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Abstract—In this work, we consider nonnegative matrix factorization (NMF) with a regularization that promotes small volume of the convex hull spanned by the basis matrix. We present highly efficient algorithms for three different volume regularizers, and compare them on endmember recovery in hyperspectral unmixing. The NMF algorithms developed in this work are shown to outperform the state-of-the-art volume-regularized NMF methods, and produce meaningful decompositions on real-world hyperspectral images in situations where endmembers are highly mixed (no pure pixels). Furthermore, our extensive numerical experiments show that when the data is highly separable, meaning that there are data points close to the true endmembers, and there are a few endmembers, the regularizer based on the determinant of the Gramian produces the best results in most cases. For data that is less separable and/or contains more endmembers, the regularizer based on the logarithm of the determinant of the Gramian performs best in general.

Index Terms—nonnegative matrix factorization, volume regularization, hyperspectral unmixing, blind source separation

I. INTRODUCTION

Non-negative Matrix Factorization (NMF) is the following problem: given a matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and an integer $r$, find two matrices $W \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{m \times r}$ and $H \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{r \times n}$ such that

$$\text{(NMF): } X \cong WH, \quad (1)$$

Throughout the paper we assume that $W, H$ are full rank and $1 \leq r \leq \min\{m, n\}. \quad (2)$

NMF has many applications; see, e.g., [4], [9], [6] and the references therein. In this work, we focus on hyperspectral unmixing (HU) [2] that aims at recovering the pure materials (called endmembers) and their abundances in each pixel within a hyperspectral image; see Section II for more details. In order to tackle HU, we will use volume-regularized NMF (VRNMF) which can be formulated as follows

$$\min_{W, H} f(W, H; X) + \lambda V(W)$$

subject to $W \geq 0, H \geq 0, H^T 1_n \leq 1_n, \quad (3)$

where $1_n$ denotes the vector of ones of length $n$ and $W \geq 0$ indicates that $W$ is component-wise non-negative.

The regularization parameter $\lambda \geq 0$ controls the trade off between the data fitting term $f(W, H; X)$ and the volume regularizer $V(W)$. In this paper, we will consider the most widely used data fitting term, namely the least squares error $f(W, H; X) = \frac{1}{2} \|X - WH\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (X_{ij} - WH_{ij})^2$. For the volume regularizer, we will consider the following three functions

- Determinant: $V_{\text{det}}(W) = \frac{1}{2} \text{det}(W^T W)$,
- Log-det: $V_{\text{logdet}}(W) = \frac{1}{2} \log \text{det}(W^T W + \delta I_r)$,
- Nuclear: $V_{\text{nucl}}(W) = \|W\|_*$,

where $\text{det}(A)$ is the determinant of matrix $A$, $I_r$ is identity matrix of size $r$, $\delta > 0$ is a constant to lower bound $V_{\text{logdet}}$, and $\|A\|_*$ is the nuclear norm of $A$, that is, the sum of the singular values of $A$. VRNMF aims at fitting the data points within the convex hull of the columns of $W$ which should have a small volume. The reason to consider the functions $V_{\text{det}}$ and $V_{\text{logdet}}$ is that $\sqrt{\text{det}(WW^T)}/r!$ is the volume of the convex hull of the columns of $W$ and the origin. In this paper, we also consider, for the first time in the context of VRNMF, the regularizer $\|W\|_*$, which is also a non-increasing function in the singular values of $W$. As we will see, this regularizer also performs well in practice.

The approach of using a volume regularization with NMF has a long history and has been considered for example in [15], [20], [23], [7], [6], [13]. The key differences among these works are in the choice of $V$. Almost all previous works have focused on the two functions $V_{\text{det}}$ and $V_{\text{logdet}}$. We believe it is important to design efficient algorithms for these regularizes, and compare them on solving HU on highly mixed hyperspectral images in order to know which one performs better in which situations.

A. Contributions

The contribution of this work is twofold: the first part of this work is algorithm design, in which we implement and enhance the algorithms to solve VRNMF by using block coordinate descent and optimal first-order methods. Experimental results will show that our algorithms perform better than the current-state-of-the-art volume-regularization based method from [2]. The second part of this work is focused on model comparisons. We will answer the question “which volume function is better suited for VRNMF to tackle HU?”. We do so by performing extensive numerical comparisons of VRNMF with different...
The findings are as follows:

- For data that is highly separable, meaning that there exists data points close to the true endmembers, VRNMF with $V_{\text{det}}$ produces the best results in most cases.
- For data that is less separable or in the presence of a large number of endmembers, VRNMF with $V_{\text{logdet}}$ performs best in general.

