0.9936	0.0484
	a5	1.0000	1.0000	0.6316	1.0000
	a6	1.0000	1.0000	0.7333	1.0000
Prostate	a1	0.9995	1.0000	0.0024	0.9858
	a2	0.8475	0.7741	0.5046	0.7354
	a3	3.85E-04	7.70E-17	0.1537	0.0021
	a4	0.9862	0.0560	0.7086	0.0612
	a5	1.0000	1.0000	0.6049	1.0000
	a6	0.9048	0.9048	0.4286	0.9048
Brain	a1	1.1593	1.0067	0.0570	0.9860
	a2	1.1237	1.1911	0.3932	0.7015
	a3	0.1033	0.0909	0.4649	0.0963
	a4	0.9462	0.0400	0.9951	0.0686
	a5	1.0000	1.0000	0.1515	0.9394
	a6	0.4444	0.2222	0.1111	0.2222
Lymphomia	a1	1.3041	1.0069	1.0825	0.9987
	a2	1.3876	1.3459	1.3662	1.2618
	a3	0.0208	0.0204	0.0614	0.0229
	a4	0.9839	0.0396	0.9898	0.0606
	a5	1.0000	1.0000	0.3061	1.0000
	a6	1.0000	1.0000	0.5385	1.0000

TABLE III
DATA STRUCTURES: DATA DIMENSION (n), NUMBER OF DATA (m),
NUMBER OF COLUMNS IN W_1 , W_2 AND W_3 (ℓ).

Type	Data	n	m	ℓ
Document Data	English	5552	1000	1
	French	6126	1000	1
	Spanish	6292	1000	1

- **b3** denotes the reconstruction error for training.
- **b4** stands for the sparsity of canonical variates for each view.
- **b5** stands for the average sparsity of canonical variates.
- **b6** denotes the AROC results for training data.
- **b7** means the AROC results of each pair for test data.
- **b8** denotes the average AROC results for test data.

TABLE IV
COMPARISON RESULTS ON EUROPARL DATASET.

Criterion	SGCCA	GCCA	DGCCA	WGCCA
b1	0.9971	1.0000	0.0283	1.0000
b2	0.0244	0.4030	0.0401	0.0228
b3	1.49E-03	1.31E-30	7.23E+03	2.45E-11
b4	0.8559	0.1059	0.0904	0.1081
	0.8767	0.1100	0.9987	0.1116
	0.8755	0.1187	0.2146	0.1219
b5	0.8694	0.1115	0.4346	0.1139

Obviously, the proposed sparse GCCA algorithm is considerably more prominent than other algorithms in sparsity for every view and also slightly outperforms in average AROC, showing that SGCCA could preferably find the sparse structure in the cross-language document retrieval task.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, based on MAX-VAR formulation of GCCA, by employing SVD technique, we achieved a novel GCCA framework from the linear system of equations viewpoint, and

TABLE V
AROC ACHIEVED BY EUROPARL DATASET.

Criterion	type	SGCCA	GCCA	DGCCA	WGCCA
b6	I	0.8325	1.0000	1.0000	0.4956
	II	0.6905	1.0000	1.0000	0.4867
	III	0.7072	1.0000	1.0000	0.5008
b7	I	0.6198	0.5773	0.5173	0.4600
	II	0.5837	0.5840	0.5239	0.5155
	III	0.5823	0.6111	0.5112	0.5009
b8	null	0.5953	0.5908	0.5175	0.4921

imposed sparsity under this framework. Theoretical consistency was investigated under mild conditions. We designed a distributed alternating iteration based sparse GCCA algorithm. Experimental results on synthetic dataset, gene data, and Europarl dataset all demonstrated the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm, which is promising for CCA applications that involves more than two views and have sparsity structure.

APPENDIX

This section gives the proofs of Lemma 1, Theorems 1 and 2. Before that, we directly cite two lemmas which play significant role in proving theoretical results. We first give some notations.

