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Abstract—Metric learning especially deep metric learning has been widely developed for large-scale image inputs data. However, in many real-world applications, we can only have access to vectorized inputs data. Moreover, on one hand, well-labeled data is usually limited due to the high annotation cost. On the other hand, the real data is commonly streaming data, which requires to be processed online. In these scenarios, the fashionable metric learning is not suitable anymore. To this end, we reconsider the traditional shallow online metric learning and newly develop an online progressive deep metric learning (ODML) framework to construct a metric-algorithm-based deep network. Specifically, we take an online metric learning algorithm as a metric-algorithm-based layer (i.e., metric layer), followed by a nonlinear layer, and then stack these layers in a fashion similar to deep learning. Different from the shallow online metric learning, which can only learn one metric space (feature transformation), the proposed ODML is able to learn multiple hierarchical metric spaces. Furthermore, in a progressively and nonlinearly learning way, ODML has a stronger learning ability than traditional shallow online metric learning in the case of limited available training data. To make the learning process more explainable and theoretically guaranteed, we also provide theoretical analysis. The proposed ODML enjoys several nice properties and can indeed learn a metric progressively and performs better on the benchmark datasets. Extensive experiments with different settings have been conducted to verify these properties of the proposed ODML.

Index Terms—Online Metric Learning, Deep Architecture, Nonlinearity, Interpretability

I. INTRODUCTION

Metric learning can automatically learn a suitable metric from data, making it widely adopted in data mining and computer vision. Generally, the data in these two fields mainly has two types of inputs, i.e., vectors and images. Traditional (shallow) metric learning algorithms can only learn from pre-extracted vectorized features. For example, for images, hand-crafted features, such as LBP [1], Gabor [2] and SIFT [3], are normally extracted in a vectorized fashion in the days of non-deep learning. In the era of deep learning, deep metric learning (DML), especially convolutional neural networks (CNNs) based algorithms [4, 5] are proposed to make it possible to simultaneously learn features and metric directly from the raw data. Such kind of DML algorithms have achieved significant success in a variety of computer vision tasks, including image classification, face recognition and person re-identification [6–11].
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(DML) algorithms [4], [5]. One key difference is that DML is based on deep neural network while our ODML is composed of shallow metric learning algorithms. Basically, such DML algorithms are generally developed to deal with image inputs data rather than vectorized data, while our ODML is specially designed for vectorized inputs data especially in the scenarios where the labeled training data is scarce.

Another difference is the training style. Since each metric layer in ODML is a relatively independent OML algorithm, as a result, the parameters of each metric layer can be innovatively updated according to its own local loss during forward propagation (FP). It means that it is possible to train such a metric-algorithm-based network by only using the FP strategy, while the existing DML cannot. The advantages of this FP updating are: (1) the parameter updating is immediate, unlike the delayed updating of the commonly used backward propagation (BP); (2) when additional BP is adopted, FP updating can vastly accelerate the convergence. Note that the second advantage has a similar effect of layer-wise unsupervised pre-training [20]–[22]. However, there are fundamental differences. The existing layer-wise training is unsupervised and only acts as a pre-training operation (or a regularizer [22]), which is not end-to-end. In contrast, the FP updating in the proposed ODML is supervised and serves the primary training mode rather than a pre-training role (elaborated in Section IV-C), which is end-to-end. In fact, these two updating strategies (i.e., FP and BP) can be combined to train this metric-algorithm-based deep network. Ideally, FP updating can explore new feature spaces sequentially, while BP updating can amend the exploration in further.

Furthermore, to facilitate the theoretical analysis of ODML, we design a new general Mahalanobis-based Online Metric Learning (MOML) algorithm, which is a shallow OML algorithm. MOML has a convex objective function and enjoys a closed-form solution with few constraints at each step. We also derive a theoretical regret bound for MOML to prove its convergence. Through stacking MOML hierarchically, the ability of learning feature representation progressively can be explainable and guaranteed.

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- **An Online Progressive Deep Metric Learning (ODML)** framework is developed for vectorized streaming data, such that we can learn a metric space progressively and deeply, i.e., exploring and learning a new metric in a nonlinear transformation space sequentially. Theoretical guarantees are presented to show that the classification performance will be improved or at least well maintained as the depth of the network increases.

- **Compared with traditional deep metric models**, the proposed ODML can be trained through forward propagation, which is more effective and efficient with a time complexity of $O(n(d^2 + \tau))$, where $n$ is the number of metric layers, $d$ is the feature dimensionality and $\tau$ indicates the time complexity of square rooting of the parameter matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. ODML can learn feature representation progressively, which enjoys a stronger learning ability than shallow online metric learning algorithms especially in the case of limited labeled data.

- **ODML is simple yet effective**, as verified by extensive experiments.

