
Optimization on product manifolds under a preconditioned metric

Bin Gao · Renfeng Peng · Ya-xiang Yuan

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract Since optimization on Riemannian manifolds relies on the chosen metric, it is appealing to know that how the performance of a Riemannian optimization method varies with different metrics and how to exquisitely construct a metric such that a method can be accelerated. To this end, we propose a general framework for optimization problems on product manifolds where the search space is endowed with a preconditioned metric, and we develop the Riemannian gradient descent and Riemannian conjugate gradient methods under this metric. Specifically, the metric is constructed by an operator that aims to approximate the diagonal blocks of the Riemannian Hessian of the cost function, which has a preconditioning effect. We explain the relationship between the proposed methods and the variable metric methods, and show that various existing methods, e.g., the Riemannian Gauss–Newton method, can be interpreted by the proposed framework with specific metrics. In addition, we tailor new preconditioned metrics and adapt the proposed Riemannian methods to the canonical correlation analysis and the truncated singular value decomposition problems, and we propose the Gauss–Newton method to solve the tensor ring completion problem. Numerical results among these applications verify that a delicate metric does accelerate the Riemannian optimization methods.

Keywords Riemannian optimization · preconditioned metric · canonical correlation analysis · singular value decomposition · tensor completion

PACS 15A69 · 65K05 · 65F30 · 90C30

BG was supported by the Young Elite Scientist Sponsorship Program by CAST. YY was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant No. 12288201).

Bin Gao · Ya-xiang Yuan

State Key Laboratory of Scientific and Engineering Computing, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

E-mail: {gaobin,yyx}@lsec.cc.ac.cn;

Renfeng Peng

State Key Laboratory of Scientific and Engineering Computing, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, and University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

E-mail: pengrenfeng@lsec.cc.ac.cn

1 Introduction

We consider the optimization problems on product manifolds:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{M}} f(x), \quad (1.1)$$

where f is a smooth cost function and the search space \mathcal{M} is a product manifold, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{M}_K,$$

\mathcal{M}_k is a manifold for $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ and K is a positive integer. Optimization on product manifolds has a wide variety of applications, including singular value decomposition [23], joint approximate tensor diagonalization problem [27], dimensionality reduction of EEG covariance matrices [29], and canonical correlation analysis [24]. In addition, instead of working with full-size matrices or tensors, matrix and tensor decompositions—which decompose a matrix and tensor into smaller blocks—allow us to implement optimization methods on a product manifold in low-rank matrix and tensor completion [5, 15, 11, 7, 12].

Related works and motivation Recently, Riemannian optimization, designing algorithms based on the geometry of the Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} , appears to be prosperous in many areas. Specifically, one can propose Riemannian optimization methods to solve problem (1.1), e.g., Riemannian gradient descent and Riemannian conjugate gradient methods. We refer to [2, 4] for a comprehensive overview.

Since different metrics result in different Riemannian gradients and thus distinct Riemannian methods, one is inquisitive about how the performance of a Riemannian method relies on the choice of a metric g . Moreover, the condition number of the Riemannian Hessian of the cost function at a local minimizer x^* , denoted by $\kappa := \kappa_g(\text{Hess}_g f(x^*))$, affects the local convergence of first-order methods in Riemannian optimization. For instance, in the Euclidean case, i.e., $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^n$, the asymptotic local linear convergence rates of the steepest gradient descent and the conjugate gradient methods for solving the symmetric positive-definite linear systems are $(\kappa - 1)/(\kappa + 1)$ and $(\sqrt{\kappa} - 1)/(\sqrt{\kappa} + 1)$ respectively [28, Theorem 3.3, Theorem 5.5]. In general, the asymptotic local linear convergence rate of the Riemannian gradient descent method was proved to be $1 - 1/\mathcal{O}(\kappa)$, see, e.g., [26, Chapter 7, Theorem 4.2], [2, Theorem 4.5.6], and [4, Theorem 4.20]. Notice that an appropriate metric g can lead to a smaller condition number. In view of these observations, it is natural to ask:

*Can Riemannian optimization methods be accelerated
by choosing a metric “exquisitely”?*

The following example presents a positive answer.

Example 1 Consider the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & f(\mathbf{x}) := -\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{x} \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{B} \mathbf{x} = 1\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric positive definite and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The search space \mathcal{M} is an ellipsoid. The problem has a closed-form solution $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{b}/\|\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{B}}$ with $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbf{B}}^2 := \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{B} \mathbf{x}$. We explore the effect of a family of metrics,

$$g_{\lambda, \mathbf{x}} := \langle \xi, (\lambda \mathbf{I}_n + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{B})\eta \rangle \quad \text{for tangent vectors } \xi \text{ and } \eta,$$

to the Riemannian gradient descent (RGD) method and the condition number of $\text{Hess}_{g_{\lambda, \mathbf{x}}} f(\mathbf{x}^*)$ in Fig. 1, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lambda \mathbf{I}_n + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{B}$ is positive definite. The left figure depicts the sequences generated by RGD under the Euclidean metric $g_{1, \mathbf{x}}(\xi, \eta) = \langle \xi, \eta \rangle$ and the *scaled metric* $g_{0, \mathbf{x}}(\xi, \eta) = \langle \xi, \mathbf{B}\eta \rangle$, and it shows that RGD under the metric $g_{0, \mathbf{x}}$ converges faster than the one under the Euclidean metric. Furthermore, the right figure confirms that the condition number varies with the metrics and $g_{0, \mathbf{x}}$ leads to the smallest condition number. The detailed computation can be found in Appendix A.




Fig. 1 Left: sequences generated by the Riemannian gradient descent method under two metrics for $\mathbf{B} = \text{diag}(2^2, 3^2, 1)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (1, 1, 1)$. Blue marker: the Euclidean metric; green marker: the scaled metric. Right: the condition number of $\text{Hess}_{g_{\lambda, \mathbf{x}}} f(\mathbf{x}^*)$ for $\lambda \in (-1/8, 1]$


Developing an appropriate metric to enhance the performance of Riemannian optimization methods was discussed in the existing works. For instance, the *Riemannian preconditioning* was proposed by Mishra and Sepulchre [19] for solving equality-constrained optimization problems where the feasible set is a manifold. The non-Euclidean metrics were derived from the Euclidean Hessian of the Lagrangian function, while the explicit construction of the Hessian can be expensive in practice. As a remedy, the *block-diagonal approximation* was considered to construct metrics in the tensor completion problems [15, 11, 7, 12]. Specifically, in view of the block structure in tensor decompositions, the metric was developed by taking advantage of the diagonal blocks of the Hessian of the cost function, and the Riemannian optimization methods under those metrics were proved to be efficient. More recently, Shustin and Aeron [24] proposed a preconditioned metric for generalized Stiefel manifolds by exploiting the Riemannian Hessian of the cost function at the local minimizer and computed its condition number under the proposed metric in the ellipsoid case.

In addition, there are other approaches that incorporate preconditioning techniques in Riemannian optimization. Mishra et al. [18] constructed a new metric and proposed Riemannian conjugate gradient (RCG) and Riemannian trust-region (RTR) methods for the matrix completion problem. Boumal and Absil [5] developed a preconditioner to approximate the Riemannian Hessian in matrix completion. Kressner et al. [16] proposed preconditioned Richardson iteration and approximate Newton method to solve the tensor equations by constructing a Laplacian-like operator. More recently, Tong et al. [25] introduced the scaled gradient descent method for low-rank matrix estimation. Bian et al. [3] presented a preconditioned Riemannian gradient descent algorithm for low-rank matrix recovery.

Contributions In this paper, we propose a general framework to construct a preconditioned metric on the product manifold $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{M}_K$, which improves the performance of Riemannian optimization methods. Specifically, we consider a metric by designing a self-adjoint and positive-definite linear operator $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ on the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{E}$ such that

$$g_x(\xi, \eta) := \langle \xi, \bar{\mathcal{H}}(x)[\eta] \rangle \approx \langle \xi, \text{Hess}_e f(x)[\eta] \rangle \quad \text{for } \xi, \eta \in T_x \mathcal{M},$$

where $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{E}_1 \times \mathcal{E}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{E}_K$ is the ambient space of \mathcal{M} and $\text{Hess}_e f(x)$ refers to the Riemannian Hessian of f at $x \in \mathcal{M}$ under the Euclidean metric $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle$. Since the operator $\bar{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ approximates the second-order information, we refer to the metric as a *preconditioned metric*. Instead of approximating the full Riemannian Hessian, which can be computationally unfavorable in practice, we benefit from the block structure of $\text{Hess}_e f(x)$ and construct a new metric by exploiting the diagonal blocks; see an illustration in Fig. 2.



$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} &= \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{M}_K \\ g_x(\xi, \eta) &= g_{x_1}^1(\xi_1, \eta_1) + g_{x_2}^2(\xi_2, \eta_2) + \cdots + g_{x_K}^K(\xi_K, \eta_K) \\ &= \langle \xi_1, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_1(x)[\eta_1] \rangle + \langle \xi_2, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_2(x)[\eta_2] \rangle + \cdots + \langle \xi_K, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_K(x)[\eta_K] \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 2 A new metric on the product manifold \mathcal{M}

Specifically, given $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K) \in \mathcal{M}$, we construct operators $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k(x) : T_{x_k} \mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow T_{x_k} \mathcal{E}_k$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ that aim to approximate the diagonal blocks of $\text{Hess}_e f(x)$, and each manifold \mathcal{M}_k is endowed with a metric

$$g_{x_k}^k(\xi_k, \eta_k) := \langle \xi_k, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_k(x)[\eta_k] \rangle \quad \text{for } \xi_k, \eta_k \in T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}_k.$$

Therefore, the Riemannian metric on \mathcal{M} is defined by the sum of the Riemannian metric on each component, i.e., $g_x(\xi, \eta) := \sum_{k=1}^K g_{x_k}^k(\xi_k, \eta_k)$. By virtue of the new metric, we propose the Riemannian gradient descent and Riemannian conjugate gradient methods, and the condition number-related convergence results are presented.

