#### Tensor-on-tensor regression

#### Eric F. Lock (elock@umn.edu)

University of Minnesota Division of Biostatistics

Texas A&M, 03/09/2018

### Multi-way (tensor) data

- Two-way data matrix  $\mathbf{Y}: N \times Q$ 
  - N cases, Q features (genes, metabolites, voxels,...)
- Multi-way data  $\mathbb{Y}: N imes Q_1 imes Q_2 imes \cdots imes Q_L$ 
  - E.g., N subjects,  $Q_1$  genes,  $Q_2$  cell types,  $Q_3$  time points



## Multi-way (tensor) data

- Two-way data matrix  $\mathbf{Y}: N \times Q$ 
  - N cases, Q features (genes, metabolites, voxels,...)
- Multi-way data  $\mathbb{Y}: N imes Q_1 imes Q_2 imes \cdots imes Q_L$ 
  - E.g., N subjects, Q<sub>1</sub> metabolites, Q<sub>2</sub> brain regions, Q<sub>3</sub> time points



#### Multi-way (tensor) data

• Two-way data matrix  $\mathbf{Y}: N \times Q$ 

• N cases, Q features (genes, metabolites, voxels,...)

- Multi-way data  $\mathbb{Y}: N imes Q_1 imes Q_2 imes \cdots imes Q_L$ 
  - E.g., N subjects,  $Q_1$  time points,  $Q_2 \times Q_3 \times Q_4$  voxel image



# Application: Fluorescence data

- Spectrofluorometer applied to 5 chemical samples <sup>1</sup>
- Intensity measured for
  - 61 excitation wavelengths (250nm-310nm)
  - 201 emission wavelengths (250nm-450nm)





<sup>1</sup>http://www.models.life.ku.dk/nwavdata

Eric F. Lock (elock@umn.edu)

Tensor-on-tensor regression

#### Fluorescence: matrix dimension reduction

• Matricized data  $\mathbf{Y}: 5 \times (61 \cdot 201) = 5 \times 12261$ 

Principal components analysis / SVD factorization:

 $\mathbf{Y} \approx \mathbf{U} \mathbf{V}^{\mathcal{T}}$ 

where

**U** :  $5 \times R$  sample scores,

▶  $\mathbf{V}$  : 12261 × R feature loadings ( $\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{I}$ )

$$\mathbf{Y}[n,p] \approx \sum_{r=1}^{R} \mathbf{U}[n,r] \mathbf{V}[p,r]$$

▶ 99% of variation in **Y** explained with R = 3 components

#### Fluorescence: matrix dimension reduction

• Components  $V_1, V_2, V_3$ :



• Approximation for sample n = 1:



## Candecomp/Parafac (CP) factorization

▶ Multi-way data 
$$\mathbb{Y}: N imes Q_1 imes Q_2 imes \cdots imes Q_L$$

Rank-R CP factorization [RA Harshman, 1970]:

$$\mathbb{X} \approx \llbracket \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_L \rrbracket$$

$$\mathbf{U} : N \times R$$

$$\mathbf{V}_{l} : Q_{l} \times R \text{ for } l = 1, \dots, L.$$

$$\mathbb{X}[n, q_{1}, q_{2}, \dots, q_{L}] \approx \sum_{r=1}^{R} \mathbf{U}[n, r] \prod_{l=1}^{L} \mathbf{V}_{l}[q_{l}, r]$$

$$||V_{lr}|| = 1 \text{ for all } l = 1, \dots, L \text{ and } r = 1, \dots, R.$$

#### Fluorescence: CP factorization

• 99% of variation explained with R = 3 CP components



Eric F. Lock (elock@umn.edu)

Tensor-on-tensor regression

► Each sample composed of 3 amino acids

► Tryptophan (Trp), tyrosine (Tyr), phenylalanine (Phe)

> X :  $5 \times 3$ : concentration of each amino acid in Mole/L

How does amino acid composition relate to fluorescence components?

