

---

# Fast, Guaranteed Spectral Model Selection for Topic Models

---

## Abstract

The question of how to determine the number of independent latent factors, or topics, in 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. We introduce a guaranteed procedure for topic number estimation that does not necessitate learning the model’s latent parameters beforehand. The procedure relies on adaptations of results from random matrix theory to the case of rectangular noncentered i.i.d. matrices and Markov matrices. The procedure can estimate the number of topics more accurately than the nonparametric Bayesian approach in an experimental setting. We also discuss some implications of our results for the sample complexity and accuracy of popular spectral learning algorithms for LDA. The principles underlying procedure can be extended to spectral learning algorithms for other exchangeable mixture models with similar conditional independence properties.

## 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 (Blei et al., 2003) 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 an additional round of fine-tuning.

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 principles be extended to other mixture models with similar conditional independence properties. Unlike previous approaches to model order selection, the resulting procedure comes with probabilistic guarantees and does not require computationally expensive learning of the hidden parameters of the model in order to return an estimate of the model order. The estimate can be further refined by running a spectral learning procedure that does learn the parameters.

Our approach relies on the assumption that the parameter vectors that characterize each of the topics are randomly distributed. It can then be proven that with high probability, the least singular value of the random matrix resulting from collecting these parameter vectors will be bounded with high probability. Roughly speaking, randomly distributed topics will be unlikely to be too correlated with each other. Therefore, we can estimate how many independent topics are needed to characterize the data.

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 .2, we can recover the number of topics whose expected proportion is greater than  $\epsilon$ , with probability greater than  $1 - \delta$ .*

The intermediate results which allow us to prove this guar-

---

Preliminary work. Under review by the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML). Do not distribute.

000  
001  
002  
003  
004  
005  
006  
007  
008  
009  
010  
011  
012  
013  
014  
015  
016  
017  
018  
019  
020  
021  
022  
023  
024  
025  
026  
027  
028  
029  
030  
031  
032  
033  
034  
035  
036  
037  
038  
039  
040  
041  
042  
043  
044  
045  
046  
047  
048  
049  
050  
051  
052  
053  
054

arXiv:1312.2646v3 [stat.ML] 19 Jan 2014

055  
056  
057  
058  
059  
060  
061  
062  
063  
064  
065  
066  
067  
068  
069  
070  
071  
072  
073  
074  
075  
076  
077  
078  
079  
080  
081  
082  
083  
084  
085  
086  
087  
088  
089  
090  
091  
092  
093  
094  
095  
096  
097  
098  
099  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109

antee also provide new insights on sample complexity bounds for spectral learning of mixture models, in particular excess correlation analysis (ECA) (Anandkumar et al., 2012b). These spectral algorithms have garnered attention 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, sample complexity results in previous literature bound the estimation error and sample complexity of learning the latent parameter matrix  $\Phi$  in terms of  $\Phi$  itself: given that in practice  $\Phi$  is unknown beforehand, this is of limited practical utility for assessing the confidence of the estimate. In contrast, our results allow sample complexity to 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 the latent word-topic matrix  $\Phi$  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.

### 1.1. Existing approaches to model order estimation

Nonparametric Bayesian models such as the Hierarchical Dirichlet Process (HDP) (Teh et al., 2006) 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 impractically slow for the large sample sizes likely to be encountered in many real-world applications. As is common for MCMC methods, the Gibbs sampler for HDP is susceptible to local optima, and finding the global optimum is intractable when the number of topics is large (Sontag & Roy, 2011).

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 are even more computationally intensive than nonparametric methods when the range of model orders under consideration is

large. This is because the latent parameters of the model must be learned for every single model order under consideration in order to compute the likelihoods as a basis for comparison. The range of candidate model orders 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 (Griffiths et al., 2004).

### 1.2. Outline

We will first provide a brief overview of the LDA generative model in Section 2.1, and discuss how our method is motivated by the spectral learning approach. In Section 3, 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 4, where we describe our procedure for finding the number of topics, demonstrate that our method outperforms a nonparametric Bayesian method on an experimental setting taken from the literature, and discuss some other implications of our results for the accuracy of algorithms for learning  $\Phi$ .

