

Derivation of Coupled PCA and SVD Learning Rules from a Newton Zero-Finding Framework

Ralf Möller

Computer Engineering Group, Faculty of Technology
Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany

`www.ti.uni-bielefeld.de`

In coupled learning rules for PCA (principal component analysis) and SVD (singular value decomposition), the update of the estimates of eigenvectors or singular vectors is influenced by the estimates of eigenvalues or singular values, respectively. This coupled update mitigates the speed-stability problem since the update equations converge from all directions with approximately the same speed. A method to derive coupled learning rules from information criteria by Newton *optimization* is known. However, these information criteria have to be designed, offer no explanatory value, and can only impose Euclidean constraints on the vector estimates. Here we describe an alternative approach where coupled PCA and SVD learning rules can systematically be derived from a Newton *zero-finding* framework. The derivation starts from an objective function, combines the equations for its extrema with arbitrary constraints on the vector estimates, and solves the resulting vector zero-point equation using Newton's zero-finding method. To demonstrate the framework, we derive PCA and SVD learning rules with constant Euclidean length or constant sum of the vector estimates.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Newton Zero-Finding Framework	2
3. PCA	4
3.1. PCA Objective Function	4
3.2. PCA with Euclidean Weight Vector Norm	5
3.3. PCA with Constant Weight Vector Sum	7
4. SVD	9
4.1. SVD Objective Function	9
4.2. SVD with Euclidean Weight Vector Norm	10
4.3. SVD with Constant Weight Vector Sum	12
5. Discussion	14
5.1. Newton Zero-Finding Framework	14
5.2. Limitation and Alternative Lagrange-Newton Framework	16
6. Conclusion	17
7. Acknowledgements	17
8. Changes	17
References	17
A. Derivative of the Rayleigh Quotient	18
B. Derivative of a Scalar Product with a Unit Vector	19
C. Stability Analysis of SVD with Constant Weight Vector Sum	20
D. Example of a Saddle Point in a Lagrange-Multiplier Equation	23

1. Introduction

Coupled learning rules have been developed to mitigate the speed-stability problem in online learning rules for principal component analysis (PCA) or singular value decomposition (SVD) (for reviews see Möller and Könies, 2004; Kaiser et al., 2010). Coupled learning rules are systems of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) where not only the principal eigenvectors or singular vectors are estimated (vector estimates), but simultaneously also the principal eigenvalues or singular values (scalar estimates). The ODEs for vector and scalar estimates are coupled, and it is the influence of the scalar estimates on the ODEs of the vector estimates that ensures fast convergence to the stationary points from all directions.

As we have suggested earlier (Möller and Könies, 2004; Kaiser et al., 2010), coupled learning rules can be derived by applying a Newton descent

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = -\mathbf{H}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial p(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \quad (1)$$

to an information criterion $p(\mathbf{x})$. The Hessian matrix $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x})$ of $p(\mathbf{x})$ has to be analytically inverted in the vicinity of the desired stationary point (e.g. at the principal eigenvector / eigenvalue pair). The information criterion only has to have the desired stationary points, regardless of whether they are attractors, repellers, or saddle points. The Newton descent at the desired stationary point turns this stationary point into an attractor and leads to equal convergence speed from all directions.

We have proposed (Möller and Könies, 2004) the following information criterion for the derivation of coupled learning rules which extract the principal or minor eigenvector / eigenvalue pair $\mathbf{x}^T = (\mathbf{w}^T | \lambda)$ from a covariance matrix \mathbf{C} :

$$p(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w} \lambda^{-1} - \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} + \ln \lambda. \quad (2)$$

The same learning rules can also be derived from another criterion suggested by Hou and Chen (2006) (original publication not available to us, cited after Feng et al. (2017)):

$$p(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} \lambda + \lambda. \quad (3)$$

The resulting online learning rule for the vector estimate resembles Oja’s rule (Oja, 1982) with an additional factor λ^{-1} that influences the effective learning rate; the coupled version resembles “ALA” (Chen and Chang, 1995).

For singular value decomposition, coupled learning rules for the principal singular vectors / singular value triplet $\mathbf{x}^T = (\mathbf{u}^T | \mathbf{v}^T | \sigma)$ of a cross-covariance matrix \mathbf{A} can be obtained from the information criterion

$$p(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma) = \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} \sigma^{-1} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v} + \ln \sigma \quad (4)$$

as suggested by Kaiser et al. (2010). Supposedly an alternative similar to the PCA criterion by Hou and Chen (2006) also exists for the SVD case. The online learning rules

derived from this criterion for the vector estimates resemble the “cross-coupled Hebbian rule” suggested by Diamantaras and Kung (1994) with an additional factor σ^{-1} .

For the generalized eigenproblem $\mathbf{R}_y \mathbf{w} = \lambda \mathbf{R}_x \mathbf{w}$, similar information criteria have been proposed by Nguyen and Yamada (2013)

$$p(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) = \mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{R}_y \mathbf{w} \lambda^{-1} - \mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{R}_x \mathbf{w} + \ln \lambda \quad (5)$$

and by Feng et al. (2016)

$$p(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) = \mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{R}_y \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{R}_x \mathbf{w} \lambda + \lambda. \quad (6)$$

The approach of deriving learning rules from an information criterion by a Newton descent (the latter being commonly used in optimization problems) has obviously proven its value, but is limited in three ways:

1. An information criterion has to be designed that has the desired stationary points. While the design is simplified by the fact that the relevant stationary point doesn't have to be an attractor, there is currently no systematic way to obtain such a criterion.
2. The information criterion has no explanatory value. The decisive property is just that it has the desired stationary points, but the criterion doesn't reveal anything about the problem at hand since the desired stationary point is typically not an attractor.
3. The PCA and SVD information criteria listed above (2,3,4) lead to solutions where the vector estimates have a Euclidean (L2) norm of 1. Information criteria where the vector estimates fulfill other constraints in the stationary point are currently not known.

In this paper we suggest an alternative approach which resolves these limitations. Instead of deriving learning rules from a Newton *descent*, we use a Newton *zero-finder* to find the zero points of systems of equations. These equations are easy to derive (e.g. by optimizing some objective function), they are directly related to the problem (e.g. they constitute the well-known eigen equations), and different constraints can be imposed on the vector estimates by adding the appropriate equations.

2. Newton Zero-Finding Framework

Given an equation $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$, the Newton zero-finder ODE is given by

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = -\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})$ is the Jacobian matrix of $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$. In a similar way as in our earlier paper (Möller and Könies, 2004, appendix I) we can show that the speed of convergence is the same from all directions: If we insert the first-order Taylor approximation of $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ at the zero point \mathbf{x}_0 ,

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0) + \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}_0) \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) + \dots \quad (8)$$

into equation (7) and take into account that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{0}$, we obtain

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = -\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) [\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}_0) \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) + \dots]. \quad (9)$$

If we also approximate $\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$ in a first-order Taylor expansion as

$$\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_0) + \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) + \dots \quad (10)$$

and omit second-order terms after inserting (10) into (9), we get

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = -(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0). \quad (11)$$

This ODE has an attractor in \mathbf{x}_0 and converges with the same speed from all directions.

In the following, we will start the derivation of each ODE system from some objective function. This preparatory step proved to be necessary for the SVD system with non-Euclidean constraint on the weight vectors since the well-known SVD equations (as for example used by Kaiser et al. (2010)) only apply for a Euclidean constraint. The objective function is then turned into a zero-finding problem formulated over the vector estimates and scalar estimates. The desired constraints are added and the learning rules are derived from (7), in a way similar to our earlier approach (Möller and Könies, 2004; Kaiser et al., 2010). Online forms of the rules can finally be derived by replacing the covariance / cross-covariance matrices by rank-1 outer vector products.

