

IN FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

E016350 - Artificial Intelligence Lecture 8

Machine Learning Unsupervised learning

Aleksandra Pizurica

Ghent University Spring 2025

Overview

- Dimensionality reduction
 - PCA
 - A glimpse of nonlinear methods basic insights
- Clustering
 - K-Means
 - Examples of more advanced methods

Andrew Ng: Lecture notes - Machine Learning (CS229), Ch. 10 & Ch 12







Hyperspectral remote sensing image



DNA microarray



Medical images (Ultrasound, MRI, CT scan)



Dimensionality reduction

- Goal: convert the high-dimensional data set $\mathcal{X} = {\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(N)}}$, $\mathbf{x}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ into a lower-dimensional data $\mathcal{Y} = {\mathbf{y}^{(1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(N)}}$, $\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $k \ll d$
- $\bullet~$ Often k~ is 2~ or 3~ so that ${\mathcal Y}$ can be displayed in a scatterplot
- Note this is different from pure visualization of high-dimensional data
- $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ are often refereed to as the map points of $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal Y$ is called a map
- Traditional **linear** dimensionality reduction techniques focus on keeping the low-dimensional representations of dissimilar datapoints far apart.
 - Principal Component Analysis (PCA)
 - Multidimensional scaling (MDS)
- Nonlinear dimensionality reduction techniques aim to preserve the local structure

Curse of dimensionality



The same number of data points shown in 1D, 2D and 3D.

- When the data dimensionality increases, the volume of the space increases so fast that the available data become sparse
- The amount of data needed for training grows exponentially with the number of features/dimensions

Principal Component Analysis – PCA



We may reason that data actually lies along some diagonal axis (the u_1 direction) capturing the intrinsic information, with only a small amount of noise lying off this axis. \rightarrow How can we automatically compute this u_1 direction?

Preprocessing

Preprocess the data by normalizing each feature to have mean 0 and variance 1:

$$x_j^{(i)} \leftarrow \frac{x_j^{(i)} - \mu_j}{\sigma_j}$$

where

$$\mu_j = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_j^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \qquad \sigma_j^2 = \frac{1}{N} (x_j^{(i)} - \mu_j)^2$$

Dividing by σ_j rescales each coordinate to have unit variance, which ensures that different attributes are all treated on the same "scale"

Finding the major axis of variation



Suppose we have already carried out the normalization and now seeking the projection

Finding the major axis of variation – Intuition



Projected data still has a fairly large variance, and the points tend to be far from zero.

Finding the major axis of variation – Intuition



In contrast, here much smaller variance, and points much closer to the origin.

Finding the major axis of variation – Formally

For a point x and a unit vector u, the length of the projection of x onto u is $x^{\top}u$ Hence, to maximize the variance of the projections, choose u so as to maximize:

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\mathbf{x}^{(i)^{\top}} \mathbf{u})^2 = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{u}^{\top} \mathbf{x}^{(i)} \mathbf{x}^{(i)^{\top}} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^{\top} \left(\underbrace{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{x}^{(i)} \mathbf{x}^{(i)^{\top}}}_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}\right) \mathbf{u}$$

We require $\max \mathbf{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{u}$ subject to $\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 = 1$

where $\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 = \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{u}$. Te method of Lagrange multipliers, for some λ , gives:

$$\max_{\mathbf{u}} \ \mathbf{u}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{u} + \lambda (1 - \mathbf{u}^{\top} \mathbf{u})$$

Setting $\partial/\partial \mathbf{u}$ to zero, gives $\Sigma \mathbf{u} = \lambda \mathbf{u} \Rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ must be an **eigen vector** of Σ The variance $\mathbf{u}^{\top} \Sigma \mathbf{u} = \lambda$ is largest when \mathbf{u} corresponds to the largest eigen value $\lambda \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ is the **principal eigen vector** of Σ

Finding the major axis of variation – Formally

- We showed: to project the data onto a 1-D subspace, preserving the maximum variance, u should be the principal eigenvector of Σ
- More generally, to project the data onto a k-dimensional subspace (k < d), we should choose $\mathbf{u}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_k$ to be the **top** k **eigenvectors** of Σ , i.e., those that correspond to the k largest eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k$
 - The u_i's now form a new, orthogonal basis for the data
 - The map point of $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ in this basis is

$$\mathbf{y}^{(i)} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{x}^{(i)} \\ \mathbf{u}_2^\top \mathbf{x}^{(i)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{u}_k^\top \mathbf{x}^{(i)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^k$$

The amount of variance explained by each eigenvector (or principal component) is indicated by its corresponding eigen value:

The portion of variance explained by the *i*th PCA compnent is $\frac{\lambda_i}{\sum_i \lambda_i}$

Example of dimensionality reduction in HSI



Demonstration of the informative content of different components. The dataset has 126 spectral bands (HyMAP), but only NIR, Red and Green are shown. (Neusling, Bavaria, Germany)



Component 1

59%

Unsupervised learning

16 / 39

Other applications: Data compression



The mean vector and the first four PCA eigen vectors $u_1, ..., u_4$ for a digit dataset, with the corresponding eigen values.



An original example from the dataset together with its reconstructions obtained retaining M PCs for various M. The reconstruction would be perfect for $M=28 \ge 28=784$

Example from C. Bishop: Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning

Example: Image analysis

Consider a dataset of 32 faces



Example: Image analysis

Approximation by 4 principal components only:



For this image: $q_1 = 0.078; \ q_2 = 0.062; \ q_3 = -0.182; \ q_4 = 0.179$

Example from: V. Hlavác, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) applied to images

Limitations



PCA doesn't unroll the structure. We need nonlinear methods for that!

