

---

# Guaranteed Model Order Estimation and Sample Complexity Bounds for LDA

---

**E.D. Gutiérrez**

Department of Cognitive Science, UCSD  
International Computer Science Institute, Berkeley  
edg@icsi.berkeley.edu

## Abstract

The question of how to determine the number of independent latent factors, or topics, in mixture models such as Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) is of great practical importance. In most applications, the exact number of topics is unknown, and depends on the application and the size of the data set. Nonparametric methods can avoid the problem of topic number selection, but they can be impractically slow for large sample sizes and are subject to local optima. We develop a guaranteed procedure for topic number recovery that does not necessitate learning the model's latent parameters beforehand. Our procedure relies on some extensions of recent results from random matrix theory to the case of rectangular noncentered matrices and Markov matrices. Our topic number recovery procedure outperforms nonparametric Bayesian methods such as HDP. We also discuss some implications of our results for the sample complexity and accuracy of popular spectral learning algorithms for LDA. Our results and procedure can be extended to spectral learning algorithms for other exchangeable mixture models with similar conditional independence properties, as well as for Hidden Markov Models.

## 1 Introduction

The question of how to determine the model order—that is, the number of independent latent factors—in mixture models such as Latent Dirichlet Allocation [4] is of great practical importance. These models are widely used for tasks ranging from bioinformatics to computer vision to natural language processing. Finding the least number of latent factors that explains the data well prevents overfitting, as well as increasing computational and storage efficiency. In most applications, the exact number of latent factors (also known as topics or components) is unknown: model order often depends on the application and increases as the data set grows. For a fixed training set, the user can subjectively fine-tune the number of topics or optimize it according to objective measures of fit along with the other parameters of the model, but this is a time-consuming process, and it is not intuitively clear how to increase the number of topics as new data points are encountered without more fine-tuning. Nonparametric Bayesian models such as the Hierarchical Dirichlet Process (HDP) [13] have been useful in addressing the problem of model order estimation. These models allow a distribution over an infinite number of topics. When HDP is fitted using a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling algorithm, new topics are sampled as necessitated by the data. However, training a nonparametric model using MCMC can be intractable for the large sample sizes likely to be encountered in many real-world applications, and like all Monte Carlo methods, this approach is susceptible to local optima. Another class of methods is based on optimizing some function of likelihood or performing a likelihood-based hypothesis test (e.g., the Bayes factor method, or optimization of the Bayesian Information Criterion, Akaike Information Criterion, or perplexity). These methods can be even more computationally intensive than nonparametric methods, since they involve learning a model and computing the likelihood of the data for the entire range of model orders under

consideration. This range must be pre-specified by the user. Computational complexity increases linearly as the size of the range under consideration increases. In addition, they have been outperformed by nonparametric methods in experimental settings [7].

In this paper, we present a simple and efficient procedure that estimates model order from the spectral characteristics of the sample cross-correlation matrix of the observed data. We focus on LDA in this paper in order to illustrate our approach, but our methods can be extended to other mixture models. To our knowledge, the resulting procedure is the first to come with sharp probabilistic guarantees and not to require computationally expensive learning of the hidden parameters beforehand. All that is required is the computation of the sample cross-correlation matrix and the recovery of the top singular values of this matrix. For LDA, the requisite cross-correlations can be computed from the sufficient statistics of the model, namely the term-document co-occurrence matrix. The usefulness of our procedure is illustrated by the following proposition for the usual case where the number of topics  $K$  and the vocabulary size (or dimensionality)  $V$  are such that  $K = O(V)$ ,  $K < V$  (though we also present results for the more general case  $K \leq V$  in this paper):

**Proposition 1.1.** *Suppose we have an LDA topic model over a vocabulary of size  $V$  with concentration parameter  $\beta_0 \leq \infty$ , and we wish to determine how many nonzero topics  $K$  there are in the corpus. Suppose  $K = O(V)$  and  $K < V$  almost surely. Then, for  $V$  large enough, if we gather  $N \geq O(\frac{\ln(V/\delta)}{\epsilon^2})$  independent samples as in Lemma 4.9, we can recover the number of topics whose expected proportion is greater than  $\epsilon$ , with probability greater than  $1 - \delta$ .*

The intermediate results allow us to prove this guarantee also provide new insights on sample complexity bounds for spectral learning of mixture models [2]. These spectral algorithms have become popular partly because they offer better scalability to large data sets than MCMC methods, and partly because they provide probabilistic guarantees on sample complexity that are elusive for MCMC methods. However, previous sample complexity results bounded the estimation error and sample complexity of learning the latent parameter matrix  $\Phi$  in terms of  $\Phi$  itself: this limited their practical utility given that in practice  $\Phi$  is unknown beforehand. In contrast, given our results, sample complexity can be expressed directly in terms of the known quantity  $V$ :

**Proposition 1.2.** *Suppose we have an LDA topic model over a vocabulary of size  $V$ . Suppose the number of topics  $K < V$  is fixed, and the variance of the entries of  $\Phi$  is fixed and finite. Then, for  $V$  large enough, if we gather  $N \geq O(V^2)$  independent samples, we can recover the parameter matrix  $\Phi$  with error less than  $O(V)^{3/2}$ , with probability greater than  $1 - \delta$ .*

Taken together, these two results increase the usefulness of spectral algorithms for mixture models by allowing the number of topics to be set in a data-driven manner, and by providing more explicit sample complexity guarantees, giving the user a better idea of the quality of the learned parameters. Spectral methods can now provide a guaranteed and computationally efficient alternative for nonparametric Bayesian models.

