

ON THE CONVERGENCE OF HIGHER-ORDER ORTHOGONALITY ITERATION*

YANGYANG XU†

Abstract. The higher-order orthogonality iteration (HOOI) has been popularly used for finding a best low-multilinear-rank approximation of a tensor. However, its iterate sequence convergence is still an open question. In this paper, we propose to implement HOOI in a greedy way. We update each factor matrix by selecting from the best candidates one that is closest to the current iterate. With this greedy selection, we establish the subsequence convergence of HOOI without any additional assumptions, i.e., any limit point of the iterates generated by HOOI is a critical point. Assuming the existence of a nondegenerate limit point, we further show that the entire iterate sequence converges to a critical point through the so-called Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property. In addition, we show that if the starting point is sufficiently close to any nondegenerate globally optimal solution, HOOI produces a sequence convergent to a globally optimal solution.

Key words. higher-order orthogonality iteration (HOOI), global convergence, Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property, greedy algorithm, block coordinate descent

1. Introduction. It is shown in [4] that any tensor (i.e., multi-dimensional array) can be decomposed into the product of orthogonal matrices and an *all-orthogonal* core tensor. This decomposition generalizes the matrix SVD and is today commonly called higher-order singular value decomposition (HOSVD) or multilinear SVD. In applications, people are usually interested in seeking a low-multilinear-rank approximation of a given tensor, such as the multilinear subspace learning [14] and multilinear principal component analysis [13]. Unlike the matrix SVD, *truncated* HOSVD can give a good but not necessarily the best low-multilinear-rank approximation of the given tensor. To obtain a better approximation, people (e.g., [5, 6, 9]) solve the best rank- (r_1, \dots, r_N) approximation problem

$$\min_{\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{A}} \|\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{C} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N\|_F^2, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{A}_n \in \mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n}, \forall n, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_1 \times \dots \times I_N}$ is a given tensor, \times_n denotes mode- n tensor-matrix multiplication (see the definition in (1.2) below), and

$$\mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n} = \{\mathbf{A}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{I_n \times r_n} : \mathbf{A}_n^\top \mathbf{A}_n = \mathbf{I}\}.$$

One popular method for solving (1.1) is the higher-order orthogonality iteration (HOOI) (see Algorithm 1). Although HOOI is commonly used and practically efficient (already coded in the Matlab Tensor Toolbox [2] and Tensorlab [16]), its sequence convergence is still an open question (c.f. [8, pp. 478]). In this paper, we address this open question by implementing HOOI in a greedy way. We show that any limit point of the generated sequence is a critical point, and assuming a nondegeneracy condition, we further establish a global sequence convergence result.

*This work is partially supported by AFOSR.

†yangyang.xu@uwaterloo.ca. Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario

1.1. Basic concepts of tensor. Before proceeding with discussion, we first review some basic concepts about tensor that we use in this paper; see [8] for more review.

The (i_1, \dots, i_N) -th component of an N -way tensor \mathcal{X} is denoted as $x_{i_1 \dots i_N}$. For $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times \dots \times m_N}$, their inner product is defined in the same way as that for matrices, i.e.,

$$\langle \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \rangle = \sum_{i_1=1}^{m_1} \cdots \sum_{i_N=1}^{m_N} x_{i_1 \dots i_N} \cdot y_{i_1 \dots i_N}.$$

The Frobenius norm of \mathcal{X} is defined as $\|\mathcal{X}\|_F = \sqrt{\langle \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X} \rangle}$. A *fiber* of \mathcal{X} is a vector obtained by fixing all indices of \mathcal{X} except one. The mode- n *matricization* (also called *unfolding*) of \mathcal{X} is denoted as $\text{unfold}_n(\mathcal{X})$, which is a matrix with columns being the mode- n fibers of \mathcal{X} in the lexicographical order. The mode- n product of $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times \dots \times m_N}$ with $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m_n}$ is written as $\mathcal{X} \times_n \mathbf{Y}$ which gives a tensor in $\mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times \dots \times m_{n-1} \times p \times m_{n+1} \times \dots \times m_N}$ and is defined component-wisely by

$$(\mathcal{X} \times_n \mathbf{Y})_{i_1 \dots i_{n-1} j i_{n+1} \dots i_N} = \sum_{i_n=1}^{m_n} x_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} \cdot y_{j i_n}. \quad (1.2)$$

If $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N$, then for all n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{unfold}_n(\mathcal{X}) &= \mathbf{A}_n \text{unfold}_n(\mathcal{C})(\mathbf{A}_N \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{A}_{n+1} \otimes \mathbf{A}_{n-1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{A}_1)^\top, \\ &= \mathbf{A}_n \text{unfold}_n(\mathcal{C} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \dots \times_{n-1} \mathbf{A}_{n-1} \times_{n+1} \mathbf{A}_{n+1} \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N). \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

1.2. Higher-order orthogonality iteration. Given \mathbf{A} , the optimal core tensor is given by $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{X} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1^\top \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N^\top$. Absorbing this \mathcal{C} into the objective, one can write (1.1) equivalently to (see [5, Theorem 3.1] for detailed derivation)

$$\max_{\mathbf{A}} \|\mathcal{X} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1^\top \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N^\top\|_F^2, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{A}_n \in \mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n}, \forall n. \quad (1.4)$$

The HOOI method updates \mathbf{A} by maximizing the objective of (1.4) alternately with respect to $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N$, one factor matrix at a time while the remaining ones are fixed. Specifically, assuming the iterate to be \mathbf{A}^k at the beginning of the k -th iteration, it performs the following update sequentially from $n = 1$ through N :

$$\mathbf{A}_n^{k+1} \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{A}_n \in \mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n}} \|\mathbf{A}_n^\top \mathbf{G}_n^k\|_F^2, \quad (1.5)$$

where we have used (1.3), and

$$\mathbf{G}_n^k = \text{unfold}_n(\mathcal{X} \times_{i < n} (\mathbf{A}_i^{k+1})^\top \times_{i > n} (\mathbf{A}_i^k)^\top). \quad (1.6)$$

Any orthonormal basis of the dominant r_n -dimensional left singular subspace of \mathbf{G}_n^k is a solution of (1.5). The pseudocode of HOOI is given in Algorithm 1.

