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Abstract Many machine learning methods (classification, clustering, etc.) start with a known kernel that provides similarity or distance measure between two objects. Recent work has extended this to situations where the information about objects is limited to comparisons of distances between three objects (triplets). Humans find the comparison task much easier than the estimation of absolute similarities, so this kind of data can be easily obtained using crowd-sourcing. In this work, we give an efficient method of augmenting the triplets data, by utilizing additional implicit information inferred form the existing data. Triplets augmentation improves the quality of kernel-based and kernel-free data analytics tasks. Secondly, we also propose a novel set of algorithms for common supervised and unsupervised machine learning tasks based on triplets. These methods work directly with triplets, avoiding kernel evaluations. Experimental evaluation on real and synthetic datasets shows that our methods are more accurate than the current best-known techniques.

1 Introduction

In many supervised and unsupervised machine learning algorithms, it is generally assumed that input data is drawn from a feature space along with a pairwise distance/similarity measure. Some techniques, such as support vector machines (SVM), do not explicitly require input data points and only utilize the pairwise distance information or kernel matrix. Recently a further relaxed paradigm of drawing analytics from similarity triplets has emerged [23]. A triplet \((A, B, C)\) encodes ordinal information about the 3 pairwise distances between the objects. This ordinal information can be encoded using three different definitions [24] and are described in Table 1.

The primary motivation behind similarity triplets is to rely on human judgments about the qualitative similarity between objects in human-based computation settings (e.g. crowd-sourcing). It is widely accepted that unlike computers, humans are good at making qualitative assessments such as determining two images to be “perceptually” similar. Since it is inherently
Table 1: Three different definitions of triplets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>((x, y, z)_A)</td>
<td>(x) is closer to (y) than to (z) (d(x, y) &lt; d(x, z))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:</td>
<td>((x, y, z)_C)</td>
<td>(x) is the central element (d(x, y) &lt; d(y, z)) and (d(x, z) &lt; d(y, z))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O:</td>
<td>((x, y, z)_O)</td>
<td>(x) is the outlier (d(x, y) &gt; d(y, z)) and (d(x, z) &gt; d(y, z))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

easier to compare two distances than to actually compute a distance \cite{32}, comparison based distance information tends to be more accurate. For instance, considering Figure 1, one can perceptually infer three triplets \((c_1, c_2, c_3)_A\), \((c_2, c_1, c_3)_C\), and \((c_3, c_1, c_2)_O\). Although, a pixel-based distance measure might bring about very different results.

![Car Images](c1: Sedan, c2: SUV, c3: Truck-Trailer)

Fig. 1: \(c_1\) is more similar to \(c_2\) than to \(c_3\), \(c_2\) is the central and \(c_3\) is an outlier among the three.

Given a set \(\mathcal{X}\) of abstractly described \(n\) objects, where pairwise distances are implicitly provided by a collection of similarity triplets, \(\mathcal{T}\). The traditional approach for machine learning on such an input consists of two steps. The first step is to find an explicit representation of \(\mathcal{X}\), as points in a low dimensional Euclidean space (known as embedding), that preserves the distance information provided in the triplets \cite{34,3,21}. Next step is to employ known algorithms to solve the specific machine learning problem at hand.

Recent approaches bypass this expensive embedding step by defining a kernel function (a function of two objects in \(\mathcal{X}\) returning a real value), which serves as the similarity between two objects. The kernel function associates a “feature vector” to each object in \(\mathcal{X}\), based on \(\mathcal{T}\), and then uses the dot product on these vectors as the similarity measure \cite{23}. This approach differs from the Euclidean space embedding, in that it does not try to satisfy some global fit to the data, but instead simply represents the object itself. Typically these vectors are high-dimensional but sparse, so explicitly representing them and using ordinary dot products is computationally infeasible.

In this paper, we partition the triplets such that each part induces a transitive relation on the set of objects. We compute the transitive closure of these relations (represented as directed acyclic graphs) to augment the data with further sound information (without expensive data gathering) leading to better quality kernel values. The data augmentation technique can also identify data inconsistency issues with the input. This can also lead to better data collection strategies. In addition to this, we also give kernel-free algorithms to perform several machine learning tasks.

The main contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

- The first contribution is that we give a method to compute the closeness of points from a fixed point. We use this closeness to compute the nearest neighbors and to perform classification and clustering tasks. Note that our method works directly on triplets and avoids kernel computation. The proposed method takes linear time of the number of
triplets while being scalable and parallelizable. Results show that classification and clustering algorithms, based on closeness, perform better than the competitor methods.

