

Temporal Supervised Contrastive Learning with Applications to Tabular Time Series Data

Shahriar Noroozizadeh, Jeremy C. Weiss, George H. Chen

snoroozi@andrew.cmu.edu, jeremy.weiss@nih.gov, georgechen@cmu.edu



Introduction: Supervised Contrastive Learning

Contrastive Learning:

- "Similar" data points have close embeddings
- "Dissimilar" data points have their embeddings far apart
- Classification Extension \rightarrow Supervised Contrastive Learning



Temporal-SCL:

- Extending SCL to incorporate temporal dynamics
- Learning the embedding representation of time series at individual time step level

Main Contributions of Temporal-SCL

Temporal-SCL Framework Learns the embedding space with following properties:

- Predictive
- Temporally smooth
- Diverse in capturing raw feature heterogeneity

Clustering-based heatmap visualization relating the embedding space to both raw features and to prediction outcomes.

Experimental Findings:

- Temporal-SCL correctly recovers the underlying ground truth embedding structure of a synthetic dataset
- In two real-world clinical datasets, Temporal-SCL achieves competitive accuracy compared to various baselines

Real-world Clinical Datasets:

MIMIC Dataset (Static Outcome):

- Time series data of septic patients
- 18,354 septic patients
- Observed mortality rate ~20%
- Each time series has a sinale classification label

ADNI Dataset (Dynamic Outcome):

- Longitudinal data tracking the progression of Alzheimer's disease
- 11,651 hospital visits from 1,346 patients
- Different classification label at each timestep

Temporal-SCL Framework:

Temporal-SCL consists of 3 networks:

- Encoder network (f)
- Map each time step features (snapshots) to an embedding Predictor network (a)
- Maps the embeddings predicted class probabilities • Temporal network (h)
 - Encourgaing temporal smoothness of embeddings



$$L_{\rm overall} = L_{\rm SCL-snapshots} + \alpha L_{\rm temp}.$$

• Supervised contrastive loss:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{For the construction of the costs,} \\ &\text{For the set of the costs,} \end{aligned} \\ &\text{For the cost of the costs,} \end{aligned} \\ & = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \left[\frac{\exp(\langle f(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{(\ell)}), f(\mathbf{x}_{i''}^{(\ell')}) \rangle / \tau)}{\sum_{(\mathbf{x}_{i''}^{(\ell')}) \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{max}}} \exp(\langle f(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{(\ell)}), f(\mathbf{x}_{i''}^{(\ell')}) \rangle / \tau)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$((\mathbf{x}_{i}^{(\ell)}, y_{i}^{(\ell)}), (\mathbf{x}_{i}^{(\ell')}, y_{i}^{(\ell')})) \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{back}} \quad \text{s.t.} (i'', \ell'') \neq (i, \ell)$$
• Temporal-Smoothness loss:
$$\mathbf{x}_{i} = \frac{N}{L_{i} - 1}$$

$$L_{\text{temp-reg}} \coloneqq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{L_i - 1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{L_i - 1} \left\| h\big((\mathbf{z}_i^{(1)}, \delta_i^{(1)}), \dots, (\mathbf{z}_i^{(\ell)}, \delta_i^{(\ell)}) \big) - \mathbf{z}_i^{(\ell+1)} \right\|^2$$

Synthetic Data Experiment:

Model	AUROC	AUPRC	Recovery
Logistic Regression	0.902 ± 0.010	0.900 ± 0.003	0/10
LSTM	0.951 ± 0.008	$0.948 {\pm} 0.002$	0/10
RETAIN	$0.951 {\pm} 0.008$	$0.948 {\pm} 0.002$	2/10
DIPOLE	0.951 ± 0.008	$0.948 {\pm} 0.002$	3/10
AC-TPC	0.951 ± 0.008	$0.948 {\pm} 0.002$	0/10
Transformer:BERT	0.951 ± 0.008	$0.948 {\pm} 0.002$	1/10
SIMPLE-SCL	0.805 ± 0.007	$0.804 {\pm} 0.002$	0/10
TEMPORAL-SCL (no pretrain)	0.950 ± 0.009	$0.944 {\pm} 0.004$	2/10
TEMPORAL-SCL (no NN pairing)	0.951 ± 0.008	$0.948 {\pm} 0.002$	0/10
TEMPORAL-SCL (full)	0.951 ± 0.008	$0.948 {\pm} 0.002$	10/10



- Share the same classification outcome
- Raw feature vectors are "close to each other"

Sampling approach to find pairs of "similar: snapshots based on nearest neighbor pairing Nearest neighbor pairing mechanism.



