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ABSTRACT

Ubiquitous linear Gaussian exploratory tools such as principle component analysis (PCA) and factor
analysis (FA) remain widely used as tools for: exploratory analysis, pre-processing, data visualization
and related tasks. However, due to their rigid assumptions including crowding of high dimensional
data, they have been replaced in many settings by more flexible and still interpretable latent feature
models. The Feature allocation is usually modelled using discrete latent variables assumed to follow
either parametric Beta-Bernoulli distribution or Bayesian nonparametric prior. In this work we
propose a simple and tractable parametric feature allocation model which can address key limitations
of current latent feature decomposition techniques. The new framework allows for explicit control
over the number of features used to express each point and enables a more flexible set of allocation
distributions including feature allocations with different sparsity levels. This approach is used to
derive a novel adaptive Factor analysis (aFA), as well as, an adaptive probabilistic principle component
analysis (aPPCA) capable of flexible structure discovery and dimensionality reduction in a wide
case of scenarios. We derive both standard Gibbs sampler, as well as, an expectation-maximization
inference algorithms that converge orders of magnitude faster to a reasonable point estimate solution.
The utility of the proposed aPPCA model is demonstrated for standard PCA tasks such as feature
learning, data visualization and data whitening. We show that aPPCA and aFA can infer interpretable
high level features both when applied on raw MNIST and when applied for interpreting autoencoder
features. We also demonstrate an application of the aPPCA to more robust blind source separation for
functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI).

1 Introduction

Latent feature models provide principled and interpretable means for structure decomposition through leveraging
specified relationships in the observed data. They are complementary to flexible continuous latent variable models
(LVMs) or black-box autoencoder approaches which do not explicitly handle discreteness in the latent space and in
fact can often be used in conjunction. A widely used application of latent feature models has been as building block
for Bayesian sparse factor analysis models [1,2,3] which are backbone tools for dimensionality reduction and latent
structure discovery in high dimensional data. In contrast, latent feature visualization counterparts have received a
lot less attention despite the large popularity of empirical sparse principle component analysis techniques [4,5]. In
this work, we propose a more flexible set of latent feature factor analysis models, based on adopting the multivariate
hypergeometric distribution as feature allocation process. We fill the gap for latent feature visualization counterparts by
proposing a fully Bayesian paradigm for specifying the probabilistic principal component analysis (PPCA) [6]. Markov
Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) inference scheme is proposed for these models, as well as, a novel scalable approximate
expectation-maximization inference.

¹corresponding author
Linear dimensionality reduction methods are a mainstay of high-dimensional data analysis, due to their simple geometric interpretation and attractive computational properties. In linear Gaussian LVMs we assume the following generative model for the data:

\[ y = Wx + \mu + \epsilon \]  

(1)

where the observed data is \( y \in \mathbb{R}^D \); \( W \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times K} \) is a transformation matrix the columns of which are commonly referred to as principal components or factors; \( x \in \mathbb{R}^K \) are unknown multivariate Gaussian latent variables, also referred to as factor loadings; \( \mu \in \mathbb{R}^D \) is a mean (offset) vector and \( \epsilon \) describes the model noise, typically Gaussian. Depending on the assumptions we impose on \( x, W \) and \( \epsilon \), we can obtain widely-used techniques:

- The ubiquitous principal component analysis (PCA) \([7]\) can be derived from Equation (1) and further making the assumptions that \( \mu = 0 \), vectors of \( W \) are orthogonal and the variance of the isotropic noise is 0 \([8]\), i.e. assume \( \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_D) \) and \( \sigma \rightarrow 0 \).
- If we avoid the small variance asymptotic step from above, but still assume \( W \) has orthogonal vectors and Gaussian noise \( \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_D) \), we recover probabilistic PCA (PPCA) \([8]\).
- In the case where we omit the orthogonality assumption on \( W \) and assume more flexible elliptical noise \( \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{diag} (\sigma)) \) with \( \sigma = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_D) \), we obtain the classic factor analysis (FA) \([9]\).
- Variants of independent component analysis \([10]\) can be obtained by assuming flexible elliptical noise \( \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{diag} (\sigma)) \) with \( \sigma = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_D) \), but also assuming a non-Gaussian distribution model for the latent variables \( x \in \mathbb{R}^K \); for example Laplace distribution model \([2]\).

A widely accepted challenge shared in all of these linear Gaussian techniques is that the columns of \( W \) (i.e. the principal components or factors) are a linear combination of all the original variables. This problem also persists for more flexible continuous latent variable models \([11]\) and often makes it difficult to interpret the results. To handle these issues, there has been a plethora of prior work on developing sparse PCA \([4]\) and sparse FA models \([1]\). Zhou et al. \([4]\) places a least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) regularization on columns of \( x \), which leads to more interpretable components, compared to simple thresholding. Similar models have been achieved with a fully Bayesian approach of placing relevance determination priors \([12]\). \([1]\) have further suggested placing a two-component mixture model over the loadings \( x \) that allow to switch on and off factors from \( W \) imposing natural dimensionality reduction. In this scenario, the probabilities of factors having non-zero loadings are independent across all points. The sparse PCA \([4]\) can be used to produce modified principal components with sparse loadings, however, falls short in scenarios where we wish to also model the factor sharing among specific subsets of the input data.

In such cases explicit modelling of partitions in the high dimensional input space can be achieved via augmenting the latent space with additional of discrete latent variables \([1]\). In latent feature models, we denote these latent variables with binary vectors \( z \in \mathbb{R}^K \) which indicate all the features associated with that point. This approach allows to capture flexible cluster topology and also can account for overlapping factors and mixed group membership (see Figure 1). This is in contrast to latent class LVMs which are designed for subspace clustering \([13, 14]\) or mixture of factor analyzers \([15, 16, 12]\). The challenge is in designing a sufficiently flexible and intuitive model of the latent feature space. Several nonparametric FA models have addressed this using the Beta processes \([3]\), or their marginal Indian buffet processes \([2, 17]\) (IBP) which have infinite capacity and can be used to infer the feature space dimensionality (i.e. number of features). However, the IBP imposes some explicit sparsity constraints on the feature allocation distribution which can lead to producing non-interpretable spurious features and overestimation of the underlying number of features \([18]\).

The multivariate hypergeometric model we propose here allows for intuitive control over the sparsity of the feature allocation matrix. We show that the parameters of the hypergeometric prior allow for control over the expected sharing, while the IBP assumes log-linear growth of the number of factors \([19]\) and decaying factor representation \([20]\). The proposed model is parametric since it fixes the number of unique features instantiated, but at the same time has a different parameter controlling the number of unique features used to represent each data point. This is a vital point since it allows us to naturally separate (1) features which explain large variance percentage for a small subset of the data from (2) spurious features which explain small variance percentage for a potentially larger subset of the data. This formulation is natural in the context of data visualization and dimensionality reduction, where natural constraints on the feature representation for each data point occur – in visualization normally points are reduced to two or three dimensions; in dimensionality reduction, we model each point with \( K << D \) dimensions.
Figure 1: Illustration of latent feature PCA model used for decomposition and dimensionality reduction, plotted against conventional PCA. The left 3-D plot displays synthetic data which lies approximately in one of three separate linear 2-D subspaces which are spanned by different combinations of three orthogonal 1-D principal components. The right subplots display the inferred 2-D projections onto the identified subspaces using aPPCA and PCA.

