Geometry Understanding in Higher Dimensions CHAIRE D'INFORMATIQUE ET SCIENCES NUMÉRIQUES Collège de France - June 2017

Statistics and Topological Data Analysis

Bertrand MICHEL Ecole Centrale de Nantes - Lab. de mathématiques Jean Leray



Laboratoire de Mathémariques Jean Leray





Introduction : Topological Data Analysis and Statistics **Topological Data Analysis and Topological Inference**

 The aim of TDA is to infer relevant qualitative and quantitative topological structures (clusters, holes ...) directly from the data.

• data : typically point cloud \mathbb{X}_n



 Two popular methods in TDA : Mapper algorithm [Singh et al., 2007] and persistent homology [Edelsbrunner et al., 2002].

Topological Data Analysis (TDA)

Why is topology interesting for data analysis?

- multiscale
- compact
- invariant under coordinate changes
- stable with respect to (small) perturbations
- informative



Topological Data Analysis (TDA)

• For exploratory analysis, visualization



Topological Data Analysis (TDA)

- For exploratory analysis, visualization
- For feature extraction and statistical learning





Statistics, Learning and TDA

A statistical approach to TDA means that :

- we consider data as generated from an unknown distribution
- the inferred topological features by TDA methods are seen as estimators of topological quantities describing an underlying object.



Statistics, Learning and TDA

Directions of research (non-exhaustive list):

- Consistency / convergence of TDA methods: [Chazal15 JMLR], [Bobrowski 17 Bernouilli]
- Confidence regions for TDA [Fasy 14 AoS] [Chazal 15 JOCG]
- Central tendency for persistent homology [Turner 14 DCG] [Fasy15 Nips]
- Robust methods for TDA [Chazal 17, EJS Chazal 17 JMLR]
- Representations of persistence in Euclidean spaces [Bubenik15 JMLR] [Adams15]
- Develop kernels for topological descriptors [Reininghaus 15 IEEE] [Carriere 17 ICML]
- Statistical analysis of Mapper [Carriere 17]

• ...

Homology and Persistent homology

Topological inference : under "regularity assumptions", topological properties of X can be recovered from (the off-sets) of a close enough object Y.

Topological inference : under "regularity assumptions", topological properties of X can be recovered from (the off-sets) of a close enough object Y.

- The *local feature size* is a local notion of regularity : For $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $\mathsf{lfs}_{\mathbb{X}}(x) := d(x, \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X}^c))$.
- The global version of the local feature size is the *reach* [Federer, 1959] :

 $\kappa(\mathbb{X}) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{X}^c} \mathsf{lfs}_{\mathbb{X}}(x).$

The reach is small if either X is not smooth or if X is close to being self-intersecting.



 Weak feature size and its extensions [Chazal and Lieutier, 2007] (by considering the critical values of d_X).

Topological inference : under "regularity assumptions", topological properties of X can be recovered from (the off-sets) of a close enough object Y.

$$d_{\mathsf{H}}(\mathbb{X},\mathbb{Y}) = \inf \left\{ \alpha \ge 0 \mid \mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{Y}^{\alpha} \text{ and } \mathbb{Y} \subset \mathbb{X}^{\alpha} \right\}$$

Example :

Theorem [Chazal and Lieutier, 2007]: Let X and Y be two compact sets in \mathbb{R}^d and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $d_{\mathsf{H}}(X, Y) < \varepsilon$, $wfs(X) > 2\varepsilon$ and $wfs(Y) > 2\varepsilon$. Then for any $0 < \alpha < 2\varepsilon$, X^{α} and Y^{β} are homotopy equivalent.

Topological inference : under "regularity assumptions", topological properties of X can be recovered from (the off-sets) of a close enough object Y.

$$d_{\mathsf{H}}(\mathbb{X},\mathbb{Y}) = \inf \left\{ \alpha \ge 0 \mid \mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{Y}^{\alpha} \text{ and } \mathbb{Y} \subset \mathbb{X}^{\alpha} \right\}$$

Example :

Theorem [Chazal and Lieutier, 2007]: Let X and Y be two compact sets in \mathbb{R}^d and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $d_{\mathsf{H}}(X, Y) < \varepsilon$, $\mathrm{wfs}(X) > 2\varepsilon$ and $\mathrm{wfs}(Y) > 2\varepsilon$. Then for any $0 < \alpha < 2\varepsilon$, X^{α} and Y^{β} are homotopy equivalent.

Sampling conditions in Hausdorff metric.

Statistical analysis of homotopy inference can be deduced from support estimation of a distribution under the Hausdorff metric.

