
K-Tensors: Clustering Positive Semi-Definite Matrices

Hanchao Zhang¹ Baoyi Shi² Thaddues Tarpey¹

Abstract

This paper introduces K -Tensors, a novel self-consistent clustering algorithm designed to cluster positive semi-definite (PSD) matrices by their eigenstructures. Clustering PSD matrices is crucial across various fields, including computer and biomedical sciences. Traditional clustering methods, which often involve matrix vectorization, tend to overlook the inherent PSD characteristics, thereby discarding valuable shape and eigenstructural information. To preserve this essential shape and eigenstructural information, our approach incorporates a unique distance metric that respects the PSD nature of the data. We demonstrate that K -Tensors is not only self-consistent but also reliably converges to a local optimum. Through numerical studies, we further validate the algorithm's effectiveness and explore its properties in detail.

1. Introduction

Positive semi-definite (PSD) matrices, also known as covariance matrices, serve as powerful data descriptors with applications in various domains, including computer vision (Tuzel et al., 2006; Alavi et al., 2014; Cherian & Sra, 2016), brain imaging (van den Heuvel & Hulshoff Pol, 2010; Cherian & Sra, 2016) and other machine learning fields (Shinohara et al., 2010). For example, an image patch in computer vision can be represented by the covariance matrix between low-level features such as color and intensity gradients (Cherian & Sra, 2016). Similarly, the functional connectivity matrices obtained from fMRI measures the covariance between different brain regions across time (van den Heuvel & Hulshoff Pol, 2010), and allows us to explore the cognitive functions, disease processes, and developmental

¹Division of Biostatistics, Department of Population Health, Grossman School of Medicine, New York University, New York, the United States ²Department of Biostatistics, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, the United States. Correspondence to: Hanchao Zhang <hanchao.zhang@nyu.edu>.

changes in the human brain.

However, directly examining these PSD matrices can be computationally demanding and challenging. Thus, dimension reduction techniques, which transform high-dimensional matrices into more compact forms, become crucial. Clustering algorithms often integrate the idea of dimension reduction to simplify and improve the data analysis process. For instance, the K -means algorithm effectively represent each cluster of data by their average location, commonly referred to as clustering centroids. Each centroid serves as a representative point for the corresponding cluster of the data, providing a concise summary of the underlying patterns and groupings within the dataset.

Traditional clustering algorithms that handle PSD matrices typically employ the Euclidean distance (Hartigan & Wong, 1979), the affine-invariant Riemannian distance (Moakher, 2005), or the log-determinant divergence (Banerjee et al., 2005). Using the Euclidean distance requires the vectorization of each matrix, which involves a linear summation that compromises its inherent PSD structure.

Another widely used distance metric is the affine-invariant Riemannian distance (Moakher, 2005). For two PSD matrices ψ_1 and ψ_2 , the affine-invariant Riemannian distance is defined as $d_{\text{AIR}} = \|\log(\psi_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\psi_2\psi_1^{-\frac{1}{2}})\|$. However, a notable drawback of this method is that it's not self-consistent. This issue renders the center calculation for clustering algorithms both inefficient and computationally demanding, posing challenges in practical applications.

The log-determinant divergence (Banerjee et al., 2005) is a key metric for clustering algorithms with a significant relevance to the Wishart distribution and Normal random variables. Defined for two PSD matrices ψ_1 and ψ_2 as $d_{\text{logdet}} = \text{tr}(\psi_1\psi_2^{-1} - \mathbf{I}) - \log \det(\psi_1\psi_2^{-1})$, this metric excels at identifying subtle differences in distributions modeled by or associated with the Wishart distribution. Even though the self-consistency property can be proved for log-determinant divergence, this reliance on distributional assumptions can present challenges in the analysis of real-world data, where these assumptions may rarely hold true.

The primary focus of this paper is to introduce a novel self-consistent algorithm (Tarpey, 1999) designed to cluster PSD matrices while maintaining their PSD structure, this involves

construction of a distance metrics that well capture the differences in their shape and eigenstructure information while maintaining its PSD nature. The notion of self-consistency was introduced in [Hastie & Stuetzle \(1989\)](#), as a smooth, nonlinear generalization of principal component axes called principal curves. [Tarpey & Flury, 1996](#) generalized the notion of self-consistency to include methods such as principal component analysis and clustering. The main application of self-consistency is to approximate a distribution with a simpler (often lower-dimensional) distribution. For instance, [Tarpey et al. \(1995\)](#) determine properties for an optimal k -point approximation to elliptical distributions. In the context of principal components analysis, the principal component axis provides a lower-dimensional, self-consistent approximation to multivariate normal distribution [Tarpey \(1999\)](#). Relatedly, [Flury \(1984\)](#) presents a generalization to principal components, called common principal components (CPC). The CPC approach gives an approximation that assumes the covariance matrices ψ_1, \dots, ψ_K of K populations share common eigenvectors, which describe the “shape” of the PSD matrices. The shared eigenvectors define a common space spanned by the support of K populations, enabling shared structures across multiple populations to be considered in the analysis.

In this work, we present a novel self-consistency clustering algorithm for PSD matrices. First, we propose a nonparametric approach to transform the PSD matrices into an informational core (information in the reduced space), which captures their shape and eigenstructural information in the shared space. Second, to assign an individual’s PSD matrix to its closest group (a set of PSD matrices), we define a distance metric that relies on the projection of the matrix onto the shared space of a set of PSD matrices.

Moreover, we investigate the algorithm under the Wishart distribution and other simulation settings and study its performance in various scenarios. To the best of our knowledge, this type of clustering algorithm has not been previously explored. Our work provides new insights into the internal information of PSD matrices, and it offers a powerful tool for analyzing complex data structures.

