

Numerical Optimization for Symmetric Tensor Decomposition*

Tamara G. Kolda[†]

September 9, 2018

Abstract

We consider the problem of decomposing a real-valued symmetric tensor as the sum of outer products of real-valued vectors. Algebraic methods exist for computing complex-valued decompositions of symmetric tensors, but here we focus on real-valued decompositions, both unconstrained and nonnegative. We discuss when solutions exist and how to formulate the mathematical program. Numerical results show the properties of the proposed formulations (including one that ignores symmetry) on a set of test problems and illustrate that these straightforward formulations can be effective even though the problem is nonconvex.

Keywords: symmetric, outer product, canonical polyadic, tensor decomposition, completely positive, nonnegative

1 Introduction

We consider the problem of decomposing a real-valued symmetric tensor as the sum of outer products of real-valued vectors. Let \mathcal{A} represent an m -way, n -dimension symmetric tensor. Given a real-valued vector \mathbf{x} of length n , we let \mathbf{x}^m denote the m -way, n -dimensional symmetric outer product tensor such that $(\mathbf{x}^m)_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_m} = x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_m}$. Comon et al. [13] showed that any real-valued symmetric tensor \mathcal{A} can be decomposed as

$$\mathcal{A} = \sum_{k=1}^p \lambda_k \mathbf{x}_k^m, \quad (1)$$

with $\lambda_k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$. We survey the methods that have been proposed for related problems and discuss several optimization formulations, including a surprisingly effective method that *ignores* the symmetry.

We also consider the related problem of decomposing a real-valued nonnegative symmetric tensor as the sum of outer products of real-valued nonnegative vectors. Let $\mathcal{A} \geq 0$ represent an m -way, n -dimension nonnegative symmetric tensor. In this case, the goal is a factorization of the form

$$\mathcal{A} = \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{x}_k^m \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{x}_k \geq 0. \quad (2)$$

If such a factorization exists, we say that \mathcal{A} is completely positive [34]. If such a factorization does not exist, then we propose to solve a “best fit” problem instead.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides notation and background material. Related decompositions, including the best symmetric rank-1 approximation, the symmetric Tucker decomposition,

*This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research, Applied Mathematics program. Sandia National Laboratories is a multi-program laboratory managed and operated by Sandia Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of Lockheed Martin Corporation, for the U.S. Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration under contract DE-AC04-94AL85000.

[†]Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, CA, tgtkolda@sandia.gov

partially symmetric decompositions, and the complex-valued canonical decompositions are discussed in Section 3. We describe two optimization formulations for symmetric decomposition in Section 4, and a mathematical program for the nonnegative problem in Section 5. Numerical results, including the methodology for generating challenging problems, is presented in Section 6. Finally, Section 7 discusses our findings and future challenges.

2 Background

2.1 Notation and preliminaries

A tensor is a multidimensional array. The number of ways or modes is called the *order* of a tensor. For example, a matrix is a tensor of order two. Tensors of order three or greater are called *higher-order* tensors.

Let $n_1 \times n_2 \times \cdots \times n_m$ denote the size of an m -way tensor. We say that the tensor is *cubic* if all the modes have the same size, i.e., $n = n_1 = n_2 = \cdots = n_m$. In other words, “cubic” is the tensor generalization of “square.” In this case, we refer to n as the *dimension* of the tensor.

We let $\mathbb{R}^{[m,n]}$ denote the space of all cubic real-valued tensors of order m and dimension n .

As appropriate, we use *multiindex* notation to compactly index tensors so that $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m)$. Thus, $a_{\mathbf{i}}$ denotes $a_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_m}$.

The norm of a tensor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{[m,n]}$ is the square root of the sum of squares of its elements, i.e.,

$$\|\mathcal{A}\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{i_2=1}^n \cdots \sum_{i_m=1}^n a_{\mathbf{i}}^2}.$$

2.2 Symmetric tensors

A tensor is symmetric if its entries do not change under permutation of the indices. Formally, we let $\pi(m)$ denote the space of permutations of length m . For instance,

$$\pi(3) = \{ (1, 2, 3), (1, 3, 2), (2, 1, 3), (2, 3, 1), (3, 1, 2), (3, 2, 1) \}.$$

It is well known that $|\pi(m)| = m!$. We say a real-valued m -way n -dimensional tensor \mathcal{A} is *symmetric* [13] if

$$a_{i_{p(1)} \dots i_{p(m)}} = a_{i_1 \dots i_m} \quad \text{for all } i_1, \dots, i_m \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ and } p \in \pi(m).$$

Such tensors are also sometimes referred to as *supersymmetric*. For a 3-way tensor \mathcal{A} of dimension n , symmetry means

$$a_{ijk} = a_{ikj} = a_{jik} = a_{kij} = a_{jki} = a_{kji} \quad \text{for all } i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

We let $\mathbb{S}^{[m,n]} \subset \mathbb{R}^{[m,n]}$ denote the subspace of all symmetric tensors.

2.3 Symmetric outer product tensors

A tensor in $\mathbb{S}^{[m,n]}$ is called *rank one* if it has the form $\lambda \mathbf{x}^m$ where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If m is odd or $\lambda > 0$, then the m th real root of λ always exists, so we can rewrite the tensor as

$$\lambda \mathbf{x}^m = \mathbf{y}^m \quad \text{where } \mathbf{y} = \left(\sqrt[m]{\lambda} \right) \mathbf{x}.$$

If m is even, however, the m th real root does not exist if $\lambda < 0$, so the scalar cannot be absorbed into the vector.

2.4 Model parameters

For both the symmetric decomposition, we let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ denote the matrix of weights and \mathbf{X} denote the matrix of component vectors, i.e.,

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [\lambda_1 \quad \lambda_2 \quad \cdots \lambda_p]^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1 \quad \mathbf{x}_2 \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{x}_p].$$

The notation x_{ik} refers to the i th entry in the k th column, so

$$(\mathbf{x}_k^m)_i = x_{i_1 k} x_{i_2 k} \cdots x_{i_m k}.$$

3 Related problems

3.1 CP tensor decomposition

CP tensor decomposition has been known since 1927 [23, 22]. It is known under several names, two of the most prominent being CANDECOMP as proposed by Carroll and Chang [12] and PARAFAC by Harshman [21]. Originally, the term CP was proposed as a combination of these two names [25], but more recently has been re-purposed to mean ‘‘canonical polyadic.’’ For details, we refer the reader to the survey [27]. Here, we describe the problem in the case of a cubic tensor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{[m,n]}$. Our goal is to discover a decomposition of the form

$$\mathcal{A} = \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{u}_k^{(1)} \circ \mathbf{u}_k^{(2)} \circ \cdots \circ \mathbf{u}_k^{(m)}. \quad (3)$$

The circle denotes the vector outer product so the $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m)$ entry is

$$\left(\mathbf{u}^{(1)} \circ \mathbf{u}^{(2)} \circ \cdots \circ \mathbf{u}^{(m)} \right)_i = u_{i_1}^{(1)} u_{i_2}^{(2)} \cdots u_{i_m}^{(m)}.$$

Each summand is called a *component*. One of the most effective methods for this problem is alternating least squares. We solve for each *factor* matrix

$$\mathbf{U}^{(j)} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1^{(j)} & \mathbf{u}_2^{(j)} & \cdots & \mathbf{u}_p^{(j)} \end{bmatrix},$$

in turn by solving a linear least squares problem.

