

A Riemannian symmetric rank-one trust-region method

Wen Huang · P.-A. Absil · K. A. Gallivan

Received: 18 April 2013 / Accepted: 7 February 2014

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg and Mathematical Optimization Society 2014

Abstract The well-known symmetric rank-one trust-region method—where the Hessian approximation is generated by the symmetric rank-one update—is generalized to the problem of minimizing a real-valued function over a d -dimensional Riemannian manifold. The generalization relies on basic differential-geometric concepts, such as tangent spaces, Riemannian metrics, and the Riemannian gradient, as well as on the more recent notions of (first-order) retraction and vector transport. The new method, called RTR-SR1, is shown to converge globally and $d + 1$ -step q -superlinearly to stationary points of the objective function. A limited-memory version, referred to as LRTR-SR1, is also introduced. In this context, novel efficient strategies are presented to construct a vector transport on a submanifold of a Euclidean space. Numerical experiments—Rayleigh quotient minimization on the sphere and a joint diagonalization problem on the Stiefel manifold—illustrate the value of the new methods.

This paper presents research results of the Belgian Network DYSCO (Dynamical Systems, Control, and Optimization), funded by the Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme initiated by the Belgian Science Policy Office. This work was financially supported by the Belgian FRFC (Fonds de la Recherche Fondamentale Collective). This work was performed in part while the third author was a Visiting Professor at the Institut de mathématiques pures et appliquées (MAPA) at Université catholique de Louvain.

W. Huang · K. A. Gallivan
Department of Mathematics, Florida State University, 208 Love Building,
1017 Academic Way, Tallahassee, FL 32306-4510, USA
e-mail: wh08@fsu.edu

K. A. Gallivan
e-mail: kgallivan@fsu.edu

P.-A. Absil (✉)
Department of Mathematical Engineering, ICTEAM Institute,
Université catholique de Louvain, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
e-mail: absil@inma.ucl.ac.be

Keywords Riemannian optimization · Optimization on manifolds · Symmetric rank-one update · Rayleigh quotient · Joint diagonalization · Stiefel manifold

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000) 65K05 · 90C48 · 90C53

1 Introduction

We consider the problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{M}} f(x) \quad (1)$$

of minimizing a smooth real-valued function f defined on a Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} . Recently investigated application areas include image segmentation [30] and recognition [37], electrostatics and electronic structure calculation [39], finance and chemistry [7], multilinear algebra [21, 32], low-rank learning [8, 26], and blind source separation [25, 34].

The wealth of applications has stimulated the development of general-purpose methods for (1)—see, e.g., [2, 30, 31] and references therein—including the trust-region approach upon which we focus in this work. A well-known technique in optimization [16], the trust-region method was extended to Riemannian manifolds in [1] (or see [2, Ch. 7]), and found applications, e.g., in [8, 21, 23, 26, 38]. Trust-region methods construct a quadratic model m_k of the objective function f around the current iterate x_k and produce a candidate new iterate by (approximately) minimizing the model m_k within a region where it is “trusted”. Depending on the discrepancy between f and m_k at the candidate new iterate, the size of the trust region is updated and the candidate new iterate is accepted or rejected.

For lack of efficient techniques to produce a second-order term in m_k that is inexact but nevertheless guarantees superlinear convergence, the Riemannian trust-region (RTR) framework loses some of its appeal when the exact second-order term—the Hessian of f —is not available. This is in contrast with the Euclidean case, where several strategies exist to build an inexact second-order term that preserves superlinear convergence of the trust-region method. Among these strategies, the symmetric rank-one (SR1) update is favored in view of its simplicity and because it preserves symmetry without unnecessarily enforcing positive definiteness; see, e.g., [27, §6.2] for a more detailed discussion. The $n + 1$ step q-superlinear rate of convergence of the SR1 trust-region method was shown by Byrd et al. [11] using a sophisticated analysis that builds on [15, 24].

The classical (Euclidean) SR1 trust-region method can also be viewed as a quasi-Newton method, enhanced with a trust-region globalization strategy. The idea of quasi-Newton methods on manifolds is not new [18, §4.5], however, most of the literature of which we are aware restricts consideration to generalizing the Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno (BFGS) quasi-Newton method combined with a line search strategy. Early work such as [10, 32] used Riemannian BFGS methods for a specific application without an analysis of convergence properties, but more recently, systematic analyses of Riemannian BFGS methods based on the framework of retraction and vector trans-

port developed in [2, 4] have been made. Qi [29] analyzed a version of Riemannian BFGS methods with retraction and vector transport restricted to exponential mapping and parallel translation and showed superlinear convergence using a Riemannian Dennis-Moré condition. Ring and Wirth [30] proposed and analyzed a Riemannian BFGS that avoids the restrictions on retraction and vector transport assumed by Qi but that needs to resort to the derivative of the retraction. Seibert et al. [33] discussed the freedom available when generalizing BFGS to Riemannian manifolds and analyzed one generalization of BFGS method on Riemannian manifolds that are isometric to \mathbb{R}^n . Most recently, Huang [20] developed a complete convergence theory that avoids the restrictions of Qi, Ring and Wirth, guarantees superlinear convergence for the Riemannian Broyden family of quasi-Newton methods (including a version of SR1), and facilitates efficient implementation.

In this paper, motivated by the situation described above, we introduce a generalization of the classical (i.e., Euclidean) SR1 trust-region method to the Riemannian setting (1). Besides making use of basic Riemannian geometric concepts (tangent space, Riemannian metric, gradient), the new method, called RTR-SR1, relies on the notions of retraction and vector transport introduced in [2, 4]. A detailed global and local convergence analysis is given. A limited-memory version of RTR-SR1, referred to as LRTR-SR1, is also introduced. Numerical experiments show that the RTR-SR1 method displays the expected convergence properties. When the Hessian of f is not available, RTR-SR1 thus offers an attractive way of tackling (1) by a trust-region approach. Moreover, even when the Hessian of f is available, making use of it can be expensive computationally, and the numerical experiments show that ignoring the Hessian information and resorting instead to the RTR-SR1 approach can be beneficial.

Another contribution of this paper with respect to [11] is an extension of the analysis to allow for inexact solutions of the trust-region subproblem—compare (10) with [11, (2.4)]. This extension makes it possible to resort to inner iterations such as the Steihaug–Toint truncated CG method (see [2, §7.3.2] for its Riemannian extension) while staying within the assumptions of the convergence analysis.

The paper is organized as follows. The RTR-SR1 method is stated and discussed in Sect. 2. The convergence analysis is carried out in Sect. 3. The limited-memory version is introduced in Sect. 4. Numerical experiments are reported in Sect. 5. Conclusions are drawn in Sect. 6.

2 The Riemannian SR1 trust-region method

The proposed Riemannian SR1 trust-region (RTR-SR1) method is described in Algorithm 1. The algorithm statement is commented in Sect. 2.1 and the important questions of representing tangent vectors and choosing the vector transport are discussed in Sects. 2.2 and 2.3.

2.1 A guide to Algorithm 1

Algorithm 1 can be viewed as a Riemannian version of the classical (Euclidean) SR1 trust-region method (see, e.g., [27, Algorithm 6.2]). It can also be viewed as an SR1

Algorithm 1 Riemannian trust region with symmetric rank-one update (RTR-SR1)

Input: Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} with Riemannian metric g ; retraction R ; isometric vector transport \mathcal{T}_S ; differentiable real-valued objective function f on \mathcal{M} ; initial iterate $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$; initial Hessian approximation \mathcal{B}_0 , symmetric with respect to g .

1: Choose $\Delta_0 > 0$, $\nu \in (0, 1)$, $c \in (0, 0.1)$, $\tau_1 \in (0, 1)$ and $\tau_2 > 1$; Set $k \leftarrow 0$;

2: Obtain $s_k \in T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$ by (approximately) solving

$$s_k = \arg \min_{s \in T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}} m_k(s) = \arg \min_{s \in T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}} f(x_k) + g(\text{grad } f(x_k), s) + \frac{1}{2} g(s, \mathcal{B}_k s),$$

$$\text{s.t. } \|s\| \leq \Delta_k;$$
(2)

3: Set $\rho_k \leftarrow \frac{f(x_k) - f(R_{x_k}(s_k))}{m_k(0) - m_k(s_k)}$;

4: Let $y_k = \mathcal{T}_{S_k}^{-1} \text{grad } f(R_{x_k}(s_k)) - \text{grad } f(x_k)$; If $|g(s_k, y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k)| < \nu \|s_k\| \|y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k\|$, then $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{k+1} = \mathcal{B}_k$, otherwise define the linear operator $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{k+1} : T_{x_k} \mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$ by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{k+1} = \mathcal{B}_k + \frac{(y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k)(y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k)^{\flat}}{g(s_k, y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k)}, \quad (\text{SR1})$$
(3)

where a^{\flat} denotes the flat of $a \in T_x \mathcal{M}$, i.e., $a^{\flat} : T_x \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : v \rightarrow g(a, v)$;

5: **if** $\rho_k > c$ **then**

6: $x_{k+1} \leftarrow R_{x_k}(s_k)$; $\mathcal{B}_{k+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{T}_{S_k} \circ \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{k+1} \circ \mathcal{T}_{S_k}^{-1}$;

7: **else**

8: $x_{k+1} \leftarrow x_k$; $\mathcal{B}_{k+1} \leftarrow \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{k+1}$;

9: **end if**

10: **if** $\rho_k > \frac{3}{4}$ **then**

11: **if** $\|s_k\| \geq 0.8 \Delta_k$ **then**

12: $\Delta_{k+1} \leftarrow \tau_2 \Delta_k$;

13: **else**

14: $\Delta_{k+1} \leftarrow \Delta_k$;

15: **end if**

16: **else if** $\rho_k < 0.1$ **then**

17: $\Delta_{k+1} \leftarrow \tau_1 \Delta_k$;

18: **else**

19: $\Delta_{k+1} \leftarrow \Delta_k$;

20: **end if**

21: $k \leftarrow k + 1$, goto 2 until convergence.

version of the Riemannian trust-region framework [2, Algorithm 10 p. 142]. Therefore, several pieces of information given in [2, Ch. 7] remain relevant for Algorithm 1.

In particular, the algorithm statement makes use of standard Riemannian concepts that are described, e.g., in [2, 28], such as the tangent space $T_x \mathcal{M}$ to the manifold \mathcal{M} at a point x , a Riemannian metric g , and the gradient $\text{grad } f$ of a real-valued function f on \mathcal{M} . The algorithm statement also relies on the notion of retraction, introduced in [4] (or see [2, §4.1]). A *retraction* R on \mathcal{M} is a smooth map from the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{M}$ (i.e., the set of all tangent vectors to \mathcal{M}) onto \mathcal{M} such that, for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and all $\xi_x \in T_x \mathcal{M}$, the curve $t \mapsto R(t\xi_x)$ is tangent to ξ_x at $t = 0$. We let R_x denote the restriction of R to $T_x \mathcal{M}$. The domain of R need not be the entire tangent bundle, but this is usually the case in practice, and in this work we assume throughout that

R is defined wherever needed. Specific ways of constructing retractions are proposed in [2–4]; see also [22, 39] for the important case of the Stiefel manifold.

Within the Riemannian trust-region framework, the characterizing aspect of Algorithm 1 lies in the update mechanism for the Hessian approximation \mathcal{B}_k . The proposed update mechanism, based on formula (3) and on Step 6 of Algorithm 1, is a rather straightforward Riemannian generalization of the classical SR1 update

$$B_{k+1} = B_k + \frac{(y_k - B_k s_k)(y_k - B_k s_k)^T}{(y_k - B_k s_k)^T s_k}.$$

Significantly less straightforward is the Riemannian generalization of the superlinear convergence result, as we will see in Sect. 3.4. (Observe that the local convergence result [2, Theorem 7.4.11] does not apply here because the Hessian approximation condition [2, (7.36)] is not guaranteed to hold.)

Instrumental in the Riemannian SR1 update is the notion of vector transport, introduced in [2, §8.1] as a generalization of the classical Riemannian concept of parallel translation. A *vector transport* on a manifold \mathcal{M} on top of a retraction R is a smooth mapping

$$T\mathcal{M} \oplus T\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T\mathcal{M} : (\eta_x, \xi_x) \mapsto \mathcal{T}_{\eta_x}(\xi_x) \in T\mathcal{M}$$

satisfying the following properties for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$:

1. (Associated retraction) $\mathcal{T}_{\eta_x}(\xi_x) \in T_{R_x(\xi_x)} \mathcal{M}$ for all $\xi_x \in T_x \mathcal{M}$;
2. (Consistency) $\mathcal{T}_{0_x}(\xi_x) = \xi_x$ for all $\xi_x \in T_x \mathcal{M}$;
3. (Linearity) $\mathcal{T}_{\eta_x}(a\xi_x + b\zeta_x) = a\mathcal{T}_{\eta_x}(\xi_x) + b\mathcal{T}_{\eta_x}(\zeta_x)$.

The Riemannian SR1 update uses tangent vectors at the current iterate to produce a new Hessian approximation at the next iterate, hence the need to perform a vector transport (see Step 6) from the current iterate to the next.

In the Input step of Algorithm 1, the requirement that the vector transport \mathcal{T}_S is isometric means that, for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and all $\xi_x, \zeta_x, \eta_x \in T_x \mathcal{M}$, the equation

$$g(\mathcal{T}_{S_{\eta_x}} \xi_x, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\eta_x}} \zeta_x) = g(\xi_x, \zeta_x) \quad (4)$$

holds. Techniques for constructing an isometric vector transport on submanifolds of Euclidean spaces are described in Sect. 2.3.

The symmetry requirement on \mathcal{B}_0 with respect to the Riemannian metric g means that $g(\mathcal{B}_0 \xi_{x_0}, \eta_{x_0}) = g(\xi_{x_0}, \mathcal{B}_0 \eta_{x_0})$ for all $\xi_{x_0}, \eta_{x_0} \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{M}$. It is readily seen from (3) and Step 6 of Algorithm 1 that \mathcal{B}_k is symmetric for all k . Note however that \mathcal{B}_k is, in general, not positive definite.

A possible stopping criterion for Algorithm 1 is $\|\text{grad } f(x_k)\| < \epsilon$ for some specified $\epsilon > 0$, where $\|\cdot\|$, which also appears in the statement of Algorithm 1, denotes the norm induced by the Riemannian metric g , i.e.,

$$\|\xi\| = \sqrt{g(\xi, \xi)}. \quad (5)$$

In the spirit of [30, Remark 4], we point out that it is possible to formulate the SR1 update (3) in the new tangent space $T_{x_{k+1}} \mathcal{M}$; in the present case of SR1, the algorithm remains equivalent since the vector transport is isometric.

Otherwise, Algorithm 1 does not call for comments other than those made in [2, Ch. 7]. In particular, we point out that the meaning of “approximately” in Step 2 of Algorithm 1 depends on the desired convergence results. We will see in the convergence analysis (Sect. 3) that enforcing the Cauchy decrease (9) is enough to ensure global convergence to stationary points, but another condition such as (10) is needed to guarantee superlinear convergence. The truncated CG method, discussed in [2, §7.3.2] in the Riemannian context, is an inner iteration for Step 2 that returns an s_k satisfying conditions (9) and (10).

2.2 Representation of tangent vectors

Let us now consider the frequently encountered situation where the manifold \mathcal{M} is described as a d -dimensional submanifold of an m -dimensional Euclidean space \mathcal{E} . In particular, this is the case of the sphere and the Stiefel manifold involved in the numerical experiments in Sect. 5.

