

Bayesian Semi-supervised learning under nonparanormality

Rui Zhu

RZHU4@NCSU.EDU

*Department of Statistics
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27607, USA*

Subhashis Ghosal

SGHOSAL@NCSU.EDU

*Department of Statistics
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27607, USA*

Editor:

Abstract

Semi-supervised learning is a classification method which makes use of both labeled data and unlabeled data for training. In this paper, we propose a semi-supervised learning algorithm using a Bayesian semi-supervised model. We make a general assumption that the observations will follow two multivariate normal distributions depending on their true labels after the same unknown transformation. We use B-splines to put a prior on the transformation function for each component. To use unlabeled data in a semi-supervised setting, we assume the labels are missing at random. The posterior distributions can then be described using our assumptions, which we compute by the Gibbs sampling technique. The proposed method is then compared with several other available methods through an extensive simulation study. Finally we apply the proposed method in real data contexts for diagnosing breast cancer and classify radar returns. We conclude that the proposed method has better prediction accuracy in a wide variety of cases.

Keywords: Classification, Semi-supervised learning, B-splines, Gibbs sampling, Missing at random

1. Introduction

Semi-supervised learning is a classification method which makes use of both labeled data and unlabeled data for training. There has been a growing interest in semi-supervised learning in recent years. Traditional classification methods are supervised in nature. They use only labeled data for training. To train a traditional classifier, we have to obtain the true class information for each unit in the dataset, along with the measurements associated with it. However, labels are often difficult to obtain. It can be expensive and time consuming, and it requires human labor and expertise. For example, obtaining label can be a hard problem in a fraud detection system. One way to identify fraud transaction or account takeover is through client report. However it is unlikely for clients to notice every crime act. There could be a huge amount of undetected fraud if we rely the labeling process only on client report. The only way to obtain a thorough and reliable label for every instance is through human evaluation, meaning that a verification team will give a judgement given the information, which will cost both time and human labor. On the other hand, unlabeled

data in most cases are substantial and easy to obtain. Unsupervised learning methods like clustering provide a way to make use of unlabeled data. However, it may not be appropriate or useful in a classification problem. Supervised learning seems to be the best solution for these cases. When a few units in a dataset have labels, then semi-supervised learning technique can use these large number of unlabeled units in classification instead of discarding them; thus greatly improving the performance of the classifier. In summary, semi-supervised learning lies in between supervised learning and unsupervised learning and the goal is to make the most efficient use with a dataset contains both labeled and unlabeled observations.

Semi-supervised learning can be classified to two big classes-generative methods and discriminative methods. Generative methods are mainly based on Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm (Dempster et al., 1977) and they have to make some assumptions on the underlying distributions of different classes. Discriminative methods, on the other hand, only learn the boundary between classes. In the recent literature, discriminative methods are explored much more compared to generative methods. Self-Training (Yarowsky, 1995) is the most widely-used semi-supervised learning method. The basic idea is that the chosen classifier teaches itself the labels and then learn iteratively. Co-Training (Blum and Mitchell, 1998) is conducted by splitting the features to two subsets. The idea is that each subset can learn and teach the other some labels they are confident of. Another commonly used algorithm is Semi-Supervised Support Vector Machines (S^3VM). The goal of S^3VM is to find a linear boundary which has the maximum margin for both labeled and unlabeled data. This is an NP-hard problem and there are many algorithms being proposed to solve this problem. In our simulations, we have compared with several different SVM algorithms like Belkin et al. (2006), Li et al. (2013), Sindhwani and Keerthi (2006). The method S^3VM is based on the assumption that the boundary will not cut in dense regions. Other methods like Gaussian Process (Lawrence and Jordan, 2005) also make use of this assumption. There are also a huge number of methods based on graphical analysis, for example, Balcan et al. (2005), Zemel and Carreira-Perpiñán (2005), Zhang and Lee (2007), Hein and Maier (2007). A thorough introduction of semi-supervised learning methods can be found in Zhu (2005).

Generative methods based on EM algorithm have two widely known disadvantages. First, some assumptions on the underlying distributions have to be made. If the assumptions are wrong, then the mislabeled data will hurt the accuracy (Cozman et al., 2003). Second, EM algorithm has a tendency to stick to a local maximum instead of the global maximum. This may also cause problems when using unlabeled data.

In this paper, we propose a new generative method for semi-supervised learning which can solve the two problems mentioned. First of all, we make a flexible semi-parametric modeling assumption. We assume that the two underlying distributions map to multivariate normal distributions after the same unknown transformation on each class. This is definitely a lot more general than a specific parametric assumption. This is called non-paranormal assumption in graphical model (Liu et al., 2012; Mulgrave and Ghosal, 2019). Nonparametric since the transformation has unrestricted functional form. We shall use B-spline to estimate the transformation so this will be reduced to parameter estimation. Second, instead of finding point estimates using the EM algorithm, we obtain the posterior

distributions using Gibbs sampling framework. This prevent the problem of trapping at local maxima.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We describe the model and the algorithm given by Gibbs Sampling in Section 2. We give a method of selecting hyperparameters in Section 3. Then we present the results of a simulation study to compare our method with other semi-supervised learning methods in Section 4. Finally we apply our method to real data sets in Section 5.