Figure 2: Graphical model for the proposed adaptive factor analysis (aFA) and the adaptive probabilistic principal component analysis (aPPCA) models as well as isFA and ilCA.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Latent feature factor analysis models

In latent feature linear Gaussian LVMs, we augment the model from Equation (1) and write the following constriction in matrix notation for \( N \) \( D \)-dimensional observations:

\[
Y = W(X \odot Z) + E
\]  
(2)

where \( Y = [y_1, \ldots, y_N] \) is the observation matrix, \( W \) is a \((D \times K)\) factor (or mixing) matrix, \( Z = [z_1, \ldots, z_N]^T \) is a binary indicator matrix selecting which of \( K \) hidden sources are active, \( \odot \) denotes the Hadamard product, also known as the element-wise or Schur product, \( E = [\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_N] \) is a noise matrix consisting of \( N \) independent and identically distributed \( D \)-dimensional zero-mean vectors drawn from \( N(0, \sigma I_D) \); finally \( X = [x_1, \ldots, x_N]^T \) are the latent variables where each point \( x_{k,n} \) is assumed Gaussian for FA and PCA models, and Laplace distributed for Bayesian independent component analysis models. The graphical model is depicted in Figure 2.
2.2 Inference

The joint likelihood of the model (see Figure 2), generally can be written as:

$$P(Y, W, X, Z|\theta) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \left( P(y_n|W, x_n, z_n, \sigma) \prod_{k=1}^{K} P(x_{k,n}) P(z_{k,n}|\alpha) \right)$$

$$\times \prod_{k=1}^{K} P(w_k|\sigma_W)$$

(3)

where we use $\theta$ to denote jointly the hyperparameters. For the infinite sparse FA (isFA) model [2], we assume a Gaussian prior on the factor matrix $W$ and IBP prior on $Z$ which results in $\theta = \{\alpha, \sigma_W\}$ where $\alpha$ is the concentration parameter for the IBP, $\sigma^2$ is the variance of the observed data and $\sigma^2_W$ is the variance of the factors. We will only briefly summarize a straightforward Gibbs sampler for this isFA model. Paisley and Carin [3] proposed a scalable variational inference algorithm for estimating this model.

The posterior distribution over the latent variables $x_{k,n}$ for which its respective $z_{k,n} = 1$ is sampled from a Gaussian:

$$P(x_{k,n}|\ldots) = \mathcal{N}\left(x_{k,n} | \frac{w_k^T e_{-k,n} \sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + w_k^T w_k}, \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + w_k^T w_k}\right)$$

(4)

where we have omitted all the variables upon which $x_{k,n}$ depends on. $w_k$ is the $k$-th column of the matrix $W$ and $e_{-k,n}$ is $(y_n - W(x_n \odot z_n))$ with $z_{k,n} = 0$, or the noise associated with $n$-th point and $k$-th feature.

The posterior distribution over the $k$-th factor loading $w_k$ is a $D$-dimensional multivariate Gaussian:

$$P(w_k|\ldots) = \mathcal{N}\left(w_k | \frac{\sigma^2 W}{x_k^T x_k \sigma^2_W + \sigma^2}, \left(\frac{x_k^T x_k}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2_W}\right) I_D\right)$$

(5)

where $x_k$ is the $k$-th column of the matrix $X$ and $E_{-k} = (Y - W(X \odot Z))$ with $w_k = 0$.

The matrix $Z$ is sampled in two steps: the first involves sampling existing features and the second, sampling new features. The latent variables $x_{k,n}$ are marginalized out since the collapsed Gibbs sampler can lead to faster convergence [21]; the marginal distribution is available in closed form as the Gaussian prior over the hidden sources is conjugate to the Gaussian likelihood over the observed data. The existing features $z_{k,n}$ can be sampled directly using the Bernoulli posterior:

$$P(z_{k,n}|\ldots) = \text{Bern}\left(\frac{P(y_n|z_{k,n} = 1) P(z_{k,n} = 1|z_{k,-n})}{P(y_n|z_{k,n} = 1) P(z_{k,n} = 1|z_{k,-n}) + P(y_n|z_{k,n} = 0) P(z_{k,n} = 0|z_{k,-n})}\right)$$

(6)

In the described setup, the posterior for new features is not available in closed form, but it can be approximated using a Metropolis-Hastings step. For each observation, adding $\kappa$ number of new features and their corresponding parameters (columns of matrix $W$) are jointly proposed and accepted with probability proportional to likelihood improvement brought about by these new features.

2.3 Sparsity in Beta-Bernoulli models

If each component $z_{k,n}$ from the binary vectors $z_n$ is independently drawn from a Bernoulli distribution with the $K$ mixing parameters $\{p_k\}_{k=1}^{K}$, each independently drawn from a Beta distribution, then as the number of latent features $K \rightarrow \infty$, one can show that the conjugate prior over the matrix $Z^T = [z_1, \ldots, z_N]^T$ is the Beta process [22].

Tje mixing parameters can be integrated out in order to work with the simpler IBP marginal process. Under the IBP prior, the indicator matrix $Z$ is $(K \times N)$-dimensional with $K$ being the unknown number of represented features in the observed data which is assumed to increase with $N$. The expected number of features $K$ follows a Poisson distribution with mean $\alpha \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N}$; for large $N$, $K \approx \alpha \ln (N)$. The prior for the matrix $Z^T$ under the IBP is:

$$P(Z^T|\alpha) \propto \exp \left(-\alpha H_N\right) \alpha^K \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K} \frac{(m_k-1)!}{N!}\right)$$

(7)
where $H_N = \sum_{n=1}^{N} 1$ and $m_k = \sum_{n=1}^{N} z_{k,n}$.

The IBP prior enforces sparse $Z^T$ by placing diminishing probability on the event of having many popular features $k$, i.e. features with large $m_k$. It has been observed that the number of observations being active in each feature follows Zipf’s Law [20, 23]; this implies small number of observations are active in all features; and a large number of observations are only active in small number of features. The Zipf’s Law behavior has been observed and proven as $N \to \infty$ [20], the distribution which models size of the features is approximately proportionate to the reciprocal of the feature size. The first few principal components explain larger proportion of the variance, and are more likely to be shared by large number of points. Then from Zipf’s Law most of the remaining principal components are a linear combination of just a few observations. In summary, the IBP prior is appropriate in scenarios where we want to induce sparse feature allocation process, but falls short in cases where we seek a composition of dense features.

3 The adaptive factor analysis (aFA) model

The latent feature FA model described above assumes a product of independent Bernoulli distributions to represent the feature allocation process, with a shared Beta distribution or Beta process prior. This modelling choice leads to intrinsic sparsity assumption about the allocation indicators $Z$; log-linear growth of the number of factors [19] and decaying factor representation [20]. The result is that the underlying IBP can lead to producing non-interpretable spurious features and inconsistent overestimation of the number of inferred factors [18].

To address some of these issues here we propose a constrained allocation model for $Z$ which relies on the multivariate hypergeometric distribution. The hypergeometric distribution describes the probability of $L$ successes in $K$ draws, without replacement. Under the Beta-Bernoulli feature allocation model, features are used with independent probabilities, modelled with replacement and popular features become more common because of the reinforcement effect. In contrast, we will see that FA model with hypergeometric feature allocations, can capture a wider set of allocation distributions, while also very efficient to train.

Motivated by the huge computational costs involved with training latent feature FA models, we derive a scalable expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm for approximate inference in adaptive FA.

