

# Latent Association Mining for Binary Data

Carson Mosso<sup>\*§</sup>, Kelly Bodwin<sup>\*‡</sup>, Suman Chakraborty<sup>†</sup>, Kai Zhang<sup>§</sup>, Andrew B. Nobel<sup>§</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> : These authors contributed equally to this work.

<sup>§</sup> : University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

<sup>‡</sup> : California Polytechnic State University

<sup>†</sup> : University of Michigan at Ann Arbor

March 8, 2024

## Abstract

We consider the problem of identifying stable sets of mutually associated features in moderate or high-dimensional binary data. In this context we develop and investigate a method called Latent Association Mining for Binary Data (LAMB). The LAMB method is based on a simple threshold model in which the observed binary values represent a random thresholding of a latent continuous vector that may have a complex association structure. We consider a measure of latent association that quantifies association in the latent continuous vector without bias due to the random thresholding. The LAMB method uses an iterative testing based search procedure to identify stable sets of mutually associated features. We compare the LAMB method with several competing methods on artificial binary-valued datasets and two real count-valued datasets. The LAMB method detects meaningful associations in these datasets. In the case of the count-valued datasets, associations detected by the LAMB method are based only on information about whether the counts are zero or non-zero, and is competitive with methods that have access to the full count data.

**Keywords:** binary data, binary association, data mining, unsupervised learning, latent variable models

# 1 Introduction

A common problem in exploratory data analysis is to identify relational structure among a set of features based on a set of samples. It is often the case in real datasets that the set of features or the set of samples or both are of moderate to large size. In some cases measurements may be missing or restricted in their values. This problem, which has points of contact with market basket analysis, recommender systems, and unsupervised learning, falls under the broad umbrella of association mining.

In this paper we introduce a statistical method for association mining that is focused on finding sets of features with strong positive association in binary-valued data. The method, Latent Association Mining for Binary Data (LAMB), is based on a simple threshold model and association measure. In our threshold model observed binary samples are obtained by randomly thresholding the entries of a continuous random vector. The continuous random vector and the random thresholds are assumed to be independent, and neither are observed in this model. The model for the random thresholds is of limited complexity, but is flexible enough to capture heterogeneity in the frequency of 1s between samples and between features in the dataset.

Association between two binary features is measured indirectly in our statistical framework: it is not a function of the features alone, but of the features in conjunction with the unobserved thresholds. We call this measure latent association. In particular, the latent association between two features is the expected value of their conditional correlation given the random thresholds.

To identify sets of features having strong positive latent association, we employ a novel iterative testing based search procedure. Our search procedure is computationally efficient, so it can be applied to high-dimensional datasets. In contrast to many conventional association mining methods, the LAMB method is carried out in a statistical framework and based on hypothesis tests. The LAMB method’s statistical framework is able to account for sample heterogeneity, and the testing based search procedure moderates false discoveries in both the real and artificial datasets discussed in this paper.

## 1.1 Motivating Example

Binary-valued market basket data motivated a number of important association mining methods in the data mining literature. In market basket data, features correspond to items available for purchase and samples correspond to transactions carried out by a buyer. Binary measurements indicate whether or not a particular buyer purchased a particular item.<sup>1</sup> Market basket data often exhibits sample heterogeneity, reflecting the fact that a buyer’s decision to purchase an item can depend on the buyer’s valuation of that item relative to other items, as well as the buyer’s needs, financial resources, time, et cetera.

---

<sup>1</sup>Binary-valued data was due to barcode technology at the time and could include purchases made at different times [Agrawal et al., 1993].


	Buyers											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Item 1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Item 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Item 3	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Item 4	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Item 5	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Item 6	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Item 7	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Item 8	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Item 9	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Item 10	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Item 11	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Item 12	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Item 13	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Item 14	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0

Figure 1: Toy market basket dataset.

Figure 1 contains a toy market basket dataset with 12 buyers and 14 items. The  $(i, j)$  entry of the table is 1 if item  $i$  was purchased by buyer  $j$  and 0 otherwise. Note the heterogeneity among the samples: samples 1 through 5 correspond to high volume buyers, samples 6 and 7 to medium volume buyers, and samples 8 through 12 to low volume buyers. Consider the item sets  $\{1, 2\}$  and  $\{3, 4\}$ , which show identical behavior up to a permutation of the samples. The correlation between the two items in each set is the same ( $r_{12} = r_{34} = 0.667$ ), and the items in each set are also equally far apart in both  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$  distance ( $d_{12}^1 = d_{34}^1 = 2$  and  $d_{12}^2 = d_{34}^2 = \sqrt{2}$ , respectively). Differences emerge, however, when one considers these pairs in the context of buyer behavior. The association between items 3 and 4 (and other pairs of items 3 through 9) is driven by high volume buyers who are purchasing the majority of items for sale. By contrast, the association between items 1 and 2 is driven by low volume buyers who purchase relatively few items, but buy items 1 and 2 together. It is reasonable, then, to treat the reported association measures of these two item sets differently.

Figure 2 illustrates the difference between latent association (calculated using the methods of Section 2) and correlation for items in the toy market basket data. Note that in Figure 2(a) the item set  $\{1, 2\}$  has strong latent association, but other associations are attenuated since they are not distinguishable from the pattern among high volume buyers. The item set  $\{1, 2\}$  is the only set of items that the LAMB method declares to be associated. This result is in contrast with those of conventional methods. For example, the item sets  $\{1, 2\}$ ,  $\{3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13\}$ , and  $\{4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14\}$  are often considered associated by other methods. See Appendix E.1 for details.

A simple way of addressing the effects of high volume buyers is to divide each sample



(a) Latent association in the toy market basket dataset. (b) Correlation in the toy market basket dataset. (c) Correlation in the “buyer normalized” dataset.

Figure 2: Item association heat maps.

by its Hamming weight, which is the total number of purchased items. We will refer to data transformed in this way as “buyer normalized”. Note that buyer normalized data will not, in general, be binary, and that the sign of the correlation between items can change after this normalization. Figure 2(c) illustrates the sample correlation matrix of the buyer normalized dataset. We note that there are still strong correlations between items 3 through 9, and that the correlations of items 10 through 14 have undergone a sign change.

As mentioned in the introduction, the LAMB method handles heterogeneity among both samples and features (buyers and items in this context) through a statistical framework. The LAMB method’s statistical framework acts as a de facto normalization of the observed binary samples. The hypothesis tests used in the LAMB method’s search procedure help to account for sampling artifacts, as opposed to population quantities. As a result of this, the LAMB method is less prone to making spurious claims of association among features, e.g., the association between items 3 and 4 (and other pairs of items 3 through 9) in the toy market basket data.

## 1.2 Related Work

### 1.2.1 Itemset Mining Methods

The LAMB method is related to Itemset Mining (IM) in the data mining literature. As noted earlier, IM methods were originally motivated by market basket datasets that were often binary-valued [Agrawal et al., 1993, 1996]. In general, most IM methods can be applied to undirected bipartite graphs [Zaki, 2000, Sun and Nobel, 2006].<sup>2</sup> See Goethals [2003], Ceglar and Roddick [2006], Han et al. [2007], Aggarwal and Han [2014], and Fournier-Viger et al. [2017] for recent surveys of IM methods.

<sup>2</sup>There is a bijection between binary data matrices and undirected bipartite graphs.



The LAMB method uses a novel iterative testing based search procedure that is similar to the IM method of Brin et al. [1997a], which explicitly tests for dependence between features. In most cases, however, IM methods use exhaustive search procedures to discover sets of features that co-occur at a given frequency threshold [Brin et al., 1997b, Zaki, 2000].

As noted by Yang et al. [2001], Liu et al. [2005], Sun and Nobel [2006], Alves et al. [2010] and Naulaerts et al. [2015], the results of many IM methods are not always robust to noisy datasets or datasets with sample heterogeneity. IM methods may struggle with discovering associations in sparse datasets or datasets with a moderate to large amount of features, due to modeling assumptions or exhaustive search procedures or both [Brin et al., 1997a, Moens et al., 2013, Tatti et al., 2014].

### 1.2.2 Iterative Hypothesis Testing

The iterative testing framework of the LAMB method’s search procedure has been employed in community detection [Wilson et al., 2014], differential correlation mining [Bodwin et al., 2018], and biclustering of multi-view data [Dewaskar et al., 2020]. Liu et al. [2011] discuss the importance of considering false positives in IM methods, and they propose multiple approaches to account for this. The LAMB method’s iterative testing based search procedure moderates false discoveries by using a multiple testing procedure per iteration. In Bolton and Adams [2003] a statistical model for generating data is iteratively tested, and this is called an iterative hypothesis testing strategy. In contrast to the iterative hypothesis testing strategy, in the LAMB method’s search procedure the statistical model is fixed and a test statistic is calculated per iteration.

### 1.2.3 Clustering Methods

In some cases, association mining problems can be addressed by model- or dissimilarity-based clustering methods that identify patterns of interest among sets of features. See Kriegel et al. [2009], Everitt et al. [2011], and Hastie et al. [2017] for reviews of clustering methods. A collection of binary distance and dissimilarity measures is provided in Choi et al. [2010], and clustering binary data is surveyed in Li [2005] and Li [2006]. Clustering methods typically partition the available features into disjoint groups, and these methods can be prone to spurious results when samples exhibit substantial inhomogeneity.

### 1.2.4 Topic Model Methods

Topic Model (TM) methods postulate a latent variable model that generates observed data.<sup>3</sup> In contrast to the LAMB method, the latent variables in TM methods are discrete-valued and each value corresponds to a generative probability distribution (called a topic) over the set of features. TM methods are related to IM and clustering methods. Whereas

---

<sup>3</sup>TM methods are usually applied to count-valued data and were originally motivated by text data.

IM methods use a search procedure based on counting the frequency of occurrences of a set of features, TM methods usually estimate probability distributions. The latent variables and estimated probabilities in TM methods allow for a soft clustering of features or samples.

Commonly used Topic Model methods include Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF) [Lee and Seung, 1999, 2000] and Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) [Blei et al., 2003]. See Steyvers and Griffiths [2007] and Blei and Lafferty [2009] for surveys of Topic Model methods and extensions of the LDA method. Recent surveys of the NMF method include Huang et al. [2012] and Wang and Zhang [2013]. Work on binary matrix factorization methods and algorithms includes Zhang et al. [2007], Kumar et al. [2019], and Lu et al. [2020].

### 1.2.5 Bernoulli Mixture Models

Another class of methods that can be used for association mining includes the Bernoulli Mixture Model (BMM) and its various extensions [Govaert and Nadif, 2008, Saeed et al., 2013, Tang et al., 2015, Yamamoto and Hayashi, 2015, Ye et al., 2018]. A BMM is a latent variable model and the association between features is usually modeled through hyperparameters. The Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm and its extensions are often used for estimating the hyperparameters to provide clustering information [Bishop, 2006]. Compared to BMM methods, the LAMB method assumes a more general threshold model. Furthermore, to improve the computational efficiency, instead of applying an EM algorithm globally to all of the hyperparameters, the LAMB method employs an efficient search procedure to discover associations between features.

## 1.3 Organization

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The threshold model and latent association measure for the LAMB method are formalized in Section 2. In Section 3 we describe the LAMB method and outline the iterative testing based search procedure. We review a simulation study in Section 4 that demonstrates how the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods perform under controlled conditions. The LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods are also applied to two real (count-valued) datasets in Section 5. Section 6 summarizes the LAMB method and the results in this paper. Supporting theory, details, and results are included in the appendices and is referenced throughout the paper.

## 2 Threshold Model and Latent Association

In this section we describe the statistical model and the latent association measure used in the LAMB method. We explore and prove some basic properties of the threshold model and latent association in Appendix A.

## 2.1 Threshold Model

The LAMB method is based on a simple threshold model in which an observed binary-valued vector indicates whether or not the components of a latent continuous vector lie above or below the corresponding components of a (transformed) threshold vector.<sup>4</sup> We assume that the continuous and threshold vectors are random and independent of one another, though the components of each may be dependent. The formal definition of the model follows.

**Definition 2.1 (Threshold Model).** Let  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)^T$  be a fixed vector of positive constants and let  $\tau$  be a positive-valued random variable with density  $\pi$ . Define the  $d$ -dimensional random threshold vector  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)^T \in (0, 1)^d$  by

$$\theta_i := 1 - \exp(-\alpha_i \tau) \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\}. \quad (1)$$

Let  $\mathbf{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_d)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be a latent random vector with continuous distribution function  $F$  that is independent of  $\theta$ . We assume that the threshold vector  $\theta$  and continuous vector  $\mathbf{V}$  are unobserved. The observable random vector  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)^T \in \{0, 1\}^d$  is defined by

$$X_i := \mathbb{I}(V_i \leq F_i^{-1}(\theta_i)) \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \quad (2)$$

where  $F_i$  is the marginal distribution function of  $V_i$ . In what follows, we will describe the model above as the *threshold model* for  $\mathbf{X}$  generated by  $(\theta, \mathbf{V})$ , and use the shorthand  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{V} \leq \mathbf{F}^{-1}(\theta)]$ .

As the model for the threshold  $\theta$  is similar to the Poisson factorization approach of Gopalan et al. [2014, 2015] and Hu et al. [2015], we refer to it as a truncated Poisson factorization model (TPFM). For a given sample, the value of  $\theta_i$  depends only on the product  $\alpha_i \tau$ . Randomness in  $\theta$  arises from the (shared) random variable  $\tau$ . In the case of market basket data, the fixed parameters  $\alpha$  account for the intrinsic popularity or utility of different features (items), and the resources or budget allocated to each sample (buyer) is captured by the value of  $\tau$ . In this way, the threshold model is able to capture heterogeneity among the features and the samples without the need for normalization or preprocessing steps that might not be suitable for binary data.

## 2.2 Latent Association

Under the threshold model dependence among the components of the binary vector  $\mathbf{X}$  arises from two sources: dependence among the components of the continuous vector  $\mathbf{V}$  and dependence among the components of the threshold vector  $\theta$ . Dependence among the

---

<sup>4</sup>Note that  $F_i^{-1}(\theta_i)$  in Equation (2) is simply the  $\theta_i$  percentile of  $F_i$ , and that  $X_i$  records whether the realized value of  $V_i$  is less than this number.

components of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is due to the shared value of  $\tau$  in the truncated Poisson factorization model. In our analysis, we regard dependence in  $\mathbf{X}$  arising from the dependence in  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  as a nuisance parameter; we seek to capture dependence in  $\mathbf{X}$  induced by dependence in the continuous vector  $\mathbf{V}$ . We make use of a simple measure called latent association to quantify the dependence in  $\mathbf{X}$  that arises from  $\mathbf{V}$ .

**Definition 2.2 (Latent Association).** Let the binary random vector  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{V} \leq \mathbf{F}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$  follow the threshold model of Definition 2.1. The *latent association* between  $X_i$  and  $X_k$  is defined by

$$\psi(i, k) := \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{(X_i - \theta_i)(X_k - \theta_k)}{\sqrt{\theta_i(1 - \theta_i)\theta_k(1 - \theta_k)}} \right). \quad (3)$$

Here, and in what follows, all expectations are taken with respect to the joint distribution of  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{X})$  inherited from the distribution of  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{V})$ .

Conditional on the threshold vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , the components  $X_1, \dots, X_d$  of  $\mathbf{X}$  are Bernoulli random variables, with  $X_i | \boldsymbol{\theta} \sim \text{Bern}(\theta_i)$ . The variables  $X_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}$  will exhibit dependence arising from dependence among the components of  $\mathbf{V}$ . It is easy to see that

$$\psi(i, k) = \mathbb{E}[\rho(X_i, X_k | \boldsymbol{\theta})],$$

where  $\rho(X_i, X_k | \boldsymbol{\theta})$  denotes the conditional correlation of  $X_i$  and  $X_k$  given  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . In particular,  $\psi(i, k) = 0$  if  $V_i$  and  $V_k$  are independent, regardless of the distribution of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ .

In Section 1 we provided an illustration of the importance of measuring latent association rather than correlation when sample heterogeneity is present in a binary-valued dataset. Now we give an explicit example in which  $\mathbf{X}$  has standard correlation induced by  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , despite independence in  $\mathbf{V}$ .

**Example 2.3.** Let the continuous vector  $\mathbf{V} \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ , the threshold  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  be such that

$$\theta_1 = \dots = \theta_d = \begin{cases} \epsilon & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2}, \\ 1 - \epsilon & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

for some fixed  $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ , and  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{V} \leq \mathbf{F}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$ . Then it is easy to see that, for  $i \neq k$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_i X_k) - \mathbb{E}(X_i)\mathbb{E}(X_k) = \frac{1}{4} - \epsilon(1 - \epsilon).$$

Thus, the correlation  $\rho(X_i, X_k)$  is positive, and tends to one as  $\epsilon$  tends to zero. Dependence arises from simultaneously thresholding the variables  $V_i$  and  $V_k$  at a very high or a very low percentile. Consequently,  $X_i$  and  $X_k$  are not constant, but are equal with high probability for every distinct pair  $(i, k)$ . The dependence between the components of  $\mathbf{X}$  arises from the threshold vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , and does not reflect dependence between the components of  $\mathbf{V}$ , which are independent. In contrast to  $\rho(X_i, X_k)$ , the latent association  $\psi(i, k)$  is equal to 0 for any distinct pair  $(i, k)$ , which accurately reflects the lack of dependence between the components of  $\mathbf{V}$ .

### 3 Latent Association Mining in Binary Data (LAMB)

In this section we present the details of how the LAMB method detects sets of mutually associated features in binary data.

#### 3.1 Coherent Sets

Definition 2.2 provides a measure of association between two features under the threshold model of Definition 2.1. The goal of the LAMB method, however, is to identify sets, rather than just pairs, of associated features. To this end we state the following two definitions.

**Definition 3.1 (Average Latent Association).** Given  $i \in [d]$  and  $A \subseteq [d]$ , let

$$\psi(i, A) := \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} \psi(i, k) \quad (5)$$

be the *average latent association* between  $X_i$  and  $\{X_k : k \in A\}$ .

**Definition 3.2 (Coherent Set).** A subset  $A \subseteq [d]$  with at least two elements is a *coherent set* with respect to average latent association if

1.  $\psi(i, A_{-i}) > 0$  for each  $i \in A$ , and
2.  $\psi(i, A) \leq 0$  for each  $i \notin A$ ,

where  $A_{-i} := A \setminus \{i\}$ . A coherent set is *minimal* if no proper subset is a coherent set.

A set is coherent if each element in the set has positive average latent association with the other elements in the set, and no element outside of the set satisfies this property. This definition ensures that if we add or remove a single feature to a coherent set, then it is no longer a coherent set. Note that this does not exclude the possibility of adding or removing more than one feature from a set and maintaining the coherent set definition.<sup>5</sup> For this reason the LAMB method seeks to discover minimal coherent sets.

Analogous to a block of positive correlations in a covariance matrix, a coherent set of features is mutually positively associated. For binary-valued data, coherent sets offer a narrative advantage over other measures for associated sets, since the threshold model allows latent association to be interpreted as mutual dependence in an unobserved continuous measure. Coherent sets can be estimated in a computationally efficient search procedure based on iterative hypothesis testing that is formalized in Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

---

<sup>5</sup>See Proposition D.1 in Appendix D.5 for an explicit example of such behavior.

### 3.2 Hypothesis Testing

The LAMB method's search procedure is based on iterative hypothesis testing. To carry out hypothesis tests we construct a test statistic for latent association, and then appeal to a central limit theorem to calculate approximate p-values.