2. Problem formulation

To develop a clustering algorithm for PSD matrices, it’s necessary to introduce several fundamental concepts: self-consistency, common principal components, and the projection of PSD matrices. These concepts are crucial in effectively handling the unique characteristics of such matrices and achieving meaningful clustering results. Section 2.1 introduces two critical concepts: the *projection index* and the *domain of attraction*. These concepts play a pivotal role in understanding and applying the theoretical framework discussed in our paper. Sections 2.2 and 2.3 delve into the

topics of common principal components and the projection of matrices, respectively. These discussions are crucial for laying the groundwork necessary for the development of our subspace, as detailed in Section 3.

2.1. Self-Consistency

[Hastie & Stuetzle \(1989\)](#) introduced the notion of a self-consistent curve (or principal curve) to provide a nonlinear generalization of a principal component axis to a curve summary of the data. Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be a random vector with density h and finite second moments assuming $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X}) = 0$. Let \mathbf{f} denote a smooth C^∞ unit-speed curve in \mathbb{R}^p . The projection index $\lambda_{\mathbf{f}} : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$ is defined as:

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\lambda} \left\{ \lambda : \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{f}(\lambda)\| = \inf_{\mu} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{f}(\mu)\| \right\}$$

The projection index $\lambda_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})$ of \mathbf{x} is the value of λ for which $\mathbf{f}(\lambda)$ is closest to \mathbf{x} . Then \mathbf{f} is called self-consistent or principal curve of h if $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X}|\lambda_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{X})) = \mathbf{f}(\lambda)$ for a.e. λ . This definition provides a projection of points onto the principal or self-consistent curve, with the projected point on the curve being the closest to the original points relative to the other points on the curve.

In order to estimate *self-consistent objects*, [Tarpey \(1999\)](#) presented the self-consistent algorithm, which can be viewed as a generalization of the K -means clustering algorithm on Euclidean spaces (with the usual Euclidean distance $\|\cdot\|$). Given a measurable set $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, define the *domain of attraction* of a point $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}$, denoted by $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathcal{S})$, as:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathcal{S}) := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| < \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}\|, \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{S}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{y} \right\}$$

This set represents all points in \mathbb{R}^p closest (in terms of Euclidean distance) to $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}$ compared to any other points in \mathcal{S} . The notion of self-consistency (and more specifically, clustering) requires specifying a suitable metric on the space that observations are obtained in order to measure how “close” the observations are to one another. For clustering matrices (or, more generally, tensors), we propose to use a metric on the space of PSD matrices that capture essential “shape” information in the matrices.

2.2. Principal Components and Common Principal Components

The origins of principal components analysis (PCA) can be traced back to [Pearson \(1901\)](#), where they formulated PCA as finding “lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space.” PC axes are the eigenvectors of the covariance matrix of the data.

Suppose data for each individual is inherently multivariate,

i.e., $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p, i = 1, \dots, N$. Instead of directly observing \mathbf{x}_i , we only observe covariance matrix of \mathbf{x}_i , denoted by $\psi_i = \text{cov}(\mathbf{x}_i)$. This situation is common in numerous applications, such as fMRI data analysis. By performing PCA on each individual covariance matrix, we can obtain $\psi_i = \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{U}_i^\top$, where \mathbf{U}_i is an orthogonal matrix of eigenvectors and \mathbf{D}_i is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues for individual i . \mathbf{U}_i and \mathbf{D}_i provide information on the ‘‘shape’’ of the distribution for the observations which can be thought of as ellipsoids whose axis orientations are determined by the eigenvectors and the eccentricity along the axes determined by the relative magnitude of the eigenvalues.

A natural approach to clustering matrices is to form clusters based on grouping similar matrices in terms of their eigenvectors and eigenvalues. Flury (1984) proposed the concept of common principal components (CPC) as an extension to principal components analysis to multiple groups. This approach assumes the several covariance matrices share common eigenvectors.

Let covariance matrices ψ_1, \dots, ψ_n share the same eigenvectors, then each covariance matrix can be decomposed as $\psi_i = \mathbf{B} \mathbf{F}_i \mathbf{B}^\top$. The aim is to find a common orthonormal matrix \mathbf{B} that simultaneously diagonalizes the individual matrices ψ_i as much as possible (make \mathbf{F}_i as diagonal as possible). In other words, the goal is to identify the orthonormal matrix \mathbf{B} that best describes the shape information of each covariance matrix and thus find the common shape of these covariance matrices. This metric will be introduced in the next session.

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{B}}{\text{minimize}} && \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\det(\text{diag}(\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi_i \mathbf{B}))}{\det(\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi_i \mathbf{B})} \right) \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I} \end{aligned}$$

Where \mathbf{I} is an identity matrix with appropriate size. Different approaches for estimating the common principal components have been proposed by Flury & Gautschi (1986), Vollgraf & Obermayer (2006), and Hallin et al. (2014). These methods use maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) and S-estimation to estimate the common principal components from the PSD matrices.

The common principal components (CPC) model was originally developed in a supervised learning setting with known group memberships. However, when group membership is unknown for the matrices comprising our sample, the natural question of how to partition the matrices into specific groups arises. To define a clustering algorithm to form a partition of the matrices, an appealing approach is to base a similarity metric on common principal components for different subpopulations.

2.3. Projection and Subspace

While Hastie & Stuetzle (1989) did define a projection of points onto a curve, it is not straightforward to generalize this projection to PSD matrices. Unlike points in Euclidean space, PSD matrices have additional structures and properties, such as being symmetric and having non-negative eigenvalues. Cook & Forzani (2008) introduce a projection onto a subspace spanned by the eigenvectors of the covariance matrix using the projection matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ with q orthonormal columns for a covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \succeq 0$. This projection is defined as $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{A}}(\Sigma) = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \Sigma$ and can be applied to PSD matrices, provided that the \mathbf{A} spans the subspace of the eigenvectors of the covariance matrix Σ , similar to the projection (hat) matrix in regression. However, when $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{S}^{p \times p}$ is full rank, the projection collapses to an identity matrix and is therefore incompatible with projecting a PSD matrix onto a set of PSD matrices.




