

# Adaptive Weighted LSSVM for Multi-View Classification

Farnaz Faramarzi Lighvan, Mehrdad Asadi, and Lynn Houthuys \*

Vrije Universiteit Brussel - AI Lab - Belgium

**Abstract.** Multi-view learning integrates diverse representations of the same instances to improve performance. Most existing kernel-based multi-view learning methods use fusion techniques without enforcing an explicit collaboration type across views or co-regularization which limits global collaboration. We propose AW-LSSVM, an adaptive weighted LS-SVM that promotes complementary learning by an iterative global coupling to make each view focus on hard samples of others from previous iterations. Experiments demonstrate that AW-LSSVM outperforms existing kernel-based multi-view methods on most datasets, while keeping raw features isolated, making it also suitable for privacy-preserving scenarios.

## 1 Introduction

Multi-view learning integrates multiple representations of the same data to improve performance. Views may come from different data types or feature groups and provide correlative or complementary information. Correlative views enhance generalization, while complementary ones lead to more robust models. A core component of multi-view learning is the fusion strategy [1]. Early fusion merges input-level features for joint modeling, but can be vulnerable to noise and prone to issues from high dimensionality. Late fusion combines predictions from separate models but may miss inter-view interactions. Mid fusion aims to balance both approaches.

Kernel-based methods are commonly used in multi-view classification tasks due to their capacity for nonlinear modeling, strong generalization performance on small datasets, and support for flexible regularization. Multiple kernel learning [2] aggregates kernels from each view to learn a shared decision function without explicitly enforcing a specific type of collaboration among views. Co-regularized methods impose pairwise inter-view collaborations. SVM-2K [3] encourages pairwise alignment, While coupling-based MV-LSSVM [4] incorporates pairwise products of the errors into Least-Squares SVM (LS-SVM) leading to complementary views that can offset each other's errors. Co-regularization methods lack capturing global interactions among multiple views. To address this limitation,  $\varrho$ TMV-RKM [5] uses tensor-based Restricted Kernel Machines for a joint optimization to create a shared latent space that aligns all views at once. Mumbo [6] is a boosting scheme that combines weak learners from each view through sample-weight updates. This method promotes complementary views by letting weak views handle the major view's hardest examples.

---

\*We would like to thank the Flemish Government under the Onderzoeksprogramma Artificialle Intelligentie (AI) Vlaanderen programme for funding this research.

In many real-world settings, data are often spread across multiple parties, and privacy concerns make data centralization difficult. Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) [7] is a privacy-preserving framework that enables collaborative training among parties that hold different feature subsets (views) of the same samples without exposing raw data but instead by exchanging model parameters or intermediate representations.

We propose a novel kernel-based multi-view classification model that captures a global coupling across views. It encourages each view to compensate for the hard samples of other views with greater focus on those it is less correlated with. Our proposed method not only shows a strong classification performance on different multi-view datasets, but also keeps the raw features isolated and has the capability to be utilized in privacy-preserving applications such as VFL.

## 2 Proposed Model

Multi-view data often exhibit differences in distribution or representation across views. This diversity allows them to provide complementary information and can be utilized for more robust learning. Motivated by this, we propose Adaptive Weighted LS-SVM (AW-LSSVM), an iterative approach for multi-view classification that captures a global collaboration and promotes misclassification error compensations across views. Unlike SVM [8] in which only misclassified or margin-violating samples contribute to the loss, in LS-SVM [9], each sample has an error variable that measures the deviation from the ideal margin constraint and contributes to the loss. This makes it particularly useful for our adaptive approach. Given a dataset  $\{(\mathbf{x}_k^{(v)}, y_k)\}_{k=1, v=1}^{N, V}$  with  $N$  samples and  $V$  views, at each iteration  $t > 0$ , AW-LSSVM solves following **primal** problem for each view  $v$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}^{(v,t)}, b^{(v,t)}, e^{(v,t)}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}^{(v,t)}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma^{(v,t)}}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N (e_k^{(v,t)})^2 + \frac{\rho^{(v,t)}}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N s_k^{(v,t-1)} (e_k^{(v,t)})^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y_k \left( \mathbf{w}^{(v,t)\top} \varphi^{(v,t)}(\mathbf{x}_k^{(v)}) + b^{(v,t)} \right) = 1 - e_k^{(v,t)}, \quad \forall k \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where,  $\mathbf{w}^{(v,t)}$  is the weight vector,  $b^{(v,t)}$  is the bias value,  $\varphi^{(v,t)}(\cdot)$  is the feature map, and  $\gamma^{(v,t)} > 0$  is the regularization parameter. The term  $\sum_{k=1}^N s_k^{(v,t-1)} (e_k^{(v,t)})^2$  with hyperparameter  $\rho^{(v,t)}$ , enables assigning extra weights to the error of certain samples while the base LS-SVM regularization term  $\sum_{k=1}^N (e_k^{(v,t)})^2$  penalizes all sample errors uniformly. We derive these extra weights using the aggregation of the misclassified sample errors of all views from the previous iteration, hence compensating for the errors from the previous rounds. To assign these weights, first the error vectors of the views in the previous iteration are modified as  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}^{(v,t-1)}$  to retain only the errors of misclassified samples and set the rest to zero. Then for each view  $v$ , they are averaged based on their normalized pairwise Euclidean distance with that of the view  $v$ . To maintain stability throughout