3.2 Canonical decomposition with partial symmetry

Partial symmetry has been considered since the work of Carroll and Chang [12]. At the same time Carroll and Chang [12] introduced CANDECOMP, they also defined INDSCAL which assumes two modes are symmetric. For simplicity of discussion, we assume a cubic tensor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{[m,n]}$. For $m = 3$ and the last two dimensions being symmetric, this means

$$a_{ijk} = a_{ikj} \quad \text{for all } i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

In the three-way case, assuming the last two modes are symmetric, the factorization is

$$\mathcal{A} = \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{u}_k \circ \mathbf{v}_k \circ \mathbf{v}_k.$$

In other words, the last two vectors in each component are equal.

Carroll and Chang [12] proposed to use an alternating method that ignores symmetry, with the idea that it will often converge to a symmetric solution (up to diagonal scaling). Later work showed that not all KKT points satisfy this condition [16]. In §4.7, we show how a generalization of this method can be surprisingly effective for symmetric tensor decomposition and provide some motivation for why this might be the case.

We also note that the methods proposed here can be extended to partial symmetries.

3.3 Best symmetric rank-1 approximation

The best symmetric rank-1 approximation problem is

$$\min \|\mathcal{A} - \lambda \mathbf{x}^m\|^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (4)$$

This problem was first considered in De Lathauwer et al. [15], but their proposed symmetric higher-order power method was not convergent. The power method has been improved so that it is convergent in subsequent work [26, 36, 28, 29].

This problem is directly related to the problem of computing tensor Z-eigenpairs. A pair (λ, \mathbf{x}) is a Z-eigenpair [30, 33] of a tensor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{S}^{[m,n]}$ if

$$\mathcal{A} \mathbf{x}^{m-1} = \lambda \mathbf{x} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x}\| = 1,$$

where $\mathcal{A} \mathbf{x}^{m-1}$ denotes a vector in \mathbb{R}^n such that

$$(\mathcal{A} \mathbf{x}^{m-1})_{i_1} = \sum_{i_2} \cdots \sum_{i_m} a_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_m} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} \quad \text{for} \quad i_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

The problems are related because any Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) point of (4) is a Z-eigenpair of \mathcal{A} [28].

Han [20] has considered an unconstrained optimization formulation of the problem (4). Cui, Dai, and Nie [14] use Jacobian SDP relaxations in polynomial optimization to find *all* real eigenvalues sequentially, from the largest to the smallest.

3.4 Symmetric Tucker decomposition

A related problem is symmetric Tucker decomposition. Here the goal is to find an orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and a symmetric tensor $\mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{S}^{[m,p]}$ that solves

$$\min \|\mathcal{A} - \hat{\mathcal{A}}\|^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \hat{a}_{\mathbf{i}} = \sum_{j_1=1}^p \sum_{j_2=1}^p \cdots \sum_{j_m=1}^p b_{j_1 j_2 \cdots j_m} u_{i_1 j_1} u_{i_2 j_2} \cdots u_{i_m j_m}.$$

This topic has been considered in [11, 35, 24] and is useful for compression and signal processing applications. Alas, the computational techniques are quite different, so we do not consider them further.

3.5 Complex-valued symmetric tensor decomposition

An alternative version of the problem allows a complex decomposition, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{A} = \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{x}_k^m \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{C}^n \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, \dots, p. \quad (5)$$

Techniques from algebraic geometry have been proposed to solve (5) in [10, 32]. More recently, Nie [31] has a combination of algebraic and numerical approaches for solving this problem. Generally, these approaches do not scale, though Nie's numerical method scales much better than previous approaches.

In the complex case, the typical rank (i.e., with probability one) is given by the theorem below. To the best of our knowledge, for the real case, no analogous results are known [13].

Theorem 1 (Alexander-Hirschowitz [4, 13]) *For $m > 2$, the typical symmetric rank (over \mathbb{C}) of an order- m symmetric tensor of dimension n is*

$$\left\lceil \frac{1}{n} \binom{n+k-1}{k} \right\rceil$$

except for $(m, n) \in \{(3, 5), (4, 3), (4, 4), (4, 5)\}$ where it should be increased by one.

4 Optimization formulations for symmetric tensor decomposition

4.1 Index multiplicities

A tensor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{S}^{[m,n]}$ has n^m entries, but not all are distinct. Let the set of all possible indices be denoted by

$$\mathcal{R} = \{ (i_1, \dots, i_m) \mid i_1, \dots, i_m \in \{1, \dots, n\} \}.$$

Clearly, $|\mathcal{R}| = n^m$.

Following [9], we define an *index class* as a set of tensor indices such that the corresponding tensor entries all share a value due to symmetry. For example, for $m = 3$ and $n = 2$, the tensor indices $(1, 1, 2)$ and $(1, 2, 1)$ are in the same index class since $a_{112} = a_{121}$. For each index class, we specify an *index representation* which is an index such that the entries are in nondecreasing order. For instance, $(1, 1, 2)$ is the index representation for the index class that includes a_{121} . The set

$$\mathcal{I} = \{ (i_1, \dots, i_m) \mid i_1, \dots, i_m \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ and } i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_m \} \subset \mathcal{R}$$

denotes all possible index representations.

Each index class also has a *monomial representation* [9]. For each $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}$ there is a corresponding monomial representation \mathbf{c} such that

$$x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = x_1^{c_1} x_2^{c_2} \cdots x_n^{c_n}.$$

Specifically, c_j represents that number of occurrences of index j in \mathbf{i} for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Clearly, $\sum_j c_j = m$. Conversely, for a given \mathbf{c} , we build an index \mathbf{i} with c_1 copies of 1, c_2 copies of 2, etc. This results in an m -long index representation. The set of monomial representations is denoted by

$$\mathcal{C} = \{ (c_1, \dots, c_n) \mid c_1, \dots, c_n \in \{0, \dots, m\} \text{ and } c_1 + \dots + c_n = m \}.$$

From [9], we have that the number of distinct entries of \mathcal{A} is given by

$$|\mathcal{I}| = |\mathcal{C}| = \binom{m+n-1}{m} = \frac{n^m}{m!} + O(n^{m-1}).$$

It can be shown [9] that the multiplicity of the entry corresponding to a monomial representation \mathbf{c} is

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{c}} = \binom{m}{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n} = \frac{m!}{c_1! c_2! \cdots c_n!}. \quad (6)$$

Table 1 shows an example of index and monomial representations for $\mathbb{S}^{[3,2]}$, including the multiplicities of each element.