### 1.3. Notation

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

## 2. Background

### 2.1. Latent Dirichlet Allocation

Latent Dirichlet Allocation (Blei et al., 2003) is a generative mixture model widely used in topic modeling. This model assumes that the data comprise a *corpus* of *documents*. In turn, each document is made up of discrete, observed *word tokens*. The observed word tokens are assumed to be generated from  $K$  latent topics as follows:

**for** each topic  $k$  **do**

Choose a distribution  $\phi^{(i)}$  over words from a Dirichlet distribution  $\phi^{(i)} \sim \text{Dir}(\beta)$ .

**end for**

Collect these vectors into a matrix  $\Phi = [\phi^{(1)} | \dots | \phi^{(K)}]$  where each topic distribution vector is a column of  $\Phi$ .

**for** each document  $d$  in the corpus **do**

Choose a distribution  $\mathbf{h}_d$  over the topics, from a Dirichlet distribution  $\mathbf{h}_d \sim \text{Dir}(\alpha)$ .

**for** each word token  $v$  in  $d$  **do**

110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164

165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219

Choose topic  $z_v$  from the document's distribution over topics  $z_v \sim \text{Mult}(\mathbf{h}_d)$ .

Choose a word type from the topic's distribution over words  $w_v \sim \text{Mult}(\phi^{(z_v)})$ . For  $w_v = i$  represent the word token by  $\mathbf{x}_v := \mathbf{e}_i$  (the  $i^{\text{th}}$  canonical basis vector).

**end for**

**end for**

In the generative process above, 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. 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 (Anandkumar et al., 2012a)).

## 2.2. 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  $\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}'', \dots\}$  that are conditionally independent given a latent factor vector  $\mathbf{h}$  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  $\mathbf{x}$  is equal to 1 if the word token that it represents is observed to belong to class  $i$ , and 0 otherwise. For LDA,  $\mathbf{h}$  determines the mixture of topics present in a particular document. Therefore  $\mathbf{h}$  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 other, more succinct ways, 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 membership vector  $\mathbf{h}$ :

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

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  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}''$  given  $\mathbf{h}$  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

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

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

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

Analogous expressions for even higher moments can be expressed using tensors. In fact, Anandkumar et al. (2012b) 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. The resulting algorithm, excess correlation analysis (ECA), comes with probabilistic guarantees of finding the optimal solution, unlike MCMC approaches. In the case of LDA, the only user-specified inputs to the ECA spectral algorithm are the supposed number of topics  $\bar{K}$  and the concentration parameter  $\alpha_0$  governing the distribution of the membership vector  $\mathbf{h}$ . 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  $\mathbf{h}$ . 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. (Anandkumar et al., 2012a) Thm. 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  $\alpha_0 := \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k$ . This suggests that  $\alpha$  and therefore the number of non-zero topics can be recovered by first learning  $\Phi$  and then estimating  $\alpha$  according to Eq. 3. The true number of topics  $K$  is then equal to the number of  $\alpha_k$  such that  $\alpha_k > 0$ . However, the number of latent factors  $\bar{K}$  must be specified beforehand in ECA, since the algorithm involves a truncated matrix decomposition and a truncated tensor decomposition. For low-dimensional data sets, it is possible to do this by setting  $\bar{K} = V$ . The true number of topics is then equal to the number of non-zero  $\alpha$ . However, the time complexity of ECA scales as  $O(\bar{K}^5)$  and the space complexity scales as  $O(\bar{K}^3)$  due to the storage and decomposition of the third moment tensor, (Anandkumar et al., 2012c), so this approach is not tractable for even

moderately-sized datasets. On the other hand, it is not possible to determine with any certainty whether we have captured all the non-zero topics if we set  $\bar{K} < V$  when  $K$  is unknown. This is because when  $\bar{K} < K$ , then ECA learns highly unstable estimates of  $\Phi$ , which results in incorrect estimates of  $\alpha$ . For instance, consider the following toy example: set  $\alpha = [.2, .3, .5]$ . Set  $\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0.8 & 0.4 \\ 0.4 & 0.1 & 0.3 \\ 0.3 & 0 & 0.1 \\ 0.3 & 0.1 & 0.2 \end{pmatrix}$ .

