

Granular Ball K-Class Twin Support Vector Classifier

M. A. Ganaie^{a,*}, Vrushank Ahire^a, Anouck Girard^b

^aDepartment of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Ropar, Rupnagar, 140001, Punjab, India

^bDepartment of Robotics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA, Ann Arbor, 48109-2140, Michigan, USA

Abstract

This paper introduces the Granular Ball K-Class Twin Support Vector Classifier (GB-TWKSVC), a novel multi-class classification framework that combines Twin Support Vector Machines (TWSVM) with granular ball computing. The proposed method addresses key challenges in multi-class classification by utilizing granular ball representation for improved noise robustness and TWSVM's non-parallel hyperplane architecture solves two smaller quadratic programming problems, enhancing efficiency. Our approach introduces a novel formulation that effectively handles multi-class scenarios, advancing traditional binary classification methods. Experimental evaluation on diverse benchmark datasets shows that GB-TWKSVC significantly outperforms current state-of-the-art classifiers in both accuracy and computational performance. The method's effectiveness is validated through comprehensive statistical tests and complexity analysis. Our work advances classification algorithms by providing a mathematically sound framework that addresses the scalability and robustness needs of modern machine learning applications. The results demonstrate GB-TWKSVC's broad applicability across domains including pattern recognition, fault diagnosis, and large-scale data analytics, establishing it as a valuable addition to the classification algorithm landscape.

Keywords:

Multi-class Classification, Twin Support Vector Machine, Granular Ball Computing, Noise Resistance

1. Introduction

The field of machine learning witnessed remarkable advancements in classification algorithms over the past few decades, with Support Vector Machines (SVMs) emerging as powerful tools for solving complex classification problems. Since their introduction by Vapnik [1], SVMs gain popularity due to their ability to

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: mudasir@iitrpr.ac.in (M. A. Ganaie), 2022csb1002@iitrpr.ac.in (Vrushank Ahire), anouck@umich.edu (Anouck Girard)

handle high-dimensional data and their strong theoretical foundations in statistical learning theory. However, the original SVM formulation is limited to binary classification, prompting researchers to explore methods for handling multi-class problems.

The journey towards multi-class SVMs begins with strategies like the “one-versus-one” approach proposed by Hastie and Tibshirani [2]. This method involves training binary classifiers for each pair of classes and combining their decisions. Building on this concept, Angulo and Català introduce K-SVCR [3], a multi-class SVM that assigns outputs of +1, -1, or 0 to training patterns, enhancing the model’s ability to handle complex class relationships.

A significant breakthrough comes with the introduction of Twin Support Vector Machines (TWSVM) by Khemchandani et al. [4]. TWSVM aims to improve computational efficiency by solving two smaller quadratic programming problems instead of a single large one. This innovation is particularly effective for large-scale datasets and sparks a new line of research focused on improving and extending the TWSVM framework.

The concept of multi-class TWSVM begins to take shape, with researchers exploring various strategies to extend the binary TWSVM to handle multiple classes simultaneously. These approaches offer different trade-offs between computational complexity and classification accuracy. For example, Xu et al. propose the Twin Multi-Class Classification Support Vector Machine [5], which extends the binary TWSVM to handle multiple classes efficiently.

As research in this area intensifies, several key themes emerge:

- **Computational Efficiency:** A major focus is on improving the speed and scalability of multi-class SVMs, particularly for large-scale datasets. The Least Squares Twin Multi-Class Classification Support Vector Machine (LSTKSVC) introduced by Nasiri et al. [6] replaces quadratic programming problems with systems of linear equations, significantly reducing computational complexity. This approach is later refined by Ali et al. [7] with the addition of regularization to address overfitting issues.
- **Incorporation of Local Information:** Researchers recognize the importance of utilizing local data structures to enhance classification accuracy. Xu’s K-nearest neighbor-based weighted multi-class twin support vector machine [8] uses weight matrices to exploit local information within classes. This idea is further developed by Tanveer et al. [9], combining efficiency with improved handling of imbalanced datasets.

- **Robustness and Outlier Handling:** As multi-class SVMs are applied to more complex real-world problems, the need for robust methods that can handle noisy data and outliers becomes apparent. Qiang et al.'s TSVM-M3 [10] incorporates multi-order moment matching to reduce sensitivity to outliers in large-scale multi-class classification. Their robust weighted linear loss twin multi-class support vector regression method [11] further addresses these challenges.
- **Integration with Deep Learning:** Recent years see efforts to combine the strengths of SVMs with deep learning techniques. Xie et al.'s deep multi-view multiclass twin support vector machines [12] demonstrate the potential of integrating TWSVM with deep neural networks for improved performance on multi-view data.

Parallel to these developments, the concept of granular computing begins to gain traction in the machine-learning community. The Granular-Ball Support Vector Machine (GBSVM) introduced by Xia et al. [13] represents a significant departure from traditional point-based SVMs by using granular balls as input. This approach offers improved robustness and efficiency, particularly for noisy and large datasets.

Our proposed Granular Ball K-Class Twin Support Vector Machine (GB-TWKSVC) builds upon these foundations, combining the strengths of multi-class TWSVM with the robust data representation offered by granular ball computing. It addresses several key challenges in multi-class classification:

- **Computational Efficiency:** By using the TWSVM framework and granular ball representation, GB-TWKSVC is designed to handle large-scale datasets efficiently.
- **Robustness:** The use of granular balls, formed through hierarchical k-means clustering, enhances the model's ability to handle complex data, improving resilience to outliers and data perturbations, with minimal reliance on explicit experimentation with noisy data.
- **Multi-class Handling:** GB-TWKSVC extends the binary classification capabilities of TWSVM to efficiently handle multi-class problems without resorting to multiple binary classifiers.
- **Improved Generalization:** By incorporating ideas from recent advancements in the field, such as regularization and local information exploitation, GB-TWKSVC aims to achieve better generalization performance across a wide range of datasets.

The development of GB-TWKSVC is also informed by advancements in related areas, such as the application of TSVM to regression problems [14] and the use of transductive bounds for multi-class majority vote

classifiers [15]. These related works provide valuable insights into the theoretical foundations and practical considerations of multi-class SVM variants.

Through extensive experiments, we demonstrate that GB-TWKSVC offers superior performance in terms of accuracy overall. Even after the creation of $O(K^2)$ classifiers, similar to the Twin-KSVC with the “1-versus-1-versus-rest” approach, GB-TWKSVC outperforms Twin-KSVC. Additionally, despite 1-versus-rest OTSVM employing $O(K)$ classifiers, GB-TWKSVC remains competitive in terms of computational efficiency. Our approach builds upon the comprehensive review of multi-class TWSVM methods conducted by Ding et al. [16], addressing identified areas for future research and incorporating recent advancements in the field.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides a detailed background on TWSVM and granular ball computing, explaining the fundamental concepts and their relevance to our proposed method. Section 3 introduces the GB-TWKSVC algorithm, detailing its formulation and theoretical foundations. Section 4 presents our experimental results, offering a comprehensive comparison with state-of-the-art methods across various datasets and performance metrics. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper and discusses future research directions, including potential extensions to incorporate ideas from this paper such as the development of online and incremental learning variants for streaming data applications.

Through GB-TWKSVC, we aim to contribute to the ongoing evolution of multi-class classification algorithms, offering a robust and efficient solution that addresses the challenges of modern machine-learning tasks. By combining the strengths of TWSVM, granular ball computing, and recent advancements in multi-class classification, we believe our method represents a significant step forward in the field of machine learning and pattern recognition.

2. Related Work

This section examines Twin Support Vector Machine (TSVM) models that utilize granular ball data inputs. Additionally, we discuss multi-class methods founded on two distinct approaches: the “one-versus-rest” paradigm, which employs K binary Support Vector Machine (SVM) classifiers, and the “one-versus-one-versus-rest” structure. The latter approach forms the basis for both K -SVCR (Support Vector Classification Regression for K -class classification) and Twin-KSVC models.

2.1. Twin Support Vector Machines (TSVM)

Twin Support Vector Machines (TSVM) represent an advancement in binary classification algorithms, offering a distinct approach from traditional Support Vector Machines (SVM). While conventional SVMs seek a single optimal hyperplane to separate classes, TSVMs employ a pair of non-parallel hyperplanes, each aligned closely with one class while maintaining separation from the other. The TSVM framework offers several key advantages, including computational efficiency and improved classification accuracy, particularly for non-linearly separable or imbalanced datasets. By decomposing the classification problem into two smaller quadratic programming problems (QPPs), TSVMs achieve faster training times compared to standard SVMs, especially for large-scale datasets, approximately 4 times faster with a complexity of $2 \times O((n/2)^3)$.

Mathematically, given a binary classification problem with a training dataset $\mathcal{D} = (\mathbf{z}_i, y_i) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, where $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the i -th feature vector and $y_i \in -1, +1$ denotes its corresponding class label, TSVM aims to find two non-parallel hyperplanes:

$$\mathbf{z}^T \boldsymbol{\omega}^{(1)} + b^{(1)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{z}^T \boldsymbol{\omega}^{(2)} + b^{(2)} = 0 \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\omega}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are weight vectors and $b^{(1)}, b^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}$ are bias terms. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times d}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times d}$ be matrices whose rows are the feature vectors of the positive and negative classes, respectively, where $n_1 + n_2 = N$.

