

Optimal Projected Variance Group-Sparse Block PCA

Marie Chavent ^{*} [†] Guy Chavent [‡]

February 25, 2022

Abstract

We address the problem of defining a group sparse formulation for Principal Components Analysis (PCA) - or its equivalent formulations as Low Rank approximation or Dictionary Learning problems - which achieves a compromise between maximizing the variance explained by the components and promoting sparsity of the loadings. So we propose first a new definition of the variance explained by non necessarily orthogonal components, which is optimal in some aspect and compatible with the principal components situation. Then we use a specific regularization of this variance by the group- ℓ_1 norm to define a Group Sparse Maximum Variance (GSMV) formulation of PCA. The GSMV formulation achieves our objective by construction, and has the nice property that the inner non smooth optimization problem can be solved analytically, thus reducing GSMV to the maximization of a smooth and convex function under unit norm and orthogonality constraints, which generalizes [19] to group sparsity. Numerical comparison with deflation on synthetic data shows that GSMV produces steadily slightly better and more robust results for the retrieval of hidden sparse structures, and is about three times faster on these examples. Application to real data shows the interest of group sparsity for variables selection in PCA of mixed data (categorical/numerical) .

Keywords: PCA, sparsity, dimension reduction, variance, mixed data, orthogonal constraints, block optimization.

^{*}IMB, Université de Bordeaux, 33400 Talence, France,
e-mail : marie.chavent@u-bordeaux.fr (corresponding author)

[†]Inria Bordeaux Sud-Ouest, 33405 Talence, France

[‡]Inria-Paris, 2 rue Simone Iff, 75589 Paris, France,
e-mail : guy.chavent@inria.fr

Introduction

Principal Components Analysis (PCA), Low Rank Approximation (LRA), Self-contained Regression-type formulation (REGR) and Dictionary Learning (DL) are equivalent problems whose solution is the matrix Z made of the singular vectors associated to the $m \leq \text{rank} A$ largest singular values of a $n \times p$ data matrix A which collects n samples made each of p entries :

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\text{PCA}) \quad & \max_{Z^T Z = I_m} \|AZ\|_F^2 \\
 (\text{LRA}) \quad & \min_{Z^T Z = I_m} \|A - AZZ^T\|_F^2 \\
 (\text{REGR}) \quad & \min_{B, Z^T Z = I_m} \|A - ABZ^T\|_F^2 \quad (\text{and} \quad \arg \min_B = Z) \\
 (\text{DL}) \quad & \min_{Y, Z} \|A - YZ^T\|_F^2 \quad (\text{and} \quad \arg \min_Y = AZ(Z^T Z)^{-1})
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the subscript F denotes the Frobenius norm. In the PCA context, Z represents the *loadings* and $Y = AZ$ the components, whereas in the DL context, Z is the dictionary, and Y the coefficient matrix.

The equivalence of PCA, LRA and REGR follows from the identity :

$$\|AZ\|_F^2 + \|A - AZZ^T\|_F^2 = \|A\|_F^2 \quad \text{as soon as} \quad Z^T Z = I_m \tag{2}$$

and that of PCA and DL follows from :

$$R(A, Z) + \min_Y \|A - YZ^T\|_F^2 = \|A\|_F^2, \tag{3}$$

where $R(A, Z)$ is the Generalized Rayleigh Quotient :

$$R(A, Z) = \text{tr}\{Z^T A^T A Z (Z^T Z)^{-1}\}. \tag{4}$$

But due to noise the eigenvectors vectors of the sample covariance matrix $A^T A$ can be very different from those of the underlying population covariance matrix, especially for high dimensional problems where $p \gg n$, and the need of adding information arises. This is usually done by modifying one of the formulations (1) in order to promote sparsity, limit total variation and sometimes promote smoothness of the loadings/dictionary vectors Z .

Along with the formulations derived from (1), probabilistic approaches have been developed with the objective of producing asymptotically optimal estimators, e.g. [5] and [29], who use joint sparsity constraints between the loadings for the determination of the principal eigensubspace, and provide convergence rates, [12] who use covariance thresholding, and the review paper by [6].

Among the works based on the PCA formulation, we can cite [18], who add an exterior penalization to promote sparsity, [19], who introduce the G-power method to implement ℓ_0 or ℓ_1 regularization, [26], who search for sparse leading components by introducing an auxiliary variable to compute $\|Az\|$, and an alternate maximization scheme for the ℓ_0 or ℓ_1 penalized version, [22] uses orthogonal iteration with thresholding to compute the principal subspace, [31] determine sparse eigenvectors under ℓ_0 constraint using a truncated power method and deflation, and [8] combine the maximization of a robust variance penalized with an ℓ_1 term with deflation and a “grid algorithm” for the optimization on the unit sphere.

Examples of approaches based on the LRA formulation can be found in [27], who use a rank one approximation with ℓ_1 regularization to compute sparse loadings one at a time by deflation, and in [30] where the LRA formulation is used to determine sparse and smooth loadings in the context of spatial data.

The REGR formulation allows to implement sparsity on the unconstrained variable B , which is an advantage over the three previous formulations. It was introduced by [33], who solve it by alternate minimization with respect to B (non smooth optimization) and Z (ascent gradient on a variety), and used by [20], who proposed a joint group sparse approach for hyperspectral imaging, where the same sparsity pattern is required on all loadings.

Finally, the dictionary learning formulation DL, which allows to implement the sparsity constraints directly on unconstrained loadings Z , has experienced a fast growing due to the development of image analysis. It was introduced, in a slightly different form, by [32] in the context of sparse low rank approximation, who solved it by an heuristic thresholded SVD combined with deflation. Dictionary learning with structured sparsity is considered by [17] and [3], who examine various adapted convex and non convex penalization terms. [15] use a spatially weighed DL formulation with a ℓ_1 penalization for image classification, and [11] consider penalization by both structured ℓ_1 norm and total variation for image analysis.

The above mentioned works represent a small part of the relevant literature, but they are cited here to illustrate the fact that all method derived from the formulations (1) achieve a compromise between sparsifying Z and maximizing $\|AZ\|^2$ (c.f. (2) for PCA, LRA and REGR formulations) or $R(A, Z)$ (see (3) for the DL formulation).

But sparse loadings and the corresponding components are not orthogonal, and none of these quantities is anymore a satisfactory measure of the variance explained by the components, as shown in Section 2.2 for $\|AZ\|^2$ and Lemma 2.1 for $R(A, Z)$. So we take in this paper a slightly different point of view : we first define a variance measure for non necessarily orthogonal components, and then use it as a starting point for the definition of sparse PCA formulations, thus ensuring directly a compromise between sparsity and explained variance.

To this effect, we study first the problem of defining the variance explained by a set of non-necessarily orthogonal components. Two definitions have been proposed in the literature : the *adjusted variance* of [33] and the *total variance* of [27], which we complement by two definitions based on projection (*polar variance* and *optimal variance*) and two definitions based on normalization. We introduce then a set of properties to be satisfied by any variance definition in order to ensure compatibility with the case of PCA, where the components are orthogonal, and prove that five out of the six above definitions satisfy these compatibility conditions. Numerical experimentation confirms the theoretical results, and shows that the ranking of components by variance is essentially independant of the chosen definition. As a conclusion of this study, we propose to *define the variance of any set of components* $Y = [y_1 \dots y_m]$ by the *optimal projected variance* :

$$\text{var}Y = \max_{X^T X = I_m} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \langle y_j, x_j \rangle^2, \quad (5)$$

We can now add to the four equivalent formulations (1) a fifth equivalent *Maximum Variance* formulation :

$$\text{(MV)} \quad \max_{\|z_j\|=1, j=1 \dots m} \text{var}(AZ). \quad (6)$$

The next step is to use (6) to define a sparse PCA formulation. We have chosen to implement group sparsity, where the groups form a partition of $\{1 \dots p\}$, for two reasons : first, it is useful for the analysis of mixed data, which contain both numerical and categorical variables [[16], [10], [21], [24], [25], [7]], and require an algorithm able to set simultaneously to zero all loading coefficients associated to groups of binary variables used to represent the levels of a categorical variable. Second, this choice simplifies greatly, when properly implemented, the numerical resolution of the maximization problem, avoiding the need of solving non smooth optimization problems.

So in order to derive from (6) a *group-sparse* PCA formulation, we choose a group- ℓ_1 norm $\|z_j\|_1$ and sparsity regularization parameters γ_j , but, instead of subtracting $\sum_{j=1 \dots m} \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1$

from the MV formulation (6) as it is usually done, we define a *perturbed variance* $\text{var}^\gamma(AZ)$ by :

$$\text{var}^\gamma(AZ) = \max_{X^T X = I_m} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} [\langle Az_j, x_j \rangle - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1]_+^2, \quad (7)$$

and define the *Group Sparse Maximum Variance* formulation (compare with (6)) by :

$$(\text{GSMV}) \quad \max_{\|z_j\|=1, j=1 \dots m} \text{var}^\gamma(AZ) = \max_{\|z_j\|=1, j=1 \dots m} \max_{X^T X = I_m} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} [\langle Az_j, x_j \rangle - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1]_+^2. \quad (8)$$

By construction, this formulation achieves the desired balance between maximizing the variance of the (non-necessarily orthogonal) components and promoting group-sparsity of the (non-necessarily orthogonal) unit norm loadings. And it has the nice feature that the (non smooth) optimization with respect to Z can be solved analytically, thus reducing resolution of GSMV to the maximization of a smooth convex function over all X such that $X^T X = I_m$. In the case of scalar variables, with p groups made of one variable each, this maximization problem coincides with the remarkable *block ℓ_1 formulation* of [19], from which we borrow the maximization gradient algorithm (page 526).

We propose a strategy for the initialization of the algorithm and for the choice of the parameters γ_j , aimed at balancing the sparsifying effort equally on all loadings.

The performance of the GSMV algorithm is compared to deflation on synthetic data with known underlying group sparsity structure. Then we illustrate the importance of the group-sparsity capability of the algorithm on a real data set containing numerical variables and categorical variables (mixed data).

The paper is organized as follows: Section 1 recalls the notations for PCA (Principal Component Analysis), Section 2 is devoted to the problem of defining the variance explained by a set of non-necessarily orthogonal components and selecting one definition. The properties of the MV formulation of PCA associated to the selected definition are given in Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to the definition, mathematical analysis and algorithmic resolution of the GSMV formulation (8). Finally, numerical results on both synthetic data and real mixed data are presented in Section 5.

The proposed GSMV algorithm for group sparse PCA and the six explained variance definitions of Section 2 are implemented in a R package “sparsePCA” and are available at <https://github.com/chavent/sparsePCA>.

1 Principal Component Analysis

Let A be the data matrix of rank r , whose $n \times p$ entries are made of n samples of p centered variables, and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denote the Frobenius norm on the space of $n \times p$ matrices :

$$\|A\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1 \dots n} \sum_{j=1 \dots p} a_{i,j}^2 = \text{tr}(A^T A) = \sum_{j=1 \dots r} \sigma_j^2, \quad (9)$$

where the σ_j 's are the singular values of A , defined by its singular value decomposition :

$$A = U \Sigma V^T \quad \text{with} \quad U^T U = I_r, \quad V^T V = I_r, \quad \Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) = r \times r \text{ matrix with } \sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_r > 0. \quad (10)$$

The columns $u_1 \dots u_r$ of U and $v_1 \dots v_r$ of V are the *left* and *right* singular vectors of A .

Principal Component analysis (PCA) searches for a number $m \leq r$ of combinations $z_j, j = 1, \dots, m$ (*loading vectors*) of the p variables such that the variables $y_j = Az_j, j = 1 \dots m$ (*components*) are uncorrelated and explain an as large as possible fraction of the variance $\|A\|_F^2$ of the data. The loadings, normalized components and components solution to the PCA problem are then given by :

$$Z^* = V_m \quad , \quad X^* = U_m \quad , \quad Y^* = X^* \text{diag}\{\sigma_j, j = 1 \dots m\} \quad (11)$$

where the matrices Z and Y contain the m loadings and components, and U_m and V_m contain the m first left and right singular vectors. The components y_j^* are orthogonal, so the part $\text{var}_{PCA}(m)$ of the variance of A explained by these m components is unambiguously defined by :

$$\text{var}_{PCA}(m) = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \|y_j^*\|^2 = \|Y^*\|_F^2 = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \sigma_j^2 \leq \sum_{j=1 \dots r} \sigma_j^2 = \|A\|_F^2 . \quad (12)$$

2 Defining Variance explained by non orthogonal components

Definition (12) for the variance explained by m components $Y = AZ$ makes sense as long as the components y_j are orthogonal, as it is the case for unconstrained PCA. But sparse PCA algorithms generate usually non orthogonal components, and it is known that the use of (12) can lead to overestimate the variance of Y , as shown in Section 2.2 below. So the problem of *defining* the variance $\text{var}Y$ in that case arises.

