

Follow the Compressed Leader: Faster Algorithms for Matrix Multiplicative Weight Updates

Zeyuan Allen-Zhu
zeyuan@csail.mit.edu
Institute for Advanced Study

Yuanzhi Li
yuanzhil@cs.princeton.edu
Princeton University

January 6, 2017

Abstract

Matrix multiplicative weight update (MMWU) [26] is an extremely powerful algorithmic tool for computer science and related fields. However, it comes with a slow running time due to the matrix exponential and eigendecomposition computations. For this reason, many researchers studied the followed-the-perturbed-leader (FTPL) framework which is faster, but a factor \sqrt{d} worse than the optimal regret of MMWU for dimension- d matrices.

In this paper, we propose a *followed-the-compressed-leader* framework which, not only matches the optimal regret of MMWU (up to polylog factors), but runs *even faster* than FTPL.

Our main idea is to “compress” the matrix exponential computation to dimension 3 in the adversarial setting, or dimension 1 in the stochastic setting. This result resolves an open question regarding how to obtain both (nearly) optimal and efficient algorithms for the online eigenvector problem [16].

1 Introduction

The multiplicative weight update (MWU) method is a simple but extremely powerful algorithmic tool that has been repeatedly discovered in theory of computation, machine learning, optimization, and game theory (see for instance the survey [9] and the book [12]). Its natural matrix extension, commonly known as matrix multiplicative weight update (MMWU) [26], has been used towards efficient algorithms for solving semidefinite programs [3, 10, 28], balanced separators [27], Ramanujan sparsifiers [7, 22], and even in the proof of QIP = PSPACE [19].

To discuss MMWU on an abstract level, let us consider the online linear optimization problem.

Online Matrix Optimization. Let $\Delta_d = \{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \mid \text{Tr} \mathbf{U} = 1 \wedge \mathbf{U} \succeq 0\}$ be the set of density matrices in dimension d .¹ Consider the following online game between a player and an adversary. The player plays T actions $\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_T \in \Delta_d$ in a row; after playing \mathbf{W}_k , the adversary picks a feedback matrix $\mathbf{A}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ that is symmetric and satisfies $0 \preceq \mathbf{A}_k \preceq \mathbf{I}$ (both these assumptions are for the sake of simplicity and can be removed²); this \mathbf{A}_k may depend on $\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_k$. The player receives a gain $\mathbf{A}_k \bullet \mathbf{W}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{W}_k) \in [0, 1]$.

The regret minimization problem asks us the player to design a strategy to minimize *regret*, that is, the difference between the total gain obtained by the player and that by the *a posteriori* best fixed strategy $\mathbf{U} \in \Delta_d$:

$$\text{minimize} \quad \max_{\mathbf{U} \in \Delta_d} \sum_{k=1}^T \mathbf{A}_k \bullet (\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{W}_k) = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{A}_T) - \sum_{k=1}^T \mathbf{A}_k \bullet \mathbf{W}_k .$$

The MMWU strategy chooses $\mathbf{W}_k = \frac{\exp(-\eta \Sigma_{k-1})}{\text{Tr} \exp(-\eta \Sigma_{k-1})}$ where $\Sigma_{k-1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{A}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{A}_{k-1}$ and $\eta > 0$ is the so-called *learning rate*. The best choice $\eta = \sqrt{\log d} / \sqrt{T}$ yields a total regret at most $O(\sqrt{T \log d})$ [26], and this is optimal up to constant [9]. Some authors also refer to MMWU as the *follow-the-regularized-leader* strategy or FTRL for short, because MMWU can be analyzed from a mirror-descent view with the matrix entropy function as its regularizer [7].

Online Eigenvector Problem. If instead of playing an arbitrary matrix in Δ_d , the player is only allowed to play a rank-1 matrix $\mathbf{W}_k = w_k w_k^\top$, then this online matrix optimization becomes the well-known *online eigenvector problem* [2, 13, 16, 21, 25]:

$$\text{minimize} \quad \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{A}_T) - \sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k .$$

The name comes from the fact that the player chooses only vectors in a row, but wants to compete against the leading eigenvector in hindsight. To make this problem meaningful, the feedback matrix \mathbf{A}_k , is *not* allowed to depend on w_k but can depend on w_1, \dots, w_{k-1} . This more challenging setting is very desirable for multiple reasons:

- in many applications —such as graph problems [7, 22]— \mathbf{A}_k does not depend on w_k ;
- vector-based strategies w_k can be cheaper to compute and more efficient to communicate.
- as we shall see next, online eigenvector is *more general* than online matrix optimization because the player can achieve the same regret by playing a full rank matrix \mathbf{W}_k or by simply playing $w_k w_k^\top$, as long as \mathbf{A}_k does not depend on \mathbf{W}_k .

¹We denote by $\mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B}$ spectral dominance that is equivalent to saying that $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$ is positive semidefinite (PSD).

²Firstly, all the results cited and stated in this paper, after scaling, generalize to the scenario when the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A}_k are in the range $[l, r]$ for arbitrary $l, r \in \mathbb{R}$. For notational simplicity, we have assumed $l = 0$ and $r = 1$ in this paper. Secondly, if \mathbf{A}_k is not symmetric or even rectangular, classical reductions can turn such a problem into an equivalent online game with only symmetric matrices [16, Sec 2.1].

Paper	Total Regret	Time Per Iteration	Minimum Total Time for ε Average Regret ^a
MMWU [7, 9]	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$	$O(d^3)$	$\tilde{O}(\frac{d^3}{\varepsilon^2})$
MMWU with JL [7, 28]	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$	$\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{5}{4}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$	$\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{4.5}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$
FTPL ($T \geq d$ only) [16]	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$	$\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{3}{4}} d^{-\frac{1}{4}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$	$\tilde{O}(\frac{d^{1.5}}{\varepsilon^{3.5}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$
this paper (basic)	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$	$\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{1}{4}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$	$\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2.5}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$
this paper (opt)	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ Theorem 1&2	$\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{1}{4}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma)^{\frac{3}{4}} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})^{\frac{1}{4}} + \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$ Theorem 3	$\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2.5}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma)^{\frac{3}{4}} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})^{\frac{1}{4}} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$
↓ stochastic online eigenvector only ↓			
block power method [16]	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$	$O(\text{nnz}(\Sigma))$	$\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$
this paper	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ Theorem 4	$O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}))$ Theorem 4	$\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}))$

Table 1: Comparison of known methods for the online eigenvector problem. We use $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{M})$ to denote the time needed to multiply \mathbf{M} to a vector. We denote by $\Sigma = \mathbf{A}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{A}_T$, and by $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) = \max_{k \in [T]} \{\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}_k)\}$.

^aThe total time complexity of the first T_ε rounds where T_ε is the earliest round to achieve an ε average regret.

Known Approach 1 (Better Regret). Applying the same MMWU strategy but *randomly* yields the same total $O(\sqrt{T} \log d)$ regret for the online eigenvector problem. Indeed, given an eigendecomposition $\mathbf{W}_k = \frac{\exp(-\eta \Sigma_{k-1})}{\text{Tr} \exp(-\eta \Sigma_{k-1})} = \sum_{j=1}^d p_j \cdot y_j y_j^\top$ where vectors y_j are normalized eigenvectors, the player can play each y_j with probability p_j . This gives $O(\sqrt{T} \log d)$ total regret in expectation.³ Unfortunately, the per-iteration running time of this method is $O(d^3)$ due to eigendecomposition.⁴

Some researchers [3, 7, 22, 28] use the Johnson-Lindenstrauss (JL) compression to reduce the dimension of \mathbf{W}_k to make it more efficiently computable. They define a sketch matrix $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{W}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}$ using a random $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and then use $\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^\top$ to approximate \mathbf{W}_k . The average regret loss is σ if the dimension $m = \tilde{O}(1/\sigma^2)$. We call this method MMWU-JL for short. Since σ must be around $T^{-1/2}$, MMWU-JL still runs slowly per iteration, see Table 1.⁵

Known Approach 2 (Faster Run Time). Many researchers also analyzed the so-called *follow-the-perturbed-leader* (FTPL) strategy for this problem [2, 13, 16, 21]. Most notably, Garber, Hazan and Ma [16] proposed to compute an (approximate) leading eigenvector of the matrix $\Sigma_{k-1} + rr^\top$ at iteration k , where r is a random vector whose norm is carefully chosen. They showed that the total regret of FTPL is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$, which is interesting only when $T \geq d$ and is a factor \sqrt{d} worse than the optimum regret. The per-iteration cost of FTPL is only $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{3}{4}} d^{-\frac{1}{4}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma_T))$ because computing the leading eigenvector is faster than eigendecomposition. (We use $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{M})$ to denote the time needed to multiply \mathbf{M} to a vector.)

1.1 Our Main Results

We propose a *follow-the-compressed-leader* (FTCL) strategy that, at a high level, compresses the MMWU strategy to dimension $m = 3$ as opposed to dimension $m = \tilde{\Theta}(1/\sigma^2) = \tilde{\Theta}(T)$ in MMWU-

³It requires some additional, but standard, effort to turn this into a high-confidence result.

⁴The best eigendecomposition algorithm runs in time $O(d^3)$ as opposed to $O(d^\omega)$.

⁵More specifically, the computation $\mathbf{W}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}$ becomes m computations of $\exp(-\eta \Sigma_{k-1}/2)$ applied to vectors, and this can be done using Chebyshev approximation with a total running time $\tilde{O}(\sigma^{-2} \cdot \|\eta \Sigma_{k-1}\|_2^{1/2} \cdot \text{nnz}(\Sigma_T))$. The optimal choice η will imply $\|\eta \Sigma_{k-1}\|_2 \leq T^{1/2}$, so this totals to $\tilde{O}(T^{5/4} \text{nnz}(\Sigma_T))$ in the per-iteration running time.

JL. Our FTCL strategy has significant advantages over previous results because:

- FTCL has regret $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ which is optimal up to poly-log factors (as opposed to \sqrt{d} in FTPL).
- FTCL, in its basic form, has a per-iteration complexity $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{1}{4}} \text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T))$ which is already faster than MMWU-JL by a factor $\tilde{\Omega}(T)$ and than FTPL by a factor $\tilde{\Omega}(T^{1/2}d^{-1/4}) \geq \tilde{\Omega}(T^{1/4})$.
- FTCL, after using optimization techniques to speed it up, has a per-iteration complexity

$$\boxed{\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{1}{4}} \text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T)^{\frac{3}{4}} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})^{\frac{1}{4}} + \text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T)) \text{ , where } \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{i \in [T]} \{\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}_i)\} \leq \text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T) \text{ .}}$$

We compare our running time to known results in Table 1 in full.

We stress here that a direct comparison in per-iteration complexity between FTCL (or MMWU) and FTPL is *unfair*, because FTPL requires *d* times *more iterations* in order to achieve the same average regret as FTCL (or MMWU). For this reason, in the last column of Table 1, we also summarize the minimum *total* time complexity needed to achieve an ε average regret.

Examples. If $\text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T) = d^2$ and $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) = O(d)$, the per-iteration running time comparison is $\tilde{O}(d^2 + d^{1.75}T^{0.25})$ (by us) vs. $\tilde{O}(T^{0.75}d^{1.75})$ (by FTPL, only $T \geq d$) or $O(d^3)$ (by MMWU) . We also compare the total complexity needed to achieve an ε average regret: $\tilde{O}(d^2\varepsilon^{-2} + d^{1.75}\varepsilon^{-2.5})$ (by us) vs. $\tilde{O}(d^2\varepsilon^{-4.5})$ (by MMWU-JL) or $\tilde{O}(d^3\varepsilon^{-2})$ (by MMWU) .

1.2 Our Side Result: Stochastic Online Eigenvector

Our compression idea also gives rise to a faster algorithm for the *special case* of the online eigenvector problem where the adversary is *stochastic*, meaning that $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_T$ are chosen i.i.d. from a common distribution whose expectation equals some matrix \mathbf{B} , independent of the player’s actions.

For this problem, Garber, Hazan, and Ma [16] showed that a block power method matches the optimum regret and enjoys an efficient $O(\text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T))$ -time implementation per iteration. Shamir [30] analyzed the so-called Oja’s algorithm but his total regret is $O(\sqrt{dT} \log(T))$ which is a factor \sqrt{d} worse than optimum.⁶

In this paper, we show by showing that Oja’s algorithm in fact only has a total regret $O(\sqrt{T} \log d)$ for the stochastic online eigenvector problem, which is optimal up to a $\sqrt{\log d}$ factor. Most importantly, the per-iteration complexity of Oja’s is only $O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}))$.

Example. If $\text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T) = d^2$ and $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) = O(d)$, our running time is $O(d)$ times faster than [16].

Our proof relies on a FTCL view of Oja’s algorithm which compresses MMWU to dimension $m = 1$. Our proof is less than one page, and essentially three-lined. This indicates that FTCL might be a better way of thinking about these type of problems.

1.3 Our Stronger Results in a More Refined Language

Denoting by $\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{T} \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{A}_T)$, we have $\lambda \leq 1$ according to the normalization $\mathbf{A}_k \preceq \mathbf{I}$. In general, the smaller the value λ is, the better a learning algorithm should behave. In the previous subsections, we have followed the tradition and discussed our results and prior works assuming the *worst* possibility of λ . This has indeed simplified notations.

⁶In the special case of \mathbf{A}_k being rank-1, the $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret for Oja’s algorithm was recently shown by [6], using different techniques from us.