The primal optimization problems for TSVM can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(1)}, b^{(1)}, \xi} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|A\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(1)} + \mathbf{e}_1 b^{(1)}\|^2 + c_1 \mathbf{e}_2^T \boldsymbol{\xi}, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & -(B\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(1)} + \mathbf{e}_2 b^{(1)}) + \boldsymbol{\xi} \geq \mathbf{e}_2, \quad \boldsymbol{\xi} \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(2)}, b^{(2)}, \eta} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|B\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(2)} + \mathbf{e}_2 b^{(2)}\|^2 + c_2 \mathbf{e}_1^T \boldsymbol{\eta}, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & -(A\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(2)} + \mathbf{e}_1 b^{(2)}) + \boldsymbol{\eta} \geq \mathbf{e}_1, \quad \boldsymbol{\eta} \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here, $\mathbf{e}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and $\mathbf{e}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ are vectors of ones, c_1 and c_2 are regularization parameters, and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ are slack variables.

The dual formulation of these problems leads to more efficient solutions:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\alpha} \quad & e_2^T \alpha - \frac{1}{2} \alpha^T G (H^T H)^{-1} G^T \alpha, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \alpha \leq c_1 e_2, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\beta} \quad & e_1^T \beta - \frac{1}{2} \beta^T P (Q^T Q)^{-1} P^T \beta, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \beta \leq c_2 e_1. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $H = [A \ e_1]$, $G = [B \ e_2]$, $P = [A \ e_1]$, and $Q = [B \ e_2]$.

The solutions α and β from the dual problems provide the parameters for the hyperplanes as:

$$\begin{aligned} v &= -(H^T H)^{-1} G^T \alpha, \quad \text{where} \quad v = \begin{bmatrix} \omega^{(1)} \\ b^{(1)} \end{bmatrix}, \\ v^* &= -(Q^T Q)^{-1} P^T \beta, \quad \text{where} \quad v^* = \begin{bmatrix} \omega^{(2)} \\ b^{(2)} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

For a new data point \mathbf{z}_{new} , the classification decision is made based on the proximity to the two hyperplanes:

$$\text{class}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{new}}) = \text{sign} \left(\frac{|z_{\text{new}}^T \omega^{(1)} + b^{(1)}|}{\|\omega^{(1)}\|} - \frac{|z_{\text{new}}^T \omega^{(2)} + b^{(2)}|}{\|\omega^{(2)}\|} \right) \tag{7}$$

where $\text{sign}(\cdot)$ represents the signum function. This rule assigns the new point to the class corresponding to the nearest hyperplane.

2.2. Granular Ball Support Vector Machines (GB-SVM)

Granular Ball Support Vector Machines (GB-SVM), introduced by Xia et al. [13], enhance the traditional SVM framework by representing data points as granular balls instead of discrete points. Each granular ball is defined by a center c_i and radius r_i , where c_i represents the mean of enclosed data points and r_i captures their variability. This representation enables robust classification, particularly in scenarios with noisy data or outliers.

The total number of data points in the dataset is n , but there are m granular balls, each represented by a center c_i and a radius r_i , where $i = 1, \dots, m$.

The fundamental constraint for support planes l'_1 and l'_2 incorporating granular balls is:

$$y_i \omega \cdot c_i + y_i b - \|\omega\| r_i \geq 1 \tag{8}$$

The support planes are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
l'_1 &: \omega \cdot c_i - \|\omega\|r_i + b = 1, \quad y_i = +1 \\
l'_2 &: \omega \cdot c_i + \|\omega\|r_i + b = -1, \quad y_i = -1 \\
l'_0 &: \omega \cdot c_i + b = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The goal is to find the best separation hyperplane (ω, b) that takes the granular balls into consideration.

For inseparable cases, the primal optimization problem with slack variables ξ_i and penalty coefficient C is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{\omega, b, \xi} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|\omega\|^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i \\
\text{subject to} \quad & y_i(\omega \cdot c_i + b) - \|\omega\|r_i \geq 1 - \xi_i, \\
& \xi_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The corresponding dual formulation introduces Lagrange multipliers α_i :

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\alpha} \quad & -\frac{1}{2} P^2 - \frac{1}{2} Q^2 + \|P\|Q + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \\
\text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i y_i = 0, \\
& 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq C, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $P = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i y_i c_i$ and $Q = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i r_i$. P is a vector and $\|P\|$ is its norm (scalar). The optimal weight vector ω is obtained as:

$$\omega = \frac{(\|P\| - Q)P}{\|P\|} \tag{12}$$

given:

$$\|\omega\| = \|P\| - Q \tag{13}$$

The bias term (b) is computed by averaging over all support vectors:

$$b = \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} (y_i - \omega \cdot c_i + y_i \|\omega\|r_i) \tag{14}$$

where n_s denotes the number of support vectors in the SVM model.

This granular ball representation enhances the model's robustness to noise and outliers, providing a foundation for advanced classification approaches that incorporate additional contextual information.

2.3. K-SVCR

The problem of multi-class classification remains a significant challenge in the domain of machine learning, particularly when utilizing support vector machines (SVMs), which are inherently designed for binary classification. A widely adopted strategy to address this challenge involves decomposing the multi-class problem into multiple binary classification tasks, followed by a reconstruction phase to synthesize the outcomes. Angulo et al. [3] proposed the Support Vector Classification-Regression (K-SVCR) algorithm, which provides an innovative approach to multi-class classification through a distinctive decomposition-reconstruction framework.

The K-SVCR algorithm employs a “1-versus-1-versus-rest” scheme during the decomposition phase. Unlike conventional approaches, this method integrates both classification and regression elements within the SVM framework. The algorithm is designed to handle K classes by training machines with ternary outputs $\{-1, 0, +1\}$, where -1 and $+1$ represent the two classes being explicitly separated, and 0 represents all other classes. For a training set $\mathcal{T} = \{(z_p, y_p)\}_{p=1}^n \subset \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where $\mathcal{Y} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K\}$ and n represents the total number of training samples, K-SVCR aims to find a decision function $f(z, \omega)$ that maps inputs to one of three outputs:

$$f(z_p) = \begin{cases} +1, & p = 1, \dots, n_1 \\ -1, & p = n_1 + 1, \dots, n_1 + n_2 \\ 0, & p = n_1 + n_2 + 1, \dots, n \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

The K-SVCR algorithm extends the standard SVM binary classification framework by incorporating elements from SVM regression. For binary classification, the optimization problem is typically formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_{\omega, b, \xi} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|\omega\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + c_1 \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y_i \cdot (\langle \omega, \Phi(z_i) \rangle + b) \geq 1 - \xi_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $\xi_i \geq 0$ are slack variables. Here, \mathcal{F} represents the feature space where $\omega \in \mathcal{F}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\Phi : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ denotes the mapping of input data into the feature space.

K-SVCR generalizes this formulation by incorporating the ϵ -insensitive loss function commonly used in SVM regression. The resulting optimization problem for K-SVCR is expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \arg \min_{\omega, b, \xi, \eta, \eta^*} \frac{1}{2} \|\omega\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i + D \sum_{i=1}^n (\eta_i + \eta_i^*) \\
& \text{s.t. } y_i \cdot (\langle \omega, \Phi(z_i) \rangle + b) \geq 1 - \xi_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_{12} \\
& \quad -\epsilon - \eta_i^* \leq \langle \omega, \Phi(z_i) \rangle + b \leq \epsilon + \eta_i, \quad i = n_{12} + 1, \dots, n
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $\xi_i, \eta_i, \eta_i^* \geq 0$ are slack variables, and ϵ is a pre-chosen positive parameter constrained to be less than 1 to prevent class overlap. The parameters C and D are regularization constants. C controls the trade-off between maximizing the margin and minimizing the classification error, while D balances the regression-like treatment of the remaining classes.

The dual formulation of this problem can be expressed as:

$$\arg \min L(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} \alpha^T H \alpha + c^T \alpha \tag{18}$$

where

$$\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n_{12}}, \alpha_{n_{12}+1}, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{12}+n_3+n_3}, \tag{19}$$

$$c^T = \left(-\frac{1}{y_1}, \dots, -\frac{1}{y_{n_{12}}}, \dots \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{12}+n_3+n_3}. \tag{20}$$

The kernel matrix $H = (k(x_i, x_j))$ is defined by the dot products in the transformed feature space \mathcal{F} and satisfies

$$H = H^T \in M(\mathbb{R}^{n_{12}+n_3+n_3}, \mathbb{R}^{n_{12}+n_3+n_3}). \tag{21}$$

This formulation allows K-SVCR to simultaneously handle binary classification and regression-like treatment for the remaining classes. The reconstruction phase employs a voting scheme considering both positive and negative votes, enhancing the algorithm's fault tolerance.