A tangent vector in $T_x \mathcal{M}$ can be represented either by its d -dimensional vector of coordinates in a given basis B_x of $T_x \mathcal{M}$, or else as an m -dimensional vector in \mathcal{E} since $T_x \mathcal{M} \subset T_x \mathcal{E} \simeq \mathcal{E}$. The latter option may be preferable when the codimension $m - d$ is small (e.g., the sphere) because building, storing and manipulating the basis B_x of $T_x \mathcal{M}$ may be inconvenient.

Likewise, since \mathcal{B}_k is a linear transformation of $T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$, it can be represented in the basis B_x as a $d \times d$ matrix, or as an $m \times m$ matrix restricted to act on $T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$. Here again, the latter approach may be computationally more efficient when the codimension $m - d$ is small.

A related choice has to be made for the representation of the vector transport, since \mathcal{T}_{η_x} is a linear map from $T_x \mathcal{M}$ to $T_{R_x(\eta_x)} \mathcal{M}$. This question is addressed in Sect. 2.3.

2.3 Isometric vector transport

We present two ways of constructing an isometric vector transport on a d -dimensional submanifold \mathcal{M} of an m -dimensional Euclidean space \mathcal{E} .

2.3.1 Vector transport by parallelization

An open subset \mathcal{U} of \mathcal{M} is termed *parallelizable* if it admits a smooth field of tangent bases, i.e., a smooth function $B : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} : z \mapsto B_z$ where B_z is a basis of $T_z \mathcal{M}$. The whole manifold \mathcal{M} itself may not be parallelizable; in particular, every manifold of nonzero Euler characteristic is not parallelizable [35, §1.6], and it is also known that the only parallelizable spheres are those of dimension 1, 3, and 7 [6, p. 116]. However, for the global convergence analysis carried out in Sect. 3.2, the vector transport is not required to be smooth or even continuous, and for the local convergence analysis in Sect. 3.4, we only need a parallelizable neighborhood \mathcal{U} of the limit point x^* . Such a neighborhood always exists (take for example a coordinate neighborhood [2, p. 37]).

Given an orthonormal smooth field of tangent bases B , i.e., such that $B_x^b B_x = I$ for all x (where I stands for the identity matrix of adequate size), the proposed isometric vector transport from $T_x \mathcal{M}$ to $T_y \mathcal{M}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{T} = B_y B_x^b. \quad (6)$$

The $d \times d$ matrix representation of this vector transport in the pair of bases (B_x, B_y) is simply the identity. This considerably simplifies the implementation of Algorithm 1.

2.3.2 Vector transport by rigging

If \mathcal{M} is described as a d -dimensional submanifold of an m -dimensional Euclidean space \mathcal{E} and the codimension $(m - d)$ is much smaller than the dimension d , then the vector transport by rigging, introduced next, may be preferable. For generality, we do not assume that \mathcal{M} is a *Riemannian* submanifold of \mathcal{E} ; in other words, the Riemannian metric g on \mathcal{M} may not be the one induced by the metric of \mathcal{E} . A motivation for this generality is to be able to handle the canonical metric of the Stiefel manifold [17, (2.22)]. For simplicity of the exposition, we work in an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{E} and, for $x \in \mathcal{M}$, we let G_x denote a matrix expression of g_x , i.e., $g_x(\xi_x, \eta_x) = \xi_x^T G_x \eta_x$ for all $\xi_x, \eta_x \in T_x \mathcal{M}$.

An open subset \mathcal{U} of \mathcal{M} is termed *rigged* if it admits a smooth field of normal bases, i.e., a smooth function $N : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times (m-d)} : z \mapsto N_z$ where N_z is a basis of the normal space $N_z \mathcal{M}$. The whole manifold \mathcal{M} itself may not be rigged, but it is always locally rigged.

Given a smooth field of normal bases N , the proposed isometric vector transport \mathcal{T} from $T_x \mathcal{M}$ to $T_y \mathcal{M}$ is defined as follows. Compute $(I - N_x(N_x^T N_x)^{-1} N_x^T) N_y$ (i.e., the orthogonal projection of N_y onto $T_x \mathcal{M}$) and observe that its column space is $T_x \mathcal{M} \ominus (T_x \mathcal{M} \cap T_y \mathcal{M})$. Obtain an orthonormal matrix Q_x by Gram-Schmidt orthonormalizing $(I - N_x(N_x^T N_x)^{-1} N_x^T) N_y$. Proceed likewise with x and y interchanged to get Q_y . Finally, let

$$\mathcal{T} = G_y^{-\frac{1}{2}} (I - Q_x Q_x^T - Q_y Q_y^T) G_x^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (7)$$

While it is clear that \mathcal{T} satisfies the three properties of vector transport mentioned in Sect. 2.1, proving that \mathcal{T} is (locally) smooth remains an open question. Moreover, the column space of $(I - N_x(N_x^T N_x)^{-1} N_x^T) N_y$ gets more sensitive to numerical errors as the distance between x and y decreases. Nevertheless, there is evidence that \mathcal{T} is smooth indeed, and we have observed that using vector transport by rigging in Algorithm 1 is a worthy alternative in large-scale low-codimension problems.

3 Convergence analysis of RTR-SR1

3.1 Notation and standing assumptions

Throughout the convergence analysis, unless otherwise specified, we let $\{x_k\}$, $\{B_k\}$, $\{\tilde{B}_k\}$, $\{s_k\}$, $\{y_k\}$, and $\{\Delta_k\}$ be infinite sequences generated by Algorithm 1, and we make use of the notation introduced in that algorithm. We let Ω denote the sublevel set of x_0 , i.e.,

$$\Omega = \{x \in \mathcal{M} : f(x) \leq f(x_0)\}.$$

The global and local convergence analyses each make standing assumptions at the beginning of their respective sections. The numbered assumptions introduced below are not standing assumptions and will be invoked specifically whenever needed. Note that, apart from Assumption 6, all the numbered assumptions are Riemannian generalizations of assumptions made in [11] for the analysis of the Euclidean SR1 trust-region method.

3.2 Global convergence analysis

In some results, we will assume for the retraction R that there exist $\mu > 0$ and $\delta_\mu > 0$ such that

$$\|\xi\| \geq \mu \operatorname{dist}(x, R_x(\xi)) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, \text{ for all } \xi \in T_x \mathcal{M}, \|\xi\| \leq \delta_\mu. \quad (8)$$

This corresponds to [2, (7.25)] restricted to the sublevel set Ω . Such a condition is instrumental in the global convergence analysis of Riemannian trust-region schemes. Note that, in view of [30, Lemma 6], condition (8) can be shown to hold globally under the condition that R has equicontinuous derivatives.

The next assumption corresponds to [11, (A3)].

Assumption 1 The sequence of linear operators $\{\mathcal{B}_k\}$ is bounded by a constant M such that $\|\mathcal{B}_k\| \leq M$ for all k .

We will often require that the trust-region subproblem (2) is solved accurately enough that, for some positive constants σ_1 and σ_2 ,

$$m_k(0) - m_k(s_k) \geq \sigma_1 \|\operatorname{grad} f(x_k)\| \min \left\{ \Delta_k, \sigma_2 \frac{\|\operatorname{grad} f(x_k)\|}{\|\mathcal{B}_k\|} \right\}, \quad (9)$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_k s_k &= -\operatorname{grad} f(x_k) + \delta_k \text{ with } \|\delta_k\| \leq \|\operatorname{grad} f(x_k)\|^{1+\theta}, \\ &\text{whenever } \|s_k\| \leq 0.8\Delta_k, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\theta > 0$ is a constant. These conditions are generalizations of [11, (2.3–4)]. Observe that, even if we restrict to the Euclidean case, condition (10) remains weaker than condition [11, (2.4)]. The purpose of introducing δ_k in (10) is to encompass stopping criteria such as [2, (7.10)] that do not require the computation of an exact solution of the trust-region subproblem. We point out in particular that (9) and (10) hold if the approximate solution of the trust-region subproblem (2) is obtained from the truncated CG method, described in [2, §7.3.2] in the Riemannian context.

We can now state and prove the main global convergence results. Point (iii) generalizes [11, Theorem 2.1] while points (i) and (ii) are based on [2, §7.4.1].

Theorem 1 (convergence) (i) If $f \in C^2$ is bounded below on the sublevel set Ω , Assumption 1 holds, condition (9) holds, and (8) is satisfied then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{grad } f(x_k) = 0$. (ii) If $f \in C^2$, \mathcal{M} is compact, Assumption 1 holds, and (9) holds then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{grad } f(x_k) = 0$, $\{x_k\}$ has at least one limit point, and every limit point of $\{x_k\}$ is a stationary point of f . (iii) If $f \in C^2$, the sublevel set Ω is compact, f has a unique stationary point x^* in Ω , Assumption 1 holds, condition (9) holds, and (8) is satisfied then $\{x_k\}$ converges to x^* .

Proof (i) Observe that the proof of [2, Theorem 7.4.4] still holds when condition [2, (7.25)] is weakened to its restriction (8) to Ω . Indeed, since the trust-region method is a descent iteration, it follows that all iterates are in Ω . The assumptions thus allow us to conclude, by [2, Theorem 7.4.4], that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{grad } f(x_k) = 0$. (ii) It follows from [2, Proposition 7.4.5] and [2, Corollary 7.4.6] that all the assumptions of [2, Theorem 7.4.4] hold. Hence $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{grad } f(x_k) = 0$, and every limit point is thus a stationary point of f . Since \mathcal{M} is compact, $\{x_k\}$ is guaranteed to have at least one limit point. (iii) Again by [2, Theorem 7.4.4], we get that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{grad } f(x_k) = 0$. Since $\{x_k\}$ belongs to the compact set Ω and cannot have limit points other than x^* , it follows that $\{x_k\}$ converges to x^* . \square

3.3 More notation and standing assumptions

For the purpose of conducting a local convergence analysis, we now assume that $\{x_k\}$ converges to a point x^* . Moreover, we assume throughout that $f \in C^2$.

We let \mathcal{U}_{trn} be a *totally retractive neighborhood* of x^* , a concept inspired from the notion of totally normal neighborhood (see [13, §3.3]). By this, we mean that there is $\delta_{\text{trn}} > 0$ such that, for each $y \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{trn}}$, we have that $R_y(\mathbb{B}(0_y, \delta_{\text{trn}})) \supseteq \mathcal{U}_{\text{trn}}$ and $R_y(\cdot)$ is a diffeomorphism on $\mathbb{B}(0_y, \delta_{\text{trn}})$, where $\mathbb{B}(0_y, \delta_{\text{trn}})$ denotes the ball of radius δ_{trn} in $T_y \mathcal{M}$ centered at the origin 0_y . The existence of a totally retractive neighborhood can be shown along the lines of [13, Theorem 3.3.7]. We assume without loss of generality that $\{x_k\} \subset \mathcal{U}_{\text{trn}}$. Whenever we consider an inverse retraction $R_x^{-1}(y)$, we implicitly assume that $x, y \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{trn}}$.

3.4 Local convergence analysis

The purpose of this section is to obtain a superlinear convergence result for Algorithm 1, stated in Theorem 2. The analysis can be viewed as a Riemannian generalization of the local analysis in [11, §2]. As we proceed, we will point out the main hurdles that had to be overcome in the generalization. The analysis makes use of several preparation lemmas, independent of Algorithm 1, that are of potential interest in the broader context of Riemannian optimization. These preparation lemmas become trivial or well known in the Euclidean context.

The next assumption corresponds to a part of [11, (A1)].

Assumption 2 The point x^* is a nondegenerate local minimizer of f . In other words, $\text{grad } f(x^*) = 0$ and $\text{Hess } f(x^*)$ is positive definite.

The next assumption generalizes the assumption, contained in [11, (A1)], that the Hessian of f is Lipschitz continuous near x^* . (Recall that \mathcal{T}_S is the vector transport invoked in Algorithm 1.) Note that the assumption holds if $f \in C^3$; see Lemma 4.

Assumption 3 There exists a constant c_0 such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{trn}}$,

$$\|\text{Hess } f(y) - \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta} \text{Hess } f(x) \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta}^{-1}\| \leq c \text{dist}(x, y),$$

where $\text{Hess } f(x)$ is the Riemannian Hessian of f at x (see, e.g., [2, §5.5]), $\eta = R_x^{-1}(y)$, and $\|\cdot\|$ is also used to denote the operator norm induced by the Riemannian norm (5).

The next assumption is introduced to handle the Riemannian case; in the classical Euclidean setting, Assumption 4 follows from Assumption 3. Assumption 4 is mild since it holds if $f \in C^3$, as shown in Lemma 4.

Assumption 4 There exists a constant c_0 such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{trn}}$, all $\xi_x \in T_x \mathcal{M}$ with $R_x(\xi_x) \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{trn}}$, and all $\xi_y \in T_y \mathcal{M}$ with $R_y(\xi_y) \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{trn}}$, the inequality

$$\|\text{Hess } \hat{f}_y(\xi_y) - \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta} \text{Hess } \hat{f}_x(\xi_x) \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta}^{-1}\| \leq c_0(\|\xi_y\| + \|\xi_x\| + \|\eta\|)$$

holds, where $\eta = R_x^{-1}(y)$, $\hat{f}_x = f \circ R_x$, and $\hat{f}_y = f \circ R_y$.

The next assumption corresponds to [11, (A2)]. It implies that no updates of \mathcal{B}_k are skipped. In the Euclidean case, Khalfan et al. [24] show that this is usually the case in practice.

Assumption 5 The inequality

$$|g(s_k, y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k)| \geq \nu \|s_k\| \|y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k\|$$

holds.

The next assumption is introduced to handle the Riemannian case. It states that the iterates eventually *continuously stay* in the totally retractive neighborhood \mathcal{U}_{trn} (the terminology is borrowed from [5, Definition 2.8]). The assumption is needed, in particular, for Lemma 5. Note that, whereas in the Euclidean setting the assumption follows from the standing assumption that $\{x_k\}$ converges to x^* , this is no longer the case on some Riemannian manifolds, where $\{x_k\}$ may converge to x^* while the connecting segments $\{R_{x_k}(ts_k) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ do not. Assumption 6 is thus invoked to ensure that we are in a position to carry out a *local* convergence analysis.

Assumption 6 There exists N such that, for all $k \geq N$ and all $t \in [0, 1]$, $R_{x_k}(ts_k) \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{trn}}$.

The next lemma is proved in [19, Lemma 14.1].

Lemma 1 Let \mathcal{M} be a Riemannian manifold, let \mathcal{U} be a compact coordinate neighborhood in \mathcal{M} , and let the hat denote coordinate expressions. Then there are $c_2 > c_1 > 0$ such that, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{U}$, we have

$$c_1 \|\hat{x} - \hat{y}\|_2 \leq \text{dist}(x, y) \leq c_2 \|\hat{x} - \hat{y}\|_2,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean norm, i.e., $\|\hat{x}\|_2 = \sqrt{\hat{x}^T \hat{x}}$.

Lemma 2 Let \mathcal{M} be a Riemannian manifold endowed with a retraction R and let $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there exist $a_0 > 0$, $a_1 > 0$, and $\delta_{a_0, a_1} > 0$ such that for all x in a sufficiently small neighborhood of \bar{x} and all $\xi, \eta \in T_x \mathcal{M}$ with $\|\xi\| \leq \delta_{a_0, a_1}$ and $\|\eta\| \leq \delta_{a_0, a_1}$, the inequalities

$$a_0 \|\xi - \eta\| \leq \text{dist}(R_x(\eta), R_x(\xi)) \leq a_1 \|\xi - \eta\|$$

hold.