2. Model

Below we shall use the following notation list: $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ denotes a p -dimensional normal distribution with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$; $\Phi(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and $\phi(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ denote the cumulative distribution function and the density function of a normal distribution with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ respectively; $TN_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathcal{T})$ stands for a truncated normal distribution $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ restricted on a set $\mathcal{T}$; $W(n, V)$ stands for the Wishart distribution with n degree of freedom and scale matrix V ; $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$ stands for the beta distribution with shape parameters α and β .

Suppose we observe $\mathbf{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}^{(n)}$ independently, which take value in $\mathbb{R}^p$ for some $p \geq 1$, each observation as $\mathbf{X}^{(i)} = (X_1^{(i)}, \dots, X_p^{(i)})$. We denote the class for $\mathbf{X}^{(i)}$ by $L^{(i)} \in \{0, 1\}$. The observation $\mathbf{X}^{(i)}$ belongs to the Class 0 if $L^{(i)} = 0$ and it belongs to the Class 1 otherwise, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Notice that in the semi-supervised learning settings, not all $L^{(i)}$ are available to us. We denote the observed label by $L_{\text{ob}}^{(i)}$. If i -th label is missing, then we set $L_{\text{ob}}^{(i)} = 2$; otherwise $L_{\text{ob}}^{(i)} = L^{(i)}$. Here we assume that the label is missing at random. That is, $P(L_{\text{ob}}^{(i)} \neq 2 | \mathbf{X}^{(i)}, L^{(i)}) = g(\mathbf{X}^{(i)})$. This assumption makes sense because at the time we decide whether or not to verify an instance, we do not know the true class $L^{(i)}$. the only information we have is the observation $\mathbf{X}^{(i)}$.

When we talk about a generic observation, we omit the index i from $\mathbf{X}^{(i)}$ and just write $\mathbf{X}$. We assume that under some unknown increasing transformation f , the transformed observations follow one of the two normal distributions according to their classes,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{X}) | \{L = 0\} &\sim N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0), \\ f(\mathbf{X}) | \{L = 1\} &\sim N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{f}$ is a p -dimensional vector of functions, $\mathbf{f}(X_1, \dots, X_p) = (f_1(X_1), \dots, f_p(X_p))$. Notice that any continuous random variable can be transformed to a normal variable by a strictly increasing transformation and hence is not an assumption if considered individually. The model assumption here is that the two distributions for two classes are mapped to normal distributions under the same transformation. This is called nonparanormality assumption in the literature (Liu et al., 2012).

The method we use to estimate the transformation $\mathbf{f}$ is very similar to the method used by Mulgrave and Ghosal (2019). However the purpose of estimating this transformation is completely different. Here we are estimating the transformation $\mathbf{f}$ for semi-supervised learning, while Mulgrave and Ghosal (2019) used this approach to learn the graphical structure. Like Mulgrave and Ghosal (2019), we shall estimate each component of the transformation $\mathbf{f}$. We denote the d -th dimension of the transformation by f_d . We put prior distributions

on the unknown transformation functions through a random series based on B-splines, i.e.,

$$f_d(X_d) = \sum_{j=1}^J \theta_{dj} B_j(X_d), \quad d = 1, \dots, p,$$

where X_d is the d -th dimension of an observation, $B_j(\cdot)$ are the B-spline basis functions, θ_{dj} is a coefficient in the expansion of the function, $j = 1, \dots, J$, and J is the number of B-spline basis functions with equispaced knots used in the expansion. The coefficients are ordered to induce monotonicity, and the smoothness is controlled by the order of the B-splines and the number of basis functions used in the expansion. The posterior means of the coefficients give a monotone smooth Bayes estimate of the transformations. In this chapter, we choose cubic splines, which correspond to B-splines of order 4.

Notice that for B-spline functions, $\mathbf{X}$ can only take values in the range of $[0, 1]$. Because of that, we have to do some transformation to the data if it is not in this range. For example, we can calculate the mean μ_d and variance σ_d^2 for the d -th dimension of the training data, and then apply the cumulative distribution function $\Phi(\cdot; \mu_d, \sigma_d^2)$ on the d -th dimension of the data, $d = 1, \dots, p$.

2.1 Prior distributions

2.1.1 PRIOR ON THE B-SPLINE COEFFICIENTS

The prior we use was introduced by Mulgrave and Ghosal (2019). Here we include the prior specification for contiguity.

Let us first put the monotonicity aside, and put normal prior on the coefficients of the B-splines, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\theta}_d = (\theta_{d1}, \dots, \theta_{dJ}) \sim N_J(\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$, where σ^2 is some positive constant, $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ is a J dimensional vector of constants, and $\mathbf{I}$ is the $J \times J$ identity matrix. We choose normal prior for conjugacy. Because the means and the covariances of the normal distributions are unknown, this gives the flexibility in the location and the scale of the transformation and causes identifiability issues. To address this and to retain the conjugacy normal prior, impose the following constraints on the locations and the scales of the transformation function f_d :

$$\begin{cases} 0 = f_d(1/2) = \sum_{j=1}^J \theta_{dj} B_j(1/2), \\ 1 = f_d(3/4) - f_d(1/4) = \sum_{j=1}^J \theta_{dj} [B_j(3/4) - B_j(1/4)]. \end{cases}$$

The constraints can be written in matrix form $\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_d = \mathbf{c}$, where

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} B_1(1/2) & B_2(1/2) & \cdots & B_J(1/2) \\ B_1(3/4) - B_1(1/4) & B_2(3/4) - B_2(1/4) & \cdots & B_J(3/4) - B_J(1/4) \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\mathbf{c} = (0, 1)^T$.