Moreover, we investigate the connection between developing a preconditioned metric and others existing methods. In particular, variable metric methods consider an operator to approximate the second-order information of the cost function by using the previous iterations. In contrast, the proposed preconditioned metric is pre-defined without former iterative information, which is able to save memory. Additionally, we show that the Riemannian Gauss–Newton method can be interpreted by a Riemannian gradient descent method employing a specific metric. The preconditioned metric expands the scope of Riemannian preconditioning in [19] since it facilitates flexible choices of the operator $\bar{H}(x)$. It is worth noting that exploiting more second-order information can improve the performance of Riemannian methods, but there is a trade-off between the increased cost brought by preconditioned metrics and the efficiency of preconditioned methods. In summary, the existing methods that can be interpreted by our framework are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 Existing and our works interpreted by preconditioned metrics. MC: matrix completion; TC: tensor completion; CP: canonical polyadic; TT: Tensor train; TR: Tensor ring

Problem and methods	Search space \mathcal{M} and variable	Metric $g_x(\xi, \eta)$, $\xi, \eta \in T_x \mathcal{M}$
MC [18] RGD, RCG, RTR	$\mathbb{R}_*^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times r}$ (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{R})	$\langle \xi_1, \eta_1(\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}) \rangle + \langle \xi_2, \eta_2(\mathbf{L}^\top \mathbf{L}) \rangle$
Matrix sensing [25] ScaledGD	$\mathbb{R}_*^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times r}$ (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{R})	$\langle \xi_1, \eta_1(\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}) \rangle + \langle \xi_2, \eta_2(\mathbf{L}^\top \mathbf{L}) \rangle$
Tucker TC [19] RCG	$\times_{k=1}^3 \text{St}(r_k, n_k) \times \mathbb{R}^{r_1 \times r_2 \times r_3}$ $(\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2, \mathbf{U}_3, \mathcal{G})$	$\sum_{k=1}^3 \langle \xi_k, \eta_k(\mathbf{G}_{(k)} \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^\top) \rangle + \langle \xi_G, \eta_G \rangle$
CP TC [11] RGD, RCG	$\times_{k=1}^d \mathbb{R}^{n_k \times r}$ $(\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2, \dots, \mathbf{U}_d)$	$\sum_{k=1}^d \langle \xi_k, \eta_k((\mathbf{U}^{\odot_{j \neq k}})^\top \mathbf{U}^{\odot_{j \neq k}} + \delta \mathbf{I}_r) \rangle$
TT TC [7] RGD, RCG, RGN	$\times_{k=1}^d \mathbb{R}_*^{r_{k-1} \times n_k \times r_k}$ $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2, \dots, \mathcal{X}_d)$	$\sum_{k=1}^d \langle \xi_k, \eta_k(\mathbf{H}_k^\top \mathbf{H}_k) \rangle$
TR TC [12] RGD, RCG	$\times_{k=1}^d \mathbb{R}^{n_k \times r_{k-1} \times r_k}$ $(\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \dots, \mathbf{W}_d)$	$\sum_{k=1}^d \langle \xi_k, \eta_k(\mathbf{W}_{\neq k}^\top \mathbf{W}_{\neq k} + \delta \mathbf{I}_{r_{k-1} r_k}) \rangle$
CCA [30, 24] RCG	$\text{St}_{\Sigma_{xx}}(m, d_x) \times \text{St}_{\Sigma_{yy}}(m, d_y)$ (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})	$\langle \xi_1, \Sigma_{xx} \eta_1 \rangle + \langle \xi_2, \Sigma_{yy} \eta_2 \rangle$
CCA (this work) RGD, RCG	$\text{St}_{\Sigma_{xx}}(m, d_x) \times \text{St}_{\Sigma_{yy}}(m, d_y)$ (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})	$\langle \xi_1, \Sigma_{xx} \eta_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2} \rangle + \langle \xi_2, \Sigma_{yy} \eta_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2} \rangle$
SVD (this work) RGD, RCG	$\text{St}(p, m) \times \text{St}(p, n)$ (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})	$\langle \xi_1, \eta_1(\text{sym}(\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{N})^2 + \delta \mathbf{I}_p)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rangle$ $+ \langle \xi_2, \eta_2(\text{sym}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{N})^2 + \delta \mathbf{I}_p)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rangle$
TR TC (this work) Gauss–Newton	$\times_{k=1}^d \mathbb{R}^{n_k \times r_{k-1} \times r_k}$ $(\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \dots, \mathbf{W}_d)$	$\langle \xi, (D F(\bar{\mathbf{W}}))^* [D F(\bar{\mathbf{W}})[\eta]] \rangle$

Furthermore, we construct novel preconditioned metrics and apply RGD and RCG to canonical correlation analysis and truncated singular value decomposition. We compute the condition numbers of the Riemannian Hessian of the cost function

at a local minimizer for these problems. In addition, we propose the Gauss–Newton method for tensor ring completion. Numerical results among three applications validate the effectiveness of the proposed preconditioning framework, and these methods remain a comparable computational cost with the existing Riemannian methods.

Organization We introduce the concepts in Riemannian optimization on product manifolds and present the convergence properties of RGD in section 2. A preconditioned metric for product manifolds is developed in section 3, and we explore the connection between developing a Riemannian metric and existing approaches. We apply the proposed framework to solve the canonical correlation analysis and truncated singular value decomposition in section 4 and 5. The Gauss–Newton method for tensor ring completion is proposed in section 6. Finally, we draw the conclusion in section 7.

2 Optimization on product manifolds

In this section, we provide basic tools in Riemannian geometry on product manifolds and develop the Riemannian gradient descent and Riemannian conjugate gradient methods for optimization on product manifolds. Metric-based and condition number-related convergence properties are presented.

2.1 Riemannian optimization on product manifolds

A product manifold \mathcal{M} is defined by the Cartesian product of manifolds, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{M}_K.$$

Assume that \mathcal{M} is embedded in a Euclidean space $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_1 \times \mathcal{E}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{E}_K$, which is called the *ambient space*. The tangent space of \mathcal{M} at $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K)$ is denoted by $\mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{T}_{x_1} \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathbb{T}_{x_2} \mathcal{M}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{T}_{x_K} \mathcal{M}_K$, and a tangent vector is denoted by $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_K)$. Let each manifold \mathcal{M}_k be endowed with a *Riemannian metric* g^k , and hence the Riemannian metric on the product manifold \mathcal{M} can be defined by

$$g_x(\xi, \eta) := g_{x_1}^1(\xi_1, \eta_1) + g_{x_2}^2(\xi_2, \eta_2) + \cdots + g_{x_K}^K(\xi_K, \eta_K)$$

for $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M}$, which induces a norm $\|\eta\|_x := \sqrt{g_x(\eta, \eta)}$. Given a vector $\bar{\eta} = (\bar{\eta}_1, \bar{\eta}_2, \dots, \bar{\eta}_K) \in \mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{E} \simeq \mathcal{E}$, the orthogonal projection operator onto $\mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M}$ with respect to the metric g is defined by

$$\Pi_{g,x}(\bar{\eta}) := \left(\Pi_{g^1, x_1}(\bar{\eta}_1), \Pi_{g^2, x_2}(\bar{\eta}_2), \dots, \Pi_{g^K, x_K}(\bar{\eta}_K) \right),$$

where each Π_{g^k, x_k} refers to orthogonal projection operator with respect to the metric g^k onto $\mathbb{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}_k$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$. Let $\mathbb{T} \mathcal{M} := \cup_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M}$ be the *tangent bundle*. A smooth mapping $\mathbb{R} : \mathbb{T} \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $\mathbb{R}_x(0_x) = x$ and $\mathbb{D} \mathbb{R}_x(0_x) = \mathbb{I}_x$ is called a *retraction* [4], where $0_x \in \mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M}$ is the zero element and $\mathbb{I}_x : \mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M}$ is the identity operator on $\mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M}$. A retraction on a product manifold \mathcal{M} is defined by

$$\mathbb{R}_x(\eta) := (\mathbb{R}_{x_1}^1(\eta_1), \mathbb{R}_{x_2}^2(\eta_2), \dots, \mathbb{R}_{x_K}^K(\eta_K)),$$

where R^k is a retraction on \mathcal{M}_k . The *vector transport* operator is denoted by $\mathcal{T}_{y \leftarrow x} : T_x \mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_y \mathcal{M}$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$.

Consider a smooth function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The *Riemannian gradient* [2] under the metric g is denoted by $\text{grad}_g f(x)$, which is the unique tangent vector satisfying

$$g_x(\text{grad}_g f(x), \eta) = Df(x)[\eta]$$

for all $\eta \in T_x \mathcal{M}$, where $Df(x)[\eta]$ refers to the differential of f at x along η . The *Riemannian Hessian* operator of f at x with respect to g is defined by $\text{Hess}_g f(x)[\eta] := \nabla_\eta \text{grad}_g f$, where the symbol ∇ refers to *Levi-Civita connection* on \mathcal{M} . In particular, if \mathcal{M} is a Riemannian submanifold of the Euclidean space \mathcal{E} , it follows from [4, Corollary 5.1.6] that

$$\text{Hess}_e f(x)[\eta] = \Pi_{e,x}(D\bar{G}(x)[\eta]), \quad (2.1)$$

where \bar{G} is a smooth extension of $\text{grad}_e f(x)$ on a neighborhood of \mathcal{M} , $\text{grad}_e f(x)$ and $\text{Hess}_e f(x)$ are the Riemannian gradient and Riemannian Hessian of f under the Euclidean metric.

By assembling the required ingredients, we present the Riemannian gradient descent and Riemannian conjugate gradient methods in Algorithms 1 and 2. We refer to [2, 21] for the global convergence of RGD and RCG.

Algorithm 1 Riemannian gradient descent method (RGD)

Input: Manifold \mathcal{M} endowed with a metric g , initial guess $x^{(0)} \in \mathcal{M}$, $t = 0$.

- 1: **while** the stopping criteria are not satisfied **do**
- 2: Compute $\eta^{(t)} = -\text{grad}_g f(x^{(t)})$.
- 3: Compute a stepsize $s^{(t)}$.
- 4: Update $x^{(t+1)} = R_{x^{(t)}}(s^{(t)}\eta^{(t)}) = (R_{x_1^{(t)}}^1(\eta_1^{(t)}), R_{x_2^{(t)}}^2(\eta_2^{(t)}), \dots, R_{x_K^{(t)}}^K(\eta_K^{(t)}))$; $t = t + 1$.

5: **end while**

Output: $x^{(t)} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Algorithm 2 Riemannian conjugate gradient method (RCG)

Input: Manifold \mathcal{M} endowed with a metric g , initial guess $x^{(0)} \in \mathcal{M}$, $t = 0$, $\beta^{(-1)} = 0$.

- 1: **while** the stopping criteria are not satisfied **do**
- 2: Compute $\eta^{(t)} = -\text{grad}_g f(x^{(t)}) + \beta^{(t)}\mathcal{T}_{x^{(t)} \leftarrow x^{(t-1)}}\eta^{(t-1)}$, where $\beta^{(t)}$ is a conjugate gradient parameter.
- 3: Compute a stepsize $s^{(t)}$.
- 4: Update $x^{(t+1)} = R_{x^{(t)}}(s^{(t)}\eta^{(t)}) = (R_{x_1^{(t)}}^1(\eta_1^{(t)}), R_{x_2^{(t)}}^2(\eta_2^{(t)}), \dots, R_{x_K^{(t)}}^K(\eta_K^{(t)}))$; $t = t + 1$.

5: **end while**

Output: $x^{(t)} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Observe that the Riemannian gradients in RGD and RCG depend on the chosen metric g . In other words, the Riemannian methods are metric-dependent. Moreover, the computational cost in the updates of RGD and RCG varies with different metrics. Therefore, choosing an appropriate metric is apt to improve the performance of Riemannian methods.

Definition 1 (critical points) Given a smooth function f defined on a manifold \mathcal{M} endowed with a metric g , a point $x^* \in \mathcal{M}$ is called a critical point of f if $\text{grad}_g f(x^*) = 0$.