Homology inference

- **Homotopy** is not easy to compute in practice.
- **Singular homology** provides a algebraic description of "holes" in a geometric shape (connected components, loops, etc ...)
- Betti number β_k is the rank of the k-th homology group.
- **Computational Topology** : Betti numbers can be computed on simplicial complexes.



Homology inference [Niyogi et al., 2008 and 2011] [Balakrishnan et al., 2012] : The Betti number (actually the homotopy type) of Riemannian manifolds with positive reach can be recovered with high probability from offsets of a sample on (or close to) the manifold.

Persistent homology

Starting from a point cloud \mathbb{X}_n , let $\operatorname{Filt} = (\mathcal{C}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ be a fitration of nested simplicial complexes.



Persistent homology: identification of "persistent" topological features along the filtration.

- multiscale information ;
- more stable and more robust ;

Barecodes and Persistence Diagrams



Barcode

Barecodes and Persistence Diagrams



Distance between persistence diagrams and stability



The bottleneck distance between two diagrams Dgm_1 and Dgm_2 is

$$d_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathsf{Dgm}_{1},\mathsf{Dgm}_{2}) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{p \in \mathsf{Dgm}_{1}} \|p - \gamma(p)\|_{\infty}$$

where Γ is the set of all the bijections between Dgm_1 and Dgm_2 and

$$||p - q||_{\infty} = \max(|x_p - x_q|, |y_p - y_q|).$$

Distance between persistence diagrams and stability



Statistics and Persistent homology

Persistence diagram inference [Chazal 2015 JMLR]



Persistence diagram inference

For a, b > 0, μ satisfies the (a, b)-standard assumption on its support X_{μ} if for any $x \in X_{\mu}$ and any r > 0:

 $\mu(B(x,r)) \ge \min(ar^b, 1).$

 $\mathcal{P}(a, b, \mathbb{M})$: set of all the probability measures satisfying the (a, b)-standard assumption on the metric space (\mathbb{M}, ρ) .

Theorem: For a, b > 0:

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(a,b,\mathbb{M})} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{Dgm}(\mathrm{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_{\mu})),\mathsf{Dgm}(\mathrm{Filt}(\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_{n})))\right] \leq C\left(\frac{\ln n}{n}\right)^{1/b}$$

where C only depends on a and b.

Under additional technical hypotheses, for any estimator $\widehat{\mathsf{Dgm}}_n$ of $\mathsf{Dgm}(\mathrm{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu))$:

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(a,b,\mathbb{M})} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{Dgm}(\mathrm{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_{\mu})), \widehat{\mathsf{Dgm}}_{n}) \right] \ge C' n^{-1/b}$$

where C' is an absolute constant.

Confidence sets for persistence diagrams [Fasy 2014 AoS]



Confidence sets for persistence diagrams [Fasy 2014 AoS]



Using the Hausdorff stability, we can define confidence sets for persistence diagrams:

 $d_{b} (\mathsf{Dgm} (\mathrm{Filt}(K)), \mathsf{Dgm} (\mathrm{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_{n}))) \leq d_{\mathrm{H}}(K, \mathbb{X}_{n}).$

It is sufficient to find c_n such that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \left(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{H}}(K, \mathbb{X}_n) > c_n \right) \le \alpha.$$

Confidence sets for persistence diagrams [Fasy 2014 AoS]

Subsampling method:

- N subsamples $\mathbb{X}_{b,n}^1, \ldots, \mathbb{X}_{b,n}^N$ of size b.
- Compute $T_j = d_H\left(\mathbb{X}_{b,n}^j, \mathbb{X}_n\right)$, $j = 1, \dots, N$.

• Compute
$$L_b(t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{T_j > t}$$
,

• Take
$$c_b = 2L_b^{-1}(\alpha)$$
.

If P satisfies an $\left(a,b\right)$ standard assumption then, for n large enough :

$$P(W_{\infty}(\mathsf{Dgm}(\mathrm{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_{\mu})), \mathsf{Dgm}(\mathrm{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_{n}))) > c_{b}) \leq P(\mathsf{d}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathbb{X}_{\mu}, \mathbb{X}_{n}) > c_{b})$$
$$\leq \alpha + O\left(\frac{b}{n}\right)^{1/4}$$

Central tendency for persistent homology



• Frechet mean [Turner 2014]

• Use an alternative descriptor of persistence : Persistence landscapes [Bubenik, 2015]

Persistence landscapes [Bubnik JMLR 2015]



$$\mathsf{Dgm} = \left\{ \left(\frac{d_i + b_i}{2}, \frac{d_i + b_i}{2} \right), \, i \in I \right\}$$

Persistence landscape λ of Dgm:

For $p = (\frac{b+d}{2}, \frac{d-b}{2}) \in \mathsf{Dgm}$, $\Lambda_p(t) = \begin{cases} t-b & t \in [b, \frac{b+a}{2}] \\ d-t & t \in (\frac{b+d}{2}, d] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

$$\lambda(k,t) = \underset{p \in D}{\operatorname{kmax}} \Lambda_p(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \, k \in \mathbb{N},$$

where kmax is k-th largest value in the set.