By the property of the normal distribution, we have

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_d | \{\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_d = \mathbf{c}\} \sim N_J(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \boldsymbol{\zeta} + \mathbf{A}^T(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T)^{-1}(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\zeta})$, $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \sigma^2[\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^T(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T)^{-1}\mathbf{A}]$. Because of the two linear constraints, the covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ is actually singular. So we remove two coefficients by

representing them as linear combinations of the others. Here we choose J_1 where $B_{J_1}(1/2)$ is the largest (middle one if J is odd, either of middle two if J is even) and J_2 where $B_{J_2}(3/4) - B_{J_2}(1/4)$ is the largest (upper 75th quantile one) and that $J_2 \neq J_1$. In principle, any J_1 and J_2 with non-zero coefficients can work. Here we choose them in this way to guarantee numerical stability in later calculation. Then by $\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_d = \mathbf{c}$ we can get

$$\begin{pmatrix} \theta_{dJ_1} \\ \theta_{dJ_2} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{W}_d \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d + \mathbf{q}_d, \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d$ is the reduced vector after removing θ_{dJ_1} and θ_{dJ_2} from $\boldsymbol{\theta}_d$, and $\mathbf{W}_d$ and $\mathbf{q}_d$ can be calculated correspondingly.

The reduced vector $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d$ follows the prior distribution:

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d | \{\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_d = \mathbf{c}\} \sim N_{J-2}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}})$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}$ are obtained by removing the J_1 and J_2 dimension correspondingly.

Finally, consider the monotonicity constraint $\theta_{d1} < \theta_{d2} < \dots < \theta_{dJ}$. Written in matrix form, that is, $\mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}_d > 0$, where

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This can be further reduced to $\bar{\mathbf{F}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d + \bar{\mathbf{g}} > 0$ according to (2).

The final prior is given by

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d | \{\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_d = \mathbf{c}\} \sim \text{TN}_{J-2}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}, \mathcal{T}) \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{T} = \{\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d : \bar{\mathbf{F}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d + \bar{\mathbf{g}} > 0\}$. Notice that this prior reserves the conjugacy.

The parameter $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ is chosen such that $\zeta_j = \nu + \tau \Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{j - 0.375}{J - 0.75 + 1}\right)$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, where ν is a constant and τ is a positive constant. The motivation behind this prior specification is that this is an approximation for the expected values of the order statistics of a $N_p(\nu, \tau^2)$ random variable.

2.1.2 PRIOR ON THE MEANS AND COVARIANCES

Because the means and covariances corresponds to transformed measurements, it is hard to obtain any prior information. Hence, we put an noninformative prior about them, i.e., $\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0) \propto 1$, $\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) \propto 1$.

2.2 Gibbs sampling algorithm

Denote the transformed observations by $\mathbf{Y}$, i.e., $\mathbf{Y}_d^{(i)} = f_d(\mathbf{X}_d^{(i)}) = \mathbf{B}_d^{(i)}\boldsymbol{\theta}_d$, where $\mathbf{B}_d^{(i)} = (B_1(X_d^{(i)}), \dots, B_J(X_d^{(i)}))$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Because of (2), we can calculate $\mathbf{Y}^{(i)}$ based on $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{Y}_d^{(i)} = (\bar{\mathbf{B}}_d^{(i)} + \mathbf{B}_d^{(i)*}\mathbf{W}_d)\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d + \mathbf{B}_d^{(i)*}\mathbf{q}_d, \quad (4)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_d^{(i)}$ is obtained by removing the J_1 -th and the J_2 -th columns of $\mathbf{B}_d^{(i)}$, and $\mathbf{B}_d^{(i)*}$ is given by $(B_{J_1}(X_d^{(i)}), B_{J_2}(X_d^{(i)}))$.

Before doing the Gibbs sampling, we need to assign some initial values. We assign the initial values for B-spline coefficients $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1, \dots, \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_p$ by assuming that the true transformation is $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$. These initial values will also be useful when sampling from the posteriors which are truncated normal distributions. After finding the initial values $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d$, we can calculate the initial value for $\mathbf{Y}$ according to (4). The initial values for $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0$ is the mean and the covariance matrix of $\mathbf{Y}$ whose $L_{\text{ob}}^{(i)} = 0$ respectively; similarly the initial values for $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1$ is the mean and the covariance matrix of the $\mathbf{Y}$ whose $L_{\text{ob}}^{(i)} = 1$. The original value for the class $\mathbf{L}$ is given as follows: for $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$L^{(i)} = \begin{cases} L_{\text{ob}}^{(i)}, & \text{if } L_{\text{ob}}^{(i)} \neq 2, \\ 0, & \text{if } L_{\text{ob}}^{(i)} = 2 \text{ and } \|\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0\| < \|\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1\|, \\ 1, & \text{if } L_{\text{ob}}^{(i)} = 2 \text{ and } \|\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0\| > \|\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1\|, \end{cases}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ stands for the Euclidean distance.

