Gradients manipulations

Optimization for Machine Learning — Exercise 01

Monday 17th April, 2023

Recall that the gradient of a differentiable function $f: \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ at $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a vector in \mathbb{R}^m , usually denoted by $\nabla f(x)$, such that

$$\nabla f(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_1} f(x) \\ \vdots \\ \partial_{x_n} f(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\partial_{x_i} f(x) := \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_i}$ is the partial derivative of f at x with respect to x_j .

When f is multivalued, i.e. $f: \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$, then its *Jacobian* at x, denoted by $J_f(x)$, is the $n \times m$ matrix such that, if $y = f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$J_f(x) = \left(\frac{\partial y_i}{\partial x_j}\right)_{i=1,j=1}^{n,m} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial y_1}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial y_1}{\partial x_2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial y_1}{\partial x_m} \\ \frac{\partial y_2}{\partial x_1} & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & & & \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial x_m} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x y_1 \\ \partial_x y_2 \\ \vdots \\ \partial_x y_n \end{pmatrix} = \partial_x f(x),$$

where $\partial_x y$ is understood as having as **column indices** the indices from x, and **row indices** the indices of y. This notation might be confusing, be is sometimes useful, see e.g. Exercise 2c.

When
$$n = 1$$
, note that we have $\nabla f(x) = (J_f(x))^{\top} = (\partial_x f(x))^{\top}$.

Product rule Similar to the 1D case, a product rule exists for multivariate functions.

- 1. a) If $f: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$, show that $\nabla (f^\top g)(x) = J_f(x)^\top g(x) + J_g(x)^\top f(x)$.
 - b) What happens with n = 1?

Answer

1. a) With $f: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $g: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$, and for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ where f and g are differentiable, $f(x)^{\top}g(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n f_k(x)g_k(x)$. Therefore, for an index $i \in [d]$,

$$\begin{split} \partial_{x_{i}}(f^{\top}g)(x) &= \partial_{x_{i}}(f(x)^{\top}g(x)) = \partial_{x_{i}} \sum_{l=1}^{n} f_{k}(x)g_{k}(x) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{n} \partial_{x_{i}} f_{k}(x)g_{k}(x) + f_{k}(x)\partial_{x_{i}}g_{k}(x) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{n} J_{f}(x)_{ki}g_{k}(x) + J_{g}(x)_{ki}f_{k}(x) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{n} J_{f}(x)_{ik}^{\top}g_{k}(x) + J_{g}(x)_{ik}^{\top}f_{k}(x) \\ &= J_{f}^{\top}(x)_{i,:}g(x) + J_{g}^{\top}(x)_{i,:}f(x), \end{split}$$

where $A_{i,:}$ stand for the row i of a matrix A. Since this is true for all $i \in [d]$, and i is a row index on both sides, we can write

$$\Longrightarrow$$
 $\nabla_x (f^\top g)(x) = J_f^\top(x)g(x) + J_g^\top(x)f(x).$

Always check the dimensions!

b) In the case n=1, then $J_f^\top = \nabla f$ and $J_g^\top = \nabla g$, therefore

$$\nabla (fg)(x) = \nabla f(x)g(x) + f(x)\nabla g(x)$$

Chain rule The chain rule for Jacobian is, for $f: \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^k$, and $g: \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $J_{g \circ f}(x) = J_g(f(x))J_f(x)$ (when the composition makes sense, and everything is differentiable). Compare with the chain rule in the 1D case: $(g \circ f)'(x) = g'(f(x)) \cdot f'(x)$.

- 2. a) Compute the gradient of $g \circ f$ at $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, when $f : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^k$ and $g \circ \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$, as a function of $J_f(x)$ and $\nabla g(f(x))$ (note the difference between $\nabla (g \circ f)(x)$ and $\nabla g(f(x))$).
 - b) Compute the gradient of $h_2 \circ h_1 \circ f$, when $h_1 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $h_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are single valued functions, and $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is a vector function.
 - c) Assume that x(w), y(w), z(w) are function of $w \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and that $\mathcal{L} \colon \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a function of x, y, z. Show that $\nabla_w \mathcal{L}(x(w), y(w), z(w)) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(x, y, z)}{\partial x} \nabla x(w) + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(x, y, z)}{\partial y} \nabla y(w) + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(x, y, z)}{\partial z} \nabla z(w)$.