The effective domain of a convex function f on S is denoted by $\text{dom}f$, and defined by

$$\text{dom}f = \{x | \exists \mu, (x, \mu) \in \text{epi}f\} = \{x | f(x) < +\infty\},$$

where $\text{epi}f$ stands for the epigraph of f . $\text{ri}C$ means the relative interior of a convex set C :

$$\text{ri}C = \{x \in \text{aff}C | \exists \varepsilon > 0, (x + \varepsilon B) \cap (\text{aff}C) \subset C\},$$

where $\text{aff}C$ means the affine hull of C , $B = \{x | \|x\| \leq 1\}$ denotes the Euclidean ball in R^n . $f'(x; y)$ stands for the

directional derivative of f at x with the respect to a vector y .

Lemma 2: ([37], Theorem 23.4) Let f be a proper convex function. For $x \notin \text{dom}f$, $\partial f(x)$ is empty. For $x \in \text{ri}(\text{dom}f)$, $\partial f(x)$ is non-empty, $f'(x; y)$ is closed and proper as a function of y , and

$$f'(x; y) = \sup\{\langle x^*, y \rangle \mid x^* \in \partial f(x)\} = \delta^*(y \mid \partial f(x)).$$

Finally, $\partial f(x)$ is a non-empty bounded set if and only if $x \in \text{int}(\text{dom}f)$ (int stands for the interior of a set), in which case $f'(x; y)$ is finite for every y .

Lemma 3: ([37], Theorem 24.4) Let f be a closed proper convex function on R^n . If x_1, x_2, \dots , and x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots , are two sequences such that $x_i^* \in \partial f(x_i)$, where x_i converges to x and x_i^* converges to x^* , then $x^* \in \partial f(x)$. In other words, the graph of ∂f is a closed subset of $R^n \times R^n$.

Following the similar technique route for ADMM convergence discussion ([38]), we can prove Lemma 1 as the following,

Proof 1 (Proof of Lemma 1): Since $(W_1^*, \dots, W_J^*, Z^*)$ is a local minimizer of problem (7), it should satisfy the optimality conditions,

$$A_j W_j^* + B_j Z^* = 0, \quad (Z^*)^T Z^* = I_\ell.$$

By proving the existence of $\Lambda_{1,j}$ ($j = 1, \dots, J$) such that $A_j^T \Lambda_{1,j}^* \in \partial \|W_j^*\|_1$ for each fixed j and setting $\Lambda_2^* = -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^*)^T \Lambda_{1,j}^*$, we have the conclusion that $(W_1^*, \dots, W_J^*, Z^*, \Lambda_{1,1}^*, \dots, \Lambda_{1,J}^*, \Lambda_2^*)$ satisfies the optimality conditions in (8). For each fixed j , to prove the existence of such $\Lambda_{1,j}^*$, we only need to prove $S_j \cap \partial \mathcal{J}(W_j^*) \neq \emptyset$, where the cone $S_j = \{A_j^T \Lambda_{1,j}, \Lambda_{1,j} \in R^{r_j \times \ell}\}$, and $\mathcal{J}(W_j) = \|W_j\|_1$, $j = 1, \dots, J$. Obviously, both S_j and $\mathcal{J}(W_j)$ are nonempty closed convex sets. Suppose that $S_j \cap \partial \mathcal{J}(W_j^*) = \emptyset$. According to the separation theorem of convex sets ([37]), there exist nonzero $Y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j \times \ell}$ for each fixed j ($j = 1, \dots, J$) such that

$$\langle Y_j, D_j \rangle \leq \langle Y_j, A_j^T \Lambda_{1,j} \rangle - 1, \quad \forall D_j \in \partial \mathcal{J}(W_j^*), \quad \Lambda_{1,j} \in R^{r_j \times \ell}.$$

Thus, $A_j Y_j = 0, j = 1, \dots, J$, otherwise, let $\Lambda_{1,j} = \alpha A_j Y_j$ and $\alpha \rightarrow -\infty$ so that $\langle Y_j, D_j \rangle \leq -\infty$ which is obviously false. Hence, we can see that

$$\langle Y_j, D_j \rangle \leq -1, \quad \forall D_j \in \partial \mathcal{J}(W_j^*), \quad j = 1, \dots, J.$$