If we try to recover the first two values of  $\alpha$  from the moments by running ECA with  $\bar{K} = 2$ , we get  $\alpha_2 = 2.5 \times 10^{-5}$ . In a practical setting where a finite number of noisy samples are used to estimate the moments, one might conclude that  $\alpha_2$  is noise and that there is only one topic in this model. Similar parameter recovery problems arise when using low-rank approximations for learning spectral algorithms for other models (see (Kulesza et al.) for some Hidden Markov Model examples). Thus, iterative methods where  $\bar{K}$  is increased or decreased until  $\alpha_{\bar{K}} = 0$  for some  $\bar{K}$  are uncertain to provide the correct result.

We suggest a novel approach in this paper, based on singular value bounds. Observe that taking the singular values of both sides of Eq. 3 yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_k &= \sigma_k \left( \alpha_0(\alpha_0 + 1)\Phi^+(M_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0 + 1}M_1M_1^T)\Phi^{+T} \right) \\ &\leq \sigma_1(\Phi^+)^2 \sigma_k(M_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0 + 1}M_1M_1^T) \\ &\leq \sigma_K(\Phi)^2 \sigma_k(M_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0 + 1}M_1M_1^T). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Thus, rather than learning  $\Phi$ , we need only find some reasonably sharp bound on the least singular value of  $\Phi$ . 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. In random matrix theory, finding the least singular values of random matrices is often referred to as resolving the so-called "hard edge" of the spectrum. While most work on the hard edge of the spectrum has focused on 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 adapt the results known for non-centered square random matrices with i.i.d. entries to the matrices of interest in our setting.

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 application of standard tail

bounds for the eigenvalues and singular values 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. 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.

### 2.3. Assumptions

We place some further conditions on the LDA model that allow well-behaved spectral properties. These conditions are generally equivalent to those for ECA (Anandkumar et al., 2012a), 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 (Chafäi, 2010).
- The concentration parameters  $\alpha_0$  and  $\beta_0$  are approximately known. 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  $\beta_i = \beta_0/V$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, V$ . This is known as a *symmetric* Dirichlet prior and is equivalent to a uniform distribution on the simplex (Bordenave et al., 2012). Setting a symmetric prior on  $\beta$  is standard procedure in most applications of Dirichlet mixture models; for an empirical justification of this practice, see (Wallach et al., 2009).
- 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 recover the number of topics within a margin of error defined by the expected probability mass of the topics, as follows:

**Definition 2.1.** *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 low probability of detecting topics to which no words are assigned in the corpus. 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).

### 3. Singular Value Bounds

In this section we provide tail bounds on the smallest singular values of rectangular Dirichlet random matrices. Similar results can be derived for other Markov random matrices. These bounds closely mirror the work of (Tao & Vu, 2008), (Tao & Vu, 2009), and (Rudelson & Vershynin, 2009), 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, but 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 an elementary way.

**Fact 3.1.** Define a vector  $\gamma^\theta \in \mathbf{R}^K$  such that  $\gamma_i^\theta \sim \text{Gamma}(\beta_0/V, \theta)$  for some  $\beta_0, \theta > 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, V$ . Then the scaled vector  $\phi = \frac{\gamma^\theta}{\sum_{i=1}^V \gamma_i^\theta} \sim \text{Dir}(\beta_0/V)$ .

**Corollary 3.2.** For any Dirichlet random matrix  $\Phi$  with i.i.d. columns, and for the corresponding Gamma random matrix  $\Gamma^\theta$  with independent entries  $\Gamma_{ij}^\theta \sim \text{Gamma}(\beta_0/V, \theta)$ , we have that

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

*Proof.* See (Bordenave et al., 2012) Section 2 and Lemma B.4. □

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  $\theta = \bar{\theta} := V/\sqrt{\beta_0}$ . Note that, for Gamma random variables, it follows that  $\mathbf{E}[\Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{\theta}}] = \sqrt{\beta_0/V}$  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  $u > 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \max_j \left( \sum_{i=1}^V \Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{\theta}} \right) \geq \left( u + \sqrt{\frac{\beta_0}{V}} \right) V \right) \leq 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{Vu^2} \right)^K. \quad (5)$$

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

The following singular value bound for square matrices follows from Tao & Vu (2009) Corollary 4:

**Theorem 3.3.** Suppose  $\Gamma$  is an  $V \times V$  random matrix with independent, identically distributed entries with variance 1, mean  $\mu < \infty$ , and bounded fourth moment. For any  $\delta > 0$  there exist positive constants  $c_1, c_2$  that depend only on  $\mu$  such that

$$\mathbf{P}(\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma) \leq c_1/V^{1+c_2}) \leq \delta V^{-c_1}$$