We derive equations for PCA with Euclidean weight vector norm (reproducing the results by Möller and Könies (2004)), for PCA with constant weight vector sum (new), for SVD with Euclidean weight vector norm (similar to the derivation by Kaiser et al. (2010)), and for SVD with constant weight vector sum (new).

All four derivations go through the following steps:

1. Define an objective function independent of the length of the vector estimate.
2. Determine the optimum of the objective function.
3. Introduce scalar estimates.
4. Define the zero-point problem by adding constraints on the vector estimates.
5. Compute the Jacobian of the zero-point function.
6. Apply an orthogonal transformation to the Jacobian.
7. Interrelate between the vector estimates in Euclidean norm and the given constraint.

8. Approximate the transformed Jacobian for the desired zero point.
9. Invert the approximated transformed Jacobian (e.g. by Gauss-Jordan elimination).
10. Apply the inverted orthogonal transformation.
11. Extract the ODEs for vector estimates and scalar estimates.
12. Compute the online ODEs for vector estimates and scalar estimates.

3. PCA

3.1. PCA Objective Function

The objective of PCA is to find a weight vector \mathbf{w} which maximizes the variance of the projection of a vector \mathbf{x} (drawn from a random distribution) onto this weight vector. We define the projection as

$$\hat{\xi} = \frac{\mathbf{w}^T}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \mathbf{x} \quad (12)$$

and the objective function as variance of the projection:

$$p(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2} E\{\hat{\xi}^2\}. \quad (13)$$

We see that

$$p(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2} E \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{w}^T}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^T \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \right\} \quad (14)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbf{w}^T}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} E\{\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^T\} \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \quad (15)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w}}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbf{C} = E\{\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^T\}$ is the covariance matrix of \mathbf{x} . Equation (16) is the well-known Rayleigh quotient.

The derivative of the Rayleigh quotient for a symmetric matrix is given by equation (130) in appendix A. We obtain

$$\frac{\partial p(\mathbf{w})}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} \left(\mathbf{C} \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w} \frac{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w}}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} \right). \quad (17)$$

The extreme point of this equation is given by

$$\frac{1}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} \left(\mathbf{C} \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w} \frac{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w}}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} \right) = \mathbf{0} \quad (18)$$

$$\mathbf{C} \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w} \frac{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w}}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (19)$$

The next step is crucial for the derivation of coupled learning rules as it introduces the scalar estimate, in this case the eigenvalue. We define

$$\lambda = \frac{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w}}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} \quad (20)$$

and obtain the well-known PCA equation to which the Newton zero-finder is applied below:

$$\mathbf{C} \mathbf{w} = \lambda \mathbf{w}. \quad (21)$$

By inserting (21) into (20) we can verify that this replacement is consistent. It is currently unclear whether the replacement of a scalar sub-expression by a variable which becomes part of the solution vector is generally applicable or can only be used for cases like PCA or SVD equations.

3.2. PCA with Euclidean Weight Vector Norm

We can now combine the PCA equation (21) with an Euclidean (L2) constraint on the weight vector to define the following equation over the vector $\mathbf{z}^T = (\mathbf{w}^T | \lambda)$ (we use \mathbf{z} here since \mathbf{x} is reserved for input vectors):

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w} - \lambda \mathbf{w} \\ \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} - 1) \end{pmatrix} \quad (22)$$

The zero points of this equation are all unit-length eigenvectors and eigenvalues of \mathbf{C} . The Jacobian of this system is

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})}{\partial \mathbf{z}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C} - \lambda \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{w}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (23)$$

The Jacobian needs to be inverted in the vicinity of the desired root, which for PCA is the *principal* eigenvector / eigenvalue pair. Inversion in the vicinity of the desired root requires an orthogonal transformation of the Jacobian into

$$\mathbf{J}^* = \mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{J} \mathbf{T}. \quad (24)$$

For the PCA case, we use

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{W}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0}^T & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ contains all unit-length eigenvectors $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i$ of \mathbf{C} in its columns. The matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ is orthogonal for disjunct non-zero eigenvalues, i.e. $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}} = \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T = \mathbf{I}$, and thus also \mathbf{T} is orthogonal, i.e. $\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T} \mathbf{T}^T = \mathbf{I}$. This Jacobian is inverted and transformed back by

$$\mathbf{J}^{-1} = \mathbf{T} \mathbf{J}^{*-1} \mathbf{T}^T. \quad (26)$$

The transformed Jacobian \mathbf{J}^* can be approximated in the vicinity of the principal eigenvector $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1$ for which the corresponding eigenvalue λ_1 is much larger than all other eigenvalues ($\lambda_1 \gg \lambda_i \forall i \neq 1$). This step selects the zero point which we want to approach. We approximate $\mathbf{w} \approx \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1$ and $\lambda \approx \lambda_1$. From the eigen equations $\mathbf{C}\tilde{\mathbf{W}} = \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\Lambda$ and from $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T \mathbf{w} \approx \mathbf{e} = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^T$ we obtain

$$\mathbf{J}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda - \lambda \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{e} \\ \mathbf{e}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

In the vicinity of the principal eigenvector / eigenvalue pair we can approximate

$$\Lambda - \lambda \mathbf{I} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 - \lambda & & & \\ & \lambda_2 - \lambda & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \lambda_n - \lambda \end{pmatrix} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & -\lambda & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & -\lambda \end{pmatrix} = \lambda(\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}^T - \mathbf{I}) \quad (28)$$

where n is the dimension of the input vectors. This gives

$$\mathbf{J}^* \approx \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}^T - \mathbf{I}) & -\mathbf{e} \\ \mathbf{e}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (29)$$

Inversion of \mathbf{J}^* is most easily done by writing the matrix out as single elements and using Gauss-Jordan elimination to transform $(\mathbf{J}^*|\mathbf{I})$ via exchange of rows, scaling of rows, or addition of scaled rows into $(\mathbf{I}|\mathbf{J}^{*-1})$. For this case we obtain

$$\mathbf{J}^{*-1} \approx \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}^T - \mathbf{I}) & \mathbf{e} \\ -\mathbf{e}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (30)$$

The test of whether $\mathbf{J}^* \mathbf{J}^{*-1} = \mathbf{I}$ holds can easily be done by block-wise matrix multiplication in vector notation (rather than by multiplication in single-element notation).

Now the matrix is transformed back using equation (26). We approximate $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{e} = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 \approx \mathbf{w}$ and obtain

$$\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) \approx \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{w}^T - \mathbf{I}) & \mathbf{w} \\ -\mathbf{w}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (31)$$

Finally we compute the ODE system from equation (7)

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{w}} \\ \dot{\lambda} \end{pmatrix} = -\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) \quad (32)$$

into which we insert (31) and (22)

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{w}} \\ \dot{\lambda} \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{w}^T - \mathbf{I}) & \mathbf{w} \\ -\mathbf{w}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}\mathbf{w} - \lambda\mathbf{w} \\ \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} - 1) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

This leads to the learning rule ODEs

$$\dot{\mathbf{w}} = \lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{C}\mathbf{w} - (\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C}\mathbf{w})\mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} - 1)\mathbf{w} \quad (34)$$

$$\dot{\lambda} = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C}\mathbf{w} - \lambda \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} \quad (35)$$

which coincide with the “nPCA” rules derived by Möller and Köries (2004).

