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**Abstract**

Sparse Gaussian process models provide an efficient way to perform regression on large data sets. Sparsification techniques approach deals with the selection of a representative subset of available training data for inducing the sparse model approximation. A variety of insertion and deletion criteria have been proposed, but they either lack accuracy or suffer from high computational costs. In this paper, we present a new and straightforward criterion for successive selection and deletion of training points in sparse Gaussian process regression. The proposed novel strategies for sparsification are as fast as the purely randomized schemes and, thus, appropriate for applications in online learning. Experiments on real-world robot data demonstrate that our obtained regression models are competitive with the computationally intensive state-of-the-art methods in terms of generalization and accuracy. Furthermore, we employ our approach in learning inverse dynamics models for compliant robot control using very large data sets, i.e. with half a million training points. In this experiment, it is also shown that our approximated sparse Gaussian process model is sufficiently fast for real-time prediction in robot control.
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1. Introduction

Nowadays, Gaussian processes (GPs) are a widely used non-parametric Bayesian modeling technique\cite{2}. In contrast to other kernel approaches such as support vector machines (SVMs), see\cite{3} for more details, GPs offer a probabilistic framework. This leads to predictive distributions for test points and model selection is easy to achieve with standard Bayesian procedures. However, the applicability of full Gaussian process regression (GPR) to large scale problems with a high number of training points \( n \) is limited due to the unfavourable scaling in training time and memory requirements. The dominating factors are usually \( \mathcal{O}(n^3) \) cost for solving a linear system and computing a logarithmic determinant with respect to the dense covariance matrix \( \mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) between all available training points and the \( \mathcal{O}(n^2) \) space required to store it in memory. Furthermore, the full GPR model needs \( \mathcal{O}(n^2) \) cost per predictive test point variance, as well as \( \mathcal{O}(dn) \) for predicting the mean, if a kernel evaluation costs \( \mathcal{O}(d) \), where \( d \) is the data dimension.

To overcome these limitations in computational cost and storage requirements, many approximations to full GPR have been proposed. In Fig. 1, an illustration showing different approximation approaches is presented. Local GPR approaches, e.g. as proposed in Nguyen-Tuong et al.\cite{4}, can be used to increase modeling performance. These methods are based on a partition of the input space, where for each region a local GP model is trained. On the other hand, more sophisticated GPR approximation techniques consider either approximations of the dense covariance matrix \( \mathbf{K} \) or focus on sparse likelihood approximations. For example, covariance matrix approximations such as the Nyström method\cite{6} can be employed to reduce modeling effort. Moreover, Fourier kernel approximations\cite{7} like the sparse spectrum GPR scheme\cite{8} directly consider an approximation of the specified covariance function to increase computational speed. Additionally, various sparse likelihood approximations have emerged recently, whose relations have been formalized in the unifying framework\cite{9}. The fully independent training conditional (FITC) approximation\cite{10} uses a flexible subset of virtual training points to generate a sparse GPR model and optimizes the virtual training points along with all other hyperparameters. In contrast, the deterministic training conditional (DTC) approximation selects a representative subset of real training points, the so-called active points, that induces the sparse likelihood approximation. A variational formalism for both sparse approximation techniques, which leads to a regularized log marginal likelihood for hyperparameter learning and the additional optimization of virtual training points with respect to the FITC approximation plus a new greedy selection method for the DTC approximation, is presented in\cite{11}. Here, greedy schemes are
employed for the DTC approximation due to the high computational complexity of the optimal subset selection problem. A fast information gain criterion for insertion of training points to the active set is proposed in [12]. Smola and Bartlett, cf. [13], use a computationally costly selection heuristic which approximates the logarithmic marginal posterior probability. The same formalism as the previous criterion is used in [14], while improving computational performance by using a simpler approximation of the posterior probability. Quiñonero-Candela’s [15] selection is based on the increase in the log marginal likelihood of the sparse GP by the insertion of a training point in the active subset. In [16], Csató and Opper measure the projection-induced error in the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) and select the point which maximally extends the spanned subspace of the RKHS. Based on this idea, they also introduce a heuristic for deletion of training points from the active set. They show that removing active points can considerably reduce the prediction times for test points with only slightly decreasing generalization accuracy. All of the insertion and deletion methods mentioned above either lack computational speed, have high memory requirements, or lack of modeling accuracy. Moreover, if the regression model generation is based on a purely randomized selection or on a method with a small randomly selected subset of remaining training points for criteria evaluation, e.g. as done in [11,13–15], the performance in hard regression tasks deteriorates.