– Our second contribution is robust augmentation of triplets in an efficient way. Using the available information, augmentation expands the current dataset by adding sound triplets. Benefits of augmentation are twofold: (i) reduction in cost of collecting triplets as it gives additional triplets for free, (ii) improved quality of kernel-based and kernel-independent data analytics. An additional benefit of augmentation is that it reveals hidden conflicts in the data. This is unavoidable in human-sourced data and can be dealt with in a number of ways. However, dealing with conflicts is out of the scope of this study.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The related work is discussed in Section 2. We formulate the problem in Section 3. The proposed solution is presented in Section 4. We report experimental results and comparisons with the existing solutions in Section 5. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 6.

2 Related work

Finding similarity among objects is a fundamental task in many machine learning problems. This makes the building block for common tasks of classification, clustering and outlier analysis. Since comparing two distances is fundamentally easier than computing actual distances, recent works utilize ‘relative similarity’ among objects rather than working on actual pairwise similarities.

Relative similarities among objects are used to generate ordinal embedding of objects. In doing so, a representation of data points that preserves the distance information provided in the similarity triplets is learned [28, 20]. This representation, usually in a low dimensional Euclidean space, is used to solve the specific machine learning problem at hand. Low rank embedding based on convex optimization is done in [11]. Ordinal embedding based on an objective function that counts the number of constraints violated and the amount of violation is discussed in [35]. In this approach, the quantity and quality of triplets are of pivotal importance to extract meaningful information [4]. A lower bound of $\omega(n \log n)$ triplets is derived in [22] to get useful knowledge. Methods to learn embedding with bounded errors from noisy similarity information are proposed in [21, 3, 8], while [38] presents techniques to get higher quality triplets via crowd-sourcing.

Kernel functions based on similarity triplets is proposed in [23]. The bottleneck, however, is the kernel computation through matrix multiplication which takes time proportional to $O(n^3)$. An approximation of multidimensional scaling (MDS) called Landmark technique [11] reduces the search space to a chosen useful subset of data points.

Given the quadratic dimensions of the feature spaces, kernel computation is computationally prohibitive. Some recent works perform data analytics directly on triplets without computing the kernels. An approximate median of the dataset using triplets of the form $O$ is computed in [19]. Algorithms to estimate density using relative similarity are provided in [17]. Similarly, triplets of the form $C$ are used to find approximate median and outlier in a dataset [24]. Moreover, approximate nearest neighbors based clustering and classification algorithms are also provided in [24]. Recent works avoid the embedding and kernel computation and perform machine learning tasks directly based on comparison trees [17]. Active triplets generation mechanism is used in [44, 17, 16] in which the triplets of desired choice are queried. Machine learning tasks performed directly on triplets include nearest neighbors search [17], classification [30, 16], comparison based hierarchical clustering [14], and correlation clustering [36].
Data gathering in this setting is expensive as it requires human judges to order objects in a triplet \( \{13,15,29\} \). This leads to reduced quality in inferences drawn from limited information. Dense feature vectors and kernels based on them will likely lead to enhanced accuracies of machine learning algorithms. Furthermore, dense feature vectors can lead to approximation algorithms for computing kernels with quality guarantees. For literature on large scale kernel learning \([7,33,39,31]\) and kernel approximation \([12,26]\) see references therein. Data augmentation on text data for paraphrase detection has been used in \([18]\).

Kernel computation, which is binary matrix multiplication, is computationally challenging. Another area to look into is the efficient binary matrix multiplication and set intersection problem. Fast algorithms for intersection of sets and sequences are described in \([8,6,9]\) while \([5]\) works for sorted sequences. For text similarity, efficient set intersection algorithm is discussed in \([25]\).

3 Problem Formulation

Let \( \mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \) be a set of \( n \) objects in an arbitrary but fixed order and let \( d : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \) be a distance measure. We do not assume \( d \) to be a metric and only assume that

\[
\forall x, y \in \mathcal{X} : d(x, y) \geq 0, \quad d(x, y) = 0 \iff x = y, \quad \text{and} \quad d(x, y) = d(y, x).
\]

The distance measure on \( \mathcal{X} \) is provided as a collection \( \mathcal{T} \) of triplets of the form \( \square \), \( \triangledown \), or \( \Box \). An illustration of three forms of triplets is shown in Figure 2. Observe that a triplet of the form \( \Box \) or \( \triangledown \) provides relative orderings of three pairs of objects and is stronger than that of the form \( \square \) which provides relative orderings of two pairs. More formally,

\[
(x, y, z)_C \iff d(x, y) < d(y, z) \land d(x, z) < d(y, z) \iff (y, x, z)_A \land (z, x, y)_A \quad (1)
\]

Similarly, a statement of the form \( \triangledown \) is equivalent to two statements of the form \( \square \)

\[
(x, y, z)_O \iff d(x, y) > d(y, z) \land d(x, z) > d(y, z) \iff (y, z, x)_A \land (z, y, x)_A \quad (2)
\]

In this paper, we focus on type \( \square \) triplets and when input \( \mathcal{T} \) is of the form \( \triangledown \) or \( \Box \) we translate it to a collection of triplets of the \( \square \) using Equation (1) or (2). For notational convenience we still refer to input as \( \mathcal{T} \).