3.1 Feature allocation models with replacement

To implement the proposed aFA, we place a multivariate hypergeometric distribution [24] as a prior over all the latent feature indicators $Z$:

$$P(Z|K, L, m_1, ..., K) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \frac{\binom{1}{z_{1,n}} \binom{1}{z_{2,n}} \times \cdots \times \binom{1}{z_{k,n}}}{\binom{K}{L}} \quad (8)$$

for given hyperparameter values of $L$ and $K$, such that $L < K$. For Equation (8) $z_{k,n} \in \{0, 1\}$ and we have $\sum_{k=1}^{K} z_{k,n} = L$. The parameter $L$ allows for explicit control over the number of latent factors used to decompose each observation. $K$ denotes the number of unique factors used to represent the data, i.e. the number of columns in $W$. This implies that each input data point is associated with different subset of $L$ factors, selected from a total of $K$ unique factors. $K$ accounts for the global sharing of structure across overlapping groups of data points with common factors; if $K$ is large enough, each point can, in principle, be associated with non-overlapping subsets of $L$ factors, equivalent to mixture of FAs model. But, as $K$ reduces, more of these factors are constrained to be shared across subsets of the data. $L$ acts much like the number of latent dimensions in traditional linear LVMs, but here $L$ is constrained by $K$. This allows us to interpret $L$ as the local capacity of the model and $K$ controls global capacity of sharing. If $L = K$, we recover classical FA models, since all features are associated with all observed data points. As $K - L$ increases, more local structure of the data can be captured.

3.2 Scalable inference for aFA model

The joint likelihood for the proposed model takes the same form as the FA from Equation [3] with changed distribution on $Z$. The parametric nature of the hypergeometric model allows us to write an efficient EM algorithm for training the aFA which can be used both for initialization of a full Gibbs sampler or for obtaining quick maximum-a-posteriori solution for the model. We marginalize over the continuous latent variables $X$ and at each iteration we compute the expectation of the likelihood with respect to $X$: $\mathbb{E}_{X|...} \{ P(Y, Z, X|W, \sigma, \sigma_x) \times P(W) \}$ where $\mathbb{E}_{X|...}$ denotes conditional expectation with respect to $P(X|Y, Z, W, \sigma, \sigma_x)$ and $\sigma^2_x$ is the variance over the latent space. The
Algorithm 1 EM algorithm for parametric adaptive factor (aFA) analysis.

Input: Y, Θ, MaxIter
Initialise: Sample a random (K × N) binary matrix Z and initialize \{W, X\} using PCA
for iter ← 1 to MaxIter
    for n ← 1 to N
        Set I = \{k : z_{k,n} = 1\}
        for l ← 1 to L
            Set z_{l,n} = 0
        Sample I using [19]
        Set z_{l,n} = 1
    for n ← 1 to N
        Set x_n = (\sigma_n^2 I_K + \sigma^2 A_n W^T W A_n)^{-1} (\sigma_n^2 A_n W^T y_n)
        Set Ψ_n = (\sigma_n^2 I_K + \sigma^2 A_n W^T W A_n)^{-1} + x_n x_n^T
        Set W = \left( \sum_{n=1}^{N} y_n (A_n x_n)^T \right) \left( \sum_{n=1}^{N} A_n Ψ_n A_n \right)^{-1}
        Set σ^2 = \frac{1}{NB} \sum_{n=1}^{N} (y_n^T y_n - 2x_n^T A_n W^T y_n + \text{trace} (A_n W^T W A_n \Psi_n))
        Set σ_x^2 = \frac{1}{NK} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \text{trace} (Ψ_n)

log-likelihood can be expressed as:

\[ L_N = -\sum_{n=1}^{N} \left( \frac{K}{2} \ln \left( \sigma_x^2 \right) + \frac{D}{2} \ln \left( \sigma^2 \right) 
+ \frac{1}{2\sigma_x^2} x_n^T x_n + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} y_n^T y_n - \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} x_n^T A_n^T W^T y_n
+ \frac{1}{2\sigma_2^2} x_n^T A_n^T W^T W A_n x_n \right) \]  \tag{9}

where A_n is a (K × K) matrix with the diagonal elements being z_{k,n}. The expectation of x_n from above can then be written as:

\[ E[x_n] = (\sigma_n^2 I_K + \sigma^2 A_n^T W^T W A_n)^{-1} (\sigma_n^2 A_n^T W^T y_n) \]  \tag{10}

Using E[x_n], we can rewrite the marginal log-likelihood after integrating x_n:

\[ L_N = -\sum_{n=1}^{N} \left( \frac{K}{2} \ln \left( \sigma_x^2 \right) + \frac{D}{2} \ln \left( \sigma^2 \right) 
+ \frac{1}{2\sigma_x^2} \text{tr} \left( E[x_n x_n^T] \right) + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} y_n^T y_n
- \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} E[x_n]^T A_n^T W^T y_n 
+ \frac{1}{2\sigma_2^2} \text{tr} \left( A_n^T W^T W A_n E[x_n x_n^T] \right) \right) \]  \tag{11}

In the EM maximization step, we update the rest of the parameters and the indicator variables by solving \( \frac{\partial L_N}{\partial W}, \frac{\partial L_N}{\partial \sigma}, \frac{\partial L_N}{\partial z} \) and \( \frac{\partial L_N}{\partial \sigma} = 0 \).

Since we are often interested only in a point estimate for the indicator variables Z, iterative optimization via coordinate descend can lead to robust MAP estimation i.e. Z^MAP \[23, 26, 27\]. The complete EM algorithm for the proposed aFA is summarized in Algorithm 1. Typically, it converges in only a few iterations and later we show its MAP decomposition leads to comparable reconstruction error to a Gibbs trained aFA. The EM algorithm for aFA will also lead to lower reconstruction error compared to other well known parametric and nonparametric FA algorithms.

4 The adaptive probabilistic principal component analysis (aPPCA) model

In this section we propose novel adaptive probabilistic principal component analysis (aPPCA) framework which models linear subspace sharing across overlapping subsets of observations. The aPPCA can be described as a latent feature approach, in which the latent features are assumed to share orthogonal one-dimensional subspaces, characterized via the projection vectors \( w_1, w_2, ..., w_K \) forming W. If two points \( y_i \) and \( y_j \) are associated with a projection vector \( w_k \), it means that sufficient information about these points can be preserved by projecting them in the direction specified by \( w_k \).
We study two variants of aPPCA, which differ in the way they model the latent subspace allocation. First, we derive a direct extension of the nonparametric FA model from Knowles and Ghahramani [2] to the PPCA setup in which the columns of the transformation matrix \( W \) are orthogonal. Second, we also propose a parametric hypergeometric variant of the aPPCA which allows for explicit control over both the number of unique columns \( K \) in \( W \), as well as the observation specific number of active vectors \( L \).

Both these proposed aPPCA models share the following construction:

\[
\begin{align*}
    y_n &= W(x_n \odot z_n) + \mu + \epsilon_n \\
    x_n &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_K) \\
    \epsilon_n &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_D)
\end{align*}
\]  

(12)

for \( n = 1, \ldots N \), where \( y_n \in \mathbb{R}^D \) is the \( D \)-dimensional observed data; \( x_n \in \mathbb{R}^K \) is the lower dimensional latent variable; \( W = [w_1, w_2, ..., w_K] \) is an unobserved \((D \times K)\) projection matrix with \( w_i \perp w_j \) for all \( i \neq j \); \( z_n \in \mathbb{R}^K \) is a binary vector indicating the active subspaces for point \( n \); \( \epsilon_n \) is zero-mean Gaussian noise; and without loss of generality we assume the \( D \)-dimensional mean vector \( \mu = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} y_n \) is zero. Under both of the proposed aPPCA models, we can write the likelihood of point \( n \) as:

\[
P (y_n \mid W, x_n, z_n, \sigma) = \frac{1}{(2\pi \sigma^2)^{D/2}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (y_n - W(x_n \odot z_n))^T (y_n - W(x_n \odot z_n)) \right)
\]