Note that the definition of Riemannian gradient relies on the metric g , whereas the set of critical points of f is invariant to the choice of metrics; see the following proposition.

Proposition 1 *Given a smooth function f defined on a manifold \mathcal{M} . Consider two Riemannian manifolds (\mathcal{M}, g) and (\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g}) , it holds that*

$$g_x(\text{grad}_g f(x), \text{grad}_{\tilde{g}} f(x)) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{g}_x(\text{grad}_g f(x), \text{grad}_{\tilde{g}} f(x)) \geq 0$$

for $x \in \mathcal{M}$. The equality holds if and only if x is a critical point. Moreover, $\text{grad}_g f(x) = 0$ if and only if $\text{grad}_{\tilde{g}} f(x) = 0$.

Proof It suffices to prove the first inequality, and the other can be proved in the same fashion. Let (\mathcal{U}, φ) be a chart of the manifold \mathcal{M} , E_i be the i -th coordinate vector field. For vector fields $\zeta = \sum_i \alpha_i E_i$ and $\chi = \sum_i \beta_i E_i$, it follows the definition of the Riemannian metric g that

$$g_x(\zeta_x, \chi_x) = \sum_{i,j} g_{ij} \alpha_i \beta_j = \hat{\zeta}_x^T \mathbf{G}_x \hat{\chi}_x,$$

where $\hat{x} := \varphi(x)$, $\hat{\zeta}_x := D\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\hat{x}))[\zeta_x]$, $\hat{\chi}_x := D\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\hat{x}))[\chi_x]$, and the (i, j) -th element of \mathbf{G}_x is $g_{ij} := g(E_i, E_j)$. Denote $\zeta_x := \text{grad}_g f(x)$ and $\chi_x := \text{grad}_{\tilde{g}} f(x)$. It follows from the coordinate expression [2, §3.6] that

$$\hat{\zeta}_x = \mathbf{G}_x^{-1} \nabla \hat{f}(\hat{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\chi}_x = \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_x^{-1} \nabla \hat{f}(\hat{x}),$$

where $\hat{f}(\hat{x}) := f \circ \varphi^{-1}(\hat{x})$ and $\nabla \hat{f}$ refers to the Euclidean gradient of \hat{f} . We obtain that

$$g_x(\text{grad}_g f(x), \text{grad}_{\tilde{g}} f(x)) = \hat{\zeta}_x^T \mathbf{G}_x \hat{\chi}_x = (\nabla \hat{f}(\hat{x}))^T \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_x^{-1} \nabla \hat{f}(\hat{x}) \geq 0.$$

The equality holds if and only if $\nabla \hat{f}(\hat{x}) = 0$, i.e., $\text{grad}_g f(x) = \text{grad}_{\tilde{g}} f(x) = 0$. Moreover, if $\text{grad}_g f(x) = 0$, it follows that $\hat{\zeta}_x = 0$, and hence

$$\hat{\chi}_x = \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_x^{-1} \nabla \hat{f}(\hat{x}) = \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_x^{-1} \mathbf{G}_x \mathbf{G}_x^{-1} \nabla \hat{f}(\hat{x}) = \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_x^{-1} \mathbf{G}_x \hat{\zeta}_x = 0,$$

i.e., $\text{grad}_{\tilde{g}} f(x) = 0$. □

The second-order critical point of f is defined as follows.

Definition 2 (second-order critical points) Given a smooth function f defined on a manifold \mathcal{M} endowed with a metric g , a critical point $x^* \in \mathcal{M}$ of f is called a second-order critical point of f if $\text{Hess}_g f(x^*)$ is positive semidefinite. Furthermore, if $\text{Hess}_g f(x^*)$ is positive definite, then x^* is a local minimizer for (1.1).

Note that the set of second-order critical points is also invariant in terms of metrics; see [4, Proposition 6.3]. Specifically, if x^* is a second-order critical point of f , it holds that $\text{Hess}_g f(x^*)$ is positive semidefinite if and only if $\text{Hess}_{\tilde{g}} f(x^*)$ is positive semidefinite for different metrics g and \tilde{g} .

2.2 Local convergence properties

We present the local convergence properties of the Riemannian gradient descent method in terms of condition numbers. Specifically, the Armijo backtracking line search is applied to computing the stepsize in Algorithm 1.

Definition 3 (Armijo backtracking line search) Given a smooth function f defined on a manifold \mathcal{M} endowed with a metric g , a point $x \in \mathcal{M}$, a vector $\eta \in T_x \mathcal{M}$, an initial stepsize $s_0 > 0$, and constants $\rho, a \in (0, 1)$. The Armijo backtracking line search aims to find the smallest non-negative integer ℓ , such that for $s = \rho^\ell s_0$, the inequality

$$f(x) - f(\mathbf{R}_x(s\eta)) \geq -sag_x(\text{grad}_g f(x), \eta) \quad (2.2)$$

holds.

In Riemannian optimization, the condition number of the Riemannian Hessian at the local minimizer x^* is crucial to the local converge rate of Riemannian methods; see, e.g., [2, Theorem 4.5.6] and [4, Theorem 4.20]. The condition number of the Riemannian Hessian $\text{Hess}_g f(x^*)$ is defined by

$$\kappa_g(\text{Hess}_g f(x^*)) := \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\text{Hess}_g f(x^*))}{\lambda_{\min}(\text{Hess}_g f(x^*))} = \frac{\sup_{\eta \in T_{x^*} \mathcal{M}} q_{x^*}(\eta)}{\inf_{\eta \in T_{x^*} \mathcal{M}} q_{x^*}(\eta)}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\lambda_{\min}(\text{Hess}_g f(x^*))$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\text{Hess}_g f(x^*))$ denote the smallest and largest eigenvalue of $\text{Hess}_g f(x^*)$, and

$$q_{x^*}(\eta) := \frac{g_{x^*}(\eta, \text{Hess}_g f(x^*)[\eta])}{g_{x^*}(\eta, \eta)} \quad (2.4)$$

refers to the Rayleigh quotient. Then, the local convergence rate of RGD with Armijo backtracking line search (2.2) for optimization on product manifolds can be proved by using [2, Theorem 4.5.6].

Theorem 1 Let $\{x^{(t)}\}_{t=0}^\infty$ be an infinite sequence generated by Algorithm 1 with backtracking line search (2.2) converging to a local minimizer x^* . There exists $T > 0$, such that for all $t > T$, it holds that

$$\frac{f(x^{(t)}) - f(x^*)}{f(x^{(t-1)}) - f(x^*)} \leq 1 - \min \left\{ 2as_0\lambda_{\min}, \frac{4a(1-a)\rho}{\kappa_g(\text{Hess}_g f(x^*))} \right\},$$

where $\lambda_{\min} := \lambda_{\min}(\text{Hess}_g f(x^*))$.

Note that different metrics can lead to different λ_{\min} and $\kappa_g(\text{Hess}_g f(x^*))$ by definition (2.3), which affect the local convergence rate. More precisely, a lower condition number indicates a faster convergence of RGD.

3 A preconditioned metric on product manifolds

We first develop a preconditioned metric on a product manifold \mathcal{M} by constructing an operator $\bar{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ that aims to approximate the diagonal blocks of Riemannian Hessian. Next, we explain the relationship between the proposed framework and other existing methods, e.g., the variable metric methods and the Riemannian Gauss–Newton method.

Specifically, we propose to endow \mathcal{M} with a metric g by designing a self-adjoint and positive-definite linear operator $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ on the tangent bundle $\mathbb{T}\mathcal{E}$ such that

$$g_x(\xi, \eta) := \langle \xi, \bar{\mathcal{H}}(x)[\eta] \rangle \approx \langle \xi, \text{Hess}_e f(x)[\eta] \rangle \quad \text{for } \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the Euclidean inner product and $\text{Hess}_e f(x)$ is the Riemannian Hessian of f under the Euclidean metric. Since $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{M}_K$ is a product manifold, it follows from [4, Example 5.19] that the Riemannian Hessian of f at $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K)$ along $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_K)$ enjoys a block structure, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hess}_e f(x)[\eta] &= (H_{11}(x)[\eta_1] + H_{12}(x)[\eta_2] + \cdots + H_{1K}(x)[\eta_K], \\ &\quad H_{21}(x)[\eta_1] + H_{22}(x)[\eta_2] + \cdots + H_{2K}(x)[\eta_K], \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &\quad H_{K1}(x)[\eta_1] + H_{K2}(x)[\eta_2] + \cdots + H_{KK}(x)[\eta_K]), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$H_{ij}(x)[\eta_j] := \begin{cases} \text{Hess}_e f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, \cdot, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_K)(x_i)[\eta_i], & \text{if } i = j, \\ \text{DG}_i(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, \cdot, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_K)(x_j)[\eta_j], & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, \cdot, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_K) : \mathcal{M}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

denotes the function that f is restricted on \mathcal{M}_i . The operator $G_i : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{x_i} \mathcal{M}_i$, $G_i(x) := \text{grad}_e f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, \cdot, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_K)(x_i)$, gives the Riemannian gradient of the above function. The restriction of G_i on \mathcal{M}_j is

$$G_i(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, \cdot, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_K) : \mathcal{M}_j \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{x_i} \mathcal{M}_i.$$

Then, the Riemannian gradient of f at x with respect to g can be computed by following [2, (3.37)].

Proposition 2 *Let (\mathcal{M}, g) be a Riemannian submanifold of the ambient space (\mathcal{E}, g) . Given a function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and its smooth extension $\bar{f} : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Riemannian gradient of f at $x \in \mathcal{M}$ can be computed by*

$$\text{grad}_g f(x) = \Pi_{g,x} \left(\bar{\mathcal{H}}(x)^{-1} [\nabla \bar{f}(x)] \right),$$

where $\Pi_{g,x} : \mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{E} \simeq \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M}$ is the orthogonal projection operator with respect to the metric g onto $\mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M}$, and $\nabla \bar{f}(x)$ denotes the Euclidean gradient of \bar{f} .

In view of (3.1) and Proposition 2, the operator $\bar{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ has a preconditioning effect. Hence, we refer to the metric g as a preconditioned metric, and $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ is the *preconditioner*. The methodology of using a preconditioned metric can be deemed a general framework to accelerate the Riemannian methods.

3.1 Approximation by diagonal blocks of Riemannian Hessian

Next, we consider how to construct a preconditioner $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ on a product manifold. Instead of acquiring the full Riemannian Hessian $\text{Hesse}f(x)$, which involves the computation of all blocks $H_{i,j}(x)$ in (3.2), we develop a metric in a more economical manner by using the diagonal blocks $H_{11}, H_{22}, \dots, H_{KK}$, as a trade-off between the efficiency and the computational cost.

