

A Very Fast Algorithm for Matrix Factorization

Vladimir Nikulin^a, Tian-Hsiang Huang^b, Shu-Kay Ng^c, Suren I
Rathnayake^{a,d}, Geoffrey J McLachlan^{a,d,*}

^a*Department of Mathematics, University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD, Australia*

^b*Institute of Information Management, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan,
Taiwan*

^c*School of Medicine, Griffith University, Meadowbrook, QLD, Australia*

^d*Institute for Molecular Bioscience, University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD, Australia*

Abstract

We present a very fast algorithm for general matrix factorization of a data matrix for use in the statistical analysis of high-dimensional data via latent factors. Such data are prevalent across many application areas and generate an ever-increasing demand for methods of dimension reduction in order to undertake the statistical analysis of interest. Our algorithm uses a gradient-based approach which can be used with an arbitrary loss function provided the latter is differentiable. The speed and effectiveness of our algorithm for dimension reduction is demonstrated in the context of supervised classification of some real high-dimensional data sets from the bioinformatics literature.

Keywords: matrix factorization, non-negative matrix factorization, high-dimensional data, microarray gene-expression data, supervised classification

1. Introduction

We let $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ denote n observed p -dimensional observations, where the number of variables p is very large relative to n . For example, in the analysis of microarray gene-expression data, n (the number of tissues) might be only 50, whereas p (the number of genes) might be in the tens of thousands.

*Corresponding author

Email address: `gjm@maths.uq.edu.au` (Geoffrey J McLachlan)

We follow the traditional biologists' practice of letting

$$\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$$

be the $p \times n$ data matrix. The usual statistical practice is to take the transpose of \mathbf{X} , \mathbf{X}^T , as the data matrix. Without loss of generality, we assume that the overall mean of \mathbf{X} is zero.

In most statistical analyses of the data matrix \mathbf{X} , some form of dimension reduction is required, typically before the primary analysis is performed, or with some approaches it might be done in conjunction with the main analysis. In recent times, much attention has been given to matrix factorizations of the form,

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}, \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{A} is a $p \times q$ matrix and \mathbf{B} is a $q \times n$ matrix and where q is chosen to be much smaller than p . For a specified value of q , the matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are chosen to minimize

$$\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\|^2, \quad (2)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Frobenius norm (the sum of squared elements of the matrix). With this factorization, dimension reduction is effected by replacing the data matrix \mathbf{X} by the solution $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ for the factor matrix \mathbf{B} ; the i th row of $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ gives the values of the i th metavariable for the n entities. Thus the original p variables are replaced by q metavariables. When the elements of \mathbf{X} are nonnegative, we can restrict the elements of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} to be nonnegative. This approach is called nonnegative matrix factorization (NMF) in the literature (Lee and Seung, 1999). We shall call the general approach where there are no constraints on \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , GMF (general matrix factorization).

The classic method for factoring the data matrix \mathbf{X} is singular-value decomposition (SVD, Golub and van Loan (1983)). It follows from this theorem that we can decompose \mathbf{X} exactly into the form

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{R}^T, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{L} = (\mathbf{l}_1, \dots, \mathbf{l}_k)$ is a $p \times k$ matrix with orthonormal columns, $\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_k)$ is a $n \times k$ matrix with orthonormal columns, \mathbf{D} is a diagonal matrix with elements $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_k > 0$, and $k \leq \min(p, n)$ is the rank of \mathbf{X} . For any $q \leq k$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^q d_i \mathbf{l}_i \mathbf{r}_i^T = \arg \min_{\hat{\mathbf{X}} \in M(q)} \|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2, \quad (4)$$

where $M(q)$ is the set of rank- q $p \times n$ matrices; see, for example, Eckart and Young (1936).

Let $\mathbf{L}^{(q)} = (\mathbf{l}_1, \dots, \mathbf{l}_q)$, $\mathbf{R}^{(q)} = (\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_q)$, and $\mathbf{D}^{(q)}$ be the diagonal matrix with diagonal elements d_1, \dots, d_q . Then on considering the matrix factorization (1) of \mathbf{X} , it follows from (4) that for a specified value of q we can find the factor matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} that minimize (2) by taking $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{L}^{(q)}$ and $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{D}^{(q)} \mathbf{R}^{(q)T}$.