Paper	Total Regret	Time Per Iteration	Minimum Total Time for ε Average Regret
MMWU [7, 9]	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\lambda T})$	$O(d^3)$	$\tilde{O}(\frac{\lambda d^3}{\varepsilon^2})$
MMWU with JL [7, 28]	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\lambda T})$	$\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{5}{4}} \lambda^{-\frac{3}{4}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$	$\tilde{O}(\frac{\lambda^{0.25}}{\varepsilon^{4.5}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$
this paper (basic)	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\lambda T})$	$\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{1}{4}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{4}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$	$\tilde{O}(\frac{\lambda^{1.5}}{\varepsilon^{2.5}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$
this paper (opt)	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\lambda T})$ Theorem 1&2	$\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{1}{4}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{4}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma)^{\frac{3}{4}} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})^{\frac{1}{4}} + \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$ Theorem 3	$\tilde{O}(\frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^{2.5}} \text{nnz}(\Sigma)^{\frac{3}{4}} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})^{\frac{1}{4}} + \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^2} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$
↓ stochastic online eigenvector only ↓			
block power method [16]	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\lambda T})$	$O(\text{nnz}(\Sigma))$	$\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \text{nnz}(\Sigma))$
this paper	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\lambda T})$ Theorem 4	$O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}))$ Theorem 4	$\tilde{O}(\frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^2} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}))$

Table 2: Comparison of known methods for the online eigenvector problem in the λ -refined language (see Section 1.3). We denote by $\Sigma = \mathbf{A}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{A}_T$, by $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) = \max_{k \in [T]} \{\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}_k)\}$, and by $\lambda = \frac{1}{T} \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma) \in [0, 1]$.

If λ is much smaller than 1, our complexity bounds can be improved to quantities that depend on λ . We call this the λ -refined language. We restate our FTCL results for this language in Table 2. At a high level, for our FTCL, in both the adversarial and stochastic settings,

- the total regret formula improves from $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ to $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\lambda T})$; and
- for obtaining the same average regret,
 - the necessary number of iterations reduces by a factor λ ; and
 - the total running time improves by a factor between λ and $\lambda^{3/2}$.

We emphasize that there is an information-theoretic lower bound of $\Omega(\sqrt{\lambda T})$ for the total regret in this λ -refined language, see Appendix I. This lower bound even holds for the simpler stochastic online eigenvector problem, even when the matrices \mathbf{A}_k are of rank 1.

As for prior works, it has been recorded that (cf. [7, Theorem 3.1]) the MMWU method (or the MMWU-JL) has a total regret of only $O(\sqrt{\lambda T \log d})$ as opposed to $O(\sqrt{T \log d})$ in this λ -refined language. The running time of MMWU therefore improves by a factor of λ . The total time complexity of MMWU-JL improves only by a factor of $\lambda^{1/4}$.⁷

The block power method (for the stochastic online eigenvector problem) can also be analyzed in this λ -refined language, for instance by modifying the proof in [16]. This improves the total regret to $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\lambda T})$. To the best of our knowledge, FTPL has not been analyzed in the λ -refined language (and even if it has, the resulting time complexity must be outperformed by ours). We compare our results with prior work in Table 2 for this λ -refined language.

1.4 Other Related Works

For the online eigenvector problem, if the feedback matrices \mathbf{A}_k are only of rank-1, then the $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ total regret of FTPL can be improved to $\tilde{O}(d^{1/4} T^{1/2})$. This is first shown by Dwork *et al.* [13] and independently shown by Kotłowski and Warmuth [21]. However, this $d^{1/4}$ factor for the rank-1 case and the $d^{1/2}$ factor for the high-rank case are tight at least for their proposed FTPL methods [18]. Abernethy *et al.* showed that FTPL strategies can also be analyzed using a FTRL framework [1].

⁷This is so because, in the same notations of Footnote 5, the per-iteration running time is $\tilde{O}(\sigma^{-2} \cdot \|\eta \Sigma_{k-1}\|_2^{1/2} \cdot \text{nnz}(\Sigma_T))$. This time, the optimal choice η will imply $\|\eta \Sigma_{k-1}\|_2 \leq (\lambda T)^{1/2}$ which is $\lambda^{1/4}$ smaller than before; however, the error tolerance σ must satisfy $\sigma^2 \approx T/\lambda$, so this totals to a per-iteration complexity of $\tilde{O}(T^{5/4} \lambda^{-3/4} \text{nnz}(\Sigma_T))$.

Researchers also put efforts to understand high-rank variants of the online eigenvector problem. Nie *et al.* studied the high-rank variant using MMWU [25], but their per-iteration running time is still $O(d^3)$ due to eigendecomposition. Some authors also study a very different online model for computing the top k eigenvectors [11, 20]: they are interested in outputting $O(k \cdot \text{poly}(1/\varepsilon))$ vectors instead of k but with a good PCA reconstruction error.

The *stochastic* online eigenvector problem is *almost equivalent* to the streaming PCA problem [6, 17].⁸ In streaming PCA, we are given i.i.d. random matrices with an expectation \mathbf{B} and asked to approximately find a unit vector w with large $w^\top \mathbf{B} w$ in the end. The two papers [6, 17] use different techniques from ours and do not imply our result on stochastic online eigenvector.

For the most efficient offline eigenvectors algorithms, we refer interested readers to our paper [5] (for PCA / SVD) and [4] (for CCA and generalized eigendecomposition).

1.5 Roadmap

We introduce necessary notations in Section 2, and discuss the high-level difficulties and our techniques in Section 3. We introduce a new trace inequality in Section 4 that shall be used in our main proof. In Section 5 we prove our main FTCL result for an oblivious adversary, and then extend it to the adversarial setting in Section 6. We discuss how to implement FTCL fast in Section 7. Finally, in Section 8 we provide our FTCL result for a stochastic adversary.

All of our results are stated and proved directly in the λ -refined language.

2 Notations and Preliminaries

Define $\Sigma_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{A}_i$ for every $k = 0, 1, \dots, T$. Since each \mathbf{A}_k is positive semi-definite (PSD), we can find $\mathbf{P}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $\mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top$; we only use \mathbf{P}_k for analysis purpose only. Given two matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we write $\mathbf{A} \bullet \mathbf{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{B})$. We write $\mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B}$ if \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} are symmetric matrices and $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$ is PSD. We write $[\mathbf{A}]_{i,j}$ the (i, j) -th entry of \mathbf{A} . We use $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{M})$ to denote time needed to multiply matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with an arbitrary vector in \mathbb{R}^d . In particular, $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{M})$ is at most d plus the number of non-zero elements in \mathbf{M} . We denote $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{k \in [T]} \{\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}_k)\}$.

Suppose $x_1, \dots, x_t \in \mathbb{R}$ are drawn i.i.d. from the standard Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, then $\chi = \sum_{i=1}^t x_i^2$ has a chi-squared distribution of t -degree freedom. χ^{-1} is called inverse-chi-squared distribution of t -degree freedom. It is known that $\mathbb{E}[\chi^{-1}] = \frac{1}{t-2}$ for $t \geq 3$.

For a polynomial $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we use $f^{(k)}$ to denote the k -th order derivative of f at point x . We use Markov brothers' inequality: if polynomial f is of degree n , then $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\forall a > 0$:

$$\max_{x \in [0, a]} |f^{(k)}(x)| \leq \left(\frac{2}{a}\right)^i \frac{n^2(n^2 - 1^2)(n^2 - 2^2) \dots (n^2 - (k-1)^2)}{(2k-1)!!} \max_{x \in [0, a]} |f(x)| . \quad (2.1)$$

3 High-Level Discussion of Our Techniques

Let us first revisit the high-level idea behind MMWU. Recall $\mathbf{W}_k = \exp(c_k \mathbf{I} + \eta \Sigma_{k-1})$ where c_k is the unique constant such that $\text{Tr} \mathbf{W}_k = 1$. Now, the key idea behind the analysis of MMWU is to use the Golden-Thompson inequality:

$$\text{Tr}(e^{c_k \mathbf{I} + \eta \Sigma_k}) \leq \text{Tr}(e^{c_k \mathbf{I} + \eta \Sigma_{k-1}} e^{\eta \mathbf{A}_k}) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_k e^{\eta \mathbf{A}_k}) \approx \text{Tr}(e^{c_k \mathbf{I} + \eta \Sigma_{k-1}}) + \eta \mathbf{W}_k \bullet \mathbf{A}_k .$$

⁸This ‘‘equivalence’’ is not a black-box reduction; one usually needs open up the analysis and turn the solution of one to the other.

In other words, the gain value $\mathbf{W}_k \bullet \mathbf{A}_k$, up to a factor η , is proportional to the change of the trace function. One can also use convexity to show $\text{Tr}(e^{c_{k+1}\mathbf{I}+\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_k}) - \text{Tr}(e^{c_k\mathbf{I}+\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_k}) \leq c_{k+1} - c_k$. Using these two inequalities plus a little more work, one can obtain the total regret bound.

In the rest of this section, let us perform a thought experiment to “modify” the MMWU analysis step-by-step. In the end, our FTCL method and its intuition shall become clear to the reader.

Thinking Step 1. Choose a random Gaussian vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and “compress” MMWU to dimension 1 in the direction of u . More specifically, we define $\mathbf{W}_k = \exp(c_k\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1})$ but this time c_k is the unique constant such that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_k uu^\top) = u^\top \mathbf{W}_k u = 1$. In such a case, we *wish* to say that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(e^{c_k\mathbf{I}+\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_k} uu^\top) &= \text{Tr}(e^{c_k\mathbf{I}+\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1}+\eta\mathbf{A}_k} uu^\top) \stackrel{(\star)}{\leq} \text{Tr}(e^{(c_k\mathbf{I}+\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1})/2} uu^\top e^{(c_k\mathbf{I}+\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1})/2} e^{\eta\mathbf{A}_k}) \\ &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{1/2} uu^\top \mathbf{W}_k^{1/2} e^{\eta\mathbf{A}_k}) \approx \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_k uu^\top) + \eta \mathbf{W}_k^{1/2} uu^\top \mathbf{W}_k^{1/2} \bullet \mathbf{A}_k . \end{aligned}$$

If the above inequality were true, then we could define $w_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{W}_k^{1/2} u$ which is a unit vector (because $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_k uu^\top) = 1$) and the gain $w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k = w_k w_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{A}_k$ would again be proportional to the change of this new potential function $\text{Tr}(e^{c_k\mathbf{I}+\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1}} uu^\top)$. This idea almost worked except that inequality (\star) is false due to the non-commutativity of matrices.⁹

Perhaps the most “immediate” idea to fix this issue is to use the randomness of uu^\top . Recall that $\mathbb{E}[uu^\top]$ can be made \mathbf{I} and therefore it “seems like” we have $\mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_k uu^\top)] = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_k)$ and the inequality will go through. Unfortunately, this idea fails for a fundamental reason: the normalization constant c_k depends on u , so \mathbf{W}_k is *not* independent from the randomness of u .¹⁰

Thinking Step 2. Since Gaussian vectors are rotationally invariant, we temporarily switch to the eigenbasis of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1}$ so \mathbf{W}_k is a diagonal matrix. We make an important observation:¹¹

$$c_k \text{ depends only on } |u_1|, \dots, |u_d|, \text{ but not on the } 2^d \text{ possible signs of } u_1, \dots, u_d.$$

For this reason, we can fix a diagonal matrix \mathbf{D} and consider all random uu^\top which *agrees* with \mathbf{D} on its diagonal,¹² All of such vectors u give the same normalization constant c_k , and it satisfies $\mathbb{E}[uu^\top | \mathbf{D}] = \mathbf{D}$. This implies that we can now study the conditional expected potential change

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{Tr}(e^{c_k\mathbf{I}+\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_k} uu^\top) - \text{Tr}(e^{c_k\mathbf{I}+\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1}} uu^\top) | \mathbf{D}] = \text{Tr}(e^{c_k\mathbf{I}+\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_k} \mathbf{D}) - \text{Tr}(e^{c_k\mathbf{I}+\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1}} \mathbf{D}) ,$$

or if we denote by $\mathbf{B} = c_k\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1}$, we want to study the difference $\text{Tr}(e^{\mathbf{B}+\eta\mathbf{A}_k} \mathbf{D}) - \text{Tr}(e^{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{D})$ only in the special case that \mathbf{D} and \mathbf{B} are *simultaneously diagonalizable*.

Thinking Step 3. A standard way to bound $\text{Tr}(e^{\mathbf{B}+\eta\mathbf{A}_k} \mathbf{D}) - \text{Tr}(e^{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{D})$ is to define $f(\eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}(e^{\mathbf{B}+\eta\mathbf{A}_k} \mathbf{D})$ and bound $f(\eta)$ by its Taylor series $f(0) + f'(0)\eta + \frac{1}{2}f''(0)\eta^2 + \dots$. The zero-order derivative $f(0)$ is $\text{Tr}(e^{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{D})$. The first-order derivative $f'(0) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_k e^{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{D}) = e^{\mathbf{B}/2} \mathbf{D} e^{\mathbf{B}/2} \bullet \mathbf{A}_k$ behaves exactly in the way we hope, and this strongly relies on the commutativity between \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{D} . Unfortunately, higher-order derivatives $f^{(k)}(0)$ benefit less and less from the commutativity between \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{D} due to the existence of terms such as $\mathbf{A}_k e^{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{D} e^{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{D}$. For this reason, we need to (1) truncate the Taylor series and (2) use different analytic tools. This motivates us to use the following regime that can be viewed as a “low-degree” version of MMWU:

A Quick Detour. In a recent result, the authors of [7] generalized MMWU to $\ell_{1-1/q}$ regularized strategies. For every $q \geq 2$, they define $\mathbf{X}_k = (c_k\mathbf{I} - \eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-q}$ where c_k is the unique constant such

⁹A analogy for this effect can be found in the inequality $\text{Tr}(e^{\mathbf{A}}) \leq \text{Tr}(e^{\mathbf{B}})$ for every $\mathbf{A} \preceq \mathbf{B}$. This inequality becomes false when multiplied with uu^\top and in general $e^{\mathbf{A}} \preceq e^{\mathbf{B}}$ is false.

¹⁰In fact, c_k can be made almost independent from u if we replace uu^\top with some $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top$ where \mathbf{Q} is a random $d \times m$ matrix for some very large m . That was the main idea behind MMWU-JL.