Two alternative mappings of objects in \( \mathcal{X} \) to feature vectors in \( \{-1, 0, 1\}^\binom{n}{2} \) and \( \{-1, 0, 1\}^n \) are given in \([23]\). The coordinates of the feature vectors correspond to ordered pairs \( (x_i, x_j) \) with \( i < j \). For \( x \in \mathcal{X} \), the feature value at the coordinate corresponding to \( (x_i, x_j) \) is 1 if

Fig. 2: Illustration of relative locations of the three points corresponding to each of three types of triplets
\( (x_i, x_j, x_k) \in \mathcal{T} \), is \(-1\) if \((x_i, x_j, x_k) \in \mathcal{T} \), and \(0\) otherwise. More precisely, \(x \in \mathcal{X}\) is mapped to \(\Phi_1(x)\) as follows:

\[
\Phi_1(x) = \Phi_1(x)[\gamma]_{\gamma \in \binom{\mathcal{X}}{2}}, \text{ where } \Phi_1(x)[\gamma] = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \gamma = (x_i, x_j), i < j, (x_i, x_j) \in \mathcal{T} \\
-1 & \text{if } \gamma = (x_i, x_j), i < j, (x_i, x_j, x_k) \in \mathcal{T} \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

In the second feature mapping, \(x \in \mathcal{X}\) is mapped to \(\Phi_2(x) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{n^2}\) as follows:

\[
\Phi_2(x)[\gamma] = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \gamma = (x_i, x_j), i < j, (x_i, x_j) \in \mathcal{T} \\
-1 & \text{if } \gamma = (x_i, x_j), i < j, (x_i, x_j, x_k) \in \mathcal{T} \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

For both feature mappings, the kernel is given as:

\[
K_r(x, y|\mathcal{T}) = \langle \Phi_r(x), \Phi_r(y) \rangle = \sum_{\gamma \in \binom{\mathcal{X}}{2}} \Phi_r(x)[\gamma] \Phi_r(y)[\gamma]
\]

Intuitively, the kernel value of \(x\) and \(y\), \(K_1(x, y|\mathcal{T})\) counts the number of pairs having same relative ordering with respect to both \(x\) and \(y\) minus those having different relative ordering. \(K_2(x, y|\mathcal{T})\), on the other hand, measures the similarity of \(x\) and \(y\) based on whether they rank similarly with respect to their distances from other objects. In this work, we focus on \(K_1\) and use it as \(K\) onwards. Note that all our results can be extended to \(K_2\) in a straightforward manner. We use \(K\) to show the improvement achieved by triplets augmentation in the quality of data analytics tasks.

Given the triplets data \(\mathcal{T}\), our goal is to perform efficient data analytics tasks (computing nearest neighbors, clustering, and classification) without using the kernel. Given that our data do not necessarily reside in a numeric feature space and the distance measure is not explicitly provided, we define centrality, median, and closeness as follows:

**Definition 1** The centrality of an object in a dataset is how close or similar it is to all other objects. Centrality of \(x \in \mathcal{X}\) is defined as: \(\text{cent}(x) := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \text{sim}(x, y) =: \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} -d(x, y)\).

**Definition 2** A median (or centroid) of the dataset is an object with the largest centrality. The median \(x_{med}\) of \(\mathcal{X}\) is given by: \(x_{med} := \arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \text{cent}(x)\).
Definition 3 For two objects \(x, y \in \mathcal{X}\), closeness of \(y\) to \(x\) is the rank of \(y\) by similarity to \(x\), more formally: \(\text{close}_x(y) := (n - 1) - |\{z \in \mathcal{X}, z \neq x : \text{sim}(x, z) < \text{sim}(x, y)\}|\), i.e. \(\text{close}_x(y)\) is index of \(y\) in the list of all objects in the decreasing order of similarity to \(x\).

Definition 4 The (ordered) set of \(k\) nearest neighbors of an object \(x \in \mathcal{X}\), \(\text{kNN}(x)\), is given by \(\text{kNN}(x) := \{y \mid \text{close}_x(y) \leq k\}\).

