

Sparse Learning and Class Probability Estimation with Weighted Support Vector Machines

Liyun Zeng^{1,2} and Hao Helen Zhang^{1,2,*}

¹Statistics and Data Science GIDP, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, 85721, USA

²Department of Mathematics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, 85721, USA

*Corresponding author: hzhang@math.arizona.edu

Abstract

Classification and probability estimation have broad applications in modern machine learning and data science applications, including biology, medicine, engineering, and computer science. The recent development of a class of weighted Support Vector Machines (wSVMs) has shown great values in robustly predicting the class probability and classification for various problems with high accuracy (Wang et al., 2008). The current framework is based on the ℓ^2 -norm regularized binary wSVMs optimization problem, which only works with dense features and has poor performance at sparse features with redundant noise in most real applications. The sparse learning process requires a prescreen of the important variables for each binary wSVMs for accurately estimating pairwise conditional probability. In this paper, we proposed novel wSVMs frameworks that incorporate automatic variable selection with accurate probability estimation for sparse learning problems. We developed efficient algorithms for effective variable selection for solving either the ℓ^1 -norm or elastic net regularized binary wSVMs optimization problems. The binary class probability is then estimated either by the ℓ^2 -norm regularized wSVMs framework with selected variables or by elastic net regularized wSVMs directly. The two-step approach of ℓ^1 -norm followed by ℓ^2 -norm wSVMs show a great advantage in both automatic variable selection and reliable probability estimators with the most efficient time. The elastic net regularized wSVMs offer

the best performance in terms of variable selection and probability estimation with the additional advantage of variable grouping in the compensation of more computation time for high dimensional problems. The proposed wSVMs-based sparse learning methods have wide applications and can be further extended to K -class problems through ensemble learning.

Key Words and Phrases: ℓ^1 -norm support vector machines, elastic net, binary classification, probability estimation, sparse learning.

1 Introduction

Binary classification is an important topic in machine learning and artificial intelligence (Bishop, 2006). It functions as the fundamental of multiclass classification, as the decision boundary of multiclass is calculated by aggregating the multiple binary classification rules, such as pairwise coupling-based approach and One-vs-All (Hastie et al., 2009). For many real-world applications such as disease testing to determine if a patient has a certain disease or not, quality control in industry to decide whether a specification has been met for a certain product, or information retrieval to determine whether a page should be in the result set of a search or not. In modern machine learning applications, it is common that abundant predictive variables and features are collected with only a few of them having predictive power (Li et al., 2022). For example, in biomedical research, a large number of genetic information as predictive variables are collected by high-throughput technology, far exceeds the available sample size, but the underlying disease model is usually sparse and depends on few predictors (Larrañaga et al., 2006; Ye and Liu, 2012). Under this scenario, any classification method without variable selection may offer poor performance due to noise in the data and over-parametrization. The resulting model is also too complex and difficult to interpret due to the inclusion of all features. Without an appropriate variable selection method and including all features in the classifier will lead to bad performance due to noisy and variable correlations (Wang et al., 2011; Muthukrishnan and Rohini, 2016). Therefore, it is essential to identify important variables to improve both classification accuracy and model interpretability.

Support vector machines (SVMs) are supervised machine learning models that are efficient in

highly accurate classification with robust performance and fast computation in high dimensional data analysis, based on data geometric distribution with margin maximizing and optimization on dual problems rely on the sample size n rather than dimension p (Cristianini and Shawe-Taylor, 2000). The standard soft-margin SVMs have shown to be equivalent to an optimization problem with hinge loss and ℓ^2 -norm regularization (Lin et al., 2002). For given set of n training samples $(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), (\mathbf{x}_2, y_2), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_n, y_n)$ with data $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ as p dimensional predictive variable, and the class label as $y \in \{-1, +1\}$, the SVMs learns the decision function as $f(\mathbf{x}) = \beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}$, where $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ by solving the following regularization problem:

$$\min_{\beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(y_i(\beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2, \quad (1)$$

where $\phi(\mathbf{x}_i) = y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is the functional margin, $L(z) = (1 - z)_+ = \max\{0, 1 - z\}$ is the hinge loss, $\lambda > 0$ is the regularized term control the model complexity and balances the bias-variance trade-off (Hastie et al., 2009). Though the ℓ^2 -penalty is designed to shrink the fitted coefficients towards zero and hence control the model variance in the presence of many highly correlated predictors, standard SVMs generally keep all the variables in the final classifier without performing variable selection (Hastie et al., 2004, 2009). To overcome the limitation of L_2 -SVMs in sparse learning problems, a variety of sparse SVMs have been proposed in the literature, including the ℓ^1 -norm SVM (Zhu et al., 2004), the SCAD SVM (Zhang et al., 2006), and the ElasticNet SVM (DrSVM) (Wang et al., 2006).

In particular, the linear L_1 -SVM imposes the regularization term as the ℓ^1 -norm penalty in 1 and solves:

$$\min_{\beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(y_i(\beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)) + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1, \quad (2)$$

The ℓ^1 -norm penalty performs Lasso-type variable selection (Tibshirani, 1996) to shrink small coefficients to exactly zero. It is shown that the L_1 -SVM has an advantage over the standard L_2 -SVM when there are redundant noisy variables in high dimensional settings (Donoho et al., 1995; Ng, 2004).

Through the L_1 -SVM is effective in removing noise features and improving prediction accuracy, it has two limitations. First, when there are highly correlated predictors relevant to the response, the ℓ^1 -norm penalty tends to randomly pick up a subset of them and remove the rest.

In the example of gene pathway enrichment analysis (Reimand et al., 2019), functional genes sharing the same biological pathway are usually highly correlated, but using ℓ^1 -norm penalty may select only one gene from the group. It would be better to include whole groups of relevant genes for downstream analysis. Second, in high-dimensional settings with $p \gg n$, Rosset et al. (2004) show that the ℓ^1 -norm penalty can select at most n predictors, which is not desired in some applications. In many clinical trials, the sample size n is at the order of 10s while the dimension of gene biomarkers is at the order of 1000s, then the ℓ^1 -norm penalty can identify at most n key genes, which is not accurate for complex disease pathways. Wang et al. (2006) proposed the elastic net penalty to overcome these two limitations by using a mixture of L_1 - and L_2 -norms as the regularized term, known as the doubly regularized (ElasticNet) SVM:

$$\min_{\beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(y_i(\beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)) + \lambda_1 \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2, \quad (3)$$

where λ_1 and λ_2 are tuning parameters to control the model complexity. Similar to the L_1 -SVM, the ElasticNet SVM performs automatic variable selection and continuous shrinkage. In addition, it has the "grouping effect", the ability to select groups of variables together by encouraging them to have similar coefficients. For the ElasticNet SVM, the number of selected variables is no longer limited to the sample size n .

Standard SVMs, regardless of which penalty term is applied, the classification rule is given by $\text{sign}(\beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x})$ for any new data \mathbf{x} and targets the decision boundary directly, thus it cannot predict the class probability and offer any confidence measure of class prediction as other soft classifiers including Naïve Bayes, Logistic Regression and Linear Discriminant Analysis (Schölkopf and Smola, 2002; Hastie et al., 2009). Recent works propose a robust yet efficient method for probability estimation with weighted SVMs (wSVMs) (Wang et al., 2008). The method solves sequential wSVMs classifiers to bracket the class probability and estimate the class probability up to the desired precision level. The method is based on the optimization of weighted SVMs with ℓ^2 -norm penalty (L_2 -wSVMs), with poor performance when the features are redundant or noisy. Thus, variable selection is important for accurate class probability estimation and classification for high-dimensional data. Due to the nice property of L_2 -wSVMs with generalized modeling strategy and the ability to predict class probabilities, we would like to incorporate au-

automatic variable selection in the context of wSVMs to achieve sparse learning in class probability estimation and classification.

In this paper, motivated by L_1 -SVMs for automatic variable selection, and ElasticNet SVMs with hybrid effect on variable selection and grouping effect, we propose the sparse learning methods for wSVMs to perform automatic variable selection and class probability estimation for high-dimensional data with redundant and noisy features. The proposed methods show robust performance on variable selection and improved probability estimation and classification over the L_2 -wSVMs on high-dimensional problems. The proposed methods can be solved by linear programming (LP) and quadratic programming (QP), using popular software such as R, Python, and MATLAB. The divide-and-conquer nature of the algorithms can be further accelerated using parallel computing technology with CUDA and multi-core parallel computing, high-performance computing (HPC) clusters, and massively parallel computing (MPP).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Sections 2, 3, 4 review the binary wSVMs framework and present the new sparse learning methods. The grouping effect of the elastic net wSVMs is proved. Sections 5, 6 discuss the computation complexity and strategies of hyperparameter tuning. Sections 7, 8 conducts simulated studies and real data examples, followed by concluding remarks in Section 9.

