

Riemannian Hamiltonian methods for min-max optimization on manifolds

Andi Han* Bamdev Mishra† Pratik Jawanpuria† Pawan Kumar‡ Junbin Gao*

Abstract

In this paper, we study the min-max optimization problems on Riemannian manifolds. We introduce a Riemannian Hamiltonian function, minimization of which serves as a proxy for solving the original min-max problems. Under the Riemannian Polyak–Łojasiewicz (PL) condition on the Hamiltonian function, its minimizer corresponds to the desired min-max saddle point. We also provide cases where this condition is satisfied. To minimize the Hamiltonian function, we propose Riemannian Hamiltonian methods (RHM) and present their convergence analysis. We extend RHM to include consensus regularization and to the stochastic setting. We illustrate the efficacy of the proposed RHM in applications such as subspace robust Wasserstein distance, robust training of neural networks, and generative adversarial networks.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the Riemannian manifold constrained min-max problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{M}_x} \max_{y \in \mathcal{M}_y} f(x, y), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{M}_x, \mathcal{M}_y$ are Riemannian manifolds and $f : \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a jointly smooth real-valued function. The aim is to find a global saddle point (x^*, y^*) that satisfies for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y$,

$$f(x^*, y) \leq f(x^*, y^*) \leq f(x, y^*). \quad (2)$$

Examples of Riemannian manifolds of interest include the sphere manifold, the Stiefel manifold, the manifold of orthogonal matrices, the manifold of doubly stochastic matrices, and the symmetric positive definite manifold, to name a few [3, 12, 67, 10].

When both $\mathcal{M}_x, \mathcal{M}_y$ are the Euclidean space, problem (1) reduces to the classical min-max problem, which has been widely studied for applications including adversarial training [40], robust learning [19], generative adversarial networks [22, 5], constrained optimization [9], and fair statistical inference [39], among others. When f is convex in x and concave in y (convex-concave), the existence of a global saddle point is guaranteed by the well-established minimax theorem [53, 69]. Algorithms converging to such saddle points include the optimistic gradient descent ascent (OGDA) algorithm [59] and the extra-gradient algorithm (EG) [21], which have been analyzed in [52, 48, 49, 47]. For

*University of Sydney (andi.han@sydney.edu.au, junbin.gao@sydney.edu.au).

†Microsoft India. (bamdevm@microsoft.com, pratik.jawanpuria@microsoft.com).

‡IIIT Hyderabad India (pawan.kumar@iiit.ac.in)

the general nonconvex-nonconcave setting, however, the saddle point, be it local or global, may not exist [31], and it remains challenging to establish convergence for both OGDA and EG.

On Riemannian manifolds, there exist cases where many nonconvex (or nonconcave) functions turn out to be geodesic convex (or concave), a generalized notion of convexity on Riemannian manifolds [71]. This ensures the existence of a global saddle point on manifolds under the generalized min-max theorem [72, 79]. Furthermore, there is a growing interest in the Riemannian min-max problem (1) with applications such as orthonormal generative adversarial networks [51, 15], subspace robust Wasserstein distances [37, 28], and adversarial neural network training [26]. It is, therefore, motivating to study the min-max problem on manifolds.

Nevertheless, existing works that systematically study the Riemannian min-max problem are sparse. In [26], a Riemannian gradient descent ascent method has been proposed, yet the analysis is restricted to \mathcal{M}_y being a convex subset of the Euclidean space and $f(x, y)$ being strongly concave in y . A recent paper [79] has formally characterized the optimality conditions of the Riemannian min-max problem for geodesic convex geodesic concave functions. A Riemannian corrected extra-gradient algorithm has been proposed and analyzed.

Contributions

In this paper, we propose a class of methods for solving the min-max problem (1) on Riemannian manifolds, which we call Riemannian Hamiltonian methods (RHM). The idea is to minimize the squared norm of the Riemannian gradient of (1), known as the Riemannian Hamiltonian. Minimizing the Hamiltonian function serves as a good proxy for solving problem (1). Under the Riemannian Polyak–Łojasiewicz (PL) condition [78] on the Hamiltonian function, its minimizer recovers the desired saddle point. In the Euclidean space, the Hamiltonian gradient methods have been considered for solving min-max problems [1, 6, 44, 38], which show great promise in accelerating and stabilizing the convergence to saddle points. This paper generalizes many of those analysis to Riemannian manifolds.

It should be emphasized that the proposed generalization to manifolds is nontrivial as the analysis for the Euclidean counterparts, such as in [1], rely heavily on the matrix properties of the Jacobian. Generalization to Riemannian manifolds require adherence to Riemannian operations independent of the matrix structure. Another challenge is to deal with the varying inner product (Riemannian metric) structure on manifolds. We handle the above by devising novel proof strategies and proposing a metric-aware Riemannian Hamiltonian function that respects the manifold geometry.

In particular, we show global linear convergence of any Riemannian solver to saddle points of problem (1) as long as the Riemannian Hamiltonian of f satisfies the Riemannian PL condition [78]. We show this occurs when f is geodesic strongly convex geodesic strongly concave, and also for some nonconvex functions with sufficient geodesic linearity. We additionally extend the proposed RHM to incorporate a consensus regularization and to the stochastic setting, and prove their convergence. Existing Riemannian algorithms for solving (1) such as [79] make use of the exponential map to update the iterates on the manifolds. In this work, we discuss convergence results with exponential as well as general retraction maps on manifolds.

We empirically show the convergence of our proposed RHM algorithms for different min-max functions and compare them with existing baselines. We further demonstrate the usefulness of RHM algorithms in various applications such as learning subspace robust Wasserstein distance, robust training of neural networks and training of generative adversarial networks.

Organizations

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the preliminary knowledge on Riemannian geometry and Riemannian optimization as well as introduces various functions classes on Riemannian manifolds. We also briefly discuss the existing literature on mix-max optimization in the Euclidean space and on Riemannian manifolds. In Section 3, we propose the Riemannian Hamiltonian function and RHM algorithms, as well as analyze their convergence under the Riemannian PL condition. We provide three cases when such condition is satisfied. Section 4 introduces and analyzes the Riemannian Hamiltonian consensus method. Sections 5 and 6 extend the proposed methods to stochastic settings and to the case of retraction. In Section 7, we empirically compare our algorithms with different baselines on various applications. Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we give a brief overview of Riemannian geometry and relevant ingredients required for Riemannian optimization. For a more complete treatment of the topic, see [3, 12]. We also briefly discuss some of the existing works on min-max optimization.

2.1 Riemannian geometry and optimization

Basic Riemannian geometry

Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} is a manifold with a Riemannian metric, which is a smooth, symmetric positive definite function $g : T_p\mathcal{M} \times T_p\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on every tangent space $T_p\mathcal{M}$, with $p \in \mathcal{M}$. It is usually written as an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p$. The metric structure induces a norm for any tangent vector $\xi \in T_p\mathcal{M}$, which is $\|\xi\|_p := \sqrt{\langle \xi, \xi \rangle_p}$. For a linear operator on the tangent space $H : T_p\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_p\mathcal{M}$, its operator norm is defined as $\|H\|_p := \max_{\xi \in T_p\mathcal{M}: \|\xi\|_p=1} \|H[\xi]\|_p$.

A geodesic on the manifold $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is the locally shortest curve with zero acceleration. The exponential map at p , $\text{Exp}_p : T_p\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is defined as the end point of a geodesic along the initial velocity. That is, $\text{Exp}_p(\xi) = \gamma(1)$ where $\gamma'(0) = \xi$, $\gamma(0) = p$ for any $\xi \in T_p\mathcal{M}$. Riemannian distance is computed as $d(p, q) = \int_0^1 \|\gamma'(t)\|_{\gamma(t)} dt$ where $\gamma(t)$ is the distance minimizing geodesic connecting $p, q \in \mathcal{M}$. In a totally normal neighbourhood Ω where there exists a unique geodesic between any $p, q \in \Omega$, the exponential map has a well-defined inverse $\text{Exp}_p^{-1} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_p\mathcal{M}$ and the Riemannian distance can be written as $d(p, q) = \|\text{Exp}_p^{-1}(q)\|_p = \|\text{Exp}_q^{-1}(p)\|_q$. Parallel transport $\Gamma_p^q : T_p\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_q\mathcal{M}$ transports tangent vector along the geodesic while being isometric, i.e., $\langle \xi, \zeta \rangle_p = \langle \Gamma_p^q \xi, \Gamma_p^q \zeta \rangle_q$ for any $\xi, \zeta \in T_p\mathcal{M}$.

Riemannian product manifolds

The product of Riemannian manifolds $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y$ is a Riemannian manifold with the Riemannian metric defined as, for any $p = (x, y) \in \mathcal{M}$, and $(u, u'), (v, v') \in T_p\mathcal{M}$, $\langle (u, u'), (v, v') \rangle_p = \langle u, v \rangle_x^{\mathcal{M}_x} + \langle u', v' \rangle_y^{\mathcal{M}_y}$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_x^{\mathcal{M}_x}$, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_y^{\mathcal{M}_y}$ are Riemannian metrics on $\mathcal{M}_x, \mathcal{M}_y$ respectively. From the metric, one can derive the geodesic, the exponential map, parallel transport, Riemannian distance, which also admit a product structure. See more details in [12].

Riemannian optimization ingredients

Riemannian optimization treats the constrained problem as an unconstrained problem on manifold by generalizing the notions of gradient and Hessian. For a differentiable function $h : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Riemannian gradient at p , $\text{grad}h(p)$ is a tangent vector that satisfies $\langle \text{grad}h(p), \xi \rangle_p = Dh(p)[\xi]$ for any $\xi \in T_p\mathcal{M}$ where $Dh(p)[\xi]$ is the directional derivative of h along ξ . The Riemannian Hessian of h , $\text{Hess}h(p) : T_p\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_p\mathcal{M}$ is a symmetric linear operator, defined as the covariant derivative of the Riemannian gradient. For a bi-function $f : \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we can similarly define Riemannian partial gradient $\text{grad}_x f(x, y), \text{grad}_y f(x, y)$ as Riemannian gradient for x, y , holding the other variable constant. The Riemannian cross derivative $\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y) : T_x\mathcal{M}_x \rightarrow T_y\mathcal{M}_y$ is defined as $\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u] := D_x \text{grad}_y f(x, y)[u]$ and similarly for $\text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)$.

Riemannian geodesic convex optimization

Geodesic convexity [76, 12] generalizes the notion of convexity to Riemannian manifold. A *geodesic convex set* $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ requires for any two points in the set, there exist a geodesic (on \mathcal{M}) connecting them that lies entirely in the set. From this definition, any connected, complete Riemannian manifold is geodesic convex itself. A function $h : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *geodesic convex* if for any $p, q \in \Omega$, it satisfies that $h(\gamma(t)) \leq (1-t)h(p) + th(q)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$ and γ is a geodesic connecting p, q . A function is *geodesic linear* if it is both geodesic convex and geodesic concave. A twice differentiable function h is *geodesic μ -strongly convex* if $\frac{d^2 h(\gamma(t))}{dt^2} \geq \mu$. We call a function $h(p)$ *g-(strongly)-convex* if it is geodesic (strongly) convex. Similarly, we call a function $f(x, y)$ *g-(strongly)-convex-concave* if it is geodesic (strongly) convex in x and geodesic (strongly) concave in y .

Next, we define the spectrum of a linear operator on the tangent space, which is used to analyze the Riemannian Hessian as well as the Riemannian cross derivatives in the subsequent sections.

Definition 1 (Spectrum of a linear operator). Consider a linear operator $T : V \rightarrow W$ where V, W are two inner product spaces. If $V = W$, and T is symmetric, i.e., $T = T^*$, where T^* is the adjoint operator of T , then we say (λ, v) is an eigenpair of T if $T[v] = \lambda v$. In general, when $V \neq W$, the singular value σ of T is the square root of the eigenvalues of $T^* \circ T$.

We use $\lambda_{\min}/\lambda_{\max}$ and $\sigma_{\min}/\sigma_{\max}$ to represent the smallest/largest eigenvalues and singular values, respectively. We also use $\lambda_{|\min|}$ to denote the minimum eigenvalue in magnitude. Below, we introduce several function classes on manifolds, generalizing the Lipschitz continuity as well as the Polyak–Łojasiewicz condition from the Euclidean space [62, 58]

Definition 2 (Lipschitz continuity [12]). Let $L_0, L_1, L_2 > 0$.

- (1). A real-valued function $h : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L_0 -Lipschitz continuous if for all $p \in \mathcal{M}$, $\|\text{grad}h(p)\|_p \leq L_0$.
- (2). A vector field $V \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ is L_1 -Lipschitz continuous if for all $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and $s \in T_p\mathcal{M}$ such that $q = \text{Exp}_p(s) \in \Omega$, a totally normal neighbourhood of p , it satisfies $\|\Gamma_q^p V(q) - V(p)\|_x \leq L_1 \|s\|_p$.
- (3). A linear operator $H(p) : T_p\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_p\mathcal{M}$ is L_2 -Lipschitz continuous if for all $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and $q = \text{Exp}_p(s) \in \Omega$, it satisfies $\|\Gamma_q^p \circ H(q) \circ \Gamma_p^q - H(p)\|_p \leq L_2 \|s\|_p$.

Definition 3 (Polyak–Łojasiewicz (PL) condition on Riemannian manifold [78, 33, 23]). A function $h : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the PL condition on Riemannian manifold if for any $p \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{2} \|\text{grad}h(p)\|_p^2 \geq \delta(h(p) - h(p^*))$, where $p^* = \arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} h(p)$ is the global minimizer of h .

The following lemma shows the connection between smoothness of a function on manifold and its Lipschitz Riemannian gradient, which is fundamental for convergence analysis.

Lemma 1 (Lipschitz Riemannian gradient and smoothness [12]). *For a function $h : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its Riemannian gradient is L_1 -Lipschitz continuous if and only if $\|\text{Hess}h(p)\|_p \leq L_1$ for all $p \in \mathcal{M}$. Suppose h has L_1 -Lipschitz Riemannian gradient, then h is L_1 -smooth on \mathcal{M} with $|h(q) - h(p) - \langle \text{grad}h(p), s \rangle_p| \leq \frac{L_1}{2} \|s\|_p^2$, for all $q = \text{Exp}_p(s) \in \Omega$ and $p \in \mathcal{M}$.*

2.2 Min-max optimization

Here we discuss related works on min-max optimization both in the Euclidean space and on Riemannian manifolds.

In Euclidean space

In the Euclidean space (i.e., \mathbb{R}^n), the standard gradient descent ascent (GDA) that follows the min-max gradient is known to cycle or diverge for simple convex-concave objectives [43]. To address the cycling issue, the optimistic gradient descent ascent algorithm (OGDA) [59] modifies the GDA update to include an additional gradient momentum. On the other hand, the extra-gradient algorithm (EG) [21] employs an additional min-max gradient step at every iteration. As shown in [46, 47], both OGDA and EG methods approximate the proximal point method [61] and converge sublinearly under convex-concave settings [52, 48] and linearly under strongly-convex-strongly-concave settings [74, 46].