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. (Horn & Johnson, 1990)), this bound is not sharp when  $K \ll V$ . The following result follows from adapting the arguments in Tao et al. (2010) Section 8:

**Theorem 3.4.** Suppose  $\Gamma$  is an  $V \times K$  random matrix with independent, identically distributed entries with variance 1 and mean  $\mu < \infty$ . Moreover, suppose the aspect ratio  $K/V \leq 1 - V^{1-\epsilon}$  for some small  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then for any  $\delta > 0$  there exists a small enough positive constant  $c_1$  that depends only on  $\mu$  such that

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

In order to prove Theorem 3.4, we need two results from (Tao et al., 2010), presented here without proof:

**Proposition 3.5.** (Distance Tail Bound; (Tao et al., 2010) 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 for any  $\delta > 0$  there exists a small enough positive constant  $\tilde{c}_1 > 0$  that depends only on  $\mu$  such that

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

**Lemma 3.6.** (Negative Second Moment; (Tao et al., 2010) 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 3.4.

*Proof.* Proof of Theorem 3.4. 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  $\Gamma$ . By the Cauchy Interlacing Theorem,  $\sigma_K(\Gamma) \geq \sigma_{K+1}(\Gamma')$ . By Lemma 3.6, we have that

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

By Proposition 3.5, w.p.  $1 - \delta \exp(-V^\epsilon)$ ,  $\text{dist}(\Gamma_j, W_j) \geq \tilde{c}_1 \sqrt{V - K' + 1} = \tilde{c}_1 \sqrt{\frac{V+K+2}{2}}$  for all  $j$ . Thus, with this probability, the right-hand side of Eq. (6) is less than  $\frac{K'}{\tilde{c}_1^2(V-K)} \leq \frac{V+K+2}{\tilde{c}_1^2(V-K)}$ . On the other hand, as the  $\sigma_j(\Gamma')$  are ordered decreasingly, the left-hand side of this equation is at least

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

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

$$\sigma_K(\Gamma) \geq \sigma_{K+1}(\Gamma') \geq c_1 \frac{V - K}{\sqrt{V + K + 2}}$$

thus completing the proof.  $\square$

### 3.2. Singular value bounds for Dirichlet random matrices

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

**Theorem 3.7.** *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  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  can be made small enough so that for any  $\delta' > 0$ :*

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

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \sigma_{\min}(\Phi) \leq \frac{c_0(V - K)}{\sqrt{V(V + K + 2)\beta_0}} \right) \leq \delta'.$$

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

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \sigma_{\min}(\Phi) \leq \frac{c_1}{V^{1+c_2}\sqrt{\beta_0}} \right) \leq \delta'.$$

*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  $\beta_i := \beta_0/V$ . Fix  $\bar{\theta} := \sqrt{V/\beta_0}$ . Observe that  $\Gamma^{\bar{\theta}}$  has variance 1 and mean

$\sqrt{\beta_0/V} < \infty$ . So we apply the singular value bound from Theorem 3.4 to deduce that for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $c_1 > 0$  such that  $\mathbf{P}(\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma^{\bar{\theta}}) \geq c_1 \frac{(V-K)\sqrt{V}}{\sqrt{V+K+2}}) \leq \delta' \exp(-V^\epsilon)$ .

Suppose  $\max_j (\sum_{i=1}^V \Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{\theta}}) < (u+1)\sqrt{\beta_1}V$  for some  $u > 0$  and  $\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma^{\bar{\theta}}) \geq \frac{c_1(V-K)}{\sqrt{V+K+2}}$ . Then by Corollary 3.2, it follows that

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

By the union bound and the application of Equation 5 and Theorem 3.4, it follows that this event is bounded in probability as follows:

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

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  $c_1$ . Therefore, we can find a  $c_0 > 0$  for any  $\delta' > 0$  such that for all  $V$  large enough,

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \sigma_{\min}(\Phi) \leq \frac{c_0(V-K)}{\sqrt{V(V+K+2)\beta_0}} \right) \leq \delta'.$$

$\square$

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

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

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

605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659

### 3.3. Sample concentration lemmas

We are able to bound the error in estimating  $\alpha$  from a sample thanks to sample concentration lemmas for singular values that are analogous to more well-known concentration lemmas for scalar random variables (e.g., Markov's inequality).