Recall that a Riemannian metric on the product manifold \mathcal{M} is defined by the sum of the metrics on each component, i.e.,

$$g_x(\xi, \eta) = g_{x_1}^1(\xi_1, \eta_1) + g_{x_2}^2(\xi_2, \eta_2) + \dots + g_{x_K}^K(\xi_K, \eta_K)$$

for $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_K), \eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_K) \in \mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M}$. In view of (3.2), we construct an operator $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k(x) : \mathbb{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{E}_k$ such that

$$g_{x_k}^k(\xi_k, \eta_k) := \langle \xi_k, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_k(x)[\eta_k] \rangle \approx \langle \xi_k, H_{kk}(x)[\eta_k] \rangle \quad \text{for } \xi_k, \eta_k \in \mathbb{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}_k.$$

Subsequently, the operator $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ is defined by

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}(x)[\eta] := (\bar{\mathcal{H}}_1(x)[\eta_1], \bar{\mathcal{H}}_2(x)[\eta_2], \dots, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_K(x)[\eta_K]) \quad \text{for } \eta \in \mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M},$$

and a preconditioned metric on $\mathbb{T}_x \mathcal{M}$ reads

$$g_x(\xi, \eta) = \langle \xi_1, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_1(x)[\eta_1] \rangle + \langle \xi_2, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_2(x)[\eta_2] \rangle + \dots + \langle \xi_K, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_K(x)[\eta_K] \rangle. \quad (3.3)$$

Under the metric (3.3), the Riemannian gradient of a smooth function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at $x \in \mathcal{M}$ is given by using Proposition 2.

Proposition 3 *Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{M}_K$ be a product manifold endowed with the metric (3.3). Given a function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and its smooth extension $\bar{f} : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Riemannian gradient of f at x is*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad}_g f(x) &= (\Pi_{g^1, x_1}(\bar{\mathcal{H}}_1(x)^{-1}[\partial_1 \bar{f}(x)]), \\ &\quad \Pi_{g^2, x_2}(\bar{\mathcal{H}}_2(x)^{-1}[\partial_2 \bar{f}(x)]), \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &\quad \Pi_{g^K, x_K}(\bar{\mathcal{H}}_K(x)^{-1}[\partial_K \bar{f}(x)]), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where Π_{g^k, x_k} is the orthogonal projection operator with respect to the metric g^k onto $\mathbb{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}_k$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ and $\partial_k \bar{f}(x)$ is the partial derivative of f with respect to x_k .

It is worth noting that developing an appropriate metric by exploiting the diagonal blocks is closely related to the *block-Jacobi* preconditioning [10] in numerical linear algebra. Specifically, given a symmetric positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the goal of block-Jacobi preconditioning is to construct an invertible block-diagonal matrix

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{11} & & & \\ & \mathbf{D}_{22} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \mathbf{D}_{KK} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n},$$

such that $\kappa_2(\mathbf{DAD}^\top) := \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{DAD}^\top)/\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{DAD}^\top)$ is reduced, where $\mathbf{D}_{kk} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k \times n_k}$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ and $n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_K = n$. Alternatively, consider the minimization problem of a quadratic function $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}$. We can construct a preconditioned metric on the product manifold $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{n_K}$ by

$$g_{\mathbf{x}}(\xi, \eta) := \sum_{k=1}^K \langle \xi_k, (\mathbf{D}_{kk}^\top \mathbf{D}_{kk})^{-1} \eta_k \rangle = \langle \xi, (\mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{D})^{-1} \eta \rangle.$$

Given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, it follows from Proposition 3 and the definition of Riemannian Hessian that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad}_g f(\mathbf{x}) &= (\mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{D}) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}, \\ \text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{x}) &= (\mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{D}) \mathbf{A}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the Rayleigh quotient is given by

$$q_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta) = \frac{g_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta, \text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{x})[\eta])}{g_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta, \eta)} = \frac{\langle \eta, \mathbf{A} \eta \rangle}{\langle \eta, (\mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{D})^{-1} \eta \rangle} \stackrel{\tilde{\eta} := \mathbf{D}^{-\top} \eta}{=} \frac{\langle \tilde{\eta}, (\mathbf{DAD}^\top) \tilde{\eta} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\eta} \rangle}$$

for $\eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{R}^n$. It follows from (2.3) holds that

$$\kappa_g(\text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{\sup_{\eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{M}} q_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta)}{\inf_{\eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{M}} q_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta)} = \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{DAD}^\top)}{\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{DAD}^\top)} = \kappa_2(\mathbf{DAD}^\top).$$

As a result, the block-Jacobi preconditioning that aims to reduce $\kappa_2(\mathbf{DAD}^\top)$ is equivalent to selecting a specific preconditioned metric on \mathbb{R}^n to reduce the condition number of the Riemannian Hessian of f , i.e., $\kappa_g(\text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{x}))$.

3.2 Relationship to variable metric methods

We investigate the relationship between the proposed preconditioning framework and the *variable metric methods*—a pioneering work of quasi-Newton methods—which were proposed to minimize a differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by Davidon [9] in 1959. The motivation behind the variable metric methods was to achieve faster convergence and avoid the failures in early computers. To this end, given a point $\mathbf{x}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a positive-definite matrix $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})$ is constructed from the previous information [9] to approximate the Euclidean Hessian $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})$. Then, the search direction $\mathbf{d}^{(t)}$ is determined by

$$\mathbf{d}^{(t)} := \arg \min_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}), \mathbf{d} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \mathbf{d} \rangle.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbf{d}^{(t)} = -(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}))^{-1} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}).$$

Consider the proposed framework, the search space \mathbb{R}^n is endowed with the metric

$$g_{\mathbf{x}}(\xi, \eta) = \langle \xi, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{x}) \eta \rangle \quad \text{for } \xi, \eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{R}^n \simeq \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{x})$ is a positive-definite matrix that relies on the current information. Based on this metric, the search direction of the Riemannian gradient descent method is given by

$$\eta^{(t)} = -\text{grad}_g f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) = -\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})^{-1} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}).$$

Note that $\mathbf{d}^{(t)}$ is different from $\eta^{(t)}$ since $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})$ contains the previous information, e.g., the information from $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(t-1)}$, whereas $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})$ only relies on $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$.

Furthermore, we explore the variable metric methods [20] proposed by Powell for the following constrained optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & f(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & c_i(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m', \\ & c_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, \quad i = m' + 1, m' + 2, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where m, m' are integers and c_i are differentiable functions for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. The search direction $\mathbf{d}^{(t)}$ is the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}), \mathbf{d} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \mathbf{d} \rangle \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & c_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) + \mathbf{d}^\top \nabla c_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m', \\ & c_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) + \mathbf{d}^\top \nabla c_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \geq 0, \quad i = m' + 1, m' + 2, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})$ is positive definite that serves to provide second-order information of f from previous iterations [20].

We illustrate the connection between the proposed framework and the variable metric methods [20] in a special case that (3.5) contains only equality constraints, i.e., $m = m'$. Assume that the feasible set $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}$ of (3.5) is a Riemannian manifold endowed with the metric

$$g_{\mathbf{x}}(\xi, \eta) := \langle \xi, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{x})[\eta] \rangle \quad \text{for } \xi, \eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{M},$$

where $h(\mathbf{x}) := [c_1(\mathbf{x}), c_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots, c_m(\mathbf{x})]^\top$. Given a point $\mathbf{x}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{M}$, i.e., $c_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) = 0$, it follows from [19] that the Riemannian gradient of f at $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ under the metric g can be computed by the minimization problem

$$\min_{\eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}^{(t)}} \mathcal{M}} f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}), \eta \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \eta, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})[\eta] \rangle. \quad (3.7)$$

In fact, $T_{\mathbf{x}^{(t)}} \mathcal{M} = \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n : Dh(\mathbf{x})[\eta] = 0\} = \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n : \eta^\top \nabla c_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Therefore, the only difference between problem (3.6) and (3.7) is the quadratic term.

Note that the matrix $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x})$ in (unconstrained and constrained) variable metric methods is updated based on the previous iterative information. On the contrary, the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{x})$ in a preconditioned metric is pre-defined before the implementation of Riemannian methods, which is apt to avoid the storage of previous information. Therefore, the proposed preconditioning framework is essentially not a variable metric method.

Remark 1 In particular, let $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}) := f(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}, h(\mathbf{x}) \rangle$ be the Lagrangian function of the problem (3.5) with the equality constraint $h(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, and the Lagrange multiplier is given by $\lambda_{\mathbf{x}} := ((\nabla h(\mathbf{x}))^\top \nabla h(\mathbf{x}))^{-1} (\nabla h(\mathbf{x}))^\top \nabla f(\mathbf{x})$. If the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies that $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})[\eta] = D^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}^{(t)}})[\eta]$ for all $\eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}^{(t)}} \mathcal{M}$ as proposed in [19], it holds that the solution of (3.7), i.e., $-\text{grad}_g f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})$, is indeed the Riemannian Newton direction under the Euclidean metric; see [1, Proposition 4.1] and [19, Proposition 2.1].

3.3 Connection to Riemannian Gauss–Newton methods

The Riemannian Gauss–Newton method was proposed to minimize the cost function $f(x) := \frac{1}{2}\|F(x)\|_F^2$, where $F: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is smooth and $DF(x)$ is assumed to be injective. Specifically, the search direction $\eta^{(t)} \in T_{x^{(t)}} \mathcal{M}$ at $x^{(t)} \in \mathcal{M}$ is computed by the following Gauss–Newton equation [2, §8.4.1]

$$\langle DF(x^{(t)})[\xi], DF(x^{(t)})[\eta^{(t)}] \rangle + \langle DF(x^{(t)})[\xi], F(x^{(t)}) \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for } \xi \in T_{x^{(t)}} \mathcal{M},$$

or

$$\left((DF(x^{(t)}))^* \circ DF(x^{(t)}) \right) [\eta^{(t)}] = -(DF(x^{(t)}))^* [F(x^{(t)})],$$

where $(DF(x^{(t)}))^*$ is the adjoint operator of $DF(x^{(t)})$. Since $DF(x)$ has full rank, it follows that

$$\eta^{(t)} = - \left((DF(x^{(t)}))^* \circ DF(x^{(t)}) \right)^{-1} [(DF(x^{(t)}))^* [F(x^{(t)})]],$$

which is also the solution of the following least-squares problem

$$\min_{\eta \in T_{x^{(t)}} \mathcal{M}} \frac{1}{2} \langle DF(x^{(t)})[\eta], DF(x^{(t)})[\eta] \rangle + \langle DF(x^{(t)})[\eta], F(x^{(t)}) \rangle. \quad (3.8)$$

Notice that

$$\langle DF(x^{(t)})[\eta^{(t)}], F(x^{(t)}) \rangle = Df(x^{(t)})[\eta^{(t)}] = D\bar{f}(x^{(t)})[\eta^{(t)}] = \langle \nabla \bar{f}(x^{(t)}), \eta^{(t)} \rangle,$$

where $\bar{f}: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is any smooth extension of f . Therefore, problem (3.8) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\eta \in T_{x^{(t)}} \mathcal{M}} \frac{1}{2} \langle \bar{\mathcal{H}}(x^{(t)})[\eta], \eta \rangle + \langle \nabla \bar{f}(x^{(t)}), \eta \rangle, \quad (3.9)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{H}}(x^{(t)}) := (DF(x^{(t)}))^* \circ DF(x^{(t)})$. Consider the preconditioned metric

$$g_x(\xi, \eta) = \langle \xi, \bar{\mathcal{H}}(x^{(t)})[\eta] \rangle = \langle \xi, ((DF(x)) \circ DF(x))^* [\eta] \rangle,$$

it follows from [19] that the solution of (3.9) is $\eta^{(t)} = -\text{grad}_g f(x^{(t)})$. In other words, the Riemannian Gauss–Newton method can be interpreted by the Riemannian gradient descent method with the metric g .