However, for the more general nonconvex-nonconcave settings, finding a global saddle point satisfying (2) is difficult and several existing works [16, 4, 41] aim to find a local saddle point that satisfies (2) in a local neighbourhood. It should be noted that when the function is convex-concave, all local saddle points are global.

A necessary set of conditions for the saddle points is that they satisfy the first-order stationarity, i.e., the gradients with respect to x and y vanish. This motivates the Euclidean Hamiltonian gradient descent (EHGD) [44, 6, 1, 38] approach for solving the min-max problem, which minimizes the sum of the squares of the gradient norms with respect to x and y . It should be noted that EHGD works under the assumption that all such stationary points are global min-max saddle points [1, 38]. Cases are discussed where this assumption is satisfied, which allows EHGD to converge to a global min-max saddle point of the original min-max problem [1, 38]. Further, studies [44, 6, 1, 38] demonstrate good empirical performance of EHGD in a variety of applications.

It should be noted that EHGD approaches have only been studied for unconstrained problems in the Euclidean space. Challenges in the constrained settings appear with definition of the Hamiltonian and subsequent analysis.

On Riemannian manifolds

There is a growing theoretical and empirical interest in solving min-max problems under Riemannian optimization framework [37, 28, 26, 79]. An extension of the GDA algorithm to manifolds, named RGDA, has been proposed in [26]. However, [26] considers a min-max setting in which the minimization problem (in x) is on a manifold, but the maximization problem (in y) is on a convex set. In addition, it analyzes the convergence when the maximization problem over y is strongly concave. Hence, [26] does not study the general Riemannian min-max problem (1). It discusses the

convergence of their algorithm to first-order stationary points of the min-max problem. Additionally, they propose different stochastic extensions of their algorithm and analyze their convergence.

Recently, [79] has proposed a Riemannian corrected extra-gradient algorithm (RCEG) for the Riemannian min-max problems (1), which contains two steps. First, RCEG takes a step similar to the RGDA update. Then, starting from the newly obtained point, RCEG combines the RGDA direction with the direction of the first step. In the g-convex-concave settings, this correction allows [79] to prove convergence of RCEG to global min-max saddle points of (1).

More details on the RGDA and RCEG algorithms are in Appendix C.

3 Riemannian Hamiltonian gradient methods

As mentioned earlier, the Euclidean Hamiltonian approach [44, 6, 1, 38] is a popular approach to tackle the min-max problem (1) when \mathcal{M}_x and \mathcal{M}_y are restricted to the Euclidean space. Specifically, the Euclidean Hamiltonian function \mathcal{E} is defined as,

$$\mathcal{E}(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla_x f(x, y)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla_y f(x, y)\|_2^2, \quad (3)$$

where $\nabla_x f(x, y)$ and $\nabla_y f(x, y)$ are the partial derivatives of f with respect to x and y , respectively. Here, $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the Frobenius norm. The global minimum of the function \mathcal{E} is attained when $\mathcal{E}(x, y) = 0$, i.e., $\nabla_x f(x, y) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\nabla_y f(x, y) = \mathbf{0}$. This corresponds to a first-order stationary point of the function f . Hence, minimization of \mathcal{E} in (3), becomes a good proxy to solve the original min-max problem.

Building on the Euclidean Hamiltonian approach, a generalization to the Riemannian min-max problem (1) requires understanding of first-order stationary points on manifolds \mathcal{M}_x and \mathcal{M}_y . These are necessarily identified with the points where the Riemannian gradient of f vanishes. This leads to our proposed Riemannian Hamiltonian function as

$$\mathcal{H}(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} \|\text{grad}_x f(x, y)\|_x^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\text{grad}_y f(x, y)\|_y^2, \quad (4)$$

where $\text{grad}_x f(x, y)$ and $\text{grad}_y f(x, y)$ are the Riemannian partial gradients of f with respect to x and y respectively. Here, $\|\text{grad}_x f(x, y)\|_x^2 = \langle \text{grad}_x f(x, y), \text{grad}_x f(x, y) \rangle_x^{\mathcal{M}_x}$ is the square of the gradient norm in the Riemannian metric sense on \mathcal{M}_x . Similarly, $\|\text{grad}_y f(x, y)\|_y^2 = \langle \text{grad}_y f(x, y), \text{grad}_y f(x, y) \rangle_y^{\mathcal{M}_y}$ is the square of the norm on \mathcal{M}_y .

Remark 1. The proposed Riemannian Hamiltonian function (4) generalizes the Euclidean Hamiltonian function (3) in two different ways:

- 1) Equation (4) implicitly embeds the manifold geometry of $\mathcal{M}_x, \mathcal{M}_y$ into the Hamiltonian function.
- 2) Equation (4) generalizes the Euclidean metric considered in (3) to a Riemannian metric. This generalization allows to use other varying metrics for min-max problems *in the Euclidean space*, e.g., the Fisher information metric [18] or real-projective space metrics [3, Chapter 2].

It should be noted that the Riemannian Hamiltonian (4) can be viewed on the product manifold $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y$, i.e., for $p = (x, y) \in \mathcal{M}$, the Riemannian gradient is $\text{grad}_p f(p) =$

$(\text{grad}_x f(x, y), \text{grad}_y f(x, y))$, and therefore, $\mathcal{H}(x, y) = \|\text{grad}_p f(p)\|_p^2$. Hence, we propose to solve the following problem on the product manifold as

$$\min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \mathcal{H}(p) = \frac{1}{2} \|\text{grad} f(p)\|_p^2 \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Similar to the EHGD approaches [1, 38], we work with the following assumption.

Assumption 1. The objective f admits at least one stationary point and all stationary points are global min-max saddle points.

It is worth noticing that under Assumption 1, solving (5) is equivalent to solving (1). On Riemannian manifolds, Assumption 1 holds when f is g-convex-concave.

We now show that the Riemannian gradient of the Riemannian Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}(p)$ admits a simple expression.

Proposition 1. *Riemannian gradient of \mathcal{H} is $\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p) = \text{Hess}f(p)[\text{grad}f(p)]$.*

Proof. First, we see that \mathcal{H} is a smooth function on the manifold due to the smoothness of f and its Riemannian gradient (formally characterized later in Proposition 2). For any smooth vector field $U : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow T\mathcal{M}$, denoted as $U \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$, we have $U\mathcal{H} = \langle \text{grad}\mathcal{H}, U \rangle$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the Riemannian metric (on any tangent space). Let ∇ be the Riemannian connection (or the Levi-Civita connection) of \mathcal{M} , which provides a way to differentiate vector fields on manifolds. By definition, the Riemannian connection satisfies the metric compatibility property [3, 12], i.e., $U\langle V, W \rangle = \langle \nabla_U V, W \rangle + \langle V, \nabla_U W \rangle$ for any vector fields U, V, W . Also, by definition, application of the Riemannian Hessian of $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ along a vector field U is $\text{Hess}f[U] = \nabla_U \text{grad}f$. Based on these claims, we show

$$\begin{aligned} U\mathcal{H} &= \frac{1}{2} U\langle \text{grad}f, \text{grad}f \rangle = \langle \nabla_U \text{grad}f, \text{grad}f \rangle = \langle \text{Hess}f[U], \text{grad}f \rangle \\ &= \langle \text{Hess}f[\text{grad}f], U \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the self-adjoint property of the Riemannian Hessian. The proof is complete by noticing $\langle \text{Hess}f[\text{grad}f], U \rangle = \langle \text{grad}\mathcal{H}, U \rangle$ for any U . \square

Remark 2. The importance of the varying metric in the proposed Riemannian Hamiltonian (4), can be observed in Proposition 1, where we obtain a simple expression for the Riemannian gradient of \mathcal{H} . This allows to connect the properties of \mathcal{H} with that of the min-max objective f , discussed in detail later in Section 3.2.

Remark 3. It should be noted that for the Euclidean case when $x \in \mathbb{R}^m, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, existing works [6, 1, 38] analyze the Hamiltonian methods in the form of $\mathbf{J}^\top v$, where \mathbf{J} is an asymmetric Jacobian matrix and v is the min-max gradient $(\nabla_x f(x, y), -\nabla_y f(x, y))$. For the same setting, however, Proposition 1 obtains the Hamiltonian gradient as $\mathbf{H}\nabla f$, where \mathbf{H} and ∇f are the (Euclidean) Hessian matrix and gradient vector $\nabla f = (\nabla_x f(x, y), \nabla_y f(x, y))$, respectively. This is not surprising as $\mathbf{J}^\top v = \mathbf{H}\nabla f$. Proposition 1 allows to analyze the performance of the Riemannian Hamiltonian approach in terms of the symmetric Riemannian Hessian operator. The analysis in [1, 38] heavily rely on the matrix structure of \mathbf{J} and makes use of the linear algebraic properties of the Jacobian. Our approach, thanks to Proposition 1, adheres to general Riemannian manifolds as we directly deal with the operator, which is independent of the matrix structure. Hence, many of the subsequent analysis in this paper differ from [1, 38].

Algorithm 1 Riemannian Hamiltonian methods (RHM)

- 1: Initialize $p_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{M}$.
 - 2: **for** $t = 0, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 3: Compute the step $\xi(p_t)$ from the gradient $\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t) = \text{Hess}f(p_t)[\text{grad}f(p_t)]$.
 - 4: Update $p_{t+1} = \text{Exp}_{p_t}(\xi(p_t))$.
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **Output:** p_T .
-

To minimize the Riemannian Hamiltonian (5), one can apply first-order Riemannian solvers including Riemannian steepest descent [75], Riemannian conjugate gradient [60], or second-order solvers, such as Riemannian trust-regions [2, 11], provided the Hessian (or approximated Hessian) of the Hamiltonian is available. We refer to such class of methods for solving min-max problems on manifolds collectively as Riemannian Hamiltonian methods (RHM). Its procedures are outlined in Algorithm 1, where the step $\xi(p_t)$ is computed depending on the selected solver.

Now we analyze the performance of the proposed RHM. In particular, we aim to obtain the global minimizer p^* of \mathcal{H} , which satisfies $\mathcal{H}(p^*) = 0$ with RHM. However, this may not always be numerically tractable without additional structures on the Riemannian Hamiltonian. One such structure is assuming the Riemannian Hamiltonian is g -convex, for which RHM converges to the optimal p^* (g -convexity guarantees convergence to global optimality). This, however, may not lead to interesting problem classes for f . Moreover, there is no guarantee that \mathcal{H} is a g -convex even when f is g -convex-concave.

Another interesting structure is the Polyak–Łojasiewicz (PL) condition. The PL condition [58] amounts to a sufficient condition to establish linear convergence for gradient-based methods to global optimality [32]. The Riemannian version of the PL condition (Definition 3) has been studied in [78, 33, 80, 23]. In Section 3.1, we impose the Riemannian PL condition on the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} as it allows convergence of RHM to global optimality. It should be noted that functions satisfying the Riemannian PL condition subsume g -(strongly)-convex functions. In Section 3.2, we discuss many interesting function classes of f that allow the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} to satisfy the condition.

3.1 Convergence analysis

To analyze the convergence of RHM, we focus on the Riemannian steepest descent direction in the main text, i.e., $\xi(p_t) = -\eta_t \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)$ with either fixed stepsize or variable stepsize computed from backtracking line-search [13, 12]. We include the details of implementing the Riemannian conjugate gradient and Riemannian trust-region methods together with their convergence analysis in Appendix F.

We make the following standard assumption [3, 12, 78, 66] throughout the rest of the paper.

Assumption 2. The objective f , its Riemannian gradient, and its Riemannian Hessian are L_0, L_1, L_2 -Lipschitz continuous, respectively.

In the next proposition, we show that the Riemannian Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} is L -smooth.

Proposition 2 (Smoothness of Riemannian Hamiltonian). *Under Assumption 2, the Riemannian Hamiltonian is L -smooth with $L = L_0L_2 + L_1^2$, i.e., for any $p \in \mathcal{M}, q = \text{Exp}_p(\xi)$, it satisfies $\mathcal{H}(q) \leq \mathcal{H}(p) + \langle \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p), \xi \rangle_p + \frac{L}{2} \|\xi\|_p^2$.*

Proof. According to Lemma 1, it is sufficient to show that the Riemannian gradient of \mathcal{H} is L -Lipschitz. From Proposition 1 and Assumption 2, we have for any $p \in \mathcal{M}$, $q = \text{Exp}_p(s) \in \Omega$, the domain of exponential map around p ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Gamma_p^q \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p) - \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(q)\|_q &= \|\Gamma_p^q \text{Hess}f(p)[\text{grad}f(p)] - \text{Hess}f(q)[\text{grad}f(q)]\|_q \\
&\leq \|\Gamma_p^q \text{Hess}f(p)[\text{grad}f(p)] - \text{Hess}f(q)[\Gamma_p^q \text{grad}f(p)]\|_q \\
&\quad + \|\text{Hess}f(q)[\Gamma_p^q \text{grad}f(p)] - \text{Hess}f(q)[\text{grad}f(q)]\|_q \\
&= \|\text{Hess}f(p)[\text{grad}f(p)] - \Gamma_q^p \text{Hess}f(q)[\Gamma_p^q \text{grad}f(p)]\|_p \\
&\quad + \|\text{Hess}f(q)[\Gamma_p^q \text{grad}f(p)] - \text{Hess}f(q)[\text{grad}f(q)]\|_q \\
&\leq L_2 \|\text{grad}f(p)\|_p \|s\|_p + L_1 \|\Gamma_p^q \text{grad}f(p) - \text{grad}f(q)\|_q \\
&\leq (L_0 L_2 + L_1^2) \|s\|_p,
\end{aligned}$$

where we apply the triangle inequality and the isometry property of parallel transport. \square

If the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} satisfies the Riemannian PL condition, then we show that Algorithm 1 with the steepest descent update (RHM-SD) converges linearly to the global minimizer of \mathcal{H} . We begin with the convergence result for RHM-SD with fixed stepsize.

Theorem 1 (Linear convergence of RHM-SD with fixed stepsize). *Let f satisfy Assumption 2 and \mathcal{H} satisfy the Riemannian PL condition, i.e., $\frac{1}{2}\|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p)\|_p^2 \geq \delta\mathcal{H}(p)$ (with $\mathcal{H}(p^*) = 0$). Consider Algorithm 1 using steepest descent direction with fixed stepsize $\eta_t = \eta = 1/L$, where $L = L_0 L_2 + L_1^2$. Then, the iterates p_t satisfy $\|\text{grad}f(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \leq (1 - \frac{\delta}{L})^t \|\text{grad}f(p_0)\|_{p_0}^2$.*

Proof. From the smoothness of the Riemannian Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} (Proposition 2, Lemma 1) and the gradient update in Algorithm 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}(p_{t+1}) - \mathcal{H}(p_t) &\leq -\eta \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 + \frac{\eta^2 L}{2} \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \\
&= -\frac{1}{2L} \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \leq -\frac{\delta}{L} \mathcal{H}(p_t),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality employs the Riemannian PL condition. This leads to $\mathcal{H}(p_{t+1}) \leq (1 - \frac{\delta}{L})\mathcal{H}(p_t)$. Applying this result recursively completes the proof. \square

Line-search methods are practically favourable because they adapt the stepsize without requiring the knowledge of the Lipschitz constant L . Here, we consider the backtracking line-search for choosing stepsize η_t for Riemannian steepest descent, which is commonly used in practice. Given an initial stepsize $\bar{\eta}$, the backtracking line-search iteratively decreases the stepsize by a factor of $\varrho \in (0, 1)$ until the Armijo-type sufficient decrease condition is satisfied, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{H}(p_t) - \mathcal{H}(\text{Exp}_{p_t}(\eta_t \zeta(p_t))) \geq r_1 \eta_t \langle -\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t), \zeta(p_t) \rangle_{p_t}, \quad (6)$$

for some update direction $\zeta(p_t)$. The complete procedure is included in Appendix B. We next present the convergence for RHM-SD with backtracking linesearch.

