

Graph-based Extreme Feature Selection for Multi-class Classification Tasks

Shir Friedman¹, Gonen Singer², and Neta Rabin¹

¹Tel-Aviv University, Dept. of Industrial Engineering, Tel-Aviv, Israel

²Bar-Ilan University, Faculty of Engineering, Ramat-Gan, 52900, Israel

Abstract

When processing high-dimensional datasets, a common pre-processing step is feature selection. Filter-based feature selection algorithms are not tailored to a specific classification method, but rather rank the relevance of each feature with respect to the target and the task. This work focuses on a graph-based, filter feature selection method that is suited for multi-class classifications tasks. We aim to drastically reduce the number of selected features, in order to create a sketch of the original data that codes valuable information for the classification task. The proposed graph-based algorithm is constructed by combing the Jeffries-Matusita distance with a non-linear dimension reduction method, diffusion maps. Feature elimination is performed based on the distribution of the features in the low-dimensional space. Then, a very small number of feature that have complementary separation strengths, are selected. Moreover, the low-dimensional embedding allows to visualize the feature space. Experimental results are provided for public datasets and compared with known filter-based feature selection techniques.

1 Introduction

Generating and storing large amount of data for improving automatic learning tasks have become common practice in the industry. However, with storage becoming more and more expansive, companies will eventually have to limit the amount of stored data, and select subsets of data according to a cost-benefit policy [1]. Feature selection techniques, which where initially focused on improving the learning accuracy of models in case of redundant features, and on reducing the computational complexity, may now become valuable for reducing storage space of data warehouses. Hence, as we enter the era of big data overflow, the importance of generating sketches of large dataset, by selecting the most relevant features, is clear.

Feature selection algorithms can be coarsely separated into three types: wrapper, embedded and filter methods [2]. Wrapper methods perform an iterative search for finding the best subset of features [3]. The selection procedure in is combined with a specific machine learning algorithm, and the selected subset of features is aimed at optimizing the performance of this specific machine learning algorithm. The main drawback is that is in the case of high-dimensional data sets, wrapper methods may have a high computational complexity [4].

In embedded method, the features are selected during the learning process, thus requiring to modify the machine learning algorithm [5]. Although these methods provide efficient solutions for classification tasks, they depend on the specific classifier, which may be an obstacle for industry users that apply off-the-shelf classification methods, who will prefer separated feature selection algorithm for the classification algorithms.

Filter-based feature selection algorithms are not tailored to a specific classification method, but rather rank the relevance of each feature with respect to the target and the task. Relief [6] and ReliefF [7] are a well-known filter method, which ranks the quality of a features based on their ability to distinguish between data instances that are close to one another. However, these methods does not remove redundant features. In the Fisher score method [8], the feature are ranked and selected independently according to their Fisher criterion scores, which is the ratio of inter-class separation and intra-class variance. Correlation-based feature selection (CFS , [9]) selects features that have low linear relations with other features, but are correlated with the label. A feature selection method that is based on mutual information select a subset of features that minimize redundancy maximize new information was proposed in [10]. Maximum Relevance Minimum Redundancy (MRMR [11]) finds a minimal optimal subset of features. It resembles ideas that are presented in this work, although the algorithmic approach is different and its iterative nature may be a drawback when the number of features is large.

In recent years, graph-based methods have been proposed for filter feature selection. The main idea is to construct a feature-graph for modeling the feature space, and then evoke graph-based algorithms for selection of a representative subset of features. The graph allows to code the pairwise relationships between the features, taking into account both relevance and redundancy. A hybrid feature selection approach that is based on Feature Association Map was developed in [12]. Selection of the best feature subset relays on graph-theoretic principles, minimal vertex cover and maximal independent set. The INF-FS approach [13] for the supervised case, constructs a feature-graph in which the edges take into account several metrics such as Fisher criterion, normalized mutual information and the feature's normalized standard deviation. A single rank score is calculated by letting the paths on the graph go to infinite. A graph-based feature selection method that deals with the case of multi-label data, was developed in [14]. The PageRank algorithm, which operates on the graph, derived the features' ranking.