the iterations, sample weights are updated incrementally as follows:

$$s_k^{(v,t-1)} = \beta^{t-2} \sum_{u=1}^V \frac{\|(\tilde{\mathbf{e}}^{(v,t-1)})^{\circ 2} - (\tilde{\mathbf{e}}^{(u,t-1)})^{\circ 2}\|_2}{\sum_{u'} \|(\tilde{\mathbf{e}}^{(v,t-1)})^{\circ 2} - (\tilde{\mathbf{e}}^{(u',t-1)})^{\circ 2}\|_2} (\tilde{e}_k^{(u,t-1)})^2 + s_k^{(v,t-2)} \quad (2)$$

with  $s_k^{(v,0)} = 0$  at the initial round  $t = 1$ ,  $\circ$  denotes element-wise operation, and  $\beta^{(t-2)} \in (0, 1)$  is the decay factor that gradually reduces the increments for smaller adjustments, leading to more refined weights. By taking the Lagrangian of the primal problem, deriving the KKT optimality conditions, and eliminating the primal variables  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $e$ , we obtain the following **dual** problem:

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c|c} 0 & \mathbf{y}^{(v,t)T} \\ \hline \mathbf{y}^{(v,t)} & \mathbf{\Omega}^{(v,t)} + \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(v,t)} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} b^{(v,t)} \\ \mathbf{\alpha}^{(v,t)} \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \mathbf{1}_N \end{array} \right] \quad (3)$$

where,  $\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(v,t)} = \text{diag}((\gamma^{(v,t)} + \rho^{(v,t)} e_1^{(v,t)})^{-1}, \dots, (\gamma^{(v,t)} + \rho^{(v,t)} e_N^{(v,t)})^{-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ ,  $\mathbf{\Omega}^{(v,t)}$  is a labeled kernel matrix with elements  $\Omega_{ij} = y_i y_j K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$  using a kernel function  $K : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Solving Eq.(3), yields dual variables  $\mathbf{\alpha}^{(v,t)} \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and a bias variable  $b^{(v,t)} \in \mathbb{R}$  that can be used to compute the error vector of training samples for the next iteration as follows:

$$\mathbf{e}^{(v,t)} = \mathbf{y} - (\mathbf{\Omega}^{(v,t)} \mathbf{\alpha}^{(v,t)} + b^{(v,t)} \mathbf{1}) \quad (4)$$

For multiclass AW-LSSVM, one-vs-all label encoding produces multiple binary subproblems for each view, which can then be solved in a block-structured dual form similar to the structure in multiclass LS-SVM classification [4, Eq.(6)]. After a fixed number of iterations  $T$ , we use the following decision rule to classify a new unseen test data point  $\mathbf{x}^*$ :

$$\hat{y}_k = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{v=1}^V \sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k^{(v,T)} y_k K(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}_k^{(v)}) + b^{(v,T)} \quad (5)$$

Eq.(5) aggregates soft scores from each view's classifier by simply averaging them. The ability of AW-LSSVM to keep the raw features isolated across views makes it well-suited for privacy-preserving learning schemes such as VFL.

### 3 Experiments and results

We conducted experiments on nine multi-view datasets<sup>1</sup> [10–16], whose statistical properties are summarized in Table 1. Following the experimental setup of the baseline methods, stratified downsampling was applied to large datasets, and only the top classes were retained in datasets with more than 10 classes.