¹¹This is because, $\text{Tr}(e^{c_k\mathbf{I}-\eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1}} uu^\top) = \sum_{i=1}^d (|u_i|^2 / (c_k - \eta\lambda_i))$ where λ_i is the i -th eigenvalue of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1}$.

¹²That is, all random uu^\top such that $\|u_i\|_2^2 = \mathbf{D}_{i,i}$ for each $i \in [d]$. For simplicity we also denote this event as \mathbf{D} .

that $c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1} \succ 0$ and $\text{Tr} \mathbf{X}_k = 1$.¹³ This is a generalization of MMWU because when $q \approx \log d$, the matrix \mathbf{X}_k behaves nearly the same as \mathbf{W}_k ; in particular, it gives the same regret bound. The analysis behind this new strategy is to keep track of the potential change in $\text{Tr}((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-(q-1)})$, and then use the so-called Lieb-Thirring inequality (see Section 4) to replace the use of Golden-Thompson. (Note that c_k is chosen with respect to q but the potential is with respect to $q - 1$.)

Thinking Step 4. Let us now replace MMWU strategies in our Thinking Steps 1,2,3 with $\ell_{1-1/q}$ regularized strategies. Such strategies have two advantages: (1) they help us overcome the issue for higher-order terms in Thinking Step 3, and (2) matrix inversions are *more efficient* than matrix exponentials in terms of computation. We shall choose $q = \Theta(\log(dT))$ in the end.

Specifically, we prepare a random vector u and define the normalization constant c_k to be the unique one satisfying $\text{Tr}((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-q} u u^\top) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k u u^\top) = 1$. At iteration k , we let the player choose strategy $\mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} u$ which is a unit vector.

If one goes through all the math carefully (using Woodbury formula), this time we are entitled to upper bound the trace difference of the form $\text{Tr}((\mathbf{B} + \eta \mathbf{C})^{q-1} \mathbf{D}) - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}^{q-1} \mathbf{D})$ where \mathbf{D} is simultaneously diagonalizable with \mathbf{B} but not \mathbf{C} . Similar to Thinking Step 3, we can define $f(\eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}((\mathbf{B} + \eta \mathbf{C})^{q-1} \mathbf{D})$ and bound this polynomial $f(\eta)$ using its Taylor expansion at point 0. Commutativity between \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{D} helps us compute $f'(0) = (q-1) \text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}^{q-2} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{D})$ but again we cannot bound higher-derivatives directly. Fortunately, this time $f(\eta)$ is a degree $q-1$ polynomial so we can use Markov brothers' inequality to give an upper bound on its higher-order terms. This is the place we lose a few extra polylogarithmic factors in the total regret.

Thinking Step 5. Somehow necessarily, even the second-order derivative $f''(0)$ can depend on terms such as $1/D_{ii}$ where $D_{ii} = |u_i|^2$ is the i -th diagonal entry of \mathbf{D} . This quantity, over the Gaussian random choice of u_i , does not have a bounded mean. More generally, the inverse chi-squared distribution with degree t (recall Section 2) has a bounded mean only when $t \geq 3$. For this reason, instead of picking a single random vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we need pick three random vectors $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and replace all the occurrences of $u u^\top$ with $\frac{1}{3}(u_1 u_1^\top + u_2 u_2^\top + u_3 u_3^\top)$ in the previous thinking steps. As a result, each D_{ii} becomes a chi-squared distribution of degree 3 so the issue goes away. This is why we claimed in the introduction that

we can compress MMWU to dimension 3.

REMARK. By losing a polylog factor in regret, one can compress it further to dimension 2. This is because the mean of the inverse chi-squared distribution with degree 2, if truncated at some large value v , is only $\log(v)$. However, this “truncated mean” becomes $\Omega(\sqrt{v})$ for degree 1.

Thinking Step 6. Putting together previous steps, we obtain a FTCL strategy with total regret $O(\sqrt{T} \log^3(dT))$, which is worse than MMWU only by a factor $O(\log^{2.5}(dT))$. We call this method FTCL^{obl} and include its analysis in Section 5. However, FTCL^{obl} only works for an oblivious adversary (i.e., when $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_T$ are fixed a priori) and gives an expected regret. To turn it into a robust strategy against *adversarial* $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_T$, and to make the regret bound work with high confidence, we need to re-sample u_1, u_2, u_3 every iteration. We call this method FTCL^{adv} . A careful but standard analysis with Azuma inequality helps us reduce FTCL^{adv} to FTCL^{obl} . We state this result in Section 6.

Running Time. As long as q is an even integer, the computation of “ $(c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-1}$ applied to a vector” becomes the bottleneck of each iteration of FTCL^{obl} and FTCL^{adv} . However, as long

¹³The name of such strategies come from the following fact. Recall that MMWU naturally arises as the strategy in follow-the-regularized-leader when the regularizer is the matrix entropy. If that entropy function is replaced with a negative $\ell_{1-1/q}$ norm, the resulting strategy becomes the so-defined matrix \mathbf{X}_k . We encourage interested readers to see the introduction of [7] for more background information, but we shall make this present paper self-contained.

as $q \geq \Omega(\log(dT))$, we show that the condition number of the matrix $c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}$ is at most $\eta T = \Theta(T^{1/2})$. Using conjugate gradient, we can compute this inversion in time $\tilde{O}(T^{1/4})$ times $O(\text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}))$. This gives the FTCL (basic) running time in Table 1. As for the faster FTCL (opt) running time, one need to use more advanced optimization tools —namely, accelerated variance reduction— to perform inversion. We discuss the details in Section 7.

Compress MMWU to Dimension 1 in Stochastic Online Eigenvector. If the adversary is stochastic, we observe that Oja’s algorithm corresponds to a potential function $\text{Tr}((\mathbf{I} + \eta \mathbf{A}_k) \cdots (\mathbf{I} + \eta \mathbf{A}_1) uu^\top (\mathbf{I} + \eta \mathbf{A}_1) \cdots (\mathbf{I} + \eta \mathbf{A}_k))$. Because the matrices are drawn from a common distribution, this potential behaves similar to the matrix exponential but compressed to dimension 1, namely $\text{Tr}(e^{\eta(\mathbf{A}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{A}_k)} uu^\top)$. In fact, just using linearity of expectation carefully, one can both upper and lower bound this potential. We state this result in Section 8 (and it can be proved in one page!)

4 A New Trace Inequality

Prior work on MMWU and its extensions relies heavily on one of the following trace inequalities [7]:

$$\text{Golden-Thompson inequality : } \text{Tr}(e^{\mathbf{A} + \eta \mathbf{B}}) \leq \text{Tr}(e^{\mathbf{A}} e^{\eta \mathbf{B}})$$

$$\text{Lieb-Thirring inequality : } \text{Tr}((\mathbf{A} + \eta \mathbf{B})^k) \leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^{k/2} (\mathbf{I} + \eta \mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2})^k \mathbf{A}^{k/2}) .$$

Due to our compression framework in this paper, we need inequalities of type

$$\text{“ } \text{Tr}(e^{\mathbf{A} + \eta \mathbf{B}} \mathbf{D}) \leq \text{Tr}(e^{\eta \mathbf{B}} e^{\mathbf{A}/2} \mathbf{D} e^{\mathbf{A}/2}) \text{ ”}$$

$$\text{“ } \text{Tr}((\mathbf{A} + \eta \mathbf{B})^k \mathbf{D}) \leq \text{Tr}((\mathbf{I} + \eta \mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2})^k \mathbf{A}^{k/2} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A}^{k/2}) \text{ . ”} \quad (4.1)$$

which look almost like “generalizations” of Golden-Thompson and Lieb-Thirring (by setting $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{I}$). Unfortunately, such generalizations do not hold for an arbitrary \mathbf{D} . For instance, if the first “generalization” holds for every PSD matrix \mathbf{D} then it would imply “ $e^{\mathbf{A} + \eta \mathbf{B}} \preceq e^{\mathbf{A}/2} e^{\eta \mathbf{B}} e^{\mathbf{A}/2}$ ” which is a false inequality due to matrix non-commutativity.

In this paper, we show that if \mathbf{D} is *commutative* with \mathbf{A} , then the “generalization” (4.1) holds *for the zeroth and first order terms* with respect to η . As for the second and higher order terms, we can control it using Markov brothers’ inequality. (Proof in Appendix A.)

Lemma 4.1. *For every symmetric matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, every integer $k \geq 1$, every $\eta^* \geq 0$, and every $\eta \in [0, \eta^*/k^2]$, if \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{D} are commutative, then*

$$(\mathbf{A} + \eta \mathbf{B})^k \bullet \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}^k \bullet \mathbf{D} \leq k \eta \mathbf{B} \bullet \mathbf{A}^{k-1} \mathbf{D} + \left(\frac{\eta k^2}{\eta^*} \right)^2 \max_{\eta' \in [0, \eta^*]} \left\{ |(\mathbf{A} + \eta' \mathbf{B})^k \bullet \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}^k \bullet \mathbf{D}| \right\} .$$

5 Oblivious Online Eigenvector + Expected Regret

In this section we first focus on a simpler oblivious setting. $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_T$ are T PSD matrices chosen by the adversary *in advance*, and they do not depend on the player’s actions in the T iterations. We are interested in upper bounding the total *expected* regret

$$\lambda_{\max} \left(\sum_{k=1}^T \mathbf{A}_k \right) - \sum_{k=1}^T \mathbb{E}[w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k] ,$$

where the expectation is over player’s random choices $w_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Recall $\|w_k\|_2 = 1$. (In Section 6 we generalize this result to the full adversarial setting along with high-confidence regret.)

Our algorithm FTCL^{obl} is presented in Algorithm 1. This algorithm is parameterized by an even integer $q \geq 2$ and a learning rate $\eta > 0$. It initializes with a rank-3 Wishart random matrix \mathbf{U} . For

every $k \in [T + 1]$, we denote by $\mathbf{X}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-q}$ where

$$c_k > 0 \text{ is the unique constant s.t. } c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1} \succ 0 \text{ and } \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{U}) = 1 .$$

At iteration $k \in [T]$, the player plays a random vector among the three eigenvectors of $\mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2}$.

We prove the following theorem in this paper for the total regret of $\text{FTCL}^{\text{obl}}(T, q, \eta)$.

Theorem 1. *In the online eigenvector problem with an oblivious adversary, there exists absolute constant $C > 1$ such that if $q \geq 3 \log(2dT)$ and $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{11q^3}]$, then $\text{FTCL}^{\text{obl}}(T, q, \eta)$ satisfies*

$$\sum_{k=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \right] = \sum_{k=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{A}_k \bullet \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \right] \geq (1 - C \cdot \eta q^5 \log(dT)) \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T) - \frac{4}{\eta} .$$

Corollary 5.1. *Choosing $q = 3 \log(2dT)$ and $\eta = \Theta(\log^{-3}(dT) / \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T)})$, we have*

$$\sum_{k=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \right] \geq \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T) - O\left(\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T)} \log^3(dT)\right) , \quad (\lambda\text{-refined language})$$

or choosing the same q but $\eta = \Theta(\log^{-3}(dT) / \sqrt{T})$ we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \right] \geq \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T) - O\left(\sqrt{T} \log^3(dT)\right) . \quad (\text{general language})$$

As discussed in Section 3, our proof of Theorem 1 relies on a careful analysis on how the potential function $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U}) = \text{Tr}((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U})$ changes across iterations. We analyze this potential increase in two steps: in the first step we replace $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}$ with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k$, and in the second step we replace c_k with c_{k+1} . After appropriate telescoping, we can derive the result of Theorem 1.

We now discuss the details in the subsequent sections.

Algorithm 1 $\text{FTCL}^{\text{obl}}(T, q, \eta)$

- Input:** T , number of iterations; $q \geq 2$, an even integer, \diamond theory-predicted choice $q = \Theta(\log(dT))$
 η , the learning rate. \diamond theory-predicted choice $\eta = \log^{-3}(dT) / \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T)}$
- 1: Choose 3 vectors $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ where the $3d$ coordinates are i.i.d. drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.
 - 2: $\mathbf{U} \leftarrow \frac{1}{3}(u_1 u_1^\top + u_2 u_2^\top + u_3 u_3^\top)$.
 - 3: **for** $k \leftarrow 1$ **to** T **do**
 - 4: $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1} \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{A}_i$.
 - 5: Denote by $\mathbf{X}_k \leftarrow (c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-q}$ where c_k is the unique constant satisfying that $c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1} \succ 0$ and $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{U}) = 1$.
 - 6: Compute $\mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} = \sum_{j=1}^3 p_j \cdot y_j y_j^\top$ where y_1, y_2, y_3 are orthogonal unit vectors in \mathbb{R}^d .
 \diamond This is an eigendecomposition and it satisfies $p_1, p_2, p_3 \geq 0$ and $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = 1$.
 - 7: Choose $w_k \leftarrow y_j$ with probability p_j .
 - 8: Play strategy w_k and receive matrix \mathbf{A}_k .
 - 9: **end for**
-

5.1

Well-Conditioning Events

Due to concentration reasons, the potential increase could only be “reasonably” bounded for well-conditioned matrices \mathbf{U} . We now make this definition formal. Given some parameter $\delta > 0$ that we shall later choose to be $1/T^3$, we introduce the following event:

Definition 5.2. For every $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, T\}$, define event

$$\mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{U}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \nu_1^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_1 \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \forall i \in [d]: \nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i \leq 2 \log \frac{ed}{\delta} \right\}$$

where ν_1, \dots, ν_d are the eigenvectors of Σ_k with non-increasing eigenvalues. Let $\mathcal{E}_{< j}(\mathbf{U}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigwedge_{k=0}^{j-1} \mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{U})$.