Our proposed novel sparsification method is closely related to the inclusion heuristic by Smola and Bartlett [13]. However, by employing some reasonable assumptions, we are able to significantly reduce the computational costs to the level of randomized selection, without a huge loss in model accuracy. Compared to the deletion criterion by Csató and Opper [16], our approach offers nearly the same prediction performance with lower computing time.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In the following section, we introduce the sparse GPR setting and review the state-of-the-art sparsification criteria for inclusion and deletion. Our novel strategies for fast greedy insertion and deletion are presented in Section 3. We also describe an efficient way for learning the resulting hyperparameters with a generalized expectation maximization (EM) algorithm in our specific setup. In Section 4, we report on the results of our comprehensive comparison on several benchmark data sets for learning inverse dynamics models. Furthermore, we demonstrate the real-time applicability of our learned inverse dynamics models for a compliant robot control task. Finally, in Section 5, we discuss the results of our method and give directions for future work.

2. Sparse Gaussian process regression

Let $\mathcal{D} = (y, X)$ be the training data set, where $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector of noisy realizations $y_i$ of the underlying regression function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $f(x_i) = f_i + \epsilon_i$, obeying Gaussian noise $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. Furthermore, the $n$ training inputs $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are row-wise summarized in $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. Our goal is the construction of a sparse GPR model for the underlying regression function. Csató [17] and Seeger [18] laid the foundation for this sparse GPR model under the DTC approximation which is presented below. We adopt the notation by Seeger et al. [12] to facilitate the comparability of the different criteria. Let $I$ be the index set of size $m$ of all active points $x_i$ with $i \in I$, i.e. training points that represent the sparse approximation, and $R$ be the index set of all remaining points, such that $I \cup R = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. The centered prior distribution over the latent function values $f_I \in \mathbb{R}^m$ corresponding to the active subset is then given by

$$P(f_I | X_I) = N(f_I | 0, K_I) \quad \text{with} \quad K_I = (k(x_i, x_j))_{i,j \in I} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}. \tag{1}$$

Here, $K_I$ is the covariance matrix over the active training points determined through the specified covariance function $k_{ij} = k(x_i, x_j)$. The sparseness of this method is introduced via a likelihood approximation $Q(f | f_I, X)$ that is optimized with respect to the Kullback–Leibler divergence (KL-divergence) and induced through the active training points which leads to

$$Q(f | f_I, X) = N(f | \mathcal{P} f_I, \sigma^2 I) \tag{2}$$

The projection matrix $P_I = K_I^{-1} K_{II} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, where $K_{II} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ comprises the covariance function values between all training points (notation) and the active subset of training points, maps $f_I$ to the prior conditional mean $E[P(f | f_I)] = K_I \mathcal{P} f_I \in \mathbb{R}^m$. With Bayesian inference we get the approximated posterior distribution

$$Q(f | f_I, X) = N(f | LM^{-1} V y, \sigma^2 LM^{-1} L^T) \tag{3}$$

which is proportional to the product of the prior in Eq. (1) and the approximated likelihood in Eq. (2). Here $L \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is the lower Cholesky factor of $K_I$, $V = L^{-1} K_{II} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, and $M = \sigma^2 I + V V^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ for fixed $I$ of size $m$. The approximated marginal likelihood directly follows from the integration over the same product about the active function values $f_I$ and results in

$$Q(f | X) = N(f | 0, \sigma^2 I + V V^T) \tag{4}$$

The predictive distribution for a test point $x_s \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is given by

$$Q(f | x_s, y, X) = N(f_s | k_{I}^T L^{-T} L^{-1} \beta_s, k_{ss} - \| L^{-1} k_{is} \|^2 + \sigma^2 \| L_{M}^{-1} L^{-1} k_{is} \|^2) \tag{5}$$