Figure 1. Projection of PSD matrices onto its common eigenstructures from 4 directions

Here, we developed a new approach to project PSD matrices onto an orthonormal matrix, defined as follows (detail provided in section 3):

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi) = \mathbf{B}^\top ((\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{B}^\top,$$

where \circ represent Hadamard product (matrix element-wise product). Figure 1 shows projection of half vectorized PSD matrices (colored points) onto a marginally symmetric subspace (gray plane). Let ψ_i be one of the PSD matrix, define

half vectorization $\text{vecf}(\psi_i)$ as a vector that contains the upper triangle elements of ψ_i . Figure 1(a) illustrates how the projected subspace bisects the entire distribution, resulting in two marginally symmetric shapes. Additionally, Figures 1(b), 1(c), and 1(d) show that the subspace, depicted as a gray plane, captures the essential characteristics of the shapes within this distribution, including their marginal symmetry when viewed from various angles.

3. Method

To develop a clustering algorithm for PSD matrices, we require the definition of several key concepts. First, we need to establish a method for projecting a PSD matrix onto an orthonormal basis matrix. Second, we must define a distance metric based on this projection. Finally, we need to introduce the concept of the *domain of attraction* in terms of PSD matrices, which can be used to assign matrix observations to the closet cluster. All these concepts should incorporate the shape and eigensturctral information of the PSD matrices.

3.1. Distance Metrics for Positive Semi-Definite Matrices

Let $\mathcal{V}_q(\mathbb{R}^p) = \{\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q} : \mathcal{X}^\top \mathcal{X} = \mathbf{I}_q\}$ denote the Stiefel manifold, representing the set of all orthonormal q -frames in \mathbb{R}^p . We also consider two other sets: $\mathbb{S}_+^p = \{\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} | \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^\top, \mathcal{X} \succeq 0\}$, the set of all PSD symmetric matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, and $\mathbb{D}_+^p = \{\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} | \mathbf{D} = (\mathbf{a}\mathbf{1}_p^\top) \circ \mathbf{I}_p, \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \mathbf{a} \succeq 0\}$, the set of all diagonal matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ with only non-negative diagonal elements. Here \mathbf{I}_p is the p by p identity matrix, $\mathbf{1}_p$ is the $p \times 1$ constant vector with all elements equal to 1, and \circ denotes the Hadamard product.

Definition 3.1. For an given orthogonal matrix \mathbf{B} , the projection index of a given PSD matrix ψ , denoted $\Lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi) : \mathbb{S}_+^p \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_+^p$, is defined as:

$$\Lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi) = \arg \min_{\Theta \in \mathbb{D}_+^p} \|\psi - \mathbf{B}\Theta\mathbf{B}^\top\|^2 \quad (1)$$

The projection index $\Lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi)$ corresponds to the non-negative diagonal matrix in \mathbb{D}_+^p that minimizes the Frobenius norm of the difference between the PSD matrix $\mathbf{B}\Theta\mathbf{B}^\top$ and the matrix ψ for a given $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{V}_p(\mathbb{R}^p)$. The goal is to find the non-negative diagonal matrix that provides the closest approximation to ψ in terms of the Frobenius norm when projected onto the orthonormal matrix \mathbf{B} .

Definition 3.2. For a given ψ in \mathbb{S}_+^p and a given p -frame orthonormal matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{V}_p(\mathbb{R}^p)$, we define the projection of the matrix ψ onto \mathbf{B} as:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi) = \mathbf{B}\Lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi)\mathbf{B}^\top$$

This projection allows us to approximate ψ using a projection that is determined by orthonormal matrix \mathbf{B} .

Theorem 3.3. For a given orthonormal matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{V}_p(\mathbb{R}^p)$ and a PSD matrix ψ , the projection index $\Lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi)$ that minimizes the Frobenius norm of the differences between ψ and its projection onto \mathbf{B} in equation (1) is equal to the diagonal of the matrix $\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}$, that is: $\Lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi) = (\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}$.

The previously defined $\Lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi)$ is based on a given orthogonal matrix \mathbf{B} and a given observation ψ . The natural question that arises now is which orthogonal matrix best characterizes a random matrix $\Psi \in \mathbb{S}_+^p$ with some probability distribution. Therefore, in order to address this, we introduce the common principal components of a random PSD matrix Ψ denoted by $\mathbf{B}(\Psi) : \mathbb{S}_+^p \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_p(\mathbb{R}^p)$. This mapping takes a distribution of PSD matrices in \mathbb{S}_+^p and maps it to an orthonormal p -frame matrix in \mathbb{R}^p .

$$\mathbf{B}(\Psi) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{V}_p(\mathbb{R}^p)} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\Psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\Psi)\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right\} \quad (2)$$

Definition 3.4. We call $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\Psi)$ the *principal PSD tensors* of Ψ if

$$\mathbb{E}[\Psi | \Lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi)] = \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi)$$

Here, we use \mathcal{B} in the subscript to represent $\mathbf{B}(\Psi)$.

The PSD tensors contains important shape information in $\mathbf{B}(\Psi)$ and $\Lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi)$ by the conditional expectation. It plays a vital role in representing a matrix distribution, capturing its essential features and structure.

A common objective when clustering observations from a given distribution is to determine a set of ‘‘prototypical’’ points that optimally represent the distribution. Instead of using a single PSD tensor to represent the entire distribution, we can consider K ‘‘principal’’ PSD tensors to capture the characteristics of K distinct subpopulations within the distribution. These K principal PSD tensors serve as representatives of the underlying subpopulations and provide a more comprehensive representation of the data.