Intuitively, event $\mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{U})$ makes sure that the matrix \mathbf{U} is “well-conditioned” in the eigenbasis of Σ_k : (1) it has a not-so-small first coordinate $\nu_1^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_1$, and (2) each coordinate $\nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i$ is no more than logarithmic. Using tail bounds for Gaussian distributions, it is not hard to show that this event occurs with probability at least $1 - \delta$ (see Appendix B):

Lemma 5.3. For every $k = 0, 1, \dots, T$, we have $\Pr_{\mathbf{U}}[\mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{U})] \geq 1 - \delta$.

Under event $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{U})$, the barrier c_k and the matrix \mathbf{X}_k satisfy the following nice properties. (Their proofs are simple manipulations of matrix algebra and included in Appendix B.)

Proposition 5.4. If $q \geq \max\{\log \frac{2}{\delta}, \log(3d \log \frac{ed}{\delta})\}$, then

$$\text{event } \mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{U}) \text{ implies } \frac{1}{e} \leq c_k - \eta \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{k-1}) \leq e .$$

In particular, $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{U})$ implies (recall $\mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top$)

$$(a): c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_{k-1} \succeq \frac{1}{e} \mathbf{I} \quad (b): \mathbf{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U}) \leq c_k \leq \eta \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{k-1}) + e \quad (c): \eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k \preceq e \eta \mathbf{I} .$$

5.2

First Potential Increase

We next lemma bounds the potential increase if we replace Σ_{k-1} with Σ_k :

Lemma 5.5. There exists constant $C > 1$ such that, if $q \geq \max\{\log \frac{2}{\delta}, \log(3d \log \frac{ed}{\delta})\}$ and $\eta \leq \frac{1}{3q^3}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{< k}(\mathbf{U})} - \mathbf{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_{k-1})^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{< k}(\mathbf{U})} \right] \\ & \leq (q-1) \eta (1 + C \cdot \eta q^5 \log(d/\delta)) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{A}_k \bullet \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \right] + (\eta T + e) T \delta . \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 5.5 is the main technical contribution of this paper, and deviates the most from classical analysis of MMWU. It makes use of our trace inequality in Section 4, and is the only place in our analysis that relies on $\mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{U}) \geq 3$. We include the details in Appendix C.

Remark 5.6. We have slightly abused notations here. In principle, the quantity $\mathbf{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right)$ can be unbounded if $c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_k$ is not invertible. However, as we shall see in the proof of Lemma 5.5, this necessarily implies $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{< k}(\mathbf{U})} = 0$ because of Proposition 5.4. Therefore, we define $\mathbf{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{< k}(\mathbf{U})}$ to be zero if this happens.

5.3

Second Potential Increase

The following lemma bounds the potential increase if we replace c_k with c_{k+1} . Its proof is included in Appendix D and is reasonably straightforward.

Lemma 5.7. For all $q \geq 2$ and $\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Tr} \left((c_{k+1} \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{< (k+1)}(\mathbf{U})} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{< k}(\mathbf{U})} \right] \\ & \leq -(q-1) (\mathbb{E}[c_{k+1}] - \mathbb{E}[c_k]) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove in Appendix E that Theorem 1 is a direct consequence of our two potential increase lemmas above.

6 Adversarial Online Eigenvector + Regret in High-Confidence

In this section, we switch to the more challenging adversarial setting: in each iteration k , the adversary picks \mathbf{A}_k after seeing the player's strategies w_1, \dots, w_{k-1} . In other words, \mathbf{A}_k may depend on the randomness used in generating w_1, \dots, w_{k-1} as well.

In such a case, denoting by \mathcal{D} the same rank-3 Wishart distribution we generate \mathbf{U} from in FTCL^{obl} , we consider a variant of FTCL^{obl} where a new random \mathbf{U}_k is generated from \mathcal{D} per iteration. In other words, instead of choosing $\mathbf{U} \sim \mathcal{D}$ only once at the beginning, we choose $\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_T$ i.i.d. from \mathcal{D} . Then, the normalization constant c_k is defined to satisfy $\text{Tr}((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-q} \mathbf{U}_k) = 1$. We call this algorithm FTCL^{adv} and present it in the appendix for completeness' sake.

Our next theorem shows that, algorithm FTCL^{adv} gives the same regret bound as Theorem 1 even in the adversarial setting; in addition, it elevates the regret bound to a high-confidence level.

Theorem 2. *In the online eigenvector problem with an adversarial adversary, there exists constant $C > 1$ such that for every $p \in (0, 1)$, $q \geq 3 \log(2dT)$ and $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{11q^3}]$, our $\text{FTCL}^{\text{adv}}(T, q, \eta)$ satisfies*

$$w.p. \geq 1 - p: \quad \sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \geq \left(1 - C \cdot \eta(q^5 \log(dT) + \log(1/p))\right) \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T) - \frac{5}{\eta}.$$

Corollary 6.1. *Let $q = 3 \log(2dT)$ and $\eta = \Theta\left(\frac{\log^3(dT) + \log^{1/2}(1/p)}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T)}}\right)^{-1}$, then with prob. $\geq 1 - p$:*

$$\sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \geq \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T) - \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T)} \cdot O\left(\log^3(dT) + \sqrt{\log(1/p)}\right), \quad (\lambda\text{-refined language})$$

or choosing the same q but $\eta = \Theta\left(\frac{\log^3(dT) + \log^{1/2}(1/p)}{\sqrt{T}}\right)^{-1}$ we have with prob. $\geq 1 - p$:

$$\sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \geq \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T) - \sqrt{T} \cdot O\left(\log^3(dT) + \sqrt{\log(1/p)}\right). \quad (\text{general language})$$

Proof of Theorem 2 relies on a reduction to the oblivious setting, and is included in Appendix F.

7 Efficient Implementation

Recall that our regret theorems were based on the assumption that in each iteration k , the three vectors $v_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} u_j = (c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-q/2} u_j$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$ can be computed exactly. If this is the case, then one can compute the 3×3 matrix $(u_i^\top \mathbf{X}_k u_j)_{i,j \in [3]}$ explicitly, and then we can obtain its rank-3 eigendecomposition $\mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} = \sum_{j=1}^3 p_j \cdot y_j y_j^\top$ in $O(d)$ time.

To make such computations efficient, we need to deal with three important issues:

- We need to allow v_1, v_2, v_3 to be computed approximately.
- We need to find the unique normalization constant c_k efficiently.
- We need to compute $(c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-1} b$ efficiently for any vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

At a high level, issue (a) is not a big deal because if v'_j satisfies $\|v_j - v'_j\|_2 \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}/\text{poly}(d, T)$ and we use v'_j instead of v_j , then the final regret is affected by less than $\tilde{\varepsilon}$; issue (b) can be dealt as long as we perform a careful binary search to find c_k , similar to prior work [7]; issue (c) can be done as long as we have a good control on the condition number of the matrix $(c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})$.

We discuss the details in Appendix G, and state below our final running-time theorem:

Theorem 3. *As long as $q \geq 3 \log(2dT/p)$, with probability at least $1 - p$, each of the T iterations of FTCL^{obl} and FTCL^{adv} can be implemented to run in time*

$$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\eta \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_T) + 1} \cdot \text{nnz}(\Sigma_T)) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\Sigma_T) + \sqrt{\eta T} \cdot \text{nnz}(\Sigma_T)^{3/4} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})^{1/4}) .$$

Corollary 7.1. *Let $q = 3 \log(2dT/p)$ and $\eta = \Theta(\log^{-3}(dT/p)/\sqrt{T})$, then with prob. $\geq 1 - p$, each iteration runs in time $\tilde{O}(T^{1/4} \cdot \text{nnz}(\Sigma_T))$ and $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\Sigma_T) + T^{1/4} \cdot \text{nnz}(\Sigma_T)^{3/4} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})^{1/4})$.*

Alternatively, if we choose $\eta = \Theta(\log^{-3}(dT/p)/\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_T)})$, then each iteration runs in time $\tilde{O}((\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_T) + 1)^{1/4} \cdot \text{nnz}(\Sigma_T))$ and $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\Sigma_T) + (T/\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_T)})^{1/2} \cdot \text{nnz}(\Sigma_T)^{3/4} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})^{1/4})$.

8 Stochastic Online Eigenvector

Consider the simplest setting when the matrices $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_T$ are generated i.i.d. from a common distribution whose expectation equals \mathbf{B} . This is known as the stochastic online eigenvector problem, and we wish to minimize the regret $\sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k - T \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B})$.¹⁴

In this setting, we revisit Oja's algorithm: beginning with a random vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ where each u_i is i.i.d. drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, at each iteration k , play w_k to be $(\mathbf{I} + \eta \mathbf{A}_{k-1}) \cdots (\mathbf{I} + \eta \mathbf{A}_1)u$ after normalization. It is clear that w_k can be computed from w_{k-1} with an additional time $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})$.

We include in Appendix H a one-paged proof of the following theorem:

Theorem 4. *There exists $C > 1$ such that, for every $p \in (0, 1)$, if $\eta \in [0, \sqrt{p/(60T \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}))}]$ in Oja's algorithm, we have with probability at least $1 - p$:*

$$\sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \geq (1 - 2\eta)T \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}) - C \cdot \frac{\log(d + \log(1/p))}{\eta} .$$

Corollary 8.1. *Choosing $\eta = \sqrt{p}/\sqrt{60T \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B})}$, we have with prob. $\geq 1 - p$:*

$$\sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \geq T \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}) - O\left(\frac{\sqrt{T \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B})}}{\sqrt{p}} \cdot \log(d + \log(1/p))\right) . \quad (\lambda\text{-refined language})$$

Choosing $\eta = \sqrt{p}/\sqrt{60T}$, we have with prob. $\geq 1 - p$:

$$\sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \geq T \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}) - O\left(\frac{\sqrt{T}}{\sqrt{p}} \cdot \log(d + \log(1/p))\right) . \quad (\text{general language})$$

The proof of Theorem 4 uses a potential function analysis which is similar to the matrix exponential potential used in MMWU, but compressed to dimension 1.

Acknowledgement

We thank Yin Tat Lee for discussing the problem regarding how to compress MMWU to constant dimension in 2015. We thank Elad Hazan for suggesting us the problem and for several insightful discussions. We thank Dan Garber and Tengyu Ma for clarifying some results of prior work [16].

¹⁴In principle, one can also ask to minimize regret where $T \cdot \mathbf{B}$ is replaced with $\mathbf{A}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{A}_T$. However, due to simple concentration results, there is no big difference between the two different notions. [16]

APPENDIX

A Proof of Lemma 4.1

Lemma 4.1. *For every symmetric matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, every integer $k \geq 1$, every $\eta^* \geq 0$, and every $\eta \in [0, \eta^*/k^2]$, if \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{D} are commutative, then*

$$(\mathbf{A} + \eta\mathbf{B})^k \bullet \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}^k \bullet \mathbf{D} \leq k\eta\mathbf{B} \bullet \mathbf{A}^{k-1}\mathbf{D} + \left(\frac{\eta k^2}{\eta^*}\right)^2 \max_{\eta' \in [0, \eta^*]} \left\{ |(\mathbf{A} + \eta'\mathbf{B})^k \bullet \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}^k \bullet \mathbf{D}| \right\} .$$

Proof. Consider a degree- k polynomial

$$f(\eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{A} + \eta\mathbf{B})^k \bullet \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}^k \bullet \mathbf{D} = \sum_{i=1}^k \eta^i \sum_{\substack{j_0, \dots, j_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ j_0 + \dots + j_i = k-i}} \mathbf{A}^{j_0} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{j_1} \mathbf{B} \dots \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{j_i} \bullet \mathbf{D}$$

Its first order derivative

$$f'(0) = \sum_{\substack{j_0, j_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ j_0 + j_1 = k-1}} \mathbf{A}^{j_0} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{j_1} \bullet \mathbf{D} = \sum_{\substack{j_0, j_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ j_0 + j_1 = k-1}} \mathbf{A}^{(k-1)/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{(k-1)/2} \bullet \mathbf{D} = k\mathbf{B} \bullet \mathbf{A}^{(k-1)/2} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A}^{(k-1)/2} .$$

Above, the first equality is due to the commutativity between \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{D} . Letting $f^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\eta' \in [0, \eta^*]} |f(\eta')|$, we can apply Markov brothers' inequality (2.1) and obtain for every $i \geq 2$,

$$|f^{(i)}(0)| \leq \left(\frac{2}{\eta^*}\right)^i \cdot \frac{k^2(k^2-1) \cdots (k^2 - (i-1)^2)}{1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdots (2i-1)} \max_{\eta' \in [0, \eta^*]} |f(\eta')| \leq \frac{k^{2i}}{(\eta^*)^i} f^* .$$

Therefore, as long as $\eta \leq \frac{\eta^*}{k^2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\eta) &= f(0) + f'(0) \cdot \eta + \sum_{i=2}^k \eta^i \cdot \frac{f^{(i)}(0)}{i!} \leq f(0) + f'(0) \cdot \eta + \sum_{i=2}^k \left(\frac{\eta k^2}{\eta^*}\right)^i \cdot \frac{f^*}{i!} \\ &\leq f(0) + f'(0) \cdot \eta + \left(\frac{\eta k^2}{\eta^*}\right)^2 f^* . \end{aligned}$$

Since $f(0) = 0$ we complete the proof. \square

B Proof for Section 5.1

B.1 Proof of Lemma 5.3

Lemma 5.3. *For every $k = 0, 1, \dots, T$, we have $\Pr_{\mathbf{U}}[\mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{U})] \geq 1 - \delta$.*

Proof. Let ν_1, \dots, ν_d be the eigenvectors of Σ_k with non-increasing eigenvalues. Because Gaussian random vectors are rotationally invariant, we can view each u_1, u_2, u_3 as drawn in the basis of ν_1, \dots, ν_d , so each $\nu_i^\top u_j$ is drawn i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ for every $i \in [d], j \in [3]$.