2 Notations and Review of Binary Weighted SVMs

2.1 Notations

The training set is $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), i = 1, \dots, n\}$, where $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip})^T \in \mathbb{R}^p$, n is the sample size, p is the dimension of predictive variables. The class label as $y \in \{-1, +1\}$, the linear weighted SVM learns the decision function as $f(\mathbf{x}) = \beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}$, for some $\boldsymbol{\beta} = [\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p]^T$ and $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let n -vector $\mathbf{e} = [1, \dots, 1]^T$, $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, \dots, y_n]^T$, the weight vector $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y}) = [W(y_1), \dots, W(y_n)]^T$, where $W(y_i) = \pi$ if $y_i = -1$, and $(1 - \pi)$ if $y_i = +1, i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n]^T$ be the $n \times p$ design matrix, \mathbf{Y} is $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with diagonal elements as \mathbf{y} . With n training data to fit the optimal classifier $f(\mathbf{x})$ yield $\mathbf{f} = [f(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, f(\mathbf{x}_n)]^T$, thus $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{e}\beta_0 + \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Let the hinge loss as slack variables: $\mathbf{z} = [z_1, \dots, z_n]^T$, where $z_i = (1 - y_i f_i)_+, i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The

classification rule for weight classifier is then given by $\text{sign}(\beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x})$ for any new data \mathbf{x} . The learner from the training data is $\hat{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{x})$, represents confidence of a point \mathbf{x} belonging to $\{+1\}$ class; then the classification to $\{+1\}$ if $\hat{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0.5$, otherwise $\{-1\}$. We apply the same notations for the following discussion in sections 2-4.

2.2 Weighted SVMs for Binary Classification

In binary classification problems, the class label is $y \in \{+1, -1\}$. Define the posterior class probabilities as $p_{+1}(\mathbf{x}) = P(Y = +1 | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})$ and $p_{-1}(\mathbf{x}) = P(Y = -1 | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})$ for class $+1$ and -1 , respectively. By assigning the weight π ($0 \leq \pi \leq 1$) to data points from class -1 and assigning $1 - \pi$ to data points from class $+1$, the binary-weighted SVM (wSVM) learns the decision function $f \in \mathcal{F}$ by solving the following regularization problem:

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n} \left[(1 - \pi) \sum_{y_i=1} (1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i))_+ + \pi \sum_{y_i=-1} (1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i))_+ \right] + \lambda \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{K}}}^2 \quad (4)$$

where $(1 - yf(\mathbf{x}))_+ = \max\{0, 1 - yf(\mathbf{x})\}$ is the hinge loss, and \mathcal{F} is some functional space. For kernel SVMs, the function of the form $f = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) + d$, with $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{K}}$, where $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{K}}$ is the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS, Wahba, 1990) induced by the bivariate Mercer kernel representation $\mathbf{K}(\cdot, \cdot)$, and $d \in \mathbb{R}$. The ℓ^2 -norm on $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{K}}$ is a regularization term that controls the model complexity, and $\lambda > 0$ balances the bias–variance trade-off (Hastie et al., 2009). The representer theorem (Kimeldorf and Wahba, 1971) guarantees that (4) has the solution of $\mathbf{h}(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbf{K}(\cdot, \mathbf{x}_i)$, with the penalty $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{K}}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n c_i c_j \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$. For kernel SVM (Schölkopf and Smola, 2002), the minimizer of (4) yields the optimal classifier $f_{\pi}^{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) = d + \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$, for some $\mathbf{c} = [c_1, \dots, c_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$ by quadratic programming (QP) with complexity solely rely on sample size n by duality (Lin et al., 2002).

For any given weight π , the minimizer of the expected weighted hinge loss of the form $\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{X}, Y) \sim P(\mathbf{X}, Y)} \{W(Y)L[Yf(\mathbf{X})]\}$ has the same sign as $\text{sign}[p_{+1}(\mathbf{X}) - \pi]$ (Wang et al., 2008). The class probability can be estimated by training multiple classifiers $\hat{f}_{\pi_1}, \dots, \hat{f}_{\pi_M}$ by solving (4) with a series of π , with $0 < \pi_1 < \dots < \pi_M < 1$. The values $\hat{f}_{\pi}(\mathbf{x})$ is non-increasing in π for any \mathbf{x} , leading to a unique m^* such that $\pi_{m^*} < p_{+1}(\mathbf{x}) < \pi_{m^*+1}$, with $\hat{f}_{\pi_{m^*}}(\mathbf{x}) = +1$ and $\hat{f}_{\pi_{m^*+1}}(\mathbf{x}) = -1$, allow us to construct a consistent probability estimator by $\hat{p}_{+1}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}(\pi_{m^*} + \pi_{m^*+1})$ with

numerical precision determined by M , as the density of the weight grids. This approach is based on the L_2 -wSVMs denoted as “LTWSVM”. The LTWSVM has great performance on data set with dense features (Wang et al., 2008, 2019; Zeng and Zhang, 2022), but is less efficient in the presence of redundant noise features (Tan et al., 2010; Ghaddar and Naoum-Sawaya, 2018).

3 L_1 - L_2 wSVMs Learning Scheme

In this section, we propose efficient algorithms for sparse learning using L_1 -wSVMs as automatic variable selection followed by L_2 -wSVMs for class probability estimation. In L_1 -wSVMs, the weighted SVM minimizes the hinge loss in f , and $f(\mathbf{x}) = \beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}$, where $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, as the regularization problem:

$$\min_{\beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}} \frac{1}{n} \left[(1 - \pi) \sum_{y_i=1} (1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i))_+ + \pi \sum_{y_i=-1} (1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i))_+ \right] + \lambda_1 \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j|. \quad (5)$$

We adopt the same notations in 2.1, and $\lambda_1 > 0$ is the regularization parameter. In addition, we introduce slack variables $u_j, v_j \geq 0$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Let $\beta_j = u_j - v_j$, The solution has either u_j or v_j equal to 0, depending on the sign of β_j , we have $|\beta_j| = u_j + v_j$. Then $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$. $\lambda_1 \geq 0$ is the tuning parameter. Now we can rewrite the unconstrained optimization problem in (5) as the constrained primal problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\beta_0, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z}} \quad & \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y})^T \mathbf{z} + n\lambda_1 \sum_{j=1}^p (u_j + v_j) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{z} \geq \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{YX}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{e}\beta_0, \\ & \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

For $\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \geq 0$, the dual problem is the max-min of the Lagrange function of (6):

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}} \min_{\beta_0, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} \quad & \mathcal{L} = \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y})^T \mathbf{z} + n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e}^T (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{e}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ & - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{YX}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}) - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{e}\beta_0 - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{v} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

To minimize \mathcal{L} regarding $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \beta_0$, by differentiating, we have:

$$(1). \quad \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\gamma} = \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y})$$

$$(2). \quad n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \mathbf{s} = 0, \text{ since } \mathbf{s} \geq 0, \text{ we have } \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \leq n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e}$$

$$(3). \quad n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \mathbf{t} = 0, \text{ since } \mathbf{t} \geq 0, \text{ we have } \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \geq -n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e}$$

$$(4). \quad \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha} = 0$$

By substituting above equations in (7), the Wolfe dual of (6) is equivalent to minimizing:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \quad & -\mathbf{e}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{y}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} = 0, \\ & 0 \leq \boldsymbol{\alpha} \leq \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y}), \\ & \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \leq n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e}, \\ & \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \geq -n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The dual problem of (8) is standard linear programming (LP) problem, which can be solved by many programming platforms such as R, Python, and MATLAB. Since the strong duality holds for LP due to the fact we have a feasible solution for L_1 -wSVMs (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004), solving (8) will have same optimal solution as the primal problem (6). We get the optimal $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$ from (8), then: $\mathbf{s} = n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$, and $\mathbf{t} = n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$. Based on the complementary slackness of Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) optimality condition for LP, we have $s_j u_j = 0$ and $t_j v_j = 0$, for $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. When $s_j > 0$ and $t_j > 0$, we have $u_j = 0$ and $v_j = 0$, thus $\beta_j = 0$, indicate a j -th variable can be removed. We then have selected variable set $\mathcal{V}^* = \{j : \beta_j \neq 0\}$, and the variable selection indicator as a p -vector \mathcal{I}^* where $\mathcal{I}^*[j] = 1$ if $j \in \mathcal{V}^*$, otherwise, $\mathcal{I}^*[j] = 0$.

Sequence of weights $\pi_\epsilon \in \Pi_M = \{\frac{j-1}{m} \mid j = 2, \dots, m\}$ are applied for the L_1 -wSVMs in (5) and the subset of selected variable $\mathcal{V}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$ as input of L_2 -wSVMs of the corresponding weight for class probability estimation in Section 2.2. We denote this as ‘‘LOTWSVM’’ learning. The final variable set is defined by combining all the selected variables for each weight and calculating the selection frequency as $\mathcal{F} = \sum_{\pi_\epsilon \in \Pi_M} \mathcal{I}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$. The important variables are selected by the threshold, i.e. $\mathcal{V}_s = \{j : \mathcal{F}[j] > s\}$, where s is the threshold frequency set for automatic variable selection.

The complete LOTWSVM algorithm is outlined below in **Algorithm 1**. The regularization parameter $\lambda_1 > 0$ in the L_1 -wSVMs and $\lambda_2 > 0$ in the L_2 -wSVMs are fixed at Step 2 and Step

3, and it needs to be tuned for optimal results. In Section 6 we discuss the parameter tuning in detail.