Stability: For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $|\lambda(k,t) - \lambda'(k,t)| \leq d_b(\mathsf{Dgm},\mathsf{Dgm'})$.

Subsampling methods for pers. homology [Chazal ICML 2015]

joint work with F. Chazal, B. Fasy, F. Lecci, A. Rinaldo and L. Wasserman

- Let $X = \{X_1, \cdots, X_m\}$ sampled from μ .
- λ_X : corresponding persistence landscape.
- Ψ^m_μ : the measure induced by $\mu^{\otimes m}$ on the space of persistence landscapes.
- We consider the point-wise expectations of the (random) persistence landscape under this measure:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Psi^m_{\mu}}[\lambda_X(t)], t \in [0,T]$$

• For S_1^m, \ldots, S_ℓ^m some independent samples of size m from $\mu^{\otimes m}$, the empirical counterpart of $\mathbb{E}_{\Psi_\mu^m}[\lambda_X(t)]$ is

$$\overline{\lambda_{\ell}^{m}}(t) = \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \lambda_{S_{i}^{m}}(t), \quad \text{ for all } t \in [0, T],$$

Subsampling methods for pers. homology [Chazal ICML 2015]

Definition: The p-th Wasserstein distance between two measures μ,ν defined on (\mathbb{M},ρ) is

$$W_{\rho,p}(\mu,\nu) = \left(\inf_{\Pi} \int_{\mathbb{M}\times\mathbb{M}} [\rho(x,y)]^p d\Pi(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where the infimum is taken over all measures on $\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{M}$ with marginals μ and ν .

Stability of the average landscape:

Theorem: Let $X \sim \mu^{\otimes m}$ and $Y \sim \nu^{\otimes m}$, where μ and ν are two probability measures on \mathbb{M} . For any $p \geq 1$ we have

$$\left\|\mathbb{E}_{\Psi^m_{\mu}}[\lambda_X] - \mathbb{E}_{\Psi^m_{\nu}}[\lambda_Y]\right\|_{\infty} \le 2\,m^{\frac{1}{p}}W_{\rho,p}(\mu,\nu).$$

Subsampling methods for pers. homology [Chazal ICML 2015]

Application: Analysis of accelerometer data.



- topological features carry discriminative information
- no registration/calibration preprocessing step needed

Commercial break: Gudhi with Statistical learning Python Libraries



and coming soon : Gudhi Stat with more tools for statistics and TDA.

Robust TDA

Standard TDA methods are not robust to outliers



$$\begin{array}{r} \cdot := & \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} B(x,r) \\ &= & d_{\mathbb{X}}^{-1}([0,r]) \end{array}$$

where the distance function $d_{\mathbb{X}}$ to \mathbb{X} is

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(y) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \|x - y\|$$

Standard TDA methods are not robust to outliers

Circle with Outliers



Sublevel Set, t=0.25



Distance Function





$\mathbb{X}^r := \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} B(x, r)$ $= d_{\mathbb{X}}^{-1}([0, r])$

where the distance function $d_{\mathbb{X}}$ to \mathbb{X} is

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(y) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \|x - y\|$$

Some possible "noise models" for geometry



Robust TDA with an alternative distance function ?



We would like to consider the sub levels of an alternative distance function related to the sampling measure, which support is X, or close to X.

Distance To Measure [Chazal 11 FoCM]

Preliminary distance function to a measure P: Let $u \in]0,1[$ be a positive mass, and P a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d :

$$\delta_{P,u}(x) = \inf \{r > 0 : P(B(x,r)) \ge u\}$$



 $\delta_{P,u}$ is the smallest distance needed to capture a mass of at least u.

 $\delta_{P,u}$ is the quantile function at u of the r.v.

$$||x - X||$$

where $X \sim P$.