Online rules can be derived by replacing \mathbf{C} with $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T$ where \mathbf{x} is a data vector; the computation of the expectation $E\{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T\}$ is transferred to the averaging properties of the learning rule. If we introduce the neuron’s activity as $\xi = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}$, we get

$$\dot{\mathbf{w}} = \lambda^{-1} \xi (\mathbf{x} - \xi \mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} - 1) \mathbf{w} \quad (36)$$

$$\dot{\lambda} = \xi^2 - \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} \lambda. \quad (37)$$

We recognize the resemblance to Oja’s L2 rule $\dot{\mathbf{w}} = \xi (\mathbf{x} - \xi \mathbf{w})$ which was derived from approximating a normalization to unit length for small learning rates (Oja, 1982). The factor λ^{-1} ensures fast convergence. If we approximate $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} \approx 1$ in the vicinity of the solution, we obtain the “ALA” system suggested by Chen and Chang (1995).

3.3. PCA with Constant Weight Vector Sum

If we demand that the sum of the elements of the weight vector is constant (unity), we start from the zero-point function

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}\mathbf{w} - \lambda \mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{w} - 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (38)$$

where $\mathbf{1}^T = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$. The Jacobian of this function is

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})}{\partial \mathbf{z}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C} - \lambda \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{1}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (39)$$

The orthogonal transformation (24) is done by the same transformation matrix (25). However, we now have to establish a relationship between the L2 unit-length vectors in $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ and the weight vector \mathbf{w} which in the zero point is constrained to constant sum. We obtain the relationships

$$\mathbf{w}_i = \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i}{\mathbf{1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i = \frac{\mathbf{w}_i}{\|\mathbf{w}_i\|}, \quad \text{thus} \quad \|\mathbf{w}_i\| \cdot (\mathbf{1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i) = 1 \quad (40)$$

which can be verified by showing that $\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{w}_i = 1$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i^T \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i = 1$, respectively.¹ We approximate $\mathbf{w} \approx \mathbf{w}_1$ for $\lambda \approx \lambda_1 \gg \lambda_j \forall j \neq 1$. With

$$\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T \mathbf{w} = \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \|\mathbf{w}\| = \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \|\mathbf{w}\| = \mathbf{e} \|\mathbf{w}\| \quad (41)$$

we get the transformed Jacobian and approximate in the vicinity of the desired zero point:

$$\mathbf{J}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda} - \lambda \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{e} \|\mathbf{w}\| \\ \mathbf{1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \approx \begin{pmatrix} \lambda (\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}^T - \mathbf{I}) & -\mathbf{e} \|\mathbf{w}\| \\ \mathbf{1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

¹Note that none of the vectors should be parallel to the constant-sum plane, since then $\mathbf{1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i = 0$. This should be guaranteed if \mathbf{w}_1 is not a multiple of $\mathbf{1}$.

For the single-element Gauss-Jordan elimination we introduce the vector $\mathbf{s}^T = \mathbf{1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$. The inversion gives

$$\mathbf{J}^{*-1} \approx \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{-1}[(\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}^T - \mathbf{I}) + s_1^{-1}\mathbf{e}(0, s_2, \dots, s_n)] & s_1^{-1}\mathbf{e} \\ -\mathbf{e}^T \|\mathbf{w}\|^{-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (43)$$

The inverse orthogonal transformation via (26) requires the following computation for the second term of the upper-left element:

$$(0, s_2, \dots, s_n) \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T \quad (44)$$

$$= (s_1, \dots, s_n) \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T - s_1 \mathbf{e}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T \quad (45)$$

$$= \mathbf{1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T - s_1 \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^T \quad (46)$$

$$= \mathbf{1}^T - \mathbf{1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^T \quad (47)$$

$$= \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^T) \quad (48)$$

Moreover, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} s_1^{-1} \mathbf{e} = s_1^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{w}$, such that the upper-left element becomes

$$\lambda^{-1}[(\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^T - \mathbf{I}) + \mathbf{w} \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^T)] \quad (49)$$

$$= \lambda^{-1}[(\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^T - \mathbf{I}) + \mathbf{w} \mathbf{1}^T - \mathbf{w} (\mathbf{1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{w}}) \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^T] \quad (50)$$

$$= \lambda^{-1}[(\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^T - \mathbf{I}) + \mathbf{w} \mathbf{1}^T - \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^T] \quad (51)$$

$$= \lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{w} \mathbf{1}^T - \mathbf{I}). \quad (52)$$

For the lower-left element we see that

$$\mathbf{e}^T \|\mathbf{w}\|^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T = \|\mathbf{w}\|^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^T = \|\mathbf{w}\|^{-1} \|\mathbf{w}\|^{-1} \mathbf{w}^T = (\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w})^{-1} \mathbf{w}^T, \quad (53)$$

and for the upper-right element we also have $s_1^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{e} = s_1^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{w}$, so the inverted Jacobian becomes

$$\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{w}, \lambda) \approx \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{w} \mathbf{1}^T - \mathbf{I}) & \mathbf{w} \\ -\frac{\mathbf{w}}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (54)$$

From (32) we get

$$\dot{\mathbf{w}} = -[\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{w} \mathbf{1}^T - \mathbf{I})(\mathbf{C}\mathbf{w} - \lambda \mathbf{w}) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{w} - 1)] \quad (55)$$

$$= \lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{C}\mathbf{w} - (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{C}\mathbf{w})\mathbf{w}) \quad (56)$$

$$\dot{\lambda} = \frac{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C}\mathbf{w}}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} - \lambda. \quad (57)$$

If we compare the \mathbf{w} learning rule (34) with (56) we see that $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C}\mathbf{w}$ has been replaced by $\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{C}\mathbf{w}$ and that the second term has disappeared. Comparing the λ learning rule (35) with (57) reveals that these equations differ by a factor $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}$: The Rayleigh quotient is necessary since \mathbf{w} is not a (L2) unit vector in the zero point. However, the Rayleigh quotient is unfortunate since it requires the computation of $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}$. In the vicinity of the zero point, the Rayleigh quotient and the term $\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{C}\mathbf{w}$ from the \mathbf{w} rule coincide, so we assume that (57) can be replaced by

$$\dot{\lambda} = \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{C}\mathbf{w} - \lambda. \quad (58)$$

This assumption is supported by the fact that similar terms appear in the coupled SVD rules with constant-sum constraint (109,110).

The online form of the system (56,58) is

$$\dot{\mathbf{w}} = \lambda^{-1} \xi (\mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x}) \mathbf{w}) \quad (59)$$

$$\dot{\lambda} = (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x}) \xi - \lambda. \quad (60)$$

4. SVD

4.1. SVD Objective Function

To define the objective function for SVD, we introduce the projections of two different input vectors \mathbf{x} (dimension n) and \mathbf{y} (dimension m) onto vectors \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{u} , respectively:

$$\hat{\xi} = \frac{\mathbf{v}^T}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \mathbf{x}, \quad \hat{\eta} = \frac{\mathbf{u}^T}{\|\mathbf{u}\|} \mathbf{y}. \quad (61)$$

The objective of SVD is to find extrema in \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} of the covariance of the projection

$$p(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = E\{\hat{\eta}\hat{\xi}\} \quad (62)$$

$$= E\left\{ \frac{\mathbf{u}^T}{\|\mathbf{u}\|} \mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^T \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \right\} \quad (63)$$

$$= \frac{\mathbf{u}^T}{\|\mathbf{u}\|} E\{\mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^T\} \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \quad (64)$$

$$= \frac{\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{v}\|} = \frac{\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u}}{\|\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{v}\|}, \quad (65)$$

where $\mathbf{A} = E\{\mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^T\}$ is the cross-covariance matrix of the distribution formed by vector pairs (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) .