Algorithm 1 Sparse Learning with LOTWSVM

- 1: Initialize $\Pi_M = \{\frac{j-1}{m} \mid j = 2, \dots, m\}$, where m controls the precision of the estimated probabilities;
 - 2: For each $\pi_\epsilon \in \Pi_M$, fixed $\lambda_1 > 0$, train the L_1 -wSVMs by minimizing (5), and denote the selected variables as $\mathcal{V}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$ and the variable indicator $\mathcal{I}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$;
 - 3: For each $\pi_\epsilon \in \Pi_M$, fixed $\lambda_2 > 0$, apply the reduced $\mathcal{V}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$ as the new input for the L_2 -wSVMs with a linear kernel by minimizing (4), and estimate the class probability $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x})$ based on Section 2.2;
 - 4: The predicted class label is $\{+1\}$ if $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0.5$, and $\{-1\}$ otherwise. The decision boundary is then given by as $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) = 0.5$;
 - 5: The final set of important variables is threshold by selection frequency as $\mathcal{F} = \sum_{\pi_\epsilon \in \Pi_M} \mathcal{I}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$.
-

4 ElasticNet wSVMs Learning Scheme

4.1 wSVMs with Elastic Net Penalty

The L_1 - L_2 wSVMs share the limitations of L_1 -SVMs. To improve the performance, we propose the wSVMs with the elastic net penalty for class probability estimation. We prove that the new scheme has the "variable group effect" and can select more than n important variables. We propose two learning schemes, (1) similar to the L_1 - L_2 wSVMs, we use ElasticNet wSVMs for automatic variable selection, followed by the L_2 -wSVMs for class probability estimation, denoted as "ElasticNet- L_2 wSVMs" learning scheme; (2) use ElasticNet wSVMs for automatic variable selection and class probability estimation directly, denoted as the "ElasticNet wSVMs" learning scheme. Both schemes solve the optimization problem of ElasticNet wSVMs, and the weighted SVMs minimize the hinge loss in f , and $f(\mathbf{x}) = \beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}$, where $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, as the doubly

regularized optimization problem:

$$\min_{\beta_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}} \frac{1}{n} \left[(1 - \pi) \sum_{y_i=1} (1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i))_+ + \pi \sum_{y_i=-1} (1 - y_i f(\mathbf{x}_i))_+ \right] + \lambda_1 \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j| + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j^2 \quad (9)$$

We use the same notations as in 2.1, and the slack variables $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} > 0$ to relax the ℓ^1 -norm same as described in Section 3. $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 > 0$ are the regularization parameters. We formulate the unconstrained optimization problem in (9) as the constrained primal problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\beta_0, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z}} \quad & \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y})^T \mathbf{z} + n\lambda_1 \sum_{j=1}^p (u_j + v_j) + \frac{n\lambda_2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^p (u_j + v_j)^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{z} \geq \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{YX}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{e}\beta_0, \\ & \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

For $\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \geq 0$, we have the Lagrange function of (10) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}} \min_{\beta_0, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} \quad & \mathcal{L} = \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y})^T \mathbf{z} + n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e}^T (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) + \frac{n\lambda_2}{2} (\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v}) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \mathbf{z} \\ & + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T [\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{YX}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{e}\beta_0 - \mathbf{z}] - \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{v} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Taking derivatives with respect to $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \beta_0$, we have:

- (1). $\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\gamma} = \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y})$
- (2). $\mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{n\lambda_2} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \mathbf{s} - n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e})$
- (3). $\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{n\lambda_2} (-\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \mathbf{t} - n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e})$
- (4). $\mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{Y} \boldsymbol{\alpha} = 0$

Denote \mathbf{e}_k as 1-vector with k elements, $\mathbf{0}_k$ as 0-vector with k elements, $\mathbf{0}_{s,k}$ as $s \times k$ zero matrix, and \mathbf{I}_k as $k \times k$ identity matrix. We define $p \times (n+3p)$ matrices $\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{n\lambda_2} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} & \frac{1}{n\lambda_2} \mathbf{I}_p & \mathbf{0}_{p,p} & -\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \mathbf{I}_p \end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{n\lambda_2} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y} & \mathbf{0}_{p,p} & \frac{1}{n\lambda_2} \mathbf{I}_p & -\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \mathbf{I}_p \end{bmatrix}$. Define $(n+3p)$ -vectors $\mathbf{c}^T = [\mathbf{e}_n^T \quad \mathbf{0}_{3p}^T]$ and $\mathbf{w}^T = [\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \quad \mathbf{s}^T \quad \mathbf{t}^T \quad \mathbf{e}_p^T]$. Now we have $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{w}$. Define the $(n+3p)$ square matrix $\mathbf{Q} = n\lambda_2(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B})$, $p \times (n+3p)$ matrix $\mathbf{D} = [\mathbf{0}_{p,n+2p} \quad \mathbf{I}_p]$, and the $(2n+2p+1) \times (n+3p)$ constraint coefficients matrix \mathbf{M} as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y}^\top & & \mathbf{0}_{1,3p} \\ \mathbf{I}_n & & \mathbf{0}_{n,3p} \\ -\mathbf{I}_n & & \mathbf{0}_{n,3p} \\ \mathbf{0}_{p,n} & \mathbf{I}_p & \mathbf{0}_{p,2p} \\ \mathbf{0}_{p,n+p} & \mathbf{I}_p & \mathbf{0}_{p,p} \end{pmatrix}$$

The Wolfe dual of (10) is equivalent to minimizing:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{w} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{M} \mathbf{w} [1] = 0, \\ & \mathbf{M} \mathbf{w} [2 : 2n + 2p + 1] \geq \mathbf{0}, \\ & \mathbf{D} \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{e}_p, \\ & \mathbf{A} \mathbf{w} \geq \mathbf{0}, \\ & \mathbf{B} \mathbf{w} \geq \mathbf{0} \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

which is a standard quadratic programming (QP) problem. Applying a similar approach, the primal problem of (10) can be formulated as QP as well.

Define $(n + 2p + 1)$ -vectors $\mathbf{w}^\top = [\mathbf{z}^\top \ \mathbf{u}^\top \ \mathbf{v}^\top \ \beta_0]$, and $\mathbf{d}^\top = [\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y})^\top \ n\lambda_1 \mathbf{e}_{2p}^\top \ 0]$. Define the $(n + 2p + 1)$ square matrix \mathbf{P} as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} & & \mathbf{0}_{n,n+2p+1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{p,n} & \mathbf{I}_p & \mathbf{0}_{p,p+1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{p,n+p} & & \mathbf{I}_p & \mathbf{0}_p \\ & & & \mathbf{0}_{n+2p+1}^\top \end{pmatrix}$$

Let the right hand side of $(2n + 2p)$ constraint coefficient vector as $\mathbf{b}_0^\top = [\mathbf{0}_{n+2p}^\top \ \mathbf{e}_n^\top]$, and the left hand side $(2n + 2p) \times (n + 2p + 1)$ constraint coefficients matrix \mathbf{R} :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_n & & \mathbf{0}_{n,2p+1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{p,n} & \mathbf{I}_p & \mathbf{0}_{p,p+1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{p,n+p} & & \mathbf{I}_p & \mathbf{0}_p \\ \mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{YX} & -\mathbf{YX} & \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{e}_n \end{pmatrix}$$

Now we have the QP of primal problem (10) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{P} \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{w} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{R} \mathbf{w} \geq \mathbf{b}_0 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Since the strong duality holds for SVMs (Díaz and Castañón, 2009; Dekel and Singer, 2016; Wang and Xu, 2022), the primal problem and the dual problem have same optimal solution. The QP for primal and dual problems of ElasticNet wSVMs have different complexity and will be discussed in Section 5. For primal problem we get optimal \mathbf{u}^* and \mathbf{v}^* and β_0^* directly from (13), and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^p = \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}^*$, $\hat{\beta}_0^p = \beta_0^*$. For dual problem (12), we get $\mathbf{u}^* = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{w}^*$, $\mathbf{v}^* = \mathbf{B} \mathbf{w}^*$, and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$. We have $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^d = \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}^*$. Based on complementary slackness of Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) optimality condition, we have (1) $\alpha_i^*(1 - y_i \hat{f}_i - z_i) = 0$, and (2) $\gamma_i^* z_i = 0$, $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $\{\gamma_i^* + \alpha_i^* = W(y_i), \gamma_i^*, \alpha_i^* \geq 0\}$. For some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have $0 < \alpha_i^* < W(y_i)$, leading to $z_i = 0$, then $1 - y_i \hat{f}_i = 0$. Since $\hat{f}_i = \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \hat{\beta}_0^d + \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^d \mathbf{x}_i$, we have $\hat{\beta}_0^d = y_i^{-1} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^d \mathbf{x}_i$. Any α_i^* satisfy the above condition is the support vectors of wSVMs, and it will give the same $\hat{\beta}_0^d$ value. Due to numerical instability, we provide a robust solution:

$$\hat{\beta}_0^d = \frac{\mathbf{e}^T [\mathbf{I} \odot \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*] [\mathbf{I} \odot (\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y}) - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)] [\mathbf{y}^{-1} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^d]}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{*T} (\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y}) - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \quad (14)$$

where \mathbf{I} is $n \times n$ identity matrix, and \odot is Hadamard product with *broadcasting*. For given weight π and fixed tuning parameters $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 > 0$, the optimal classifier for (9) is: $\hat{f}_\pi^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{x}$, where $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ are estimated either by primal or dual problem, and they should provide same values. Now we have selected variable set $\mathcal{V}_\pi^* = \{j : \beta_j \neq 0\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, and the variable selection indicator \mathcal{I}_π^* where $\mathcal{I}_\pi^*[j] = 1$ if $j \in \mathcal{V}_\pi^*$, otherwise, $\mathcal{I}_\pi^*[j] = 0$. We discuss the parameter tuning in Section 6.