Index (\mathcal{I})	Monomial (\mathcal{C})	Multiplicity (σ)
(1,1,1)	(3,0)	1
(1,1,2)	(2,1)	3
(1,2,2)	(1,2)	3
(2,2,2)	(0,3)	1

Table 1: Index and monomial representations for $\mathbb{S}^{[3,2]}$.

Without loss of generality, we exploit the one-to-one correspondence between index and monomial representations to change between them. For example,

$$\|\mathcal{A}\|^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{R}} a_{\mathbf{i}}^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}} \sigma_{\mathbf{i}} a_{\mathbf{i}}^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}} \sigma_{\mathbf{c}} a_{\mathbf{c}}^2,$$

and

$$(\mathbf{x}_k^m)_{\mathbf{i}} = x_{i_1 k} x_{i_2 k} \cdots x_{i_m k} = (\mathbf{x}_k^m)_{\mathbf{c}} = x_{1k}^{c_1} x_{2k}^{c_2} \cdots x_{nk}^{c_n}.$$

4.2 Two formulations

For given $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{S}^{[m,n]}$, our goal is to find $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and \mathbf{X} such that (1) is satisfied. We assume p is known. We consider two optimization formulations. The first formulation is the standard least squares formulation, i.e.,

$$f_1(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{X}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{R}} \left(a_{\mathbf{i}} - \sum_{k=1}^p \lambda_k (\mathbf{x}_k^m)_{\mathbf{i}} \right)^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}} \sigma_{\mathbf{i}} \left(a_{\mathbf{i}} - \sum_{k=1}^p \lambda_k (\mathbf{x}_k^m)_{\mathbf{i}} \right)^2. \quad (7)$$

Observe that this counts each unique entry multiple times, according to its multiplicity. The second formulation counts each unique entry only once, i.e.,

$$f_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{X}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}} \left(a_{\mathbf{i}} - \sum_{k=1}^p \lambda_k (\mathbf{x}_k^m)_{\mathbf{i}} \right)^2. \quad (8)$$

Either formulation can be expressed generically as

$$f_{\mathbf{w}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{X}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}} w_{\mathbf{i}} \left(a_{\mathbf{i}} - \sum_{k=1}^p \lambda_k (\mathbf{x}_k^m)_{\mathbf{i}} \right)^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}} w_{\mathbf{i}} \delta_{\mathbf{i}}^2.$$

Choosing $w_{\mathbf{i}} = \sigma_{\mathbf{i}}$ yields f_1 whereas $w_{\mathbf{i}} = 1$ yields f_2 . The value $\delta_{\mathbf{i}}$ is the difference between the model and the tensor at entry \mathbf{i} . Note that this formulation easily adapts to the case of missing data, i.e., missing data should have weight of zero in the optimization formulation [3, 2].

4.3 Gradients

Using the generic formulation, the gradients are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_{\mathbf{w}}}{\partial \lambda_k} &= -2 \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}} w_{\mathbf{i}} \delta_{\mathbf{i}} (\mathbf{x}_k^m)_{\mathbf{i}}, \\ \frac{\partial f_{\mathbf{w}}}{\partial x_{jk}} &= -2 \lambda_k \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}} c_j w_{\mathbf{c}} \delta_{\mathbf{c}} \left(x_{1k}^{c_1} \cdots x_{jk}^{c_j-1} \cdots x_{nk}^{c_n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For f_1 , we mention an alternate gradient expression because it may be more efficient to compute. The derivation follows [1], and the gradients are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial \lambda_k} &= -2 \mathcal{A} \mathbf{x}_k^m + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^p \lambda_{\ell} (\mathbf{x}_k^{\top} \mathbf{x}_{\ell})^m, \\ \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial \mathbf{x}_k} &= -2m \lambda_k \mathcal{A} \mathbf{x}_k^{m-1} + 2m \lambda_k \sum_{\ell=1}^p \lambda_{\ell} (\mathbf{x}_k^{\top} \mathbf{x}_{\ell})^{m-1} \mathbf{x}_{\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

4.4 Scaling ambiguity

Observe that either objective function suffers from scaling ambiguity. Suppose we have two equivalent models defined by

$$\sum_{k=1}^p \lambda_k \mathbf{x}_k^m = \sum_{k=1}^p \hat{\lambda}_k \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^m,$$

related by a positive scaling vector $\boldsymbol{\rho} \in \mathbb{R}_+^p$ such that

$$\hat{\lambda}_k = \rho_k^m \lambda_k \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k = \mathbf{x}_k / \rho_k \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, \dots, p.$$

Hence, it is convenient to require $\|\mathbf{x}_k\| = 1$ for all k . We could enforce it as an equality constraint, but instead we treat it as a penalty, i.e.,

$$p_\gamma(\mathbf{X}) = \gamma \sum_{k=1}^p (\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k - 1)^2. \quad (9)$$

It is straightforward to observe that

$$\frac{\partial p_\gamma}{\partial \mathbf{x}_k} = 4\gamma (\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k - 1) \mathbf{x}_k$$

4.5 Sparse component weights

We assume that p is known, but this is not generally the case. One technique to get around this problem is to guess a large value for p and then add a sparsity penalty of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. Specifically, we can use an approximate ℓ_1 penalty of the form suggested by [37]:

$$p_{\alpha,\beta}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \sum_{k=1}^p \log(1 + \exp(-\alpha\lambda_k)) + \log(1 + \exp(\alpha\lambda_k)) \approx \beta \|\boldsymbol{\lambda}\|_1$$

In this case, the gradient is

$$\frac{\partial p_{\alpha,\beta}}{\partial \lambda_k} = \beta [(1 + \exp(-\alpha\lambda_k))^{-1} + (1 + \exp(\alpha\lambda_k))^{-1}].$$

4.6 Putting it all together

The final function to be optimized is

$$\hat{f}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{X}) = f_{\mathbf{w}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{X}) + p_\gamma(\mathbf{X}) + p_{\alpha,\beta}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}).$$

The choice of \mathbf{w} determines the choice of objective function. We can also set $w_i = 0$ for any missing values. The choice of γ determines the weight of the penalty on the norm of the columns of \mathbf{X} . The parameter α determines the ‘‘steepness’’ of the approximate ℓ_1 penalty function, and the choice of β determines the weight of the sparsity-encouraging penalty.

