Algorithmic guarantees

1 General setting

We first introduce the regularity condition on the loss function \mathcal{L} and set \mathcal{S} .

Definition 1. Let f be a real-valued function. We say f satisfies $RCG(\alpha, \beta, S)$ condition for $\alpha, \beta > 0$ and the set S if,

$$\langle \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x'), x - x' \rangle \ge \alpha \|x - x'\|_2^2 + \beta \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x')\|_2^2$$

for any $x, x' \in \mathcal{S}$.

Define

$$\begin{split} \bar{\lambda} &:= \max \left\{ \sigma_{\max} \left(\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{B}) \right), \sigma_{\max} \left(\mathcal{M}_2(\mathcal{B}) \right), \sigma_{\max} \left(\mathcal{M}_3(\mathcal{B}) \right) \right\}, \\ \underline{\lambda} &:= \min \left\{ \sigma_{\min} \left(\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{B}) \right), \sigma_{\min} \left(\mathcal{M}_2(\mathcal{B}) \right), \sigma_{\min} \left(\mathcal{M}_3(\mathcal{B}) \right) \right\}, \end{split}$$

and $\kappa = \bar{\lambda}/\underline{\lambda}$ can be regarded as a tensor condition number. Here \mathcal{M}_i is the matricization operator with respect to *i*-th mode.

We define some constants related to side information X_1, X_2, X_3 as

$$\gamma := \prod_{k=1}^3 \sigma_{\max}(\boldsymbol{X}_k)^2, \quad \gamma_1 := \prod_{k=1}^3 \sigma_{\min}(\boldsymbol{X}_k)^2, \quad \text{ and } \quad \gamma_2 := \prod_{k=1}^3 \|\boldsymbol{X}_k\|_F^2.$$

Without loss of generality, we scale the side information matrices X_k so that $||X_k||_{\infty} \leq 1$ for all k = 1, 2, 3.

Lemma 1.1. Suppose $f: \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2 \times d_3} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $RCG(\alpha, \beta, \mathcal{S})$ where $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2 \times d_3} : rank(\mathcal{T}) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3)\}$. Define $g: \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \to \mathbb{R}$ as $g(\mathcal{B}) = f(\mathcal{B} \times \{X_1, X_2, X_3\})$ for all $\mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3}$ and $\mathcal{S}' = \{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} : rank(\mathcal{T}) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3)\}$. Then, g satisfies $RCG(\alpha \gamma_1, \beta / \gamma_2, \mathcal{S}')$.

Proof. Notice that for any $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2 \in \mathcal{S}'$,

$$\begin{split} &\langle \nabla g(\mathcal{B}_{1}) - \nabla g(\mathcal{B}_{2}), \mathcal{B}_{1} - \mathcal{B}_{2} \rangle \\ &= \left\langle (\nabla f(\mathcal{B}_{1} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1}, \boldsymbol{X}_{2}, \boldsymbol{X}_{3}\}) - \nabla f(\mathcal{B}_{2} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1}, \boldsymbol{X}_{2}, \boldsymbol{X}_{3}\})) \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1}^{T}, \boldsymbol{X}_{2}^{T}, \boldsymbol{X}_{3}^{T}\}, \mathcal{B}_{1} - \mathcal{B}_{2} \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \nabla f(\mathcal{B}_{1} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1}, \boldsymbol{X}_{2}, \boldsymbol{X}_{3}\}) - \nabla f(\mathcal{B}_{2} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1}, \boldsymbol{X}_{2}, \boldsymbol{X}_{3}\}), (\mathcal{B}_{1} - \mathcal{B}_{2}) \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1}, \boldsymbol{X}_{2}, \boldsymbol{X}_{3}\} \right\rangle \\ &\geq \alpha \|(\mathcal{B}_{1} - \mathcal{B}_{2}) \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1}, \boldsymbol{X}_{2}, \boldsymbol{X}_{3}\}\|_{F}^{2} + \beta \|\nabla f(\mathcal{B}_{1} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1}, \boldsymbol{X}_{2}, \boldsymbol{X}_{3}\}) - \nabla f(\mathcal{B}_{2} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1}, \boldsymbol{X}_{2}, \boldsymbol{X}_{3}\})\|_{F}^{2} \\ &\geq \alpha \gamma_{1} \|\mathcal{B}_{1} - \mathcal{B}_{2}\|_{F}^{2} + \frac{\beta}{\gamma_{2}} \|\nabla g(\mathcal{B}_{1}) - \nabla g(\mathcal{B}_{2})\|_{F}^{2}, \end{split}$$

where the first inequality uses the fact that f satisfies $RCG(\alpha, \beta, S)$ and the last inequality uses Cauch Schwartz inequality.