Since $\nu_1^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_1 = \frac{1}{3}((\nu_1^\top u_1)^2 + (\nu_1^\top u_2)^2 + (\nu_1^\top u_3)^2)$, we immediately know that $3\nu_1^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_1$ is distributed according to chi-square distribution $\chi^2(3)$. The probability density function of $\chi^2(3)$ is $f(x) = \frac{e^{-x/2} \sqrt{x}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ (for $x \in [0, \infty)$) and therefore

$$\Pr \left[\nu_1^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_1 \leq \delta/2 \right] \leq \int_0^{3\delta/2} \frac{e^{-x/2} \sqrt{x}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dx \leq \int_0^{3\delta/2} \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dx = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{3}{\pi}} \delta^{3/2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2} .$$

As for the second condition, for every $t \geq 0$ and $i \in [d]$,

$$\Pr \left[\nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i \geq t/3 \right] \leq \int_t^\infty \frac{e^{-x/2} \sqrt{x}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dx = 1 - \text{Erf} \left(\frac{\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{2}} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} e^{-t/2} \sqrt{t} \leq e^{-t/2} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} e^{-t/2} \sqrt{t} ,$$

where $\text{Erf}(x)$ is the Gauss error function. Picking $t = 4 \log \frac{ed}{\delta}$, we have

$$e^{-t/2} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} e^{-t/2} \sqrt{t} \leq \frac{\delta^2}{e^2 d^2} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{\delta^2}{e^2 d^2} \cdot 2 \sqrt{\frac{ed}{\delta}} < \frac{\delta}{2d} .$$

Therefore, we have $\Pr [\forall i \in [d]: \nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i \geq 2 \log \frac{ed}{\delta}] \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ and we conclude by union bound $\Pr_{\mathbf{U}}[\overline{\mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{U})}] \leq \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} = \delta$. \square

B.2 Proof of Proposition 5.4

Proposition 5.4. *If $q \geq \max\{\log \frac{2}{\delta}, \log(3d \log \frac{ed}{\delta})\}$, then*

$$\text{event } \mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{U}) \text{ implies } \frac{1}{e} \leq c_k - \eta \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) \leq e . \quad (\text{B.1})$$

In particular, $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{U})$ implies (recall $\mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top$)

$$(a): c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1} \succeq \frac{1}{e} \mathbf{I} \quad (b): \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U}) \leq c_k \leq \eta \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) + e \quad (c): \eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k \preceq e \eta \mathbf{I} .$$

Proof. Let ν_1, \dots, ν_d be the eigenvectors of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}$ with non-increasing eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$. Then, $\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i}{(c_k - \eta \lambda_i)^q} = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{U}) = 1$. However, event $\mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{U})$ tells us $\nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i \geq \frac{\delta}{2}$ which implies $(c_k - \eta \lambda_1)^q \geq \frac{\delta}{2}$. Under our choice of q , we have $c_k - \eta \lambda_1 \geq \frac{1}{e}$ which proves the first inequality in (B.1).

On the other hand, letting $c = \eta \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) + e$, our choice of q implies

$$\text{Tr}((c \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-q} \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i}{(c - \eta \lambda_i)^q} \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{2 \log(ed/\delta)}{e^q} \leq 1 .$$

Since the left hand side of the above inequality is an decreasing function in c , and since $\text{Tr}((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-q} \mathbf{U}) = 1$, we must have $c_k \leq c$ which proves the second inequality in (B.1).

Finally, (a) is a simple corollary of the first inequality of (B.1). As for (b), it simply comes from the following upper bound

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i}{(c_k - \eta \lambda_i)^{q-1}} \leq c_k \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i}{(c_k - \eta \lambda_i)^q} = c_k \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{U}) = c_k .$$

As for (c), it follows from $\mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{P}_k \preceq \mathbf{I}$ so $\eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k \preceq \eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top (e \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{P}_k \preceq e \eta \mathbf{I}$. \square

C Proof for Section 5.2

Lemma 5.5. *There is constant $C > 1$ such that, if $q \geq \max\{\log \frac{2}{\delta}, \log(3d \log \frac{ed}{\delta})\}$ and $\eta \leq \frac{1}{11q^3}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<k}(\mathbf{U})} - \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<k}(\mathbf{U})} \right] \\ & \leq (q-1) \eta (1 + C \cdot \eta q^5 \log(d/\delta)) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{A}_k \bullet \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \right] + (\eta T + e) T \delta . \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let ν_1, \dots, ν_d be the eigenvectors of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}$ with non-increasing eigenvalues. In this proof, let us assume without loss of generality that all vectors and matrices are written in this eigenbasis (so $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}$ and \mathbf{X}_k are both diagonal matrix).

Since Gaussian random vectors are rotationally invariant, we assume that u_1, u_2, u_3 are generated according to the following procedure: first, the absolute values of their $3d$ coordinates u_1, u_2, u_3 are determined; then, their signs are determined.

Denoting by $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{U}_{11}, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{dd}\}$ the diagonal part of \mathbf{U} , we immediately notice that \mathbf{D} is determined *completely* at the first step of the above procedure. This has two important consequences that we shall rely crucially in the proof:

- fixing the randomness of \mathbf{D} , it satisfies $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{U}}[\mathbf{U}|\mathbf{D}] = \mathbf{D}$;¹⁵
- c_k is completely determined by \mathbf{D} .¹⁶

In addition, since the event $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{U})$ only depends on the diagonal entry of \mathbf{U} , slightly abusing notation, we also use $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{D})$ to denote this event on diagonal matrices \mathbf{D} . We also use D_i to represent the i -th diagonal entry of \mathbf{D} . Our proof now has three parts:

Part I: Potential Increase for \mathbf{D} . For every PSD matrix \mathbf{D} , denoting by $\mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr}\left(\left(c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k\right)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{D}\right) - \text{Tr}\left(\left(c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}\right)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{D}\right) \\ \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} & \text{Tr}\left(\left(\mathbf{X}_k^{-1/q} - \eta \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top\right)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{D}\right) - \text{Tr}\left(\mathbf{X}_k^{1-1/q} \mathbf{D}\right) \\ \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{=} & \text{Tr}\left(\left(\mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} + \eta \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k (\mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k)^{-1} \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q}\right)^{q-1} \mathbf{D}\right) - \text{Tr}\left(\mathbf{X}_k^{1-1/q} \mathbf{D}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Above, $\textcircled{1}$ follows from the definition of \mathbf{X}_k and $\textcircled{2}$ uses the Woodbury formula for matrix inversion.

Now, unlike the classical proof for MMWU, our matrix \mathbf{D} here is *not* identity so we cannot rely on the Lieb-Thirring trace inequality to bound the right hand side of (C.1) like it was used in [7]. We can instead consult our new trace inequality Lemma 4.1 because \mathbf{D} and \mathbf{X}_k are both diagonal matrices so they are commutative. Recall that Lemma 4.1 requires a crude upper bound on the first trace quantity on the term “ $|(\mathbf{A} + \eta' \mathbf{B})^k \bullet \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}^k \bullet \mathbf{D}|$ ”, and we shall provide this crude upper bound in Lemma C.1.

Formally, choosing $\eta^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{11q}$, we that for every \mathbf{D} satisfying $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{D})$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr}\left(\left(c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k\right)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{D}\right) - \text{Tr}\left(\left(c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}\right)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{D}\right) \\ \stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{\leq} & (q-1) \eta \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k (\mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k)^{-1} \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \bullet \mathbf{X}_k^{(q-2)/q} \mathbf{D} \\ & + \left(\frac{\eta(q-1)^2}{\eta^*}\right)^2 \cdot 4(q-1) \eta^* \|\mathbf{D}\|_2 \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k \\ \stackrel{\textcircled{4}}{\leq} & \frac{(q-1)\eta}{1-e\eta} \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{D} + O(\eta^2 q^6) \cdot \|\mathbf{D}\|_2 \cdot \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k \\ \stackrel{\textcircled{5}}{\leq} & (q-1) \eta \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{D} + O(\eta^2 q^6 \log(d/\delta)) \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Above, $\textcircled{3}$ follows from Lemma 4.1 (with $\eta \leq \eta^*/q^2$) together with Lemma C.1 (for $\eta = \eta^*$); $\textcircled{4}$ follows from $\mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k \succeq (1 - e\eta) \mathbf{I}$ (see Proposition 5.4), the fact that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{C}) \leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C})$ for $\mathbf{A} \preceq \mathbf{B}$ and \mathbf{C} symmetric, and the choice of η^* ; $\textcircled{5}$ follows from our assumption $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6}$ as well as $\|\mathbf{D}\|_2 \leq 2 \log \frac{2d}{\delta}$ which comes from the definition of event $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{D})$.

Part II: Potential Increase for All \mathbf{U} That Agrees With \mathbf{D} . For every fixed \mathbf{D} that satisfies

¹⁵More specifically, since the off-diagonal entries of \mathbf{U} can still randomly flip signs in the second step of the random procedure, their expectations are all equal to zero.

¹⁶This is because c_k is defined as the constant satisfying $1 = \text{Tr}((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) \mathbf{U}) = \text{Tr}((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) \mathbf{D})$.

$\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{D})$, taking expectation over all matrices \mathbf{U} that agrees with \mathbf{D} :¹⁷

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<(k-1)}(\mathbf{U})} - \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<(k-1)}(\mathbf{U})} \middle| \mathbf{D} \right] \\
& \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) - \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot (1 - \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<(k-1)}(\mathbf{U})}) \middle| \mathbf{D} \right] \\
& \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{D} \right) - \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{D} \right) + \mathbb{E} \left[(\eta T + e) \cdot (1 - \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<(k-1)}(\mathbf{U})}) \middle| \mathbf{D} \right] \\
& = \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{D} \right) - \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{D} \right) + (\eta T + e) \cdot \Pr \left[\overline{\mathcal{E}_{<(k-1)}(\mathbf{U})} \middle| \mathbf{D} \right] \\
& \stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{\leq} (q-1) \eta \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{D} + O(\eta^2 q^6 \log(d/\delta)) \cdot \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k + (\eta T + e) T \delta \\
& \stackrel{\textcircled{4}}{=} (q-1) \eta \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{U} \middle| \mathbf{D} \right] + O(\eta^2 q^6 \log(d/\delta)) \cdot \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k + (\eta T + e) T \delta. \tag{C.3}
\end{aligned}$$

Above, $\textcircled{1}$ is because indicator functions are never greater than 1; $\textcircled{2}$ uses $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U}) \leq \eta \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) + e \leq \eta T + e$ which follows from Proposition 5.4; $\textcircled{3}$ follows from (C.2) as well as Lemma 5.3; and $\textcircled{4}$ follows from the observation $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U}}[\mathbf{U} | \mathbf{D}] = \mathbf{D}$ together with the fact that \mathbf{X}_k only depends on \mathbf{D} .

Part III: Potential Increase for All \mathbf{U} . We now claim for *all* possible diagonal \mathbf{D} , it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<k}(\mathbf{U})} - \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<k}(\mathbf{U})} \middle| \mathbf{D} \right] \\
& \leq (q-1) \eta \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{U} \middle| \mathbf{D} \right] + O(\eta^2 q^6 \log(d/\delta)) \cdot \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k + (\eta T + e) T \delta. \tag{C.4}
\end{aligned}$$

This is because, if \mathbf{D} satisfies $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{D})$ then (C.4) comes from (C.3); or if \mathbf{D} does not satisfy $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{D})$ then the left hand side of (C.4) is zero (see Remark 5.6) but the right hand side is *non-negative*.

Taking expectation with respect to the randomness of \mathbf{D} in (C.4), and using Lemma C.2 which upper bounds $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D}}[\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k]$ by $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D}}[\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{D}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U}}[\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \bullet \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{U}]$ we get the desired inequality. (Note that $\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2}$.) \square

C.1 Missing Auxiliary Lemmas

In this subsection we prove the following two auxiliary lemmas. The first one shall be used to bound the higher-order terms in Lemma 4.1.

Lemma C.1. *For every $q \geq 2$ and every $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{4e(q-1)}]$, event $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{D})$ implies that*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \text{Tr} \left(\left(\mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} + \eta \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k (\mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k)^{-1} \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \right)^{q-1} \mathbf{D} \right) - \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \mathbf{D} \right) \right| \\
& \leq 4\eta(q-1) \|\mathbf{D}\|_2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top).
\end{aligned}$$

The second one upper bounds the expectation of the right hand side of Lemma C.1. We highlight that the proof of Lemma C.2 is the only place in this paper that we have assumed $k(\mathbf{U}) = 3$.

Lemma C.2. *We have $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D}}[\text{Tr}(\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k)] \leq 9 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D}}[\text{Tr}(\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{D})]$.*

Note that we can assume without loss of generality that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}$, \mathbf{X}_k and \mathbf{D} are all diagonal matrices, which has been argued in the proof of Lemma 5.5. Therefore, all the proofs in this subsection will be given under this assumption.

¹⁷Note when \mathbf{D} satisfies $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{D})$ we have $c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1} \succeq \frac{1}{e} \mathbf{I}$ according to Proposition 5.4. This implies, as long as $\eta \leq e^{-1}$, it satisfies $c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k \succ 0$ so $\text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) > 0$.