Definition 3.5. Let $\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_K \in \mathcal{V}_p(\mathbb{R}^p)$ be K orthonormal matrices, the minimal distance of a given $\psi \in \mathbb{S}_+^p$ to the set $\{\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_k}(\psi), k = 1, \dots, K\}$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{d}(\psi | \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_1}(\psi), \dots, \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_K}(\psi)) = \min_{1 \leq h \leq K} \|\psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_h}(\psi)\|_{\text{F}}$$

Definition 3.6. We call $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_1}(\psi), \dots, \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_K}(\psi)$ the K *principal positive semi-definite tensors* of Ψ if $\mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbf{d}^2(\Psi | \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_1}(\Psi), \dots, \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_K}(\Psi)) \right\}$ is less than or equal to the expected minimal distance of Ψ to any other set of K orthogonal matrices in $\mathcal{V}_p(\mathbb{R}^p)$.

This definition provide the distance function for each PSD matrix to its closet cluster in terms of their eigenstructures.

3.2. Domain of Attraction to an Orthonormal Matrix

Definition 3.7. Given a set of distinct $\mathbf{B}_k \in \mathcal{V}_p(\mathbb{R}^p)$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, we define $\mathcal{D}_k(\Psi)$ (sometimes referred as \mathcal{D}_k) the domain of attraction for each \mathbf{B}_k as:

$$\mathcal{D}_k := \left\{ \psi \in \mathbb{S}_+^p, : \|\psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_k}(\psi)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 = \inf_h \{ \|\psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_h}(\psi)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 : h = 1, \dots, K \} \right\} \quad (3)$$

Definition 3.8. Let \mathbf{B}_k be the common principal components for $\mathcal{D}_k(\Psi)$, $k = 1, \dots, K$. Define the random orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{B}(\Psi)$ (sometimes referred as \mathbf{B} in the subscript), and self-consistent PSD tensors $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi)$ as follow:

$$\mathbf{B}(\psi) = \mathbf{B}_k \text{ and } \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_k}(\psi) \text{ if } \psi \in \mathcal{D}_k$$

An observation is assigned to a specific set $\mathcal{D}_k(\Psi)$ if its projection, parameterized by \mathbf{B}_k , is closest to the observation compared to the projections using other parameterizations \mathbf{B}_h for $h = 1, \dots, K$.

3.3. K-Tensors: Algorithms for Clustering Positive Semi-Definite Matrices

Drawing on the concepts introduced in the preceding sections, we propose a novel iterative self-consistency clustering algorithm called K-Tensors to cluster PSD matrices. This algorithm leverages PSD tensors to approximate the distribution of subpopulations and clusters matrices based on their shapes as characterized by eigenvectors and eigenvalues. The K-Tensors algorithm comprises two key steps: (1) identifying the common eigenvectors within each cluster of PSD matrices and (2) assigning all matrices to their closest cluster based on these shapes information. The algorithm iterates between these steps until convergence is achieved.

Algorithm 1 K-Tensors: Clustering Positive Semi-Definite Matrices

Initialize $\{\mathcal{D}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ by randomly partitioning the data $\{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n\}$.

Iterate until the cluster assignment $\{\mathcal{D}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ doesn't change:

1. Estimate common principal components for each cluster and update $\{\mathbf{B}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ by equation 2.
 2. Obtain the new assignment for each observation and update $\{\mathcal{D}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ by equation 3.
-

4. Properties of the Algorithm

Theorem 4.1. The least-squares estimate of common principal components, as defined in equation 2, is equivalent to

the maximum likelihood estimate presented in Flury (1984), which is derived under the Wishart distribution.

Remark 4.2. The proof of theorem 4.1 establishes the equivalence between minimizing the expected difference in Frobenius norm of the off-diagonal elements (minimize $\mathbb{E}[\|\Psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\Psi)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2]$) and maximizing the expected difference in Frobenius norm of the diagonal elements maximize $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\Psi)]$ for PSD matrices.

Theorem 4.3. Under the assumption that $\Psi \sim \mathcal{W}_p(N, \Sigma)$ follows a Wishart distribution with scale parameter Σ and N degrees of freedom, where each observed $\psi_i \in \mathbb{S}_+^p$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) are the observed p by p PSD matrix, the eigenvectors of the sample mean $\mathbb{E}[\Psi] = \frac{1}{nN} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i$ serve as a consistent estimator of the common principal components of this Wishart distribution.

Theorem 4.4. Let Ψ be a random variable following an unknown distribution, with observed PSD matrices ψ_1, \dots, ψ_n . The common principal components of Ψ can be identified by examining the eigenvectors of its second moment, which is given by $\mathbb{E}[\Psi^2] = \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i^2$.

Remark 4.5. By invoking Theorems 4.3 and 4.4, we can simplify the process of obtaining a set of K orthogonal matrices associated with each cluster. This process is a crucial part of our clustering algorithm, where each cluster is characterized by its own distinct orthogonal matrix, effectively implementing a common principal component analysis approach. The result of this simplification is a more streamlined algorithm, which we refer to as Fast K -Tensors, detailed in Algorithm 2. This version of the algorithm incorporates an efficient method for estimating common principal components, thereby enhancing the overall performance and utility of the clustering procedure.

Algorithm 2 Fast K-Tensors: Clustering Positive Semi-Definite Matrices

Initialize $\{\mathcal{D}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ by randomly partitioning the data $\{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n\}$

Iterate until the cluster assignment $\{\mathcal{D}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ doesn't change:

1. Estimate common principal components for each cluster and update $\{\mathbf{B}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ by the eigenvectors of the first or the second moment (theorems 4.3 and 4.4).
 2. Obtain the new assignment for each observation and update $\{\mathcal{D}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ by equation 3.
-

Theorem 4.6. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_j}$, ($j = 1, 2, \dots$) denote the principal PSD tensors from successive iterations of the self-consistency algorithm K-Tensors for a random PSD matrix $\Psi \in \mathbb{S}_+^p$. Then $\mathbb{E}[\|\Psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}_j}(\Psi)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2]$ is monotonically decreasing in j .