The derivative of the scalar product of a constant vector with a unit vector is derived in appendix B; see equation (137). The extrema (stationary points) can be determined from

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial \mathbf{u}} = \frac{\mathbf{A} \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \|\mathbf{u}\| - \frac{\mathbf{v}^T}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} \frac{\mathbf{u}}{\|\mathbf{u}\|}}{\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{0} \quad (66)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial \mathbf{v}} = \frac{\mathbf{A}^T \frac{\mathbf{u}}{\|\mathbf{u}\|} \|\mathbf{v}\| - \frac{\mathbf{u}^T}{\|\mathbf{u}\|} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|}}{\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (67)$$

leading to

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} - \frac{\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u}}{\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} \quad (68)$$

$$\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} - \frac{\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v}} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (69)$$

We introduce the scalar estimates

$$\sigma = \frac{\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u}}{\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u}} \quad (70)$$

$$\rho = \frac{\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v}} \quad (71)$$

and obtain the functions to which the zero finder is applied:

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} = \sigma \mathbf{u} \quad (72)$$

$$\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} = \rho \mathbf{v}. \quad (73)$$

The consistency can be checked by inserting (72) into (70) and (73) into (71). Note that σ and ρ only coincide if $\|\mathbf{u}\| = \|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$.

4.2. SVD with Euclidean Weight Vector Norm

If $\|\mathbf{u}\| = \|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$, equations (70) and (71) coincide and thus we only have a single scalar estimate $\sigma = \rho$. Moreover, if we guarantee the constraint $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$ in the zero point, we automatically ensure that $\|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$: From $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} = \sigma \mathbf{u}$ we obtain $\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} = \sigma \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u} = \sigma$ if $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$, and from $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} = \sigma \mathbf{v}$ we obtain $\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} = \sigma \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v}$; since $\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}$ we can conclude that $\|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$. Therefore we only have to include a single constraint into our function. This reduction is important as otherwise the Jacobian would be non-square and could not be inverted.

We define the following equation over the vector $\mathbf{z}^T = (\mathbf{u}^T | \mathbf{v}^T | \sigma)$:

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} - \sigma \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} - \sigma \mathbf{v} \\ \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u} - 1) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (74)$$

The Jacobian of this system is

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})}{\partial \mathbf{z}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sigma \mathbf{I}_m & \mathbf{A} & -\mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{A}^T & -\sigma \mathbf{I}_n & -\mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{u}^T & \mathbf{0}_n^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (75)$$

For the orthogonal transformation we define $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$, the orthogonal $m \times m$ matrix containing all left singular vectors $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$, the orthogonal $n \times n$ matrix containing all right singular vector $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, both sorted such that $|\sigma_1| \gg |\sigma_i| \forall i \neq 1$ holds for the corresponding singular values. The transformation matrix is defined as

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{U}} & \mathbf{0}_{mn} & \mathbf{0}_m \\ \mathbf{0}_{nm} & \tilde{\mathbf{V}} & \mathbf{0}_n \\ \mathbf{0}_m^T & \mathbf{0}_n^T & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (76)$$

We also introduce the $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{S} whose first $\min\{m, n\}$ diagonal elements σ_i are the singular values, sorted as described above. We approximate $\mathbf{u} \approx \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1$, $\mathbf{v} \approx \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1$, and $\sigma \approx \sigma_1$. With $\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\mathbf{S}$ and $\mathbf{A}^T\tilde{\mathbf{U}} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{S}^T$ and the transformation (24) we get

$$\mathbf{J}^* = \begin{pmatrix} -\sigma\mathbf{I}_m & \mathbf{S} & -\mathbf{e}_m \\ \mathbf{S}^T & -\sigma\mathbf{I}_n & -\mathbf{e}_n \\ \mathbf{e}_m^T & \mathbf{0}_n^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (77)$$

We approximate $\mathbf{S} \approx \sigma\mathbf{e}_m\mathbf{e}_n^T$. Using Gauss-Jordan elimination on the single-element form of \mathbf{J}^* we get

$$\mathbf{J}^{*-1} \approx \begin{pmatrix} -\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{e}_m\mathbf{e}_m^T) & \mathbf{0}_{mn} & \mathbf{e}_m \\ \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{e}_n\mathbf{e}_m^T & -\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{e}_n\mathbf{e}_n^T) & \mathbf{e}_n \\ -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{e}_m^T & -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{e}_n^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (78)$$

The inverse orthogonal transformation (26) leads to

$$\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma) \approx \begin{pmatrix} -\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^T) & \mathbf{0}_{mn} & \mathbf{u} \\ \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{u}^T & -\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^T) & \mathbf{v} \\ -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{u}^T & -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (79)$$

and the Newton zero-finding equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \\ \dot{\mathbf{v}} \\ \dot{\sigma} \end{pmatrix} = -\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma)\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma) \quad (80)$$

gives

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}} = \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{u} - 1)\mathbf{u} \quad (81)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}} = \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{u} - (\mathbf{v}^T\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{u})\mathbf{v}) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}^T\mathbf{v} - 1)\mathbf{v} \quad (82)$$

$$\dot{\sigma} = \mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}^T\mathbf{v}) \quad (83)$$

which coincides with the rules derived by Kaiser et al. (2010).

The online rules are obtained by replacing \mathbf{A} by $\mathbf{y}\mathbf{x}^T$ and introducing the neuron activities $\xi = \mathbf{v}^T\mathbf{x}$ and $\eta = \mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y}$, which leads to

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}} = \sigma^{-1}\xi(\mathbf{y} - \eta\mathbf{u}) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{u} - 1)\mathbf{u} \quad (84)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}} = \sigma^{-1}\eta(\mathbf{x} - \xi\mathbf{v}) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}^T\mathbf{v} - 1)\mathbf{v} \quad (85)$$

$$\dot{\sigma} = \eta\xi - \frac{1}{2}\sigma(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}^T\mathbf{v}). \quad (86)$$

In the vicinity of the zero point we can further approximate for $\|\mathbf{u}\| \approx 1$ and $\|\mathbf{v}\| \approx 1$ such that the second terms of equation (84) and (85) disappear and equation (86) turns into

$$\dot{\sigma} = \eta\xi - \sigma. \quad (87)$$

4.3. SVD with Constant Weight Vector Sum

For the constraint of constant weight vector sums, σ (70) and ρ (71) do not coincide. We define the following equation over the vector $\mathbf{z}^T = (\mathbf{u}^T, \mathbf{v}^T, \sigma, \rho)$:

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma, \rho) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} - \sigma\mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{u} - \rho\mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{1}_m^T\mathbf{u} - 1 \\ \mathbf{1}_n^T\mathbf{v} - 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (88)$$

We obtain a square Jacobian

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma, \rho) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})}{\partial \mathbf{z}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sigma\mathbf{I}_m & \mathbf{A} & -\mathbf{u} & \mathbf{0}_m \\ \mathbf{A}^T & -\rho\mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{0}_n & -\mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{1}_m^T & \mathbf{0}_n^T & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_m^T & \mathbf{1}_n^T & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (89)$$

For the orthogonal transformation we define $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$, the orthogonal $m \times m$ matrix containing all left singular vectors $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$, the orthogonal $n \times n$ matrix containing all right singular vector $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, both sorted according to the corresponding singular values μ_i obtained for L2 unit-length left and right singular vectors such that $|\mu_1| \gg |\mu_i| \forall i \neq 1$. We introduce the $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{M} whose first $\min\{m, n\}$ diagonal elements are the singular values μ_i (obtained for L2 unit-length vectors), sorted as described above. This matrix can be approximated as $\mathbf{M} \approx \mu_1 \mathbf{e}_m \mathbf{e}_n^T \approx \mu \mathbf{e}_m \mathbf{e}_n^T$. We can use the relationships $\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{A}^T\tilde{\mathbf{U}} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{M}^T$. The transformation matrix is defined as

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{U}} & \mathbf{0}_{mn} & \mathbf{0}_m & \mathbf{0}_m \\ \mathbf{0}_{nm} & \tilde{\mathbf{V}} & \mathbf{0}_n & \mathbf{0}_n \\ \mathbf{0}_m^T & \mathbf{0}_n^T & 1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_m^T & \mathbf{0}_n^T & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (90)$$