Theorem 2 (Linear convergence of RHM-SD with backtracking line-search). *Under the same setting as in Theorem 1, consider Algorithm 1 using the steepest descent direction with backtracking line-search, parameters $r_1, \rho \in (0, 1)$, and an initial stepsize $\bar{\eta}$. Then, the iterates p_t satisfy*

$$\|\text{grad}f(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \leq \left(1 - 2 \min \left\{ \bar{\eta} r_1, \frac{2\rho(1-r_1)r_1}{L} \right\} \delta \right)^t \|\text{grad}f(p_0)\|_{p_0}^2.$$

Proof. Given \mathcal{H} is L -smooth, the proof follows from [12, Lemma 4.12] and the Riemannian PL condition. \square

3.2 Important problem classes for RHM

We now discuss the instances of f where the Riemannian Hamiltonian satisfies the Riemannian PL condition (Definition 3). This allows RHM (Algorithm 1) to converge to global min-max saddle points of (1).

From the expression of $\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p)$ in Proposition 1, we observe that if all eigenvalues of $\text{Hess}f(p)$ are lower bounded in magnitude (i.e., $|\lambda| \geq \alpha > 0$), then the Riemannian Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} satisfies the Riemannian PL condition with $\delta = \alpha^2$. This is because

$$\underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p)\|_p^2 \geq \alpha^2\mathcal{H}(p)}_{\text{Riemannian PL condition}} \Leftrightarrow \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\|\text{Hess}f(p)[\text{grad}f(p)]\|_p^2 \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{2}\|\text{grad}f(p)\|_p^2}_{\text{Required eigenvalue bound on Hess}f(p)}. \quad (7)$$

Our aim, therefore, is to identify classes of f that satisfy the right hand side of (7). We provide three cases where the Riemannian PL condition is naturally satisfied on the Riemannian Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} , which generalize the results in [1] to Riemannian manifolds. These include the cases when the objective f is g -strongly-convex-concave and when f is smooth with sufficient geodesic linearity.

In order to analyze function classes of f that lead to (7), we require the following results on the Riemannian Hessian $\text{Hess}f(p)$ of the product manifold \mathcal{M} (which are of independent interest as well).

- 1) Decomposition of the Riemannian Hessian $\text{Hess}f(p)$ and adjoint property of the cross derivatives. This is shown in Appendix D.
- 2) We establish general lower bounds on the eigenvalue magnitude of the Riemannian Hessian, which we include in Appendix E.

The above results help to bound the eigenvalues of $\text{Hess}f(p)$ in terms of the spectrum of $\text{Hess}_x f(x, y)$, $\text{Hess}_y f(x, y)$, and the cross derivatives $\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)$, $\text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)$. We now present the main results below.

Proposition 3 (Geodesic strongly convex strongly concave). *Let $f(x, y)$ be geodesic strongly convex in x and geodesic strongly concave in y with parameter $\mu > 0$. Then, \mathcal{H} satisfies the Riemannian PL condition (7) with $\delta = \mu^2$.*

Proof. We show that if there exists an eigenpair (λ, ξ) of $\text{Hess}f(p)$ such that $|\lambda| < \mu$ with $p = (x, y)$, $\xi = (u, v)$, then it leads to a contradiction. From the expression of the Riemannian Hessian in Proposition 9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u] + \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v] &= \lambda u \\ \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[v] + \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u] &= \lambda v. \end{aligned}$$

This can be equivalently written as

$$\langle \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u], u \rangle_x + \langle \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v], u \rangle_x = \lambda \|u\|_x^2 \quad (8)$$

$$\langle \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[v], v \rangle_y + \langle \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u], v \rangle_y = \lambda \|v\|_y^2. \quad (9)$$

From (8), we obtain

$$\langle \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v], u \rangle_x = -\langle u, (\text{Hess}_x f(x, y) - \lambda \text{id})[u] \rangle_x, \quad (10)$$

where id is the identity operator. From the symmetry of the Riemannian cross derivatives (Proposition 10), we can substitute (10) into (9), which gives

$$\langle \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[v], v \rangle_y - \langle u, (\text{Hess}_x f(x, y) - \lambda \text{id})[u] \rangle_x = \lambda \|v\|_y^2. \quad (11)$$

The geodesic strong convexity in x and geodesic strong concavity in y leads to $\text{Hess}_x f(x, y) \succeq \mu \text{id}$ and $\text{Hess}_y f(x, y) \preceq -\mu \text{id}$ respectively. Thus the LHS of (11) is smaller than $-\mu$, which contradicts $|\lambda| < \mu$. Thus, all eigenvalues of $\text{Hess}f(p)$ satisfies $|\lambda| \geq \mu$. \square

Proposition 4 (Smooth and geodesic linear). *Let $\sigma_{\min}(\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)) \geq \tau > 0$ and let $f(x, y)$ be geodesic linear in one variable and has L_1 -Lipschitz Riemannian gradient in another variable. Then, \mathcal{H} satisfies the Riemannian PL condition (7) with $\delta = \frac{\tau^4}{2\tau^2 + L_1^2}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $f(x, y)$ has L_1 -Lipschitz gradient in x and geodesic linear in y . The geodesic linearity in y implies that $\text{Hess}_y f(x, y) = 0$, and therefore, we can apply Lemma 2, which shows

$$\lambda_{|\min|}^2(\text{Hess}f(p)) \geq \frac{\sigma_{\min}^4(\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y))}{2\sigma_{\min}^2(\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)) + \|\text{Hess}_x f(x, y)\|_x^2}.$$

Also, from Lemma 1, we have $\|\text{Hess}_x f(x, y)\|_x^2 \leq L_1^2$. Finally, from the assumption $\sigma_{\min}(\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)) \geq \tau$, the proof is complete. \square

Proposition 5 (Smooth and sufficiently geodesic bilinear). *Let $0 < \tau \leq \sigma(\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)) \leq \Upsilon$ and let $f(x, y)$ has L_1 -Lipschitz Riemannian gradient for both x and y . Define $\mu = \lambda_{|\min|}(\text{Hess}_x f(x, y))$, $\rho = \lambda_{|\min|}(\text{Hess}_y f(x, y))$ and let the sufficient geodesic bilinearity condition holds: $(\tau^2 + \mu^2)(\tau^2 + \rho^2) - 4L_1^2\Upsilon^2 > 0$. Then, \mathcal{H} satisfies the Riemannian PL condition (7) with $\delta = \frac{(\tau^2 + \mu^2)(\tau^2 + \rho^2) - 4L_1^2\Upsilon^2}{2\tau^2 + \rho^2 + \mu^2}$.*

Proof. We can directly apply Lemma 3 and set $a = 2\tau^2 + \rho^2 + \mu^2$ and $b = (\tau^2 + \mu^2)(\tau^2 + \rho^2) - 4L_1^2\Upsilon^2 > 0$ by assumption. \square

It is worth noticing that the sufficient geodesic bilinearity condition in Proposition 5 can be interpreted as requiring a sufficiently large weight on the geodesic bilinear component in the objective function f . To see this, suppose $f(x, y) = c_l f_0(x, y) + f_1(x) + f_2(y)$ where f_0 is geodesic linear in each x and y (i.e. bilinear) with the weight $c_l > 0$ and f_1, f_2 have L_1 -Lipschitz Riemannian gradient. Because by definition, Riemannian Hessian of a geodesic linear function is zero, f has $2L_1$ -Lipschitz Riemannian gradient (by Lemma 1). Let τ_0, Υ_0 be the minimum and maximum singular values of $\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f_0(x, y)$. Then, $\tau = c_l \tau_0, \Upsilon = c_l \Upsilon_0$. The sufficient geodesic bilinearity condition is satisfied for $c_l \geq 4L_1 \Upsilon_0 / \tau_0^2$. This is because $(\tau^2 + \mu^2)(\tau^2 + \rho^2) > \tau^4 = c_l^4 \tau_0^4 \geq 16L_1^2 c_l^2 \Upsilon_0^2 = 16L_1^2 \Upsilon^2$.

Remark 4. In particular, when $f_1(x) = f_2(y) = 0$, $f(x, y) = c_l f_0(x, y)$ is geodesic bilinear. Then, \mathcal{H} satisfies the Riemannian PL condition with $\delta = \frac{c_l^2 \tau_0^2}{2}$.

Algorithm 2 Riemannian Hamiltonian consensus (RHM-CON) method

- 1: **Input:** Stepsize η and regularization parameter γ .
 - 2: Initialize $p_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{M}$.
 - 3: **for** $t = 0, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 4: Compute the min-max gradient $v(p_t) = (\text{grad}_x f(x_t, y_t), -\text{grad}_y f(x_t, y_t))$.
 - 5: Compute the update direction $\zeta(p_t) = \gamma v(p_t) + \text{Hess}f(p_t)[\text{grad}f(p_t)]$.
 - 6: Update $p_{t+1} = \text{Exp}_{p_t}(-\eta_t \zeta(p_t))$.
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **Output:** p_T .
-

4 Riemannian Hamiltonian consensus method

In the Euclidean setting, [44] proposes the consensus method for solving min-max problems in the Euclidean space. The consensus method has also been viewed as a perturbation of the Euclidean Hamiltonian method [1]. In this section, we propose an extension of RHM with steepest descent update, namely the Riemannian Hamiltonian consensus method (RHM-CON), by combining the Hamiltonian gradient direction with the min-max gradient direction. The update of RHM-CON is given by

$$p_{t+1} = \text{Exp}_{p_t}(-\eta_t \zeta(p_t)) = \text{Exp}_{p_t}\left(-\eta_t (\gamma v(p_t) + \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t))\right),$$

with $\gamma \geq 0$ and $v(p_t) := (\text{grad}_x f(x_t, y_t), -\text{grad}_y f(x_t, y_t))$ is the min-max gradient. When $\gamma = 0$, this reduces to RHM-SD. The RHM-CON method is formalized in Algorithm 2. Below, we provide the convergence result for RHM-CON.

Theorem 3 (Linear convergence of RHM-CON). *Under Assumption 2 with $L = L_0 L_2 + L_1^2$, suppose that the Riemannian Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} satisfies the PL condition. Let $c > 0$ such that $\|\zeta(p_t)\|^2 = \|\gamma v(p_t) + \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|^2 \geq c\|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|^2$ for all the iterates p_t . Set $\gamma < \sqrt{\delta}$, $\eta_t = \eta \leq \frac{1}{L}$, then Algorithm 2 converges with*

$$\|\text{grad}f(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \leq (1 - \nu)^t \|\text{grad}f(p_0)\|_{p_0}^2,$$

where $\nu = (c\delta + \delta - \gamma^2)\eta - Lc\delta\eta^2 > 0$.

Proof. First, we highlight that

$$\frac{1}{2}\|v(p)\|_p^2 = \frac{1}{2}\|\text{grad}f(p)\|_p^2 = \mathcal{H}(p).$$

From the smoothness of Riemannian Hamiltonian (Proposition 2, Lemma 1) and the update in

Algorithm 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{H}(p_{t+1}) - \mathcal{H}(p_t) \\
& \leq -\eta \langle \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t), \zeta(p_t) \rangle_{p_t} + \frac{\eta^2 L}{2} \|\zeta(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \\
& = -\frac{\eta}{2} \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 + \frac{\eta}{2} \|\zeta(p_t) - \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 - \left(\frac{\eta}{2} - \frac{\eta^2 L}{2}\right) \|\zeta(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \\
& \leq \left(-\frac{\eta}{2} - \frac{\eta c}{2} + \frac{\eta^2 L c}{2}\right) \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 + \frac{\eta \gamma^2}{2} \|v(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \\
& \leq (-\eta - \eta c + \eta^2 L c) \delta \mathcal{H}(p_t) + \eta \gamma^2 \mathcal{H}(p_t) \\
& = \left(L c \delta \eta^2 - c \delta \eta - \delta \eta + \eta \gamma^2\right) \mathcal{H}(p_t),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from $\eta \leq \frac{1}{L}$ (which gives $\frac{\eta}{2} - \frac{\eta^2 L}{2} \geq 0$) and the lower bound on $\|\zeta(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2$. The last inequality uses the PL condition and $\eta \leq \frac{1}{L} < \frac{1+c}{Lc}$, which ensures $-\frac{\eta}{2} - \frac{\eta c}{2} + \frac{\eta^2 L c}{2} < 0$. From the choice of η and γ as well as the definition of ν , we have $\nu > 0$. This is because $\nu = \eta(c\delta + \delta - \gamma^2 - Lc\delta\eta) \geq \eta(\delta - \gamma^2) > 0$. Thus, $\mathcal{H}(p_{t+1}) = (1 - \nu)\mathcal{H}(p_t)$ ensuring linear convergence. Applying this result recursively completes the proof. \square

From Theorem 3, we see that linear convergence is achieved provided that the weight γ on min-max gradient direction is sufficiently small. Also, we highlight that a uniform parameter $c > 0$ always exists in a compact set as long as $\gamma v(p_t) \neq -\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)$. This can be ensured by choosing a small value for γ .

5 Stochastic min-max optimization

Applications such as domain generalization, robust training, and generative adversarial networks yield a min-max problem with a stochastic function f , e.g., with a finite sum structure of the function [38]. Under the stochastic setting, the objective function in (1) can be expressed as an expectation, i.e.,

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{M}_x} \max_{y \in \mathcal{M}_y} \left\{ f(x, y) = \mathbb{E}_\omega [f(x, y; \omega)] \right\},$$

where $\omega \in \mathcal{D}$ is a random variable following a certain distribution \mathcal{D} . This implies an expectation structure on the Riemannian Hamiltonian as

$$\mathcal{H}(p) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbb{E}_\omega [\text{grad}f(p; \omega)] \right\|_p^2 = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbb{E}_\varphi \langle \text{grad}f(p; \omega), \text{grad}f(p; \varphi) \rangle_p,$$

for $\omega, \varphi \in \mathcal{D}$. Modifying Proposition 1 for the stochastic setting leads to

$$\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\omega, \varphi} \left[\text{Hess}f(p; \omega) [\text{grad}f(p; \varphi)] + \text{Hess}f(p; \varphi) [\text{grad}f(p; \omega)] \right].$$

Let $\text{grad}\mathcal{H}_{\omega, \varphi}(p) := \frac{1}{2} \text{Hess}f(p; \omega) [\text{grad}f(p; \varphi)] + \frac{1}{2} \text{Hess}f(p; \varphi) [\text{grad}f(p; \omega)]$. We can modify RHM-SD by replacing the gradient of Hamiltonian with its stochastic version (which we call RHM-SGD) as

$$\text{grad}\mathcal{H}_{S, S'}(p_t) := \frac{1}{|S||S'|} \sum_{\omega \in S, \varphi \in S'} \text{grad}\mathcal{H}_{\omega, \varphi}(p), \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{|\mathcal{S}|}\}, \mathcal{S}' = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{|\mathcal{S}'|}\}$ are randomly selected subsets with $\omega_i, \varphi_j \in \mathcal{D}$. The stochastic Hamiltonian gradient provides an unbiased estimate of the full gradient, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'}[\text{grad}\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'}(p)] = \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p)$. We now show the convergence result of RHM-SGD.