This theorem demonstrates that the algorithm monotonically reduces the loss function, and shows that the K-Tensors algorithm guarantees convergence to a local minimum. To augment the possibility of finding the global minimum, we employ a strategy akin to that of KMeans, which includes multiple initiations.

5. Numerical Studies

Our numerical studies are divided into two distinct sections. The first section provides a visualization of the K-Tensors algorithm in action, along with the clustering centers obtained through its application. This visual representation serves to illustrate the algorithm's functionality and the nature of the clustering results it produces. The second section involves a comparative analysis of the K-Tensors algorithm against various distance metrics mentioned in the introduction section. This comparison aims to highlight the strengths and characteristics of the K-Tensors algorithm relative to other methods, offering insights into its performance and efficacy in different clustering scenarios.

5.1. Visualization




Figure 2. K-Tensors and Their Partitions for 6 Groups

Figure 2 depicts a simulation of "semi-definite flower" within a PSD cone. for visualization purpose, we simulated 2x2 PSD matrices in seven different groups, with each group characterized by similar eigenvectors. For each matrix, the vector of its upper triangular part was extracted and plotted in a three-dimensional space, allowing for a clear and distinct representation of the various groups in the context of the PSD cone. Let ψ_{k_i} be the i^{th} observation of PSD matrix in group k , where $k = 1, \dots, 6$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{k_i} &= \mathbf{B}_k(\mathbf{D}_i + \mathbf{E}_i)\mathbf{B}_k^\top \\ &= \mathbf{B}_k\mathbf{D}_i\mathbf{B}_k^\top + \mathbf{B}_k\mathbf{E}_i\mathbf{B}_k^\top,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbf{B}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\frac{2\pi k}{7}) & \sin(\frac{2\pi k}{7}) \\ -\sin(\frac{2\pi k}{7}) & \cos(\frac{2\pi k}{7}) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$d_{i1} \sim \chi^2(10) \quad d_{i2} \sim \chi^2(3)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_i = \begin{bmatrix} d_{i1} & 0 \\ 0 & d_{i2} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{E}_i \sim \mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{I}, 10),$$

where d_i is simulated from chi-square distribution and \mathbf{E}_i is simulated from Wishart distribution with identity matrix as the scale parameter.

Figure 2(a) presents the plot viewed from a side angle, illustrating how all points reside within the PSD cone. Meanwhile, Figure 2(b) offers a perspective from above, providing a different vantage point to observe the arrangement and distribution of the points in the plot.




Figure 3. K-Tensors and Their Partitions for 6 Groups

Figure 3 displays the same plot as before, but with an added feature: a gray plane in the middle of each subgroup, representing the subspace or clustering center for that group using K-Tensors algorithm. Each gray plane is nicely positioned to serve as the center around which the members of its respective subgroup are clustered.

5.2. Evaluation

We evaluate our K-tensors algorithm in two simulation settings:

Setting 1:

In Setting one, the simulation of observations from different groups mirrors the method used for generating PSD matrices. The key difference lies in the generation of the orthonormal

matrix \mathbf{B}_k , which is now randomly produced based on a θ chosen from a uniform distribution.

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\psi}_{k_i} &= \mathbf{B}_k(\mathbf{D}_i + \mathbf{E}_i)\mathbf{B}_k^\top \\ &= \mathbf{B}_k\mathbf{D}_i\mathbf{B}_k^\top + \mathbf{B}_k\mathbf{E}_i\mathbf{B}_k^\top,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{B}_k &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta) & \sin(\theta) \\ -\sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{bmatrix} \\ \theta &\sim \text{Uniform}(0, 2\pi) \\ df_1 &\sim \mathcal{N}(10, 3) \quad df_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(3, 3) \\ d_{i1} &\sim \chi^2(df_1) \quad d_{i2} \sim \chi^2(df_2) \\ \mathbf{D}_i &= \begin{bmatrix} d_{i1} & 0 \\ 0 & d_{i2} \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{E}_i &\sim \mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{I}, 10),\end{aligned}$$

Setting 2:

The other simulation is based on the Wishart distribution.

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\Psi}_k &\sim \mathcal{W}_2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k, n), \quad k = 1, 2 \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k &= \text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}_k) \\ \mathbf{X}_k &\sim \text{Bivariate-Uniform}(0, 1) \\ n &\sim \text{Uniform}(10, 60).\end{aligned}$$

We compare its performance with alternative similarity metrics, including Euclidean distance, Log-determinant divergence, and Affine-Invariant Riemannian distance, within the framework of self-consistency algorithms. Our goal is to assess their effectiveness in capturing the true data generation process. Considering the clustering task’s challenging nature, the true parameters are set to be very similar.

| Algorithm | Frobenius Norm of Error Matrix | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| K-Tensors | 0.85 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Eucl. ¹ | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.51 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| Aff-Inv | 0.55 | 0.56 | 0.58 | 0.55 | 0.56 | 0.56 |
| Log-Det | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.55 | 0.56 | 0.58 |

Table 1. Average Classification Accuracy for Simulation Setting 1

Where the Frobenius Norm of Error Matrix is $\|\mathbf{E}_i\|_F^2$.