with the Cholesky decomposition $M = L_M L_M^T$, $\beta_s = L_M^{-1} V y$, and the covariance vector $k_{is} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ between the test input and the active points. If only the predicted mean values are of interest, the prediction vector $\alpha_s = L^{-1} L_M^{-1} \beta_s$ can be precomputed to perform computations of mean values with only $O(md)$ cost. Note that this cost depends on the calculation of the vector $k_{is}$ and, thus, on the
specified covariance function, and is typically proportional to the input dimension \(d\). The predictive variance is feasible in \(O(q^2)\) if \(d < m\). The approximated posterior distribution for all training points \(Q(f|y, X)\) induced through the active subset indexed by \(l\) is given by

\[
Q(f|y, X) = \mathcal{N}\left(f| \mathbf{V}^T L_M^{-1} \mathbf{b}_l, \mathbf{K} - \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{V} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{M}^{-1} \mathbf{V}\right)
\]  

(6)

with the estimated mean vector \(\mathbf{\mu}_l = \mathbb{E}[Q(f|y, X)] = \mathbf{V}^T L_M^{-1} \mathbf{b}_l \in \mathbb{R}^m\). Due to the matrix–matrix multiplications, the training complexity of this sparse GPR model is \(O(qm^2)\). Predicting the mean for one test point is feasible in \(O(dm)\).

2.1. State-of-the-art strategies for sparsification

Before the various state-of-the-art insertion and deletion schemes are presented, the most important symbols of the sparse GPR technique are summarized in Table 1. Most of the GP approximation techniques differ in the way, how the active set \(X_l\) is selected [9]. Sparsification deals with the insertion and deletion of training points to or from the active set. Usually, the remaining point \(x_i\) with \(i \in R\) that has maximum gain with respect to an insertion criterion \(\Delta_i\) will be selected. Analogously, we will remove the active point from the current posterior model given by Eq. (6) that has minimal loss with respect to a deletion criterion \(\nabla_i\). In the following, let \(l = l \cup \{i\}\). One of the simplest and fastest point selection and deletion methods is to randomly select one of the training points. This approach provides the baseline strategy to which we compare all other methods.

Currently, one of the best selection methods with respect to modeling accuracy is proposed by Smola and Bartlett. Their greedy scheme [13] select the remaining point that maximizes the posterior likelihood

\[
P(\alpha|y, X) \propto P(y|\alpha, X)P(\alpha|X) = \mathcal{N}(y|\mathbf{K}\alpha, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}) \mathcal{N}(\alpha|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K})
\]

(7)

for the admission of the prediction vector \(\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m\) of the full GP model under the given data set \(D\). This likelihood approach is based on the transformation of \(\alpha = K^{-1}f\) and leads to the equivalent formulation

\[
\tau_i = \min_{\alpha_i}(\tau(\alpha)) = \min_{\alpha_i} \left(\frac{1}{2} \alpha_i^T \mathbf{M}^{-1} \alpha_i - \mathbf{1}_i^T \mathbf{L}_m^{-1} \mathbf{1}_i \right) = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{b}_i^T \mathbf{b}_i
\]

(8)

in the sparse sense as pointed out in [12], i.e. \(\mathbf{a}R = 0\). The decrease in the sparse posterior likelihood derived from Eq. (7) defines the selection criterion of Smola and Bartlett (SB), i.e.

\[
\text{SB}\Delta_i = \tau_i - \tau_j = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{b}_i^T \mathbf{b}_i,
\]

(9)

for each remaining point and with the new component \(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_j\) of the updated vector \(\mathbf{b}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}\). Due to the high computational cost of \(O(nm)\) for the criterion calculation per remaining point, the criterion is only evaluated for a randomly chosen subset of cardinality \(k\). The authors of [13] recommend \(k = 59\), which they justify with a probabilistic argument. Nevertheless, they end up with high computational cost of \(O(knm^2)\) for the whole DTC approximation. The conjugation of this selection heuristic defines the corresponding deletion criterion

\[
\text{SB} V_i = \text{SB}\Delta_i
\]

(10)

which leads to cost of \(O(m^2)\) per active point.