2.4. Twin-KSVC

Twin k-class Support Vector Machines (Twin-KSVC) [5] was proposed as an extension to traditional support vector machines for multi-class classification tasks. This approach employs a “1-versus-1-versus-rest” structure, wherein two distinct sample sets are selected from k classes and treated as focal partitions. The algorithm maps the remaining samples into an intermediate region between these non-parallel hyperplanes, resulting in a ternary output system $\{-1, 0, +1\}$. A key advantage of Twin-KSVC over K-SVCR is its ability to resolve a pair of smaller-sized quadratic programming problems (QPPs) instead of a single large one, potentially improving computational efficiency.

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times d}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times d}$ denote the two focal sample sets, labeled +1 and -1 respectively. The remaining samples are represented by $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n_3 \times d}$ and labeled 0. The objective is to generate two non-parallel hyperplanes:

$$z^T w^{(1)} + b^{(1)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad z^T w^{(2)} + b^{(2)} = 0 \quad (22)$$

These hyperplanes are obtained by solving the following pair of QPPs:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w^{(1)}, b^{(1)}, \xi, \eta} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|Aw^{(1)} + e_1 b^{(1)}\|^2 + c_1 e_2^T \xi + c_2 e_3^T \eta \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & -(Bw^{(1)} + e_2 b^{(1)}) + \xi \geq e_2, \quad \xi \geq 0, \\ & -(Cw^{(1)} + e_3 b^{(1)}) + \eta \geq (1 - \epsilon)e_3, \quad \eta \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w^{(2)}, b^{(2)}, \xi^*, \eta^*} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|Bw^{(2)} + e_2 b^{(2)}\|^2 + c_3 e_1^T \xi^* + c_4 e_3^T \eta^* \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (Aw^{(2)} + e_1 b^{(2)}) + \xi^* \geq e_1, \quad \xi^* \geq 0, \\ & (Cw^{(2)} + e_3 b^{(2)}) + \eta^* \geq (1 - \epsilon)e_3, \quad \eta^* \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $w^{(1)}, w^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$, $b^{(1)}, b^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times 1}$, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_3 \times 1}$, $\xi^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times 1}$, $\eta^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n_3 \times 1}$, and e_i denotes a vector of ones with appropriate dimensions.

The dual problem of the first QPP can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_c \quad & -\frac{1}{2} c^T N (H^T H)^{-1} N^T c + e_4^T c \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq c \leq F \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $H = [A \ e_1]$, $G = [B \ e_2]$, $M = [C \ e_3]$, $N = [G; M]$, $c = [\alpha; \beta]$, $e_4 = [e_2; e_3(1 - \epsilon)]$, and $F = [c_1 e_2; c_2 e_3]$.

The solution vector $u = [w^{(1)}; b^{(1)}]$ can be obtained as:

$$u = (H^T H + \delta I_{d+1})^{-1} (G^T \alpha + M^T \beta) \quad (26)$$

where δ is a small positive regularization term introduced in the case when the matrix is (nearly) singular.

Similarly, we can derive the dual problem of QPP, and the other solution vector u^* can be obtained as:

$$u^* = (G^T G + \delta I_{d+1})^{-1} (H^T \alpha^* + M^T \beta^*) \quad (27)$$

This formulation of Twin-KSVC provides a great approach to multi-class classification, offering potential advantages in terms of computational efficiency and classification accuracy for complex datasets.

3. Proposed Model: GB-TWKSVC

The performance of traditional classification methods, including classical Twin K-class Support Vector Machines, can be limited by challenges such as sensitivity to label noise and the inability to handle complex, multi-dimensional data effectively. While these models are powerful in binary classification tasks, they struggle to generalize in multi-class scenarios, which are prevalent in real-world applications. Moreover, these methods often face scalability issues that hinder their adaptability to various types of data distributions. Therefore, there is a need for more robust, scalable, and noise-resilient classification techniques.

Granular computing provides a promising solution, especially through the concept of granular balls. While its success has been demonstrated in binary classification, its potential in multi-class problems has yet to be fully explored. By grouping similar data points into granular balls, the proposed approach introduces an additional layer of abstraction that improves generalization. This is in line with human cognitive processes, where information is often abstracted into meaningful chunks or granules. This abstraction enhances the interpretability of the models and helps reduce computational complexity by working with clusters of data rather than individual points.

The granular ball representation also facilitates a transformation of the feature space, potentially uncovering hidden patterns that are not obvious in the original data. The adaptability of granular balls to varying data densities and distributions allows for more flexible decision boundaries compared to traditional hyperplane-based methods. This flexibility is especially useful in addressing class imbalance, a common challenge in many classification tasks. By integrating granular ball computing with Twin Support Vector Machines, our GB-KTVSM model overcomes the limitations of existing methods, offering a more efficient and adaptable multi-class classification framework that enhances performance across a variety of real-world applications.

3.1. Model Overview

This section provides an overview of the model's key components and processes.

3.1.1. Granular Ball Generation

The initial step in the proposed model involves the generation of granular balls using a hierarchical k-means clustering algorithm. The granular ball generation process can be formalized, as illustrated in Figure 1. This process is governed by two primary parameters: a purity threshold and a minimum number of data points per cluster. The algorithm proceeds as follows:




Figure 1: Granular Ball Generation Flowchart

1. Initially, the data points are segregated into k clusters, corresponding to the k unique class labels.
2. Within each of these initial clusters, further clustering is performed.
3. For each resulting sub-cluster, two conditions are evaluated:
 - (a) The purity of the cluster, defined as the proportion of the dominant class within the cluster, must exceed the specified threshold.
 - (b) The number of data points in the cluster must be greater than a predetermined minimum value.
4. If both conditions are satisfied, the sub-cluster is designated as a granular ball.

The granular ball generation process is detailed in the following algorithm 1:

Algorithm 1 Granular Ball Generation

Require: Dataset $X = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, purity threshold θ , minimum points m

Ensure: Set of granular balls $\mathcal{G} = \{(c_j, r_j, l_j)\}_{j=1}^M$

- 1: Initialize $\mathcal{G} \leftarrow \emptyset$
 - 2: Apply hierarchical k-means clustering to X
 - 3: **for** each leaf cluster C_k in the hierarchy **do**
 - 4: **if** $\text{purity}(C_k) \geq \theta$ **and** $|C_k| \geq m$ **then**
 - 5: $c_k \leftarrow \text{mean}(\{x_i \mid (x_i, y_i) \in C_k\})$
 - 6: $r_k \leftarrow \max(\{\|x_i - c_k\|_2 \mid (x_i, y_i) \in C_k\})$
 - 7: $l_k \leftarrow \text{mode}(\{y_i \mid (x_i, y_i) \in C_k\})$
 - 8: $\mathcal{G} \leftarrow \mathcal{G} \cup \{(c_k, r_k, l_k)\}$
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: **return** \mathcal{G}
-

Each granular ball is characterized by a centroid and a radius. The centroid is computed as the mean of all feature vectors of the data points within the ball, resulting in a d -dimensional vector for d features. The radius is defined as the maximum of the individual radii within the ball, where each radius is calculated as the $L2$ norm of a data point's feature vector. The final step in granular ball formation involves label assignment. Each ball is assigned the label of the majority class among its constituent data points.

3.1.2. Classification Framework

The GB-TWKSVC employs a “1-versus-1-versus-rest” strategy for multi-class classification. This approach involves considering two classes at a time while treating the remaining $k - 2$ classes as a collective entity. The objective is to compute two non-parallel planes that effectively separate the two focal classes while positioning the remaining classes between these planes. The proposed model includes an ϵ -tube, with $\epsilon < 1$, to prevent plane overlap and offer a margin of tolerance for the $k - 2$ classes positioned between the planes. The ϵ parameter is essential for managing the margin tolerance around the predicted values, ensuring that no penalty is applied to the $k - 2$ class granular balls within this margin during training. The classification output of GB-TWKSVC is ternary, with values $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. Here, -1 and 1 correspond to the two focal classes,

while 0 represents all classes falling between the two planes. The final classification decision for a new data point is determined through a voting system that considers the outcomes of all pairwise comparisons.

To illustrate this classification framework visually, Figure 2 presents a graphical representation of the GB-TWKSVC model. This figure demonstrates the concept of two non-parallel planes separating two focal classes (represented by blue and red points), with the remaining classes (green points) positioned between these planes. The ϵ -tube is depicted, showing the margin of tolerance around each plane. This visualization helps to clarify the “1-versus-1-versus-rest” strategy and the role of the ϵ parameter in managing class separation.




Figure 2: Visual representation of the GB-TWKSVC classification framework

3.1.3. Augmented Training Set

The program involves building up an augmented training set $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ for GB-TWKSVC. This set comprises labeled granular balls from multiple classes and is defined as the union of granular balls corresponding to each class:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}} = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{T}_k \quad (28)$$

where \mathcal{T}_k represents the set of granular balls for the k -th class. Each element in \mathcal{T}_k is a tuple (c_i^k, r_i^k, y_k) , where:

- $c_i^k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the centroid of the i -th granular ball of class k
- $r_i^k \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the corresponding radius
- y_k is the class label

It's important to note that $\sum_{k=1}^K m_k = m$, where m_k is the number of granular balls in class k , and n is the total number of original data points. This augmented training set forms the foundation for the subsequent mathematical formulation of the GB-TWKSVC model, which details the optimization problem in both linear and nonlinear cases.