4 Proposed Solutions

In this section, we describe the representation of the feature vector \(\Phi_1\), that enables fast kernel evaluation, efficient data augmentation, and approximate nearest neighbor computation. For evaluating centrality of objects and finding the median of the dataset, we give an abstract representation of similarity triplets in \(\mathcal{T}\) (statements of type \(\mathcal{A}\)). This facilitates performing these analytics in linear time and space (linear in \(|\mathcal{T}|\)). We refer to the set of all ordered pairs of \(\mathcal{X}\) as \(\binom{n}{2}\), i.e. \(\mathcal{X} = \{(x_i, x_j) : x_i, x_j \in \mathcal{X}, i < j\}\). Suppose that triplets in \(\mathcal{T}\) are lexicographically sorted and let \(|\mathcal{T}| = \tau\). This does not result in any loss of generality as \(\mathcal{T}\) can be sorted as a preprocessing step in \(O(\tau \log \tau)\) time.

4.1 Feature Vector Representation:

For a triplet \((x, y, z)_A\), we refer to \(x\) as an anchor of the triplet. For each \(x_i \in \mathcal{X}\), information in the triplets in \(\mathcal{T}\) with \(x_i\) as an anchor, is encoded in a directed graph \(G_i\) having vertex set \(\mathcal{X}\). The set of directed edges \(E(G_i)\) in \(G_i\) is defined as follows.

\[
E(G_i) := \{(y, z) | y, z \in \mathcal{X}, (x_i, y, z)_A \in \mathcal{T}\}
\]

Note that edges directed from lower indexed to higher indexed objects in \(G_i\) correspond to coordinates of \(\Phi_1(x_i)\) with values 1 and -1 otherwise.

Lemma 1 For \(1 \leq i \leq n\), \(G_i\) is a directed acyclic graph (DAG).

Proof. Suppose, \(G_i\) contains \(t\) edges with no cycle. Suppose adding a new edge \((x, y)\) creates a cycle in \(G_i\). A cycle can only be created by \((x, y)\) in \(G_i\) only if there is already a directed path from \(y\) to \(x\). Let the directed path from \(y\) to \(x\) be the form of \(y, z_1, z_2, ..., z_t, x\). The path implies that \(d(i, y) < d(i, z_1) < d(i, z_2), ..., d(i, z_t) < d(i, x)\). By transitivity, we have \(d(i, y) < d(i, x)\). However, the edge \((x, y)\) contradicts the inequality \(d(i, y) < d(i, x)\). As in our setting, each comparison of pair of two distances will give exactly one same answer each time, the edge \((x, y)\) can not exist. This confirms the statement that directed graph \(G_i\) made from triplets set with an anchor \(i\) will always be a DAG.

4.2 Kernel Computation:

The feature vector \(\Phi_1(x_i)\) described in Equation (3) is represented by \(G_i\) as follows.

\[
\Phi_1(x_i)[\gamma] = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{iff } \gamma = (x_j, x_k) \text{ and } (x_j, x_k) \in E(G_i) \\
-1 & \text{iff } \gamma = (x_j, x_k) \text{ and } (x_k, x_j) \in E(G_i) \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

Computing \(K(i, j)\) directly from \(\Phi_1(x_i)\) and \(\Phi_1(x_j)\) as in Equation (5) takes \(O(n^2)\) time. Using a feature matrix with \(\Phi_1(x_i)\) as row would yield the whole kernel matrix in time \(O(n^{3.376})\) using best known matrix multiplication \(\mathcal{A}\).
4.3 Data Augmentation:

Any reasonable notion of distance (similarity) must admit the following property. If an object \(a\) is closer to \(x\) than object \(b\), and object \(b\) is closer to \(x\) than object \(c\), then object \(a\) is closer to \(x\) than \(c\), i.e.

\[
d(x, a) < d(x, b) \land d(x, b) < d(x, c) \implies d(x, a) < d(x, c).
\]

In other words, 1 \(\leq i \leq n\), edges of \(G_i\) must induce a transitive relation on \(X\). We compute transitive closures of all \(G_i\)’s to obtain more sound triplets. In a digraph, \(G = (V, E)\), for \(v \in V\), let \(R(v)\) be the set of vertices reachable from \(v\), i.e. vertices that have a path from \(v\) in \(G\), \(R(v) = N^+(v) \cup \bigcup_{u \in N^+(v)} R(u)\), where \(N^+(v)\) is the set of out-neighbors of \(v\). Algorithm 1 computes reachability set of all vertices in a given DAG.