<sup>1</sup>Data is available at <https://github.com/ChuanbinZhang/Multi-view-datasets?tab=readme-ov-file>

| Dataset | ACM  | MSRC | 3Sources | Cora | Caltech | NUSWIDE | Prokaryotic | ProteinFold | Flower |
|---------|------|------|----------|------|---------|---------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| Samples | 350↓ | 210  | 169      | 350↓ | 369↓    | 360↓    | 551         | 302↓        | 500↓   |
| Views   | 5    | 5    | 3        | 4    | 6       | 5       | 3           | 12          | 7      |
| Classes | 3    | 7    | 6        | 7    | 7↓      | 6↓      | 4           | 6↓          | 10     |

Table 1: Properties of the multi-view datasets used in experiments. ↓ indicates downsampling or reduced classes from the original datasets.

We compare AW-LSSVM with the baseline models **BSV**, **Early Fusion**, and **Late Fusion** as well as the state-of-the-art kernel-based classifiers **MV-LSSVM** [4], **EasyMKL** [2], **Mumbo** [6], and  $\varrho$ **TMV-RKM** [5]. **BSV** applies LSSVM on each view separately, reporting the best-performing view. **Early Fusion** concatenates all view features before training a single LSSVM, while **Late Fusion** combines predictions of view-specific classifiers via majority voting.

For hyperparameter tuning<sup>2</sup>, each dataset is divided into three distinct train-test splits, and on each train split, dual annealing is applied using three-fold cross-validation. The final results in Table 2 report the balanced accuracy score over the three hold-out test splits, using their respective best parameters. The last four rows of the table correspond to our proposed AMV-LSSVM model using different numbers of iterations  $T$  ( $T = 1$  being the initial LS-SVM round) with  $\beta = 0.7$ .

The results show that AW-LSSVM achieves the highest performance on six datasets and a competitive performance on the other three. This improvement of our proposed model arises from the global misclassified sample compensation that effectively imposes complementary collaboration among views meaning each view classifier is not only fitted on its own data but also has focused on the weaknesses of the others. AW-LSSVM generally shows stronger performance on datasets with a large number of views. The very low late-fusion result on Cora indicates that the majority of the views are weak, making uniform score averaging ineffective. This aligns with the strong performance of EasyMKL, which applies weighted kernel averaging. Therefore, incorporating a weighted averaging strategy based on measures such as the error covariance matrix could further enhance the AW-LSSVM decision rule. AW-LSSVM often exhibits improving performance over the iterations with the chosen decay parameter  $\beta = 0.7$ . However, tuning this parameter can lead to better refined results on all datasets.

### 3.1 Statistical analysis

For statistical analysis of the performance improvement of AW-LSSVM over baseline methods, we conducted pairwise Wilcoxon signed-rank [17] tests across the nine datasets. In particular, when compared against BSV, EarlyFusion, Late Fusion, MV-LSSVM, and Mumbo, the Wilcoxon statistics are all  $T = 0.0$  with  $p < 0.05$ , indicating that our method consistently outperforms these methods across every dataset, with no observed negative performance differences.

<sup>2</sup>To reduce the timing complexity the same kernel function (RBF) and regularization hyperparameters are assumed for all views (except for BSV)