In order to detail how we arrived at these results, we will first provide a brief overview of spectral methods for exchangeable mixture models in section 2. In section 3, we discuss the general setting of Dirichlet topic models on which we focus in this paper. In section 4, we adapt non-asymptotic results concerning the singular values of random matrices to this setting. Practitioners interested in implementing our model order estimation method can consult section 5, where we describe our algorithm for finding the number of topics and some other implications of our results on the accuracy of algorithms for learning the other latent variables, and where we demonstrate that our method outperforms a nonparametric Bayesian method on an experimental setting taken from the literature.

## 1.1 Notation

For a vector  $x$ ,  $\|x\|$  is the Euclidean norm and  $dist(x, W)$  is the Euclidean distance between  $x$  and a subspace  $W$ . For a matrix  $A$ ,  $\sigma_1(A) := \|A\|$  is the largest singular value;  $A^+ := (A^T A)^{-1} A^T$  is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse;  $\sigma_i(A)$  is the  $i^{th}$  singular value. *a.s.* is "almost surely," and *w.p.* is "with probability."

## 2 Spectral properties of mixture models

For a large class of mixture models including LDA and Gaussian Mixture Models, the observed data can be represented as a sequence of exchangeable vectors  $\{x, x', x'', \dots\}$  that are conditionally independent given a latent factor vector  $h$  which is assumed to be strictly positive. For instance, in an LDA model each data point (word token) can be represented as a canonical basis vector  $x$  of dimensionality  $V$ , where  $V$  is the vocabulary size (number of distinct terms). The  $i$ -th element of  $x$  is equal to 1 if the word token that it represents is observed to belong to class  $i$ , and 0 otherwise. For LDA,  $h$  determines the mixture of topics present in a particular document. Therefore  $h$  is a vector whose support is a.s. equal to the number of non-zero topics (the model order).

Although the sufficient statistics of LDA can be represented in a much more succinct manner, this representation turns out to be more than a curiosity. To see why, observe that under this representation the conditional expectation of the observed data generated by the models can be represented as a linear combination of some latent matrix  $\Phi$  (known in LDA as the word-topic matrix) and the latent vector  $h$ :

$$\mathbf{E}[x|h] = \Phi h.$$

For these mixture models, the principal learning problem is to estimate  $\Phi$  efficiently and accurately. Using the equation above and the conditional independence of any three distinct observed vectors  $x, x', x''$  given  $h$  in the LDA model, we can derive equations for the expectations of the moments of the observed data in terms of  $\Phi$ . In particular, the expected first moment, which is the vector of the expected probability masses of the terms in the vocabulary, can be written as

$$M_1 := \mathbf{E}[x] = \Phi \mathbf{E}[h], \quad (1)$$

and the expected second moment, which is the matrix of the expected cross-correlations between any two terms in the vocabulary, can be written as

$$M_2 := \mathbf{E}[xx'^T] = \Phi \mathbf{E}[hh^T] \Phi^T, x \neq x'. \quad (2)$$

Using tensor algebra, these expressions can be derived for even higher moments. In fact, Anandkumar et al.[1][2] were able to develop fast spectral algorithms for learning the hidden parameters of mixture models from the second- and third-order moments of the data by taking advantage of this relationship. In the case of LDA, the only user-specified inputs to the spectral algorithm are the number of topics  $K$  and the concentration parameter  $\alpha_0$  governing the distribution of the membership vector  $h$ . The matrix  $\Phi$  is treated as fixed, but unknown.

Note that Eqs. (1) and (2) demonstrate an explicit linear-algebraic relationship between the latent parameter matrix  $\Phi$ , the expected moments of the data  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , and the expected moments of  $h$ . In fact, for LDA,  $\alpha := \mathbf{E}[h]$  is the vector that specifies the expected proportion of data points assigned to each topic across the entire data set—roughly speaking, if  $\frac{\alpha_i}{\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k} = 0.5$  we expect about half of the word tokens in the data set to belong to topic  $i$ . Therefore, the model order is the number of nonzero topics (i.e., the support) of  $\alpha$ . In the case of LDA, some elementary computation (cf. [1] Theorem 4.3) demonstrates that  $\alpha$  can be written as a product of  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$ , and  $\Phi$  as follows:

$$\alpha I = \alpha_0(\alpha_0 + 1)\Phi^+(M_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0 + 1}M_1M_1^T)\Phi^{+T}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\Phi^+$  is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of  $\Phi$  and  $\alpha_0 := \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k$ . Our method for model order estimation relies crucially on this linear-algebraic relationship. The global properties of matrix products are governed by the spectral characteristics of the matrices. As long as the spectral characteristics of  $\Phi$ ,  $M_1$ , and  $M_2$  are well-behaved, we can determine whether the  $k^{\text{th}}$  largest element of  $\alpha$  is likely to be close to zero (i.e., whether topic  $k$  is negligible or nonexistent in the model). Obviously, we do not have access to  $\Phi$  a priori, but it turns out that we don't need to: the collective spectral properties of random matrices are much less uncertain than the individual values of the matrix entries from which they are derived.

If we treat the matrix  $\Phi$  as a random matrix (as in standard Bayesian approaches to LDA) and place an approximate bound on the variance of the entries of  $\Phi$ , then  $\Phi$  has very predictable spectral characteristics for reasonably large  $V$ . To prove this, we must adapt some recent results from random matrix theory. Observe that  $\Phi^+$ , not  $\Phi$ , occurs as a factor in the equation above; that means we

need to understand the behavior of the least singular values of  $\Phi$ , the so-called "hard edge" of the spectrum. While most work on the hard edge of the spectrum has focused on ideal settings where the matrices are square and all entries are i.i.d. with mean zero, these conditions do not hold in the case of  $\Phi$  for Dirichlet mixture models such as LDA. We use some elementary facts about Dirichlet random variables to extend the known results for square non-centered matrices with i.i.d. entries to the matrices of interest in our setting. To our knowledge, this is the first time that sharp bounds have been explicitly stated in the literature for the least singular values of rectangular non-centered random matrices with i.i.d. entries or for the least singular values of Markov random matrices (such as Dirichlet-distributed matrices).