(13)

4.1 Inference for aPPCA model

Computing the posterior distribution of the latent variables \( \{X, Z\} \) and the projection matrix \( W \) is analytically intractable and we have to resort to approximate inference. The main difference for the aPPCA model above, when compared to the aFA model above, is that the new distribution of the orthonormal matrix \( W \) does not allow for closed form updates. Numerically optimizing over \( W \) and marginalizing \( X \) leads to slow mixing and EM scheme leads to poor local solutions for this model. An efficient Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) scheme [28] can be derived which iterates between explicit updates for \( W, z_n, x_n \) and the hyperparameters we wish to infer, i.e. \( \sigma^2 \) and \( \alpha \) (update of \( \sigma^2 \) and \( \alpha \) is in given in Appendix [3]). Sampling from directional posteriors is prohibitively slow, so we propose MAP update scheme for the updates on \( W \). Alternatively we could use an automated MCMC platforms such as STAN [29] for the inference, but STAN does not deal well with discontinuous likelihood models such as aPPCA. This can be addressed using discrete relaxations such as Maddison et al. [30] or numerical solver extensions such as Nishimura et al. citeNishimura2017discontinuous. However, such an approach can be justified only for nonlinear intractable extensions of aPPCA, since the Gibbs sampler with closed form updates is substantially more efficient, hence we derive it here.

The joint data likelihood of both aPPCA models we propose takes the form:

\[
P (Y, W, X, Z|\sigma, \alpha) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} P (y_n|W, x_n, z_n, \sigma) \prod_{k=1}^{K} P (x_{k,n}) P (z_{k,n}|\alpha)
\]

(14)

We can check whether the MCMC sampler has converged using standard tests such as Raftery and Lewis [31] directly on Equation (14). Comparing the two aPPCA models from Section 4, the only difference is in \( P (Z) \). We will see that this will affect the posterior update of \( W \), but the rest of inference algorithm is otherwise identical across both models.

Posterior of \( W \)

In order to comply with the orthogonality constraint on \( W \), i.e. \( w_i \perp w_j \ \forall i \neq j \), we have to use a distribution with support on the Stiefel manifold (see [32] for a good introduction). One option explored in Elvira et al. [18] would be using conjugate Bingham prior [33] independently on the columns of \( W \) leading to independent von Mises-Fisher posterior over each column where re-scaling is required after each sample to maintain orthogonality. Empirical trails suggest that this results in very poor mixing. To overcome this issue, we propose joint sampling of the columns of \( W \). We place a uniform prior over the Steifel manifold on the matrix \( W \) which allows us to work with a matrix von Mises-Fisher [34] posterior:

\[
P (W|Y, X, Z, \sigma) = gF^{-1} \left( \theta, \frac{D}{2}, AA^T \right) \exp (tr (AW))
\]

(15)
where \( A = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (X \odot Z) Y^T \) and \( nF_1^{-1} (\cdot) \) is a hypergeometric function [35]. The normalization term of the matrix von Mises-Fisher posterior is not available in closed form, hence it is common to sample from it using rejection sampling.

Fallaize, Theodore Fallaize, and Kypraios [36] proposed a Metropolis-Hastings scheme to generate samples from Equation (15), the resulting posterior of \( W \) converges faster than the Bingham-von-Mises-Fisher posterior, but can be further sped up by numerical optimization methods. Here, we propose updating the matrix \( W \) by maximizing the posterior from Equation (15) over the Stiefel manifold, i.e. keeping the orthogonality assumption \( w_i \perp w_j \forall i \neq j \). An efficient implementation can be achieved using the YMANOPT toolbox [37], for optimization over manifolds with different geometries; this step is outlined in Appendix C.

**Posterior of X**

The posterior distribution over the latent variable \( x_{k,n} \), for which its respective \( z_{k,n} = 1 \), is sampled from a Gaussian:

\[
P (x_{k,n} | w_k, y_n, z_n) = \mathcal{N} \left( x_{k,n} ; \frac{y_n^T w_k}{\sigma^2 + 1}, \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + 1} \right)
\]

where \( w_k \) is the \( k \)th column of the matrix \( W \).

### 4.1.1 Bayesian nonparametric aPPCA

In the Bayesian nonparametric aPPCA, we placed an IBP prior over the indicator matrix \( Z \); this assumes that after a finite \( N \) number of observations only a finite \( K \) number of one-dimensional subspaces are active. This results in the first \( K \) rows of \( Z \) having non-zero entries, and the remaining being all zeros. By design, \( K \) cannot exceed the dimension of the data \( D \) and this leads to truncation of the IBP such that \( K \) has a upper limit of \( K_{\text{max}} \); where \( K \leq K_{\text{max}} \leq D \), therefore in Bayesian nonparametric aPPCA, \( Z \) is a \((K_{\text{max}} \times N)\) binary matrix, with the sum of the first \( K \) rows being non-zero and the sum of the remaining \( K_{\text{max}} - K \) rows being zero. Following Knowles and Ghahramani [2], we sample the matrix \( Z \) in two stages which include sampling “existing features” and “new features”; in both cases the latent variables \( x_{k,n} \) are marginalized out. The posterior distribution over the existing features \( z_{k,n} \) is Bernoulli distributed:

\[
P (z_{k,n} | \ldots) = \text{Bern} \left( \frac{P (y_n | z_{k,n} = 1) P (z_{k,n} = 1 | z_{k,-n})}{P (y_n | z_{k,n} = 1) P (z_{k,n} = 1 | z_{k,-n}) + P (y_n | z_{k,n} = 0) P (z_{k,n} = 0 | z_{k,-n})} \right)
\]

\[
= \text{Bern} \left( \frac{m_{k,n} \exp \left( \frac{1}{2\sigma^2 (\sigma^2 + 1)} (y_n^T w_k) \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + 1} \right)^\frac{1}{2} \right)}{m_{k,n} \exp \left( \frac{1}{2\sigma^2 (\sigma^2 + 1)} (y_n^T w_k) \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + 1} \right)^\frac{1}{2} \right) + 1} \right)
\]

where we omit the dependence on \( W \) and \( \sigma^2 \) and \( m_{k,-n} = \sum_{i \neq n} z_{k,i} \).

Then, we sample \( \kappa \) number of new features with \( \kappa \sim \text{Poisson} \left( \frac{\alpha}{\lambda} \right) \), where we maintain \( \kappa > 0 \) or \( \kappa + K \leq K_{\text{max}} \). For observed data point \( n \), the posterior distribution over the new features is:

\[
P (z_{K+j,n} | \ldots) = \text{Bern} \left( \frac{\exp \left( \frac{1}{2\sigma^2 (\sigma^2 + 1)} \sum_{k=K+1}^{K+\kappa} (y_n^T w_k)^2 \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + 1} \right)^\frac{1}{2} \right)}{\exp \left( \frac{1}{2\sigma^2 (\sigma^2 + 1)} \sum_{k=K+1}^{K+\kappa} (y_n^T w_k)^2 \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + 1} \right)^\frac{1}{2} \right) + 1} \right)
\]

for \( j = 1, \ldots, \kappa \) new features.

### 4.1.2 Parametric aPPCA

In many common PPCA applications, constraints on the latent feature dimensionality occur naturally. In data visualization, we are mostly interested in reducing high dimensional data down to two or three dimensions; in regression problems when PCA is used to remove multicollinearity from input features, the output dimensionality is usually fixed to \( D \) (the dimensionality of the input). In these scenarios the multivariate hypergeometric model for \( Z \) allows explicit control over the number of latent subspaces \( L \) used to decompose each single observation. \( K \) denotes the number of unique orthogonal linear subspaces which we will use to reduce the original data into the lower dimensional space; each
where after each draw we set $z_{k,n} = 1$ and sample $x_{k,n}$ using Equation 16.