We now have to establish the relationships between the L2 unit-length vectors in $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$ and the weight vectors \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} which in the zero point are constrained to constant sum:

$$\mathbf{u}_i = \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i}{\mathbf{1}_m^T \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i = \frac{\mathbf{u}_i}{\|\mathbf{u}_i\|}, \quad \text{thus} \quad \|\mathbf{u}_i\| \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m^T \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i) = 1 \quad (91)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_i = \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i}{\mathbf{1}_n^T \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i = \frac{\mathbf{v}_i}{\|\mathbf{v}_i\|}, \quad \text{thus} \quad \|\mathbf{v}_i\| \cdot (\mathbf{1}_n^T \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i) = 1 \quad (92)$$

(and see footnote 1). We approximate $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{u}_1$, $\mathbf{v} \approx \mathbf{v}_1$, and $\mu \approx \mu_1$. We apply the transformation (24), use $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^T \mathbf{u} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \|\mathbf{u}\| \approx \mathbf{e}_m \|\mathbf{u}\|$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^T \mathbf{v} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{v}} \|\mathbf{v}\| \approx \mathbf{e}_n \|\mathbf{v}\|$, and get

$$\mathbf{J}^* \approx \begin{pmatrix} -\sigma\mathbf{I}_m & \mu \mathbf{e}_m \mathbf{e}_n^T & -\mathbf{e}_m \|\mathbf{u}\| & \mathbf{0}_m \\ \mu \mathbf{e}_n \mathbf{e}_m^T & -\rho\mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{0}_n & -\mathbf{e}_n \|\mathbf{v}\| \\ \mathbf{1}_n^T \tilde{\mathbf{U}} & \mathbf{0}_n^T & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_m^T & \mathbf{1}_m^T \tilde{\mathbf{V}} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (93)$$

For the single-element inversion we introduce the vectors

$$\mathbf{s}^T = \mathbf{1}_m^T \tilde{\mathbf{U}} = (s_1, \dots, s_m) \quad (94)$$

$$\mathbf{r}^T = \mathbf{1}_n^T \tilde{\mathbf{V}} = (r_1, \dots, r_n). \quad (95)$$

The inversion of \mathbf{J}^* yields

$$\mathbf{J}^{*-1} \approx \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^{-1}[s_1^{-1} \mathbf{e}_m \check{\mathbf{s}}^T - (\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{e}_m \mathbf{e}_m^T)] & \mathbf{0}_{mn} & s_1^{-1} \mathbf{e}_m & \mathbf{0}_m \\ \mathbf{0}_{nm} & \rho^{-1}[r_1^{-1} \mathbf{e}_n \check{\mathbf{r}}^T - (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{e}_n \mathbf{e}_n^T)] & \mathbf{0}_n & r_1^{-1} \mathbf{e}_n \\ -\mathbf{s}^T & \mu \rho^{-1} s_1 r_1^{-1} \check{\mathbf{r}}^T & -\sigma & \mu s_1 r_1^{-1} \\ \mu \sigma^{-1} r_1 s_1^{-1} \check{\mathbf{s}}^T & -\mathbf{r}^T & \mu r_1 s_1^{-1} & -\rho \end{pmatrix} \quad (96)$$

where $\check{\mathbf{s}}^T = (0, s_2, \dots, s_m)$ and $\check{\mathbf{r}}^T = (0, r_2, \dots, r_n)$. For the test $\mathbf{J}^* \mathbf{J}^{*-1} = \mathbf{I}_{m+n+2}$, note that $s_1^{-1} = \|\mathbf{u}\|$ and $r_1^{-1} = \|\mathbf{v}\|$ which results from equations (91,92) and (94,95).

For the inverse transformation (26) we use the following relationships:

$$\mathbf{s}^T \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^T = \mathbf{1}_m^T \tilde{\mathbf{U}} \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^T = \mathbf{1}_m \quad (97)$$

$$\mathbf{r}^T \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^T = \mathbf{1}_n^T \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^T = \mathbf{1}_n \quad (98)$$

$$\check{\mathbf{s}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^T = (\mathbf{s}^T - s_1 \mathbf{e}_m^T) \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^T = \mathbf{1}_m^T - \mathbf{1}_m^T \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^T \quad (99)$$

$$\check{\mathbf{r}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^T = (\mathbf{r}^T - r_1 \mathbf{e}_n^T) \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^T = \mathbf{1}_n^T - \mathbf{1}_n^T \tilde{\mathbf{v}} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^T \quad (100)$$

$$s_1^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{u} \quad (101)$$

$$r_1^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{v} \quad (102)$$

$$s_1^{-1} = \|\mathbf{u}\| \quad (103)$$

$$r_1^{-1} = \|\mathbf{v}\| \quad (104)$$

and obtain

$$\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma, \rho) = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{u} \mathbf{1}_m^T - \mathbf{I}_m) & \mathbf{0}_{mn} & \mathbf{u} & \mathbf{0}_m \\ \mathbf{0}_{nm} & \rho^{-1}(\mathbf{v} \mathbf{1}_n^T - \mathbf{I}_n) & \mathbf{0}_n & \mathbf{v} \\ -\mathbf{1}_m^T & \mu \frac{(\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{1}_n^T - \mathbf{v}^T}{\rho \|\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{v}\|} & -\sigma & \mu \frac{\|\mathbf{v}\|}{\|\mathbf{u}\|} \\ \mu \frac{(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{1}_m^T - \mathbf{u}^T}{\sigma \|\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{v}\|} & -\mathbf{1}_n^T & \mu \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} & -\rho \end{pmatrix}. \quad (105)$$

If we apply

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \\ \dot{\mathbf{v}} \\ \dot{\sigma} \\ \dot{\rho} \end{pmatrix} = -\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma, \rho) \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \sigma, \rho) \quad (106)$$

we obtain

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}} = \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}) \quad (107)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}} = \rho^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} - (\mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{v}) \quad (108)$$

$$\dot{\sigma} = \mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} - \sigma - \frac{\mu}{\rho \|\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{v}\|} [(\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u}] \quad (109)$$

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} - \rho - \frac{\mu}{\sigma \|\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{v}\|} [(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u})(\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}]. \quad (110)$$

The last terms of (109,110) are cumbersome as they require the computation of L2 lengths of the weight vectors (which are constrained to unit sum) and need an additional ODE which estimates μ . From (107,108) we can conclude that $\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} = \sigma$ and $\mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} = \rho$ are valid in the stationary point. Since we also have $\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} / (\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u}) = \sigma$ (70) and $\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} / (\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v}) = \rho$ (71), and $\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u}$, we see that the terms are at least small in the vicinity of the stationary point; however they are not necessarily smaller than the remaining terms. It is therefore not obvious how the approximations

$$\dot{\sigma} = \mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{v}} - \sigma \quad (111)$$

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T \dot{\mathbf{u}} - \rho, \quad (112)$$

where the last terms are omitted, affect the behavior of (109,110). However, at least the system (107,108,111,112) has the proper stationary points $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} = \sigma \mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} = \rho \mathbf{v}$, $\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{v} = 1$. The stability analysis of this system is presented in appendix C.