4.2 Learning with ElasticNet- L_2 wSVMs

The weighted SVMs with elastic net penalty provide the close solution of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. Due to the contribution of ℓ^1 -norm, it performs continuous variable selection, and the solution is sparse. Similar to the LOTWSVM, we can use ElasticNet wSVMs for automatic variable selection, then use the selected variables as input for the L_2 -wSVMs for class probability estimation. It may have

an advantage for data following a complex non-linear distribution due to the downstream L_2 -wSVMs with the ability for non-linear kernels. It also has the ‘‘variable grouping effect’’ due to the ℓ^2 -norm effect, and the selected variables are no longer limited to n . We denote this as ‘‘ENTPWSVM’’ if we have a sparse solution by primal QP, or ‘‘ENTWSVM’’ by dual QP. Herein we illustrate the complete algorithm based on ElasticNet- L_2 wSVMs learning approach in 2.

Algorithm 2 Sparse Learning with ENTPWSVM (primal) or ENTWSVM (dual)

- 1: Initialize $\Pi_M = \{\frac{j-1}{m} \mid j = 2, \dots, m\}$, where m controls the estimated probability precision;
 - 2: For each $\pi_\epsilon \in \Pi_M$, fixed $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$, train the ElasticNet wSVMs by minimizing (9), either by solving the primal QP (13) as ‘‘ENTPWSVM’’, or the dual QP (12) as ‘‘ENTWSVM’’. We get the sparse solution $\hat{\beta}$, and the selected variables as $\mathcal{V}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$ and the variable indicator $\mathcal{I}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$;
 - 3: For each $\pi_\epsilon \in \Pi_M$, fixed $\lambda_3 > 0$, apply the reduced $\mathcal{V}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$ as the new input for L_2 -wSVMs with linear kernel by minimizing (4), and estimate the class probability $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x})$ based on Section 2.2;
 - 4: The predicted class label is $\{+1\}$ if $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0.5$, and $\{-1\}$ otherwise. The decision boundary is then given by as $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) = 0.5$;
 - 5: The final set of important variables is threshold by selection frequency as $\mathcal{F} = \sum_{\pi_\epsilon \in \Pi_M} \mathcal{I}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$.
-

4.3 Learning with ElasticNet wSVMs

Alternatively, we can use the ElasticNet wSVMs for automatic variable selection and class probability estimation directly as a one-step approach, without the L_2 -wSVMs involved. It has the same advantage of the ‘‘variable grouping effect’’. We denote it as ‘‘ENPWSVM’’ if we have a sparse solution by the primal QP, or the ‘‘ENWSVM’’ by dual QP. Herein we illustrate the complete algorithm based on the ElasticNet wSVMs as a one-step learning approach in 3.

Algorithm 3 Sparse Learning with ENPWSVM (primal) or ENWSVM (dual)

- 1: Initialize $\Pi_M = \{\frac{j-1}{m} \mid j = 2, \dots, m\}$, where m controls the estimated probability precision;
 - 2: For each $\pi_\epsilon \in \Pi_M$ and fixed $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$, train the ElasticNet wSVMs by minimizing (9), either by solving primal QP (13) as "ENPWSVM", or dual QP (12) as "ENWSVM". We get the optimal classifier $\hat{f}_{\pi_\epsilon}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}$, the selected variables $\mathcal{V}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$ and the variable indicator $\mathcal{I}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$, based on the sparsity of $\hat{\beta}$;
 - 3: Replace the multiple classifiers \hat{f}_{π_ϵ} for L_2 -wSVMs with $\hat{f}_{\pi_\epsilon}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(\mathbf{x})$ from step (2), and follow the procedure for class probability estimation in 2.2 with predicted labels associated weights;
 - 4: The predicted class label is $\{+1\}$ if $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0.5$, and $\{-1\}$ otherwise. The decision boundary is then given by as $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) = 0.5$;
 - 5: The final set of important variables is threshold by selection frequency as $\mathcal{F} = \sum_{\pi_\epsilon \in \Pi_M} \mathcal{I}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$.
-

4.4 Grouping Effect of ElasticNet wSVMs

The ElasticNet wSVMs have the advantage of "variable grouping" in the variable selection process, in comparison with the L_1 -wSVMs. In this section, we theoretically prove the grouping effect of highly correlated variables for the ElasticNet wSVMs. The results are general and hold for all Lipschitz continuous loss functions.

Theorem 1. *Denote the solution to (9) as $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}$, If the loss function $L(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous, i.e. $|L(t_1) - L(t_2)| \leq M|t_1 - t_2|$ for some positive infinite real constant M , then for any pair (s, t) , where $1 \leq s < t \leq p$, we have:*

$$|\hat{\beta}_s - \hat{\beta}_t| \leq \frac{M}{n\lambda_2} \left[(1 - \pi) \sum_{y_i=1} |x_{is} - x_{it}| + \pi \sum_{y_i=-1} |x_{is} - x_{it}| \right] \quad (15)$$

The proof is similar to that of Theorem 1 in Wang, Zhu and Zou (2006) and hence omitted. For the hinge loss it is obvious the Lipschitz continuity holds when $M = 1$, thus Theorem 1 holds for the ElasticNet wSVMs, and the grouping effect depends on λ_2 from ℓ^2 -norm penalty in the elastic net.

5 Complexity Analysis

In this section, we provide a thorough complexity analysis of the different learning methods including the L_2 -wSVMs (LTWSVM) and L_1 - L_2 wSVMs (LOTWSVM) for solving dual problems, and ElasticNet wSVMs (ENPWSVM/ENWSVM) and ElasticNet- L_2 wSVMs (ENTPWSVM/ENTWSVM) for solving both primal and dual problems.

We follow the same annotations without loss of generality. Assume the binary classification is balanced, i.e. $n_{+1} = n_{-1}$. We randomly split the data into training and tuning sets while keeping the balance property. The sample size for training is n_{train} , and tuning for n_{tune} . The data dimension is p . For convex optimization, which is true for the wSVMs with a hinge loss, we denote the number of variables in the objective as N and the number of constraints as D . We implement the quadratic programming (QP) in R using `quadprog` package which applies the active set algorithm with polynomial time complexity $C_{QP} \sim O(\max(N^3, N^2D))$ (Tseng, 1988; Ye and Tse, 1989; Ye, 1998; Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004). For linear programming (LP) we use `lpSolveAPI` as an R interface for `lp_solve` Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP) solver (Berkelaar et al., 2004) with the polynomial complexity of $C_{LP} \sim O(\max(N^{2.5}, ND^{1.5}))$ (Vaidya, 1989). The time complexity for label prediction is $C_{LLT} \sim O(n_{tune}n_{train})$ for the L_2 kernel wSVMs and $C_{LEN} \sim O(n_{tune})$ for the ElasticNet wSVMs. We train $O(m)$ sequence of wSVMs for binary class probability estimation with n_{tune} data points is $C_P \sim n_{tune}O(m \log m)$. For parameter tuning, let n_{par} be the number of tuning parameters and $\{\gamma_p \mid p \in \{1, \dots, n_{par}\}\}$ is the number of grid points. We have the following time complexity in Table 1 for proposed sparse learning methods:

Table 1: Complexity Analysis of Sparse Learnings with wSVMs

Methods	Opt	N	D	Solver	Complexity
LTWSVM	Dual	n	$2n + 1$	quadprog	$(\prod_{p=1}^{n_{par}} \gamma_p) [O(m)(C_{QP} + C_{LLT}) + C_P]$
LOTWSVM	Dual	n	$2n + 2p + 1$	lpSolveAPI	$(\prod_{p=1}^{n_{par}} \gamma_p) [O(m)(\max(C_{QP}, C_{LP}) + C_{LLT}) + C_P]$
ENPWSVM	Primal	$n + 2p + 1$	$2n + 2p$	quadprog	$(\prod_{p=1}^{n_{par}} \gamma_p) [O(m)(C_{QP} + C_{LEN}) + C_P]$
ENWSVM	Dual	$n + 3p$	$2n + 5p + 1$	quadprog	$(\prod_{p=1}^{n_{par}} \gamma_p) [O(m)(C_{QP} + C_{LEN}) + C_P]$
ENTPWSVM	Primal	$n + 2p + 1$	$2n + 2p$	quadprog	$(\prod_{p=1}^{n_{par}} \gamma_p) [O(m)(C_{QP} + C_{LLT}) + C_P]$
ENTWSVM	Dual	$n + 3p$	$2n + 5p + 1$	quadprog	$(\prod_{p=1}^{n_{par}} \gamma_p) [O(m)(C_{QP} + C_{LLT}) + C_P]$

NOTE: The table shows the summary of the complexity analysis for the proposed sparse learning methods based on wSVMs. Opt: Optimization, N : number of variables in the objective function, D : number of the constraints, n : number of training data, p : data dimensionality. The LOTWSVM use **quadprog** solver for probability estimation.