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $\alpha \in \Delta^{K-1}$  be a random vector. Let  $\hat{\alpha}$  be an unbiased estimator of  $\alpha$  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  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$\mathbf{P}(\|\alpha - \hat{\alpha}\|/\alpha_0 \geq \epsilon) \leq V \exp(-Nh(4\epsilon)/4).$$

*Proof.* Observe that  $\mathbf{E}[\hat{\alpha}I - \alpha I] = 0$  by construction. Furthermore, note that  $\frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\alpha_0}$  is a vector defined on the simplex, so  $\text{Var}(\hat{\alpha}_k) \leq 1/4$  for all  $k$ . Therefore,

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

The result then follows from application of Bennet's inequality (Tropp (2011) Thm 5.1) noting that the eigenvalues and singular values are identical for this matrix, since it is real and diagonal.  $\square$

**Remark 3.9.** *It may be possible to provide a tighter 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  $\hat{M}_2$ .*

## 4. Applications and Experiments

### 4.1. Topic number estimation

Although we are unable to compute the estimator  $\hat{\alpha} = \Phi^+(\hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0+1}\hat{M}_1\hat{M}_1^T)\Phi^+$  without knowledge of  $\Phi$ , we can use Theorem 3.7 to provide an upper bound for  $\hat{\alpha}$ .


Define  $\tilde{\alpha}_k := c^2\beta_0 V \frac{V+K+2}{(V-K)^2} \sigma_k(\hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0+1}\hat{M}_1\hat{M}_1^T)$ . We can now apply Theorem 3.7 to Eq 4 to infer that there is a constant  $c$  such that, for  $V$  large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\alpha}_k &\leq \sigma_K(\Phi^+)^2 \sigma_k(\hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0+1}\hat{M}_1\hat{M}_1^T) \\ &\leq \tilde{\alpha}_k \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

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<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>1</sup>For most applications, we recommend  $c \approx 2$ . We computed the least singular value for  $10^6$  randomly generated Dirichlet random matrices with  $\beta_0 \in (0.1V, 10V)$   $K/V \in [0.5, 0.9]$  and  $V \in \{1000\}$ ; all of these matrices were dominated by  $c \approx 2$ .

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



On the other hand, observe that by the triangle inequality, since  $\alpha_k \geq 0$ ,

$$\hat{\alpha}_k \leq |\hat{\alpha}_k - \alpha_k| + \alpha_k \leq \|\hat{\alpha}I - \alpha I\| + \alpha_k$$

So by applying Theorem .2 we deduce that

$$\mathbf{P}(\hat{\alpha}_k \geq \epsilon/2) \leq \delta \text{ if } \alpha_k = 0, \quad (10)$$

$$\mathbf{P}(\hat{\alpha}_k \leq \epsilon/2) \leq \delta \text{ if } \alpha_k \geq \epsilon. \quad (11)$$

It follows from 9 and 10 that if  $\tilde{\alpha}_k \leq \epsilon/2$ , then  $\mathbf{P}(\alpha_k \geq \epsilon) \leq \delta + \delta'$ .

This suggests the following procedure to estimate the number of topics:

**Input:**  $N$ , hyperparameters  $\alpha_0, \beta_0$ , error tolerance  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  according to  $\delta = V \exp(-Nh(4\epsilon)/4)$ .

- 1: Compute the term-document matrix  $C$ , where  $C^{(\ell)}$  represents the count vector for document  $\ell$ .
- 2: Compute 'plug-in' estimates of the first and second moments of the data ((Anandkumar et al., 2012c) Section 6.1):

$$\begin{aligned} \bullet \hat{M}_1 &\leftarrow \frac{1}{D} \sum_{\ell=1}^D \frac{C_\ell}{\sum_{i=1}^m C_{\ell,i}} \\ \bullet \hat{M}_2 &\leftarrow \frac{1}{D} \sum_{\ell=1}^D \frac{C_\ell C_\ell^T - \text{diag}(C_\ell)}{(\sum_{i=1}^m C_{\ell,i})(\sum_{i=1}^m C_{\ell,i} - 1)} \end{aligned}$$

$$3: \hat{M}_{1,2} \leftarrow \hat{M}_2 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0+1} \hat{M}_1 \hat{M}_1^T.$$

$$4: k \leftarrow 1, \tilde{\alpha}_1 \leftarrow 1.$$

5: **while**  $\tilde{\alpha}_k/\alpha_0 > \epsilon/2$  **do**

$$6: \quad k \leftarrow k + 1.$$

$$7: \quad \tilde{\alpha}_k \leftarrow \alpha_0(\alpha_0 + 1)c^2\beta_0 V \frac{(V+k+2)}{(V-k)^2} \sigma_{k-1}(\hat{M}_{1,2})$$