Supervised CP factorization (SupCP):

$$\mathbb{Y} = \llbracket \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_L \rrbracket + \mathbb{E}$$
$$\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{F}$$

where

- **U** :  $N \times R$  is a latent score matrix for samples
- ▶  $\{\mathbf{V}_l : Q_l \times R\}_{l=1}^L$  are loading matrices for each dimension
- $\mathbb{E}: N \times Q_1 \times \cdots \times Q_L$  is error array with iid  $N(0, \sigma_e^2)$  entries
- **B** :  $P \times R$  are regression coefficients for **Y** on **U**
- **F** :  $N \times R$  has iid rows MVN( $\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_f$ )

# SupCP

• Maximize likelihood over  $\{\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_L, \mathbf{B}, \Sigma_f, \sigma_e^2\}$ 

Expectation Maximization (EM) algorithm

- $\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\{\mathbf{V}_l\}_{l=1}^L,\mathbf{B},\Sigma_f,\sigma_e^2) = E_{\mathbf{U}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{U},\mathbb{X},\mathbf{Y},\{\mathbf{V}_l\}_{l=1}^L,\mathbf{B},\Sigma_f,\sigma_e^2)$
- ► Update  $\{\{\mathbf{V}_l\}_{l=1}^L, \mathbf{B}, \Sigma_f, \sigma_e^2\}$  to maximize  $\hat{L}(\{\mathbf{V}_l\}_{l=1}^L, \mathbf{B}, \Sigma_f, \sigma_e^2)$

▶ Predictive model of 𝔄 from X:

 $\mathbb{Y} = \llbracket \mathsf{X}\mathsf{B}, \mathsf{V}_1, \dots, \mathsf{V}_L \rrbracket + \llbracket \mathsf{F}, \mathsf{V}_1, \dots, \mathsf{V}_L \rrbracket + \mathbb{E}$ 

- ▶ Prediction of  $\mathbb{Y}$  given **X**  $E(\mathbb{Y} | \mathbf{X})$
- $\blacktriangleright$  Structured residual variation in  $\mathbb {Y}$
- ► IID error in 𝔄

- Likelihood cross-validation selects R = 3
- Scaled coefficients for rank-3 fluorescence model:

	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3
$B_{Phe} * sd(X_{Phe})$	7638	138	130
$B_{Trp} * sd(X_{Trp})$	140	11734	-5
$B_{\mathrm{Tyr}} * \mathrm{sd}(X_{\mathrm{Tyr}})$	87	-72	8514

#### Fluorescence: SupCP



Eric F. Lock (elock@umn.edu)

Tensor-on-tensor regression

- For a matrix **Y** : *N* × *Q*, SupCP reduces to SupSVD (G Li et al, JMVA, 2016)
- Reduces to a least-squares CP factorization as

$$\min_{r} \Sigma_{f}[r, r] / \sigma_{e}^{2} \to \infty$$

• Reduces to least-squares tensor response regression as

$$||\Sigma_f\|_F^2/\sigma_e^2 \to 0$$

• Predict  $\mathbb{Y} : N \times Q_1 \times \cdots \times Q_L$  from  $\mathbf{X} : N \times P$ .

- ▶ Predict  $\mathbb{Y}$  :  $N \times Q_1 \times \cdots \times Q_M$  from  $\mathbb{X}$  :  $N \times P_1 \times \cdots \times P_L$
- Special case:  $\mathbf{Y} : N \times Q, \mathbf{X} : N \times P$

Partial least squares, reduced rank regression

- Special case:  $Y : N \times 1$ ,  $X : N \times P_1 \times \cdots \times P_L$ 
  - Tensor regression ([H Zhou, L Li, & H Zhu; 2013] & others)
- Special case:  $\mathbb{Y} : N \times Q_1 \times \cdots \times Q_M$ ,  $\mathbf{X} : N \times P$

▶ Tensor response regression ([L Li & X Zhang; 2016] & others)

- 2000 frontalized facial images from different individuals <sup>2</sup>
- Each image 90  $\times$  90 pixels, over 3 colors







• Data  $\mathbb{X}:$  Individuals  $\times$  X  $\times$  Y  $\times$  Color

<sup>2</sup>Labeled Face in the Wild: http://vis-www.cs.umass.edu/lfw/

▶ 72 describable attributes measured for each face <sup>3</sup>

- Smiling / not smiling
- ▶ male / female
- beard/ no beard
- Measured on continuous scale
  - Smiling: positive values, not smiling: negative values.
- Predict  $\mathbf{Y} : N \times Q$  from  $\mathbb{X} : N \times P_1 \times P_2 \times P_3$ 
  - ► Facial attributes **Y** : Individual × Attribute, from
  - ▶ Facial images X : Individual × X × Y × Color

<sup>3</sup>[N Kumar, AC Berg, PN Belhumeur, & SK Nayar; 2009]

#### Contracted tensor product

$$\mathbb{A} : I_1 \times \cdots \times I_K \times P_1 \times \cdots \times P_L \text{ and } \\ \mathbb{B} : P_1 \times \cdots \times P_L \times J_1 \times \cdots \times J_M$$