Binary data  $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$  is assumed to arise from independent replicates from the threshold model of Definition 2.1. Suppose that the random threshold vectors  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n$  are observed along with the binary vectors  $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ . In this case, a straightforward estimator for the latent association of Definition 2.2 is the corresponding sample average

$$\hat{\psi}_n(i, k) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n U_{ij} U_{kj}, \quad \text{where} \quad U_{ij} := \frac{X_{ij} - \theta_{ij}}{\sqrt{\theta_{ij}(1 - \theta_{ij})}}. \quad (6)$$

For  $A \subseteq [d]$  we then define  $\hat{\psi}_n(i, A) := |A|^{-1} \sum_{k \in A} \hat{\psi}_n(i, k)$ . Note that the sample quantities  $\hat{\psi}_n(i, k)$  and  $\hat{\psi}_n(i, A)$  are not guaranteed to fall between -1 and 1. See Proposition B.6 in Appendix B for details.

Suppose that  $V_i$  is independent of  $\{V_k : k \in A\}$  for some  $i \in [d]$  and  $A \subset [d] \setminus \{i\}$ . Theorem B.3 of Appendix B establishes that, for a suitable variance estimator<sup>6</sup>  $\hat{\sigma}_n^2(i, A)$  and under some conditions<sup>7</sup> on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n$ , the quantity  $\sqrt{n} \hat{\psi}_n(i, A) / \hat{\sigma}_n(i, A)$  is approximately standard normal, i.e.,

$$\frac{\sqrt{n} \hat{\psi}_n(i, A)}{\hat{\sigma}_n(i, A)} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In the iterative testing based search procedure, we wish to test the following hypotheses for a fixed  $A \subset [d]$  and each  $k \in [d]$ :

$$H_0(k, A) : \psi(k, A_{-k}) \leq 0 \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1(k, A) : \psi(k, A_{-k}) > 0 \quad (7)$$

where  $A_{-k} := A \setminus \{k\}$ . Large positive values of  $\hat{\psi}_n(k, A_{-k})$  provide strong evidence for positive association, i.e., strong evidence against the null hypothesis  $H_0(k, A)$ . Therefore, we define approximate p-values by

$$\text{pv}(k, A) := 1 - \Phi^{-1} \left( \frac{\sqrt{n} \hat{\psi}_n(k, A_{-k})}{\hat{\sigma}_n(k, A_{-k})} \right). \quad (8)$$

The approximate p-values defined by Equation (8) are used to perform a set update step in the LAMB method's search procedure that is discussed in the next section.

<sup>6</sup>There are two consistent estimators for the variance under the same conditions. However, one is more computationally efficient. See Appendix B for details.

<sup>7</sup>These conditions provide an upper bound that guarantees the Lindeberg condition is satisfied and the Lindeberg-Feller Central Limit Theorem can be applied.

Recall that above it is assumed the random threshold vectors  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n$  are observed along with the binary vectors  $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ . In practice the thresholds  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n$  are not observable, but they can be consistently estimated under suitable assumptions. Supporting theory for estimating  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n$  is detailed in Appendix C. The computational approach to estimating  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n$  from binary data is discussed in Section 3.4. The LAMB method uses estimates  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\cdot j}$  of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\cdot j}$  and plugs in these values to calculate the statistics  $\hat{\psi}_n(i, A)$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_n(i, A)$  defined above.

### 3.3 Iterative Testing Search Procedure

We now discuss the LAMB method’s search procedure for discovering coherent sets. The pseudocode for the LAMB method’s iterative testing based search procedure is contained in Algorithm 1. Initializing all possible singleton sets is recommended, and we consider this an “exhaustive” search in practice.<sup>8</sup> Intuitively, initializing the search procedure with a singleton set increases the chance of estimating a minimal coherent set. However, Algorithm 1 is not guaranteed to estimate minimal coherent sets.

#### Algorithm 1: Iterative Testing Search Procedure

```

input :  $i \in [d]$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $N \geq 2$ , and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ 
Initialize  $t := 0$  and  $A^0 := \{i\}$ ;
while  $t \leq T$  do
    for  $k \in [d]$  do
        | Test  $H_0(k, A^t)$  using the approximate p-value from Equation (8);
    end
    Calculate Benjamini-Yekutieli adjusted approximate p-values
     $\text{BY}(1, A^t), \dots, \text{BY}(d, A^t)$ ;
    Define  $A^{t+1} := \{k \in [d] : \text{BY}(k, A^t) \leq \delta\}$ ;
    if  $A^t = A^{t+1}$  or  $A^{t+1} = \emptyset$  then
        | if  $|A^{t+1}| \geq N$  then
            | | output:  $A^* := A^t$ 
        | else
            | | output:  $A^* := \emptyset$ 
        | end
    else
        |  $t := t + 1$ ;
    end
end

```

<sup>8</sup>Algorithm 1 allows for initializing sets of features other than singletons, and the search procedure can be performed in parallel across multiple seeds  $A^0$  and across the for  $k \in [d]$  loop (see Appendix D.2). Multiple testing procedures other than Benjamini and Yekutieli [2001] could be used (see Appendix D.3).

The output set  $A^*$  in Algorithm 1 is a fixed point of the search procedure; further set updates will not change  $A^*$ . Note that  $\emptyset$  is a fixed point of the search procedure that represents an unsuccessful search. There is a close relationship between nonempty fixed points and coherent sets. By definition, a nonempty fixed point  $A^*$  of the search procedure has the properties:  $H_0(k, A^*)$  is rejected for all  $k \in A^*$ , and  $H_0(k, A^*)$  is accepted for all  $k \notin A^*$ .<sup>9</sup> Therefore a nonempty fixed point  $A^*$  satisfies Definition 3.2 up to a level of statistical significance. Consequently, nonempty fixed points of the search procedure are natural estimates of coherent sets.<sup>10</sup>

In practice, many or all of the LAMB method’s searches may degenerate to  $A^* = \emptyset$ , indicating lack of evidence of a true underlying signal in the features of a dataset. Other searches might result in overlapping or identical estimated coherent sets. Multiple instances of the same set are considered a single estimated coherent set. In cases where substantial overlap is present, a variety of heuristic methods may be employed to form a representative set from an overlapping class of sets.<sup>11</sup>

### 3.4 Estimating Random Thresholds

In Section 3.2, we assumed that the random thresholds  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$  were observed to define estimators of latent association. However, as noted earlier, in practice we must estimate the random thresholds and plug in the estimates  $\hat{\theta}_1, \dots, \hat{\theta}_n$  into the estimators of latent association defined in Section 3.2.

First we note that the threshold model of Definition 2.1 underlying the LAMB method is not a true generative model. Recall that we do not impose any assumptions for the underlying distribution of  $\mathbf{V}$ , other than assuming it has a continuous joint distribution function  $F$ . We also do not assume the density  $\pi$  of the random variables  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$ . Consequently, more distribution assumptions for  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  are needed in our threshold model in order to use the popular Expectation-Maximization (EM) or Variational Inference (VI) optimization algorithms [Wainwright and Jordan, 2008, Tran et al., 2015]. However, the marginal distributions of  $\mathbf{X} | \boldsymbol{\theta}$  are Bernoulli distributions, which allows us to implement a pseudo-likelihood approach.

To estimate the random thresholds  $\theta_{ij}$  it is necessary and sufficient to estimate the parameters in the truncated Poisson factorization model (see Equation (1) in Definition 2.1 and Proposition A.4). In particular, instead of estimating  $d \cdot n$  random thresholds  $\{\theta_{ij}\}_{i \in [d], j \in [n]}$ , we estimate  $d + n - 1$  parameters<sup>12</sup>  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} := (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d)^T$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^0 := (\tau_1^0, \dots, \tau_n^0)^T$ , where  $\tau_j^0$  is the realized value of the random variable  $\tau_j$ , for each  $j \in [n]$ .

Consistent estimators of  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^0$  are derived in Appendix C (see Proposition C.1 and

<sup>9</sup>We reject or accept the null hypotheses using a multiple testing procedure.

<sup>10</sup>Fixed points are not the only thing we observe from this search procedure in practice. Cycles do occur and are discussed in Appendix D.4.

<sup>11</sup>See Appendix D.7 for details about post-processing the LAMB method’s estimated coherent sets.

<sup>12</sup>Identifiability of the truncated Poisson factorization model requires  $\alpha_1 := 1$ . See Proposition A.4.



Theorem C.3). These consistent estimators rely on knowing the density  $\pi$  for the random sample  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$ . The results in Appendix C demonstrate that the problem of estimating random thresholds from binary data is a well-posed inference problem. However, estimating  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^0$  is still a computationally difficult problem. The computational goal, therefore, is to efficiently approximate the consistent estimators discussed in Appendix C. We use two different approximations for the density  $\pi$  and the likelihood  $f(\mathbf{X} | \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$  to accomplish this goal. For the first approximation, we replace the unknown density  $\pi$  with an uninformative prior  $\hat{\pi} \sim \text{Unif}(0, 8)$ .<sup>13</sup> For the second approximation we use, for each  $j \in [n]$ ,

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{X}_{\cdot j} | \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \tau_j^0) := \prod_{i=1}^d \left(1 - e^{-\alpha_i \tau_j^0}\right)^{X_{ij}} \left(e^{-\alpha_i \tau_j^0}\right)^{1-X_{ij}}.$$

This approximation is sometimes called a pseudo-likelihood [Besag, 1974, 1975, Amini et al., 2013].<sup>14</sup> Note that the distribution for  $\mathbf{V}$  is not approximated.

To approximate the consistent estimators of Appendix C, we want to find  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^0$  that maximize the pseudo-likelihood subject to a method of moments constraint:

$$\hat{f}(\mathbb{X}, \boldsymbol{\tau}^0 | \boldsymbol{\alpha}) := \prod_{j=1}^n \hat{f}(\mathbf{X}_{\cdot j} | \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \tau_j^0) \hat{\pi}(\tau_j^0) \quad (9)$$

$$\bar{X}_i := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} X_{ij} \approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} (1 - e^{-\alpha_i \tau_j^0}) =: \bar{\theta}_i \quad \text{for each } i \in [d]. \quad (10)$$

Equation (10) is based on the fact that under the threshold model we have  $\mathbb{E}(X_{ij}) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[X_{ij} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\cdot j}]) = \mathbb{E}(\theta_{ij})$ , for each  $i \in [d]$  and  $j \in [n]$ .<sup>15</sup> Although this optimization problem does not have a closed form solution, it can be approximately computed.

Algorithm 2 contains the pseudocode for estimating the random thresholds. Note that Algorithm 2 is a coordinate-wise optimization procedure with two alternating steps. Given values for  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ , we minimize the negative logarithm<sup>16</sup> of each sample in the pseudo-likelihood given by Equation (9). Then, given values for  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^0$ , we minimize a smoothed version of the constraint in Equation (10). We note here that it is possible to optimize  $\alpha_i | \boldsymbol{\tau}^0$  in Algorithm 2 subject to a constraint that ensures convexity. See Appendix D.8 for details.

<sup>13</sup>The interval  $(0, 8)$  is arbitrary, and any number larger than 8 could be chosen. As the values  $\alpha_i$  or  $\tau_j^0$  get larger than 8, the random threshold gets exponentially close to the value 1. In practice, the interval  $(0, 8)$  is large enough for robust estimation.

<sup>14</sup>This approximation resembles the conditional independence assumption used in naive Bayes classification [Domingos and Pazzani, 1997].

<sup>15</sup>This approach resembles a constrained MLE estimator in the frequentist perspective, and a constrained MAP estimator in the Bayesian perspective.

<sup>16</sup>This is commonly done. In this case, it protects the optimization procedure from numerical underflow.

**Algorithm 2:** Estimate Random Thresholds

**Data:** binary data matrix  $\mathbb{X} \in \{0, 1\}^{d \times n}$   
**input :**  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $M \in \mathbb{N}$   
 Let  $\alpha_1 := 1$ ,  $m := 0$ , and  $\Delta := 1$ ;  
 Initialize  $\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d$  randomly or using row means of  $\mathbb{X}$ ;  
**while**  $\Delta \geq \epsilon$  and  $m \leq M$  **do**  
   **for**  $j \in [n]$  **do**  
      $\tau_j^0 \mid \alpha := \operatorname{argmin}_{t \in (0, 8)} \sum_{i \in [d]} [\alpha_i t - X_{ij}(\alpha_i t + \ln[1 - \exp\{-\alpha_i t\}])]$ ;  
   **end**  
   **for**  $i \in [d] \setminus \{1\}$  **do**  
      $\alpha_i \mid \tau^0 \in \operatorname{argmin}_{a \in (0, 8)} \left(1 - \bar{X}_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} \exp\{-a \tau_j^0\}\right)^2$ ;  
   **end**  
    $m := m + 1$ ;  
   **if**  $m > 1$  **then**  
      $a^* := \operatorname{median}(\|\alpha - \alpha_{\text{old}}\|_1)$ ;  
      $t^* := \operatorname{median}(\|\tau^0 - \tau_{\text{old}}^0\|_1)$ ;  
      $\Delta := \max\{a^*, t^*\}$ ;  
   **end**  
    $\alpha_{\text{old}} := \alpha$  and  $\tau_{\text{old}}^0 := \tau^0$ ;  
**end**

## 4 Simulation Study

The LAMB method was applied to artificial binary datasets to establish the effectiveness of the method at discovering associated sets of features under controlled conditions. In Section 4.1 we discuss the high-level details of generating these artificial binary datasets. The full details of generating the artificial datasets is discussed in Appendix E.2.1. Analysis of the results obtained from different association mining methods applied to the artificial datasets is discussed in Section 4.2. Additional figures are included in Appendix E.2.2.

### 4.1 Artificial Datasets

A total of 450 artificial binary datasets  $\mathbb{X} \in \{0, 1\}^{d \times n}$  were created in accordance with the threshold model of Definition 2.1. In particular, binary data contains a randomly thresholded version of a continuous latent random vector with nontrivial covariance between its components.

To resemble the high-dimension low-sample size setting of most modern datasets, we used  $n = 200$  and  $d = 2,000$ . Analyzing datasets with larger values of  $n$  or  $d$  is possible, and we expect the results to be robust to an increased value of  $n$  or an increased value of  $d$ .

or both. However, because of the approximate p-values used in the iterative testing search procedure (see Section 3.2), using  $n < 200$  could lead to spurious results from the LAMB method.

Continuous vectors  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with nontrivial association structure were generated from a  $d$ -multivariate normal distribution. Five disjoint sets of associated features  $A_1, \dots, A_5 \subset [d]$ , all of size 200, were embedded into the artificial binary datasets.<sup>1718</sup> Embedding associated sets of features is accomplished by using blocks of correlation in the covariance matrix for the  $d$ -multivariate normal distribution that generates  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$ . The sets of associated features  $A_1, \dots, A_5$  were independently given (population) correlation values  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_5 \in [0, 1]$ . Note that features belonging to different sets  $A_p$  and  $A_q$ , for  $p, q \in [5]$ , are independent in their population covariance because of the block correlation structure used to generate  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$ . This process for generating  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$  was done a total of 50 times; values of the (population) correlation  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_5$  corresponding to the sets of features  $A_1, \dots, A_5$  varied significantly across the interval  $[0, 1]$ .

Random thresholds  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$  were generated independently of  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$ . Recall that the random thresholds are completely specified by the values of  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)^T$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^0 := (\tau_1^0, \dots, \tau_n^0)^T$  (see Equation (1) in Definition 2.1). The values of  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  were independently generated using a (scaled) beta distribution and the values of  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^0$  were independently generated using a gamma distribution. Three different pairs of parameters for the beta distribution were used to generate three different vectors  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\text{low}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\text{med}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\text{high}}$ . Similarly, three different pairs of parameters for the gamma distribution were used to generate three different vectors  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{\text{low}}^0, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{\text{med}}^0, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{\text{high}}^0$ . See Figures 6 and 7 in Appendix E.2.1 for histograms of the corresponding values of  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^0$ , respectively. Using all combinations of  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\text{low}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\text{med}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\text{high}}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{\text{low}}^0, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{\text{med}}^0, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{\text{high}}^0$  generated a total of 9 different threshold matrices  $\boldsymbol{\Theta} := [\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n]$ .

## 4.2 Analysis

We now discuss the results of the LAMB method applied to the (450) artificial binary datasets that were generated in accordance to the threshold model of Definition 2.1. The Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF) and Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) methods discussed in Section 1.2 were also applied to the artificial datasets. The LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods are further compared on two real (count-valued) dataset applications in Section 5.

Precision and recall statistics were used to compare the results of the different association mining methods. Suppose an estimated set of associated features is denoted by  $E$  (for

---

<sup>17</sup>Five disjoint sets were embedded into the artificial datasets so that half of the features in the datasets are white noise.

<sup>18</sup>The results obtained from the LAMB method do not depend on knowing the number nor the size of the embedded sets of associated features. Using the same number of sets and the same size for each set makes comparing the results obtained from the LAMB method to the results obtained from the NMF and LDA methods more systematic and informative.

any method), and assume that the discovered set  $E$  best estimates<sup>19</sup> the embedded set of features  $A_j$ , for some  $j \in [5]$ . Then we define the precision and recall statistics for the set  $E$  estimating the set  $A_j$  by

$$\mathbf{precision}(E, A_j) := \frac{|E \cap A_j|}{|E|} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{recall}(E, A_j) := \frac{|E \cap A_j|}{|A_j|}.$$

The embedded associated sets of features  $A_1, \dots, A_5$  were all of the same size, and the corresponding features of  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$  varied in their (population) correlation independently. It is therefore reasonable to take the median values of the precision and recall statistics for a fixed value of (population) correlation. Due to the manner in which the associated sets of features  $A_1, \dots, A_5$  were independently given (population) correlation values  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_5$ , we expect the median precision and recall statistics to be robust estimates of the results obtained from all of the association mining methods that we considered.

Results from the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods are visualized in Figure 3. The LAMB method is successful at discovering truly associated sets of features whenever the underlying correlation in the corresponding features of the continuous latent vectors  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$  is above around .125. Soft clusters of features arising from the NMF and LDA methods were restricted to the “top 200” features to better visualize the results of the different methods.<sup>20</sup> Note that since only the top 200 features are used for both the NMF and LDA methods, and the embedded sets of associated features were all of size 200, both the precision and recall statistics are exactly the same for these two methods.<sup>21</sup> In contrast to the NMF and LDA methods, the number of sets and the sizes of the sets discovered by the LAMB method is not fixed.

The NMF method also successfully discovers truly associated sets of features (see Figure 3). Note that the NMF and LDA methods are Topic Model methods for count-valued data. Restriction to binary-valued data negatively impacted the LDA method more than the NMF method.<sup>22</sup> These results are not an indictment of the LDA method. Rather, the results of this simulation study indicate the difficulty that binary-valued data can present for inference and association mining problems. On the other hand, we see in Section 5 that the LAMB method is able to discover meaningful associations in count-valued data that is “binarized”. Additional results are included in Appendix E.2.2.

<sup>19</sup>Here “best” refers to the set  $A_j$  with the smallest Jaccard distance from  $E$  [Jaccard, 1901]. In particular, we are not interested in the precision or recall statistics of “noisy” sets or clusters from the methods. For example, methods such as NMF, LDA, and hierarchical clustering benefit from have more topics or clusters than known sets because at least one of the clusters produced by these methods can then contain the “noisy” features. See Appendix E.2.2 for additional figures for each method.

