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## One approach : Linear Dimensionality Reduction (or low-rank matrix factorization)


$\checkmark$ Dimensionality reduction
$\checkmark$ Identification of dominant features (A)
$>$ Filters redundancy and noise/errors
$>$ Helps user interpretation
$\checkmark$ Compact representation
$\checkmark$ Extraction of feature's coefficients (X)
$>$ Good for data analysis

## Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF)

- Used for nonnegative data: images, amplitude spectrogram (sound), word frequencies (text), reflectance (hyper-spectral images), etc...


Image processing, [Buciu \& al., 2008]


Music analysis, [Kameoka \& al., 2012]

etc...

- The basis elements (vectors $a_{j}$ ) as well as the coefficients ( $x_{j, i}$ ) are imposed to be nonnegative:

$$
a_{j} \geq 0 \text { and } x_{j, i} \geq 0 \quad \forall i, j .
$$

## Nonnegative Matrix Factorization: illustration



NMF
Data


Linear mix


## Ground truth signals



Example of recovered signals, with noise level $=20 \mathrm{~dB}$ and 50 observations


Example of recovered signals, imposing them to be polynomials


Comparison of signals recovered by usual NMF and polynomial NMF


- Usual NMF
—— Polynomial NMF $(0,015)$
- Ground Truth


## NMF using polynomials (Polynomial-NMF)



- An extension of NMF use polynomials in the factorization [Debals et al. 2017, Hautecoeur \& Glineur 2019, Zdunek 2014 (using splines)]

Each $n$ observation is approximated as a nonnegative linear combination of $r$ nonnegative polynomials with $r \ll \boldsymbol{n}$ :

$$
y_{i}(t) \simeq \sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{j}(t) x_{j, i} \quad a_{j}(t) \underset{x_{j, i} \in \mathbb{R}^{+}}{\text {nonnegative polynomial },}
$$

- Recovers smooth signals, and less sensitive to noise


## Polynomial NMF

- Recovers smooth signals, and less sensitive to noise
- But can be slower, especially when analyzing low-scale data or using highdegree polynomials

P-HALS and LS are 2 methods for NMF using polynomials.
HALS is a method for usual NMF.



## Polynomial NMF

- Recovers smooth signals, and less sensitive to noise
- But can be slower, especially when analyzing low-scale data or using highdegree polynomials


## Can we accelerate these algorithms and how?

## Outline

$>$ Methods for Polynomial-NMF
> Improve polynomial projections
> Numerical results

## LS algorithm [Debals \& al., 2017]

Polynomial NMF: $\quad \min _{A, X \geq 0}| | Y-A X| |_{F}^{2} \quad$ where A contains polynomials

Can be formulated as an (unconstrained) nonlinear least-squares problem in $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{H}$

$$
\min _{B, H}| | Y-f(B, H)| |_{F}^{2}
$$

Solved as a whole using least-squares solver.

-     + unconstrained formulation
-     + attains good accuracy solutions
-     - depends on solver efficiency
-     - slow


## P-HALS algorithm [Hautecoeur \& Glineur, 2019]

Polynomial NMF:

$$
\min _{A, X \geq 0}| | Y-A X| |_{F}^{2} \quad \text { where A contains polynomials }
$$

Let $\Pi$ a Vandermonde-like matrix: $a_{i}(t)=\Pi b$, with $b$ the coefficient vector of size $\mathrm{d}+1$.

The problem becomes

$$
\begin{gathered}
\min _{B, X}| | Y-\Pi B X| |_{F}^{2} \\
\text { such that } X \geq 0, B \geq_{p o l} 0
\end{gathered}
$$

Solved alternatively using hierarchical alternating least squares (HALS):

- Find optimal row $X_{i}$, with all other variable fixed

Repeat till convergence

- Project $X_{i}$ on its feasible set [repeat for all $X_{i}$ ]
- Find optimal column $B_{i}$, with all other variable fixed
- Project $\boldsymbol{B}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ on its feasible set [repeat for all $B_{i}$ ]


## P-HALS algorithm

- Find optimal row $X_{i}$, with all other variable fixed
- Project $X_{i}$ on its feasible set [repeat for all $X_{i}$ ]
- Find optimal column $B_{i}$, with all other variable fixed
- Project $\boldsymbol{B}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ on its feasible set [repeat for all $B_{i}$ ]


## All steps are straigthforward except the projection of $\boldsymbol{B}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$

Projection dominates total algorithmic cost
(e.g. $>97 \%$ for $n=m=1000, d=12$ )

-     + convex in B and X, potentially fast updates
-     + guaranteed convergence to stationary point
-     - update in $B$ is costly (because of projection)


## Objective

# Accelerate the projection of polynomials on the nonnegative set 

To improve the promising P-HALS algorithm.

## Outline

> Methods for Polynomial-NMF
> Improve polynomial projections
> Numerical results

## Projection over nonnegative polynomials using Sum-Of-Squares

Projection computed as Semidefinite optimization problem:
To the best of our knowledge, only way to compute exact projection

Suppose $g$ is a polynomial of degree d .