Finally, as a proof of concept, we showcase the ability of VRNMF to produce a meaningful unmixing on hyperspectral images using real-world data.

This work is the continuation of the conference paper [1]. The additional contributions of this extended version are the following:

- We base our numerical experiments only on real endmembers, as opposed to randomly generated ones in [1].
- We use a fine grid search by bisection to tune the regularization parameter $\lambda$.
- We implement VRNMF with the nuclear norm regularizer.
- We have improved our implementations; they are available from [https://angms.science/research.html](https://angms.science/research.html)
- We compare our implementation of VRNMF with the state-of-the-art volume-regularization algorithm RVolMin [7].

B. Outline of the paper

The remaining of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we give a more complete introduction to HU, followed by the discussion of the pure-pixel assumption also known as the separability assumption. This motivates the use of VRNMF when this assumption is violated. Section III gives the details about the enhancement and implementation of the algorithms for VRNMF. Section IV presents the experiments on VRNMF and Section V concludes the paper.

II. BRIEF REVIEW ON HU

We now give a brief review on HU; see [2], [14] and the references therein for more details. The goal of HU is to study the composition and the distribution of materials in a given scene being imaged. A scene usually consists of a few fundamental types of materials called endmembers, and the first goal of HU is to obtain the information of these endmembers from the observed hyperspectral image (HSI). HSI are images captured by sensors over different wavelengths in the electromagnetic spectrum. These images form of a hyperspectral data cube of size $n \times \text{col} \times \text{row}$, where $n$ is the number of spectral bands, and “col” and “row” are the dimensions of the images with $n = \text{col} \times \text{row}$. Vectorizing these images we obtain a collection of vector with length $n$, and stacking these vectors together we get the $m$-by-$n$ data matrix $X$. In other words, given the observed data matrix $X$, the goal of HU is to (i) identify the number of endmembers $r$, (ii) obtain the spectral signature of these endmembers, (iii) identify which pixel contains which endmember and in which proportion. This work does not consider problem (i) by assuming $r$ is known. In fact, model order selection is a topic of research on its own; see, e.g., [2] and the references therein. The focus of this work is (ii): recover the (ground truth) endmember spectral matrix, denoted by $W^{\text{true}}$, from the observed data $X$. In fact, assuming (ii) is solved, (iii) can be tackled by solving a (convex) nonnegative least squares problem [2], [14]. The most widely used model for HU is the linear mixing model for which a hidden low-rank linear mixing structure for the data $X = W^{\text{true}}H^{\text{true}} + N$ is assumed. The data $X$ is hence generated by $W^{\text{true}}$ (the basis, where each column of $W^{\text{true}}$ is the spectral signature of an endmember), weighted by the matrix $H^{\text{true}}$ plus some noise $N$. The matrix $H$ in the HU literature is also called the abundance matrix and encodes how much each endmember (columns of $W^{\text{true}}$) is present in each pixel of the image, where each row of $H$ is a vectorized image in grey scale of the scene. There are two physical constraints in HU: the non-negativity constraints $W \geq 0$ (spectral signatures are nonnegative), and the nonnegativity $H \geq 0$ and sum-to-one constraint $H^\top 1_r = 1_n$ (the abundances in each pixel are nonnegative and sum to one). In this paper, we consider a more general model, namely using $H^\top 1_r \leq 1_n$, that allows to take into account different intensities of illumination among the pixels of the image. Finally, NMF is the right model to perform HU under the linear mixing model, that is, to learn the endmember matrix $W$ and the abundance matrix $H$ from the data matrix $X$. However, NMF is a difficult problem in general [21].