**II. RELATED WORK**

### A. Online Metric Learning

Online metric learning enjoys several practical and theoretical advantages, making it widely studied and applied in data mining tasks, which can be roughly divided into two categories: Mahalanobis distance-based and bilinear similarity-based methods.

Representative Mahalanobis distance-based OML methods include POLA [14], LEGO [15], RDML [16] and OPML [18]. For example, to solve the constraint construction problem, Li et al. [13] presented a one-pass triplet construction strategy and designed an OPML algorithm. In the second kind of bilinear similarity-based OML method, several algorithms such as OASIS [17], SOML [23], OMKS [24] and SORS [25] are also developed. As an example, OASIS learned a similarity measure by applying Passive-Aggressive (PA) algorithm [26] to solve the image retrieval task.

The proposed ODML, which is developed based on a newly designed mahalanobis-based online metric learning (MOML), belongs to the first kind of OML method. Compared with the above OML algorithms, ODML has the following advantages:

1. ODML is hierarchical and can learn feature representation progressively (i.e., better and better); (2) ODML is nonlinear by employing nonlinear activation functions; (3) ODML enjoys a stronger learning ability than shallow OML algorithms with the same amount of data.

### B. Deep Metric Learning

DML is applied to various tasks by taking advantage of the nonlinear feature representation learning ability of deep learning and discrimination power of metric learning [4], [5], [27]–[50]. Generally, the metric loss, i.e., pairwise loss (triplet loss) is employed to train a deep neural network with a structure of two (three) sub-networks (e.g., CNN or MLP). In these algorithms, the role of metric learning is only to optimize the deep neural networks for learning a good feature representation. Another closely related work is [37], which proposes a novel Hedge Backpropagation to train DNNs for the online setting.

Our proposed ODML can be considered as one kind of DML algorithm, but it is still an online algorithm, which is essentially different from the existing DML methods. Specifically, the differences are: (1) ODML is built on the existing shallow OML algorithms, while other DML methods are mainly built on CNNs or MLP; (2) ODML takes an independent OML algorithm as a metric layer with its own local loss, making it different from the embedded hidden layer of neural networks used by other DML methods; (3) ODML can be trained through forward propagation (enjoying low training time), while other DML methods can only be trained by backward propagation (suffering from high training time and vanishing gradient problem). In addition, ODML,
designed for vectorized data, may not work well for image data like other DML methods, because ODML does not have the feature learning part from raw image data.

III. OUR FRAMEWORK

Our goal is to design a novel hierarchical nonlinear online metric learning framework for online vectorized inputs data, which is modeled after the deep architecture, by using the existing online metric learning algorithms. In other words, to handle the vectorized data in an online manner, one existing online metric learning algorithm is more suitable than a fully connected layer or a convolutional layer to make up a base metric layer in this framework. For the hierarchical purpose, we repeatedly stack this base metric layer to construct a metric-algorithm-based deep network. As for nonlinearity, the ReLU function is employed as the nonlinear layer. The framework is illustrated in Fig. 2

For each metric layer, a Mahalanobis parameter matrix \( M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) is learnt. Then \( M \) is mathematically decomposed as \( L^T L \) by calculating the principal square root of \( M \) (where \( L \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) is a full-rank square matrix), mapping samples to a new feature space. The worst time complexity of the square root of \( M \) is \( O(d^3) \), but many optimization tricks can be adopted to accelerate the computing [38], [39]. When the input is \( x_0 \), the output is \( x_1 = Lx_0 \). As each metric layer is an independent metric learning algorithm in essence, the local loss of each metric layer is maintained, making parameter updating possible in the forward propagation. After forward propagation, backward propagation can also be optionally adopted to update the entire network. In fact, specific training (or updating) strategy should be determined by the specific tasks, as discussed in section [IV.C]

A. Online Progressive Deep Metric Learning

In this section, we propose and explain our ODML in detail. ODML is made up of multiple metric layers, in which one metric layer is an OML algorithm. To ensure the progressively learning ability of ODML, we should guarantee the convexity of each metric layer, which can easily guarantee the convergence of each layer. Therefore, a new Mahalanobis-based OML algorithm (MOML) is designed specifically. MOML has a convex objective function and enjoys a closed-form solution. Moreover, a tight regret bound of MOML is also proved (see Theorem 2).

Specifically, MOML is built on triplet-based constraints as triplet-based constraints have better properties. Thus, ODML is also learnt from triplet constraints. For computational efficiency, a one-pass triplet construction strategy presented by OPML [38] is also employed to construct triplets rapidly. In brief, for each new coming sample, two latest samples from both the same and different classes in the past samples are selected. By using this strategy, triplets can be constructed in an online manner. There are two types of layers in ODML, that are OML layer and ReLU layer. If we design a three-layer ODML network (i.e., ODML-3L), there should be three OML layers in this network. Moreover, each OML layer is followed by a ReLU layer except the last OML layer (i.e., the third OML layer).