The calculation of the exact SVD of the matrix \mathbf{X} has time complexity $O(\min\{pn^2, n^2p\})$. Hence the use of SVD for high-dimensional data sets is not feasible and the use of the best q -approximation (4) for q larger enough to capture most of the variance in \mathbf{X} requires essentially the same amount of time as the full SVD.

Hence we consider a very fast approach to the general matrix factorization (1), using a gradient-based algorithm applicable for an arbitrary (differentiable) loss function. In the sequel, we consider the exponential family of loss functions that include the least-squares loss function (2) as a limiting case. The novelty of our algorithm lies in the way that on each global iteration it

- (a) iterates on only a small subset of the elements of the factor matrix \mathbf{A} with the other factor matrix \mathbf{B} fixed before reversing their roles;
- (b) loops through all the terms in the objective function, minimizing them individually at a time rather than their total sum (that is, it adopts a stochastic gradient descent approach).

As to be presented in Section 3, our algorithm takes only between 10 and 15 seconds in performing 300 global iterations to provide a $q = 11$ rank factorization of a 2000 x 62 data matrix for the colon cancer data set of Alon et al. (1999). In contrast, 20 global iterations with non-negative matrix factorization (NMF) for the same task required about 25 minutes.

The effectiveness of our algorithm is to be demonstrated in its application to provide a reduction in the number of genes for use in the formation of classifiers in the supervised classification of five well-known high-dimensional data sets in the bioinformatics literature.

2. Background

Here we consider the factorization of \mathbf{X} into \mathbf{AB} in the spirit that it has no real importance in and of itself other than as a computationally convenient

means for obtaining a reduction in the number of variables. Of course in some situations in practice once the factorization has been made, attention will turn to the interpretability of the metavariables.

The latter consideration has led to much recent interest in the use of NMF in the analysis of data for which the elements are nonnegative. It constrains the elements of the factor matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} to be nonnegative, which can be advantageous from the point of view of interpretability. Lee and Seung, 1999; Lee and Seung 2001 developed NMF in order to improve upon the interpretability of the SVD. The nonnegativity constraints on \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} form a whole in a nonsubtractive way. In this way, NMF is considered as a procedure for learning a parts-based representation (Lee and Seung, 1999). However, as pointed out in Li et al. (2001) the additive parts by NMF are not necessarily localized. This led them to propose a subspace method, called local nonnegative matrix factorization (LNMF) for learning spatially localized, parts-based representation of visual patterns; see also (Donoho et al., 2004; Gao et al., 2005; Gogel et al., 2007) and the recent monograph (Cichocki et al., 2010).

More recently, Ding et al. (2010) has considered variations of NMF where the elements of \mathbf{A} , but not of \mathbf{B} , are constrained to be nonnegative, and so allowing the data matrix \mathbf{X} to have mixed signs (semi-NMF). They also consider algorithms in which the basis vectors of \mathbf{A} are constrained to be convex combinations of the data points. In other work, Witten et al. (2009) have proposed a penalized matrix decomposition for computing a q -rank approximation to \mathbf{X} .

3. Gradient-Based Algorithm for GMF

We now describe our gradient-based algorithm for carrying out the general matrix factorization (1) of the data matrix \mathbf{X} . The objective function to be minimized is given by

$$L(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}) = \frac{1}{p \cdot n} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^n \Psi(E_{ij}), \quad (5)$$

where $E_{ij} = x_{ij} - \sum_{f=1}^q a_{if} b_{fj}$, and Ψ is the loss function assumed to be differentiable with derivative denoted by ψ . For illustrative purposes, we take Ψ to be a member of the exponential family of loss functions given by

$$\Psi(x; \alpha) = 2 \frac{(\cosh(\alpha x) - 1)}{\alpha^2} = \alpha^{-2} (\exp(\alpha x) + \exp(-\alpha x) - 2), \quad (6)$$

where α is a regularization parameter. Note that a squared loss function may be regarded as a marginal limit in relation to this family of loss functions since

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \Psi(x; \alpha) = x^2. \quad (7)$$

In our initial experiments Nikulin and McLachlan (2009), we tried a range of values between 0.003 and 0.004 for α , which gave similar results as for the squared loss function.