Define the contracted tensor product

$$\langle \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B} \rangle_L : I_1 \times \cdots \times I_K \times J_1 \times \cdots \times J_M$$

by  $\langle \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B} \rangle_L[i_1, \ldots, i_K, j_1, \ldots, j_M]$ 

$$=\sum_{p_1=1}^{P_1}\cdots\sum_{p_L=1}^{P_L}\mathbb{A}[i_1,\ldots,i_K,p_1,\ldots,p_L]\mathbb{B}[p_1,\ldots,p_L,j_1,\ldots,j_M].$$

For matrices  $\mathbf{A} : I \times P$  and  $\mathbf{B} : P \times Q$ ,

$$\langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \rangle_1 = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B},$$

► Predict 
$$\mathbb{Y} : N \times Q_1 \times \cdots \times Q_M$$
 from  $\mathbb{X} : N \times P_1 \times \cdots \times P_L$ :  
 $\mathbb{Y} = \langle \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{B} \rangle_L + \mathbb{E}$   
►  $\mathbb{B} : P_1 \times \cdots \times P_L \times Q_1 \times \cdots \times Q_M$  is a coefficient array  
►  $\mathbb{E} : N \times Q_1 \times \cdots \times Q_M$  is an error array  
 $\mathbb{Y}[n, q_1, \dots, q_M] \approx \sum_{p_1}^{P_1} \cdots \sum_{p_L}^{P_L} \mathbb{X}[N, p_1, \dots, p_L] \mathbb{B}[p_1, \dots, p_L, q_1, \dots, q_M]$ 

 $\blacktriangleright$  Supports all valid linear relations between  $\mathbb X$  and  $\mathbb Y$ 

# Candecomp/Parafac (CP) factorization

Assume  $\mathbb{B}$  has a rank *R* CP factorization:

 $\mathbb{B} = \llbracket \mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_L, \mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_M \rrbracket$ 

$$\mathbf{U}_{l}: P_{l} \times R$$

$$\mathbf{V}_{m}: Q_{m} \times R$$

$$\mathbb{B}[p_{1}, \dots, p_{L}, q_{1}, \dots, q_{M}] = \sum_{r=1}^{R} \prod_{l=1}^{L} \mathbf{U}_{l}[p_{l}, r] \prod_{m=1}^{M} \mathbf{V}_{m}[q_{m}, r]$$

• Full dimension of  $\mathbb{B}$ :  $\prod_{l=1}^{L} P_l \prod_{m=1}^{M} Q_m$ 

▶ Reduced dimension of  $\mathbb{B}$ :  $R(P_1 + \cdots + P_L + Q_1 + \cdots + Q_M)$ 

### Penalized least squares estimation

▶ 1.) Unpenalized criterion:

$$\underset{\mathsf{rank}(\mathbb{B})\leq R}{\arg\min} ||\mathbb{Y}-\langle \mathbb{X},\mathbb{B}\rangle_L||_F^2.$$

$$\underset{\mathsf{rank}(\mathbb{B})\leq R}{\arg\min} ||\mathbb{Y} - \langle \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{B} \rangle_L ||_F^2 + \lambda \sum_{I=1}^L ||\mathbf{U}_I||_F^2 \sum_{m=1}^M ||\mathbf{V}_I||_F^2$$

▶ 3.) Global L<sub>2</sub> penalty:

$$\underset{\mathsf{rank}(\mathbb{B}) \leq R}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} ||\mathbb{Y} - \langle \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{B} \rangle_L ||_F^2 + \lambda ||\mathbb{B}||_F^2$$

► Iteratively update U<sub>1</sub>, U<sub>2</sub>, ..., U<sub>L</sub>, V<sub>1</sub>, ..., V<sub>M</sub> to optimize objective.

For 
$$\mathbf{X} = N \times P$$
 and  $\mathbf{Y} : N \times Q$ :

 No penalty (1) corresponds to reduced rank regression [AJ Izenman, 1975]

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{E}$$

▶ **B** : *P* × *Q* has a rank *R* factorization

 $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^{\mathcal{T}}$ 

$$\bullet \mathbf{U} : P \times R$$
$$\bullet \mathbf{V} : Q \times R$$

- ► For X : N × P, Y : N × 1, global penalty (3) corresponds to ridge regression
- For X : N × P, Y : N × Q, global penalty (3) corresponds to reduced rank ridge regression [A Mukherjee and Ji Zhu, 2011]
- For X : N × P<sub>1</sub> × ··· × P<sub>L</sub>, Y : N × 1, separable penalty (2) corresponds to tensor regression [H Zhou, L Li, and H Zhu, 2013]
- ► For X : N × P<sub>1</sub> × ··· × P<sub>L</sub>, Y : N × 1, separable penalty (3) corresponds to tensor ridge regression [W Guo, I Kotsia, I Patras, 2012]
- Whenever B is a matrix (P × Q, P<sub>1</sub> × P<sub>2</sub>, Q<sub>1</sub> × Q<sub>2</sub>) separable L<sub>2</sub> penalty (2) corresponds to a nuclear norm penalty on B.