Since negative log-likelihoods of poisson and binomial distribution are not strongly convex and smooth in the unbounded domain. We thus introduce the following assumption on $\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}}$ to ensure that $\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}}$ is in a bounded set.

Assumption 1. Suppose $\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} = \mathcal{C}^* \times \{M_1^*, M_2^*, M_3^*\}$, where $M_k^* \in \mathbb{R}^{p_k \times r_k}$ is a orthogonal matrix for k = 1, 2, 3. There exists some constants $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^3$, B such that $\|M_k^*\|_{2,\infty}^2 \leq \frac{\mu_k r_k}{p_k}$ for k = 1, 2, 3 and $\bar{\lambda} \leq B\sqrt{\frac{\prod_{k=1}^3 p_k}{\prod_{k=1}^3 \mu_k r_k}}$. Here $\|M_k^*\|_{2,\infty}$ is the largest row-wise ℓ_2 norm of M_k^* .

Remark 1. This condition guarantees that $\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}}$ is entry-wise upperbounded by B, which guarantees the local strong convexity and smoothness of the negative log-likelihood function.

We define searching space S as follows:

$$S = S_c \times S_1 \times S_2 \times S_3, \text{ where}$$

$$S_k = \left\{ (\boldsymbol{M}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p_k \times r_k} : \|\boldsymbol{M}_k\|_{2,\infty} \le b\sqrt{\frac{\mu_k r_k}{p_k}} \right\} \text{ for } k = 1, 2, 3,$$

$$S_c = \left\{ C \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1 \times r_2 \times r_3} : \max_k \|\mathcal{M}_k(C)\|_2 \le b^{-3}B\sqrt{\frac{\prod_{k=1}^3 p_k}{\prod_{k=1}^3 \mu_k r_k}} \right\}.$$

2 General tensor case from exponential family

Suppose we observe $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2 \times d_3}$ from exponential family with canonical parameter $\Theta = \mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} \times \{X_1, X_2, X_3\}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}_{ijk}|\Theta_{ijk}) = c(\mathcal{Y}_{ijk}, \phi) \exp\left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}_{ijk}\Theta_{ijk} - b(\Theta_{ijk})}{\phi}\right),$$

where $b(\cdot)$ is a known function, $\phi > 0$ is the dispersion parameter, and $c(\cdot)$ is a known normalization function. Then we consider the following negative log-likelihood to estimate $\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}}$,

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}|\boldsymbol{X}_{1},\boldsymbol{X}_{2},\boldsymbol{X}_{3}) = -\langle \mathcal{Y},\mathcal{B} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1},\boldsymbol{X}_{2},\boldsymbol{X}_{3}\} \rangle + \sum_{ijk} b\left(\mathcal{B} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1},\boldsymbol{X}_{2},\boldsymbol{X}_{3}\}\right).$$

Example 1 (Gaussian). Suppose we observe $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2 \times d_3}$ that satisfies

$$\mathcal{Y}_{ijk} \sim \text{Gaussian}\left(\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_1, \boldsymbol{X}_2, \boldsymbol{X}_3\}, \sigma\right)$$
 independently.

Then the corresponding negative log-likelihood is,

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}|oldsymbol{X}_1,oldsymbol{X}_2,oldsymbol{X}_3) = rac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{B}_{ ext{true}} imes \{oldsymbol{X}_1,oldsymbol{X}_2,oldsymbol{X}_3\}\|_F^2$$

Example 2 (Poisson). Suppose we observe $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{N}^{d_1 \times d_2 \times d_3}$ that satisfies

$$\mathcal{Y}_{ijk} \sim \text{Poisson}\left(\exp\left(\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_1, \boldsymbol{X}_2, \boldsymbol{X}_3\}\right)\right)$$
 independently.

Then the corresponding negative log-likelihood is,

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}|\boldsymbol{X}_{1},\boldsymbol{X}_{2},\boldsymbol{X}_{3}) = \sum_{ijk} \left(-\mathcal{Y}_{ijk} \left[\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} \times \left\{ \boldsymbol{X}_{1},\boldsymbol{X}_{2},\boldsymbol{X}_{3} \right\} \right]_{ijk} + \exp \left(\left[\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} \times \left\{ \boldsymbol{X}_{1},\boldsymbol{X}_{2},\boldsymbol{X}_{3} \right\} \right]_{ijk} \right) \right) .$$