**Algorithm 1**: Compute Reachability \((\text{DAG} = (V, E))\)

1: \(R \leftarrow \text{ZEROS}[1, \ldots, |V|]\)
2: \(\text{DAG}_T \leftarrow \text{TOPOLOGICAL SORT}(\text{DAG})\)
3: for each node \(v_i \in \text{DAG}_T\) do
4: \(R[v_i] \leftarrow \text{RECURSIVE REACHABILITY}(v_i)\)
5: return \(R\)
6: function \(\text{RECURSIVE REACHABILITY}(\text{Vertex} \ v)\)
7: if \(R[v] == \phi\) then
8: if \(|N^+(v)| == 0\) then return
9: \(R[v] = \bigcup_{v_j \in N^+(v)} \{v_j \cup \text{RECURSIVE REACHABILITY}(v_j)\}\)
10: return \(R[v]\)

**Definition 5** For a digraph \(G\), it’s Transitive Closure is a graph \(G^*\) that contains an edge \((u, v)\) if there is a path from \(u\) to \(v\). More formally, \(G^*\) is a digraph such that \(V(G^*) = V(G)\) and \(E(G^*) = \{(u, v) : v \in R(u)\}\).

![Fig. 4: A graph \(G\) (left) with its transitive closure \(G^*\) (right).](image)

Note that some non-obvious conflicts due to collection errors can be brought forth by the data augmentation. For example consider a set of triplets \(T_A = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3), (x_1, x_3, x_5), (x_1, x_5, x_2), (x_1, x_4, x_5)\}\). The corresponding \(G_i\) seems to be a conflict free graph. However the augmentation reveals all the indirect dependencies among nodes also. Augmenting \(G_i\) yields triplet set as \(T_A^* = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3), (x_1, x_1, x_3), (x_1, x_2, x_3), (x_1, x_2, x_3), (x_1, x_3, x_5), (x_1, x_5, x_2), (x_1, x_3, x_3), (x_1, x_5, x_4)\}\). It is clear that we have two pairs of conflicting triplets \(\{(x_1, x_2, x_3), (x_1, x_5, x_2)\}\) and \(\{(x_1, x_3, x_3), (x_1, x_5, x_3)\}\). The pictorial representation of \(T_A\) and \(T_A^*\) is shown in Figure 4.
For kernel evaluation and data analytics, we assume that the information in $T$ is sound, i.e. the system of inequalities encoded in $T$ are consistent. This assumption infers that no conflict after augmentation will occur.

**Lemma 2** Runtime for data augmentation is $O(n^2 + |T^*|)$.

**Proof:** Transitive closure of a DAG can be computed with a single depth first search traversal of the graph [10]. The total runtime of DFS traversal of each of $n$ graphs ($G_i$’s) is $O(\sum_{i=1}^{n} n + |E(G_i)|) = n^2 + \tau$. Counting the time for saving all the new edges or triplets in $T^*$, we get total runtime of data augmentation as $O(n^2 + |T^*|)$. Note that length of a feature vector is $O(n^2)$.

### 4.4 Centrality and Median Computation:

Kernel matrix $K$ approximately measures the pairwise similarity among the objects in the dataset $\mathcal{T}$ and the values in a row of $K$ tend to correlate with that of corresponding row in the true similarity matrix $S$. Based on $T$, the approximate centrality of $x \in \mathcal{T}$, $cent_K(x)$, is computed as $\sum_{y \neq x} K(x, y)$. It may happen that $cent_K$ values fail to correlate with $cent$ values. To overcome this, we define $cent'(x)$ which quantifies of how many objects, $x$ is the nearest neighbor to. We maintain a matrix $H_{n \times n}$, in which corresponding to each object $x$, the $x^{th}$ row contains the similarity rank of objects based on the $x^{th}$ row of $K$. We define similarity rank of $y$ in row $x$ of $K$ as $rank_x(y) = (n - 1) - |\{z \in \mathcal{T} : K(x, z) < K(x, y)\}|$. The element that is the closest to $x$ will have rank 1 and the farthest element from $x$ will have rank of $(n - 1)$. This implies that corresponding to each row in $K$, we have a different permutation of numbers in range $[0, n - 1]$ in $H$. Based on $H$, $cent'(x)$ is computed as $\sum_y ||H(y, x)||_p$ which basically aggregates the similarity rank of $x$ with respect to all other elements. As the smaller rank values imply the more similarity of $x$ in the respective row, the element having minimum $cent'$ value is regarded as the most central object or the median of the dataset. Note that in case of $cent$, median is the one having maximum $cent$ value.

**Algorithm 2** : Compute Centrality($K$)

1: for $i = 1 : n$ do
2: \hspace{1cm} $H(i, :) = \text{GetRanks}((K(i,:))$ $\triangleright$ returns ranks of elements in $i^{th}$ row of $K$
3: for $i = 1 : n$ do
4: \hspace{1cm} $cent'(i) = ||H(:, i)||_p$ $\triangleright$ $l_p$-norm of $i^{th}$ column of $H$, $p \in [1, 3]$

4.5 Nearest Neighbors:

Using the information in $T$ stored in the DAG $G_i$ associated with each object $x_i$, we can find upper and lower bounds on $close_{x_i}(y)$. Note that all elements $z \in R(y)$ in $G_i$ are closer to...
We present experimental results in this section. Experiments are performed on several datasets.