Two definitions have been proposed in the literature. In 2006, [33] introduced the (order dependent) *adjusted variance*, as the sum of the additional variances explained by each new component; in 2008, [27] introduced an (order independant) *total variance*, depending only on the subspace spanned by the components. The total variance is bounded by the variance $\|A\|_F^2$ of A , [27][Theorem 1 p.1021], but it is not known whether or not these definitions ensure a diminution of the explained variance with respect to unconstrained PCA, and if they coincide with (12) when Y is orthogonal.

So we perform in this section a quite systematic search for possible definitions of the variance $\text{var}Y$, under the constraint that $\text{var}Y$ satisfies a set of reasonable necessary conditions. This will result in six (including adjusted and total variance) different definitions of $\text{var}Y$ - but we shall end up with only one recommendation.

Let Y be a block of components associated to a block Z of loadings, with Y and Z linearly independant but possibly non orthogonal :

$$Y = AZ \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \quad , \quad Z \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m} \quad , \quad \text{rank}Y = \text{rank}Z = m \quad (13)$$

where the number m of loadings and components satisfies :

$$m \leq \text{rank}A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} r . \quad (14)$$

As it will turn out, the unit norm constraint on the z_j 's will not always be necessary, so we shall add it only where required. We want to *define* $\text{var}Y$ in such a way that :

- **property 1** : $\text{var}Y$ coincides with $\text{var}_{PCA}(m)$ as soon as Y coincides with the PCA components $Y^* = AZ^*$ recalled in (11), that is :

$$\text{var}Y^* = \text{var}_{PCA}(m) = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \sigma_j^2 \leq \sum_{j=1 \dots r} \sigma_j^2 = \|A\|_F^2 \quad \text{for } m = 1 \dots r . \quad (15)$$

- **property 2** : for a given number $m \leq r$ of unit norm loadings, the variance $\text{var}Y$ is *smaller than the variance obtained by PCA* :

$$\text{var}Y \leq \text{var}_{PCA}(m) = \sigma_1^2 + \dots + \sigma_m^2 . \quad (16)$$

- **property 3** : when the components Y happen to be orthogonal, this variance has to coincide with the usual formula :

$$\text{var}Y = \sum_{j=1\dots m} \|y_j\|^2 = \|Y\|_F^2 . \quad (17)$$

We give now two formulas for the computation of $\text{var}_{PCA}(m)$ which will provide starting points for the definition of $\text{var}Y$ in the case where the components Y are not anymore aligned with the left singular vectors.

Equation (12) gives immediately a first formula for $\text{var}_{PCA}(m)$:

$$\text{var}_{PCA}(m) = \sum_{j=1\dots m} \|y_j^*\|^2 = \|Y^*\|_F^2 . \quad (18)$$

Then we complement (18) by an equivalent *subspace formulation* of $\|Y^*\|_F^2$. Let P_{V_m} denotes the orthogonal projection on the subspace spanned by the m first right singular vectors $V_m = [v_1 \dots v_m]$ of A . Then $P_{V_m} = V_m V_m^T$, so that $\|A P_{V_m}\|_F^2 = \|Y^*\|_F^2$. This gives a second formula for $\text{var}_{PCA}(m)$:

$$\text{var}_{PCA}(m) = \|A P_{V_m}\|_F^2 . \quad (19)$$

We can now start from either (18) or (19) to define the variance of the components $Y = AZ$ associated to any block Z of $m \leq r$ linearly independant - but not necessarily orthogonal - loading vectors.

2.1 Subspace variance

We proceed here by analogy with (19), and define, when Z satisfies (13), the *subspace variance* of $Y = AZ$ by :

$$\text{var}_{subsp} Y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|A P_Z\|_F^2 , \quad (20)$$

which shows that $\text{var}_{subsp} Y$ coincides with the *total variance* explained by Y introduced by Shen and Huang in [27, section 2.3 p. 1021].

Note that with this definition, $\text{var}_{subsp} Y$ depends only of the *subspace* spanned by $[z_1 \dots z_m]$, so the normalization of loadings z_j is not required, as mentioned at the beginning of Section 2. Of course, we will still continue to represent loadings by unit norm vectors - but this is here only a convenience.

Lemma 2.1 (Subspace Variance) *Let Z satisfy (13). Then the subspace variance of $Y = AZ$ satisfies :*

$$\text{var}_{subsp} Y = \text{tr}\{Y^T Y (Z^T Z)^{-1}\} \leq \text{var}_{PCA}(m) , \quad (21)$$

and satisfies properties 1 and 2. Moreover :

$$\text{var}_{subsp} Y = \text{var}_{PCA}(m) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \text{span}Z = \text{span}V_m . \quad (22)$$

When the components $Y = AZ$ happen to be orthogonal , with $\|z_j\| = 1$, $j = 1 \dots m$, one has :

$$\|Y\|_F^2 \leq \text{var}_{subsp} Y , \quad (23)$$

and :

$$\|Y\|_F^2 = \text{var}_{\text{subsp}} Y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad z_j = v_{\ell(j)} , \quad j = 1 \dots m , \quad (24)$$

where $\ell(j), j = 1 \dots m$ denotes m distinct indices among $1 \dots r$. Hence $\text{var}_{\text{subsp}}$ does not satisfy property 3 : it will overestimate the variance when the components Y are orthogonal without pointing in the direction of left singular vectors.

The proof is in Section 7.3 of the Appendix. Also, when the loadings Z are orthogonal, (21) shows that $\text{var}_{\text{subsp}} Y = \|Y\|_F^2$, but this is again not satisfying as now the components Y are generally not orthogonal.

So we explore in the next section another road in the hope of being able to comply with all properties 1, 2 and 3.

2.2 Projected and Normalized variances

We start now from formula (18). A natural generalization would be :

$$\text{var} Y \stackrel{?}{=} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \|y_j\|^2 = \|Y\|_F^2 = \|AZ\|_F^2 . \quad (25)$$

This tentative definition makes sense only if the magnitude of the individual loading vectors is fixed. Hence it has to be used together with the normalization constraint :

$$\|z_j\| = 1 \quad , \quad j = 1 \dots m . \quad (26)$$

In PCA, the loadings Z coincide with right singular vectors $[v_1 \dots v_m]$, and the tentative definition (25) gives :

$$\text{var} Y = \|A[v_1 \dots v_m]\|_F^2 = \text{var}_{PCA}(m) , \quad (27)$$

which corresponds to the upper bound required in property 2.

In the general case of possibly non orthogonal loadings which satisfy only (13) (26), property 2 is not ensured anymore with this definition, as many authors have pointed out. For example, consider a matrix A with three singular values 3, 2, 1, and chose for Z two linearly independant unit vectors close to the first right singular vector v_1 . Then definition (25) would give :

$$\text{var} Y = \|AZ\|_F^2 = \underbrace{\|Az_1\|^2}_{\simeq \sigma_1^2=9} + \underbrace{\|Az_2\|^2}_{\simeq \sigma_1^2=9} \simeq 18 > \underbrace{9+4}_{\sigma_1^2+\sigma_2^2} + 1 = \|A\|_F^2 . \quad (28)$$

This contradicts both properties 1 and 2, *which makes (25) inadequate as a general definition of variance.*

However, this definition continues to make perfect sense for the variance as long as the components are orthogonal, without pointing necessarily in the direction of left singular vectors : the components correspond then to a block of independant variables, whose total variance is defined by (25).

Hence a natural way to eliminate the redundancy caused by the orthogonality default of the components Y and to satisfy property 3 is to :

1. **choose a rule to associate to the components Y an orthonormal basis X of $\text{span}\{Y\}$ that, loosely speaking, “points in the direction of the components Y ” :**

$$X^T X = I_m \quad , \quad \text{span}\{X\} = \text{span}\{Y\} , \quad (29)$$

(with the constraint that $x_j = y_j / \|y_j\|$ as soon as $\langle y_j, y_k \rangle = 0 \quad \forall j \neq k$.)

We denote by M the matrix of the coordinates of Y in the chosen basis :

$$M = X^T Y \iff Y = X M . \quad (30)$$

Example of such decomposition are the QR and polar decomposition :

$$Y = Q R , \quad Q^T Q = I_m , \quad R = \text{upper triangular matrix} , \quad (31)$$

$$Y = U P , \quad U^T U = I_m , \quad P^T = P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} , \quad P \geq 0 . \quad (32)$$

2. **associate to Y *orthogonal modified components* Y' along the X axes, and *define* the variance $\text{var} Y$ explained by the components Y by :**

$$\text{var} Y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|Y'\|_F^2 . \quad (33)$$

2.2.1 Projected Variance

We define here the modified components y'_j as the projection of y_j on the j -th axis of the basis X :

$$y'_j = \langle y_j , x_j \rangle x_j = m_{j,j} x_j , \quad j = 1 \dots m . \quad (34)$$

Lemma 2.2 (Projected variance) *For any choice of orthogonal basis X satisfying (29), the variance $\text{var}_{proj} Y$ defined by (33) and (34) satisfies :*

$$\text{var}_{proj} Y = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \langle y_j , x_j \rangle^2 = \text{tr}\{\text{diag}^2 M\} \leq \text{var}_{subsp} Y \leq \text{var}_{PCA}(m) . \quad (35)$$

and Properties 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied. Moreover,

$$\exists X \text{ s.t. } \text{var}_{proj} Y = \text{var}_{PCA}(m) \iff \begin{cases} \text{span} Z &= \text{span} V_m , \\ z_j^T V_m \Sigma_m^{-2} V_m^T z_k &= 0 \text{ for } j \neq k \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

Of course, $z_j = v_j, j = 1 \dots m$ satisfies the right part of (36) !

The proof is given in Section 7.4 of the Appendix. Depending on the rule chosen at step 1 for the selection of X , formula (35) gives different possible definitions for the variance, which all satisfy Lemmas 2.2 :

Adjusted variance. Let X and M be given by the *QR-decomposition* (31) of Y ($X = Q, M = R$). Then (35) gives :

$$\text{var}_{proj}^{QR} Y = \text{tr}\{\text{diag}^2 R\} = \text{tr}\{R^2\} = \langle R^T , R \rangle_F , \quad (37)$$

which is the *adjusted variance* introduced by Zou et al. in [33]. Because the QR orthogonalization procedure is started with the components of largest norm, the basis $X = Q$ will point in the direction of Y at least for the components of larger norm.

Polar variance. Define X and M by the *polar decomposition* UP of Y (32). The choice $X = U$ does its best to point in the same direction as the components Y , in that it maximizes the scalar product $\langle Y, X \rangle$ over \mathcal{S}_m^n . Formula (35) gives now :

$$\text{var}_{proj}^{UP} Y = \text{tr}\{\text{diag}^2 P\} = \text{tr}\{(\text{diag}^2(Y^T Y)^{1/2})\} . \quad (38)$$

This *polar variance* is order independant.

Optimal variance. Lemmas 2.2 shows that the variance $\text{var}_{proj}Y$ defined by (35) satisfies the desired properties 1,2 and 3 for any X such that $X^T X = I_m$. It is hence natural to associate to Y the basis X^* which gives the largest variance :

$$\text{var}_{proj}^{opt}Y = \sum_{j=1\dots m} \langle y_j, x_j^* \rangle^2 = \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_m^n} \sum_{j=1\dots m} \langle y_j, x_j \rangle^2, \quad (39)$$

where \mathcal{S}_m^n is the *Stiefel variety* of the component space :

$$\mathcal{S}_m^n = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \text{ such that } X^T X = I_m\}. \quad (40)$$

This optimal variance can be computed by maximization of the convex function $\text{var}_{proj}Y$ over the Stiefel manifold \mathcal{S}_m^n by mean of [19, Algorithm 1 page 526] recalled in (75), which gives :

$$X^* = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} X_k \quad \text{where:} \quad X_{k+1} = \text{polar}(Y \text{diag}(X_k^T Y)) \quad , \quad X_0 = U = \text{polar}(Y). \quad (41)$$

This shows that X^* is a solution of the equation :

$$X = \text{polar}(Y \text{diag}(X^T Y)). \quad (42)$$

2.2.2 Normalized Variance

We choose now y'_j in the direction of x_j such that :

$$y'_j = A z'_j \quad , \quad \text{with} \quad \|z'_j\| = 1, \quad j = 1 \dots m, \quad \text{where :} \quad (43)$$

$$z'_j = \frac{t_j}{\|t_j\|}, \quad \text{with } T \text{ is given by : } Z = TM \quad (\text{compare to (30) : } Y = XM). \quad (44)$$

One sees that T is obtained by performing on the loadings Z the same linear combinations which transformed Y into X , so that $AT = X$.