1. First sample the B-spline coefficients for $d = 1, \dots, p$.

The joint posterior for the B-spline coefficients is a truncated normal with density

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi^*(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1, \dots, \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_p | \mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) \\ & \propto \prod_{L^{(i)}=0} (\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0^{-1}(\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0)\right) \\ & \quad \times \prod_{L^{(i)}=1} (\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)\right) \\ & \quad \times \prod_{d=1}^p \pi_d(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d). \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_d(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d)$ is the prior distribution of $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d$ given by (3).

Let $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{-d}$ denote the vector $(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1, \dots, \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{d-1}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{d+1}, \dots, \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_p)$. We have

$$\pi^*(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d | \mathbf{Y}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{-d}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) \propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{*-1} \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d + \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{*-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}^*\right\} \times \mathbb{1}\{\bar{\mathbf{F}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d + \bar{\mathbf{g}} > 0\}, \quad (5)$$

So we can sample $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d$ from $\text{TN}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^*, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*, \{\bar{\mathbf{F}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_d + \bar{\mathbf{g}} > 0\})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^* &= \{(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0)_{dd}^{-1} \sum_{L^{(i)}=0} (\bar{\mathbf{B}}_d^{(i)} + \mathbf{B}_d^{(i)*} \mathbf{W}_d)^T (\bar{\mathbf{B}}_d^{(i)} + \mathbf{B}_d^{(i)*} \mathbf{W}_d) + \\ & \quad (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)_{dd}^{-1} \sum_{L^{(i)}=1} (\bar{\mathbf{B}}_d^{(i)} + \mathbf{B}_d^{(i)*} \mathbf{W}_d)^T (\bar{\mathbf{B}}_d^{(i)} + \mathbf{B}_d^{(i)*} \mathbf{W}_d) + \bar{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}^{-1}\}^{-1}, \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}^* &= \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^* \{ \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}^{-1} - \sum_{L^{(i)}=0} (\bar{\mathbf{B}}_d^{(i)} + \mathbf{B}_d^{(i)*} \mathbf{W}_d) [(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0)_{dd}^{-1} (\mathbf{B}_d^{(i)*} \mathbf{q} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{0d}) + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0)_{d,-d}^{-1} (\mathbf{Y}_{-d}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{0,-d})] \\ & \quad - \sum_{L^{(i)}=1} (\bar{\mathbf{B}}_d^{(i)} + \mathbf{B}_d^{(i)*} \mathbf{W}_d) [(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)_{dd}^{-1} (\mathbf{B}_d^{(i)*} \mathbf{q} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{1d}) + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)_{d,-d}^{-1} (\mathbf{Y}_{-d}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{1,-d})] \} \end{aligned}$$

The truncated normal distributions are sampled using the method proposed by Li and Ghosh (2015). After obtaining the posterior samples of $\bar{\theta}_1, \dots, \bar{\theta}_p$, we can update $\mathbf{Y}$ according to (4).

2. Update $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1$ according to their posterior probability. That is,

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0^{-1} &\sim \text{W}(n_0, \sum_{L^{(i)}=0} (\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_0)(\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_0)^T), \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 &\sim \text{N}_p(\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0/n_0), \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1} &\sim \text{W}(n_1, \sum_{L^{(i)}=1} (\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_1)(\mathbf{Y}^{(i)} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_1)^T), \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 &\sim \text{N}_p(\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1/n_1),\end{aligned}$$

where $n_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{L^{(i)} = 0\}$, $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{L^{(i)} = 0\} \mathbf{Y}^{(i)} / n_0$, $n_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{L^{(i)} = 1\}$, $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{L^{(i)} = 1\} \mathbf{Y}^{(i)} / n_1$.

3. Update the missing labels according to the current distributions; for $i = 1, \dots, n$, if label is missing, update

$$L^{(i)} \sim \text{Bernoulli}\left(\frac{\lambda_1 \phi(Y^{(i)}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)}{\lambda_0 \phi(Y^{(i)}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0) + \lambda_1 \phi(Y^{(i)}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)}\right),$$

since $\frac{P(L^{(i)} = 0|Y^{(i)})}{P(L^{(i)} = 1|Y^{(i)})} = \frac{\lambda_0 \phi(Y^{(i)}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0)}{\lambda_1 \phi(Y^{(i)}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)}$ based on the missing at random assumption, where λ_0 and λ_1 stand for the proportion of class 0 and class 1. There are two ways to figure out λ_0 and λ_1 , one is to specify them in advance if we know the proportion of each category in the population. The other way is to treat them as unknown parameters. We can specify the prior distribution $\lambda_0 \sim \text{Beta}(l_0, l_1)$ and update them with each MCMC iteration $\lambda_0 \sim \text{Beta}(l_0 + n_0, l_1 + n_1)$.