Example 3 (Bernoulli). Suppose we observe $\mathcal{Y} \in \{0,1\}^{d_1 \times d_2 \times d_3}$ that satisfies

$$\mathcal{Y}_{ijk} \sim \text{Bernoulli}\left(\text{logistic}\left(\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_1, \boldsymbol{X}_2, \boldsymbol{X}_3\}\right)\right) \text{ independently,}$$

where $logistic(x) = (1 + e^{-x})^{-1}$. Then the corresponding negative log-likelihood is,

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}|\boldsymbol{X}_{1},\boldsymbol{X}_{2},\boldsymbol{X}_{3}) = -\sum_{ijk} \left(\mathcal{Y}_{ijk} \left[\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} \times \left\{ \boldsymbol{X}_{1},\boldsymbol{X}_{2},\boldsymbol{X}_{3} \right\} \right]_{ijk} + \log \left(1 + \exp \left(\left[\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} \times \left\{ \boldsymbol{X}_{1},\boldsymbol{X}_{2},\boldsymbol{X}_{3} \right\} \right]_{ijk} \right) \right) \right).$$

Theorem 2.1. Suppose Assumption 1 holds for Poisson and Bernoulli cases and

- 1. Initialization: $\|\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} \mathcal{B}^{(0)}\|_F^2 \le c_1 \alpha \beta \kappa^{-2} \underline{\lambda}^2$
- 2. Signal to noise ratio: $\underline{\lambda}^2 \ge c_2 \frac{\kappa^4}{\alpha^3 \beta} \left(\frac{\prod_k r_k}{\max_k r_k} \gamma \sum_k p_k \right)$.

where $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are universal constants. Let $\mathcal{B}^{(t)}$ be t-th iteration output of the alternating gradient descent algorithm with a suitable step size. Then, with probability at least $1 - \exp(-c_3 \sum_k p_k r_k)$, we have

$$\|\mathcal{B}^{(t)} - \mathcal{B}_{\text{true}}\|_F^2 \lesssim \underbrace{\left(r_1 r_2 r_3 + \sum_{k=1}^3 p_k r_k\right)}_{\text{Statistical error}} + \underbrace{\rho^T \|\mathcal{B}^{(0)} - \mathcal{B}_{\text{true}}\|_F^2}_{\text{Algorithmic error}},$$

for all $t \ge 1$ where $\rho = \rho(\alpha, \beta, \kappa) \in (0, 1)$ is a contraction parameter, and $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ are some constants.

Remark 2. Combining Lemma 1.1 and proofs of the theorems in Han et al. [2020], we have

- 1. (Gaussian case) We have $\alpha = \frac{\gamma_1}{2}$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{2\gamma_2}$.
- 2. (Poisson case) We have $\alpha = \frac{\gamma_1}{e^B + e^{-B}}$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{\gamma_2(e^B + e^{-B})}$
- 3. (Bernoulli case) We have $\alpha = \frac{\gamma_1}{2(e^B + 3)}$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{2\gamma_2}$

Proof. We bound the statistical error and apply the result to Theorem 3.1. in Han et al. [2020]. We show that with probability at least $1 - \exp(-C_2 \sum_k p_k r_k)$,

$$\xi = \sup_{\substack{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3) \\ \|\mathcal{T}\|_r^2 \leq 1}} \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}|\boldsymbol{X}_1, \boldsymbol{X}_2, \boldsymbol{X}_3), \mathcal{T} \rangle \leq C_1 \sqrt{\gamma_1} \phi U \left(r_1 r_2 r_3 + \sum_{k=1}^3 p_k r_k \right)^{1/2},$$

for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$. By definition of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}|X_1, X_2, X_3)$, we have

$$\xi = \sup_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \operatorname{rank}(T) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3) \\ \|T\|_F^2 \leq 1}} \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}|\boldsymbol{X}_1, \boldsymbol{X}_2, \boldsymbol{X}_3), \mathcal{T} \rangle$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \operatorname{rank}(T) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3) \\ \|T\|_F^2 \leq 1}} \langle (\mathcal{Y} - b'(\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_1, \boldsymbol{X}_2. \boldsymbol{X}_3\})) \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_1^T, \boldsymbol{X}_2^T, \boldsymbol{X}_3^T\}, \mathcal{T} \rangle$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \|T\|_F^2 \leq 1}} \langle \mathcal{E} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_1^T, \boldsymbol{X}_2^T, \boldsymbol{X}_3^T\}, \mathcal{T} \rangle, \qquad (1)$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \operatorname{rank}(T) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3) \\ \|T\|_F^2 \leq 1}} \langle \mathcal{E} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_1^T, \boldsymbol{X}_2^T, \boldsymbol{X}_3^T\}, \mathcal{T} \rangle, \qquad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{E} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Y} - b'(\mathcal{B}_{\text{true}} \times \{\boldsymbol{X}_1, \boldsymbol{X}_2. \boldsymbol{X}_3\})$. Based on Proposition 3, Assumption A2 implies that \mathcal{E} is a sub-Gaussian- (ϕU) tensor. Decompose the side information matrices \boldsymbol{X}_k into $\boldsymbol{X}_k = \boldsymbol{U}_k \Sigma_k \boldsymbol{V}_k^T$, where $\boldsymbol{U}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times d_k}$, $\boldsymbol{V}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p_k \times p_k}$ are singular vectors and $\Sigma_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times r_k}$ is a diagonal matrix whose entries are singular values for k = 1, 2, 3. Notice that