<sup>20</sup>In general, the size and the number of the soft clusters of features generated by the NMF and LDA methods is essentially another parameter to consider.

<sup>21</sup>That is to say, for the estimated sets  $E$  from the NMF and LDA methods we have  $|E| = |A_j|$ , in the notation used to define  $\mathbf{precision}(E, A_j)$  and  $\mathbf{recall}(E, A_j)$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{precision}(E, A_j) = \mathbf{recall}(E, A_j)$  for the NMF and LDA methods across all estimated sets and artificial datasets.

<sup>22</sup>It appears that the binary-valued artificial datasets do not provide enough information for the inference problem used in the LDA method.




Figure 3: Comparison of the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods on the artificial datasets of Section 4 using the (median) precision and recall of their estimated associated sets. For this figure we used  $\delta = .05$  for the LAMB method and fit 6 latent topics for the NMF and LDA methods. As a baseline reference we include results obtained from hierarchical clustering with binary distance and average linkage using 7 clusters. Additional figures for different values of these parameters are included in Appendix E.2.2.

## 5 Real Dataset Applications

Applying association mining methods to real datasets is similar to Exploratory Data Analysis [Tukey, 1977] and Feature Selection [Guyon and Elisseeff, 2003, Khalid et al., 2014]. Binary-valued datasets are still encountered in modern settings [Needell et al., 2018, Li and Quon, 2019]. The purpose of this section, however, is to demonstrate how the LAMB method performs relative to the well-known Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF) and Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) methods on count-valued datasets that contain important sample heterogeneity.

In this section, count-valued data matrices were “binarized” into co-occurrence data matrices for the LAMB method. Unlike the LAMB method, the NMF and LDA methods were applied to the count-valued data matrices. In principle, the count data matrices contain sufficiently more information than the binary co-occurrence matrices. This section demonstrates that the LAMB method is able to detect meaningful associations among features without information of the raw counts.

In Section 5.1 we study a text dataset of famous works in Western literature. Then in Section 5.2 we study a bipartite graph dataset. Section 5.3 discusses another suitable

application of the LAMB method to gene expression data. Additional details, figures, and tables are included in Appendices E.3 and E.4.

## 5.1 Text Data

Text analysts are often interested in classifying texts by finding sets of terms that appear together frequently. See Salton and McGill [1986] and Manning et al. [2008] for introductions to text analysis and information retrieval, and see Forman [2003] and Aggarwal and Zhai [2012] for surveys of text classification methods. In text data samples are documents within a work (e.g., chapters in a novel) and features are unique terms.<sup>23</sup> Different text documents can vary significantly in length, content, and style. Text data is therefore an ideal source for detecting associated sets of features based on heterogeneous samples.

In this section we consider a text dataset that consists of famous works in Western literature. Text sources were restricted to Western literature only to facilitate interpreting associated sets of terms. Nonetheless, the chosen works are very heterogeneous in terms of document length, authors, and themes. The online database `gutenberg.org` and the R package `gutenbergr` from Robinson [2019] were used to create this text dataset. See Tables 3 and 4 in Appendix E.3 for the different works used in this text dataset.

Text data is naturally sequence-valued. However, term sequences within a document can be “tokenized” using a so-called “bag-of-words” assumption to create a count-valued term-document matrix. In particular, if the  $(i, j)$ -entry of the term-document matrix has value  $c$ , then the term  $i$  was used  $c$  times in document  $j$ .

Individual works such as *Moby Dick* or *Romeo and Juliet* were broken up by chapter or scene, respectively.<sup>24</sup> For example, *Moby Dick* was broken up into 135 documents, each document representing one chapter in the novel. After removing stop words<sup>25</sup>, the resulting term-document matrix consisted of 40,561 unique terms and 971 documents. This text data matrix was preprocessed to further reduce it to 11,757 unique terms and 971 documents by removing terms that occurred fewer than three times across all documents.<sup>26</sup> The original  $40,561 \times 971$  dimensional term-document matrix is 99% sparse, i.e., 99% of the term-document matrix entries are 0. The reduced  $11,757 \times 971$  dimensional term-document matrix is 97% sparse. Both the final term-document matrix size and the amount of sparsity is common for a text dataset.

Typically, term-document data matrices use either a term-frequency (tf) weight or term-frequency inverse-document-frequency (tf-idf) weight for each matrix entry. The NMF and LDA methods take as input a tf-weighted term-document matrix. As mentioned earlier, a binary co-occurrence (or binary-weighted) term-document matrix is used as input to the

<sup>23</sup>It is possible to use  $n$ -grams instead of distinct terms as features.

<sup>24</sup>Individual Shakespeare sonnets were treated as one document to add more heterogeneity among the documents in this text dataset.

<sup>25</sup>Including Shakespearean stop words such as “thou”. This filtering step was not perfect. For example, we failed to combine the counts of “england’s” and “england”.

<sup>26</sup>All documents contained at least 6 distinct terms among the remaining 11,757 terms.

LAMB method. In particular, a 1 in the  $(i, j)$ -entry of the co-occurrence term-document matrix indicates that term  $i$  appeared at least once in document  $j$ , and a 0 indicates that term  $i$  was never used in document  $j$ .

Recall that the LAMB method outputs estimated coherent sets. The NMF and LDA methods can produce soft clusters of terms, and the elements of these soft clusters can essentially be ranked.<sup>27</sup> To demonstrate the soft clustering by the NMF and LDA methods we considered different sizes of soft clusters and different numbers of latent topics. To form soft clusters of different sizes we selected “top” cluster elements based on the corresponding method’s rankings.

Some of the effective numbers (see Definition D.2 in Appendix D.6) of distinct term sets produced by the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods is presented in Table 1. The results in Table 1 and Appendix E.3 demonstrate that the LAMB method detects sets of associated terms that are as discriminative as the results obtained from the NMF and LDA methods, but usually contain many more terms in the associated sets. Appendix E.3 contains more detailed results obtained from the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods.

Figure 4 provides a simple numerical description of some of the LAMB method’s estimated coherent sets. For example, the second estimated coherent set in Figure 4 contains many terms present in Moby Dick such as characters, sailing terms, and hunting terms. Based on the plots and settings of these two novels, it is not very surprising that *The Call of the Wild* and *Moby Dick* share a decent amount of terms. In particular, the LAMB method’s estimated coherent sets of terms for this text dataset contain important terms such as characters, but the sets also contain more general terms that belong to many works. It is important to note that the LAMB method is able to detect these associated terms with access to only binary co-occurrence data, as opposed to the raw count data used by the NMF and LDA methods.

Method	Parameter	Set Filtering	Effective Number
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	$\geq 25$ terms	7.510
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	$\geq 25$ terms	10.004
NMF	25 topics	top 50 terms	12.42
NMF	25 topics	top 1000 terms	7.11
LDA	25 topics	top 50 terms	11.12
LDA	25 topics	top 1000 terms	6.40

Table 1: Effective number of distinct term sets obtained from applying the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods to the text dataset in Section 5.1. The LAMB method estimates coherent sets while the NMF and LDA methods can produce soft clusters of terms.

---

<sup>27</sup>For the NMF method the rank can be based on the latent nonnegative value in the matrix factorization. For the LDA method there are two ways to rank terms: one rank is based on estimated probabilities and another is based on so-called “term-scores” that resemble tf-idf weighting (see [Blei and Lafferty, 2009]).




Figure 4: Box plots of precision per work for four estimated coherent sets obtained from the LAMB method with  $\delta = .01$  on the text dataset in Section 5.1. Each data point within a box plot row corresponds to a chapter or scene in a given work. Higher values of precision correspond to the estimated coherent sets containing more terms in the work.

## 5.2 Last.fm Artist-User Data

Music streaming services such as Pandora ([pandora.com](http://pandora.com)), Last.fm ([last.fm](http://last.fm)), and Spotify ([spotify.com](http://spotify.com)) offer their users the opportunity to discover new artists or bands based on the user’s musical preferences. Companies usually develop complex algorithms for finding similar artists or bands based on era, genre, user ratings, et cetera. In this section we study a Last.fm dataset provided by Celma [2010] and accessible from the `last.fm` public API through the author’s website.<sup>28</sup> It is natural to apply association mining methods to the Last.fm dataset in order to discover associated artists or bands. However, one can also analyze this Last.fm dataset using a recommender system method, e.g., Dai et al. [2019] have recently studied a similar Last.fm dataset using such a method.

The Last.fm dataset presents another ideal source for detecting associated sets of features in heterogeneous samples. For this dataset, individual Last.fm users are treated as samples and individual artists or bands are treated as features. Heterogeneity among the samples in the dataset arises from the variety in the demographics of the Last.fm users, as well as different users listening to different amounts of artists or bands. Note that the Last.fm dataset can be represented as a bipartite graph where one set of vertices corresponds to artists or bands, and another set of vertices corresponds to Last.fm users.

The corresponding artist-user data matrix is count-valued; if the  $(i, j)$ -entry of the artist-user matrix has value  $c$ , then Last.fm user  $j$  listened to  $c$  songs by artist  $i$ .<sup>29</sup> The Last.fm dataset contains 153,898 unique artists or bands available to listen to, the listen-

<sup>28</sup>This Last.fm data was collected during the aughts, up until May 2009.

<sup>29</sup>Not necessarily a count of distinct songs. The original dataset includes the individual songs that users listened to. However, for the purposes of this section, it makes sense to focus on associated artists or bands rather than associated songs. Therefore, we agglomerate the counts of individual songs per artist or band.



ing history of 924 anonymized Last.fm users, and the matrix is 99% sparse.<sup>30</sup> A basic preprocessing step filtered out artists or bands and Last.fm users below a certain listening threshold. The filtering done was such that all remaining artists or bands were listened to by at least 11 different Last.fm users, and all remaining Last.fm users listened to at least 11 different artists or bands. This data preprocessing step reduced the artist-user data matrix to 10,957 distinct artists or bands, 913 distinct Last.fm users, and is 94% sparse.

The NMF and LDA methods were applied to the count-valued artist-user data matrix. However, the LAMB method was applied to the corresponding binary-valued artist-user co-occurrence matrix. In this co-occurrence matrix, a value of 1 in the  $(i, j)$ -entry indicates that Last.fm user  $j$  listened to artist or band  $i$  at least once, and a 0 indicates user  $j$  never listened to artist or band  $i$ .

Latent association and coherent sets provide a novel means of matching artists or bands when Last.fm users exhibit diverse listening behavior. The LAMB method detects large and diverse sets of associated artists and bands in the Last.fm dataset (see Table 2 and Appendix E.4). Results from the LAMB method are not heavily skewed towards popular music. In particular, the LAMB method consistently detects the most popular artists and bands in the Last.fm dataset in one of its estimated coherent sets, while the other estimated coherent sets detect more diverse sets of artists and bands. Additional results are included in Appendix E.4.

Method	Parameter	Set Sizes	Effective Number
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	$\geq 25$	4.710
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	$\geq 25$	5.166
NMF	12 topics	top 50	8.840
NMF	12 topics	top 1000	4.784
LDA	12 topics	top 50 (probabilities)	8.820
LDA	12 topics	top 1000 (probabilities)	6.157

Table 2: Effective number of distinct artist sets from applying the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods to the Last.fm dataset in Section 5.2. The LAMB method outputs estimated coherent sets while the NMF and LDA methods can produce soft clusters of artists and bands.

### 5.3 Further Applications

Gene interaction networks and gene expression data in general are an important application of association mining methods [Alves et al., 2010, Naulaerts et al., 2015, Al-Aamri et al., 2019]. One important future application of the LAMB method is to single-cell data known colloquially as scRNA-seq and scATAC-seq data. See Chen et al. [2019a] and Kiselev et al.

<sup>30</sup>This dataset contains a lot of metadata that is not utilized for this application.

[2019] for general reviews of scRNA-seq data, and see Chen et al. [2019b] and Yan et al. [2020] for general reviews of scATAC-seq data. Usually both scRNA-seq and scATAC-seq data are high-dimensional, contain heterogeneous samples (e.g., cells), and usually have a low signal-to-noise ratio. Li and Quon [2019] demonstrate the utility of binary methods for analyzing scRNA-seq and scATAC-seq data.

## 6 Summary

The LAMB method is based on a simple threshold model and latent association measure for binary data. We have shown that the LAMB method is able to detect meaningful sets of mutually associated features in artificial and real datasets. The LAMB method’s iterative testing based search procedure moderated false discoveries when applied to the artificial datasets. For the two real dataset applications that we considered, the data is naturally count-valued. However, we have demonstrated that there is sufficient information present in the corresponding binary co-occurrence data for the LAMB method to detect meaningful sets of associated features. In particular, the LAMB method is able to find large sets of associated features that are as discriminative as the best soft clusters produced by the NMF and LDA methods.

In principle, methods developed for count-valued data do not have sufficient information from binary-valued data to detect meaningful sets of associated features. For example, this occurs for the Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) method on the artificial binary datasets in Section 4. However, the Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF) method is able to discover meaningful sets of associated features in binary data. On the other hand, the LAMB method is able to discover meaningful sets of associated features in binary data in a less supervised manner than the NMF method.

## Acknowledgement

This work was partly supported by the National Institutes of Health under award number R01HG009125-01. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. This work was also partly supported by the National Science Foundation under Grants DMS-1613072, DMS-1613261, DMS-1613112, IIS-1633212, and DMS-1916237. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. The authors thank Miheer Dewaskar and Kevin O’Connor for helpful discussions about the LAMB method’s search procedure and post-processing results obtained from the LAMB method.

## References

- Charu C. Aggarwal and Jiawei Han. *Frequent Pattern Mining*. Springer International Publishing, 2014. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-07821-2.
- Charu C. Aggarwal and ChengXiang Zhai. *A Survey of Text Classification Algorithms*, pages 163–222. Springer US, 2012. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4614-3223-4\_6.
- Rakesh Agrawal, Tomasz Imieliński, and Arun Swami. Mining association rules between sets of items in large databases. In *Proceedings of the 1993 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, SIGMOD '93, pages 207–216. Association for Computing Machinery, 1993. doi: 10.1145/170035.170072.
- Rakesh Agrawal, Heikki Mannila, Ramakrishnan Srikant, Hannu Toivonen, and A. Inkeri Verkamo. Fast discovery of association rules. *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 307–328, 1996. chapter: 12.
- Amira Al-Aamri, Kamal Taha, Yousof Al-Hammadi, Maher Maalouf, and Dirar Homouz. Analyzing a co-occurrence gene-interaction network to identify disease-gene association. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 20, 2019. doi: 10.1186/s12859-019-2634-7.
- Ronnie Alves, Domingo S. Rodriguez-Baena, and Jesus S. Aguilar-Ruiz. Gene association analysis: a survey of frequent pattern mining from gene expression data. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 11(2):210–224, 2010. doi: 10.1093/bib/bbp042.
- Arash A. Amini, Aiyu Chen, Peter J. Bickel, and Elizaveta Levina. Pseudo-likelihood methods for community detection in large sparse networks. *Annals of Statistics*, 41(4): 2097–2122, 2013. doi: 10.1214/13-AOS1138.
- Yoav Benjamini and Yosef Hochberg. Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 57(1):289–300, 1995.
- Yoav Benjamini and Daniel Yekutieli. The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency. *The Annals of Statistics*, 29(4):1165–1188, 2001.
- Julian Besag. Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 36(2):192–225, 1974.
- Julian Besag. Statistical analysis of non-lattice data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician)*, 24(3):179–195, 1975. doi: 10.2307/2987782.
- Christopher Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2006. ISBN: 978-0-387-31073-2.

- David M. Blei and John D. Lafferty. Topic models. In *Text Mining: Classification, Clustering, and Applications*, volume 10, pages 71–93. CRC Press Boca Raton, FL, 2009.
- David M. Blei, Andrew Y. Ng, and Michael I. Jordan. Latent dirichlet allocation. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:993–1022, 2003.
- Kelly Bodwin, Kai Zhang, and Andrew Nobel. A testing based approach to the discovery of differentially correlated variable sets. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 12(2):1180–1203, 2018. doi: 10.1214/17-A0AS1083.
- Richard J. Bolton and Niall M. Adams. An iterative hypothesis-testing strategy for pattern discovery. In *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD ’03, pages 49–58. Association for Computing Machinery, 2003. doi: 10.1145/956750.956760.
- Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, and Craig Silverstein. Beyond market baskets: Generalizing association rules to correlations. *ACM SIGMOD Record*, 26(2):265–276, 1997a. doi: 10.1145/253262.253327.
- Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, Jeffrey D. Ullman, and Shalom Tsur. Dynamic itemset counting and implication rules for market basket data. *ACM SIGMOD Record*, 26(2):255–264, 1997b. doi: 10.1145/253262.253325.
- Aaron Ceglar and John F. Roddick. Association mining. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 38(2):1–42, 2006. doi: 10.1145/1132956.1132958.
- Òscar Celma. *Music Recommendation and Discovery: The Long Tail, Long Fail, and Long Play in the Digital Music Space*. Springer-Verlag, 2010. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-13287-2.
- Geng Chen, Baitang Ning, and Tielu Shi. Single-cell RNA-seq technologies and related computational data analysis. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 10:317, 2019a. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2019.00317.
- Huidong Chen, Caleb Lareau, Tommaso Andreani, Michael E Vinyard, Sara P Garcia, Kendell Clement, Miguel A Andrade-Navarro, Jason D Buenrostro, and Luca Pinello. Assessment of computational methods for the analysis of single-cell ATAC-seq data. *Genome Biology*, 20(1):1–25, 2019b. doi: 10.1186/s13059-019-1854-5.
- Seung-Seok Choi, Sung-Hyuk Cha, and Charles C. Tappert. A survey of binary similarity and distance measures. *Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics*, 8(1):43–48, 2010.
- Taeryon Choi and R.V. Ramamoorthi. Remarks on consistency of posterior distributions. In *Pushing the Limits of Contemporary Statistics: Contributions in Honor of Jayanta*

- K. Ghosh, pages 170–186. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 2008. doi: 10.1214/074921708000000138.
- Ben Dai, Junhui Wang, Xiaotong Shen, and Annie Qu. Smooth neighborhood recommender systems. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20:589–612, 2019.
- Miheer Dewaskar, John Palowitch, Mark He, Michael I. Love, and Andrew Nobel. Finding stable groups of cross-correlated features in multi-view data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.05079*, 2020.
- Pedro Domingos and Michael Pazzani. On the optimality of the simple bayesian classifier under zero-one loss. *Machine Learning*, 29(2–3):103–130, 1997. doi: 10.1023/A:1007413511361.
- Brian S. Everitt, Sabine Landau, Morven Leese, and Daniel Stahl. *Cluster Analysis*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, 2011.
- George Forman. An extensive empirical study of feature selection metrics for text classification. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:1289–1305, 2003.
- Philippe Fournier-Viger, Chun-Wei Lin, Bay Vo, Tin Truong Chi, Ji Zhang, and Haoi Bac Le. A survey of itemset mining. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 7(4), 2017. doi: 10.1002/widm.1207.
- Bart Goethals. Survey on frequent pattern mining. Technical report, 2003. URL <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.147.2277>.
- Prem Gopalan, Francisco J.R. Ruiz, Rajesh Ranganath, and David M. Blei. Bayesian non-parametric poisson factorization for recommendation systems. In *AISTATS*, volume 33, pages 275–283. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2014.
- Prem Gopalan, Jake M. Hofman, and David M. Blei. Scalable recommendation with hierarchical poisson factorization. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, page 326–335. AUAI Press, 2015. ISBN: 9780996643108.
- Gérard Govaert and Mohamed Nadif. Block clustering with bernoulli mixture models: Comparison of different approaches. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 52(6): 3233–3245, 2008.
- Isabelle Guyon and André Elisseeff. An introduction to variable and feature selection. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:1157–1182, 2003.
- Jiawei Han, Hong Cheng, Dong Xin, and Xifeng Yan. Frequent pattern mining: Current status and future directions. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 15:55–86, 2007. doi: 10.1007/s10618-006-0059-1.

- Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome Friedman. *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer New York, 2nd edition, 2017.
- Changwei Hu, Piyush Rai, and Lawrence Carin. Zero-truncated poisson tensor factorization for massive binary tensors. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, UAI’15, pages 375–384. AUAI Press, 2015.
- Zhengyu Huang, Aimin Zhou, and Guixu Zhang. Non-negative matrix factorization: A short survey on methods and applications. In *International Symposium on Intelligence Computation and Applications*, ISICA 2012, pages 331–340. Springer, 2012. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-34289-9\_37.
- Paul Jaccard. Distribution de la flore alpine dans le bassin des dranses et dans quelques régions voisines. *Bulletin de la Societe Vaudoise des Sciences Naturelles*, 37(140):241–272, 1901. doi: 10.5169/seals-266440.
- Samina Khalid, Tehmina Khalil, and Shamila Nasreen. A survey of feature selection and feature extraction techniques in machine learning. In *2014 Science and Information Conference*, pages 372–378, 2014. doi: 10.1109/SAI.2014.6918213.
- Vladimir Yu Kiselev, Tallulah S Andrews, and Martin Hemberg. Challenges in unsupervised clustering of single-cell RNA-seq data. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 20(5):273–282, 2019. doi: 10.1038/s41576-018-0088-9.
- Hans-Peter Kriegel, Peer Kröger, and Arthur Zimek. Clustering high-dimensional data: A survey on subspace clustering, pattern-based clustering, and correlation clustering. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, 3(1), 2009. doi: 10.1145/1497577.1497578.
- Ravi Kumar, Rina Panigrahy, Ali Rahimi, and David Woodruff. Faster algorithms for binary matrix factorization. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97, pages 3551–3559. PMLR, 2019. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/kumar19a.html>.
- Daniel D. Lee and H. Sebastian Seung. Learning the parts of objects by non-negative matrix factorization. *Nature*, 401:788–791, 1999. doi: 10.1038/44565.
- Daniel D. Lee and H. Sebastian Seung. Algorithms for non-negative matrix factorization. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS’00, pages 535–541. MIT Press, 2000.
- Ruoxin Li and Gerald Quon. scBFA: modeling detection patterns to mitigate technical noise in large-scale single-cell genomics data. *Genome Biology*, 20(1):193, 2019. doi: 10.1186/s13059-019-1806-0.

- Tao Li. A general model for clustering binary data. In *KDD '05*, pages 188–197, New York, NY, USA, 2005. Association for Computing Machinery. doi: 10.1145/1081870.1081894.
- Tao Li. A unified view on clustering binary data. *Machine Learning*, 62(3):199–215, 2006. doi: 10.1007/s10994-005-5316-9.
- Guimei Liu, Haojun Zhang, and Limsoon Wong. Controlling false positives in association rule mining. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 5(2):145–156, 2011. doi: 10.14778/2078324.2078330.
- Jinze Liu, Susan Paulsen, Wei Wang, Andrew Nobel, and Jan Prins. Mining approximate frequent itemsets from noisy data. In *Proceedings of the Fifth IEEE International Conference on Data Mining, ICDM '05*, pages 721–724. IEEE Computer Society, 2005. doi: 10.1109/ICDM.2005.93.
- Haibing Lu, Xi Chen, Junmin Shi, Jaideep Vaidya, Vijayalakshmi Atluri, Yuan Hong, and Wei Huang. Algorithms and applications to weighted rank-one binary matrix factorization. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems*, 11(2), 2020. doi: 10.1145/3386599.
- Christopher Manning, Prabhakar Raghavan, and Hinrich Schütze. *An Introduction to Information Retrieval*. Cambridge University Press, 2008. doi: 10.1017/CB09780511809071.
- Sandy Moens, Emin Aksehirli, and Bart Goethals. Frequent itemset mining for big data. In *2013 IEEE International Conference on Big Data*, pages 111–118, 2013. doi: 10.1109/BigData.2013.6691742.
- Stefan Naulaerts, Pieter Meysman, Wout Bittremieux, et al. A primer to frequent itemset mining for bioinformatics. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 16(2):216–231, 2015. doi: 10.1093/bib/bbt074.
- Deanna Needell, Rayan Saab, and Tina Woolf. Simple classification using binary data. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19:2487–2516, 2018.
- Roger B. Nelsen. *An Introduction to Copulas*. Springer-Verlag, 2nd edition, 2010. doi: 10.1007/0-387-28678-0.
- David Robinson. *gutenbergr: Download and Process Public Domain Works from Project Gutenberg*, 2019. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gutenbergr>. R package version 0.1.5.
- Mehreen Saeed, Kashif Javed, and Haroon Atique Babri. Machine learning using bernoulli mixture models: Clustering, rule extraction and dimensionality reduction. *Neurocomputing*, 119:366–374, 2013.

- Gerard Salton and Michael McGill. *Introduction to Modern Information Retrieval*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1986. ISBN: 978-0-07-054484-0.
- Andrey A. Shabalin, Victor J. Weigman, Charles M. Perou, and Andrew B. Nobel. Finding large average submatrices in high dimensional data. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 3(3):985–1012, 2009. doi: 10.2307/30242874.
- David Slepian. The one-sided barrier problem for gaussian noise. *Bell Labs Technical Journal*, 41(2):463–501, 1962. doi: 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1962.tb02419.x.
- Mark Steyvers and Tom Griffiths. Probabilistic topic models. *Handbook of Latent Semantic Analysis*, 427(7):424–440, 2007.
- Xing Sun and Andrew Nobel. Significance and recovery of block structures in binary matrices with noise. In Gábor Lugosi and Hans Ulrich Simon, editors, *Learning Theory. COLT 2006.*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 4005, pages 109–122. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006. doi: 10.1007/11776420\_11.
- Yang Tang, Ryan P. Browne, and Paul D. McNicholas. Model based clustering of high-dimensional binary data. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 87:84–101, 2015.
- Nikolaj Tatti, Fabian Moerchen, and Toon Calders. Finding robust itemsets under sub-sampling. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems*, 39(3), 2014. doi: 10.1145/2656261.
- Dustin Tran, David Blei, and Edo M. Airolidi. Copula variational inference. In C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28, pages 3564–3572. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2015/file/e4dd5528f7596dcdf871aa55cfccc53c-Paper.pdf>.
- John W Tukey. *Exploratory Data Analysis*. Pearson, 1977.
- Martin J. Wainwright and Michael I. Jordan. Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 1(1–2):1–305, 2008. doi: 10.1561/22000000001.
- Yu-Xiong Wang and Yu-Jin Zhang. Nonnegative matrix factorization: A comprehensive review. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 25(6):1336–1353, 2013. doi: 10.1109/TKDE.2012.51.
- James D. Wilson, Simi Wang, Peter J. Mucha, Shankar Bhamidi, and Andrew B. Nobel. A testing based extraction algorithm for identifying significant communities in networks. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 8(3):1853–1891, 2014.



- Michio Yamamoto and Kenichi Hayashi. Clustering of multivariate binary data with dimension reduction via L1-regularized likelihood maximization. *Pattern Recognition*, 48(12):3959–3968, 2015.
- Feng Yan, David R Powell, David J Curtis, and Nicholas C Wong. From reads to insight: a hitchhiker’s guide to ATAC-seq data analysis. *Genome Biology*, 21(1):22, 2020. doi: 10.1186/s13059-020-1929-3.
- Cheng Yang, Usama Fayyad, and Paul S. Bradley. Efficient discovery of error-tolerant frequent itemsets in high dimensions. In *Proceedings of the Seventh ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD ’01, pages 194–203. Association for Computing Machinery, 2001. doi: 10.1145/502512.502539.
- Mao Ye, Peng Zhang, and Lizhen Nie. Clustering sparse binary data with hierarchical bayesian bernoulli mixture model. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 123:32–49, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.csda.2018.01.020.
- Mohammed J. Zaki. Scalable algorithms for association mining. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 12(3):372–390, 2000. doi: 10.1109/69.846291.
- Kai Zhang. BET on independence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114(528):1620–1637, 2019. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2018.1537921.
- Zhongyuan Zhang, Tao Li, Chris Ding, and Xiangsun Zhang. Binary matrix factorization with applications. In *Proceedings of the 2007 Seventh IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, ICDM ’07, pages 391–400. IEEE Computer Society, 2007. doi: 10.1109/ICDM.2007.99.

## A Supporting Theory

### A.1 Properties of the Threshold Model

An important feature of the threshold model of Definition 2.1 is that it imposes no structure on the latent vector  $\mathbf{V}$  beyond the assumption that its joint distribution function  $F$  is continuous. While we wish to assess latent association among the components of  $\mathbf{X}$  arising from dependence in  $\mathbf{V}$ , the latent associations do not determine  $F$ , and we do not seek to estimate  $F$  nor the marginal distribution functions  $F_1, \dots, F_d$ . Indeed, if  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is defined by  $\gamma(v_1, \dots, v_d) := (\gamma_1(v_1), \dots, \gamma_d(v_d))^T$  where each function  $\gamma_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous and strictly increasing, then the threshold model generated by  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{V})$  is the same as the model generated by  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \gamma(\mathbf{V}))$ .

The threshold model is also invariant to more general, multivariate monotone transformations. This can be described by viewing the threshold model in terms of copulas instead of quantiles. Continuity of the joint distribution function  $F$  of  $\mathbf{V}$  ensures that of the marginal distribution functions  $F_1, \dots, F_d$ . Thus,  $F_1(V_1), \dots, F_d(V_d)$  are (potentially dependent)  $\text{Unif}(0, 1)$  random variables. The joint distribution function

$$C(u_1, \dots, u_d) := \mathbb{P}(F_1(V_1) \leq u_1, \dots, F_d(V_d) \leq u_d)$$

is the copula for the joint distribution function  $F$  with marginals  $F_1, \dots, F_d$  [Nelsen, 2010, Chapter 2]. If  $\mathbf{V}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$  has a continuous distribution function  $\tilde{F}$  and marginals  $\tilde{F}_1, \dots, \tilde{F}_d$  with the same copula  $C$ , then the threshold model generated by  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{V})$  is the same as that generated by  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{V}')$ . The converse, however, is not the case: it can be shown that under the threshold model two random vectors  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{V}'$  having different copulas can yield identical (in distribution) binary random vectors. As a result, different copulas for  $\mathbf{V}$  can lead to identical latent associations.

We will now show how Example 2.3 in Section 2.2 is not exceptional. In Zhang [2019] truncated binary expansions are used for a nonparametric test of independence. Our threshold model conditioned on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  can be considered a binary expansion truncated at the first resolution. A simple, but important, point used in Zhang [2019] is that uncorrelated binary variables implies independent binary variables. Note that under the threshold model the Law of Total Covariance implies that

$$\text{Cov}(X_i, X_k) = \mathbb{E}(\text{Cov}[X_i, X_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}]) + \text{Cov}(\theta_i, \theta_k). \quad (11)$$

We are not interested in dependence between  $X_i$  and  $X_k$  arising from the dependence of their respective thresholds, i.e., the  $\text{Cov}(\theta_i, \theta_k)$  term in Equation (11). A measure of intrinsic association between features  $i$  and  $k$  is captured by  $\text{Cov}(V_i, V_k)$  under the threshold model. The LAMB method detects dependence between the features of the latent vector  $\mathbf{V}$  from observation of  $\mathbf{X}$  by using latent association. That is to say, by using latent association we are effectively avoiding estimating the joint distribution  $F$  of  $\mathbf{V}$  while still testing for dependence between features in  $\mathbf{V}$ .

## A.2 Properties of Latent Association

Latent association shares some of the basic properties of standard correlation. For example,  $|\psi(i, k)| \leq 1$  (see Lemma B.1) and  $\psi(i, k) \neq 0$  implies dependence between  $V_i$  and  $V_k$ . Although the latent association of two features in  $\mathbf{X}$  is not necessarily equal to the correlation of the same two features in the continuous vector  $\mathbf{V}$ , there is a monotonic relationship when  $\mathbf{V}$  is multivariate normal.

**Proposition A.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{V} \leq \mathbf{F}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$  as in Definition 2.1, where  $\mathbf{V} \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$  such that  $\Sigma_{ii} = 1$  for each  $i \in [d]$ . Then  $\psi(i, k)$  is a monotone nondecreasing function of  $\rho(V_i, V_k) = \Sigma_{ik}$ .*

*Remark.* We note that the LAMB method does not rely on normality assumptions for  $\mathbf{V}$ . However, the above proposition states that whenever  $\mathbf{V}$  has a multivariate normal distribution, latent association is guaranteed to be a monotone nondecreasing function of the correlation between components of  $\mathbf{V}$ . Note that this matches intuition for the generative model: if the correlation between  $V_i$  and  $V_k$  is increasing, then the latent association  $\psi(i, k)$  is monotonically nondecreasing.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality assume  $d = 2$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  be a random threshold as in Definition 2.1. Let  $\mathbf{V} := (V_1, V_2)^T$  and  $\mathbf{W} := (W_1, W_2)^T$  be bivariate normal random vectors such that  $\mathbb{E}(V_i) = \mathbb{E}(W_i) = 0$  and  $\text{Var}(V_i) = \text{Var}(W_i) = 1$ , for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Further assume that  $r_1 := \rho(V_1, V_2) \in [-1, 1]$  and  $r_2 := \rho(W_1, W_2) \in [-1, 1]$  such that  $r_2 > r_1$ . Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}(V_1 V_2) = \text{Cov}(V_1, V_2) = r_1 < r_2 = \text{Cov}(W_1, W_2) = \mathbb{E}(W_1 W_2).$$

By Slepian's Lemma [Slepian, 1962], for any  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(V_1 \leq a, V_2 \leq b) \leq \mathbb{P}(W_1 \leq a, W_2 \leq b). \quad (12)$$

Define  $X_i := \mathbb{I}(V_i \leq \Phi^{-1}(\theta_i))$  and  $\tilde{X}_i := \mathbb{I}(W_i \leq \Phi^{-1}(\theta_i))$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Denote by  $\psi(r_1) := \psi_{\mathbf{X}}(1, 2)$  and  $\psi(r_2) := \psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(1, 2)$  the latent associations of the threshold models for  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ , respectively. Recall that we assume  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \perp \mathbf{V}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \perp \mathbf{W}$ . Fix arbitrary  $t_1, t_2 \in (0, 1)$ . Denote  $a := \Phi^{-1}(t_1)$  and  $b := \Phi^{-1}(t_2)$ . Then note that, by inequality (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(V_1 \leq a) \mathbb{I}(V_2 \leq b)] &= \mathbb{P}(V_1 \leq a, V_2 \leq b) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(W_1 \leq a, W_2 \leq b) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(W_1 \leq a) \mathbb{I}(W_2 \leq b)]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by independence and the above inequality pointwise, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}|\boldsymbol{\theta}}[\tilde{X}_1 \tilde{X}_2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\theta}}[X_1 X_2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}] \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{\geq} 0.$$

Hence, by the linearity of  $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ ,

$$\psi(r_2) - \psi(r_1) \geq 0.$$

In particular, the latent association  $\psi(1, 2)$  is a monotonically nondecreasing function of  $r := \rho(V_1, V_2)$  on  $[-1, 1]$ .  $\square$

*Remark.* A more general form of monotonicity than that of Proposition A.1 can be shown through copulas. This type of monotonicity is present in nonparametric association statistics such as Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho [Nelsen, 2010, Chapter 5].

**Definition A.2** (Concordance Ordering). If  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are both 2-dimensional copulas, then we define the *concordance ordering of copulas* to be  $C_1 \prec C_2$  if and only if  $C_1(a, b) \leq C_2(a, b)$  for all  $a, b \in [0, 1]$ .

**Proposition A.3.** If  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are two copulas for the threshold model such that  $C_1 \prec C_2$  (concordance ordering), then  $\psi_1(i, k) \leq \psi_2(i, k)$  for arbitrary  $i, k \in [d]$  where  $\psi_j$  is the latent association under copula  $C_j$  for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality consider the case  $d = 2$ . Recall from Appendix A.1 that the copula  $C$  of  $\mathbf{V}$  is uniquely determined by the continuous joint distribution function  $F$ :

$$C(u_1, u_2) := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{V}}(F_1(V_1) \leq u_1, F_2(V_2) \leq u_2).$$

Suppose that  $\mathbf{V}$  has copula  $C_1$  and  $\mathbf{W}$  has copula  $C_2$  such that  $C_1 \prec C_2$  and the marginal distributions  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are the same for  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{W}$ . In particular, the only difference between the distributions of  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{W}$  is that, for all  $a, b \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{V}}(F_1(V_1) \leq a, F_2(V_2) \leq b) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C_1(a, b) \leq C_2(a, b) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}}(F_1(W_1) \leq a, F_2(W_2) \leq b).$$

Since we assume that  $\mathbf{V} \perp \boldsymbol{\theta}$  and  $\mathbf{W} \perp \boldsymbol{\theta}$ , the above inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{V}}(F_1(V_1) \leq \theta_1, F_2(V_2) \leq \theta_2 \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}}(F_1(W_1) \leq \theta_1, F_2(W_2) \leq \theta_2 \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

From here the proof proceeds just as in the proof of Proposition A.1, i.e., we have

$$\psi_1(1, 2) \leq \psi_2(1, 2)$$

where  $\psi_1$  is the latent association under the threshold model for  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{V})$  and  $\psi_2$  is the latent association under the threshold model for  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{W})$ .  $\square$

### A.3 Random Thresholds are Identifiable

**Proposition A.4.** Setting  $\alpha_1 := 1$  makes the model for  $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = [\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\cdot 1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\cdot n}]$  identifiable. In particular,  $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\tau}^0) \equiv (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^0)$  if and only if  $\boldsymbol{\Theta}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\tau}^0) \equiv \boldsymbol{\Theta}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^0)$ .

*Proof.* This follows from carefully using that  $\exp(x)$  is an injective function.  $\square$

## B Central Limit Theorem for Latent Association

As discussed in Section 3.2, the set update step in the LAMB method's search procedure relies on approximate p-values for estimates of the latent association. The approximate p-values are derived from a central limit theorem that we now present in full detail.

In what follows, let the  $d$ -dimensional random vectors  $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , and  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{V} \leq \mathbf{F}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$  be as in threshold model of Definition 2.1. Recall that  $X_i | \boldsymbol{\theta} \sim \text{Bern}(\theta_i)$ . For each  $i \in [d]$ , let

$$U_i := \frac{X_i - \theta_i}{\sqrt{\theta_i(1 - \theta_i)}} \quad (13)$$

be the conditionally standardized  $X_i$ . For any subset  $A \subset [d]$ , denote the average of  $U_i$  over the features  $i \in A$  by

$$U_A := \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{i \in A} U_i, \quad (14)$$

and define

$$\Psi(A) := \frac{1}{|A|^2} \sum_{i, k \in A} \psi(i, k). \quad (15)$$

The next two lemmas establish some basic properties of the quantities defined above in relation to latent association (see Equations (3) and (5)).