4.7 Ignoring symmetry

Another approach to symmetric decomposition is to ignore the symmetry altogether and use a standard CP tensor decomposition method such as alternating least squares (ALS) [17, 27]; surprisingly, there are conditions that are favorable to this approach.

Under mild conditions, the CP decomposition (3) is unique up to permutation and scaling of the components, i.e., *essentially unique*. Sidiropoulos and Bro [38] have a general result on the essential uniqueness of the CP decompositions for tensors. If we specialize that to the symmetric case by assuming $\mathbf{U}^{(j)} = \mathbf{X}$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$, the result says that a sufficient condition for the uniqueness of (3) is

$$2p + (m - 1) \leq m \text{k-rank}(\mathbf{X}). \quad (10)$$

Here, the k -rank of the matrix \mathbf{X} is the largest number k such that every subset of k columns of \mathbf{X} is linearly independent. Table 2 shows sufficient k -rank’s for various values of m and p . For instance, if $m = 3$ and $p = 25$, then $\text{k-rank}(\mathbf{X}) \geq 18$ is sufficient for uniqueness. Recall that \mathbf{X} is an $n \times p$ matrix, so $\text{k-rank}(\mathbf{X}) \leq \min\{n, p\}$.

The import of essential uniqueness is that the global solution of the unconstrained problem (3) is the same as for the symmetric problem (1) so long as \mathbf{X} satisfies (10). If we normalize the factors in (3) and, without loss of generality, ignore the permutation ambiguity, then uniqueness implies, for $k = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\lambda_k = \pm \|\mathbf{u}_1^{(k)}\| \cdots \|\mathbf{u}_m^{(k)}\| \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{x}_k = \pm \mathbf{u}_k^{(1)} / \|\mathbf{u}_1^{(k)}\| = \cdots = \pm \mathbf{u}_k^{(m)} / \|\mathbf{u}_m^{(k)}\|$$

		components (p)							
		2	3	4	5	10	25	50	100
order (m)	3	2	3	4	4	8	18	34	68
	4	2	3	3	4	6	14	26	51
	5	2	2	3	3	5	11	21	41
	6	2	2	3	3	5	10	18	35

Table 2: Minimal k -rank(\mathbf{X}) sufficient for uniqueness of symmetric outer product factorization.

A bit of care must be taken to convert from a solution that ignores symmetry since it could be the case, e.g., that $\mathbf{u}_k^{(1)} = -\mathbf{u}_k^{(2)}$. Algorithm 1 gives a simple procedure to “symmetrize” a tensor so that the signs align. It also averages the final sign-aligned factor matrices in case they are not exactly equal.

The benefit of ignoring symmetry is that we can use existing software for the CP decomposition. The disadvantage is that it requires m times as much storage, i.e., it must store the matrices $\mathbf{U}^{(1)}$ thru $\mathbf{U}^{(m)}$ rather than just \mathbf{X} . Moreover, there is no guarantee that the optimization algorithm will find the global minimum.

Algorithm 1 Symmetrize Kruskal tensor

Input: CP decomposition defined by $\mathbf{U}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{U}^{(m)}$

Output: Symmetric CP decomposition defined by $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and \mathbf{X}

```

1: for  $k = 1, \dots, p$  do
2:    $\lambda_k \leftarrow 1$ 
3:   for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  do
4:      $\eta \leftarrow \|\mathbf{u}_k^{(j)}\|_2$ 
5:      $\lambda_k \leftarrow \eta \lambda_k$  and  $\mathbf{u}_k^{(j)} \leftarrow \mathbf{u}_k^{(j)} / \eta$  ▷ Normalize
6:     if  $j > 1$  and  $\langle \mathbf{u}_k^{(1)}, \mathbf{u}_k^{(j)} \rangle < 0$  then
7:        $\lambda_k \leftarrow -\lambda_k$  and  $\mathbf{u}_k^{(j)} \leftarrow -\mathbf{u}_k^{(j)}$  ▷ Flip  $\mathbf{u}_k^{(j)}$  to align with  $\mathbf{u}_k^{(1)}$ 
8:     end if
9:   end for
10: end for
11:  $\mathbf{X} \leftarrow \sum_j \mathbf{U}^{(j)} / m$ .
```

5 Optimization formulation for NNSCP

The notion of completely positive tensors has been introduced by Qi, Xu, and Xu [34]. It is a natural extension of completely positive matrices. A nonnegative tensor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{S}^{[m,n]}$ is called completely positive if it has a decomposition of the form in (2).

The formulation is analogous to the unconstrained case, except that there is no $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ (or equivalently, we constrain $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = 1$) and we add nonnegativity constraints. For given $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{S}^{[m,n]}$, our goal is to find \mathbf{X} such that (2) is satisfied. We again assume p is known. The mathematical program is given by

$$\min f_+(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}} w_{\mathbf{i}} \left(a_{\mathbf{i}} - \sum_{k=1}^p (\mathbf{x}_k^m)_{\mathbf{i}} \right)^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}} w_{\mathbf{i}} \delta_{\mathbf{i}}^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{X} \geq 0.$$

Choosing $w_{\mathbf{i}} = \sigma_{\mathbf{i}}$ yields the analogue of f_1 whereas $w_{\mathbf{i}} = 1$ yields the analogue f_2 . The value $\delta_{\mathbf{i}}$ is the difference between the model and the tensor at entry \mathbf{i} .

Using the generic formulation, the gradients are given by

$$\frac{\partial f_+}{\partial x_{jk}} = -2 \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}} c_j w_{\mathbf{c}} \delta_{\mathbf{c}} \left(x_{1k}^{c_1} \cdots x_{jk}^{c_j-1} \cdots x_{nk}^{c_n} \right).$$

6 Numerical results

For our numerical results, we assume the tensor has underlying low-rank structure. Hence, we assume there is some underlying $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbf{X}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ to be recovered, where p may be lower than the typical rank. The data tensor \mathcal{A} may also be contaminated by noise, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^* + \eta \frac{\|\mathcal{A}^*\|}{\|\mathcal{N}\|} \mathcal{N} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{A}^* = \sum_{k=1}^p \lambda_k^* \mathbf{x}_k^* \quad \text{and} \quad n_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

The parameters m, n, p control the size of the problem. If the vectors in \mathbf{X}^* are collinear and/or components are equal in magnitude, then the problem may also be more difficult.

For each problem size, we precompute the index set \mathcal{I} as well as the corresponding monomial representations \mathcal{C} and multiplicities $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. This means that these values need not be computed each time the objective function and gradient are evaluated.