Distance To Measure [Chazal 11 FoCM]

Preliminary distance function to a measure P: Let $u \in]0,1[$ be a positive mass, and P a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d :

$$\delta_{P,u}(x) = \inf \{r > 0 : P(B(x,r)) \ge u\}$$



Definition: Given a probability measure P on \mathbb{R}^d and m > 0, the distance function to the measure P (DTM) is defined by

$$d_{P,m}: x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \left(\frac{1}{m} \int_0^m \delta_{P,u}^2(x) du\right)^{1/2}$$

Distance To Measure [Chazal 11 FoCM]

Properties of the DTM :

• Stability under Wassertein perturbations:

$$||d_{P,m} - d_{Q,m}||_{\infty} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} W_2(P,Q)$$

- The function $x \mapsto d_{P,m}^2(x)$ is semiconcave, this is ensuring strong regularity properties on the geometry of its sublevel sets.
- Consequently, if \tilde{P} is a probability distribution close to P for Wasserstein distance W_2 , then the sublevel sets of $d_{\tilde{P},m}$ provide a topologically correct approximation of the support of P.

Distance to The Empirical Measure (DTEM)

Let X_1, \ldots, X_n sample according to P and let P_n be the empirical measure. Then

$$d_{P_n,\frac{k}{n}}^2(x) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} ||x - X_{(i)}||^2$$

where $||X_{(1)} - x|| \ge ||X_{(2)} - x|| \ge \dots \ge ||X_{(k)} - x| \dots \ge ||X_{(n)} - x||$



Geometric inference with the DTM

Theorem: [Chazal et al., 2011]

Let μ be a measure that has dimension at most k > 0 with compact support G such that reach_{α} $(G) \ge R > 0$ for some $\alpha > 0$.

Let ν be another measure and ε be an upper bound on the uniform distance between d_G and d_{ν,m_0} . Then, for any $r \in [4\varepsilon/\alpha^2, R-3\varepsilon]$ and any $\eta \in]0, R[$, the *r*-sublevel sets of d_{μ,m_0} and the η -sublevel sets of d_G are homotopy equivalent as soon as:

$$W_2(\mu,\nu) \le \frac{R\sqrt{m_0}}{5+4/\alpha^2} - C(\mu)^{-1/k} m_0^{1/k+1/2}$$

In practice : $X_1 \dots X_n$ sampled according to P.

Assume $W_2(P,\mu)$ small.

 $P_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$: empirical measure.

Than for n large enough, $W_2(P_n, \mu)$ is small and the sublevel sets of $d_{P_n,m}$ provide a topologically correct approximation of G.



Wasserstein deconvolution and DTM denoising



In this case, $W_2(P,\mu)$ can be large.

Ideally we would like to denoise directly $d_{P_n,n}$, but this can be hardly achieved because the DTM is not a linear functional of the measure.

Alternative approach : deconvolve the observed measure [Caillerie EJS 2011]

 $X_1, \ldots, X_n \longrightarrow \text{Deconvolved} \longrightarrow d_{\tilde{\mu}_n, m}$ measure $\tilde{\mu}_n$

$$W_2(P_n,\mu) \ge W_2(\tilde{\mu}_n,\mu) \ge \sqrt{m} \|d_{\tilde{\mu}_n,m} - d_{\mu}\|_{\infty}$$

$$(\to 0)$$

Wasserstein deconvolution and DTM denoising



Distance to the empirical measure



Distance to the estimator



DTM and persistent homology



DTM and persistent homology



$$d_{b} \left(\mathsf{Dgm}_{P,m}, \mathsf{Dgm}_{Q,m} \right) \leq \|d_{P,m} - d_{Q,m}\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} W_{2}(P,Q)$$
Take $Q = P_{n} \dots$
Wasserstein Stability of the DTM [Chazal et al., 2012]

Stability of Persistent homology [Cohen-Steiner et al., 2005, Chazal et al., 2012]

Estimation of the DTM via the empirical DTM [Chazal EJS 17, Chazal JMLR 17]

Quantity of interest:

$$d_{P_n,\frac{k}{n}}^2(x) - d_{P,\frac{k}{n}}^2(x)$$

• Observe that

$$d_{P,m}^2(x) = \frac{1}{m} \int_0^m F_x^{-1}(u) du$$

where F_x is the cdf of $||x - X||^2$ with $X \sim P$.

• The distance to the empirical measure is the empirical counter part of the distance to *P*:

$$d_{P_n,m}(x)^2 = \frac{1}{m} \int_0^m F_{x,n}^{-1}(u) du$$

where $F_{x,n}$ is the cdf of $||x - X||^2$ with $X \sim P_n$.