**Lemma B.1.** *For each  $i, k \in [d]$  and  $A \subseteq [d]$ :*

1.  $\mathbb{E}(U_i) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}(U_i^2) = 1$ ;
2.  $\psi(i, k) = \mathbb{E}(U_i U_k)$ ,  $|\psi(i, k)| \leq 1$ , and  $|\Psi(A)| \leq 1$ ;
3.  $\mathbb{E}(U_i U_A) = \psi(i, A)$  and  $\mathbb{E}(U_A^2) = \Psi(A)$ ;
4. If  $V_i$  is independent of  $\{V_k : k \in A\}$ , then  $\mathbb{E}(U_i U_A) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}(U_i^2 U_A^2) = \Psi(A)$ .

*Proof.* Fix arbitrary  $i, k \in [d]$  and  $A \subset [d]$ . The definition of  $U_i$  in (13) ensures that both  $\mathbb{E}(U_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}(U_i^2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1$  almost surely. It is clear from the definitions that  $\psi(i, k) = \mathbb{E}(U_i U_k)$ . Consequently, the bound  $|\psi(i, k)| \leq 1$  follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Note that the bound  $|\Psi(A)| \leq 1$  trivially follows by the definition of  $\Psi(A)$  and the triangle inequality. By the linearity of expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(U_i U_A) &= \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} \mathbb{E}(U_i U_k) = \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} \psi(i, k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi(i, A) \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbb{E}(U_A^2) &= \frac{1}{|A|^2} \sum_{k, l \in A} \mathbb{E}(U_k U_l) = \frac{1}{|A|^2} \sum_{k, l \in A} \psi(k, l) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Psi(A). \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that  $V_i$  is independent of  $\{V_k : k \in A\}$ . Then  $U_i$  is conditionally independent of  $U_A$  given  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , since  $\mathbf{V} \perp \boldsymbol{\theta}$ . Therefore, since  $\mathbb{E}(U_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$  almost surely,

$$\mathbb{E}(U_i U_A) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[U_i U_A | \boldsymbol{\theta}]) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[U_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}] \mathbb{E}[U_A | \boldsymbol{\theta}]) = 0.$$

Similarly,  $\mathbb{E}(U_i^2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1$  almost surely and so

$$\mathbb{E}(U_i^2 U_A^2) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[U_i^2 U_A^2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}]) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[U_i^2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}] \mathbb{E}[U_A^2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}]) = \mathbb{E}(U_A^2) = \Psi(A).$$

□

**Lemma B.2.** *For each  $i \in [d]$  and any  $A \subset [d]$ :*

$$1. \mathbb{E}(U_i^4) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\theta_i(1-\theta_i)}\right) \text{ and } \mathbb{E}(U_A^4) \leq \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\theta_k(1-\theta_k)}\right).$$

2. *If  $V_i$  is independent of  $\{V_k : k \in A\}$ , then*

$$\mathbb{E}(U_i^4 U_A^4) \leq \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\theta_i(1-\theta_i)\theta_k(1-\theta_k)}\right).$$

*Proof.* Fix arbitrary  $i \in [d]$  and  $A \subset [d]$ . Note that, because  $X_i$  is  $\{0,1\}$ -valued, we can express

$$U_i^4 = X_i \left( \frac{1-\theta_i}{\sqrt{\theta_i(1-\theta_i)}} \right)^4 + (1-X_i) \left( \frac{-\theta_i}{\sqrt{\theta_i(1-\theta_i)}} \right)^4.$$

Using  $\mathbb{E}(X_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \theta_i$  almost surely, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(U_i^4 | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{(1-\theta_i)^2}{\theta_i} + \frac{\theta_i^2}{(1-\theta_i)} \leq \frac{1}{\theta_i} + \frac{1}{(1-\theta_i)} = \frac{1}{\theta_i(1-\theta_i)},$$

because  $\theta_i$  is  $(0,1)$ -valued. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}(U_i^4) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\theta_i(1-\theta_i)}\right).$$

Moreover, it follows from Jensen's inequality that pointwise we have

$$U_A^4 = \left( \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} U_k \right)^4 \leq \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} U_k^4,$$

and so by the above work we have that

$$\mathbb{E}(U_A^4 | \boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} \frac{1}{\theta_k(1-\theta_k)}.$$

Hence, by the monotonicity of expectation,

$$\mathbb{E}(U_A^4) \leq \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_k(1 - \theta_k)} \right).$$

Now suppose that  $V_i$  is independent of  $\{V_k : k \in A\}$ . Then  $U_i$  is conditionally independent of  $U_A$  given  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , since  $\mathbf{V} \perp \boldsymbol{\theta}$ . So conditioning on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(U_i^4 U_k^4) &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[U_i^4 U_k^4 | \boldsymbol{\theta}]) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[U_i^4 | \boldsymbol{\theta}] \mathbb{E}[U_k^4 | \boldsymbol{\theta}]) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_i(1 - \theta_i)\theta_k(1 - \theta_k)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for each  $k \in A$ . Finally, by the pointwise Jensen inequality above, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(U_i^4 U_A^4) \leq \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} \mathbb{E}(U_i^4 U_k^4) \leq \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_i(1 - \theta_i)\theta_k(1 - \theta_k)} \right).$$

□

With Lemmas B.1 and B.2, we can now establish a triangular array central limit theorem for latent association. First we must set up the asymptotic setting for the threshold model of Definition 2.1. For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

- (i)  $d_n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,
- (ii)  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$  be an iid sample of  $\mathbb{R}^{d_n}$ -valued random vectors with distribution  $\mu_n$  and continuous joint distribution function  $F_n$ ,
- (iii)  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n$  be an iid sample of  $(0, 1)^{d_n}$ -valued random vectors with distribution  $\nu_n$ ,
- (iv) and  $\mathbf{V}_j$  be independent of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j$  for each  $j \in [n]$ .

Note that the distributions  $\mu_n$  and  $\nu_n$  as well as the dimension  $d_n$  may depend on  $n$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $j \in [n]$ , let  $\mathbf{X}_{\cdot j} = \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{V}_j \leq \mathbf{F}_n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\cdot j})]$  as in the shorthand for the threshold model of Definition 2.1, with  $\mathbf{X}_{\cdot j} = (X_{1j}, \dots, X_{d_n j})^T$ .

For now fix arbitrary  $i, k \in [d]$  and  $A \subset [d]$ . The sample latent association  $\hat{\psi}_n(i, k)$  between features  $i$  and  $k$  is defined to be

$$\hat{\psi}_n(i, k) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n U_{ij} U_{kj}, \quad \text{where} \quad U_{ij} := \frac{X_{ij} - \theta_{ij}}{\sqrt{\theta_{ij}(1 - \theta_{ij})}}.$$

Let  $U_{Aj}$  be defined as in (14) for each  $j \in [n]$ . Then a natural estimate of  $\psi(i, A) = \mathbb{E}(U_i U_A)$  (see Lemma B.1) is the sample average

$$\hat{\psi}_n(i, A) := \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} \hat{\psi}_n(i, k) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} U_{ij} U_{Aj}. \quad (16)$$

In particular, it follows from Lemma B.1 that  $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\psi}_n(i, A)) = \psi(i, A)$ .

Now suppose that  $V_i$  is independent of  $\{V_k : k \in A\}$ . Then, by Lemma B.1,

$$\text{Var}(\sqrt{n}\widehat{\psi}_n(i, A)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} \text{Var}(U_{ij} U_{Aj}) = \mathbb{E}(U_{i1}^2 U_{A1}^2) = \Psi(A).$$

Hence,

$$\widehat{\sigma}_n^2(i, A) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} U_{Aj}^2 \quad (17)$$

is an unbiased estimator of the variance of  $\sqrt{n}\widehat{\psi}_n(i, A)$ . We note that another unbiased estimator of the variance of  $\sqrt{n}\widehat{\psi}_n(i, A)$  is

$$\widehat{s}_n^2(i, A) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} U_{ij}^2 U_{Aj}^2.$$

Both  $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2(i, A)$  and  $\widehat{s}_n^2(i, A)$  converge in probability to  $\Psi(A)$ , under the same assumptions used below in Lemma B.5. However,  $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2(i, A)$  is more efficient computationally<sup>31</sup> than  $\widehat{s}_n^2(i, A)$ , so it is the estimator used in the LAMB method when calculating approximate p-values.

We are now ready to formally state the central limit theorem for latent association. This establishes the approximate p-values used in the LAMB method's iterative testing based search procedure, as described in Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

**Theorem B.3. (CLT for Latent Association)** *Fix a feature index  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $A_n \subset [d_n] \setminus \{i\}$  be a set of index features, let  $\widehat{\psi}_n(i, A_n)$  be the sample latent association of  $i$  and  $A_n$  under the threshold model for  $(\nu_n, \mu_n)$  (expressed as  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{V})$  in Section 2), and let  $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2(i, A_n)$  be defined as in (17). Assume:*

1. *For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $V_i$  is independent of  $\{V_k : k \in A_n\}$  under  $\mu_n$ ;*

2.  $\frac{1}{\Psi(A_n)^2 |A_n|} \sum_{k \in A_n} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{i1}(1-\theta_{i1})\theta_{k1}(1-\theta_{k1})} \right) = o(n)$ .

Then,

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}\widehat{\psi}_n(i, A_n)}{\widehat{\sigma}_n(i, A_n)} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (18)$$

*Proof.* The proof follows from Slutsky's lemma with Lemmas B.4 and B.5.  $\square$

<sup>31</sup>This is because  $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2(i, A)$  can be calculated and stored outside of the search procedure. The key difference is the lack of dependence on  $i$  in the statistic  $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2(i, A)$ , which makes calculations more efficient as the set  $A$  is updated during the search procedure (see Section 3.3).



**Lemma B.4.** *Under the notation and assumptions of Theorem B.3,*

$$\frac{\sqrt{n} \hat{\psi}_n(i, A_n)}{\sqrt{\Psi(A_n)}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (19)$$

*Proof.* Note that, under the assumptions on  $V_i$  and  $\{V_k : k \in A_n\}$ ,  $\hat{\psi}_n(i, A_n)$  is the average of independent random variables with mean zero (see Lemma B.1). It suffices to verify the Lindeberg condition for the Lindeberg Central Limit Theorem. The Lindeberg condition requires that, for all  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{U_{ij}^2 U_{A_n j}^2}{\Psi(A_n)} \mathbb{I} \left[ |U_{ij} U_{A_n j}| > \epsilon \sqrt{n \Psi(A_n)} \right] \right) = 0.$$

After applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}(U_{i1}^4 U_{A_n 1}^4)}{\Psi(A_n)^2} \mathbb{P} \left( |U_{i1} U_{A_n 1}| > \epsilon \sqrt{n \Psi(A_n)} \right) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \epsilon > 0. \quad (20)$$

By Markov's inequality and Lemma B.1, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left( |U_{i1} U_{A_n 1}| > \epsilon \sqrt{n \Psi(A_n)} \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(U_{i1}^2 U_{A_n 1}^2)}{n \epsilon^2 \Psi(A_n)} = \frac{\Psi(A_n)}{n \epsilon^2 \Psi(A_n)} = \frac{1}{n \epsilon^2}. \quad (21)$$

Lemma B.2, Inequality (21), and the second assumption of Theorem B.3 ensure that Equation (20) holds, and therefore the Lindeberg condition holds.  $\square$

**Lemma B.5.** *Under the notation and assumptions of Theorem B.3,*

$$\left| \frac{\hat{\sigma}_n^2(i, A_n)}{\Psi(A_n)} - 1 \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (22)$$

*Remark.* A similar result holds for the estimator  $\hat{s}_n^2(i, A_n)$ .

*Proof.* To reduce notation, let us denote  $\hat{\sigma}_n^2 := \hat{\sigma}_n^2(i, A_n)$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\sigma}_n^2) = \mathbb{E}(U_{A_n 1}^2) = \Psi(A_n)$  by Lemma B.1. So (22) is equivalent to

$$\left| \frac{\hat{\sigma}_n^2 - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\sigma}_n^2)}{\Psi(A_n)} \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

By Chebyshev's inequality, it suffices to show that  $\frac{\text{Var}(\hat{\sigma}_n^2)}{\Psi(A_n)^2} = o(1)$ . Using independence and Lemmas B.1 and B.2, it is clear that

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\sigma}_n^2) = \frac{1}{n} \text{Var}(U_{A_n 1}^2) \leq \frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{1}{|A_n|} \sum_{k \in A_n} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{k1}(1 - \theta_{k1})} \right) - \Psi(A_n)^2 \right).$$

Therefore, it is enough to show that

$$\frac{1}{|A_n| \Psi(A_n)^2} \sum_{k \in A_n} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{k1}(1 - \theta_{k1})} \right) = o(n),$$

which follows from the second assumption of Theorem B.3 combined with the monotonicity of expectation.  $\square$

Finally, note that the sample quantities  $\widehat{\psi}_n(i, k)$  and  $\widehat{\psi}_n(i, A)$  are not guaranteed to fall between -1 and 1. Under mild conditions, however, their values will converge to the interval  $[-1, 1]$  as  $n$  tends to infinity.

**Proposition B.6.** *If  $\max_{i \in [d_n]} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{i1}(1 - \theta_{i1})} \right) = o(n)$  then, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,*

$$\max_{i \in [d_n]} \max_{A \subset [d_n]} \mathbb{P} \left( |\widehat{\psi}_n(i, A)| > 1 + \epsilon \right) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof.* Fix arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $i \in [d_n]$ , and  $A \subset [d_n]$ . Since  $\mathbb{E} \left( \widehat{\psi}_n(i, A) \right) = \psi(i, A)$  and  $|\psi(i, A)| \leq 1$ , a routine argument implies that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( |\widehat{\psi}_n(i, A)| > 1 + \epsilon \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \widehat{\psi}_n(i, A) - \mathbb{E} \left( \widehat{\psi}_n(i, A) \right) \right| > \epsilon \right).$$

By Chebyshev's inequality, it suffices to show that  $\text{Var}(\widehat{\psi}_n(i, A)) = o(1)$ . By Jensen's inequality,  $U_{A1}^2 \leq \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} U_{k1}^2$  pointwise, and it follows that

$$\text{Var}(\widehat{\psi}_n(i, A)) = \frac{1}{n} \text{Var}(U_{i1} U_{A1}) \leq \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}(U_{i1}^2 U_{A1}^2) \leq \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{k \in A} \frac{\mathbb{E}(U_{i1}^2 U_{k1}^2)}{n}.$$

Hence, it is enough to show that  $\max_{i, k \in [d_n]} \mathbb{E}(U_{i1}^2 U_{k1}^2) = o(n)$ . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma B.2,

$$\mathbb{E}(U_{i1}^2 U_{k1}^2) \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(U_{i1}^4) \mathbb{E}(U_{k1}^4)} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{i1}(1 - \theta_{i1})} \right) \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{k1}(1 - \theta_{k1})} \right)}.$$

The condition  $\max_{i \in [d_n]} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{i1}(1 - \theta_{i1})} \right) = o(n)$  completes the proof.  $\square$

## C Theory for Estimating the Random Thresholds

The hypothesis testing approach outlined in Section 3.2 and Appendix B requires that the random thresholds  $\Theta = [\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n]$  be known alongside the observed  $\mathbb{X} = [X_{ij}] \in \{0, 1\}^{d \times n}$ . In the threshold model of Definition 2.1, however,  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$  are latent vectors. In this appendix we derive consistent estimators of  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$  from the data matrix  $\mathbb{X}$ . This implies that the inference problem outlined in Section 3.4 is well-posed, and so the approximate solution of the corresponding optimization procedure is meaningful. As discussed throughout Section 3, we plug in the estimates  $\hat{\theta}_1, \dots, \hat{\theta}_n$  directly into the sample latent association defined in Equation (6). The successful results obtained from applying the LAMB method to both the artificial and real datasets discussed in this paper, as well as the asymptotic consistency of  $\hat{\theta}_1, \dots, \hat{\theta}_n$  discussed below, suggests that this is a reasonable procedure.

Recall that, under the truncated Poisson factorization model (TPFM) for the random threshold,  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$  depend on a random sample  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$  with density  $\pi$  and deterministic parameters  $1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d$  (see Equation 1 in Definition 2.1 and Proposition A.4).<sup>32</sup> Therefore, the number of quantities to estimate is reduced from  $d \cdot n$  realized values of  $\{\theta_{ij}\}$  to  $d + n - 1$  parameters  $(1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d, \tau_1^0, \dots, \tau_n^0)$ , where  $\tau_j^0$  is a realized value of  $\tau_j \sim \pi$  for  $j \in [n]$ . Reducing the effective dimension of  $\Theta$  from  $d \cdot n$  to  $d + n - 1$  allows us to efficiently estimate  $\Theta$  from  $\mathbb{X} \in \{0, 1\}^{d \times n}$  under mild conditions.

### C.1 Asymptotic Consistency

Throughout this appendix we consider the asymptotic setting as in Appendix B for the threshold model of Definition 2.1 and Equation (1), i.e.,  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \nu_n$ . Denote by  $\pi$  the density of  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$  inherited from the distribution  $\nu_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . First, we consider the consistency in estimating the expected value. Note that, for each  $j \in [n]$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{ij}) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[X_{ij} | \theta_{\cdot j}]) = \mathbb{E}(\theta_{ij}) = \mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1}).$$

Therefore, unconditionally for each  $i \in [d_n]$ ,  $X_{i1}, \dots, X_{in} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Bern}(\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1}))$ , and a natural estimate of  $\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})$  is  $\bar{X}_i := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n X_{ij}$ . We now present the following proposition on the consistency of  $\bar{X}_i$  when the expected values  $\{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})\}_{i \in [d_n]}$  are not too small.

**Proposition C.1.** *Suppose we have the following condition on  $\{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})\}_{i \in [d_n]}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{i \in [d_n]} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})} = 0.$$

*Then we have the following convergence:*

$$\max_{i \in [d_n]} \left| \frac{\bar{X}_i}{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})} - 1 \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

---

<sup>32</sup>The TPFM resembles a stochastic “rank-one approximation” of  $\Theta$ .

*Remark.* The condition in Proposition C.1 trivially holds when  $\{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})\}_{i \in [d_n]}$  is uniformly bounded from below.

*Proof.* Fix arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}(X_{ij}^2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\cdot j}) = \theta_{ij}$ , and so, unconditionally,  $\mathbb{E}(X_{ij}^2) = \mathbb{E}(\theta_{ij})$  for each  $j \in [n]$ . Then, by Chebyshev's inequality and the condition on  $\{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})\}_{i \in [d_n]}$ , we have

$$\max_{i \in [d_n]} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \frac{\bar{X}_i}{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})} - 1 \right| \geq \epsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{n \epsilon^2} \max_{i \in [d_n]} \left[ \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})} - 1 \right] = o(1).$$

□

Suppose that the condition on  $\{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})\}_{i \in [d_n]}$  in Proposition C.1 is satisfied. An immediate consequence of Proposition C.1 is the estimation of  $\alpha_i$  for  $i \in [d_n]$ . From Equation (1) we see that

$$\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1}) = h(\alpha_i) := \int_{\mathcal{T}} (1 - e^{-t\alpha_i}) \pi(t) dt,$$

where  $\mathcal{T} \subset (0, \infty)$  is the support corresponding to the density  $\pi$ . If the density  $\pi$  leads to a function  $h$  that is invertible and  $\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1}) \in C_{h^{-1}} := \{x : h^{-1} \text{ is continuous at } x\}$ , then the Continuous Mapping Theorem implies that  $h^{-1}(\bar{X}_i)$  is consistent for  $\alpha_i$ .