A. Pure-pixel assumption

Separable NMF (SNMF) is able to solve HU when the data satisfies the separability condition, which is also known as the pure-pixel assumption in HU. It means the data $X$ contains at least $r$ pure pixels where each pure pixel contains only one endmember, and there is a one-to-one correspondence between the $r$ pure pixels and the $r$ endmembers. Mathematically, separability changes the NMF model (1) to

$$(\text{SNMF}) : \quad X \cong WH^\top \Pi_n = [X(:,A) \cdot H']\Pi_n,$$

where $\Pi_n$ is a $n$-by-$n$ permutation matrix, and $H' \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times (n-r)}$ has its columns with $l_1$ norm smaller than one. In SNMF, we have that $W = X(:,A)$, that is, the index set $A$ contains the indices of the pure pixels. Since all columns of $H'$ have $l_1$ norm smaller than one, $X(:,A)$ and the origin are the $r$ extreme points of the data cloud $X$, that is, the convex hull of $X(:,A)$ and the origin encapsulates all the other points in $X$. Hence, SNMF is geometrically a vertex identification problem: given $X$, locate the extreme points $W = X(:,A)$ which will be exactly $W^{\text{true}}$ if the separability condition holds and no noise is present. Many algorithms exist to perform this task (referred to as pure-pixel search algorithms), e.g., vertex component analysis (VCA) [16] or the successive projection algorithm (SPA) [11]; see [2], [14] and the references therein for more algorithms and discussions. In this paper, we will compare VRNMF to SPA, as SPA is a state-of-the-art provably robust pure-pixel search algorithm.
However, when the separability condition does not hold, pure-pixel search algorithms fail. In order to quantify how much separability is violated, we introduce the non-separability parameter \( p \in (0, 1]^r \). First, note that separability holds if and only if each row of \( H \) contains at least one entry equal to one, that is, \( \|h^j\|_\infty = 1 \) for \( j \in [r] \), where \( h^j \) denotes the \( j \)th row of \( H \) and \( [r] = \{1, 2, \ldots, r\} \). Therefore, to break the separability condition, we need to have \( \|h^j\| \leq p_j \) for some \( j \) and \( p_j < 1 \). Figure 1 gives an example with \( r = 4 \). Hence, having \( \|h^j\| \leq p_j \) means that the maximum abundance of the \( j \)th endmember in all pixels is at most \( p_j \), which sets a minimal amount of separation between the data points (the black dots in Figure 1) to the vertex \( w_j \) (the black stars). In other words, \( p_j \) controls the gap between \( \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]} \) and \( w_j \), where \( x_i \) is the \( i \)th data point (\( i \)th column of \( X \)). It is important to note that the entries of \( p \) can be different in general meaning that we have asymmetric non-separability. For example, in Figure 1 data points are closer to vertex 1 than vertex 4.

Note that in Figure 1 the reconstructions given by SPA (11) (green vertices) and RVolMin (7) (deep blue vertices, a state-of-the-art minimum-volume NMF algorithm) are far away from the ground truth. VRNMF with \( V_{\det} \) (cyan vertices) produces a perfect recovery of \( W^{\text{true}} \). The next section describes how we solve the VRNMF minimization problem to obtain such results.

III. SOLVING VRNMF

In this section, we describe how to solve (3). We use the framework of block coordinate descent (BCD) by solving the subproblems on \( W \) and \( H \) separately in an alternating scheme, as done in most NMF works (9). Let us start with the subproblem for \( H \).

A. Subproblem for \( H \)

Splitting \( H \) into columns yields \( n \) independent problems: for \( 1 \leq j \leq n \), solve

\[
\min_{h_j \in \Delta} \frac{1}{2}\|x_j - Wh_j\|_2^2, \quad \Delta = \{h \in \mathbb{R}_+^r | h^\top 1_r \leq 1\},
\]

(4)

where \( h_j \) is the \( j \)th column of \( H \) and \( \Delta \) is the \( r \)-dimensional unit simplex that encodes the non-negativity and sum-to-one constraints in (3). By (2), this unit simplex least square is a convex problem with strongly convex objective function. We use the accelerated projected gradient (APG) method from Nesterov (17) which requires \( O\left(\sqrt{\kappa} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \) iterations to reach an \( \epsilon \)-accurate solution, where \( \kappa \) is the condition number of \( W^\top W \) which is the Hessian of the objective function in (3). The convergence rate of APG is optimal as no other first-order method can have a faster convergence rate (17). We defer the explanation of the acceleration scheme to section III-C. For the projection onto \( \Delta \), which is given by \( P_\Delta(h) = (h - 11_r)_+ \) with \( l \) as the Lagrangian multiplier obtained by solving the KKT system of (4), we use the implementation of (8) requiring \( O(r \log r) \) operations. Since \( r \) is small (usually \( r \leq 20 \)), the implementation of (8) is numerically as good as the optimal method (5) with complexity \( O(r) \).