Theorem 4 (Convergence of RHM-SGD with fixed and decaying stepsize). *Let Assumption 2 hold with $L = L_0L_2 + L_1^2$, and let the Riemannian Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} satisfy the PL condition with parameter δ . Assume also that the variance of the stochastic gradient is bounded, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\omega, \varphi} \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}_{\omega, \varphi}(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \leq G$. Then, RHM-SGD with fixed stepsize $\eta_t = \eta < \frac{1}{2\delta}$ converges with $\mathbb{E} \|\text{grad}f(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \leq (1 - 2\eta\delta)^t \mathbb{E} \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_0)\|_{p_0}^2 + \frac{\eta LG}{4}$. Also, RHM-SGD with decaying stepsize $\eta_t = \frac{2t+1}{2\delta(t+1)^2}$, converges with $\mathbb{E} \|\text{grad}f(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \leq \frac{LG}{2\delta^2 t}$.*

Proof. The proof follows from [32, Theorem 4] and can be easily adapted to the Riemannian manifold setting, and therefore, is omitted. \square

We can similarly consider the stochastic version of RHM-CON, which we denote as RHM-SCON, with the update step as

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'}(p_t) = \gamma(v_{\mathcal{S}}(p_t) + v_{\mathcal{S}'}(p_t))/2 + \text{grad}\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'}(p_t),$$

where $v_{\mathcal{S}}(p_t)$ is the stochastic min-max gradient on sample set \mathcal{S} . Theorem 4 can be adapted to prove the convergence of RHM-SCON following similar assumptions and analysis in Theorem 3.

6 Convergence under retraction

Existing algorithms for solving (1), such as RCEG [79], employs the exponential map to update iterates on the manifolds. However, in many cases, the computational cost of implementing the exponential map for many Riemannian manifolds is prohibitive. An alternative is to consider the more general retraction operation [3, Chapter 4]. In this section, we show that the use of retraction (instead of the exponential map) in RHM algorithms guarantees similar convergence under an additional mild assumption.

Retraction $R_p : T_p\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a map that satisfies for all $p \in \mathcal{M}$, (1) $R_p(0) = p$ (2) $DR_p(0)[\xi] = \xi$ for all $\xi \in T_p\mathcal{M}$. From the definition, we observe that the exponential map is a special case of retraction. In practice, when an efficient retraction is available, the Hamiltonian gradient update can be performed via retraction, i.e., $p_{t+1} = R_{p_t}(-\eta \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t))$. To analyze the convergence, we make the following additional assumption that bound the differential operator of the retraction map.

Assumption 3. There exists constants $\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0$ such that the retraction curve $c(t) := R_p(t\xi)$ with $\|\xi\|_p = 1$ satisfies $\|c'(t)\|_{c(t)} \leq \theta_1$ and $\|c''(t)\|_{c(t)} \leq \theta_2$ for all t where $c(t) \in \mathcal{U}$, where \mathcal{U} is a compact subset of \mathcal{M} .

This assumption is always satisfied for a compact manifold \mathcal{M} . The compactness appears to be necessary for retraction-based analysis for first-order algorithms [23, 66, 33, 12]. We remark that for the case of the exponential map, the retraction curve coincides with the geodesic curve. Then, $\theta_1 = 1$ because $\|c'(t)\|_{c(t)} = \|\Gamma_p^{c(t)}\xi\|_{c(t)} = 1$ by isometric property of parallel transport. Also, $\theta_2 = 0$ from the definition of the geodesic.

Proposition 6. *Under Assumptions 2 and 3, the Riemannian Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} is retraction L_R -smooth with $L_R = \theta_1^2 L + \theta_2 L_1 L_0$, i.e., for any $p \in \mathcal{M}$, $q = R_p(\xi) \in \mathcal{U}$, we have $\mathcal{H}(q) \leq \mathcal{H}(p) + \langle \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p), \xi \rangle_p + \frac{L_R}{2} \|\xi\|_p^2$.*

Proof. For any retraction curve $c(t) = R_p(t\xi)$ with $\|\xi\|_p = 1$ and $t \geq 0$ such that $c(t) \in \mathcal{U}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \mathcal{H}(c(t)) &= \langle \text{Hess} \mathcal{H}(c(t)) [c'(t)], c'(t) \rangle_{c(t)} + \langle \text{grad} \mathcal{H}(c(t)), c''(t) \rangle_{c(t)} \\ &\leq L\theta_1^2 + \theta_2 \|\text{Hess} f(c(t)) [\text{grad} f(c(t))]\|_{c(t)} \\ &\leq L\theta_1^2 + \theta_2 L_1 L_0 = L_R, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where the second inequality applies the gradient of Hamiltonian is L -Lipschitz (Proposition 2, Lemma 1) and Assumption 3. The last inequality follows from Assumption 2. The proof from (13) to L_R -smoothness of \mathcal{H} is due to [29, Lemma 3.2], which we include here for completeness.

For any $\xi \in T_p \mathcal{M}$ such that $R_p(\xi) \in \mathcal{U}$, let $\alpha = \|\xi\|_p$, $\zeta = \xi/\|\xi\|_p$ and hence $\xi = \alpha\zeta$ with $\|\zeta\|_p = 1$. Applying Taylor's Theorem on $\mathcal{H} \circ R_p$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(R_p(\xi)) - \mathcal{H}(p) &= \mathcal{H}(R_p(\alpha\zeta)) - \mathcal{H}(R_p(0)) \\ &= \alpha \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}(R_p(t\zeta)) \Big|_{t=0} + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \mathcal{H}(R_p(t\zeta)) \Big|_{t=\tilde{t}} \\ &\leq \alpha \langle \text{grad} \mathcal{H}(p), \zeta \rangle_p + \frac{\alpha^2 L_R}{2} \\ &= \langle \text{grad} \mathcal{H}(p), \xi \rangle + \frac{L_R}{2} \|\xi\|_p^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{t} \in [0, \alpha]$. Thus, the proof is complete. \square

Using Proposition 6, we show below that RHM-SD attains a linear convergence rate with retraction.

Theorem 5 (Linear convergence of RHM-SD under retraction). *Under same settings as in Theorem 1, suppose Assumption 3 holds, and the iterates stay in the compact set \mathcal{U} . Then, RHM-SD with retraction and $\eta = 1/L_R$ converges with $\|\text{grad} f(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \leq (1 - \frac{\delta}{L_R})^t \|\text{grad} f(p_0)\|_{p_0}^2$.*

Similar analysis with retraction operation can be performed for other variants of RHM including RHM-CON, RHM-SGD, and RHM-SCON.

7 Experiments

In this section, we discuss empirical performance of the proposed Riemannian Hamiltonian methods for various min-max optimization problems on manifolds. The algorithms are implemented in Matlab using the Manopt package [14] except for Section 7.4, 7.5 where we use Pytorch with the Geopt package [34]. We highlight that there exist many other manifold optimization packages, such as ROPTLIB [30], Manopt.jl [8], Pymanopt [73], McTorch [42], and RiemOpt [70], where RHM can also be implemented efficiently. We use the following acronyms for the various RHM algorithms considered in this section.

- RHM-SD-F: RHM with steepest descent direction with fixed stepsize.
- RHM-SD: RHM with steepest descent direction with backtracking line search.
- RHM-CON: RHM consensus method with fixed stepsize (Section 4).

- RHM-CG: RHM with the conjugate gradient method.
- RHM-TR: RHM with the trust-region method where we use Hessian approximation with finite differentiation [11].
- RHM-SGD: RHM with stochastic gradient (Section 5)
- RHM-SCON: RHM with stochastic consensus method (Section 5)

We compare the proposed Riemannian Hamiltonian methods with the Riemannian gradient descent ascent (RGDA) [26] and the Riemannian corrected extra-gradient (RCEG) [79]. As discussed previously, RGDA has not been studied and analyzed for solving the general min-max problem (1), but when \mathcal{M}_y is a convex subset of the Euclidean space [26]. In our experiments, however, we extend RGDA to solve (1).

For all the experiments, we implement the algorithms with exponential map for comparability with RCEG, except for the applications of subspace robust Wasserstein distance (Section 7.3), robust training (Section 7.4) and generative adversarial networks (Section 7.5) where we implement with retraction map because the manifolds considered do not have a well-defined logarithm map. Hence, for these applications, RCEG is excluded for comparison. In robust training and generative adversarial network experiments, we also test stochastic algorithms for RGDA and RHM. The codes are available at <https://github.com/andyjm3>.

7.1 Geodesic quadratic bilinear optimization

The first example we consider is

$$f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = c_q(\log \det(\mathbf{X}))^2 + c_l \log \det(\mathbf{X}) \log \det(\mathbf{Y}) - c_q(\log \det(\mathbf{Y}))^2, \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, the set of $d \times d$ symmetric positive definite (SPD) matrices. The weights $c_l, c_q \geq 0$ control the balance between the linear and quadratic terms.

For $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, the tangent space $T_{\mathbf{X}}\mathbb{S}_{++}^d$ is the set of symmetric matrices. When endowed with the affine-invariant (AI) metric, i.e., $\langle \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_{\mathbf{X}} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{X}^{-1}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{X}^{-1}\mathbf{V})$, for any $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \in T_{\mathbf{X}}\mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, one can derive the geodesic, exponential map, and other Riemannian optimization ingredients [24, 10, 56]. We include the expressions in Appendix A. Here, we use \mathcal{M}_{SPD} to represent the SPD manifold with the AI metric. It is worth noticing that the function (14) is nonconvex-nonconcave in the Euclidean space (with details included in Appendix G).

However, the log-det function is geodesic linear on SPD manifold with the AI metric [71] and we show in the following proposition that $f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ is g-convex-concave, although not necessarily g-strongly-convex-concave.

Proposition 7. *The function (14) is g-convex-concave on \mathcal{M}_{SPD} but not g-strongly-convex-concave.*

We next prove that the Riemannian Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} of the objective (14) satisfies the PL condition, which allows linear convergence of the proposed RHM algorithms.

Proposition 8. *The Riemannian Hamiltonian of (14) satisfies the PL condition with $\delta = (4c_q^2 + c_l^2)d^2$. A point $(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*)$ is a global saddle point of (14) if and only if it satisfies $\det(\mathbf{X}^*) = \det(\mathbf{Y}^*) = 1$.*

In Proposition 8, we see that there exist a continuum of global saddle points. Consequently, we define an optimality gap criterion as $|\det(\mathbf{X}) - 1| + |\det(\mathbf{Y}) - 1|$ for a candidate point (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) .

Experiment settings and results

We consider $d = 30$ and discuss results on various combinations of c_q, c_l . We compare our RHM with RGDA [26] and RCEG [79]. All the choices of stepsize are tuned to reflect the best performance except for RHM-SD, RHM-CG, RHM-TR where the stepsizes are selected adaptively by the algorithms. For RHM-CON, we set $\gamma = 0.5$. Convergence of an algorithm is measured in terms of $\|\text{grad}f(p_t)\|_{p_t}$, which is equivalent to $\sqrt{2\mathcal{H}(p_t)}$. This measure of convergence has also been considered in [79] for min-max problems on manifolds. Algorithms are stopped either when gradient norm falls below 10^{-10} or the max iteration has been reached. Results are reported in Fig. 1.

From Fig. 1, we observe rapid convergence of RHM algorithms in all the settings. The convergence for RGDA varies across different choices of c_q, c_l where it converges faster when the weight on the quadratic term (c_q) is relatively higher and is not able to converge when c_l increases. We also observe convergence for RCEG in all cases but the rate is slower compared to RHM algorithms. In Fig. 1f, we further compare the optimality gap where we observe all the proposed RHM algorithms reach below 10^{-10} at a faster rate than the baselines. The slopes of RHM-SD-F and RHM-CON are steeper than that of RCEG (indicating better theoretical rates for RHM). Additional results on optimality gap comparisons are in Fig. 4 in Appendix H. Finally, Fig. 1g shows the runtime performance of various algorithms, with the markers indicating the progress of respective algorithms per iteration. We observe that the per-iteration computational cost of RHM is higher than RGDA. This is because RHM exploits second-order information of f to compute the gradient of \mathcal{H} . Also, we see that RCEG can be costly because it requires evaluation of the exponential map twice and the logarithm map once per iteration.

7.2 Robust Geometry-aware PCA

Geometry-aware principal component analysis (PCA) on \mathcal{M}_{SPD} [25] concerns dimensionality reduction for SPD matrices while preserving geometric structures on the manifold. The robust PCA (or robust Fréchet mean) on SPD manifolds has been considered in [79]. For a set of SPD matrices $\mathbf{M}_i \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, the aim is to find the Fréchet mean $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$ that is bounded away from zero, i.e.,

$$\min_{\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{SPD}}} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}^d} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x} + \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{dist}^2(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}_i), \quad (15)$$

where $\alpha > 0$ and $\mathcal{S}^{d-1} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = 1\}$ denotes the sphere manifold and $\text{dist} : \mathbb{S}_{++}^d \times \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$ is the Riemannian distance on \mathcal{M}_{SPD} .

We first note that the function in (15) is geodesic strongly convex in \mathbf{M} and geodesic nonconcave in \mathbf{x} . Also, it is difficult to verify the Riemannian PL condition on the Hamiltonian of (15). Hence, this is a challenging problem instance as it does not fall into the studied settings of the existing works [26, 79] including ours.

Experiment settings and results

For this problem, we follow the same settings as discussed in [79] for generating the SPD matrices \mathbf{M}_i with the eigenvalues bounded in $[\mu_0, \mu_1]$. Following [79], we choose $d = 50$, $n = 40$, $\mu_0 = 0.2$, and $\mu_1 = 4.5$. The convergence results are presented in Figs. 2a and 2b, where we only include RHM-SD-F, RHM-CON ($\gamma = 0.5$), and RHM-CG for clarity (RHM-TR performs similar to RHM-CG). We observe that although RGDA and RCEG converge faster than RHM when $\alpha = 3$, they fail




Figure 1: Experiments on the geodesic quadratic bilinear problem (14) with $d = 30$, under varying weights c_q, c_l . We observe that our RHM algorithms converge quickly in all settings while baselines such as RGDA [26] and RCEG [79]. The performance of RGDA varies greatly with the settings where it converges only for a few settings and for the others RGDA fails to converge. RCEG presents a relatively more stable convergence behavior than RGDA but with a rate that is slower than our proposed RHM algorithms.

to converge when $\alpha = 0.1$. The latter finding is not surprising as both RGDA and RCEG seem to perform poorly on approximately bilinear problems (as also observed in Section 7.1). In contrast, we observe that RHM algorithms converge in both the settings, which is also validated by our analysis in Section 3.2. It is known that the conjugate gradient based methods outperforms steepest descent methods on more challenging optimization problems. This explains the faster convergence of RHM-CG over RHM-SD-F and RHM-CON. Overall, the results in Fig. 2 show the benefit of the Riemannian Hamiltonian modeling in non standard settings.