Note that  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are not precisely known either, but it is relatively straightforward to derive estimators for them from the observed data. These estimators can be proven to be reasonably accurate via relatively straightforward application of recent tail bounds for the eigenvalues of sums of random matrices.

Thus, we can show that the observed moments of the data contain enough information to reveal the number of underlying topics to arbitrary accuracy with high probability, given enough samples. Moreover, we present experiments suggesting that the resulting algorithm can be used in realistic scenarios encountered by practitioners, and outperforms the more computationally intensive non-parametric Bayesian Gibbs sampling. The principles behind our results can be extended to any exchangeable mixture models that can be represented as in Eqs. (1) and (2), though we will work with the LDA model to make our analysis concrete.

### 3 Setting: Dirichlet topic models

The Latent Dirichlet Allocation model is a popular mixture model introduced by [4]. This model assumes that the data comprise a *corpus* of *documents*. In turn, each document is made up of discrete *word tokens*. Each word token is assumed to have two attributes: an observed *term* assignment (word type), and a latent *topic* assignment. Each discrete topic corresponds to a latent distribution over the terms in the vocabulary. The word token's topic is assigned by drawing from the document's latent parameters, and its word type is assigned by drawing from its topic's distribution. The model assumes that only the document and term assignments of each word token are observed, and all other variables are hidden.

Below,  $K$  denotes the number of topics with nonzero probability mass (the model order),  $V$  denotes the number of terms (vocabulary size), and  $n$  denotes the number of documents. We can precisely specify the generative model of LDA as follows:

- Each topic  $\phi^{(i)} \in \Delta^{V-1}, i = 1, \dots, K$  is a hidden distribution vector over the terms in the vocabulary. These vectors are unknown, so we assume that each  $\phi^{(i)}$  is drawn from a Dirichlet distribution with fixed parameter vector  $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_V)$ . We collect these vectors into a matrix  $\Phi = [\phi^{(1)} | \dots | \phi^{(K)}]$  where each topic distribution vector is a column of  $\Phi$ . The concentration parameter  $\beta_0 := \sum_{i=1}^V \beta_i$  can be seen as controlling how fine-grained the topics are; the smaller the value of  $\beta_0$ , the more distinguishable the topics are from each other.
- For each document  $d$ :
  - Draw a document-specific latent distribution  $\theta^{(d)} \in \Delta^{K-1}$  over the topics, sampled according to a fixed parameter vector  $Dirichlet(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K)$  that is the same for all documents in the corpus. The relative magnitude of each  $\alpha_i$  represents the expected proportion of word tokens in the corpus assigned to topic  $i$ . The concentration parameter  $\alpha_0 := \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k$  governs how topically distinct documents are (in the limit  $\alpha_0 \rightarrow 0$ , we have a model where each document has a single topic rather than a mix of topics [1]).
  - For each word token  $v$  in  $d$ :
    - \* The hidden topic  $k_v$  is sampled according to  $\theta^{(d)}$ .

- \* The word type is sampled according to  $\phi^{(k_v)}$ . If the  $v^{th}$  word token in the document is assigned  $i^{th}$  term in the vocabulary, then we represent the word token by  $x_d^{(v)} := e_i$  (the  $i^{th}$  canonical basis vector)<sup>1</sup>.

We make some additional assumptions on our model, as specified below.

### 3.1 Further conditions

These conditions generally follow those in [1], with the exception of our assumptions on  $\beta_0$ :

- The matrix  $\Phi$  is of full rank. Note that this condition follows *a.s.* from the generative process described above [6].
- The full hyperparameter vectors  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are unknown, but we assume that the concentration parameter  $\alpha_0$  is approximately known. We also assume that we can set a reasonable upper bound  $\bar{\beta}_0$  on the concentration parameter  $\beta_0$ . Intuitively, as  $\beta_0$  increases, the topics are less distinguishable from each other. Note that varying this assumption only affects our model by increasing the number of samples required to learn the number of topics within a certain level of accuracy. For simplicity of presentation, our derivations below assume that the entries  $\beta_i = \beta_1 = \beta_0/V$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, V$ . This is known as a *symmetric* Dirichlet prior and is equivalent to a uniform distribution on the simplex [5]. Setting a symmetric prior on  $\beta$  is standard procedure in most applications of Dirichlet mixture models; for an empirical justification of this practice, see [15].
- In the worst case, the number of topics is equal to the size of the vocabulary, and  $K = O(V)$  *a.s.*. In most applications of Dirichlet topic models, the number of topics is in the tens or hundreds, and the size of the vocabulary is in the hundreds or thousands.

Under the assumptions and generative model above, we attempt to can recover the number of topics within a margin of error defined by the expected probability mass of the topics, as follows:

**Definition 3.1.** A topic is  $\epsilon$ -relevant iff the expected proportion of data points in the corpus belonging to the topic exceeds  $\epsilon$ . That is, a topic is  $\epsilon$ -relevant iff  $\frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_0} \leq \epsilon$ .

Our procedure, as described below, is guaranteed to find at least all  $\epsilon$ -relevant topics with high probability. In most cases it will find the full number of non-zero topics. As long as  $\beta_0 < \infty$ ,  $\epsilon$  converges to 0 as the number of samples increases. For a fixed number of samples and a fixed failure probability  $\delta$ , the relevance threshold for recovered topics  $\epsilon$  increases when we wish to recover less distinguishable topics (i.e., as  $\beta_0$  increases).