We can then obtain the posterior mean of $\bar{\theta}_1, \dots, \bar{\theta}_p, \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_0, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_0, \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1$ (and $\bar{\lambda}_0, \bar{\lambda}_1$ if treated as unknown parameters). For the new data $X^{(\text{new})}$ coming in, we shall first apply the transformation as the one applied to the original training data. Then calculate $\mathbf{Y}^{(\text{new})}$ according to (4). If $\bar{\lambda}_0 \phi(Y^{(\text{new})}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_0, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_0) > \bar{\lambda}_1 \phi(Y^{(\text{new})}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1)$, then assign it to Class 0; otherwise, assign it to Class 1. We will call our method Nonparanormal method in the simulations.

3. Model selection

Notice that we have to choose the number of basis functions J we want to use to estimate the transformation function. If the labeled data is sufficiently extensive, we can consider using cross validation to choose J . However, in semi-supervised learning settings, the number of labeled units in the data is usually very limited. The method we propose here is inspired by the low-density assumption which is widely used in the semi-supervised learning literature. The idea is that we choose the classifier which best satisfies the low-density assumption,

i.e., the one with the least number of points on the boundary. More specifically, we define the points that is close to the boundary by

$$\left\{ X^{(i)} : m^{-1} < \frac{\lambda_0 \phi(Y^{(i)}; \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_0, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_0)}{\lambda_1 \phi(Y^{(i)}; \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1)} < m, i = 1, \dots, n \right\}. \quad (6)$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_0, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_0, \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1$ are the posterior means of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1$ respectively, $m > 1$ is a fixed value we shall specify. Obviously, the set is more precise to the boundary when m is closer to 1. However, this may lead to a small number of points in the boundary set and therefore cannot serve the purpose of distinguishing different J . According to our numerical experiment, moderate value $m = 3$ is a good choice. Notice that here $\mathbf{Y}$ is calculated based on the posterior mean $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1, \dots, \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_p$. We choose the J which has the smallest number of points in the set defined by (6).

In the simulation studies, to save computation time, we run the procedure with $J = 8, \dots, 15$, each for 500 iterations to get a decision rule. Then we choose the best J according to the low density assumption introduced above and then run 10000 iterations to get the final classifier.

4. Simulations

Since our proposed method relies on the nonparanormality assumption, in the simulation studies, we consider two cases: the case when the assumption satisfies and the case when the assumption is violated.

4.1 Nonparanormality assumption satisfied

We consider $p = 5, 10, 15$ in our simulations. For each dimension p , instead of specifying some values for means and covariances of the underlying Gaussian distributions $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0)$ and $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)$, we decide to randomly generate some values as follows:

- Generate μ_{0d} and μ_{1d} independently and identically from a uniform distribution ranging in $[0, 4]$ for $d = 1, \dots, p$.
- Generate $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0$ by $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}$, where every element in $\mathbf{A}$ is generated from the uniform distribution over $[-1, 1]$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1$ is generated the same way independently.

Here we considered two true transformations:

1. The logistic transformation $\left\{ 1 + \exp\left(-\frac{X_d - (\mu_{0d} + \mu_{1d})/2}{(\sqrt{\Sigma_{0d,d}} + \sqrt{\Sigma_{1d,d}})/2}\right) \right\}^{-1}$ for each dimension $d = 1, \dots, p$.
2. The probit transformation $\Phi(X_d, (\mu_{0d} + \mu_{1d})/2, (\sqrt{\Sigma_{0d,d}} + \sqrt{\Sigma_{1d,d}})/2)$ for each dimension $d = 1, \dots, p$.

For each of the settings above, generate n^* number of observations for each class and randomly select n_l^* of them to be labeled. Here n^* takes values in (50, 100) and n_l^* takes values in (3, 5, 10). For the testing set, we will generate 5000 data for each class. We compare our Nonparanormal (NN) method to other widely used semi-supervised learning methods in R package 'RSSL' (Krijthe, 2016). We have tried all methods included in this package. However,

Table 1: Classification error rate ($\times 10^2$) for the test data when the data is generated with a logistic transformation. (Here * means 1–6 cases failed to give an output. The error is calculated based on the remianing outputs.)