| Method            | Datasets                    |                             |                             |                             |                             |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                   | ACM                         | MSRC                        | 3Sources                    | Cora                        | Caltech                     |
| BSV               | 82.08( $\pm 0.08$ )         | 94.44( $\pm 2.45$ )         | 72.50( $\pm 12.31$ )        | 44.18( $\pm 7.54$ )         | 83.33( $\pm 14.87$ )        |
| Early Fusion      | 83.99( $\pm 4.34$ )         | 97.62( $\pm 2.38$ )         | 67.10( $\pm 7.65$ )         | 51.96( $\pm 4.05$ )         | 84.13( $\pm 8.36$ )         |
| Late Fusion       | 84.43( $\pm 3.01$ )         | 93.59( $\pm 2.29$ )         | 59.72( $\pm 1.93$ )         | 21.27( $\pm 2.51$ )         | 65.87( $\pm 15.71$ )        |
| MV-LSSVM          | 84.47( $\pm 3.76$ )         | 98.41( $\pm 2.75$ )         | 44.88( $\pm 16.91$ )        | 48.81( $\pm 4.18$ )         | 84.70( $\pm 8.36$ )         |
| EasyMKL           | 81.84( $\pm 7.76$ )         | 97.61( $\pm 1.94$ )         | 68.98( $\pm 9.64$ )         | <b>63.63</b> ( $\pm 5.62$ ) | 84.12( $\pm 6.82$ )         |
| Mumbo             | 80.66( $\pm 2.00$ )         | 95.25( $\pm 3.88$ )         | 76.25( $\pm 5.15$ )         | 33.44( $\pm 6.08$ )         | 73.80( $\pm 13.46$ )        |
| $\varrho$ TMV-RKM | 84.92( $\pm 4.64$ )         | 96.83( $\pm 1.37$ )         | <b>88.21</b> ( $\pm 4.28$ ) | 52.66( $\pm 4.25$ )         | 81.75( $\pm 9.62$ )         |
| AW-LSSVM $_{T=2}$ | 84.43( $\pm 2.49$ )         | <b>99.21</b> ( $\pm 1.37$ ) | 74.85( $\pm 15.58$ )        | 53.23( $\pm 9.91$ )         | <b>86.29</b> ( $\pm 8.79$ ) |
| AW-LSSVM $_{T=3}$ | <b>85.44</b> ( $\pm 4.23$ ) | 99.21( $\pm 1.37$ )         | 81.64( $\pm 5.88$ )         | 58.67( $\pm 5.83$ )         | 72.22( $\pm 19.25$ )        |
| AW-LSSVM $_{T=4}$ | 84.43( $\pm 4.23$ )         | 99.21( $\pm 1.37$ )         | 74.51( $\pm 19.56$ )        | 58.67( $\pm 5.83$ )         | 80.16( $\pm 11.98$ )        |
| AW-LSSVM $_{T=5}$ | 83.91( $\pm 1.58$ )         | 99.21( $\pm 1.37$ )         | 77.47( $\pm 14.44$ )        | 58.67( $\pm 5.83$ )         | 80.16( $\pm 11.96$ )        |
| Method            | Datasets                    |                             |                             |                             |                             |
|                   | NUSWIDE                     | Prokaryotic                 | ProteinFold                 | Flower                      |                             |
| BSV               | 34.72( $\pm 2.78$ )         | 66.05( $\pm 4.64$ )         | 71.88( $\pm 4.14$ )         | 72.67( $\pm 5.03$ )         |                             |
| Early Fusion      | 46.76( $\pm 3.21$ )         | 63.19( $\pm 7.93$ )         | 76.99( $\pm 1.11$ )         | 83.67( $\pm 2.52$ )         |                             |
| Late Fusion       | 37.49( $\pm 8.34$ )         | 56.69( $\pm 4.85$ )         | 69.39( $\pm 6.24$ )         | 75.33( $\pm 4.49$ )         |                             |
| MV-LSSVM          | 46.76( $\pm 3.21$ )         | 73.50( $\pm 5.01$ )         | 79.35( $\pm 7.53$ )         | 84.67( $\pm 3.21$ )         |                             |
| EasyMKL           | 42.12( $\pm 0.65$ )         | 80.20( $\pm 4.91$ )         | 77.61( $\pm 9.31$ )         | 84.33( $\pm 1.69$ )         |                             |
| Mumbo             | 37.96( $\pm 1.30$ )         | 66.49( $\pm 7.98$ )         | 76.64( $\pm 5.94$ )         | n/a                         |                             |
| $\varrho$ TMV-RKM | 44.44( $\pm 3.67$ )         | <b>80.51</b> ( $\pm 4.88$ ) | 78.19( $\pm 3.59$ )         | 84.67( $\pm 2.08$ )         |                             |
| AW-LSSVM $_{T=2}$ | 44.44( $\pm 5.56$ )         | 80.30( $\pm 5.58$ )         | 78.26( $\pm 7.00$ )         | 85.67( $\pm 4.14$ )         |                             |
| AW-LSSVM $_{T=3}$ | 43.52( $\pm 4.01$ )         | 73.70( $\pm 4.46$ )         | 75.72( $\pm 12.14$ )        | 85.33( $\pm 4.73$ )         |                             |
| AW-LSSVM $_{T=4}$ | 46.76( $\pm 5.78$ )         | 76.08( $\pm 6.47$ )         | 80.30( $\pm 8.51$ )         | <b>86.33</b> ( $\pm 3.06$ ) |                             |
| AW-LSSVM $_{T=5}$ | <b>47.22</b> ( $\pm 4.81$ ) | 74.56( $\pm 7.54$ )         | <b>80.67</b> ( $\pm 7.89$ ) | 86.33( $\pm 3.06$ )         |                             |

Table 2: Mean and std. of balanced accuracy score on three hold-out test splits. **Bold** values indicate the highest score.