Lemma 2.3 (Normalized variance) *For any choice of orthogonal basis X satisfying (29), the variance $\text{var}_{norm}Y$ defined by (33) and (43) (44) satisfies :*

$$\text{var}_{norm}Y = \sum_{j=1\dots m} 1/\|t_j\|^2 \leq \text{var}_{subsp} Y \leq \text{var}_{PCA}(m), \quad (45)$$

and satisfies Properties 1, 2 and 3. Moreover :

$$\exists X \text{ s.t. } \text{var}_{norm}Y = \text{var}_{PCA}(m) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \text{span}Z = \text{span}V_m \quad (46)$$

The proof of (45) follows immediately from (23) in Lemma 2.1 applied to the orthogonal components $Y' = AZ'$. In order to prove (46), one remarks first that $\text{var}_{norm}Y = \text{var}_{PCA}(m)$ implies by (45) that $\text{var}_{subsp}Y = \text{var}_{PCA}(m)$, which in turn implies by Lemma 2.1 that $\text{span}Z = \text{span}V_m$. Conversely, if $\text{span}Z = \text{span}V_m$, one can choose for X the m first left singular vectors U_m , which gives $\text{var}_{norm}Y = \|Y'\|^2 = \text{var}_{PCA}(m)$, which ends the proof of the lemma.

QR normalized variances. Let X and M be defined by the *QR decomposition* (31) of Y . Then (45) leads to another definition of variance :

$$\text{var}_{norm}^{QR}Y = \sum_{j=1\dots m} 1/\|t_j\|^2 = \text{tr}\{\text{diag}^{-1}(T^T T)\} \quad \text{where} \quad T = ZR^{-1}. \quad (47)$$

UP normalized variances. Let X and M be defined by the *UP polar decomposition* (32) of Y . Then (45) defines a new variance :

$$\text{var}_{\text{norm}}^{UP} Y = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} 1/\|t_j\|^2 = \text{tr}\{\text{diag}^{-1}(T^T T)\} \quad \text{where } T = Z(Y^T Y)^{-1/2} . \quad (48)$$

We have not considered defining an *optimal normalized variance* by associating to Y the basis X which maximizes $\text{var} Y$ defined by (45) (44), for the reason that, because of (46), such an optimal normalized variance would achieve its maximum $\text{var}_{PCA}(m)$ as soon as $\text{span} Z = \text{span} V_m$, no orthogonality condition being required on Z as it was the case for projected variance. Another reason for this choice is that $\text{var} Y$ is not anymore a convex function of X , so its computation would be more delicate.

2.3 Size comparison

The variance $\text{var}_{\text{subsp}} Y$ is larger than any of the five other variances, as shown by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3.

But there is no natural ordering between the variances defined by projection and normalization, as illustrated in Figure 1 for the case of polar decomposition.




Figure 1: The two sets of components $Y = [y_1 \ y_2]$ and $\tilde{Y} = [\tilde{y}_1 \ \tilde{y}_2]$ have been chosen such that their polar decomposition produces the same basis $X = [x_1 \ x_2]$, and one sees that : $\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{UP} \tilde{Y} \leq \text{var}_{\text{norm}}^{UP} \tilde{Y} = \text{var}_{\text{norm}}^{UP} Y \leq \text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{UP} Y$.

Then among projected variances, $\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{\text{opt}} Y$ is greater by definition than any other projected variance, in particular greater than $\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{QR} Y$ and $\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{UP} Y$. But there is no natural order between these latter : when the components Y are of equal norm, one checks easily that the basis X which maximizes the variance is $\text{polar} Y$, which implies in particular that :

$$\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{\text{opt}} Y = \text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{UP} Y \geq \text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{QR} Y . \quad (49)$$

But the converse of the last inequality can hold when the norms of the components are very different : for $m = 2$, one checks that $\|y_2\|/\|y_1\|$ small enough implies that $\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{UP} Y \leq \text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{QR} Y$.

There is also no natural order between the normalized variances $\text{var}_{\text{norm}}^{QR} Y$ and $\text{var}_{\text{norm}}^{UP} Y$: for components Y such that the basis X associated by QR-decomposition coincides with the

m -first left singular vectors U_m of A , one has, according to Lemma 2.3 :

$$\text{var}_{\text{norm}}^{QR} Y = \text{var}_{PCA}(m) \geq \text{var}_{\text{norm}}^{UP} Y , \quad (50)$$

with a strict inequality as soon as Y and $U_m \text{diag}\{\sigma_j\}$ don't coincide. The same reasoning with the polar decomposition in place of the QR decomposition shows that the converse inequality can happen.

We complete now these theoretical results by comparing numerically the six definitions of $\text{var}Y$ proposed Section 2 and summarized in Table 1.

Name	Notation	Short name
subspace variance	$\text{var}_{\text{subsp}}$	subspVar
optimal variance	$\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{\text{opt}}$	optVar
polar variance	$\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{UP}$	polVar
adjusted variance	$\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{QR}$	adjVar
QR normalized variance	$\text{var}_{\text{norm}}^{QR}$	QRnormVar
UP normalized variance	$\text{var}_{\text{norm}}^{UP}$	UPnormVar

Table 1: Names and notation for the 6 variance definitions.

The numerical comparison of the six definitions of variance is made on sets of 30000 non orthogonal components Y computed as follows:

- Two sets of 100 matrices A each are simulated using the simulation scheme of Section 5.2. The matrices of the first set (referred to as “close eigenvalues”) are drawn randomly using a covariance matrix whose first eigenvalues are 200, 180, 150 and 130. The matrices of the second set (referred to as “different eigenvalues”) are drawn randomly using a covariance matrix whose first eigenvalues are 200, 100, 50 and 20.
- Three group-sparse PCA algorithms (one deflation and two block algorithms described in Section 5.2.2) are applied to these simulated matrices with a grid of 50 reduced sparsity parameter λ (see (79) in Section 4.2.3) between 0 and 0.5. For each sparsity parameter λ , a set of 300 matrices Z (of $m = 4$ loading vectors) are then obtained with the “close eigenvalues” (resp. “different eigenvalues”) set of matrices A .
- For each loading matrix Z , the six variance definitions of $\text{var}Y = \text{var}(AZ)$ are computed

We display here for each variance definition the dimensionless *proportion of explained variance* (pev) defined by :

$$0 \leq \text{pev} = \text{var}Y / \|A\|_F^2 \leq \text{var}_{PCA}(m) / \|A\|_F^2 , \quad (51)$$

where the right inequality follows from (16) in Property 2, which is satisfied by all definitions of variance. Figure 2 gives thus for each definition of $\text{var}Y$ the *mean values* of the pev over the 300 non orthogonal components $Y = AZ$ (for the “close eigenvalues” and ‘the ‘different eigenvalues” case) as a function of the reduced sparsity parameter λ .

For the “close eigenvalues ” case (top), where the variances of the principal components are in a ratio less than 1:2, the mean pev’s produced by optVar and polVar are so close that they cannot be distinguished on the figure (remember that they would coincide were the norms equal, see (49)). One sees also that the *mean pev*’s seem to be in an apparent order for all λ :

$$\text{subspVar} \geq \text{optVar} \geq \text{polVar} \geq \text{adjVar} \geq \text{QRnormVar} \geq \text{UPnormVar} \quad (52)$$

(the two first inequalities are not a surprise, as they hold already for any realization Y of the components according to Lemma 2.2 and the definition of var_{proj}^{opt}).

But in the “different eigenvalues” case (bottom), where the ratio of the principal components variances is 1:10, a zoom on the curves shows that optVar is clearly larger than polVar and adjVar (which is coherent with the theoretical results), but that the apparent order (52) is not satisfied by the other mean pev’s anymore.




Figure 2: Comparison of the mean pev’s (proportion of explained variance) over two sets of components (top and bottom) as function of reduced sparsity parameter λ (see (79) in Section 4.2) for the six variance definitions.

When it comes to real data, the variability of variance is an important feature, as only one realization is available. Table 2 shows that all definitions but UPnormVar (in the “Different eigenvalues” case) exhibit quite similar dispersions.

2.4 Ranking properties of variances

The proportions of explained variance $\text{pev}_i, i = 1 \dots 6$ defined by (51) are meant to be used for the ranking of algorithms, so it is important to figure out whether or not definitions i and j will rank in the same order the components Y and Y' obtained from possibly different algorithms and/or sparsity parameter λ and/or realization of the data matrix A . There are 3 algorithms,

	Close eigenvalues	Different eigenvalues
subspVar	0.63	1.63
optVar	0.66	1.38
polVar	0.66	1.06
adjVar	0.72	1.25
QRnormVar	1.06	1.33
UPnormVar	1.21	7.74

Table 2: Standard deviations $\times 100$ of the six pev (proportion of explained variance) obtained for $\lambda = 0.3$ with the three algorithms over the two sets of components (close eigenvalues and different eigenvalues).

50 values of λ and 100 realizations of A (‘close eigenvalues ’ case), and hence $15000 \times 14999/2$ couples (Y, Y') to be tested. Among these couples, we may consider as ϵ -distinguishable from the point of view of our explained variances those for which

$$|\text{pev}_i(Y) - \text{pev}_i(Y')| \geq \epsilon \quad \text{for all } i = 1 \dots 6 \quad (53)$$

for some $\epsilon \geq 0$. Table 3 shows the percentage of cases where pev_i and pev_j rank identically components Y and Y' among all ϵ -distinguishable couples. The good news is that all three projected variances optVar, polVar and adjVar, as well as the normalized variance QRnormVar, produce the same ranking as soon as one considers that differences in proportion of explained variance under 10^{-2} are not significative. For the same ϵ , the two other definitions subspVar and UPnormVar still produce quite different rankings. Of course, this is only an experimental result based on our simulated data sets.

2.5 Recommendation for the choice of a definition of variance

Among the definitions of variance we have investigated, the subspace variance $\text{var}_{\text{subsp}} Y$ (Lemma 2.1) fails to satisfy property 3 : when the components Y happen to be orthogonal without pointing in the directions of left singular vectors, $\text{var}_{\text{subsp}} Y > \|Y\|_F^2$, where one would like equality. So $\text{var}_{\text{subsp}} Y$ does not seem to be the best choice.

Then Lemma 2.2 and 2.3 show that all projected and normalized variances satisfy properties 1, 2 and 3. We rank them now according to their ability to achieve their maximum value $\text{var}_{PCA}(m)$: the more restrictive the conditions on the loadings Z , the lesser the chance that $\text{var} Y = \text{var}_{PCA}(m)$! This is a desirable property, as it will allow to quantify the drop in explained variance with respect to PCA induced by using sparse loading, and will help to make a decision in the trade-off ‘explained variance versus sparsity’.

For normalized variances, the possibility that $\text{var}_{\text{norm}} Y$ achieves the PCA value $\text{var}_{PCA}(m)$ will arise as soon as $\text{span} Z = \text{span} V_m$ (Lemma 2.3), if the basis X associated to Y happens to be the basis U_m of left singular vectors. Hence equality can hold for a large family of components, so $\text{var}_{\text{norm}} Y$ does not seem either to be the best choice.

For the projected variances $\text{var}_{\text{proj}} Y$, achieving the PCA maximum $\text{var}_{PCA}(m)$ requires not only that $\text{span} Z = \text{span} V_m$, *but also that* the loadings Z satisfy a weighted orthogonality condition (Lemma 2.2). They seem to be the best suited to arbitrate the trade-off between explaining the variance and achieving sparsity of the loadings, as $\text{var}_{\text{proj}} Y < \text{var}_{PCA}(m)$ as soon as the loadings fail to span the m first right singular vector *or* to satisfy the weighted orthogonality condition. So projected explained variances will be our preferred definitions.