8: **end while**

9: (Optional) Run the ECA algorithm ((Anandkumar et al., 2012a) Algorithm 2) with  $k$  as the number of topics and estimate  $\hat{\Phi}$  and compute  $\hat{\alpha}$  as in 3.

$$10: k \leftarrow \sum_k \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\alpha}_k > \epsilon}$$

11: **return**  $k$  as the estimate of  $K$ .

#### 4.1.1. EMPIRICAL COMPARISON TO NONPARAMETRIC BAYESIAN METHOD

To compare the performance of our procedure against previous model order estimation methods, we replicated the

715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769

770 same experimental setting used to demonstrate the model  
 771 selection capabilities of hLDA by Griffiths et al. (2004).  
 772 hLDA (a Gibbs sampling method for the nonparametric  
 773 equivalent of LDA using the Chinese restaurant process  
 774 prior) was shown to be much faster and accurate than  
 775 the Bayes factors method (a likelihood-based hypothesis-  
 776 testing method) in this setting. 210 corpora of 1000 10-  
 777 word documents each were generated from an LDA model  
 778 with  $K \in \{5, \dots, 25\}$ , a vocabulary size of 100, and word-  
 779 topic matrix  $\Phi$  with columns randomly generated from a  
 780 symmetric Dirichlet ( $\beta_i = 0.1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, V$ , so  $\beta_0 = 10$ )  
 781 and  $\alpha_0 = 1$ .

782 hLDA requires the input of a concentration parameter  $\gamma$   
 783 that controls how frequently a new topic is introduced, so  
 784 the authors set  $\gamma = 1$ . Since Gibbs sampling is subject  
 785 to local maxima, so the sampler is randomly restarted 25  
 786 times for each corpus. Each time, the sampler is burned  
 787 in for 10000 iterations and subsequently samples are taken  
 788 100 iterations apart for another 1000 iterations. The restart  
 789 with the highest average likelihood over the post-burn-in  
 790 period is selected, and the number of topics for this restart  
 791 that had non-zero word assignments throughout the burn-in  
 792 period is selected as the hLDA prediction of model order.  
 793 We used the Java implementation of the hLDA Gibbs sam-  
 794 pler by Bleier (2010).  
 795

796 For our spectral model selection procedure, we set our topic  
 797 relevance sensitivity threshold at  $\epsilon := 3 \times 10^{-2}$ , which  
 798 corresponds to an expected error rate of  $\delta < 1.5 \times 10^{-3}$ .  
 799 We implemented our procedure using the MATLAB stan-  
 800 dard library. Both methods are somewhat sensitive to  $\alpha_0$   
 801 and  $\beta_0$ , so we set these parameters to the ground truth for  
 802 both methods, just as in (Griffiths et al., 2004).  
 803

804 Figure 4.1 shows that our model outperforms hLDA for this  
 805 experimental setting (points are jittered slightly to reveal  
 806 overlapping points). Our procedure correctly estimated the  
 807 model order for all of the 210 corpora, whereas for hLDA  
 808 the error rate was 10 out of 210. (Griffiths et al., 2004)  
 809 reported an error rate of 15 out of 210 for hLDA in this  
 810 experimental setting, and an error rate of 80 out of 210 for  
 811 the Bayes factors method.