In this work, the focus is on feature selection for multi-class classifications tasks. When the label consists of multiple classes, the contribution of each fea-

ture should be defined by how well it separated between all pairs of classes. Nevertheless, we would not want to select two *strong* features if their separation abilities are similar. In the multi-class case, avoiding redundancy in the selected feature subset, may be achieved by selection of features that are capable of complementary discrimination capabilities. Therefore, our goal is to find a subset of features that do not necessarily hold the best, highest, pairwise separability scores, but rather that their combination *covers* the feature space in terms of pairwise class separation abilities. In order to form such a graph, we combine a graph-based manifold learning method named diffusion maps (DM) [15] that constructs a compact representation of a dataset while preserving its geometric structure based in the Jeffries-Matusita (JM) distance, denoted by JM-DM. The JM distance used to quantify the separation abilities of each single feature between each two pairs of classes. We note that other distances like the Wasserstein distance may be considered instead of JM. Given a multi-class problem, the JM based feature separation is coded by symmetric matrix that holds the class separability strength of each feature. Application of diffusion maps to the feature space, where each feature is represented by a JM distance matrix, provides a visual description of the feature distribution with respect to class separability. In order to prioritize features that do not necessarily have the highest averaged separation [16], but contribute to specific class-separation pairs, a simple k-means algorithm is evoked in the low-dimensional space. It results with a sampled subset of features that are associated with different JM matrices, thus they have different separation capabilities. Features with similar JM distance matrices lie close to one another are eliminated.

Experimental results are demonstrated on two high-dimensional datasets and are compared with known common used filter methods for feature selection. We show that the proposed JM-DM procedure results in higher classification accuracy, especially when we consider extreme cases where a very small number of features from the original dataset are kept. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the JM distance measure and diffusion maps (DM). The proposed feature selection algorithm is described in Section 3. Experimental results are presented in Section 4. Last, conclusions are provided in Section 5.

2 Methods

This section reviews the Jeffries-Matusita (JM) distance measure and diffusion maps. Denote the learned dataset by (X, Y) . X is a dataset of size $N \times M$. Here, N is the number of samples and M is the dimension of the feature space. The label, of size $N \times 1$ is stored in the vector Y , we assume that there are C classes, meaning that Y contains C different values. The dataset X is comprised of M feature vectors, denoted by $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_M\}$, each f_i is of size $1 \times N$. In general, we assume that X holds at least one instance from each class.

2.1 Jeffries-Matusita distance for feature selection

Given a feature $f_i \in F$, the JM distance constructs a $C \times C$ matrix that defines how well the feature f_i separates between *all* pairs of classes. This matrix is denoted by JM_i . The matrix entry $JM_i(c, \tilde{c})$ informs us how well the feature f_i separates between the two classes c and \tilde{c} , where $1 \leq c, \tilde{c} \leq C$. The matrix entries are computed by

$$JM_i(c, \tilde{c}) = 2 \left(1 - e^{-B_i(c, \tilde{c})} \right), \quad (1)$$

where

$$B_i(c, \tilde{c}) = \frac{1}{8} (\mu_{i,c} - \mu_{i,\tilde{c}})^2 \frac{2}{\sigma_{i,c}^2 + \sigma_{i,\tilde{c}}^2} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{\sigma_{i,c}^2 + \sigma_{i,\tilde{c}}^2}{2\sigma_{i,c}\sigma_{i,\tilde{c}}} \right) \quad (2)$$

is the Bhattacharyya distance. The values $\mu_{i,c}, \mu_{i,\tilde{c}}$ and $\sigma_{i,c}, \sigma_{i,\tilde{c}}$ are the mean and variance values of two given classes c and \tilde{c} from the feature f_i .

2.2 Diffusion maps

Diffusion maps (DM) allows to model high-dimensional data that lie on a non-linear manifold. Given a dataset $\mathbf{Z} = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_M\}$ with M data points, a graph $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{W})$ is constructed, where the points in \mathbf{Z} are the vertices of \mathbf{G} and a kernel matrix \mathbf{W} of size $M \times M$, holds the graph's weighted edges. \mathbf{W} should satisfy the following properties: symmetric, positive-preserving, and positive semi-definite (see [15] for details).