The K-Tensor clustering algorithm demonstrates superior performance compared to Euclidean distance $d_E(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1, \boldsymbol{\psi}_2) = \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\psi}_2\|_F$, Affine-Invariant Riemannian distance $d_{aiE}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1, \boldsymbol{\psi}_2) = \|\log(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\psi}_2\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^{-1/2})\|_F$, and log-determinant divergence $d_{\log \det}^1(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1, \boldsymbol{\psi}_2) = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_2^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 - \mathbf{I}) - \log \det(\boldsymbol{\psi}_2^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}_1)$ in both simulation settings. Additionally, the runtime of the K-Tensor method

| Algorithm | Degrees of Freedom for Wishart Distribution | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 |
| K-Tensors | 0.58 | 0.61 | 0.65 | 0.66 | 0.69 | 0.73 | 0.74 | 0.75 |
| Eucl. ² | 0.55 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.54 |
| Aff-Inv | 0.53 | 0.56 | 0.61 | 0.59 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.53 | 0.58 |
| Log-Det | 0.53 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.55 |

Table 2. Average Classification Accuracy for Simulation Setting 2

is comparable to that of K-means while significantly faster than other metrics, which involves computationally intensive element-wise matrix inverse computations. While Affine-Invariant and Log-Determinant divergence have a close connection to the mixture Wishart distribution and are expected to perform well in clustering PSD matrices under the Wishart density, our proposed method consistently outperforms them on average.

6. Discussion

We emphasize the importance of our clustering algorithm development, especially its relevance to regression models employing PSD matrix-valued observations. This link underscores the algorithm’s role in improving analytical methods using PSD matrices.

Recent developments in modeling PSD matrices as outcomes in a regression framework have incorporated the concept of CPC. Specifically, Zhao et al. (2021a) and Zhao et al. (2021b) have proposed novel approaches that account for PSD matrix outcomes using a 1-dimensional quadratic form that assumes a shared subspace in the log-regression setting. Consider a regression setting where the outcomes are PSD matrices, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_i = \text{cov}(\mathbf{Y}|i)(i = 1, 2, \dots, n)$, of a random vector $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, assuming \mathbf{Y} is centered at 0 without loss of generality:

$$\log \{(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma})\} = \beta_0 + \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_1$$

In this heteroscedasticity model, the covariates collected from individual i are denoted by $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, where $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ are the model parameters. The common subspace of PSD matrices $\boldsymbol{\psi}_i$ is assumed to be spanned by a shared vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. The magnitude of the spanned by the common orthonormal vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ with respect to each covariance matrix is also a representation of the variance of the latent variable $\mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{Y}_i\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, where $\text{cov}(\mathbf{z}_i) = \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \mathbf{Y}_i^\top \mathbf{Y}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma} = \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma}$. This assumption enables the quadratic form $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ to satisfy the heteroscedasticity model, with the covariance matrix for each observation being a PSD matrix with a common subspace. Zhao et al. (2022) extend this approach to account for longitudinally measured covariates for each subject, resulting in a more comprehensive and flexible method for analyzing complex data structures. However, these models, including tensor regression models, assume a common




Figure 4. Clustering Accuracy for Simulation Setting 1




Figure 5. Clustering Accuracy for Simulation Setting 2

γ across all individuals. This assumption of a shared γ can obscure vital information within the eigenstructures, presenting an intriguing avenue for integrating *principal positive semi-definite tensors* into regression models. This integration could potentially capture more nuanced relationships and variations among individual data points, enriching the model’s analytical depth.

Cook & Forzani (2008) studied the sample covariance matrices of a random vector observed in different populations, assuming that the differences between the populations, aside from sample size, are solely due to the quadratic reduction $R(\Psi) = \alpha^T \Psi \alpha$. Here, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ denotes a matrix with q orthonormal columns. Subsequently, Franks & Hoff (2019) extended this approach to the “spiked covariance model,” also known as the partial isotropy model, which was studied by Mardia et al. (1979) and Johnstone (2001). This model is commonly used in multivariate statistical analysis and assumes that the covariance matrix of a high-dimensional random vector consists of a low-rank component (the “spike”) and a high-rank component (the “noise”).

These methods outline approaches for estimating covariance matrices across diverse populations, which in turn inspire

our clustering strategy for positive semi-definite (PSD) tensor data. In our context, each observation corresponds to a PSD matrix. This approach opens up a pathway for incorporating sparsity and lower rank estimation into the subspace of the K-Tensors clustering centroids. Such enhancements aim to refine and optimize the clustering process, potentially improving the accuracy and interpretability of the resulting clusters.

References

Alavi, A., Wiliem, A., Zhao, K., Lovell, B. C., and Sander-son, C. Random projections on manifolds of symmetric positive definite matrices for image classification. *IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pp. 301–308, 2014.

Banerjee, A., Merugu, S., Dhillon, I. S., Ghosh, J., and Lafferty, J. Clustering with bregman divergences. *Journal of machine learning research*, 6(10), 2005.

Cherian, A. and Sra, S. Positive definite matrices: data representation and applications to computer vision. *Algorithmic Advances in Riemannian Geometry and Applications: For Machine Learning, Computer Vision, Statistics, and Optimization*, pp. 93–114, 2016.

Cook, R. D. and Forzani, L. Covariance reducing models: An alternative to spectral modelling of covariance matrices. *Biometrika*, 95(4):799–812, 2008.

Flury, B. N. Common principal components in k groups. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 79(388): 892–898, 1984.

Flury, B. N. and Gautschi, W. An algorithm for simultaneous orthogonal transformation of several positive definite symmetric matrices to nearly diagonal form. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 7(1):169–184, 1986.

Franks, A. M. and Hoff, P. Shared subspace models for multi-group covariance estimation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 20:171–1, 2019.

Hallin, M., Paindaveine, D., and Verdebout, T. Efficient r-estimation of principal and common principal components. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109(507):1071–1083, 2014.

Hartigan, J. A. and Wong, M. A. Algorithm as 136: A k-means clustering algorithm. *Journal of the royal statistical society. series c (applied statistics)*, 28(1):100–108, 1979.

Hastie, T. and Stuetzle, W. Principal curves. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84(406):502–516, 1989.