4 Application to canonical correlation analysis

In this section, we apply the proposed framework to solve the canonical correlation analysis (CCA) problem. A new left and right preconditioned metric is proposed. Then, numerical experiments verify that the proposed metric accelerates the Riemannian methods.

Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_x}$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_y}$ be two data matrices with n samples and d_x, d_y variables respectively. The goal of CCA is to choose weights $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ and $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ such that the data matrices $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{V}$ has the highest correlation, where $\mathbf{U} := [\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m]$ and $\mathbf{V} := [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m]$. CCA can be written

as an optimization problem on the product manifold of two generalized Stiefel manifolds, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times m}, \mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times m}} \quad & f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) := -\text{tr}(\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{N}) \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \in \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where $\Sigma_{xx} := \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \lambda_x \mathbf{I}_{d_x}$, $\Sigma_{yy} := \mathbf{Y}^\top \mathbf{Y} + \lambda_y \mathbf{I}_{d_y}$, $\lambda_x, \lambda_y \geq 0$ are regularization parameters, $\Sigma_{xy} := \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Y}$, $\mathcal{M}_1 := \text{St}_{\Sigma_{xx}}(m, d_x) = \{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times m} : \mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xx} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}_m\}$ and $\mathcal{M}_2 := \text{St}_{\Sigma_{yy}}(m, d_y)$ refer to the *generalized Stiefel manifold*, and $\mathbf{N} := \text{diag}(\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_m)$ satisfies $\mu_1 > \mu_2 > \dots > \mu_m > 0$. The problem (4.1) has a closed-form solution

$$(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*) = (\Sigma_{xx}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{U}}, \Sigma_{yy}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{V}}),$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{U}} := [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_m]$ and $\bar{\mathbf{V}} := [\bar{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_m]$ are the m leading left and right singular vectors of the matrix $\Sigma_{xx}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy} \Sigma_{yy}^{-1/2}$ respectively. We refer to the m largest singular values $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_m > 0$ of $\Sigma_{xx}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy} \Sigma_{yy}^{-1/2}$ as the canonical correlations.

The tangent space $T_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{M}$ is characterized by

$$T_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{M} \simeq T_{\mathbf{U}} \mathcal{M}_1 \times T_{\mathbf{V}} \mathcal{M}_2, \quad (4.2)$$

where

$$T_{\mathbf{U}} \mathcal{M}_1 = \{\mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_1 + \mathbf{U}_{\Sigma_{xx}^\perp} \mathbf{K}_1 : \boldsymbol{\Omega}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\top = -\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1, \mathbf{K}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(d_x - m) \times m}\}$$

is the tangent space of the generalized Stiefel manifold \mathcal{M}_1 , the matrix $\mathbf{U}_{\Sigma_{xx}^\perp} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times (d_x - m)}$ satisfies that $(\mathbf{U}_{\Sigma_{xx}^\perp})^\top \Sigma_{xx} \mathbf{U}_{\Sigma_{xx}^\perp} = \mathbf{I}_{d_x - m}$ and $\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xx} \mathbf{U}_{\Sigma_{xx}^\perp} = 0$. The $T_{\mathbf{V}} \mathcal{M}_2$ is defined in the same fashion.

Next, we intend to propose preconditioned metrics on \mathcal{M} and adapt the Riemannian methods to solve (4.1).

4.1 Left preconditioner

Shustin and Avron [24, §4.2] proposed to endow \mathcal{M} with the following metric

$$g_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})}(\xi, \eta) := \langle \xi_1, \Sigma_{xx} \eta_1 \rangle + \langle \xi_2, \Sigma_{yy} \eta_2 \rangle \quad \text{for } \xi, \eta \in T_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{M}. \quad (4.3)$$

In our framework, it is equivalent that the operators in (3.3) are defined by $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_1(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})[\eta_1] := \Sigma_{xx} \eta_1$ and $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_2(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})[\eta_2] := \Sigma_{yy} \eta_2$, which have left preconditioning effect. The orthogonal projection of a vector $\bar{\eta} \in T_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{E} \simeq \mathcal{E}$ onto the tangent space $T_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{M}$ is given by

$$\Pi_{g, (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})}(\bar{\eta}) = \left(\bar{\eta}_1 - \mathbf{U} \text{sym}(\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xx} \bar{\eta}_1), \bar{\eta}_2 - \mathbf{V} \text{sym}(\mathbf{V}^\top \Sigma_{yy} \bar{\eta}_2) \right),$$

where $\mathcal{E} := \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times m} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times m}$ is the ambient space of \mathcal{M} . Therefore, the Riemannian gradient reads

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad}_g f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = & \left(-\Sigma_{xx}^{-1} \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{N} + \mathbf{U} \text{sym}(\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{N}), \right. \\ & \left. -\Sigma_{yy}^{-1} \Sigma_{xy}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{N} + \mathbf{V} \text{sym}(\mathbf{V}^\top \Sigma_{xy}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{N}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Since the local converge rate of Riemannian optimization methods is closely related to the condition number $\kappa_g(\text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*))$ (see section 2.2), we first compute the Riemannian Hessian of f at (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) along $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2) \in \mathbb{T}_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{M}$ by using (2.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})[\eta] &= \Pi_{g, (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \left(\eta_1 \text{sym}(\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{N}) + \mathbf{U} \text{sym}(\eta_1^\top \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{N}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbf{U} \text{sym}(\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xy} \eta_2 \mathbf{N}) - \Sigma_{xx}^{-1} \Sigma_{xy} \eta_2 \mathbf{N}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \eta_2 \text{sym}(\mathbf{V}^\top \Sigma_{xy}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{N}) + \mathbf{V} \text{sym}(\eta_2^\top \Sigma_{xy}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{N}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbf{V} \text{sym}(\mathbf{V}^\top \Sigma_{xy}^\top \eta_1 \mathbf{N}) - \Sigma_{yy}^{-1} \Sigma_{xy}^\top \eta_1 \mathbf{N} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Then, we compute the condition number as follows.

Proposition 4 *Let $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \dots > \sigma_{m+1} \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\min\{d_x, d_y\}}$ be singular values of the matrix $\Sigma_{xx}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy} \Sigma_{yy}^{-1/2}$. It holds that*

$$\kappa_g(\text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)) = \frac{\max \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(\mu_1 + \mu_2)(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2), \mu_1(\sigma_1 + \sigma_{m+1}) \right\}}{\min \left\{ \min_{i, j \in [m], i \neq j} \frac{1}{2}(\mu_i - \mu_j)(\sigma_i - \sigma_j), \mu_m(\sigma_m - \sigma_{m+1}) \right\}},$$

where $[m] := \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$.

Proof See Appendix B. \square

Note that Proposition 4 boils down to $\kappa_g(\text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)) = (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)/(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)$ for $m = 1$, which coincides with the result in [24, Lemma 4.1].

4.2 New left and right preconditioner

Observing from the second-order information in (4.5), we aim to approximate the diagonal blocks of (4.5) and propose a new metric where the operators in (3.3) have both left and right preconditioning effect:

$$g_{\text{new}, (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})}(\xi, \eta) := \langle \xi_1, \Sigma_{xx} \eta_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2} \rangle + \langle \xi_2, \Sigma_{yy} \eta_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2} \rangle, \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_{1,2} &:= \left(\text{sym}(\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{N})^2 + \delta \mathbf{I}_m \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \mathbf{M}_{2,2} &:= \left(\text{sym}(\mathbf{V}^\top \Sigma_{xy}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{N})^2 + \delta \mathbf{I}_m \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

$\text{sym}(\mathbf{A}) := (\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A}^\top)/2$ and $\delta > 0$. Since $\mathbf{M}_{1,2}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{2,2}$ are positive-definite, the metric (4.6) is a Riemannian metric. Subsequently, the projection operator $\Pi_{\text{new}, (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})}$ is given by the following proposition.

Proposition 5 *Given the new metric (4.6), the orthogonal projection operator on $\mathbb{T}_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{M}$ is given by*

$$\Pi_{\text{new}, (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})}(\bar{\eta}) = (\Pi_{\text{new}, \mathbf{U}}(\bar{\eta}_1), \Pi_{\text{new}, \mathbf{V}}(\bar{\eta}_2)) = (\bar{\eta}_1 - \mathbf{U} \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1}, \bar{\eta}_2 - \mathbf{V} \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1}) \quad (4.7)$$

for $\bar{\eta} \in \mathbb{T}_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{E} \simeq \mathcal{E}$, where $\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2$ are the unique solutions of the following Lyapunov equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_{1,2} \mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2} &= 2 \text{sym}(\mathbf{M}_{1,2} (\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xx} \bar{\eta}_1) \mathbf{M}_{1,2}), \\ \mathbf{M}_{2,2} \mathbf{S}_2 + \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2} &= 2 \text{sym}(\mathbf{M}_{2,2} (\mathbf{V}^\top \Sigma_{yy} \bar{\eta}_2) \mathbf{M}_{2,2}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof It suffices to prove $\Pi_{\text{new}, \mathbf{U}}(\bar{\eta}_1) = \bar{\eta}_1 - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{S}_1\mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1}$, and the others can be obtained in the same fashion. The orthogonal complement with regard to the metric (4.6) of the tangent space $T_{\mathbf{U}}\mathcal{M}_1$ is

$$(T_{\mathbf{U}}\mathcal{M}_1)^\perp = \{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{S}_1\mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1} : \mathbf{S}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, \mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{S}_1^\top\}.$$

Moreover, since $T_{\mathbf{U}}\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus (T_{\mathbf{U}}\mathcal{M}_1)^\perp = T_{\mathbf{U}}\mathbb{R}^{d_x \times m} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times m}$, it yields a unique orthogonal decomposition

$$\bar{\eta}_1 = \Pi_{\text{new}, \mathbf{U}}(\bar{\eta}_1) + \Pi_{\text{new}, \mathbf{U}}^\perp(\bar{\eta}_1) = (\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1 + \mathbf{U}_{\Sigma_{xx}^\perp}\mathbf{K}_1) + \mathbf{U}\mathbf{S}_1\mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1}, \quad (4.8)$$

i.e.,

$$\Pi_{\text{new}, \mathbf{U}}(\bar{\eta}_1) = \bar{\eta}_1 - \Pi_{\text{new}, \mathbf{U}}^\perp(\bar{\eta}_1) = \bar{\eta}_1 - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{S}_1\mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1}.$$

To characterize the symmetric matrix \mathbf{S}_1 , we multiply (4.8) from the left by $\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xx}$, and it follows that

$$\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xx} \bar{\eta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_1 + \mathbf{S}_1\mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1}.$$