4.5 Clustering and Classification:

We construct the $k$-nearest neighborhood graph $kNNG$ for $\mathcal{X}$ using $T$. $kNNG$ of a dataset $\mathcal{X}$ is a graph on vertex set $\mathcal{X}$ and object $x$ is adjacent to $k$ vertices in $kNNG(x)$. $kNNG$ is $kNNG$ with edge-weights proportional to closeness of the adjacent vertices. For clustering $\mathcal{X}$, we apply spectral clustering [27] on $kNNG$ for $\mathcal{X}$. For constructing $kNNG$ we use the approximate $k$ nearest neighbors $kNN'(x)$ of each each object $x$. The well-known nearest neighbor classification can be used by taking a majority label among the labeled points in $kNN'(x)$.

5 Experimental Evaluation

We present experimental results in this section. Experiments are performed on several real and synthetic datasets. We use three real image datasets, CAR [24], FOOD [38], and NATURE [19] and the corresponding triplets shared by the respective sources. We use four datasets IRIS [19], GLASS [21], MINIST [31] and ZOO [10] to randomly generate synthetic triplets. We evaluate the performance of our approach by comparing it with other competitor techniques.

We show that data augmentation helps in improving the quality of the kernel matrix and the analytics performed on the kernel. We perform data analytics tasks like median computation, finding approximate nearest neighbors, classification and clustering. We compare the median results of our approach with CROWD-MEDIAN [19] and LENSDEPTH [24]. Clustering results are compared with LENSDEPTH and we compare classification results with LENSDEPTH and TRIPLETBOOST [30]. Note that CROWD-MEDIAN works with $\mathcal{O}$ form triplets only and LENSDEPTH works with triplets of form $\mathcal{C}$ in experiments, while comparing with CROWD-MEDIAN and LENSDEPTH, we generate triplets of form $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ respectively and then translated them to form $\mathcal{A}$ triplets for our methods.

5.1 Datasets Description:

- **CAR** dataset consists of 60 images of different types (sedan, SUV, jeeps etc.) of cars. The original triplet set has 7,097 records out of which 521 are duplicates. The provided triplets are of form C.

- **NATURE** dataset has 120 images of scenic views of mountains, plains, rivers etc. There are 3,335 similarity triplets available in which 1,851 are duplicated and 224 records are conflicting. The number of unique triplets in the dataset is 1,280. The dataset has triplets of form O.

- **FOOD** dataset comprises of 100 pictures of food items like vegetables, salads, fruit etc. The dataset is gathered through multiple surveys done by the people and has 181,027 non-conflicting and unique triplets. The dataset consists of AAA type triplets.

- **ZOO** dataset consists of 101 records and each record is represented by a 16 dimensional feature vector describing the physical features of an animal. The dataset has 7 different classes.

- **IRIS** is a flower dataset containing 150 records, with 50 records belonging to each of 3 classes.

- **GLASS** dataset contains 214 objects and each object has 9 features. Features show the amount of components used in the composition of the glass. The dataset has 7 classes.

- **MNIST** dataset consists of hand-written digits and each digit is represented by a 784-dimensional vector. We performed experiments on a subset of the dataset by randomly selecting 250 records from digits 0 and 1.

For synthetic datasets, we use feature vectors to generate similarity matrix $S$ and distance matrix $D$. We use distance metrics that are widely adopted in the literature for the respective datasets. We use euclidean similarity metric for IRIS, GLASS and MNIST datasets and cosine similarity metric for ZOO dataset. We use $D$ and $S$ only to generate triplets and to compare the effectiveness of our method. We randomly generate triplets by comparing distances of two objects $y$ and $z$ from an anchor object $x$. A triplet $(x, y, z)$ is obtained by comparing $d(x, y)$ and $d(x, z)$ such that $d(x, y) < d(x, z)$. We generate $\{1, 5, 10, 20, 30\}$% of total possible triplets in our experiments. The results are averaged over 5 runs to mitigate the effect of randomness. Experiments are performed on a core i7 system with 8GB RAM. The Matlab code is available for reproducibility of results.

5.2 Kernel Matrix

The effectiveness of kernel matrix $K$ is to what extent $K$ agrees with $S$ and how well $K$ maintains the order of objects with respect to $S$. We show that the augmented kernel $K^*$ computed from $T^*$ is a closer approximation to $S$ as compared to the kernel $K$ computed from $T$. Since only the ordering of distances is important, we report the row-wise rank correlation between $K$ and $S$ and that between $K^*$ and $S$. In Figure 5, we plot the corresponding means and standard deviations of row-wise rank correlations with increasing number of triplets, showing improvement in correlations especially for small number of triplets. Standard deviations are too small to be seen in the reported results.