In short, for the projected variances, $\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{QR}$ is easy to compute but order dependent, $\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{UP}$ is order independant, and $\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{\text{opt}}$ is larger than any projected variance (including $\text{var}_{\text{proj}}^{QR}$ and

	subspVar	optVar	polVar	adjVar	QRnormVar	UPnormVar
subspVar		79.98	71.05	70.71	69.75	56.19
optVar			88.93	89.87	89.19	73.71
polVar				96.22	95.27	84.62
adjVar					98.34	83.15
QRnormVar						82.75
UPnormVar						
	subspVar	optVar	polVar	adjVar	QRnormVar	UPnormVar
subspVar		86.13	83.78	84.70	84.57	68.68
optVar			96.40	98.57	98.32	81.14
polVar				97.81	97.72	84.74
adjVar					99.66	82.55
QRnormVar						82.66
UPnormVar						
	subspVar	optVar	polVar	adjVar	QRnormVar	UPnormVar
subspVar		89.57	89.57	89.57	89.57	68.80
optVar			100.00	100.00	100.00	79.23
polVar				100.00	100.00	79.23
adjVar					100.00	79.23
QRnormVar						79.23
UPnormVar						

Table 3: The entry of each table on line i and column j gives the percentage of ϵ -distinguishable couples Y, Y' which are ranked identically by pev_i and pev_j . Top : $\epsilon = 0$, middle : $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$, bottom : $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$.

var_{proj}^{UP}), but its computation requires an iterated polar decomposition. They are all good choices, our best choice for variance being var_{proj}^{opt} , which we shall use in the sequel as *the* definition of variance, and hence drop the indices “proj” and “opt” :

Definition 2.4 *The optimal projected variance of m not necessarily orthogonal components $Y = [y_1 \dots y_m]$ is :*

$$\text{var}Y = \max_{X \in S_m^n} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \langle y_j, x_j \rangle^2. \quad (54)$$

This definition satisfies properties 1, 2 and 3, in particular it reduces to the usual formula $\text{var}Y = \|Y\|_F^2$ when the components Y are orthogonal, and is larger than all projected variance definitions.

3 Maximum Variance (MV) Block PCA formulations

Because of properties (35) (36) of Lemma 2.2, the optimal projected variance $\text{var}Y$ of Definition 2.4 achieves its maximum $\text{var}_{PCA}(m) = \sigma_1^2 + \dots + \sigma_m^2$ for any loading Z^* which satisfies (36), in other terms :

$$Z^* = \arg \max_{Z \in (\mathcal{B}^p)^m} \text{var}(AZ) \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \text{span} Z^* & = \text{span} V_m, \\ z_j^{*T} V_m \Sigma_m^{-2} V_m^T z_k^* & = 0 \text{ for } j \neq k \end{cases}, \quad (55)$$

where :

$$(\mathcal{B}^p)^m = \{Z \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m} \text{ such that } \|z_j\| \leq 1, j = 1 \dots m\} . \quad (56)$$

So the variance $\text{var}Y$ can be used as an objective function whose maximization with respect to m (non-necessarily orthogonal) unit norm loadings produces m (non-necessarily orthogonal) components $Y^* = AZ^*$ with variance $\text{var}_{PCA}(m) = \sigma_1^2 + \dots + \sigma_m^2$. Note that the blocks $Z^* = V_m$ made of the m first right singular vector, and all those obtained by column index permutation, satisfy trivially the property in the right part of (55) and hence are all maximizers of $\text{var}(AZ)$

In order to select the maximizer $Z^* = V_m$ of interest for PCA, one introduces weights μ_j such that :

$$\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \mu_m > 0 , \quad (57)$$

and defines a “weighted variance” var_μ by :

$$\text{var}_\mu(AZ) = \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_m^n} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 \langle Az_j, x_j \rangle^2 , \quad (58)$$

which coincides with $\text{var}(AZ)$ when $\mu_j = 1$ for all j . The *Maximum Variance (MV) Block PCA* formulation is then defined as :

$$\max_{Z \in (\mathcal{B}^p)^m} \text{var}_\mu(AZ) = \max_{Z \in (\mathcal{B}^p)^m} \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_m^n} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 \langle Az_j, x_j \rangle^2 = \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_m^n} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 \|A^T x_j\|^2 . \quad (59)$$

The nice properties of this formulation are recalled in the next proposition :

Proposition 3.1 *Let the singular values of A satisfy :*

$$\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \dots > \sigma_m > 0 , \quad (60)$$

and the weights μ_j satisfy (57). Then the PCA loadings $Z^ = V_m$ and normalized components $X^* = U_m$ defined in (11) are one solution of the MV problem (59) when the weights μ_j are constant, and the unique solution (up to a multiplication by ± 1 of each column of course) of the MV problem (59) when the weights μ_j are strictly decreasing. The maximizers Z^* and X^* are hence independant of the weights μ_j , and the variance explained by $Y^* = AZ^*$ is :*

$$\text{var} Y^* = \text{var}_{PCA}(m) = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \sigma_j^2 \leq \|A\|_F^2 , \quad (61)$$

with X^ and Z^* related by :*

$$x_j^* = (Az_j^*)/\|Az_j^*\| , \quad z_j^* = (A^T x_j^*)/\|A^T x_j^*\| \quad \text{for } j = 1 \dots m . \quad (62)$$

Proof: The last formulation in resp. (59) is the maximization of a weighted Rayleigh quotient for A^T , which is known to be equivalent to a PCA problem for A^T , and hence for A (see for example [2], recalled as Theorem 7.1 in the Appendix for the case of constant weights, and [4] for the case of decreasing weights). ■

4 Group-Sparse Maximum Variance (GSMV) Block PCA formulation

The aim of group sparse PCA is to build group sparse loading vectors z_j in order to select relevant groups of variables to build the component y_j . This is helpful in particular for the treatment of mixed data, where a group of scalar variables is used to describe one categorical variable.

We denote by g the number of groups of variables (also called “group variables” below) and by p_1, \dots, p_g the number of variables in each group. The data matrix A and the loading vectors $z_j \in \mathbb{R}^p, j = 1 \dots m$ are then split accordingly :

$$A = [A_1 \dots A_g] \quad , \quad z_j^T = [z_{1,j}^T \dots z_{g,j}^T] \quad , \quad (63)$$

where the A_i ’s are $n \times p_i$ matrices, and the $z_{i,j}$ ’s are column vectors of dimension p_i . We denote also by $\|\cdot\|_2$ the norm on $n \times p_i$ matrices induced by the Euclidian norms $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^{p_i} (largest singular value) :

$$\|A_i z_{i,j}\| \leq \|A_i\|_2 \|z_{i,j}\| \quad \forall z_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i} \quad . \quad (64)$$

4.1 Choice of the formulation

We start from the MV Block PCA formulation (59) of Section section 3, whose unique solution, for strictly decreasing μ_j , happens to maximize also $\text{var}(AZ)$ (Proposition 3.1). In order to promote the apparition of zeroes in the loading vectors for some group variables, we use the *group ℓ^1 -norm* of the loadings z_j :

$$\|z_j\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^g \|z_{i,j}\| \quad , \quad j = 1 \dots m \quad , \quad (65)$$

where $\|z_{i,j}\|$ is the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^{p_i} , and choose regularization parameters :

$$\gamma_j > 0 \quad , \quad j = 1 \dots m \quad . \quad (66)$$

We use this group ℓ^1 -norm to define a group-sparse weighted variance var_μ^γ associated to the (non-necessarily orthogonal) loadings $Z \in (\mathcal{B}^p)^m$, which penalizes loadings Z whose columns z_j have large group ℓ^1 -norm (compare with (58)) :

$$\text{var}_\mu^\gamma(AZ) = \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_m^n} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 [x_j^T A z_j - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1]_+^2 \quad , \quad (67)$$

where $[t]_+ = t$ if $t \geq 0$ and $[t]_+ = 0$ if $t < 0$. Maximization of this variance leads to the *Group-Sparse Maximum Variance* (GSMV) Block PCA formulation :

$$\max_{Z \in (\mathcal{B}^p)^m} \text{var}_\mu^\gamma(AZ) = \max_{Z \in (\mathcal{B}^p)^m} \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_m^n} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 [x_j^T A z_j - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1]_+^2 \quad . \quad (68)$$

It produces *non-necessarily orthonormal* sparse loading vectors z_j^* , and orthonormal vectors x_j^* - but these latter do not coincide anymore with the normalized component :

$$x_j^* \neq (A z_j^*) / \|A z_j^*\| \quad , \quad j = 1 \dots m \quad , \quad (69)$$

in opposition to the case where no sparsity is required, where equality holds (see (62)). Hence neither the sparse loading vectors nor the principal components produced by formulation (68) are orthogonal.

But the good side of this formulation is that the numerical difficulties are split between X and Z : the orthonormality constraint is for X , the non-differentiable group ℓ^1 -norm is for Z . Moreover, as it was proved, for scalar variables, by [9] in the case of cardinality regularization, and indicated by [19] in the case of ℓ^1 regularization, the maximization loop on Z in (68) can be solved analytically, despite the non-differentiable terms, for any given $X \in \mathcal{S}_m^n$, as it was trivially

the case in (59) for PCA, thus leading to the *maximization of the differentiable convex* function F of X given by (72) below (to be compared to the last maximization problem in (59)), which coincides, for scalar variables, with the function $\Phi_{\ell_1, m}^2$ indicated in [19, formula (16) page 524], which is the starting point of its ℓ_1 -penalty method.

Hence formulation (68) provides a natural generalization of this algorithm to the case of group variables, together with a new interpretation of the algorithm as a sparse version of the maximization of the explained variance $\text{var}(AZ)$ over all unit norm loadings Z : it realizes a compromise between maximizing the variance $\text{var}Y$ explained by Y and sparsifying the loadings Z .

We detail now the resolution of the GSMV formulation (68). For any $j = 1 \dots m$ we denote by S_j the *soft group thresholding operator* which acts on any set of group variables $\zeta = (\zeta_1 \dots \zeta_g) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ by setting, for each $i = 1 \dots g$, the i -th group of variables $\|\zeta_i\|$ to zero if its norm is smaller than γ_j , and by reducing its length by γ_j otherwise :

$$(S_j(\zeta))_i = \begin{cases} \zeta_i(1 - \eta/\|\zeta_i\|) & \text{if } \|\zeta_i\| > \gamma_j \\ 0 & \text{if } \|\zeta_i\| \leq \gamma_j \end{cases}, \quad i = 1 \dots g, \quad (70)$$

so that :

$$\|S_j(\zeta)\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^g [\|\zeta_i\| - \gamma_j]_+^2. \quad (71)$$

Proposition 4.1 *The solution (X^*Z^*) of the GSMV formulation (68) can be obtained in two steps :*

1. Determine $X^* = [x_1^* \dots x_m^*]$ which maximizes over \mathcal{S}_m^n the convex function :

$$F(X) = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 \sum_{i=1}^g [\|A_i^T x_j\| - \gamma_j]_+^2 = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 \|S_j(A^T x_j)\|^2. \quad (72)$$

2. Compute $t_j^* = S_j(A^T x_j^*)$ for $j = 1 \dots m$, and define $Z^* = [z_1^* \dots z_m^*]$ by :

$$z_j^* = \begin{cases} t_j^*/\|t_j^*\| & \text{if } t_j^* \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } t_j^* = 0 \end{cases}, \quad j = 1 \dots m. \quad (73)$$

When $\gamma_j \rightarrow 0$, one sees that $t_j^* \rightarrow A^T x_j^*$, so t_j^* can be understood as a perturbation of $A^T x_j^*$ caused by the sparsity inducing parameter γ_j .

The condition :

$$\min_{j=1 \dots m} \gamma_j < \max_{i=1 \dots g} \|A_i\|_2, \quad (74)$$

on the regularization weights γ_j ensures that at least one of the t_j^* and z_j^* are non zero, and hence that the value of the maximum in (72) is strictly positive.

The proof of this proposition is given in Section 7.2 of the Appendix.