Let $W_j(\alpha) = W_j^* + \alpha Y_j$ ($j = 1, \dots, J$), then $(W_1(\alpha), \dots, W_J(\alpha), Z^*)$ is a feasible point of problem (7) and $W_j(\alpha) \rightarrow W_j^*$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$. Since $(W_1^*, \dots, W_J^*, Z^*)$ is a local minimizer of problem (7), we have

$$\mathcal{J}(W_j(\alpha)) - \mathcal{J}(W_j^*) \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, J$$

for a sufficiently small α , and the directional derivative of \mathcal{J} at W_j^* is defined as

$$\mathcal{J}'(W_j^*, Y_j) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{J}(W_j(\alpha)) - \mathcal{J}(W_j^*)}{\alpha} \geq 0.$$

However, Lemma 2 tells us that

$$\mathcal{J}'(W_j^*, Y_j) = \max_{D_j \in \partial \mathcal{J}(W_j^*)} \langle Y_j, D_j \rangle \leq -1, \quad j = 1, \dots, J.$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, for each fixed j , $S_j \cap \partial \mathcal{J}(W_j^*) \neq \emptyset$.

Now we are in position to give the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof 2: (Proof of Theorem 1) We only need to prove the boundedness of $\{W_j^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and $\{\Lambda_j^k\}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, J$, since $\{Z^k\}$ is an orthogonal matrix which is obviously bounded. Because W_j^{k+1} solves (14), it satisfies the optimality condition

$$0 \in \beta_k A_j^T (A_j W_j^{k+1} + B_j Z^{k+1} - \Lambda_j^k / \beta_k) + \partial \|W_j^{k+1}\|_1, \quad \forall k \geq 0,$$

or equivalently

$$A_j^T \Lambda_j^{k+1} \in \partial \|W_j^{k+1}\|_1,$$

by noticing $\beta_k (A_j W_j^{k+1} + B_j Z^{k+1}) = \Lambda_j^k - \Lambda_j^{k+1}$. When A_j is of full row rank, then

$$\Lambda_j^{k+1} \in (A_j A_j^T)^{-1} \bullet \partial \|W_j^{k+1}\|_1, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Obviously, for a fixed j , $\partial \|W_j^{k+1}\|_1$ is a compact set ([37]), from which it follows that the sequence $\{\Lambda_j^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ ($j = 1, \dots, J$) is bounded (fixed j). From the iteration procedure of Algorithm 1, we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} & L_{\beta_k} (W_1^{k+1}, W_2^{k+1}, W_3^{k+1}, \dots, W_J^{k+1}, Z^{k+1}, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k) \\ & \leq L_{\beta_k} (W_1^k, W_2^{k+1}, W_3^{k+1}, \dots, W_J^{k+1}, Z^{k+1}, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k) \\ & \leq L_{\beta_k} (W_1^k, W_2^k, W_3^{k+1}, \dots, W_J^{k+1}, Z^{k+1}, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k) \\ & \vdots \\ & \leq L_{\beta_k} (W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^{k+1}, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & L_{\beta_k} (W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^{k+1}, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k) \\ & \leq L_{\beta_k} (W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k) \\ & = L_{\beta_{k-1}} (W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^{k-1}, \dots, \Lambda_J^{k-1}) \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^J \langle \Lambda_j^{k-1} - \Lambda_j^k, A_j W_j^k + B_j Z^k \rangle \\ & \quad + \frac{\beta_k - \beta_{k-1}}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \|A_j W_j^k + B_j Z^k\|_F^2 \\ & = L_{\beta_{k-1}} (W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^{k-1}, \dots, \Lambda_J^{k-1}) \\ & \quad + \frac{\beta_{k-1} + \beta_k}{2\beta_{k-1}^2} \sum_{j=1}^J \|\Lambda_j^k - \Lambda_j^{k-1}\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is achieved with the relation $\beta_{k-1} (A_j W_j^k + B_j Z^k) = \Lambda_j^{k-1} - \Lambda_j^k$. Notice that $\{\Lambda_j^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded and

$$\sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\beta_{k-1} + \beta_k}{2\beta_{k-1}^2} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\rho^{k-1} \beta_0 + \rho^k \beta_0}{2\rho^{2(k-1)} \beta_0^2} = \frac{\rho(1+\rho)}{2(\rho-1)\beta_0}.$$