3.2. Linear Case

The Granular Ball Twin k -Class Support Vector Machine (GB-TWKSVC) extends the traditional twin support vector machine framework to handle multi-class classification using granular balls. In this section, we present a detailed mathematical formulation for the linear kernel case.

$$\mathcal{G} = \{(c_i, r_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^m \quad (29)$$

where $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the centroid, $r_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the radius, and $y_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ is the class label. For any pair of classes (p, q) , we define $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_p \times d}$ as the matrix of centroids for class p , $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m_q \times d}$ as the matrix of centroids for class q , $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m_r \times d}$ as the matrix of centroids for the remaining $K - 2$ classes, and R_1, R_2, R_3 as the diagonal matrices of the corresponding radii.

The objective is to find two non-parallel hyperplanes:

$$f_1(z) = z^T w^{(1)} + b^{(1)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(z) = z^T w^{(2)} + b^{(2)} = 0 \quad (30)$$

These hyperplanes are obtained by solving the following pair of quadratic programming problems (QPPs):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w^{(1)}, b^{(1)}, \xi, \eta} & \frac{1}{2} \|Aw^{(1)} + e_1 b^{(1)}\|^2 + c_1 e_2^T \xi + c_2 e_3^T \eta \\ \text{s.t.} & \quad -(Bw^{(1)} + e_2 b^{(1)}) + \xi \geq e_2 + R_2, \quad \xi \geq 0, \\ & \quad -(Cw^{(1)} + e_3 b^{(1)}) + \eta \geq (1 - \epsilon)e_3 + R_3, \quad \eta \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min_{w^{(2)}, b^{(2)}, \xi^*, \eta^*} \frac{1}{2} \|Bw^{(2)} + e_2 b^{(2)}\|^2 + c_3 e_1^T \xi^* + c_4 e_3^T \eta^* \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad (Aw^{(2)} + e_1 b^{(2)}) + \xi^* \geq e_1 + R_1, \quad \xi^* \geq 0, \\
& \quad \quad (Cw^{(2)} + e_3 b^{(2)}) + \eta^* \geq (1 - \epsilon)e_3 + R_3, \quad \eta^* \geq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where $w^{(1)}, w^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are weight vectors, $b^{(1)}, b^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}$ are bias terms, ξ, ξ', η, η' are slack variables, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 are penalty parameters, e_1, e_2, e_3 are vectors of ones with appropriate dimensions, and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ is the margin parameter for the remaining classes. The incorporation of radii (R_1, R_2, R_3) in the constraints ensures that the entire granular ball, not just its centroid, satisfies the margin conditions.

To solve these QPPs, we derive their dual formulations. For the first QPP, the Lagrangian function is:

$$\begin{aligned}
L(\Omega) &= \frac{1}{2} \|Aw^{(1)} + e_1 b^{(1)}\|^2 + c_1 e_2^T \xi + c_2 e_3^T \eta \\
&\quad - \alpha^T \left(-(B\omega^{(1)} + e_2 b^{(1)}) + \xi - e_2 - R_2 \right) - \beta^T \xi \\
&\quad - \mu^T \left(-(Cw^{(1)} + e_3 b^{(1)}) + \eta - (1 - \epsilon)e_3 - R_3 \right) - \gamma^T \eta
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where $\Omega = \{\omega^{(1)}, b^{(1)}, \xi, \eta, \alpha, \beta, \mu, \gamma\}$, and α, β, μ , and γ are Lagrange multiplier vectors.

Applying the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\Omega} L(\Omega), \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad \frac{\partial L(\Omega)}{\partial \omega^{(1)}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \frac{\partial L(\Omega)}{\partial b^{(1)}} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial L(\Omega)}{\partial \xi} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \frac{\partial L(\Omega)}{\partial \eta} = \mathbf{0}, \\
& \quad \quad \alpha, \beta, \mu, \gamma \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Evaluating the partial derivatives yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial L}{\partial \omega^{(1)}} &= A^T (A\omega^{(1)} + e_1 b^{(1)}) + B^T \alpha + C^T \mu = 0, \\
\frac{\partial L}{\partial b^{(1)}} &= e_1^T (A\omega^{(1)} + e_1 b^{(1)}) + e_2^T \alpha + e_3^T \mu = 0, \\
\frac{\partial L}{\partial \xi} &= c_1 e_2 - \alpha - \beta = 0, \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial \eta} = c_2 e_3 - \mu - \gamma = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Given that $\beta, \gamma \geq 0$, we can reformulate the constraints on α and μ :

$$\mathbf{0} \leq \alpha \leq c_1 e_2, \quad \mathbf{0} \leq \mu \leq c_2 e_3. \tag{36}$$

From (35), we have:

$$[A \ e_1]^T [A \ e_1] [\omega^{(1)}; b^{(1)}] + [B \ e_2]^T \alpha + [C \ e_3]^T \mu = 0. \tag{37}$$

To simplify the equations, we define the following matrices and vectors:

$$H = [A \ e_1], \quad G = [B \ e_2], \quad O = [C \ e_3], \quad (38)$$

and the extended vector $\vartheta^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} \omega^{(1)} \\ b^{(1)} \end{bmatrix}$ represents the parameters of the separating hyperplane for the p class.

We can rewrite the system of equations (37) as:

$$H^T H \vartheta^{(1)} + G^T \alpha + O^T \mu = 0, \quad (39)$$

leading to:

$$\vartheta^{(1)} = -(H^T H)^{-1} (G^T \alpha + O^T \mu). \quad (40)$$

To ensure numerical stability and handle potential singularities, we introduce a regularization parameter δ , modifying $(H^T H)^{-1}$ as $((H^T H)^{-1} + \delta I)$, where δ is a small positive value and I is the identity matrix.

In dual optimization theory, the Wolfe dual corresponding to the (31) is formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\alpha, \mu} \quad & -\frac{1}{2} (\alpha^T G + \mu^T O) (H^T H)^{-1} (G^T \alpha + O^T \mu) \\ & + (e_2^T + R_2^T) \alpha + ((1 - \epsilon) e_3^T + R_3^T) \mu \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \alpha \leq c_1 e_2, \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq c_2 e_3 \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The problem can be represented in an augmented matrix form as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\alpha, \mu} \quad & -\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^T & \mu^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} G \\ O \end{bmatrix} (H^T H)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} G^T & O^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \mu \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} (e_2 + R_2) \\ ((1 - \epsilon) e_3 + R_3) \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \mu \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \alpha \leq c_1 e_2, \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq c_2 e_3. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

This formulation highlights the quadratic nature of the optimization problem and facilitates the use of standard quadratic programming solvers.

Finally, we can derive the dual formulation of the QPP (31) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\alpha} \quad & -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{X}^T \mathcal{V} (H^T H)^{-1} \mathcal{V}^T \mathcal{X} + e_4^T \mathcal{X}, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \alpha \leq E. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where $\mathcal{V} = [G; O]$, $e_4 = [(e_2 + R_2); ((1 - \epsilon) e_3 + R_3)]$, $\mathcal{X} = [\alpha; \beta]$, $E = [c_1 e_2; c_2 e_3]$.

Similarly, we can derive the dual problem and solution for the second QPP:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\lambda, \nu} \quad & -\frac{1}{2}(\lambda^T P + \nu^T S)(Q^T Q)^{-1}(P^T \lambda + S^T \nu) \\
& + (e_1^T + R_1^T)\lambda + ((1 - \epsilon)e_3^T + R_3^T)\nu \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \lambda \leq c_3 e_1, \quad 0 \leq \nu \leq c_4 e_3
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where

$$P = [A \ e_1], \quad Q = [B \ e_2], \quad S = [C \ e_3], \tag{45}$$

and the extended vector $\vartheta^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} \omega^{(2)} \\ b^{(2)} \end{bmatrix}$, represents the parameters of the separating hyperplane for the q class. We can write the system of equations as:

$$Q^T Q \vartheta^{(2)} + P^T \lambda + S^T \nu = 0, \tag{46}$$

thus,

$$\vartheta^{(2)} = -(Q^T Q)^{-1}(P^T \lambda + S^T \nu). \tag{47}$$

Similarly, we can derive the dual formulation of the QPP (32) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\alpha} \quad & -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{P}^T \mathcal{R} (G^T G)^{-1} \mathcal{R}^T \mathcal{P} + e_4^T \alpha, \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \alpha \leq F
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where $\mathcal{R} = [H; O]$, $e_4 = [(e_1 + R_1); ((1 - \epsilon)e_3 + R_3)]$, $\mathcal{P} = [\gamma; \nu]$, $F = [c_3 e_1; c_4 e_3]$.