- Johnstone, I. M. On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis. *The Annals of statistics*, 29(2):295–327, 2001.
- Mardia, K. V., Kent, J. T., and Bibby, J. M. Multivariate analysis. *Probability and mathematical statistics*, 1979.
- Moakher, M. A differential geometric approach to the geometric mean of symmetric positive-definite matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 26(3):735–747, 2005. doi: 10.1137/S0895479803436937. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0895479803436937>.
- Pearson, K. On lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space. *Lond. Edinb. Dublin Philos. Mag. J. Sci*, 2:559–572, 1901.
- Shinohara, Y., Masuko, T., and Akamine, M. Covariance clustering on riemannian manifolds for acoustic model compression. *2010 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. 4326–4329, 2010.
- Tarpey, T. Self-consistency and principal component analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(446):456–467, 1999.
- Tarpey, T. and Flury, B. Self-consistency: A fundamental concept in statistics. *Statistical Science*, 11:229–243, 1996.
- Tarpey, T., Li, L., and Flury, B. D. Principal points and self-consistent points of elliptical distributions. *The Annals of Statistics*, pp. 103–112, 1995.
- Tuzel, O., Porikli, F., and Meer, P. Region covariance: A fast descriptor for detection and classification. *Computer Vision—ECCV 2006: 9th European Conference on Computer Vision, Graz, Austria, May 7-13, 2006. Proceedings, Part II 9*, pp. 589–600, 2006.
- van den Heuvel, M. and Hulshoff Pol, H. Exploring the brain network: a review on resting-state fmri functional connectivity. *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, 20(8):519–534, 2010.
- Vollgraf, R. and Obermayer, K. Quadratic optimization for simultaneous matrix diagonalization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 54(9):3270–3278, 2006.
- Zhao, Y., Caffo, B., and Luo, X. Principal regression for high dimensional covariance matrices. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(2):4192–4235, 2021a.
- Zhao, Y., Wang, B., Mostofsky, S. H., Caffo, B. S., and Luo, X. Covariate assisted principal regression for covariance matrix outcomes. *Biostatistics*, 22(3):629–645, 2021b.
- Zhao, Y., Caffo, B. S., and Luo, X. Longitudinal regression of covariance matrix outcomes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.04553*, 2022.

A. Missing Proofs

A.1. Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof. Let $\psi = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^*\mathbf{U}^\top$ be the spectral decomposition of ψ , and let \mathbf{B} be a given orthonormal matrix. Our goal is to find $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{D}_+^p$ that minimizes the quantity $\min_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{D}_+^p} \|\psi - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{B}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$.

We can write the objective function as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\psi - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{B}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 & (4) \\ &= \|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^*\mathbf{U}^\top - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{B}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\ &= \text{tr} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^*\mathbf{U}^\top - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{B}^\top \right)^\top \left(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^*\mathbf{U}^\top - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{B}^\top \right) \right\} \\ &= \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^{*2}\mathbf{U}^\top - \psi^\top \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{B}^\top - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{B} \psi + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}^2\mathbf{B}^\top \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^{*2}\mathbf{U}^\top$ is independent of \mathbf{D} , minimizing $\|\psi - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{B}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$ is equivalent to minimizing:

$$\text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}^2\mathbf{B}^\top - 2\psi^\top \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{B}^\top \right\} = \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}^2 \right\} - 2 \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D} \underbrace{(\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B})}_{\mathbf{A}} \right\} \quad (5)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^p (d_j^2 - 2d_j a_j), \quad (6)$$

where a_j is the j^{th} diagonal element of \mathbf{A} , and a_j is upper bounded by d_j and lower bounded by 0 since d_j is the eigenvalue for $\psi \in \mathbb{S}_+^p$ $j = 1, \dots, p$. Therefore, $\|\psi - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{B}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$ is minimized when $a_j = d_j$. Therefore, we have $\Lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(\psi) = (\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}$. \square

A.2. Proof of theorem 4.1 and remark 4.2

Proof. To obtain the common principal components $\mathbf{B}(\Psi)$ nonparametrically without any distribution assumption, the goal is to find a such orthonormal matrix that solves equation (2).

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Psi} \left[\|\Psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\Psi)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\Psi} \left[\|\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B})\mathbf{B}^\top - \mathbf{B}(\Lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(\Psi))\mathbf{B}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right] \quad (7)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\Psi} \left[\|\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B} \circ \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top - (\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right] \quad (8)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\Psi} \left[\text{tr} \left\{ (\Psi^\top \Psi) - 2(\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B})^\top ((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) + ((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I})^\top ((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) \right\} \right] \quad (9)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\Psi} \left[-((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I})^\top ((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) \right] + C \quad (10)$$

where $(\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B})((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) = ((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I})((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I})$ in equation 9 if and only if

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\text{tr} \left\{ ((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B})(\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top - \mathbf{I}))^\top ((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B})(\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top - \mathbf{I})) \right\} \right] = 0. \quad (11)$$

By the definition of self-consistent PSD tensor, we have $\mathbb{E}[\text{tr}((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B})(\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top - \mathbf{I}))] = \mathbf{0}$, therefore, the condition in equation 11 can be rewritten to $\sum_{r=1}^p \sum_{h>r} \text{Var}(\mathbf{F}_{rh}) = 0$, which means the off-diagonal elements are zero a.e., here, $C = \mathbb{E}_\Psi(\text{tr}(\Psi^\top \Psi))$ is a constant with respect to \mathbf{B} . Therefore, under such condition, to minimize $\mathbb{E}_\Psi \left[\|\Psi - \mathcal{P}_\mathbf{B}(\Psi)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right]$ over \mathbf{B} is equivalent to:

$$\underset{\mathbf{B}}{\text{maximize}} \quad \mathbb{E}_\Psi \left[((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I})^\top ((\mathbf{B}^\top \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) \right] \quad (12)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I} \quad (13)$$