All tests were conducted on a laptop with an Intel Dual Core i7-3667U CPU and 8 GB of RAM, using MATLAB R2013a. For the optimization, unless otherwise noted, all tests are based on SNOPT, Version 7.2-9 [18, 19], using the MATLAB MEX interface. SNOPT default parameters were used except for the following: Major iteration limit = 10,000, New superbasics limit / Superbasics limit = 999, Major optimality tolerance = 1e-8. All tensor computations use the Tensor Toolbox for MATLAB, Version 2.5 [6, 7, 8].

6.1 Choice of function and scaling penalty

We consider a total of 60 test problems to compare the impact of the choice of objective function and scaling penalty. To construct the test problems, we vary the following parameters:

- Two possible sizes: $m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$ or $m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$
- Three noise levels: $\eta \in \{0, 0.01, 0.1\}$.
- Ten random instances per size/noise combination.

To generate a random instance, we randomly generate each entry of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^*$ from a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and then obtain \mathbf{X}^* by normalizing the columns, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_k = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k / \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k\| = 1$ for all k . The entries of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ are selected uniformly at random from $\{-1, 1\}$. It may be interesting to know that in the matrix case ($m = 2$), components with identical λ_k values would not be distinguishable in the sense that the components would define a subspace, but this is not the case for higher-order tensors ($m \geq 3$).

For each size, we generate five random starting points, where the entries of \mathbf{X} are random Gaussian distributed, and the entries of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ are selected uniformly at random from $\{-1, 1\}$. The same five starting points are used for all problems of that size.

We compare a total of four solution methods, as follows:

- Two least squares difference functions: f_1 defined in (7), which is the standard least squares formulation, and f_2 defined in (8), which counts each unique entry only once. These functions are referred to as weighted and unweighted, respectively.
- Two values for the column normalization penalty: $\gamma \in \{0, 0.1\}$.

We have a total of 300 optimization runs (2 sizes \times 3 noise levels \times 10 instances \times 5 random starts) per difference function and column normalization penalty combination. Summary results are presented in Table 3. For a computed solution $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{X})$, the relative error measures the distance of the model from the observed data tensor, i.e.,

$$\text{Relative Error} = \left\| \mathcal{A} - \sum_{k=1}^p \lambda_k \mathbf{x}_k^m \right\| / \|\mathcal{A}\|.$$

The solution scores compute how accurately $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and \mathbf{X} are as compared to $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$ and \mathbf{X}^* . Without loss of generality, we assume both \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{X}^* have normalized columns. (If $\|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 \neq 1$, then we rescale $\lambda_k = \lambda_k \sqrt{\|\mathbf{x}_k\|}$ and $\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{x}_k / \|\mathbf{x}_k\|$.) There is a permutation ambiguity, but we permute the computed solution so as to maximize the following score:

$$\text{Solution Score} = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^p \left(1 - \frac{|\lambda_k - \lambda_k^*|}{\max\{|\lambda_k|, |\lambda_k^*|\}} \right) |\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k^*|.$$

Summary results are presented in Table 3, showing how many runs obtain a relative error less than 0.1, how many runs obtain a solution score greater than 0.9, and the mean and standard deviation on the run time. We do not break out the different noise levels in these tables; instead, we compare the different formulations of the objective function. Overall, the results in Table 3 show that the unweighted least squares function f_2 yields better results (in terms of relative error and solution score) than the standard (weighted) least squares function f_1 . Likewise, a small penalty ($\gamma = 0.1$) improves the results.

Size	Unweighted (f_2)		Weighted (f_1)	
	$\gamma = 0$	$\gamma = 0.1$	$\gamma = 0$	$\gamma = 0.1$
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	139	144	107	122
$m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$	28	128	20	59

(a) Number of runs (out of 150) with relative error ≤ 0.1

Size	Unweighted (f_2)		Weighted (f_1)	
	$\gamma = 0$	$\gamma = 0.1$	$\gamma = 0$	$\gamma = 0.1$
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	120	125	89	104
$m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$	31	128	25	59

(b) Number of runs (out of 150) with solution score ≥ 0.9

Size	Unweighted (f_2)		Weighted (f_1)	
	$\gamma = 0$	$\gamma = 0.1$	$\gamma = 0$	$\gamma = 0.1$
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	0.24 ± 0.59	0.23 ± 0.33	0.48 ± 1.07	0.35 ± 0.59
$m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$	69.19 ± 39.26	87.02 ± 26.00	63.63 ± 34.65	94.05 ± 50.20

(c) Mean and standard deviation on runtime (in seconds) for 150 runs

Table 3: Comparison of difference functions and column normalization penalty

We give more detailed results for the best-performing objective function, using the f_2 difference function and $\gamma = 0.1$ in the column normalization penalty. In Table 4, we consider the impact of noise. For each size and noise combinations, we focus on the ten random instances and five starting points as described above, yielding a total of 50 runs per size-noise combination. Not surprisingly, the median relative error is consistent with the noise; in other words, the relative error is approximately equal to η . We also consider how often we are able to find the true solution, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$ and \mathbf{X}^* , for a given instance. Specifically, we report the number of instances (out of 10) where at least one of the 5 initial guesses yielded a solution score greater than or equal to 0.9. Additionally, we report the average number of initial guesses that yield such a solution. At the highest noise level, we are not able to solve every instance for the smaller size. Otherwise, we have a perfect recovery rate and converge to the true solution from nearly every starting point.

Size	$\eta = 0$	$\eta = 0.01$	$\eta = 0.1$
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	1.09e-06	8.44e-03	7.77e-02
$m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$	1.94e-05	9.99e-03	9.94e-02

(a) Median relative error over 50 runs

Size	$\eta = 0$	$\eta = 0.01$	$\eta = 0.1$
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	10 (5.0)	10 (4.6)	7 (3.4)
$m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$	10 (4.0)	10 (4.4)	10 (4.4)

(b) Number of instances (out of 10) with at least one solution score ≥ 0.9 and mean number of starting points (out of 5) satisfying condition

Table 4: Impact of noise on solution

In Table 5, we consider more difficult test problems where \mathbf{X}^* has collinear normalized columns, i.e., $(\mathbf{x}_k^*)^\top \mathbf{x}_\ell^* = 0.9$ for all $k \neq \ell$ with $k, \ell \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. The procedure for generating the collinear columns is described by Tomasi and Bro [39]. Otherwise, everything is the same as in previous tests except that we only consider the case with no noise ($\eta = 0$). This means we have 10 instances and five starting points per instance. Here we see that the unweighted difference function f_2 and $\gamma = 0.1$ are the best combination in terms of getting high solution scores. However, the advantage is not as clear in terms of the relative error. Moreover, the larger problems are not solved as easily as in the non-collinear case.