To prove Lemma C.1 we need the following lemma:

Lemma C.3 (Monotonicity of Diagonal entries). *Let $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be two diagonal positive definite matrices,¹⁸ let $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be PSD, then for every $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $q \|\mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2}\|_2 < 1$:*

$$0 \leq \text{Tr}((\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q \mathbf{D}) - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^q \mathbf{D}) \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{D}\|_2}{1 - q \|\mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2}\|_2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^{q-1} \mathbf{B}) .$$

Proof of Lemma C.3. For every $i \in [D]$, let \mathbf{P} be a matrix with all zero entries except $\mathbf{P}_{i,i} = 1$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} [(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q]_{i,i} &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{P}^q (\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q \mathbf{P}^q) \geq \text{Tr}((\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})\mathbf{P})^q) \\ &= ([\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}]_{i,i})^q \geq [\mathbf{A}]_{i,i}^q = [\mathbf{A}^q]_{i,i} . \end{aligned}$$

Where the first inequality is due to the Lieb-Thirring inequality, and the last equality is because \mathbf{A} is diagonal. Since \mathbf{D} is a diagonal PSD matrix, we can conclude that¹⁹

$$\text{Tr}((\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q \mathbf{D}) - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^q \mathbf{D}) = \sum_{i=1}^d [\mathbf{D}]_{i,i} ([(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q - \mathbf{A}^q]_{i,i}) \geq 0 .$$

and

$$\text{Tr}((\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q \mathbf{D}) - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^q \mathbf{D}) \leq \max_{i \in [d]} [\mathbf{D}]_{i,i} \sum_{i=1}^d [(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q - \mathbf{A}^q]_{i,i} = \|\mathbf{D}\|_2 \text{Tr}((\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q - \mathbf{A}^q) . \quad (\text{C.5})$$

We focus on the term $(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q$. We can re-write it as $(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q = (\mathbf{A}^{1/2} (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2}) \mathbf{A}^{1/2})^q$. Then by Lieb-Thirring again, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}((\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q) &\leq \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^{q/2} \left(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \right)^q \mathbf{A}^{q/2} \right) \\ &\leq \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^{q/2} \left(\mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{1 - q \|\mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2}\|_2} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \right) \mathbf{A}^{q/2} \right) \\ &\leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^q) + \frac{q}{1 - q \|\mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2}\|_2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^{q-1} \mathbf{B}) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Where the second inequality uses $(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{X})^q \preceq \mathbf{I} + \frac{q}{1 - q \|\mathbf{X}\|_2} \mathbf{X}$ for every PSD matrix \mathbf{X} with $q \|\mathbf{X}\|_2 < 1$. Putting together (C.5) and (C.6), we obtain:

$$\text{Tr}((\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^q \mathbf{D}) - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^q \mathbf{D}) \leq \frac{q \|\mathbf{D}\|_2}{1 - q \|\mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2}\|_2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^{q-1} \mathbf{B}) . \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma C.1. Under event $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}(\mathbf{D})$, we know $\mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k \succeq (1 - e\eta) \mathbf{I}$ (see Proposition 5.4) and thus

$$0 \preceq \eta \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2q} \mathbf{P}_k (\mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2q} \mathbf{P}_k)^{-1} \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \preceq \frac{e\eta}{1 - e\eta} \mathbf{I} .$$

We now apply Lemma C.3 with $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q}$, $\mathbf{B} = \eta \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k (\mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k)^{-1} \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q}$, and $q = q - 1$. We can do so because \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{D} are both diagonal and $\frac{(q-1)e\eta}{1 - e\eta} < 1$ under our assumption of η . The

¹⁸In fact, we have only required them to be simultaneously diagonalizable.

¹⁹The authors would like to thank Elliott Lieb who has helped us obtain the inequality of the next line.

conclusion of Lemma C.3 tells us that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \text{Tr} \left(\left(\mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} + \eta \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k (\mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \mathbf{P}_k)^{-1} \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/q} \right)^{q-1} \mathbf{D} \right) - \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \mathbf{D} \right) \right| \\
& \leq \frac{q-1}{1 - \frac{(q-1)e\eta}{1-e\eta}} \|\mathbf{D}\|_2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^{q-2} \mathbf{B}) \leq \left(2(q-1) \|\mathbf{D}\|_2 \right) \left(\frac{\eta}{1-e\eta} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top) \right) \\
& \leq 4\eta(q-1) \|\mathbf{D}\|_2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top) .
\end{aligned}$$

Above, the second and third inequalities have respectively used $\frac{(q-1)e\eta}{1-e\eta} < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{1-e\eta} \leq 2$, which are both true by our assumption on η . \square

Proof of Lemma C.2. Let $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d \geq 0$ be the eigenvalues of Σ_{k-1} and ν_1, \dots, ν_d be the corresponding eigenvectors. Let D_1, \dots, D_d be the diagonals of \mathbf{D} . Recall that $\Sigma_{k-1}, \mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{D}$ are all diagonal matrices. Define function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$f(r_1, \dots, r_d) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{[\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top]_{i,i} \cdot r_i}{(c_k - \lambda_i)^q} \quad (\text{recall that } c_k \text{ depends on } (D_1, \dots, D_d))$$

We shall prove that for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ that shall be chosen later, it satisfies for every $i \in [d]$,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\gamma, \dots, \gamma, D_i, \dots, D_d)] \geq \mathbb{E}[f(\gamma, \dots, \gamma, D_{i+1}, \dots, D_d)]$$

where recall that both expectations are only over the randomness of D_1, \dots, D_d . Let $D_{-i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (D_1, \dots, D_i, D_{i+2}, \dots, D_d)$. Then, it is sufficient to prove that for every fixed possibility of D_{-i} , the following inequality holds:

$$\mathbb{E}_{D_i}[f(\gamma, \dots, \gamma, D_i, \dots, D_d) \mid D_{-i}] \geq \mathbb{E}_{D_i}[f(\gamma, \dots, \gamma, D_{i+1}, \dots, D_d) \mid D_{-i}] .$$

Therefore, in the remaining proofs, we shall consider D_i as the only random variable, and thus c_k only depends on D_i . For a fixed value $s \geq 1$ that we shall choose later, we can let c be the (unique) value of c_k when $D_i = s\gamma$.

Letting $g(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{x}{(c_k - \lambda_i)^q}$, we make three quick observations:

1. $g(\gamma) = \frac{\gamma}{(c_k - \lambda_i)^q}$ is a monotone decreasing function of D_i .

This is so because c_k is a monotone increasing function of D_i .

2. $g(D_i) = \frac{D_i}{(c_k - \lambda_i)^q}$ is a monotone decreasing function of D_i .

This is because $g(D_i) = 1 - \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{D_j}{(c_k - \lambda_j)^q} = 1$ but c_k is a monotone increasing function of D_i .

3. When $D_i \leq s\gamma$, we have $g(\gamma) \leq \frac{s\gamma}{D_i} \frac{\gamma}{(c - \lambda_i)^q}$.

This is because $g(\gamma) = \frac{\gamma}{D_i} \left(1 - \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{D_j}{(c_k - \lambda_j)^q} \right) \leq \frac{\gamma}{D_i} \left(1 - \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{D_j}{(c - \lambda_j)^q} \right) = \frac{\gamma}{D_i} \frac{s\gamma}{(c - \lambda_j)^q}$, where the first inequality is because $c_k \leq c$ when $D_i \leq s\gamma$ (by the monotone increasing of c_k with respect to D_i), and the second equality is according to the definition of c .

Combining the above three observations, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[g(D_i)] & \geq \Pr[D_i \geq s\gamma] \mathbb{E}[g(D_i) \mid D_i \geq s\gamma] \geq \Pr[D_i \geq s\gamma] \frac{s\gamma}{(c - \lambda_i)^q} \\
\mathbb{E}[g(\gamma)] & \leq \Pr[D_i \geq s\gamma] \mathbb{E}[g(\gamma) \mid D_i \geq s\gamma] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{D_i} \right] \frac{s\gamma^2}{(c - \lambda_i)^q} \\
& \leq \frac{\gamma}{(c - \lambda_i)^q} + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{D_i} \right] \frac{s\gamma^2}{(c - \lambda_i)^q} \leq \frac{s\gamma}{(c - \lambda_i)^q} \left(\frac{1}{s} + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\gamma}{D_i} \right] \right) .
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that each $D_i = \frac{1}{3}(\langle \nu_i, u_1 \rangle^2 + \langle \nu_i, u_2 \rangle^2 + \langle \nu_i, u_3 \rangle^2)$ where u_1, u_2, u_3 are three normal Gaussian random vectors. Therefore, each $3D_i$ has a chi-square distribution of degree 3, which implies $\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{D_i}] = 3$ and $\Pr[D_i \geq \frac{1}{3}] > \frac{2}{3}$. In sum, if we take $\gamma = \frac{1}{9}$ and $s = 3$, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{D_i}[g(D_i)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{D_i}[g(\gamma)] .$$

Finally, this implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{D_i}[f(\gamma, \dots, \gamma, D_i, \dots, D_d) - f(\gamma, \dots, \gamma, D_{i+1}, \dots, D_d) \mid D_{-i}] = [\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top]_{i,i} \mathbb{E}_{D_i}[g(D_i) - g(\gamma) \mid D_{-i}] \geq 0 .$$

so we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D}}[f(\gamma, \dots, \gamma, D_i, \dots, D_d)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D}}[f(\gamma, \dots, \gamma, D_{i+1}, \dots, D_d)] .$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{D})] = \mathbb{E}[f(D_1, \dots, D_d)] \geq \mathbb{E}[f(\gamma, \dots, \gamma)] = \gamma \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{P}_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k)] . \quad \square$$

D Proof for Section 5.3

Lemma 5.7. For all $q \geq 2$ and $\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr} \left((c_{k+1} \mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<(k+1)}(\mathbf{U})} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{< k}(\mathbf{U})} \right] \\ & \leq -(q-1)(\mathbb{E}[c_{k+1}] - \mathbb{E}[c_k]) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall that $c_{k+1} \geq c_k$ because all matrices \mathbf{A}_k are PSD. Denoting by ν_1, \dots, ν_d the eigenvectors of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_k$ with non-increasing eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d$,²⁰ we have for every \mathbf{U} ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} \left((c_{k+1} \mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) - \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i}{(c_{k+1} - \eta \lambda_i)^{q-1}} - \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i}{(c_k - \eta \lambda_i)^{q-1}} \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} -(q-1)(c_{k+1} - c_k) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\nu_i^\top \mathbf{U} \nu_i}{(c_{k+1} - \eta \lambda_i)^q} \\ & = -(q-1)(c_{k+1} - c_k) \cdot \text{Tr} \left((c_{k+1} \mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)^{-q} \mathbf{U} \right) = -(q-1)(c_{k+1} - c_k) \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_{k+1} \mathbf{U}) \\ & = -(q-1)(c_{k+1} - c_k) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Above, $\textcircled{1}$ is derived from inequality $\frac{1}{(c+x)^{q-1}} - \frac{1}{x^{q-1}} \leq -\frac{(q-1)c}{(c+x)^q}$ (for every $c \geq 0, x > 0$) which follows from the convexity of function $f(x) = \frac{1}{x^{q-1}}$.

Next, we observe that for every \mathbf{U} that does *not* satisfy $\mathcal{E}_{< k}(\mathbf{U})$, the very right hand side of (D.1) is still non-negative. Therefore, we conclude that for all \mathbf{U} ,

$$\text{Tr} \left((c_{k+1} \mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{< k}(\mathbf{U})} - \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{< k}(\mathbf{U})} \leq -(q-1)(c_{k+1} - c_k) .$$

Finally, since $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<(k+1)}(\mathbf{U})} \leq \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{< k}(\mathbf{U})}$ and $\text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \geq 0$, we have

$$\text{Tr} \left((c_{k+1} \mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<(k+1)}(\mathbf{U})} - \text{Tr} \left((c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)^{-(q-1)} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{< k}(\mathbf{U})} \leq -(q-1)(c_{k+1} - c_k)$$

and taking expectation we finish the proof of Lemma 5.7. \square

²⁰This is different from the proof of Lemma 5.5 where we defined them to be eigenvectors of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1}$.

E Proof of Theorem 1: Oblivious Online Eigenvector

Proof of Theorem 1. Combining Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Tr} \left(\mathbf{X}_{k+1}^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<k+1}(\mathbf{U})} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Tr} \left(\mathbf{X}_k^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<k}(\mathbf{U})} \right] \\ & \leq -(q-1)(\mathbb{E}[c_{k+1}] - \mathbb{E}[c_k]) + (q-1)\eta(1 + O(\eta q^5 \log(d/\delta))) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{A}_k \bullet \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \right] + (\eta T + e)T\delta . \end{aligned}$$

Telescoping it for all $k = 1, \dots, T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Tr} \left(\mathbf{X}_{T+1}^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<T+1}(\mathbf{U})} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Tr} \left(\mathbf{X}_1^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<1}(\mathbf{U})} \right] \tag{E.1} \\ & \leq -(q-1)(\mathbb{E}[c_{T+1}] - \mathbb{E}[c_1]) + (q-1)\eta(1 + O(\eta q^5 \log(d/\delta))) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^T \mathbf{A}_k \bullet \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \right] + (\eta T + e)T^2\delta . \end{aligned}$$

We make four quick observations:

- Regardless of the randomness of \mathbf{U} , we have $\mathbf{Tr} \left(\mathbf{X}_{T+1}^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<T+1}(\mathbf{U})} \geq 0$.
- Regardless of the randomness of \mathbf{U} , we have $c_{T+1} \geq \eta \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_T)$.
- We have $\mathbb{E}[c_1] \leq e$. To derive that, we use $\frac{1}{c_1} \mathbf{Tr} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_1 \mathbf{U}) = 1$ which implies $c_1 = (\mathbf{Tr} \mathbf{U})^{1/q}$. Notice that $\mathbf{Tr} \mathbf{U} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i \in [d], j \in [3]} (u_{j,i})^2$ so $3 \mathbf{Tr} \mathbf{U}$ is distributed according to chi-squared distribution $\chi^2(3d)$ whose PDF is $p(x) = \frac{2^{-\frac{3d}{2}} e^{-\frac{x}{2}} x^{\frac{3d}{2}-1}}{\Gamma(3d/2)}$. We thus have

$$\mathbb{E}[c_1] = \int_0^\infty x^{1/q} p(x) dx = \frac{2^{1/q} \Gamma \left(\frac{3d}{2} + \frac{1}{q} \right)}{\Gamma \left(\frac{3d}{2} \right)} \leq 2^{1/q} \cdot \left(\frac{3d}{2} \right)^{1/q} = (3d)^{1/q} \leq e .$$

Above, the first inequality uses $\frac{\Gamma(x+a)}{\Gamma(x)} \leq x^a$ for $a \in (0, 1)$ and $x > 0$ (cf. Wendell [32]), and the second inequality uses our assumption on q .