The separating hyperplanes are derived from $\vartheta^{(1)}$ and $\vartheta^{(2)}$ Eq.(40) and (51):

$$z^T \omega^{(1)} + b^{(1)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad z^T \omega^{(2)} + b^{(2)} = 0 \tag{49}$$

A distinct sample $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is classified based on its minimum distance to these hyperplanes:

$$h(z) = \min_{1,2} \{\delta^1(z), \delta^2(z)\}, \tag{50}$$

where,

$$\delta^1(z) = |z^T \omega^{(1)} + b^{(1)}|, \quad \delta^2(z) = |z^T \omega^{(2)} + b^{(2)}|. \tag{51}$$

where $|\cdot|$ signifies the orthogonal distance of the point z from the planes $z^T \omega^{(1)} + b^{(1)} = 0$ and $z^T \omega^{(2)} + b^{(2)} = 0$.

3.3. Nonlinear Twin-KSVC

This section explores the extension of the linear Twin-KSVC to accommodate nonlinear patterns. We employ kernel-generated surfaces to map input data into a higher-dimensional feature space, where a linear classifier is implemented. This classifier corresponds to a nonlinear separating surface in the original input space. The kernel-generated surfaces are defined as:

$$K(z^T, D)w^{(1)} + e_1b^{(1)} = 0, \quad (52)$$

$$K(z^T, D)w^{(2)} + e_2b^{(2)} = 0, \quad (53)$$

Here, $D = [A; B; C]$, and K represents an arbitrary kernel function. The primal Quadratic Programming Problems (QPPs) of the nonlinear Twin-KSVC corresponding to these surfaces are formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w^{(1)}, b^{(1)}, \xi, \eta} & \frac{1}{2} \|K(A, D)w^{(1)} + e_1b^{(1)}\|^2 + c_1e_2^T\xi + c_2e_3^T\eta \\ \text{s.t.} & \quad -(K(B, D)w^{(1)} + e_2b^{(1)}) + \xi \geq e_2 + R_2, \quad \xi \geq 0, \\ & \quad -(K(C, D)w^{(1)} + e_3b^{(1)}) + \eta \geq (1 - \epsilon)e_3 + R_3, \quad \eta \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w^{(2)}, b^{(2)}, \xi^*, \eta^*} & \frac{1}{2} \|K(B, D)w^{(2)} + e_2b^{(2)}\|^2 + c_3e_1^T\xi^* + c_4e_3^T\eta^* \\ \text{s.t.} & \quad (K(A, D)w^{(2)} + e_1b^{(2)}) + \xi^* \geq e_1 + R_1, \quad \xi^* \geq 0, \\ & \quad (K(C, D)w^{(2)} + e_3b^{(2)}) + \eta^* \geq e_3(1 - \epsilon) + R_3, \quad \eta^* \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

To solve these QPPs, we introduce the Lagrangian function:

$$\begin{aligned} L(\Omega) &= \frac{1}{2} \|K(A, D)w^{(1)} + e_1b^{(1)}\|^2 + c_1e_2^T\xi + c_2e_3^T\eta \\ & \quad - \alpha^T (-(K(B, D)w^{(1)} + e_2b^{(1)}) + \xi - e_2 - R_2) - \beta^T \xi \\ & \quad - \mu^T (-(K(C, D)w^{(1)} + e_3b^{(1)}) + \eta - (1 - \epsilon)e_3 - R_3) - \gamma^T \eta \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where $\alpha \geq 0e$, $\beta \geq 0e$, $\mu \geq 0e$, $\gamma \geq 0e$ are Lagrangian multipliers. Applying the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions, we differentiate the Lagrangian function with respect to the variables, yielding:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \omega^{(1)}} &= K(A, D)^T (K(A, D)\omega^{(1)} + e_1b^{(1)}) + K(B, D)^T \alpha + K(C, D)^T \mu = 0, \\ \frac{\partial L}{\partial b^{(1)}} &= e_1^T (K(A, D)\omega^{(1)} + e_1b^{(1)}) + e_2^T \alpha + e_3^T \mu = 0, \\ \frac{\partial L}{\partial \xi} &= c_1e_2 - \alpha - \beta = 0, \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial \eta} = c_2e_3 - \mu - \gamma = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Given that $\beta, \gamma \geq 0$, we can reformulate the constraints on α and μ :

$$0 \leq \alpha \leq c_1 e_2, \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq c_2 e_3. \quad (58)$$

we can consolidate equations (57) into a more compact form:

$$[K(A, D) e_1]^T [K(A, D) e_1] [\omega^{(1)}; b^{(1)}] + [K(B, D) e_2]^T \alpha + [K(C, D) e_3]^T \mu = 0. \quad (59)$$

To enhance clarity and streamline our notation, let's introduce the following matrix and vector definitions:

$$H = [K(A, D) e_1], \quad G = [K(B, D) e_2], \quad O = [K(C, D) e_3] \quad (60)$$

Employing these newly defined terms, our equation transforms into:

$$H^T H \vartheta^{(1)} + G^T \alpha + O^T \mu = 0, \quad (61)$$

This condensed form allows us to solve for $\vartheta^{(1)}$, yielding:

$$\vartheta^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} \omega^{(1)} \\ b^{(1)} \end{bmatrix} = -(H^T H)^{-1} (G^T \alpha + O^T \mu). \quad (62)$$

For cases of ill-conditioning, we modify this to:

$$\vartheta^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} \omega^{(1)} \\ b^{(1)} \end{bmatrix} = -(H^T H + \delta I)^{-1} (G^T \alpha + O^T \mu). \quad (63)$$

Substituting these equations into the Lagrangian function, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\alpha, \mu} \quad & -\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^T & \mu^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} G \\ O \end{bmatrix} (H^T H)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} G^T & O^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \mu \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} (e_2 + R_2) \\ ((1 - \epsilon)e_3 + R_3) \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \mu \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \alpha \leq c_1 e_2, \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq c_2 e_3 \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

This formulation highlights the quadratic nature of our optimization problem, facilitating the use of standard quadratic programming solvers. We can further simplify this to:

$$L = -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{X}^T \mathcal{V} (H^T H)^{-1} \mathcal{V}^T \mathcal{X} + e_4^T \mathcal{X}, \quad (65)$$

where $\mathcal{V} = [G; O]$, $e_4 = [(e_2 + R_2); ((1 - \epsilon)e_3 + R_3)]$, $\mathcal{X} = [\alpha; \mu]$. Finally, we derive the dual formulation of the first QPP as:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\alpha} \quad & -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{X}^T \mathcal{V} (H^T H)^{-1} \mathcal{V}^T \mathcal{X} + e_4^T \mathcal{X}, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \alpha \leq E \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where $E = [c_1 e_2; c_2 e_3]$. Similarly, the dual formulation of the second QPP is:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\alpha} \quad & -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{P}^T \mathcal{R} (G^T G)^{-1} \mathcal{R}^T \mathcal{P} + e_4^T \alpha, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq \alpha \leq F \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

where $\mathcal{R} = [H; O]$, $e_4 = [(e_1 + R_1); ((1 - \epsilon)e_3 + R_3)]$, $\mathcal{P} = [\gamma; \nu]$, $F = [c_3 e_1; c_4 e_3]$.

3.4. Algorithm Design and Implementation

The GB-TKSVC algorithm employs a combination of hierarchical clustering with K-Means and granular ball generation to efficiently partition and classify multi-class data.

The clustering method used in GB-TKSVC incorporates hierarchical clustering and K-Means to recursively partition data into clusters based on purity thresholds and label homogeneity. Each cluster is iteratively formed to maximize homogeneity, resulting in final clusters that accurately reflect class separations. The hierarchical clustering with the K-Means algorithm is detailed in Algorithm 2.

The GB-TKSVC Code is structured as follows:

- **Granular Ball Generation:** The process begins with hierarchical K-Means clustering to partition the dataset into granular balls (Algorithm 1). This step ensures that the data is split into homogeneous subsets based on a purity threshold, with each granular ball defined by its centroid, radius, and label. These granular balls serve as a foundation for constructing hyperplanes in the classification phase.
- **Hierarchical Clustering with K-Means:** The hierarchical clustering method (Algorithm 2) recursively divides the data into smaller clusters. This structured partitioning reduces within-cluster variance and provides a more organized dataset for subsequent analysis. The hierarchical approach helps in efficiently managing data and minimizing the complexity of classification.
- **GB-TKSVC Classification:** Using the granular balls, the GB-TKSVC algorithm (Algorithm 3) constructs pairwise comparisons between classes. For each class pair, the data is divided into three sets: A (class 1), B (class 2), and C (remaining classes). Centroids and radii are extracted for these sets, and QPPs are formulated to derive hyperplane parameters (w_1, b_1) and (w_2, b_2) . The hyperplanes are then used for classifying new data points through a voting mechanism.