Thus, $L_{\beta_k}(W_1^{k+1}, \dots, W_J^{k+1}, Z^{k+1}, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k)$ is upper bounded. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^J \|W_j^k\|_1 &= L_{\beta_{k-1}}(W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^{k-1}, \dots, \Lambda_J^{k-1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\beta_{k-1}} \sum_{j=1}^J (\|\Lambda_j^{k-1}\|_F^2 - \|\Lambda_j^k\|_F^2), \end{aligned}$$

is upper bounded, which could be achieved by noticing the expression for $L_{\beta_{k-1}}(W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^{k-1}, \dots, \Lambda_J^{k-1})$ and $\Lambda_j^{k-1} - \Lambda_j^k = \beta_{k-1}(A_j W_j^k + B_j Z^k)$. Thus the sequence $\{W_j^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded. Also notice that

$$A_j W_j^k + B_j Z^k = \frac{\Lambda_j^{k-1} - \Lambda_j^k}{\beta_{k-1}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence for any accumulation point $(W_1^*, \dots, W_J^*, Z^*, \Lambda_1^*, \dots, \Lambda_J^*, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^*)^T \Lambda_j^*)$ of $\{(W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^k)^T \Lambda_j^k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$, without any loss of generality, we can assume that $(W_1^*, \dots, W_J^*, Z^*, \Lambda_1^*, \dots, \Lambda_J^*, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^*)^T \Lambda_j^*)$ is the limit of $\{(W_1^{k_i}, \dots, W_J^{k_i}, Z^{k_i}, \Lambda_1^{k_i}, \dots, \Lambda_J^{k_i}, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^{k_i})^T \Lambda_j^{k_i})\}_{i=1}^\infty$, where k_i is the subsequence of k , $i = 1, \dots, \infty$. Letting $i \rightarrow \infty$ and applying Lemma 3, we have $A_j^T \Lambda_{1,j}^* \in \partial \|W_j^*\|_1$, $j = 1, \dots, J$. Thus, $(W_1^*, \dots, W_J^*, Z^*, \Lambda_1^*, \dots, \Lambda_J^*, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^*)^T \Lambda_j^*)$ satisfies the KKT conditions (8).

Proof 3: (Proof of Theorem 2) Since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Lambda_j^{k+1} - \Lambda_j^k}{\beta_k} = 0$ and notice that $\frac{\Lambda_j^k - \Lambda_j^{k+1}}{\beta_k} = A_j W_j^{k+1} + B_j Z^{k+1}$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_j W_j^k + B_j Z^k = 0.$$

For any accumulation point $(W_1^*, \dots, W_J^*, Z^*, \Lambda_1^*, \dots, \Lambda_J^*, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^*)^T \Lambda_j^*)$ of $\{(W_1^k, \dots, W_J^k, Z^k, \Lambda_1^k, \dots, \Lambda_J^k, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^k)^T \Lambda_j^k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$, there exists subsequence $\{(W_1^{k_i}, \dots, W_J^{k_i}, Z^{k_i}, \Lambda_1^{k_i}, \dots, \Lambda_J^{k_i}, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^{k_i})^T \Lambda_j^{k_i})\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} W_j^{k_i} = W_j^*, \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} Z^{k_i} = Z^*, \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_j^{k_i} = \Lambda_j^*.$$