The algorithm can be implemented as follows.

Gradient-based framework for matrix factorization

- 1: Input: \mathbf{X} - matrix of microarrays.
- 2: Select m - number of global iterations; q - number of factors; $\lambda > 0$ - initial learning rate, $0 < \xi < 1$ - correction rate, L_S - initial value of the target function.
- 3: Initial matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} may be generated randomly.
- 4: Global cycle: repeat m times the following steps 5 - 17:
- 5: genes-cycle: for $i = 1$ to p repeat steps 6 - 15:
- 6: tissues-cycle: for $j = 1$ to n repeat steps 7 - 15:
- 7: compute prediction $S = \sum_{f=1}^q a_{if} b_{fj}$;
- 8: compute error of prediction: $E = x_{ij} - S$;
- 9: internal factors-cycle: for $f = 1$ to q repeat steps 10 - 15:
- 10: compute $\alpha = a_{if} b_{fj}$;
- 11: update $a_{if} \leftarrow a_{if} + \lambda \psi(E) b_{fj}$;
- 12: $E \leftarrow E + \alpha - a_{if} b_{fj}$;
- 13: compute $\alpha = a_{if} b_{fj}$;
- 14: update $b_{fj} \leftarrow b_{fj} + \lambda \psi(E) a_{if}$;
- 15: $E \leftarrow E + \alpha - a_{if} b_{fj}$;
- 16: compute $L = L(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$;
- 17: $L_S = L$ if $L < L_S$; otherwise: $\lambda \leftarrow \lambda \cdot \xi$.
- 18: Output: \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} - matrices of loadings and metagenes.

The following partial derivatives are necessary for the above algorithm (see steps 11 and 14 above):

$$\frac{\partial \Psi(E_{ij})}{\partial a_{if}} = -\psi(E_{ij}) b_{fj}, \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\partial \Psi(E_{ij})}{\partial b_{fj}} = -\psi(E_{ij}) a_{if}. \quad (9)$$

The target function (5) that needs to be minimized includes a total of $q(p + n)$ regularization parameters. The algorithm loops through all the differences E_{ij} , minimizing them as a function of the elements of the two factor matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} . If the optimization were to be performed by fixing on \mathbf{B} and solving the optimization with respect to \mathbf{A} and then reversing the roles of the variables with the intention to iterate until convergence, there can be difficulties with convergence given that the two factor matrices are completely unconstrained. We circumvent this problem by iterating on only some of the elements of \mathbf{A} before iterating on some of the elements of \mathbf{B} . This partial updating of \mathbf{A} before a switch to a partial updating of \mathbf{B} is very effective and is responsible for the very fast convergence of the process.

This procedure of role reversal between the elements of the two factors matrices after only partial updating of their elements has been used effectively in the context of a recommender system; see, for example Paterek (2007) and, more recently, Koren (2009), who used factorization techniques to predict users' preferences for movies on the Netflix Prize data set.

It is noted that in the case of the squared loss function, we can optimise the value of the step-size. However, taking into account the complexity of the model, we recommend maintaining fixed and small values of the step size or learning rate. In all our experiments we applied our algorithm using 100 global iterations with the following regulation parameters. The initial learning rate λ was set at 0.01, while the correction rate ξ rate was set at 0.75. The convergence of the algorithm is illustrated in Figure 1 for GMF applied to the 2000×62 data matrix \mathbf{X} for three data sets, including the colon cancer data set of Alon et al. (1999) with $n = 62$ tissues and $p = 2,000$ genes. The other cancer data sets (leukaemia and lymphoma) are to be described in the next section. As pointed out in the introductory section, our algorithm takes only between 10 and 15 seconds in performing 300 global iterations to provide a $q = 11$ rank factorization of this data matrix compared to around 25 minutes to perform 20 global iterations with non-negative matrix factorization. We used a Linux computer with speed 3.2GHz, RAM 16GB with the algorithm using special code written in C).

