

CHAU Dang Minh

TENSOR DECOMPOSITIONS
THEORY AND IMPLEMENTATION

1 CP Decomposition

By convention, let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times J}$ be a matrix, we shall denote by $\mathbf{a}_j \in \mathbb{R}^I$, where $1 \leq j \leq J$ the j -th column of \mathbf{A} . Let $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times J \times K}$ be an order-3 tensor. The CP decomposition seeks for matrices $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times R}$, $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times R}$ and $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times R}$ such that

$$\mathcal{X} = \sum_{r=1}^R \mathbf{a}_r \circ \mathbf{b}_r \circ \mathbf{c}_r, \quad (1)$$

such that R is the smallest possible number. In such case, R is called the *rank* of \mathcal{X} . It is usually useful to standardize the column vectors of the matrices to unit norm by introducing scaling factors $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_R)^\top$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{X} = \sum_{r=1}^R \lambda_r \mathbf{a}_r \circ \mathbf{b}_r \circ \mathbf{c}_r. \quad (2)$$

The decomposition can be described briefly as $\mathcal{X} = [[\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}]]$. Let $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$, we have the equivalent matricization expressions

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{X}_{(1)} = \mathbf{A}\Lambda(\mathbf{C} \odot \mathbf{B})^\top \\ \mathbf{X}_{(2)} = \mathbf{B}\Lambda(\mathbf{C} \odot \mathbf{A})^\top \\ \mathbf{X}_{(3)} = \mathbf{C}\Lambda(\mathbf{B} \odot \mathbf{A})^\top. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

There is no known finite algorithm for determining the rank of a tensor [1]. Therefore, for each $R = 1, 2, \dots$, we attempt to minimize the difference between \mathcal{X} and a rank- R tensor $\hat{\mathcal{X}} = [[\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}]]$, i.e.

$$\min_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}} \|\mathcal{X} - \hat{\mathcal{X}}\|^2 \quad (4)$$

until the difference is less than a given tolerance. Using (3), we can write, for example, mode-1 matricization form of the problem as

$$\min_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}} \|\mathbf{X}_{(1)} - \mathbf{A}\Lambda(\mathbf{C} \odot \mathbf{B})\|. \quad (5)$$

The solution is

$$\mathbf{A}\Lambda = \mathbf{X}_{(1)}[(\mathbf{C} \odot \mathbf{B})^\top]^\dagger = \mathbf{X}_{(1)}(\mathbf{C} \odot \mathbf{B})(\mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{C} \star \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B})^\dagger \quad (6)$$

We use the last expression because it requires calculating the pseudoinverse of an $R \times R$ matrix rather than a $JK \times R$ matrix. Therefore, we can solve for each factor iteratively until a convergence criterion is met. The general case for N -way tensor is represented in the algorithm below.

Algorithm 1 CP Decomposition using Alternative Least Square

Input: $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_1, \dots, I_N}$, $\mathbf{A}_{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_n \times R}$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^R$, $\epsilon = 1e - 10$, $\text{maxIter} = 5000$.

iter $\leftarrow 0$

while $\|\mathcal{X} - [[\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{A}_{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_{(N)}]]\| > \epsilon$ and iter $< \text{maxIter}$ **do**

for $n = 1, \dots, N$ **do**

$\mathbf{V} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}_{(1)}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(1)} \star \dots \star \mathbf{A}_{(n-1)}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(n-1)} \star \mathbf{A}_{(n+1)}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(n+1)} \star \dots \star \mathbf{A}_{(N)}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(N)}$

$\mathbf{A}_{(n)} \leftarrow \mathbf{X}_{(n)}(\mathbf{A}_{(N)} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{A}_{(n+1)} \mathbf{A}_{(n-1)} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{A}_{(1)}) \mathbf{V}^\dagger$

$\boldsymbol{\lambda} \leftarrow (\mathbf{a}_{(n)1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{(n)r})^\top$

 Normalize columns of $\mathbf{A}_{(N)}$

end for

end while

Output: $\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{A}_{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_{(N)}$.

2 Tucker Decompositions: HOSVD and HOOI

Let $R_n = \text{rank}(\mathbf{X}_{(n)})$. Tucker decomposition of ranks S_1, \dots, S_N , where $S_n \leq R_n$ seeks a tensor $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{S_1 \times \dots \times S_N}$ and matrices $\mathbf{A}_{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_n \times S_n}$, where $n = 1, \dots, N$ to minimize

$$\|\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{G} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_{(1)} \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_{(N)}\|. \quad (7)$$

The decomposition is written briefly as

$$\mathcal{X} \approx [[\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A}_{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_{(N)}]]. \quad (8)$$

If $S_n = R_n$, for all $n = 1, \dots, N$, we have an exact such decomposition, called the higher-order SVD of \mathcal{X} (HOSVD).

Algorithm 2 Higher-order SVD

Input: $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_1, \dots, I_N}$, $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_1, \dots, R_N}$, $\mathbf{A}_{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_n \times R_n}$.

for $n = 1, \dots, N$ **do**

$\mathbf{A}_{(n)} \leftarrow R_n$ leading left singular vectors of $\mathbf{X}_{(n)}$

end for

$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{X} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_{(1)}^\top \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_{(N)}^\top$

Output: $\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A}_{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_{(N)}$.

In the case there exists $S_n < R_n$ for some $n = 1, \dots, N$, taking S_n left singular vectors of $\mathbf{X}_{(n)}$ as in HOSVD does not lead to an optimal solution. We use the Higher-order Orthogonal Iteration (HOOI) approach with HOSVD as an initialization.

Algorithm 3 Higher-order Orthogonal Iteration

Input: $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_1, \dots, I_N}$, $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{S_1, \dots, S_N}$, $\mathbf{A}_{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_n \times S_n}$, $\epsilon = 1e - 10$, $\text{maxIter} = 5000$.

 Initialize $\mathbf{A}_{(n)}, n = 1, \dots, N$ using HOSVD.

while $\|\mathcal{X} - [[\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A}_{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_{(N)}]]\| > \epsilon$ and $\text{iter} < \text{maxIter}$ **do**

for $n = 1, \dots, N$ **do**

$\mathcal{Y} \leftarrow \mathcal{X} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_{(1)}^\top \dots \times_{n-1} \mathbf{A}_{(n-1)}^\top \times_{n+1} \mathbf{A}_{(n+1)}^\top \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_{(N)}^\top$

$\mathbf{A}_{(n)} \leftarrow S_n$ singular vectors of $\mathbf{Y}_{(n)}$

end for

end while

$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{X} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_{(1)}^\top \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_{(N)}^\top$

Output: $\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A}_{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_{(N)}$.

3 Implementation Details

References

- [1] Joseph B Kruskal. “Rank, decomposition, and uniqueness for 3-way and N-way arrays”. In: *Multiway data analysis*. 1989, pp. 7–18.