Size	Unweighted (f_2)		Weighted (f_1)	
	$\gamma = 0$	$\gamma = 0.1$	$\gamma = 0$	$\gamma = 0.1$
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	10 (4.1)	10 (4.2)	10 (3.7)	10 (3.8)
$m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$	6 (1.0)	8 (2.8)	8 (2.0)	9 (2.1)

(a) Number of instances (out of 10) with at least one relative error ≤ 0.1 and mean number of starting points (out of 5) satisfying condition

Size	Unweighted (f_2)		Weighted (f_1)	
	$\gamma = 0$	$\gamma = 0.1$	$\gamma = 0$	$\gamma = 0.1$
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	10 (3.8)	10 (4.2)	10 (3.1)	10 (3.6)
$m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$	5 (0.7)	7 (1.2)	6 (0.7)	5 (0.6)

(b) Number of instances (out of 10) with at least one solution score ≥ 0.9 and mean number of starting points (out of 5) satisfying condition

	Unweighted (f_2)		Weighted (f_1)	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	0.51	0.93	0.62	1.12
$m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$	70.20	52.07	76.53	89.52

(c) Mean and standard deviation on run time (in seconds) for 50 runs

Table 5: Comparison of difference functions and column normalization penalty for collinear problems

From these results, we have a sense that the symmetric factorization problem can often be solved using standard optimization techniques. Because the problems are nonconvex, multiple starting points improve the odds of finding a global minimizer. In general, it may be helpful to add a small penalty to remove the scaling ambiguity (with no penalty, the Jacobian at the solution is singular). Additionally, experimentation with different difference formulations (i.e., f_1 versus f_2) yield some advantage in terms of finding a global optima, though not always as the collinear results show. For individual runs, it may be the case that f_1 is better than f_2 ; likewise, using a penalty to remove the scaling ambiguity does not universally yield improvement. Additionally, other factors can impact the results, including even the method of computation. For instance,

Size	$\eta = 0$	$\eta = 0.01$	$\eta = 0.1$
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	2.25e-04	8.18e-03	7.68e-02
$m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$	8.74e-07	9.98e-03	9.93e-02

(a) Median relative error for 50 runs

Size	$\eta = 0$	$\eta = 0.01$	$\eta = 0.1$
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	10 (4.4)	10 (4.0)	9 (4.0)
$m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$	9 (3.7)	10 (4.4)	10 (4.6)

(b) Number of instances (out of 10) with solution score ≥ 0.9 and average number of starting points (out of 5) satisfying condition

Size	Runtime (sec)
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	0.06 ± 0.04
$m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$	0.07 ± 0.04

(c) Mean and standard deviation on runtime (in seconds) for 150 runs

Table 6: Ignoring symmetry for instances that satisfy the uniqueness conditions

§4.3 gives an alternate method for computing the gradient of f_1 .

6.2 Ignoring symmetry

As noted previously, Carroll and Chang [12] ignored symmetry with the idea that it may not be required. Ideally, the solution that is computed by a standard method, like CP-ALS [17, 27] or CP-OPT [1], will be symmetric up to scaling.

Using the same problems from Table 4, we apply CP-ALS (as implemented in the Tensor Toolbox), followed by Algorithm 1 to symmetrize the solution. Note that both sizes are expected to satisfy the uniqueness conditions.

- For $m = 3$ and $p = 2$, we require $\text{k-rank}(\mathbf{X}^*) \geq 2$. Since \mathbf{X}^* is an $n \times p$ matrix with $n = 4$ whose columns are randomly generated, $\text{k-rank}(\mathbf{X}^*) = 2$ with probability 1.
- For $m = 4$ and $p = 3$, we require $\text{k-rank}(\mathbf{X}^*) \geq 3$. Since \mathbf{X}^* is an $n \times p$ matrix with $n = 25$ whose columns are randomly generated, $\text{k-rank}(\mathbf{X}^*) = 3$ with probability 1.

Table 6 shows the results, which are similar to Table 4. In fact, CP-ALS does slightly better in the smaller noisiest case ($m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$ and $\eta = 0.1$) but slightly worse for the larger noise-free case ($m = 4, n = 25, p = 3$ and $\eta = 0$). Most significant, however, is the speed advantage: the CP-ALS version is 10X-1000X faster.

Unfortunately, the results depend on uniqueness of the global solution. If the solution is not unique, the CP-ALS is unlikely to find a symmetric solution. As a result, the symmetrization procedure in Algorithm 1 does not produce a useful symmetric solution. Table 7 shows results on 10 instances of size $m = 4, n = 3$, and $p = 5$. For $m = 4$ and $p = 5$, it is sufficient that $\text{k-rank}(\mathbf{X}^*) \geq 4$. Since \mathbf{X}^* is an $n \times p$ matrix with $n = 3$, $\text{k-rank}(\mathbf{X}^*) \leq 3$. We consider ten instances with no noise ($\eta = 0$) and five random starting points (the same over all instances). Because the solution is not unique, we do not expect to recover \mathbf{X}^* and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$, but we do expect to find a solution with small relative error. Table 7 shows that the symmetrized CP-ALS solution does not yield small relative error, whereas the symmetric optimization approach does.

Despite the negative results when the solution is not unique, using a standard CP solution procedure followed by symmetrization is indeed an effective approach in many situations.

Instance	Sym. Opt.		CP-ALS + Sym.	
	Min	Median	Min	Median
1	5.1e-07	7.4e-04	8.3e-03	1.8e-02
2	2.7e-02	3.7e-02	4.2e-03	3.6e-02
3	5.6e-07	1.9e-06	8.7e-04	1.8e-02
4	1.0e-06	7.3e-03	4.4e-03	6.9e-03
5	6.1e-07	2.2e-06	1.6e-03	2.8e-02
6	7.2e-07	5.0e-05	3.3e-03	6.5e-03
7	5.6e-04	2.8e-03	5.5e-03	6.7e-03
8	3.4e-07	2.0e-06	1.0e-02	3.0e-02
9	7.8e-07	1.2e-04	5.6e-03	2.8e-02
10	1.5e-06	1.3e-04	8.1e-03	3.9e-02

Table 7: Relative error comparison (for 5 starting points) on problem instances that do not satisfy the uniqueness conditions

6.3 Sparsity penalty for rank determination

In Example 5.5(i) of [31], Nie considers an method for determining the rank of a tensor. The example tensor is of order $m = 4$ and defined by

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \begin{bmatrix} 676 \\ 196 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{X}^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3/\sqrt{14} \\ 1/\sqrt{26} & 2/\sqrt{14} \\ -5/\sqrt{26} & -1/\sqrt{14} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.00 & 0.80 \\ 0.20 & 0.53 \\ -0.98 & -0.27 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using our optimization approach with f_1 and $\gamma = 0.1$, we impose the approximate ℓ_1 penalty of the form suggested by [37], using $\alpha = 10$ and $\beta = 0.1$ to arrive at the following result:

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \begin{bmatrix} 675.99 \\ 195.95 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.01 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.00 & 0.80 & -0.80 & 0.80 & -0.79 & -0.02 \\ -0.20 & 0.53 & -0.53 & 0.54 & -0.55 & -0.26 \\ 0.98 & -0.27 & 0.27 & -0.25 & 0.27 & 0.97 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We calculate the similarity score as described previously, selected the best two components and yielding a score of 0.999865. The calculation takes approximately 2 seconds.