• Finally we get that

$$d_{P_n,\frac{k}{n}}^2(x) - d_{P,\frac{k}{n}}^2(x) = \frac{1}{m} \int_0^m \left\{ F_{x,n}^{-1}(u) - F_x^{-1}(u) \right\} du$$

Estimation of the DTM via the empirical DTM [Chazal EJS 17, Chazal JMLR 17]

Quantity of interest:

$$d_{P_n,\frac{k}{n}}^2(x) - d_{P,\frac{k}{n}}^2(x)$$

Two complementary approaches of the problem:

• Asymptotic approach : $\frac{k_n}{n} = m$ is fixed and n tends to infinity.

• Non asymptotic approach : n is fixed, and we want a tight control over the fluctuations of the empirical DTM, in function of k, which can be taken very small.

We **do not use Wasserstein stability** for either of the two approaches. Wasserstein rates of convergence [Fournier and Guillin, 2013 ;Dereich et al., 2013] do not provide tight rates for the DTM in this context.

Aim : studying the persistent homology of the sub-levels of the DTM and providing confidence regions.

Two alternative boostrap methods :

- by bootstrapping the DTM
- Bottleneck Bootstrap













Bootstrapping the DTM

For $m \in (0,1)$, define c_{α} by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n}||d_{P,m}^2 - d_{P_n,m}^2||_{\infty} > c_{\alpha}\right) = \alpha.$$

Let X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^* be a sample from P_n , and let P_n^* be the corresponding (bootstrap) empirical measure.

We consider the bootstrap quantity $d_{P_n^*,m}(x)$ of $d_{P_n,m}$.

The bootstrap estimate \hat{c}_{α} is defined by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n}||d_{P_n,m}^2 - d_{P_n^*,m}^2||_{\infty} > \hat{c}_{\alpha}|X_1,\dots,X_n\right) = \alpha$$

where \hat{c}_{α} can be approximated by Monte Carlo.

Theorem: If F_x^{-1} is regular enough, the DTM is Hadamard differentiable at P. Consequently, the bootstrap method for the DTM is asymptotically valid.

Bootstrapping the DTM

Dgm : persistence diagram of the sub-levels of $d_{P,m}$ $\widehat{\text{Dgm}}$: persistence diagram of the sub-levels of $d_{P_n,m}$. Let

$$\mathcal{C}_n = \left\{ E \in \mathcal{D}iag : d_b(\widehat{\mathsf{Dgm}}, E) \leq \underbrace{\hat{c}_{\alpha}}_{\sqrt{n}} \right\},\$$

where $\mathcal{D}\textsc{iag}$ is the set of all the persistence diagrams.

Then, Bootstrap estimate

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathsf{Dgm} \in \mathcal{C}_n) = \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{Dgm}, \widehat{\mathsf{Dgm}}) \leq \underbrace{\hat{c}_{\alpha}}_{\sqrt{n}}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\|d_{P,m}^2 - d_{P_n,m}^2\|_{\infty} \leq \underbrace{\hat{c}_{\alpha}}_{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

The Bottleneck Bootstrap

Dgm : persistence diagram of the sub-levels of $d_{P,m}$

Dgm: persistence diagram of the sub-levels of $d_{P_n,m}$.

 $\widehat{\mathsf{Dgm}}^*$: persistence diagram of the sub-levels of $d_{P_n^*,m}$.

We directly bootstrap in the set of the persistence diagram by considering the random quantity $d_b(\widehat{Dgm}^*, \widehat{Dgm})$. We define \hat{t}_{α} by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n}\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{b}}(\widehat{\mathsf{Dgm}}^{*},\widehat{\mathsf{Dgm}})>\hat{t}_{\alpha}\,|\,X_{1},\ldots,X_{n}\right)=\alpha.$$

The quantile \hat{t}_{α} can be estimated by Monte Carlo.

For both methods we can identify significant features by putting a band of size $2\hat{c}_{\alpha}$ or $2\hat{t}_{\alpha}$ around the diagonal:



In practice, the bottleneck bootstrap can lead to more precise inferences because in many cases the stability result is not sharp enough:

 $d_{\mathrm{b}}(\widehat{\mathsf{Dgm}},\mathsf{Dgm}) \le ||d_{P,m} - d_{P_n,m}||_{\infty}.$

Concluding remarks

- TDA methods focus on the topological properties (homology / persistent homology) of a shape.
- TDA methods can be used
 - as an "exploratory method", in particuar when the point cloud is sampled on (close to) a real geometric object
 - as a "feature extraction" procedure, next these extracted features can be used for learning purposes.
- TDA is an emerging field, at the interface maths, computer sciences, statistics.
- Many topics about the statistical analysis of TDA
- Applications in many fields of sciences (medecine, biology, dynamic systems, astronomy, dynamical systems, physics ...)