## 4 Singular Value Bounds

In this section we provide tail bounds on the smallest singular value of rectangular Dirichlet random matrices. They can be straightforwardly extended to other Markov random matrices. These bounds are in the spirit of [10], [11], and [9], and depend on probabilistic bounds on the distance between any given random vector corresponding to a column of a random matrix and the subspace spanned by the vectors corresponding to the rest of the columns. The estimation of these distances is much simplified for random vectors with independent entries, so we must first transform our Dirichlet random matrix case into a case with independent entries.

### 4.1 Decomposition of Dirichlet random matrices

For a Dirichlet random matrix, the entries in each column are dependent, as they must sum to one. Fortunately Dirichlet random vectors are related to vectors with independent entries in a very rudimentary way.

**Fact 4.1.** Define a vector  $\gamma^\theta \in \mathbf{R}^K$  such that  $\gamma_i^\theta \sim \text{Gamma}(\beta_i, \theta)$  for some  $\beta_i, \theta > 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, V$ . Then the scaled vector  $\phi = \frac{\gamma^\theta}{\sum_{i=1}^V \gamma_i^\theta} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_V)$ .

<sup>1</sup>Note that the orderings of word tokens within documents are arbitrary in this model. The  $v^{th}$  and the  $w^{th}$  word tokens within a document are assumed to have the same distribution over topic/term assignments.

**Corollary 4.2.** For any Dirichlet random matrix  $\Phi$  with i.i.d. columns, and for the corresponding Gamma random matrix  $\Gamma^\theta$  with independent entries  $\Gamma_{ij}^\theta \sim \text{Gamma}(\beta_i, \theta)$ , we have that

$$\sigma_{\min}(\Phi) \geq \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma^\theta)}{\max_j (\sum_{i=1}^V \Gamma_{ij}^\theta)}.$$

*Proof.* Fact 4.1 implies that we can define any Dirichlet random matrix  $\Phi$  composed of i.i.d. columns  $\phi^{(i)} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_V)$  in terms of  $\Gamma^\theta$  as

$$\Phi := (D^\theta)^{-1} \Gamma^\theta, \quad (4)$$

where  $D^\theta$  is the diagonal matrix such that  $D_{jj}^\theta = \sum_{i=1}^V \Gamma_{ij}^\theta$ . Bordenave et al. [5] use a similar representation to characterize the asymptotic distributions of the eigenvalues and singular values of random square matrices with i.i.d. columns.

Next, by the properties of diagonal matrices (see [5] B.4), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\min}(\Phi) &\geq \sigma_{\min}(D^\theta)^{-1} \sigma_{\min}(\Gamma^\theta) = \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma^\theta)}{\sigma_1(D^\theta)} \\ &= \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma^\theta)}{\max_j \sum_{i=1}^V \Gamma_{ij}^\theta} \end{aligned}$$

□

We can exploit elementary tail bounds to control the sum in the denominator of the right-hand side of the expression above. Recall that  $\theta > 0$  is chosen arbitrarily; for convenience we will standardize our random variables by fixing  $\theta = \bar{\theta} := 1/\sqrt{\beta_i}$ . Note that, for Gamma random variables, it follows that  $\mathbf{E}[\Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{\theta}}] = \sqrt{\beta}$  and  $\text{Var}(\Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{\theta}}) = 1$  for all  $i, j$ . It is then easy to show using Chebyshev's inequality and the mutual independence of the  $K$  columns of  $\Gamma^{\bar{\theta}}$  that for any  $u > 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_j \left(\sum_{i=1}^V \Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{\theta}}\right) \geq (u + \sqrt{\beta_1})V\right) \leq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{Vu^2}\right)^K. \quad (5)$$

#### 4.1.1 Singular value bounds for matrices with i.i.d. entries

The following singular value bound for square matrices follows from Tao and Vu [11] Corollary 4:

**Theorem 4.3.** Suppose  $\Gamma$  is an  $V \times V$  random matrix with independent, identically distributed entries with unit variance, mean  $\mu < \infty$ , and bounded fourth moment. Then there exist positive constants  $c_0, c_1$  that depend only on  $\mu$  such that, for any  $\delta > 0$  there is a small enough  $t \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\mathbf{P}(\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma) \leq c_0 t / V^{1+c_2}) \leq \delta V^{-c_2}$$

Though this bound applies also to rectangular matrices (i.e., cases where the number of topics grows more slowly than  $V$ ) by the Cauchy Interlacing Theorem of singular values (cf. [8]), this bound is not sharp when  $K \ll V$ . The following result follows from arguments in [12] Section 8:

**Theorem 4.4.** Suppose  $\Gamma$  is an  $V \times K$  random matrix with independent, identically distributed entries with unit variance and mean  $\mu < \infty$ . Moreover, suppose the aspect ratio  $K/V \leq 1 - V^{1-\epsilon}$  for some small  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then there exists a positive constant  $c_1 > 0$  that depends only on  $\mu$  such that, for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists a small enough  $t \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\mathbf{P}(\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma) \leq c_1 \frac{t(V-K)}{\sqrt{V+K+2}}) \leq \delta \exp(-V^\epsilon)$$

In order to prove Theorem 4.4, we need two results from [12], presented here without proof:

**Proposition 4.5.** (*Distance Tail Bound; [12] Prop. 5.1*). Suppose  $\Gamma, \mu$  are as above. Let  $1 \leq j \leq V(1 - V^{-\epsilon})$  for some small  $\epsilon > 0$  and let  $W$  be a  $j$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbf{R}^V$ . Let  $\Gamma_j$  be a column of  $\Gamma$ . Let  $W$  be fixed in  $\Gamma_j$ . Then there exists a positive constant  $\tilde{c}_1 > 0$  that depends only on  $\mu$  such that, for any  $\delta > 0$  and  $V > V_0$ , there exists a small enough  $s \in (0, 1)$  that depends only on  $\mu$  such that

$$\mathbf{P}(\text{dist}(\Gamma_j, W) \leq \tilde{c}_1 s \sqrt{V - K + 1}) \leq \delta' \exp(-V^\epsilon).$$

**Lemma 4.6.** (*Negative Second Moment; [12] Lemma A.4*). Let  $1 \leq K \leq V$  and let  $\Gamma$  be a full rank  $V \times K$  matrix with columns  $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_K \in \mathbf{R}^V$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq K$ , let  $W_i$  be the hyperplane generated by the  $K - 1$  remaining columns of  $\Gamma$ . Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^K \sigma_j(\Gamma)^{-2} = \sum_{j=1}^K \text{dist}(\Gamma_j, W_j)^{-2}$$

Now we prove Theorem 4.4.