Sample $W$ using Equation 15.

Sample $\{\sigma^2, \alpha\}$ from Appendix B.

Algorithm 2: Pseudocode for inference in Bayesian nonparametric aPPCA using Gibbs sampling.

**Input:** $Y$, $\Theta$, MaxIter, $K$

**Initialise:** Sample a random $(K^{\text{max}} \times N)$ binary matrix $Z$ and initialize $W$ using PCA.

for iter ← 1 to MaxIter
  for $n$ ← 1 to $N$
    for $k$ ← 1 to $K$
      Sample $z_{k,n}$ using Equation 17.
      Sample $\kappa \sim \text{Poisson} \left( \frac{\gamma}{2} \right)$
      Accept $\kappa$ new features with probability Equation 18 and update $K$ accordingly.
    for $n$ ← 1 to $N$
      for $k$ ← 1 to $K$
        if $z_{k,n} = 1$
          Sample $x_{k,n}$ using Equation 16.
        Sample $W$ using Equation 15.
        Sample $\{\sigma^2, \alpha\}$ from Appendix B.

Algorithm 3: Pseudocode for inference in parametric aPPCA using Gibbs sampling.

**Input:** $Y$, $\Theta$, MaxIter

**Initialise:** Sample a random $(K \times N)$ binary matrix $Z$ and initialize $W$ using PCA.

for iter ← 1 to MaxIter
  for $n$ ← 1 to $N$
    Set $I = \{k : z_{k,n} = 1\}$
    for $l$ ← 1 to $L$
      Set $z_{l,n} = 0$
      Sample $Z_l$ using Equation 19.
      Set $z_{l,n} = 1$
    for $n$ ← 1 to $N$
      for $k$ ← 1 to $K$
        if $z_{k,n} = 1$
          Sample $x_{k,n}$ using Equation 16.
        Sample $W$ using Equation 15.
        Sample $\{\sigma^2, \alpha\}$ using Appendix B.

input data point can be associated with different subset of $L$ subspaces, selected from a total of $K$ subspaces. So, any single point is actually represented by lower dimensional spaces subsets of $\mathbb{R}^L$. Note that the orthogonality assumption $w_i \perp w_j \forall i \neq j$ for the columns of $W$ implies that $K \leq D$.

In the parametric aPPCA we place a flexible multivariate hypergeometric prior on the latent $Z$. The hypergeometric prior allows updates of $Z$ across $N$ in parallel, since the number of observed data points assigned to a latent subspace no longer implies higher probability of assigning a new data point to that subspace, i.e. no reinforcement effect. Instead, for each $n = 1, \ldots, N$, we sample $z_n$ by first finding the $L$ observed data indices $\{l_1, \ldots, l_L\}$ for which $z_n$ is one, then for each $l_i$, we set $z_{n,l_i} = 0$ and sample $l_i$ from the following Categorical distribution:

$$l_i \sim \text{Categorical} \left( \frac{(1 - z_{1,n}) \exp \left( (y_{n}^T w_1)^2 \right)}{\sum_k (1 - z_{k,n}) \exp \left( (y_{n}^T w_k)^2 \right)}, \ldots, \frac{(1 - z_{K,n}) \exp \left( (y_{n}^T w_K)^2 \right)}{\sum_k (1 - z_{k,n}) \exp \left( (y_{n}^T w_k)^2 \right)} \right) \text{ (19)}$$

where after each draw we set $z_{n,l_i} = 1$. In dimensionality reduction applications we often assume $L$ being two or three, hence $l_1$ might indicate the $x$-axis, $l_2$ the $y$-axis and $l_3$ the $z$-axis of the lower dimensional subspace. A Gibbs sampler for the parametric aPPCA is suggested in Algorithm 3.

4.2 Relationship to PCA

If we marginalize the likelihood (from Equation 13) with respect to the discrete and continuous latent variables $\{x_n, z_n\}$ and take the limit $\sigma^2 \to 0$, the maximum likelihood solution with respect to the transformation matrix $W$ is a scaled version of the $K$ largest eigenvectors of the covariance matrix (like PCA) of the data (multiplied by orthonormal rotation); proof of this can be seen in Appendix A. Furthermore, different priors over the matrix $Z$ result in different variants of the model, giving explicit control over the scale of the different projection axis.
Table 1: Performance of factor analysis (FA) methods measured in terms of mean absolute reconstruction error. Different variations of parametric and nonparametric latent feature FA as well as vanilla FA are compared. The FA variations were tested on discrete-continuous synthetic datasets of 1000 points all assuming \( Y = W (X \odot Z) + E \), where \( Y \) is a \((D \times 1000)\) observation matrix, \( X \) is a \((K \times 1000)\) latent feature matrix, \( W \) is a \((D \times K)\) factor loading matrix and \( E \) is a \((D \times 1000)\) noise matrix. The latent feature indicator matrix \( Z \) is \((K \times 1000)\) binary matrix and \( Z \) is all that changes in the different settings. We have considered 5 separate synthetic sets and the distribution of \( Z \) for each is displayed in Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Sparse matrix</th>
<th>Dense matrix</th>
<th>Balanced matrix</th>
<th>Subspace clustering</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor analysis (FA)</td>
<td>.012 .014</td>
<td>.012 .014</td>
<td>.088 .099</td>
<td>.012 .015</td>
<td>.012 .014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite sparse FA</td>
<td>.014 .018</td>
<td>.015 .018</td>
<td>.090 .101</td>
<td>.016 .018</td>
<td>.014 .019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite sparse FA</td>
<td>.023 .042</td>
<td>.021 .042</td>
<td>.073 .970</td>
<td>.024 .046</td>
<td>.045 .075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive FA (aFA) Gibbs</td>
<td>.014 .019</td>
<td>.012 .019</td>
<td>.047 .056</td>
<td>.013 .021</td>
<td>.015 .019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive FA (aFA) EM</td>
<td>.011 .013</td>
<td>.011 .013</td>
<td>.034 .044</td>
<td>.012 .014</td>
<td>.012 .014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Experiments

This section provides some empirical results on the performance of the proposed variations of PCA and FA techniques to: data visualization applications; data whitening and blind source separation. The methods are evaluated on different types of synthetic data, images of handwritten digits from MNIST and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) data.

5.1 Synthetic data from varying latent feature FA models

First, we generate a wide variety of latent feature linear Gaussian datasets, assuming that the data matrix \( Y \) takes the form: \( Y = W (X \odot Z) + E \) with \( X \) a latent feature matrix with standard Gaussian distribution; \( W \) is a factor loading matrix with columns drawn from a multivariate Gaussian with mean zero and covariance matrix \( \sigma_W^2 I_K \) with \( \sigma_W = 1 \); \( E \) noise matrix with multivariate Gaussian columns each with mean zero and covariance matrix \( \sigma^2 I_D \) with \( \sigma = 0.1 \). The core of the generative model remains the same across the different datasets we generate and only the latent feature indicator matrix \( Z \) changes. We have considered 5 separate synthetic sets and the distribution of \( Z \) for each setup is displayed in Figure 3. In Table 1, we evaluate how well 4 different FA methods (i.e. with changing treatment of \( Z \)) perform across each scenario. The resulting FA methods tested are:

- Factor analysis (FA): the \( Z \) matrix is full of ones and all factors are shared across all points.
- Infinite sparse FA (isFA): the \( Z \) matrix is modelled with an IBP prior (see Equation (7)) and most factors are shared only across small overlapping subsets of points.
- Finite sparse FA (fsFA): the \( Z \) matrix is modelled with a finite Beta-Bernoulli distribution across all points and features.
- Adaptive FA (aFA): \( Z \) is modelled with a multivariate hypergeometric prior (see Equation (8)).