7.3 Subspace robust Wasserstein distance

We next consider the problem of learning subspace robust Wasserstein distance [55, 37, 28], where the aim is to compute the Wasserstein distance over the worst-case optimal transport cost on a low-




Figure 2: Convergence on the robust geometry-aware PCA (RGPCA) problem (15) with $d = 50, n = 40, \mu = 0.2, L = 4.5$, and subspace robust Wasserstein distance (SRWD) problem on the example of fragmented hypercube [37]. We observe that the baselines RGDA and RCEG fail to converge for $\alpha = 0.1$ (approximately bilinear setting), whereas the proposed RHM algorithms show convergence for $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\alpha = 0.3$.

dimensional space. Given two discrete measures on \mathbb{R}^d , $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \nu = \sum_{j=1}^n b_j \delta_{\mathbf{y}_j}$ where $\delta_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the Dirac at location \mathbf{x} . The weights a_i, b_j belong to the probability simplex, i.e., $\sum_i a_i = \sum_j b_j = 1$. The objective (with entropy regularization) is then given as

$$\min_{\Gamma \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \max_{\mathbf{U} \in \text{St}(d, r)} \sum_{i, j} \left(\Gamma_{i, j} \|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{y}_j\|_2^2 + \epsilon \pi_{i, j} (\log(\pi_{i, j}) - 1) \right), \quad (16)$$

where $\text{St}(d, r) := \{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r} : \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}\}$ is the set of column orthonormal matrices ($d \geq r$), known as the Stiefel manifold. $\Pi(\mu, \nu) := \{\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : \Gamma_{i, j} > 0, \sum_i \Gamma_{i, j} = b_j, \sum_j \Gamma_{i, j} = a_i, \forall i, j\}$ is the set of couplings, which forms the so-called doubly stochastic manifold (or coupling manifold) [18, 67, 45].

Experiment settings and results

We follow the same experiment settings as in [37, 28] and consider a uniform distribution over hypercube $[-1, 1]^d$ and a pushforward map defined as $T(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} + 2 \text{sign}(\mathbf{x}) \odot (\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{e}_i)$, where $\text{sign}(\mathbf{x})$ extracts the sign of \mathbf{x} elementwise and $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=1}^d$ are the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^d .

We choose $d = 30, r = 5, k = 2, n = 100, \epsilon = 0.2$ and compare the proposed RHM-SD-F, RHM-CON ($\gamma = 0.5$), RHM-CG with RGDA in Fig. 2c. RCEG cannot be implemented to solve (16) because the doubly stochastic manifold does not have a well-defined logarithm map. From the results, we see similar convergence speed of all methods while due to the inbuilt line-search algorithm of RHM-CG, it converges to a point with a smaller gradient norm.

7.4 Robust training of neural networks with orthonormal weights

We next consider adversarial robust training of deep neural networks with orthonormal weights [26]. Adversarial training of neural networks provide robust prediction against small data perturbations. Orthonormality on parameters has shown to improve generalization accuracy as well as accelerate and stabilize convergence of neural network models [7, 17, 77, 27]. This corresponds to optimization over the Stiefel manifold.

In particular, we consider the adversarial training to defend against a universal perturbation \mathbf{p} proposed in [50]. The perturbation set we consider is the sphere manifold $\mathcal{S}^{d-1}(r) := \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{p}\|_2 = r\}$ with radius r . This requires the perturbed samples to stay a certain distance away from




Figure 3: (3a): Convergence on adversarial robust training of neural network (RTNN). (3b): generative adversarial networks with orthonormal weights (OGAN). (3c): Ground truth distribution. (3d), (3e): generated samples from RSGDA, RHM-SCON respectively where we see RHM-SCON quickly converge to the ground truth distribution while RSGDA suffers from mode collapse. The numbers in the parentheses indicated the best tuned stepsizes for different algorithms.

the original ones, a strategy also applied in [36]. Given a set of data-target pairs $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are the feature vectors. The objective of adversarial training is

$$\min_{\{\mathbf{W}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L, \mathbf{W}_\ell \in \text{St}(d_\ell, d_{\ell+1})} \max_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}(r)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}(h(\mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{p}; \{\mathbf{W}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L), y_i),$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a loss function and $h(\cdot)$ represents the forward function of a neural network.

Experiment settings and results

The adversarial training is implemented for classification tasks on MNIST images [35] where we include two hidden layers of size 16 with the orthonormality constraint. We compare the proposed stochastic version of RHM (RHM-SGD), detailed in Section 5, with Riemannian stochastic gradient descent ascent (RSGDA) algorithm [26]. We highlight that RHM-SCON performs similarly to RHM-SGD, and thus, we exclude its result for clarity. Because we require dual sampling per-iteration to compute the stochastic Hamiltonian gradient $\text{grad}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'}}(p_t) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{S}'|} \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{S}, \varphi \in \mathcal{S}'} \text{grad}_{\mathcal{H}_{\omega, \varphi}}(p)$, we choose the batch size to be 32 for both $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'$ and 64 for RSGDA. Hence, the per-iteration sampling cost is identical. We measure convergence in terms of the relative Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}(p_t)/\mathcal{H}(p_0)$, where the Hamiltonian is evaluated on the full training set. The stepsize is fixed for both the algorithms.

We plot the convergence results (with the best tuned stepsize) in Fig. 3a, which are averaged over five different runs. We see a clear advantage of RHM-SGD compared to RSGDA with faster and more stable convergence.

7.5 Orthonormal generative adversarial networks

Generative adversarial networks (GAN) [22, 6] are popular in generating synthetic samples by optimizing a min-max game between a generator and a discriminator. The orthonormality constraint on weight parameters of the discriminator has shown to benefit the training of GANs [15, 51]. In particular, given samples $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ we consider the following min-max problem

$$\min_{\{\mathbf{W}_\ell^D\}: \mathbf{W}_\ell^D \in \text{St}(d_\ell, d_{\ell+1})} \max_{\{\mathbf{W}_\ell^G\}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\log(\sigma(D(\mathbf{x}_i))) + \log(1 - \sigma(D(G(\mathbf{z}_i)))) \right),$$

where $D(\cdot), G(\cdot)$ represent the discriminator and generator with $\{\mathbf{W}_\ell^D\}, \{\mathbf{W}_\ell^G\}$ denoting their network weight parameters respectively. Here, $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid function and the prior \mathbf{z}_i is sampled from the standard normal distribution.

Experiment settings and results

Following [6], we train the GAN model on 2d samples from a multimodal mixture of Gaussian distribution. The ground truth is shown in Fig. 3c. Both the generator and discriminator have 5 hidden layers with 128 units and ReLU activation. The dimension of the prior \mathbf{z}_i is 64. For simplicity, we add the orthonormal constraint only for the penultimate layer of the discriminator model. For this experiment, we apply RHM-SCON with $\gamma = 0.5$ and compare against RSGDA, both with fixed stepsize. The batch size is chosen to be 128 for RHM-SCON and 256 for RSGDA. Similarly, the best choices of stepsize are reported, and the results are averaged over five different runs.

The convergence in terms of the relative Hamiltonian are shown in Fig. 3b, where we see RSGDA diverges while RHM-SCON is more stable. We also examine the solution quality by providing the generated samples from both algorithms at iteration $10^4, 2 \times 10^4$, and 3×10^4 in Figs 3d and 3e respectively. We note that RSGDA results in undesired mode collapse, an observation also made in [6] for training SGDA on the Euclidean space. In contrast, RHM-SCON quickly converges and recovers the ground truth distribution. Even though RHM-SGD converges to a lower Hamiltonian value, its performance in recovery of the ground truth is poor, as shown in Fig. 5 in Appendix H where the generated samples collapse to a single point. It indicates that RHM-SGD converges to a stationary point which is not a saddle point (not surprising as Assumption 1 may not be satisfied). This also highlights the practical benefit of consensus regularization for RHM (Section 4), as evidenced in the good performance of RHM-SCON.

8 Concluding remarks

Building on the success of the Hamiltonian methods for solving min-max problems in the Euclidean space, we have considered a more general problem on manifolds, and proposed a Riemannian Hamiltonian function \mathcal{H} that respects the manifold geometry. This leads to a gradient expression (in Proposition 1) that allows simple analysis for the resulting optimization methods. Adapting the proofs from the Euclidean space to Riemannian manifolds requires to forgo the matrix structure of the ingredients, which includes addressing a varying inner product (Riemannian metric). The proposed Riemannian Hamiltonian methods (RHM) come with convergence guarantees and various extensions. The experiments validate the good performance of RHM in different applications. As future work, one direction is to develop variance reduction stochastic extension to RHM. In addition,

the current convergence analysis is measured in the Riemannian Hamiltonian, which is the gradient norm squared of the original objective f . It remains a question whether linear convergence can be maintained in terms of the optimality gap on function value of f .

A Riemannian geometries of the considered manifolds

In this section, we review the Riemannian optimization-related ingredients of several manifolds that are considered in the experiments section. The expressions are from the works [3, 12, 71, 67, 18, 45].

A.1 Symmetric positive definite manifold

Consider the set of the symmetric positive definite matrices of size $d \times d$, $\mathbb{S}_{++}^d := \{\mathbf{X} : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : \mathbf{X}^\top = \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X} \succeq \mathbf{0}\}$, equipped with the affine-invariant Riemannian metric. The geodesic from \mathbf{X} to \mathbf{Y} is given by $\gamma(t) = \mathbf{X}^{1/2}(\mathbf{X}^{-1/2}\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}^{-1/2})^t\mathbf{X}^{1/2}$. At $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, the exponential map is derived as $\text{Exp}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{U}) = \mathbf{X} \exp(\mathbf{X}^{-1}\mathbf{U})$ for any $\mathbf{U} \in T_{\mathbf{X}}\mathbb{S}_{++}^d$. The logarithm map is $\text{Log}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{Y}) = \mathbf{X} \log(\mathbf{X}^{-1}\mathbf{Y})$. The Riemannian gradient of a function $f : \mathbb{S}_{++}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by $\text{grad}f(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{X}\nabla f(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{X}$, where $\nabla f(\mathbf{X})$ is the Euclidean partial derivative of f at \mathbf{X} .

A.2 Sphere manifold

It is defined as $\mathcal{S}^{d-1} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = 1\}$, which is an embedded submanifold of \mathbb{R}^d with the tangent space expression $T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{S}^{d-1} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{u} = 0\}$. It can be endowed with the standard inner product at the Riemannian metric, i.e., $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbf{x}} = \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_2$, for $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{S}^{d-1}$. The orthogonal projection of any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to $T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ is derived as $\text{Proj}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{v})\mathbf{x}$. The exponential map along $u \in T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ is $\text{Exp}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) = \cos(\|\mathbf{v}\|_2)\mathbf{x} + \sin(\|\mathbf{v}\|_2)\frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|}$ and the logarithm map is $\text{Log}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}) = \arccos(\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y})\frac{\text{Proj}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})}{\|\text{Proj}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})\|_2}$. The Riemannian gradient of f is $\text{Proj}_{\mathbf{x}}(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}))$, where $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$ is the Euclidean partial derivative of f at \mathbf{x} .

A.3 Stiefel manifold

It is the set $\text{St}(d, r) = \{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r} : \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{I}\}$. It is a generalization of the sphere manifold to higher dimensions and can be similarly endowed with the standard inner product as metric $\langle \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_{\mathbf{X}} = \langle \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_2$. For the experiments, we consider the popular QR-based retraction for approximating the exponential map, i.e., $R_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{U}) = \text{qf}(\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{U})$, where $\text{qf}(\cdot)$ returns the Q-factor from the QR decomposition for any tangent vector \mathbf{U} .

A.4 Doubly stochastic manifold

The doubly stochastic manifold (or coupling manifold) between two discrete probability measures $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \nu = \sum_{j=1}^n b_j \delta_{\mathbf{y}_j}$ is the set of couplings $\Pi(\mu, \nu) := \{\mathbf{\Gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : \mathbf{\Gamma}_{i,j} > 0, \sum_i \mathbf{\Gamma}_{i,j} = b_j, \sum_j \mathbf{\Gamma}_{i,j} = a_i, \forall i, j\}$ endowed with the Fisher information Riemannian metric. The geometry has been developed in [18, 67, 45].

Without loss of any generality, we assume $\sum_i a_i = \sum_j b_j = 1$. The tangent space at $\mathbf{\Gamma} \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ is given by $T_{\mathbf{\Gamma}}\Pi(\mu, \nu) = \{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : \sum_i \mathbf{U}_{i,j} = \sum_j \mathbf{U}_{i,j} = 0, \forall i, j\}$. The Fisher information metric is defined as for $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \in T_{\mathbf{\Gamma}}\Pi(\mu, \nu)$, $\langle \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_{\mathbf{\Gamma}} = \sum_{i,j} (\mathbf{U}_{i,j}\mathbf{V}_{i,j})/\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i,j}$. For the experiments, we consider the Sinkhorn-based retraction. The Sinkhorn-Knopp algorithm [68] is a popular

Algorithm 3 Backtracking line-search

- 1: **Input:** Current iterate $p_t \in \mathcal{M}$, search direction $\xi_t \in T_{p_t}\mathcal{M}$, initial stepsize $\bar{\vartheta}$ and $r_1, \varrho \in (0, 1)$.
 - 2: Initialize $\vartheta \leftarrow \bar{\vartheta}$.
 - 3: **while** $h(p_t) - h(\text{Exp}_{p_t}(\vartheta\xi_t)) < r_1\vartheta\langle -\text{grad}h(p_t), \xi_t \rangle_{p_t}$ **do**
 - 4: Set $\vartheta \leftarrow \varrho\bar{\vartheta}$.
 - 5: **end while**
 - 6: **Output:** ϑ .
-

approach for balancing non-negative matrices to satisfy the row-sum and column sum constraint and later adapted to solve the optimal transport problem efficiently [57]. Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\mathbf{A}_{i,j} > 0$, and denote $\text{Sinkhorn}(\mathbf{A})$ as the output of applying the Sinkhorn-Knopp algorithm on \mathbf{A} with constraint defined by $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$, i.e., $\text{Sinkhorn}(\mathbf{A}) \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$. Subsequently, the retraction is given by $R_{\mathbf{\Gamma}}(\mathbf{U}) = \text{Sinkhorn}(\mathbf{\Gamma} \odot \exp(\mathbf{U} \oslash \mathbf{\Gamma}))$, where \exp , \odot , and \oslash are elementwise exponential, product, and division operations, respectively.

B Line-search methods and Wolfe conditions on Riemannian manifolds

In this section, we provide details of implementing line-search methods on Riemannian manifolds. We first present the Riemannian versions of the Armijo, Wolfe, and strong Wolfe conditions [65].