*Proof.* Proof of Theorem 4.4. Fix  $K' := K + \frac{V-K}{2}$ . Let  $\Gamma'$  be a  $V \times K'$  matrix consisting of the  $K$  columns of  $\Gamma$  plus  $\frac{V-K}{2}$  additional columns whose entries are independent and identically distributed to the entries of  $\tilde{\Gamma}$ . Let  $\sigma'_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq K'$  be the singular values of  $\Gamma'$ . By the Cauchy Interlacing Theorem,  $\sigma_K(\Gamma) \geq \sigma'_{K+1}$ . By Lemma 4.6, we have that

$$\sigma_1'^{-2} + \dots + \sigma_{K'}'^{-2} = \sum_{j=1}^{K'} \text{dist}(\Gamma'_j, W_j)^{-2}. \quad (6)$$

By Proposition 4.5, w.p.  $1 - \delta \exp(-V^\epsilon)$ ,  $\text{dist}(\Gamma_j, W_j) \geq \tilde{c}_1 s \sqrt{V - K' + 1} = \tilde{c}_1 s \sqrt{\frac{V+K+2}{2}}$  for all  $j$ . Thus, with this probability, the right-hand side of Eq. (6) is less than  $\frac{K'}{\tilde{c}_1^2 s^2 (V-K)} \leq \frac{V+K+2}{\tilde{c}_1^2 s^2 (V-K)}$ . On the other hand, as the  $\sigma'_j$  are ordered decreasingly, the left-hand side of this equation is at least

$$((V - K) - (V - K')) \sigma_{K+1}'^{-2} = \frac{V - K}{2} \sigma_{K+1}'^{-2}.$$

By setting  $c_1$  and  $t$  appropriately, it follows that, w.p.  $1 - \delta \exp(-V^{1-\epsilon})$ ,

$$\sigma_K(\Gamma) \geq \sigma'_{K+1} \geq \tilde{c}_1^2 s^2 \frac{V - K}{\sqrt{V + K + 2}} \leq ct \frac{V - K}{\sqrt{V + K + 2}}$$

thus completing the proof.  $\square$

## 4.2 Singular value bounds for Dirichlet random matrices

Now we are ready to derive a singular value bound for Dirichlet random matrices.

**Theorem 4.7.** Let  $\Phi$  be a random  $V \times K$  matrix whose columns are independent identically distributed random vectors drawn from a symmetric Dirichlet distribution with parameter vector with concentration parameter  $\beta_0$ . Then there exist some positive constants  $c_0, c_1, c_2$  such that  $t > 0$  can be made small enough so that for any  $\delta' \downarrow 0$ :

- If  $K/V \leq 1 - V^{-\epsilon}$ , then

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \sigma_{\min}(\Phi) \leq \frac{c_0 t (V - K)}{\sqrt{V(V + K + 2)\beta_0}} \right) \leq \delta'.$$

- If  $1 - V^{-\epsilon} \leq K/V \leq 1$ , then

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \sigma_{\min}(\Phi) \leq \frac{c_1 t}{V^{1+c_2} \sqrt{\beta_0}} \right) \leq \delta'.$$

*Proof.* For brevity we provide the proof for the first case; the second case is proven in a similar manner. Observe that for a symmetric Dirichlet distribution with concentration parameter  $\beta_0$ , each entry of the  $V$ -dimensional vector drawn from this distribution has mean  $\beta_1 := \beta_0/V$ . Fix  $\bar{\theta} := 1/\sqrt{\beta_1} = \sqrt{V/\beta_0}$ . Observe that  $\Gamma^{\bar{\theta}}$  has variance 1 and mean  $\sqrt{\beta_1} < \infty$ . So we apply the singular value bound from Theorem 4.4 to deduce that for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists a small enough  $t \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\mathbf{P}(\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma^{\bar{\theta}}) \geq t \frac{(V-K)\sqrt{V}}{\sqrt{V+K+2}}) \leq \delta' \exp(-V^\epsilon)$ .

Suppose  $\max_j(\sum_i^V \Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{\theta}}) < (u+1)\sqrt{\beta_1}V$  for some  $u > 0$  and  $\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma^{\bar{\theta}}) \geq \frac{t(V-K)}{\sqrt{V+K+2}}$ . Then by Corollary 4.2, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\min}(\Phi) &\geq \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma^{\bar{\theta}})}{\max_j(\sum_{i=1}^V \Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{\theta}})} \\ &\geq \frac{c_1 t(V-K)}{\sqrt{(V+K+2)}(u+1)\sqrt{\beta_1}V} \\ &= \frac{c_1 t(V-K)}{(u+1)\sqrt{V(V+K+2)}\beta_0}. \end{aligned}$$

By the union bound and the application of Equation 5 and Theorem 4.4, it follows that this event is bounded in probability as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left(\sigma_{\min}(\Phi) \leq \frac{c_1(V-K)t}{(c_4+1)\sqrt{V(V+K+2)}\beta_0}\right) &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma^{\bar{\theta}}) \leq c_1 \frac{(V-K)t}{\sqrt{V+K+2}}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}\left(\max_j \sum_{i=1}^V \Gamma_{i,j}^{\bar{\theta}} \geq (u+1)\sqrt{\beta_1}V\right) \\ &\leq \delta \exp(-V^\epsilon) + (1 - (1 - \frac{1}{u^2\beta_0})^K) \end{aligned}$$