4. Application of GMF in Supervised Classification

In the sequel, we focus on the performance of GMF in its application to some data sets in the context of supervised classification (discriminant analysis). In this latter context, we have an obvious criterion to guide in the

choice of the number q of metavariables, namely the estimated error rate of the classifier.

Concerning suitable estimates for the error rate of a classifier, we introduce the following notation. It is assumed that the observed data points $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ come from g possible classes, C_1, \dots, C_g , with known class labels specified by \mathbf{z} , where

$$\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)^T,$$

and where \mathbf{z}_j is a g -dimensional vector of zeros or ones with its i th element, z_{ij} , defined to be one if \mathbf{x}_j comes from class C_i , and zero otherwise ($i = 1, \dots, g; j = 1, \dots, n$). For the allocation of an observation \mathbf{x}_o to one of the g possible classes, we let $r(\mathbf{x}_o; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{z})$ be a classifier formed from the training data \mathbf{X} with its known class labels in \mathbf{z} , where $r(\mathbf{x}_o; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{z})$ equal to i implies that \mathbf{x}_o is assigned to class C_i ($i = 1, \dots, g$). We shall henceforth abbreviate $r(\mathbf{x}_o; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{z})$ to $r(\mathbf{x}_o; \mathbf{X})$. Also, we let $e(\mathbf{X})$ denote an estimate of the error rate of $r(\mathbf{x}_o; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{z})$, where dependency of this estimate on \mathbf{z} is also suppressed for brevity of expression. If we use, for example, n -fold cross-validation (that is, the leave-one-out estimate), then

$$e(\mathbf{X}) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^g \sum_{j=1}^n z_{ij} H[i, r(\mathbf{x}_j; \mathbf{X}_{(j)})], \quad (10)$$

where the function $H[u, v]$ is defined to be equal to 1 if $u \neq v$, and zero otherwise and where $\mathbf{X}_{(j)}$ denotes \mathbf{X} with \mathbf{x}_j deleted. Finally, we let $\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X})$ denote the solution for \mathbf{B} when GMF is applied to \mathbf{X} for a specified value of q .

In the case where the full data matrix \mathbf{X} is replaced by the reduced matrix $\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X})$ computed for a specified q , we can use (10) to estimate the expected error rate of the classifier formed from this reduced set. An estimate is given by

$$e_1(\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X})) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^g \sum_{j=1}^n z_{ij} H[i, r(\mathbf{b}_j; \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{(j)}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X}))], \quad (11)$$

where \mathbf{b}_j is the j th column of $\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{(j)}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X})$ denotes $\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X})$ with its j th column \mathbf{b}_j deleted.

As pointed out by Ambroise and McLachlan (2002), this estimate will provide an optimistic assessment of the true error rate of the classifier, since the reduced data matrix $\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X})$ should be recomputed on each fold of the

cross-validation; that is, in the right-hand side of (11), $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{(j)}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X})$ should be replaced by $\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X}_{(j)})$, the reduced data matrix obtained by applying the GMF algorithm to $\mathbf{X}_{(j)}$, the data matrix \mathbf{X} with its j th column deleted. This estimate can be written as

$$e_2(\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X})) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^g \sum_{j=1}^n z_{ij} H[i, r(\mathbf{b}_j; \hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X}_{(j)}))], \quad (12)$$

In order to calculate this estimated error rate with n -fold cross-validation, it means that the GMF algorithm has to be run n times in addition to its replication to the full data set. This is feasible given the speed with which the algorithm carries out the GMF. It should be pointed out that since the GMF does not make use of the known class labels, the selection bias of the classifier based on the selected subset of metavariables $\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}$ will not be nearly as great in magnitude as with selection methods that use the class labels. Also, in practice, n -fold cross validation can produce an estimate with too much variability and so five- or ten-fold cross validation is often used in a variance versus bias tradeoff (Ambroise and McLachlan, 2002).