The overall time complexity of GB-TKSVC includes the complexity of hierarchical clustering with K-Means and the classification process. The hierarchical clustering with K-Means has a time complexity of $O(k \cdot n \cdot t \cdot d)$, where k is the number of clusters, n is the number of data points, t is the number of iterations for

Algorithm 2 Hierarchical Clustering with KMeans

Require: Dataset $X = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, purity threshold θ , number of clusters k

Ensure: Set of hierarchical clusters $C = \{C_j\}_{j=1}^M$

- 1: Initialize $C \leftarrow \emptyset$, root cluster $C_0 \leftarrow X$
 - 2: **while** purity of C is below θ or unique labels > 1 **do**
 - 3: Apply KMeans on C to partition into sub-clusters
 - 4: **for** each sub-cluster C_s **do**
 - 5: Recursively cluster C_s and add to C
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: **end while**
 - 8: **return** C
-

Algorithm 3 GB-TKSVC

Require: DataTrain, TestX, $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, \epsilon$

Ensure: Predicted labels for TestX

- 1: Initialize: $\mu, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \text{kerfPara}$; identify classes, generate pairs
 - 2: **for** each class pair ($class_1, class_2$) **do**
 - 3: Separate data into A (class 1), B (class 2), C (other classes)
 - 4: Extract centroids and radii: $C_1, C_2, C_3, R_1, R_2, R_3$
 - 5: Prepare matrices: H_1, G_1, O_1, GO, HO
 - 6: Solve QPP for z_1 using formulation, extract w_1, b_1
 - 7: Solve QPP for z_2 using formulation, extract w_2, b_2
 - 8: Store (w_1, b_1, w_2, b_2) for the class pair
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: **for** each test point in TestX **do**
 - 11: **for** each class pair **do**
 - 12: Apply hyperplanes: $y_1 = P_1 w_1 + b_1, y_2 = P_1 w_2 + b_2$
 - 13: Update votes based on decision boundaries
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: Assign class with maximum votes
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: **return** Predicted labels, Actual labels, Computation time
-

convergence, and d is the dimensionality of the data. This complexity comes from the repeated partitioning and centroid updates.

The complete time complexity of GB-TKSVC is:

$$O(k \cdot n \cdot t \cdot d + c^2 \cdot m^3 + n_{\text{test}} \cdot c^2 \cdot d) \quad (68)$$

where:

- $O(k \cdot n \cdot t \cdot d)$ is from hierarchical K-Means clustering.
- $O(c^2 \cdot m^3)$ arises from solving QPPs for each class pair.
- $O(n_{\text{test}} \cdot c^2 \cdot d)$ accounts for applying hyperplanes to test points.

The space complexity is:

$$O(m \cdot d + c^2 \cdot d) \quad (69)$$

where m is the number of granular balls, c is the number of classes, and d is the number of features. This complexity analysis highlights the algorithm's efficiency in handling a large number of input samples by utilizing granular structures.

4. Experimental Results and Analysis

This section presents a comprehensive analysis of the proposed Granular Ball K-Class Twin Support Vector Machine (GB-TWKSVC) model. We evaluate its performance against two baseline models: 1-versus-rest TSVM and Twin-KSVC. The assessment focuses on classification accuracy and training time. We also conduct statistical tests to validate the significance of our results.

4.1. Dataset Information

We evaluated the GB-TWKSVC algorithm on 10 diverse multi-class datasets from the UCI Machine Learning Repository and the LIBSVM Data Collection. These datasets represent a wide range of application domains and vary in the number of instances, features, and classes. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of these datasets. The selected datasets allow us to test the robustness of GB-TWKSVC across various data complexities, including the number of classes, dimensionality, and class distribution.

Dataset	#Instances	#Features	#Classes	Class Distribution (%)
Balance	625	4	3	(46.8, 46.8, 7.84)
Dermatology	358	4	6	(31.00, 16.75, 19.83, 13.40, 13.40, 5.58)
Ecoli	327	7	5	(43.70, 23.54, 10.70, 6.11, 15.90)
Glass	214	9	6	(35.51, 32.71, 13.55, 7.94, 5.14, 2.8, 2.33)
Hayes-roth	132	5	3	(38.63, 38.63, 22.74)
Iris	150	4	3	(33.33, 33.33, 33.33)
Image-segmentation	210	19	7	(14.28, 14.28, 14.28, 14.28, 14.28, 14.28, 14.28)
Seeds	210	7	3	(33.33, 33.33, 33.33)
Teaching Evaluation	151	5	3	(33.77, 33.11, 32.45)

Table 1: Summary of Datasets Used in Experiments

4.2. Experimental Setup

We conducted our experiments on a personal computer with an Intel Core i5-11320H CPU @ 3.20GHz and 16 GB of RAM, running Windows 11. We used Python 3.10, using scikit-learn, solvers.qp(). For datasets without predefined train-test splits, we randomly partitioned the data, allocating 80% for training and 20% for testing. We maintained class proportions during partitioning to ensure balanced training and testing sets. We optimized the GB-TWKSVC model using 5-fold cross-validation on the training data. The key hyperparameters tuned included:

- Regularization parameters, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 : These parameters is tuned over the set $\{2^{-4}, 2^{-2}, 2^0, 2^1, 2^2, 2^4, 2^6, 2^8\}$.
- Margin tolerance parameter, ϵ : The margin tolerance is varied across the values $\{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9, 1.0\}$.
- Gaussian kernel parameter, p : This parameter is also considered and tuned over the set $\{2^{-4}, 2^{-2}, 2^0, 2^1, 2^2, 2^4, 2^6, 2^8\}$.

Additionally, we tuned parameters specific to the granular ball clustering method:

- Minimum number of data points within a granular ball, num : This parameter was varied across the set $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Before comprehensive hyperparameter tuning, we preliminarily tuned the num and pur values. This step was critical to identify appropriate ranges where the number of clusters formed was greater than the number of classes. The upper bound for num was set based on the total number of data points divided by the number of classes.

- Purity threshold, *pur*: The purity threshold, defined as the proportion of the majority class within a granular ball, was adjusted in the range [0.5, 1.0] in increments of 0.05, generally using a linspace distribution. After analysis, it was observed that the optimal range for consideration lies between 0.95 and 1.0. Thus, the values considered for further analysis were {0.95, 0.96, 0.97, 0.98, 0.99, 1.0}.

4.3. Results and Analysis

Dataset		GB-TWKSVC (c1, c2, eps, num, pur, p)	Twin-KSVC (c1, c2, eps, p)	1-versus-rest TSVM (c1, c2, p)
Balance	Parameters	(0.25, 1.0, 0.1, 2, 0.97, 0.0625)	(4.0, 4.0, 0.1, 0.0625)	(1.0, 0.0625, 0.0625)
	Accuracy (%)	89.58 ± 1.35	87.72 ± 0.96	84.88 ± 4
	Time (s)	0.1032	0.2283	0.1956
Dermatology	Parameters	(0.0625, 0.0625, 0.1, 2, 0.97, 0.0625)	(0.25, 0.25, 0.5, 0.0625)	(0.25, 0.0625, 0.0625)
	Accuracy (%)	90.74 ± 5.22	84.34 ± 4.16	69.73 ± 8.48
	Time (s)	0.0976	0.3872	0.0903
Ecoli	Parameters	(0.0625, 4.0, 0.5, 2, 0.99, 4.0)	(1.0, 0.0625, 0.3, 0.25)	(0.25, 0.0625, 0.0625)
	Accuracy (%)	91.04 ± 2.83	88.66 ± 3.8	80.68 ± 5.18
	Time (s)	0.074	0.2124	0.0628
Glass	Parameters	(1.0, 0.25, 0.1, 3, 0.95, 0.0625)	(0.25, 0.0625, 0.5, 0.0625)	(0.25, 2.0, 0.0625)
	Accuracy (%)	76.74 ± 2.57	69.99 ± 6.16	62.45 ± 1.93
	Time (s)	0.04809	0.162	0.0526
Hayes-roth	Parameters	(1.0, 0.25, 0.3, 2, 0.97, 4.0)	(1.0, 0.0625, 0.7, 0.0625)	(0.0625, 0.0625, 0.0625)
	Accuracy (%)	52.44 ± 2.27	54.13 ± 5.86	51.17 ± 5.9
	Time (s)	0.0139	0.0143	0.0138
Iris	Parameters	(0.0625, 2.0, 0.3, 3, 0.99, 1.0)	(0.25, 0.0625, 0.5, 0.0625)	(0.0625, 0.0625, 0.0625)
	Accuracy (%)	99.34 ± 2.63	97.31 ± 3.89	95.33 ± 4
	Time (s)	0.016	0.0167	0.015
Image-segmentation	Parameters	(2.0, 0.0625, 0.1, 2, 0.95, 0.0625)	(0.0625, 0.0625, 0.7, 0.0625)	(4.0, 0.0625, 0.0625)
	Accuracy (%)	90.13 ± 4.49	89.01 ± 5.53	77.03 ± 6.85
	Time (s)	0.0729	0.2309	0.0585
Seeds	Parameters	(16.0, 0.25, 0.1, 3, 0.98, 0.0625)	(4.0, 0.0625, 0.3, 0.25)	(0.0625, 0.0625, 0.0625)
	Accuracy (%)	97.61 ± 4.07	93.81 ± 5.55	89.98 ± 4.83
	Time (s)	0.0257	0.029	0.0259
Teaching Evaluation	Parameters	(0.25, 4.0, 0.5, 3, 0.97, 0.0625)	(2.0, 0.0625, 0.1, 0.25)	(4.0, 0.0625, 4.0)
	Accuracy (%)	74.38 ± 7.2	67.33 ± 8.27	64.67 ± 4.99
	Time (s)	0.0153	0.0162	0.0174

Table 2: Comparison of GB-TWKSVC, Twin-KSVC, and 1-Versus-Rest TSVM on different datasets

GB-TWKSVC demonstrated superior performance, achieving the highest accuracy on 8 out of 9 datasets

and competitive accuracies on the Dermatology, Ecoli, Seeds, and Teaching Evaluation datasets. The model exhibited particular excellence on datasets with a moderate number of classes (3-6), where its granular ball clustering mechanism effectively differentiated between classes. Notably, GB-TWKSVC achieved perfect classification (around 99.34% accuracy) on the Iris dataset, showcasing its exceptional capability in handling well-separated class structures.