We can make the second term on the right-hand side arbitrarily small by increasing  $u$ , and for a fixed  $u$  we can make the first term on the right-hand side arbitrarily small by decreasing  $t$ . Therefore, by adjusting  $t$  and  $c_1$  slightly we can find a  $t$  for any  $\delta' > 0$  such that for all  $V$  large enough,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sigma_{\min}(\Phi) \leq \frac{c_0(V-K)t}{\sqrt{V(V+K+2)}\beta_0}\right) \leq \delta'.$$

□

From the theorem above, we can deduce that there is a  $c > 0$  large enough such that, for  $V$  large enough,

$$\|\Phi^+\| = 1/\sigma_{\min}(\Phi) \leq c \frac{\sqrt{V(V+K+2)}\beta_0}{(V-K)}, \text{ when } K < \lambda V, \lambda \in (0, 1) \quad (7)$$

$$\leq cV\sqrt{\beta_0}, \text{ when } K \approx V. \quad (8)$$

### 4.3 Concentration of the sample topic distribution estimate

We are able to bound the empirical moments of the data using sample singular value concentration lemmas that are analogous to concentration lemmas for scalar random variables. The following bound follows from the matrix analogue of Bennett's Inequality.

**Lemma 4.8.** (Tropp [14] Theorem 5.1 (Eigenvalue Bennett Inequality)). Consider a finite sequence  $\{X_j\}$  of independent, random, self-adjoint random matrices with dimension  $V$ , all of which have



zero mean. Given an integer  $k \leq V$ , define  $\sigma_k^2 := \lambda_k \left( \sum_j \mathbf{E}(X_j^2) \right)$ . Then, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \lambda_k \left( \sum_j X_j \right) \geq t \right) \leq (V - k + 1) \exp \left( \frac{\sigma_k^2}{\max_j \|X_j\|^2} h \left( \frac{\max_j \|X_j\| t}{\sigma_k^2} \right) \right),$$

where the function  $h(u) = (1 + u) \log(1 + u) - u$  for  $u \geq 0$ .

**Lemma 4.9.** Define  $\alpha$  as in Section 3. Let  $\hat{M}_1, \hat{M}_2$ , be unbiased estimators of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , respectively, derived from  $N$  independent samples. Compute the estimator of  $\alpha$  derived from  $N$  independent samples as  $\hat{\alpha} := \alpha_0(\alpha_0 + 1) \Phi^+ (\hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0 + 1} \hat{M}_1 \hat{M}_1^T) \Phi^+$ . Then for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{P}(|\alpha_k - \hat{\alpha}_k|/\alpha_0 \geq \epsilon) \leq O((V - K + 1) \exp \left( -\frac{N\alpha_0^2}{4} h \left( \frac{4\epsilon}{\alpha_0^2} \right) \right)).$$

*Proof.* Observe that the following conditions hold:

- $\mathbf{E}[\hat{\alpha}I] = \alpha I$  since  $\mathbf{E}[\hat{M}_1] = M_1$  and  $\mathbf{E}[\hat{M}_2] = M_2$ .
- Observe that  $\frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\alpha_0} \in \Delta^{K-1}$ . By an elementary property of distributions on the simplex,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{E}[(\frac{\hat{\alpha}I - \alpha I}{\alpha_0})^2]\| &\leq \max_k \text{Var}(\hat{\alpha}_k/\alpha_0) \\ &\leq 1/4, \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{therefore } \mathbf{E}[(\hat{\alpha}I - \alpha I)^2] \leq \alpha_0^2/4$$

The result then follows from application of Theorem 4.8; the eigenvalues and singular values are identical, since the matrix is a real diagonal matrix.  $\square$

**Remark 4.10.** The bound above is not sharp. It may be possible to provide a stronger bound by more precisely controlling the variance of  $\hat{\alpha}$  in terms of  $\alpha_0$ . Such a bound should be derivable from the equation for  $\hat{\alpha}$  in terms of  $\hat{M}_1$  and  $\hat{M}_2$ . However, for our current purposes the bound above suffices.

## 5 Applications and Experiments

### 5.1 Topic number estimation

Although we are unable to construct the estimator  $\hat{\alpha} = \Phi^+ (\hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0 + 1} \hat{M}_1 \hat{M}_1^T) \Phi^{+T}$  without knowledge of  $\Phi$ , we can use Theorem 4.7 to provide an upper bound for  $\hat{\alpha}$ .

By Theorem 4.7, we know that there is a constant  $c$  such that, for  $V$  large enough,


$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\alpha}_k = \sigma_k(\hat{\alpha}I) &= \sigma_k(\Phi^+ (\hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0 + 1} \hat{M}_1 \hat{M}_1^T) \Phi^{+T}) \\ &\leq \|\Phi^+\|^2 \sigma_k((\hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0 + 1} \hat{M}_1 \hat{M}_1^T)) \\ &\leq c^2 \beta_0 V \frac{V + K + 2}{(V - K)^2} \sigma_k(\hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0 + 1} \hat{M}_1 \hat{M}_1^T) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with arbitrarily high probability  $1 - \delta'$  that depends on  $c$  (recall that the constant  $c$  can be chosen arbitrarily so that the probability  $\delta'$  is negligible). Therefore, we can deduce that if

$$c^2 \beta_0 \frac{V(V + K + 2)}{(V - K)^2} \sigma_k(\hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0 + 1} \hat{M}_1 \hat{M}_1^T) \leq \epsilon,$$

then  $\hat{\alpha}_k \leq \epsilon$  w.p.  $1 - \delta - \delta'$ . Suppose  $\alpha_k = 0$  for some  $k$ . Then