812 The running time for hLDA Gibbs sampling procedure was  
 813 6040 sec per corpus on a single thread of a machine with  
 814 an eight-core 2.67Ghz CPU, while the running time for the  
 815 spectral model selection procedure without the ECA step  
 816 was 0.252 sec per corpus. However, hLDA learns the latent  
 817 matrix  $\Phi$  while estimating the model order. Including the  
 818 ECA step in our spectral model selection procedure to learn  
 819  $\Phi$ , the running time increases to 2.05 sec per corpus.  
 820  
 821  
 822  
 823  
 824

## 4.2. Convergence and learnability of spectral methods

825 The learnability and sample complexity of spectral algo-  
 826 rithms for mixture models depend crucially on the latent  
 827 variable matrix  $\Phi$  being well-conditioned. For instance  
 828 (Anandkumar et al., 2012a)’s algorithm for learning LDA  
 829 comes with the following guarantee:  
 830  
 831

**Theorem 4.1.** ((Anandkumar et al., 2012a) Thm 5.1). Fix  
 832  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $p_{min} = \min_i \frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_0}$  and let  $\sigma_K(\Phi)$  denote  
 833 the smallest (non-zero) singular value of  $\Phi$ . Suppose that  
 834 we obtain  $N \geq \left( \frac{(\alpha_0+1)(6+6\sqrt{\log(3/\delta)})}{p_{min}\sigma_K(\Phi)^2} \right)^2$  independent sam-  
 835 ples of  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}''$  in the LDA model. w.p. greater than  
 836  $1 - \delta$ , the following holds: for  $\theta \in \mathbf{R}^K$  sampled uniformly  
 837 over the sphere  $S^{K-1}$ , w.p. greater than 3/4, Algorithm 5  
 838 in (Anandkumar et al., 2012a) returns a set  $\{\hat{\Phi}_1, \dots, \hat{\Phi}_K\}$   
 839 such that there exists a permutation  $\pi$  of the columns of  $\Phi$   
 840 so that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$   
 841  
 842

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

843 Theorem 3.7 allows us to replace the dependence on  $\Phi$  by  
 844 a dependence on  $V, K$ , and  $\beta_0$ :  
 845

**Corollary 4.2.** Let  $\alpha_0, \delta, p_{min}, \theta, \pi$ , and  
 846  $\{\hat{\Phi}_1, \dots, \hat{\Phi}_K\}$  be as in 4.1. Suppose that we obtain  
 847  $N = O\left(\left(\frac{\alpha_0+1}{p_{min}}\right)^2 \log(1/\delta) \left(\frac{\beta_0 V(V+K+2)}{V-K}\right)^4\right)$  indepen-  
 848 dent samples of  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}''$  in the LDA model. w.p. greater  
 849 than  $1 - \delta$ ,  
 850  
 851  
 852  
 853  
 854  
 855

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

856 Proposition 1.2 follows from assuming that the variance pa-  
 857 rameter  $\beta_1 = \beta_0/V$  of each entry remains constant as  $V$   
 858 increases (so that  $\beta_0 = O(V)$ ), and from assuming that  $K$   
 859 is fixed, so that  
 860  
 861  
 862  
 863  
 864  
 865  
 866  
 867  
 868  
 869  
 870  
 871  
 872  
 873  
 874

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

## 5. Conclusions and Further Work

875 In this paper, we have derived a novel procedure for deter-  
 876 mining the number of latent topics in Latent Dirichlet Al-  
 877 location. Our experiments suggest that this procedure can  
 878  
 879



880 outperform nonparametric Bayesian models learned using  
881 MCMC.

882 Our results rely on a adapting random-matrix-theoretic re-  
883 sults to the case of rectangular noncentered matrices, and  
884 connecting these results to the spectral properties of the  
885 moments of data generated by an LDA model. Similar  
886 random-matrix theoretic results should be applicable to the  
887 problem of finding the number of latent factors in many  
888 other mixture models with similar conditional indepen-  
889 dence properties, and we plan to present such results in  
890 future work.  
891

## 892 References

894 Anandkumar, A, Foster, DP, Hsu, D, Kakade, SM, and Liu,  
895 YK. Two SVDs suffice: spectral decompositions for  
896 probabilistic topic models and latent dirichlet allocation.  
897 *arXiv preprint arXiv:1204.6703*, 2012a.  
898

899 Anandkumar, A., Hsu, D., and Kakade, S.M. A method of  
900 moments for mixture models and hidden Markov mod-  
901 els. *JMLR: Workshop & Conference Proc.*, 23:33.1–  
902 33.34, 2012b.