Definition 4. Consider an iterative algorithm for minimizing $h : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, producing $p_{t+1} = \text{Exp}_{p_t}(\vartheta_t\xi_t)$ for some direction $\xi_t \in T_{p_t}\mathcal{M}$ and stepsize $\vartheta_t \in \mathbb{R}$. The Armijo condition is $h(p_t) - h(p_{t+1}) \geq r_1\vartheta_t\langle -\text{grad}h(p_t), \xi_t \rangle$, for some $r_1 \in (0, 1)$. The (weak) Wolfe condition is the Armijo condition together with (17) and the strong Wolfe condition is the Armijo condition with (18), where

$$\langle \text{grad}h(p_{t+1}), \text{DExp}_{p_t}(\vartheta_t\xi_t)[\xi_t] \rangle_{p_{t+1}} \geq r_2\langle \text{grad}h(p_t), \xi_t \rangle_{p_t} \quad (17)$$

$$|\langle \text{grad}h(p_{t+1}), \text{DExp}_{p_t}(\vartheta_t\xi_t)[\xi_t] \rangle_{p_{t+1}}| \leq r_2|\langle \text{grad}h(p_t), \xi_t \rangle_{p_t}| \quad (18)$$

for some $r_2 \in (r_1, 1)$. Here, DExp is the differential of the exponential operation.

One can generalize the analysis from the Euclidean space to show that there exists a stepsize that satisfy the three conditions for arbitrary direction ξ_t . The backtracking line-search for satisfying the Armijo condition is in Algorithm 3. This has been used in Riemannian steepest descent method [13]. The procedures that return stepsizes satisfying the Wolfe conditions are in [63, 54].

C Review of RGDA and RCEG

In this section, we provide the details of the Riemannian gradient descent ascent [26] and Riemannian corrected extra-gradient [79] algorithms for min-max optimization on manifolds.

RGDA simultaneously updates the variables in the direction of the min-max Riemannian gradient, i.e.,

$$x_{t+1} = \text{Exp}_{x_t}(-\eta_t \text{grad}_x f(x_t, y_t)), \quad y_{t+1} = \text{Exp}_{y_t}(\eta_t \text{grad}_y f(x_t, y_t)).$$

RCEG first updates the variables to the point (w_t, z_t) along the min-max Riemannian gradient. It then uses the obtained point to generate the final update, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} w_t &= \text{Exp}_{x_t}(-\eta_t \text{grad}_x f(x_t, y_t)), \\ z_t &= \text{Exp}_{y_t}(\eta_t \text{grad}_y f(x_t, y_t)), \\ x_{t+1} &= \text{Exp}_{w_t}(-\eta_t \text{grad}_x f(w_t, y_t) + \text{Log}_{w_t}(x_t)), \\ y_{t+1} &= \text{Exp}_{z_t}(\eta_t \text{grad}_y f(w_t, y_t) + \text{Log}_{z_t}(y_t)). \end{aligned}$$

D Key propositions

In this section, we derive the explicit expression for the Riemannian Hessian on the product manifold $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y$ and show that the cross derivatives are adjoint with respect to the Riemannian metric.

Proposition 9 (Riemannian Hessian of product manifold). *Consider a product Riemannian manifold $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y$ and $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For any $p = (x, y) \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\xi = (u, v) \in T_x \mathcal{M}$, the Riemannian Hessian $\text{Hess}f(p)[\xi]$ is derived as*

$$\text{Hess}f(p)[\xi] = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u] + \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v] \\ \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u] + \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[v] \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. From standard analysis, the Levi-Civita connection on a product manifold $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y$ (e.g., in [12, Exercise 5.4]) is given by

$$\nabla_{(U_x, U_y)}(V_x, V_y) = \left(\nabla_{U_x}^{(x)} V_x + D_y V_x[U_y], D_x V_y[U_x] + \nabla_{U_y}^{(y)} V_y \right),$$

where $V_x \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M}_x)$, $V_y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M}_y)$ are vector fields on respective manifolds and D is the directional derivative. Further, $D_y V_x : \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M}_y) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M}_x)$ and when evaluating at (x, y) , this is equivalently defined as $D_y V_x(x, \cdot)(y) : T_y \mathcal{M}_y \rightarrow T_x \mathcal{M}_x$, which is the directional derivative. $\nabla^{(x)}$, $\nabla^{(y)}$ are the Levi-Civita connections on \mathcal{M}_x , \mathcal{M}_y , respectively. Applying the definition of the Riemannian Hessian, $\text{Hess}f(p)[\xi] = \nabla_{\xi} \text{grad}f(p)$, we obtain the desired result. \square

Proposition 10. *For any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y$ and $(u, v) \in T_x \mathcal{M}_x \times T_y \mathcal{M}_y$, we have $\langle \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v], u \rangle_x = \langle \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u], v \rangle_y$. Equivalently, $\text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)$ is the adjoint operator of $\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)$.*

Proof. Let $p = (x, y)$ and $\xi = (u, v)$, $\zeta = (w, z)$ for any $(u, v), (w, z) \in T_x \mathcal{M}_x \times T_y \mathcal{M}_y$. Then, from the self-adjoint property (symmetry) of the Riemannian Hessian, we have

$$\langle \text{Hess}f(p)[\xi], \zeta \rangle_p = \langle \text{Hess}f(p)[\zeta], \xi \rangle_p, \quad (19)$$

for any ξ, ζ . Combining with Proposition 9, the result (19) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u], w \rangle_x + \langle \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v], w \rangle_x + \langle \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u], z \rangle_y \\ & + \langle \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[v], z \rangle_y \\ = & \langle \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[w], u \rangle_x + \langle \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[z], u \rangle_x + \langle \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[w], v \rangle_y \\ & + \langle \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[z], v \rangle_y. \end{aligned}$$

Given that Hess_x and Hess_y satisfy the self-adjoint property, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v], w \rangle_x + \langle \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u], z \rangle_y \\ &= \langle \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[z], u \rangle_x + \langle \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[w], v \rangle_y. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

We can see (20) holds for any choice of $(u, v), (w, z)$ and this only happens when $\langle \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v], u \rangle_x = \langle \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u], v \rangle_y$ holds for any (u, v) . To see this, consider the vectorization of the tangent vectors as $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}$. We also denote $\mathbf{B}_{xy}, \mathbf{B}_{yx}$ as the matrix representation of the linear operators $\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y), \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)$ at (x, y) respectively. Then (20) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{G}_x \mathbf{B}_{yx} \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{G}_y \mathbf{B}_{xy} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{G}_x \mathbf{B}_{yx} \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{G}_y \mathbf{B}_{xy} \mathbf{w},$$

where $\mathbf{G}_x, \mathbf{G}_y$ are the (symmetric positive definite) metric tensors at x, y . This is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{z}^\top (\mathbf{G}_y \mathbf{B}_{xy} - \mathbf{B}_{yx}^\top \mathbf{G}_x) \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{G}_y \mathbf{B}_{xy} - \mathbf{B}_{yx}^\top \mathbf{G}_x) \mathbf{w},$$

which is satisfied for any $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}$ and any $\mathbf{G}_x, \mathbf{G}_y$ as metric tensors. Hence, $\mathbf{G}_y \mathbf{B}_{xy} = \mathbf{B}_{yx}^\top \mathbf{G}_x$ and the proof is complete. \square

Remark 5. Proposition 10 shows that the Riemannian cross derivatives are symmetric with respect to Riemannian metric on respective manifolds. When $\mathcal{M}_x, \mathcal{M}_y$ are the Euclidean spaces, then Proposition 10 is equivalent to the Schwarz's theorem of symmetric second-order derivatives.

E Essential lemmas

The following lemmas generalize [1, Lemmas 17, 28] to linear operators specifically in terms of the Riemannian Hessian operator. We first highlight that for two operators T, T^* that are adjoint, we have $\lambda(T \circ T^*) = \lambda(T^* \circ T) = \sigma^2(T) = \sigma^2(T^*)$.

Lemma 2. *Consider the Riemannian Hessian $\text{Hess}f(p)$ where $p = (x, y) \in \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y$. Suppose $\text{Hess}_y f(x, y) = 0$. Then, $\lambda_{|\min|}(\text{Hess}f(p)) \geq \frac{\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy})}{\sqrt{2\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \|H_x\|_x^2}}$.*

Proof. We consider the operator $\text{Hess}f(p) \circ \text{Hess}f(p)$ and study its eigenvalue. First, we see that for any $p = (x, y) \in \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y$ and $\xi = (u, v) \in T_x \mathcal{M}_x \times T_y \mathcal{M}_y$, we have

$$\text{Hess}f(p)[\xi] = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u] + \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v] \\ \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u] \end{pmatrix},$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Hess}f(p)[\text{Hess}f(p)[\xi]] \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u] + \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v]] \\ \quad + \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u]] \\ \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u] + \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v]] \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose (δ, ξ) is an eigenpair of the operator $\text{Hess}f(p) \circ \text{Hess}f(p)$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u]] + \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v]] \\ + \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u]] = \delta u, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u]] + \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v]] = \delta v. \quad (22)$$

Let $B_{xy} = \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)$, $B_{yx} = \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)$, and $H_x = \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)$. Suppose $\delta < \frac{\sigma_{\min}^4(B_{xy})}{2\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \|H_x\|_x^2} < \sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy})$. Then, we have $B_{xy} \circ B_{yx} - \delta \text{id}$ is invertible where we use the fact that B_{xy} and B_{yx} are adjoint. Hence, from (22) we have $v = -(B_{xy} \circ B_{yx} - \delta \text{id})^{-1} \circ (B_{xy} \circ H_x)[u]$. Substituting the expression of v into (21) yields

$$\left(H_x \circ (\text{id} - B_{yx} \circ (B_{xy} \circ B_{yx} - \delta \text{id})^{-1} \circ B_{xy}) \circ H_x + B_{yx} \circ B_{xy} - \delta \text{id} \right) [u] = 0. \quad (23)$$

We next show that when

$$\delta < \frac{\sigma_{\min}^4(B_{xy})}{2\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \|H_x\|_x^2} < \sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}), \quad (24)$$

then (23) does not have a nontrivial solution in u (i.e., $u \neq 0$), which leads to a contradiction that ξ is an eigenvector. It suffices to show that for any δ satisfying the condition (24), the following inequality

$$\frac{-\delta \|H_x\|_x^2}{\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) - \delta} + \sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) - \delta > 0, \quad (25)$$

holds, which violates (23). Here, we highlight B_{xy} is the adjoint of B_{yx} , and therefore, the eigenvalues $\lambda_i(\text{id} - B_{yx} \circ (B_{xy} \circ B_{yx} - \delta \text{id})^{-1} \circ B_{xy}) = \frac{-\delta}{\sigma_i^2(B_{xy}) - \delta} < 0$ from the singular value decomposition of B_{xy} . The roots of (25) are

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= \sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \frac{1}{2} \|H_x\|_x^2 - \sqrt{(\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \frac{1}{2} \|H_x\|_x^2)^2 - \sigma_{\min}^4(B_{xy})} \\ r_2 &= \sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \frac{1}{2} \|H_x\|_x^2 + \sqrt{(\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \frac{1}{2} \|H_x\|_x^2)^2 - \sigma_{\min}^4(B_{xy})}. \end{aligned}$$

One can show for any $c_1 > 0$, $4c_2 < c_1^2$, then $\frac{2c_2}{c_1} < c_1 - \sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2}$. Let $c_1 = \sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \frac{1}{2} \|H_x\|_x^2$, $c_2 = \frac{1}{4} \sigma_{\min}^4(B_{xy})$, we have the smaller root satisfies $r_1 > \frac{\sigma_{\min}^4(B_{xy})}{2\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \|H_x\|_x^2} > \delta$. Hence, there does not exist $u \neq 0$ that satisfies (23), which implies $\delta \geq \frac{\sigma_{\min}^4(B_{xy})}{2\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \|H_x\|_x^2}$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3. Consider the Riemannian Hessian $\text{Hess}f(p)$, where $p = (x, y) \in \mathcal{M}_x \times \mathcal{M}_y$. Let $H_x := \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)$, $H_y := \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)$, $B_{xy} := \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} a &= 2\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \lambda_{|\min|}^2(H_x) + \lambda_{|\min|}^2(H_y), \\ b &= \left(\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \lambda_{|\min|}^2(H_x) \right) \left(\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \lambda_{|\min|}^2(H_y) \right) \\ &\quad - \sigma_{\max}^2(B_{xy}) (\|H_x\|_x + \|H_y\|_y)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $b > 0$. Then, $\lambda_{|\min|}(\text{Hess}f(p)) \geq \sqrt{\frac{b}{a}}$.

Proof. Similarly to Lemma 2, we consider the operator $\text{Hess}f(p) \circ \text{Hess}f(p)$, i.e.,

$$\text{Hess}f(p)[\xi] = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u] + \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v] \\ \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[v] + \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u] \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Hess}f(p)[\text{Hess}f(p)[\xi]] \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u] + \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v]] \\ + \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[v]] + \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u]] \\ \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[v] + \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u]] \\ + \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u]] + \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v]] \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose (δ, ξ) is an eigenpair of the operator $\text{Hess}f(p) \circ \text{Hess}f(p)$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u]] + \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v]] \\ & + \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[v]] + \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u]] = \delta u, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[v]] + \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[u]] \\ & + \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[\text{Hess}_x f(x, y)[u]] + \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)[\text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)[v]] = \delta v. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Denote $T_x := H_x \circ H_x + B_{yx} \circ B_{xy} - \delta \text{id}$ and similarly for $T_y := H_y \circ H_y + B_{xy} \circ B_{yx} - \delta \text{id}$, where $H_x = \text{Hess}_x f(x, y)$, $H_y = \text{Hess}_y f(x, y)$ and $B_{xy} = \text{grad}_{xy}^2 f(x, y)$, $B_{yx} = \text{grad}_{yx}^2 f(x, y)$. Then, we can simplify (26) and (27) as

$$\begin{aligned} T_x[u] &= -(H_x \circ B_{yx} + B_{yx} \circ H_y)[v] \\ T_y[v] &= -(H_y \circ B_{xy} + B_{xy} \circ H_x)[u] \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Suppose $\delta < \frac{b}{a}$. Then, we can show T_y is invertible. This is because, for any $c_1 > 0$, $4c_2 < c_1^2$, we have $\frac{2c_2}{c_1} < c_1 - \sqrt{c_1^2 - 4c_2}$. From the definition of a and b and setting $c_1 = a$, $c_2 = b$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2b}{a} &< 2\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \lambda_{\min}(H_x \circ H_x) + \lambda_{\min}(H_y \circ H_y) \\ &\quad - \sqrt{(\lambda_{\min}(H_x \circ H_x) - \lambda_{\min}(H_y \circ H_y))^2 + 4\sigma_{\max}^2(B_{xy})(\|H_x\|_x + \|H_y\|_y)^2} \\ &< 2\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \lambda_{\min}(H_x \circ H_x) + \lambda_{\min}(H_y \circ H_y) \\ &\quad - |\lambda_{\min}(H_x \circ H_x) - \lambda_{\min}(H_y \circ H_y)| \\ &\leq 2\sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + 2\lambda_{\min}(H_y \circ H_y), \end{aligned}$$

where we emphasize that B_{yx} is the adjoint to B_{xy} and hence $\lambda(B_{yx} \circ B_{xy}) = \lambda(B_{xy} \circ B_{yx}) = \sigma^2(B_{xy}) = \sigma^2(B_{yx})$.