It is easy to implement Algorithm 1 by simply setting \mathbf{A}_n^{k+1} to the left r_n leading singular vectors of \mathbf{G}_n^k . This implementation is adopted in the Matlab Tensor Toolbox [2]. However, such choice of \mathbf{A}_n^{k+1} causes trouble to the convergence analysis of the HOOI method. While preparing this paper, we did not

Algorithm 1: Higher-order orthogonality iteration (HOOI)

```
1 Input:  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $(r_1, \dots, r_N)$ 
2 Initialization: choose  $(\mathbf{A}_1^0, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N^0)$  with  $\mathbf{A}_n^0 \in \mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n}, \forall n$ 
3 for  $k = 0, \dots$ , do
4   for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  do
5      $\lfloor$  Set  $\mathbf{A}_n^{k+1}$  to an orthonormal basis of the dominant  $r_n$ -dimensional left singular subspace of  $\mathbf{G}_n^k$ .
6   if Some stopping criteria are met then
7      $\lfloor$  Output  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^{k+1}$ ,  $\mathbf{C} = \mathcal{X} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N$  and stop.
```

find any work that gives an iterate sequence convergence result of HOOI, except for our recent paper [17] that establishes subsequence convergence by assuming a strong condition on the entire iterate sequence. The essential difficulty is the non-uniqueness of the solution of (1.5), and the leading singular vectors are not uniquely determined either. To tackle this difficulty, we greedily choose one solution of (1.5) that is closest to \mathbf{A}_n^k as follows:

$$\mathbf{A}_n^{k+1} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{A}_n \in \mathcal{H}_n^k} \|\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{A}_n^k\|_F^2, \quad (1.7)$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_n^k = \arg \max_{\mathbf{A}_n \in \mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n}} \|\mathbf{A}_n^\top \mathbf{G}_n^k\|_F^2. \quad (1.8)$$

Although (1.7) can in general have multiple solutions, we will show that near any limit point of the iterate sequence, it must have a unique solution. Using the greedy selection of \mathbf{A}^{k+1} , we are able to establish iterate sequence convergence of the HOOI method, as shown in sections 2 and 3. The pseudocode of our implementation is shown in Algorithm 2. The subproblem in (1.7) can be solved by the method given in Remark 2.3.

Algorithm 2: Greedy higher-order orthogonality iteration (Greedy-HOOI)

```
1 Input:  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_1 \times \dots \times I_N}$  and  $(r_1, \dots, r_N)$ 
2 Initialization: choose  $(\mathbf{A}_1^0, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N^0)$  with  $\mathbf{A}_n^0 \in \mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n}, \forall n$ 
3 for  $k = 0, \dots$ , do
4   for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  do
5      $\lfloor$  Set  $\mathbf{A}_n^{k+1}$  by (1.7)
6   if Some stopping criteria are met then
7      $\lfloor$  Output  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^{k+1}$ ,  $\mathbf{C} = \mathcal{X} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N$  and stop.
```

1.3. Contributions. We summarize our contributions as follows.

- We propose to implement the HOOI method in a greedy way. For each update, we select from the best candidates one that is closest to the current iterate. It guarantees the uniqueness of the solution of each subproblem in the limit.
- With the greedy implementation, we — for the first time — establish an iterate subsequence convergence result of HOOI, i.e., any limit point of the generated iterate sequence is a critical point. Assuming the existence of a nondegenerate limit point (see Definition 3.2), we further establish a global sequence convergence result, i.e., the entire iterate sequence converges to a critical point.
- In addition, we show that the iterate sequence converges to a globally optimal solution, if the starting point is sufficiently close to any globally optimal solution.

1.4. Notation and outline. We use bold capital letters $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \dots$ to denote matrices, caligraphic letters $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U}, \dots$ for (set-valued) mappings, and bold caligraphic letters $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \dots$ for tensors. \mathbf{I} denotes an identity matrix, whose size is clear from the context. The i -th largest singular value of a matrix \mathbf{X} is denoted by $\sigma_i(\mathbf{X})$. The set of all orthonormal matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ is denoted as $\mathcal{O}_{m \times r} = \{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r} : \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{I}\}$. Throughout the paper, we focus on real field, but our analysis can be directly extended to complex field.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 shows subsequence convergence of Algorithm 2 without any assumption. In section 3, global convergence of Algorithm 2 is established under the assumption of the existence of a nondegenerate limit point. Finally, section 4 concludes the paper.

2. Subsequence convergence. In this section, without any assumption, we show the subsequence convergence of Algorithm 2, namely, any limit point of the iterate sequence $\{\mathbf{A}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ generated from Algorithm 2 is a critical point of (1.4). If $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a critical point of (1.4), then letting $\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{X} \times_1 \bar{\mathbf{A}}_1 \dots \times_N \bar{\mathbf{A}}_N$, we have $(\bar{\mathcal{C}}, \bar{\mathbf{A}})$ to be a critical point of (1.1). Therefore, our analysis will only focus on (1.4).

The Lagrangian function of (1.4) is

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{\Lambda}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{X} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1^\top \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N^\top\|_F^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \langle \mathbf{\Lambda}_n, \mathbf{A}_n^\top \mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I} \rangle,$$

where $\mathbf{\Lambda} = (\mathbf{\Lambda}_1, \dots, \mathbf{\Lambda}_N)$ is the Lagrangian multiplier. The KKT conditions of (1.4) can be derived by $\nabla \mathcal{L} = \mathbf{0}$, namely,

$$\mathbf{G}_n \mathbf{G}_n^\top \mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{A}_n \mathbf{\Lambda}_n = \mathbf{0}, \forall n, \quad (2.1a)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_n^\top \mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{0}, \forall n, \quad (2.1b)$$

where

$$\mathbf{G}_n = \text{unfold}_n(\mathcal{X} \times_{i \neq n} \mathbf{A}_i^\top). \quad (2.2)$$

We say a point $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a critical point of (1.4) if there is $\bar{\mathbf{\Lambda}}$ such that $(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \bar{\mathbf{\Lambda}})$ satisfies the conditions in (2.1).

The following result is well known, and we will use it several times in our convergence analysis.

LEMMA 2.1 (von Neumann's Trace Inequality [15]). *For any matrices $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$, it holds that*

$$|\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \rangle| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\min(m,p)} \sigma_i(\mathbf{X}) \sigma_i(\mathbf{Y}). \quad (2.3)$$

The inequality (2.3) holds with equality if \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} have the same left and right singular vectors.