The AUC values further corroborate the strong performance of GB-TWKSVC across diverse datasets: Balance (93.42 ± 3.2), Iris (99.72 ± 0.2), Ecoli (95.00 ± 2.8), Seeds (96.22 ± 5.9) and Glass (73.29 ± 2.4). These results highlight the model’s robust discriminative power, particularly evident in the near-perfect AUC for the Iris dataset and the strong performance on the Ecoli dataset.

It is important to note that the optimal parameters for Twin-KSVC and 1-versus-rest TSVM, as reported in the tables from [5], are based on Gaussian kernel implementations and were obtained after extensive tuning. To replicate similar results in our study, we also employ Gaussian kernels for these two models. In contrast, our proposed GB-TWKSVC model utilizes a linear kernel, achieving competitive performance while significantly reducing computational demands and avoiding complex data transformations. While the linear kernel approach is designed for efficient training, the Gaussian kernel is used where necessary to align with the performance characteristics of Twin-KSVC and 1-versus-rest TSVM.




Figure 3: Scalability Comparison Across Datasets. The plot shows the training time of different models across various datasets, with the y-axis on a logarithmic scale to better visualize differences.

A key advantage of GB-TWKSVC is its scalability, which we assessed by comparing training times across increasing dataset sizes. As illustrated in Figure 3, GB-TWKSVC exhibited superior scalability, with training times growing more slowly as dataset size increased. This efficiency can be attributed to the granular ball clustering mechanism, which effectively reduces computational complexity by clustering data points before classification. The times mentioned in Table 2 represent the average times for 5-fold cross-validation, based on the selected parameter set for the program to run. It is important to note that while the scalability of the algorithm is impressive, increasing the number of hyperparameters may lead to longer processing times, which is a common trade-off in machine learning tasks.

Figure 4 shows a 3D surface plot that maps the accuracy of GB-TWKSVC against different combinations of purity and the number of data points. The surface plots for the Seeds, Iris, and Ecoli datasets reveal the performance of the model under varying num and pur parameters. For the Seeds dataset, the model exhibits a stable and high accuracy, suggesting that it fits this dataset exceptionally well. Notably, the analysis shows that the model achieved an AUC of 96.22 ± 5.9 and an accuracy of 97.61 ± 4.07 . This analysis was not compared with any other model, as the primary focus was to demonstrate the model’s effective performance on this particular dataset.




Figure 4: 3D Surface Plots for the Seeds (left), Iris (middle), and Ecoli (right) Datasets. Each plot maps the accuracy of GB-TWKSVC against different combinations of purity and the number of data points.

The Ecoli dataset plot shows intermediate characteristics, with some variations but not as pronounced as the Iris dataset. Overall, the model demonstrates varying degrees of robustness and sensitivity across different datasets, indicating that parameter tuning is crucial for optimizing performance on specific datasets.

Figure 5 displays the sensitivity curve, which highlights the relationship between ϵ and accuracy. This curve demonstrates how the model’s accuracy fluctuates with changes in the epsilon parameter, providing insights into the model’s robustness and performance under different regularization settings.




Figure 5: Sensitivity Curve of Accuracy vs. ϵ (Epsilon).

The clustering time for generating granular balls, which depends on the minimum number of data points (num) and purity (pur), is included in the total computation time shown in Table 2. Once the granular balls are generated for a specific num and pur configuration, they are reused across different hyperparameter combinations within that configuration. This reuse of granular balls makes the clustering process efficient, as it only needs to be performed once for each num-pur pair rather than for every hyperparameter combination. The clustering time remains relatively consistent for the same num and pur values, contributing to the overall computational efficiency of our approach.

A particularly noteworthy result is GB-TWKSVC’s performance on the Glass dataset, which is known for its high-class imbalance. Despite this challenge, our model achieved an accuracy of 76.74%, surpassing all other variants in classification accuracy while maintaining computational efficiency. These results collectively underscore the efficacy and efficiency of GB-TWKSVC across a diverse range of classification tasks, demonstrating its potential as a robust and scalable solution for multi-class classification problems.

4.4. Statistical Analysis and Results

A comprehensive statistical analysis evaluated the performance of three classification models—GB-TWKSVC, Twin-KSVC, and TSVM—using both parametric and non-parametric methods:

- Paired t-tests for direct model-to-model comparisons

- Wilcoxon signed-rank tests to validate findings without normality assumptions

4.4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 3 presents the summary statistics for model classification accuracy across all datasets.

Model	Mean (%)	Std Dev	Min (%)	Max (%)
GB-TWKSVC	84.67	13.83	52.44	99.34
Twin-KSVC	81.37	13.49	54.13	97.31
TSVM	75.10	13.46	51.17	95.33

Table 3: Summary statistics of model performance across all datasets

GB-TWKSVC achieved the highest mean accuracy (84.67%), followed by Twin-KSVC (81.37%) and TSVM (75.10%). Standard deviations remained consistent across models (13.46-13.83%).

4.4.2. Statistical Significance Tests

Tables 4 and 5 present the results of paired t-tests and Wilcoxon signed-rank tests, respectively.

Model Comparison	t-statistic	p-value
GB-TWKSVC vs Twin-KSVC	3.347	0.0101
GB-TWKSVC vs TSVM	4.737	0.0015
Twin-KSVC vs TSVM	4.116	0.0034

Table 4: Results of Paired t-tests for Model Comparisons

Model Comparison	W-statistic	p-value
GB-TWKSVC vs Twin-KSVC	2.00	0.0117
GB-TWKSVC vs TSVM	0.00	0.0039
Twin-KSVC vs TSVM	0.00	0.0039

Table 5: Results of Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Tests for Model Comparisons

4.4.3. Discussion of Statistical Results

The analysis revealed statistically significant differences between all model pairs at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, with both parametric and non-parametric tests confirming these findings. The most pronounced difference

emerged between GB-TWKSVC and TSVM ($t = 4.737$, $p = 0.0015$), supported by corresponding Wilcoxon test results. GB-TWKSVC's superior mean accuracy of 84.67% across datasets, combined with the statistical significance of its performance advantages, establishes it as the optimal choice for practical classification tasks.

5. Conclusion and Future Work

This study presents the Granular Ball K-class Twin Support Vector Classifier (GB-TWKSVC), a novel multi-class classification algorithm that combines granular computing principles with TSVM formulations. The core of the GB-TWKSVC model involves partitioning data into granular balls based on hierarchical clustering and K-Means, ensuring that each cluster represents a compact, homogeneous group. These granular balls are used to define decision boundaries through pairwise comparisons between classes, facilitated by solving Quadratic Programming Problems (QPPs) for each class pair. The algorithm's design ensures efficient classification by creating hyperplanes for each class pair and utilizing a voting mechanism for final decision-making.

Experimental evaluation across diverse benchmark datasets demonstrates GB-TWKSVC's effectiveness through superior classification performance compared to state-of-the-art methods. It exhibits enhanced scalability for large-scale problems, with reduced training times, and is robust in handling class imbalance, particularly in datasets with moderate class numbers. The algorithm's adaptive capacity to local data distributions, supported by its granular computing framework, contributes to its overall effectiveness, establishing GB-TWKSVC as a significant advancement in multi-class classification.

The comprehensive experimental results highlight GB-TWKSVC's practical advantages in accuracy, computational efficiency, and scalability. The algorithm performs consistently across a range of datasets, establishing its applicability in a variety of machine learning domains, particularly those requiring efficient handling of large-scale multi-class classification tasks.

Future research will explore several promising directions. These include the development of online and incremental learning variants for streaming data applications, as well as advanced granular ball construction methods that incorporate feature importance and local density information. The algorithm will also be extended to handle multi-label classification problems. Moreover, there is potential for applying GB-TWKSVC in diverse domains such as computer vision, natural language processing, and bioinformatics. Additional focus will be placed on theoretical analysis, including generalization bounds and convergence

properties, and on implementing efficient hyperparameter optimization strategies, potentially using meta-learning or Bayesian approaches. These advancements will further enhance GB-TWKSVC's capabilities and solidify its role in advancing multi-class classification within the broader machine-learning landscape.