In summary, we solve (4) using an optimal first-order method. Note that (4) is parallelizable, we can solve the \( n \) problems (4) in parallel.

B. Subproblem for \( W \) with \( V_{\det} \)

We follow the idea from (23) and perform a block coordinate descent method on the columns \( w_i \) of \( W \) (\( 1 \leq i \leq r \)). We have

\[
\|X - WH\|_F^2 = \|h^i\|_2^2\|w_i\|_2^2 - 2\langle X, h^iT, w_i \rangle + c,
\]

(5)

\[
det(W^TW) = \gamma_i w_i^TQ_i Q_i^T w_i.
\]

(6)

In (5), \( X_i = X - \sum_{j \neq i} w_j h^j \) and \( c \) is a constant independent of \( w_i \). In (6), \( \gamma_i = \det(W_i^T W_i) \) and \( Q_i \) is the orthonormal basis of the null space of \( W_i^T \), where \( W_i \) is \( W \) without the column \( w_i \); see (23 Appendix) for more details. Using (5) and (6), we obtain the following problem for each column of \( W \):

\[
\min_{w_i \geq 0} \frac{1}{2} w_i^T(\|h^i\|_2^2 I_m + \gamma_i Q_i Q_i^T) w_i - \langle X_i, h^iT, w_i \rangle.
\]

Unlike the problem on \( h \), here the objective function in \( w_i \) depends on the other columns of \( W \) so the problem is not parallelizable. We solve this NNQP using APG, which is faster than the standard quadratic programming algorithms used in (23).

C. Subproblem for \( W \) with \( V_{\logdet} \)

To solve for \( V_{\logdet} \), we use majorization minimization, similarly as in (7). First we have

\[
(\text{Lemma 2, (12)}) \quad \log \det(W^TW + \delta I_r) \leq \|W\|_D^2 + c,
\]

(7)
where $\|W\|_D = \|D^{1/2}W^T\|_F$ is a weighted norm with $D = (Y^TY + \delta I_r)^{-1}$ for any matrix $Y$. This expression comes from performing the first-order Taylor expansion of the concave function $\log \det(\cdot)$. The inequality (7) holds when $Y = W$. In other words, we minimize the tight convex upper bound on the non-convex logdet function

$$\min_{W^T \geq 0} \Phi(W) = \frac{1}{2} \langle W^TW, HH^T \rangle - \langle X, WH \rangle + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|W\|_D^2,$$

(8)

where $D_t = \left( W_{t-1}^TW_{t-1} + \delta I_r \right)^{-1}$. To solve (8), we again use APG. However, we embed the following two acceleration strategies to APG:

- The adaptive restart heuristic from [13]. The APG update of $W$ at iteration $t$ can be expressed as

$$W^{t+1} = \left[ W^t - \alpha_t \nabla \Phi(W^t + \beta_t \Delta_t) + \beta_t \Delta_t \right]_+,$$

where $\alpha$ is the step size, $\nabla \Phi$ is the gradient of the objective function and $[\cdot]_+$ is the projection onto the nonnegative orthant. Here $\beta_t \Delta_t$ is the momentum term added in Nesterov’s acceleration that extrapolates $W^t$ along the direction $\Delta_t = W^t - W_{t-1}$ and $\beta_t \in [0, 1]$ is a parameter with $\beta_0 = 0$. The extrapolation may increase the value of $\Phi$, and when this happens, we “restart” the APG scheme by reinitializing $\beta_t$, which reduces the APG back to a standard projected gradient step that decreases the value of $\Phi$.

- The general acceleration framework for NMF algorithms from [10]. There are several terms independent of $W$, in particular $HH^T$ and $XH^T$, in the gradient term and are the main computational cost. The idea has two components: (i) pre-compute the terms independent of $W$ outside the update to avoid repeated computation of the same terms, and (ii) perform the update on $W$ multiple times to re-use these precomputed terms (in most standard NMF algorithms, $W$ is only updated once before the update of $H$).