To prove theorem 4.1 and get a solution for \mathbf{B} , we can formulate the Lagrangian function with respect to each column space of \mathbf{B} as follow ($\mathbf{B} = [\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_p]$):

$$\mathcal{L}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p | \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p (\beta_j^\top \psi_i \beta_j)^2 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{h>j}^p \gamma_{hj} \beta_h^\top \beta_j - \sum_{h=1}^p \gamma_h \beta_h^\top \beta_h, \quad (14)$$

where β_j and β_h are the j^{th} and the h^{th} column of \mathbf{B} . Taking the partial derivatives with respect to β_ℓ and set it to zero, we will get:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \beta_\ell} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell \beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell - 2 \sum_{\substack{h=1 \\ h \neq \ell}}^p \gamma_{h\ell} \beta_h - 2\gamma_\ell \beta_\ell = 0 \quad (15)$$

multiplying equation 15 by $\frac{1}{2} \beta_\ell^\top$ from the left side, we can obtain $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell \beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell - \sum_{\substack{h=1 \\ h \neq \ell}}^p \gamma_{h\ell} \beta_h^\top \beta_h - \gamma_\ell \beta_\ell^\top \beta_\ell = 0$, implying that $\gamma_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell)^2$. Now substitute γ_ℓ back to equation 15 and multiplying it from the left by β_m^\top ($m \neq \ell$) implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell \beta_m^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell - \sum_{\substack{h=1 \\ h \neq \ell}}^p \gamma_{h\ell} \beta_m^\top \beta_h - \sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell)^2 \beta_m^\top \beta_\ell = 0 \quad (16)$$

For $m \neq \ell$, equation 16 implies that $\lambda_{m\ell} = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell \beta_m^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell \beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_m$, since $\beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_m = \beta_m^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell$. Now by setting $\gamma_{m\ell} = \gamma_{\ell m}$, we will obtain:

$$\beta_\ell^\top \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_\ell^\top \psi_i \beta_\ell - \beta_m^\top \psi_i \beta_m) \psi_i \right) \beta_m = 0 \quad (17)$$

for $\ell, m = 1, \dots, p$, and $m \neq \ell$. This is equivalent to the maximum likelihood estimates shown in Flury (1984), and can be solved by the algorithm proposed in Flury & Gautschi (1986). \square

A.3. Proof of theorem 4.4

Proof. Here, we seek to find $\mathbf{B}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{V}_p(\mathbb{R}^p)} \mathbb{E}_f \left\{ \|\Psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\Psi)\|_F^2 \right\}$:

$$\mathbb{E}_f \|\Psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\Psi)\|_F^2 \quad (18)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{T}} \|\psi - \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{B}^\top\|_F^2 dP_{\Psi}(\psi) \quad (19)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{T}} \text{tr} \left\{ (\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B} - (\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I})^\top (\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B} - (\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) \right\} dP_{\Psi}(\psi) \quad (20)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{T}} \text{tr} \left\{ (\psi^\top \psi) - 2(\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B})((\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) + ((\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I})^2 \right\} dP_{\Psi}(\psi) \quad (21)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{T}} \left(\text{tr} \{ \psi^\top \psi \} - \text{tr} \{ ((\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I})^2 \} \right) dP_{\Psi}(\psi) \quad (22)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{T}} \left(\text{tr} \{ \psi^\top \psi \} - \text{tr} \{ (\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) (\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I} \} \right) dP_{\Psi}(\psi) \quad (23)$$

$$= \text{tr} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{T}} \left[\psi^\top \psi - [(\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) (\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B})] \circ \mathbf{I} \right] dP_{\Psi}(\psi) \right\} \quad (24)$$

$$= \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[\Psi^\top \Psi] - (\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbb{E}[\Psi^\top \Psi] \mathbf{B} \circ \mathbf{I}) \right\}, \quad (25)$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\Psi^\top \Psi]$ is independent with the orthonormal matrix \mathbf{B} , therefore, minimizing $\mathbb{E}_f \|\Psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{B}}(\Psi)\|_F^2$ is equivalent to maximizing $\mathbb{E}_f \|(\mathbf{B} \Psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}\|_F^2 = \text{tr} \{ \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbb{E}[\Psi^\top \Psi] \mathbf{B} \circ \mathbf{I} \}$, which is equivalent to solving the eigenvectors of $\mathbb{E}[\Psi^\top \Psi]$.

Note that:

$$\text{tr} \{ \mathbf{F} \mathbf{F} \} = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{F}_{ij}^2 \quad (26)$$

$$\text{tr} \{ \mathbf{F} (\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{I}) \} = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=i}^p \mathbf{F}_{ij}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j \neq i}^p \mathbf{F}_{ij} \times 0 = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=i}^p \mathbf{F}_{ij}^2 \quad (27)$$

$$\text{tr} \{ (\mathbf{F} \mathbf{F}) \circ \mathbf{I} \} = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=i}^p \mathbf{F}_{ij}^2 \quad (28)$$

$$\text{tr} \{ (\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{I}) (\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{I}) \} = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=i}^p \mathbf{F}_{ij}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j \neq i}^p 0 \times 0 = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=i}^p \mathbf{F}_{ij}^2, \quad (29)$$

therefore, we have in equation (21, 22), $\text{tr} \{ (\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) ((\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) \} = \text{tr} \{ ((\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) ((\mathbf{B}^\top \psi \mathbf{B}) \circ \mathbf{I}) \}$. \square

A.4. Proof for theorem 4.6

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}_j}(\Psi) \right\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right] &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi - \mathbb{E} \left[\Psi \mid \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}_j}(\Psi) \right] \right\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{B}_j}(\Psi) \right\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right] \\
 &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\inf_{\mathcal{B}_{j+1}} \left\| \Psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}_{j+1}}(\Psi) \right\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi - \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}_{j+1}}(\Psi) \right\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

□