Hence, $\delta < \frac{b}{a} < \sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \lambda_{\min}(H_y \circ H_y)$ and $T_y = H_y \circ H_y + B_{xy} \circ B_{yx} - \delta \text{id}$ is invertible, because $\lambda_{\min}(T_y) \geq \sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) + \lambda_{\min}(H_y \circ H_y) - \delta > 0$ by Weyl's inequality. Thus, (28) gives $v = -T_y^{-1} \circ (H_y \circ B_{xy} + B_{xy} \circ H_x)[u]$. Substituting this expression for v into the first equation of (28) yields

$$\left(T_x - (H_x \circ B_{yx} + B_{yx} \circ H_y) \circ T_y^{-1} \circ (H_y \circ B_{xy} + B_{xy} \circ H_x) \right) [u] = 0. \quad (29)$$

Nevertheless, we can verify when $\delta < \frac{b}{a}$, (29) does not have any nontrivial solution for u , which gives a contradiction. Specifically, we show the following inequality is always satisfied under the condition on δ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda_{\min}(H_y \circ H_y) + \sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) - \delta)^{-1} \sigma_{\max}^2(B_{xy}) (\|H_x\|_x + \|H_y\|_y)^2 \\ < \lambda_{\min}(H_x \circ H_x) + \sigma_{\min}^2(B_{xy}) - \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

which violates (29) for any $u \neq 0$, because (30) would imply that

$$\lambda_{\min} \left(\left(T_x - (H_x \circ B_{yx} + B_{yx} \circ H_y) \circ T_y^{-1} \circ (H_y \circ B_{xy} + B_{xy} \circ H_x) \right) \right) > 0,$$

subsequently (29) implies $u = 0$, hence, $\xi = 0$, a contradiction. It remains to show that under $\delta < \frac{b}{a}$, (30) is satisfied. That is, the roots of (30) are given by $\frac{1}{2}(a \pm \sqrt{a^2 - 4b})$. We have shown that $\delta < \frac{b}{a} < \frac{1}{2}(a - \sqrt{a^2 - 4b})$. This implies (30) is always satisfied and results in a contradiction. Hence, $\delta \geq \frac{b}{a}$, which completes the proof. \square

F Analysis of RHM with conjugate gradient and trust-region update steps

We provide details of the implementation and convergence analysis of minimizing the Riemannian Hamiltonian with the Riemannian conjugate gradient and trust-region methods, i.e., we consider Algorithm 1 with the update step $\xi(p_t)$ computed as conjugate gradient direction and trust-region step.

F.1 RHM with conjugate gradient (RHM-CG)

For the Riemannian conjugate gradient methods (CG), the step $\xi(p_t)$ is given by a conjugate direction of the Riemannian gradient as

$$\xi(p_t) = \eta_t \zeta(p_t) = \eta_t \left(-\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t) + \beta_t \Gamma_{p_{t-1}}^{p_t} \xi(p_{t-1}) \right),$$

where β_t is the weight on the previous direction. There exists many choices of β_t , which leads to different types of conjugate gradient direction. See [65, 54] for a review. Given the conjugate gradient direction $\xi(p_t)$ is a modified gradient direction, we can always ensure a linear convergence under the Riemannian PL condition provided the direction stays ‘close’ to the negative gradient direction, i.e., $\xi(p_t)$ is a descent direction with $\langle \xi(p_t), -\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t) \rangle_{p_t} > 0$. For practical implementation, such condition can always be safeguarded by choosing $\beta_t = 0$ when $\langle \xi(p_t), -\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t) \rangle \leq 0$.

Theorem 6 (Linear convergence of RHM-CG). *Under the same settings as in Theorem 1, consider Algorithm 1 with conjugate gradient direction $\xi(p_t)$ where β_t and η_t are chosen such that $\langle \xi(p_t), -\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t) \rangle \geq c \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2$ for some $c > 0$ and the Armijo condition (Definition 4) is satisfied. Let $\tilde{\eta} = \min_{i=0, \dots, t} \eta_i$. Then, the iterates p_t satisfies $\|\text{grad}f(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \leq (1 - 2r_1 \tilde{\eta} c \delta)^t \|\text{grad}f(p_0)\|_{p_0}^2$.*

Proof. From the Armijo condition, we have for the stepsize η_t ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(p_{t+1}) - \mathcal{H}(p_t) &\leq r_1 \eta_t \langle \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t), \zeta(p_t) \rangle \\ &\leq -r_1 \eta_t c \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \leq -2r_1 \eta_t c \delta \mathcal{H}(p_t) \leq -2r_1 \tilde{\eta} c \delta \mathcal{H}(p_t), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of $\tilde{\eta}$ and $\mathcal{H}(p_t) \geq 0$ for all p_t . Applying the result recursively completes the proof. \square

We notice that the bound only requires a descent direction and a sufficient function decrease. Hence, we suspect a tighter bound exists when analyzing specific types of conjugate gradient.

We also highlight that most, if not all, types of conjugate gradient methods satisfy the conditions in Theorem 6. See more discussions in [64]. As an example, consider the *Fletcher-Reeves-type CG* [20] with $\beta_t = \frac{\|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2}{\|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_{t-1})\|_{p_{t-1}}^2}$. If the stepsize η_t is chosen to satisfy the strong Wolfe conditions (Definition 4) with $0 < r_1 < r_2 < 1/2$, then from [65, Lemma 4.1], the conditions in Theorem 6 are satisfied with $\langle \xi(p_t), -\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t) \rangle \geq \frac{1-2r_2}{1-r_2} \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|^2$.

F.2 RHM with trust-region (RHM-TR)

For the Riemannian trust-region (TR) method, the update step $\xi(p_t)$ is computed by (approximately) solving the trust-region subproblem on the tangent space, i.e.,

$$\xi(p_t) = \arg \min_{\xi \in T_{p_t}\mathcal{M}: \|\xi\|_{p_t} \leq \Delta_t} \widehat{m}_{p_t}(\xi) = \mathcal{H}(p_t) + \langle \text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t), \xi \rangle_{p_t} + \frac{1}{2} \langle H_t[\xi], \xi \rangle_{p_t}, \quad (31)$$

where $H_t : T_{p_t}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_{p_t}\mathcal{M}$ is a self-adjoint linear operator that approximates the Hessian $\text{Hess}\mathcal{H}(p_t)$. The model $\widehat{m}_{p_t}(\xi)$ provides a second-order approximation to the pull-back function $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{p_t} := \mathcal{H} \circ \text{Exp}_{p_t}$. The step computed from solving (31) is tentative and accepted when the model provides a sufficient approximation accuracy. Let

$$\rho_t = \frac{\mathcal{H}(p_t) - \mathcal{H}(\text{Exp}_{p_t}(\xi(p_t)))}{\widehat{m}_{p_t}(0) - \widehat{m}_{p_t}(\xi(p_t))}.$$

For some threshold $\rho' \in [0, 1/4)$, the step is only accepted when $\rho_t > \rho'$. In addition, the trust-region radius δ_t is changed according to ρ_t . To solve (31), *truncated conjugate gradient* is applied and with specific stopping condition, we can ensure local superlinear convergence. See [2, 3, 13] for more details.

Next, we show that RHM-TR achieves global linear convergence and local superlinear convergence to the global optimality. The former is guaranteed by a sufficient decrease in the model value and the latter is a corollary of the standard analysis in [2, 3]. For simplicity of the analysis, we consider only a subsequence of iterates \mathcal{T} where for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $\rho_t > \rho'$ and the trust-region step is accepted.

Theorem 7 (Convergence of RHM-TR). *Under the same settings as in Theorem 1 with $L = L_0L_1 + L_2^2$, consider Algorithm 1 with $\xi(p_t)$ given by solving (31) with truncated conjugate gradient. Assume further that $\|H_t - \text{Hess}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t} \leq L_H \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}$. Let $c = \min_{i=0, \dots, t} \frac{\Delta_i}{L_0L_1}$ and $\widetilde{L} = L_H L_0 L_1 + L$. Then, the iterates p_t satisfy $\|\text{grad}f(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \leq (1 - \frac{1}{2} \min\{c, 1/\widetilde{L}\} \rho' \delta)^t \|\text{grad}f(p_0)\|_{p_0}^2$.*

Under an additional Lipschitzness condition on $\nabla^2 \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_p$, we can show around the global minima p^ , there exists $\theta > 0, T > 0$ such that for all $t > T$, the convergence is superlinear with $d(p_{t+1}, p^*) \leq \theta d^2(p_t, p^*)$.*

Proof. First from Assumption 2, $\|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t} = \|\text{Hess}f(p_t)[\text{grad}f(p_t)]\|_{p_t} \leq L_1 L_0$ and the operator norm of H_t is bounded as

$$\|H_t\|_{p_t} \leq \|H_t - \text{Hess}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t} + \|\text{Hess}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t} \leq L_H L_0 L_1 + L.$$

Also, the trust-region direction $\xi(p_t)$ returned by the truncated conjugate gradient method satisfies a so-called *Cauchy decrease inequality* [3, eq. (7.14)], which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{m}_{p_t}(0) - \widehat{m}_{p_t}(\xi(p_t)) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t} \min \left\{ \Delta_t, \frac{\|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}}{\|H_t\|_{p_t}} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t} \min \left\{ c \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}, \frac{\|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}}{\|H_t\|_{p_t}} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ c, \frac{1}{L_H L_0 L_1 + L} \right\} \|\text{grad}\mathcal{H}(p_t)\|_{p_t}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ c, \frac{1}{L_H L_0 L_1 + L} \right\} \delta\mathcal{H}(p_t). \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the definition of c and Assumption 2 where Furthermore, from the acceptance rule,

$$\mathcal{H}(p_{t+1}) - \mathcal{H}(p_t) \leq \rho'(\widehat{m}_{p_t}(\xi(p_t)) - \widehat{m}_{p_t}(0)) \leq -\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ c, \frac{1}{L_H L_0 L_1 + L} \right\} \rho' \delta\mathcal{H}(p_t).$$

Hence, the linear convergence is proved by recursively applying the result. The superlinear convergence simply follows from [3, Theorem 7.4.11] around any local minima. \square

G On geodesic quadratic bilinear optimization

Proposition 11. *The function (14) is nonconvex-nonconcave.*

Proof. It is sufficient to verify whether $g(t) := c_q(\log \det(\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{V}))^2 + c_l \log \det(\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{V}) \log \det(\mathbf{Y})$ where $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, \mathbf{V} is symmetric, and $\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$ is convex in t . For this, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} g'(t) &= \left(2c_q \log \det(\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{V}) + c_l \log \det(\mathbf{Y}) \right) \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\lambda_i}{1 + t\lambda_i}, \\ g''(t) &= 2c_q \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\lambda_i}{1 + t\lambda_i} \right)^2 - \left(2c_q \log \det(\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{V}) + c_l \log \det(\mathbf{Y}) \right) \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\lambda_i^2}{(1 + t\lambda_i)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_i, i = 1, \dots, d$ are the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{Z}^{-1/2}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{Z}^{-1/2}$. We see $g''(t)$ is not necessarily non-negative, and therefore, f is not convex in \mathbf{X} in the Euclidean sense. Applying the same argument to \mathbf{Y} completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 7. First the expression of geodesic curve connecting any $\mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{X}_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{SPD}}$ is given by $\gamma(t) = \mathbf{X}_0^{1/2}(\mathbf{X}_0^{-1/2}\mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{X}_0^{-1/2})^t\mathbf{X}_0^{1/2}$. From [76, Proposition 5.7], we see $\log \det(\mathbf{X})$ is geodesic linear. That is, for the geodesic $\gamma(t)$ joining $\mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{X}_1$ with $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{X}_0, \gamma(1) = \mathbf{X}_1$, it can be shown that $\log \det(\gamma(t)) = (1-t) \log \det(\mathbf{X}_0) + t \log \det(\mathbf{X}_1)$. It remains to show $(\log \det(\mathbf{X}))^2$ is geodesic convex, which is equivalent to show $\frac{d^2(\log \det(\gamma(t)))^2}{dt^2} \geq 0$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ (second order characterization of geodesic convexity [76]). Specifically, we show

$$\frac{d^2(\log \det(\gamma(t)))^2}{dt^2} = 2(\log \det(\mathbf{X}_1) - \log \det(\mathbf{X}_0))^2 \geq 0. \quad (32)$$

The equality in (32) holds when $\mathbf{X}_0 \neq \mathbf{X}_1$ while $\det(\mathbf{X}_0) = \det(\mathbf{X}_1)$ and hence $\frac{d^2(\log \det(\gamma(t)))^2}{dt^2} > 0$ is not always satisfied. Similar arguments hold for g -concavity with respect to \mathbf{Y} . \square

Proof of Proposition 8. The Riemannian gradient of f is derived as

$$\begin{aligned}\text{grad}_{\mathbf{X}}f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) &= (c_l \log \det(\mathbf{Y}) + 2c_q \log \det(\mathbf{X}))\mathbf{X} \\ \text{grad}_{\mathbf{Y}}f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) &= (c_l \log \det(\mathbf{X}) - 2c_q \log \det(\mathbf{Y}))\mathbf{Y}.\end{aligned}$$

Under the affine-invariant metric, the Hamiltonian is given by

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{(4c_q^2 + c_l^2)d}{2} \left((\log \det(\mathbf{X}))^2 + (\log \det(\mathbf{Y}))^2 \right).$$

The gradient of Hamiltonian is given by $\text{grad}_{\mathbf{X}}\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = (4c_q^2 + c_l^2)d \log \det(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{X}$ and $\text{grad}_{\mathbf{Y}}\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = (4c_q^2 + c_l^2)d \log \det(\mathbf{Y})\mathbf{Y}$. Next, we verify

$$\begin{aligned}& \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\text{grad}_{\mathbf{X}}\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})\|_{\mathbf{X}}^2 + \|\text{grad}_{\mathbf{Y}}\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})\|_{\mathbf{Y}}^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{(4c_q^2 + c_l^2)^2 d^3}{2} \left((\log \det(\mathbf{X}))^2 + (\log \det(\mathbf{Y}))^2 \right) \\ &= (4c_q^2 + c_l^2)d^2 \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}).\end{aligned}$$

In addition, from the definition of global saddle point in (2), the pair $(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*)$ where $\det(\mathbf{X}^*) = \det(\mathbf{Y}^*) = 1$, satisfies $f(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*) = 0$. Thus, we have

$$f(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}) = -c_q(\log \det(\mathbf{Y}))^2 \leq f(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*) \leq c_q(\log \det(\mathbf{X}))^2 = f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}^*)$$

for all $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$. Hence, the proof is complete. \square

H Additional experiment results

H.1 Optimality gap for geodesic quadratic bilinear optimization

We include additional convergence results in Fig. 4 on the optimality gap for the geodesic quadratic bilinear optimization problem in Section 7.1.