Hence, for each fixed $j (j = 1, \dots, J)$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_j W_j^* + B_j Z^* &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_j W_j^{k_i} + B_j Z^{k_i} = 0, \\ (Z^*)^T Z^* &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (Z^{k_i})^T Z^{k_i} = I, \end{aligned}$$

which means $(W_1^*, \dots, W_J^*, Z^*)$ is a feasible point of problem (7). Since W_j^{k+1} solves problem (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta_k}{\delta} \left(W_j^k - \delta A_j^T (A_j W_j^k + B_j Z^{k+1} - \Lambda_j^k / \beta_k) - W_j^{k+1} \right) \\ \in \partial \|W_j^{k+1}\|_1, \quad \forall k \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently

$$A_j^T \Lambda_j^k + \left(A_j^T A_j - \frac{1}{\delta} I \right) \beta_{k-1} (W_j^k - W_j^{k-1}) \in \partial \|W_j^k\|_1, \quad \forall k \geq 1,$$

by noticing

$$B_j Z^k = \frac{1}{\beta_{k-1}} (\Lambda_j^{k-1} - \Lambda_j^k) - A_j W_j^k.$$

Similarly, by passing to subsequence $\{k_i\}$, letting $i \rightarrow \infty$, and applying Lemma 3, we can see that $A_j^T \Lambda_j^* \in \partial \|W_j^*\|_1$. Therefore, $(W_1^*, \dots, W_J^*, Z^*, \Lambda_1^*, \dots, \Lambda_J^*, -\sum_{j=1}^J (B_j Z^*)^T \Lambda_j^*)$ satisfies the KKT conditions (8). This completes the proof.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank Dr. Xiaowei Zhang from the Bioinformatics Institute, A*STAR, Singapore, for discussing the theoretical analysis of the proposed algorithm.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Hotelling, "Relations between two sets of variates," *Biometrika*, vol. 2, no. 3/4, pp. 321–377, 1936.
- [2] A. Vinokourov, N. Cristianini, and J. Shawe-Taylor, "Inferring a semantic representation of text via cross-language correlation analysis," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2003, pp. 1497–1504.
- [3] Y. Yamanishi, J.-P. Vert, A. Nakaya, and M. Kanehisa, "Extraction of correlated gene clusters from multiple genomic data by generalized kernel canonical correlation analysis," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 19, no. suppl1, pp. i323–i330, 2003.
- [4] O. Friman, J. Cedefamn, P. Lundberg, M. Borga, and H. Knutsson, "Detection of neural activity in functional mri using canonical correlation analysis," *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine: An Official Journal of the International Society for Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 323–330, 2001.
- [5] T. Michaeli, W. Wang, and K. Livescu, "Nonparametric canonical correlation analysis," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2016, pp. 1967–1976.
- [6] C. Gao, D. Garber, N. Srebro, J. Wang, and W. Wang, "Stochastic canonical correlation analysis," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 20, no. 167, pp. 1–46, 2019.
- [7] J. Cai and H. Sun, "Constrained erm learning of canonical correlation analysis: a least squares perspective," *Neural Computation*, vol. 29, no. 10, pp. 2825–2859, 2017.
- [8] P. B. Zhang and Z.-X. Yang, "Robust matrix elastic net based canonical correlation analysis: An effective algorithm for multi-view unsupervised learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05068*, 2017.
- [9] K. M. Tan, Z. Wang, H. Liu, and T. Zhang, "Sparse generalized eigenvalue problem: optimal statistical rates via truncated rayleigh flow," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, vol. 80, no. 5, pp. 1057–1086, 2018.
- [10] Z. Ma, Y. Lu, and D. Foster, "Finding linear structure in large datasets with scalable canonical correlation analysis," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015, pp. 169–178.
- [11] W. Wang, R. Arora, K. Livescu, and N. Srebro, "Stochastic optimization for deep cca via nonlinear orthogonal iterations," in *2015 53rd Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 688–695.
- [12] R. Ge, C. Jin, P. Netrapalli, A. Sidford *et al.*, "Efficient algorithms for large-scale generalized eigenvector computation and canonical correlation analysis," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2016, pp. 2741–2750.
- [13] S. Waaijenborg, P. C. V. de Witt Hamer, and A. H. Zwinderman, "Quantifying the association between gene expressions and dna-markers by penalized canonical correlation analysis," *Statistical applications in genetics and molecular biology*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2008.
- [14] D. M. Witten, R. Tibshirani, and T. Hastie, "A penalized matrix decomposition, with applications to sparse principal components and canonical correlation analysis," *Biostatistics*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 515–534, 2009.
- [15] D. R. Hardoon and J. Shawe-Taylor, "Sparse canonical correlation analysis," *Machine Learning*, vol. 83, no. 3, pp. 331–353, 2011.
- [16] D. Chu, L. Z. Liao, M. K. Ng, and X. Zhang, "Sparse canonical correlation analysis: new formulation and algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 3050–3065, 2013.
- [17] M. Chen, C. Gao, Z. Ren, and H. H. Zhou, "Sparse cca via precision adjusted iterative thresholding," in *Proceedings of International Congress of Chinese Mathematicians*, 2016.
- [18] C. Gao, Z. Ma, H. H. Zhou *et al.*, "Sparse cca: adaptive estimation and computational barriers," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 2074–2101, 2017.