To completely estimate  $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = [\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\cdot 1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\cdot n}]$  we must also estimate the realized values of the random variables  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \pi$ , which we denote by  $\tau_1^0, \dots, \tau_n^0$ . Consider the posterior density of  $\tau \sim \pi$  given  $\mathbf{X}_{\cdot j}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_n := (\alpha_1^n, \dots, \alpha_{d_n}^n)^T$ , which we denote by  $\pi(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_{\cdot j}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_n)$ . A natural estimator for  $\tau_j^0$  is the posterior mean

$$\mathbb{E}(\tau_j | \mathbf{X}_{\cdot j}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_n) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} t \pi(t | \mathbf{X}_{\cdot j}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_n) dt. \quad (23)$$

The following result guarantees consistency of the posterior mean. We appeal directly to Theorem 4.1 of Choi and Ramamoorthi [2008], which requires the following condition on the prior  $\pi$  for  $\tau$ .

**Condition C.2.** For all  $\delta > 0$  there exist sets  $\{S_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that the diameter of each set is less than  $\delta$ ,  $\cup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} S_k = \mathcal{T} \subseteq (0, \infty)$ , and  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_{\pi}(S_k)} < \infty$ .

*Remark.* In essence, Condition C.2 is a concentration condition, guaranteeing that the measure  $\mathbb{P}_{\pi}$  is not too spread out over the support  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\tau$ .

**Theorem C.3. (Choi and Ramamoorthi [2008])** Suppose that Condition C.2 holds and that  $\pi(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_{\cdot j}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_n)$  is bounded. Then, for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( |\mathbb{E}[\tau_j | \mathbf{X}_{\cdot j}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_n] - \tau_j^0| \geq \epsilon \right) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

In practice  $\alpha_n$  is not known, so we instead estimate  $\tau_j^0$  by plugging in consistent estimates  $(\hat{\alpha}_1^n, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{d_n}^n)$ , i.e.,

$$\hat{\tau}_j^n := \mathbb{E}[\tau_j \mid \mathbf{X}_{\cdot j}, \hat{\alpha}_n] = \int_{\mathcal{T}} t \pi(t \mid \mathbf{X}_{\cdot j}, \hat{\alpha}_n) dt. \quad (24)$$

Then, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $j \in [n]$ , and  $i \in [d_n]$ ,  $\theta_{ij}$  is estimated by  $\hat{\theta}_{ij}(n) := 1 - \exp(-\hat{\alpha}_i^n \hat{\tau}_j^n)$ .

The following proposition provides a general family of models which satisfy the conditions in Theorem B.3 and Proposition C.1.

**Proposition C.4.** *Consider the prior distribution  $\text{Gamma}(\zeta, \beta)$  for  $\tau$ , with density*

$$\pi(t) := \frac{\beta^\zeta}{\Gamma(\zeta)} t^{\zeta-1} e^{-\beta t}.$$

*As in Theorem B.3, fix  $i \in [d_n]$  and for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $A_n \subset [d_n] \setminus \{i\}$  be an index set with cardinality  $m_n := |A_n|$ . Assume the following:*

1.  $\min_{i \in [d_n]} n \alpha_i \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .
2.  $\max_{i \in [d_n]} \alpha_i \leq M \in (0, \infty)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .
3. *If we denote  $c_n := \min_{i \in [d_n]} \alpha_i$  and  $\rho_n := \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma(A_n))$ , the minimal eigenvalue of the matrix  $\Sigma(A_n) := [\psi(l, k)]_{l, k \in A_n}$ , then  $\frac{m_n^2}{\rho_n^2 c_n^2} = o(n)$ .*

*Then the  $\text{Gamma}(\zeta, \beta)$  prior with  $\beta > 6M$  and  $\zeta > 3$  satisfies:*

1.  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{i \in [d_n]} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})} = 0$  as in Proposition C.1.
2.  $\frac{1}{\Psi(A_n)^2 |A_n|} \sum_{k \in A_n} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{i1}(1-\theta_{i1})\theta_{k1}(1-\theta_{k1})} \right) = o(n)$  as in Theorem B.3.

*Proof.* Fix arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $k \in [d_n]$ . First recall that  $\theta_{k1} = 1 - \exp(-\alpha_k \tau_1)$ . Then, since  $\alpha_k > 0$ , the corresponding moment-generating function implies that

$$\mathbb{E}(\theta_{k1}) = 1 - \left( \frac{\beta}{\beta + \alpha_k} \right)^\zeta \geq 1 - \left( \frac{\beta}{\beta + \alpha_k} \right) = \frac{\alpha_k}{\beta + \alpha_k}.$$

Therefore, we have the following inequality:

$$\frac{1}{n} \max_{i \in [d_n]} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})} \leq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\beta}{\min_{i \in [d_n]} n \alpha_j}.$$

Hence,  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{i \in [d_n]} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(\theta_{i1})} = 0$  because we assumed that  $\min_{i \in [d_n]} n \alpha_i \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now notice that  $\Psi(A_n) = \frac{1}{m_n^2} \mathbf{1}^T \Sigma(A_n) \mathbf{1}$ . Therefore, by our notation and the min-max theorem for symmetric matrices, we have

$$\Psi(A_n) = \frac{1}{m_n} \left( \frac{\mathbf{1}}{\sqrt{m_n}} \right)^T \Sigma(A_n) \left( \frac{\mathbf{1}}{\sqrt{m_n}} \right) \geq \frac{\rho_n}{m_n}. \quad (25)$$

Fix an arbitrary  $k \in A_n$ . Holder's inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{i1} \theta_{k1} (1 - \theta_{i1}) (1 - \theta_{k1})} \right) \leq \left[ \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{i1}^3} \right) \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{k1}^3} \right) \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{(1 - \theta_{i1})^3 (1 - \theta_{k1})^3} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{3}}. \quad (26)$$

The moment generating function of the Gamma( $\zeta, \beta$ ) distribution and the assumption that  $\beta > 6M$  further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{(1 - \theta_{i1})^3 (1 - \theta_{k1})^3} \right) &= \mathbb{E} \left( e^{3(\alpha_i + \alpha_k) \tau_1} \right) \\ &= \left( 1 - \frac{3(\alpha_i + \alpha_k)}{\beta} \right)^{-\zeta} \leq \left( 1 - \frac{6M}{\beta} \right)^{-\zeta}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Now note that  $\frac{1}{1-e^{-t}}$  is a decreasing function of  $t$  and  $1 - e^{-t} \geq t - \frac{t^2}{2}$  when  $t > 0$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{i1}^3} \right) &= \int_{t>0} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \exp(-\alpha_i t)} \right)^3 \pi(t) dt \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^3 + \int_0^{\frac{1}{2\alpha_i}} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \exp(-\alpha_i t)} \right)^3 \pi(t) dt \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^3 + \int_0^{\frac{1}{2\alpha_i}} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_i t - \frac{\alpha_i^2 t^2}{2}} \right)^3 \pi(t) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

For the second term in Equation (28), there exists a constant  $C(\beta, \zeta) \in (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\frac{1}{2\alpha_i}} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_i t - \frac{\alpha_i^2 t^2}{2}} \right)^3 \pi(t) dt &= \int_0^{\frac{1}{2\alpha_i}} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_i t \left[ 1 - \frac{\alpha_i t}{2} \right]} \right)^3 \pi(t) dt \\ &\leq \frac{64}{27} \int_0^{\frac{1}{2\alpha_i}} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_i t} \right)^3 \pi(t) dt \\ &= \frac{64}{27 \alpha_i^3 \Gamma(\zeta)} \int_0^{\frac{1}{2\alpha_i}} t^{\zeta-4} e^{-\beta t} dt \\ &\leq \frac{C(\beta, \zeta)}{c_n^3}, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where we use the monotonicity of integration in the first inequality and the assumption that  $\zeta > 3$  in the second inequality.

Mutatis mutandis, Equations (26), (27), (28), and (29) imply that there exists a constant  $\bar{C}(\beta, \zeta) \in (0, \infty)$  that is independent of  $i$  and  $k$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{i1} \theta_{k1} (1 - \theta_{i1}) (1 - \theta_{k1})} \right) \leq \frac{\bar{C}(\beta, \zeta)}{c_n^2}. \quad (30)$$

Combining Equations (25) and (30) yields

$$\frac{1}{\Psi(A_n)^2 |A_n|} \sum_{k \in A_n} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{i1} \theta_{k1} (1 - \theta_{i1}) (1 - \theta_{k1})} \right) \leq \frac{m_n^2}{\rho_n^2 c_n^2} \bar{C}(\beta, \zeta).$$

Finally, using the assumption  $\frac{m_n^2}{\rho_n^2 c_n^2} = o(n)$ , we have shown that

$$\frac{1}{\Psi(A_n)^2 |A_n|} \sum_{k \in A_n} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{i1} \theta_{k1} (1 - \theta_{i1}) (1 - \theta_{k1})} \right) = o(n).$$

□

## D Additional LAMB Method Details

The LAMB method is presented in Section 3. In this appendix we will discuss additional details relevant to using the LAMB method in practice.

### D.1 Full LAMB Algorithm

1. GIVEN: Binary data matrix  $\mathbb{X} \in \{0, 1\}^{d \times n}$  and parameters  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $N \geq 2$ .
2. ESTIMATION (ALGORITHM 2 IN SECTION 3.4): Compute  $\widehat{\Theta}$ , a matrix of estimates of the random thresholds  $\Theta = [\theta_{ij}]$ , from  $\mathbb{X}$ .
3. INITIALIZATION: Initialize the set  $A^0 := \{i\}$  for some  $i \in [d]$ .
4. SEARCH PROCEDURE (ALGORITHM 1 IN SECTION 3.3):
  - ▷ Given  $A^t$  and notation  $A_{-k}^t := A^t \setminus \{k\}$ , compute  $\widehat{\psi}(k, A_{-k}^t)$  and  $\widehat{\sigma}(k, A_{-k}^t)$  from  $\mathbb{X}$  and  $\widehat{\Theta}$ , for each  $k \in [d]$ , as in Section 3.2 and Appendix B.
  - ▷ Compute approximate p-values  $\{\text{pv}(1, A^t), \dots, \text{pv}(d, A^t)\}$  as in Equation (8) in Section 3.2.
  - ▷ Simultaneously test the hypotheses
 
$$H_0(k, A^t) : \psi(k, A_{-k}^t) \leq 0 \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1(k, A^t) : \psi(k, A_{-k}^t) > 0 \quad \text{for each } k \in [d],$$
 by applying the Benjamini-Yekutieli multiple testing procedure at level  $\delta$  to the set of approximate p-values.
5. UPDATE: Define  $A^{t+1} := \{k \in [d] : H_0(k, A^t) \text{ was rejected}\}$ .
6. ITERATION: Repeat steps 4 and 5 until  $A^t = A^{t'}$  for some  $t' < t$  or a maximum number of iterations is reached.
7. OUTPUT: Output  $A^* := A^t$  if  $|A^*| \geq N$  and  $t = t' + 1$ . In this case  $A^*$  is a nonempty fixed point and an estimated coherent set.
8. REPETITION: Repeat 3-7 as many times as desired, for a given subset of indices  $\mathcal{I} \subset [d]$ , or for every  $i \in [d]$ , or for a given class of features  $\mathcal{C} \subset 2^{[d]}$ .



## D.2 Embarrassingly Parallel Search Procedure

The overall time expense of the LAMB method comes from the iterative testing based search procedure (Algorithm 1 in Section 3.3). Unless explicitly specified otherwise, the LAMB method’s search procedure is run  $d$  times, for initial sets  $\{1\}, \dots, \{d\}$ , and within each search is a for  $k \in [d]$  loop. This search procedure, however, is embarrassingly parallel from a computational perspective.

Before the search procedure is run, a  $d \times d$  dimensional matrix is computed and temporarily stored so that the statistics  $\hat{\psi}_n(k, A_{-k}^t)$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_n^2(k, A_{-k}^t)$  can be easily calculated for an arbitrary set  $A^t \subset [d]$  without dependence on the step  $t$  or initialized set  $A^0$  (see Section 3.3). The variance estimator  $\hat{\sigma}_n^2(k, A_{-k}^t)$  is actually independent of the feature  $k \in [d]$ . Consequently, it is feasible to have multiple searches in parallel starting from different initialized sets, and to calculate the Benjamini-Yekutieli adjusted approximate p-values  $\text{BY}(k, A^t)$  in parallel across the for  $k \in [d]$  loop.

## D.3 Multiple Testing Procedures

The set update process in Algorithm 1 in Section 3.3 uses a multiple testing procedure to update and refine a set  $A^t \subset [d]$  of features. In principle, any multiple testing procedure can be applied in this step of the algorithm. A Bonferroni adjustment would guarantee family wise error control at each step, but would, in many cases, greatly reduce the sensitivity of the algorithm. The default implementation of the LAMB method uses the FDR-controlling procedure of Benjamini and Yekutieli [2001], which controls the expected false discovery rate even when the p-values of the hypotheses are correlated. The FDR-controlling procedure of Benjamini and Hochberg [1995] can be easily used instead. This set update step only controls the expected false discovery rate *per iteration*. Currently, we do not have theoretical guarantees for controlling the expected false discovery rate over the entire search procedure.

## D.4 Fixed Points and Cycles

The LAMB method’s search procedure stops when  $A^t = A^{t'}$  for some  $t > t'$ . If  $t = t' + 1$ , then  $A^t$  is a fixed point of the search procedure and further set updates will not change  $A^t$ . As mentioned in Section 3.3, nonempty fixed points of the search procedure satisfy Definition 3.2 up to a level of statistical significance, and they are considered estimated coherent sets. Nonempty fixed points, however, are not the only result from the LAMB method’s search procedure; nonempty cycles occur in both real and artificial data settings.

If  $A^t = A^{t'}$  for  $t' + 1 < t$ , then the LAMB method’s search procedure has reached a terminating cycle  $A^{t'}, \dots, A^t$  of three or more sets. When the algorithm cycles through three or more sets, the final set  $A^* := A^t$  is included in the output, but labeled differently than the fixed points, since cycles are not considered estimated coherent sets. In our experience, cycling is rare in artificial datasets, but not in real datasets. For example,

cycles occur when the LAMB method is applied to the text dataset in Section 5.1, and these cycles typically differ from similar fixed points only by a few different features, out of hundreds or thousands of features.

## D.5 Iterative Testing Based Search Procedure is Greedy

Proposition D.1 below demonstrates that the set update step in the iterative testing based search procedure is Greedy. We only test  $\psi(k, A_{-k}^t)$  for some  $A^t \subset [d]$  and  $k \in [d]$  (see Section 3.3). In particular, by only testing  $\psi(k, A_{-k}^t)$  for a fixed set  $A^t \subset [d]$  and each  $k \in [d]$  we are only considering a local change of one element to the set, instead of a global change of two or more elements. However, because of the multiple testing procedure used in the set update step, it is still possible for two or more features to be added to  $A^t$  or removed from  $A^t$  in the updated set  $A^{t+1}$ .

**Proposition D.1.** *Let  $A \subset [d]$  be a coherent set for latent association. Denote the elements  $A = \{k_l : l \in [q]\}$  for some  $q \geq 2$ . Suppose there exists  $\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2 \in [d] \setminus A$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{j \in [2]} \max_{i \in [d] \setminus \{\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2\}} \psi(\tilde{k}_j, i) \leq 0, \quad \psi(\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2) > \max_{j \in [2]} \left\{ - \sum_{l \in [q]} \psi(\tilde{k}_j, k_l) \right\}, \\ \text{and} \quad \min_{\tilde{l} \in [q]} \left\{ \sum_{l \in [q] \setminus \{\tilde{l}\}} \psi(k_{\tilde{l}}, k_l) + \sum_{j \in [2]} \psi(k_{\tilde{l}}, \tilde{k}_j) \right\} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

*Then neither  $A \cup \{\tilde{k}_1\}$  nor  $A \cup \{\tilde{k}_2\}$  are coherent sets for latent association. However,  $A \cup \{\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2\}$  is a coherent set for latent association.*

*Remark.* Note that the assumptions in Proposition D.1 are trivially satisfied if  $\{V_{\tilde{k}_1}, V_{\tilde{k}_2}\}$  are positively associated with each other and independent of  $\{V_i : i \in [d] \setminus \{\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2\}\}$ . In particular,  $\psi(\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2) > 0$  and  $\psi(i, \tilde{k}_j) = 0$  for all  $j \in [2]$  and  $i \in [d] \setminus \{\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2\}$ .

*Remark.* The intuition is that two features not in the coherent set  $A$  are negatively associated with, or are independent of, all other features, but they have a strong positive association with each other.

*Proof.* Denote  $B := A \cup \{\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2\}$ . By Definition 3.2 of coherent sets, we immediately know that  $\psi(\tilde{k}_j, A) \leq 0$  for each  $j \in [2]$  since

$$\max_{j \in [2]} \max_{i \in [d] \setminus \{\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2\}} \psi(\tilde{k}_j, i) \leq 0.$$

Hence,  $A \cup \{\tilde{k}_j\}$  is not a coherent set for latent association for any  $j \in [2]$ . Now note that

$$\psi(\tilde{k}_1, B \setminus \{\tilde{k}_1\}) = \frac{1}{|A| + 1} \left[ \sum_{l \in [q]} \psi(\tilde{k}_1, k_l) + \psi(\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2) \right] > 0,$$

because

$$\psi(\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2) > \max_{j \in [2]} \left\{ - \sum_{l \in [q]} \psi(\tilde{k}_j, k_l) \right\}.$$

Mutatis mutandis,  $\psi(\tilde{k}_2, B \setminus \{\tilde{k}_2\}) > 0$ . Similarly, for arbitrary  $p \in [q]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(k_p, B \setminus \{k_p\}) &= \frac{1}{|A| + 1} \left[ \sum_{l \in [q] \setminus \{p\}} \psi(k_p, k_l) + \sum_{j \in [2]} \psi(k_p, \tilde{k}_j) \right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|A| + 1} \min_{\tilde{l} \in [q]} \left\{ \sum_{l \in [q] \setminus \{\tilde{l}\}} \psi(k_{\tilde{l}}, k_l) + \sum_{j \in [2]} \psi(k_{\tilde{l}}, \tilde{k}_j) \right\} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, fix arbitrary  $i \notin B$  and note that  $\psi(i, A) \leq 0$  implies that

$$\psi(i, B) = \frac{1}{|A| + 2} \left[ |A| \psi(i, A) + \sum_{j \in [2]} \psi(i, \tilde{k}_j) \right] \leq 0$$

by again using

$$\max_{j \in [2]} \max_{i \in [d] \setminus \{\tilde{k}_1, \tilde{k}_2\}} \psi(\tilde{k}_j, i) \leq 0.$$

Thus,  $B$  is a coherent set for latent association by definition.  $\square$

## D.6 Effective Number of Sets

In practice, the LAMB method and other association mining methods can produce many estimated sets with high overlap in constituent features.<sup>33</sup> It is important to have a measure of distinct sets, to allow for post-processing of the output into a more straightforward result. This motivates a measure as in Shabalín et al. [2009] that is adapted for the LAMB method and coherent sets.

**Definition D.2 (Effective Number of Sets).** Given nonempty sets  $A_1, \dots, A_K \subset [d]$  for some  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define the observed count of feature  $i \in [d]$  in the sets  $A_1, \dots, A_K$  as

$$N_i(A_1, \dots, A_K) := \sum_{j=1}^K \mathbb{I}(i \in A_j).$$

---

<sup>33</sup>Minimal coherent sets are ideally discovered, but that is not guaranteed by the LAMB method's search procedure. Indeed, because of the Greedy set update step, estimated coherent sets often exhibit either substantial overlap of features or very little overlap.