p	(n^*, n_l^*)	NN	ICLS	LSVM	WSVM	SVML	EM	SVM	RF
5	(50,3)	3.39	15.82	*29.29	19.7	29.20	41.00	26.00	31.55
	(50,5)	5.35	12.48	29.00	17.65	26.06	37.24	21.11	26.43
	(50,10)	3.23	7.70	30.37	12.00	19.75	31.02	13.73	19.94
	(100,3)	3.90	18.16	*29.46	19.86	28.88	41.94	28.40	29.76
	(100,5)	2.81	13.61	*30.01	14.03	24.05	40.08	21.09	24.70
	(100,10)	2.80	8.24	31.94	10.7	19.44	34.09	14.72	19.84
10	(50,3)	0.20	18.13	*13.98	6.26	11.52	7.44	16.54	16.89
	(50,5)	0.20	11.43	10.13	5.62	9.17	7.53	10.57	14.44
	(50,10)	0.20	4.66	7.05	4.84	6.46	7.05	6.15	11.23
	(100,3)	0.12	18.38	*12.35	4.53	10.71	7.76	17.23	16.82
	(100,5)	0.12	12.28	10.38	4.42	8.83	7.72	11.26	15.39
	(100,10)	0.12	5.20	7.51	3.98	6.52	7.51	6.63	11.15
15	(50,3)	0.10	27.29	13.99	3.48	13.98	4.33	17.10	18.29
	(50,5)	0.08	16.36	8.09	3.17	8.97	4.12	7.64	13.93
	(50,10)	0.10	6.91	5.11	2.43	5.87	3.93	3.81	8.89
	(100,3)	0.04	26.38	14.67	2.08	14.05	3.97	17.94	18.41
	(100,5)	0.04	18.78	8.36	1.95	9.07	3.97	10.44	13.58
	(100,10)	0.04	7.55	6.17	1.90	6.55	3.88	4.49	10.09

EM Linear Discriminant Classifier (Expectation Maximization applied to the linear discriminant classifier assuming Gaussian classes with a shared covariance matrix) (Dempster et al., 1977), IC Linear Discriminant Classifier (Krijthe and Loog, 2014), Kernel Least Squares Classifier, Laplacian Kernel Least Squares Classifier (Belkin et al., 2006), MC Linear Discriminant Classifier (Loog, 2011), Quadratic Discriminant Classifier do not work for our generated datasets. Entropy Regularized Logistic Regression (Grandvalet and Bengio, 2005), Linear SVM, Logistic Loss Classifier, Logistic Regression, MC Nearest Mean Classifier (Loog, 2010) do not have good performances. Here we only include 5 methods which turned out to be the the best ones for our data. These methods are IC Least Squares Classifier (ICLS) (Krijthe and Loog, 2015), Laplacian SVM (LSVM) (Belkin et al., 2006), Well SVM (WSVM) (Li et al., 2013), svmmln (SVML) (Sindhwani and Keerthi, 2006), EM Nearest Mean Classifier (EM) (Dempster et al., 1977). To prove that using unlabeled data can actually improve the accuracy of the classifier, we also include Support Vector Machine (SVM) and Random Forest (RF), two supervised classification methods, trained only on labeled data for comparison. We simulate 30 datasets for each setting and the results shown in Table 1 and 2 are the average of classification error rates for 30 datasets. ¹

1. All the code for simulations and real data are available in <https://github.com/RrZzZz/Bayesian-Semi-supervised-learning-under-nonparanormality>

Table 2: Classification error rate ($\times 10^2$) for the test data when the data is generated with a probit transformation. (Here * means 1–6 cases failed to give an output. The error is calculated based on the remianing outputs.)

p	(n^*, n_l^*)	NN	ICLS	LSVM	WSVM	SVML	EM	SVM	RF
5	(50,3)	3.88	18.47	*30.31	22.44	28.97	42.77	26.22	31.11
	(50,5)	3.75	14.96	29.18	18.49	25.11	39.14	22.12	26.16
	(50,10)	3.66	9.77	31.52	13.23	18.51	31.84	14.57	20.12
	(100,3)	6.21	19.37	*29.32	20.72	28.47	43.99	28.55	29.24
	(100,5)	3.10	14.92	30.18	15.29	23.26	42.53	21.29	24.49
	(100,10)	3.08	10.39	27.96	12.26	18.37	36.81	17.61	19.79
10	(50,3)	0.35	20.08	*13.66	6.89	12.11	7.95	16.57	16.72
	(50,5)	0.36	12.77	10.27	6.19	9.52	7.97	10.40	14.45
	(50,10)	0.33	6.74	7.60	5.39	7.00	7.54	6.54	11.34
	(100,3)	0.23	19.87	*12.86	5.10	11.42	8.10	17.44	16.80
	(100,5)	0.22	14.95	10.56	4.99	9.32	8.08	11.33	15.69
	(100,10)	0.21	7.16	7.93	4.47	6.91	7.83	7.07	11.17
15	(50,3)	0.10	27.21	*14.04	3.97	14.29	4.66	17.50	18.18
	(50,5)	0.11	16.91	8.44	3.55	9.44	4.44	8.04	13.89
	(50,10)	0.11	7.57	5.54	2.80	6.39	4.26	4.25	8.86
	(100,3)	0.05	26.50	14.79	2.61	14.37	4.33	18.09	18.62
	(100,5)	0.05	20.21	8.92	2.28	9.56	4.34	10.58	13.56
	(100,10)	0.06	8.95	6.57	2.26	7.15	4.26	4.99	10.11

