
Supplemental Material for “Locality Preserving Feature Learning”

Quanquan Gu

Marina Danilevsky

Zhenhui Li

Jiawei Han

Department of Computer Science
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL 61801, USA
{qgu3,danilev1,zli28,hanj}@illinois.edu

1 Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1. Let $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be a matrix where each column is an eigenvector of eigen-problem $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{y} = \lambda\mathbf{D}\mathbf{y}$. If there exists a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and \mathbf{p} where $\mathbf{p} \in \{0,1\}^d, \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{1} = m$ such that $\mathbf{X}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Y}$, then each column of \mathbf{A} is an eigenvector of eigen-problem $\text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{X}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{X}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{a} = \lambda \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{X}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{a}$ with the same eigenvalue λ .

Proof. Since $\mathbf{X}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{y}$ we have

$$\text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{X}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{y} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{X}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{X}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{a}$$

and

$$\lambda \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{X}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{y} = \lambda \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{X}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{a}$$

Since $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{y} = \lambda\mathbf{D}\mathbf{y}$, by left multiplying $\text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{X}$ on both sides, we get

$$\text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{X}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{y} = \lambda \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{X}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{y}$$

That is

$$\text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{X}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{X}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{a} = \lambda \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{X}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{a}$$

□

2 Proof of Theorem 2

Theorem 2. The global optimal solution of Eq. (20) is

$$\mathbf{a}^{\pi(i)*} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{c}_t^{\pi(i)}, & i \leq m \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $\pi(i)$ is a sorting function such that $\|\mathbf{c}_t^{\pi(1)}\| \geq \|\mathbf{c}_t^{\pi(2)}\| \geq \dots \geq \|\mathbf{c}_t^{\pi(d)}\|$.

Proof. Eq. (20) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_{t+1} &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{A}} \frac{\mu}{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^d \|\mathbf{a}^i - \mathbf{c}_t^i\|_2^2, \\ \text{s.t.} & \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \|\mathbf{a}^1\|_2 \\ \|\mathbf{a}^2\|_2 \\ \vdots \\ \|\mathbf{a}^d\|_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_0 \leq m. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

For any $\mathbf{a}^i \neq \mathbf{0}$, we have $\|\mathbf{a}^i - \mathbf{c}_t^i\|_0 = 1$. In such case, the optimal \mathbf{a}^i which gives the smallest objective value is $\mathbf{a}^i = \mathbf{c}_t^i$. And for $\mathbf{a}^i = \mathbf{0}$, we have $\|\mathbf{a}^i - \mathbf{c}_t^i\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{c}_t^i\|_2^2$. Thus, in order to give the smallest objective value, we have to select the first m largest $\|\mathbf{c}_t^i\|_2$ and set the corresponding $\mathbf{a}^i = \mathbf{c}_t^i$, which gives the solution of Eq. (1). □

3 Proof of Theorem 3

Theorem 3. Let $\mathbf{L}' = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{X}^T$, $\mathbf{D}' = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}^T$, and $\lambda_i(\mathbf{L}', \mathbf{D}'), i = 1, \dots, d$ be the generalized value of \mathbf{L}' and \mathbf{D}' sorted in ascending order. The optimal objective function value J of LPFL in Eq. (8) is bounded by

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i(\mathbf{L}', \mathbf{D}') \leq J \leq \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_{i+d-m}(\mathbf{L}', \mathbf{D}').$$

where l is the dimension of the subspace learned by \mathbf{A} , m is the number of selected features.

Proof. Let the pair (\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) be $d \times d$ symmetric matrices with generalized spectrum $\lambda_i(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q})$, with \mathbf{Q} a positive definite matrix. Let $(\mathbf{P}_m; \mathbf{Q}_m)$ be a corresponding pair of $m \times m$ principal submatrices where $1 \leq m \leq d$, with generalized eigenvalues $\lambda_i(\mathbf{P}_m; \mathbf{Q}_m)$. Then, according to generalized Courant-Fischer “Min-Max” theorem [1] in matrix computation, $\forall i, 1 \leq i \leq m$, we have

$$\lambda_i(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) \leq \lambda_i(\mathbf{P}_m, \mathbf{Q}_m) \leq \lambda_{i+d-m}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q})$$

Applying the above result to $(\mathbf{L}', \mathbf{D}')$, we have

$$\lambda_i(\mathbf{L}', \mathbf{D}') \leq \lambda_i(\mathbf{L}'_m, \mathbf{L}'_m) \leq \lambda_{i+d-m}(\mathbf{L}', \mathbf{D}') \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{L}'_m and \mathbf{D}'_m are the $m \times m$ principle submatrices of \mathbf{L}' and \mathbf{D}' , which are extracted from $\text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{L}'\text{diag}(\mathbf{p})$ and $\text{diag}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{D}'\text{diag}(\mathbf{p})$. Since we choose the l eigenvectors corresponding to the l smallest eigenvalues of $(\mathbf{L}'_m, \mathbf{D}'_m)$ to form the linear transformation \mathbf{A} , we have

$$J = \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i(\mathbf{L}'_m, \mathbf{L}'_m) \quad (4)$$

Combining Eq. (3) and Eq. (4), we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i(\mathbf{L}', \mathbf{D}') \leq J \leq \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_{i+d-m}(\mathbf{L}', \mathbf{D}').$$

This completes the proof. \square

References

- [1] B. Moghaddam, Y. Weiss, and S. Avidan. Generalized spectral bounds for sparse lda. In *ICML*, pages 641–648, 2006.