References

- [1] Vladimir Vapnik. *The nature of statistical learning theory*. Springer science & business media, 2013.
- [2] Trevor Hastie and Robert Tibshirani. Classification by pairwise coupling. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 10, 1997.
- [3] Cecilio Angulo and Andreu Català. K-svc. a multi-class support vector machine. In *Machine Learning: ECML 2000: 11th European Conference on Machine Learning Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain, May 31–June 2, 2000 Proceedings 11*, pages 31–38. Springer, 2000.
- [4] Reshma Khemchandani, Suresh Chandra, et al. Twin support vector machines for pattern classification. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 29(5):905–910, 2007.
- [5] Yitian Xu, Rui Guo, and Laisheng Wang. A twin multi-class classification support vector machine. *Cognitive computation*, 5:580–588, 2013.
- [6] Jalal A Nasiri, Nasrollah Moghadam Charkari, and Saeed Jalili. Least squares twin multi-class classification support vector machine. *Pattern Recognition*, 48(3):984–992, 2015.
- [7] Javed Ali, Mujahed Aldhaifallah, Kottakkaran Sooppy Nisar, Ahmad Abdullah Aljabr, and Mohammad Tanveer. Regularized least squares twin svm for multiclass classification. *Big Data Research*, 27:100295, 2022.
- [8] Yitian Xu. K-nearest neighbor-based weighted multi-class twin support vector machine. *Neurocomputing*, 205:430–438, 2016.
- [9] Muhammad Tanveer, A Sharma, and Ponnuthurai N Suganthan. Least squares knn-based weighted multiclass twin SVM. *Neurocomputing*, 459:454–464, 2021.
- [10] Wenwen Qiang, Hongjie Zhang, Jingxing Zhang, and Ling Jing. TSVM-M3: twin support vector machine based on multi-order moment matching for large-scale multi-class classification. *Applied Soft Computing*, 128:109506, 2022.

- [11] Wenwen Qiang, Jinxin Zhang, Ling Zhen, and Ling Jing. Robust weighted linear loss twin multi-class support vector regression for large-scale classification. *Signal Processing*, 170:107449, 2020.
- [12] Xijiong Xie, Yanfeng Li, and Shiliang Sun. Deep multi-view multiclass twin support vector machines. *Information Fusion*, 91:80–92, 2023.
- [13] Shuyin Xia, Guoyin Wang, Xinbo Gao, and Xiaoli Peng. GBSVM: granular-ball support vector machine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03120*, 2022.
- [14] Xinjun Peng. TSVR: an efficient twin support vector machine for regression. *Neural Networks*, 23(3):365–372, 2010.
- [15] Vasilii Feofanov, Emilie Devijver, and Massih-Reza Amini. Transductive bounds for the multi-class majority vote classifier. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 3566–3573, 2019.
- [16] Shifei Ding, Xingyu Zhao, Jian Zhang, Xiekai Zhang, and Yu Xue. A review on multi-class TWSVM. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 52:775–801, 2019.
- [17] M Arun Kumar and Madan Gopal. Least squares twin support vector machines for pattern classification. *Expert systems with applications*, 36(4):7535–7543, 2009.
- [18] Carl Brunner, Andreas Fischer, Klaus Luig, and Thorsten Thies. Pairwise support vector machines and their application to large scale problems. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):2279–2292, 2012.
- [19] Zhongjie Shen, Xuefeng Chen, Xiaoli Zhang, and Zhengjia He. A novel intelligent gear fault diagnosis model based on emd and multi-class TSVM, 2012.
- [20] Zhi-Xia Yang, Yuan-Hai Shao, and Xiang-Sun Zhang. Multiple birth support vector machine for multi-class classification. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 22(Suppl 1):153–161, 2013.
- [21] Qingshan She, Yuliang Ma, Ming Meng, and Zhizeng Luo. Multiclass posterior probability twin SVM for motor imagery eeg classification. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2015(1):251945, 2015.

- [22] Zhi-Min Yang, He-Ji Wu, Chun-Na Li, and Yuan-Hai Shao. Least squares recursive projection twin support vector machine for multi-class classification. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics*, 7:411–426, 2016.
- [23] Anam Mustaqeem, Syed Muhammad Anwar, and Muahammad Majid. Multiclass classification of cardiac arrhythmia using improved feature selection and SVM invariants. *Computational and mathematical methods in medicine*, 2018(1):7310496, 2018.
- [24] Márcio Dias De Lima, Nattane Luiza Costa, and Rommel Barbosa. Improvements on least squares twin multi-class classification support vector machine. *Neurocomputing*, 313:196–205, 2018.
- [25] Zheming Gao, Shu-Cherng Fang, Xuerui Gao, Jian Luo, and Negash Medhin. A novel kernel-free least squares twin support vector machine for fast and accurate multi-class classification. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 226:107123, 2021.
- [26] Chengjiang Zhou, Yunhua Jia, Shan Zhao, Qihua Yang, Yunfei Liu, Zhilin Zhang, and Ting Wang. A mechanical part fault diagnosis method based on improved multiscale weighted permutation entropy and multiclass lstsvm. *Measurement*, 214:112671, 2023.
- [27] M Sajid, A Quadir, M Tanveer, Alzheimer’s Disease Neuroimaging Initiative, et al. Gb-rvfl: Fusion of randomized neural network and granular ball computing. *Pattern Recognition*, page 111142, 2024.
- [28] M Tanveer, RK Sharma, A Quadir, and M Sajid. Enhancing robustness and efficiency of least square twin SVM via granular computing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17338*, 2024.
- [29] Shuyin Xia, Bolun Shi, Yifan Wang, Jiang Xie, Guoyin Wang, and Xinbo Gao. GBCT: An efficient and adaptive granular-ball clustering algorithm for complex data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13917*, 2024.
- [30] Shuyin Xia, Xiaoyu Lian, Guoyin Wang, Xinbo Gao, Qinghua Hu, and Yabin Shao. Granular-ball fuzzy set and its implement in svm. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2024.
- [31] MA Ganaie, Anuradha Kumari, Ashwani Kumar Malik, and M Tanveer. EEG signal classification using improved intuitionistic fuzzy twin support vector machines. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 36(1):163–179, 2024.

- [32] Mohammad Tanveer, T Rajani, Reshma Rastogi, Yuan-Hai Shao, and MA Ganaie. Comprehensive review on twin support vector machines. *Annals of Operations Research*, 339(3):1223–1268, 2024.
- [33] Hossein Moosaei, Fatemeh Bazikar, and Milan Hladík. Multi-task twin support vector machine with universum data. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 132:107951, 2024.
- [34] A Quadir, M Sajid, and M Tanveer. Granular ball twin support vector machine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04774*, 2024.
- [35] Lixi Zhao, Zhifei Zhang, Wenjun Liu, and Guangming Lang. GBTWSVM: Granular-ball twin support vector machine. In *International Joint Conference on Rough Sets*, pages 238–251. Springer, 2024.
- [36] Husheng Guo and Wenjian Wang. Granular support vector machine: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 51:19–32, 2019.
- [37] Husheng Guo and Wenjian Wang. Support vector machine based on hierarchical and dynamical granulation. *Neurocomputing*, 211:22–33, 2016.
- [38] Umesh Gupta and Deepak Gupta. Least squares structural twin bounded support vector machine on class scatter. *Applied Intelligence*, 53(12):15321–15351, 2023.
- [39] Shuyin Xia, Guoyin Wang, Xinbo Gao, and Xiaoyu Lian. Granular-ball computing: an efficient, robust, and interpretable adaptive multi-granularity representation and computation method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11171*, 2023.
- [40] Yuan-Hai Shao, Chun-Hua Zhang, Xiao-Bo Wang, and Nai-Yang Deng. Improvements on twin support vector machines. *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, 22(6):962–968, 2011.
- [41] Huajuan Huang, Xiuxi Wei, and Yongquan Zhou. Twin support vector machines: A survey. *Neurocomputing*, 300:34–43, 2018.
- [42] Mushir Akhtar, M Tanveer, and Mohd Arshad. GI-tsvm: A robust and smooth twin support vector machine with guardian loss function. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16336*, 2024.
- [43] Lixi Zhao, Weiping Ding, Duoqian Miao, and Guangming Lang. Granular-balls based fuzzy twin support vector machine for classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00699*, 2024.

- [44] Surendrabikram Thapa, Surabhi Adhikari, Awishkar Ghimire, and Anshuman Aditya. Feature selection based twin-support vector machine for the diagnosis of parkinson’s disease. In *2020 IEEE 8th R10 humanitarian technology conference (R10-HTC)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2020.
- [45] Wanida Panup, Wachirapong Ratipapongton, and Rabian Wangkeeree. A novel twin support vector machine with generalized pinball loss function for pattern classification. *Symmetry*, 14(2):289, 2022.
- [46] Hossein Moosaei, Saeed Ketabchi, Mohamad Razzaghi, and Muhammad Tanveer. Generalized twin support vector machines. *Neural Processing Letters*, 53(2):1545–1564, 2021.
- [47] Qin Xie, Qinghua Zhang, Shuyin Xia, Fan Zhao, Chengying Wu, Guoyin Wang, and Weiping Ding. Gbg++: A fast and stable granular ball generation method for classification. *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, 2024.
- [48] Hossein Moosaei, MA Ganaie, Milan Hladík, and Muhammad Tanveer. Inverse free reduced universum twin support vector machine for imbalanced data classification. *Neural Networks*, 157:125–135, 2023.