Can be expressed using positive semidefinite cone

- $g(t)$ is nonnegative iff it is Sum-Of-squares: $g(t) \geq 0 \forall t \Leftrightarrow g(t)=\sum_{i} f_{i}(t)^{2}$
- $g(t)$ is nonnegative over [-1,1] iff $g(t)=f(t)+\left(1-t^{2}\right) h(t) \quad f(t), h(t) \geq 0 \forall t$

- Function g

Projection of g onto the nonnegative set

## Three faster (approximate) projections

Projection: Given $g(t)$ find $f(t)$ the closest nonnegative polynomial to $g(t)$.


## 3 ideas:

- Discretization (Discr): discretizes signals
- Proximal (Prox): use known projection of a nearby polynomial
- Iterative heuristic (H1 and H2): uses iteratively polynomial curve fitting


## Discretization (Discr)

Discretize signals and impose nonnegativity at the discretization points
$\Rightarrow$ gives an (easier) linear optimization problem





- Function g
- Exact projection
--- Discr


## Proximal projection (prox)

$$
\text { If Projection }(\boldsymbol{g}+\boldsymbol{\delta})=\boldsymbol{f}, \quad \operatorname{Projection}(\boldsymbol{g}) \simeq \boldsymbol{f}-\boldsymbol{\delta}
$$

But $\boldsymbol{f}-\boldsymbol{\delta}$ not always nonnegative.
Find maximal $\gamma \in[0,1]$ such that $\boldsymbol{f}-\gamma \boldsymbol{\delta}$ nonnegative.
As convex can use bisection search, using discretization to check nonnegativity.

---- Function f

- Exact projection
--- Prox



## Iterative approaches (H1 and H2)

- Discretize signals
- Replace the negative part by small value (thresholding)
- Perform polynomial curve fitting



## Iterative approaches (H1 and H2)

- Discretize signals
- Replace the negative part by small value (thresholding)

Modify thresholded function

- Perform polynomial curve fitting iterativelly





## Outline

$>$ Methods for Polynomial-NMF
> Improve polynomial projections
$>$ Numerical results

## Comparison of approximate projections

Projection of random polynomials with various degrees.
Assess both CPU time and accuracy (error) for each approximate projection technique


- Discr: Precise, faster than Exact projection but still relatively slow (especially for low-degree polynomials)
- H1/2: Less precise but (much) faster than Exact projection ( H 1 better than H 2 )
- Prox: Fast and precise, but requires knowing projection of close polynomial


## Numerical results for solving Polynomial NMF

- Test on real signals with synthetic mixing (ground truth is known)
- Generation:
- $A=5$ real reflectance spectra with 414 discretization points ${ }^{1}$
- $X \sim N(0,1)$, with negative values replaced by 0
- $Y=A X+N_{o}$ where $N_{o}=$ Gaussian additive noise with $\mathrm{SNR}=20 \mathrm{~dB}$
- Parameters:

| $r$ | 5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\#$ observations | 100 |
| \# discretization <br> points | 414 |
| Degree (polynomials) | 12 |

- Evaluation with $\tilde{B}, \tilde{X}$ the obtained matrices:
- Residual $=\operatorname{dist}(A X, \Pi \tilde{B} \tilde{X})$
- $S I R_{A}=$ Signal to interference ratio $(A, \bar{A})$ with $\bar{A}$ the best nonnegative linear combination of $\Pi \tilde{B}$ to obtain $A \quad\left(A \simeq \bar{A}=\Pi \tilde{B} Q, \quad Q \in \mathbb{R}_{+}\right)$
- $S I R_{X}=$ Signal to interference ratio $(X, \bar{X})$ with $\bar{X}=Q^{-1} \tilde{X}$
The lower the residual the better, and the higher the SIR, the better.


## Testing algorithms for P-NMF with/without approximate projections

Box Plot of the CPU time and accuracy (error) for different NMF algorithms.



H 1 and H 2 perform quite well although they rely on much less precise projections
Using an approximate but much accelerated projection leads to final solutions with accuracy similar to exact P-HALS

## Take home messages

>Nonnegative Matrix Factorization given a nonnegative dataset recovers characteristic and interpretable features in an unsupervised way.
$>$ Improvable using polynomial signals in the factorization (LS and P-HALS)
$>$ P-HALS can be accelerated using approximate projection of polynomials, without loss of accuracy

- Experimentally, the best heuristic is an iterative approach using polynomial curve fitting

Approximate projections are also effective on P-HALS using splines, using spline-specific heuristics.
$\Rightarrow$ Look for a general heuristic for all functions.
P-HALS converges to a stationary point
$\Rightarrow$ Look for convergence properties of approximated P-HALS
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## Comment about the recovered signals

- NMF is insensitive to permutations and scaling of matrices $A$ and $X$
- Until now, we observed the best nonnegative linear combination of the obtained signals to recover the original basis


- In general, F-HALS obtains less similar signals than the other approaches when considering only permutations and scaling



## Comparison

| Method | Penalty term | Exact parametrization $(f(B), L S)$ | Nonnegative functions $(f(B) \geq 0, \text { HALS })$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pro | - Simple implementation <br> - Numerical stability <br> - Fast | - Superlinear convergence <br> - Nonnegative feature functions | - Convergence to stationary point <br> - Nonnegative feature functions <br> - Avoid discretization <br> - Extendable to other functions |
| Cons | - Data-driven parameters <br> - Non continuous features | - Nonlinear parametrization <br> - Slowest (even though good asymptotic complexity) | - Slower (due to projection, but can be accelerated ...) |