H.2 Results of RHM-SGD for orthonormal GAN

We show the sample collapse of RHM-SGD in Fig. 5.

H.3 trace-logarithm bilinear optimization

We consider the ‘bilinear’ example of [79] on the symmetric positive definite (SPD) manifold (endowed with the affine-invariant metric), i.e.,

$$f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \text{tr}(\text{Log}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X}_0)\text{Log}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y}_0))$$

for $\mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{Y}_0 \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, where $\text{Log}_{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{M}') = \{\mathbf{M} \log(\mathbf{M}^{-1}\mathbf{M}')\}_{\mathbb{S}}$ is the logarithm map on the SPD manifold with $\log(\cdot)$ representing the matrix principal logarithm. When the manifold is simply the Euclidean space, the logarithm map reduces to $\text{Log}_{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{M}') = \mathbf{M}' - \mathbf{M}$. Hence, this resembles a bilinear problem on the manifold.




Figure 4: Experiments comparing optimality gap on the geodesic quadratic bilinear problem (14) with $d = 30$, under different weights c_q, c_l . We observe that the RHM algorithms show a good rate of convergence in all the settings. In particular, RHM-SD-F and RHM-CON significantly outperforms RCEG in all the settings indicating better theoretical rates.




Figure 5: Generated samples from RHM-SGD at $1, 2, 3 \times 10^4$ iterations from left to right. We see although RHM-SGD converges in Hamiltonian, the generated samples collapse to a single point (zoom the figures to see the single point).

For the experiment setting, we consider $\gamma = 0.2$ for RHM-CON and $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{Y}_0 = \mathbf{I}$. The convergence results are shown in Fig. 6, where we notice that both RGDA and RCEG oscillate while all the RHM algorithms are convergent. RHM-CON and RHM-SD-F converge rapidly initially but subsequently have a slow rate of convergence due to the hardness of the problem. RHM-CG, on the other hand, has a faster rate of convergence.

Acknowledgments

Pawan Kumar acknowledges the support of Microsoft Academic Partnership Grant (MAPG) 2021.




Figure 6: Trace-logarithm bilinear problem on the SPD manifold. RGDA and RCEG diverge while RHM algorithms are convergent (though RHM with steepest descent has a slower rate of convergence).

References

- [1] Jacob Abernethy, Kevin A. Lai, and Andre Wibisono. Last-iterate convergence rates for min-max optimization: Convergence of hamiltonian gradient descent and consensus optimization. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, volume 132, pages 3–47. PMLR, 2021.
- [2] P-A Absil, Christopher G Baker, and Kyle A Gallivan. Trust-region methods on Riemannian manifolds. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 7(3):303–330, 2007.
- [3] P-A Absil, Robert Mahony, and Rodolphe Sepulchre. *Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [4] Leonard Adolphs, Hadi Daneshmand, Aurelien Lucchi, and Thomas Hofmann. Local saddle point optimization: A curvature exploitation approach. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 486–495. PMLR, 2019.
- [5] Martin Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 214–223. PMLR, 2017.
- [6] David Balduzzi, Sebastien Racaniere, James Martens, Jakob Foerster, Karl Tuyls, and Thore Graepel. The mechanics of n-player differentiable games. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 354–363. PMLR, 2018.
- [7] Nitin Bansal, Xiaohan Chen, and Zhangyang Wang. Can we gain more from orthogonality regularizations in training deep networks? In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31, 2018.
- [8] Ronny Bergmann. Manopt. jl: Optimization on manifolds in julia. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 7(70):3866, 2022.
- [9] Dimitri P Bertsekas. *Constrained optimization and Lagrange multiplier methods*. Academic press, 2014.
- [10] Rajendra Bhatia. *Positive definite matrices*. Princeton university press, 2009.

- [11] Nicolas Boumal. Riemannian trust regions with finite-difference Hessian approximations are globally convergent. In *International Conference on Geometric Science of Information*, pages 467–475. Springer, 2015.
- [12] Nicolas Boumal. An introduction to optimization on smooth manifolds. *Available online*, May, 3, 2020.
- [13] Nicolas Boumal, Pierre-Antoine Absil, and Coralia Cartis. Global rates of convergence for nonconvex optimization on manifolds. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 39(1):1–33, 2019.
- [14] Nicolas Boumal, Bamdev Mishra, P-A Absil, and Rodolphe Sepulchre. Manopt, a Matlab toolbox for optimization on manifolds. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1455–1459, 2014.
- [15] Andrew Brock, Jeff Donahue, and Karen Simonyan. Large scale GAN training for high fidelity natural image synthesis. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [16] Benjamin Chasnov, Lillian Ratliff, Eric Mazumdar, and Samuel Burden. Convergence analysis of gradient-based learning in continuous games. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 935–944. PMLR, 2020.
- [17] Michael Cogswell, Faruk Ahmed, Ross Girshick, Larry Zitnick, and Dhruv Batra. Reducing overfitting in deep networks by decorrelating representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2016.
- [18] Ahmed Douik and Babak Hassibi. Manifold optimization over the set of doubly stochastic matrices: A second-order geometry. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 67(22):5761–5774, 2019.
- [19] Laurent El Ghaoui and Hervé Lebret. Robust solutions to least-squares problems with uncertain data. *SIAM Journal on matrix analysis and applications*, 18(4):1035–1064, 1997.
- [20] Reeves Fletcher and Colin M Reeves. Function minimization by conjugate gradients. *The computer journal*, 7(2):149–154, 1964.
- [21] Korpelevich G. The extragradient method for finding saddle points and other problems. *Ekonomika i Matematicheskie Metody*, 12:747–756, 1976.
- [22] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27, 2014.
- [23] Andi Han and Junbin Gao. Improved variance reduction methods for Riemannian non-convex optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2021.
- [24] Andi Han, Bamdev Mishra, Pratik Kumar Jawanpuria, and Junbin Gao. On Riemannian optimization over positive definite matrices with the Bures-Wasserstein geometry. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, 2021.

- [25] Inbal Horev, Florian Yger, and Masashi Sugiyama. Geometry-aware principal component analysis for symmetric positive definite matrices. In *Asian Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1–16. PMLR, 2016.
- [26] Feihu Huang, Shangqian Gao, and Heng Huang. Gradient descent ascent for min-max problems on Riemannian manifolds. *arXiv:2010.06097*, 2020.
- [27] Lei Huang, Xianglong Liu, Bo Lang, Adams Wei Yu, Yongliang Wang, and Bo Li. Orthogonal weight normalization: Solution to optimization over multiple dependent Stiefel manifolds in deep neural networks. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- [28] Minhui Huang, Shiqian Ma, and Lifeng Lai. A Riemannian block coordinate descent method for computing the projection robust Wasserstein distance. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4446–4455. PMLR, 2021.
- [29] Wen Huang, P-A Absil, and Kyle A Gallivan. A Riemannian symmetric rank-one trust-region method. *Mathematical Programming*, 150(2):179–216, 2015.
- [30] Wen Huang, P-A Absil, Kyle A Gallivan, and Paul Hand. ROPTLIB: an object-oriented C++ library for optimization on Riemannian manifolds. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 44(4):1–21, 2018.
- [31] Chi Jin, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Michael Jordan. What is local optimality in nonconvex-nonconcave minimax optimization? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4880–4889. PMLR, 2020.
- [32] Hamed Karimi, Julie Nutini, and Mark Schmidt. Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the Polyak-Łojasiewicz condition. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 795–811. Springer, 2016.
- [33] Hiroyuki Kasai, Hiroyuki Sato, and Bamdev Mishra. Riemannian stochastic recursive gradient algorithm. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2516–2524. PMLR, 2018.
- [34] Max Kochurov, Rasul Karimov, and Serge Kozlukov. Geoopt: Riemannian optimization in pytorch. In *ICML 2020 Workshop on Graph Representation Learning and Beyond*, 2020.
- [35] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- [36] Jiaxiang Li, Krishnakumar Balasubramanian, and Shiqian Ma. Stochastic zeroth-order Riemannian derivative estimation and optimization. *arXiv:2003.11238*, 2020.
- [37] Tianyi Lin, Chenyou Fan, Nhat Ho, Marco Cuturi, and Michael Jordan. Projection robust wasserstein distance and Riemannian optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 9383–9397, 2020.
- [38] Nicolas Loizou, Hugo Berard, Alexia Jolicoeur-Martineau, Pascal Vincent, Simon Lacoste-Julien, and Ioannis Mitliagkas. Stochastic hamiltonian gradient methods for smooth games. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6370–6381. PMLR, 2020.

- [39] David Madras, Elliot Creager, Toniann Pitassi, and Richard Zemel. Learning adversarially fair and transferable representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3384–3393. PMLR, 2018.
- [40] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [41] Eric V Mazumdar, Michael I Jordan, and S Shankar Sastry. On finding local nash equilibria (and only local nash equilibria) in zero-sum games. *arXiv:1901.00838*, 2019.
- [42] Mayank Meghwanshi, Pratik Jawanpuria, Anoop Kunchukuttan, Hiroyuki Kasai, and Bamdev Mishra. McTorch, a manifold optimization library for deep learning. *arXiv:1810.01811*, 2018.
- [43] Panayotis Mertikopoulos, Christos Papadimitriou, and Georgios Piliouras. Cycles in adversarial regularized learning. In *Proceedings of the Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2703–2717. SIAM, 2018.
- [44] Lars Mescheder, Sebastian Nowozin, and Andreas Geiger. The numerics of GANs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, 2017.
- [45] Bamdev Mishra, NTV Satyadev, Hiroyuki Kasai, and Pratik Jawanpuria. Manifold optimization for non-linear optimal transport problems. *arXiv:2103.00902*, 2021.
- [46] Aryan Mokhtari, Asuman Ozdaglar, and Sarath Pattathil. A unified analysis of extra-gradient and optimistic gradient methods for saddle point problems: Proximal point approach. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1497–1507. PMLR, 2020.
- [47] Aryan Mokhtari, Asuman E Ozdaglar, and Sarath Pattathil. Convergence rate of $O(1/k)$ for optimistic gradient and extragradient methods in smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 30(4):3230–3251, 2020.
- [48] Renato DC Monteiro and Benar Fux Svaiter. On the complexity of the hybrid proximal extragradient method for the iterates and the ergodic mean. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(6):2755–2787, 2010.
- [49] Renato DC Monteiro and Benar Fux Svaiter. Complexity of variants of tseng’s modified fb splitting and korpelevich’s methods for hemivariational inequalities with applications to saddle-point and convex optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21(4):1688–1720, 2011.
- [50] Seyed-Mohsen Moosavi-Dezfooli, Alhussein Fawzi, Omar Fawzi, and Pascal Frossard. Universal adversarial perturbations. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1765–1773, 2017.
- [51] Jan Müller, Reinhard Klein, and Michael Weinmann. Orthogonal Wasserstein GANs. *arXiv:1911.13060*, 2019.
- [52] Arkadi Nemirovski. Prox-method with rate of convergence $O(1/t)$ for variational inequalities with Lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 15(1):229–251, 2004.

- [53] J v Neumann. Zur theorie der gesellschaftsspiele. *Mathematische Annalen*, 100(1):295–320, 1928.
- [54] Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J Wright. *Numerical optimization*. Springer, 1999.
- [55] François-Pierre Paty and Marco Cuturi. Subspace robust wasserstein distances. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5072–5081. PMLR, 2019.
- [56] Xavier Pennec. Manifold-valued image processing with SPD matrices. In *Riemannian Geometric Statistics in Medical Image Analysis*, pages 75–134. Elsevier, 2020.
- [57] Gabriel Peyré, Marco Cuturi, et al. Computational optimal transport: With applications to data science. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(5-6):355–607, 2019.
- [58] Boris Teodorovich Polyak. Gradient methods for minimizing functionals. *Zhurnal Vychislitel’noi Matematiki i Matematicheskoi Fiziki*, 3(4):643–653, 1963.
- [59] Leonid Denisovich Popov. A modification of the Arrow-Hurwicz method for search of saddle points. *Mathematical notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR*, 28(5):845–848, 1980.
- [60] Wolfgang Ring and Benedikt Wirth. Optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds and their application to shape space. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(2):596–627, 2012.
- [61] R Tyrrell Rockafellar. Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 14(5):877–898, 1976.
- [62] Halsey Lawrence Royden and Patrick Fitzpatrick. *Real analysis*, volume 32. Macmillan New York, 1988.
- [63] Hiroyuki Sato. A Dai–Yuan-type Riemannian conjugate gradient method with the weak Wolfe conditions. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 64(1):101–118, 2016.
- [64] Hiroyuki Sato. Riemannian conjugate gradient methods: General framework and specific algorithms with convergence analyses. *arXiv:2112.02572*, 2021.
- [65] Hiroyuki Sato. *Riemannian Optimization and Its Applications*. Springer, 2021.
- [66] Hiroyuki Sato, Hiroyuki Kasai, and Bamdev Mishra. Riemannian stochastic variance reduced gradient algorithm with retraction and vector transport. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(2):1444–1472, 2019.
- [67] Dai Shi, Junbin Gao, Xia Hong, ST Boris Choy, and Zhiyong Wang. Coupling matrix manifolds assisted optimization for optimal transport problems. *Machine Learning*, 110(3):533–558, 2021.
- [68] Richard Sinkhorn. A relationship between arbitrary positive matrices and doubly stochastic matrices. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35(2):876–879, 1964.
- [69] Maurice Sion. On general minimax theorems. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 8(1):171–176, 1958.
- [70] Oleg Smirnov. TensorFlow RiemOpt: a library for optimization on Riemannian manifolds. Technical report, arXiv:2105.13921, 2021.

- [71] Suvrit Sra and Reshad Hosseini. Conic geometric optimization on the manifold of positive definite matrices. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(1):713–739, 2015.
- [72] LL Stachó. Minimax theorems beyond topological vector spaces. *Acta Sci. Math.(Szeged)*, 42(1-2):157–164, 1980.
- [73] James Townsend, Niklas Koep, and Sebastian Weichwald. Pymanopt: A python toolbox for optimization on manifolds using automatic differentiation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(137):1–5, 2016.
- [74] Paul Tseng. On linear convergence of iterative methods for the variational inequality problem. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 60(1-2):237–252, 1995.
- [75] Constantin Udriste. *Convex functions and optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds*, volume 297. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [76] Nisheeth K Vishnoi. Geodesic convex optimization: Differentiation on manifolds, geodesics, and convexity. *arXiv:1806.06373*, 2018.
- [77] Jiayun Wang, Yubei Chen, Rudrasis Chakraborty, and Stella X Yu. Orthogonal convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11505–11515, 2020.
- [78] Hongyi Zhang, Sashank J Reddi, and Suvrit Sra. Riemannian SVRG: Fast stochastic optimization on Riemannian manifolds. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 29, 2016.
- [79] Peiyuan Zhang, Jingzhao Zhang, and Suvrit Sra. Minimax in geodesic metric spaces: Sion’s theorem and algorithms. *arXiv:2202.06950*, 2022.
- [80] Pan Zhou, Xiao-Tong Yuan, and Jiashi Feng. Faster first-order methods for stochastic non-convex optimization on Riemannian manifolds. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 138–147. PMLR, 2019.