- [19] Y. Luo, D. Tao, K. Ramamohanarao, C. Xu, and Y. Wen, "Tensor canonical correlation analysis for multi-view dimension reduction," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 27, no. 11, pp. 3111–3124, 2015.
- [20] M. Kang, B. Zhang, X. Wu, C. Liu, and J. Gao, "Sparse generalized canonical correlation analysis for biological model integration: a genetic study of psychiatric disorders," in *Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC), 2013 35th Annual International Conference of the IEEE*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1490–1493.
- [21] A. Benton, R. Arora, and M. Dredze, "Learning multiview embeddings of twitter users," in *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, vol. 2, 2016, pp. 14–19.
- [22] X. Fu, K. Huang, M. Hong, N. D. Sidiropoulos, and A. M.-C. So, "Scalable and flexible multiview max-var canonical correlation analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 16, pp. 4150–4165, 2017.
- [23] A. Benton, H. Khayrallah, B. Gujral, D. A. Reisinger, S. Zhang, and R. Arora, "Deep generalized canonical correlation analysis," in *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP (ReplANLP-2019)*, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [24] C. I. Kanatsoulis, X. Fu, N. D. Sidiropoulos, and M. Hong, "Structured sumcor multiview canonical correlation analysis for large-scale data," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 306–319, 2018.
- [25] J. Vía, I. Santamaría, and J. Pérez, "A learning algorithm for adaptive canonical correlation analysis of several data sets," *Neural Networks*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 139–152, 2007.
- [26] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein, "Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers," *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2011.
- [27] D. R. Hardoon, S. Szedmak, and J. Shawe-Taylor, "Canonical correlation analysis: an overview with application to learning methods," *Neural Computation*, vol. 16, no. 12, pp. 2639–2664, 2004.
- [28] J. Carroll, "Equations and tables for a generalization of canonical correlation analysis to three or more sets of variables," in *Proceedings of Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association*, vol. 3, 1968, pp. 227–228.
- [29] J. R. Kettenring, "Canonical analysis of several sets of variables," *Biometrika*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 433–451, 1971.
- [30] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations, 3rd*. Johns Hopkins Univ Press, 1996.
- [31] S. J. Wright, R. D. Nowak, and M. A. T. Figueiredo, "Sparse reconstruction by separable approximation," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 57, pp. 2479–2493, 2008.
- [32] E. T. Hale, W. Yin, and Y. Zhang, "A fixed-point continuation method for ℓ_1 -regularized minimization with applications to compressed sensing," *SIAM journal on Optimization*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 1107–1130, 2008.
- [33] A. Beck and M. Teboulle, "A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems," *SIAM J. Imaging Sciences*, vol. 2, pp. 183–202, 2009.
- [34] M. Dettling, "Bagboosting for tumor classification with gene expression data," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 20, no. 18, pp. 3583–3593, 2004.
- [35] P. Koehn, *Europarl: a parallel corpus for statistical machine translation*. MIT summit, 2005, vol. 5.
- [36] B. K. Sriperumbudur, D. A. Torres, and G. R. G. Lanckriet, "A majorization-minimization approach to the sparse generalized eigenvalue problem," *Machine Learning*, vol. 85, no. 1-2, pp. 3–39, 2011.
- [37] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [38] X. Zhang, D. Chu, and R. C. Tan, "Sparse uncorrelated linear discriminant analysis for undersampled problems," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 1469–1485, 2015.