To show the convergence of Algorithm 2, we analyze the solution of the subproblem (1.5), which can be written in the following general form:

$$\min_{\mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{Y}}} \|\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{X}\|_F^2, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{O}_{m \times r}$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ are given, and

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \arg \max_{\mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{O}_{m \times r}} \|\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2. \quad (2.5)$$

DEFINITION 2.2 (Quotient set of left leading singular vectors). *Given a matrix $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ and positive integer $r \leq \min(m, p)$, define*

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Y}, r) = \{\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{O}_{m \times r} : \text{span}(\mathbf{U}) \text{ is a dominant } r\text{-dimensional left singular subspace of } \mathbf{Y}\}.$$

For any $\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$, if $\text{span}(\mathbf{U}_1) = \text{span}(\mathbf{U}_2)$, i.e., they span the same subspace, we say they are equivalent and denote $\mathbf{U}_1 \sim \mathbf{U}_2$. By this equivalence relation, we partition $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$ to a set of equivalence classes and form a quotient set denoted as $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$.

REMARK 2.1. *Throughout the paper, we regard $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$ as the finite set of orthonormal matrices, and each of its elements contains a set of left r leading singular vectors of \mathbf{Y} . If $\sigma_r(\mathbf{Y}) > \sigma_{r+1}(\mathbf{Y})$, then \mathbf{Y} has a unique dominant r -dimensional left singular subspace, and $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$ is a singleton. However, if $\sigma_r(\mathbf{Y}) = \sigma_{r+1}(\mathbf{Y})$, then \mathbf{Y} has multiple dominant r -dimensional left singular subspaces, and $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$ has more than one element.*

PROPOSITION 2.3. *The problem (2.4) has a unique solution if the following two conditions hold:*

1. *For any $\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$, if $\mathbf{U}_1 \neq \mathbf{U}_2$, then $\|\mathbf{U}_1^\top \mathbf{X}\|_* \neq \|\mathbf{U}_2^\top \mathbf{X}\|_*$;*
2. *If $\mathbf{U}_* = \arg \max_{\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{Y}, r)} \|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}\|_*$, then $\mathbf{U}_*^\top \mathbf{X}$ is nonsingular;*

where $\|\cdot\|_$ denotes matrix nuclear norm, defined as the sum of all singular values of a matrix.*

Proof. Assume $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$ are both solutions of (2.4). Note that $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{Y}}$ in (2.5) is exactly the set $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$. Hence, $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = \mathbf{U}_{\tilde{z}} \mathbf{W}_{\tilde{z}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{Z}} = \mathbf{U}_{\hat{z}} \mathbf{W}_{\hat{z}}$ for $\mathbf{U}_{\tilde{z}}, \mathbf{U}_{\hat{z}} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$ and some $\mathbf{W}_{\tilde{z}}, \mathbf{W}_{\hat{z}} \in \mathcal{O}_{r \times r}$. Note

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} - \mathbf{X}\|_F^2 = 2r - 2\langle \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}, \mathbf{X} \rangle = 2r - 2\langle \mathbf{W}_{\tilde{z}}, \mathbf{U}_{\tilde{z}}^\top \mathbf{X} \rangle.$$

Then by Lemma 2.1 and the optimality of $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ on solving (2.4), we have

$$\langle \mathbf{W}_{\tilde{z}}, \mathbf{U}_{\tilde{z}}^\top \mathbf{X} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(\mathbf{U}_{\tilde{z}}^\top \mathbf{X}) = \|\mathbf{U}_{\tilde{z}}^\top \mathbf{X}\|_*. \quad (2.6)$$

Hence, from items 1 and 2, it follows that $\mathbf{U}_{\tilde{z}} = \mathbf{U}_*$, and similarly $\mathbf{U}_{\hat{z}} = \mathbf{U}_*$.

Let $\mathbf{U}_*^\top \mathbf{X} = \bar{\mathbf{U}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \bar{\mathbf{V}}^\top$ be the full SVD of $\mathbf{U}_*^\top \mathbf{X}$ and write $\mathbf{W}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} = \bar{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}^\top$. Then from (2.6), it holds that

$$\langle \mathbf{W}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}, \mathbf{U}_*^\top \mathbf{X} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}^\top, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \bar{\mathbf{V}}^\top \rangle = \langle \mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{V}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(\mathbf{U}_*^\top \mathbf{X}) (\mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{V}})_{ii} = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(\mathbf{U}_*^\top \mathbf{X}).$$

Note that $\sigma_i(\mathbf{U}_*^\top \mathbf{X}) > 0$ and $(\mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{V}})_{ii} \leq 1$. The last equality holds only if $(\mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{V}})_{ii} = 1$. Since $\mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{V}}$ is orthogonal, we must have $\mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{V}} = \mathbf{I}$. Hence, $\mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} = \bar{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} = \bar{\mathbf{U}} \bar{\mathbf{V}}^\top$. For the same reason, $\mathbf{W}_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}} = \bar{\mathbf{U}} \bar{\mathbf{V}}^\top$. Therefore, $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = \hat{\mathbf{Z}}$, and the solution of (2.4) is unique. \square

REMARK 2.2. *The two conditions in items 1 and 2 are also necessary for uniqueness of the solution of (2.4). We leave the proof to the interested readers. Define*

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{Y}, r) = \{\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{O}_{m \times r} : \mathbf{X} \text{ satisfies the two conditions in Proposition 2.3}\}.$$

Then for any $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$, (2.4) has a unique solution, which we denote as $T_{\mathbf{Y}, r}(\mathbf{X})$. In this way, $T_{\mathbf{Y}, r}$ defines a mapping on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$.

REMARK 2.3. *The proof of Proposition 2.3 provides a way for finding a solution of (2.4). Find $\mathbf{U}_* \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{Y}, r)} \|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}\|_*$ and get full SVD of $\mathbf{U}_*^\top \mathbf{X} = \bar{\mathbf{U}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \bar{\mathbf{V}}^\top$. Then $\mathbf{Z}_* = \mathbf{U}_* \bar{\mathbf{U}} \bar{\mathbf{V}}^\top$ is a solution of (2.4).*

Using Proposition 2.3, one can easily show the following two corollaries.