We can choose the final value of q by taking it to be the value q_o that minimizes the estimated error rate $e_2(\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X}))$;

$$q_o = \arg \min_{q \in Q} e_2(\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X}_{(j)})), \quad (13)$$

where Q denotes the set of values considered for q . However, there is still a selection bias if we use

$$e_2(\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q_o)}(\mathbf{X})) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^g \sum_{j=1}^n z_{ij} H[i, r(\mathbf{b}_j; \hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q_o)}(\mathbf{X}_{(j)}))], \quad (14)$$

to estimate the error rate of the classifier based on the reduced set with the smallest error rate over the values of q considered; see, for example, (Wood et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 2008). We can correct for this bias by using the estimate

$$e_3(\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q_o)}(\mathbf{X})) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^g \sum_{j=1}^n z_{ij} H[i, r(\mathbf{b}_j; \hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q_o)}(\mathbf{X}_{(j)}))], \quad (15)$$

where

$$q_{oj} = \arg \min_{q \in Q} \sum_{i=1}^g \sum_{\substack{j'=1 \\ j' \neq j}}^n \frac{z_{ij'} H[i, r(\mathbf{b}_{j'}; \hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q)}(\mathbf{X}_{(j,j')}))]}{n-1}, \quad (16)$$

and $\mathbf{X}_{(j,j')}$ denotes the data matrix \mathbf{X} with \mathbf{x}_j and $\mathbf{x}_{j'}$ deleted.

It can be seen from (16) that in order to calculate the cross-validated estimate (15), we need to perform the GMF $n(n-1)$ times in addition to the original application to the full data set \mathbf{X} . This is still feasible since GMF can be implemented so quickly, although the total computational time becomes large as n increases. As noted above, using, say, ten-fold cross-validation would reduce the number of times that GMF has to be employed. In the data sets considered here, the increase in the estimated error rate given by the use of $e_3(\hat{\mathbf{B}}^{(q_0)})$ over (14) was very small (not of practical significance).

5. Supervised Classification of Some Cancer Data Sets

We shall demonstrate the application of the GMF for dimension reduction in the context of supervised classification of five cancer data sets that have been commonly analysed in the bioinformatics literature, as briefly described in the following section.

5.1. Five Data Sets

For the colon data set (Alon et al., 1999) the data matrix \mathbf{X} contains the expression levels of $p=2000$ genes in each of $n=62$ tissue samples consisting of $n_1=40$ tumours and $n_2=22$ normals.

The data matrix for the leukaemia data set (Golub et al., 1999) contains the expression levels of $p = 7129$ genes for each of $n = 72$ patients, consisting of $n_1=47$ patients suffering from acute lymphoblastic leukaemia (ALL) and $n_2= 25$ patients suffering from acute myeloid leukaemia (AML).

We followed the pre-processing steps of (Golub et al., 1999) applied to the leukaemia set: 1) thresholding: floor of 1 and ceiling of 20000; 2) filtering: exclusion of genes with $\max/\min \leq 2$ and $(\max - \min) \leq 100$, where \max and \min refer respectively to the maximum and minimum expression levels of a particular gene across the tissue samples. This left us with $p = 1896$ genes. In addition, the natural logarithm of the expression levels was taken.

The data matrix for the lymphoma data set (Alizadeh et al., 2000) contains the gene expression levels of the three most prevalent adult lymphoid malignancies: $n_1= 42$ samples of diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLCL), $n_2= 9$ samples of follicular lymphoma (FL), and $n_3= 11$ samples of chronic lymphocytic leukaemia (CLL). The total sample size is thus $n= 62$ and there are $p = 4026$ genes.

The Sharma data set was described in (Sharma et al., 2005) and contains the expression levels (mRNA) of $p=1368$ genes for each of 60 blood samples taken from 56 women. Each sample was labelled by clinicians, with $n_1=24$ labelled as having breast cancer and $n_2=36$ labelled as not having it. Some of the samples were analysed more than once in separate batches giving a total of $n=102$ labelled samples.

The fifth data set (Khan et al., 2001) contains the expression levels of $p=2308$ genes for each of $n=83$ tissue samples, each from a child who was determined by clinicians to have a type of small round blue cell tumour. This includes the following $g=4$ classes: neuroblastoma (N), rhabdomyosarcoma (R), Burkitt lymphoma (B) and the Ewing sarcoma (E). The numbers in each class are: $N(n_1=18)$, $R(n_2=25)$, $B(n_3=11)$, and $E(n_4=29)$.