From the above results, we can see that clearly our Nonparanormal method outperforms other methods when our assumption is satisfied. It is worth pointing out that because the parameters generated for different dimensions are different, the difficulty for classification is different as well. Obviously here the difficulty for classification decreases as the dimensions increases. The accuracy increases as the number of labels increases, which is expected. The accuracy also increases as the number of samples increases in general, (except when $p = 5$, $(n^*, n_l^*) = (50, 3)$ comparing to $(n^*, n_l^*) = (100, 3)$, maybe because the problem is too difficult and the labeling proportion is playing a more important part). Comparing different methods, the EM algorithm is highly dependent on the assumption that the underlying distributions are Gaussian. This assumption is not applicable in these cases so it does not have a good performance as expected. Indeed it is the worst when $p = 5$. It is actually a bit surprising to find out that for the case when $p = 10$ and $p = 15$, EM is actually doing reasonably, maybe because the distributions can be approximated by Gaussian to some extent. Among those SVM methods, WSVM has the best performance; LSVM sometimes even failed to give a result. The reason why SVM does not work well in our cases is that the low density assumption of the decision boundary does not satisfy in our cases. Looking at supervised classifiers trained with only labeled data, for some cases they perform even better than some semi-supervised learning classifiers. For example, SVM is better than LSVM, SVML and EM when $p = 5$. Indeed, this shows that unlabeled data can hurt accuracy when used inappropriately. Only when used in the right way, unlabeled data can greatly improve the accuracy, like the NN methods we proposed, in these cases.

4.2 Nonparanormality assumption fails

To simulate the case when the nonparanormality assumption is violated, we still generate Gaussian distributions $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0)$ and $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)$ as the underlying distributions, but we will apply different transformation on different classes. For simplicity, we will only consider the case when $p = 5$ and we will use the same values generated above for means and covariances. The transformation we applied are:

1. The logistic transformation $\left\{1 + \exp\left(-\frac{X_d - (\mu_{0d} + \mu_{1d})/2}{(\sqrt{\Sigma_{0d,d}} + \sqrt{\Sigma_{1d,d}})/2}\right)\right\}^{-1}$ for each dimension $d = 1, \dots, p$ on observations from Class 0.
2. The probit transformation $\Phi(X_d, (\mu_{0d} + \mu_{1d})/2, (\sqrt{\Sigma_{0d,d}} + \sqrt{\Sigma_{1d,d}})/2)$ for each dimension $d = 1, \dots, p$, on observations from Class 1.

We generate n^* number of observations for each class and randomly select n_l^* of them to be labeled. Once again, n^* takes values in $(50, 100)$ and n_l^* takes values in $(3, 5, 10)$. For testing set, we will generate 5000 data for each class. 30 datasets are generated for each setting and we compare our proposed method with other methods mentioned above. The results are shown in Table 3.

From the result above, we can see that our proposed NN method has substantially lower error rates than others even when nonparanormality assumption fails. This shows that our method is robust with respect to this assumption.

Table 3: Classification error rate ($\times 10^2$) for the test data when the data violate the Non-paranormal assumption. (Here * means 7–9 cases failed to give an output. The error is calculated based on the remaining outputs.)

p	(n^*, n_l^*)	NN	ICLS	LSVM	WSVM	SVML	EM	SVM	RF
5	(50,3)	5.32	16.38	31.58	17.41	28.45	42.95	22.54	31.30
	(50,5)	2.17	14.19	29.74	16.03	25.75	38.14	17.18	23.99
	(50,10)	2.00	8.89	31.73	10.40	18.65	31.26	10.41	16.31
	(100,3)	3.46	18.97	30.49	17.95	28.18	44.01	23.24	29.12
	(100,5)	1.66	13.82	33.13	11.96	23.39	40.46	17.42	23.11
	(100,10)	1.67	9.51	31.97	9.23	18.81	35.83	11.07	16.04

5. Real data

For real data part, we follow the literature by choosing datasets with labels and then generate missing labels, so that we can make a comparison of the performances for different methods. Here we consider two datasets from UCI Machine Learning Repository². For each dataset, we randomly select 70% of the data for training purpose and 30% of the data as testing set. For the training set, we again randomly select 15% of the label and regard the rest as unlabeled data for our semi-supervised learning method. For each dataset, we repeat the process for 10 times and take the mean of the false positive rate, the false negative rate, the overall error rate and the Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC) for all semi-supervised methods considered. We calculate the MCC because it takes into account true and false positives and negatives and is generally regarded as a balanced measure which can be used even if the classes are of very different sizes. The two data sets we considered are:

- Breast Cancer Wisconsin (Diagnostic) Data Set ³

The purpose of this data is to use the features of the cell nucleus to predict whether the disease is malignant or benign. The features are computed from a digitized image of a fine needle aspirate (FNA) of a breast mass. Those features include radius, texture, perimeter, area, smoothness, compactness, concavity, concave points, symmetry and fractal dimension. For each feature, the mean, standard error, and "worst" or largest (mean of the three largest values) are calculated for each image. All features are continuous variables. The data have 357 benign cases and 212 malignant cases.