Proof Since R is smooth, we can choose a neighborhood small enough such that R satisfies the condition of [30, Lemma 6], and the result follows from that lemma. \square

The following lemma follows from Lemma 2 by setting $\eta = 0$. We state it separately for convenience as we will frequently invoke it in the analysis.

Lemma 3 Let \mathcal{M} be a Riemannian manifold endowed with retraction R and let $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there exist $a_0 > 0$, $a_1 > 0$, and $\delta_{a_0, a_1} > 0$ such that for all x in a sufficiently small neighborhood of \bar{x} and all $\xi \in T_x \mathcal{M}$ with $\|\xi\| \leq \delta_{a_0, a_1}$, the inequalities

$$a_0 \|\xi\| \leq \text{dist}(x, R_x(\xi)) \leq a_1 \|\xi\|$$

hold.

Lemma 4 If $f \in C^3$, then Assumptions 3 and 4 hold.

Proof First, we prove that Assumption 3 holds. Define a function $h : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \times T\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T\mathcal{M}$, $(x, y, \xi_y) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta} \text{Hess } f(x) \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta}^{-1} \xi_y$, where $\eta = R_x^{-1}(y)$. Since $f \in C^3$, we know that $h(x, y, \xi_y)$ is C^1 . Then there exists b_0 such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{tm}}$, $\xi_y \in T_y \mathcal{M}$, $\|\xi_y\| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|h(y, y, \xi_y) - h(x, y, \xi_y)\| &\leq b_0 \text{dist}(\{y, y, \xi_y\}, \{x, y, \xi_y\}) \\ &\leq b_1 \|\{\hat{y}, \hat{y}, \hat{\xi}_y\} - \{\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{\xi}_y\}\|_2 \quad (\text{by Lemma 1}) \\ &= b_1 \|\hat{y} - \hat{x}\|_2 \\ &\leq b_2 \text{dist}(y, x), \quad (\text{by Lemma 1}) \end{aligned}$$

where b_0, b_1 and b_2 are some constants. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_2 \text{dist}(y, x) &\geq \|h(y, y, \xi_y) - h(x, y, \xi_y)\| \\ &= \|(\text{Hess } f(y) - \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta} \text{Hess } f(x) \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta}^{-1}) \xi_y\| \end{aligned}$$

Given any linear operator A on $T_y \mathcal{M}$, we have that $\|A\|$ by definition is $\sup_{\|\xi\|=1} \|A\xi\|$. Note that $\|\xi\| = 1$ is a compact set. Hence, there exists $\|\xi^*\| = 1$ such that $\|A\| = \|A\xi^*\|$. Therefore, we can choose $\xi_y, \|\xi_y\| = 1$ such that

$$\|(\text{Hess } f(y) - \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta} \text{Hess } f(x) \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta}^{-1}) \xi_y\| = \|(\text{Hess } f(y) - \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta} \text{Hess } f(x) \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta}^{-1})\|.$$

We obtain

$$\|\text{Hess } f(y) - \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta} \text{Hess } f(x) \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta}^{-1}\| \leq b_2 \text{dist}(y, x).$$

To prove Assumption 4, we redefine h as $h(y, x, \xi_x) = \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta} \text{Hess } \hat{f}_x(\xi_x) \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta}^{-1}$. If we use orthonormal vector fields to obtain the coordinate expression of h , denoted by \hat{h} , then the manifold norm and the Euclidean norm of coordinate expressions are the same and we have

$$\|\text{Hess } \hat{f}_y(\xi_y) - \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta} \text{Hess } \hat{f}_x(\xi_x) \mathcal{T}_{S_\eta}^{-1}\| = \|\text{Hess } \hat{f}_y(\hat{\xi}_y) - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{S_\eta} \text{Hess } \hat{f}_x(\hat{\xi}_x) \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{S_\eta}^{-1}\|_2. \quad (11)$$

Since $f \in C^3$, we know that \hat{h} is also in C^1 . Hence there exists a constant b_3 such that

$$\|\hat{h}(\hat{y}, \hat{y}, \hat{\xi}_y) - \hat{h}(\hat{y}, \hat{x}, \hat{\xi}_x)\|_2 \leq b_3 \|\{\hat{y}, \hat{y}, \hat{\xi}_y\} - \{\hat{y}, \hat{x}, \hat{\xi}_x\}\|_2.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\text{Hess } \hat{f}_y(\hat{\xi}_y) - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{S_\eta} \text{Hess } \hat{f}_x(\hat{\xi}_x) \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{S_\eta}^{-1}\|_2 \\ &= \|\hat{h}(\hat{y}, \hat{y}, \hat{\xi}_y) - \hat{h}(\hat{y}, \hat{x}, \hat{\xi}_x)\|_2 \\ &\leq b_3 \|\{\hat{y}, \hat{y}, \hat{\xi}_y\} - \{\hat{y}, \hat{x}, \hat{\xi}_x\}\|_2 \\ &\leq b_4 (\|\hat{y} - \hat{x}\|_2 + \|\hat{\xi}_y\|_2 + \|\hat{\xi}_x\|_2) \\ &\leq b_5 (\text{dist}(x, y) + \|\hat{\xi}_y\|_2 + \|\hat{\xi}_x\|_2) \text{ (by Lemma 1)} \\ &\leq b_6 (\|\eta\| + \|\xi_y\| + \|\xi_x\|). \text{ (by Lemma 3)} \end{aligned}$$

This and (11) give us Assumption 4. \square

The next lemma generalizes [11, Lemma 2.2]. The key difference with the Euclidean case is the following: in the Euclidean case, when s_k is accepted, we simply have $\|s_k\| = \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|$, while in the Riemannian generalization, we invoke Assumption 6 and Lemma 3 to deduce that $\|s_k\| \leq \frac{1}{a_0} \text{dist}(x_{k+1}, x_k)$. Note that Assumption 6 cannot be removed. To see this, consider for example the unit sphere with the exponential retraction, where we can have $x_k = x_{k+1}$ with $\|s_k\| = 2\pi$.

Lemma 5 Suppose Assumption 6 holds. Then either

$$\Delta_k \rightarrow 0 \quad (12)$$

or there exist $K > 0$ and $\Delta > 0$ such that for all $k > K$

$$\Delta_k = \Delta. \quad (13)$$

In either case $s_k \rightarrow 0$.

Proof Let $\Delta = \liminf \Delta_k$ and suppose first that $\Delta > 0$. From line 1 of Algorithm 1, if Δ_k is increased, then $\|s_k\| \geq 0.8\Delta_k$ and $x_{k+1} = R_{x_k}(s_k)$, which implies by Lemma 3 and Assumption 6 that $\text{dist}(x_k, x_{k+1}) \geq a_0 0.8\Delta_k$. The latter inequality cannot hold for infinitely many values of k since $x_k \rightarrow x^*$ and $\liminf \Delta_k > 0$. Hence, there exists $K \geq 0$ such that Δ_k is not increased for any $k \geq K$. Since $\Delta > 0$, this implies that $\Delta_k \geq \Delta$ for all $k \geq K$. In view of the trust-region update mechanism in Algorithm 1 and since $\Delta = \liminf \Delta_k$, we also know that, for some $K_1 > K$, $\Delta_{K_1} < \frac{1}{\tau_1} \Delta$. If the trust region radius were to be decreased we would have $\Delta_{K_1+1} < \Delta$, which we have ruled out. Since neither increase nor decrease can occur, we must have $\Delta_k = \Delta$ for all $k \geq K_1$.

Suppose now that $\Delta = 0$. Since $x_k \rightarrow x^*$, for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $K_\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $\text{dist}(x_{k+1}, x_k) < \epsilon$ for all $k \geq K_\epsilon$. Since $\liminf \Delta_k = 0$, there exists $j \geq K_\epsilon$ such that $\Delta_j < \epsilon$. But since Δ_k is increased only if $\Delta_k \leq \frac{1}{0.8} \|s_k\| \leq \frac{1}{0.8a_0} \text{dist}(x_{k+1}, x_k) < \frac{\epsilon}{0.8a_0}$, and the increase factor is τ_2 , we have that $\Delta_k < \frac{\tau_2 \epsilon}{0.8a_0}$ for all $k \geq j$. Therefore (12) follows.

To show that $\|s_k\| \rightarrow 0$, note that if (12) is true, then clearly $\|s_k\| \rightarrow 0$. If (13) is true, then for all $k > K$, the step s_k is accepted and $\|s_k\| \leq \frac{1}{a_0} \text{dist}(x_{k+1}, x_k)$ (by Lemma 3), hence $\|s_k\| \rightarrow 0$ since $\{x_k\}$ converges. \square

Lemma 6 *Let \mathcal{M} be a Riemannian manifold endowed with two vector transports \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 , and let $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there exist a constant a_4 and a neighborhood \mathcal{U} of \bar{x} such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{U}$ and all $\xi \in T_y \mathcal{M}$,*

$$\|\mathcal{T}_{1_\eta}^{-1} \xi - \mathcal{T}_{2_\eta}^{-1} \xi\| \leq a_4 \|\xi\| \|\eta\|,$$

where $\eta = R_x^{-1}(y)$.

Proof We use the hat to denote coordinate expressions. Let $T_1(\hat{x}, \hat{\eta})$ and $T_2(\hat{x}, \hat{\eta})$ denote the coordinate expression of $\mathcal{T}_{1_\eta}^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{2_\eta}^{-1}$, respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_{1_\eta}^{-1} \xi - \mathcal{T}_{2_\eta}^{-1} \xi\| &\leq b_0 \|(T_1(\hat{x}, \hat{\eta}) - T_2(\hat{x}, \hat{\eta})) \hat{\xi}\|_2 \\ &\leq b_0 \|\hat{\xi}\|_2 \|T_1(\hat{x}, \hat{\eta}) - T_2(\hat{x}, \hat{\eta})\|_2 \\ &\leq b_1 \|\hat{\xi}\|_2 \|\hat{\eta}\|_2 \text{ (since } T_1(\hat{x}, 0) = T_2(\hat{x}, 0) \text{ and both } T_1 \text{ and } T_2 \text{ are smooth)} \\ &\leq b_2 \|\xi\| \|\eta\| \end{aligned}$$

for some constants b_0 , b_1 , and b_2 . \square

The next lemma is proved in [19, Lemma 14.5].

Lemma 7 *Let F be a C^1 vector field on a Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} and let $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{M}$ be a nondegenerate zero of F . Then there exist a neighborhood \mathcal{U} of \bar{x} and $a_5, a_6 > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{U}$,*

$$a_5 \text{dist}(x, \bar{x}) \leq \|F(x)\| \leq a_6 \text{dist}(x, \bar{x}).$$

In the Euclidean case, the next lemma holds with $\tilde{a}_7 = 0$ and reduces to the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus.

Lemma 8 *Let F be a C^1 vector field on a Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} , let R be a retraction on \mathcal{M} , and let $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there exist a neighborhood \mathcal{U} of \bar{x} and a constant \tilde{a}_7 such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{U}$,*

$$\|P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow 1} F(y) - F(x) - \left[\int_0^1 P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \mathbb{D}F(\gamma(t)) P_\gamma^{t \leftarrow 0} dt \right] \eta\| \leq \tilde{a}_7 \|\eta\|^2,$$

where $\eta = R_x^{-1}(y)$ and P_γ is the parallel translation along the curve γ given by $\gamma(t) = R_x(t\eta)$.

Proof Define $G : [0, 1] \rightarrow T_x \mathcal{M} : t \mapsto G(t) = P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} F(\gamma(t))$. Observe that $G(0) = F(x)$ and $G(1) = P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow 1} F(y)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} G'(t) &= \frac{d}{d\epsilon} G(t + \epsilon)|_{\epsilon=0} \\ &= P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \frac{d}{d\epsilon} P_\gamma^{t \leftarrow t+\epsilon} F(\gamma(t + \epsilon))|_{\epsilon=0} \\ &= P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \mathbb{D}F(\gamma(t)) \left[\frac{d}{d\epsilon} \gamma(t + \epsilon) \right]|_{\epsilon=0} \\ &= P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \mathbb{D}F(\gamma(t)) [\mathcal{T}_{R(t\eta)} \eta], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used an expression of the covariant derivative \mathbb{D} in terms of the parallel translation P (see, e.g., [14, theorem I.2.1]), and where $\mathcal{T}_{R(t\eta)} \eta = \frac{d}{dt}(R(t\eta))$. Since $G(1) - G(0) = \int_0^1 G'(t) dt$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow 1} F(y) - F(x) - \int_0^1 P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \mathbb{D}F(\gamma(t)) P_\gamma^{t \leftarrow 0} \eta dt\| \\ &= \left\| \int_0^1 P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \mathbb{D}F(\gamma(t)) (\mathcal{T}_{R(t\eta)} \eta - P_\gamma^{t \leftarrow 0} \eta) dt \right\| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \|P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \mathbb{D}F(\gamma(t)) P_\gamma^{t \leftarrow 0}\| \| (P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \mathcal{T}_{R(t\eta)} \eta - \eta) \| dt \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \|P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \mathbb{D}F(\gamma(t)) P_\gamma^{t \leftarrow 0}\| \| (P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \mathcal{T}_{R(t\eta)} \eta - \mathcal{T}_{R(t\eta)}^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{R(t\eta)} \eta) \| dt \\ &\leq b_0 \|\eta\|^2 \text{ (by Lemma 6)} \end{aligned}$$

where b_0 is some constant. \square

Lemma 9 Suppose Assumptions 2 and 3 hold. Then there exist a neighborhood \mathcal{U} and a constant a_7 such that for all x_1, \tilde{x}_1, x_2 , and $\tilde{x}_2 \in \mathcal{U}$, we have

$$|g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \xi_1, y_2) - g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} y_1, \xi_2)| \leq a_7 \max\{\text{dist}(x_1, x^*), \text{dist}(x_2, x^*), \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_1, x^*), \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_2, x^*)\} \|\xi_1\| \|\xi_2\|,$$

where $\zeta = R_{x_1}^{-1}(x_2)$, $\xi_1 = R_{x_1}^{-1}(\tilde{x}_1)$, $\xi_2 = R_{x_2}^{-1}(\tilde{x}_2)$, $y_1 = \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_1}}^{-1} \text{grad } f(\tilde{x}_1) - \text{grad } f(x_1)$, and $y_2 = \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_2}}^{-1} \text{grad } f(\tilde{x}_2) - \text{grad } f(x_2)$.