(c) TEMPORAL-SCL (no NN

pairing)



				2																						
	MIMIC dataset		ADNI dataset		_	0.018	0.042	0.095	0.192	0.267	0.296	0 382	Fractio	n of De	ath per 0.523	Cluster	(Cluster 0.641	Size) 0.696	0.737	0.740	0.842	0.860	0.919	1.000	1.000	
Model	AUROC	AUPRC	AUROC	AUPRC	AST #0 (2.7, 30.0]	(793)	(3321)	(7102)	(4154)	(1467)	(2369)	(1790)	(993)	(128)	(921)	(432)	(449)	(273)	(224)	(73)	(133)	(50)	(37)	(14)	(10)	1.0
Logistic Regression	$0.745 {\pm} 0.003$	$0.499 {\pm} 0.008$	$0.845 {\pm} 0.006$	0.676 ± 0.009	- AST #1 (30.0, 49.4) AST #2 (49.4, 24343.0)													1111200210	111001000		CONTRACTOR OF					
LSTM	$0.767 {\pm} 0.003$	0.509 ± 0.005	$0.947 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.823 {\pm} 0.005$	Lactate #1 (1.3, 1.5)										_											-0.1
RETAIN	$0.730 {\pm} 0.010$	0.431 ± 0.006	$0.884 {\pm} 0.012$	$0.795 {\pm} 0.016$	Lactate #3 (1.8, 20.1)																in the second second	- ANN THE P	The second	WINDOW!		
DIPOLE	$0.767 {\pm} 0.004$	$0.453 {\pm} 0.003$	$0.958 {\pm} 0.006$	$0.824 {\pm} 0.009$	ALT #1 (24.5, 30.0)										_											-0.6
AC-TPC	0.703 ± 0.006	$0.432 {\pm} 0.007$	0.839 ± 0.013	$0.681 {\pm} 0.017$	ALT #3 (36.6, 14764.8)																				inin-	
Transformer:BERT	$0.769 {\pm} 0.005$	0.509 ± 0.003	$0.959 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.922 {\pm} 0.003$	Bicarbonate #1 (21.0, 24.0)												-	_		-						-0.4
SIMPLE-SCL	0.744 ± 0.003	$0.486 {\pm} 0.003$	0.902 ± 0.024	$0.796 {\pm} 0.020$	Bicarbonate #2 (24.0, 26.0) Bicarbonate #3 (26.0, 28.0)	-																				
TEMPORAL-SCL (no pretrain)	$0.725 {\pm} 0.042$	0.471 ± 0.001	$0.867 {\pm} 0.035$	$0.766 {\pm} 0.050$	INR #0 (0.6, 1.1]																					-0.3
TEMPORAL-SCL (no NN pairing)	$0.767 {\pm} 0.005$	0.509 ± 0.003	0.894 ± 0.062	$0.807 {\pm} 0.045$	INR #1 (1.1, 1.3) INR #2 (1.3, 1.5)									1								·				
TEMPORAL-SCL (full)	$0.763 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.510{\pm}0.002$	$0.961 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.867 {\pm} 0.006$	INR #3 (1.5, 30.0]									1											8	- 0.0

(b) Transformer

Conclusion:

- Presented an extension of supervised contrastive learning to handle temporal dynamics.
- Utilized nearest neighbor pairing to capture raw feature heterogeneity
- Our pairing method alleviates the need for data augmentation in tabular time series data

Future Work: Investigate when and why nearest neighbor pairing works in different applications .

Related Works:

- ★ SCL (Khosla et al. 2020)
- ★ SimCLR (Chen et al., 2020)
- ★ AC-TPC (Lee and van der Schaar, 2020)

(d) TEMPORAL-SCL

- ★ BERT-based Transformer (Devlin et al., 2019)
- ★ Dynamic-DeepHit (Lee et al., 2019)
- ★ DIPOLE (Ma et al., 2017)
- ★ RETAIN (Choi et al., 2016)
- ★ TCLR (Dave et al., 2022)

rld	Clinical	Data E	xperim	ient:														
	MIMIC dataset		ADNI	dataset	- 0.018	0.018	0.042	0.095	0.192	0.267	0.296	0.382	Fractio 0.428	on of De 0.492	ath per 0.523	Cluster 0.525	(Cluste 0.641	er S
	AUROC	AUPRC	AUROC	AUPRC	AST #0 (2.7, 30.0]	(793)	(3321)	(7102)	(4154)	(1467)	(2369)	(1790)	(993)	(128)	(921)	(432)	(449)	(2
on	0.745±0.003	$0.499 {\pm} 0.008$	$0.845 {\pm} 0.006$	0.676±0.009	AST #1 (30.0, 49.4) AST #2 (49.4, 24343.0)									harmon		Second		
	$0.767 {\pm} 0.003$	$0.509 {\pm} 0.005$	$0.947 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.823 {\pm} 0.005$	Lactate #1 (1.3, 1.5)				-						-		-	
	$0.730 {\pm} 0.010$	$0.431 {\pm} 0.006$	$0.884 {\pm} 0.012$	$0.795 {\pm} 0.016$	Lactate #3 (1.8, 20.1)													
	076710004	0 452 1 0 002	0.059 1.0.006	0.924 1.0.000	ALT #1 (24.5, 20.0)		_	_	_	_		_	_		-	-		

(a) Ground truth