Answer

2. a) Since $g \circ f : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ is real-valued, we have

$$\nabla (g \circ f)(x) = (J_{g \circ f}(x))^{\top} = J_f(x)^{\top} J_g(f(x)) = J_f(x)^{\top} \nabla g(f(x)),$$

since $g \colon \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ is real valued.

b) Applying the previous rule with $g = h_2 \circ h_1$, we get

$$\nabla (h_2 \circ h_1 \circ f)(x) = J_f(x)^{\top} \nabla (h_2 \circ h_1)(f(x))$$

= $\nabla f(x) \cdot (h_2 \circ h_1)'(f(x))$
= $\nabla f(x) \cdot h_2'(h_1(f(x))) \cdot h_1'(f(x)),$

since h_1, h_2 are 1D functions and f is real valued.

c) We write the parametrization of x,y,z as $\phi\colon\mathbb{R}^p\to\mathbb{R}^3,\,w\mapsto\phi(w)=\begin{pmatrix}x(w)\\y(w)\\z(w)\end{pmatrix}$.

The function on w is then $(\mathcal{L} \circ \phi)(w)$, of which we can take the gradient

$$\begin{split} \nabla_{w}(\mathcal{L} \circ \phi)(w) &= J_{\phi}^{\top}(w) \nabla \mathcal{L}(\phi(w)) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{w} x(w) \\ \partial_{w} y(w) \\ \partial_{w} z(w) \end{pmatrix}^{\top} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x} \mathcal{L}(\phi(w)) \\ \partial_{y} \mathcal{L}(\phi(w)) \\ \partial_{z} \mathcal{L}(\phi(w)) \end{pmatrix} & \text{(Recall the notation } \partial_{w} x(w) = (\nabla_{w} x(w))^{\top}) \\ &= (\nabla_{w} x(w) \quad \nabla_{w} y(w) \quad \nabla_{w} z(w)) \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x} \mathcal{L}(x,y,z) \\ \partial_{y} \mathcal{L}(x,y,z) \\ \partial_{z} \mathcal{L}(x,y,z) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \partial_{x} \mathcal{L}(x,y,z) \nabla_{w} x(w) + \partial_{y} \mathcal{L}(x,y,z) \nabla_{w} y(w) + \partial_{z} \mathcal{L}(x,y,z) \nabla_{w} z(w), \end{split}$$

where the dependency on w for x, y, z has been dropped where it was not relevant.

Classical vector functions Often, the functions that will appear are build from simpler ones, such as the linear product $\langle a,b\rangle=a^{\top}b$, or a matrix-vector multiplication $A\cdot b$, etc. The easiest to find the gradient of such function is usually to go back to the expression with the indices, e.g. $\langle a,b\rangle=\sum_i a_ib_i$. Another method, especially for more complex cases, is to look up if the formula is in the Matrix Cookbook.

- 3. a) Let $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Show that $\nabla_x \langle a, x \rangle = a$,
 - b) Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, and $f : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \mapsto Ax$. Show that $J_f(x) = A$.
 - c) What is $\nabla_x \langle x, Ax \rangle$? $(A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$
 - d) What is $\nabla_A \langle x, Ax \rangle$? $(A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$

Answer

3. a) With $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $\langle a, x \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j x_j$, and therefore, for $i \in [n]$,

$$\partial_{x_i}\langle a, x \rangle = \partial_{x_i} \sum_{j=1}^n a_j x_j = \sum_{j=1}^n a_i \partial_{x_i} x_j = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j \delta_{ij},$$

where $\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$. Therefore, the only non-zero term in the sum is when j = i, and

$$\partial_{x_i}\langle a, x \rangle = a_i \implies \nabla_x \langle a, x \rangle = a,$$

since i is a row index on both sides of the equation.