Table 1 also includes a second result for the aFA model when trained using the proposed EM training scheme (Algorithm 1). This was done to distinguish between performance gains due to the model architecture and due to the adopted inference. The results in Table 1 suggest that for sparse latent feature data and for single feature linear Gaussian data, most of the methods perform similarly. The isFA model performs consistently worse then all other methods and this is due to its tendency to overestimate the underlying number of latent features. When we set the concentration parameters of isFA to learn the fixed \( K \) number of factors, reconstruction error is higher; if we set concentration parameters to infer higher then the generating true \( K \) number of factors, the reconstruction error drops. This effect is similar to the one reported for Dirichlet process mixtures in [38].

FA performs well in terms of reconstruction error because it learns less parsimonious data representation where for same number of factors \( K \), vanilla FA learns a lot more factor loadings. In practices latent feature FA methods are
Figure 3: A plot of the different distributions used to model the latent latent space in Table 1. The subplots display different samples of the zero-one indicator matrix $Z$: black cells indicate 1’s and white cells indicate 0’s. Five different latent models are considered: (a) Sparse latent feature model, (b) Dense latent feature model, (c) Latent class model in which sharing of some feature between subsets of points implies sharing of all features of those points, (d) Balanced latent feature model sampled from specific hypergeometric distribution, (e) Collapsed latent space consisting of a single state.

Figure 4: Estimated proportion of data associated with the different factors for sparse (left) and dense (right) linear Gaussian data (i.e. as in Table 1). The $x$-axis denotes the proportion of points associated with a factor (i.e. factor popularity) and the $y$-axis denotes the factor numbers where factors are ordered by size (i.e. number of points associated with them). The true feature popularity is displayed in red; the remaining lines show the feature popularity associated with the estimated factors using the nonparametric factor analysis (isFA) and the proposed adaptive factor analysis (aFA) model.

used with larger $K$ then vanilla FA due to the fact that each factor there is a linear combination of only smaller subset of data points. isFA manages to perform well across most settings, often achieving comparable reconstruction error using a lot sparser factor loadings. However, we see its performance drops substantially for non-sparse balanced latent feature models. Due to the extra generality of the aFA model, it performs well across all settings, since the considered latent space structures are all special cases for the assumed multivariate hypergeometric model. The slightly lower reconstruction of the EM compared to Gibbs aFA, suggest convergence to good local optima for the proposed EM scheme and convergence issues of the Gibbs sampler.

5.2 MNIST Handwritten Digits Dataset

In this section we demonstrate the utility of aFA and aPPCA on the MNIST digit dataset [39]. We train the aFA model using EM inference on $N = 2500$ odd digits (500 of each type) from MNIST. The vectored pixels were first reduced to $D = 350$ using standard PCA since this still preserves 99.5% of the total variance within the data. The total number of unique factors is set to $K = 100$ and the number $L$ of observation specific subset of available factors is set to maximize the factor profiles of the different digits.

In Figure 5, we show the factor sharing across the digits which are calculated based on the proportion of factors sharing between different digit pairs. We count the number of factors shared between 1’s and 1’s, 1’s and 3’s, 1’s and 5’s, 1’s and 7’s, 1’s and 9’s; then we normalize by the largest number of features shared. The larger and darker circles indicate
Figure 5: aFA model is trained on 2500 odd MNIST digit, 500 of each type. Left: grid plotting the proportion of shared identified factors between pairs of different digits. The size and color of the circles depends on the proportion of features shared between digit pairs as denoted on the x-axis and y-axis. Intuitively, 10,000 MNIST digits Factor sharing grid between digits: circles are sized depending on the number of features shared between digit pairs denoted on the x-axis and y-axis; color enforces this effect where darker circles indicate more sharing and brighter circles - less. Right: Distribution of feature allocation process: y-axis denotes the proportion of data sharing current factor; x-axis indicates the factor number where they have been ordered based on most popular (left), least popular with small number of data allocated (right).

more sharing. As expected, observations depicting the same digits have the most shared factors; 1’s and 7’s also share significant structure as well as 5’s and 9’s which is inline with the geometry of the digits. The results can be directly compared with a similar experiment in [40]. In Figure 5, we display the estimated feature weights obtained by summing over the $Z$ matrix and normalizing. Varying $L$ and $K$ one can study how well sparse and dense aFA models infer features specific to the different digits.

Next, we also apply aPPCA for subspace feature allocation and subspace clustering of MNIST digits. We first use a 2-layer multilayer perceptron variational autoencoder (VAE) [41] to reduce the dimension of 10,000 MNIST digits. The 784-dimensional data is reduced with the VAE to 10 dimensions and then we train parametric aPPCA with $K = 3$ and $L = 2$ to visualize the digits in the latent space. We will assume that subspace 1 is spanned by the inferred features 1 and 2; subspace 2 by features 2 and 3; subspace 3 by features 1 and 3. Note that all pairs subspaces share one of their principal axis. In Figure 6, we display the reduced data in each of these subspaces where can be seen increased separation between the distinct clusters of different digits, especially compared to PCA. From Figure 7, we can see that distinct geometric properties of digits are encoded in the separated subspaces. Figure 7 shows randomly selected digits from each subspace and we can see that most digits in subspace 1 are written in thicker font; most digits in subspace 2 are slanted.

The visualization reduces the crowding effect of PCA and produces multiple two-dimensional plots which jointly decompose the data and plot intuitively the information about the observed data.

5.3 Data pre-processing

With the emergence of flexible manifold embedding and other nonlinear algorithms, PCA is less widely-used as a visualization tool, but remains in heavy use for data whitening. This is often used pre-processing step which aims to decorrelate the observed data to simplify subsequent processing and analysis, for example, image data tends to have highly correlated adjacent pixels. In this capacity, PCA works by “rotating” the data in observation space, retaining dimensionality unlike with visualization applications.

Here we show a simple example demonstrating how aPPCA can be used to do more effective local whitening which can lead to more accurate and interpretable supervised classification in decorrelated latent feature space. To demonstrate that, we compare a classifier trained on raw data with the same classifier on the first few principal component projections of the data where the principal components are estimated (1) globally using PCA and (2) locally, within subsets of the data using aPPCA.

For simplicity, we show an example of pre-processing the MNIST handwritten digit classification dataset, before training a multilayer perceptron. We train a simple multilayer perceptron with one hidden layer with a softmax activation function on a 9000-image subset of the 784-dimensional MNIST dataset with 1000 images reserved for testing. We
compare the performance of the same classifier network when (1) trained on the original 784-dimensional pre-processed data, (2) trained on lower dimensional projection of the data using PCA (3) trained on locally whitened data by aPPCA ($K$-dimensional). The classifier is a multilayer perceptron in all three scenarios. Figure 8 shows the classification accuracy of these three different pre-processing approaches as we vary $K$, i.e. the number of principal components to which we project down the data. For aPPCA, we have kept $L = K - 1$ for simplicity. We have also seen increases in performance if multiple, separate classifiers are trained on each $L$-dimensional subspace, but these are not reported since it is not fair comparison with PCA.

A key feature of the aPPCA algorithm when used for localized data whitening is that it estimates more robust subspaces which can be seen in the smaller number of subspaces (i.e. principal components or columns of $W$) required for training of the same classifier, to achieve better out-of-sample performance. The multilayer perceptron trained on PCA whitened data requires more subspaces in training to achieve comparable out-of-sample results.