4.2 A Block algorithm for the GSMV formulation

4.2.1 Algorithm

The function $F(X)$ in proposition 4.1 is convex and the Stiefel manifold \mathcal{S}_m^n compact, so one can use [19, Algorithm 1 page 526], which computes X^* as the limit of the sequence X_k defined by:

$$X_{k+1} \text{ maximizes } \{F(X_k) + \langle \nabla F(X_k), Y - X_k \rangle\} \text{ over } Y \in \mathcal{S}_m^n. \quad (75)$$

The maximizer of $\langle \nabla F(X_k), Y \rangle$ over all $Y \in \mathcal{S}_m^n$ in (75) is the polar of the $n \times m$ matrix $\nabla F(X) = 2ATN^2$, where

$$T = [t_1 \dots t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m} \quad , \quad N = \text{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} . \quad (76)$$

This gives the Group-Sparse Maximum Variance block algorithm :

GSMV block algorithm

```

input           :  $X_0 \in \mathcal{S}_m^n$ 
output          :  $X_n$  (approximate solution)
begin
  0  $\leftarrow$  k
  repeat
     $T_k \leftarrow$  group-thresholding of  $A^T X_k$  according to (70)
     $G_k \leftarrow \nabla F(X_k) = 2AT_k N^2$ 
     $X_{k+1} \leftarrow \text{polar}(G_k)$ 
     $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
  until a stopping criterion is satisfied
end

```

Once X^* has been determined, Z^* is computed from (73) by applying the group-thresholding operator (70) to $A^T X^*$.

One iteration requires the computation of the matrix products $A^T X$ and AT , the group thresholding of the $p \times m$ matrix $A^T X$, and the polar decomposition of the $n \times m$ matrix ATN^2 .

By construction, the GSMV block algorithm has the convergence properties of [19, Algorithm 1 page 526] : its limit points are all stationary points of F , but non-necessarily local maxima, which is the best one can expect from local gradient methods.

4.2.2 Initialization

The function F has many local maxima, so in order to limit the odds that the algorithm converges to a local maximum and/or produces loadings in the wrong order, we have chosen in all numerical experiments - deflation as well as block algorithms - to perform first an unconstrained PCA by running the algorithm with $\gamma_j = 0$ for all j . Then we can use the left singular vectors $[u_1 \dots u_m]$ as initial value X_0 , and the singular values to balance the regularization level between the loadings - c.f. section 4.2.3.

4.2.3 Choice of regularization parameters

In order to impose a similar level of regularization on all loadings, we have chosen to fit each *sparsity parameter* γ_j to the norm of the vector $A^T x_j$ it is in charge of thresholding. This norm is simply estimated by its initial value $\|A^T x_j^0\| = \|A^T u_j\| = \|\sigma_j v_j\| = \sigma_j$. To this effect we define for each component a *nominal sparsity parameters* $\gamma_{j,max}$ by :

$$\gamma_{j,max} = \frac{\sigma_j}{\sigma_1} \gamma_{max} \quad \text{where} \quad \gamma_{max} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{i=1 \dots g} \|A_i\|_2 \quad \text{as defined in (74)} , \quad (77)$$

and a *reduced sparsity parameters* λ_j by :

$$\lambda_j = \gamma_j / \gamma_{j,max} \quad , \quad j = 1 \dots m . \quad (78)$$

Moreover, in the usual situation where no a priori information on the sparsity of the underlying loadings is known, one can apply the same level of regularization for all components simply by

using the same reduced parameters $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ for all loadings :

$$0 \leq \lambda = \lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_m \leq 1 . \quad (79)$$

When this choice is done, the regularization parameters satisfy

$$0 \leq \gamma_j < \gamma_{j,max} \leq \gamma_{max} \quad , \quad j = 1 \dots m , \quad (80)$$

which of course satisfies condition (74), and up to $m - 1$ loadings may vanish at the optimum.

4.2.4 Choice of weights μ_j

According to Proposition 3.1, we have considered two options :

- **block_diff_mu** : here we use strictly decreasing weights μ_j , for example :

$$\mu_j = 1/j \quad j = 1 \dots m , \quad (81)$$

in order to relieve the underdetermination which happens for equal μ_j at $\lambda = 0$ and to drive the optimization, when $\lambda > 0$, towards a minimizer X^* which is “close” to the m first left eigenvectors $[u_1, \dots, u_m]$

- **block_same_mu** : but we have also tested the behavior of the algorithm for equal weights :

$$\mu_j = 1 \quad j = 1 \dots m , \quad (82)$$

as it corresponds exactly to the maximization of a sparse penalized version of the variance $\text{var}(AZ)$ of Definition 2.4.

4.3 A deflation group-sparse algorithm for PCA

For comparison purpose with the above block algorithm, we recall here a group-sparse deflation algorithm :

$$\text{Set } A_0 = A , \quad z_0 = 0 , \quad \text{and compute, for } j = 1 \dots m : \quad (83)$$

$$A_j = A_{j-1}(I_p - z_{j-1}z_{j-1}^T) \quad (84)$$

$$z_j = \arg \max_{\|z\|=1} (\|A_j z\| - \gamma_j \|z\|_1) \quad (85)$$

The optimization problem (85) coincides with the GSMV block formulation (68) written for $m = 1$. Hence we shall implement the deflation algorithm by applying the GSMV block algorithm of Section 4.2.1 with $m = 1$ (one single sparse loading) iteratively to each deflated matrix A_j .

4.4 Specification to sparse PCA of a mixture of numerical and categorical variables

The columns of A are now either centered (or standardized) numerical variables or centered binary variables coding the levels of a categorical variable. Let p_1 denote the number of numerical variables and p_2 the number of categorical variables. Each categorical variable j has q_j levels and $q = \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} q_j$ is the total number of levels. The number of columns of A is then $p = p_1 + q$ and the dimension of the matrix A is then $n \times (p_1 + q)$.

Let $\|\cdot\|_{M,N}$ denote the generalized Frobenius or Hilbert-Schmitt norm on the space of $n \times p$ matrices :

$$\|A\|_{M,N}^2 = \text{tr}(A^T N A M) = \sum_{j=1 \dots r} \sigma_j^2 , \quad (86)$$

where M and N are symmetric positive definite matrices and the σ_j 's are the singular values of the *generalized singular value decomposition* (GSVD) of A :

$$\begin{aligned} A &= U\Sigma V^T \quad \text{with} \quad U^T N U = I_r \quad , \quad V^T M V = I_r \quad , \\ \Sigma &= \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) = r \times r \text{ matrix with } \sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_r > 0 \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

The columns $u_1 \dots u_r$ of U and $v_1 \dots v_r$ of V are the left and right *generalized singular vectors*.

PCA of a mixture of numerical and categorical data (PCAmix) finds a number $m \leq r$ of combinations $z_j, j = 1, \dots, m$ of the $p = p_1 + q$ columns of A such that the variables $y_j = AMz_j, j = 1 \dots m$ are uncorrelated and explain an as large as possible fraction of the variance $\|A\|_{M,N}^2$ of the data. Here, N is the diagonal matrix of the weights of the n observations ($N = \mathbb{I}_n$ when all observations are weighted by 1) and M is the diagonal matrix of the weights of the $p_1 + q$ columns of A :

$$M = \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1, \frac{n}{n_1}, \dots, \frac{n}{n_q})$$

The p_1 first columns (numerical variables) are weighted by 1. The q last columns (levels) are weighted by the inverse of the frequencies $\frac{n_1}{n} \dots \frac{n_q}{n}$ of the q levels. This metric M (between observations) is the standard Euclidean distance for numerical variables and a weighted Euclidean distance (in the spirit of the χ^2 distance) for the levels (to give more importance to rare levels). The loadings and components solutions to the PCAmix problem are then given by :

$$Z = V_m \quad , \quad Y = AMV_m \quad (88)$$

where V_m contains the m first right *generalized singular vectors*.

Sparse PCA of a mixture of numerical and categorical variables (sparsePCAmix) is then performed via group-sparse PCA as follows. Groups of variables are specified according to the nature of the variables: each numerical variable defines a group of size 1 and each categorical variable with q_j levels defines a group of size q_j . Group-sparse PCA is then applied to the matrix $\tilde{A} = N^{1/2} A M^{1/2}$ to find a solution \tilde{Z} and this solution is transformed back to the original scale to find the sparse loadings $Z = M^{-1/2} \tilde{Z}$. In this way the loadings of the levels of a categorical variable are simultaneously set to 0.

5 Numerical results

The GSMV block algorithm of Section 4.2 and its adaptation to mixed data of Section 4.4, as well as the deflation algorithm of Section 4.3, have been implemented in the R packages “sparsePCA” and “sparsePCAmix” available at <https://github.com/chavent/>. All numerical results of this section have been produced using these codes.

5.1 Performance indicators

The first measure of performance is the variance $\text{var}Y$ explained by the (usually non orthogonal) m components y_j . We use here for $\text{var}Y$ the *optimal projected variance* as suggested in Definition 2.4, which we recall here :

$$\text{var}Y = \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_m^n} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \langle y_j, x_j \rangle^2 \quad . \quad (89)$$

As shown in Section 2 above, this variance is optimal in the sense that it produces the largest explained variance among a large class of possible definitions.

We display the dimensionless *proportion of explained variance* (pev) (51), which measures the loss in explained variance induced by sparsity compared to PCA, as well as the individual contributions pev_j of each components :

$$pev = \sum_{j=1}^m pev_j = \text{var}Y / \text{var}_{PCA}(m) \quad , \quad pev_j = \|y'_j\|^2 / \text{var}_{PCA}(m) \quad j = 1 \dots m \quad , \quad (90)$$

where the y'_j are the “modified loadings” (34) which enter the definition of projected variances.

The *orthogonality of components* will be measured by the m -dimensional volume $\text{Vol}(Y) = |\det(P)|$ of the parallelepiped constructed on the columns of Y , where $Y = UP$ is the polar decomposition of Y . One defines then a *dimensionless orthogonality measure* volume of Y by :

$$0 \leq \text{volume} = \text{Vol}(Y) / \prod_{j=1 \dots m} \|y_j\| \leq 1 \quad \text{where } \text{Vol}(Y) = |\det(P)| \quad . \quad (91)$$

In the case where one y_j or more vanish, which may happen as up to $m - 1$ optimal z_j may be equal to zero (c.f. Section 4.2.3), the volume index is computed on the non-zero remaining y_j s.

When the algorithm is run on simulated data, where the true sparsity pattern is known, the *adequation of the sparsity structure* of the estimated loadings Z to that of the underlying Z_{true} is measured by :

- the *true positive rate* (tpr) : proportion of zero entries of Z_{true} retrieved as 0 in Z ,
- the *false positive rate* (fpr) : proportion of non zero entries of Z_{true} retrieved as 0 in Z .

These quantities can be evaluated loading by loading (i.e. on the columns of Z), or globally over all loadings (i.e. on the whole matrix Z).

The *subspace proximity between Z_{true} and Z* will be measured by $R_V(Z, Z_{true})$ where $R_V(X, Y)$ is the R_V -index defined following [14] and [1] by :

$$R_V(X, Y) = \frac{\|X^T Y\|_F^2}{\|X^T X\|_F \|Y^T Y\|_F} = \frac{\langle X^T X, Y^T Y \rangle_F}{\|X^T X\|_F \|Y^T Y\|_F} = R_V(Y, X) \quad . \quad (92)$$

The first formula is used to compute R_V , and the second implies that :

$$0 \leq R_V(X, Y) \leq 1 \quad . \quad (93)$$

5.2 Simulated data

5.2.1 Data generation

In order to test the ability of the algorithms to retrieve group-sparse singular vectors, we have generated *two sets of synthetic data matrices* A with $n = 300$ samples and $p = 20$ variables each, which share the four first sparse underlying right singular vectors given Table 4 (the “underlying loadings Z_{true} ”). There are hence $g = 5$ group variables made of $p_j = 4$ scalar variables each. The two sets differ by the underlying eigenvalues :

- the “close eigenvalue” set is associated to eigenvalues 200, 180, 150, 130, 1...1,
- the “different eigenvalue” set is associated to eigenvalues 200, 100, 50, 20, 1...1.

We have simulated for each case 100 matrices A . More precisely, we have followed the procedure proposed by [27] and [19] to generate data matrices A by drawing n samples from a zero-mean distribution with covariance matrix C defined by $C = V_{true} \Sigma_{true}^2 V_{true}^T$, where Σ_{true}^2 is the diagonal matrix of the chosen eigenvalues, and V_{true} is the $p \times p$ orthogonal matrix defined by the QR-decomposition $[Z_{true}, U] = V_{true} R$, where U of dimension $p \times (p-m)$ is randomly drawn from $U(0, 1)$. Notice that, by definition of the QR-decomposition, the m first columns of V_{true} coincide with Z_{true} .