A loss layer can also be added, which can give a global adjustment of the entire metric-algorithm-based network via backward propagation. To adequately use the effect of each local metric layer, the local loss is also utilized to update all the former layers (i.e., the loss of the \( i \)-th metric layer can be used to update the \( 1 \)-st to the \( (i-1) \)-th layers). In this way, vanishing gradient problem can also be alleviated. The novel loss function can be formulated as follows:

\[
\Gamma = \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{triplet} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \Gamma_{local}^i + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|L^i\|^2_F, \quad \text{(1)}
\]

where \( \Gamma_{triplet} = \|x_t^{(n)} - x_p^{(n)}\|^2 + 1 - \|x_t^{(n)} - x_q^{(n)}\|^2 \) indicates the triplet loss of the final output of the network (where \( z = \max(0, z) \)). \( \Gamma_{local}^i \) denotes the local loss of the \( i \)-th OML layer (i.e., Eq. (4)), and \( \|L^i\|^2_F \) represents the Frobenius norm of parameter matrix \( L^i \), i.e., the transformation matrix learnt in the \( i \)-th OML layer. Moreover, \( \lambda \) is the predefined hyper-parameter. While \( w_i \), the weight of the \( i \)-th metric layer.

![Fig. 2. Framework of the proposed online progressive deep metric learning (ODML), where each metric layer is an online metric learning algorithm.](image-url)
can be learnt by SGD during training phase, indicating the importance of each metric layer.

A New Mahalanobis-based OML (MOML): To build a metric layer of the proposed ODML, a new OML algorithm named MOML is presented, which can act as a representative of Mahalanobis-based algorithms. Note that, in essence, ODML can be constructed by other Mahalanobis-based algorithms. However, with MOML as a building component, ODML enjoys better theoretical properties. The goal of MOML, learnt from triplet constraints, is to learn a Mahalanobis distance function \( D \) that satisfies the following large margin constraint:

\[
D_M(x, x_p) > D_M(x, x_q) + r, \forall x, x_p, x_q \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{2}
\]

where \( x \) and \( x_p \) belong to the same class, while \( x \) and \( x_q \) come from different classes. \( D_M(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 - x_2)^\top M (x_1 - x_2) \), where \( M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) is a positive-definite parameter matrix. Also, \( r \) is the margin. Naturally, the hinge loss (i.e., \( r = 1 \)) can be employed as below,

\[
\ell(M, (x, x_p, x_q)) = \max(0, 1 + D_M(x, x_p) - D_M(x, x_q)). \tag{3}
\]

In a sequential manner, given a triplet \( \langle x_1, x_p, x_q \rangle \) at the \( t \)-th time step. Inspired by the Passive-Aggressive (PA) algorithms (i.e., a family of margin based online learning algorithms) [20], we design a convex objective function at each time step as follows,

\[
\Gamma = \arg \min_{M \succ 0} \frac{1}{2} \| M - M_{t-1} \|_F^2 + \gamma \left[ 1 + D_M(x, x_p) - D_M(x, x_q) \right], \tag{4}
\]

\[
(M_{t, x, x_p, x_q} = (x - x_p)^\top M (x - x_p), \quad (M_{t, x, x_q} = (x - x_q)^\top M (x - x_q))
\]

\[
\min_{M \succ 0} \frac{1}{2} \| M - M_{t-1} \|_F^2 + \gamma \left[ 1 + \text{Tr}(MA_t) \right]_+, \tag{4} \]

where \( \| \cdot \|_F \) is Frobenius norm, \( [z]_+ = \max(0, z) \) is the hinge loss, \( \text{Tr}(\cdot) \) denotes the trace operation, \( \gamma \) is the regularization parameter and \( A_t = (x_1 - x_p)(x_1 - x_p)^\top - (x_1 - x_q)(x_1 - x_q)^\top \). We can easily get that \( \Gamma \) is a convex function for \( M \), because \( \text{Tr}(MA_t) \) is a linear function of \( M \) which is convex, the hinge loss function \( [1 + z]_+ \) is convex (not continuous at \( z = -1 \)), and \( \| \cdot \|_F \) and the domain \( M \succ 0 \) are convex too. It can be shown that an optimal solution can be found within the domain \( M \succ 0 \) by properly setting the value of \( \gamma \). Thus, we can get the optimal solution of Eq. [4] by calculating the gradient \( \frac{\partial \Gamma(M)}{\partial M} = 0 \):

\[
\frac{\partial \Gamma(M)}{\partial M} = \begin{cases} M - M_{t-1} + \gamma A_t = 0 & \quad[z]_+ > 0 \\ M - M_{t-1} = 0 & \quad[z]_+ = 0. \end{cases} \tag{5}
\]

s.t. \( M \succ 0 \)