### 5.4 Blind source separation in fMRI

Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) is a technique for the non-invasive study of brain functions. fMRI can act as indirect measure of neuronal activation in the brain, by detecting blood oxygenation level dependent (BOLD) contrast [42]. BOLD relies on the fact that oxygenated (diamagnetic) and deoxygenated (paramagnetic) blood have different magnetic properties. When neurons fire there is a resultant increase in localised flow of more oxygenated blood, which can be detected using BOLD fMRI.

fMRI time-series data is often represented as a series of three-dimensional images (see Figure 9). However, data can be also represented as a two-dimensional matrix using vectorized voxel matrices against time (time by voxels). In this representation each matrix row contains all voxels from the brain image (or the subset selected for analysis) from a single time point. Although useful, fMRI data often suffers from low image contrast-to-noise ratio, it is biased from subject head motions, scanner drift (i.e. due to overheating of the equipment) and from signals from irrelevant physiological sources (cardiac or pulmonary). Therefore, direct analysis of raw fMRI measurements is rare [43] and domain experts tend to work with pre-processed, reduced statistics of the data. In clinical studies, due to the typical scarcity of fMRI series per subject and the low signal-to-noise ratio, flexible black-box algorithms are rarely used. The preferred methods for pre-processing of fMRI series and localization of active spatial regions of the brain are variants
of linear dimensionality reduction methods such as PCA and FA [44, 45, 46, 43, 47]. Typically, of main interest is then analysis of a representative subset of the inferred components or factors respectively, instead of the use of raw data.

A key problem with this approach is that these linear methods assume that the components/factors are a linear combination of all of the data, i.e. with other words PCA and FA would assume that all components are active for the full duration of the recording. Common implementations for fMRI series [48, 49] might adopt thresholding the inferred components or using sparse alternatives of the decomposition techniques. These still can lead to biased decomposition into components and we are likely to overestimate the firing area of the brain for some components and completely overlooking functional areas of the brain active for shorter periods of time. Here, we show that using our proposed adaptive linear methods, are better motivated model to alleviate this problem and can infer better localized spatial regions of activation from fMRI; furthermore we can potentially discover novel short-term components in a principled, probabilistic, data driven fashion.
Figure 9: fMRI data consists of 3-dimensional brain volumes collected over time (e.g. every 1 second). Commonly images are vectorised and represented as 2-dimensional $T \times V$ matrix (top panel), with $V$ being number of all voxels in all dimensions and $T$ the number of time samples. This matrix can be then reduced down to $K \times V$ matrix (i.e. $X$) which represents spatial maps of regions with intrinsically similar time-courses (middle panel). $W$ denotes the modelled transformation matrix and $Z$ infers if components (i.e. rows of $X$) should be included in our representation of the data matrix or not. Columns of $W$, also referred to as components, are easier to interpret in terms of their correlation to experimental stimuli.

As a proof of concept, here we apply parametric aPPCA to fMRI data collected from a single participant while exposed to continuous visual stimuli. fMRI data was initially realigned to correct for subjected motion and registered to a group template (Montreal Neurological Institute Template). Using 3T Siemens scanner, a whole brain image with voxel resolution of $2 \times 2 \times 2$ mm was acquired each 0.8 seconds. The data had 215, 302 voxels and 989 time points. aPPCA decomposition was performed by treating time points as features, which is standard in the neuroimaging field. For aPPCA we used $K = 500$ unique components and constraint of $L = 200$ components, which were selected to achieve component similarity with the benchmark and enable visually intuitive comparisons. We also performed PPCA with $K = 200$ components for comparison, see Figure 10.

The figure shows the component most associated with the task estimated both with aPPCA and PPCA. aPPCA results in sparser maps across space, which enhance localization. This sparsity increases with higher numbers of components that explain less variance in the data. This can be useful for identifying noisy components and brain areas that are only transiently active during task performance. We also show the corrected t-statistic map that shows the voxels that have significant correlation with task 1. Map is family-wise error (FWE) corrected at $p < 0.05$ at voxel threshold $p < 0.001$.

One benefit of decomposition methods versus standard correlation methods is that they do not need a predefined model of assumed task activation.

Direct quantitative evaluation of pre-processing tools of fMRI data is an open problem, due to the lack of clear definition of the brain activity related components. We have measured the mean reconstruction error across all 215, 302 voxels as well as the standard deviation across voxels. We find that highest error with highest standard deviation (i.e. average
Figure 10: The figure shows the lower dimensional, reduced across time fMRI recordings plotted against the subject brain. The fMRI time series of length $T$ is reduced to $K$ components and here we display the single component most associated with the stimuli during the experiment. The top panel displays the reduced projection estimated using our aPPCA and the bottom panel the projection estimated using PPCA. The larger amount of grey regions indicates that the aPPCA projection localizes better the regions of the brain fluctuation through time, as a response to the visual stimuli. Reference regions of activation can be seen in Figure 11.

6 Summary and conclusions

In this work, we have studied generic discrete latent variable augmentation for ubiquitous linear Gaussian methods applied for feature learning, whitening and dimensionality reduction applications. We have proposed a nonparametric latent feature PCA model (i.e. the aPPCA) which learns a flexible set of principal components all of which are computed as a linear combination of only subsets of the input data. The manuscript details some shortcomings with existing Bayesian nonparametric linear Gaussian methods and demonstrates that flexible alternatives can be derived using hypergeometric distributions. This leads to novel aFA and aPPCA models which be trained efficiently, which overcome the inherent over-partitioning in Beta process and allows for more flexible regularization of the model.
Figure 11: The spatial map shows voxels that have significant correlation with the visual stimuli. The map is family-wise error corrected at $p < 0.05$ at voxel threshold $p < 0.001$ and indicates voxel regions most likely to be truly associated with a cognitive function specific to the stimuli.

capacity, compared to Beta-Bernoulli models. The proposed models can be extended to many other related methods such as: generalized linear Gaussian models, Gaussian process latent variable models (GPLVMs), kernel PCA methods, and others. Dai et al. [11] has already introduced the problem of handling discontinuity in GPLVMs and proposed a simple spike and slab prior to augment the continuous latent variables in GPLVMs. Augmenting GPLVMs with discrete hypergeometric feature allocation indicators, can in principle allow for richer model of the manifold and more compact modelling using smaller number of underlying feature specific Gaussian processes. In our study of aPPCA models, we have also proposed efficient practical inference methods for distributions on Stiefel manifolds. The utility of the proposed tools is demonstrated first on a wide range of synthetic latent feature Gaussian data sets and then also on MNIST and brain imaging fMRI data. Our synthetic study shows that a wide range of feature allocation distributions can be captured with a multivariate hypergeometric model. We have applied aPPCA to MNIST variational autoencoder projections, to show that in can be used to identify images sharing clear geometric features. aFA was applied to nearly raw digits to show that images of visually similar digits share more factors together. We conclude with an application of aPPCA to a widely-encountered problem in brain imaging with fMRI, and demonstrate accurate decomposition of active spatial regions in the brain during different stimuli (or at rest). We also demonstrate that this discrete-continuous decomposition leads to more accurate localization of active brain regions. This can have huge impact on analysis pipelines for fMRI data for neurological screening and cognitive neuroscience applications.
A Adaptive PCA