Proof Define $\bar{y}_1 = P_{\gamma_1}^{0 \leftarrow 1} \text{grad } f(\tilde{x}_1) - \text{grad } f(x_1)$ and $\bar{y}_2 = P_{\gamma_2}^{0 \leftarrow 1} \text{grad } f(\tilde{x}_2) - \text{grad } f(x_2)$, where P is the parallel transport, $\gamma_1(t) = R_{x_1}(t\xi_1)$, and $\gamma_2(t) = R_{x_2}(t\xi_2)$. From Lemma 8, we have

$$\|\bar{y}_1 - \bar{H}_1(x_1, \tilde{x}_1)\xi_1\| \leq b_0 \|\xi_1\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\bar{y}_2 - \bar{H}_2(x_2, \tilde{x}_2)\xi_2\| \leq b_0 \|\xi_2\|^2, \quad (14)$$

where b_0 is a positive constant, $\bar{H}_1(x_1, \tilde{x}_1) = \int_0^1 P_{\gamma_1}^{0 \leftarrow t} \text{Hess } f(\gamma_1(t)) P_{\gamma_1}^{t \leftarrow 0} dt$ and $\bar{H}_2(x_2, \tilde{x}_2) = \int_0^1 P_{\gamma_2}^{0 \leftarrow t} \text{Hess } f(\gamma_2(t)) P_{\gamma_2}^{t \leftarrow 0} dt$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & |g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \xi_1, y_2) - g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} y_1, \xi_2)| \\ & \leq |g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \xi_1, \bar{y}_2) - g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \bar{y}_1, \xi_2)| + |g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \xi_1, y_2 - \bar{y}_2) - g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} (y_1 - \bar{y}_1), \xi_2)| \\ & \leq |g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \xi_1, \bar{H}_2(x_2, \tilde{x}_2)\xi_2) - g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \bar{H}_1(x_1, \tilde{x}_1)\xi_1, \xi_2)| \\ & \quad + b_1(\|\xi_1\| + \|\xi_2\|) \|\xi_1\| \|\xi_2\| \quad (\text{by (14)}) \\ & \quad + |g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \xi_1, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_2}}^{-1} \text{grad } f(\tilde{x}_2) - P_{\gamma_2}^{0 \leftarrow 1} \text{grad } f(\tilde{x}_2))| \\ & \quad + |g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} (\mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_1}}^{-1} \text{grad } f(\tilde{x}_1) - P_{\gamma_1}^{0 \leftarrow 1} \text{grad } f(\tilde{x}_1)), \xi_2)| \\ & \leq |g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \xi_1, \bar{H}_2(x_2, \tilde{x}_2)\xi_2) - g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \bar{H}_1(x_1, \tilde{x}_1)\xi_1, \xi_2)| \\ & \quad + b_1(\|\xi_1\| + \|\xi_2\|) \|\xi_1\| \|\xi_2\| \\ & \quad + b_2 \|\xi_1\| \|\xi_2\| \|\text{grad } f(\tilde{x}_2)\| + b_3 \|\xi_1\| \|\xi_2\| \|\text{grad } f(\tilde{x}_1)\| \quad (\text{by Lemma 6}) \\ & \leq |g(\bar{H}_2(x_2, \tilde{x}_2)\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \xi_1, \xi_2) - g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \bar{H}_1(x_1, \tilde{x}_1)\xi_1, \xi_2)| \\ & \quad (\text{average Hessian is also self-adjoint}) \\ & \quad + b_4 \|\xi_1\| \|\xi_2\| (\text{dist}(x_1, \tilde{x}_1) + \text{dist}(x_2, \tilde{x}_2) + \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_2, x^*) + \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_1, x^*)) \\ & \quad (\text{by Lemmas 3 and 7}) \\ & \leq b_5 \|\xi_1\| \|\xi_2\| \max\{\text{dist}(x_1, x^*), \text{dist}(x_2, x^*), \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_1, x^*), \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_2, x^*)\} \\ & \quad (\text{by triangle inequality of distance}) \\ & \quad + |g(\bar{H}_2(x_2, \tilde{x}_2)\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \xi_1, \xi_2) - g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta} \bar{H}_1(x_1, \tilde{x}_1)\xi_1, \xi_2)| \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 and b_5 are some constants. Using $\hat{\cdot}$ to denote coordinate expressions, $T(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)$ to denote \mathcal{T}_ζ and $\hat{G}(\hat{x}_2)$ to denote the matrix expression of the Riemannian metric at x_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |g(\bar{H}_2(x_2, \tilde{x}_2)\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta}\xi_1, \xi_2) - g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta}\bar{H}_1(x_1, \tilde{x}_1)\xi_1, \xi_2)| \\
&= |\hat{\xi}_1^T T(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)^T \hat{H}_2(\hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_2)^T \hat{G}(\hat{x}_2)\hat{\xi}_2 - \hat{\xi}_1^T \hat{H}_1(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_1)^T T(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)^T \hat{G}(\hat{x}_2)\hat{\xi}_2| \\
&\leq \|\hat{\xi}_1\|_2 \|T(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)^T \hat{H}_2(\hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_2)^T - \hat{H}_1(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_1)^T T(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)^T\|_2 \|\hat{G}(\hat{x}_2)\|_2 \|\hat{\xi}_2\|_2
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean norm. Define a function

$$J(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_2) = T(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)^T \hat{H}_2(\hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_2)^T - \hat{H}_1(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_1)^T T(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)^T.$$

We can see that when $(\hat{x}_1^T, \hat{x}_1^T) = (\hat{x}_2^T, \hat{x}_2^T)$, $J = 0$. Since, in view of Assumption 3, J is Lipschitz continuous, it follows that (16) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& |g(\bar{H}_2\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta}\xi_1, \xi_2) - g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta}\bar{H}_1\xi_1, \xi_2)| \\
&\leq b_6 \|(\hat{x}_1^T, \hat{x}_1^T) - (\hat{x}_2^T, \hat{x}_2^T)\|_2 \|\hat{\xi}_1\|_2 \|\hat{\xi}_2\|_2 \\
&\leq b_7 \|\xi_1\| \|\xi_2\| \max\{\text{dist}(x_1, x_2), \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2)\},
\end{aligned}$$

where b_6, b_7 are some constants. Combining this equation with (15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& |g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta}\xi_1, y_2) - g(\mathcal{T}_{S_\zeta}y_1, \xi_2)| \\
&\leq b_8 \|\xi_1\| \|\xi_2\| \max\{\text{dist}(x_1, x^*), \text{dist}(x_2, x^*), \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_1, x^*), \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_2, x^*)\},
\end{aligned}$$

where b_8 is a constant. \square

Lemma 10 Let \mathcal{M} be a Riemannian manifold endowed with a vector transport \mathcal{T} with associated retraction R , and let $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there is a neighborhood \mathcal{U} of \bar{x} and a_8 such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\text{id} - \mathcal{T}_\xi^{-1} \mathcal{T}_\eta^{-1} \mathcal{T}_\zeta\| \leq a_8 \max(\text{dist}(x, \bar{x}), \text{dist}(y, \bar{x})), \\
& \|\text{id} - \mathcal{T}_\zeta^{-1} \mathcal{T}_\eta \mathcal{T}_\xi\| \leq a_8 \max(\text{dist}(x, \bar{x}), \text{dist}(y, \bar{x})),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\xi = R_{\bar{x}}^{-1}(x)$, $\eta = R_{\bar{x}}^{-1}(y)$, $\zeta = R_{\bar{x}}^{-1}(y)$, id is the identity operator, and $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm induced by the Riemannian metric.

Proof Let the hat denote coordinate expressions, chosen such that the matrix expression of the Riemannian metric at \bar{x} is the identity. Let $L(x, y)$ denote $\mathcal{T}_{R_{\bar{x}}^{-1}(y)}$. We have

$$\|\text{id} - \mathcal{T}_\xi^{-1} \mathcal{T}_\eta^{-1} \mathcal{T}_\zeta\| = \|I - L(\bar{x}, x)^{-1} L(x, y)^{-1} L(\bar{x}, y)\|.$$

Define a function $J(\bar{x}, \xi, \zeta) = I - L(\bar{x}, R_{\bar{x}}(\xi))^{-1} L(R_{\bar{x}}(\xi), R_{\bar{x}}(\zeta))^{-1} L(\bar{x}, R_{\bar{x}}(\zeta))$. Notice that J is a smooth function and $J(\bar{x}, 0_{\bar{x}}, 0_{\bar{x}}) = 0$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
\|J(\bar{x}, \xi, \zeta)\| &= \|J(\bar{x}, \xi, \zeta) - J(\bar{x}, 0_{\bar{x}}, 0_{\bar{x}})\| \\
&= \|\hat{J}(\hat{\bar{x}}, \hat{\xi}, \hat{\zeta}) - \hat{J}(\hat{\bar{x}}, \hat{0}_{\bar{x}}, \hat{0}_{\bar{x}})\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq b_0(\|\hat{\xi}\|_2 + \|\hat{\zeta}\|_2) \text{ (smoothness of } J) \\
&\leq b_1(\text{dist}(x, \bar{x}) + \text{dist}(y, \bar{x})) \text{ (by Lemma 3)} \\
&\leq b_2 \max(\text{dist}(x, \bar{x}), \text{dist}(y, \bar{x})),
\end{aligned}$$

where b_0, b_1 and b_2 are some constants and $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean norm. So

$$\|\text{id} - \mathcal{T}_{\xi}^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{\eta}^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{\zeta}\| \leq b_2 \max(\text{dist}(x, \bar{x}), \text{dist}(y, \bar{x})).$$

This concludes the first part of the proof. The second part of the result follows from a similar argument. \square

The next lemma generalizes [15, Lemma 1]. It is instrumental in the proof of Lemma 13 below. In the Euclidean setting, it is possible to give an expression for a_9 and a_{10} in terms of c of Assumption 3 and ν of Assumption 5. In the Riemannian setting, we could not obtain such an expression, in part because the constant b_2 that appears in the proof below is no longer zero. However, the existence of a_9 and a_{10} can still be shown, under the assumption that $\{x_k\}$ converges to x^* , and this is all we need in order to carry on with Lemma 13.

Lemma 11 *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 5 hold. Then*

$$y_j - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{j+1} s_j = 0 \quad (17)$$

for all j . Moreover, there exist constants a_9 and a_{10} such that

$$\|y_j - (\mathcal{B}_i)_j s_j\| \leq a_9 a_{10}^{i-j-2} \epsilon_{i,j} \|s_j\| \quad (18)$$

for all j , $i \geq j+1$, where $\epsilon_{i,j} = \max_{j \leq k \leq i} \text{dist}(x_k, x^*)$ and

$$(\mathcal{B}_i)_j = \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,i}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_i \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,i}}}$$

with $\zeta_{j,i} = R_{x_j}^{-1}(x_i)$.

Proof From (3), we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{j+1} s_j = \left(\mathcal{B}_j + \frac{(y_j - \mathcal{B}_j s_j)(y_j - \mathcal{B}_j s_j)^b}{g(s_j, y_j - \mathcal{B}_j s_j)} \right) s_j = y_j.$$

This yields (17), as well as (18) with $i = j+1$. The proof of (18) for $i > j+1$ is by induction. We choose $k \geq j+1$ and assume that (18) holds for all $i = j+1, \dots, k$. Let $r_k = y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
|g(r_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j)| &= |g(y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j)| \\
&\leq |g(y_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j) - g(s_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} y_j)| + |g(s_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} (y_j - (\mathcal{B}_k)_j s_j))| \\
&\quad + |g(s_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} ((\mathcal{B}_k)_j s_j)) - g(\mathcal{B}_k s_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j)|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \leq |g(y_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j) - g(s_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} y_j)| + \|\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} (y_j - (\mathcal{B}_k)_j s_j)\| \|s_k\| \\
& \quad + |g(s_k, \mathcal{B}_k \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j) - g(\mathcal{B}_k s_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j)| \\
& \leq |g(y_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j) - g(s_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} y_j)| + b_0 a_9 a_{10}^{k-j-2} \epsilon_{k,j} \|s_j\| \|s_k\| \\
& \quad (\mathcal{B}_k \text{ self-adjoint and induction assumption}) \\
& \leq b_0 a_9 a_{10}^{k-j-2} \epsilon_{k,j} \|s_j\| \|s_k\| + b_1 \epsilon_{k+1,j} \|s_k\| \|s_j\|, \text{ (by Lemma 9)}
\end{aligned}$$

where b_0 and b_1 are some constants. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|y_j - (\mathcal{B}_{k+1})_j s_j\| &= \|y_j - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k+1}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k+1} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k+1}}} s_j\| \\
&= \|y_j - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k+1}}}^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{S_{s_k}} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{k+1} \mathcal{T}_{S_{s_k}}^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k+1}}} s_j\| \\
&\leq \|y_j - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}}^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{k+1} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j\| \\
&\quad + \|\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}}^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{k+1} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k+1}}}^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{S_{s_k}} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{k+1} \mathcal{T}_{S_{s_k}}^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k+1}}} s_j\| \\
&\leq \|y_j - ((\mathcal{B}_k)_j + \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}}^{-1} \frac{(r_k)(r_k)^b}{g(s_k, r_k)} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j)\| + b_2 \epsilon_{k+1,j} \|s_j\| \\
&\quad (\text{by Lemma 10, Assumption 1, and (3)}) \\
&\leq \|y_j - (\mathcal{B}_k)_j s_j\| + b_3 \frac{|g(r_k, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{j,k}}} s_j)|}{\|s_k\|} + b_2 \epsilon_{k+1,j} \|s_j\| \text{ (by Assumption 5)} \\
&\leq a_9 a_{10}^{k-j-2} \epsilon_{k,j} \|s_j\| + b_3 b_0 a_9 a_{10}^{k-j-2} \epsilon_{k,j} \|s_j\| + b_3 b_1 \epsilon_{k,j} \|s_j\| + b_2 \epsilon_{k+1,j} \|s_j\| \\
&\leq (a_9 a_{10}^{k-j-2} + b_3 b_0 a_9 a_{10}^{k-j-2} + b_3 b_1 + b_2) \epsilon_{k+1,j} \|s_j\|, \text{ (since } \epsilon_{k,j} \leq \epsilon_{k+1,j} \text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

where b_2, b_3 are some constant. Because b_0, b_1, b_2 and b_3 are independent of a_9 and a_{10} , we can choose a_9 and a_{10} large enough such that

$$(a_9 a_{10}^{k-j-2} + b_3 b_0 a_9 a_{10}^{k-j-2} + b_3 b_1 + b_2) \leq a_9 a_{10}^{k+1-j-2}.$$

for all $j, k \geq j+1$. Take for example, $a_9 > 1$ and $a_{10} > 1 + b_3 b_0 + b_3 b_1 + b_2$. Therefore

$$\|y_j - (\mathcal{B}_{k+1})_j s_j\| \leq a_9 a_{10}^{k+1-j-2} \epsilon_{k+1,j} \|s_j\|.$$

This concludes the argument by induction. \square

Lemma 12 *If Assumption 3 holds then there exist a neighborhood \mathcal{U} of x^* and a constant a_{11} such that for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{U}$, the inequality*

$$\|y - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_1}} \text{Hess } f(x^*) \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_1}}^{-1} s\| \leq a_{11} \|s\| \max\{\text{dist}(x_1, x^*), \text{dist}(x_2, x^*)\}$$

holds, where $\zeta_1 = R_{x^}^{-1}(x_1)$, $s = R_{x_1}^{-1}(x_2)$, $y = \mathcal{T}_{S_s}^{-1} \text{grad } f(x_2) - \text{grad } f(x_1)$.*

Proof Define $\bar{y} = P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow 1} \text{grad } f(x_2) - \text{grad } f(x_1)$, where P is the parallel transport along the curve γ defined by $\gamma(t) = R_{x_1}(ts)$. From Lemma 8, we have

$$\|\bar{y} - \bar{H}s\| \leq b_0 \|s\|^2, \quad (19)$$

where $\bar{H} = \int_0^1 P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \text{Hess } f(\gamma(t)) P_\gamma^{t \leftarrow 0} dt$ and b_0 is a constant. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|y - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_1}} \text{Hess } f(x^*) \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_1}}^{-1} s\| \\ & \leq \|y - \bar{y}\| + \|\bar{y} - \bar{H}s\| + \|\bar{H}s - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_1}} \text{Hess } f(x^*) \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_1}}^{-1} s\| \\ & = \|\mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_1}}^{-1} \text{grad } f(x_2) - P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow 1} \text{grad } f(x_2)\| + b_0 \|s\|^2 \\ & \quad + \|\bar{H} - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_1}} \text{Hess } f(x^*) \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_1}}^{-1}\| \|s\| \\ & \leq b_1 \|s\| \max\{\text{dist}(x_1, x^*), \text{dist}(x_2, x^*)\} + b_0 \|s\|^2 \text{ (by Lemma 6)} \\ & \quad + \left(\left\| \int_0^1 P_\gamma^{0 \leftarrow t} \text{Hess } f(\gamma(t)) P_\gamma^{t \leftarrow 0} dt - \text{Hess } f(x_1) \right\| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\text{Hess } f(x_1) - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_1}} \text{Hess } f(x^*) \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_1}}^{-1}\| \right) \|s\| \\ & \leq b_2 \|s\| \max\{\text{dist}(x_1, x^*), \text{dist}(x_2, x^*)\}, \text{ (by Assumption 3)} \end{aligned}$$

where b_1 and b_2 are some constants. \square

With these technical lemmas in place, we now start the Riemannian generalization of the sequence of lemmas in [11] that leads to the main result [11, Theorem 2.7], generalized here as Theorem 2. For an easier comparison with [11], in the rest of the convergence analysis, we let n (instead of d) denote the dimension of the manifold \mathcal{M} .