Using the same penalty parameters, we construct 10 instances of problems of size $m = 4, n = 3$, and $p = 2$ for each noise level $\eta \in \{0, 0.01, 0.1\}$. We use a solution with 3 components but once again apply the sparsity penalty, using the same parameters as above. We use five random starts per instance. The results as shown in Table 8. The second column shows the number of instances (out of 10) where the solution score was ≥ 0.9 , and the third column is the mean number of initial guesses (out of 5) for which this condition was satisfied. The fourth column shows that median relative error, and the last column shows the mean and standard deviation of the runtime. In the noise-free case, the correct solution is found in every run. For $\eta = 0.01$, the correct solution is obtained for 9 out of 10 instances. For $\eta = 0.1$, the problem is harder to solve.

Alas, the penalty approach is a heuristic; forthcoming work [5] will use statistical validation to select the rank.

6.4 Nonnegative factorization

Lastly, we consider the problem of nonnegative factorization. We use f_2 for the difference function. We do not penalized the column norms of \mathbf{X} because they are unrestricted. We restrict $\mathbf{X} \geq 0$. We consider a total

Noise	Score ≥ 0.9	Mean Inits	Median Error	Runtime (sec)
$\eta = 0.00$	10	5.0	3.4e-04	0.60 ± 0.20
$\eta = 0.01$	9	4.5	6.9e-03	0.54 ± 0.19
$\eta = 0.10$	4	1.9	6.4e-02	0.47 ± 0.13

Table 8: Impact of sparsity penalty for problems of size $m = 4, n = 3$, and $p = 2$ with a solution that has $p = 3$.

Size	$\eta = 0$	$\eta = 0.01$	$\eta = 0.1$
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	4.02e-07	8.00e-03	7.51e-02
$m = 6, n = 6, p = 4$	1.82e-07	1.03e-02	1.04e-01

(a) Median relative error over 50 runs

Size	$\eta = 0$	$\eta = 0.01$	$\eta = 0.1$
$m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$	10 (4.8)	6 (3.0)	2 (1.0)
$m = 6, n = 6, p = 4$	10 (5.0)	10 (5.0)	4 (1.8)

(b) Number of instances (out of 10) with at least one solution score ≥ 0.9 and the average number of starting points satisfying the condition

Table 9: Nonnegative

of 60 test problems to compare the impact of noise. To construct the test problems, we vary the following parameters:

- Two possible sizes: $m = 3, n = 4, p = 2$ or $m = 6, n = 6, p = 4$
- Three noise levels: $\eta \in \{0, 0.01, 0.1\}$.
- Ten random instances per size/noise combination.

To generate a random instance, we randomly generate each entry of \mathbf{X}^* from a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. The component weights λ are redundant and therefore ignored.

Table 9 shows the results, using five random starting points per problem instance. Without noise, the method has no problem finding the solution. The addition of noise makes the problem more difficult, especially for the smaller size.

We constructed test problems where a nonnegative solution is guaranteed to exist. However, it may be the case that no such solution exists and we would instead ideally want to find the best fit.

7 Conclusions & future challenges

We consider relatively straightforward optimization formulations for real-valued SCP and NNSCP decompositions. Such approaches should be considered as a baseline for comparison as new methods are developed. In particular, these methods should be useful for larger problems. The size $m = 4$ and $n = 25$ is larger than most other SCP decomposition problems in the literature [31]. Moreover, most other methods are intolerant to noise. Although the SCP and NNSCP problems are nonconvex, these optimization approaches are effective, especially with multiple starting points. Moreover, we show that if the solution is essentially unique (and the optimization method finds a global minima), then symmetry need not be directly enforced by the optimization method. In this case, efficient tools for the CP problem may be employed directly.

Of course, optimization formulations analogous to these may be considered as well in the case of partial symmetries.

Of course, there is much room for improvements, including different optimization formulations and consideration of other optimization methods.

References

- [1] Acar, E., Dunlavy, D.M., Kolda, T.G.: A scalable optimization approach for fitting canonical tensor decompositions. *Journal of Chemometrics* **25**(2), 67–86 (2011). DOI 10.1002/cem.1335
- [2] Acar, E., Dunlavy, D.M., Kolda, T.G., Mørup, M.: Scalable tensor factorizations with missing data. In: *SDM10: Proceedings of the 2010 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*, pp. 701–712 (2010). DOI 10.1137/1.9781611972801.61
- [3] Acar, E., Dunlavy, D.M., Kolda, T.G., Mørup, M.: Scalable tensor factorizations for incomplete data. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* **106**(1), 41–56 (2011). DOI 10.1016/j.chemolab.2010.08.004
- [4] Alexander, J., Hirschowitz, A.: Polynomial interpolation in several variables. *Journal of Algebraic Geometry* **4**, 201–222 (1995)
- [5] Austin, W., Kolda, T.G., Plantenga, T.: Tensor rank prediction via cross validation. in progress (2014)
- [6] Bader, B.W., Kolda, T.G.: Algorithm 862: MATLAB tensor classes for fast algorithm prototyping. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software* **32**(4), 635–653 (2006). DOI 10.1145/1186785.1186794
- [7] Bader, B.W., Kolda, T.G.: Efficient MATLAB computations with sparse and factored tensors. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **30**(1), 205–231 (2007). DOI 10.1137/060676489
- [8] Bader, B.W., Kolda, T.G., et al.: Matlab tensor toolbox version 2.5. Available online (2012). URL <http://www.sandia.gov/~tgkolda/TensorToolbox/>
- [9] Ballard, G., Kolda, T.G., Plantenga, T.: Efficiently computing tensor eigenvalues on a GPU. In: *IPDPSW'11: Proceedings of the 2011 IEEE International Symposium on Parallel and Distributed Processing Workshops and PhD Forum*, pp. 1340–1348. IEEE Computer Society (2011). DOI 10.1109/IPDPS.2011.287
- [10] Brachat, J., Comon, P., Mourrain, B., Tsigaridas, E.: Symmetric tensor decomposition. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **433**(11-12), 1851–1872 (2010). DOI 10.1016/j.laa.2010.06.046. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6V0R-50M0TVJ-2/2/060f24da5301d406f2c2504cce6fff9e>
- [11] Cambre, J., De Lathauwer, L., De Moor, B.: Best rank (R, R, R) super-symmetric tensor approximation—a continuous-time approach. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE 1999 Signal Processing Workshop on Higher-Order Statistics*, pp. 242–246 (1999). DOI 10.1109/HOST.1999.778734. URL <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?arnumber=778734>
- [12] Carroll, J.D., Chang, J.J.: Analysis of individual differences in multidimensional scaling via an N-way generalization of “Eckart-Young” decomposition. *Psychometrika* **35**, 283–319 (1970). DOI 10.1007/BF02310791
- [13] Comon, P., Golub, G., Lim, L.H., Mourrain, B.: Symmetric tensors and symmetric tensor rank. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **30**(3), 1254–1279 (2008). DOI 10.1137/060661569
- [14] Cui, C.F., Dai, Y.H., Nie, J.: All real eigenvalues of symmetric tensors, arXiv:1403.3720 (2014)
- [15] De Lathauwer, L., De Moor, B., Vandewalle, J.: On the best rank-1 and rank- (R_1, R_2, \dots, R_N) approximation of higher-order tensors. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **21**(4), 1324–1342 (2000). DOI 10.1137/S0895479898346995
- [16] Dosse, M.B., Ten Berge, J.M.F.: The assumption of proportional components when CANDECOMP is applied to symmetric matrices in the context of INDSCAL. *Psychometrika* **73**(2), 303–307 (2008). DOI 10.1007/s11336-007-9044-x. URL <http://www.springerlink.com/content/1683x3734320025h/fulltext.pdf>

