

Relationship with nonnegative matrix factorization

First, for ease of explanation, let assume that the full representation" representation ($L = 1$) is used. Suppose that each \mathbf{m} has unique appropriate index from 1 to $|\mathbf{M}| = \prod_{l=1}^L M_l$ (the number of possible mutation patterns), so that \mathbf{m} can be indices of matrices.

Let $G = \{g_{i,\mathbf{m}}\}$ denote the $I \times |\mathbf{M}|$ matrix, where $g_{i,\mathbf{m}}$ is the number of mutations whose mutation patters are equal to \mathbf{m} in the i -th cancer genome. Nonnegative matrix factorization aims to find low rank decomposition, $G \sim \tilde{Q}F$, where $\tilde{Q} = \{\tilde{q}_{i,k}\}$ and $F = \{f_{k,\mathbf{m}}\}$ are nonnegative matrix, and row vectors of F are often restricted to be sum to one. We used the notation \tilde{Q} instead of Q to represent that the row vectors of \tilde{Q} are not normalized to sum to one in general.

For solving NMF, the previous study (Lee et al. 2000) used the following updating rule:

$$f_{k,\mathbf{m}} \leftarrow f_{k,\mathbf{m}} \frac{(\tilde{Q}^T G)_{k,\mathbf{m}}}{(\tilde{Q}^T \tilde{Q} F)_{k,\mathbf{m}}}, \quad \tilde{q}_{i,k} \leftarrow \tilde{q}_{i,k} \frac{(G F^T)_{i,k}}{(\tilde{Q} F F^T)_{i,k}},$$

that reduces the *Euclidean distance* $\|G - \tilde{Q}F\|$. Therefore, the optimization problem for the existing approach is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} \quad \|G - \tilde{Q}F\| \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{\mathbf{m}} f_{k,\mathbf{m}} = 1, \quad k = 1, \dots, K \\ & \quad \quad \quad f_{k,\mathbf{m}} \geq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad \mathbf{m} \in M \\ & \quad \quad \quad \tilde{q}_{i,k} \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, I, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

On the other hand, there is another type of updating rule:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{k,\mathbf{m}} & \leftarrow f_{k,\mathbf{m}} \frac{\sum_i \tilde{q}_{i,k} g_{i,\mathbf{m}} / (\tilde{Q}F)_{i,\mathbf{m}}}{\sum_i \tilde{q}_{i,k}}, \\ \tilde{q}_{i,k} & \leftarrow \tilde{q}_{i,k} \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{m}} f_{k,\mathbf{m}} g_{i,\mathbf{m}} / (\tilde{Q}F)_{i,\mathbf{m}}}{\sum_{\mathbf{m}} f_{k,\mathbf{m}}}. \end{aligned}$$

that reduces the Kullback-Liebler Divergence:

$$KL(G||\tilde{Q}F) = \sum_{i,\mathbf{m}} \left(g_{i,\mathbf{m}} \log \frac{g_{i,\mathbf{m}}}{(\tilde{Q}F)_{i,\mathbf{m}}} - g_{i,\mathbf{m}} + (\tilde{Q}f)_{i,\mathbf{m}} \right).$$

In general cases including the independent representation, there is restrictions $f_{k,\mathbf{m}} = \prod_l f_{k,l,m_l}$ by smaller set of parameters. Let us consider the following optimization problem with the Kullback-Liebler Divergence and the restrictions on F :

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} \quad KL(G||\tilde{Q}F) \\ & \text{subject to} \quad f_{k,\mathbf{m}} = \prod_l f_{k,l,m_l}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad \mathbf{m} \in M \\ & \quad \quad \quad f_{k,l,p} \geq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad \mathbf{m} \in M \\ & \quad \quad \quad \tilde{q}_{i,k} \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, I, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

In fact, this is equivalent to the proposed method, whose optimization problem can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{maximize} && L(Q, F|G) (= \sum_{i,m} g_{i,m} \log(QF)_{i,m}) \\
& \text{subject to} && f_{k,\mathbf{m}} = \prod_l f_{k,l,m_l}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad \mathbf{m} \in M \\
& && f_{k,l,p} \geq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad \mathbf{m} \in M \\
& && \sum_k q_{i,k} = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, I \\
& && q_{i,k} \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, I, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Proposition 1 *When $(Q, F) = (Q^*, F^*)$ is an optimal solution of the optimization problem (3), then $(\tilde{Q}, F) = (R^* Q^*, F^*)$ is an optimal solution of the optimization problem (2). On the other hand, when $(\tilde{Q}, F) = (\tilde{Q}^*, F^*)$ is an optimal solution of the optimization problem (2), then $(Q, F) = (R^{*-1} \tilde{Q}^*, F^*)$ is an optimal solution of the optimization problem (3), where $R^* = \text{diag}(r_1^*, \dots, r_I^*)$, $r_i^* = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} g_{i,\mathbf{m}}$, $i = 1, \dots, I$.*

Proof. This is because

$$KL(G||\tilde{Q}F) = - \sum_i \left(\left(\sum_m g_{i,m} \right) \log \tilde{r}_i - \tilde{r}_i \right) - L(Q, F|G) + (\text{constant value}),$$

where Q is row-normalized matrix for \tilde{Q} , $\tilde{r}_i = \sum_k q_{i,k}$ for each i , and $(\sum_m g_{i,m}) \log \tilde{r}_i - \tilde{r}_i$ takes its maximum at $\tilde{r}_i = r_i^*$. \square