According to Theorem [1] (presented below), with a proper \( \gamma \), the semi-positive definitiveness of \( M \) can be guaranteed. Thus, at the \( t \)-th step, the parameter matrix \( M_t \) can be updated as below,

\[
M_t = \begin{cases} M_{t-1} - \gamma A_t & \quad[z]_+ > 0 \\ M_{t-1} & \quad[z]_+ = 0. \end{cases} \tag{6}
\]

From Eq. [6], we can see that the time complexity of MOML is \( O(d^2) \) at each time step. Using MOML as the base metric layer of ODML has the following advantages: (1) the objective function of MOML is convex, which is beneficial to theoretical analysis; (2) without loss of generality, MOML can act as a representative of Mahalanobis-based OML algorithms.

Theoretical Guarantee: Several theoretical guarantees are given for the proposed algorithms. Theorem [1] is a positive-definite guarantee of the parameter matrix \( M \) in MOML. Moreover, Theorem [2] presents a regret bound of MOML. Proposition [1] tries to analyze and explain the effectiveness of the proposed framework (i.e., ODML). All the details of the proofs can be found in the appendix.

Theorem 1. Suppose \( M_t \) is positive-definite, then \( M_{t+1} \) given by the MOML update, i.e., \( M_{t+1} = M_t - \gamma A_{t+1} \) is positive definite by properly setting \( \gamma \).

Theorem 2. Let \( \langle x_1, x_p, x_q \rangle, \cdots, \langle x_T, x_p, x_q \rangle \) be a sequence of triplet constraints where each sample \( x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d \) has \( \|x_t\| = 1 \) for all \( t \). Let \( M_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) be the solution of MOML at the \( t \)-th time step, and \( U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) denotes an arbitrary parameter matrix. By setting \( \gamma = \frac{1}{3\sqrt{\Phi}} \) (where \( \Phi \in \mathbb{R}^+ \)), the regret bound is

\[
R(U, T) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \ell(M_t) - \sum_{t=1}^{T} \ell(U) \leq \frac{1}{2} \| I - U \|_F^2 + \frac{32}{\Phi^2}. \tag{7}
\]

Proposition 1. Let \( M_1, \cdots, M_n \) be the parameter matrices learnt by each metric layer of ODML. The subsequent metric layer can learn a feature space that is at least as good as the one learnt by the former metric layer. That is, the composite feature space learnt by both \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) is better than the feature space learnt only by \( M_1 \) in most cases (i.e., the feature space is more discriminative for classification).

Other OML Algorithms In addition to MOML, other OML algorithms such as LEGO [15], RDML [16] and OPML [18] etc., can also be adapted into the proposed deep framework (namely LEGO-Deep, RDML-Deep and OPML-Deep). It is worth mentioning that both LEGO and RDML learn a Mahalanobis parameter matrix \( M \), while OPML just learns a transformation matrix \( L \). Hence, OPML doesn’t need an additional matrix decomposition operation (i.e., \( M = L^\top L \)). The experimental results of LEGO-Deep, RDML-Deep and OPML-Deep will be discussed in Section [IV-F].

B. Forward and Backward Propagation

The proposed ODML can be categorized as one specific deep learning algorithm. The difference is that ODML is made up of a series of OML algorithms (i.e., MOML metric layer). As we know deep learning is strongly dependent on SGD and backward propagation (BP). Particularly, our proposed ODML attempts to explore a new way to train this metric-algorithm-based deep network by introducing forward propagation (FP) updating. In fact, ODML can not only be learnt by forward propagation, but also be learnt by backward propagation. Moreover, these two strategies can be adopted simultaneously too. During forward propagation, each metric layer can be
learnt immediately, through this way, new feature space can be explored sequentially. When backward propagation, the return gradients can be used to fine-tune all the metric layers, amending the feature spaces learnt by the forward propagation.

Therefore, ODML can be trained with three different propagation strategies as follows: (1) **ODML-FP**, which is only trained by employing forward propagation strategy. (2) **ODML-FBP**, which utilizes forward and backward propagation strategies simultaneously. Specifically, a loss layer is added as the last layer to calculate the final loss, where the loss function (i.e., Eq. (1)) is adopted. (3) **ODML-BP** is similar to ODML-FBP, while ODML-BP only utilizes the final loss to train the entire network without the local losses and without forward updating. The flowcharts of these three variations can be seen in Fig. 3. The comparison between these variations will be shown in Section IV-C.

C. Training

We will describe how to train ODML in detail in this section. Note that, ODML is trained from scratch in an end-to-end manner, which is totally different from the traditional layer-by-layer training.