COROLLARY 2.4. *If \mathbf{X} is sufficiently close to one \mathbf{U} in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$, then the solution of (2.4) is unique.*

COROLLARY 2.5. *If $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$, then $T_{\mathbf{Y}, r}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{X}$, i.e., \mathbf{X} is a fixed point.*

Furthermore, we can show the continuity of $T_{\mathbf{Y}, r}$.

THEOREM 2.6. *The mapping $T_{\mathbf{Y}, r}$ is continuous on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$.*

Proof. For convenience of the description, in this proof, we simply write $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$, $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$ and $T_{\mathbf{Y}, r}$ to \mathcal{U} , \mathcal{S} and T , respectively.

For any $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{S}$, let $\mathbf{Z} = T(\mathbf{X})$. If T is not continuous at \mathbf{X} , then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and a sequence $\{\mathbf{X}^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in \mathcal{S} such that $\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}^k\|_F \leq \frac{1}{k}$ and $\|\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{Z}^k\|_F \geq \epsilon$, where $\mathbf{Z}^k = T(\mathbf{X}^k)$. By the definition of \mathcal{S} , we know that there is $\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}\|_* > \|\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top \mathbf{X}\|_*$ for any $\tilde{\mathbf{U}} \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{\mathbf{U}\}$. Similarly, there is a sequence $\{\mathbf{U}^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in \mathcal{U} such that for each k , $\|(\mathbf{U}^k)^\top \mathbf{X}^k\|_* > \|\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top \mathbf{X}^k\|_*$ for any $\tilde{\mathbf{U}} \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{\mathbf{U}^k\}$.

Let $\delta = \|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}\|_* - \max_{\tilde{\mathbf{U}} \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{\mathbf{U}\}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top \mathbf{X}\|_* > 0$. There is a sufficiently large integer k_0 such that for all $k \geq k_0$, it holds $\|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}^k\|_* \geq \|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}\|_* - \frac{\delta}{4}$ and $\|(\mathbf{U}^k)^\top \mathbf{X}^k\|_* \leq \|(\mathbf{U}^k)^\top \mathbf{X}\|_* + \frac{\delta}{4}$. Note $\|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}^k\|_* \leq \|(\mathbf{U}^k)^\top \mathbf{X}^k\|_*$. Hence, $\|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}\|_* - \frac{\delta}{4} \leq \|(\mathbf{U}^k)^\top \mathbf{X}\|_* + \frac{\delta}{4}$, i.e., $\|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}\|_* \leq \|(\mathbf{U}^k)^\top \mathbf{X}\|_* + \frac{\delta}{2}$. Therefore, by the definition of δ , it must hold that $\mathbf{U}^k = \mathbf{U}$, $\forall k \geq k_0$.

Hence, we can write $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{W}_z$ and $\mathbf{Z}^k = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{W}_{z^k}$ for all $k \geq k_0$, where $\mathbf{W}_z, \mathbf{W}_{z^k} \in \mathcal{O}_{r \times r}$. Note $\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then from the proof of Proposition 2.3, we have $\mathbf{W}_{z^k} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}_z$ and thus $\mathbf{Z}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This contradicts to $\|\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{Z}^k\|_F \geq \epsilon$. Therefore, T is continuous at \mathbf{X} . Since \mathbf{X} is an arbitrary point in \mathcal{S} , this completes the proof. \square

One can also show the following result. We leave its proof to the interested readers.

THEOREM 2.7. *Assume $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$ and $\mathbf{Y}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then there is a sufficiently large integer*

k_0 such that $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{Y}^k, r)$ for all $k \geq k_0$, and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbf{Y}^k, r}(\mathbf{X}) = T_{\mathbf{Y}, r}(\mathbf{X}).$$

We also need the following result.

LEMMA 2.8. *For any feasible solution $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$, if $T_{\bar{\mathbf{G}}_n, r_n}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}_n) = \bar{\mathbf{A}}_n$, $\forall n$, then $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a critical point of (1.4), where*

$$\bar{\mathbf{G}}_n = \text{unfold}_n(\mathcal{X} \times_{i \neq n} \bar{\mathbf{A}}_i). \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. Note that $T_{\bar{\mathbf{G}}_n, r_n}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}_n) = \bar{\mathbf{A}}_n$, $\forall n$ implies that $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_n$ is a basis of the dominant r_n -dimensional left singular subspace of $\bar{\mathbf{G}}_n$. Hence, $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_n \bar{\mathbf{A}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{G}}_n \bar{\mathbf{G}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{A}}_n = \bar{\mathbf{G}}_n \bar{\mathbf{G}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{A}}_n$. Letting $\mathbf{A}_n = \bar{\mathbf{A}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{G}}_n \bar{\mathbf{G}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{A}}_n$, we have $\bar{\mathbf{G}}_n \bar{\mathbf{G}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{A}}_n = \bar{\mathbf{A}}_n \mathbf{A}_n$ for all n . Therefore, $(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \bar{\mathbf{A}})$ satisfies the conditions in (2.1). This completes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to show the subsequence convergence result.

THEOREM 2.9 (Subsequence convergence). *Let $\{\mathbf{A}^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be the sequence generated from Algorithm 2. Then $\{\mathbf{A}^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ has at least one limit point, and any limit point is a critical point of (1.4).*

Proof. Since $\{\mathbf{A}^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded, it must have a limit point. Suppose that $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is one limit point and the subsequence $\{\mathbf{A}^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ converges to $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$. From the update rule in (1.5), it is easy to see

$$\|(\mathbf{A}_n^{k+1})^\top \mathbf{G}_n^k\|_F^2 \leq \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{G}}_n\|_F^2, \forall k, \forall n. \quad (2.8)$$

We claim that $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_1$ is a solution of $\max_{\mathbf{A}_1 \in \mathcal{O}_{I_1 \times r_1}} \|\mathbf{A}_1^\top \bar{\mathbf{G}}_1\|_F^2$. Otherwise, $\|\bar{\mathbf{A}}_1^\top \bar{\mathbf{G}}_1\|_F^2 < \sum_{i=1}^{r_1} \sigma_i^2(\bar{\mathbf{G}}_1)$. Note

$$\lim_{\mathcal{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \|(\mathbf{A}_1^{k+1})^\top \mathbf{G}_1^k\|_F^2 = \lim_{\mathcal{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{r_1} \sigma_i^2(\mathbf{G}_1^k) = \sum_{i=1}^{r_1} \sigma_i^2(\bar{\mathbf{G}}_1),$$

which contradicts to (2.8). Hence, $T_{\bar{\mathbf{G}}_1, r_1}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}_1) = \bar{\mathbf{A}}_1$.