To increase the performance of the former selection heuristic from Eq. (9), a matching pursuit approach (MPA) which reduces the computational effort but not the memory requirements is presented in [14]. Here, the authors fix \(\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}^m\) in the minimization of \(\tau(\alpha_i)\) in Eq. (8) and only vary \(\alpha_{i,j}\) with \(i \in R\). This yields the insertion criterion

\[
\text{MPA}\Delta_i = \tau_i - \min_{\alpha_{i,j}}(\tau(\alpha_i)) = \frac{(\mathbf{k}_i^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{\mu}_i) - \sigma^2 \mathbf{\mu}_i)^2}{2(\sigma^2 + \mathbf{k}_i^T \mathbf{k}_j)}
\]

(11)

with covariance vector \(\mathbf{k}_i \in \mathbb{R}^m\). However, despite the lower computational cost of \(O(dm)\) per remaining point, on large data sets or under high input dimensions they also select a randomized subset of size \(k\) for criteria evaluation to boost efficiency. An additional matrix cache that contains for example \(k\) rows of the full covariance matrix \(\mathbf{K}\) can help to speed up the criterion evaluations, but increases the memory requirements considerably.

In [12], a very fast greedy criterion with computational complexity of \(O(1)\) per remaining point is proposed. Here, the information gain (IG)

\[
\text{IG}\Delta_i = \text{KL}(\tilde{Q}_i|f|y, X) || Q_i(f|y, X)
\]

(12)

is measured by the increase in the KL-divergence between the current posterior distribution \(Q_i(f|y, X)\) following from Eq. (6) and an approximated one \(\tilde{Q}_i(f|y, X)\) after inclusion of the remaining point \(x_i\). Thereby, couplings between the latent function value \(f_i\) and the targets \(y_i\) i.e. without the \(i\)-th element, are ignored to guarantee low computational costs.

The intention of the following greedy selection criterion by Quiñonero–Candela (QC) is to increase the logarithmic marginal likelihood \(\varphi(\theta)\) obtained from Eq. (4) by the inclusion of a remaining point. This leads to the equivalent criterion

\[
\text{QC}\Delta_i = \varphi(\theta) - \varphi(\theta) = \frac{\text{IG}\Delta_i}{\sigma^2} - \log (l_{M,\theta}) + \log (\sigma),
\]

(13)

where only the change induced through the inclusion is considered, i.e. the hyperparameters \(\theta\) are fixed during the selection process, cf. [15]. More details for the adaption of hyperparameters are presented in Section 3.2. As pointed out in Eq. (13), this heuristic is closely related to the criterion in [13], since \(\beta_{i,j} \propto l_{M,i,j}\), where \(l_{M,i,j}\) is the \(i\)-th diagonal element of \(L_m\). Consequently, this criterion leads to the same computational cost of \(O(nm)\) per remaining point and is also calculated for only a small randomly selected remaining subset of size \(k\).
The idea in [11] is the same as in [15], but a regularized logarithmic marginal likelihood given through a variational (VAR) framework is increased. This results in the criterion
\[
\text{VAR}_i = \frac{||k_{ij} - V L^{-1} \alpha_i||^2}{2\sigma^2 ||k_{ii} - L^{-1} \alpha_i||^2}
\]
for active point selection. The relation to the criterion in [15] induces the same computational complexity of $O(nm)$ per remaining point. To increase performance, the disadvantageous sub-sampling on a randomly chosen subset of remaining training points is again required.

The last insertion criterion which we discuss here is introduced in [17]. Csató (CS) defined his selection heuristic over the projection-induced error in the RKHS specified by the covariance function, see [3] for more details, which leads to
\[
CS_{\alpha_i} = k_{ij} - \|L^{-1} \alpha_i\|^2
\]
with covariance vector $k_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Due to its relatively low computational cost of $O(m^2)$ per remaining point, it is possible to evaluate this criterion for all remaining points, which slightly increases the overall complexity of the DTC approximation to $O(nm^2)$. Furthermore, in [16] Csató defined a greedy deletion criterion given by
\[
CS_{\text{VI}_i} = |CS_{\alpha_i} - \alpha_i|.
\]

The main difference between the deletion and selection heuristic by Csató lies in the influence of the respective element of the prediction vector $\alpha_i$. As $\alpha_i$ is known, we also need $O(m^2)$ arithmetic operations per active point, which is equally costly as the removal heuristic by Smola and Bartlett in Eq. (10). Note that the active point of the posterior model in Eq. (6) with minimal loss in terms of a deletion criterion is always removed.