We applied double normalization to each data set. Firstly, we normalized each column to have means zero and unit standard deviations. Then we applied the same normalization to each row.

5.2. Error rates for classifiers formed on the basis of metagenes

In Figure 2, we plot the cross-validated error rate e_1 versus the number of metagenes q for four of the five data sets, using the support vector machine (SVM) in the case of $g=2$ classes and (multinomial) logistic regression (LR) in the case of $g>2$ classes. We did not plot e_1 for the leukaemia data set as it was close to zero if $q \geq 10$.

In Table 1, we list the cross-validated error rates e_1 and its bias-corrected version e_2 for each of the four data sets, where the classifier (SVM or MLR) is formed on the basis of q metagenes. To give some guide as to the level of performance of the performance of these classifiers, we also list the value of the error rate using the nearest-shrunk centroids method (Tibshirani et al., 2002). The bias-corrected error rate e_2 is smaller than that of the NSC method for all but one of the data sets (the lymphoma set). The estimated error rate for the nearest-shrunk method corresponds to e_2 in that it can be regarded as an almost unbiased estimate for a given subset of the genes, but it has not been corrected for bias over the set of values q considered; see Wood et al. (2007) and Zhu et al. (2008).

On the question of which metavariates (metagenes) are useful in the discriminatory process, an inspection of the heat maps (coloured lots of each metagene value for each tissue) can be useful, but not always. To illustrate this, we have plotted the heat maps in Figure 3 for three of the data sets. In this figure, we have sorted the tissues into their classes in order to consider

visual differences between the patterns. In the case of the colon data in Figure 3(a), we cannot see clear separation of the negative and positive classes. In contrast, in the case of the leukaemia data in Figure 3(b), metagene N2 separates the first 47 tissues (from the top) from the remaining 25 tissues with only one exception. It is tissue 58, which is the only one misclassified tissue in Table 1 (cases $q = 3, 4$). Similarly, in the case of the lymphoma data in Figure 3(c), metagene N1 separates clearly CLL from the remaining two classes. Further, metagene N3 separates DLCL from the remaining two classes.

To assist with the interpretation of the metagenes, we can examine the Gene Ontology (GO) (The GO Consortium, 2009) and the pathway records of the Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) (Kanehisa et al., 2010) for those genes that have high (absolute) correlations with the metagenes.

6. Conclusions

We have presented an algorithm for performing extremely fast general matrix factorization (GMF) of a high-dimensional data matrix \mathbf{X} . In practice some form of dimension reduction is invariably needed if standard or even nonstandard methods of statistical analysis are to be employed to gain meaningful insight from high-dimensional data matrices. The algorithm undertakes the factorization using gradient-based optimization for an arbitrary (differentiable) loss function. The $p \times n$ data matrix \mathbf{X} is approximated by the product of two matrices, $\hat{\mathbf{A}}\hat{\mathbf{B}}$, where the $q \times n$ factor matrix $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ can be used in place of \mathbf{X} for a specified value of q taken to be much smaller than p . The n columns of $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ contain the values of the q metavariables for each of the n observed data vectors. The stability of the algorithm depends essentially on a properly selected learning rate, which must not be too big. We can provide additional functions so that the learning rate will be reduced or increased depending on the current performance.

To demonstrate the usefulness of the reduced data matrix $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ in the context of supervised classification, we applied it to the data matrices from five cancer data matrices of microarray gene expressions that have been commonly analysed in the medical and scientific literature. The classification of the microarrays (tissue samples) containing these gene expressions are of known classification with respect to g classes, where g varies from 2 to 4. The results suggest that GMF as implemented by our algorithm is effective

in providing a reduced data matrix for their subsequent use in forming a classifier that was taken to be either the SVM in the case of $g = 2$ classes or logistic regression for $g > 2$ classes.