In the following, we illustrate the complexity across different methods with the linear kernel wSVMs. For the LTWSVM, we have a single hyperparameter $\lambda > 0$ associated with the L_2 -wSVMs; for the LOTWSVM, we have two hyperparameters $\lambda_1 > 0, \lambda_2 > 0$, where λ_1 associated with the L_1 -wSVMs and λ_2 associated with the L_2 -wSVMs; for the ENPWSVM/ENWSVM we have two hyperparameters $\lambda_1 > 0, \lambda_2 > 0$ associated with ElasticNet-wSVMs; and for the ENTPWSVM/ENTWSVM, we have three hyperparameters $\lambda_1 > 0, \lambda_2 > 0, \lambda_3 > 0$, where λ_1, λ_2 associated with ElasticNet-wSVMs, and λ_3 associated with the L_2 -wSVMs. For each hyperparameter, we have the number of grid points as $\gamma_\lambda = \tau$. Assume fixed precision with m as constant, and $n_{train} = n_{tune} = n$. To optimize the algorithm, we let $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ in the LTWSVM and $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3$ in the ENTPWSVM/ENTWSVM to reduce the tuning complexity, as there is no significant performance improvement with additional loop. Now we have the complexity from Table 1 reduced as: (1) LTWSVM: $O(\tau n^3)$; (2) LOTWSVM: $O(\tau \max(n^3, np^{1.5}))$; (3) ENPWSVM/ENTPWSVM: $O(\tau^2(n + 2p)^3)$; and (4) ENWSVM/ENTWSVM: $O(\tau^2(n + 3p)^3)$. In the low dimensional case ($p \ll n$), all the methods have the same complexity as $O(n^3)$ for each tuning loop; in the high dimensional case ($p \gg n$), the sparse learning methods have the complexity increase with data dimensionality p , with the most expensive for ElasticNet-wSVMs dual problem.

Solve QP and LP are computationally expensive for high dimensional data with solvers as

`quadprog` and `lp_solve`. To improve the computational efficiency, the recent development of `OSQP` as QP solver with modified alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) algorithm (Boyd et al., 2011) largely reduces the computation time, with typically ten times faster than `quadprog` (Stellato et al., 2020). The `OSQP` algorithm requires the symmetric square matrix Q as positive semidefinite in the QP objective. We make a slight adjustment of `OSQP` solver to set $Q = \mathbf{0}_{N,N}$ so it works with LP as well. In Section 7 we use Example 1 to illustrate the complexity of all the methods with different solvers, aligned with the theoretic analysis.

6 Parameter Tuning

The regularization parameters $\Lambda > 0$ need to be tuned dynamically with the finite data as their values are critical for the optimal performance of wSVMs. For LTWSVM and LOTWSVM, $\Lambda = \{\lambda\}$, and for ElasticNet-wSVMs, $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$. To retrieve the proper values of the Λ , we randomly split the data into two equal parts with sample size as n , with the training set \mathbb{S}_{train} to train the wSVMs classifiers for a given weight π and fixed Λ , and the tuning set \mathbb{S}_{tune} to choose the optimal values of Λ .

For one-step approaches as LTWSVM and ENWSVM/ENTWSVM, for any fixed Λ , we train $m - 1$ classifiers $\hat{f}_{\pi_\epsilon}^\Lambda(\mathbf{x})$ for $\pi_\epsilon \in \{\frac{j-1}{m} \mid j = 2, \dots, m\}$ with the data in \mathbb{S}_{train} to estimate the $\{+1\}$ class probability \hat{p}^Λ in \mathbb{S}_{tune} . For two steps approaches as LOTWSVM and ENPWSVM/ENTPWSVM, for any fixed $\Lambda_1 \in \Lambda$, where $\Lambda_1 = \lambda$ for LOTWSVM and $\Lambda_1 = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$ for ENPWSVM/ENTPWSVM, we train $m - 1$ classifiers $\hat{f}_{\pi_\epsilon}^{\Lambda_1}(\mathbf{x})$ with the data in \mathbb{S}_{train} to for automatic variable selection to reduced the data dimension to \mathbf{x}' with the new $\mathbb{S}_{train}^{\Lambda_1'}$ and $\mathbb{S}_{tune}^{\Lambda_1'}$, next, for any fixed $\Lambda_2 \in \Lambda$, where $\Lambda_2 = \lambda$ for LOTWSVM and $\Lambda_2 = \lambda_2$ for ENPWSVM/ENTPWSVM, we train $m - 1$ classifiers $\hat{f}_{\pi_\epsilon}^{\Lambda_2}(\mathbf{x}')$ with the data in $\mathbb{S}_{train}^{\Lambda_1'}$ to estimate \hat{p}^Λ in $\mathbb{S}_{tune}^{\Lambda_1'}$. We choose the tuning parameters with grid search, based on the performance of \hat{p}^Λ 's on the tuning set. Assume the true $\{+1\}$ class probabilities are $p(\mathbf{x})$. To quantify the estimation accuracy of \hat{p} 's, we use

the generalized Kullback-Leibler (GKL) loss function:

$$GKL(p, \hat{p}^\Lambda) \tag{16}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{P}} \left[p(\mathbf{X}) \log \frac{p(\mathbf{X})}{\hat{p}^\Lambda(\mathbf{X})} + (1 - p(\mathbf{X})) \log \frac{1 - p(\mathbf{X})}{1 - \hat{p}^\Lambda(\mathbf{X})} \right] \tag{17}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{P}} [p(\mathbf{X}) \log p(\mathbf{X}) + (1 - p(\mathbf{X})) \log(1 - p(\mathbf{X}))] \tag{17}$$

$$- \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{P}} [p(\mathbf{X}) \log \hat{p}^\Lambda(\mathbf{X}) + (1 - p(\mathbf{X})) \log(1 - \hat{p}^\Lambda(\mathbf{X}))] \tag{18}$$

The expectation is taken *w.r.t* the randomness of \mathbf{X} over the distribution of \mathcal{P} , the term (17) is unrelated to $\hat{p}^\Lambda(\mathbf{X})$ and can be considered as a constant, and only (18) matter. In real applications, the true class probability $p(\mathbf{X})$ generally is an unknown quantity, we develop an empirical estimator to approximate GKL based on the tuning data. Noted $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2}(Y + 1) | \mathbf{X}, Y \in \{+1, -1\} \right] = p(\mathbf{X})$, we have the approximation of GKL as:

$$EGKL(\hat{p}^\Lambda) = -\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n [(1 + y_i) \log \hat{p}^\Lambda(\mathbf{x}_i) + (1 - y_i) \log(1 - \hat{p}^\Lambda(\mathbf{x}_i))] \tag{19}$$

The optimal values of Λ are chosen by minimizing the EGKL.

7 Numerical Studies

In this section, we illustrate the performance with the proposed sparse learning methods based on L_1 -wSVMs and ElasticNet-wSVMs on simulated high dimensional dataset, and compare it with L_2 -wSVMs without the variable selection power. We show that our methods can remove the irrelevant variables and identify relevant variables efficiently, and as a consequence, our proposed methods provide high accuracy for class probability estimation and classification. We also show that learning based on ElasticNet-wSVMs can identify the highly correlated variables together as the “grouping effect” with the best performance across all methods. All the numerical experiments are performed on the High-Performance Computing (HPC) cluster in the University of Arizona, with AMD Zen2 48 core processors and 15GB memory.

For class probability estimation, to solve the binary wSVMs, we set the weights as $\pi_\epsilon = \frac{j-1}{m}$, $j = \{1, \dots, m + 1\}$ with m a preset value control probability estimation precision and we set as $\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$, where n is the training data size. We use a linear kernel for the simulation examples.

The tuning parameters $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} \in \{5.5 \times 10^{-4}, 5.5 \times 10^{-3}, \dots, 5.5 \times 10^3\}$ is selected by grid search using EGKL, which has shown to be a good approximation of GKL (Zeng and Zhang, 2022). In simulated examples, we set $|\mathbb{S}_{train}| = |\mathbb{S}_{tune}| = n$. To evaluate probability estimation accuracy of $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x})$'s, we generate a test set $\mathbb{S}_{test} = \{(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \tilde{y}_i), i = 1, \dots, \tilde{n}\}$, with $|\mathbb{S}_{test}| = \tilde{n} = 50n$, and compute the EGKL as criteria. The classification is based on the argmax rule, i.e. \mathbf{x} classify to $\{+1\}$ class when $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0.5$.