**Initialization:** Parameter matrix $M_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$) is initialized as an identity matrix. The hyper-parameter $\gamma$ in MOML and the $\lambda$ in loss layer need to be chosen by cross-validation according to the specific task. All $w_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$) is initialized as 1. The number of layers in ODML is also a hyper-parameter, which can be chosen according to a specific task (3 or 5 layers are usually enough).

**Forward Propagation:** At the $t$-th time step, one triplet $\langle \mathbf{x}_t^{(0)}, \mathbf{x}_p^{(0)}, \mathbf{x}_q^{(0)} \rangle$ is constructed. Then the triplet is fed into the first OML layer, and the current local triplet loss (i.e., Eq. (4)) is calculated by using the current metric matrix $M_1$. According to the updating strategy of MOML (i.e., Eq. (5)), the metric matrix $M_1$ is updated for the first time. Then, $M_1$ is mathematically decomposed as $L_1^\top L_1$. After transformation by using $L_1$, the new triplet $\langle \mathbf{x}_t^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}_p^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}_q^{(1)} \rangle = \langle L_1 \mathbf{x}_t^{(0)}, L_1 \mathbf{x}_p^{(0)}, L_1 \mathbf{x}_q^{(0)} \rangle$ is fed into the next ReLU layer. In a serial manner, the final output of the last layer is $\langle \mathbf{x}_t^{(n)}, \mathbf{x}_p^{(n)}, \mathbf{x}_q^{(n)} \rangle$. Through the linear (i.e., OML layer) and nonlinear transformation (i.e., ReLU layer), new feature spaces are sequentially explored. At the same time, the metric matrix of each OML layer is also learnt.

**Backward Propagation (optional):** The final loss is calculated according to Eq. (1) by using the output of the last OML layer. By using chain rule, SGD is adopted to update all the decomposed transformation matrix $L_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$). Then each metric matrix $M_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$) can be obtained naturally by $M_i = L_i^\top L_i$. Note that all these three samples in a triplet are used to calculate the gradients. Ideally, forward updating can explore new feature spaces, while backward updating can amend the exploration. In this way, that is, exploration with amendment, a much better feature space can be found. In practice, the backward propagation indeed can further slightly improve the feature space learnt by the forward propagation in some cases, but this could also bring additional computation load. As a trade-off between time and performance, if not specified, we will train the proposed ODML only by forward propagation, similar to the Deep forest [40]. More details can be seen in Section IV-C.

IV. Experiments

To verify the effectiveness and applicability of the proposed ODML, we conduct various experiments on the UCI datasets, which include multiple real-world machine learning tasks for which only vectorized features can be accessed, to analyze and interpret the properties of ODML.

A. Datasets

We pick twelve commonly used datasets from UCI Machine Learning Repository [41], which vary in the dimensionality and size. The details of these twelve datasets can be seen in Table I. The reason of choosing these datasets is that they are all vectorized data and can be representative data for the real-world applications. For example, lsvt is a real voice rehabilitation treatment dataset. pems contains 15 months worth of daily data that describes the occupancy rate of different car lanes of the San Francisco bay area freeways. Also, ionosphere is real radar data, which is collected by a system in Goose Bay, Labrador.

Classification task will be conducted on these datasets. For each dataset, 50% samples are randomly sampled as training set, and the rest is taken as test set. Each dataset will be resampled 30 times, and each algorithm will be tested on all these sampled datasets. When the feature dimensionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I</th>
<th>Twelve UCI datasets with different scales (i.e., #inst) and feature dimensions (i.e., #feat).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Datasets</td>
<td>#inst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lsvt</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iris</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wine</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spect</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ionosphere</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pems</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For fair comparison, all OML algorithms adopt the same triplet construction strategy introduced by ODML to construct the pairwise or triplet constraints. The difference is that, in OPML, the triplet construction strategy is one-pass, while here multiple-scan strategy is employed to construct more constraints for adequately training (the scanning number is set to $20$). Note that, all OML algorithms are still trained in an online manner. Moreover, three metric layers OML (named as OML-3L) is adopted in this experiment. A k-NN classifier ($i.e., k = 5$) is used to get the final classification results. The results are summarized in Table II. For each dataset, the mean and standard deviation of error rate are calculated, and pairwise t-tests between OML and other algorithms at 95% significance level are also performed. Then the win/tie/loss is counted according to the $t$-test. From this table, we can see that ODML can achieve superior performance compared with other metric learning algorithms. ODML is not only better than other state-of-the-art OML algorithms, but also better than batch metric learning algorithms, which owes to the design of deep architecture. We can also see that ODML is robust on small datasets, e.g., lsut, iris and spect, which means that ODML can handle small-scale data very well.