Note that $\mathbf{G}_1^k \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{G}}_1$ as $\mathcal{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathbf{A}_1^k \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{G}_1^k, r_1)$ as $k \in \mathcal{K}$ is sufficiently large. From Theorems 2.6 and 2.7, we have

$$\lim_{\mathcal{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{A}_1^{k+1} = \lim_{\mathcal{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbf{G}_1^k, r_1}(\mathbf{A}_1^k) = T_{\bar{\mathbf{G}}_1, r_1}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}_1) = \bar{\mathbf{A}}_1. \quad (2.9)$$

Hence, taking a sufficiently large $k \in \mathcal{K}$, we can make $\|\mathbf{A}_1^{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{A}}_1\|_F$ sufficiently small, and thus we can repeat the above arguments for $n = 2, \dots, N$ to conclude

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}}_n \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{A}_n \in \mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n}} \|\mathbf{A}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{G}}_n\|_F^2, \forall n.$$

Therefore, from the definition of $T_{\bar{\mathbf{G}}_n, r_n}$, it holds that $T_{\bar{\mathbf{G}}_n, r_n}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}_n) = \bar{\mathbf{A}}_n$, $\forall n$, and $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a critical point of (1.4) from Lemma 2.8. \square

REMARK 2.4. *The result in (2.9) is a key step to have the subsequence convergence. In general, it does not hold for the original HOOI. We doubt that the original HOOI has the same convergence result unless some assumptions are made.*

3. Global sequence convergence. In this section, we assume the existence of one nondegenerate (see Definition 3.2 below) limit point and show global convergence of Algorithm 2. The key tool we use is the so-called Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz (KL) property (see Definition 3.4 below).

Let $f(\mathbf{A}) = -\|\mathcal{X} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1^\top \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N^\top\|_F^2$ and

$$g_n(\mathbf{A}_n) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \mathbf{A}_n \in \mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n}, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

be the indicator function on $\mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n}$ for $n = 1, \dots, N$. Also let

$$F(\mathbf{A}) = f(\mathbf{A}) + \sum_{n=1}^N g_n(\mathbf{A}_n).$$

Then (1.4) is equivalent to $\min_{\mathbf{A}} F(\mathbf{A})$, and $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a critical point of (1.4) *if and only if* $\mathbf{0} \in \partial F(\bar{\mathbf{A}})$, where ∂F denotes the limiting Fréchet subdifferential (see [10] for example).

We show the global convergence of Algorithm 2 also by analyzing the solution of the subproblem (1.5). As shown below, if there is a gap between $\sigma_{r_n}(\mathbf{G}_n^k)$ and $\sigma_{r_n+1}(\mathbf{G}_n^k)$, the distance between \mathbf{A}_n^k and \mathbf{A}_n^{k+1} can be bounded by the objective difference.

THEOREM 3.1. *Given $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{O}_{m \times r}$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$, any solution \mathbf{Z} of (2.4) satisfies*

$$\frac{\sigma_r^2(\mathbf{Y}) - \sigma_{r+1}^2(\mathbf{Y})}{2} \|\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{X}\|_F^2 \leq \|\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2 - \|\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Note $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}_z$ for some $\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{Y}, r)$ and $\mathbf{W}_z \in \mathcal{O}_{m \times r}$. Let $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top + \mathbf{U}_\perp \mathbf{\Sigma}_\perp \mathbf{V}_\perp^\top$ be the corresponding full SVD of \mathbf{Y} . Also, let $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{W}_\perp = \mathbf{U}_\perp^\top \mathbf{X}$. Then $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{W} + \mathbf{U}_\perp \mathbf{W}_\perp$ and $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{W}_\perp^\top \mathbf{W}_\perp = \mathbf{I}$ from $\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{I}$.

As in the proof of Proposition 2.3, we have $\|\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i^2(\mathbf{Y})$ and

$$\|\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{X}\|_F^2 = 2r - 2\langle \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{X} \rangle = 2r - 2\langle \mathbf{W}_z, \mathbf{W} \rangle = 2r - 2 \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(\mathbf{W}),$$

where the last equality is from Lemma 2.1 and the optimality of \mathbf{Z} for (2.4). Also, note that

$$\|\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{W}_\perp^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_\perp\|_F^2.$$

Assume $\mathbf{W}_\perp = \tilde{\mathbf{U}} \tilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}} \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^\top$ to be the full SVD of \mathbf{W}_\perp . Then

$$\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{W}_\perp^\top \mathbf{W}_\perp = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}}) \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^\top.$$

Let $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \geq \tilde{\sigma}_2 \geq \dots \geq \tilde{\sigma}_r$ be the first r largest singular values of \mathbf{W}_\perp . Then $\sigma_i(\mathbf{W}) = \sqrt{1 - \tilde{\sigma}_{r-i+1}^2}$, $\forall i$, and using Lemma 2.1 again, we have

$$\|\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}\|_F^2 = \langle \mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top, \mathbf{\Sigma}^2 \rangle \leq \sum_{i=1}^r (1 - \tilde{\sigma}_i^2) \sigma_{r-i+1}^2(\mathbf{Y}),$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{W}_\perp^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\perp\|_F^2 = \langle \mathbf{W}_\perp \mathbf{W}_\perp^\top, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\perp \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\perp^\top \rangle \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \tilde{\sigma}_i^2 \sigma_{r+i}^2(\mathbf{Y}).$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i^2(\mathbf{Y}) - \|\mathbf{W}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_F^2 - \|\mathbf{W}_\perp^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\perp\|_F^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^r \tilde{\sigma}_i^2 (\sigma_{r-i+1}^2(\mathbf{Y}) - \sigma_{r+i}^2(\mathbf{Y})).$$

Using the inequality $1 - \sqrt{1-x} \leq x$, $\forall x \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$2r - 2 \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(\mathbf{W}) = 2r - 2 \sum_{i=1}^r \sqrt{1 - \tilde{\sigma}_i^2} \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^r \tilde{\sigma}_i^2.$$

Noting $\sigma_r^2(\mathbf{Y}) - \sigma_{r+1}^2(\mathbf{Y}) \leq \sigma_{r-i+1}^2(\mathbf{Y}) - \sigma_{r+i}^2(\mathbf{Y})$, $\forall i$, we have the desired result. \square

DEFINITION 3.2 (Nondegeneracy). *A feasible solution \mathbf{A} of (1.4) is nondegenerate if $\sigma_{r_n}(\mathbf{G}_n) > \sigma_{r_n+1}(\mathbf{G}_n)$, $\forall n$, where \mathbf{G}_n is defined in (2.2).*

Using Theorem 3.1, we show the following result.