The Gaussian kernel $\mathbf{W} = w(z_i, z_j) = e^{-\frac{\|z_i - z_j\|^2}{2\epsilon}}$ is a common choice for the weight matrix of \mathbf{G} . The scale of the kernel ϵ defines the local neighborhood around each data point in the original space. The value of ϵ should be adapted to the density distribution of the data, and may be set by the following heuristic $\epsilon = \max_j [\min_{i, i \neq j} (\|z_i - z_j\|)^2]$. This value can be further controlled by a factor multiplication. We note that the Gaussian kernel may be replaced by other kernels that obey the above properties.

By introducing a scale parameter α , the effect of the non-uniform data distribution may be controlled. A general normalized form of the kernel is given by

$$\mathbf{W}_\alpha = w_\alpha(z_i, z_j) = \frac{w(z_i, z_j)}{q^\alpha(z_i)q^\alpha(z_j)}, \quad q(z_i) = \sum_{z_j \in \mathbf{Z}} w(z_i, z_j). \quad (3)$$

Here, we set $\alpha = 1$, which results in an approximation of \mathbf{K} to the Laplace-Beltrami operator [15], and it allows to recover the geometry of the data points, regardless of their distribution. A second normalization is performed for generating a Markov transition matrix \mathbf{K} from \mathbf{W}_α . This results in

$$\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{W}_\alpha, \quad \mathbf{D} = d(z_i, z_i) = \sum_{z_j \in \mathbf{Z}} w_\alpha(z_i, z_j). \quad (4)$$

The spectral decomposition of \mathbf{K} yields a set of embedding coordinates for the dataset \mathbf{Z} . Denote the eigenvalues of \mathbf{K} by $\{\lambda_l\}_{l=0}^{M-1}$ and the left and right

eigenvectors by $\{\phi_l\}_{l=0}^{M-1}$ and $\{\psi_l\}_{l=0}^{M-1}$, respectively. Although \mathbf{K} is not a symmetric matrix, it is conjugate to a symmetric matrix, thus the two sets of eigenvectors $\{\phi_l\}_{l=0}^{M-1}$ and $\{\psi_l\}_{l=0}^{M-1}$, are biorthonormal $\langle \phi_m, \psi_l \rangle = \delta_{l,m}$. Therefore, each element in \mathbf{K} can be computed by

$$k(z_i, z_j) = \sum_{l=0}^{M-1} \lambda_l \psi_l(z_i) \phi_l(z_j). \quad (5)$$

The matrix \mathbf{K} has a decaying spectrum, $\lambda_l \rightarrow 0$ as l grows. This allows to approximate the entries of \mathbf{K} in Eq. (5) by considering a small number of terms d in the sum. Finally, the diffusion maps coordinates are defined by

$$\Psi(z_i) = (\lambda_1 \psi_1(z_i), \lambda_2 \psi_2(z_i), \lambda_3 \psi_3(z_i), \dots). \quad (6)$$

The first $d \leq M$ diffusion maps coordinates are considered, thus the space is reduced. Algorithm 1 summarizes the DM construction.

Algorithm 1 Diffusion maps

Input: Dataset $\mathbf{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_M\}$. Kernel scale parameter ϵ .

Output: Diffusion maps embedding coordinates $\Psi(z_i)$.

- 1: Construct the Gaussian kernel $\mathbf{W}_{ij} = w(z_i, z_j) = e^{-\frac{\|z_i - z_j\|^2}{2\epsilon}}$.
 - 2: Normalize \mathbf{W} by $\mathbf{W}_\alpha = \frac{w(z_i, z_j)}{q(z_i)q(z_j)}$, where $q(z_i) = \sum_{z_j} w(z_i, z_j)$.
 - 3: Normalize \mathbf{W}_α to be a Markov transition matrix $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{W}_\alpha$, where \mathbf{D} is a diagonal matrix with $\mathbf{D} = d(z_i, z_i) = \sum_{z_j} w_\alpha(z_i, z_j)$.
 - 4: Compute the spectral decomposition of \mathbf{K} by $k(z_i, z_j) = \sum_{l=0}^{M-1} \lambda_l \psi_l(z_i) \phi_l(z_j)$.
 - 5: Construct diffusion maps coordinates $\Psi(z_i) = (\lambda_1 \psi_1(z_i), \lambda_2 \psi_2(z_i), \dots)$.
-