$$\sup_{\substack{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3) \\ \|\mathcal{T}\|_F^2 \leq 1}} \langle \mathcal{E} \times_1 \mathbf{X}_1, \mathcal{T} \rangle = \sup_{\substack{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3) \\ \|\mathcal{T}\|_F^2 \leq 1}} \langle \mathbf{X}_1^T \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{E}), \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{T}) \rangle$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3) \\ \|\mathcal{T}\|_F^2 \leq 1}} \langle \Sigma_1^T \mathbf{U}_1^T \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{E}), \mathbf{V}_1^T \mathbf{M}_1(\mathcal{T}) \rangle$$

$$\leq \sup_{\substack{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3) \\ \|\mathcal{T}\|_F^2 \leq 1}} \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{X}_1) \langle \mathcal{E} \times_1 \mathbf{U}_1, \mathcal{T} \rangle,$$

$$\|\mathcal{T}\|_F^2 \leq 1$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that the multiplication of orthonormal matrix does change the space

of \mathcal{T} . Applying this inequality with k=1,2,3 to (1) gives us

$$\xi = \sqrt{\gamma} \sup_{\substack{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3) \\ \|\mathcal{T}\|_F^2 \leq 1}} \langle \mathcal{E} \times \{ \boldsymbol{U}_1, \boldsymbol{U}_2, \boldsymbol{U}_3 \}, \mathcal{T} \rangle$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\gamma} \sup_{\substack{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3) \\ \|\mathcal{T}\|_F^2 < 1}} \langle \mathcal{E}', \mathcal{T} \rangle,$$

where $\mathcal{E}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{E} \times \{U_1, U_2, U_3\} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3}$ and $\gamma = \prod_{k=1}^3 \sigma_{\max}(X_k)^2$. By orthonormality of U_k for k = 1,2,3, \mathcal{E}' is again a sub-Gaussian- (ϕU) tensor whose entries are independent. Therefore, combination of Lemma and Lemma E.5 in Han et al. [2020] yields

$$\sup_{\substack{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times p_2 \times p_3} \\ \operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}) \leq (r_1, r_2, r_3) \\ \|\mathcal{T}\|_2^2 < 1}} \langle \mathcal{E}', \mathcal{T} \rangle \leq C_1 \phi U \left(r_1 r_2 r_3 + \sum_{k=1}^3 p_k r_k \right)^{1/2},$$

with probability at least $1 - \exp(-C_2 \sum_k p_k r_k)$ for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$.

Finally, we have

$$\xi \le C_1 \sqrt{\gamma_1} \phi U \left(r_1 r_2 r_3 + \sum_{k=1}^3 p_k r_k \right)^{1/2}.$$

Applying the upper bound of ξ to Theorem 3.1 in Han et al. [2020] completes the proof with explicit $\rho = 1 - \frac{\alpha\beta\eta_0}{1000\kappa^2}$, where $\eta_0 \leq \frac{1}{28}$ is a constant. Notice the algorithm requires to have a step size $\eta = \frac{\eta_0\beta}{b^6}$ for the result.

Lemma 2.1 (Proposition 3.2 in Rivasplata [2012]). If X is σ -subgaussian, then for any q > 0 one has

$$\mathbb{E}|X|^q = q2^{q/2}\sigma^q\Gamma\left(\frac{q}{2}\right).$$

Consequently, for any $q \geq 1$,

$$(\mathbb{E}|X|^q)^{1/q} \le C\sigma\sqrt{q}.$$

References

Rungang Han, R. Willett, and Anru Zhang. An optimal statistical and computational framework for generalized tensor estimation. *ArXiv*, abs/2002.11255, 2020.

Omar Rivasplata. Subgaussian random variables: An expository note. Internet publication, PDF, 2012.