### C. Forward and Backward Propagation

In this section, we analyze the learning ability of ODML by adopting different propagation strategies, i.e., ODML-FP, ODML-BP and ODML-FBP. Specifically, we conduct classification task on the twelve UCI datasets to compare these three variations of ODML, each of which contains three metric layers. The results are exhibited in Table III. From the results, we can see that ODML-FP performs better than
Fig. 4. Results of different metric layers of ODML-5L. Moreover, Euclidean, MOML and LMNN are taken as the baseline algorithms.

Fig. 5. Feature visualization on four UCI datasets, demonstrating the feature representation learnt by each metric layer in ODML-3L.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Error Rate (%)</th>
<th>Metric Layers</th>
<th>Baselines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>MOML, ODML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>MOML, ODML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetic</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>MOML, ODML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spect</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>MOML, ODML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEMS</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>MOML, ODML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSVT</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>MOML, ODML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionosphere</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>MOML, ODML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>MOML, ODML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>MOML, ODML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetic</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>MOML, ODML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLprove</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>MOML, ODML</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 6.** Error rates on nine UCI datasets by changing the number of scans for MOML and ODML.

**Fig. 7.** Results of different metric layers of RDML-Deep-5L, LEGO-Deep-5L and OPML-Deep-5L, respectively. Moreover, Euclidean, RDML, LEGO and OPML are taken as the baselines.
ODML-BP. The reason is not difficult to perceive, because BP may suffer from the vanishing gradient problem. Taking advantage of the fact that each metric layer of ODML is a MOML algorithm, it can learn a good metric in each layer during FP. We can also observe that ODML-FP performs similarly to ODML-FBP. The reason may be that ODML-FP has achieved quite good classification performance on some datasets, so additional BP updating cannot further improve the performance. However, on other datasets, ODML-FBP indeed has achieved quite good classification performance on some similarly to ODML-FBP. The reason may be that ODML-FP learns a good metric in each layer.

Taking ODML-BP as the baseline algorithm, it can learn a good metric in each layer. BP may suffer from the vanishing gradient problem. Taking ODML-BP as the baseline, the reason is not difficult to perceive, because with a time complexity of $O(nd^2)$, where $n$ is the number of metric layers. Overall, for the proposed ODML, the FP training strategy is the best one when considering both training performance and training efficiency.

D. Progressive Feature Representation

In this section, we will analyze the progressive feature representation ability of each metric layer in ODML and verify that the metric space can become better and better by adding metric layer gradually. Particularly, an ODML-5L network is employed. To test the feature representation ability of each metric layer, we perform classification task on the output features of each metric layer respectively. We choose nine UCI datasets and take Euclidean distance, MOML and LMNN as the baseline algorithms. Note that only the test sets of these datasets are used to perform this experiment. From Fig. 4, we can see that the classification performance of ODML-5L becomes better with the increase of metric layer. Besides, in some datasets, the curve of error rate can converge smoothly. Moreover, we visualized the feature space learnt by each metric layer for more intuition (shown in Fig. 5). Four UCI datasets are picked and entered into one learnt ODML-3L network. Next, all output samples of each metric layer are $\ell_2$ normalized and reduced to a two-dimensional space by PCA. As seen, in original feature space, the distribution of samples is disordered. As the number of metric layers increases, the intra-class distance becomes smaller, the inter-class distance becomes larger, and the distribution of samples becomes more separable.

E. Learning Ability of ODML

Since the multiple-scan strategy is performed in the training phase, it is necessary to test the learning ability of ODML by setting different numbers of scans. Note that $m$ times scanning will scan the training data $m$ times. Therefore, we set the number of scans from 1 to 20, and compare the classification performance between ODML and MOML under different scans. Specifically, nine datasets are picked, and Euclidean distance is taken as the baseline. The results are presented in Fig. 6. From the figure, we can see that as the number of scans increases, the classification performance of ODML is significantly improved and then converge, which can reflect the ability of ODML for reusing data. Compared with MOML, with the same amount of data (i.e., the same scan), ODML can learn better feature representation (i.e., lower error rate).

In other words, the learning ability of ODML (i.e., a deep metric-algorithm-based method) is stronger than MOML (i.e., a shallow metric method), which means that ODML can gain more learning ability from the deep architecture.

F. Extendability of ODML

In order to verify the extendability of the proposed framework, we take the other three OML algorithms (e.g., LEGO, RDML and OPML) as the base OML layer and construct their corresponding deep versions, respectively (i.e., LEGO-Deep, RDML-Deep and OPML-Deep). Note that these three algorithms are all Mahalanobis-based OML algorithms. For simplicity, FP strategy is employed for these three algorithms similar to ODML-FP. Other settings are similar to the ones in Section V-D. From Fig. 7, we can see that LEGO-Deep, RDML-Deep and OPML-Deep have similar characteristic to ODML. In most cases, deep versions of these algorithms perform better than their corresponding shallow versions. Moreover, the progressive learning ability of feature representation is demonstrated. Therefore, the effectiveness and extendability of the proposed framework are verified.

V. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we propose an online hierarchical metric learning scheme in the spirit of deep learning. Specifically, we implement online progressive deep metric learning (ODML) by stacking a set of OML algorithms. Extensive experiments have been conducted to analyze and verify the properties of ODML. For future work, we will analyze and discuss this framework from three aspects as follows.

- **Extendability**: Although only OML-based algorithms are implemented (e.g., ODML), the proposed framework is extensible, such as: a) mini-batch or batch metric learning based metric network can be constructed; b) different metric learning algorithms can be combined as different metric layers; c) advanced deep learning tricks can be introduced in this framework.
- **Advantages**: The proposed ODML has many nice properties: a) it is online; b) it can be trained by either forward or backward propagation; c) it is quite fast and effective, which can be trained by CPU; d) it can progressively learn feature representation.
- **Drawbacks**: Because ODML is based on MOML, the performance of ODML depends on the performance of MOML. Currently, ODML cannot efficiently handle high dimensional data well due to a full matrix $M$ learned in MOML. This problem can be tackled by learning a diagonal matrix, which will be investigated in the future.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. As $A_{t+1} = (x_{t+1}−x_p)(x_{t+1}−x_p)^\top−(x_{t+1}−x_q)(x_{t+1}−x_q)^\top$, whose rank is 1 or 2, it has at most 2 non-zero eigenvalues. That is to say, $\text{Tr}(A_{t+1}) = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$. Specifically, we can also easily get that,

$$-\|x_{t+1}−x_q\|_2^2 \leq \lambda(A_{t+1}) \leq \|x_{t+1}−x_p\|_2^2,$$

(8)
where $\lambda(A_{t+1})$ means the eigenvalue of $A_{t+1}$ (i.e., $\lambda_1$ or $\lambda_2$). For each sample $x$ is $\ell_2$ normalized, the ranges of $\|x_{t+1} - x_p\|_2^2$ and $\|x_{t+1} - x_q\|_2^2$ vary from $[0, 4]$. Thus,

$$
\lambda_{\min}(M_t) - 4\gamma \leq \lambda(M_t - \gamma A_{t+1}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(M_t) + 4\gamma . \tag{9}
$$

When $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{4}\lambda_{\min}(M_t)$, it is guaranteed that the minimum eigenvalue of $M_t - \gamma A_{t+1}$ is greater than zero. As the initial matrix $M_1 = I$ is positive definite (i.e., $\lambda_{\min}(M_1) = 1$). By properly setting a small $\gamma$, the minimum eigenvalue of $M_t - \gamma A_{t+1}$ is generally large than zero. Thus, the positive definiteness of $M_{t+1} = M_t - \gamma A_{t+1}$ can be guaranteed. Same theoretical guarantee (i.e., the small perturbations of positive definite matrix) can also be found in the chapter 9.6.12 of [4].

**B. Proof of Theorem 2**

**Proof.** According to the objective function of MOML, i.e.,

$$
\Gamma = \arg \min_{M > 0} \frac{1}{2} \| M - M_{t-1} \|_F^2 + \gamma \left[ 1 + \text{Tr}(M A_t) \right] ,
$$

we denote $\ell_t$ as the instantaneous loss suffered by MOML at each $t$-time step with the learnt $M_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, and denote by $\ell_t^*$ the loss suffered by an arbitrary parameter matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, which can be formalized as below:

$$
\ell_t = \ell(M_t; \langle x_t, x_p, x_q \rangle) = \left[ 1 + \text{Tr}(M_t A_t) \right] ,
$$

$$
\ell_t^* = \ell(U; \langle x_t, x_p, x_q \rangle) = \left[ 1 + \text{Tr}(U A_t) \right] ,
$$

where $A_t = (x_t - x_p)(x_t - x_p)^T - (x_t - x_q)(x_t - x_q)^T$. Tr denotes trace and $[z]_+ = \max(0, z)$. As $\text{Tr}(M_t A_t)$ is a linear function, it is convex w.r.t $A_t$ by natural. Besides, the hinge loss function $[z]_+$ is a convex function (but not continuous at $z = 0$) w.r.t $z$. Hence, the resulting composite function $\ell_t(M_t)$ is convex w.r.t $M_t$. As $\ell$ is a convex function, we can introduce the first-order condition as follow:

$$
\ell(Y) \geq \ell(X) + \text{VEC}(\nabla \ell(X))^\top \text{VEC}(Y - X) , \tag{12}
$$

where $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, VEC denotes vectorization of a matrix, and $\nabla \ell(X)$ is the gradient of function $\ell$ at $X$.