Summing up $\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xx} \bar{\eta}_1$ and $(\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xx} \bar{\eta}_1)^\top$, we obtain that

$$\mathbf{S}_1\mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1} + \mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1}\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xx} \bar{\eta}_1 + \bar{\eta}_1^\top \Sigma_{xx} \mathbf{U}.$$

By multiplying $\mathbf{M}_{1,2}$ from the left and right, the symmetric matrix \mathbf{S}_1 satisfies

$$\mathbf{M}_{1,2}\mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_1\mathbf{M}_{1,2} = 2\text{sym}(\mathbf{M}_{1,2}(\mathbf{U}^\top \Sigma_{xx} \bar{\eta}_1)\mathbf{M}_{1,2}),$$

which has a unique solution according to [14, Theorem 2.4.4.1]. \square

It follows from Propositions 3 and 5 that the Riemannian gradient of f at (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad}_{\text{new}} f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) &= (\Sigma_{xx}^{-1} \partial_1 f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})\mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1} - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{S}_1\mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1}, \\ &\quad \Sigma_{yy}^{-1} \partial_2 f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})\mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{S}_2\mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

where \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 are the solutions of the following Lyapunov equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_{1,2}\mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_1\mathbf{M}_{1,2} &= 2\text{sym}\left(\mathbf{M}_{1,2}\mathbf{U}^\top \partial_1 f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})\right), \\ \mathbf{M}_{2,2}\mathbf{S}_2 + \mathbf{S}_2\mathbf{M}_{2,2} &= 2\text{sym}\left(\mathbf{M}_{2,2}\mathbf{V}^\top \partial_2 f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})\right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{M}_{1,2}, \mathbf{M}_{2,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $m \ll \min\{d_x, d_y\}$. Therefore, the computational cost of the Riemannian gradient under the new metric (4.6) is comparable to one under (4.3).

Then, we illustrate the effect of the metric (4.6) by computing the condition number of f at $(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)$. To this end, the Riemannian Hessian of f at $(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)$ along η is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hess}_{\text{new}} f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)[\eta] &= \Pi_{\text{new}, (\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)}(\text{D}\bar{G}(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)[\eta]) \\ &= \Pi_{\text{new}, (\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)} \left(-\Sigma_{xx}^{-1} \Sigma_{xy} \eta_2 \mathbf{N}\mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1} + \Sigma_{xx}^{-1} \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{V}^* \mathbf{N}\mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{M}}_{1,2} \mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1} \right. \\ &\quad - \eta_1 \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1} - \mathbf{U}^* \dot{\mathbf{S}}_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1} + \mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{M}}_{1,2} \mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1}, \\ &\quad - \Sigma_{yy}^{-1} \Sigma_{xy} \eta_1 \mathbf{N}\mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1} + \Sigma_{yy}^{-1} \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{N}\mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{M}}_{2,2} \mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1} \\ &\quad \left. - \eta_2 \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}^* \dot{\mathbf{S}}_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^* \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{M}}_{2,2} \mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{G} : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth extension of $\text{grad}_{\text{new}} f$, $\dot{\mathbf{M}}_{1,2} := \text{DM}_{1,2}(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)[\eta]$, $\dot{\mathbf{M}}_{2,2} := \text{DM}_{2,2}(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)[\eta]$, and the symmetric matrices $\dot{\mathbf{S}}_1$ and $\dot{\mathbf{S}}_2$ satisfy the Lyapunov equations

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym} \left(\dot{\mathbf{M}}_{1,2} \mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{M}_{1,2} \dot{\mathbf{S}}_1 + \dot{\mathbf{M}}_{1,2} \Sigma \mathbf{N} + \mathbf{M}_{1,2} (\eta_1^\top \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{V}^* + (\mathbf{U}^*)^\top \Sigma_{xy} \eta_2) \right) &= 0, \\ \text{sym} \left(\dot{\mathbf{M}}_{2,2} \mathbf{S}_2 + \mathbf{M}_{2,2} \dot{\mathbf{S}}_2 + \dot{\mathbf{M}}_{2,2} \Sigma \mathbf{N} + \mathbf{M}_{2,2} (\eta_2^\top \Sigma_{xy}^\top \mathbf{U}^* + (\mathbf{V}^*)^\top \Sigma_{xy}^\top \eta_1) \right) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can prove the result in the same fashion as in Proposition 4.

Proposition 6 *Let $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \dots > \sigma_{m+1} \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\min\{d_x, d_y\}}$ be the singular values of the matrix $\Sigma_{xx}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy} \Sigma_{yy}^{-1/2}$. Then, the condition number at the local minimizer $(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)$ is computed by*

$$\kappa_{\text{new}}(\text{Hess}_{\text{new}} f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)) = \frac{\max \left\{ \max_{i,j \in [m], i \neq j} \frac{(\mu_i + \mu_j)(\sigma_i + \sigma_j)}{\sqrt{\sigma_i^2 \mu_i^2 + \delta} + \sqrt{\sigma_j^2 \mu_j^2 + \delta}}, \frac{\mu_1(\sigma_1 + \sigma_{m+1})}{\sqrt{\sigma_1^2 + \delta}} \right\}}{\min \left\{ \min_{i,j \in [m], i \neq j} \frac{(\mu_i - \mu_j)(\sigma_i - \sigma_j)}{\sqrt{\sigma_i^2 \mu_i^2 + \delta} + \sqrt{\sigma_j^2 \mu_j^2 + \delta}}, \frac{\mu_m(\sigma_m - \sigma_{m+1})}{\sqrt{\sigma_m^2 + \delta}} \right\}}.$$

4.3 RGD and RCG for canonical correlation analysis

By using the Riemannian metric (4.6) and required ingredients, we adapt the Riemannian gradient descent (Algorithm 1) and Riemannian conjugate gradient (Algorithm 2) methods to solve the CCA problem in Algorithm 3 and 4.

Algorithm 3 RGD for CCA

Input: \mathcal{M} endowed with a metric (4.6), initial guess $(\mathbf{U}^{(0)}, \mathbf{V}^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{M}$, $t = 0$.

1: **while** the stopping criteria are not satisfied **do**

2: Compute $\eta^{(t)} = -\text{grad}_g f(\mathbf{U}^{(t)}, \mathbf{V}^{(t)})$ by (4.9).

3: Compute the stepsize $s^{(t)}$ by Armijo backtracking (2.2).

4: Update $\mathbf{U}^{(t+1)} = \Sigma_{xx}^{-1/2} \text{qf}(\Sigma_{xx}^{1/2}(\mathbf{U}^{(t)} + \eta_1^{(t)}))$ and $\mathbf{V}^{(t+1)} = \Sigma_{yy}^{-1/2} \text{qf}(\Sigma_{yy}^{1/2}(\mathbf{V}^{(t)} + \eta_2^{(t)}))$; $t = t + 1$.

5: **end while**

Output: $(\mathbf{U}^{(t)}, \mathbf{V}^{(t)}) \in \mathcal{M}$.

Algorithm 4 RCG for CCA

Input: \mathcal{M} endowed with a metric (4.6), initial guess $(\mathbf{U}^{(0)}, \mathbf{V}^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{M}$, $t = 0$, $\beta^{(-1)} = 0$.

1: **while** the stopping criteria are not satisfied **do**

2: Compute $\eta^{(t)} = -\text{grad}_g f(\mathbf{U}^{(t)}, \mathbf{V}^{(t)}) + \Pi_{g,(\mathbf{U}^{(t)}, \mathbf{V}^{(t)})}(\eta^{(t-1)})$ by (4.7) and (4.9).

3: Compute the stepsize $s^{(t)}$ by Armijo backtracking (2.2).

4: Update $\mathbf{U}^{(t+1)} = \Sigma_{xx}^{-1/2} \text{qf}(\Sigma_{xx}^{1/2}(\mathbf{U}^{(t)} + \eta_1^{(t)}))$ and $\mathbf{V}^{(t+1)} = \Sigma_{yy}^{-1/2} \text{qf}(\Sigma_{yy}^{1/2}(\mathbf{V}^{(t)} + \eta_2^{(t)}))$; $t = t + 1$.

5: **end while**

Output: $(\mathbf{U}^{(t)}, \mathbf{V}^{(t)}) \in \mathcal{M}$.

Note that 1) the retraction mapping is the *generalized QR decomposition* [22] with respect to Σ_{xx} and Σ_{yy} , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{R}_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})}(\eta) := \left(\Sigma_{xx}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{qf}(\Sigma_{xx}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{U} + \eta_1)), \Sigma_{yy}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{qf}(\Sigma_{yy}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{V} + \eta_2)) \right) \quad \text{for } \eta \in \mathbb{T}_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{M},$$

where $\text{qf}(\mathbf{X})$ refers to the \mathbf{Q} factor in the QR decomposition $\mathbf{QR} = \mathbf{X}$. In practice, the retraction can be efficiently computed by $\mathbf{R}_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})}(\eta) = ((\mathbf{U} + \eta_1)\mathbf{R}_1^{-1}, (\mathbf{V} + \eta_2)\mathbf{R}_2^{-1})$ instead, where $\mathbf{R}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_1 = (\mathbf{U} + \eta_1)^\top \Sigma_{xx} (\mathbf{U} + \eta_1)$ and $\mathbf{R}_2^\top \mathbf{R}_2 = (\mathbf{V} + \eta_2)^\top \Sigma_{yy} (\mathbf{V} + \eta_2)$ are Cholesky decompositions; 2) the vector transport in Algorithm 4 is defined by the projection operator in (4.7), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{T}_{t \leftarrow t-1}(\eta) := \Pi_{g, (\mathbf{U}^{(t)}, \mathbf{V}^{(t)})}(\eta) \quad \text{for } \eta \in \mathbb{T}_{(\mathbf{U}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{V}^{(t-1)})} \mathcal{M}.$$

4.4 Numerical validation

Algorithms 3 and 4 are implemented in Manopt [6], a Matlab library for Riemannian methods. The stopping criteria are the same as default settings in Manopt. All experiments are performed on a MacBook Pro 2019 with MacOS Ventura 13.3, 2.4 GHz 8 core Intel Core i9 processor, 32GB memory, and Matlab R2020b. The codes are available at <https://github.com/JimmyPeng1998>.

We test the performance of RGD and RCG under different metrics, i.e., five different choice of the operators $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_1, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_2$ in

$$g_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})}(\xi, \eta) := \langle \xi_1, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_1(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})[\eta_1] \rangle + \langle \xi_2, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_2(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})[\eta_2] \rangle;$$

see Table 2. The Euclidean metric is denoted by “(E)”. “(L1)” and “(L2)” are the metrics that only one component of $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ is endowed with a preconditioned metric. The metric (4.3) proposed by [24] is called “(L12)”. The metric (4.6) have both the left and right preconditioning effect and is denoted by “(LR12)”. We set $d_x = 800$, $d_y = 400$, $n = 30000$, $m = 5$, $\delta = 10^{-15}$, $\lambda_x = \lambda_y = 10^{-6}$, and $\mathbf{N} = \text{diag}(m, m-1, \dots, 1)$. Elements of the data matrices \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are generated by the unit distribution in $[0, 1]$. The performance of a method is evaluated by the residual $f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) - f_{\min}$, gradient norm “gnorm”, and the subspace distances $D(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^*) := \|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\top - \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{U}^*)^\top\|_F$ and $D(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{V}^*) := \|\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top - \mathbf{V}^*(\mathbf{V}^*)^\top\|_F$, where $f_{\min} := f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)$.