### 3. Maximum error criterion for sparse Gaussian process regression

All the insertion and deletion methods discussed above either lack computational speed, have high memory requirements, or lack modeling accuracy. Moreover, if the regression model is generated based on a purely randomized selection or on a method with a small randomly selected remaining subset for criteria evaluation, e.g. as done in [13–15], the performance in hard regression tasks deteriorates. Our novel approach aims to provide a favorable compromise between modeling accuracy, computational cost, and memory requirements.

#### 3.1. Maximum error criterion for fast greedy insertion and deletion of training points

In this section, we first discuss the successive inclusion of training points into the active subset. To include a remaining point $x_i$ with $i \in \mathcal{R}$ in the active subset, we have to update the Cholesky factors $L$, $LM$ and the matrix $V$, respectively $K_{ij}$, the vector $\beta_j$, and the mean $\mu_i$ of the posterior distribution given in Eq. (6), as shown in [12]. Thus, the cost for the sequential insertion in the $m$-th iteration is $O(nm)$.

Similar to the method of Smola and Bartlett in [13], our approach maximizes the posterior probability given by Eqs. (7) and (8). The greedy scheme in Eq. (9) successively maximizes the Euclidean norm of the vector $\beta_j$. This task is equivalent to iteratively minimizing $\|y - \mu_i\|$ for the normalized vector $y$ and, thus, approximately normalized $\mu_i$, since we have $||\beta_j||^2 = \beta_j^T \mu_i = y^T \mu_i$ after an inclusion. Due to the equivalence of norms in finite dimensional spaces, it holds true that $\|y - \mu_i\| \leq n \max_{j \neq i} |y_j - \mu_{ij}|$. In the limit, i.e. with increasing $m$, we will approximately have $\mu_i \approx \mu_i$. Since this convergence assumption holds only true for large $m$, we yield not necessarily to an upper bound for the model error after an inclusion. Nevertheless, we define
\[
\text{ME}_{\alpha_i} = |y - \mu_i|.
\]

as our new insertion criterion and select the remaining point that has the maximal error (ME) under the current posterior model in Eq. (6). This computationally efficient approach has $O(1)$ cost for criterion calculation per remaining point. The convergence assumption obviates the update of the posterior model for each remaining point as needed for other selection criteria, e.g. in [11,13,15].

In the following, we present our maximum error deletion criterion for the removal of active points. Typically, the maximum number of active points $m$ is predefined, since it influences computing time quadratically and memory requirements linearly. If a stopping criterion for $m$ is used, for example, by monitoring the averaged square training error as in [12], deletion of appropriate active points improves the predictive performance without significantly deteriorating the existing model quality. The deletion also provides a way to reduce redundancy in the greedily selected active subset. Similar to the presented insertion strategy, we opt for a greedy criterion to successively delete active points. Note that deleting an active point does not necessarily lead to a state that was previously encountered when iteratively inserting training points. The reason is that the underlying assumptions for greedy insertion and deletion differ considerably. While for the inclusion strategies Cholesky updates are sufficiently fast and stable, QR downdates based on the factorization $QR = LM^T$ are used for deleting active points since they offer higher numerical stability. This advantageous behavior is discussed in [19]. For our proposed technique, the cost for deletion of one point is equal to its insertion cost, i.e. $O(nm)$ in the $m$-th iteration of the DTC approximation. Inspired by the criterion in [17], we define our new deletion criterion as follows. Beginning with an already selected subset determined by $l$, we remove the active point with minimal value regarding the deletion criterion
\[
\text{ME}_{\text{VI}_i} = |\text{ME}_{\alpha_i}|.
\]

where $\alpha_i = R^{-1} Q^T K_i y \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Note that we use the maximum error $\text{ME}_{\alpha_i}$ instead of the expensive projection-induced error $CS_{\alpha_i}$. Thus, we obtain the same low complexity for a deletion criterion evaluation of $\text{O}(1)$ per active point. Here, we coupled the error of an active training point in the current sparse model given by Eq. (6) with its importance under prediction in relation to the behavior in Eq. (7). So, our deletion criterion controls the current model accuracy and the generalization capability.