2.2.1 Diffusion Distances

Diffusion maps provide a locally preserving metric named diffusion distance that is defined on the data points. Two data points z_i and z_j are close in this metric if the graph G holds many paths that connect between the two points. In this work, two features with similar JM matrices are guaranteed to be embedded close to one another, making DM a suitable method to fulfil our objectives. Mathematically, the diffusion distance is defined by

$$D^2(z_i, z_j) = \sum_{z_m \in \mathbf{Z}} \frac{(k(z_i, z_m) - k(z_m, z_j))^2}{\phi_0(z_m)}, \quad (7)$$

where ϕ_0 is the first left eigenvector of \mathbf{K} . The spectral decomposition of \mathbf{K} , as defined in Eq. (5) is substituted into the nominator of Eq. (7) to yield the diffusion distance expressed by the DM embedding coordinates, which is expressed by

$$D^2(z_i, z_j) = \sum_l \lambda_l^2 (\psi_l(z_i) - \psi_l(z_j))^2. \quad (8)$$

From Eqs. (7) and (8), we deduce that the Euclidean distance between the data points (here the features) low-dimensional representation is equivalent to the random-walk distance as defined in the original space. This fact gives rise to the idea of selecting the features in the generated low-dimensional space.

3 JM-DM Feature Selection

The proposed feature selection approach consists of three steps. First, each feature is replaced with its computed JM matrix. Next, DM is applied to create a low-dimensional embedding of the feature space. Last, a selection procedure is applied for picking a subset of relevant features from the low-dimensional space.

The DM coordinates provide a reduced and compact space that organizes the features by their underlying class separability properties. Using a Gaussian kernel with Euclidean distances will keep features with similar JM matrices close to each other in this space. Here, we suggest to perform the elimination process by application of k-means on the embedded feature space, where k^* is the desired number of selected features, as defined by the user. K-means act as a simple sampling mechanism, choosing features from different areas of the embedded space, therefore, these features have different separability characteristics. In order to improve the k-means selection procedure, and to shift the selection such that the worse features (in terms of the JM separability measure) will not be selected, a cut-off parameter q is defined. This cut-off parameter defines the quantile of low-seperability features to be ignored in the selection process. In order to calculate a naive ranking of the features, we use the average JM matrix values. Algorithm 2 summarizes the proposed feature selection approach.

Algorithm 2 JM-DM feature selection

Input: Feature vectors $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_M\}$. Number of selected features k^* , Quantile of features to ignore q , DM kernel scale parameter ϵ .

Output: A subset of selected features F_S .

- 1: For each feature f_i , compute the JM-matrix JM_i of size $C \times C$.
 - 2: Compute the average value of each JM-matrix, $\mathbf{m}(i) = \text{average}(JM_i)$.
 - 3: Reshape JM_i to be a vector of size $1 \times (C \times C)$ and form a dataset \mathbf{Z} that holds the reshaped JM matrices as its rows.
 - 4: Apply Algorithm 1 to \mathbf{Z} . This results with DM coordinates $\Psi(JM_i) = (\lambda_1\psi_1(JM_i), \lambda_2\psi_2(JM_i), \lambda_3\psi_3(JM_i), \dots)$.
 - 5: Sort $\Psi(JM_i)$ according to the values of the vector \mathbf{m} and keep the reduced set $\Psi_q(JM_i)$ such that $\mathbf{m}(i)$ is above the q -quantile.
 - 6: Apply k-means to $\Psi_q(JM_i)$. From each of the k^* clusters select the representative feature as the feature with the highest value of \mathbf{m} .
 - 7: Return the list F_S that holds the k^* selected features.
-

4 Experimental Results

Two public datasets from the UCI repository ¹ belonging to multi-class classification, with a large number of features, tasks are considered.