Table 2 Compared metrics in CCA

	(E)	(L1)	(L2)	(L12)	(LR12)
$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_1(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})[\eta_1]$	η_1	$\Sigma_{xx}\eta_1$	η_1	$\Sigma_{xx}\eta_1$	$\Sigma_{xx}\eta_1\mathbf{M}_{1,2}$
$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_2(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})[\eta_2]$	η_2	η_2	$\Sigma_{yy}\eta_2$	$\Sigma_{yy}\eta_2$	$\Sigma_{yy}\eta_2\mathbf{M}_{2,2}$

Numerical results are reported in Fig. 3, Fig. 4 and Table 3. We have following observations: 1) the proposed metric (4.6) improves the performance of RGD and RCG since it benefits more from the second-order information; 2) Figure 4 shows that the computation time per iteration of Algorithms 3 and 4 is comparable to RGD(L12) and RCG(L12); 3) Table 3 illustrates that RGD(LR12) and

RCG(LR12) require fewer iterations and less time to reach the stopping criteria than the others. The subspace distances are smaller than 10^{-8} , and hence the sequences generated by proposed methods converge to the correct subspace.




Fig. 3 Numerical results for CCA problem for $d_x = 800$, $d_y = 400$, and $m = 5$. Left: RGD. Right: RCG. Each method is tested for 10 runs




Fig. 4 Computation time per iteration for RGD (left) and RCG (right) under different metrics for CCA problem for $d_x = 800$, $m = 5$, and $d_y = 200, 400, \dots, 1000$

Table 3 Convergence results of the CCA problem for $d_x = 800$, $d_y = 400$, and $m = 5$

metric	method	#iter	time (s)	gnorm	$D(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^*)$	$D(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{V}^*)$	κ_g
(E)	RGD	10000	249.11	5.95e-02	2.69e-05	2.66e-05	2.10e+04
	RCG	1745	31.03	1.70e-05	4.01e-10	3.89e-10	
(L1)	RGD	10000	255.33	1.02e+00	4.12e-04	4.07e-04	1.43e+07
	RCG	2500	74.13	4.94e-02	2.85e-04	2.79e-04	
(L2)	RGD	10000	245.81	8.20e-01	4.13e-04	4.05e-04	1.52e+07
	RCG	2500	56.16	6.90e-02	2.93e-04	2.90e-04	
(L12)	RGD	10000	274.91	4.67e-04	9.68e-07	9.57e-07	1.12e+04
	RCG	937	30.39	8.82e-07	1.68e-09	1.65e-09	
(LR12)	RGD	6607	195.03	1.34e-06	7.47e-16	7.46e-16	2.38e+03
	RCG	410	15.38	8.49e-07	4.63e-09	4.53e-09	

Moreover, the condition number of the Riemannian Hessian is numerically computed by the Manopt function `hessianspectrum`: $\kappa_g(\text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*))$ of five

metrics are 2.10×10^4 (E), 1.43×10^7 (L1), 1.52×10^7 (L2), 1.12×10^4 (L12), and 2.38×10^3 (LR12). It is direct to verify that these numbers coincide with the theoretical results in Propositions 4 and 6. We observe that the Riemannian Hessian under the proposed metric (LR12) has the smallest condition number among all choices, which confirms that RGD(LR12) and RCG(LR12) outperform the others.

5 Application to truncated singular value decomposition

In this section, the truncated singular value decomposition (SVD) problem is considered. Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, the $p < \min\{m, n\}$ largest singular vectors $(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)$ is the global minimizer of the following problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}, \mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}} \quad & f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) := -\text{tr}(\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{N}) \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \in \mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 = \text{St}(p, m) \times \text{St}(p, n), \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where $\text{St}(p, m) := \{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p} : \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}_p\}$ is the *Stiefel manifold* and $\mathbf{N} := \text{diag}\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p\}$ with $\mu_1 > \dots > \mu_p > 0$. Sato and Iwai [23] proposed RGD and RCG methods to solve problem (5.1), where the search space is endowed with the Euclidean metric. We apply the proposed framework to solve (5.1) by endowing \mathcal{M} with a non-Euclidean metric to accelerate the Riemannian optimization methods.

5.1 A new preconditioned metric

Observe that the Riemannian Hessian of f at (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) along $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2) \in \mathbb{T}_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{M}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hesse}_e f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})[\eta] = & (\eta_1 \mathbf{M}_1 - \mathbf{A} \eta_2 \mathbf{N} - \mathbf{U} \text{sym}(\mathbf{U}(\eta_1 \mathbf{M}_1 - \mathbf{A} \eta_2 \mathbf{N})), \\ & \eta_2 \mathbf{M}_2 - \mathbf{A}^\top \eta_1 \mathbf{N} - \mathbf{V} \text{sym}(\mathbf{V}(\eta_2 \mathbf{M}_2 - \mathbf{A}^\top \eta_1 \mathbf{N}))) \end{aligned}$$

in [23, Proposition 3.5], where $\mathbf{M}_1 := \text{sym}(\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{N})$ and $\mathbf{M}_2 := \text{sym}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{N})$.

We take advantage of the diagonal blocks of the Riemannian Hessian and define a new preconditioned metric on \mathcal{M} :

$$g_{\text{new}, (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})}(\xi, \eta) := \langle \xi_1, \eta_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2} \rangle + \langle \xi_2, \eta_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2} \rangle, \quad (5.2)$$

for $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{T}_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{M}$, where

$$\mathbf{M}_{1,2} := \left(\text{sym}(\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{N})^2 + \delta \mathbf{I}_p \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \mathbf{M}_{2,2} := \left(\text{sym}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{N})^2 + \delta \mathbf{I}_p \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and $\delta > 0$. Since $\mathbf{M}_{1,2}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{2,2}$ are smooth and positive-definite matrices, the metric (5.2) is a Riemannian metric. The projection operator with respect to (5.2) is given by

$$\Pi_{\text{new}, (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})}(\bar{\eta}) = (\bar{\eta}_1 - \mathbf{U} \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1}, \bar{\eta}_2 - \mathbf{V} \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1}) \quad (5.3)$$

for $\bar{\eta} \in \mathbb{T}_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathbb{R}^{m \times p} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{m \times p} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, where $\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2$ are the unique solutions of the following Lyapunov equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_{1,2} \mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2} &= 2 \operatorname{sym}(\mathbf{M}_{1,2} (\mathbf{U}^\top \bar{\eta}_1) \mathbf{M}_{1,2}), \\ \mathbf{M}_{2,2} \mathbf{S}_2 + \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2} &= 2 \operatorname{sym}(\mathbf{M}_{2,2} (\mathbf{V}^\top \bar{\eta}_2) \mathbf{M}_{2,2}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, it follows from Proposition 3 and (5.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{grad}_{\text{new}} f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) &= (\partial_1 f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1} - \mathbf{U} \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2}^{-1}, \\ &\quad \partial_2 f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1} - \mathbf{V} \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2}^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 are the solution of the following Lyapunov equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_{1,2} \mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{M}_{1,2} &= 2 \operatorname{sym} \left(\mathbf{M}_{1,2} \mathbf{U}^\top \partial_1 f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \right), \\ \mathbf{M}_{2,2} \mathbf{S}_2 + \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{M}_{2,2} &= 2 \operatorname{sym} \left(\mathbf{M}_{2,2} \mathbf{V}^\top \partial_2 f(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

These results can be obtained in the same fashion as in Proposition 5 for CCA. Note that the computational cost of the Riemannian gradient (5.4) is comparable to one under the Euclidean metric since $\mathbf{M}_{1,2}, \mathbf{M}_{2,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $p \ll \min\{m, n\}$.

The effect of the new metric (5.2) is illustrated by the following proposition, which can be proved analogously to Propositions 4 and 6.

Proposition 7 *Let $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \dots > \sigma_p > \sigma_{p+1} \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\min\{m, n\}}$ be the singular values of \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{U}^* and \mathbf{V}^* be the p largest left and right singular vectors of \mathbf{A} respectively. It holds that*

$$\kappa_{\text{new}}(\operatorname{Hess}_{\text{new}} f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)) = \frac{\max \left\{ \max_{i, j \in [p], i \neq j} \frac{(\mu_i + \mu_j)(\sigma_i + \sigma_j)}{\sqrt{\sigma_i^2 \mu_i^2 + \delta} + \sqrt{\sigma_j^2 \mu_j^2 + \delta}}, \frac{\mu_1(\sigma_1 + \sigma_{p+1})}{\sqrt{\sigma_1^2 + \delta}} \right\}}{\min \left\{ \min_{i, j \in [p], i \neq j} \frac{(\mu_i - \mu_j)(\sigma_i - \sigma_j)}{\sqrt{\sigma_i^2 \mu_i^2 + \delta} + \sqrt{\sigma_j^2 \mu_j^2 + \delta}}, \frac{\mu_p(\sigma_p - \sigma_{p+1})}{\sqrt{\sigma_p^2 + \delta}} \right\}}.$$

5.2 RGD and RCG for truncated singular value decomposition

Let \mathcal{M} be endowed with the Riemannian metric (5.2). We apply the Riemannian gradient descent (Algorithm 1) and Riemannian conjugate gradient (Algorithm 2) methods to solve the SVD problem (5.1) in Algorithms 5 and 6. Note that the retraction mapping is based on the QR decomposition, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{R}_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})}(\eta) := (\operatorname{qf}(\mathbf{U} + \eta_1), \operatorname{qf}(\mathbf{V} + \eta_2)) \quad \text{for } \eta \in \mathbb{T}_{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})} \mathcal{M}.$$

The vector transport in Algorithm 6 is defined by the projection operator (5.3).

Algorithm 5 RGD for SVD

Input: \mathcal{M} endowed with a metric (5.2), initial guess $(\mathbf{U}^{(0)}, \mathbf{V}^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{M}$, $t = 0$.
1: **while** the stopping criteria are not satisfied **do**
2: Compute $\eta^{(t)} = -\text{grad}_g f(\mathbf{U}^{(t)}, \mathbf{U}^{(t)})$ by (5.4).
3: Compute the stepsize $s^{(t)}$ by Armijo backtracking line search (2.2).
4: Update $\mathbf{U}^{(t+1)} = \text{qf}(\mathbf{U}^{(t)} + s^{(t)}\eta_1^{(t)})$ and $\mathbf{V}^{(t+1)} = \text{qf}(\mathbf{V}^{(t)} + s^{(t)}\eta_2^{(t)})$; $t = t + 1$.
5: **end while**
Output: $(\mathbf{U}^{(t)}, \mathbf{V}^{(t)}) \in \mathcal{M}$.