The next lemma generalizes [11, Lemma 2.3], itself a slight variation of [24, Lemma 3.2]. The proof of [11, Lemma 2.3] involves considering the span of a few s_j 's. In the Riemannian setting, a difficulty arises from the fact that the s_j 's are not in the same tangent space. We overcome this difficulty by transporting the s_j 's to $T_{x^*} \mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 13 *Let s_k be such that $R_{x_k}(s_k) \rightarrow x^*$. If Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 5 hold then there exists $K \geq 0$ such that for any set of $n+1$ steps $S = \{s_{k_j} : K \leq k_1 < \dots < k_{n+1}\}$, there exists an index k_m with $m \in \{2, 3, \dots, n+1\}$ such that*

$$\frac{\|(\mathcal{B}_{k_m} - H_{k_m})s_{k_m}\|}{\|s_{k_m}\|} < (a_{12}a_{10}^{k_{n+1}-k_1-2} + \bar{a}_{12})\epsilon_S^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

where a_{12}, \bar{a}_{12} are some constants, n is the dimension of the manifold, $H_{k_m} = \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_{k_m}}} \text{Hess } f(x^*) \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_{k_m}}}^{-1}$, $\epsilon_S = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n+1} \{\text{dist}(x_{k_j}, x^*), \text{dist}(R_{x_{k_j}}(s_{k_j}), x^*)\}$, and $\xi_{k_m} = R_{x^*}^{-1}(x_{k_m})$.

Proof Given S , for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n + 1$, define

$$S_j = \left[\frac{\bar{s}_{k_1}}{\|\bar{s}_{k_1}\|}, \frac{\bar{s}_{k_2}}{\|\bar{s}_{k_2}\|}, \dots, \frac{\bar{s}_{k_j}}{\|\bar{s}_{k_j}\|} \right],$$

where $\bar{s}_{k_i} = \mathcal{T}_{S_{k_i}}^{-1} s_{k_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, j$. The proof is organized as follows. We will first obtain in (28) that there exists $m \in [2, n + 1]$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, $w \in \mathcal{T}_{x^*} \mathcal{M}$ such that $\bar{s}_{k_m} / \|\bar{s}_{k_m}\| = S_{m-1}u - w$, S_{m-1} has full column rank and is well conditioned, and $\|w\|$ is small. We will also obtain in (30) that $(\mathcal{T}_{S_{k_m}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_m} \mathcal{T}_{S_{k_m}} - \text{Hess } f(x^*))S_{m-1}$ is small due to the Hessian approximating properties of the SR1 update given in Lemma 12 above. The conclusion follows from these two results.

Let G_* denote the matrix expression of inner product of $\mathcal{T}_{x^*} \mathcal{M}$ and \hat{S}_j denote the coordinate expression of S_j , for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let κ_j be the smallest singular value of $G_*^{1/2} \hat{S}_j$ and define $\kappa_{n+1} = 0$. We have

$$1 = \kappa_1 \geq \kappa_2 \dots \geq \kappa_{n+1} = 0.$$

Let m be the smallest integer for which

$$\frac{\kappa_m}{\kappa_{m-1}} < \epsilon_S^{\frac{1}{n}}. \quad (20)$$

Since $m \leq n + 1$ and $\kappa_1 = 1$, we have

$$\kappa_{m-1} = \kappa_1 \left(\frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} \right) \dots \left(\frac{\kappa_{m-1}}{\kappa_{m-2}} \right) > \epsilon_S^{(m-2)/n} > \epsilon_S^{(n-1)/n}. \quad (21)$$

Since $x_k \rightarrow x^*$ and $R_{x_k}(s_k) \rightarrow x^*$, we can assume that $\epsilon_S \in (0, (\frac{1}{4})^n)$ for all k . Now, we choose $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\|G_*^{1/2} \hat{S}_m z\|_2 = \kappa_m \|z\|_2 \quad (22)$$

and

$$z = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $u \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$. (The last component of z is nonzero due to that m is the smallest such that (20) is true.) Let $w = S_m z$ and its coordinate expression $\hat{w} = \hat{S}_m z$. From the definition of $G_*^{1/2} \hat{S}_m$ and z , we have

$$G_*^{1/2} \hat{S}_{m-1} u - G_*^{1/2} \hat{w} = \frac{G_*^{1/2} \hat{s}_{k_m}}{\|G_*^{1/2} \hat{s}_{k_m}\|_2}, \quad (23)$$

where \hat{s}_{k_m} is the coordinate expression of \bar{s}_{k_m} . Since κ_{m-1} is the smallest singular value of $G_*^{1/2} \hat{S}_{m-1}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_2 &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa_{m-1}} \|G_*^{1/2} \hat{S}_{m-1} u\|_2 = \frac{1}{\kappa_{m-1}} \|G_*^{1/2} \hat{w} + \frac{G_*^{1/2} \hat{s}_{k_m}}{\|G_*^{1/2} \hat{s}_{k_m}\|_2}\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{\|G_*^{1/2} \hat{w}\|_2 + 1}{\kappa_{m-1}} = \frac{\|w\| + 1}{\kappa_{m-1}} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

$$< \frac{\|G_*^{1/2} \hat{w}\|_2 + 1}{\epsilon_S^{(n-1)/n}} = \frac{\|w\| + 1}{\epsilon_S^{(n-1)/n}}. \text{ (by (21))} \quad (25)$$

Using (22) and (24), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|^2 &= \|G_*^{1/2} \hat{w}\|_2^2 = \|G_*^{1/2} \hat{S}_m z\|_2^2 = \kappa_m^2 \|z\|_2^2 = \kappa_m^2 (1 + \|u\|_2^2) \\ &\leq \kappa_m^2 + \left(\frac{\kappa_m}{\kappa_{m-1}}\right)^2 (\|G_*^{1/2} \hat{w}\|_2 + 1)^2 = \kappa_m^2 + \left(\frac{\kappa_m}{\kappa_{m-1}}\right)^2 (\|w\| + 1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since (20) implies that $\kappa_m < \epsilon_S^{1/n}$, using (20),

$$\|w\|^2 < \epsilon_S^{2/n} + \epsilon_S^{2/n} (\|w\| + 1)^2 < 4\epsilon_S^{2/n} (\|w\| + 1)^2. \quad (26)$$

This implies

$$\|w\| (1 - 2\epsilon_S^{1/n}) < 2\epsilon_S^{1/n},$$

and hence $\|w\| < 1$, since $\epsilon_S < (\frac{1}{4})^n$. Therefore, (25) and (26) imply that

$$\|u\|_2 < \frac{2}{\epsilon_S^{(n-1)/n}}, \quad (27)$$

$$\|w\| < 4\epsilon_S^{1/n}. \quad (28)$$

Equation (28) is the announced result that w is small. The bound (27) will also be invoked below.

Now we show that $\|(\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{k_j}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_j} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{k_j}}} - \text{Hess } f(x^*)) S_{j-1}\|$ is small for all $j \in [2, n+1]$ (and thus in particular for $j = m$). By Lemma 11, we have

$$\|y_i - (\mathcal{B}_{k_j})_i s_i\| \leq a_9 a_{10}^{k_j-i-2} \epsilon_{k_j,i} \|s_i\| \leq a_9 a_{10}^{k_{n+1}-k_1-2} \epsilon_S \|s_i\|, \quad (29)$$

for all $i \in \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{j-1}\}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{kj}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_j} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{kj}}} - \text{Hess } f(x^*)) \frac{\bar{s}_i}{\|\bar{s}_i\|}\| \\
& \leq \left\| \frac{\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_i}}^{-1} y_i - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{kj}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_j} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{kj}}} \bar{s}_i}{\|\bar{s}_i\|} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_i}}^{-1} y_i - \text{Hess } f(x^*) \bar{s}_i}{\|\bar{s}_i\|} \right\| \\
& \leq \left\| \frac{\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_i}}^{-1} y_i - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{kj}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_j} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{kj}}} \bar{s}_i}{\|\bar{s}_i\|} \right\| + b_1 \epsilon_S \text{ (by Lemma 12)} \\
& = \left\| \frac{\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_i}}^{-1} (y_i - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_i}} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{kj}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_j} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{kj}}} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_i}}^{-1} s_i)}{\|\bar{s}_i\|} \right\| + b_1 \epsilon_S \\
& \leq b_2 \frac{\|(y_i - (\mathcal{B}_{k_j})_i s_i)\|}{\|s_i\|} + b_3 \epsilon_S \text{ (by Lemma 10 and Assumption 1)} \\
& \leq (b_4 a_{10}^{k_{n+1}-k_1-2} + b_3) \epsilon_S \text{ (by (29))}
\end{aligned}$$

where b_2 , b_3 and b_4 are some constants. Therefore, we have that for any $j \in [2, n+1]$,

$$\|(\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{kj}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_j} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{kj}}} - \text{Hess } f(x^*)) S_{j-1}\|_{g,2} \leq b_5 \epsilon_S, \quad (30)$$

where $b_5 = \sqrt{n}(b_4 a_{10}^{k_{n+1}-k_1-2} + b_3)$ and $\|\cdot\|_{g,2}$ is the norm induced by the Riemannian metric g and the Euclidean norm, i.e., $\|A\|_{g,2} = \sup \|Av\|/\|v\|_2$ with $\|\cdot\|$ defined in (5).

We can now conclude the proof as follows. Using (23) and (30) with $j = m$, (27) and (28), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\|(\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_m} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}} - \text{Hess } f(x^*)) \bar{s}_m\|}{\|\bar{s}_m\|} \\
& = \|(\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_m} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}} - \text{Hess } f(x^*)) (S_{m-1} u - w)\| \\
& \leq \|(\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_m} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}} - \text{Hess } f(x^*)) S_{m-1}\|_{g,2} \|u\|_2 \\
& \quad + \|(\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_m} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}} - \text{Hess } f(x^*))\| \|w\| \\
& \leq b_5 \epsilon_S \frac{2}{\epsilon_S^{(n-1)/n}} + (M + \text{Hess } f(x^*)) 4 \epsilon_S^{1/n} \text{ (by Assumption 1)} \\
& \leq (2b_5 + b_6) \epsilon_S^{1/n}
\end{aligned}$$

where b_6 is some constant. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\|(\mathcal{B}_{k_m} - H_{k_m}) s_{k_m}\|}{\|s_{k_m}\|} = \frac{\|(\mathcal{B}_{k_m} - \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}} \text{Hess } f(x^*) \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}}^{-1}) s_{k_m}\|}{\|s_{k_m}\|} \\
& = \frac{\|(\mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}}^{-1} \mathcal{B}_{k_m} \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_{km}}} - \text{Hess } f(x^*)) \bar{s}_{k_m}\|}{\|\bar{s}_{k_m}\|} \leq (2b_5 + b_6) \epsilon_S^{1/n}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The next lemma generalizes [11, Lemma 2.4]. Its proof is a translation of the proof of [11, Lemma 2.4], where we invoke two manifold-specific results: the equality of $\text{Hess } f(x^*)$ and $\text{Hess}(f \circ R_{x^*})(0_{x^*})$ (which holds in view of [2, Proposition 5.5.6] since x^* is a critical point of f), and the bound in Lemma 3 on the retraction R .

Lemma 14 *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 hold and the trust-region subproblem (2) is solved accurately enough for (9) to hold. Then there exists N such that for any set of $p > n$ consecutive steps $s_{k+1}, s_{k+1}, \dots, s_{k+p}$ with $k \geq N$, there exists a set, \mathcal{G}_k , of at least $p - n$ indices contained in the set $\{i : k + 1 \leq i \leq k + p\}$ such that for all $j \in \mathcal{G}_k$,*

$$\frac{\|(\mathcal{B}_j - H_j)s_j\|}{\|s_j\|} < a_{13}\epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

where $a_{13} = a_{12}a_{10}^{p-2} + \bar{a}_{12}$, $H_j = \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_j}} \text{Hess } f(x^*) \mathcal{T}_{S_{\zeta_j}}^{-1}$, $\zeta_j = R_{x^*}^{-1}(x_j)$, and

$$\epsilon_k = \max_{k+1 \leq j \leq k+p} \{\text{dist}(x_j, x^*), \text{dist}(R_{x_j}(s_j), x^*)\}.$$

Furthermore, for k sufficiently large, if $j \in \mathcal{G}_k$, then

$$\|s_j\| < a_{14} \text{dist}(x_j, x^*), \quad (31)$$

where a_{14} is a constant, and

$$\rho_j \geq 0.75. \quad (32)$$

Proof By Lemma 5, $s_k \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, by Lemma 13, applied to the set

$$\{s_k, s_{k+1}, \dots, s_{k+p}\}, \quad (33)$$

there exists N such that for any $k \geq N$ there exists an index l_1 , with $k + 1 \leq l_1 \leq k + p$ satisfying

$$\frac{\|(\mathcal{B}_{l_1} - H_{l_1})s_{l_1}\|}{\|s_{l_1}\|} < a_{13}\epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

where $a_{13} = a_{12}a_{10}^{p-2} + \bar{a}_{12}$. We apply Lemma 13 to the set $\{s_k, s_{k+1}, \dots, s_{k+p}\} - s_{l_1}$ to get l_2 . Repeating this $p - n$ times, we get a set of $p - n$ indices $\mathcal{G}_k = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{p-n}\}$ such that if $j \in \mathcal{G}_k$, then

$$\frac{\|(\mathcal{B}_j - H_j)s_j\|}{\|s_j\|} < a_{13}\epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}}. \quad (34)$$

We show (31) next. Consider $j \in \mathcal{G}_k$. By (34), we have

$$g(s_j, (H_j - \mathcal{B}_j)s_j) \leq \|s_j\| \|(H_j - \mathcal{B}_j)s_j\| \leq a_{13}\epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}} \|s_j\|^2.$$

Therefore, $g(s_j, \mathcal{B}_j s_j) \geq g(s_j, H_j s_j) - a_{13} \epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}} \|s_j\|^2 > b_0 \|s_j\|^2$ for sufficient large k , where b_0 is a constant and we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq m_j(0) - m_j(s_j) &= -g(\text{grad } f(x_j), s_j) - \frac{1}{2} g(s_j, \mathcal{B}_j s_j) \\ &\leq \|\text{grad } f(x_j)\| \|s_j\| - \frac{1}{2} b_0 \|s_j\|^2 \\ &\leq b_1 \text{dist}(x_j, x^*) \|s_j\| - \frac{1}{2} b_0 \|s_j\|^2, \text{ (by Lemma 7)} \end{aligned}$$

where b_1 is some constant. This yields (31).