1. **Isolet:** The dataset holds 617 features extracted from voice recordings of 150 subjects, who spoke out each of the English alphabets. The number of instances is 7797. The task is to classify the correct letter (26 classes).
2. **Multiple features (digit recognition):** The dataset consists of 649 features of handwritten digits 0, 1, ..., 9. These features include Fourier coefficients, profile correlations, Karhunen-Love coefficients, pixel averages and morphological features. The number of instances is 2000, 500 per class.

To benchmark the proposed method, several filter selection methods, including ReliefF, Fisher, Correlation-based selection (CFS), Maximum Relevance Minimum Redundancy (MRMR) were applied, while a 5-fold cross validation scheme was used for each data set. The classification measures were averaged over the 5 folds. In addition, we compared our results to a “random filter” (Rand. in the results tables), in which the number of desired features are randomly selected from the input feature columns. Classification was carried out using k-nearest neighbors (KNN, k=5) and classification trees (denoted by C-TREE in the tables below). The number of DM coordinates in Alg. 1 was set to 3 and the value of q in Alg. 2 was set to 0.25. For each of the datasets we selected $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{16}$ and $\frac{1}{32}$ of the original features. These correspond to 77, 39 and

¹UCI: <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets.php>

19 features for the Isolet dataset, and 81, 41, and 20 for the multiple feature dataset.

Figure 1 plots the DM embedding of the ISOLET feature space as well as features selected by the JM-DM and the Relieff algorithms. Each feature is colored by the mean value of its computed JM matrix. Features with stronger average separation are colored in yellow, while features with a weak class separation are colored in blue.




Figure 1: DM embedding of the Isolet features, colored by the average JM score. The $\frac{19}{617}$ features that were selected by JM-DM (left) and by Relieff (right) are circled in black. JM-DM selects features with different separation strengths, while Relieff selects features with strong average separation abilities.

Table 1 presents the classification results for the Isolet dataset. For the first case, where the features are reduced by $\frac{1}{8}$, the results of the proposed JM-DM algorithm are significantly better for all cases, using a paired t-test with p-value of 0.05. When the proportion of selected features is $\frac{1}{16}$, the results of a JM-DM are significantly better than Relieff, Fisher, CFS and random for the C-TREE classification. Last, when only $\frac{1}{32}$ of the features are kept, JM-DM is significantly better than all of the algorithms except MRMR.

Table 2 presents the classification results for the Multiple features dataset. For the first case, where the features are reduced by $\frac{1}{8}$, the results of the proposed JM-DM algorithm are significant for all cases, except for CFS and MRMR with KNN classification. When $\frac{1}{16}$ and $\frac{1}{32}$ of the features are kept, JM-DM is significantly better than all of the other compared algorithms. It is surprising to see random selection of features outperforms some of the tested methods.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed a feature selection algorithm that is suited for multi-class classification tasks. Its main idea is to select an extremely small subset of features that have complementary separation abilities. This subset does not necessarily hold the features that have the best average separation ability, but

Table 1: Classification Results for the Isolet Dataset (617 input features)

Alg.	Fraction of Selected Features	Feature Selection Method					
		JM-DM	RelieFF	Fisher	CFS	MRMR	Rand.
KNN	1/8	0.864	0.725	0.790	0.642	0.850	0.330
C-TREE	1/8	0.760	0.6663	0.708	0.525	0.743	0.698
KNN	1/16	0.800	0.638	0.653	0.582	0.819	0.583
C-TREE	1/16	0.719	0.586	0.597	0.483	0.717	0.648
KNN	1/32	0.733	0.552	0.537	0.472	0.720	0.350
C-TREE	1/32	0.666	0.494	0.477	0.422	0.649	0.506

Table 2: Classification Results for the Multiple-Features Dataset (649 input features)