Nonlinear dimensionality reduction methods



S. T. Roweis and L. K. Saul: Nonlinear Dimensionality Reduction by Locally Linear Embedding, Science, 2000.

Locally Linear Embedding (LLE)





S. T. Roweis and L. K. Saul: Nonlinear Dimensionality Reduction by Locally Linear Embedding, Science, 2000.

Isomap

Idea: preserve geodesic distances in the lower-dimension



(A) In the highdimensional input space the Euclidean distance may not accurately reflect the intrinsic similarity between data points, as measured by geodesic distance. (B) The neighborhood graph allows an approximation (red segments) to the true geodesic path. (C) The 2-D embedding, which best preserves the shortest path distances in the neighborhood graph.

J. B. Tenenbaum, V. de Silva, J. C. Langford: A Global Geometric Framework for Nonlinear Dimensionality Reduction, Science, 2000.

Example: Swiss roll after PCA and Isomap



Experiment with this in the notebook 'Principal Component Analysis' (Ufora).

t-SNE

- A variant of SNE (Stochastic Neighbor Embedding) [Hinton & Roweis, 2002]
- SNE starts by converting the high-dimensional Euclidean distances between datapoints into conditional probabilities that represent similarities
 - ► The similarity of x^(j) to x⁽ⁱ⁾ is the conditional probability, p_{j|i}, that x⁽ⁱ⁾ would pick x^(j) as its neighbor if neighbors were picked in proportion to their probability density under a Gaussian centered at x⁽ⁱ⁾, i.e.

$$p_{j|i} = \frac{\exp(\|\mathbf{x}^{(i)} - \mathbf{x}^{(j)}\|^2 / 2\sigma_i^2)}{\sum_{k \neq i} \exp(\|\mathbf{x}^{(i)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)}\|^2 / 2\sigma_i^2)}$$

- ▶ Do equivalently for the low-dimensional counterparts y⁽ⁱ⁾ and y^(j) of the high-dim. datapoints x⁽ⁱ⁾ and x^(j) and denote this conditional probability by q_{j|i}. (Some technicalities: normalize the variance of the Gaussian and set p_{i|i} = 0 and q_{i|i} = 0)
- Idea: If the map points $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(j)}$ correctly model the similarity between $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(j)}$, the conditional probabilities $p_{j|i}$ and $q_{j|i}$ will be equal

 - \star practically, minimize KL divergences over all datapoints using gradient descent

Example: handwritten digits from the MNIST data set



L. van der Maaten and G. Hinton: Visualizing Data using t-SNE, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 2008.

Demo: web-based fast t-SNE



Clustering





Example: motion segmentation:



E. Elhamifar and R. Vidal: Sparse Subspace Clustering: Algorithm, Theory, and Applications, IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell. 2013

Clustering task

Given the input training data $\mathcal{D}_{train} = [\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(N)}]$, output the **assignment** of each point to a cluster. The assignment vector is:

$$\mathbf{c} = [c^{(1)}, \dots, c^{(N)}], \text{ where } c^{(i)} \in \{1, \dots, K\}$$

Each cluster is represented by a centroid $\mu = \mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$



Intuition: we want each point $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ to be close to its assigned centroid $\mu_{c^{(i)}}$

A. Pizurica, E016350 Artificial Intelligence (UGent) Spring 2025

K-Means



$$Loss_{kmeans}(\mathbf{c}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \|\mathbf{x}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{c}^{(j)}}\|$$

K-Means objective:

 $\min_{\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{\mu}} Loss_{kmeans}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{\mu})$

K-Means algorithm



K-Means

Initialize $\mu = \mu_1, \dots \mu_k$ randomly Iterate:

• Step 1: Set assignments c given μ ($\mathbf{x}^{(j)} \rightarrow$ nearest centroid):

$$\forall j, \ c^{(j)} = \arg\min_{i=1,\dots,k} \|\mathbf{x}^{(j)} - \mu_i\|^2$$

• Step 2: Set centroids μ given c $i = 1, \dots, k$:

$$\mu_i \leftarrow \frac{1}{|\{j:c^{(j)}=i\}|} \sum_{j:c^{(j)}=i} \mathbf{x}^{(j)}$$

Example



The number of clusters is a parameter of K-Means

Experiment with this in the notebook 'Clustering Tutorial' (Ufora).

Other clustering algorithms



DBSCAN – Density-based clustering (determines automatically the number of clusters)

Experiment with this in the notebook 'Clustering Tutorial' (Ufora).

Soft clustering: Gaussian Mixture Models (GMM) (can be seen as a probabilistic extension of K-Means)

K-Means vs GMM

K-Means

Initialize $\mu = \mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$ randomly lterate:

• Step 1: Set assignments c given μ ($\mathbf{x}^{(j)} \rightarrow$ nearest centroid):

$$\forall j, \ c^{(j)} = \arg\min_{i=1,\dots,k} \|\mathbf{x}^{(j)} - \mu_i\|^2$$

• Step 2: Set centroids μ given c $i = 1, \dots, k$:

$$\mu_i \leftarrow \frac{1}{|\{j: c^{(j)} = i\}|} \sum_{j: c^{(j)} = i} \mathbf{x}^{(j)}$$

GMM

Initialize $\mu_i, \Sigma_i, i = 1, \dots k$ Iterate:

• **E-step**: Find probabilities that data points were generated by different components

$$\forall i, j \quad p_{ij} = P(C = i | \mathbf{x}^{(j)})$$

• **M-step**: Find new parameters that maximize the log-likelihood:

Using $p_{ij},$ update μ_i, Σ_i, π_i

K-Means vs GMM



Experiment with this in the notebook 'Kmeans&Gmm' (Ufora).