The proposed sparse learning methods L_1 -wSVMs and ElasticNet-wSVMs perform an automatic variable selection for each wSVMs with weight π_ϵ . We set the P_β as a threshold to control the number of selected variables. Any $|\beta_j| < P_\beta$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ are set to 0, indicating an j -th variable is irrelevant. The p -vector as a variable selection indicator for weight π_ϵ is defined by $\mathcal{I}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$, where $\mathcal{I}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*[j] = 1$ if $|\beta_j| > P_\beta$, otherwise, $\mathcal{I}^*[j] = 0$. We train $m - 1$ wSVMs with N Monte Carlo simulations and obtain the candidate variables set by union $\mathcal{A} = \sum_N \sum_{\pi_\epsilon \in \Pi_M} \mathcal{I}_{\pi_\epsilon}^*$. The variable selection frequency is defined as $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{A}/N \in [0, m - 1]$. The final variables set is selected by threshold, i.e. $\mathcal{V}_s = \{j : \mathcal{F}[j] > s\}$. In the following simulation examples, we set $s = (m - 1)/2$.

We consider three examples with five important variables at different levels of correlations. We use $n = 100$ and $\tilde{n} = 5,000$, with 4 dimensions, $p \in \{100, 200, 400, 1000\}$. In example 1, we run $N = 50$ Monte Carlo simulations for all the methods with different optimization methods and solvers to examine the complexity and pick the best optimization and solver for each learning method. We then run $N = 100$ Monte Carlo simulations for each example and report the average performance measurement with standard error $s_e = \sigma_v/\sqrt{N}$.

Example 1 (Balanced, Independent). In this example the input variables are independent. Let \mathbf{c}_k as a vector with k elements all equal c . The data is generated by multivariate normal distribution, with $\{+1\}$ class with $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{+1} = [\mathbf{0.5}_5 \ \mathbf{0}_{p-5}]^T$, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{-1} = [-\mathbf{0.5}_5 \ \mathbf{0}_{p-5}]^T$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}_p$. The Bayes classifier only depends on x_1, \dots, x_5 , and Bayes error is 0.132, independent with p .

We use this example to explore the complexity of proposed learning methods with L_2 -wSVMs (LTWSVM), with different optimization methods and solvers, in different p . Table 2 summarizes the performance, aligned with the complexity analysis in section 5. In all the proposed sparse learning methods with automatic variable selection capability, the computation time increases with the data dimensionality p , unlike the LTWSVM only depends on the training sample size n .

It shows that the Primal and Dual problem has identical results in elastic net-based approaches, and solving the primal problem is more than 20 times faster with the standard `quadprog` QP solver. Additionally, by switching to `OSQP`, the primal problem can be accelerated for additional 15 times, making it 300 times faster than solving the dual problem. The `LOTWSVM` has less order of complexity compared with elastic net-based approaches, with `OSQP` solver it is more than 10 times faster in high dimensional data with comparable performance as `lpSolveAPI` solver. `OSQP` has no performance gain as `quadprog` in the `LTWSVM`. We use standard `quadprog` solver for `LTWSVM` and `OSQP` solver for the `LOTWSVM`, `ENPWSVM`, and `ENTPWSVM` for the following simulations.

Table 2: Performance measure on wSVMs learning methods

Methods	Opt	Solver	n = 100, p =100			n = 100, p =200			n = 100, p =400			n = 100, p =1000		
			Time	EGKL	TE	Time	EGKL	TE	Time	EGKL	TE	Time	EGKL	TE
LTWSVM	Dual	quadprog	0.3 (0.0)	49.8 (0.5)	22.8 (0.3)	0.3 (0.0)	54.6 (0.3)	26.2 (0.2)	0.3 (0.0)	59.2 (0.3)	30.4 (0.2)	0.4 (0.1)	64.8 (0.2)	36.3 (0.3)
LTWSVM	Dual	OSQP	0.3 (0.0)	49.8 (0.5)	22.8 (0.3)	0.3 (0.0)	54.6 (0.3)	26.2 (0.2)	0.3 (0.0)	59.2 (0.3)	30.4 (0.2)	0.4 (0.1)	64.7 (0.2)	36.2 (0.2)
LOTWSVM	Dual	lpSolveAPI	0.5 (0.0)	42.2 (0.5)	17.7 (0.3)	0.7 (0.1)	43.8 (0.5)	17.9 (0.3)	1.6 (0.1)	44.4 (0.4)	18.8 (0.3)	17.8 (0.2)	47.6 (0.5)	20.5 (0.4)
LOTWSVM	Dual	OSQP	0.4 (0.0)	44.3 (0.6)	18.3 (0.4)	0.4 (0.0)	46.3 (0.6)	18.9 (0.3)	0.6 (0.0)	47.7 (0.6)	20.0 (0.3)	1.7 (0.1)	49.1 (0.5)	21.3 (0.3)
ENPWSVM	Primal	quadprog	1.1 (0.0)	44.7 (0.7)	17.3 (0.4)	2.8 (0.0)	45.5 (0.8)	18.0 (0.4)	11.3 (0.1)	44.4 (0.5)	18.6 (0.3)	153.9 (2.8)	46.7 (0.5)	20.9 (0.3)
ENPWSVM	Primal	OSQP	0.7 (0.0)	44.7 (0.7)	17.3 (0.4)	1.3 (0.0)	45.3 (0.7)	18.1 (0.5)	3.1 (0.0)	44.8 (0.7)	18.9 (0.4)	11.2 (0.3)	47.2 (0.7)	20.9 (0.4)
ENWSVM	Dual	quadprog	3.9 (0.0)	45.3 (0.7)	17.5 (0.4)	20.1 (0.1)	45.1 (0.6)	17.9 (0.4)	158.2 (3.1)	44.5 (0.5)	18.7 (0.3)	2832.0 (34.7)	46.8 (0.5)	20.9 (0.3)
ENWSVM	Dual	OSQP	1.0 (0.0)	45.4 (0.8)	17.4 (0.4)	1.9 (0.0)	45.9 (0.9)	18.2 (0.5)	4.5 (0.1)	44.9 (0.7)	18.9 (0.4)	16.7 (0.2)	46.9 (0.5)	21.0 (0.4)
ENTPWSVM	Primal	quadprog	1.1 (0.0)	43.5 (0.7)	17.6 (0.4)	2.8 (0.0)	45.0 (0.6)	18.2 (0.3)	11.2 (0.1)	46.4 (0.4)	19.1 (0.3)	151.7 (2.7)	48.7 (0.4)	20.5 (0.4)
ENTPWSVM	Primal	OSQP	0.8 (0.0)	43.2 (0.5)	18.3 (0.4)	1.4 (0.0)	44.9 (0.4)	18.1 (0.4)	3.1 (0.0)	47.1 (0.5)	18.4 (0.5)	11.2 (0.6)	49.2 (0.5)	20.3 (0.8)
ENTWSVM	Dual	quadprog	3.9 (0.0)	43.6 (0.6)	17.8 (0.4)	19.6 (0.2)	45.3 (0.6)	18.4 (0.3)	147.8 (2.4)	47.3 (0.4)	18.7 (0.4)	2627.2 (40.9)	50.1 (0.3)	19.4 (0.3)
ENTWSVM	Dual	OSQP	1.1 (0.0)	43.7 (0.6)	18.0 (0.3)	2.0 (0.0)	44.2 (0.5)	18.1 (0.3)	4.5 (0.1)	46.6 (0.4)	20.2 (0.4)	16.7 (0.2)	49.5 (0.5)	19.4 (0.6)

TABLE NOTE: The running time is measured as minutes. Opt: Optimization methods for wSVMs. EGKL and TE (misclassification rate) multiplied by 100 for both mean and standard derivation in parenthesis.

Example 2 (Balanced, Dependent). In this example, we consider the correlated input variables. The data follow multivariate normal distribution, with $\{+1\}$ class with $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{+1} = [\mathbf{1}_5 \ \mathbf{0}_{p-5}]^T$, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{-1} = [-\mathbf{1}_5 \ \mathbf{0}_{p-5}]^T$, with the covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ as (20), where the diagonal elements of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{5 \times 5}^*$ are 1 and off-diagonal elements are all equal to $\rho = 0.8$. The Bayes classifier only depends on x_1, \dots, x_5 which are highly correlated, and the Bayes error is 0.138, independent of p .


$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{5 \times 5}^* & \mathbf{0}_{5, p-5} \\ \mathbf{0}_{p-5, 5} & \mathbf{I}_{p-5} \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

Example 3 (Unbalanced, Dependent). In this example, we examine the input relevant variables that have different levels for decision boundary and the pairwise correlation is not the same. We have unbalanced binary classification, with $n_{+1} = \lfloor 0.6n \rfloor$, and $n_{-1} = n - n_{+1}$. The data follow multivariate normal distribution, with $\{+1\}$ class with $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{+1} = [\mathbf{1}_5 \ \mathbf{0}_{p-5}]^T$, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{-1} = [-\mathbf{1}_5 \ \mathbf{0}_{p-5}]^T$, with the covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ same form as (20), except the $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{5 \times 5}^*$ takes the form of (21) and $\rho = 0.8$. The Bayes classifier only depends on x_1, \dots, x_5 , and Bayes error is 0.115, independent with p .