The online rules are obtained by replacing \mathbf{A} by $\mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^T$ and introducing the neuron activities $\xi = \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{x}$ and $\eta = \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{y}$, which leads to

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}} = \sigma^{-1} \xi (\mathbf{y} - (\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{u}) \quad (113)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}} = \rho^{-1} \eta (\mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{x}) \mathbf{v}) \quad (114)$$

$$\dot{\sigma} = (\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{y}) \xi - \sigma \quad (115)$$

$$\dot{\rho} = (\mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{x}) \eta - \rho. \quad (116)$$

5. Discussion

5.1. Newton Zero-Finding Framework

Deriving coupled learning rules from either the Newton optimization framework or the Newton zero-finding framework leads to rules which are similar to those derived by Taylor expansions of normalization for small learning rates (as done by Oja, 1982). At least in simplified form and for the *principal* component case, the coupling always takes the form of multiplying the ODE of the vector estimate by an inverse scalar estimate (eigenvalue, singular value). This may raise the question whether the Newton approach is too complicated compared to the Taylor approach. There are two arguments in favor of the Newton approach:

- The Taylor approach only produces learning rules for *principal* component estimates. As shown by Möller and Köries (2004), the Newton framework can also be used to derive *minor* component rules by approximating the Hessian or Jacobian in the vicinity of this stationary or zero point (but no online rules can directly be derived for this case as the *inverse* covariance matrix appears in the solution). We can conclude that the Newton approach is more general.

- Additional terms appear in the update equations derived from the Newton approach, such as the last term in equation (34). The terms are required to have approximately unit convergence speed from all directions. Leaving them out leads to a different convergence speed in one direction (Möller and Könies, 2004) (however, no effect of this difference is apparent in simulations). Therefore the rule-of-thumb “derive from Taylor approach and multiply by inverse scalar estimate” is only an approximation.

Nevertheless, it is somewhat worrying that after rather complex derivations (approximation of the Jacobian / Hessian, orthogonal transformation, inversion of Hessian / Jacobian, inverse orthogonal transformation, simplification of resulting ODEs) we obtain quite simple learning rules. This may indicate that there is a simpler way to derive these rules or some generalization for the given class of problems (PCA, SVD, GPCA).

The advantages of the Newton *zero-finding* framework over the the Newton *optimization* framework could be demonstrated in this paper: a clear derivation starting from an objective function related to the problem at hand (rather than from a “designed” information criterion with no explanatory value) and the possibility to add arbitrary constraints on the vector estimates (rather than just Euclidean constraints implicitly embedded in the information criterion). The constant-sum constraint was deliberately chosen in this work as it allows to obtain neurons which specialize to represent the conjunction (logical “and”) of binary (0/1) inputs. Note that for Euclidean constraints, the zero-finding and the optimization framework produce the same learning rules.

One important step in the Newton zero-finding framework is the orthogonal transformation of the Jacobian (which allows an approximation in the vicinity of the desired solution). The orthogonal transformation requires orthogonal matrices with estimates of the eigenvectors / singular vectors, thus these vectors have Euclidean unit length. In contrast, different constraints are imposed on the vector estimates in the ODEs. Transformations need to be introduced to interrelate between both types of vectors (equations (40), (91), (92)). In the SVD constant-sum case, this unfortunately introduces the singular value estimate μ into the equations which relates to the Euclidean unit-length vectors. This variable survives into the update equations of the two other singular value estimates σ and ρ (equations (109,110)). So far we have no suggestion how this can be avoided.

In some cases, the Newton zero-finding framework leads to solutions which are awkward in an implementation. In the PCA constant-sum case, the update equation for the eigenvalue (57) includes the squared Euclidean norm of the eigenvector estimate ($\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w} / \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}$). It is more convenient to replace this by $\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w}$ (equation (58)) as this term also appears in the update equation for the vector estimate (56). Surprisingly, the desired terms appear in the update equations of the singular value estimates in the SVD constant-sum case (first terms of equations (109,110)).

5.2. Limitation and Alternative Lagrange-Newton Framework

A note of caution has to be added here. The standard approach to solve an optimization problem under a given constraint would be to use the method of Lagrange multipliers: An optimization criterion is combined with all constraint equations multiplied by a vector of Lagrange multipliers. Here, in contrast, we do not consider the optimization criterion but its *unconstrained* optimum given by its derivative (PCA: (21), SVD: (72,73)). The system of equations obtained by combining the derivative of the optimization criterion with the constraint equations only leads to a solution, *if the constraints intersect the unconstrained optimum*. In all four cases described here, the unconstrained optimum allows for arbitrary vectors lengths, so the vector-length constraints always intersect the unconstrained optimum. In other cases where this condition is not fulfilled, the suggested zero-finding framework will fail to provide a solution. This is a clear limitation of the Newton zero-finding framework.

Actually it should be possible to derive the same learning rules from a Lagrange-Newton framework. In the Lagrange-Newton framework, the Lagrange-multiplier variables are considered in the Newton step.² In the following we sketch the solution for the first case, PCA with Euclidean constraint. The Lagrange-multiplier equation is

$$J(\mathbf{w}, \alpha) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w} - \frac{1}{2} \alpha (\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} - 1), \quad (117)$$

where α is the Lagrange multiplier. The derivatives are

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{w} - \alpha \mathbf{w} \quad (118)$$

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial \alpha} = -\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} - 1). \quad (119)$$

We see that, except for the sign of the second equation, this coincides with (22). We obtain the Hessian

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{w}, \alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C} - \alpha \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{w} \\ -\mathbf{w}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (120)$$

and, in a similar way as in section 3.2, the approximated inverse

$$\mathbf{H}^{-1}(\mathbf{w}, \alpha) \approx \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^{-1} (\mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^T - \mathbf{I}) & -\mathbf{w} \\ -\mathbf{w}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (121)$$

A Newton descent³ leads to the same learning rule ODEs as (34, 35), except for using the name α instead of λ .

The derivation of the other three cases should be similar, but hasn't been performed yet.

²A Newton step is actually necessary, since the solutions of the Lagrange equations are typically saddle points, thus a gradient descent or ascent would not be sufficient. Applying a Newton descent turns the saddle into an attractor. See appendix D for an example. I couldn't find a proof so far.

³Note that regardless of whether the criterion should be maximized or minimized, it is always a Newton *descent* step. This is different from following a gradient: Maximizing a criterion needs a gradient *ascent*, minimizing a gradient *descent*.

6. Conclusion

Despite some open problems mentioned in the discussion, the value of the novel Newton zero-finding framework as a way to systematically derive coupled learning rules with arbitrary vector constraints from objective functions has been demonstrated. The four examples elaborated in this paper can serve as a guideline for the derivation of learning rules for other problems (such as GPCA).

7. Acknowledgements

Thanks to Alexander Kaiser for corrections of the manuscript.

8. Changes

March 13, 2017: Updated reference (Feng et al., 2017).

March 14, 2017: Corrected reference (Feng et al., 2017).

April 15, 2019: Added subsection 5.2 to discussion (original discussion now in subsection 5.1). Added appendix D with example of saddle point in Lagrange-multiplier equation.

March 25, 2020: arXiv version: different title page, moved appendix

References

- L.-H. Chen and S. Chang. An adaptive learning algorithm for principal component analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 6(5):1255–1263, 1995.
- K. I. Diamantaras and S.-Y. Kung. Cross-correlation neural network models. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 42(11):3218–3223, 1994.
- X. Feng, X. Kong, Z. Duan, and H. Ma. Adaptive generalized eigen-pairs extraction algorithms and their convergence analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 64(11):2976–2989, 2016.
- X. Feng, X. Kong, H. Ma, and H. Liu. Unified and coupled self-stabilizing algorithms for minor and principal eigen-pairs extraction. *Neural Processing Letters*, 45(1):197–222, 2017. doi:10.1007/s11063-016-9520-3.
- L. Hou and T. Chen. Online algorithm of coupled principal (minor) component analysis. *Journal of Fudan University (Natural Science)*, 45(2):158–169, 2006.