Additional experiments with 3000 samples instead of 300 have been performed in the (more difficult) case of the “close eigenvalue” set of synthetic data matrices.

0.253	0.000	0.000	0.220
-0.253	0.000	0.000	0.220
0.253	0.000	0.000	0.220
-0.253	0.000	0.000	0.220
0.000	0.393	0.416	0.000
0.000	0.393	0.416	0.000
0.000	-0.393	0.416	0.000
0.000	-0.393	0.416	0.000
-0.211	0.262	0.000	0.183
-0.211	0.262	0.000	-0.183
0.211	0.262	0.000	0.183
0.211	0.262	0.000	-0.183
0.168	0.000	0.000	-0.367
0.168	0.000	0.000	-0.367
0.168	0.000	0.000	-0.367
0.168	0.000	0.000	-0.367
0.337	0.164	0.277	0.183
0.337	0.164	-0.277	0.183
0.337	-0.164	0.277	0.183
0.337	-0.164	-0.277	0.183

Table 4: The underlying $p \times m$ group-sparse block of loadings Z_{true}

5.2.2 Block versus deflation

We compare here the performances of three group-sparse algorithms :

- **deflation** : the deflation algorithm described in Section 4.3,
- **block.diff.mu** : the GSMV block algorithm of Section 4.2 with $\mu_j = 1/j$
- **block.same.mu** : as above, but with $\mu_j = 1$ for all j .

The same reduced sparsity parameter λ is chosen for all loadings as proposed in section 4.2.3, and its influence is explored by letting it vary from 0 to 1 by steps of 0.01. The performances of the three algorithms are first compared in Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6 on the “different eigenvalues” set of data matrices A with 300 samples.

Figure 3 shows the mean values of the R_V -index (proximity to the underlying Z_{true}) (left), the percentage of explained variance pev defined by (89) (90) (center) and the volume measure of orthogonality of components (right) as a function of λ . One sees that **block.diff.mu** performs better than **deflation** for the three investigated indexes over essentially the whole range of λ . The most significant gain occurs for the R_V -index, where a gain of 10% can be observed for values of λ as small as 0.4. Unsurprisingly, the **block.same.mu** algorithm, where the objective function is a sparsified version of the variance $\text{var}Y$ itself, produces a significantly larger pev , at the expense of a worse proximity R_V -index to the underlying Z_{true} and of less orthogonal loadings. Notice the somewhat chaotic behavior of the volume orthogonality index (Figure 3

right, green dotted line) corresponds to the vanishing of the first loading for $\lambda \simeq 0.3$ (Figure 5 right, black dotted line).

The boxplots of Figure 4 for $\lambda = 0.2$ confirm that the results are slightly better with **block_diff_mu** than with **deflation** with similar dispersions.

Figure 5 (left and center) shows that **deflation** and **block_diff_mu** algorithms produce the right number of zeroes for each component for a range of λ between 0.1 and 0.3, in opposition to the **block_same_mu** algorithm (right), which adds quickly too many zeros to the first loading.




Figure 3: Mean value of the proximity index rv to the underlying loadings Z_{true} (left), proportion of explained variance defined by (89) (90) (center) and orthogonality measure volume (right) as function of λ , for the three algorithms.




Figure 4: Boxplots for the proximity index rv to the underlying loadings Z_{true} (left), the proportion of explained variance defined by (89) (90) (center) and the orthogonality measure volume (right) for $\lambda = 0.2$, for the three algorithms.




Figure 5: Mean value of the number of zeroes in each loading as function of λ , for the three algorithms.

As a check for the choice (77) (78) (79) of the sparsity parameters γ_j , we have plotted in

Figure 6 the decay, as a function of λ , of the contributions pev_i of each sparse component to the explained variance $\text{var}Y$, as defined by (89) (90). As one can see, the decrease is roughly similar, which indicates that the relative size of the γ_j is correctly chosen.




Figure 6: Contribution of each component to the explained variance $\text{var}Y$ as function of λ for the three algorithms in the case of 300 samples.




Figure 7: Mean true positive rates (dotted lines) and false positive rates (full lines) for each sparse loading versus reduced sparsity parameter λ . From left to right: **deflation**, **block_diff_mu**, **block_same_mu**. Top : different eigenvalues and $n = 300$, center : close eigenvalues and $n = 300$, bottom : close eigenvalues and $n = 3000$.

In order to get a more detailed view of the ability of the algorithms to retrieve the exact sparse structure of Z_{true} , we show in Figure 7 the mean values of tpr (true positive rate) and fpr

(false positive rate) for loadings obtained by applying the three algorithms (from left to right) to two sets of 300 samples matrices A (top : different eigenvalues, center : close eigenvalues) and one set of 3000 samples matrices A (bottom : close eigenvalues). With this representation the sparsity pattern is perfectly recovered for the values of λ such that $tpr = 1$ and $fpr = 0$. As expected, increasing λ increases the global true positives, at the expense of more false positive.

The top row of the figure shows that in the case of “different eigenvalues”, both the **deflation** and **block_diff_mu** algorithms are able to retrieve the exact group sparse structure of Z_{true} for a large interval $0.1 \leq \lambda \leq 0.3$, as expected from Figure 5. The center row shows that the “close eigenvalues” case is more difficult, as the exact sparsity structure is never exactly recovered by any of the three methods. The bottom row shows that the difficulty related to “close eigenvalues” can be overcome by increasing the number of samples from 300 to 3000 : both the **deflation** and the **block_diff_mu** algorithms are now able to retrieve, even in the mean, the exact sparsity structure of Z_{true} for $\lambda \simeq 0.1$. The **block_diff_mu** algorithm shows hence a slight advantage over the deflation in that the tpr grow slower and fpr grow faster for small values of λ , and that the tpr are less erratic for large large values of λ . And in all theses case, the **block_same_mu** algorithm performs the worst with its tendency to add too quickly wrong zeroes.

We conclude this section by comparing computation time and iteration numbers. We show in Figure 8 their mean values over the 100 random matrices A for the more difficult “close eigenvalues” case with 300 samples for $\lambda = 0.2$. One sees that **block_diff_mu** and **block_same_mu** are three times faster than **deflation**, and that **deflation** performs more iterations, which is expected as it repeats the iterations at each deflation step. Computation times are multiplied by 10 for the same case with 3000 samples; iteration numbers are down to $3 \times 4 = 12$ for **deflation** and 3 for **block_diff_mu** and **block_same_mu**.




Figure 8: Computational time and iteration numbers for the “close eigenvalues” case with 300 samples for the three methods and $\lambda = 0.2$.

5.2.3 Sparse versus group-sparse

We illustrate in Figure 9 the effect of imposing sparsity on group of variables rather than on single variables for the close eigenvalues case with $n = 300$. The top row shows the true positive rates and false positive rates for the three algorithms when no group sparsity information is available, to be compared to the bottom row, where group sparsity is taken into account, and which exhibits higher true positive rates and lower false positive rates. It is hence important to use the group structure information, when available, as it helps greatly the algorithm to retrieve the sparsity structure of the underlying loadings.




Figure 9: True positive rates (dotted lines) and false positive rates (full lines) for each sparse loading versus reduced sparsity parameter λ in the close eigenvalues case and $n = 300$. Top: scalar variables, bottom: group variables.

5.3 Real mixed data

The heart disease dataset¹ [13] describes $n = 270$ observations on a mixture of $p_1 = 6$ numerical variables and $p_2 = 7$ categorical variables. Each categorical variable has 2, 3 or 4 levels for a total of $q = 19$ levels. In order to perform sparse PCA with this mixture of numerical and categorical variables (sparsePCAmix), the matrix A of size 270×25 ($25 = p_1 + q$) is build and transformed using specific metrics as described Section 4.4. Then the group-sparse PCA algorithm **block_diff_mu** of Section 4.2 is applied with $\mu_j = 1/j$ to the matrix A with $g = 13$ groups (one group for each variable):

- 6 groups of size 1 (for the 6 numerical variables),
- 7 groups of size 2, 3 or 4 (for the 7 categorical variables) where the size of the group corresponds to the number of levels.

¹<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Statlog+Heart>

The methods PCAmix (PCA of A) and sparsePCAmix (group-sparse PCA of A) are both implemented in the R package “PCAmixdata” available at <https://github.com/chavent/PCAmixdata>.

Table 5 gives the variance explained by the 3 first principal components of PCAmix (combinations of all columns of A) and shows that 35.41 % of the variance of the data is explained by $m = 3$ components.

	Eigenvalue	Proportion	Cumulative
dim 1	3.22	17.87	17.87
dim 2	1.67	9.28	27.15
dim 3	1.49	8.26	35.41

Table 5: Eigenvalues and proportion of variance explained by the 3 first principal components of PCAmix.




Figure 10: Proportion of explained variance defined by (89) (90) (left) and number of selected variables (right) as function of λ for the sparsePCAmix method.

Figure 10 gives the proportion of explained variance (left) and of the number of selected variables (right) as a function of the reduced sparsity parameter λ for sparsePCAmix with $m = 3$ components. This figure suggests to choose $\lambda = 0.35$. With this sparsity parameter, the explained variance over the 3 dimensions decreases from 35.41 % to 27.76 % (i.e. a lost of nearly 7%). Moreover 6 variables (2 numerical and 3 categorical) are selected to build the first component, 4 variables (3 numerical and 1 categorical) are selected to build the second and the third one is build with a single categorical variable (see Table 6).

	dim 1	dim 2	dim 3
age	0.00	0.40	0.00
blood_pressure	0.00	0.16	0.00
serum_cholesterol	0.00	0.86	0.00
max_heart_rate	0.43	0.00	0.00
oldpeak	-0.51	0.00	0.00
number_vessels	0.00	0.00	0.00
sex=0	0.00	0.13	0.00
sex=1	0.00	-0.13	0.00
chest_pain=1	-0.00	0.00	0.00
chest_pain=2	0.08	0.00	0.00
chest_pain=3	0.06	0.00	0.00
chest_pain=4	-0.14	0.00	0.00
fasting_blood_sugar=0	0.00	0.00	0.00
fasting_blood_sugar=1	0.00	0.00	0.00
resting_results=0	0.00	0.00	0.00
resting_results=1	0.00	0.00	0.00
resting_results=2	0.00	0.00	0.00
induced_angina=0	0.15	0.00	0.00
induced_angina=1	-0.15	0.00	0.00
slope=1	0.27	0.00	0.08
slope=2	-0.21	0.00	-0.31
slope=3	-0.05	0.00	0.23
thal=3	0.13	0.00	0.00
thal=6	-0.02	0.00	0.00
thal=7	-0.11	0.00	0.00

Table 6: Matrix Z of sparse loadings for $\lambda = 0.35$.




Figure 11: PCAmix (left) versus sparsePCAmix for $\lambda = 0.35$ (right).

Finally the $n = 270$ observations are plotted Figure 11 according to the two first principal components of PCAmix (on the left) and of sparsePCAmix for $\lambda = 0.35$ (on the right). Each

observation is colored according to the binary variable of interest "Heart Diseases" (HD) (not used to build the components). The sparse first component on the right (build with 2 numerical and 4 categorical variables instead of 13 variables) keeps enough variance to discriminate between presence or absence of heart disease.

6 Conclusion

We propose an approach to *Group-Sparse Block* Principal Component Analysis based on the maximization of the *variance explained by non-necessarily orthogonal components*, with the objective of being able to analyze mixed data containing both numerical and categorical variables.

In a first step, we investigate the problem of defining the variance explained by non necessarily orthogonal components, and check existing and new definitions against their compatibility with the PCA situation. As a result of this study, we propose to use the *optimal projected variance*, which is larger than all projected variance, as the definition of $\text{var}Y$ for non orthogonal components.

Maximization of $\text{var}(AZ)$ with respect to unit norm loadings Z provides a new Block PCA formulation without orthogonality constraints on the loadings. A Group-Sparse Maximum Variance (GSMV) block PCA formulation is naturally derived by an ad-hoc penalization by the group- ℓ^1 norm of the loadings. We show that GSMV reduces to the maximization a convex function over a Stiefel manifold, and generalizes the ℓ^1 -algorithm of [19].