Finally, for a better comparison the complexity of each presented insertion criterion is presented in Table 2. Thereby, the row regarding to the memory effort describes only the storage amount which is needed for the criterion calculation for only one remaining training point. Since the FITC approximation depends not on a selection criterion, the respective entries in the presented table are empty.

#### 3.2. Generalized expectation maximization for learning hyperparameters

The presented sparse GPR model depends not only on the active points $x_i$ with $i \in \mathcal{I}$, but also on the hyperparameters of the specified covariance function and the variance $\sigma^2$ of the Gaussian noise model. Let the vector $\theta$ denote the collection of all hyperparameters. For the sake of notational simplicity the dependency of the above formulas on $\theta$ was neglected. The adaptation of the hyperparameters can be realized by gradient based optimization
algorithms that maximize the logarithmic marginal likelihood
\[ q_f(\theta) = \log Q_f(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}, \theta) = -(n - m) \log(\sigma) \]

\[ -\sum_{i=1}^{m} \log(l_{m,i}) - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(\mathbf{y}_i^T - \mathbf{\beta}_i)^T \mathbf{\beta}_i - \frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi) \]  \hspace{1cm} (19)

obtained from Eq. (4). The values \( l_{m,i} \) are the diagonal entries of the Cholesky factor \( L_m \). In [11], the author uses a regularized version of the above logarithmic marginal likelihood, i.e.

\[ \text{VAR}\, q_f(\theta) = q_f(\theta) - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \text{trace}(\mathbf{K} - \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{V}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (20)

described through his variational (VAR) approach. This additional regularization term leads to correcting the Nyström approximation of the full covariance matrix in the hyperparameter learning process and gives a lower bound to the true logarithmic marginal likelihood in Eq. (19) of the DTC approximation, cf. [11]. One problem encountered when maximizing \( q_f(\theta) \) or \( q_f(\theta) \) in the variational framework, respectively, is their dependence on the active subset of training points determined by \( I \). To solve this problem, we take alternating constrained optimization steps in an expectation maximization manner employing the theory of [20]. Then, the expectation step for estimating the new posterior distribution \( Q_{\text{new}}(\int_{\theta_{\text{new}}} p_f(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}, \theta) \) from Eq. (3) with fixed hyperparameters \( \theta \) is given by

\[ Q_{\text{new}}(\int_{f_{\text{new}}} p_f(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}, \theta) = \arg\min_{Q_{f_{\text{new}}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}, \theta) \in G_{\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}}} \text{KL}[Q_{f_{\text{new}}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}, \theta) \| Q_f(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}, \theta) \] \hspace{1cm} (21)

Here, the posterior distribution in the expectation step in Eq. 21 regarding the KL-divergence is conditioned on the probability distribution \( Q_f(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}, \theta) \). That is the approximated posterior, which is induced by an active subset of size \( m \). This condition is handled with a fixed final size \( m \) of the active subset in the greedy selection process. Furthermore, the maximization step results in

\[ \theta_{\text{new}} = \arg\max_{\theta} E_{\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}, \theta} \left[ \log Q_f(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}, \theta) \right] \] \hspace{1cm} (22)

to determine an updated set of hyperparameters \( \theta_{\text{new}} \). The maximization step in Eq. (22) is realized with only few gradient ascents on the logarithmic marginal likelihoods from Eq. (19) or (20) with a fixed active point set \( X_i \), respectively. In this case, the repeated alternating computation of the E- and M-steps leads to a generalized EM algorithm, since we only increase the logarithmic marginal likelihood. Since the generalized EM algorithm converges to local maxima, the choice of the active training points is important in order to obtain a good set of hyperparameters \( \theta \). For the selection of the active subset we employ our efficient maximum error criterion to keep the hyperparameter learning fast and stable.