- A. Kaiser, W. Schenck, and R. Möller. Coupled singular value decomposition of a cross covariance matrix. *International Journal of Neural Systems*, 20(4):293–318, 2010.
- R. Möller and A. Könies. Coupled principal component analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 15(1):214–222, 2004.
- T. D. Nguyen and I. Yamada. Adaptive normalized quasi-newton algorithms for extraction of generalized eigen-pairs and their convergence analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 61(6):1404–1418, 2013.
- E. Oja. A simplified neuron model as principal component analyzer. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 15:267–273, 1982.

A. Derivative of the Rayleigh Quotient

The vector derivative of the Rayleigh quotient

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}} \quad (122)$$

is obtained by computing the scalar derivative

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}}{\partial x_j \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}} = \frac{\partial \sum_{l,m} x_l A_{lm} x_m}{\sum_k x_k^2}. \quad (123)$$

The derivative of the numerator u is obtained from the product rule

$$u' = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \sum_{l,m} x_l A_{lm} x_m \quad (124)$$

$$= \sum_{l,m} \delta_{lj} A_{lm} x_m + \sum_{l,m} x_l A_{lm} \delta_{mj} \quad (125)$$

where δ is Kronecker's delta and $\partial x_i / \partial x_j = \delta_{ij}$ is used. If a sum runs over one index of δ , the sum disappears and its index is replaced everywhere by the other index of δ , which here leads to

$$u' = \sum_m A_{jm} x_m + \sum_l x_l A_{lj} = (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x})_j + (\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{x})_j. \quad (126)$$

The derivative of the denominator v is

$$v' = 2x_j = 2(\mathbf{x})_j. \quad (127)$$

The derivative of u/v given by $(u'v - v'u)/v^2$ is

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j v} = \frac{[(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x})_j + (\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{x})_j] (\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}) - 2(\mathbf{x})_j (\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x})}{(\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x})^2} \quad (128)$$

which, in vector form, is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}} \left[(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A}^T) \mathbf{x} - 2 \mathbf{x} \frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}} \right]. \quad (129)$$

For symmetric \mathbf{A} , i.e. $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^T$, we obtain the special form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}} = \frac{2}{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}} \left[\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x} \frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}} \right]. \quad (130)$$

B. Derivative of a Scalar Product with a Unit Vector

The vector derivative of

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{a}^T \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} \quad (131)$$

is obtained by computing the scalar derivative

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \mathbf{a}^T \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \frac{\sum_j a_j x_j}{\sqrt{\sum_k x_k^2}}. \quad (132)$$

The derivative of the numerator u is

$$u' = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \sum_j a_j x_j = \sum_j a_j \delta_{ij} = a_i, \quad (133)$$

the derivative of the denominator v is

$$v' = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(\sum_k x_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \sum_k x_k^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|^{-1} \sum_k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} x_k^2 \quad (134)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|^{-1} \sum_k 2x_k \delta_{ik} = \|\mathbf{x}\|^{-1} x_i, \quad (135)$$

such that the derivative of u/v given by $(u'v - v'u)/v^2$ is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \frac{u}{v} = \frac{a_i \|\mathbf{x}\| - (\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}) \|\mathbf{x}\|^{-1} x_i}{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}}. \quad (136)$$

In vector form we obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{a}^T \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} = \frac{\mathbf{a} \|\mathbf{x}\| - (\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}) \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}}{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}}. \quad (137)$$

C. Stability Analysis of SVD with Constant Weight Vector Sum

We analyze the stability of the ODE system

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}} = \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}) \quad (138)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}} = \rho^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} - (\mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u})\mathbf{v}) \quad (139)$$

$$\dot{\sigma} = \mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} - \sigma \quad (140)$$

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} - \rho. \quad (141)$$

The stationary points of this system are characterized by the equations

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} = \sigma\mathbf{u} \quad (142)$$

$$\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{v} = \rho\mathbf{u} \quad (143)$$

$$\sigma = \mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} \quad (144)$$

$$\rho = \mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} \quad (145)$$

$$\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{u} = 1 \quad (146)$$

$$\mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{v} = 1. \quad (147)$$

The Jacobian of the ODE system is

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})\mathbf{I}_m & \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{u}\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A}) & -\sigma^{-2}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}) & \mathbf{0}_m \\ \rho^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T) & -\rho^{-1}(\mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u})\mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{0}_n & -\rho^{-2}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u} - (\mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u})\mathbf{v}) \\ \mathbf{0}_m^T & \mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A} & -1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T & \mathbf{0}_n^T & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (148)$$

At the stationary points, the Jacobian turns into

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{I}_m & \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{u}\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A}) & \mathbf{0}_m & \mathbf{0}_m \\ \rho^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T) & -\mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{0}_n & \mathbf{0}_n \\ \mathbf{0}_m^T & \mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{A} & -1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{1}_n^T \mathbf{A}^T & \mathbf{0}_n^T & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (149)$$

We analyze the eigenvalues of the Jacobian at the stationary points. Eigenvalues are invariant under similarity transformations (and thus also under orthogonal transformations). We apply the orthogonal transformation (24) with the transformation matrix (90). Using the relationships $\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{A}^T \tilde{\mathbf{U}} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{M}^T$ (where \mathbf{M} contains the $\min\{m, n\}$ singular values μ_i with respect to L2 unit length vectors on its main diagonal), introducing \mathbf{s} from (94) and \mathbf{r} from (95), and considering $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^T \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{e}_m \|\mathbf{u}\|$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^T \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{e}_n \|\mathbf{v}\|$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{I}_m & \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{M} - \|\mathbf{u}\|\mathbf{e}_m \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{M}) & \mathbf{0}_m & \mathbf{0}_m \\ \rho^{-1}(\mathbf{M}^T - \|\mathbf{v}\|\mathbf{e}_n \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{M}^T) & -\mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{0}_n & \mathbf{0}_n \\ \mathbf{0}_m^T & \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{M} & -1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{M}^T & \mathbf{0}_n^T & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (150)$$

Eigenvalues of the transformed Jacobian are obtained from the characteristic equation

$$\det\{\mathbf{J} - \lambda \mathbf{I}_{m+n+2}\} = 0. \quad (151)$$

We need to analyze the determinant

$$\left| \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{I}_m(\lambda + 1) & \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{M} - \|\mathbf{u}\|\mathbf{e}_m\mathbf{s}^T\mathbf{M}) & \mathbf{0}_m & \mathbf{0}_m \\ \rho^{-1}(\mathbf{M}^T - \|\mathbf{v}\|\mathbf{e}_n\mathbf{r}^T\mathbf{M}^T) & -\mathbf{I}_n(\lambda + 1) & \mathbf{0}_n & \mathbf{0}_n \\ \mathbf{0}_m^T & \mathbf{s}^T\mathbf{M} & -(\lambda + 1) & 0 \\ \mathbf{r}^T\mathbf{M}^T & \mathbf{0}_n^T & 0 & -(\lambda + 1) \end{pmatrix} \right|. \quad (152)$$

We see that the upper right block of size $(m + n) \times 2$ is a zero matrix, therefore the determinant reduces to the product of the determinants of the blocks on the main diagonal:

$$= (-\lambda - 1)^2 \left| \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{I}_m(\lambda + 1) & \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{M} - \|\mathbf{u}\|\mathbf{e}_m\mathbf{s}^T\mathbf{M}) \\ \rho^{-1}(\mathbf{M}^T - \|\mathbf{v}\|\mathbf{e}_n\mathbf{r}^T\mathbf{M}^T) & -\mathbf{I}_n(\lambda + 1) \end{pmatrix} \right|. \quad (153)$$

To the four blocks we now apply one of the following equations:

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{pmatrix} = \det \mathbf{A} \cdot \det\{\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{C}\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B}\} \quad (154)$$

$$= \det \mathbf{D} \cdot \det\{\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{C}\}. \quad (155)$$