LEMMA 3.3. *Let $\{\mathbf{A}^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be the sequence generated from Algorithm 2. Assume it has a nondegenerate limit point $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$. Then there is a constant α such that if \mathbf{A}^k is sufficiently close to $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$, we have*

$$\alpha \|\mathbf{A}^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}^k\|_F^2 \leq F(\mathbf{A}^k) - F(\mathbf{A}^{k+1}).$$

Proof. It is easy to see that there exists a small positive number δ such that if $\|\mathbf{A} - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F \leq \delta$, then

$$\sigma_{r_n}(\mathbf{G}_n) - \sigma_{r_n+1}(\mathbf{G}_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{r_n}(\bar{\mathbf{G}}_n) - \sigma_{r_n+1}(\bar{\mathbf{G}}_n)) \triangleq \alpha_n > 0, \forall n,$$

where the strict inequality is from the nondegeneracy of $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$. Assume \mathbf{A}^k is sufficiently close to $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \sqrt{\frac{2(F(\mathbf{A}^k) - F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}))}{\alpha_n}} + \|\mathbf{A}^k - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F \leq \delta.$$

From Theorem 3.1, it follows that

$$\frac{\alpha_1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}_1^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}_1^k\|_F^2 \leq \|(\mathbf{A}_1^{k+1})^\top \mathbf{G}_1^k\|_F^2 - \|(\mathbf{A}_1^k)^\top \mathbf{G}_1^k\|_F^2 \leq F(\mathbf{A}^k) - F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}),$$

where \mathbf{G}_1^k is defined in (1.6), and we have used (2.8). Hence, $\|\mathbf{A}_1^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}_1^k\|_F \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(F(\mathbf{A}^k) - F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}))}{\alpha_1}}$ and

$$\|(\mathbf{A}_1^{k+1}, \mathbf{A}_{>1}^k) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{A}_1^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}_1^k\|_F + \|\mathbf{A}^k - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F \leq \delta.$$

Repeating the above arguments, in general, we have for all n that

$$\|\mathbf{A}_n^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}_n^k\|_F \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(F(\mathbf{A}^k) - F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}))}{\alpha_n}},$$

and

$$\|(\mathbf{A}_{\leq n}^{k+1}, \mathbf{A}_{> n}^k) - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{A}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}_i^k\|_F + \|\mathbf{A}^k - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F \leq \delta.$$

Therefore, every intermediate point $(\mathbf{A}_{\leq n}^{k+1}, \mathbf{A}_{> n}^k)$ is in $\mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \delta) \triangleq \{\mathbf{A} : \|\mathbf{A} - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F \leq \delta\}$, and thus for all n ,

$$\frac{\alpha_n}{2} \|\mathbf{A}_n^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}_n^k\|_F^2 \leq \|(\mathbf{A}_n^{k+1})^\top \mathbf{G}_n^k\|_F^2 - \|(\mathbf{A}_n^k)^\top \mathbf{G}_n^k\|_F^2.$$

Let $\alpha = \min_n \frac{\alpha_n}{2} > 0$. Summing the above inequality from $n = 1$ to N gives the desired result. \square

Using Lemma 3.3 and the KL property of F , we can show the global convergence of Algorithm 2.

DEFINITION 3.4 (KL property). *A function $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies the KL property at point $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(\partial\psi)$ if there exists $\theta \in [0, 1)$ such that*

$$\frac{|\psi(\mathbf{x}) - \psi(\bar{\mathbf{x}})|^\theta}{\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial\psi(\mathbf{x}))} \quad (3.2)$$

is bounded around $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ under the notational conventions: $0^0 = 1, \infty/\infty = 0/0 = 0$. In other words, in a certain neighborhood \mathcal{N} of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$, there exists $\phi(s) = cs^{1-\theta}$ for some $c > 0$ and $\theta \in [0, 1)$ such that the KL inequality holds

$$\phi'(|\psi(\mathbf{x}) - \psi(\bar{\mathbf{x}})|) \text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial\psi(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1, \text{ for any } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N} \cap \text{dom}(\partial\psi) \text{ and } \psi(\mathbf{x}) \neq \psi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (3.3)$$

where $\text{dom}(\partial\psi) = \{\mathbf{x} : \partial\psi(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset\}$ and $\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial\psi(\mathbf{x})) = \min\{\|\mathbf{y}\| : \mathbf{y} \in \partial\psi(\mathbf{x})\}$.

The KL property was introduced by Łojasiewicz [12] on real analytic functions, for which the term with $\theta \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ in (3.2) is bounded around any critical point $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$. Kurdyka extended this property to functions on the α -minimal structure in [11]. Recently, the KL inequality (3.3) was extended to nonsmooth sub-analytic functions [3]. The works [1, 18] give a lot of concrete examples that own the property. The function F is one of their examples and thus has the KL property.

THEOREM 3.5 (Global sequence convergence). *If $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a nondegenerate limit point of the sequence $\{\mathbf{A}^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ generated from Algorithm 2, then $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a critical point of (1.4), and*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{A}^k = \bar{\mathbf{A}}. \quad (3.4)$$

REMARK 3.1. *The nondegeneracy condition is similar to the one assumed by the orthogonal iteration method [7, section 7.3.2] for computing r -dimensional dominant invariant subspace of a matrix \mathbf{X} . Typically, the convergence of the orthogonal iteration method requires that there is a gap between the r -th and $(r+1)$ -th largest eigenvalues of \mathbf{X} in magnitude, because otherwise, the r -dimensional dominant invariant subspace of \mathbf{X} is not unique.*

Proof. From Theorem 2.9, we have that $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a critical point of (1.4), so we only need to show (3.4). Note that $F(\mathbf{A}^k)$ is nonincreasing with respect to k and thus converges to $F(\bar{\mathbf{A}})$. We assume $F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}) < F(\mathbf{A}^k)$, $\forall k$. Otherwise, if for some k_0 , $F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}) = F(\mathbf{A}^{k_0})$, we must have $\mathbf{A}^k = \mathbf{A}^{k_0}$, $\forall k \geq k_0$.

