Lecture 3: Low-rank matrix approximation



School of Mathematical Sciences, Xiamen University

Data Analysis & Matrix Comp.

Lecture 3

Xiamen University 1 / 12

- 1. Low-rank matrix approximation problem via matvecs
 - Suppose $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is accessible via matvecs $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \mathbf{B}^{\top}\mathbf{y}$. The task is to produce a low-rank approximation of \mathbf{B} that is competitive with a best approximation of similar rank.
 - The best rank-k approximation is unique if and only if $\sigma_k > \sigma_{k+1}$:

$$\min_{\operatorname{rank}(\mathbf{M}) \le k} \|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{M}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 = \|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{U}_k^\top \mathbf{B}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 = \sum_{i > k} \sigma_i^2,$$

where \mathbf{U}_k is the matrix consisting of the leading k left singular vectors. Cost: $\mathcal{O}(mnp)$ where $p = \min(m, n)$.

• Let s = k + l for a small natural number l. For a tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$, we seek a rank-s approximation $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_s$ that competes with the best rank-k approximation:

$$\|\mathbf{B} - \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_s\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 \le (1+\varepsilon) \|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{U}_k^\top \mathbf{B}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 = (1+\varepsilon) \sum_{i > k} \sigma_i^2.$$

1.1 Randomized SVD: Intuition

• Draw a standard normal test vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. we have

$$\mathbf{B}\mathbf{w} = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i (\mathbf{v}_i^{\top} \mathbf{w}) := \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \widehat{w}_i.$$

The component $\widehat{w}_i := \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{w}$ of the random vector along the *i*th right singular vector follows a standard normal distribution, and the components $(\widehat{w}_i, i = 1, \dots, p)$ compose an independent family.

- On average, $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{w}_i^2) = 1$. Therefore, the image **Bw** tends to align with the left singular vectors associated with large singular values.
- By repeating this process with a statistically independent family $(\mathbf{w}^{(j)}: j = 1, ..., s)$ of random test vectors, we can obtain a family $(\mathbf{Bw}^{(j)}: j = 1, ..., s)$ of vectors whose span contains most of range (\mathbf{U}_k) . The number s = k + l of test vectors needs to be a bit larger than the target rank k to obtain coverage of the subspace with high probability.

- **1.2 Randomized SVD: Algorithm** (cost O(smn))
 - For a rank parameter s, we draw a random test matrix:

$$\mathbf{\Omega} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}^{(1)} & \cdots & \mathbf{w}^{(s)} \end{bmatrix}$$
 where $\mathbf{w}^{(j)} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$ i.i.d.

• We obtain $\mathbf{Y} := \mathbf{B}\Omega$. The orthogonal projector $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Y}}$ onto range (\mathbf{Y}) serves as a proxy for the ideal projector $\mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{U}_k^{\top}$. Computationally,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Y}} := \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^{\top} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{Q} := \operatorname{orth}(\mathbf{Y}).$$

The function orth returns an orthonormal basis and costs $\mathcal{O}(s^2m)$. • Finally, we report the approximation $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_s$ in factored form:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_s := \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Y}} \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{B}).$$

• If desired, we can report the SVD of the approximation after a small amount of additional work $(\mathcal{O}(s^2n))$:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_s = (\mathbf{Q}\widehat{\mathbf{U}}_0)\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \quad \text{where} \quad (\widehat{\mathbf{U}}_0,\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}},\widehat{\mathbf{V}}) = \text{svd}(\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{B}).$$

Algorithm: Randomized SVD.

$$\begin{split} & \boldsymbol{\Omega} = \operatorname{randn}(n, s) \\ & \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\Omega} \\ & \mathbf{Q} = \operatorname{orth}(\mathbf{Y}) \\ & \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Q}^{\top}\mathbf{B} \\ & (\widehat{\mathbf{U}}_0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}, \widehat{\mathbf{V}}) = \operatorname{svd}(\mathbf{C}) \\ & \widehat{\mathbf{U}} = \mathbf{Q}\widehat{\mathbf{U}}_0 \end{split}$$

Theorem 1

Consider a matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and fix the target rank $k \leq p$. When $s \geq k+2$, the randomized SVD method produces a random rank-s approximation $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_s$ that satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{B} - \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_s\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 \le \left(1 + \frac{k}{s-k-1}\right) \sum_{i>k} \sigma_i^2(\mathbf{B}).$$

Proof. See A. Kireeva and J.A. Tropp, arXiv:2402.17873, 2024.