Finally, due to space limit, we do not present another majorization for logdet which is based on eigenvalue inequality proposed in the conference work [11]. In short, that approach is another relaxation of (8) that unlocks the coupling between columns of $W$ so that column-wise update similar to the one mentioned in section III-B can be used.

### D. Subproblem for $W$ with $V_*$

The nuclear norm regularized VRNMF problem on $W$ is

$$\min_{W^T \geq 0} \frac{1}{2} \langle W^TW, HH^T \rangle - \langle X, WH \rangle + \lambda \|W\|_*.$$

(9)

Ignoring for now the non-negativity constraints, we solve the resulting problem by proximal gradient which updates $W$ as follows:

$$W^{t+\frac{1}{2}} = \text{prox}_{\theta f}(W^t),$$

$$W^{t+1} = W^{t+\frac{1}{2}} - \alpha_t \nabla f(W^{t+\frac{1}{2}}),$$

where $\alpha$ is step size and $\nabla f$ is the gradient of $\frac{1}{2} \langle W^T W, HH^T \rangle - \langle X, WH \rangle$. For the step size, we use $\alpha = 1/L$ where $L = \|HH^T\|_2$ is the Lipschitz constant of the gradient. The proximal operator of $\|\cdot\|_*$ with step size $\theta$ has the closed-form expression given by the singular value thresholding (SVT) operator [3]. We have

$$W^{t+\frac{1}{2}} = \text{SVT}_\theta(W^{t+\frac{1}{2}}),$$

where $[\cdot]_+$ is the SVD of $W^{t+\frac{1}{2}}$. Finally, to take the non-negativity constraint into account, we simply put a nonnegative projection after SVT and set $W^{t+1} = [W^{t+\frac{1}{2}}]_+$.

### E. Summary of the algorithms

Algorithm 1 shows the general framework for solving VRNMF. Our implementations are faster than previous works because of the use of Nesterov’s acceleration [17], adaptive restart [18] and the use of the acceleration strategy for NMF from [10]. Moreover, our update of $W$ in VRNMF using $V_*$ is new.

**Algorithm 1 VRNMF**

**Input:** $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, an integer $r$, $\lambda \geq 0$

**Output:** $W \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ for problem (3).

**Initialize** $(W^0, H^0)$ by SPA [11]

for $t = 1, 2, \ldots$ do

- **Update of $W$**
  - Compute and store $HH^T$ and $XH^T$
  - if $V = V_{\text{det}}$ then
    - Update $W$ as stated in section III-B
  - else if $V = V_{\logdet}$ then
    - Update $W$ as stated in section III-C
  - else if $V = V_*$ then
    - Update $W$ as stated in section III-D
  - end if

- **Update of $H$** by FGM [8].

end for

We call the algorithm on $V_{\text{det}}$, $V_{\logdet}$ and $V_* \rightarrow \text{Det}$, $\logdet$ and $\text{Nuclear}$, respectively.

We end this section by briefly mentioning the convergence of these algorithms. VRNMF is a non-convex problem and it can be shown that the sequence $\{W^t, H^t\}_{t=1,2,\ldots}$ produced by Algorithm 1 converges to a first-order stationary point: For $\text{Det}$, the convergence comes from the standard result of coordinate descent [22]. For $\logdet$, which involves the use of the upper bound $\Phi$, convergence comes from the theory of [19]. For nuclear, convergence result of proximal gradient applies [3]. Figure 2 shows a typical convergence curve of the algorithms.

### IV. Experiments

In this section we compare the VRNMF models on solving HU. We first describe the general experimental setting in section IV-A, then we report the experimental results on recovering the ground truth $W^\text{true}$ under different asymmetric non-separability and different noise levels in the subsequent subsections. Finally we present results on two real-world data sets. All the experiments are run by MATLAB (v.2015a) on a laptop with 2.4GHz CPU and 16GB RAM. The codes available from https://angms.science/research.html
We perform grid search by bisection in a greedy way to tune $\lambda$:

- (step-1) Take $\lambda_a = 10^{-6}$, $\lambda_b = 0.5$ initially.
- (step 2) Run the algorithm with $\lambda_a$, $\lambda_b$ and $\tilde{\lambda}$, where $\tilde{\lambda} = 0.5(\lambda_a + \lambda_b)$. Denote the performance of the solution $W$ produced under a specific $\lambda$ as MRSA($\lambda$), where MRSA will be defined in the next paragraph.
- (step-3) Split the search interval $I_0 = [\lambda_a, \lambda_b]$ into two intervals $I_0^1 = [\lambda_a, \tilde{\lambda}]$ and $I_0^2 = [\tilde{\lambda}, \lambda_b]$. For each interval there are two MRSA value, we let the MRSA value of an interval be the sum of these values.
- (step-4) We repeat step-1 to step-3 on the interval with the lowest MRSA value. That is, at iteration $k$, we shrink the search interval by half by defining the new search interval $I_{k+1}$ as

\[
I_{k+1} \leftarrow \min \{ \text{MRSA}(I_k^1), \text{MRSA}(I_k^2) \}.
\]

- If a draw happens in step-4, we perform two bisections on each of the interval $I_k^1$ and $I_k^2$ and set the next interval to be the one with the smallest MRSA.
- We repeat this process (step-1 to step-4) at most 20 times, or if further progression does not make a significant improvement, namely

\[
\text{MRSA} \left( \tilde{\lambda}_{k+1} \right) - \text{MRSA} \left( \tilde{\lambda}_k \right) \leq 10^{-4}.
\]

Note that such greedy bisection search does not guarantee that $\tilde{\lambda}$ will converge to the best value, that is, the value that corresponds to the lowest MRSA. However, we have observed in extensive numerical experiments the effectiveness of this scheme.

**Performance metric** We measure the quality of a solution $W$ produced by VRNMF algorithms using the mean removed spectral angle (MRSA) between $W$ and $W^{\text{true}}$. MRSA between two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0_m\}$ is defined as

\[
\frac{100}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{\langle x - \bar{x}, y - \bar{y} \rangle}{\|x - \bar{x}\|_2 \|y - \bar{y}\|_2} \right) \in [0, 100].
\]

MRSA gives a better measurement than relative percentage error as it purely depends on the shapes of $x$ and $y$, where the effects of mean and size are removed. A low MRSA value means a good matching between $x$ and $y$. We measure the performance of algorithms by calculating the MRSA between $\{w_i\}_{i \in [r]}$ and $\{w_i^{\text{true}}\}_{i \in [r]}$ which is defined as the mean of MRSA between each vector pair $\{w_i, w_i^{\text{true}}\}$, such value is within $[0, 100]$.

**B. Using the Samson dataset with $r = 3$**

We run experiments on the synthetic dataset where $W^{\text{true}}$ comes from the Samson data set with $r = 3$ as follows. We perform $10 \times 10 \times 10 = 1000$ experiments where the data in each experiment is generated using the non-separability vector $p = [p_1, p_2, p_3]$, where $p_1$ is selected from the set $P = \{0.99, 0.96, 0.93, 0.89, 0.86, 0.83, 0.79, 0.76, 0.73, 0.69\}$. Figure 5 shows the results in form of MRSA cubes for the algorithms SPA, Det, logdet, Nuclear and RVolMin, where each pixel in the cube is the result (in MRSA) over one trial. We then construct the recovery curves by counting...
the number of cases (pixels) in the cube that the MRSA value is less than a threshold; see Figure 6. For comparison, we also perform the same experiment on the state-of-the-art volume-regularized method RVolMin [7], where the same number of iterations, the same parameter search scheme and the same initialization is applied and the result of RVolMin is shown on Figure 6. In general, the results in Figures 5 and 6 show that:

- All VRNMF algorithms perform better than the state-of-the-art SNMF algorithm SPA, as the MRSA cubes of VRNMF have a wider blue region (lower MRSA) and their recovery curves in Figure 6 dominate that of SPA.
- When the data is highly non-separable (low $p_i$s), VRNMF algorithms perform worse than SPA. In fact, the region of the cube corresponding to highly non-separable data in SPA is not as red as for the VRNMF approaches. The reason is that SPA always extracts points from the data could hence these points are never too far from the vertices. However, when the data is highly non-separable, VRNMF may generate points further away
Fig. 4. An instance of the curve of MRSA versus iteration of parameter tuning of the Det and RVolMin.

than the vertices.

- Compared with RVolMin, logdet and Nuclear are consistently better, while Det performs similarly.
- logdet performs better than Det and Nuclear for highly non-separable data, as its red region is much more concentrated around the highly non-separable corner of the cube.