The comparison with EasyMKL yields a Wilcoxon statistic of  $T = 7.0$  and  $p = 0.07$ ; although our method tends to perform better on most datasets, the difference does not reach statistical significance at the 5% level, suggesting only a marginal improvement. Finally, the comparison with  $\varrho$ TMV-RKM produces  $T = 9.0$  and  $p = 0.1$ , indicating no significant difference between the two methods. Overall, these results show that AW-LSSVM delivers substantial and statistically significant gains over state-of-the-art alternatives, while performing comparably to the strongest competing method,  $\varrho$ TMV-RKM.

## 4 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper introduced AW-LSSVM, a multi-view classification method that promotes global collaboration across views through adaptive sample reweightings.

By iteratively emphasizing samples that are hard for other views, the model leverages complementary information without exchanging raw features. Experiments on nine datasets show consistent accuracy improvement over existing kernel-based approaches. The ability to operate using only view-level decision scores and errors makes AW-LSSVM suitable for privacy-preserving settings, such as VFL. Future work will explore its integration within FL frameworks and examine its robustness to adversarial attacks and raw-data inference. Extending AW-LSSVM to semi-supervised settings is another promising research direction.

## References

- [1] Francisco Mena, Diego Arenas, Marlon Nuske, and Andreas Dengel. Common practices and taxonomy in deep multiview fusion for remote sensing applications. *IEEE J-STARS*, 17:4797–4818, 2024.
- [2] Fabio Aioli and Michele Donini. Easymkl: a scalable multiple kernel learning algorithm. *Neurocomputing*, 169:215–224, 2015.
- [3] Jason Farquhar, David Hardoon, Hongying Meng, John Shawe-Taylor, and Sandor Szepesvári. Two view learning: SVM-2K, theory and practice. *NIPS*, pages 1–8, 2005.
- [4] Lynn Houthuys, Rocco Langone, and Johan AK Suykens. Multi-view least squares support vector machines classification. *Neurocomputing*, 282:78–88, 2018.
- [5] Lynn Houthuys and Johan AK Suykens. Tensor-based restricted kernel machines for multi-view classification. *Information Fusion*, 68:54–66, 2021.
- [6] Sokol Koço and Cécile Capponi. A boosting approach to multiview classification with cooperation. In *ECML PKDD*, pages 209–228, 2011.
- [7] Yang Liu, Yan Kang, Tianyuan Zou, Yanhong Pu, Yuanqin He, and Xiaozhou et al. Ye. Vertical federated learning: Concepts, advances, and challenges. *IEEE TKDE*, 36(7):3615–3634, 2024.
- [8] Corinna Cortes and Vladimir Vapnik. Support-vector networks. *Machine learning*, 20(3):273–297, 1995.
- [9] Johan AK Suykens, Tony Van Gestel, Joseph De Brabanter, Bart De Moor, and Joos PL Vandewalle. *Least squares support vector machines*. World scientific, 2002.
- [10] John Winn and Nebojsa Jojic. Locus: Learning object classes with unsupervised segmentation. In *IEEE ICCV*, pages 756–763, 2005.
- [11] Jialu Liu, Chi Wang, Jing Gao, and Jiawei Han. Multi-view clustering via joint nonnegative matrix factorization. In *ICDM*, pages 252–260, 2013.
- [12] Li Fei-Fei, Rob Fergus, and Pietro Perona. Learning generative visual models from few training examples: An incremental bayesian approach tested on 101 object categories. In *IEEE CVPR*, pages 178–185, 2004.
- [13] Tat-Seng Chua, Jianchao Tang, Ruixing Hong, Hao Li, Yunhong Luo, and Yunde Zheng. NUS-WIDE: A real-world web image database from national university of singapore. In *ACM International Conference on MIR*, pages 1–9, 2009.
- [14] Prithviraj Sen, Galileo Namata, Mustafa Bilgic, Lise Getoor, Brian Gallagher, and Tina Eliassi-Rad. Collective classification in network data. In *Workshop on MLG at ICKDDM*, pages 1–6, 2008.
- [15] Maria Brbić, Matija Piškorec, Vedrana Vidulin, Anita Kriško, Tomislav Šmuc, and Fran Supek. The landscape of microbial phenotypic traits and associated genes. *NAR*, 44:10074–10090, 2016.
- [16] Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. A visual vocabulary for flower classification. In *IEEE CVPR*, pages 2:1447–1454, 2006.
- [17] Janez Demšar. Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets. *JMLR*, 7:1–30, 2006.