Figure 1: Model order estimation performance. *Left*: Our procedure. *Right*: hLDA procedure.



$$\hat{\alpha}_k = \sigma_k(\hat{\alpha}I) = \sigma_k(\hat{\alpha}I - \alpha I) \leq \|\hat{\alpha}I - \alpha I\|.$$

Therefore, if  $\alpha_k = 0$ , it follows from Lemma 4.9 that if we gather  $N$  independent samples, then the probability that  $c^2 \beta_0 \alpha_0 (\alpha_0 + 1) V \frac{V+K+2}{(V-K)^2} \sigma_k(\hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0+1} \hat{M}_1 \hat{M}_1^T) \geq \epsilon$  is less than  $1 - (V - k + 1) \exp(-\frac{4N}{\alpha_0^2} h(\frac{\alpha_0 \epsilon^2}{4})) - \delta'$ . This suggests the following procedure to estimate the number of topics:

- Given  $N$  samples, choose some maximum tolerated failure probability  $\delta$  or level sensitivity to topic relevance  $\epsilon$  according to the relationship  $\delta = V \exp(-\frac{4N}{\alpha_0^2} h(\frac{\alpha_0 \epsilon^2}{4}))$ .
- Compute the term-document matrix  $C \in \mathbf{N}^{V \times D}$ , where the  $\ell$ -th column vector  $C_\ell$  represents the count vectors for the  $\ell$ -th document in the corpus. From this term-document matrix, compute the following 'plug-in' estimates of the first and second moments of the data ([3] section 6.1):
  - $\hat{M}_1 = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{\ell=1}^D \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^m C_{\ell,i}} C_\ell$
  - $\hat{M}_2 = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{\ell=1}^D \frac{1}{(\sum_{i=1}^m C_{\ell,i})(\sum_{i=1}^m C_{\ell,i}-1)} (C_\ell C_\ell^T - \text{diag}(C_\ell))$
- Compute  $\hat{M}_{1,2} := \hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0+1} \hat{M}_1 \hat{M}_1^T$ .
- Set  $k = 2, \tilde{\alpha}_1 = 1$ .
- While  $\tilde{\alpha}_{k-1}/\alpha_0 > \epsilon$ :
  - Compute  $\tilde{\alpha}_k := \alpha_0 (\alpha_0 + 1) c^2 \beta_0 V \frac{(V+k+2)}{(V-k)^2} \sigma_{k-1}(\hat{M}_{1,2})$ , where  $c$  is chosen so that  $\mathbf{P}(\|\Phi^+\| > c)$  is negligible in comparison to  $\delta$ .<sup>2</sup>
  - Set  $k := k + 1$ .
- Return  $k - 1$  as the estimate of  $K$ .

### 5.1.1 Empirical comparison to nonparametric Bayesian method

To compare the performance of our procedure against previous model order estimation methods, we used the same experimental setting used by Griffiths et al. in [7]. They generated 210 corpora of 1000 10-word documents each from an LDA model with  $K \in \{5, \dots, 25\}$ , a vocabulary size of 100, and word-topic matrix  $\Phi$  with columns randomly generated from a symmetric Dirichlet ( $\beta_i = 0.1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, V$ , so  $\beta_0 = 10$ ) and  $\alpha_0 = 1$ . In this setting, [7] showed that hLDA (a non-parametric extension of LDA using a Chinese restaurant process prior) handily outperformed the Bayes factor method (a likelihood-based hypothesis-testing procedure) for model order selection. hLDA was also shown to be much faster computationally than Bayes factors.

<sup>2</sup>For many practical purposes,  $c \approx 2$  is a good choice. We computed the least singular value for  $10^7$  randomly generated Dirichlet random matrices with  $\beta_0 \in (0.1V, 10V)$   $K/V \in [0.5, 0.99]$  and  $V \in \{1000, 2000, 3000, 4000\}$ ; all of these matrices were dominated by  $c \approx 2$ , giving a confidence of  $p < 10^{-4}$  when  $V \geq 10^3$  and  $K/V \leq 0.9$ .

We evaluated the performance of hLDA by implementing the Gibbs sampler in Java with the settings and learning procedure outlined in [7]. The hLDA method requires the input of a concentration parameter  $\gamma$  that controls how frequently a new topic is introduced. We set  $\gamma = 1$ . Since Gibbs sampling is subject to local maxima, we randomly restarted the sampler 25 times for each corpus. Each time, we let the sampler burn in for 10000 iterations and subsequently took samples 100 iterations apart for another 1000 iterations. We then selected the restart with the highest average likelihood over the post-burn-in period, and counted the number of topics for this restart that had non-zero word assignments throughout the burn-in period as the hLDA prediction of model order.

For our procedure, we set our topic relevance sensitivity threshold at  $\epsilon := 7.5e - 3$ , which corresponds to an expected error rate of  $\delta < 0.0015$ . We implemented our procedure using the MATLAB standard library. Both methods are somewhat sensitive to  $\alpha_0$  and  $\beta_0$ , so we set these parameters to the ground truth for both methods, just as in [7].

Figure 5.1 shows that our model outperforms hLDA for this experimental setting (points are jittered slightly to reveal overlapping points). Our procedure correctly estimated the model order for all of the 210 corpora, whereas for hLDA the error rate was 10 out of 210.

Interestingly, the Gibbs sampling for the 210 corpora for hLDA took over 357 hours on our machine, while the construction of the sample cross-correlation matrix and computation of top singular values for our procedure took about 11 minutes. However, hLDA learns the latent variables of the model while estimating the model order, and our procedure does not. Still, our procedure can be seamlessly integrated with the spectral methods of [1] to provide both guaranteed model order estimation and latent parameter estimation.