Some main issues associated with the use of GMF are the choice of the number q of metavariables (latent factors), the interpretability of the metavariables, and the need for prefiltering of the variables before the factorization. These issues are beyond the scope of this paper.

But briefly on these issues here, the choice of the number of metavariables q in supervised classification can be based on the estimated error rate of the classifier formed from the specified number of metavariables. The situation is not as straightforward in the context of cluster analysis where there are no training data of known origin even if there were some *a priori* knowledge about the existence of some group structure in the data. One way to proceed in this context is to use the stability in the clustering as the level of q is varied as a guide to its final choice (Brunet et al., 2004, Tamayo et al., 2007). The question of whether there is a need for prefiltering in the context of cluster analysis has been considered recently by Zheng et al. (2009).

The problem of interpretability of the metavariables is generally not as straightforward as with NMF's since the latter are non-subtractive combinations of the original variables (Zheng et al., 2009). In general, we can calculate the correlations between the original variables and the metavariables. For microarray data, we are currently designing a program that automatically attempts to establish links between genes highly correlated with a metagene and the Gene Ontology (The GO Consortium, 2009) and the the pathway records of the Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (Kanehisa et al., 2010).

References

- Lee, D.D., Seung, H.S., 1999. Learning the parts of objects by non-negative matrix factorization. *Nature* 401, 788–791.
- Golub, G., van Loan, C., 1983. *Matrix Computations*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Eckart, C., Young, G., 1936. The approximation of one matrix by another of low rank. *Psychometrika* 1, 211–218.

Alon, U., Barkai, N., Notterman, D.A., Gish, K., Ybarra, S., Mack, D., Levine, A.J., 1999. Broad patterns of gene expression revealed by clustering analysis of tumor and normal colon tissues probed by oligonucleotide arrays. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 96, 6745–6750.

Lee, D.D., Seung, H.S., 2001. Algorithms for non-negative matrix factorization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing System* 13, MIT Press.

Li, S.Z., Hou, X.W., Zhang, H.J., Cheng, Q.S., 2001. Learning spatially localized parts-based representation. In *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Volume I, Hawaii*, pp.207–212.

Donoho, D., Stodden, V., 2004. When does non-negative matrix factorization give a correct decomposition into parts ? In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 16, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gao, Y., Church, G., 2005. Improving molecular cancer class discovery through sparse non-negative matrix factorization. *Bioinformatics* 21, 3970–3975.

Fogel, P., Young, S.S., Hawkins, D.M., Ledirac, N., 2007. Inferential, robust non-negative matrix factorization analysis of microarray data. *Bioinformatics* 23, 44–49.

Cichocki, A., Zdunek, R., Phan, A.H., Amari, S-I., 2010. *Nonnegative Matrix and Tensor Factorizations*. Wiley, Chichester

Ding, C., Li, T., Jordan, M.I., 2010. Convex and semi-nonnegative matrix factorizations. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 32, 45–55.

Witten, D.M., Tibshirani, R., Hastie, R., 2009. A penalized matrix decomposition, with applications to sparse principal components and canonical correlation analysis. *Biostatistics* 10, 515–534.

Nikulin, V., McLachlan, G.J., 2009. On a general method for matrix factorization applied to supervised classification. In *Proceedings of 2009 IEEE In-*

ternational Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine Workshop, Washington, D.C. , J Chen et al. (Eds.). Los Alamitos, California: IEEE, pp. 43–48.

Paterek, A., 2007. Improving regularized singular value decomposition for collaborative filtering. KDD Cup , San Jose, CA: ACM, pp. 39–42.

Koren, Y., 2009. Collaborative filtering with temporal dynamics. In Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining , Paris, pp. 447–455.

Ambroise, C., McLachlan G.J., 2002. Selection bias in gene expression on the basis of microarray gene expression data. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA 99, 6562–6566.

Wood, I., Visscher, P., Mengersen, K., 2007. Classification based upon expression data: bias and precision of error rates. Bioinformatics 23, 1363–1370.

Zhu, J.X., McLachlan, G.J., Ben-Tovim, L., Wood, I., 2008. On selection biases with prediction rules formed from gene expression data. Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference 38, 374–386.