- Ionosphere Data Set ⁴

The purpose of this data is to classify the radar returns of free electrons in the ionosphere as "good" or "bad". "Good" radar returns are the ones showing evidence of some type of structure in the ionosphere while "bad" returns are those whose signals pass through the ionosphere. There are 17 pulse numbers for the system and instances

2. <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/index.php>

3. [https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Breast+Cancer+Wisconsin+\(Diagnostic\)](https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Breast+Cancer+Wisconsin+(Diagnostic))

4. <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/ionosphere>

Table 4: Classification results on Breast Cancer Wisconsin (Diagnostic) Data Set

	NN	ICLS	LSVM	WSVM	SVML	EM
False Positive Rate	0.089	0.025	0.014	0.030	0.057	0.004
False Negative Rate	0.074	0.196	0.157	0.177	0.139	0.361
Overall Error Rate	0.083	0.091	0.068	0.085	0.087	0.140
MCC	0.829	0.810	0.858	0.821	0.814	0.717

Table 5: Classification results on Ionosphere Data Set

	NN	ICLS	LSVM	WSVM	SVML	EM
False Positive Rate	0.087	0.456	0.564	0.337	0.450	0.276
False Negative Rate	0.150	0.043	0.034	0.088	0.047	0.339
Overall Error Rate	0.127	0.192	0.229	0.181	0.196	0.317
MCC	0.741	0.581	0.504	0.612	0.576	0.369

are described by 2 attributes per pulse number. There are 34 features in this data set and all of them are continuous. The data contains 126 bad cases and 225 good cases.

The results are given in Table 4 and Table 5. For Breast Cancer Wisconsin (Diagnostic) Data Set, LSVM has the best performance in terms of overall error rate and MCC. Our proposed method NN has slightly higher error rate and lower MCC. But Unlike LSVM, whose false negative rate is much higher than false positive rate, the false positive rate and false negative rate for NN are almost the same. WSVM has comparable overall error and MCC with NN. For Ionosphere Data Set, NN has much better result in terms of both overall error rate and MCC. In conclusion, NN is a safe choice for semi-supervised learning in the real world.

References

- Maria-Florina Balcan, Avrim Blum, Patrick Pakyan Choi, John D Lafferty, Brian Pantano, Mugizi Robert Rwebangira, and Xiaojin Zhu. Person identification in webcam images: An application of semi-supervised learning. In *ICML Workshop Learning with Partially Classified Training Data*, 2005.
- Mikhail Belkin, Partha Niyogi, and Vikas Sindhwani. Manifold regularization: A geometric framework for learning from labeled and unlabeled examples. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7(Nov):2399–2434, 2006.
- Avrim Blum and Tom Mitchell. Combining labeled and unlabeled data with co-training. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, pages 92–100. Citeseer, 1998.
- Fabio G Cozman, Ira Cohen, and Marcelo C Cirelo. Semi-supervised learning of mixture models. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-03)*, pages 99–106, 2003.
- Arthur P Dempster, Nan M Laird, and Donald B Rubin. Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the em algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 39(1):1–22, 1977.
- Yves Grandvalet and Yoshua Bengio. Semi-supervised learning by entropy minimization. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 529–536, 2005.
- Matthias Hein and Markus Maier. Manifold denoising. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 561–568, 2007.
- Jesse H Krijthe. Rssl: Semi-supervised learning in R. In *International Workshop on Reproducible Research in Pattern Recognition*, pages 104–115. Springer, 2016.
- Jesse H Krijthe and Marco Loog. Implicitly constrained semi-supervised linear discriminant analysis. In *2014 22nd International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, pages 3762–3767. IEEE, 2014.
- Jesse H Krijthe and Marco Loog. Implicitly constrained semi-supervised least squares classification. In *International Symposium on Sntelligent Data Analysis*, pages 158–169. Springer, 2015.
- Neil D Lawrence and Michael I Jordan. Semi-supervised learning via gaussian processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 753–760, 2005.
- Yifang Li and Sujit K Ghosh. Efficient sampling methods for truncated multivariate normal and student-t distributions subject to linear inequality constraints. *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice*, 9(4):712–732, 2015.
- Yu-Feng Li, Ivor W Tsang, James T Kwok, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Convex and scalable weakly labeled SVMs. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(1):2151–2188, 2013.

- Han Liu, Fang Han, Ming Yuan, John Lafferty, Larry Wasserman, et al. High-dimensional semiparametric gaussian copula graphical models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(4):2293–2326, 2012.
- Marco Loog. Constrained parameter estimation for semi-supervised learning: the case of the nearest mean classifier. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 291–304. Springer, 2010.
- Marco Loog. Semi-supervised linear discriminant analysis using moment constraints. In *IAPR International Workshop on Partially Supervised Learning*, pages 32–41. Springer, 2011.
- Jami J Mulgrave and Subhashis Ghosal. Bayesian inference in nonparanormal graphical models. *Bayesian Analysis (Advanced Publication)*, 2019.
- Vikas Sindhwani and S Sathiya Keerthi. Large scale semi-supervised linear SVMs. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 477–484. ACM, 2006.
- David Yarowsky. Unsupervised word sense disambiguation rivaling supervised methods. In *33rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 189–196, 1995.
- Richard S Zemel and Miguel Á Carreira-Perpiñán. Proximity graphs for clustering and manifold learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 225–232, 2005.
- Xinhua Zhang and Wee S Lee. Hyperparameter learning for graph based semi-supervised learning algorithms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1585–1592, 2007.
- Xiaojin Zhu. Semi-supervised learning literature survey. Technical Report 1530, Computer Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2005.