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## Problem and Applications

This study considers combining rank inequality constraints with a matrix manifold constraint in a problem of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{x \in \mathcal{M} \leq k} f(x), \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{\leq k}=\{x \in \mathcal{M} \mid \operatorname{rank}(x) \leq k\}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ is a submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Numerous applications exist, e.g., [ZW03, FHB04, MLP ${ }^{+} 06$, JHSX11].

## BACKGROUND

Riemannian optimization methods play important roles:

- $\mathcal{M}=\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ in most of applications;
- $\mathbb{R}_{r}^{m \times n}:=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \mid \operatorname{rank}(x)=r\right\}$ is a Riemannian manifold.

Existing methods choose the $k$ in (1) a priori. However, it is not easy to choose a suitable $k$.

- The solution with too small $k$ may be unacceptable;
- The computational time may be unacceptable with too large $k$.


## CONTRIBUTION

- Generalize the admissible set from $\mathbb{R}_{<k}^{m \times n}$ to $\mathcal{M}_{\leq k}$;
- Define an algorithm solving a rank inequality constrained problem while finding a suitable rank for approximation;
- Prove theoretical convergence results;
- Implementations based on Riemannian optimization methods.


## BASIC IDEA

Apply Riemannian optimization methods on a fixed rank manifold $\mathcal{M}_{r}$ while efficiently and effectively updating the rank $r$.

## UpDate Rank

Increase rank if next two conditions hold.

- Condition I (angle threshold $\theta_{0}$ ):

$$
\angle\left(\operatorname{grad} f_{\mathrm{F}}\left(x_{r}\right), \operatorname{grad} f_{r}\left(x_{r}\right)\right)=\theta>\theta_{0},
$$

- Condition II (difference threshold, $\epsilon_{2}$ ):

$$
\left\|\operatorname{grad} f_{\mathrm{F}}\left(x_{r}\right)-\operatorname{grad} f_{r}\left(x_{r}\right)\right\| \geq \epsilon_{2}
$$

where $x_{r} \in \mathcal{M}_{r}, \operatorname{grad} f_{\mathrm{F}}(x)$ and $\operatorname{grad} f_{r}(x)$ are the Riemannian gradients with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{r}$ respectively.


Figure 1. Strategy of increasing the rank.

## Rank-Related Objects

The new concepts of rank-related vector and rank-related retraction play an important role in updating the rank and avoiding increasing it excessively.


Figure 2. $x \in \mathcal{M}_{r} ; r<\tilde{r} ; \eta_{x, \tilde{r}}$ is a rank- $\tilde{r}$-related vector, i.e., there exists a curve $\gamma(t)$ such that $\gamma(0)=x$, $\dot{\gamma}(0)=\eta_{x, \tilde{r}}$ and $\operatorname{rank}(\gamma(t))=\tilde{r} ; R$ is a rank-related retraction, i.e., $\operatorname{rank}\left(R_{x}\left(t \eta_{x, \tilde{r}}\right)\right)=\tilde{r}$ for $t \in(0, \delta), \delta>0$.

## ALGORITHM

## Algorithm 1

1: for $\mathrm{n}=0,1,2, \ldots$ do
Approximately optimize $f$ over $\mathcal{M}_{r}$ with initial point $x_{n}$ and obtain $\tilde{x}_{n}$;
if $\tilde{x}_{n}$ is not close to a set of lower rank matrices then
if Both Conditions I and II are satisfied then

Find a $\tilde{r} \in[r, k]$ and obtain a rank- $\tilde{r}$ related vector.
6: $\quad$ Obtain $x_{n+1}$ by applying a line search algorithm along the rank-related vector using a rank-related retraction; else
If $x_{n+1}$ is accurate enough, stop end if
else
Reduce the rank of $\tilde{x}_{n}$ if the function value at a lower rank point is nonincreasing; Update $r$; Obtain next iterate $x_{n+1}$; end if
13: end for

## Main Theoretical Results

Suppose some reasonable assumptions hold:

- (Global Result) The sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfies $\liminf f_{n \rightarrow \infty}\left\|P_{T_{x_{n}} \mathcal{M}_{\leq k}}\left(\operatorname{grad} f_{\mathrm{F}}\left(x_{n}\right)\right)\right\|$ $\left(\sqrt{1+\frac{1}{\epsilon_{1}^{2}}}\right) \epsilon_{2}$, where $\epsilon_{1}=\tan \left(\theta_{0}\right)$.
- (Local Result) The sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ enters a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_{*}$ of a minimizer $x_{*}$ and remains in $\mathcal{U}_{*}$. The distance $\operatorname{dist}\left(x_{n}, x_{*}\right)$ is bounded based on $\epsilon_{1}, \epsilon_{2}$ and Hess $f_{\mathrm{F}}\left(x_{*}\right)$. The ranks of $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ are fixed eventually.

Weighted Low Rank Problem
Weighted low rank problem concerns solving

$$
\min _{X \in \mathcal{M} \leq k}\|A-X\|_{W}^{2}
$$

where $\mathcal{M}=\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, A$ is given, $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m n \times m n}$ is symmetric positive definite and $\|A-X\|_{W}^{2}=$ $\operatorname{vec}(A-X)^{T} W \operatorname{vec}(A-X)$.

## EXPERIMENTS

Algorithm 1 is compared with the state-of-theart methods for weighted low rank approximation problems.

The matrix $A$ is generated by $A_{1} A_{2}^{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{10 \times 80}$, where $A_{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{10 \times 4}, A_{2} \in \mathbb{R}^{80 \times 4}$. $W$ is a block diagonal matrix and each block of $W$ is $W_{i}=$ $U_{i} \Sigma_{i} U_{i}^{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{10 \times 10}$, where $U_{i}$ is given by matlab's ORTH and RAND and $\Sigma_{i}$ is given by randomly scaling elements from matlab's LOGSPACE

|  | k | f | R_err | err | time(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(1)$ | 3 | $2.93_{-01}$ | $8.54_{-02}$ | $2.53_{+00}$ | $1.26_{-1}$ |
|  | 4 | $3.56_{-29}$ | $9.42_{-16}$ | $2.02_{-14}$ | $1.05_{-2}$ |
|  | 5 | $7.02_{-29}$ | $1.32_{-15}$ | $2.55_{-14}$ | $9.77_{-3}$ |
| $(2)$ | 3 | $2.93_{-01}$ | $8.54_{-02}$ | $2.53_{+00}$ | $8.57_{-1}$ |
|  | 4 | $3.56_{-29}$ | $9.42_{-16}$ | $2.02_{-14}$ | $2.52_{-2}$ |
|  | 5 | $4.27_{-29}$ | $1.03_{-15}$ | $2.84_{-14}$ | $2.47_{-2}$ |
| $(3)$ | 3 | $2.93_{-01}$ | $8.54_{-02}$ | $2.53_{+00}$ | $8.39_{-1}$ |
|  | 4 | $3.74_{-26}$ | $3.05_{-14}$ | $1.32_{-12}$ | $3.19_{-2}$ |
|  | 5 | $1.36_{-22}$ | $1.84_{-12}$ | $1.04_{-10}$ | $3.17_{-2}$ |
| $(4)$ | 3 | $2.93_{-01}$ | $8.54_{-02}$ | $2.53_{+00}$ | $6.61_{-1}$ |
|  | 4 | $4.35_{-29}$ | $1.04_{-15}$ | $2.29_{-14}$ | $5.58_{-2}$ |
|  | 5 | $6.27_{-29}$ | $1.25_{-15}$ | $2.68_{-14}$ | $7.52_{-2}$ |

Table 1. (1), (2), (3) and (4) denote Algorithm 1, SULS [SU14], EW-TLS [MLP ${ }^{+}$06] and APM [LPW97] respectively. R_err denotes $\|A-X\|_{W} /\|A\|_{W}$ and err denotes $\|A-X\|_{F}$. The subscript $\pm k$ indicates a scale of $10^{ \pm k}$.
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