Alg.	Fraction of Selected Features	Feature Selection Method					
		JM-DM	RelieFF	Fisher	CFS	MRMR	Rand.
KNN	1/8	0.975	0.961	0.840	0.978	0.974	0.967
C-TREE	1/8	0.939	0.917	0.826	0.906	0.898	0.884
KNN	1/16	0.976	0.892	0.786	0.962	0.951	0.954
C-TREE	1/16	0.927	0.873	0.723	0.897	0.856	0.865
KNN	1/32	0.964	0.831	0.825	0.905	0.892	0.896
C-TREE	1/32	0.919	0.830	0.733	0.845	0.780	0.834

rather aims to select features that compensate for one another in terms of differentiating between all pairs of classes. The algorithm is composed of three techniques, JM distance matrices, diffusion maps and k-means, which are applied in a sequential manner. The feature space was represented by JM matrices that efficiently and simply code the separation ability of a feature in the case of multi-class problems. Then, in order to retain this detailed information in the selection process, a feature graph was constructed based on the JM matrices. Application of diffusion maps (DM) resulted in a small number of embedding coordinates that organize the feature space based on the JM matrices. Features with similar JM matrices are embedded close to one another in the DM embedding. Last, selection of embedded features that correspond to different JM matrices, was simply done by application of the k-mean algorithm, where k was the desired number of feature to preserve. The experimental results highlighted the advantage of the proposed approach, as it achieved higher classification results compared to classical feature selection techniques. The proposed algorithm

may be viewed as a more general framework, such that other metrics, besides JM, may be used and explored in the future. Another direction can explore the effect of fusion of several separation metrics as a basis for construction of the features-graph, which is the input to the DM algorithm.

References

- [1] H. Pugh, Getting Rid of Data: Why it's So Hard. *Information Management*, vol. 21, nu. 6, pp. 12, 2011.
- [2] B. Venkatesh, J. Anuradha, A review of feature selection and its methods. *Cybernetics and information technologies*, vol. 19, nu. 1, pp. 3–26, 2019.
- [3] A. Jović, K. Brkić, N. Bogunović, A review of feature selection methods with applications. 2015 38th international convention on information and communication technology, electronics and microelectronics (MIPRO). pp. 1200–1205, 2015.
- [4] G. Manosij, G. Ritam, R. Sarkar, A. Abraham, A wrapper-filter feature selection technique based on ant colony optimization. *Neural Computing & Applications*, vol. 32, nu. 12, pp. 7839–7857, 2020
- [5] S. T. Monteiro, R. J. Murphy, Embedded feature selection of hyperspectral bands with boosted decision trees. 2011 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium, pp. 2361–2364, 2011.
- [6] K. Kira, L. A. Rendell, The feature selection problem: Traditional methods and a new algorithm. *AAAI*, vol. 2, pp. 129–134, 1992.
- [7] M. Robnik-Šikonja, I. Kononenko, Theoretical and empirical analysis of ReliefF and RReliefF. *Machine learning*, vol. 53, nu. 1, pp. 23–69, 2003.
- [8] P. E. Hart, D. G. Stork, R. O. Duda, *Pattern classification*, 2000.
- [9] M. W. Hall, *Correlation-based feature selection for machine learning*, 1999.
- [10] J. Wang, J-M Wei, Z. Yang, S-Q Wang, Feature selection by maximizing independent classification information. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, vol. 29, nu. 4, pp. 828–841, 2017.
- [11] H. Peng, F. Long, C. Ding, Feature selection based on mutual information criteria of max-dependency, max-relevance, and min-redundancy, *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 27, nu. 8, pp. 1226–1238, 2005.
- [12] A. K. Das, S. Goswami, A. Chakrabarti, B. Chakraborty, A new hybrid feature selection approach using feature association map for supervised and unsupervised classification. *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 88, pp. 81–94, 2017.

- [13] G. Roffo, S. Melzi, U. Castellani, A. Vinciarelli, M. Cristani, Infinite feature selection: a graph-based feature filtering approach. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 43, nu. 12, pp.4396–4410, 2020.
- [14] A. Hashemi, M. B. Dowlatshahi, H. Nezamabadi-Pour, MGFS: A multi-label graph-based feature selection algorithm via PageRank centrality, *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 142, pp. 113024, 2020.
- [15] R. R. Coifman, S. Lafon, Diffusion maps. *Applied and computational harmonic analysis*, vol. 21, nu. 1, pp. 5–30, 2006.
- [16] I. Khosravi, A. Safari, S. Homayouni, MSMD: maximum separability and minimum dependency feature selection for cropland classification from optical and radar data, *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, vol. 39, nu. 8, pp. 2159–2176, 2018.