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{5 \times 5}^* = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho & \rho^2 & \rho^3 & \rho^4 \\ \rho & 1 & \rho & \rho^2 & \rho^3 \\ \rho^2 & \rho & 1 & \rho & \rho^2 \\ \rho^3 & \rho^2 & \rho & 1 & \rho \\ \rho^4 & \rho^3 & \rho^2 & \rho & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (21)$$

Figure 1 summarizes the estimation performance of all the methods in Example 1-3. We have three performance measures: running time to measure the algorithm complexity, EGKL to measure the accuracy of class probability estimation, and the test error for misclassification rates of classification. We make the following observations. In general, the newly developed sparse learning methods, LOTWSVM, ENPWSVM, and ENTPWSVM, outperform the LTWSVM in all examples for all data dimensions. The performance of LTWSVM is slightly worse than the proposed methods in the low dimension case ($n \geq p$) but degraded drastically in the high dimensional case when $p \gg n$, due to the fact that LTWSVM uses all input variables and the prediction power is diluted with noises. In comparison, the proposed methods with automatic variable selection keep a robust performance close to the Bayes error when p increases. The LOTWSVM keeps close performance as two ElasticNet-wSVMs-based approaches, with significant improvement of time complexity as a comparable scale with LTWSVM in high dimension case. Overall the ENPWSVM as one one-step approach has the best performance across all examples.

Figure 1: This figure contains the line plots of performance of Examples 1-3, with different colors (or symbols) denoting different learning methods. In each plot, we use the pairwise Wilcoxon signed-rank test for statistical significance measurement between different dimensions with $p = 100$ as the reference group. The significant stars above the curve follow the R standard. The global Kruskal–Wallis test shows the significance of performance differences for all methods. Each data point is taken as average and the standard error is shown as two-way error bars.




Besides the performance evaluation of the class probability estimation and classification, we also evaluated the automatic variable selection ability for the proposed sparse learning methods. Specifically, we define q_S as the number of selected relevant variables ($p_t = 5$ as an oracle in all examples), and q_N as the number of selected noisy variables. The results are shown in Table 3. We have the following observations, for Example 1, since the variables are independent, both ℓ^1 -norm (LOTWSVM) and elastic net (ENPWSVM/ENTPWSVM) based approaches perform similarly and can identify the relevant variables and remove most of noisy variables. In Example 2 and 3, when the relevant variables are highly correlated, the LOTWSVM tends to only keep a subset of relevant variables, but elastic net-based approaches, in particular, ENTPWSVM, the two-step approach, tends to identify all of them, due to the grouping effects. All the proposed methods tend to remove the irrelevant variables efficiently. In Figure 2, we show the feature importance map measured as variable selection frequency for the proposed three sparse learning methods. It clearly shows that all methods can select the right variables and remove noisy features if we have set the right threshold. Our methods have robust performance and outperform the L_1 -SVM and DrSVM in both classification and variable grouping in Wang et al. (2006).

Table 3: Variable selection in Examples 1-3

Methods	n	p	p _t	Example 1		Example 2		Example 3	
				q _S	q _N	q _S	q _N	q _S	q _N
LOTWSVM	100	100	5	4.56 (0.10)	4.84 (0.77)	2.38 (0.09)	4.05 (0.85)	2.98 (0.09)	5.38 (1.10)
ENPWSVM				4.85 (0.04)	11.73 (2.20)	4.02 (0.14)	32.00 (3.44)	4.25 (0.09)	33.68 (3.56)
ENTPWSVM				4.78 (0.06)	12.79 (2.17)	4.67 (0.07)	19.83 (2.42)	4.70 (0.06)	19.96 (2.55)
LOTWSVM	100	200	5	4.69 (0.10)	7.59 (0.71)	2.51 (0.10)	6.52 (0.99)	2.85 (0.10)	6.02 (1.09)
ENPWSVM				4.87 (0.03)	7.29 (1.26)	3.89 (0.15)	53.85 (6.65)	3.84 (0.11)	29.60 (4.91)
ENTPWSVM				4.74 (0.07)	12.07 (2.44)	4.88 (0.04)	27.22 (4.21)	4.71 (0.07)	27.44 (3.81)
LOTWSVM	100	400	5	4.31 (0.15)	11.23 (0.95)	2.64 (0.11)	9.09 (1.01)	3.01 (0.09)	10.09 (1.22)
ENPWSVM				4.88 (0.03)	9.42 (0.31)	3.67 (0.16)	55.40 (9.32)	3.67 (0.11)	28.86 (7.78)
ENTPWSVM				4.43 (0.10)	14.35 (3.39)	4.77 (0.06)	45.06 (6.18)	4.74 (0.07)	46.64 (7.19)
LOTWSVM	100	1000	5	4.30 (0.15)	19.86 (1.39)	2.27 (0.12)	15.06 (1.49)	3.08 (0.11)	17.43 (1.52)
ENPWSVM				4.91 (0.03)	18.97 (0.70)	3.66 (0.12)	18.02 (2.56)	3.82 (0.10)	22.47 (4.14)
ENTPWSVM				4.16 (0.09)	16.35 (2.24)	4.78 (0.06)	56.81 (11.03)	4.67 (0.07)	51.67 (7.96)

Figure 2: This figure contains the line plots as feature importance maps for variable selection in Examples 1-3 with various data dimensions. Different colors (or symbols) denote different learning methods. For each subplot, the upper panel is the full variable frequency map, and the lower panel is zoomed in for the first 10 variables, including 5 true features, for a clear illustration.



8 Real Data Analysis

In this section, we illustrate the performance of the proposed methods for two real-world examples: the Leukemia microarray dataset, and the MNIST handwritten digits database.

8.1 Leukemia Microarray Analysis

The leukemia gene microarray dataset (Golub et al., 1999) is downloaded from the site: https://hastie.su.domains/CASI_files/DATA/leukemia.html. The dataset includes a total of 3,571 gene expression measurements of 72 leukemia patients, with two types of acute leukemia, 47 acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) and 25 acute myeloid leukemia (AML). We randomly split the data into 38 training data (containing 25 ALL and 13 AML) and 34 test data (containing 22 ALL and 12 AML). We split the training and tuning sets of equal size 10 times and report the average performance evaluated on the test set with standard error. The result is summarized in Table 4. Though less time efficient, both elastic net-based approach has the overall best performance, and ENTPWSVM has the best class probability estimation and variable grouping. LOTWSVM has a close running time as the LTWSVM with comparable performance with the two elastic net-based approaches. Noted the LOTWSVM selected gene less than the training sample size, which is the subset of genes selected by ENPWSVM and ENTPWSVM. All our proposed methods outperform LTWSVM without variable selection ability in both class probability estimation and classification.

8.2 MNIST Handwritten Digit Recognition

For the second example, we use the MNIST database of handwritten digits (0-9) (LeCun et al., 1998) with a training set of 60,000 examples, and a test set of 10,000 examples, and loaded directly from `Keras` (Chollet et al., 2015). The digits have been size-normalized and centered as a result of a 28x28 grayscale image of 784 features with pixel values ranging from 0 to 255, and scale the value to $[0, 1]$. We use digit 6 versus digit 9 as examples to evaluate the proposed methods. We randomly sampled 250 + 250 as training data from a total of 5,918 of "6" and 5,949 of "9" of MNIST training images, and 750 + 750 test data from 958 of "6" and 1,009 of

"9" of MNIST test images. We randomly split the training and tuning sets of equal size 10 times and reported the average performance evaluated on the test set with standard error. The result is summarized in Table 4. Similar to the Leukemia example, our proposed methods outperform LTWSVM in both class probability estimation and classification, with ENTPWSVM has the best performance and variable grouping. LOTWSVM performs similar to ENTPWSVM/ENPWSVM with similar complexity as LTWSVM, ideal for scalable high-dimensional applications.

Table 4: Performance Measures for Real Data Sets

Dataset	Data Information			Evaluations	Methods			
	n	\tilde{n}	p		LTWSVM	LOTWSVM	ENPWSVM	ENPTWSVM
Leukemia	38	34	3571	Time	0.03 (0.00)	1.00 (0.02)	45.42 (3.41)	45.61 (3.62)
				EGKL	25.99 (2.72)	7.54 (1.24)	6.13 (0.41)	5.66 (0.37)
				TE	7.35 (1.26)	0.88 (0.45)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
				Selected Genes	3571	17	57	84
MNIST (6 vs 9)	500	1500	784	Time	0.33 (0.00)	0.95 (0.01)	5.35 (0.04)	5.87 (0.03)
				EGKL	10.82 (0.39)	6.39 (0.11)	5.56 (0.07)	5.50 (0.07)
				TE	1.02 (0.02)	0.31 (0.01)	0.10 (0.01)	0.08 (0.01)
				Selected Features	784	51	139	206

NOTE: The first column gives the names of the two data sets; the next 3 columns include the dataset information, the training sample n , test samples \tilde{n} , and data dimensionality p ; the remaining columns compare the performance of the proposed methods with real data. The running time is measured as minutes. EGKL and TE (misclassification rate) multiplied by 100 for both mean and standard derivation in parenthesis.