1.3 Randomized subspace iteration

Algorithm: Randomized subspace iteration.

$$\mathbf{X}_{0} = \operatorname{randn}(n, s)$$

$$\mathbf{for} \ t = 1, 2, \dots, T$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_{t} := \operatorname{orth}(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_{t-1})$$

$$\mathbf{X}_{t} := \mathbf{B}^{\top}\mathbf{Q}_{t}$$

$$\mathbf{end}$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{s} := \mathbf{Q}_{T}\mathbf{X}_{T}^{\top}$$

- Randomized SVD is the special case of this algorithm with T = 1.
- Randomized subspace iteration produces approximations

$$\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_s = \mathbf{Q}_t(\mathbf{Q}_t^{\top} \mathbf{B}) \text{ where } \mathbf{Q}_t = \operatorname{orth}((\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^{\top})^{t-1} \mathbf{B}\mathbf{\Omega}) \text{ for } t = 1, 2, \dots$$

• Much as the block power method drives its iterates toward the leading eigenspace, subspace iteration drives $\operatorname{range}(\mathbf{Q}_t)$ so that it aligns with $\operatorname{range}(\mathbf{U}_k)$, the leading left singular subspace of **B**.

6 / 12

2. Low-rank spsd approximation from entries

Consider an spsd matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that we access via entry evaluations: $(j, k) \mapsto a_{jk}$. The task is to produce a low-rank spsd approximation of \mathbf{A} using as few as entry evaluations.

2.1 Column Nyström approximation

• Given a list $S \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, ..., n\}$ of column indices, the column Nyström approximation:

$$\mathbf{A}_{\langle S \rangle} := \mathbf{A}(:,S)\mathbf{A}(S,S)^{\dagger}\mathbf{A}(S,:).$$

- The column Nyström approximation has several remarkable properties: (1) range $(\mathbf{A}_{\langle S \rangle}) = \operatorname{range}(\mathbf{A}(:,S))$; (2) $\mathbf{0} \preccurlyeq \mathbf{A}_{\langle S \rangle} \preccurlyeq \mathbf{A}$.
- Our goal is to find a set S of s columns that make the error

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_{\langle S \rangle}\|_* = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_{\langle S \rangle})$$

as small as possible. ($\|\mathbf{A}\|_*$: the sum of singular values of \mathbf{A})

7 / 12

2.2 Pivoted partial Cholesky

• Set
$$\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_0 := \mathbf{0}$$
 and $\mathbf{A}_0 := \mathbf{A}$.

At each step t = 1, 2, ..., s, select $i_t \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}$, and update

$$\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_t := \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{t-1} + \frac{\mathbf{A}_{t-1}(:,i_t)\mathbf{A}_{t-1}(i_t,:)}{\mathbf{A}_{t-1}(i_t,i_t)};$$
$$\mathbf{A}_t := \mathbf{A}_{t-1} - \frac{\mathbf{A}_{t-1}(:,i_t)\mathbf{A}_{t-1}(i_t,:)}{\mathbf{A}_{t-1}(i_t,i_t)}.$$

Exercise: Prove the following results: (i) $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_t + \mathbf{A}_t = \mathbf{A}$;

(ii) diag(
$$\mathbf{A}_t$$
) = diag(\mathbf{A}_{t-1}) - $\frac{1}{\mathbf{A}_{t-1}(i_t, i_t)}$ | $\mathbf{A}_{t-1}(:, i_t)$ |².

Proposition 2

Suppose that we apply the pivoted partial Cholesky algorithm to an spsd matrix \mathbf{A} , and we select i_t from S in any order. Then $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{|S|} = \mathbf{A}_{\langle S \rangle}$, where |S| denotes the number of elements of the set S.

Data Analysis & Matrix Comp.