Iterative algorithms prone to local optima for objectives 1,2,3.

- Remedies:
  - Tempered regularization: start with larger λ that gradually decreases to desired regularization
  - Simulated annealing: add decreasing level of random noise at each update

#### Assumptions:

- $\blacktriangleright$  Error array  $\mathbb E$  has mean 0 and finite second moment
- True coefficient array  $\mathbb{B}_0$  has rank R
- θ<sub>0</sub> = {U<sub>1</sub>,..., U<sub>L</sub>, V<sub>1</sub>,..., V<sub>M</sub>} is identifiable and in interior of compact space Θ
- ▶ X is bounded

Result:

▶ For  $R = R_0$  and  $\lambda \ge 0$ ,  $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_N \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{B}_0$  as  $n \to \infty$  under objectives 1.), 2.), or 3.).

▶ Global L<sub>2</sub> penalty (3.) gives mode of posterior for Bayesian model

• Errors 
$$\mathbb{E}$$
 are iid Normal $(0, \sigma^2)$ .

▶ Prior  $\mathbb{B}$  is spherical Gaussian over rank *R* tensors:

$$\mathsf{pr}(\mathbb{B}) \propto egin{cases} \exp\left(-rac{\lambda}{2\sigma^2}||\mathbb{B}||_F^2
ight) & \text{if } \mathsf{rank}(\mathbb{B}) \leq R. \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

• Choose prior for 
$$\sigma^2$$
: pr $(\sigma^2) \propto 1/\sigma^2$ 

# **MCMC** Inference

► Gibbs sample from full conditional distributions of

$$\{\sigma^2, \mathbf{U}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{U}_L, \mathbf{V}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{V}_M.\}$$

For t'th sample,

$$\mathbb{B}^{(t)} = [\![\mathbf{U}_1^{(t)}, \dots, \mathbf{U}_L^{(t)}, \mathbf{V}_1^{(t)}, \dots, \mathbf{V}_M^{(t)}]\!].$$

► For new data  $\mathbb{X}_{\text{new}}$  :  $\tilde{N} \times P_1 \times \cdots \times P_L$ , simulate outcomes  $\mathbb{Y}_{\text{new}}^{(t)} = \langle \mathbb{X}_{\text{new}}, \mathbb{B}^{(t)} \rangle_L + \mathbb{E}_{\text{new}}^{(t)}$ ,

where  $\mathbb{E}_{new}^{(t)}$  is generated with independent N(0,  $\sigma^{2(t)}$ ) entries.

- Predict Y : Individual × Attribute from
   X : Individual × X × Y × Color
- Split into training and test set of size 1000
- For estimate  $\hat{\mathbb{B}}$ , consider RPE for test data:

$$\mathsf{RPE} = \frac{||\mathbb{Y}_{\mathsf{new}} - \langle \mathbb{X}_{\mathsf{new}}, \hat{\mathbb{B}} \rangle_L ||_F^2}{||\mathbb{Y}_{\mathsf{new}}||_F^2}$$

- Choose  $\lambda$  and R to minimize test RPE
- ▶ Inference via 5000 Gibbs samples

Relative prediction error (RPE):



Predicted vs. actual outcome for test data:



Eric F. Lock (elock@umn.edu) Tensor-on-tensor regression

- Bayesian posterior densities
  - 90% credible interval coverage rate: 0.887
  - 95% credible interval coverage rate: 0.934



#### Alternatively, predict

 $\mathbb{Y}:\mathsf{Individual}\times\mathsf{X}\times\mathsf{Y}\times\mathsf{Color}$ 

from

 $\textbf{X}: \mathsf{Individual} \times \mathsf{Attribute}$ 

▶ Use SupCP model with R = 200



(a) Mean







(d) Male; Asian

(e) Male; smiling



- Email: elock@umn.edu
- SupCP
  - Article: Lock, EF and Li, G, "Supervised multiway factorization", arXiv: 1701.01037, 2016.
  - Code: https://github.com/lockEF/SupCP
- Tensor-on-tensor regression
  - Article: Lock, EF, "Tensor-on-tensor regression", JCGS, doi:10618600.2017.1401544, 2017.
  - Code: https://github.com/lockEF/MultiwayRegression
- Slides: http://ericfrazerlock.com/Talks.html