9 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we proposed and studied the new methods with ℓ^1 -norm and elastic net regularized wSVMs for robust probability estimation and variable selection in binary classification problems. The methods are highly useful in high dimensional sparse data, with the capability to remove the redundant noise variables and identify the relevant variables efficiently. Unlike the previously available methods, i.e. ℓ^1 -norm SVM and DrSVM, our methods can estimate the class probability at a high confidence level with accurate classification based on the probability

estimators, and retain the capability to select groups of variables that are correlated. We provide efficient algorithms to compute the LP and QP for class probability estimation with the right optimization method and solver available for many programming platforms such as R, Python, and MATLAB, and improve the selection process of tuning parameters for optimal results.

Several interesting directions could expand from the current sparse learning framework with wSVMs. The sparse learning methods we proposed in this paper are formulated and solved by LP and QP in R with OSQP solver. In the complexity analysis, our proposed methods, i.e. LOTWSVM, ENPWSVM, and ENTPWSVM, all depend on the data dimensionality p , which could be potentially slow for ultra-high dimensional problems, and computationally expensive for parameter tuning with cross-validation if we have limited training samples. Zhu et al. (2004); Wang et al. (2006) discuss highly efficient algorithms using solution path as a piecewise linear function of λ for ℓ^1 -norm and elastic net regularized SVMs. Developing the highly efficient solution path algorithm for ℓ^1 -norm and elastic net regularized wSVMs for super high p with robust class probability estimation would be an interesting direction to explore.

Another promising direction is to extend the current binary to multiclass with probability estimation and variable selection capability with wSVMs. There are many applications including image classification and object tracking, e.g. medical image screening with small disease target regions and lots of noise and irrelevant information. It is necessary to have an efficient algorithm to remove the irrelevant features so the model can have accurate classification and confidence measures associated with prediction. Wang et al. (2019); Zeng and Zhang (2022) proposed the robust and efficient algorithms for multiclass probability estimation with L_2 -wSVMs by ensemble learning. It would be theoretically interesting and practically important to extend the current sparse learning probability estimation framework with wSVMs for multiclass problems.

References

- BERKELAAR, M., EIKLAND, K. and NOTEBAERT, P. (2004). lp_solve 5.5, open source (mixed-integer) linear programming system. URL <http://lpsolve.sourceforge.net/5.5/>.
- BISHOP, C. M. (2006). *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning (Information Science and Statistics)*. Springer, New York, New York, USA.
- BOYD, S., PARIKH, N., CHU, E., PELEATO, B. and ECKSTEIN, J. (2011). Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, **3** 1–122. URL <https://doi.org/10.1561/22000000016>.
- BOYD, S. and VANDENBERGHE, L. (2004). *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- CHOLLET, F. ET AL. (2015). Keras. <https://keras.io>.
- CRISTIANINI, N. and SHAWE-TAYLOR, J. (2000). *An Introduction to Support Vector Machines and other Kernel-based Learning Methods*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- DEKEL, O. and SINGER, Y. (2016). Support vector machines on a budget. Tech. rep., School of Computer Science and Engineering, The Hebrew University.
- DONOHO, D. L., JOHNSTONE, I. M., KERKYACHARIAN, G. and PICARD, D. (1995). Wavelet shrinkage: asymptopia. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B* 371–394.
- DÍAZ, E. R. and CASTAÑÓN, D. A. (2009). Support vector machine classifiers for sequential decision problems. In *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC) held jointly with 2009 28th Chinese Control Conference*. 2558–2563.
- GHADDAR, B. and NAOUM-SAWAYA, J. (2018). High dimensional data classification and feature selection using support vector machines. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **265** 993–1004. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221717307713>.
- GOLUB, T. R., SLONIM, D. K., TAMAYO, P., HUARD, C., GAASENBEEK, M., MESIROV, J. P., COLLIER, H., LOH, M. L., DOWNING, J. R., CALIGIURI, M. A., BLOOMFIELD, C. D. and

- LANDER, E. S. (1999). Molecular classification of cancer: Class discovery and class prediction by gene expression monitoring. *Science*, **286** 531–537. URL <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.286.5439.531>.
- HASTIE, T., ROSSET, S., TIBSHIRANI, R. and ZHU, J. (2004). The entire regularization path for the support vector machine. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **5** 1391–1415.
- HASTIE, T., TIBSHIRANI, R. and FRIEDMAN, J. (2009). *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference and Prediction*. 2nd ed. Springer, New York, New York, USA. URL <http://www-stat.stanford.edu/~tibs/ElemStatLearn/>.
- KIMELDORF, G. and WAHBA, G. (1971). Some results on Tchebycheffian spline functions. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, **33** 82–95.
- LARRAÑAGA, P., CALVO, B., SANTANA, R., BIELZA, C., GALDIANO, J., INZA, I., LOZANO, J. A., ARMAÑANZAS, R., SANTAFÉ, G., PÉREZ, A. and ROBLES, V. (2006). Machine learning in bioinformatics. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, **7** 86–112. <https://academic.oup.com/bib/article-pdf/7/1/86/23992771/bbk007.pdf>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbk007>.
- LECUN, Y., CORTES, C. and BURGESS, C. J. (1998). The MNIST database of handwritten digits. <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>.
- LI, X., WANG, Y. and RUIZ, R. (2022). A survey on sparse learning models for feature selection. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, **52** 1642–1660.
- LIN, Y., LEE, Y. and WAHBA, G. (2002). Support vector machines for classification in non-standard situations. *Machine Learning*, **46** 191–202.
- MUTHUKRISHNAN, R. and ROHINI, R. (2016). Lasso: A feature selection technique in predictive modeling for machine learning. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Advances in Computer Applications (ICACA)*. 18–20.
- NG, A. Y. (2004). Feature selection, L_1 vs. L_2 regularization, and rotational invariance. In *Twenty-first international conference on Machine learning - ICML '04*. ACM Press, Banff, Alberta, Canada, 78. URL <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=1015330.1015435>.

- REIMAND, J., ISSERLIN, R., VOISIN, V., KUCERA, M., TANNUS-LOPES, C., ROSTAMIANFAR, A., WADI, L., MEYER, M., WONG, J., XU, C., MERICO, D. and BADER, G. D. (2019). Pathway enrichment analysis and visualization of omics data using g:Profiler, GSEA, Cytoscape and EnrichmentMap. *Nature Protocols*, **14** 482–517. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41596-018-0103-9>.
- ROSSET, S., ZHU, J. and HASTIE, T. J. (2004). Boosting as a regularized path to a maximum margin classifier. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **5** 941–973.
- SCHÖLKOPF, B. and SMOLA, A. J. (2002). *Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines, Regularization, Optimization, and Beyond*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- STELLATO, B., BANJAC, G., GOULART, P., BEMPORAD, A. and BOYD, S. (2020). OSQP: an operator splitting solver for quadratic programs. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, **12** 637–672. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12532-020-00179-2>.
- TAN, M., WANG, L. and TSANG, I. W. (2010). Learning sparse svm for feature selection on very high dimensional datasets. In *ICML*. 1047–1054. URL <https://icml.cc/Conferences/2010/papers/227.pdf>.
- TIBSHIRANI, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, **58** 267–288.
- TSENG, P. (1988). A simple polynomial-time algorithm for convex quadratic programming. Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- VAIDYA, P. (1989). Speeding-up linear programming using fast matrix multiplication. In *30th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. 332–337.
- WAHBA, G. (1990). *Spline Models for Observational Data*. CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics. SIAM, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA.
- WANG, H., NIE, F., HUANG, H., RISACHER, S., DING, C., SAYKIN, A. J. and SHEN, L. (2011). Sparse multi-task regression and feature selection to identify brain imaging predictors for memory performance. In *2011 International Conference on Computer Vision*. 557–562.

- WANG, H. and XU, Y. (2022). A safe double screening strategy for elastic net support vector machine. *Information Sciences*, **582** 382–397. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0020025521009579>.
- WANG, J., SHEN, X. and LIU, Y. (2008). Probability estimation for large margin classifiers. *Biometrika*, **95** 149–167.
- WANG, L., ZHU, J. and ZOU, H. (2006). The doubly regularized support vector machine. *Statistica Sinica*, **16** 589–615. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24307560>.
- WANG, X., ZHANG, H. H. and WU, Y. (2019). Multiclass probability estimation with support vector machines. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **28** 586–595. URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10618600.2019.1585260>.
- YE, J. and LIU, J. (2012). Sparse methods for biomedical data. *ACM Sigkdd Explorations Newsletter*, **14** 4–15.
- YE, Y. (1998). On the complexity of approximating a KKT point of quadratic programming. *Mathematical Programming*, **80** 195–211. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01581726>.
- YE, Y. and TSE, E. (1989). An extension of Karmarkar’s projective algorithm for convex quadratic programming. *Mathematical Programming*, **44** 157–179. URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF01587086>.
- ZENG, L. and ZHANG, H. H. (2022). Linear algorithms for robust and scalable nonparametric multiclass probability estimation. *Journal of Data Science*, **21** 658–680.
- ZHANG, H. H., AHN, J., LIN, X. and PARK, C. (2006). Gene selection using support vector machines with non-convex penalty. *Bioinformatics*, **22** 88–95.
- ZHU, J., ROSSET, S., HASTIE, T. and TIBSHIRANI, R. (2004). 1-norm support vector machines. In *The Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems.*, vol. 16.