2.3 Pivoted partial Cholesky: evaluating fewer entries

• Set $\mathbf{F}_0 := \mathbf{0}$. At step t = 1, 2, ..., s, select $i_t \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ and set

$$\mathbf{c}_t := \mathbf{A}(:, i_t) - \mathbf{F}_{t-1}(\mathbf{F}_{t-1}(i_t, :))^\top.$$

Update $\mathbf{F}_t := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{t-1} & \mathbf{c}_t / \sqrt{\mathbf{c}_t(i_t)} \end{bmatrix}$.

Exercise: Prove that $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_t = \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{F}_t^{\top}$ for $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots, s$.

2.4 Pivot selection rules

- Uniform random pivoting: i_t ~ uniform{1, 2, ..., n}.
 Assumption: data points represent an i.i.d. sample from a population, so one is just as good as another.
- Greedy pivoting: $i_t \in \operatorname{argmax} \{ \mathbf{A}_{t-1}(i, i) : i = 1, 2, \dots, n \}$. Note that $\mathbf{A}_t(i_t, i_t) = 0$.
- Importance sampling pivoting: $\mathbb{P}\{i_t = j\} = \mathbf{A}_{t-1}(j, j) / \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}_{t-1})$. Balance between uniform random and greedy.

2.5 Randomly pivoted partial Cholesky

Algorithm: Randomly pivoted partial Cholesky.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F} &= \operatorname{zeros}(n, s) & (\operatorname{Preallocation}) \\ \mathbf{d} &= \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{A}) \\ & \mathbf{for} \ t = 1, 2, \dots, s \\ & \operatorname{Sample} \ i_t \sim \mathbf{d} / \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{d}(j) \\ & \mathbf{c} &= \mathbf{A}(:, i_t) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{F}(i_t, :))^\top \\ & \mathbf{F}(:, t) &= \mathbf{c} / \sqrt{\mathbf{c}(i_t)} \\ & \mathbf{d} &= \mathbf{d} - |\mathbf{F}(:, t)|^2 \\ & \mathbf{d} &= \max\{\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{0}\} & (\operatorname{Improve numerical stability}) \\ & \operatorname{Stop when} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{d}(j) < \eta \cdot \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}) & (\operatorname{Optional}) \\ & \mathbf{end} \end{aligned}$$

• To produce a rank-s approximation, the algorithm only requires (s+1)n - s entries of **A**: its diagonal and the s pivot columns.

 Define the expected residual map: Φ(A) := E(A₁). This function measures the average progress that we make after one step of the algorithm. A quick calculation yields a formula for the expected residual map:

$$\Phi(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[\mathbf{A} - \frac{\mathbf{A}(:,j)\mathbf{A}(j,:)}{\mathbf{A}(j,j)} \right] \frac{\mathbf{A}(j,j)}{\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A})}$$
$$= \mathbf{A} - \frac{1}{\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A})} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{A}(:,j)\mathbf{A}(j,:) = \mathbf{A} - \frac{\mathbf{A}^{2}}{\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A})}.$$

As a result, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}_1)) = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{A}_1)) = \left(1 - \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}^2)}{(\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}))^2}\right) \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}) \le \frac{n-1}{n} \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}).$$

In each iteration, we decrease the expected trace of the residual on average.

11 / 12

• The best rank-k approximation in $\|\cdot\|_*$:

$$\min_{\operatorname{rank}(\mathbf{M}) \leq k} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{M}\|_* = \sum_{j > k} \sigma_j(\mathbf{A}).$$

• Fix a comparison rank k and a tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$. Randomly pivoted Cholesky produces an approximation $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_s$ that attains the error bound

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{A} - \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_s\|_{\star}) \le (1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{j > k} \sigma_j(\mathbf{A})$$

after selecting s columns where

$$s \ge \frac{k}{\varepsilon} + k \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\eta}\right)$$
 and $\eta := \frac{1}{\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A})} \sum_{j>k} \sigma_j(\mathbf{A}).$

• Y. Chen, E.N. Epperly, J.A. Tropp, and R,J. Webber, Randomly pivoted Cholesky: Practical approximation of a kernel matrix with few entry evaluations, arXiv:2207.06503