- $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Tr} \left(\mathbf{X}_1^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{<1}(\mathbf{U})} \right] \leq e$. This is because $\mathbf{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_1^{1-1/q} \mathbf{U}) = \frac{1}{c_1^{q-1}} \mathbf{Tr} \mathbf{U} = c_1$ and $\mathbb{E}[c_1] \leq e$.

Substituting the four observations above into the telescoping sum (E.1), we have

$$(q-1)\eta \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_T) \leq e + (q-1)e + (q-1)\eta(1 + O(\eta q^5 \log(d/\delta))) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^T \mathbf{A}_k \bullet \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \right] + (\eta T + e)T^2\delta .$$

Using the inequality $(\eta T + e)T^2\delta \leq (1+e)T^3\delta$, we conclude that if we choose $\delta = \frac{1}{1+e}T^{-3}$, then

$$(q-1)\eta \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_T) \leq (q-1)\eta(1 + O(\eta q^5 \log(dT))) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^T \mathbf{A}_k \bullet \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \right] + 4(q-1) .$$

Dividing both sides by $(q-1)\eta$ we arrive at the desired inequality. \square

F Proof of Theorem 2: Adversarial Online Eigenvector

Proof of Theorem 2. Before beginning our proof, let us emphasize that in this adversarial setting,

- \mathbf{A}_k and $\mathbf{\Sigma}_k$ can depend on the randomness of $\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{k-1}$.
- \mathbf{X}_k and c_k depend on the randomness of \mathbf{U}_k and $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1}$ (and thus also on $\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{k-2}$).

Algorithm 2 FTCL^{adv}(T, q, η)

Input: T , number of iterations;

$q \geq 2$, an even integer,

η , the learning rate.

\diamond theory-predicted choice $q = \Theta(\log(dT))$

\diamond theory-predicted choice $\eta = \log^{-3}(dT)/\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_T)}$

1: **for** $k \leftarrow 1$ **to** T **do**

2: Choose 3 vectors $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ where the $3d$ coordinates are i.i.d. drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

3: $\mathbf{U}_k \leftarrow \frac{1}{3}(u_1 u_1^\top + u_2 u_2^\top + u_3 u_3^\top)$.

4: $\Sigma_{k-1} \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{A}_i$.

5: Denote by $\mathbf{X}_k \leftarrow (c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_{k-1})^{-q}$ where c_k is the unique constant satisfying that
 $c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_{k-1} \succ 0$ and $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{U}_k) = 1$.

6: Compute $\mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} = \sum_{j=1}^3 p_j \cdot y_j y_j^\top$ where y_1, y_2, y_3 are orthogonal unit vectors in \mathbb{R}^d .
 \diamond This is an eigendecomposition and it satisfies $p_1, p_2, p_3 \geq 0$ and $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = 1$.

7: Choose $w_k \leftarrow y_j$ with probability p_j .

8: Play strategy w_k and receive matrix \mathbf{A}_k .

9: **end for**

Consider for analysis purpose only another random matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ drawn from distribution \mathcal{D} , independent of the randomness of $\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_T$. Define \tilde{c}_k to be the unique constant satisfying $\tilde{c}_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_{k-1} \succ 0$ and $\text{Tr}((\tilde{c}_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_{k-1})^{-q} \mathbf{U}) = 1$, and define $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k = (\tilde{c}_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \Sigma_{k-1})^{-q}$.

Now, if we fix the randomness of $\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{k-1}$, the matrices Σ_{k-1} and \mathbf{A}_k become fixed. The fact that \mathbf{U}_k and $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ are both drawn from the same distribution \mathcal{D} (and the fact that \mathbf{X}_k and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k$ are computed from \mathbf{U}_k and $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ in the same way) implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U}_k} \left[\mathbf{A}_k \bullet \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mid \mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{k-1} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{U}}} \left[\mathbf{A}_k \bullet \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k^{1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{U}} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k^{1/2} \mid \mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{k-1} \right] \quad (\text{F.1})$$

Now, consider random variables $Z_k = w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k$. We have that Z_k is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable for \mathcal{F}_k generated by $\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_k, w_1, \dots, w_k$. According to the martingale concentration Lemma F.1, we have

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{k=1}^T Z_k \leq (1 - \mu) \sum_{k=1}^T \mathbb{E}[Z_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] - \frac{\log \frac{1}{p}}{\mu} \right] \leq p .$$

At the same time, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] &= \mathbb{E}_{w_k, \mathbf{U}_k} \left[\mathbf{A}_k \bullet w_k w_k^\top \mid \mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{k-1} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U}_k} \left[\mathbf{A}_k \bullet \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} \mid \mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{k-1} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{U}}} \left[\mathbf{A}_k \bullet \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k^{1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{U}} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k^{1/2} \mid \mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{k-1} \right] , \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from (F.1). In sum, with probability at least $1 - p$ (over the randomness of $\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_T, w_1, \dots, w_T$), we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \geq (1 - \mu) \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{U}}} \left[\sum_{k=1}^T \mathbf{A}_k \bullet \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k^{1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{U}} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k^{1/2} \mid \mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{T-1} \right] - \frac{\log \frac{1}{p}}{\mu} .$$

Applying Theorem 1 we have (more specifically, fixing each possible sequence $\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_T$, we have a fixed sequence of $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_T$ and can apply Theorem 1):

$$\sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \geq (1 - \mu) (1 - O(\eta q^5 \log(dT))) \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_T) - \frac{4}{\eta} - \frac{\log \frac{1}{p}}{\mu} .$$

Choosing $\mu = \eta \cdot \log(1/p)$, we finish the proof of Theorem 2. \square

F.1 A Concentration Inequality for Martingales

We show the following (simple) martingale concentration lemma that we believe is classical but have not found anywhere else.

Lemma F.1 (Concentration). *Let $\{Z_t\}_{t=1}^T$ be a random process with respect to a filter $\{0, \Omega\} = \mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{F}_T$ and each $Z_t \in [0, 1]$ is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable. For every $p, \mu \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{t=1}^T Z_t \leq (1 - \mu) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[Z_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - \frac{\log \frac{1}{p}}{\mu} \right] \leq p .$$

We emphasize here that $\mathbb{E}[Z_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$ is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable and thus not a constant.

Proof of Lemma F.1. Like in classical concentration proofs, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left[\sum_{t=1}^T Z_t \leq (1 - \mu) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[Z_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - \frac{\log \frac{1}{p}}{\mu} \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[\sum_{t=1}^T ((1 - \mu) \mathbb{E}[Z_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - Z_t) \geq \frac{\log \frac{1}{p}}{\mu} \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[\exp \left\{ \mu \left(\sum_{t=1}^T ((1 - \mu) \mathbb{E}[Z_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - Z_t) \right) \right\} \geq \frac{1}{p} \right] \\ &\leq p \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \mu \left(\sum_{t=1}^T ((1 - \mu) \mathbb{E}[Z_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - Z_t) \right) \right\} \right] . \end{aligned} \tag{F.2}$$

Denote by $Y_t = \mu(1 - \mu) \mathbb{E}[Z_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - \mu Z_t$, we know that each $Y_t \in [-1, 1]$ is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T Y_t \right\} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T Y_t \right\} | \mathcal{F}_{T-1} \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} Y_t \right\} \mathbb{E} [e^{Y_T} | \mathcal{F}_{T-1}] \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} Y_t \right\} \mathbb{E} [1 + Y_T + Y_T^2 | \mathcal{F}_{T-1}] \right] . \end{aligned}$$

Now, we focus on the term $Y_T + Y_T^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_T + Y_T^2 &\leq \mu(1 - \mu) \mathbb{E}[Z_T | \mathcal{F}_{T-1}] - \mu Z_T + \mu^2(1 - \mu)^2 \mathbb{E}[Z_T | \mathcal{F}_{T-1}]^2 + \mu^2 Z_T^2 \\ &\leq \mu(1 - \mu) \mathbb{E}[Z_T | \mathcal{F}_{T-1}] - \mu Z_T + \mu^2(\mathbb{E}[Z_T | \mathcal{F}_{T-1}] + \mu Z_T) . \end{aligned}$$

(The first inequality has used $(a - b)^2 \leq a^2 + b^2$ when $a, b \geq 0$, and the second has used $Z_t \in [0, 1]$.)

Taking the conditional expectation, we obtain $\mathbb{E}[Y_T + Y_T^2 | \mathcal{F}_{T-1}] \leq 0$ and this implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T Y_t \right\} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} Y_t \right\} \right] \leq \dots \leq e^0 = 1 .$$

Plugging this into (F.2) completes the proof of Lemma F.1. \square

G Proof of Theorem 3: Implementation Details

Resolution to Issue (a). We first point out that the final regret blows up by an additive value $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ as long as the eigendecomposition $\sum_{j=1}^3 p_j \cdot y_j y_j^\top$ is computed to satisfy²¹

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^3 \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} u_j u_j^\top \mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} - \sum_{j=1}^3 p_j \cdot y_j y_j^\top \right\|_2 \leq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{\text{poly}(d, T)} .$$

Moreover, this can be done in time $O(d)$ as long as we can compute the three vectors $\{\mathbf{X}_k^{1/2} u_j\}_{j \in [3]}$ to an additive $\tilde{\varepsilon}/\text{poly}(d, T)$ error in Euclidean norm. This can be done by applying $(c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-1}$ a number $q/2$ times to vector u_j , each again to an error $\tilde{\varepsilon}/\text{poly}(d, T)$. In sum, we can repeatedly apply Lemma G.1 and the final running time only logarithmically depends on $\tilde{\varepsilon}/\text{poly}(d, T)$.

Resolution to Issue (c). We choose $\delta = p/T$ and revisit the event $\mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{U})$ defined in Def. 5.2. According to Lemma 5.3 and union bound, it satisfies with probability at least $1 - p$, all the T events $\mathcal{E}_0(\mathbf{U}_1), \dots, \mathcal{E}_{T-1}(\mathbf{U}_T)$ are satisfied. If we apply Proposition 5.4, we immediately have that

$$q \geq 3 \log(2dT/p) \implies \forall k \in [T]: \quad (\eta \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) + e) \mathbf{I} \succeq c_k \mathbf{I} \succeq c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1} \succeq \frac{1}{e} \mathbf{I} . \quad (\text{G.1})$$

This implies, throughout the algorithm, whenever we want to compute $(c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-1}$, the matrix under inversion has a bounded condition number. We have the following lemma which relies on classical results from convex optimization:

Lemma G.1. *Given any $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the computation of $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\|a - (c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-1} b\|_2 \leq \varepsilon \|b\|_2$ can be done in running time*

- $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\eta \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) + 1} \cdot \text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) \cdot \log \varepsilon^{-1})$ if conjugate gradient or accelerated gradient descent is used;
- $\tilde{O}((\text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) + \sqrt{\eta k} \cdot \max_{i \in [k-1]} \{\text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{3/4} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}_i)^{1/4}\}) \log \varepsilon^{-1})$ if accelerated SVRG is used.

Proof. This inverse operation is the same as minimizing a convex function $f(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} x^\top (c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) x - b^\top x$. The condition number of Hessian matrix $\nabla^2 f(x)$ is at most $O(\eta \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) + 1)$ according to (G.1), so one can apply conjugate gradient [31] or Nesterov’s accelerated gradient descent [24] to minimize this objective.

As for the SVRG type of result, one can write $f(x) = \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} f_i(x)$ where $f_i(x) = x^\top (c_k \mathbf{I} - \eta(k-1) \mathbf{A}_i) x - b^\top x$. Each computation of $\nabla f(x)$ requires time $O(\text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}))$ and that of $\nabla f_i(x)$ requires time $O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}_i))$. Since $\|\nabla^2 f_i(x)\|_2 \leq \eta k$ for each i , one can apply the SVRG method [8, 29] to minimize $f(x)$ which gives running time $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) + (\eta k)^2 \max_{i \in [k-1]} \{\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}_i)\})$. Then, using the Catalyst/APPA acceleration scheme [14, 23], the above running time can be improved to $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1}) + \sqrt{\eta k} \cdot \max_{i \in [k-1]} \{\text{nnz}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{3/4} \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}_i)^{1/4}\})$. \square

Resolution to Issue (b). In each iteration, we need to compute some constant c_k such that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X}^{1/2}) = 1$. This can be done via a “binary search” procedure which was used widely for shift-and-invert based methods [15]:

1. Begin with $c = \eta k + e$ which is a safe upper bound on c_k according to (G.1).

²¹We refrain from doing this precisely here because because MMWU analysis is generally “robust against noise”. The authors of [7] have shown that the potential $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}_k^{1-1/q})$ is robust against noise and a completely analogous (but lengthy) proof of theirs applies to this paper.

2. Repeatedly compute some value $\tilde{\sigma}$ which is a 9/10 approximation of $\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c - \eta\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1})$. (This requires $O(1)$ iterations of power method applied to $(c\mathbf{I} - \eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-1}$ [15].)
3. If $\tilde{\sigma} \leq \frac{1}{e} \cdot \frac{9}{10}$ (which implies $\sigma \leq \frac{1}{e}$), we end the procedure; otherwise we update $c \leftarrow c - \tilde{\sigma}/2$ and go to Step 2.

It is a simple exercise (with details given in [15]) to show that when the procedure ends, it satisfies $\frac{1}{2e} \leq c - \eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1} \leq \frac{1}{e}$ so c is a lower bound on c_k . At this point, it suffices to perform a binary search between $[c, \eta k + e]$ to find c_k . Note that, according to resolution to issue (a), it suffices to compute c_k to an additive error of $\tilde{\varepsilon}/\text{poly}(d, T)$.

In sum, the above binary search procedure requires only a logarithmic number of oracle calls to $(c\mathbf{I} - \eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1})^{-1}$, and each time we do so it satisfies $c \leq \eta k + e$ and $(\eta k + e)\mathbf{I} \succeq c\mathbf{I} - \eta\mathbf{\Sigma}_{k-1} \succeq \frac{1}{2e}\mathbf{I}$. For this reason, the same computational complexity in Lemma G.1 applies.