Finally, we show (32). Let $j \in \mathcal{G}_k$ and define $\hat{f}_x(\eta) = f(R_x(\eta))$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &|f(x_j) - f(R_{x_j}(s_j)) - (m_j(0) - m_j(s_j))| \\ &= |f(x_j) - f(R_{x_j}(s_j)) + g(\text{grad } f(x_j), s_j) + \frac{1}{2} g(s_j, \mathcal{B}_j s_j)| \\ &= |\hat{f}_{x_j}(0_{x_j}) - \hat{f}_{x_j}(s_j) + g(\text{grad } f(x_j), s_j) + \frac{1}{2} g(s_j, \mathcal{B}_j s_j)| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{2} g(s_j, \mathcal{B}_j s_j) - \int_0^1 g(\text{Hess } \hat{f}_{x_j}(\tau s_j)[s_j], s_j)(1 - \tau) d\tau \right| \text{ (by Taylor's theorem)} \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{2} g(s_j, \mathcal{B}_j s_j) - \frac{1}{2} g(s_j, H_j s_j) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{2} g(s_j, H_j s_j) - \int_0^1 g(\text{Hess } \hat{f}_{x_j}(\tau s_j)[s_j], s_j)(1 - \tau) d\tau \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{2} g(s_j, (\mathcal{B}_j - H_j) s_j) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_0^1 (g(s_j, \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_j}} \text{Hess } f(x^*) \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_j}}^{-1} s_j) - g(\text{Hess } \hat{f}_{x_j}(\tau s_j)[s_j], s_j))(1 - \tau) d\tau \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|s_j\| \|(\mathcal{B}_j - H_j) s_j\| \\ &\quad + \|s_j\|^2 \int_0^1 \|(\mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_j}} \text{Hess } \hat{f}_{x^*}(0_{x^*}) \mathcal{T}_{S_{\xi_j}}^{-1} - \text{Hess } \hat{f}_{x_j}(\tau s_j))\| (1 - \tau) d\tau \\ &\quad \text{(by [2, Proposition 5.5.6])} \\ &\leq b_2 \|s_j\|^2 \epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}} + b_3 \|s_j\|^2 (\text{dist}(x_j, x^*) + \|s_j\|) \\ &\quad \text{(by (34), Lemma 3 and Assumption 4)} \\ &\leq b_4 \|s_j\|^2 \epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}}, \text{ (by (31) and } \text{dist}(x_j, x^*) \text{ is smaller than } \epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}} \text{ eventually)} \end{aligned}$$

where b_2, b_3 and b_4 are some constants. In view of (31) and Lemma 7, we have

$$\|s_j\| < b_5 \|\text{grad } f(x_j)\|,$$

where b_5 is some constant. Combining with $\|s_j\| \leq \Delta_j$, we obtain

$$\|s_j\|^2 \leq b_5 \|\text{grad } f(x_j)\| \min\{\Delta_j, b_5 \|\text{grad } f(x_j)\|\}.$$

Noticing (9), we have

$$|f(x_j) - f(R_{x_j}(s_j)) - (m_j(0) - m_j(s_j))| \leq b_6 \epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}} (m_j(0) - m_j(s_j)),$$

where b_6 is a constant. This implies (32). \square

The next result generalizes [11, Lemma 2.5] in two ways: the Euclidean setting is extended to the Riemannian setting, and inexact solves are allowed by the presence of δ_k . The main hurdle that we had to overcome in the Riemannian generalization is that the equality $\text{dist}(x_k + s_k, x^*) = \|s_k - \xi_k\|$ does not necessarily hold. As we will see, Lemma 2 comes to our rescue.

Lemma 15 *Suppose Assumptions 2 and 3 hold. If the quantities*

$$e_k = \text{dist}(x_k, x^*) \text{ and } \frac{\|(\mathcal{B}_k - H_k)s_k\|}{\|s_k\|}$$

are sufficiently small and if

$$\mathcal{B}_k s_k = -\text{grad } f(x_k) + \delta_k \text{ with } \|\delta_k\| \leq \|\text{grad } f(x_k)\|^{1+\theta},$$

then

$$\text{dist}(R_{x_k}(s_k), x^*) \leq a_{15} \frac{\|(\mathcal{B}_k - H_k)s_k\|}{\|s_k\|} e_k + a_{16} e_k^{1+\min\{\theta, 1\}}, \quad (35)$$

$$h(R_{x_k}(s_k)) \leq a_{17} \frac{\|(\mathcal{B}_k - H_k)s_k\|}{\|s_k\|} h(x_k) + a_{18} h^{1+\min\{\theta, 1\}}(x_k), \quad (36)$$

and

$$a_{19} h(x_k) \leq e_k \leq a_{20} h(x_k) \quad (37)$$

where a_{15}, a_{16}, a_{17} and a_{18} are some constants and $h(x) = (f(x) - f(x^))^{\frac{1}{2}}$.*

Proof By definition of s_k , we have

$$s_k = H_k^{-1}[(H_k - \mathcal{B}_k)s_k - \text{grad } f(x_k) + \delta_k]. \quad (38)$$

Define $\xi_k = R_{x_k}^{-1}x^*$. Therefore, letting γ be the curve defined by $\gamma(t) = R_{x_k}(t\xi_k)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|s_k - \xi_k\| &= \|H_k^{-1}[(H_k - \mathcal{B}_k)s_k - \text{grad } f(x_k) + \delta_k - H_k\xi_k]\| \\
&\leq b_0(\|(H_k - \mathcal{B}_k)s_k\| + \|\delta_k\| \\
&\quad + \|P_\gamma^{0\leftarrow 1} \text{grad } f(x^*) - \text{grad } f(x_k) - \left(\int_0^1 P_\gamma^{0\leftarrow t} \text{Hess } f(\gamma(t)) P_\gamma^{t\leftarrow 0} dt\right) \xi_k\| \\
&\quad + \left\|\left(\int_0^1 P_\gamma^{0\leftarrow t} \text{Hess } f(\gamma(t)) P_\gamma^{t\leftarrow 0} dt\right) \xi_k - \text{Hess } f(x_k) \xi_k\right\| \\
&\quad + \|\text{Hess } f(x_k) \xi_k - H_k \xi_k\|) \\
&\leq b_0(\|(H_k - \mathcal{B}_k)s_k\| + b_1 \|\xi_k\|^{1+\min\{\theta, 1\}} \text{ (by Lemmas 7 and 8)} \\
&\quad + \left\|\left(\int_0^1 P_\gamma^{0\leftarrow t} \text{Hess } f(\gamma(t)) P_\gamma^{t\leftarrow 0} dt\right) \xi_k - \text{Hess } f(x_k) \xi_k\right\| \\
&\quad + \|\text{Hess } f(x_k) - H_k\| \|\xi_k\|) \\
&\leq b_0\|(H_k - \mathcal{B}_k)s_k\| + b_0 b_1 \|\xi_k\|^{1+\min\{\theta, 1\}} + b_0 b_3 \|\xi_k\|^2 \text{ (by Assumption 3)} \\
&\leq b_0\|(H_k - \mathcal{B}_k)s_k\| + b_4 \|\xi_k\|^{1+\min\{\theta, 1\}} \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

where b_1 , b_2 , b_3 and b_4 are some constants. From Lemma 2, we have

$$\text{dist}(R_{x_k}(s_k), x^*) = \text{dist}(R_{x_k}(s_k), R_{x_k}(\xi_k)) \leq b_5 \|s_k - \xi_k\|, \tag{40}$$

where b_5 is a constant. Combining (39) and (40) and using Lemma 3, we obtain

$$\text{dist}(R_{x_k}(s_k), x^*) \leq b_0 b_5 \|(H_k - \mathcal{B}_k)s_k\| + \bar{b}_4 b_5 e_k^{1+\min\{\theta, 1\}}. \tag{41}$$

From (38), for k large enough such that $\|H_k^{-1}\| \|(H_k - \mathcal{B}_k)s_k\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|s_k\|$, we have

$$\|s_k\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|s_k\| + \|H_k^{-1}\| (\|\text{grad } f(x_k)\| + \|\text{grad } f(x_k)\|^{1+\theta}).$$

Using Lemma 7, this yields

$$\|s_k\| \leq b_6 \text{dist}(x_k, x^*),$$

where b_6 is a constant. Using the latter in (41) yields

$$\text{dist}(R_{x_k}(s_k), x^*) \leq b_0 b_5 b_6 \frac{\|(H_k - \mathcal{B}_k)s_k\|}{\|s_k\|} \text{dist}(x_k, x^*) + \bar{b}_4 b_5 e_k^{1+\min\{\theta, 1\}},$$

which shows (35).

We show (37) next. Define $\hat{f}_x(\eta) = f(R_x(\eta))$ and let $\zeta_k = R_{x^*}^{-1}(x_k)$. We have, for some $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{f}_{x^*}(\zeta_k) - \hat{f}_{x^*}(0_{x^*}) &= g(\text{grad } f(x^*), \zeta_k) + g(\text{Hess } \hat{f}_{x^*}(t\zeta_k)[\zeta_k], \zeta_k) \\ &= g(\text{Hess } \hat{f}_{x^*}(t\zeta_k)[\zeta_k], \zeta_k),\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (Euclidean) Taylor's theorem to get the first equality and the fact that x^* is a critical point of f (Assumption 2) for the second one. Therefore, since $\text{Hess } \hat{f}_{x^*} = \text{Hess } f(x^*)$ is positive definite (in view of [2, Proposition 5.5.6] and Assumption 2), there exist b_7 and b_8 such that

$$b_7(\hat{f}_{x^*}(\zeta_k) - \hat{f}_{x^*}(0_{x^*})) \leq \|\hat{\zeta}_k\|^2 \leq b_8(\hat{f}_{x^*}(\zeta_k) - \hat{f}_{x^*}(0_{x^*}))$$

Then, using Lemma 3, we obtain that there exist b_9 and b_{10} such that

$$b_9(f(x_k) - f(x^*)) \leq \text{dist}(x_k, x^*)^2 \leq b_{10}(f(x_k) - f(x^*)).$$

In other words,

$$b_9 h^2(x_k) \leq e_k^2 \leq b_{10} h^2(x_k),$$

and we have shown (37). Combining it with (35), we get (36). \square

With Lemmas 14 and 15 in place, the rest of the local convergence analysis is essentially a translation of the analysis in [11]. The next lemma generalizes [11, Lemma 2.6].

Lemma 16 *If Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 hold and the subproblem is solved accurately enough for (9) and (10) to hold, then*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_k}{\Delta_k} = 0,$$

where $h_k = h(x_k)$.

Proof Let p be the smallest integer greater than $2n + n(-\ln \tau_1 / \ln \tau_2)$, where τ_1 and τ_2 are defined in Algorithm 1. Then

$$\tau_1^n \tau_2^{p-2n} \geq 1. \quad (42)$$

Applying Lemma 14 with this value of p , there exists N such that if $k \geq N$, then there exists a set of at least $p - n$ indices, $\mathcal{G}_k \subset \{j : k + 1 \leq j \leq k + p\}$, such that if $j \in \mathcal{G}_k$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\|(\mathcal{B}_j - H_j)s_j\|}{\|s_j\|} &< c\epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}}, \\ \rho_j &\geq 0.75.\end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

We now show that for such steps,

$$\frac{h_{j+1}}{\Delta_{j+1}} \leq \frac{1}{\tau_2} \frac{h_j}{\Delta_j}. \quad (44)$$

If $\|s_j\| \geq 0.8\Delta_j$, then since from Step 12 of Algorithm 1, $\Delta_{j+1} = \tau_2\Delta_j$ and since $\{h_i\}$ is decreasing, (44) follows. If on the other hand $\|s_j\| < 0.8\Delta_j$, then from Step 14 of Algorithm 1, we have that $\Delta_{j+1} = \Delta_j$. Also since the trust region is inactive, by condition (10), we have that $\mathcal{B}_j s_j = -\text{grad } f(x_j) + \delta_k$, $\|\delta_k\| \leq \|\text{grad } f(x_j)\|^{1+\theta}$. Therefore, in view of (36) in Lemma 15 and of (43), if N is large enough, we have that

$$h_{j+1} \leq \frac{1}{\tau_2} h_j.$$

This implies that (44) is true for all $j \in \mathcal{G}_j$, where $k \geq N$.

In addition, note that for any j , $h_{j+1} \leq h_j$ and $\Delta_{j+1} \geq \tau_1\Delta_j$ and so

$$\frac{h_{j+1}}{\Delta_{j+1}} \leq \frac{1}{\tau_1} \frac{h_j}{\Delta_j}. \quad (45)$$

Since (44) is true for $p - n$ values of $j \in \mathcal{G}_k$ and (45) holds for all j , we have that for all $k \geq N$,

$$\frac{h_{k+p}}{\Delta_{k+p}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\tau_1}\right)^n \left(\frac{1}{\tau_2}\right)^{p-n} \frac{h_k}{\Delta_k} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\tau_2}\right)^n \frac{h_k}{\Delta_k},$$

where the second inequality follows from (42). Therefore, starting at $k = N$, it follows that

$$\frac{h_{N+lp}}{\Delta_{N+lp}} \rightarrow 0$$

as $l \rightarrow \infty$. Using (45) again, we complete the proof. \square

The next result generalizes [11, Theorem 2.7].

Theorem 2 *If Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 hold and the subproblem is solved accurately enough for (9) and (10) to hold then, the sequence $\{x_k\}$ generated by Algorithm 1 is $n + 1$ -step q -superlinear (where n denotes the dimension of \mathcal{M}); i.e.,*

$$\frac{\text{dist}(x_{k+n+1}, x^*)}{\text{dist}(x_k, x^*)} \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof By Lemma 14, there exists N such that if $k \geq N$, then the set of steps $\{s_{k+1}, \dots, s_{k+n+1}\}$ contains at least one step s_{k+j} , $1 \leq j \leq n + 1$, for which

$$\frac{\|(\mathcal{B}_j - H_j)s_j\|}{\|s_j\|} < a_{13}\epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

By (31) in Lemma 14 and (37) in Lemma 15 (when checking the assumptions, recall the standing assumption made in Sect. 3.3 that $e_k := \text{dist}(x_k, x^*) \rightarrow 0$), there exists a constant b_0 such that

$$\|s_{k+j}\| < b_0 h_{k+j}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 16, if N is large enough and $k \geq N$, then we have $\|s_{k+j}\| < 0.8\Delta_{k+j}$. By (10), this implies $\mathcal{B}_{k+j}s_{k+j} = -\text{grad } f(x_{k+j}) + \delta_{k+j}$, with $\|\delta_{k+j}\| \leq \|\text{grad } f(x_{k+j})\|^{1+\theta}$. Thus by inequality (36) of Lemma 15, if N is large enough and $k \geq N$, then

$$h_{k+j+1} = h(R_{x_{k+j}}(s_{k+j})) \leq (a_{17}a_{13}\epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}} + a_{18}h_{k+j}^{\min\{\theta, 1\}})h_{k+j}.$$

The first equality holds because (32) implies that the step is accepted. Since the sequence $\{h_i\}$ is decreasing, this implies that

$$h_{k+n+1} \leq (a_{17}a_{13}\epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}} + a_{18}h_{k+j}^{\min\{\theta, 1\}})h_k$$

By (37),

$$\begin{aligned} e_{k+n+1} &\leq a_{20}h_{k+n+1} \\ &\leq a_{20}(a_{17}a_{13}\epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}} + a_{18}h_{k+j}^{\min\{\theta, 1\}})h_k \\ &\leq a_{20}(a_{17}a_{13}\epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{n}} + a_{18}\left(\frac{e_k}{a_{19}}\right)^{\min\{\theta, 1\}})\frac{e_k}{a_{19}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $n + 1$ -step q -superlinear convergence. \square

It is also possible to extend to the Riemannian setting the result [11, Theorem 2.8] that the percentage of \mathcal{B}_k being positive semidefinite approaches 1 provided that \mathcal{B}_k is positive semidefinite whenever $\|s_k\| \leq 0.8\Delta_k$. In the proof of [11, Theorem 2.8], replace Lemma 2.6 by Lemma 16, Lemma 2.4 by Lemma 14, (2.14) by (31), and (2.9) by (37).