b) With $A=(a_{ij})_{i=1,j=1}^{n,m}\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times m}, \ x\in\mathbb{R}^m, \ \text{and} \ i\in[n], \ \text{we have that} \ (Ax)_i=\sum_{k=1}^m a_{ik}x_k, \ \text{and therefore, for} \ (i,j)\in[n]\times[m], \ \text{one gets}$

$$\partial_{x_j}(f(x))_i = \partial_{x_j}(Ax)_i = \partial_{x_j} \sum_{k=1}^m a_{ik} x_k$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^m a_{ik} \partial_{x_j} x_k$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^m a_{ik} \delta_{jk}$$

$$= a_{ij}.$$

Since i (resp. j) is a row (resp. column) index on both sides of the equation, we can conclude that

$$J_f(x) = A$$

- c) We can use the product formula (Exercise 1a) with f(x) = x and g(x) = Ax: $\nabla_x \langle x, Ax \rangle = J_f(x)^\top Ax + J_g(x)^\top x = I_n Ax + A^\top x = (A + A^\top)x$.
- d) Here, similar to the gradient of a real-valued vector function, the definition of the gradient of a real-valued **matrix** function $f: \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \to \mathbb{R}$ with respect to its input is implied to be a matrix (of same size as the input), such that

$$\nabla_A f(A) = (\partial_{a_{ij}} f(A))_{i=1,j=1}^{n,m} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{a_{11}} f(A) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \ddots \\ & & \partial_{a_{nm}} f(A) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It comes up in some situations in machine learning, typically when the weights with respect to which we are computing the gradient are organized in matrices.

Here, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, so we compute, for $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$,

$$\partial_{a_{ij}} f(A) = \partial_{a_{ij}} \langle x, Ax \rangle = \partial_{a_{ij}} \sum_{k,l} x_k x_l a_{kl}$$
$$= \sum_{k,l} x_k x_l \partial_{a_{ij}} a_{kl}$$
$$= \sum_{k,l} x_k x_l \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl}$$

again with
$$\delta_{ij} = \mathbb{1}(i=j)$$
, since $\partial_{a_{ij}}a_{kl} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k=i \text{ and } l=j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$. Therefore

$$\partial_{a_{ij}} f(A) = x_i x_j.$$

The matrix that have entries $x_i x_j$ for i a row index and j a column index is the matrix xx^{\top} . Therefore,

$$\nabla_A \langle x, Ax \rangle = xx^{\top}.$$

General functions

4. Compute the gradients of the functions:

a)
$$f: \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}, (x, y, z) \mapsto \frac{1}{2}x^2 + yz - \ln(1 + \exp(x^2y^3z))$$

b)
$$g \colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}, \, x \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} x^\top x = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2$$

c) $h: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, $(x, w) \mapsto \ln (1 + \exp(-w^\top x))$. Compute the gradient with respect to $w: \nabla_w h(x, w)$.

Answer

4. a) One computes

$$\nabla f(x, y, z) = \begin{pmatrix} x - \frac{2xy^3z}{1 + \exp(x^2y^3z)} \\ z - \frac{3y^2x^2z}{1 + \exp(x^2y^3z)} \\ y - \frac{x^2y^3}{1 + \exp(x^2y^3z)} \end{pmatrix}$$

b) i. One way to compute is to use the product rule 1a with f = g = id:

$$\nabla_x (\frac{1}{2} x^{\top} x) = \frac{1}{2} (I_d x + I_d x) = x$$

- ii. Another way is to go back to the definition $\frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2 = \sum_i x_i^2$, and evaluate at each coordinate $j \in [d]$: $\partial_{x_j} \frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \partial_{x_j} x_i^2 = x_j$.
- c) For this h, the formula found in Exercise 2b is adapted:

$$\nabla_w h(x, w) = \frac{\nabla_w \exp(-x^\top w)}{1 + \exp(-x^\top w)} = -\frac{\exp(-x^\top w)}{1 + \exp(-x^\top w)} x.$$