Since F has the KL property, then in a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \rho)$, there exists $\phi(s) = cs^{1-\theta}$ for some $c > 0$ and $\theta \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$\phi'(|F(\mathbf{A}) - F(\bar{\mathbf{A}})|) \text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial F(\mathbf{A})) \geq 1, \text{ for any } \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \rho) \text{ and } F(\mathbf{A}) \neq F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}). \quad (3.5)$$

If necessary, taking a smaller ρ , we assume

$$\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \rho) \Rightarrow \sum_{n=1}^N \sqrt{\frac{2|F(\mathbf{A}) - F(\bar{\mathbf{A}})|}{\alpha_n}} + \|\mathbf{A} - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F \leq \delta,$$

where δ and α_n 's are defined in the same way as those in the proof of Lemma 3.3. Note that there is a constant L such that

$$\|\nabla_{\mathbf{A}_n} f(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{A}_n} f(\hat{\mathbf{A}})\|_F \leq L\|\tilde{\mathbf{A}} - \hat{\mathbf{A}}\|_F, \forall \tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \hat{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathcal{O}, \forall n, \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$\mathcal{O} = \{\mathbf{A} : \mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N), \mathbf{A}_n \in \mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n}, \forall n\}.$$

Since $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a limit point, there is a subsequence $\{\mathbf{A}^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ convergent to $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$. Hence, we can choose a sufficiently large $k_0 \in \mathcal{K}$ such that \mathbf{A}^{k_0} is sufficiently close to $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$. Without loss of generality, we assume \mathbf{A}^0 (otherwise set \mathbf{A}^{k_0} as a new starting point) is sufficiently close to $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ such that $\mathbf{A}^0 \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \rho)$ and

$$\|\mathbf{A}^1 - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F + \|\mathbf{A}^1 - \mathbf{A}^0\|_F + \frac{NL}{\alpha} \phi(F(\mathbf{A}^0)) - \phi(F(\bar{\mathbf{A}})) < \rho,$$

which can be guaranteed from Lemma 3.3.

Assume $\mathbf{A}^k \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \rho)$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$. We go to show $\mathbf{A}^{K+1} \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \rho)$ and thus $\mathbf{A}^k \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \rho), \forall k$ by induction. For any $n = 1, \dots, N$, from the optimality of \mathbf{A}_n^k on problem $\max_{\mathbf{A}_n} F(\mathbf{A}_{i < n}^k, \mathbf{A}_n, \mathbf{A}_{i > n}^{k-1})$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0} &\in \partial_{\mathbf{A}_n} F(\mathbf{A}_{i \leq n}^k, \mathbf{A}_{i > n}^{k-1}) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathbf{0} \in \nabla_{\mathbf{A}_n} f(\mathbf{A}_{i \leq n}^k, \mathbf{A}_{i > n}^{k-1}) + \partial g_n(\mathbf{A}_n^k) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \nabla_{\mathbf{A}_n} f(\mathbf{A}^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{A}_n} f(\mathbf{A}_{i \leq n}^k, \mathbf{A}_{i > n}^{k-1}) \in \nabla_{\mathbf{A}_n} f(\mathbf{A}^k) + \partial g_n(\mathbf{A}_n^k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial F(\mathbf{A}^k)) &\leq \sum_{n=1}^N \|\nabla_{\mathbf{A}_n} f(\mathbf{A}^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{A}_n} f(\mathbf{A}_{i \leq n}^k, \mathbf{A}_{i > n}^{k-1})\|_F \\ &\stackrel{(3.6)}{\leq} NL\|\mathbf{A}^k - \mathbf{A}^{k-1}\|_F. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Letting $F_k = F(\mathbf{A}^k) - F(\bar{\mathbf{A}})$ and $\phi_k = \phi(F_k)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi_k - \phi_{k+1} \\ &\geq \phi'(F_k)(F_k - F_{k+1}) \quad (\text{from concavity of } \phi) \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha \|\mathbf{A}^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}^k\|_F^2}{NL\|\mathbf{A}^k - \mathbf{A}^{k-1}\|_F}, \quad (\text{from KL inequality, Lemma 3.3, and (3.7)}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha = \min_n \frac{\alpha_n}{2}$ and which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \|\mathbf{A}^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}^k\|_F^2 &\leq NL\|\mathbf{A}^k - \mathbf{A}^{k-1}\|_F(\phi_k - \phi_{k+1}) \\ \Rightarrow \sqrt{\alpha} \|\mathbf{A}^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}^k\|_F &\leq \sqrt{NL\|\mathbf{A}^k - \mathbf{A}^{k-1}\|_F(\phi_k - \phi_{k+1})} \\ \Rightarrow \sqrt{\alpha} \|\mathbf{A}^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}^k\|_F &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{2} + \frac{NL}{2\sqrt{\alpha}}(\phi_k - \phi_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Summing the above inequality from $k = 1$ to K gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{A}^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}^k\|_F &\leq \|\mathbf{A}^1 - \mathbf{A}^0\|_F + \frac{NL}{\alpha}(\phi_1 - \phi_{K+1}) \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A}^1 - \mathbf{A}^0\|_F + \frac{NL}{\alpha}(\phi_0 - \phi(F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}))), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}^{K+1} - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{A}^{k+1} - \mathbf{A}^k\|_F + \|\mathbf{A}^1 - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A}^1 - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F + \|\mathbf{A}^1 - \mathbf{A}^0\|_F + \frac{NL}{\alpha}(\phi_0 - \phi(F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}))). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{A}^{K+1} \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \rho)$ and $\mathbf{A}^k \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \rho)$, $\forall k$, by induction. Hence, (3.8) holds for all K , and letting $K \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that $\{\mathbf{A}^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence and converges. Since $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a limit point, $\mathbf{A}^k \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{A}}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the proof. \square

As long as the starting point is sufficiently close to any globally optimal solution, Algorithm 2 will yield an iterate sequence convergent to a globally optimal solution as summarized below.