We propose a strategy for the choice of the regularization parameters in order to balance the sparsifying effort on the loadings, and show numerical results on simulated data which confirm the expectation that GSMV with decreasing weights is more robust and performant than deflation for group-sparse PCA : it produces steadily sparse loadings closer to the true underlying ones, larger explained variance and better orthogonality of the components, the tpr increase faster and the fpr slower, and it ran approximately three times faster on our tests.

Numerical results show that the use of group sparsity allows a better retrieval of underlying sparse structures, but the success is impacted by the heterogeneity of the PCA eigenvalues : problem with close eigenvalues are more difficult, but increasing the number of sample helps. Application of GSMV to the the interpretation of real Heart Disease data, has allowed to reduce the number of numerical and categorical variables required for the interpretation by a factor two.

7 Appendix

7.1 Generalized Rayleigh quotient

This is a classical result, see for example [2] and [4] :

Theorem 7.1 *Let the loadings Z satisfy :*

$$Z = [z_1 \dots z_m] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m} \quad , \quad \text{rank } Z = m \leq \text{rank } A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} r . \quad (94)$$

Then the generalized Rayleigh quotient

$$\text{tr}\{(Z^T A^T A Z)(Z^T Z)^{-1}\} \quad (95)$$

satisfies :

$$\text{tr}\{(Z^T A^T A Z)(Z^T Z)^{-1}\} \leq \sigma_1^2 + \dots + \sigma_m^2 \leq \|A\|_F^2 , \quad (96)$$

and the left inequality becomes an equality if and only if :

$$\text{span } Z = \text{span}\{v_1 \dots v_m\} , \quad (97)$$

where v_1, \dots, v_m are the m first right singular vectors of A .

7.2 Proof of Proposition 4.1

For any $X = [x_1 \dots x_m] \in \mathcal{S}_m^n$ and any $i = 1 \dots g$, $j = 1 \dots m$ we introduce the polar decomposition (cf (31)) of the vector $A_i^T x_j \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$:

$$A_i^T x_j = u_{ij} \alpha_{ij} , \quad \text{with} \quad \|u_{ij}\| = 1 \quad , \quad \alpha_{ij} \geq 0 , \quad (98)$$

and define for $j = 1 \dots m$ the vectors $t_j = (t_{ij}, i = 1 \dots g)$ of \mathbb{R}^p by :

$$\begin{cases} t_{ij} &= u_{ij} [\alpha_{ij} - \gamma_j]_+ \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i} \quad , \quad i = 1 \dots g . \\ \|t_j\|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^g [\alpha_{ij} - \gamma_j]_+^2 . \end{cases} \quad (99)$$

We give first an analytical solution to the inner maximization problem in (68) : we show that

$$\forall X \in \mathcal{S}_m^n \quad , \quad \max_{Z \in (\mathcal{B}^p)^m} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 [x_j^T A z_j - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1]_+^2 = F(X) \quad \text{given by (72)} , \quad (100)$$

which proves the first part of Proposition 4.1.

So let X be a given point on the Stiefel manifold \mathcal{S}_m^n . Then :

$$\max_{Z \in (\mathcal{B}^p)^m} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 [x_j^T A z_j - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1]_+^2 = \max_{\|z_j\| \leq 1, j=1 \dots m} \sum_{j=1}^m \mu_j^2 [x_j^T A z_j - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1]_+^2 \quad (101)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^m \mu_j^2 \max_{\|z_j\| \leq 1} [x_j^T A z_j - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1]_+^2 , \quad (102)$$

But $t \rightsquigarrow [t]_+^2$ is a monotonously increasing function, hence :

$$\max_{Z \in (\mathcal{B}^p)^m} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 [x_j^T A z_j - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1]_+^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m \mu_j^2 \left[\max_{\|z_j\| \leq 1} (x_j^T A z_j - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1) \right]_+^2 . \quad (103)$$

The max in the right-hand side of (103) is certainly positive, as $z_j = 0$ belongs to the admissible set $\{z \mid \|z\| \leq 1\}$, and (103) becomes :

$$\max_{Z \in (\mathcal{B}^p)^m} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 [x_j^T A z_j - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1]_+^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m \mu_j^2 \left(\max_{\|z_j\| \leq 1} (x_j^T A z_j - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1) \right)^2, \quad (104)$$

Hence the inner maximization problem (101) reduces to the solution of m independant optimization problems with respect to $z_j, j = 1 \dots m$. So we drop the index j , and consider, *given* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|x\| = 1$, the optimization problem :

$$z^* = \arg \max_{\|z\| \leq 1} (x^T A z - \gamma \|z\|_1) \quad (105)$$

$$= \arg \max_{\|z_1\|^2 + \dots + \|z_p\|^2 \leq 1} \sum_{i=1}^g (x^T a_i z_i - \gamma \|z_i\|), \quad (106)$$

where the $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ are the loadings associated to each group variable. We introduce the polar decomposition (cf (31)) of z_i in \mathbb{R}^{p_i} :

$$z_i = v_i \beta_i, \text{ with } \|v_i\| = 1, \quad \beta_i \geq 0. \quad (107)$$

and replace the search for z^* by that for $v_i^*, \beta_i^*, i = 1 \dots g$. Then equation (106) becomes :

$$(v_i^*, \beta_i^*, i = 1 \dots g) = \arg \max_{\|v_i\|=1, i=1 \dots g} \max_{\substack{\sum_{i=1 \dots g} \beta_i^2 \leq 1 \\ \beta_i \geq 0, i = 1 \dots g}} \sum_{i=1}^g \max_{\|v_i\|=1} (\alpha_i \beta_i u_i^T v_i - \gamma \beta_i). \quad (108)$$

The first maximum is obviously achieved for :

$$v_i^* = u_i, \quad i = 1 \dots g, \quad (109)$$

and (108) reduces to :

$$(\beta_i^*, i = 1 \dots g) = \arg \max_{\substack{\sum_{i=1 \dots g} \beta_i^2 \leq 1 \\ \beta_i \geq 0, i = 1 \dots g}} \sum_{i=1}^g (\alpha_i - \gamma) \beta_i, \quad (110)$$

Define :

$$I_+ = \{i = 1 \dots g \mid \alpha_i - \gamma > 0\}. \quad (111)$$

- either : $I_+ = \emptyset$, and :

$$\beta^* = 0 \quad (112)$$

is a trivial solution of (110) - but non-necessarily unique if $\alpha_i - \gamma = 0$ for some i .

- or : $I_+ \neq \emptyset$. We check first that in this case :

$$\beta_i^* = 0 \quad \forall i \notin I_+. \quad (113)$$

For that purpose, suppose that $\beta_\ell^* > 0$ for some $\ell \notin I_+$, and let k be an index of I_+ . One can define $\tilde{\beta}^*$ by $\tilde{\beta}_i^* = \beta_i^*$ for $i \neq k, \ell$, $\tilde{\beta}_\ell^* = 0$, and $\tilde{\beta}_k^* > \beta_k^*$ such that $\|\tilde{\beta}^*\| = \|\beta^*\| \leq 1$. Then :

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha_\ell - \gamma) \beta_\ell^* &\leq 0 = (\alpha_\ell - \gamma) \tilde{\beta}_\ell^*, \\ (\alpha_k - \gamma) \beta_k^* &< (\alpha_k - \gamma) \tilde{\beta}_k^*, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the fact that β^* is a maximizer, and ends the proof of (113).

We can now restrict the search to the $(\beta_i^*, i \in I_+)$, so (110) simplifies to :

$$(\beta_i^*, i \in I_+) = \arg \max_{\substack{\sum_{i \in I_+} \beta_i^2 \leq 1 \\ \beta_i \geq 0, i \in I_+}} \sum_{i \in I_+} (\alpha_i - \gamma) \beta_i, \quad (114)$$

$$= \arg \max_{\sum_{i \in I_+} \beta_i^2 \leq 1} \sum_{i \in I_+} (\alpha_i - \gamma) \beta_i, \quad (115)$$

where the last equality holds because the coefficients $\alpha_i - \gamma$ of β_i are positive for $i \in I_+$. Hence the solution β^* of (110) is given, when $I_+ \neq \emptyset$, by :

$$\beta_i^* = \frac{[\alpha_i - \gamma]_+}{\left(\sum_{i=1 \dots g} [\alpha_i - \gamma]_+^2\right)^{1/2}}, \quad i = 1 \dots g, \quad (116)$$

Returning to the z unknowns one obtains, using (107)(109)(112)(116) :

$$z^* = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } I_+ = \emptyset, \\ z_i^* = u_i \beta_i^*; i = 1 \dots, g & \text{if } I_+ \neq \emptyset, \end{cases} \quad (117)$$

and in both cases the maximum of the optimization problem (105) is given by :

$$\max_{\|z\| \leq 1} (x^T A z - \gamma \|z\|_1) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^g [\alpha_i - \gamma]_+^2\right)^{1/2}. \quad (118)$$

Reintroducing the j indices, the solution of the inner maximization problem (101), for a given $X \in \mathcal{S}_m^n$, is, using its reformulation (104) together with (117), (118) and the notation $t_j^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ defined in (72) :

$$\forall j = 1 \dots m, \quad z_j^* = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t_j^* = 0, \\ t_j^* / \|t_j^*\| & \text{if } t_j^* \neq 0, \end{cases} \quad (119)$$

$$\max_{Z \in (\mathcal{B}^p)^m} \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 [x_j^T A z_j - \gamma_j \|z_j\|_1]_+^2 = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \mu_j^2 \|t_j^*\|^2 = F(X). \quad (120)$$

The last equation proves (100), and hence part 1 of the theorem. Then (119) gives (73) when X is a solution X^* of (72), and part 2 is proved.

We prove now point 3 of the proposition : let the sparsity parameters γ_j satisfy (74). Hence there exists $\ell \in 1 \dots m$ and $k \in 1 \dots g$ such that :

$$\gamma_\ell < \|a_k\|_2 = \|a_k^t\|_2. \quad (121)$$

By definition of the matrix norm $\|\cdot\|_2$, there exists $X \in \mathcal{S}_m^n$ such that x_ℓ satisfies :

$$\gamma_\ell < \|a_k^t x_\ell\| = \alpha_{k\ell}. \quad (122)$$

Then (70) gives :

$$\|t_\ell\|^2 \geq (\alpha_{k\ell} - \gamma_\ell)^2 > 0 \implies t_\ell \neq 0, \quad (123)$$

and point 3 is proven. ■

7.3 Proof of Lemma 2.1

The left equality in (21) follows from $P_Z = Z(Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T$, which implies that

$$\text{var}_{\text{subsp}}(AZ) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|AP_Z\|_F^2 = \|AZ(Z^T Z)^{-1/2}\|_F^2 = \text{tr}\{Z^T A^T AZ(Z^T Z)^{-1}\}.$$

The inequality in (21) (right) as well as (22) follow immediately from the properties of the generalized Rayleigh quotient $\text{tr}\{Z^T A^T AZ(Z^T Z)^{-1}\}$ recalled in Theorem 7.1 of the Appendix. Property 1 follows from the definition of $\text{var}_{\text{subsp}}$, and condition (16) of property 2 follows from (21). It remains to prove (23) and (24) which shows that property 3 does not hold.

Let $Y = AZ$ be orthogonal components :

$$\langle y_j, y_k \rangle = 0, \quad j, k = 1 \dots m, j \neq k \quad (124)$$

corresponding to unit norm loadings :

$$\|z_j\| = 1 \quad j = 1 \dots m, \quad (125)$$

and define X, T by :

$$x_j = y_j / \|y_j\|, \quad t_j = z_j / \|y_j\|, \quad j = 1 \dots m, \quad (126)$$

so that :

$$X^T X = I_m. \quad (127)$$

Then on one side one has :

$$\|Y\|_F^2 = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \|y_j\|^2 = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} 1/\|t_j\|^2 = \text{tr}\{\text{diag}^{-1}(T^T T)\}, \quad (128)$$

and on the other side, as Y and X span the same subspace :

$$\text{var}_{\text{subsp}} Y = \text{var}_{\text{subsp}} X = \text{tr}\{(X^T X)(T^T T)^{-1}\} = \text{tr}\{(T^T T)^{-1}\} \quad (129)$$

Formula (23) will be proved if we show that :

$$\text{tr}\{\text{diag}^{-1}(T^T T)\} \leq \text{tr}\{(T^T T)^{-1}\}. \quad (130)$$

We use for that an idea taken from [23], and perform a QR-decomposition of T . By construction, the diagonal elements of R satisfy :

$$0 < r_{i,i} \leq \|t_i\|. \quad (131)$$

Then :

$$T^T T = R^T Q^T Q R = R^T R, \quad (132)$$

$$(T^T T)^{-1} = R^{-1}(R^T)^{-1} = R^{-1}(R^{-1})^T, \quad (133)$$

where R^{-1} satisfies :

$$R^{-1} = \text{upper triangular matrix}, \quad [R^{-1}]_{i,i} = 1/r_{i,i}. \quad (134)$$

Hence the diagonal element of $(T^T T)^{-1}$ are given by :

$$\begin{aligned} [(T^T T)^{-1}]_{i,i} &= [R^{-1}(R^{-1})^T]_{i,i} \\ &= [R^{-1}]_{i,i}^2 + \sum_{j>i} [R^{-1}]_{i,j}^2 \\ &\geq [R^{-1}]_{i,i}^2 = 1/r_{i,i}^2 \geq 1/\|t_i\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (135)$$

which gives (130) by summation over $i = 1 \dots m$, and (23) is proved.