We then define the *effective number* of the sets  $A_1, \dots, A_K$  to be

$$\mathbf{eff\ num}(A_1, \dots, A_K) := \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{1}{|A_j|} \sum_{i \in A_j} \frac{1}{N_i(A_1, \dots, A_K)}.$$

The measure  $N_i(A_1, \dots, A_K)$  increases for at least some  $i \in [d]$  as the nonempty sets  $A_1, \dots, A_K \subset [d]$  increase in their overlap of elements.<sup>34</sup> For the special case where exactly  $r \in [K]$  of the sets  $A_1, \dots, A_K$  are distinct we have  $\mathbf{eff\ num}(A_1, \dots, A_K) = r$ . The effective number of the estimated coherent sets discovered by the LAMB method gives a simple measure of how many different sets of associated features have actually been discovered. See Appendix D.7 for details about post-processing the LAMB method’s estimated coherent sets.

## D.7 Post-processing LAMB Method Output

The LAMB method may discover many estimated coherent sets, not all of which are very distinct. Often there is either substantial overlap of elements in the estimated coherent sets, or there is very little, if any, overlap in the estimated coherent sets. For this reason, we find that it is helpful to have an automated post-processing step that yields effectively distinct estimated coherent sets in a simple manner. The following procedure was adapted from the work in Dewaskar et al. [2020].

Consider estimated coherent sets  $A_1, \dots, A_K \subset [d]$  for some  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ . Here we have  $A_i \neq A_j$  for all  $i, j \in [K]$ . However, there might be some sets that are very similar (in terms of Jaccard index [Jaccard, 1901]). First we apply hierarchical clustering to the sets  $A_1, \dots, A_K$  based on Jaccard distance between the sets. The corresponding dendrogram is cut such that  $\lceil \mathbf{eff\ num}(A_1, \dots, A_K) \rceil$  clusters of sets are formed (see Definition D.2 in Appendix D.6). Finally, representative sets of each cluster are selected based on a centrality score defined by

$$\mathbf{score}(A_j | A_1, \dots, A_K) := \frac{1}{|A_j|} \sum_{i \in A_j} N_i(A_1, \dots, A_K),$$

where  $N_i(A_1, \dots, A_K)$  is defined as in Definition D.2. Note that it is possible to use  $1 \vee \lfloor \mathbf{eff\ num}(A_1, \dots, A_K) \rfloor$  or  $\lceil \mathbf{eff\ num}(A_1, \dots, A_K) \rceil + c$  for some  $c < K$  to cut the dendrogram. The use of  $\lceil \mathbf{eff\ num}(A_1, \dots, A_K) \rceil$  is simple and conservative in real data applications.

---

<sup>34</sup>Alternatively, as the Jaccard index [Jaccard, 1901] between some pairs of sets in  $A_1, \dots, A_K$  tends to 1,  $N_i(A_1, \dots, A_K)$  monotonically increases for at least some  $i \in [d]$ .

## D.8 Convexity for Optimization in Section 3.4

Recall the optimization procedure from Section 3.4 requires optimizing two separate equations coordinate-wise. In this appendix we show that the optimization procedure for estimating  $\alpha_i$  given  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^0$  can be turned into minimizing a convex function over an interval. We restate the two optimization problems below:

1. Given  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ , for each  $j \in [n]$ , solve the coordinate-wise optimization problem

$$\hat{\tau}_j^0 | \boldsymbol{\alpha} := \operatorname{argmin}_{t \in (0,8)} \sum_{i \in [d]} [\alpha_i t - X_{ij}(\alpha_i t + \ln[1 - \exp\{-\alpha_i t\}])] . \quad (31)$$

2. Given  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^0$ , for each  $i \in [d] \setminus \{1\}$ , solve the coordinate-wise optimization problem

$$\hat{\alpha}_i | \boldsymbol{\tau}^0 \in \operatorname{argmin}_{a \in (0,8)} \left( 1 - \bar{X}_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} \exp\{-a \tau_j^0\} \right)^2 . \quad (32)$$

**Proposition D.3.** *The parameterized family of functions  $\ell_{a,x}(t) := at - x(at + \ln[1 - e^{-at}])$  for  $a \in (0, \infty)$  and  $x \in \{0, 1\}$  is convex on  $t \in (0, \infty)$ .*

*Remark.* Note that this proposition is sufficient for showing that (31) is a convex optimization problem because the sum of these parameterized functions is also convex.

**Proposition D.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{t} \in (0, \infty)^n$  and  $b \in (0, 1)$  be given. There exists an interval  $(0, S(\mathbf{t}, b)) \subset (0, \infty)$  that satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} e^{-a t_j} \geq 1 - b \quad \text{for all } a \in (0, S(\mathbf{t}, b)) .$$

*Furthermore, the parameterized family of functions  $m_{\mathbf{t},b}(a) := \left(b - 1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} e^{-a t_j}\right)^2$  for fixed  $\mathbf{t} \in (0, \infty)^n$  and  $b \in (0, 1)$  is convex on  $(0, S(\mathbf{t}, b))$ .*

*Remark.* Note that this proposition is sufficient for showing that (32) is a convex optimization problem when  $a_i$  is restricted to the feasible set  $(0, S(\mathbf{t}, b))$ .

*Proof.* Fix arbitrary  $b \in (0, 1)$  and  $\mathbf{t} \in (0, \infty)^n$ . Let  $M := \max_{j \in [n]} t_j$  and note that  $M > 0$ . For each  $j \in [n]$  we have

$$e^{-a t_j} \geq e^{-a M} \geq 1 - a M$$

using the inequality  $1 + x \leq e^x$ . Define  $S(\mathbf{t}, b) := \frac{b}{M}$ . Then if  $a \in (0, S(\mathbf{t}, b)]$  we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} e^{-at_j} \geq 1 - aM \geq 1 - b.$$

Now note that the second derivative of  $m_{\mathbf{t}, b}$  with respect to  $a$  is

$$m''_{\mathbf{t}, b}(a) := 2 \left\{ \left[ b - 1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} e^{-at_j} \right] \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} t_j^2 e^{-at_j} \right) + \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} t_j e^{-at_j} \right)^2 \right\}.$$

Since  $m''_{\mathbf{t}, b}(a) \geq 0$  for all  $a \in (0, S(\mathbf{t}, b)]$ , the function is convex on this interval.  $\square$


*Remark.* In practice, we found that the interval  $(0, S(\mathbf{t}, b)]$  is not large enough for robust estimation of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^0$ .

## E Additional Results

### E.1 Toy Market Basket Dataset

A number of conventional statistical methods could be applied to the toy market basket dataset in Section 1.1. Hierarchical clustering using average linkage and binary distance discovers the item sets  $\{1, 2\}$ ,  $\{3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13\}$ , and  $\{4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14\}$  (see Figure 5(a)). The alternating pattern in the medium volume buyers (i.e., buyers 6 and 7) drives the latter two item sets.

Recall the sign change in the correlations among items 10–14 between the heat maps in Figures 2(b) and 2(c). The negative correlations among items 10–14 arise from the buyer normalization giving more weight to purchases made by low volume buyers (i.e., buyers 8–12). Using Euclidean distance on the buyer normalized dataset with average linkage discovers the item sets  $\{1, 2\}$  and  $\{3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$  (see Figure 5(b)). Buyer normalization does not appropriately account for the sample heterogeneity in this example. In particular, when considering the entire toy dataset, there is no reason to consider associations between items 3–9 to be any stronger than the associations between items 10–14 or other subsets of items 3–14.



(a) Toy market basket dataset with binary distance and average linkage. (b) “Buyer normalized” dataset with Euclidean distance and average linkage.

Figure 5: Dendrograms from hierarchical clustering.

Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF) was also applied to this toy dataset. We considered matrix factorizations of rank 2, rank 3, and rank 4. Similar item sets as the ones discovered by hierarchical clustering were discovered by the NMF method.

Conventional Itemset Mining (IM) methods (described in Section 1.2) could be applied to the toy dataset. However, because conventional IM methods do not scale well to high-dimensional datasets, we do not consider them in the simulation study (see Section 4) or the real data applications (see Section 5). For this reason we do not apply any conventional IM methods to the toy dataset.

## E.2 Simulation Study

### E.2.1 Generating Artificial Datasets

Recall the setting of Section 4.1. In particular, we are generating an artificial binary data matrix  $\mathbb{X} \in \{0, 1\}^{d \times n}$  in accordance with the threshold model of Definition 2.1. For the simulation study  $n = 200$  and  $d = 2,000$ . The problem discussed in this appendix is to systematically generate a matrix of latent continuous vectors  $\mathbb{V} := [\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  and a matrix of random thresholds  $\Theta := [\theta_{\cdot 1}, \dots, \theta_{\cdot n}] \in (0, 1)^{d \times n}$ .

Continuous random vectors  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$  were sampled iid from a multivariate normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}_d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$  to generate a matrix  $\mathbb{V} := [\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ . We set  $\boldsymbol{\mu} := \mathbf{0}$  and the diagonal entries of  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  to be 1. Hence, when generating different matrices, say  $\mathbb{V}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathbb{V}^{(2)}$ , the only population quantity that we change is the off diagonal entries of  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ . Recall that the threshold model of Definition 2.1 is invariant under component-wise monotone transformations (see Section 2.1). Therefore, these two constraints on the values of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  do not effect the robustness of the results obtained from the LAMB method to samples  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$  from a more general multivariate normal distribution.

Five associated sets of features  $A_1, \dots, A_5 \subset [d]$  were embedded into the artificial binary datasets by using five disjoint blocks of nontrivial correlation in  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ . In particular,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  was constrained to be a block diagonal matrix with five nontrivial blocks  $\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_5$  and one block the identity matrix  $\mathbf{I}$ ; for each sample of  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$  from  $\mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$  we used  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} := \text{diag}[\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_5, \mathbf{I}]$ .<sup>35</sup> The size of each embedded associated set is 200, i.e., each block  $\mathbf{B}_k$  is a  $200 \times 200$  dimensional matrix (of correlations) for  $k \in [5]$ . A nontrivial block  $\mathbf{B}_k$  generates a truly associated set of features  $A_k \subset [d]$  in the artificial dataset, for each  $k \in [5]$ . Features corresponding to the identity matrix block  $\mathbf{I}$  in  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  are independent. Note that the block diagonal structure of  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  means that any two features from different blocks are independent.

Let  $\rho_k \in [0, 1]$  be the off-diagonal value of the block  $\mathbf{B}_k$ , for each  $k \in [5]$ . The off-diagonal values  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_5$  of the correlation blocks  $\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_5$  were varied to study the sensitivity of the LAMB method to the strength of the association in the embedded sets  $A_1, \dots, A_5$ . To accomplish this, if  $\mathcal{R} := \{0, 0.02, 0.04, \dots, 0.96, 0.98, 1\}$ , then

$$\rho_1, \dots, \rho_5 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(\mathcal{R}),$$

---

<sup>35</sup>Here  $\text{diag}$  refers to a diagonal block matrix, so that entries in  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  other than the listed block matrices are zero. This is the easiest way to create a nontrivial correlation matrix while maintaining the positive definiteness of  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ .



i.e., we sample the off-diagonal (correlation) values  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_5$  from  $\mathcal{R}$  independently with replacement. This sampling was independently done 50 times, resulting in 50 independent and nontrivial (correlation) matrices  $\Sigma^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma^{(50)}$ . As discussed above, sampling  $V_{\cdot 1}^{(s)}, \dots, V_{\cdot n}^{(s)}$  from  $\mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma^{(s)})$  for each  $s \in [50]$  generated matrices  $\mathbb{V}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbb{V}^{(50)}$ .

Random thresholds  $\theta_{\cdot 1}, \dots, \theta_{\cdot n}$  were sampled independently of  $V_{\cdot 1}, \dots, V_{\cdot n}$  to generate a matrix  $\Theta := [\theta_{\cdot 1}, \dots, \theta_{\cdot n}]$ . For each matrix  $\Theta$ ,  $\alpha := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)^T$  was sampled once while  $\tau \sim \pi$  was sampled iid  $n$  times to generate the vector of realized values  $\tau^0 := (\tau_1^0, \dots, \tau_n^0)^T$  (see Equation (1) in Definition 2.1). The parameters  $\alpha$  were generated from a scaled beta distribution, i.e.,

$$\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} 2 \cdot \text{Beta}(a, b)$$

for shape parameters  $a$  and  $b$  and  $\alpha_1 := 1$  for identifiability (see Proposition A.4). The values for  $\alpha$  are scaled by a factor of 2 to make the generating distributions of  $\theta_{\cdot 1}, \dots, \theta_{\cdot n}$  more heterogeneous.<sup>36</sup> The parameters  $\tau^0$  were generated from a gamma distribution, i.e.,

$$\tau_1^0, \dots, \tau_n^0 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(s, r)$$

for shape parameter  $s$  and rate parameter  $r$ .

Recall that the LAMB method is interested in discovering the intrinsic association encoded in  $\mathbb{V}$  and that estimating the random thresholds  $\Theta$  is considered a nuisance parameter. Different random threshold matrices  $\Theta$  were generated by independently varying the distribution parameters  $a, b$  for  $\alpha$  and  $s, r$  for  $\tau^0$ . This allows for a more robust study of the results obtained from the LAMB method. We are able to study the sensitivity of the LAMB method to the values of the random thresholds by leaving the matrix  $\mathbb{V}$  the same and changing the matrix  $\Theta$  to generate a different binary data matrix  $\mathbb{X}$ . Three different pairs of parameter values were used for  $\alpha$  and  $\tau^0$ :

1. For “low”  $\alpha$  parameter values,  $(a, b) = (1, 2)$ .
2. For “medium”  $\alpha$  parameter values,  $(a, b) = (2, 2)$ .
3. For “high”  $\alpha$  parameter values,  $(a, b) = (2, 1)$ .
4. For “low”  $\tau$  parameter values,  $(s, r) = (\frac{1}{2}, 2)$ .
5. For “medium”  $\tau$  parameter values,  $(s, r) = (1, 2)$ .
6. For “high”  $\tau$  parameter values,  $(s, r) = (2, 2)$ .

---

<sup>36</sup>Recall that  $\alpha$  is not random in the threshold model of Definition 2.1. However, because these datasets are artificial, we must generate  $\alpha$ . A scaled Beta distribution is a simple way to generate heterogeneous values for  $\alpha$ .

The labels “low”, “medium”, and “high” simply refer to the skew of the densities for the corresponding distributions based on these parameters. See Figures 6 and 7 for histograms of the corresponding values of  $\alpha$  and  $\tau^0$ , respectively.

Note that, because of the functional form of the random thresholds, i.e.,  $\theta_{ij} := 1 - \exp(-\alpha_i \tau_j^0)$ , larger values of  $\alpha_i$  or  $\tau_j^0$  correspond to values of  $\theta_{ij}$  exponentially close to 1.<sup>37</sup> In total, 9 different random threshold matrices  $\Theta^{(1)}, \dots, \Theta^{(9)}$  were generated; there is one random threshold matrix  $\Theta^{(r)}$ , where  $r \in [9]$ , for each combination of  $\alpha$  and  $\tau$  parameter values.

The matrices  $\mathbb{V}$  and  $\Theta$  were combined as in the threshold model of Definition 2.1 to generate an artificial binary data matrix  $\mathbb{X}$  with nontrivial association structure and sample heterogeneity. This resulted in a total of 450 different artificial binary datasets, since 50 different matrices  $\mathbb{V}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbb{V}^{(50)}$  and 9 different matrices  $\Theta^{(1)}, \dots, \Theta^{(9)}$  were generated in total. Many values of all of the parameters discussed above were considered for this simulation study. We expect that the results from the LAMB method in Section 4.2 will be robust to changes of any of the values of the parameters used above, as long as  $n \geq 200$ .

---

<sup>37</sup>Larger values of  $\theta_{ij}$  makes it more likely that  $X_{ij}$  equals 1 in the artificial binary data matrix  $\mathbb{X}$ . So changing the parameters for  $\alpha$  and  $\tau^0$  effects the sparsity of the data matrix  $\mathbb{X}$ .




Figure 6: Histograms for the generated  $\alpha$  parameters in the artificial datasets of Section 4.




Figure 7: Histograms for the generated  $\tau^0$  parameters in the artificial datasets of Section 4.




Figure 8: Histograms for the generated random thresholds in the artificial datasets of Section 4.

### E.2.2 Additional Figures

Recall that the LAMB method relies on estimating the random thresholds  $\Theta$  to discover associated sets of features. It is therefore important that the results obtained from the LAMB method in Figures 9 and 10 are robust to changes in the values of  $\Theta$ . The lone exception is in the upper left plots of Figures 9 and 10, where the corresponding artificial binary datasets are exceptionally sparse.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>38</sup>These artificial binary datasets are sparse because both  $\alpha$  and  $\tau^0$  are generated from distributions that are skewed towards low values. Low values of both  $\alpha$  and  $\tau^0$  generate low values of  $\theta_{ij}$  in  $\Theta$ , which significantly decreases the chances of generating 1s in the threshold model of Definition 2.1 independent of the values in  $V_1, \dots, V_n$ .




Figure 9: Comparison of the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods on the artificial datasets in Section 4 using the (median) precision of their estimated associated sets. See Section 4.2 for a detailed analysis. The LAMB method produces estimated coherent sets while the NMF and LDA methods produce soft clusters of all the features per topic. Only the “top 200” features in the soft clusters of the NMF and LDA methods are used since the embedded sets all contained 200 features. Figures 6, 7, and 8 in Appendix E.2.1 show the histograms of the corresponding values of  $\alpha$ ,  $\tau^0$ , and  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ , respectively. For this figure we used  $\delta = .05$  for the LAMB method and fit 6 latent topics for the NMF and LDA methods. For reference we include results obtained from hierarchical clustering with binary distance and average linkage using 7 clusters.




Figure 10: Comparison of the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods on the artificial datasets of Section 4 using the (median) recall of their estimated associated sets. See Section 4.2 for a detailed analysis. The LAMB method produces estimated coherent sets while the NMF and LDA methods produce soft clusters of all the features per topic. Only the “top 200” features in the soft clusters of the NMF and LDA methods are used since the embedded sets all contained 200 features. Figures 6, 7, and 8 in Appendix E.2.1 show the histograms of the corresponding values of  $\alpha$ ,  $\tau^0$ , and  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ , respectively. For reference we include results obtained from hierarchical clustering with binary distance and average linkage using 7 clusters.




Figure 11: Analysis of the LAMB method based on precision of estimated sets. The value of “delta” in this figure is used during the multiple testing procedure of the LAMB method’s search. See Algorithm 1 in Section 3.3, where it is denoted  $\delta$ . Note that the LAMB method is robust to changes in the value of delta.






Figure 12: Analysis of the LAMB method based on recall of estimated sets. The value of “delta” in this figure is used during the multiple testing procedure of the LAMB method’s search. See Algorithm 1 in Section 3.3, where it is denoted  $\delta$ . Note that the LAMB method is robust to changes in the value of delta.