4 Limited memory version of RTR-SR1

In RTR-SR1 (Algorithm 1), storing $\mathcal{B}_{k+1} = \mathcal{T}_{\eta_k} \circ \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{k+1} \circ \mathcal{T}_{\eta_k}^{-1}$ in matrix form may be inefficient for two reasons. The first reason, which is also present in the Euclidean case, is that $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{k+1} = \mathcal{B}_k + \frac{(y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k)(y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k)^0}{g(s_k, y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k)}$ is a rank-one modification of \mathcal{B}_k . The second reason, specific to the Riemannian setting, is that when \mathcal{M} is a low-codimension submanifold of a Euclidean space \mathcal{E} , it may be beneficial to express \mathcal{T}_{η_k} as the restriction to $T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$ of a low-rank modification of the identity (7). Instead of storing full dense matrices, it may then be beneficial to store a few vectors that implicitly represent them. This is the purpose of the limited memory version of RTR-SR1 presented in this section.

The proposed limited memory RTR-SR1, called LRTR-SR1, is described in Algorithm 2. It relies on a Riemannian generalization of the compact representation of the classical (Euclidean) SR1 matrices presented in [12, §5]. We set $\mathcal{B}_0 = \text{id}$. At step $k > 0$, we first choose a basic Hessian approximation \mathcal{B}_0^k , which in the Riemannian setting becomes a linear transformation of $T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$. We advocate the choice

$$\mathcal{B}_0^k = \gamma_k \text{id},$$

where

$$\gamma_k = \frac{g(y_{k-1}, y_{k-1})}{g(s_{k-1}, y_{k-1})},$$

which generalizes a choice usually made in the Euclidean case [27, (7.20)]. As in the Euclidean case, we let $S_{k,m}$ and $Y_{k,m}$ contain the (at most) m most recent corrections, which in the Riemannian setting must be transported to $T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$, yielding $S_{k,m} = \{s_{k-\ell}^{(k)}, s_{k-\ell+1}^{(k)}, \dots, s_{k-1}^{(k)}\}$ and $Y_{k,m} = \{y_{k-\ell}^{(k)}, y_{k-\ell+1}^{(k)}, \dots, y_{k-1}^{(k)}\}$, where $\ell = \min\{m, k\}$ and where $s^{(k)}$ denotes s transported to $T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$. We then have the following Riemannian generalization of the limited-memory update based on [12, (5.2)]:

$$\mathcal{B}_k = \mathcal{B}_0^k + (Y_{k,m} - \mathcal{B}_0^k S_{k,m})(P_{k,m} - S_{k,m}^b \mathcal{B}_0^k S_{k,m})^{-1} (Y_{k,m} - \mathcal{B}_0^k S_{k,m})^b, \quad k > 0,$$

where $P_{k,m} = D_{k,m} + L_{k,m} + L_{k,m}^T$,

$$D_{k,m} = \text{diag}\{g(s_{k-\ell}, y_{k-\ell}), g(s_{k-\ell+1}, y_{k-\ell+1}), \dots, g(s_{k-1}, y_{k-1})\},$$

and

$$(L_{k,m})_{i,j} = \begin{cases} g(s_{k-\ell+i-1}, y_{k-\ell+j-1}), & \text{if } i > j; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, letting $Q_{k,m}$ denote the matrix $S_{k,m}^b S_{k,m}$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{B}_k = \gamma_k \text{id} + (Y_{k,m} - \gamma_k S_{k,m})(P_{k,m} - \gamma_k Q_{k,m})^{-1} (Y_{k,m} - \gamma_k S_{k,m})^b, \quad k > 0. \quad (46)$$

For all $\eta \in T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{B}_k \eta$ can thus be obtained from (46) using $Y_{k,m}$, $S_{k,m}$, $P_{k,m}$ and $Q_{k,m}$. This is how \mathcal{B}_k is defined in Algorithm 2, except that the technicality that the \mathcal{B} update may be skipped is also taken into account therein.

5 Numerical experiments

As an illustration, we investigate the performance of RTR-SR1 (Algorithm 1) and LRTR-SR1 (Algorithm 2) on a Rayleigh quotient minimization problem on the sphere and on a joint diagonalization (JD) problem on the Stiefel manifold.

Algorithm 2 Limited-memory RTR-SR1 (LRTR-SR1)

Input: Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} with Riemannian metric g ; retraction R ; isometric vector transports \mathcal{T}_S ; smooth function f on \mathcal{M} ; initial iterate $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$;

- 1: Choose an integer $m > 0$ and real numbers $\Delta_0 > 0$, $\nu \in (0, 1)$, $c \in (0, 0.1)$, $\tau_1 \in (0, 1)$ and $\tau_2 > 1$;
Set $k \leftarrow 0$, $\ell \leftarrow 0$, $\gamma_0 \leftarrow 1$;
- 2: Obtain $s_k \in \mathcal{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$ by (approximately) solving

$$s_k = \arg \min_{s \in \mathcal{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}} m_k(s) = \arg \min_{s \in \mathcal{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}} f(x_k) + g(\text{grad } f(x_k), s) + \frac{1}{2} g(s, \mathcal{B}_k s), \text{ s.t. } \|s\| \leq \Delta_k,$$

where \mathcal{B}_k is defined in accordance with (46);

- 3: Set $\rho_k \leftarrow \frac{f(x_k) - f(R_{x_k}(s_k))}{m_k(0) - m_k(s_k)}$;
 - 4: Set $y_k \leftarrow \mathcal{T}_{S\eta_k}^{-1} \text{grad } f(R_{x_k}(s_k)) - \text{grad } f(x_k)$;
 - 5: **if** $|g(s_k, y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k)| \geq \nu \|s_k\| \|y_k - \mathcal{B}_k s_k\|$ **then**
 - 6: $\gamma_{k+1} \leftarrow \frac{g(y_k, y_k)}{g(s_k, y_k)}$; Add $s_k^{(k)}$ and $y_k^{(k)}$ into storage; **If** $\ell \geq m$, then discard vector pair $\{s_{k-\ell}^{(k)}, y_{k-\ell}^{(k)}\}$ from storage, **else** $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$; Compute matrices $P_{k,m}$ and $Q_{k,m}$ by updating $P_{k-1,m}$ and $Q_{k-1,m}$ if available;
 - 7: **else**
 - 8: Set $\gamma_{k+1} \leftarrow \gamma_k$, $P_{k+1,m} \leftarrow P_{k,m}$, $Q_{k+1,m} \leftarrow Q_{k,m}$ and $\{s_k^{(k)}, y_k^{(k)}\} \leftarrow \{s_{k-1}^{(k)}, y_{k-1}^{(k)}\}, \dots, \{s_{k-\ell+1}^{(k)}, y_{k-\ell+1}^{(k)}\} \leftarrow \{s_{k-\ell}^{(k)}, y_{k-\ell}^{(k)}\}$.
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: **if** $\rho_k > c$ **then**
 - 11: $x_{k+1} \leftarrow R_{x_k}(s_k)$; Transport $s_{k-\ell+1}^{(k)}, s_{k-\ell+2}^{(k)}, \dots, s_k^{(k)}$ and $y_{k-\ell+1}^{(k)}, y_{k-\ell+2}^{(k)}, \dots, y_k^{(k)}$ from $\mathcal{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$ to $\mathcal{T}_{x_{k+1}} \mathcal{M}$ by \mathcal{T}_S ;
 - 12: **else**
 - 13: $x_{k+1} \leftarrow x_k$;
 - 14: **end if**
 - 15: **if** $\rho_k > \frac{3}{4}$ **then**
 - 16: **if** $\|\eta_k\| \geq 0.8 \Delta_k$ **then**
 - 17: $\Delta_{k+1} \leftarrow \tau_2 \Delta_k$;
 - 18: **else**
 - 19: $\Delta_{k+1} \leftarrow \Delta_k$;
 - 20: **end if**
 - 21: **else if** $\rho_k < 0.1$ **then**
 - 22: $\Delta_{k+1} \leftarrow \tau_1 \Delta_k$;
 - 23: **else**
 - 24: $\Delta_{k+1} \leftarrow \Delta_k$;
 - 25: **end if**
 - 26: $k \leftarrow k + 1$, goto 2 until convergence.
-

For the Rayleigh quotient problem, the manifold \mathcal{M} is the sphere

$$\mathbb{S}^{n-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x^T x = 1\}$$

and the objective function f is defined by

$$f(x) = x^T A x, \quad (47)$$

where A is a given n -by- n symmetric matrix. Minimizing the Rayleigh quotient of A is equivalent to computing its leftmost eigenvector (see, e.g., [2, §2.1.1]). The Rayleigh quotient problem provides convenient benchmarking exper-

iments since, except for pathological cases, there is essentially one local minimizer (specifically, there is one pair of antipodal local minimizers), which can be readily computed by standard eigenvalue software for verification. Moreover, the Hessian of f is readily available, and this allows for a comparison with RTR-Newton [2, Ch. 7], which corresponds to Algorithm 1 with the exception that \mathcal{B}_k is replaced by the Hessian of f at x_k (and thus the vector transport is no longer needed).

In the JD problem considered, the manifold \mathcal{M} is the (compact) Stiefel manifold,

$$\text{St}(p, n) = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} : X^T X = I_p\},$$

and the objective function f is defined by

$$f(X) = - \sum_{i=1}^N \|\text{diag}(X^T C_i X)\|^2, \quad (48)$$

where C_1, \dots, C_N are given symmetric matrices, $\text{diag}(M)$ denotes the vector formed by the diagonal entries of M , and $\|\text{diag}(M)\|^2$ thus denotes the sum of the squared diagonal elements of M . This problem has applications in independent component analysis for blind source separation [36].

The comparisons are performed in Matlab 7.0.0 on a 32 bit Windows platform with 2.4 GHz CPU (T8300).

The chosen Riemannian metric g on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} is obtained by making \mathbb{S}^{n-1} a Riemannian submanifold of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n . The gradient and the Hessian of f (47) with respect to the metric are given in [2, §6.4]. The chosen Riemannian metric g on $\text{St}(p, n)$ is the one obtained by viewing $\text{St}(p, n)$ as a Riemannian submanifold of the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, as in [17, §2.2]. With respect to this Riemannian metric, the gradient of the objective function (48), required in the three methods, is given in [36, §2.3]. The Riemannian Hessian of (48), required for RTR-Newton, is also given therein.

The initial Hessian approximation \mathcal{B}_0 is set to the identity in RTR-SR1. The θ , κ parameters in the inner iteration stopping criterion [2, (7.10)] of the truncated CG inner iteration [2, §7.3.2] are set to 0.1, 0.9 for RTR-SR1 and LRTR-SR1 and to 1, 0.1 for RTR-Newton. The initial radius Δ_0 is set to 1, v is the square root of machine epsilon, c is set to 0.1, τ_1 to 0.25, and τ_2 to 2.

For the retraction R on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , following [2, Example 4.1.1], we choose $R_x(\eta) = (x + \eta)/\|x + \eta\|_2$. For the retraction R on $\text{St}(p, n)$, following [2, (4.8)], we choose $R_X(\eta) = \text{qf}(X + \eta)$ where qf denotes the Q factor of the QR decomposition with nonnegative elements on the diagonal of R .

The chosen isometric vector transport \mathcal{T} on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} is the vector transport by rigging (7), which is (locally) uniquely defined in case of submanifolds of co-dimension 1. In the case of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , it turns out to be equivalent to the parallel translation along the shortest geodesic that joins the origin point x and the target point y , i.e.,

Table 1 Rayleigh quotient experiments

n		RTR-Newton	RTR-SR1	LRTR-SR1		
				m = 0	m = 2	m = 4
		1e-3/1e-6	1e-3/1e-6	1e-3/1e-6	1e-3/1e-6	1e-3/1e-6
2 ⁶	<i>iter</i>	3/6	4/15	4/50	4/18	4/13
	<i>ng</i>	3/6	4/15	4/50	4/18	4/13
	<i>nH</i>	4/13	6/34	0/0	0/0	0/0
	<i>gff</i>	1.48 ₋₄ /9.26 ₋₉	1.47 ₋₄ /3.58 ₋₈	1.47 ₋₄ /1.18 ₋₆	1.47 ₋₄ /7.65 ₋₇	1.47 ₋₄ /3.49 ₋₈
	$\frac{gff}{gfo}$	7.42 ₋₅ /4.66 ₋₉	7.38 ₋₅ /1.80 ₋₈	7.38 ₋₅ /5.94 ₋₇	7.38 ₋₅ /3.85 ₋₇	7.38 ₋₅ /1.76 ₋₈
	<i>t</i>	1.25 ₋₃ /3.12 ₋₃	3.42 ₋₃ /1.39 ₋₂	2.85 ₋₃ /4.69 ₋₂	3.27 ₋₃ /2.63 ₋₂	4.55 ₋₃ /2.40 ₋₂
2 ⁸	<i>iter</i>	3/9	4/13	4/43	4/13	4/15
	<i>ng</i>	3/9	4/13	4/43	4/13	4/15
	<i>nH</i>	4/20	6/29	0/0	0/0	0/0
	<i>gff</i>	1.80 ₋₃ /9.13 ₋₁₂	1.81 ₋₃ /2.28 ₋₇	1.81 ₋₃ /1.57 ₋₆	1.81 ₋₃ /7.57 ₋₈	1.81 ₋₃ /1.08 ₋₉
	$\frac{gff}{gfo}$	9.09 ₋₄ /4.60 ₋₁₂	9.14 ₋₄ /1.15 ₋₇	9.14 ₋₄ /7.90 ₋₇	9.14 ₋₄ /3.82 ₋₈	9.14 ₋₄ /5.45 ₋₁₀
	<i>t</i>	2.81 ₋₃ /1.58 ₋₂	2.11 ₋₂ /6.80 ₋₂	3.61 ₋₃ /5.24 ₋₂	6.93 ₋₃ /2.77 ₋₂	8.39 ₋₃ /3.64 ₋₂
2 ¹⁰	<i>iter</i>	3/9	4/14	4/53	4/13	4/12
	<i>ng</i>	3/9	4/14	4/53	4/13	4/12
	<i>nH</i>	4/19	6/30	0/0	0/0	0/0
	<i>gff</i>	1.68 ₋₃ /5.28 ₋₁₂	1.68 ₋₃ /1.78 ₋₈	1.68 ₋₃ /8.26 ₋₈	1.68 ₋₃ /3.32 ₋₈	1.68 ₋₃ /3.90 ₋₈
	$\frac{gff}{gfo}$	8.47 ₋₄ /2.65 ₋₁₂	8.47 ₋₄ /8.93 ₋₉	8.47 ₋₄ /4.15 ₋₈	8.47 ₋₄ /1.67 ₋₈	8.47 ₋₄ /1.96 ₋₈
	<i>t</i>	5.50 ₋₂ /2.43 ₋₁	2.00 ₋₁ /9.96 ₋₁	2.94 ₋₂ /4.07 ₋₁	3.01 ₋₂ /1.06 ₋₁	3.09 ₋₂ /1.05 ₋₁

$$\mathcal{T}_{\eta_x} \xi_x = \xi_x - \frac{2y^T \xi_x}{\|x + y\|^2} (x + y), \quad (49)$$

where $y = R_x(\eta_x)$. This operation is well defined whenever x and y are not antipodal points. On $\text{St}(p, n)$, since we will conduct experiments on problems of small dimension, we find it preferable to select a vector transport by parallelization (6), which amounts to selecting a smooth field of tangent bases B on $\text{St}(p, n)$. To this end, we note that $T_X \text{St}(p, n) = \{X\Omega + X_\perp K : \Omega^T = -\Omega, K \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p}\}$, where the columns of $X_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-p)}$ form an orthonormal basis of the orthogonal complement of the column space of X (see, e.g., [2, Example 3.5.2]). Hence, an orthonormal basis of $T_X \text{St}(p, n)$ is given by $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}X(e_i e_j^T - e_j e_i^T) : i = 1, \dots, p, j = i + 1, \dots, p\} \cup \{X_\perp \tilde{e}_i e_j^T, i = 1, \dots, n - p, j = 1, \dots, p\}$, where (e_1, \dots, e_p) is the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^p and $(\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_{n-p})$ is the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^{n-p} . To ensure that the obtained field of tangent bases is smooth, we need to choose X_\perp as a smooth function of X . This can be done locally by extracting the $n - p$ last columns of the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization of $[X \ C]$ where C is a given $n \times (n - p)$ matrix. In practice, we have observed that Matlab's `null` function applied to X works adequately to produce an X_\perp .