In this section we demonstrate that the proposed parametric APPCA model from Section 4 is indeed a generalization of the ubiquitous PCA and using small variance asymptotics [25]. Let us first start by marginalizing out the discrete and continuous latent variables \{x_n, z_n\} which are not of explicit interest in conventional PCA approach. To compute the marginal likelihood of \(y_n\) we compute the expectations:

\[
\mathbb{E}_{P(x_n, z_n)}[y_n] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{P(x_n, z_n)} \left[ (y_n - \mathbb{E}[y_n]) (y_n - \mathbb{E}[y_n])^T \right]
\]

where we use \(\mathbb{E}[] = \mathbb{E}_{P(x_n, z_n)}[]\) for notational convenience. We express the moments of the marginal likelihood starting with the posterior mean of the marginal,

\[
\mathbb{E}[y_n] = \mathbb{E}[W(x_n \odot z_n) + \mu + \epsilon_n] = W(E[x_n] \odot E[z_n]) + \mu + E[\epsilon_n] = \mu
\]

where we have used a diagonal \((K \times K)\) matrix \(\rho\) to denote the expectation of each feature, which is determined by the prior on the matrix \(Z\):

\[
\rho_{k,k} = \begin{cases} \frac{L}{K} & \text{if multivariate hypergeometric prior} \\ \frac{1}{N} \sum_n z_{k,n} & \text{if IBP prior} \end{cases}
\]

For the variance of the marginal, we can write:

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ (y_n - \mathbb{E}[y_n]) (y_n - \mathbb{E}[y_n])^T \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ (W(x_n \odot z_n) + \epsilon_n) (W(x_n \odot z_n) + \epsilon_n)^T \right] = W\rho W^T + \sigma^2 I_D
\]

Finally, using the obtained expression for \(\mathbb{E}[y_n]\) and \(\mathbb{E} \left[ (y_n - \mathbb{E}[y_n]) (y_n - \mathbb{E}[y_n])^T \right]\), combined with the Gaussian likelihood of \(y_n\) resulting in a linear Gaussian model, we can write the marginal likelihood as:

\[
P (y_n \mid W, \rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{D/2}} |C|^{-1/2} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} y_n^T C^{-1} y_n \right)
\]

where we used \(C = W\rho W^T + \sigma^2 I_D\) to denote the model covariance.

Now, the marginal likelihood in this collapsed APPCA model is almost identical to the PPCA model Tipping and Bishop (1999b) with the key difference being the weights \(\rho\) which can be scalar shared across each dimension or direction specific. In fact, we can say that the PPCA model is a special case of the collapsed APPCA model when the diagonal of \(\rho\) are full of ones, which occurs when the matrix \(Z\) is full of ones implying all observations are active in all \(K\) number of one-dimensional subspaces.

The complete data log-likelihood of the collapsed model is:

\[
\mathcal{L} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \ln (P (y_n \mid W, \rho, \sigma)) = -\frac{N}{2} \left( D \ln (2\pi) + \ln |C| + tr \left( C^{-1} S \right) \right)
\]

where \(S = \frac{1}{N} YY^T\). To find the maximum likelihood estimate for \(W\), we differentiate the likelihood and solve:

\[
\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dW} = -\frac{N}{2} \left( 2C^{-1} W \rho - 2C^{-1} S C^{-1} W \rho \right) = 0
\]
\[ C^{-1}W\rho = C^{-1}SC^{-1}W\rho \]
\[ W_{ML} \rho = SC^{-1}W_{ML} \rho \]

To find the solution for the above we first express the \( W\rho^{1/2} \) term using its singular value decomposition:
\[ W\rho^{1/2} = ULV^T \]

which leads to:
\[ C^{-1}W\rho^{1/2} = UL \left( L^2 + \sigma^2 I_K \right)^{-1} V^T \]

then:
\[ SC^{-1}W\rho^{1/2} = W\rho^{1/2} \]
\[ SUL \left( L^2 + \sigma^2 I_K \right)^{-1} V^T = ULV^T \]
\[ SUL = U \left( L^2 + \sigma^2 I_K \right) L \]

which implies that \( u_j \) is the eigenvector of \( S \) with eigenvalue of \( \lambda_j = \sigma^2 + \mu_j^2 \). Therefore all potential solutions for \( W_{ML} \) may be written as
\[ W_{ML} = U_K \left( K_K - \sigma^2 I_K \right)^{1/2} R\rho^{-1/2} \]

where
\[ k_{jj} = \begin{cases} \lambda_j & \text{eigenvalue of } u_j \\ \sigma^2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

Where \( R \) is \((D \times K)\) orthonomal matrix. The weighting term \( \rho \) allows to explicit control over the scale of the different projection axis. \( \rho \) controls if we should place more or less importance on the role of the input to the projection axis, which is meant to reflect our posterior belief of re-scaling due to not all data points sharing all subspaces. Appropriate scaling with \( \rho \) can address a well known pitfalls of PCA such as: the disproportionate crowding of the projections due to outliers or multi-modalities; the sphericalization of the projection.

B Updating hyperparameters

Updating \( \sigma^2 \)

We place a inverse-Gamma prior on \( \sigma^2 \) with parameters \( \{ \gamma, \vartheta \} \)
\[ p(\sigma^2|\gamma, \vartheta) = \frac{\vartheta^\gamma}{\Gamma(\gamma)} (\sigma^2)^{-\gamma-1} \exp \left[ -\frac{\vartheta}{\sigma^2} \right] \]

then the posterior distribution over \( \sigma^2 \) is
\[ p(\sigma^2|\gamma, \vartheta, Y, W, X, Z) = \frac{\vartheta^\gamma}{\Gamma(\gamma)} (\sigma^2)^{-\gamma-1} \exp \left[ -\frac{\vartheta}{\sigma^2} \right] \]
\[ \times \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{ND/2}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left( y_n - W(x_n \odot z_n) \right)^T \left( y_n - W(x_n \odot z_n) \right) \right) \]
\[ \propto (\sigma^2)^{-\gamma + ND/2 - 1} \]
\[ \times \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \left( Y - W(X \odot Z) \right)^T (Y - W(X \odot Z)) + \vartheta \right) \right) \]
which is still a inverse-Gamma distribution with parameters \( \gamma^{\text{post}} = \gamma + \frac{ND}{2} \) and \( \vartheta^{\text{post}} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[ (Y - W (X \odot Z))^T (Y - W (X \odot Z)) \right] + \vartheta \)

### Updating \( \alpha \)

We place a Gamma prior on the IBP concentration parameter \( \alpha \) with parameters \( \{\lambda, \mu\} \)

\[
p(\alpha | \lambda, \mu) = \frac{\mu^{\lambda}}{\Gamma(\lambda)} (\alpha)^{\lambda-1} \exp[-\mu \alpha]
\]

then the posterior distribution over \( \alpha \) is

\[
p(\alpha | \lambda, \mu, Y, W, X, Z) = \frac{\mu^{\lambda}}{\Gamma(\lambda)} (\alpha)^{\lambda-1} \exp[-\mu \alpha] \
\times \exp(-\alpha H_N) \alpha^K \times \left( \prod_{k=1}^{K} \frac{(m_k - 1)! (N - m_k)!}{(N)!} \right) \
\propto (\alpha)^{\lambda+K-1} \exp(-\alpha (H_N + \mu))
\]

(21)

which is still a gamma distribution with parameters \( \lambda^{\text{post}} = \lambda + K, \mu^{\text{post}} = H_N + \mu \) and \( H_N = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{n} \).

### C Projection matrix update using PYMANOPT

For both variants of the aPPCA, the matrix \( W \) is updated numerically by minimising the negative-log of of Equation (15) over the Stiefel manifold with respect to the matrix \( W \). Figure 12 shows the implementation of this using the PYMANOPT toolbox [37].

---

Figure 12: Python code for aPPCA updates on the rotation matrix \( W \) using PYMANOPT toolbox.
References