4. Evaluations

In this section, we compare our maximum error insertion and deletion criteria with other methods for the DTC approximation presented in Section 2. Furthermore, we also consider the FITC approximation given in [10] to present an extensive comparison. For all experiments, we use the stationary squared exponential covariance function

\[ k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) = \sigma_f^2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i)^T \Lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i)} \right) \] \hspace{1cm} (23)

with magnitude \( \sigma_f^2 \) and automatic relevance determination, i.e. with one lengthscale parameter \( \ell \) per input dimension \( l \) in the diagonal matrix \( \Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l} \), see [2]. The accuracy of the methods under consideration is measured by the normalized mean square error (NMSE), cf. [4].

4.1. Comparisons on learning inverse dynamics models

Here, a real benchmark data set from the 7 Degree of Freedom (DoF) SARCOS master arm (13922 training and 5569 test points), and a simulation data set from the SARCOS model (14904 training and 3520 test points) are used for validation, see [4,21]. Each point of the data sets has 21 input dimensions, i.e. position, velocity and acceleration in joint space, and 7 targets, i.e. one torque for each joint of SARCOS robot arm, see Fig. 3(c). The goal is to learn the inverse dynamics models, i.e. the mapping from position, velocity and acceleration to corresponding torque for each joint. Both robot data sets contain independent training and test points for all DoF.

The convergence trends with respect to the NMSE for all discussed sparse GP approximations on the first DoF from the real SARCOS test data are shown in Fig. 2(a) and (b). Here, for all DTC type approaches, the hyperparameters were learned with ten EM steps and randomized active point selection up to a final set size of \( m = 2000 \). For a fair comparison, we adapt the number of gradient steps in the FITC approximation linearly with increasing virtual training points, i.e. we use 150 + \( \frac{n}{2} \) optimization steps, as the number of hyperparameters in the FITC approximation also grows linearly with \( m \). The NMSE results for randomized selection in the DTC approximation are averaged over ten runs. The learning times and training times for the different sparsifications are further shown in Fig. 2(c) and (d), respectively. As shown by the results, the costs for insertion are similar for Smola and Bartlett [13] and Quiñonero-Candela [15], as pointed out in Section 2.1. The variational framework in [11] leads to constantly higher effort in the learning process, e.g. compared to the curves in [13,15], since the regularization term increase the cost of gradient based optimization techniques. We always use a remaining set size of \( k = 59 \) to speed up the criteria calculation of the methods above. Our maximum error approach outperforms all DTC selection criteria with respect to training times with low NMSE on test data, see Fig. 2(e). For large active set sizes, we nearly reach the same accuracy as the more costly selection heuristics in [13,15] and outperform the matching pursuit approach from [14], see Fig. 2(a). But our selection criterion performs also very well for small active set sizes, which empirically justify the adopted assumptions in the derivation of the maximum error (ME) strategy. As shown by the right column in Fig. 2, we outperform the DTC deletion criterion from Smola and Bartlett [13] and the randomized version in term of generalization accuracy. Our approach also yields the best
Fig. 2. Learning results as NMSE and learning times for the first DoF. The evaluation is performed on the SARCOS test data for different sparse GPR approximations, i.e. by Smola and Barlett (SB) [13], Seeger (IG) [18], Titsias (VAR) [11], Keerthi and Chu (MPA) [14], Quiñonero-Candela (QC) [15], and Csató (CS) [16]. The right column shows performances of different deletion criteria of the DTC approximation. Our novel strategy (ME) gives the best trade-off between low computing times and accurate prediction. As shown in Fig. 2(e), our approach yields the lowest learning curve and, thus, provides the best trade-off between model accuracy and computation time.
compromise between low computational effort and high prediction precision, as shown in Fig. 2(f). In Fig. 2(b), DTC + Random (training) describes the convergence trend dependent on the randomized sparse GP model generation which builds the base for the subsequent evaluated deletion criteria. Thus, in Fig. 2(d) presented deletion times depend on the current set size of \( m = 2000 \) and it would be helpful to read all plots in the right column from right to left. Note that all deletion schemes yield better NMSE results than the simple, randomized deletion.