The three resolutions above, combined together, imply that the running time statements in Theorem 3 hold.

H Proof of Theorem 4: Stochastic Online Eigenvector

Proof of Theorem 4. Define $\Phi_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_k) \cdots (\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_1) u u^\top (\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_1) \cdots (\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_k)$ and $\Psi_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_k) \cdots (\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_T) \nu_1 \nu_1^\top (\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_T) \cdots (\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_k)$. Let ν_1 and λ_1 respectively denote the largest eigenvector and eigenvalue of \mathbf{B} . We first make three simple calculations:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\Phi_T) &= \text{Tr}((\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_T)\Phi_{T-1}(\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_T)) = \text{Tr}(\Phi_{T-1}) + 2\eta\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_T\Phi_{T-1}) + \eta^2\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_T\Phi_{T-1}\mathbf{A}_T) \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \text{Tr}(\Phi_{T-1}) \cdot (1 + (2\eta + \eta^2)\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_T w_T w_T^\top)) \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} \text{Tr}(\Phi_{T-1}) \cdot e^{(2\eta + \eta^2)\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_T w_T w_T^\top)} \\ &\leq \dots \leq \|u\|_2^2 \cdot e^{(2\eta + \eta^2)\sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\nu_1^\top \Phi_T \nu_1] &= \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\nu_1 \nu_1^\top (\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_T)\Phi_{T-1}(\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_T))] = \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\nu_1 \nu_1^\top (\mathbf{I} + 2\eta\mathbf{A}_T)\Phi_{T-1}) + \eta^2 \nu_1^\top \mathbf{A}_T \Phi_{T-1} \mathbf{A}_T \nu_1] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\nu_1 \nu_1^\top (\mathbf{I} + 2\eta\mathbf{B})\Phi_{T-1})] = (1 + 2\eta\lambda_1) \mathbb{E}[\nu_1^\top \Phi_{T-1} \nu_1] \stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{\geq} e^{2\eta\lambda_1 - 2\eta^2\lambda_1^2} \mathbb{E}[\nu_1^\top \Phi_{T-1} \nu_1] \\ &\geq \dots \stackrel{\textcircled{4}}{\geq} e^{(2\eta\lambda_1 - 2\eta^2\lambda_1^2)T} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\nu_1^\top \Phi_T \nu_1)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\Psi_1^2)] = \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}((\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_1)^2 \Psi_2 (\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_1)^2 \Psi_2)] \stackrel{\textcircled{5}}{\leq} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}((\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_1)^4 \Psi_2^2)] \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{6}}{\leq} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}((\mathbf{I} + (4\eta + 11\eta^2)\mathbf{A}_1)\Psi_2^2)] = \text{Tr}((\mathbf{I} + (4\eta + 11\eta^2)\mathbf{B}) \mathbb{E}[\Psi_2^2]) \leq e^{4\eta\lambda_1 + 11\eta^2\lambda_1} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\Psi_2^2)] \\ &\leq \dots \leq e^{(4\eta\lambda_1 + 11\eta^2\lambda_1)T} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.3})$$

Above, $\textcircled{1}$ uses $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_T\Phi_{T-1}\mathbf{A}_T) \leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_T\Phi_{T-1})$ as well as $w_k w_k^\top = \Phi_{k-1}/\text{Tr}(\Phi_{k-1})$, $\textcircled{2}$ uses $1 + x \leq e^x$, $\textcircled{3}$ uses $1 + 2x \geq e^{2x - 2x^2}$ for $x \in [0, 1]$, $\textcircled{4}$ uses $\mathbb{E}[\nu_1^\top \Phi_0 \nu_1] = 1$, $\textcircled{5}$ uses the Lieb-Thirring inequality $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}) \leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{B}^2)$,²² $\textcircled{6}$ uses $(\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{A}_1)^4 \leq \mathbf{I} + (4\eta + 11\eta^2)\mathbf{A}_1$.

Now, we can combine (H.2) and (H.3) and apply Chebyshev's inequality: for every $p \in (0, 1)$

$$\Pr \left[\nu_1^\top \Phi_T \nu_1 \leq e^{(2\eta\lambda_1 - 2\eta^2\lambda_1^2)T} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \sqrt{e^{(4\eta\lambda_1 + 11\eta^2\lambda_1)T} - (e^{(2\eta\lambda_1 - 2\eta^2\lambda_1^2)T})^2} \right] \leq p .$$

In other words, as long as $\lambda_1\eta^2T \leq p/60$, we have with probability at least $1 - p$,

$$\text{Tr}(\Phi_T) \geq \nu_1^\top \Phi_T \nu_1 \geq e^{(2\eta\lambda_1 - 2\eta^2\lambda_1^2)T} \cdot (1 - p^{-1/2} \sqrt{e^{15\eta^2\lambda_1 T} - 1}) \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{(2\eta\lambda_1 - 2\eta^2\lambda_1^2)T} . \quad (\text{H.4})$$

²²In fact, we do not need the full power of Lieb-Thirring here because one of the two matrices is rank-1.

At the same time, using tail bound for chi-squared distribution, it is easy to derive that with probability at least $1 - p$ we have $\|u\|_2^2 \leq d + O(\sqrt{d \log(1/p)}) \leq O(d + \log(1/p))$.²³ Combining this with (H.1) and (H.4) we have

$$(2\eta + \eta^2) \sum_{k=1}^T w_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k w_k \geq 2\eta T \lambda_1 - 2\eta^2 \lambda_1^2 T - O(\log(d + \log(1/p))) ,$$

which after dividing both sides by $2\eta + \eta^2$ finishes the proof of Theorem 4. \square

I A Simple Lower Bound for the λ -Refined Language

We sketch the proof that for the stochastic online eigenvector problem, for every $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, a PSD matrix \mathbf{B} satisfying $\mathbf{B} \preceq \lambda \mathbf{I}$, and a distribution \mathcal{D} of (even rank-1) matrices with spectral norm at most 1 and expectation equal to \mathbf{B} , such that for every learning algorithm **Learner**, the total regret must be at least $C \cdot \sqrt{\lambda T}$.

Such a lower bound naturally translates to the harder adversarial or oblivious settings. We prove this lower bound by reducing the problem to an information-theoretic lower bound that has appeared in our separate paper [6].

The lower bound in [6] states that, for every $1 \geq \lambda \geq \lambda_2 \geq 0$, there exists a PSD matrix \mathbf{B} with the largest two eigenvalues being λ and λ_2 , and a distribution \mathcal{D} of rank-1 matrices with spectral norm at most 1 and expectation equal to \mathbf{B} . Furthermore, for any algorithm **Alg** that takes T samples from \mathcal{D} and outputs a unit vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it must satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}[1 - \langle v, \nu_1 \rangle^2] \geq \Omega\left(\frac{\lambda}{(\lambda - \lambda_2)^2 T}\right) \quad \text{for every } T \geq \Omega(\lambda/(\lambda - \lambda_2)^2) ,$$

where ν_1 is the first eigenvector of \mathbf{B} , and the expectation is over the randomness of **Alg** and the T samples from \mathcal{D} . After rewriting, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[v^\top \mathbf{B} v] \leq \mathbb{E}[\lambda \langle v, \nu_1 \rangle^2 + \lambda_2 (1 - \langle v, \nu_1 \rangle^2)] = \mathbb{E}[\lambda - (\lambda - \lambda_2)(1 - \langle v, \nu_1 \rangle^2)] \leq \lambda - \Omega\left(\frac{\lambda}{(\lambda - \lambda_2) T}\right) .$$

If we choose λ_2 such that $T = \Theta(\lambda/(\lambda - \lambda_2)^2)$, then the above inequality becomes

$$\mathbb{E}[v^\top \mathbf{B} v] \leq \lambda - \Omega(\sqrt{\lambda/T}) .$$

Finally, for any algorithm **Learner** for the stochastic online eigenvector problem, suppose **Learner** takes T samples $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_T$ from \mathcal{D} and outputs unit vectors v_1, \dots, v_T , we can define a corresponding algorithm **Alg** that outputs $v = v_k$ each with probability $1/T$. In this way, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^T v_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k v_k\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^T v_k^\top \mathbf{B} v_k\right] = T \mathbb{E}[v^\top \mathbf{B} v] \leq \lambda T - \Omega(\sqrt{\lambda T}) .$$

In other words, the total regret of **Learner** must be at least $\Omega(\sqrt{\lambda T})$.

References

- [1] Jacob Abernethy, Chansoo Lee, Abhinav Sinha, and Ambuj Tewari. Online linear optimization via smoothing. In *COLT*, pages 807–823, 2014.

²³Chi-square distribution satisfies $\Pr[\|u\|_2^2 \geq (1 + \alpha) \cdot d] \leq ((1 + \alpha) \cdot e^{-\alpha})^{d/2}$. Choosing $\alpha = \Theta(d^{-1/2} \log^{1/2}(1/p))$ makes this probability p .

- [2] Jacob Abernethy, Chansoo Lee, and Ambuj Tewari. Spectral smoothing via random matrix perturbations. *ArXiv e-prints*, abs/1507.03032, 2015.
- [3] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yin Tat Lee, and Lorenzo Orecchia. Using optimization to obtain a width-independent, parallel, simpler, and faster positive SDP solver. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '16, 2016.
- [4] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Yuanzhi Li. Doubly Accelerated Methods for Faster CCA and Generalized Eigendecomposition. *ArXiv e-prints*, abs/1607.06017, July 2016.
- [5] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Yuanzhi Li. Even Faster SVD Decomposition Yet Without Agonizing Pain. In *NIPS*, 2016.
- [6] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Yuanzhi Li. First Efficient Convergence for Streaming k-PCA: a Global, Gap-Free, and Near-Optimal Rate. *ArXiv e-prints*, abs/1607.07837, July 2016.
- [7] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Zhenyu Liao, and Lorenzo Orecchia. Spectral Sparsification and Regret Minimization Beyond Multiplicative Updates. In *Proceedings of the 47th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '15, 2015.
- [8] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Yang Yuan. Improved SVRG for Non-Strongly-Convex or Sum-of-Non-Convex Objectives. In *ICML*, 2016.
- [9] Sanjeev Arora, Elad Hazan, and Satyen Kale. The Multiplicative Weights Update Method: a Meta-Algorithm and Applications. *Theory of Computing*, 8:121–164, 2012.
- [10] Sanjeev Arora and Satyen Kale. A combinatorial, primal-dual approach to semidefinite programs. In *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing - STOC '07*, page 227, New York, New York, USA, 2007. ACM Press.
- [11] Christos Boutsidis, Dan Garber, Zohar Karnin, and Edo Liberty. Online principal components analysis. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 887–901. SIAM, 2015.
- [12] Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi and Gabor Lugosi. *Prediction, Learning, and Games*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [13] Cynthia Dwork, Kunal Talwar, Abhradeep Thakurta, and Li Zhang. Analyze gauss: optimal bounds for privacy-preserving principal component analysis. In *STOC*, pages 11–20. ACM, 2014.
- [14] Roy Frostig, Rong Ge, Sham M. Kakade, and Aaron Sidford. Un-regularizing: approximate proximal point and faster stochastic algorithms for empirical risk minimization. In *ICML*, volume 37, pages 1–28, 2015.
- [15] Dan Garber and Elad Hazan. Fast and simple PCA via convex optimization. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2015.
- [16] Dan Garber, Elad Hazan, and Tengyu Ma. Online learning of eigenvectors. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-15)*, pages 560–568, 2015.
- [17] Moritz Hardt and Eric Price. The noisy power method: A meta algorithm with applications. In *NIPS*, pages 2861–2869, 2014.
- [18] Elad Hazan. private communication, 2016.
- [19] Rahul Jain, Zhengfeng Ji, Sarvagya Upadhyay, and John Watrous. QIP = PSPACE. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 58(6):30, 2011.
- [20] Zohar Karnin and Edo Liberty. Online pca with spectral bounds. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 505–509, 2015.
- [21] Wojciech Kotłowski and Manfred K. Warmuth. Pca with gaussian perturbations. *ArXiv e-prints*, abs/1506.04855, 2015.
- [22] Yin Tat Lee and He Sun. Constructing linear-sized spectral sparsification in almost-linear time. In *FOCS*, pages 250–269. IEEE, 2015.
- [23] Hongzhou Lin, Julien Mairal, and Zaid Harchaoui. A Universal Catalyst for First-Order Optimization.

- In *NIPS*, 2015.
- [24] Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory Lectures on Convex Programming Volume: A Basic course*, volume I. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004.
 - [25] Jiazhong Nie, Wojciech Kotłowski, and Manfred K Warmuth. Online pca with optimal regrets. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 98–112. Springer, 2013.
 - [26] Lorenzo Orecchia. *Fast Approximation Algorithms for Graph Partitioning using Spectral and Semidefinite-Programming Techniques*. PhD thesis, EECS Department, University of California, Berkeley, May 2011.
 - [27] Lorenzo Orecchia, Sushant Sachdeva, and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. Approximating the exponential, the lanczos method and an $\tilde{O}(m)$ -time spectral algorithm for balanced separator. In *STOC '12*. ACM Press, November 2012.
 - [28] Richard Peng and Kanat Tangwongsan. Faster and simpler width-independent parallel algorithms for positive semidefinite programming. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM symposium on Parallelism in algorithms and architectures - SPAA '12*, page 101, New York, New York, USA, January 2012. ACM Press.
 - [29] Shai Shalev-Shwartz. SDCA without Duality, Regularization, and Individual Convexity. In *ICML*, 2016.
 - [30] Ohad Shamir. Convergence of stochastic gradient descent for pca. In *ICML*, 2016.
 - [31] Jonathan Richard Shewchuk. An introduction to the conjugate gradient method without the agonizing pain, 1994.
 - [32] J. G. Wendel. Note on the gamma function. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 55(9):563–564, 1948.