---

3 Matlab code with instructions and datasets is available at https://www.dropbox.com/sh/8scfgek7r5f00af/AABXVqusaKWiQP9sDKIBsPRk?dl=0
Fig. 6: Figures show average row wise rank correlation of $K$ and $K^*$ with $S$ (true similarity matrix) for different datasets. Standard deviations of the reported results are too small to be visible in the plots.

Fig. 7: Figures plot rank correlations of true and approximate centrality vectors. The $cent'_K$ and $cent'_K^*$ show centrality vectors computed from $K$ and $K^*$ respectively.
5.3 Centrality and Median

We demonstrate the quality of approximate centrality by showing the rank correlation between the true centrality vector $\text{cent}$ computed from $S$ and the approximate centrality vectors ($\text{cent}_K'$ and $\text{cent}_{K^*}$ computed from $K$ and $K^*$ respectively). In Figure 7, the average rank correlation approaches 1 with increasing number of triplets and augmentation helps in improving the rank correlation in most of the cases. We use centrality vectors to compute the median of the dataset. Let $\text{median}_{\text{true}}$ be the median computed from the $\text{cent}$ and $\text{median}_T$ and $\text{median}_{T^*}$ are computed from the $\text{cent}_K'$ and $\text{cent}_{K^*}$ respectively. To show that the approximate median lies close to $\text{median}_{\text{true}}$, we plot the $\text{cent}$ vector in the decreasing order and show $\text{cent}$ values of $\text{median}_{\text{true}}$, $\text{median}_T$ and $\text{median}_{T^*}$ (see Figure 8). Note that the $\text{median}_{\text{true}}$ has the maximum $\text{cent}$ value. Based on $\text{cent}$ values, we show that $\text{median}_T$ and $\text{median}_{T^*}$ also lie close to the $\text{median}_{\text{true}}$. It is clear from the results that $\text{median}_{T^*}$ is closer to $\text{median}_{\text{true}}$ as compared to $\text{median}_T$.

Another way to evaluate that true and approximate medians are close to each other is to check how many standard deviations far are the $\text{median}_T$ and $\text{median}_{T^*}$ form $\text{median}_{\text{true}}$. In Figure 9, we report the relative difference of $\text{cent}$ value of approximate median from $\text{median}_{\text{true}}$ which is computed as $\frac{\text{cent}(\text{median}_{\text{true}}) - \text{cent}(\text{median}_T)}{\sigma(\text{cent})}$, where $\sigma(\text{cent})$ is the standard deviation of $\text{cent}$ vector.

We also compare median results with CROWD-MEDIAN and LENSDEPTH algorithm on a dataset of 200 points generated randomly from a normal distribution. To make comparison with CROWD-MEDIAN and LENSDEPTH, we generate $\text{OOO}$ and $\text{CCC}$ type triplets respectively and
then transform them to AAA triplets for our method. We report the relative distance among median_{true} and approximate medians which is computed as $\frac{d(\text{median}_{true}, \text{median}_T)}{\sigma(D)}$, where $D$ is the true distance matrix. The comparison results with CROWD-MEDIAN and LENSDEPTH are averaged over 10 runs and are shown in Figure 10.

5.4 Nearest Neighbors

We show that our closeness based method to approximately find the nearest neighbors performs well in practice. For each $x \in X$, we compute true and approximate nearest neighbors denoted by $kNN(x)$ and $kNN'(x)$ respectively. To evaluate the effectiveness of our closeness based $kNN'(x)$, we apply standard $k$-means algorithm for clustering of all the data points in the $x^{th}$ row of similarity matrix $S$. We find the closest cluster from $x$ i.e. the cluster having maximum similarity with $x$. The similarity of cluster $C_i$ to $x$ is defined as $\frac{1}{|C_i|} \sum_{j \in C_i} sim(x, j)$. The performance of the proposed closeness approach is then measured by calculating average intersection size of $kNN'(x)$ and the closest cluster. We make $\lceil \frac{n}{10} \rceil$ clusters, where $n$ is the number of objects in the dataset. Here, the value of $\frac{n}{10}$ clusters is chosen empirically. We report results for $k \in \{1, 2\}$ in Figure 11 which shows that we achieve 60 – 80% accuracy in finding the nearest neighbor, for the datasets used in experiments. We also observe that the closest cluster normally contains very few points, so the intersection percentage degrades with increasing $k$. Note that the closest cluster $C_i$ for each $x$ consists of true $|C_i|$ nearest neighbors of $x$. Thus, we do not report intersection results for $kNN(x)$ and the corresponding closest cluster.