In Fig. 3, we compare our maximum error selection method for the sparse DTC approximation and the FITC approximation [10] with other established regression procedures on all DoF’s for real and simulated SARCOS test data. The results for the other methods, i.e. local Gaussian processes (LGP), \( \nu \)-SVR, GPR, and random Fourier regularized least squares (RFRLS), are taken from [4] and [22]. For comparison, we also employ a final set size of \( m = 2000 \) active or virtual training points for both sparse GP approximations. We again use ten generalized EM steps for hyperparameter learning of the DTC approximation and 650 gradient ascents for optimization of virtual training points with subsequent prediction. The higher errors for the fifth and sixth DoF on the real SARCOS test data are due to more complex non-linearities in these DoFs, e.g. induced by their joint inertia. Compared to these regression algorithms, our approach is efficient and one of the best performing methods. Compared to the FITC approximation, we have much less effort for sparse model selection with higher generalization accuracy.

4.2. Compliant and real-time tracking control

In this section, we employ learned inverse dynamics models for a real-time tracking control task [23] on a PR2 robot, as shown in Fig. 4. Here, the model-based tracking control law determines the joint torques \( \mathbf{y} \) for each of the seven DoFs necessary for following a desired joint trajectory \( \mathbf{x}_d \), \( \dot{\mathbf{x}}_d \), \( \ddot{\mathbf{x}}_d \), where \( \mathbf{x} \), \( \dot{\mathbf{x}} \), \( \ddot{\mathbf{x}} \) are joint angles, velocities and accelerations of the robot, as shown in Fig. 5. This control paradigm uses a dynamics model, while employing feedback in order to stabilize the system. Here, the dynamics model of the robot can be used as a feed-forward model that predicts the joint torques \( \mathbf{y}_f \) required to perform the desired trajectory, while a feedback term \( \mathbf{y}_f \) ensures the stability of the tracking control with a resulting control law of \( \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_f + \mathbf{y}_b \).

To obtain a global and precise dynamics model, we sample 517,783 data points with a frequency of 100 Hz from the right arm of the PR2 robot. Furthermore, we train a sparse GP model given through the DTC approximation with our maximum error (ME) criterion for each of the seven DoFs. Thereby, the hyperparameters are always learned with 10 generalized EM steps, as explained in Section 3.2. We choose a final active set size of \( m = 1000 \), which is sufficient to reach a good model quality while non-linearities [24]. In this case, the gains \( \mathbf{G}_D \) and \( \mathbf{G}_P \) can be chosen to have small values enabling compliant control performance [25].
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Fig. 3. Prediction errors as NMSE (in percent) for each degree of freedom (DoF) after prediction on the test sets with real SARCOS data 3(a) and simulated robot data 3(b) from the SARCOS master arm 3(c). Overall, the DTC approximation with the novel and fast maximum error (ME) criterion performs best, closely followed by the FITC approximation.

Fig. 4. The PR2 robot.

Fig. 5. Feed-forward control with inverse dynamics models.
In this paper, we proposed a very fast greedy insertion and deletion scheme for sparse GPR or, more precisely, for the DTC approximation. Our criterion is based on the maximum error between model and training data, inspired by [13] and [16]. It leads to a stable and efficient way for automatic sparse model selection. The primary advantage of our maximum error greedy selection is the combination of high accuracy with low computational costs for criterion calculation for all remaining points.

In contrast, the insertion methods in [11,13–15] have to select a small random subset of remaining points for criterion evaluation. This random restriction can lead to poorer results, especially on harder regression tasks. Even without caching, we are nearly as fast as a randomized insertion. For the removal of active points our approach almost reaches the accuracy of Csató’s deletion method, outperforms the deletion criterion in [13], and is still nearly as fast as a randomized removal. Compared to the FITC approximation [10], all DTC methods lead to higher prediction accuracy and lower learning times. Further results on a real PR2 robot show that the proposed method can be employed for compliant, real-time robot control.
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