In terms of computational time, on average it takes Det 2.1±0.2, logdet 1.2±0.1, Nuclear 1.3±0.2 and RVolMin 2.1±0.0 seconds, respectively. As expected, due to the inner loop and the computation of Q_i, Det is slower than the other algorithms.

C. Using the Jasper dataset with r = 4

In Figure 7 we perform the same experiment as in the previous section on the the dataset Jasper with r = 4, where we fix p_4 = 0.75. Furthermore, Table I shows the result in MRSA on the dataset Jasper across three set of predefined p values (highly separable with p_{high} = [0.9, 0.8, 0.7, 0.6], less separable with p_{mid} = [0.8, 0.7, 0.6, 0.51], and even less separable with p_{low} = [0.7, 0.65, 0.55, 0.51]) and three noise levels (σ = 0.001, 0.005 and 0.01). Each item in the table (in mean±std) is the average over 20 trails.

We observe the following:
- Figure 7 show that VRNMF algorithms are competitive with the state-of-the-art minimum volume based method RVolMin, where Det performs slightly better than RVolMin while logdet is significantly better.
- Tables I shows that all the methods improve the fitting accuracy of SPA, with Det has the best performance in all cases and RVolMin has the worst performances in all cases.

In terms of computational time, on average it takes Det 6.82±0.5, logdet 2.22±0.2, Nuclear 1.45±0.0 and RVolMin 2.7±0.0 seconds, respectively; hence, for the same reasons as in the previous experiment, Det is slower.

D. Using the Urban dataset with r = 6

Table II shows the result of the same experiment as in the previous section performed with the Urban dataset. Here p_{high} = [0.9, 0.75, 0.7, 0.65, 0.6, 0.58, 0.5], p_{mid} = [0.8, 0.7, 0.65, 0.6, 0.75, 0.8], and p_{low} = [0.7, 0.6, 0.55, 0.51, 0.65, 0.7]. The noise levels are σ = 0.001, 0.005 and 0.01.

The results show that:
- All the methods improve the fitting accuracy of SPA.
- Det has the best performance in most cases, with logdet as the first-runner up.
- Det performs well for p_{high} and p_{mid}. With p_{low}, it is not as good as logdet.
- Nuclear and RVolMin have the worst performances...
Same experimental set up as the one in Figure 6 is used with Fig. 7. Curves of recovery correspond for the the dataset Jasper with $r = 4$.

The computational times are:

Table III shows the result on the same experiments conducted with Cuprite. For example, for $p_{\text{Cuprite}}$, we use $p_{\text{Cuprite}} = [p_{\text{Urban}}^\text{high}, p_{\text{Urban}}^\text{high}]$.

The result from the two tables show that

- All the methods improve the fitting accuracy of SPA.
- logdet has the best performance in all situations, with Det and Nuclear as the first-runner ups.
- RVolMin has the worst performances in most cases.

In terms of computational time, on average it takes Det $28.1 \pm 0.9$, logdet $3.8 \pm 1.1$, Nuclear $3.4 \pm 0.1$ and $RVolMin$ $3.2 \pm 0.0$ seconds, respectively. As expected, when $r$ increase, Det takes much more time and it is not recommended for large $r$.

In general, the results show that the VRNMF algorithms with Det and logdet performs very well, better than $RVolMin$ and Nuclear in terms of fitting accuracy. As $RVolMin$ consistently produce inferior results, we do not include it in the subsequent sections.

E. On the Cuprite dataset with $r = 12$

Table II shows the result on the same experiments conducted with the Cuprite dataset. Here we concatenate the $p$ vector used in Urban two times to form the $p$ vector with length 12 for the data Cuprite. For example, for $p_{\text{Cuprite}}$, we use $p_{\text{Cuprite}} = [p_{\text{Urban}}^\text{high}, p_{\text{Urban}}^\text{high}]$.