We prove now the left-to-right implication in (24) : let the orthogonal components $y_j, j = 1 \dots m$ satisfy $\|Y\|_F^2 = \text{var}_{\text{subsp}} Y$. Then (128) (129) imply that all inequality in (135) are equalities :

1. first inequality : $[R^{-1}]_{i,j}^2 = 0$ for all $j > i \Rightarrow R^{-1}$ and hence R are diagonal
2. second inequality : $1/r_{i,i}^2 = 1/\|t_i\|^2 \Rightarrow R$ is diagonal

But R diagonal implies that the t_j - and hence also the loadings z_j - are orthogonal, which together with the hypothesis of orthogonal components y_j , implies that $(y_j/\|y_j\|, z_j)$ are pairs of singular vectors of A , and ends the proof of the left-to-right implication.

Conversely, let $z_j = v_{\ell(j)}, j = 1 \dots m$. Then $\|Y\|^2 = \sum_{j=1 \dots m} \sigma_{\ell(j)}^2 = \text{var}_{\text{subsp}} Y$, where the last equality follows from the Generalized Rayleigh Quotient formula (21) for the subspace variance. This ends the proof of the lemma ■

7.4 Proof of Lemma 2.2

Let $\mathcal{E} = A\mathcal{S}^p$ be the n -dimensional ellipsoid image by A of the unit sphere $\mathcal{S}^p \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, and :

$$\mathcal{E}^X = \mathcal{E} \cap \text{span} Y = \mathcal{E} \cap \text{span} X \quad (136)$$

the m -dimensional ellipsoid, trace of \mathcal{E} on the subspace spanned both by the given components Y and the chosen basis X . By construction one has :

$$y_j \in \mathcal{E}^X, \quad j = 1 \dots m, \quad (137)$$

and the modified components Y' defined by projection satisfy, c.f. (34) :

$$\|y'_j\| = |\langle y_j, x_j \rangle| \leq \nu_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{y \in \mathcal{E}^X} \langle y, x_j \rangle, \quad j = 1 \dots m, \quad (138)$$

so that :

$$\|Y'\|_F^2 \leq \nu_1^2 + \dots + \nu_m^2. \quad (139)$$

We can now “box” the ellipsoid \mathcal{E}^X in the parallelotope \mathcal{P}^X of $\text{span} X$ defined by :

$$\mathcal{P}^X = \{y \in \text{span} X \mid -\nu_j \leq \langle y, x_j \rangle \leq +\nu_j, \quad j = 1 \dots m\}, \quad (140)$$

(see figure 12). By construction, one can draw from each of the 2^m vertices of \mathcal{P}^X m orthogonal hyperplanes tangent to the ellipsoid \mathcal{E}^X , which implies that they are all on the orthoptic or Cartan sphere of the ellipsoid, whose radius is known to be the sum of the squares of the semi-principal axes $\sigma_j^X, j = 1 \dots m$ of \mathcal{E}^X (see for example the textbook [28]).

Hence :

$$\nu_1^2 + \dots + \nu_m^2 = (\sigma_1^X)^2 + \dots + (\sigma_m^X)^2. \quad (141)$$

Let then $y_1^X \dots y_m^X$ be vectors whose extremity are points of \mathcal{E}^X located on its principal axes, so that :

$$\|y_j^X\| = \sigma_j^X, \quad j = 1 \dots m, \quad \langle y_i^X, y_j^X \rangle = 0, \quad i, j = 1 \dots m, i \neq j. \quad (142)$$

Property (23) of Lemma 2.1 applied to $Y = Y^X$ gives :

$$(\sigma_1^X)^2 + \dots + (\sigma_m^X)^2 = \|Y^X\|^2 \leq \text{var}_{\text{subsp}} Y^X \leq \text{var}_{PCA}(m). \quad (143)$$

Combining inequalities (139) (141) (143) proves the inequality (35).

We prove now the left-to-right implication in (36). Suppose that, for some X , the equality $\text{var}_{\text{proj}} Y = \text{var}_{PCA}(m)$ holds. Then necessarily :




Figure 12: Illustration of the upper bound to $\|Y'\|_F^2$ in $\text{span} Y$ when Y' is defined by projection.

- equality holds in (143), which requires that the loadings Z span the subspace V_m of the m first right singular vectors, which proves the right part of (36), top.
- and that equality holds in (139), which implies that for $j \neq k$ the normals to \mathcal{E}^X at y_j and y_k are orthogonal (see Figure 12). The restriction A_m of A to $\text{span} V_m$ is an isomorphism from $\text{span} V_m$ to $\text{span} U_m$, hence :

$$\mathcal{E}^X = \{y \in \text{span} U_m \mid \|A_m^{-1}y\|^2 = 1\} . \quad (144)$$

A normal $n(y)$ to \mathcal{E}^X at y is then :

$$n(y) = \nabla_y (\|A_m^{-1}y\|^2 - 1) = 2(A_m^{-1})^T A_m^{-1}y = 2(A_m^{-1})^T z = 2\text{diag}\left\{\frac{1}{\sigma_1} \dots \frac{1}{\sigma_m}\right\} z , \quad (145)$$

where vectors and matrices are written on the singular bases U_m and V_m . The orthogonality of $n(y_j)$ and $n(y_k)$ proves the right part of (36), bottom.

Conversely, let the right part (top) of (36) hold. This implies that the half axes of \mathcal{E}^X are $\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_m$. Then the right part, bottom, implies that the normal n_j to \mathcal{E}^X at $y_j, j = 1 \dots m$ are orthogonal. So one can box \mathcal{E}^X with a parallelotope \mathcal{P}^X with axes parallel to the normals n_j , and define X as the orthonormal basis along its axes. Then the same reasoning as above for the proof of (35) shows that $\text{var}_{\text{proj}} Y = \text{var}_{PCA}(m)$, which ends the proof of the lemma. ■

References

- [1] Hervé Abdi. Rv coefficient and congruence coefficient. *Encyclopedia of measurement and statistics*, pages 849–853, 2007.

- [2] P-A Absil, Robert Mahony, and Rodolphe Sepulchre. *Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [3] Francis Bach, Rodolphe Jenatton, Julien Mairal, Guillaume Obozinski, et al. Structured sparsity through convex optimization. *Statistical Science*, 27(4):450–468, 2012.
- [4] RW Brockett. Dynamical systems that sort lists, diagonalize matrices, and solve linear programming problems. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 146:79–91, 1991.
- [5] T. Tony Cai, Zongming Ma, and Yihong Wu. Sparse pca: Optimal rates and adaptive estimation. *Ann. Statist.*, 41(6):3074–3110, 12 2013.
- [6] T Tony Cai, Zhao Ren, Harrison H Zhou, et al. Estimating structured high-dimensional covariance and precision matrices: Optimal rates and adaptive estimation. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10(1):1–59, 2016.
- [7] Marie Chavent, Vanessa Kuentz-Simonet, and Jérôme Saracco. Orthogonal rotation in pcamix. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification*, 6(2):131–146, 2012.
- [8] Christophe Croux, Peter Filzmoser, and Heinrich Fritz. Robust sparse principal component analysis. *Technometrics*, 55(2):202–214, 2013.
- [9] Alexandre d’Aspremont, Francis Bach, and Laurent El Ghaoui. Optimal solutions for sparse principal component analysis. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(Jul):1269–1294, 2008.
- [10] Jan De Leeuw and Jan Van Rijkevorsel. Homals and princals. some generalizations of principal components analysis. *Data analysis and informatics*, 2:231–242, 1980.
- [11] Amicie De Pierrefeu, Tommy Löfstedt, Fouad Hadj-Selem, Mathieu Dubois, Renaud Jardri, Thomas Fovet, Philippe Ciuciu, Vincent Frouin, and Edouard Duchesnay. Structured sparse principal components analysis with the tv-elastic net penalty. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, 37(2):396–407, 2017.
- [12] Yash Deshpande and Andrea Montanari. Sparse pca via covariance thresholding. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17:1–41, 2016.
- [13] Dheeru Dua and Casey Graff. UCI machine learning repository, 2017.
- [14] Yves Escoufier. Le traitement des variables vectorielles. *Biometrics*, pages 751–760, 1973.
- [15] Ruixin Guo, Mihye Ahn, and Hongtu Zhu Hongtu Zhu. Spatially weighted principal component analysis for imaging classification. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 24(1):274–296, 2015.
- [16] M.O. Hill and A.J.E. Smith. Principal component analysis of taxonomic data with multi-state discrete characters. *Taxon*, 25(2/3):249–255, 1976.
- [17] Rodolphe Jenatton, Guillaume Obozinski, and Francis Bach. Structured sparse principal component analysis. In Yee Whye Teh and Mike Titterton, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 9 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 366–373, Chia Laguna Resort, Sardinia, Italy, 13–15 May 2010. PMLR.

- [18] Ian T Jolliffe, Nickolay T Trendafilov, and Mudassir Uddin. A modified principal component technique based on the lasso. *Journal of computational and Graphical Statistics*, 12(3):531–547, 2003.
- [19] Michel Journée, Yurii Nesterov, Peter Richtárik, and Rodolphe Sepulchre. Generalized power method for sparse principal component analysis. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Feb):517–553, 2010.
- [20] Zohaib Khan, Faisal Shafait, and Ajmal Mian. Joint group sparse pca for compressed hyperspectral imaging. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 24(12):4934–4942, 2015.
- [21] Henk A. L. Kiers. Simple structure in component analysis techniques for mixtures of qualitative and quantitative variables. *Psychometrika*, 56(2):197–212, 1991.
- [22] Zongming Ma. Sparse principal component analysis and iterative thresholding. *Ann. Statist.*, 41(2):772–801, 04 2013.
- [23] G Miller. Closed-form inversion of the gram matrix arising in certain least-squares problems. *IEEE Transactions on Circuit Theory*, 16(2):237–240, 1969.
- [24] Jérôme Pagès. Analyse factorielle de données mixtes. *Revue de Statistique Appliquée*, 52(4):93–111, 2004.
- [25] Jérôme Pagès. *Multiple factor analysis by example using R*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2014.
- [26] Peter Richtárik, Martin Takáč, and Selin Damla Ahipasaoglu. Alternating maximization: unifying framework for 8 sparse pca formulations and efficient parallel codes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.4137*, 2012.
- [27] Haipeng Shen and Jianhua Z Huang. Sparse principal component analysis via regularized low rank matrix approximation. *Journal of multivariate analysis*, 99(6):1015–1034, 2008.
- [28] Patrice Tauvel. *Cours de géométrie: agrégation de mathématiques*. Dunod, 2000.
- [29] Vincent Q Vu, Jing Lei, et al. Minimax sparse principal subspace estimation in high dimensions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(6):2905–2947, 2013.
- [30] Wen-Ting Wang and Hsin-Cheng Huang. Regularized principal component analysis for spatial data. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 26(1):14–25, 2017.
- [31] Xiao-Tong Yuan and Tong Zhang. Truncated power method for sparse eigenvalue problems. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(Apr):899–925, 2013.
- [32] Zhenyue Zhang, Hongyuan Zha, and Horst Simon. Low-rank approximations with sparse factors i: Basic algorithms and error analysis. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 23(3):706–727, 2002.
- [33] Hui Zou, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. Sparse principal component analysis. *Journal of computational and graphical statistics*, 15(2):265–286, 2006.