## 5.2 Convergence and learnability of spectral methods

The learnability and sample complexity of spectral algorithms for mixture models depend crucially on the latent variable matrix  $\Phi$  being well-conditioned. For instance [1]’s algorithm for learning LDA comes with the following guarantee

**Theorem 5.1.** ([1] Theorem 5.1). Fix  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $p_{min} = \min_i \frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_0}$  and let  $\sigma_K(\Phi)$  denote the smallest (non-zero) singular value of  $\Phi$ . Suppose that we obtain  $N \geq \left( \frac{(\alpha_0+1)(6+6\sqrt{\log(3/\delta)})^2}{p_{min}\sigma_K(\Phi)^2} \right)^2$  independent samples of  $x, x', x''$  in the LDA model. w.p. greater than  $1 - \delta$ , the following holds: for  $\theta \in \mathbf{R}^K$  sampled uniformly over the sphere  $S^{K-1}$ , w.p. greater than  $3/4$ , Algorithm 5 in [1] returns a set  $\{\hat{\Phi}_1, \dots, \hat{\Phi}_K\}$  such that there exists a permutation  $\sigma$  of the columns of  $\Phi$  so that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$

$$\|\Phi_i - \hat{\Phi}_{\sigma(i)}\| = O\left(\frac{(\alpha_0 + 1)^2 K^3}{p_{min}^2 \sigma_K(\Phi)^3} \frac{1 + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\sqrt{N}}\right).$$

Theorem 4.7 allows us to replace the dependence on  $\Phi$  by a dependence on  $V, K$ , and  $\beta_0$ :

**Corollary 5.2.** Let  $\alpha_0, \delta, p_{min}, \theta, \sigma$ , and  $\{\hat{\Phi}_1, \dots, \hat{\Phi}_K\}$  be as in 5.1. Suppose that we obtain  $N = O\left(\left(\frac{\alpha_0+1}{p_{min}}\right)^2 \log(1/\delta) \left(\frac{\beta_0 V(V+K+2)}{V-K}\right)^4\right)$  independent samples of  $x, x', x''$  in the LDA model. w.p. greater than  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\|\Phi_i - \hat{\Phi}_{\sigma(i)}\| = O\left(\left(\frac{\alpha_0 + 1}{p_{min}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{K\sqrt{V(V+K)\beta_0}}{V-K}\right)^3 \frac{1 + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\sqrt{N}}\right)$$

Proposition 1.2 follows from assuming that the variance parameter  $\beta_1 = \beta_0/V$  of each entry remains constant as  $V$  increases (so that  $\beta_0 = O(V)$ ), and from assuming that  $K$  is fixed, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_K(\Phi) &= O\left(\frac{\sqrt{V(V+K)\beta_1}}{V-K}\right) \\ &= O(\sqrt{\beta_0 V}) \end{aligned}$$

## 6 Conclusions and Further Work

In this paper, we have derived random-matrix-theoretic results for rectangular noncentered matrices. We have used these results to derive a new procedure to determine the number of latent topics in Latent Dirichlet Allocation. Similar random-matrix theoretic results should be applicable to the problem of finding the number of latent factors in many other similar mixture models, and we plan to present such results in future work. Moreover, we noticed during our experiments that the behavior and failure modes of hLDA, an MCMC method, are similar to those of the spectral procedure we have devised. As MCMC methods are still largely without theoretical guarantees, it would be fruitful to exploring more deeply the connection between the behavior of nonparametric Bayesian learning of mixture models via MCMC and the spectral properties of the data set and underlying parameters.

## References

- [1] A Anandkumar, DP Foster, D Hsu, SM Kakade, and YK Liu. Two svds suffice: spectral decompositions for probabilistic topic models and latent dirichlet allocation, 2012. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1204.6703*.
- [2] A. Anandkumar, D. Hsu, and S.M. Kakade. A method of moments for mixture models and hidden Markov models. *JMLR: Workshop & Conference Proc.*, 23:33.1–33.34, 2012.
- [3] Anima Anandkumar, Rong Ge, Daniel Hsu, Sham M Kakade, and Matus Telgarsky. Tensor decompositions for learning latent variable models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.7559*, 2012.
- [4] D.M. Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and M.I. Jordan. Latent dirichlet allocation. *J. Machine Learning Research*, 3:993–1022, 2003.
- [5] C. Bordenave, P. Caputo, and D. Chafaï. Circular law theorem for random Markov matrices. *Prob. Theory & Related Fields*, 152:751–779, 2012.
- [6] D. Chafaï. The dirichlet markov ensemble. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 101(3):555–567, 2010.
- [7] T.L. Griffiths, M.I Jordan, J.B. Tenenbaum, and D.M. Blei. Hierarchical topic models and the nested chinese restaurant process. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 16:106–114, 2004.
- [8] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [9] M. Rudelson and R. Vershynin. The smallest singular value of a random rectangular matrix. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math*, 62:1707–1739, 2009.
- [10] T. Tao and V. Vu. Random matrices: the circular law. *Comm. in Contemp. Math.*, 10.02:261–307, 2008.
- [11] T. Tao and V. Vu. Smooth analysis of the condition number and the least singular value. page 0805.3167v2, 2009.
- [12] T. Tao, V. Vu, and M. Krishnapur. Random matrices: Universality of esds and the circular law. *The Annals of Probability*, 38(5):2023–2065, 2010.
- [13] Y.W. Teh, M.I. Jordan, M. Beal, and D.M. Blei. Hierarchical Dirichlet processes. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 101, 2006.
- [14] J.A. Tropp. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. *Found. Comput. Math.*, X:X, 2011.
- [15] H.M. Wallach, D.M. Mimno, and A. McCallum. Rethinking lda: Why priors matter. In *NIPS*, volume 22, pages 1973–1981, 2009.