THEOREM 3.6 (Global optimality). *Assume Algorithm 2 starts from any point \mathbf{A}^0 that is sufficiently close to one nondegenerate globally optimal solution \mathbf{A}^* of (1.4). Then the sequence $\{\mathbf{A}^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converges to a globally optimal solution.*

Proof. Note that in the proof of Theorem 3.5, we only use $F(\mathbf{A}^k) > F(\bar{\mathbf{A}})$ and the sufficient closeness of \mathbf{A}^0 to $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ to show $\{\mathbf{A}^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ to be a Cauchy sequence. Therefore, repeating the same arguments, we can show that if \mathbf{A}^0 is sufficiently close to \mathbf{A}^* , then $\{\mathbf{A}^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence and thus converges to a point $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$. From Theorem 2.9, it follows that $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a critical point. We claim $F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}) = F(\mathbf{A}^*)$, i.e., $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ is a globally optimal solution. If otherwise $F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}) > F(\mathbf{A}^*)$, then by the KL inequality, it holds that $\phi'(F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}) - F(\mathbf{A}^*))\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial F(\bar{\mathbf{A}})) \geq 1$, which contradicts to $\mathbf{0} \in \partial F(\bar{\mathbf{A}})$. Hence, $F(\bar{\mathbf{A}}) = F(\mathbf{A}^*)$. This completes the proof. \square

4. Discussions. We proposed to implement the higher-order orthogonality iteration (HOOI) greedily. In this manner, we have established the subsequence convergence of HOOI. Assuming nondegenerate limit point, we further showed its global sequence convergence and global optimality if the starting point is sufficiently close to any globally optimal solution.

We cannot expect global sequence convergence of HOOI by simply setting \mathbf{A}^{k+1} in Algorithm 1 to the left r_n leading singular vectors of \mathbf{G}_n^k , which is adopted in the Matlab Tensor Toolbox [2]. Even if the starting point is a globally optimal solution $\mathbf{A}^* = (\mathbf{A}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N^*)$, HOOI with the normal update of \mathbf{A}^{k+1} does not guarantee the convergence of the iterates because $(\mathbf{A}_1^* \mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N^* \mathbf{W}_N)$ is optimal for any $\mathbf{W}_n \in \mathcal{O}_{I_n \times r_n}$, $\forall n$. We tested HOOI with the normal and greedy updates on 100 Gaussian random tensors in $\mathbb{R}^{50 \times 50 \times 50}$ and set multilinear rank to (5, 5, 5). Both methods were fed the truncated HOSVD as the starting point. Figure 4.1 plots their objective values of (1.4) and relative changes of the iterates for one run. We observed similar

FIG. 4.1. Comparison between the normal HOOI method implemented in the Matlab Tensor Toolbox [2] and the greedy HOOI method in Algorithm 2.



performance for all the 100 runs. From the figure, we see that greedy HOOI performs the same as the normal HOOI in terms of objective value. The iterates generated from greedy HOOI converges while those from normal HOOI oscillate severely.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. ATTOUCH, J. BOLTE, P. REDONT, AND A. SOUBEYRAN, *Proximal alternating minimization and projection methods for nonconvex problems: An approach based on the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz inequality*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 35 (2010), pp. 438–457.
- [2] B. W. BADER, T. G. KOLDA, ET AL., *Matlab tensor toolbox version 2.5*, January 2012.
- [3] J. BOLTE, A. DANILIDIS, AND A. LEWIS, *The Lojasiewicz inequality for nonsmooth subanalytic functions with applications to subgradient dynamical systems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 17 (2007), pp. 1205–1223.
- [4] L. DE LATHAUWER, B. DE MOOR, AND J. VANDEWALLE, *A multilinear singular value decomposition*, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 21 (2000), pp. 1253–1278.
- [5] ———, *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 (2000), pp. 1324–1342.
- [6] L. ELDÉN AND B. SAVAS, *A newton-grassmann method for computing the best multilinear rank- (r_1, r_2, r_3) approximation of a tensor*, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and applications, 31 (2009), pp. 248–271.
- [7] G. H. GOLUB AND C. F. VAN LOAN, *Matrix computations*, Johns Hopkins Studies in the Mathematical Sciences, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, third ed., 1996.
- [8] T. KOLDA AND B. BADER, *Tensor decompositions and applications*, SIAM review, 51 (2009), p. 455.
- [9] P. M. KROONENBERG AND J. DE LEEUW, *Principal component analysis of three-mode data by means of alternating least squares algorithms*, Psychometrika, 45 (1980), pp. 69–97.
- [10] A. Y. KRUGER, *On fréchet subdifferentials*, Journal of Mathematical Sciences, 116 (2003), pp. 3325–3358.
- [11] K. KURDYKA, *On gradients of functions definable in o-minimal structures*, in Annales de l’institut Fourier, vol. 48, Chartres: L’Institut, 1950–, 1998, pp. 769–784.
- [12] S. LOJASIEWICZ, *Sur la géométrie semi-et sous-analytique*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), 43 (1993), pp. 1575–1595.
- [13] H. LU, K. N. PLATANIOTIS, AND A. N. VENETSANOPOULOS, *Mpca: Multilinear principal component analysis of tensor objects*, Neural Networks, IEEE Transactions on, 19 (2008), pp. 18–39.
- [14] ———, *A survey of multilinear subspace learning for tensor data*, Pattern Recognition, 44 (2011), pp. 1540–1551.
- [15] L. MIRSKY, *A trace inequality of john von neumann*, Monatshefte für mathematik, 79 (1975), pp. 303–306.

- [16] L. SORBER, M. V. BAREL, AND L. D. LATHAUWER, *Tensorlab v2.0*. Available online, January 2014.
- [17] Y. XU, *On higher-order singular value decomposition from incomplete data*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.4324, (2014).
- [18] Y. XU AND W. YIN, *A block coordinate descent method for regularized multiconvex optimization with applications to nonnegative tensor factorization and completion*, SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences, 6 (2013), pp. 1758–1789.