Inspired by [29], we define $\Delta_t$ to be $\| M_t - U \|_F^2 - \| M_{t+1} - U \|_F^2$. Then calculating the cumulative sum of $\Delta_t$ over all $t \in \{1, 2, \cdots, T\}$, we can easily obtain $\sum_t \Delta_t$,

$$
\sum_{t=1}^T \Delta_t = T\left[ \| M_t - U \|_F^2 - \| M_{t+1} - U \|_F^2 \right] = \| M_t - U \|_F^2 - \| M_{T+1} - U \|_F^2 \tag{13}
$$

$$
\leq \| M_t - U \|_F^2 .
$$

For simplicity, we employ stochastic gradient descent (SGD) to update the parameter matrix $M_t$. Hence, according to the definition of SGD, $M_{t+1} = M_t - \eta \nabla \ell(M_t)$, where $\eta$ is the learning rate, and $\nabla \ell(M_t) = \gamma A_{t+1}$. Then, we can rewrite the $\Delta_t$ as,

$$
\Delta_t = \| M_t - U \|_F^2 - \| M_{t+1} - U \|_F^2 = \| M_t \|_F^2 - 2\langle M_t, U \rangle + \| U \|_F^2 = \| M_t - U \|_F^2 + 2\eta \text{VEC}(M_t - U)^\top \text{VEC}(\nabla \ell(M_t)) \geq 2\eta \text{VEC}(M_t - U)^\top \text{VEC}(\nabla \ell(M_t)) \geq 2\eta \| \ell_t^* - \ell_t \|_2^2 \| \nabla \ell(M_t) \|_F^2 . \tag{14}
$$

We can easily get that,

$$
\sum_{t=1}^T \left[ 2\eta (\ell_t^* - \ell_t) - \eta \| \nabla \ell(M_t) \|_F^2 \right] \leq \| M_1 - U \|_F^2 . \tag{15}
$$

As all samples are $\ell_2$ normalized, the 2-norm of each sample is 1, namely $\| x_t \|_2 = 1, t \in \{1, 2, \cdots, T\}$. We can easily calculate the Frobenius norm of $A_{t+1}$,

$$
\| A_{t+1} \|_F \leq \| (x_{t+1} - x_p)(x_{t+1} - x_p)^T + (x_{t+1} - x_q)(x_{t+1} - x_q)^T \|_F + \| (x_{t+1} - x_p)(x_{t+1} - x_q)^T \|_F \\
\leq \| x_{t+1} - x_p \|_2 \| x_{t+1} - x_p \|_2 + \| x_{t+1} - x_q \|_2 \| x_{t+1} - x_q \|_2 \\
\leq \| x_{t+1} - x_p \|_2 + \| x_{t+1} - x_q \|_2 \\
\leq \| x \|_2 = 2 \\
\leq 8.
$$

Thus,

$$
\sum_{t=1}^T (\ell_t^* - \ell_t) \leq \frac{1}{2\eta} \| M_1 - U \|_F^2 + \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \| \ell_t \|_2^2 = \frac{1}{2\eta} \| M_1 - U \|_F^2 + \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \| M_t \|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\eta} \| M_1 - U \|_F^2 + 32T\eta \gamma^2 \tag{17}
$$

($M_1$ is initialized to an identity matrix $I$)

In particular, setting $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4T}}$ (where $\Phi > 0$ is a constant) yields the regret bound $R(U, T) \leq \frac{\Phi}{T} \| I - U \|_F^2 + \frac{32\gamma^2}{\Phi} \sqrt{T}$. In fact, in this study, a closed-form solution is employed (i.e., $\eta = 1$), the regret bound is $R(U, T) \leq \frac{\Phi}{T} \| I - U \|_F^2 + 32T\gamma^2$. By setting $\gamma$ in a decreasing way with the iteration number $T$, for example, $\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4T}}$, we can obtain a regret bound $R(U, T) \leq \frac{\Phi}{T} \| I - U \|_F^2 + \frac{32}{\Phi}$ Hence proved.

**C. Theoretical analysis of Proposition 1**

**Proof.** For simplicity, we just consider to analyze and prove this proposition of ODML-FP that only uses forward propagation strategy. In fact, as ODML-FP only has forward propagation, each metric layer is a relatively independent MOML algorithm. Thus, Theorem 2 is applicable to each metric layer. In other words, each metric layer (i.e., a MOML
algorithm) has its own tight regret bound. As the subsequent metric layer is learnt based on the output of the former metric layer, the metric space should not be worse according to the theoretical guarantee of regret bound. Moreover, ReLU activation function can introduce nonlinearity and sparsity into the feature mapping, which is also beneficial to the exploration of feature space. In some cases, if the latter metric layer is in the wrong direction, backward propagation can be chosen to correct and adjust the direction to some extent.
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