We assume $\min\{m, n\} = n$ and apply (154) since this guarantees that the term $\mathbf{M}^T\mathbf{M}$ appearing in the equations below is a full diagonal matrix (if $\mu_i \neq 0 \forall i = 1, \dots, n$); if $\min\{m, n\} = m$, we could apply (155) and have the guarantee that $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}^T$ is a full diagonal matrix. In our case we see that

$$\det \mathbf{A} = (-\lambda - 1)^m \quad (156)$$

$$\mathbf{A}^{-1} = -(\lambda + 1)^{-1}\mathbf{I}_m \quad (157)$$

$$\mathbf{C}\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B} = -(\lambda + 1)^{-1}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{B}. \quad (158)$$

We determine

$$\mathbf{C}\mathbf{B} = \rho^{-1}\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{M}^T - \|\mathbf{v}\|\mathbf{e}_n\mathbf{r}^T\mathbf{M}^T)(\mathbf{M} - \|\mathbf{u}\|\mathbf{e}_m\mathbf{s}^T\mathbf{M}) \quad (159)$$

$$= \rho^{-1}\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{M}^T\mathbf{M} - \|\mathbf{v}\|\mathbf{e}_n\mathbf{r}^T\mathbf{M}^T\mathbf{M} - \|\mathbf{u}\|\mathbf{M}^T\mathbf{e}_m\mathbf{s}^T\mathbf{M} + \|\mathbf{v}\|\|\mathbf{u}\|\mathbf{e}_n\mathbf{r}^T\mathbf{M}^T\mathbf{e}_m\mathbf{s}^T\mathbf{M}). \quad (160)$$

We now apply $\mathbf{M}^T\mathbf{e}_m = \mu_1\mathbf{e}_n$ and $\mathbf{r}^T\mathbf{e}_n = r_1$ and obtain

$$\mathbf{C}\mathbf{B} = \rho^{-1}\sigma^{-1} [(\mathbf{I}_n - \|\mathbf{v}\|\mathbf{e}_n\mathbf{r}^T)\mathbf{M}^T\mathbf{M} - \mu_1\|\mathbf{u}\|(1 - r_1\|\mathbf{v}\|)\mathbf{e}_n\mathbf{s}^T\mathbf{M}]. \quad (161)$$

In the matrices $\mathbf{e}_n\mathbf{r}^T(\mathbf{M}^T\mathbf{M})$ and $\mathbf{e}_n\mathbf{s}^T\mathbf{M}$, only the top row is occupied by non-zero elements. Except for the top-row element on the main diagonal, these elements are irrelevant to the determinant $\det\{\mathbf{D} + (\lambda + 1)^{-1}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{B}\}$ (which is seen immediately if the determinant is developed along the first column). The top-left element of $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{B}$ is $\rho^{-1}\sigma^{-1}\mu_1^2(1 - s_1\|\mathbf{u}\|)(1 - r_1\|\mathbf{v}\|)$, the remaining main diagonal is occupied by $\rho^{-1}\sigma^{-1}\mu_i^2$ for $i = 2 \dots n$.

We also have from (70,71)

$$\sigma = \frac{\mathbf{v}^T\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{u}}{\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{u}} \quad (162)$$

$$\rho = \frac{\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}^T\mathbf{v}}, \quad (163)$$

and the singular values with respect to the L2 unit-length vectors are

$$\mu = \frac{\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{v}\|}, \quad (164)$$

from which we conclude that $\sigma\rho = \mu^2$.

From this we get

$$\begin{aligned} \det\{\mathbf{J} - \lambda \mathbf{I}_{m+n+2}\} &= (-\lambda - 1)^{m+2} \\ &\cdot \left[-(\lambda + 1) + (\lambda + 1)^{-1} \frac{\mu_1^2}{\mu^2} (1 - s_1 \|\mathbf{u}\|)(1 - r_1 \|\mathbf{v}\|) \right] \\ &\cdot \prod_{j=2}^n \left[-(\lambda + 1) + (\lambda + 1)^{-1} \frac{\mu_j^2}{\mu^2} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (165)$$

and thus the eigenvalues (arranged in the same order as the factors above)

$$\lambda = -1 \quad (166)$$

$$\lambda = -1 \pm \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\mu|} \sqrt{(1 - s_1 \|\mathbf{u}\|)(1 - r_1 \|\mathbf{v}\|)} \quad (167)$$

$$\lambda = -1 \pm \frac{|\mu_j|}{|\mu|} \quad j = 2, \dots, n. \quad (168)$$

In the following we analyze the stability of the different stationary points. For that we assume that $|\mu_1| \gg |\mu_2| > \dots > |\mu_n| > 0$.

Principal singular triple ($i = 1$) For the principal singular triple $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_1, \mu = \mu_1$ we have $s_1 \|\mathbf{u}_1\| = 1$ and $r_1 \|\mathbf{v}_1\| = 1$ and $|\mu_1| \gg |\mu_j|$ for $j = 2, \dots, n$, so we get the eigenvalues

$$\lambda = -1 \quad (169)$$

$$\lambda = -1 \quad (170)$$

$$\lambda = -1 \pm \frac{|\mu_j|}{|\mu_1|} \approx -1 \quad j = 2, \dots, n. \quad (171)$$

We see that this stationary point is an attractor (the system is stable) and that the convergence speed in all eigendirections is approximately the same (-1).

Minor singular triples ($i = 3, \dots, n$) For singular triples $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_i, \mu = \mu_i$ for $i = 3, \dots, n$ we always have an index $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ where $|\mu_j| > |\mu_i|$ such that equation (168)

$$\lambda = -1 \pm \underbrace{\frac{|\mu_j|}{|\mu_i|}}_{>1}, \quad (172)$$

results in one positive eigenvalue, making the stationary point instable (saddle point).

Second singular triple ($i = 2$) For the singular triple $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_2, \mu = \mu_2$, equation (168) gives negative eigenvalues for $j = 3, \dots, n$ and $\lambda = -2, \lambda = 0$ for $j = 2$. So we have one semistable eigenvalue (0).

We analyze whether equation (167) gives an unstable eigenvalue (so we can leave the semistable eigenvalue aside):

$$\lambda = -1 \pm \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\mu_2|} \sqrt{(1 - s_1 \|\mathbf{u}_2\|)(1 - r_1 \|\mathbf{v}_2\|)} \quad (173)$$

$$= -1 \pm \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\mu_2|} \sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{\|\mathbf{u}_2\|}{\|\mathbf{u}_1\|}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_2\|}{\|\mathbf{v}_1\|}\right)}. \quad (174)$$

The factors under the square root are independent of each other (depending on the data) and thus can have the same or different signs. If they have different signs, the eigenvalue is complex and has a negative real value (stable). If they have the same sign, the eigenvalue is real, but its sign is not obvious: Even though the first factor is large ($|\mu_1|/|\mu_2| \gg 1$), the second factor obtained from the square root can be small. Thus equation (167) allows no data-independent stability judgment.

This leaves us with the semistable eigenvalue of 0 from equation (168). This is called a “non-hyperbolic fixed point”.⁴ We need to analyze the non-linear terms of the ODE system in the vicinity of this fixed point.

D. Example of a Saddle Point in a Lagrange-Multiplier Equation

Consider the following Lagrange-multiplier criterion for $\mathbf{x} = (x, y)$,

$$J(\mathbf{x}, \alpha) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x} + \alpha (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} - 1). \quad (175)$$

The derivatives are

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x} + \alpha \mathbf{1} \quad (176)$$

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial \alpha} = \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} - 1. \quad (177)$$

The Hessian of second derivatives is

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (178)$$

Octave gives the eigenvalues of \mathbf{H} as $(-1, 1, 2)$, thus the solution appears at a saddle point.

⁴Scholarpedia entry “Equilibrium”, www.scholarpedia.org/article/Equilibrium.