Golub, T.R., Slonim D.K., Tamayo, P., Huard, C., Gassenbeck, M., Mesirov, J.P., Coller, H., Loh, M.L., Downing, J.R., Caligiuri, M.A., et al. 1999. Molecular classification of cancer: class discovery. Science 286, 531–537.

Dudoit, S., Fridlyand, J., Speed, T.P., 2002. Comparison of discrimination methods for the classification of tumors using gene expression data. Journal of the American Statistical Association 97, 77–87.

Alizadeh, A., Eisen, M.B., Davis, R.E., Ma, C., Lossos, I.S., Rosenwal. A., Boldrick, J.C., Sabet, H., Tran, T., Yu, X., et al. 2000. Distinct types of diffuse large B-cell lymphoma identified by gene expression profiling. Nature 403, 503–511.

Sharma, P., Tibshirani, R., Skaane, P., Urdal, P., Berghagen, H., 2005. Early detection of breast cancer based on gene-expression patterns in peripheral

blood cells. *Breast Cancer Research* 7, R634–R644.

Khan, J., Wei, J., Ringner, M., Saal, L., Ladanyi, M., Westermann, F., Berthold, F., Schwab, M., 2001. Classification and diagnostic prediction of cancers using gene expression profiling and artificial neural networks. *Nature Medicine* 7, 673–679.

Tibshirani, R., Hastie, T., Narasimhan, B., Chu, G., 2002. Diagnosis of multiple cancer types by shrunken centroids of gene expression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 99, 6567–6572.

The GO Consortium. 2009. Gene ontolog [Online]. Available: <http://www.geneontology.org>

Kanehisa, M., Goto, S., Furumichi, M., Tanabe, M., Hirakawa, M., 2010. KEGG for representation and analysis of molecular networks involving diseases and drugs. *Nucleic Acids Research* 38, D355–D360.

Brunet, J-P., Tamayo, P., Golub, T.R., Mesirov, J.P., 2004. Metagene projection for cross-platform, cross-species characterization of global transcriptional states. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 101, 4164–4169.

Tamayo, P., Brunet, J-P., Scanfied, D., Ebert, B.L., Gillette, M.A., Roberts, C.W.M., Mesirov, J.P., 2007. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 104, 5959–5964.

Zheng. C., Huang, D., Zhang, L., Kong, X., 2009. Tumor clustering using nonnegative matrix factorizations with gene selection. *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine* 13, 599-607.

Table 1: Some selected experimental results, where numbers in brackets in the first column indicate numbers of classes in the corresponding data set, and numbers of misclassified entries in the fourth, fifth and sixth columns. Results in the sixth column “NSC” were obtained using nearest-shrunk centroids method with threshold parameter Δ as it was described in Tibshirani et al., (2002). The column p_s indicates the number of used/selected features.

Data	Model	q	e_1	e_2	NSC	p_s	Δ
Colon (2)	SVM	8	0.0806 (5)	0.1129 (7)	0.129 (8)	141	1.3
Leukaemia (2)	SVM	25	0 (0)	0.0139 (1)	0.0139 (1)	73	1.9
Lymphoma (3)	MLR	10	0.0322 (2)	0.0322 (2)	0.0161 (1)	3336	0.8
Breast (2)	SVM	18	0.1 (6)	0.15 (9)	0.2 (12)	53	1.2
Blue cell tumour (4)	MLR	21	0.0241 (2)	0.0482 (4)	0.0602 (5)	464	1.8




Figure 1: Behaviour of the target (5) with squared loss as a function of global iteration for $q = 10$ metagenes; dashed blue, solid black and dot-dashed red lines correspond to the colon, leukaemia and lymphoma cases.




Figure 2: The estimated error rate e_1 as a function of the number q of metagenes.




Figure 3: Images of the matrix \mathbf{B} for $q = 5$: (a) colon (sorted from the top: 40 positive then 22 negative), (b) leukaemia (sorted from the top: 47 ALL, then 25 AML) and (c) lymphoma (sorted from the top: 42 DLCL, then 9 FL, last 11 CLL). All three matrices were produced using the GMF algorithm with 100 global iterations as described in the text.