F. On image segmentation on real data

In this section we run the algorithms Det, logdet and Nuclear on real HU data Samson and Jasper. As stated in section IV-A, no pre-processing is performed on the raw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$p_{\text{high}}$</th>
<th>$p_{\text{mid}}$</th>
<th>$p_{\text{low}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>7.83±0.93</td>
<td>10.32±1.53</td>
<td>16.22±2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det</td>
<td>0.54±0.11</td>
<td>2.45±1.25</td>
<td>10.08±5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logdet</td>
<td>1.27±0.68</td>
<td>3.09±2.04</td>
<td>8.78±2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>3.79±0.62</td>
<td>6.39±1.54</td>
<td>13.48±4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVolMin</td>
<td>3.03±0.90</td>
<td>5.64±1.29</td>
<td>13.05±4.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$p_{\text{high}}$</th>
<th>$p_{\text{mid}}$</th>
<th>$p_{\text{low}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>7.83±0.93</td>
<td>8.56±0.86</td>
<td>15.95±3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det</td>
<td>0.54±0.11</td>
<td>1.25±0.48</td>
<td>6.85±3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logdet</td>
<td>1.27±0.68</td>
<td>4.41±0.93</td>
<td>9.85±3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>3.79±0.62</td>
<td>4.58±0.95</td>
<td>11.73±3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVolMin</td>
<td>3.03±0.9</td>
<td>4.95±1.01</td>
<td>15.32±9.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$p_{\text{high}}$</th>
<th>$p_{\text{mid}}$</th>
<th>$p_{\text{low}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>6.59±0.98</td>
<td>8.87±1.42</td>
<td>11.53±1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det</td>
<td>2.59±0.74</td>
<td>4.40±1.51</td>
<td>9.71±2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logdet</td>
<td>2.51±0.59</td>
<td>3.85±0.96</td>
<td>8.41±2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>2.55±0.70</td>
<td>4.33±1.56</td>
<td>10.07±2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVolMin</td>
<td>3.72±2.41</td>
<td>5.39±2.29</td>
<td>10.82±3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$p_{\text{high}}$</th>
<th>$p_{\text{mid}}$</th>
<th>$p_{\text{low}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>6.59±0.98</td>
<td>7.24±1.07</td>
<td>11.53±1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det</td>
<td>2.59±0.74</td>
<td>4.34±1.74</td>
<td>9.71±2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logdet</td>
<td>2.51±0.59</td>
<td>4.01±1.22</td>
<td>8.41±2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>2.55±0.70</td>
<td>4.38±1.72</td>
<td>10.07±2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVolMin</td>
<td>3.72±2.41</td>
<td>4.66±1.73</td>
<td>10.82±3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
data and we use the raw data directly. The following states the specifications of the datasets. For the dataset Samson, \((m, n, r) = (156, 95^2, 3)\). For the dataset Jasper, \((m, n, r) = (198, 100^2, 4)\). We have tuned \(\lambda\) in the same way as for the synthetic datasets using as the “true” endmembers from [24]. Figure 8 shows the decomposition result. In the same figure, we also show the references provided by [24], and we list the numerical results in table IV. In the table IV, MRSA is calculated with respect to the reference \(W^{\text{Ref}}\) of [24], in which a low MRSA value indicates the \(W\) provided by VRNMF algorithms are close to the “meaningful” decomposition. The results show that all three VRNMF algorithms produce meaningful decomposition.

Remark The reference [24] has employed sparsity regularization on \(H\) and hence the abundance map of [24] looks cleaner. In this work we do not go deep in this direction by imposing a sparsity regularization is imposed on \(H\) as we are focusing on the volume regularization on \(W\).

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, NMF models with different volume regularizations (VRNMF) were investigated. We have developed highly efficient algorithms for these VRNMF models. The VRNMF algorithms are shown to be able to outperform both the state-of-the-art separable NMF algorithm SPA and the volume-based method RVolMin [7]. Furthermore, systemic experimental results using real hyperspectral data showed that, when the data has a relatively smaller rank \(r\) and is highly separable, the volume regularizer based on the determinant (Det) provides the best results, although the the regularizer based on the logarithm of the determinant (logdet) provides almost as good decompositions. When the rank increases and/or the data becomes less separable, logdet performs best in most cases, while being computationally faster than Det. Therefore, in practice, we recommend the use of logdet.
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Fig. 9. The distribution maps of the material in the whole scene obtained from the VRNMF algorithms. In (a), the colour code is: white – rock, blue – water, and green – tree. In (b), the colour code is: green – tree, blue – water, yellow – dirt and white – road. The map is constructed by taking the largest component of $h_j$ as the material of that pixel. As factorization rank $r$ here is small and these datasets are highly separable, hence in general Det produces the best segmentation results. For example, the road in Jasper of the result produced by Det is much clearer than that of the other two.