For abstract images data, we applied our algorithm on the human generated triplets from each of the images datasets to find the 5 nearest neighbors of an arbitrarily chosen object. The chosen nearest neighbors for each query object are shown in Figure 12 for visual inspection.

![Graph](image_url)

Fig. 9: We report the relative difference of $\text{median}_T$ and $\text{median}_{T*}$ from the median_{true} based on the true centrality values. Results show that $\text{median}_{T*}$ generally lies closer to the median_{true} as compared to $\text{median}_T$. Plot on left shows that at $\tau \% = 20$, cent($\text{median}_T$) and cent($\text{median}_{T*}$) are 0.05 and 0.01 standard deviations far from the median_{true} respectively.
Fig. 10: Median results on dataset of 200 normally distributed random points are compared with LENSDEPTH and CROWD-MEDIAN algorithm. Relative distance from median show that how standard deviations far approximate medians lie from the median true. To make comparisons with LENSDEPTH and CROWD-MEDIAN, we generate triplets of type C and O respectively and then translated them to type A triplets.

Fig. 11: Average percentage of $kNN'$ that belong to the closest cluster of each object. Closest cluster is computed using $S$ and $kNN'$ is computed by our proposed method. $T^*$ refers to results obtained from augmented triplets.

5.5 Clustering

The goodness of the proposed approach is also evaluated by performing spectral clustering on the nearest neighborhood graph $kNNG$. We construct $kNNG$ and $k_{wNNG}$ using approximate neighbors $kNN'$ as described in Section 4.6. We made comparison with LENSDEPTH to evaluate clustering quality. The LENSDEPTH algorithm [24] is reimplemented using same parameters as used in the original study (errorprob = 0 and $\sigma = 5$). We make nearest neighborhood graph with $k = 10$ and in spectral clustering, we take number of clusters equal to the number of classes in the dataset. Using augmented triplets $T^*$ in this case performed slightly better than using $T$. Thus, for the sake of clarity, we only report results for augmented
triplets. In Figure 13, we plot purity of resulting clusters, which show improved results for $T^*$ as compared to LENSDEPTH. Figures 14 and 15 show clustering results on abstract datasets.

Fig. 13: Purity of clusterings using $kNNG$ and $k_wNNG$ is compared with LENSDEPTH algorithm. Results are performed with $k = 10$ and in spectral clustering we took number of eigen vectors equal to number of clusters.

5.6 Classification

We perform classification task using the $kNN$ classifier with train-test split of 70 – 30 for all datasets. Figure 16 plots the average accuracies of 5 runs of the $kNN$ classifier. We make comparisons with LENSDEPTH and TRIPLETBOOST to evaluate classification accuracy of our
approach. In case of comparison with LENSDEPTH, we generate triplets of type CCC. These triplets are converted to type AAA for compatibility with the proposed approach. Figure 16 shows comparison results with LENSDEPTH. It is observed that the proposed method performs substantially better as the proportion of triplets increases.

We make comparison with TRIPLETBOOST on two datasets (MOONS and IRIS). MOONS dataset consists of 500 points with two classes. Note that TRIPLETBOOST also incorporates noisy triplets but in our setting, only sound triplets are considered, hence, we make comparison with TRIPLETBOOST on triplets with 0% noise. These comparisons are presented in Figure 17. On IRIS dataset, comparison using 10% triplets for three distance metrics is also provided to observe the impact of distance metric. We also give true nearest neighbors $k$NN based classification accuracies which are shown in Figures 16 and 17. As $k$NN uses true nearest neighbors for classification, it performs better than our technique.
Fig. 16: Comparison of classification accuracy with LENSDEPTH using $T$ and $T^*$. \textit{kNN} shows results based on true neighbors. In this case, $\tau\%$ shows the percentage of triplets of type $\text{CCC}$. 

Fig. 17: Comparison of \textit{kNN} classification accuracy with TRIPLETBOOST using $T$ and $T^*$. Top right figure plots results on IRIS dataset with $\tau\% = 10$ generated from three different distance metrics.
6 Conclusion

In this work, we propose a novel data augmentation technique for similarity triplets for enhanced kernel evaluation and data analytics tasks. We also present efficient algorithms for both supervised and unsupervised machine learning tasks without kernel evaluation. Empirical evaluation reveals that our techniques perform better than the competitor approaches.

Future Work: As a future work, we will incorporate noise in the triplets i.e. the oracle generating triplets can make mistakes with some given probability. In addition to this, we will incorporate the notion of active learning which can be used to plan better data collection strategies.
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