Fig. 1 Comparison of RTR-Newton and the new methods RTR-SR1 and LRTR-SR1 for the Rayleigh quotient problem (47) with $n = 1024$

The experiments on the Rayleigh quotient (47) are reported in Table 1 and Fig. 1. Since the Hessian is readily available, RTR-Newton is the a priori method of choice over the proposed RTR-SR1 and LRTR-SR1 methods. Nevertheless, Table 1 illustrates that it is possible to exhibit a matrix A for which LRTR-SR1 is faster than RTR-Newton. Specifically, matrix A in the Rayleigh quotient (47) is set to UDU^T , where U is an orthonormal matrix obtained by orthonormalizing a random matrix whose elements are drawn from the standard normal distribution and $D = \text{diag}(0, 0.01, \dots, 0.01, 2, \dots, 2)$ with 0.01 and 2 occurring $n/2 - 1$ and $n/2$ times, respectively. The initial iterate is generated randomly. The number of function evaluations is equal to the number of iterations ($iter$). ng denotes the number of gradient evaluations. The differences between $iter$ and ng that may be observed in RTR-Newton are due to occasional rejections of the candidate new iterate as prescribed in the trust-region framework [2, §7.2]; for RTR-SR1 and LRTR-SR1, $iter$ and ng are identical because one evaluation of the gradient is required at each iterate to update \mathcal{B}_k or store y_k even if the candidate is rejected. nH denotes the number of operations of the form $\text{Hess } f(x)\eta$ or $\mathcal{B}\eta$. t denotes the run time (seconds). To obtain sufficiently stable timing values, an average is taken over several identical runs for a total run time of at least one minute. gf_0 and gf_f denote the initial and final norm of the gradient. Two stopping criteria are tested: $gf_f/gf_0 < 1e-3$ and $gf_f/gf_0 < 1e-6$.

Unsurprisingly, Table 1 shows that RTR-Newton, which exploits the Hessian of f , requires fewer iterations than the SR1 methods, which does not use this information. However, when n gets large, the time per iteration in LRTR-SR1—with moderate memory size m —gets sufficiently smaller for the method to become faster than RTR-Newton.

Table 2 Joint diagonalization (JD) experiments: $n = 12$, $p = 4$, $\epsilon_C = 1e - 1$

n		RTR-Newton	RTR-SR1	LRTR-SR1		
				$m = 0$	$m = 2$	$m = 4$
		1e-3/1e-6	1e-3/1e-6	1e-3/1e-6	1e-3/1e-6	1e-3/1e-6
2^4	<i>iter</i>	10/12	58/81	80/328	61/150	57/131
	<i>ng</i>	10/12	58/81	80/328	61/150	57/131
	<i>nH</i>	63/96	160/253	0/0	0/0	0/0
	<i>gff</i>	3.03 ₋₁ /5.99 ₋₄	1.93/2.26 ₋₃	2.37/2.23 ₋₃	2.37/2.21 ₋₃	2.14/1.96 ₋₃
	$\frac{gff}{gfo}$	1.21 ₋₄ /2.40 ₋₇	7.74 ₋₄ /9.07 ₋₇	9.48 ₋₄ /8.91 ₋₇	9.48 ₋₄ /8.85 ₋₇	8.55 ₋₄ /7.83 ₋₇
	<i>t</i>	4.62 ₋₂ /5.92 ₋₂	5.48 ₋₂ /7.78 ₋₂	1.00 ₋₁ /3.78 ₋₁	8.75 ₋₂ /2.13 ₋₁	1.01 ₋₁ /2.41 ₋₁
2^6	<i>iter</i>	14/16	64/88	163/402	83/176	109/199
	<i>ng</i>	14/16	64/88	163/402	83/176	109/199
	<i>nH</i>	93/120	186/288	0/0	0/0	0/0
	<i>gff</i>	1.89/2.58 ₋₃	5.54/5.48 ₋₃	8.63/8.57 ₋₃	8.79/7.39 ₋₃	7.82/7.28 ₋₃
	$\frac{gff}{gfo}$	2.13 ₋₄ /2.90 ₋₇	6.24 ₋₄ /6.18 ₋₇	9.72 ₋₄ /9.66 ₋₇	9.91 ₋₄ /8.33 ₋₇	8.82 ₋₄ /8.20 ₋₇
	<i>t</i>	1.73 ₋₁ /2.19 ₋₁	1.01 ₋₁ /1.43 ₋₁	3.24 ₋₁ /7.34 ₋₁	1.74 ₋₁ /3.65 ₋₁	2.73 ₋₁ /5.01 ₋₁
2^8	<i>iter</i>	10/13	54/82	122/372	100/168	81/165
	<i>ng</i>	10/13	54/82	122/372	100/168	81/165
	<i>nH</i>	64/109	148/240	0/0	0/0	0/0
	<i>gff</i>	3.49 ₁ /8.08 ₋₃	3.05 ₁ /3.95 ₋₂	3.99 ₁ /2.85 ₋₂	3.83 ₁ /2.77 ₋₂	2.77 ₁ /4.01 ₋₂
	$\frac{gff}{gfo}$	8.65 ₋₄ /2.00 ₋₇	7.56 ₋₄ /9.79 ₋₇	9.89 ₋₄ /7.07 ₋₇	9.51 ₋₄ /6.88 ₋₇	6.87 ₋₄ /9.94 ₋₇
	<i>t</i>	4.14 ₋₁ /6.78 ₋₁	2.31 ₋₁ /3.57 ₋₁	6.83 ₋₁ /1.70	4.77 ₋₁ /8.06 ₋₁	4.20 ₋₁ /8.71 ₋₁

Table 2 and Fig. 2 present the experimental results obtained for the JD problem (48). The C_i matrices are selected as $C_i = \text{diag}(n, n - 1, \dots, 1) + \epsilon_C(R_i + R_i^T)$, where the elements of $R_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are independently drawn from the standard normal distribution. Table 2 and Fig. 2 correspond to $\epsilon_C = 0.1$, but we have observed similar results for a wide range of values of ϵ_C . Table 2 indicates that RTR-Newton requires fewer iterations than RTR-SR1, which requires fewer iterations than LRTR-SR1. This was expected since RTR-Newton uses the Hessian of f while RTR-SR1 uses an inexact Hessian and LRTR-SR1 is further constrained by the limited memory. However, the iterations of RTR-Newton tend to be more time-consuming than those of the SR1 methods, all the more so if N gets large since the number of terms in the Hessian of f is linear in N . The experiments reported in Table 2 show that the trade-off between the number of iterations and the time per iteration is in favor of RTR-SR1 for N sufficiently large. Note also that, even though it is slower than the two other methods in the experiments presented in Table 2, LRTR-SR1 may be the method of choice in certain circumstances as it does not require the Hessian of f (unlike RTR-Newton) and it has a reduced memory usage in comparison with RTR-SR1.




Fig. 2 Comparison of RTR-Newton and the new methods RTR-SR1 and LRTR-SR1 for the joint diagonalization problem (48) with $n = 12$, $p = 4$, $N = 1024$

6 Conclusion

We have introduced a Riemannian SR1 trust-region method, where the second-order term of the model is generated using a Riemannian generalization of the classical SR1 update. Global convergence to stationary points and $d + 1$ -step superlinear convergence are guaranteed, and the experiments reported here show promise. A limited-memory version of the algorithm has also been presented. The new algorithms will be made available in the Manopt toolbox [9].

References

1. Absil, P.A., Baker, C.G., Gallivan, K.A.: Trust-region methods on Riemannian manifolds. *Found. Comput. Math.* **7**(3), 303–330 (2007)
2. Absil, P.A., Mahony, R., Sepulchre, R.: *Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ (2008)
3. Absil, P.A., Malick, J.: Projection-like retractions on matrix manifolds. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **22**(1), 135–158 (2012)
4. Adler, R.L., Dedieu, J.P., Margulies, J.Y.: Newton’s method on Riemannian manifolds and a geometric model for the human spine. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **22**(3), 359–390 (2002)
5. Afsari, B., Tron, R., Vidal, R.: On the convergence of gradient descent for finding the Riemannian center of mass. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **51**(3), 2230–2260 (2013). ArXiv:1201.0925v1
6. Boothby, W.M.: *An Introduction to Differentiable Manifolds and Riemannian Geometry*, 2nd edn. Academic Press, London (2003)
7. Borsdorf, R.: *Structured Matrix Nearness Problems: Theory and Algorithms*. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Manchester (2012)
8. Boumal, N., Absil, P.A.: RTRMC: A Riemannian trust-region method for low-rank matrix completion. *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.* **24**(NIPS), 406–414 (2011)

9. Boumal, N., Mishra, B.: The Manopt toolbox. <http://www.manopt.org>
10. Brace, I., Manton, J.H.: An improved BFGS-on-manifold algorithm for computing weighted low rank approximations. In Proceedings of 17th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems, pp. 1735–1738 (2006)
11. Byrd, R.H., Khalfan, H.F., Schnabel, R.B.: Analysis of a symmetric rank-one trust region method. *SIAM J. Optim.* **6**(4), 1025–1039 (1996)
12. Byrd, R.H., Nocedal, J., Schnabel, R.B.: Representations of quasi-Newton matrices and their use in limited memory methods. *Math. Program.* **63**(1–3), 129–156 (1994)
13. do Carmo, M.P.: Riemannian geometry. Mathematics: Theory & Applications (1992)
14. Chavel, I.: Riemannian Geometry: A Modern Introduction, 2nd ed. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics (2006)
15. Conn, A.R., Gould, N.I.M., Toint, P.L.: Convergence of quasi-Newton matrices generated by the symmetric rank one update. *Math. Program.* **50**(1–3), 177–195 (1991). doi:[10.1007/BF01594934](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01594934)
16. Conn, A.R., Gould, N.I.M., Toint, P.L.: Trust-region methods. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, MPS/SIAM Series on Optimization (2000)
17. Edelman, A., Arias, T.A., Smith, S.T.: The geometry of algorithms with orthogonality constraints. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **20**(2), 303–353 (1998). doi:[10.1137/S0895479895290954](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0895479895290954)
18. Gabay, D.: Minimizing a differentiable function over a differential manifold. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **37**(2), 177–219 (1982)
19. Gallivan, K.A., Qi, C., Absil, P.A.: A Riemannian Dennis-Moré condition. In: Berry, M.W., Gallivan, K.A., Gallopoulos, E., Grama, A., Philippe, B., Saad, Y., Saied, F. (eds.) High-Performance Scientific Computing, pp. 281–293. Springer, London (2012)
20. Huang, W.: Optimization algorithms on Riemannian manifolds with applications. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Mathematics, Florida State University (2013)
21. Ishteva, M., Absil, P.A., Van Huffel, S., De Lathauwer, L.: Best low multilinear rank approximation of higher-order tensors, based on the Riemannian trust-region scheme. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **32**(1), 115–135 (2011)
22. Jiang, B., Dai, Y.H.: A framework of constraint preserving update schemes for optimization on the Stiefel manifold (2013). ArXiv:1301.0172
23. Journée, M., Bach, F., Absil, P.A., Sepulchre, R.: Low-rank optimization on the cone of positive semidefinite matrices. *SIAM J. Optim.* **20**(5), 2327–2351 (2010)
24. Khalfan, H.F., Byrd, R.H., Schnabel, R.B.: A theoretical and experimental study of the symmetric rank-one update. *SIAM J. Optim.* **3**(1), 1–24 (1993). doi:[10.1137/0803001](https://doi.org/10.1137/0803001)
25. Kleinsteuwer, M., Shen, H.: Blind source separation with compressively sensed linear mixtures. *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.* **19**(2), 107–110 (2012). ArXiv:1110.2593v1
26. Mishra, B., Meyer, G., Bach, F., Sepulchre, R.: Low-rank optimization with trace norm penalty (2011). ArXiv:1112.2318v2
27. Nocedal, J., Wright, S.J.: Numerical Optimization, 2nd edn. Springer, Berlin (2006)
28. O'Neill, B.: Semi-Riemannian geometry. Academic Press Incorporated [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers] (1983)
29. Qi, C.: NuMerial OptiMization Methods on RieMannian Manifolds. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Mathematics, Florida State University (2011)
30. Ring, W., Wirth, B.: Optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds and their application to shape space. *SIAM J. Optim.* **22**(2), 596–627 (2012). doi:[10.1137/11082885X](https://doi.org/10.1137/11082885X)
31. Sato, H., Iwai, T.: Convergence analysis for the Riemannian conjugate gradient method (2013). ArXiv:1302.0125v1
32. Savas, B., Lim, L.H.: Quasi-Newton methods on Grassmannians and multilinear approximations of tensors. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **32**(6), 3352–3393 (2010)
33. Seibert, M., Kleinsteuwer, M., Hüper, K.: Properties of the BFGS method on Riemannian manifolds. *Mathematical System Theory C Festschrift in Honor of Uwe Helmke on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* pp. 395–412 (2013)
34. Selvan, S.E., Amato, U., Gallivan, K.A., Qi, C.: Descent algorithms on oblique manifold for source-adaptive ICA contrast. *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.* **23**(12), 1930–1947 (2012)
35. Stiefel, E.: Richtungsfelder und fernparallelismus in n-dimensionalen mannigfaltigkeiten. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici* **8**(1), 305–353 (1935). doi:[10.1007/BF01199559](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01199559)

36. Theis, F.J., Cason, T.P., Absil, P.A.: Soft dimension reduction for ICA by joint diagonalization on the Stiefel manifold. In: Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Independent Component Analysis and Signal Separation, vol. 5441, pp. 354–361 (2009)
37. Turaga, P., Veeraraghavan, A., Srivastava, A., Chellappa, R.: Statistical computations on Grassmann and Stiefel manifolds for image and video-based recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **33**(11), 2273–86 (2011). doi:[10.1109/TPAMI.2011.52](https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2011.52)
38. Vandereycken, B., Vandewalle, S.: A Riemannian optimization approach for computing low-rank solutions of Lyapunov equations. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **31**(5), 2553–2579 (2010). doi:[10.1137/090764566](https://doi.org/10.1137/090764566)
39. Wen, Z., Yin, W.: A feasible method for optimization with orthogonality constraints. *Mathematical Programming*, Published online (2012). doi:[10.1007/s10107-012-0584-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-012-0584-1)