Figure 13: Analysis of the NMF method based on precision of estimated sets. Recall that the precision and recall statistics are the same for the NMF method (see Section 4). We considered different numbers of latent topics. Note that the 5 topic NMF method has better results for large values of underlying correlation in the embedded sets. On the other hand, the 6 topic NMF method has better results for small values of underlying correlation in the embedded sets. When the underlying correlation is strong enough, the NMF method does not benefit as much from an extra topic. However, when the underlying correlation is not very strong, the NMF method benefits from an extra topic that clusters the “noisy” features.




Figure 14: Analysis of the LDA method based on precision of estimated sets. Recall that the precision and recall statistics are the same for the LDA method (see Section 4). We considered different numbers of latent topics. As mentioned in Section 4.2, it appears that the binary-valued artificial datasets do not provide enough information for the inference problem used in the LDA method. These results are not an indictment of the LDA method. Rather, the results of this simulation study indicate the difficulty that binary-valued data can present for inference and association mining problems.




Figure 15: Analysis of hierarchical clustering based on precision of estimated sets. This is using binary distance on the artificial datasets with average linkage. We considered different numbers of clusters.




Figure 16: Analysis of hierarchical clustering based on recall of estimated sets. This is using binary distance on the artificial datasets with average linkage. We considered different numbers of clusters.




Figure 17: Analysis of hierarchical clustering based on precision of estimated sets. This is using Euclidean distance on the “buyer normalized” artificial datasets with average linkage. We considered different numbers of clusters.




Figure 18: Analysis of hierarchical clustering based on recall of estimated sets. This is using Euclidean distance on the “buyer normalized” artificial datasets with average linkage. We considered different numbers of clusters.

### E.3 Additional Text Data Analysis

Moby Dick	The Count of Monte Cristo	Pride and Prejudice
Adventures of Huckleberry Finn	The Picture of Dorian Gray	Great Expectations
The Adventures of Tom Sawyer	Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland	Little Women
The Call of the Wild	Through the Looking-Glass	

Table 3: List of non-Shakespeare text documents used in Section 5.1.

The Taming of the Shrew	Romeo and Juliet	A Midsummer Night’s Dream
Julius Caesar	As You Like It	Hamlet, Prince of Denmark
Twelfth Night	All’s Well That Ends Well	Othello
King Lear	Macbeth	Antony and Cleopatra
The Tempest	Shakespeare’s Sonnets	

Table 4: List of Shakespeare text documents used in Section 5.1.

In this appendix we provide additional results from the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods applied to the text dataset discussed in Section 5.1. See Tables 3 and 4 for the different works used in this text dataset. Note that the works in both Tables 3 and 4 are all contained in a single text dataset; the works are separated into two tables to better demonstrate the taxonomy of text sources contained in this dataset.

The term sets discovered by the LAMB method, which uses only binary co-occurrence data, include characters, themes, and settings. In contrast, the NMF and LDA methods are applied to count-valued term-document matrices. Table 6 includes a sample of important terms for some of the LAMB method’s estimated coherent sets.

Tables 9, 10, and 11 demonstrate that the sets of associated terms discovered by the LAMB method are reasonably discriminative relative to the results obtained from the NMF and LDA methods. The top 50 terms in the soft clusters from the NMF and LDA methods are the most discriminative terms between the different latent topics. In particular, the effective number of distinct term sets for the NMF and LDA methods is largest when only the top 50 terms are used instead of the top 100, 500, or 1000 terms. Note that the LAMB method produces a similar effective number of distinct term sets as the best results (in the context of effective number) from the NMF and LDA methods. In contrast to the best results obtained from the NMF and LDA methods, the term sets produced by the LAMB method have 100 to 1,000 terms as opposed to only 50 terms. Neither the number nor the size of the estimated coherent sets is a parameter of the LAMB method.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>39</sup>A minimum set size for fixed points can be set in the LAMB method’s code. However, in practice we use a low threshold for this type of set filtering.



Method	Parameter	Set Filtering	Effective Number
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	$\geq 25$ terms	6.895
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	$\geq 25$ terms	7.510
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	$\geq 25$ terms	10.004
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	$\geq 25$ terms	19.416
NMF	20 topics	top 50 terms	10.30
NMF	20 topics	top 1000 terms	6.33
NMF	25 topics	top 50 terms	12.42
NMF	25 topics	top 1000 terms	7.11
NMF	30 topics	top 50 terms	13.84
NMF	30 topics	top 1000 terms	7.91
LDA	20 topics	top 50 terms (probabilities)	9.88
LDA	20 topics	top 1000 terms (probabilities)	5.73
LDA	25 topics	top 50 terms (probabilities)	11.12
LDA	25 topics	top 1000 terms (probabilities)	6.40
LDA	30 topics	top 50 terms (probabilities)	12.70
LDA	30 topics	top 1000 terms (probabilities)	7.06

Table 5: Some effective numbers of distinct term sets obtained from applying the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods to the text dataset in Section 5.1. The LAMB method outputs estimated coherent sets while the NMF and LDA methods can produce soft clusters of terms.

Method	Parameter	Set	Set Size	Sample of Representative Terms
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	1	975	elizabeth, bennet, darcy, bingley, longbourn, wickham, netherfield, hertfordshire, behaviour, feelings
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	2	1485	love, faith, gods, judgement, power, fools, wrongs, mortal, death, fortune, antony, cleopatra, macbeth, othello, ophelia, hamlet, sebastian
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	3	1215	whale, captain, ahab, ship, deck, pequod, starbuck, crew, queequeg, moby, dick, leviathan, sail, pacific, indian, ocean, water, blubber
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	4	918	jim, huck, finn, tom, sawyer, river, runaway, woods, cussing, fooling
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	5	872	beth, jo, amy, meg, march, motherly, sisters, family, laurie, lessons, prim, feeling, longed, fun, nice, afraid, shy, scolded, romance, busy, cozy, pretty, piano, sang
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	6	122	alice, dinah, kitten, queen, rank, moving, poetry, walrus, carpenter, oysters, dreaming, woke, memories, sicken, welfare, ills, purge, drugs, medicine
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	7	131	artic, chilled, flame, smoke, warming, darkness, blankets, jackets, sharing, household, quiet, enjoy, pleasant, alive, awake, consciousness, sleeping, skeleton
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	8	290	vindictive, vengeful, destructive, tearful, gratification, entitled, festive, bliss, schoolmaster, pupils, schoolhouse, tyranny, banishment, mayor, political

Table 6: A small sample of important terms for some of the LAMB method’s estimated coherent sets when applied to the text dataset in Section 5.1.




Figure 19: Box plots for each estimated coherent set obtained from the LAMB method with  $\delta = .05$  on the text dataset in Section 5.1. Each data point within a box plot row corresponds to a chapter or scene in a given work. Higher values of precision correspond to the estimated coherent sets containing more terms in the work.

Method	Parameter	Set	Set Size
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	1	1602
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	2	1471
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	3	1383
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	4	992
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	5	645
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	6	136
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	7	301
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	1	975
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	2	1485
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	3	1215
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	4	918
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	5	872
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	6	122
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	7	131
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	8	290
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	1	1276
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	2	988
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	3	955
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	4	781
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	5	432
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	6	174
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	7	108
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	8	119
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	9	79
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	10	207
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	11	264

Table 7: Basic data for the different estimated coherent sets produced by the LAMB method when it was applied to the text dataset in Section 5.1.




Figure 20: Box plots of precision per work for each estimated coherent set obtained from the LAMB method with  $\delta = .01$  on the text dataset in Section 5.1. Each data point within a box plot row corresponds to a chapter or scene in a given work. Higher values of precision correspond to the estimated coherent sets containing more terms in the work.

Method	Parameter	Set	Set Size
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	1	744
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	2	1031
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	3	616
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	4	511
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	5	117
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	6	646
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	7	298
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	8	140
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	9	92
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	10	102
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	11	107
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	12	103
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	13	145
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	14	113
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	15	196
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	16	172
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	17	158
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	18	222
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	19	76
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	20	78

Table 8: Basic data for the different estimated coherent sets produced by the LAMB method applied to the text dataset in Section 5.1.

Method	Parameter	Set Filtering	Effective Number
NMF	5 topics	top 50 terms	3.44
NMF	5 topics	top 100 terms	3.25
NMF	5 topics	top 500 terms	2.85
NMF	5 topics	top 1000 terms	2.71
NMF	10 topics	top 50 terms	5.72
NMF	10 topics	top 100 terms	5.43
NMF	10 topics	top 500 terms	4.50
NMF	10 topics	top 1000 terms	4.12
NMF	15 topics	top 50 terms	8.12
NMF	15 topics	top 100 terms	7.32
NMF	15 topics	top 500 terms	5.92
NMF	15 topics	top 1000 terms	5.38
NMF	20 topics	top 50 terms	10.30
NMF	20 topics	top 100 terms	9.27
NMF	20 topics	top 500 terms	7.17
NMF	20 topics	top 1000 terms	6.33
NMF	25 topics	top 50 terms	12.42
NMF	25 topics	top 100 terms	10.67
NMF	25 topics	top 500 terms	8.17
NMF	25 topics	top 1000 terms	7.11
NMF	30 topics	top 50 terms	13.84
NMF	30 topics	top 100 terms	12.04
NMF	30 topics	top 500 terms	9.16
NMF	30 topics	top 1000 terms	7.91

Table 9: Effective number of distinct term sets from the NMF method’s soft clustering of terms. Multiple sizes of soft clusters were considered to demonstrate the overlap between different soft clusters.

Method	Parameter	Set Filtering	Ranking	Effective Number
LDA	5 topics	top 50 terms	probabilities	3.40
LDA	5 topics	top 100 terms	probabilities	3.37
LDA	5 topics	top 500 terms	probabilities	2.96
LDA	5 topics	top 1000 terms	probabilities	2.78
LDA	10 topics	top 50 terms	probabilities	5.94
LDA	10 topics	top 100 terms	probabilities	5.44
LDA	10 topics	top 500 terms	probabilities	4.33
LDA	10 topics	top 1000 terms	probabilities	4.00
LDA	15 topics	top 50 terms	probabilities	8.30
LDA	15 topics	top 100 terms	probabilities	7.30
LDA	15 topics	top 500 terms	probabilities	5.60
LDA	15 topics	top 1000 terms	probabilities	5.10
LDA	20 topics	top 50 terms	probabilities	9.88
LDA	20 topics	top 100 terms	probabilities	8.72
LDA	20 topics	top 500 terms	probabilities	6.39
LDA	20 topics	top 1000 terms	probabilities	5.73
LDA	25 topics	top 50 terms	probabilities	11.12
LDA	25 topics	top 100 terms	probabilities	9.85
LDA	25 topics	top 500 terms	probabilities	7.22
LDA	25 topics	top 1000 terms	probabilities	6.40
LDA	30 topics	top 50 terms	probabilities	12.70
LDA	30 topics	top 100 terms	probabilities	11.18
LDA	30 topics	top 500 terms	probabilities	8.17
LDA	30 topics	top 1000 terms	probabilities	7.06

Table 10: Effective number of distinct term sets from the LDA method’s soft clustering of terms. Here the top terms were determined by the estimated probabilities. Multiple sizes of soft clusters were considered to demonstrate the overlap between different soft clusters.



Method	Parameter	Set Filtering	Ranking	Effective Number
LDA	5 topics	top 50 terms	term scores	4.24
LDA	5 topics	top 100 terms	term scores	4.08
LDA	5 topics	top 500 terms	term scores	3.33
LDA	5 topics	top 1000 terms	term scores	2.88
LDA	10 topics	top 50 terms	term scores	6.20
LDA	10 topics	top 100 terms	term scores	5.69
LDA	10 topics	top 500 terms	term scores	3.37
LDA	10 topics	top 1000 terms	term scores	2.07
LDA	15 topics	top 50 terms	term scores	7.42
LDA	15 topics	top 100 terms	term scores	6.36
LDA	15 topics	top 500 terms	term scores	2.64
LDA	15 topics	top 1000 terms	term scores	1.40
LDA	20 topics	top 50 terms	term scores	7.42
LDA	20 topics	top 100 terms	term scores	5.59
LDA	20 topics	top 500 terms	term scores	1.77
LDA	20 topics	top 1000 terms	term scores	1.29
LDA	25 topics	top 50 terms	term scores	6.94
LDA	25 topics	top 100 terms	term scores	4.91
LDA	25 topics	top 500 terms	term scores	1.30
LDA	25 topics	top 1000 terms	term scores	1.27
LDA	30 topics	top 50 terms	term scores	5.50
LDA	30 topics	top 100 terms	term scores	3.57
LDA	30 topics	top 500 terms	term scores	1.26
LDA	30 topics	top 1000 terms	term scores	1.26

Table 11: Effective number of distinct term sets from the LDA method’s soft clustering of terms. Here the top terms were determined by the term scores of Blei and Lafferty [2009]. Multiple sizes of soft clusters were considered to demonstrate the overlap between different soft clusters.

## E.4 Additional last.fm Data Analysis

In this appendix we provide additional results from the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods applied to the Last.fm dataset discussed in Section 5.2. The artist sets discovered by the LAMB method, which uses only binary co-occurrence data, include various genres of bands. The NMF and LDA methods were applied to count-valued artist-user matrices. Tables 15, 16, and 17 demonstrate that the sets of associated artists and bands discovered by the LAMB method are reasonably discriminative relative to the results obtained from the NMF and LDA methods.

Method	Parameter	Set Filtering	Effective Number
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	$\geq 25$ artists	4.000
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	$\geq 25$ artists	4.710
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	$\geq 25$ artists	5.166
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	$\geq 25$ artists	6.760
NMF	6 topics	top 50 artists	4.820
NMF	6 topics	top 1000 artists	3.391
NMF	9 topics	top 50 artists	6.800
NMF	9 topics	top 1000 artists	4.009
NMF	12 topics	top 50 artists	8.840
NMF	12 topics	top 1000 artists	4.784
LDA	6 topics	top 50 artists (probabilities)	5.020
LDA	6 topics	top 1000 artists (probabilities)	4.058
LDA	9 topics	top 50 artists (probabilities)	7.160
LDA	9 topics	top 1000 artists (probabilities)	5.246
LDA	12 topics	top 50 artists (probabilities)	8.820
LDA	12 topics	top 1000 artists (probabilities)	6.157

Table 12: Effective number of distinct artist sets from applying the LAMB, NMF, and LDA methods to the Last.fm dataset in Section 5.2. The LAMB method outputs estimated coherent sets while the NMF and LDA methods can produce soft clusters of artists and bands.

Method	Parameter	Set	Set Size
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	1	2070
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	2	1844
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	3	2357
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	4	2042
LAMB	$\delta = .10$	5	37
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	1	1939
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	2	1665
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	3	1740
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	4	37
LAMB	$\delta = .05$	5	1490
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	1	1122
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	2	1606
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	3	1371
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	4	1861
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	5	37
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	6	82
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	1	926
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	2	1611
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	3	1321
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	4	78
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	5	54
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	6	37
LAMB	$\delta = .001$	7	282

Table 13: Basic data for the different estimated coherent sets produced by the LAMB method when it was applied to the Last.fm dataset in Section 5.2.

Method	Parameter	Set	Set Size	Sample of Artists and Bands
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	1	1122	Pearl Jam, Linkin Park, Sum 41, Breaking Benjamin, Alice Cooper, Creed
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	2	1606	The Shins, Wilco, The Wombats, Phoenix, Beck, Modest Mouse, Passion Pit, Neil Young, The Beach Boys
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	3	1371	Kanye West, Lupe Fiasco, Snoop Dogg, Rihanna, Mary J. Blige, Madonna, Backstreet Boys, Justin Timberlake, Coldplay, My Chemical Romance, Green Day, The All-American Rejects
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	4	1861	Tycho, RJD2, Wax Tailor, Basshunter, Fatboy Slim, The Presets
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	5	37	Maxine Nightingale, Anita Ward, Gloria Gaynor, A Taste of Honey, George McCrae, Sia
LAMB	$\delta = .01$	6	82	Joy Division, Tom Petty and the Heartbreakers, Judas Priest, Beastie Boys

Table 14: A small sample of artists and bands for some of the LAMB method’s estimated coherent sets when it was applied to the Last.fm data.

Method	Parameter	Set Filtering	Effective Number
NMF	3 topics	top 50 artists	2.780
NMF	3 topics	top 100 artists	2.710
NMF	3 topics	top 500 artists	2.430
NMF	3 topics	top 1000 artists	2.317
NMF	6 topics	top 50 artists	4.820
NMF	6 topics	top 100 artists	4.380
NMF	6 topics	top 500 artists	3.650
NMF	6 topics	top 1000 artists	3.391
NMF	9 topics	top 50 artists	6.800
NMF	9 topics	top 100 artists	6.160
NMF	9 topics	top 500 artists	4.632
NMF	9 topics	top 1000 artists	4.009
NMF	12 topics	top 50 artists	8.840
NMF	12 topics	top 100 artists	7.830
NMF	12 topics	top 500 artists	5.740
NMF	12 topics	top 1000 artists	4.784

Table 15: Effective number of distinct artist sets from the NMF method’s soft clustering of artists and bands. Multiple sizes of soft clusters were considered to demonstrate the overlap between different soft clusters.

Method	Parameter	Set Filtering	Ranking	Effective Number
LDA	3 topics	top 50 artists	probabilities	2.720
LDA	3 topics	top 100 artists	probabilities	2.560
LDA	3 topics	top 500 artists	probabilities	2.416
LDA	3 topics	top 1000 artists	probabilities	2.369
LDA	6 topics	top 50 artists	probabilities	5.020
LDA	6 topics	top 100 artists	probabilities	4.810
LDA	6 topics	top 500 artists	probabilities	4.232
LDA	6 topics	top 1000 artists	probabilities	4.058
LDA	9 topics	top 50 artists	probabilities	7.160
LDA	9 topics	top 100 artists	probabilities	6.740
LDA	9 topics	top 500 artists	probabilities	5.670
LDA	9 topics	top 1000 artists	probabilities	5.246
LDA	12 topics	top 50 artists	probabilities	8.820
LDA	12 topics	top 100 artists	probabilities	8.360
LDA	12 topics	top 500 artists	probabilities	6.932
LDA	12 topics	top 1000 artists	probabilities	6.157

Table 16: Effective number of distinct artist sets from the LDA method’s soft clustering of artists and bands. Here the top terms were determined by the estimated probabilities. Multiple sizes of soft clusters were considered to demonstrate the overlap between different soft clusters.

Method	Parameter	Set Filtering	Ranking	Effective Number
LDA	3 topics	top 50 artists	term scores	2.840
LDA	3 topics	top 100 artists	term scores	2.760
LDA	3 topics	top 500 artists	term scores	2.624
LDA	3 topics	top 1000 artists	term scores	2.485
LDA	6 topics	top 50 artists	term scores	5.520
LDA	6 topics	top 100 artists	term scores	5.060
LDA	6 topics	top 500 artists	term scores	3.300
LDA	6 topics	top 1000 artists	term scores	2.271
LDA	9 topics	top 50 artists	term scores	7.020
LDA	9 topics	top 100 artists	term scores	5.590
LDA	9 topics	top 500 artists	term scores	2.390
LDA	9 topics	top 1000 artists	term scores	1.438
LDA	12 topics	top 50 artists	term scores	7.760
LDA	12 topics	top 100 artists	term scores	5.820
LDA	12 topics	top 500 artists	term scores	1.792
LDA	12 topics	top 1000 artists	term scores	1.419

Table 17: Effective number of distinct artist sets from the LDA method’s soft clustering of artists and bands. Here the top artists or bands were determined by the term-scores of Blei and Lafferty [2009]. Multiple sizes of soft clusters were considered to demonstrate the overlap between different soft clusters.