- [17] Faber, N.K.M., Bro, R., Hopke, P.K.: Recent developments in CANDECOMP/PARAFAC algorithms: A critical review. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* **65**(1), 119–137 (2003). DOI 10.1016/S0169-7439(02)00089-8
- [18] Gill, P.E., Murray, W., Saunders, M.A.: SNOPT: An SQP algorithm for large-scale constrained optimization. *SIAM Review* **47**(1), 99–131 (2005). DOI 10.1137/S0036144504446096
- [19] Gill, P.E., Murray, W., Saunders, M.A.: User’s Guide for SNOPT Version 7: Software for Large-Scale Nonlinear Programming (2008)
- [20] Han, L.: An unconstrained optimization approach for finding real eigenvalues of even order symmetric tensors. *Numerical Algebra, Control and Optimization (NACO)* **3**(3), 583–599 (2012). DOI 10.3934/naco.2013.3.583
- [21] Harshman, R.A.: Foundations of the PARAFAC procedure: Models and conditions for an “explanatory” multi-modal factor analysis. *UCLA working papers in phonetics* **16**, 1–84 (1970). Available at <http://www.psychology.uwo.ca/faculty/harshman/wpppfac0.pdf>
- [22] Hitchcock, F.L.: The expression of a tensor or a polyadic as a sum of products. *Journal of Mathematics and Physics* **6**(1), 164–189 (1927)
- [23] Hitchcock, F.L.: Multiple invariants and generalized rank of a p-way matrix or tensor. *Journal of Mathematics and Physics* **7**(1), 39–79 (1927)
- [24] Ishteva, M., Absil, P.A., Van Dooren, P.: Jacobi algorithm for the best low multilinear rank approximation of symmetric tensors. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **34**(2), 651–672 (2013). DOI 10.1137/11085743X. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/11085743X>
- [25] Kiers, H.A.L.: Towards a standardized notation and terminology in multiway analysis. *Journal of Chemometrics* **14**(3), 105–122 (2000). DOI 10.1002/1099-128X(200005/06)14:3<105::AID-CEM582>3.0.CO;2-I
- [26] Kofidis, E., Regalia, P.A.: On the best rank-1 approximation of higher-order supersymmetric tensors. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **23**(3), 863–884 (2002). DOI 10.1137/S0895479801387413. URL <http://link.aip.org/link/?SML/23/863/1>
- [27] Kolda, T.G., Bader, B.W.: Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM Review* **51**(3), 455–500 (2009). DOI 10.1137/07070111X
- [28] Kolda, T.G., Mayo, J.R.: Shifted power method for computing tensor eigenpairs. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **32**(4), 1095–1124 (2011). DOI 10.1137/100801482
- [29] Kolda, T.G., Mayo, J.R.: An adaptive shifted power method for computing generalized tensor eigenpairs, arXiv:1401.1183 (2014)
- [30] Lim, L.H.: Singular values and eigenvalues of tensors: A variational approach. In: *CAMSAP’05: Proceeding of the IEEE International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing*, pp. 129–132 (2005). DOI 10.1109/CAMAP.2005.1574201
- [31] Nie, J.: Generating polynomials and symmetric tensor decompositions, arXiv:1408.5664 (2014)
- [32] Oeding, L., Ottaviani, G.: Eigenvectors of tensors and algorithms for Waring decomposition. arXiv:1103.0203v1 [math.AG] (2011). URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1103.0203>
- [33] Qi, L.: Eigenvalues of a real supersymmetric tensor. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* **40**, 1302–1324 (2005). DOI 10.1016/j.jsc.2005.05.007

- [34] Qi, L., Xu, C., Xu, Y.: Nonnegative tensor factorization, completely positive tensors and an hierarchical elimination algorithm, arXiv:1305.5344 (2013)
- [35] Regalia, P.A.: Monotonically convergent algorithms for symmetric tensor approximation. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **438**(2), 875–890 (2013). DOI 10.1016/j.laa.2011.10.033. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024379511007300>
- [36] Regalia, P.A., Kofidis, E.: Monotonic convergence of fixed-point algorithms for ICA. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* **14**(4), 943–949 (2003). DOI 10.1109/TNN.2003.813843
- [37] Schmidt, M., Fung, G., Rosales, R.: Fast optimization methods for L1 regularization: A comparative study and two new approaches. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* pp. 286–297 (2007). DOI 10.1007/978-3-540-74958-5_28. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74958-5_28
- [38] Sidiropoulos, N.D., Bro, R.: On the uniqueness of multilinear decomposition of N-way arrays. *Journal of Chemometrics* **14**(3), 229–239 (2000). DOI 10.1002/1099-128X(200005/06)14:3<229::AID-CEM587>3.0.CO;2-N
- [39] Tomasi, G., Bro, R.: A comparison of algorithms for fitting the PARAFAC model. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **50**(7), 1700–1734 (2006). DOI 10.1016/j.csda.2004.11.013