Labs

Optimization for Machine LearningSpring 2024

EPFL

School of Computer and Communication Sciences

Martin Jaggi & Nicolas Flammarion

github.com/epfml/OptML_course

Problem Set 9 — Solutions (Frank-Wolfe)

Convergence of Frank-Wolfe

Exercise 63. Given some constant C>0 and a sequence of real values h_0,h_1,\ldots satisfying (10.12), i.e.

$$h_{t+1} \le (1 - \gamma_t)h_t + \gamma_t^2 C$$
 for $t = 0, 1, ...$

for $\gamma = \frac{2}{t+2}$, prove that

$$h_t \le \frac{4C}{t+1}$$
 for $t \ge 1$.

Solution: Proof by induction. The base case t=1 follows directly from applying (10.12) for $\gamma_0=\frac{2}{0+2}=1$ in which case $h_1\leq C$ is obtained. For the induction step, considering $t\geq 1$, we have

$$h_{t+1} \leq (1 - \gamma_t)h_t + \gamma_t^2 C$$

$$= (1 - \frac{2}{t+2})h_t + (\frac{2}{t+2})^2 C$$

$$\leq (1 - \frac{2}{t+2})\frac{4C}{t+1} + (\frac{2}{t+2})^2 C,$$

where in the last inequality we have used the induction hypothesis for h_t . Simply rearranging the terms gives

$$h_{t+1} \le \frac{4C}{t+2} \left(\frac{t}{t+1} + \frac{1}{t+2} \right) \\ \le \frac{4C}{t+2},$$

which is our claimed bound for t+1.

Exercise 64. Prove Lemma 10.6:

Solution: By the definition of smoothness (Definition 2.2), we have that for any $x, y \in X$,

$$f(\mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})^{\top} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|^{2}$$
.

We want to use this upper bound in the definition (10.15) of the curvature constant. Observing that for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s} \in X$, we have that also $\mathbf{y} := \mathbf{x} + \gamma(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{x}) \in X$ and $1/\gamma^2 \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{x}\|^2$, we can therefore upper bound the curvature as

$$C_{(f,X)} \leq \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{s}\in X,\\ \gamma\in(0,1],\\ \mathbf{y}=\mathbf{x}+\gamma(\mathbf{s}-\mathbf{x})}} \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 = \sup_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{s}\in X} \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \leq \frac{L}{2} \operatorname{diam}(X)^2,$$

which is the claimed bound.

(Note that this result can be extended to arbitrary norms, in which case smoothness L is measured w.r.t. that norm, and so is the diameter of X. For smoothness w.r.t. other norms, see e.g. [?, Lemma 1.2.3]).

Applications of Frank-Wolfe

Exercise 66. Consider the matrix completion problem, that is to find a matrix Y solving

$$\min_{Y \in X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}} \sum_{(i,j) \in \Omega} (Z_{ij} - Y_{ij})^2$$

where the optimization domain X is the set of matrices in the unit ball of the trace norm (or nuclear norm), which is defined the convex hull of the rank-1 matrices

$$X := conv(\mathcal{A}) \text{ with } \mathcal{A} := \left\{ \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^{\top} \mid \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, \|\mathbf{u}\|_{2} = 1 \right\}.$$

Here $\Omega \subseteq [n] \times [m]$ is the set of observed entries from a given data matrix Z (collecting the ratings given by users to items for example).

- 1. Derive the LMO_X for this set X for a gradient at iterate $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$.
- 2. Derive the projection step onto X. How do the LMO_X and the projection step compare, in terms of computational cost?

Solution:

1. Because the set X is a convex combination of rank-1 matrices, LMO_X would give one of the corners of the set and Frank-Wolfe will result in an update of the form $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^{\top}$, $\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 = 1$, $\|\mathbf{v}\|_2 = 1$ that is a 1-rank update.

The gradient of the objective function is

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{ij}} = \begin{cases} 2(Y_{ij} - Z_{ij}), & (i,j) \in \Omega \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

 LMO_X is equivalent to maximizing over \mathbf{u} , \mathbf{v} the following objective:

$$2\sum_{(i,j)\in\Omega} u_i v_j (Z_{ij} - Y_{ij}) = 2\mathbf{u}^\top B\mathbf{v},$$

where the matrix \boldsymbol{B} is

$$B_{ij} = \begin{cases} Z_{ij} - Y_{ij}, & (i,j) \in \Omega, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Taking the SVD-decomposition of B, we get that

$$\mathbf{u}^{\top} B \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}^{\top} U D V^{\top} \mathbf{v}.$$

which is a convex combination of diagonal elements of D (singular values σ_i). Hence the largest possible value is achieved by taking singular vectors corresponding to the largest singular value: $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1$, $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_1$, then $\mathbf{u}^\top UDV^\top \mathbf{v} = \sigma_1$.

 LMO_X gives a rank-1 matrix $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^{\top}$ with $\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{u}_1$, $\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{v}_1$ are singular vectors of B corresponding to its largest singular value.

2. By definition of the projection,

$$\Pi_X(S) = \underset{C \in X}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|C - S\|_F^2 = \underset{Tr(C)=1}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|C - S\|_F^2 = \underset{\sum_i d'_{ii}=1}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|U'D'V'^{\top} - UDV^{\top}\|_F^2 =$$
$$= \underset{\sum_i d'_{ii}=1}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|U^{\top}U'D'V'^{\top}V - D\|_F^2,$$

because U, V are orthogonal matrices.

If $U' \neq U$ or $V' \neq V$, then the solution for $\operatorname{argmin}_{\sum_i d'_{ii} = 1} \|U^\top U' D' V'^\top V - D\|_F^2$ is worse to the solution in case then U' = U and V' = V.

This is because if U' = U and V' = V then $\Pi_X(S) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\sum_i d'_{ii} = 1} \|D' - D\|_F^2$.

But if $U' \neq U$ or $V' \neq V$ then if we denote by F the matrix $U^{\top}U'D'V'^{\top}V$ which minimizes expression, then

$$\Pi_X(S) = \|F - D\|_F^2 = \sum_i (F_{ii} - D_{ii})^2 + \sum_{j \neq i} (F_{ij} - D_{ij})^2 \ge \underset{\sum_i d'_{ii} = 1}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|D' - D\|_F^2,$$

because the second term is always greater than zero.

Then,

$$\Pi_X(S) = \underset{\sum_i d'_{ii} = 1}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|D' - D\|_F^2.$$

This is a projection of diagonal elements of D to the unit l_1 ball. We already know from Section 3.5 of lecture notes that this is equal to

$$d'_{ii} = \begin{cases} d_{ii} - \theta_p, & i$$

where $\theta_p = \frac{1}{p} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p d_{ii} - 1 \right) \, p = \max\{p' \in \{1, \dots, d\} : d_{pp} - \theta_p > 0 \}$ (assuming that all d_{ii} are sorted in decedent order).

3. For a projection step we need to compute the full SVD-decomposition, which takes $\mathcal{O}(mn^2)$, for LMO_X we need only top 1 singular vectors, which is much faster.