904 Anandkumar, Anima, Ge, Rong, Hsu, Daniel, Kakade,  
905 Sham M, and Telgarsky, Matus. Tensor decomposi-  
906 tions for learning latent variable models. *arXiv preprint*  
907 *arXiv:1210.7559*, 2012c.

908 Blei, D.M., Ng, Andrew Y, and Jordan, M.I. Latent dirich-  
909 let allocation. *J. Machine Learning Research*, 3:993–  
910 1022, 2003.  
911

912 Bleier, A. Java Gibbs sampler for the HDP, 2010.  
913 <https://github.com/arnim/HDP>.

914 Bordenave, C., Caputo, P., and Chafaï, D. Circular law  
915 theorem for random Markov matrices. *Prob. Theory &*  
916 *Related Fields*, 152:751–779, 2012.

917 Chafaï, D. The dirichlet markov ensemble. *Journal of Mul-*  
918 *tivariate Analysis*, 101(3):555–567, 2010.

919 Griffiths, T.L., Jordan, M.I, Tenenbaum, J.B., and Blei,  
920 D.M. Hierarchical topic models and the nested chinese  
921 restaurant process. *Advances in neural information pro-*  
922 *cessing systems*, 16:106–114, 2004.

923 Horn, R.A. and Johnson, C.R. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge  
924 University Press, 1990.

925 Kulesza, Alex, Rao, N Raj, and Singh, Satinder. An explo-  
926 ration of low-rank spectral learning.

927 Rudelson, M. and Vershynin, R. The smallest singular  
928 value of a random rectangular matrix. *Commun. Pure*  
929 *Appl. Math*, 62:1707–1739, 2009.

930 Sontag, David and Roy, Dan. Complexity of inference in  
931 latent dirichlet allocation. In *Advances in Neural Infor-*  
932 *mation Processing Systems*, pp. 1008–1016, 2011.

933 Tao, T. and Vu, V. Random matrices: the circular law.  
934 *Comm. in Contemp. Math.*, 10.02:261–307, 2008.

935 Tao, T. and Vu, V. Smooth analysis of the condition number  
936 and the least singular value. pp. 0805.3167v2, 2009.

937 Tao, T., Vu, V., and Krishnapur, M. Random matrices:  
938 Universality of esds and the circular law. *The Annals*  
939 *of Probability*, 38(5):2023–2065, 2010.

940 Teh, Y.W., Jordan, M.I., Beal, M., and Blei, D.M. Hier-  
941 archical Dirichlet processes. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 101,  
942 2006.

943 Tropp, J.A. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random  
944 matrices. *Found. Comput. Math.*, X:X, 2011.

945 Wallach, H.M., Mimno, D.M., and McCallum, A. Rethink-  
946 ing lda: Why priors matter. In *NIPS*, volume 22, pp.  
947 1973–1981, 2009.

**Lemma .1.** (*Tropp (Tropp, 2011) Thm. 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  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \lambda_1 \left( \sum_j X_j \right) \geq t \right) \leq V \exp \left( \frac{\sigma_k^2}{\max_j \|X_j\|^2} h \left( \frac{\max_j \|X_j\| t}{\sigma_k^2} \right) \right)$$

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

**Lemma .2.** Define  $\alpha$  as in Section 2.1. 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  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{P}(|\alpha - \hat{\alpha}|/\alpha_0 \geq \epsilon) \leq V \exp \left( -\frac{N}{4} h(4\epsilon) \right).$$

*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,

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

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

990	The result then follows from application of Theorem .1;the	1045
991	eigenvalues and singular values are identical, since the ma-	1046
992	trix is a real diagonal matrix. $\square$	1047
993		1048
994		1049
995		1050
996		1051
997		1052
998		1053
999		1054
1000		1055
1001		1056
1002		1057
1003		1058
1004		1059
1005		1060
1006		1061
1007		1062
1008		1063
1009		1064
1010		1065
1011		1066
1012		1067
1013		1068
1014		1069
1015		1070
1016		1071
1017		1072
1018		1073
1019		1074
1020		1075
1021		1076
1022		1077
1023		1078
1024		1079
1025		1080
1026		1081
1027		1082
1028		1083
1029		1084
1030		1085
1031		1086
1032		1087
1033		1088
1034		1089
1035		1090
1036		1091
1037		1092
1038		1093
1039		1094
1040		1095
1041		1096
1042		1097
1043		1098
1044		1099