Algorithm 6 RCG for SVD

Input: \mathcal{M} endowed with a metric (5.2), initial guess $(\mathbf{U}^{(0)}, \mathbf{V}^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{M}$, $t = 0$, $\beta^{(-1)} = 0$.
1: **while** the stopping criteria are not satisfied **do**
2: Compute $\eta^{(t)} = -\text{grad}_g f(\mathbf{U}^{(t)}, \mathbf{U}^{(t)}) + \Pi_{g,(\mathbf{U}^{(t)}, \mathbf{V}^{(t)})}(\eta^{(t-1)})$ by (5.3) and (5.4).
3: Compute the stepsize $s^{(t)}$ by Armijo backtracking line search (2.2).
4: Update $\mathbf{U}^{(t+1)} = \text{qf}(\mathbf{U}^{(t)} + s^{(t)}\eta_1^{(t)})$ and $\mathbf{V}^{(t+1)} = \text{qf}(\mathbf{V}^{(t)} + s^{(t)}\eta_2^{(t)})$; $t = t + 1$.
5: **end while**
Output: $(\mathbf{U}^{(t)}, \mathbf{V}^{(t)}) \in \mathcal{M}$.

5.3 Numerical validation

We compare the performance of Algorithms 5 and 6 with RGD and RCG under the Euclidean metric in [23]. The proposed preconditioned metric (5.2), which has a right preconditioning effect, is denoted by “(R12)”. We set $m = 1000$, $n = 500$, $p = 10$, and $\mathbf{N} = \text{diag}(p, p-1, \dots, 1)$. The matrix \mathbf{A} is constructed by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}^* \Sigma (\mathbf{V}^*)^\top$, where $\mathbf{U}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ and $\mathbf{V}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ are firstly generated by the unit distribution and then orthogonalized by QR decomposition, $\Sigma := \text{diag}(1, \gamma, \gamma^2, \dots, \gamma^{p-1})$ and $\gamma = 1/1.5$. The implementation of RGD and RCG is the same as section 4.

Numerical results are shown in Fig. 5, Fig. 6 and Table 4. We have similar observations as the previous experiments in section 4. First, the proposed methods outperform RGD(E) and RCG(E) with fewer iterations since the proposed metric benefits from the second-order information. Second, computational cost per iteration of Algorithms 5 and 6 is comparable to RGD(E) and RCG(E) respectively. Third, Table 4 shows that the subspace distances are smaller than 10^{-6} in RGD(R12) and RCG(R12), which indicates that the sequences generated by proposed methods converge to the correct subspace.

Table 4 Convergence results of the SVD problem for $m = 1000$, $n = 500$, and $p = 10$

metric	method	#iter	time (s)	gnorm	$D(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^*)$	$D(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{V}^*)$	κ_g
(E)	RGD	7781	117.29	9.64e-07	4.53e-05	4.53e-05	2.43e+03
	RCG	478	5.44	8.54e-07	2.00e-05	2.00e-05	
(R12)	RGD	387	3.41	8.72e-07	2.38e-15	1.38e-15	9.50e+01
	RCG	105	1.45	7.88e-07	3.26e-07	3.83e-07	




Fig. 5 Numerical results for the SVD problem for $m = 1000$, $n = 500$, and $p = 10$. Left: RGD. Right: RCG. Each method is tested for 10 runs




Fig. 6 Average computation time per iteration for RGD (left) and RCG (right) under the Euclidean and proposed metric for $m = 1000$, $p = 10$, and $n = 200, 400, \dots, 1000$

In addition, we compute the condition numbers of $\text{Hess}f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)$ under two metrics. It follows from the construction of \mathbf{A} and Proposition 7 that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(\text{Hess}_e f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)) &= \frac{(\mu_1 + \mu_2)(\gamma + 1)}{(\mu_{p-1} - \mu_p)(\gamma^{p-2} - \gamma^{p-1})} = \frac{153389}{63} \approx 2.43 \times 10^3, \\ \kappa(\text{Hess}_{\text{new}} f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)) &= \frac{(\mu_1 + \mu_2)(1 + \gamma)}{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(1 - \gamma)} = 95, \end{aligned}$$

which exactly coincide with the numerical results in Table 4. Therefore, the lower condition number suggests faster convergence of the proposed methods.

6 Application to matrix and tensor completion

In this section, we investigate the matrix and tensor completion problem. Given a partially observed tensor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_d}$ on an index set $\Omega \subseteq [n_1] \times \dots \times [n_d]$. The goal of tensor completion is to recover the tensor \mathcal{A} from its entries on Ω . Note that it boils down to matrix completion for $d = 2$.

There are several different formulations in tensor completion. One type is based on the nuclear norm minimization, e.g., [8, 17]. These methods require working with full-size tensors. Instead, tensor decompositions—which decomposes a tensor into smaller blocks—reduce the number of parameters in search space. Therefore,

it is economical to formulate the tensor completion problem based on a tensor decomposition, which leads to an optimization problem on a product manifold

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & f(x) := \frac{1}{2p} \left\| \text{Proj}_\Omega(\tau(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K)) - \text{Proj}_\Omega(\mathcal{A}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K) \in \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{M}_K, \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

where $p := |\Omega|/(n_1 n_2 \dots n_d)$ is the sampling rate, Proj_Ω refers to the projection operator onto Ω , i.e., $\text{Proj}_\Omega(\mathcal{X})(i_1, \dots, i_d) = \mathcal{X}(i_1, \dots, i_d)$ if $(i_1, \dots, i_d) \in \Omega$, otherwise $\text{Proj}_\Omega(\mathcal{X})(i_1, \dots, i_d) = 0$ for $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_d}$, and $\tau(x_1, \dots, x_K)$ denotes the tensor decomposition with components $x_k \in \mathcal{M}_k$ for $k \in [K]$.

Since computing $\nabla^2 f(x)$ can be complicated, Kasai and Mishra [15] introduced a preconditioned metric based on the block-diagonal approximation of $\nabla^2 f(x)$ for tensor completion in Tucker decomposition. More recently, the idea became prosperous in tensor completion for other tensor formats, e.g., [11, 7, 12], see Table 1 for details. In summary, the metric was developed by constructing an operator $\bar{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ based on the diagonal blocks of the Hessian of the cost function $\phi(x) := \|\tau(x) - \mathcal{A}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2/2$, i.e.,

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}(x)[\eta] := \left(\partial_{11}^2 \phi(x)[\eta_1], \dots, \partial_{KK}^2 \phi(x)[\eta_K] \right) \quad \text{for } \eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_K) \in \text{T}_x \mathcal{M},$$

where $\partial_{kk}^2 \phi(x)[\eta_k] := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} (\partial_k \phi(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_k + h\eta_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_K) - \partial_k \phi(x))/h$ for $k \in [K]$. Consequently, the metric on \mathcal{M} is defined by

$$g_x(\xi, \eta) := \langle \xi, \bar{\mathcal{H}}(x)[\eta] \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^K \langle \xi_k, \partial_{kk}^2 \phi(x)[\eta_k] \rangle \quad \text{for } \xi, \eta \in \text{T}_x \mathcal{M}.$$

Alternatively, we can consider the Riemannian Gauss–Newton method to solve problem (6.1), which is included in the general preconditioning framework; see discussion in section 3.3.

6.1 Gauss–Newton method for tensor ring completion

Since tensor ring decomposition has been shown effective for the tensor completion problem, e.g., [12], we propose the Gauss–Newton method for tensor ring completion, which is formulated as

$$\min_{\mathcal{U}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{k-1} \times n_k \times r_k}} f(\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_d) := \frac{1}{2p} \left\| \text{Proj}_\Omega(\llbracket \mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_d \rrbracket) - \text{Proj}_\Omega(\mathcal{A}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2, \quad (6.2)$$

where $\llbracket \mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_d \rrbracket$ denotes the tensor ring decomposition [31] that decomposes an d -th order tensor into d blocks with $\mathcal{M}_k := \mathbb{R}^{r_{k-1} \times n_k \times r_k}$ for $k \in [d]$ and $r_0 = r_d$. Specifically, given $\mathcal{X} = \llbracket \mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_d \rrbracket$, the (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) -th element of \mathcal{X} is defined by

$$\mathcal{X}(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) := \text{tr}(\mathbf{U}_1(i_1) \mathbf{U}_2(i_2) \dots \mathbf{U}_d(i_d)),$$

where $\mathbf{U}_k(i_k) := \mathcal{U}_k(:, i_k, :)$ refers the i_k -th lateral slice of the tensor \mathcal{U} for $i_k \in [n_k]$. Since the k -th unfolding matrix of \mathcal{X} satisfies $\mathbf{X}_{(k)} = (\mathcal{U}_k)_{(2)} (\mathcal{U}_{\neq k})_{(2)}$, problem (6.2) can be reformulated by introducing [12]

$$\mathbf{W}_k := (\mathcal{U}_k)_{(2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{W}_{\neq k} := (\mathcal{U}_{\neq k})_{(2)},$$

where $(\mathcal{U}_k)_{(2)}$ and $(\mathcal{U}_{\neq k})_{(2)}$ are the 2-nd unfolding matrix of the tensor \mathcal{U}_k and $\mathcal{U}_{\neq k}$ respectively, and $\mathcal{U}_{\neq k} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{k-1} \times \prod_{j \neq k} n_j \times r_k}$ is defined by its lateral slice matrices, i.e., $\mathbf{U}_{\neq k} \left(1 + \sum_{\ell \neq k, \ell=1}^d (i_\ell - 1) J_\ell\right) := \left(\prod_{j=k+1}^d \mathbf{U}_j(i_j) \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{U}_j(i_j)\right)^\top$ with $J_\ell := \prod_{m=1, m \neq k}^{\ell-1} n_m$. Consequently, a reformulation of (6.2) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\vec{\mathbf{W}}=(\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_d)} \quad & f(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) := \frac{1}{2p} \left\| \text{Proj}_\Omega \left(\tau(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) - \mathcal{A} \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & \vec{\mathbf{W}} \in \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times r_0 r_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times r_1 r_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{n_d \times r_{d-1} r_d}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

where the mapping $\tau : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times \dots \times n_d}$ is defined by

$$\tau(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) := [\text{ten}_{(2)}(\mathbf{W}_1), \dots, \text{ten}_{(2)}(\mathbf{W}_d)], \quad (6.4)$$

and $\text{ten}_{(2)}(\cdot)$ is the second tensorization operator.

Noticing that the cost function f in (6.3) enjoys a least-squares structure: $f(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) = \|F(\vec{\mathbf{W}})\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2/2$, where $F(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) = \text{Proj}_\Omega \left(\tau(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) - \mathcal{A} \right) / \sqrt{p}$ is a smooth function, we propose the Gauss–Newton method to solve (6.3) in Algorithm 7; see Appendix C for implementation details.

Algorithm 7 Gauss–Newton method for tensor ring completion (TR-GN)

Input: \mathcal{M} endowed with a metric g , initial guess $\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{M}$, $t = 0$.

1: **while** the stopping criteria are not satisfied **do**

2: Compute $\eta^{(t)}$ by solving the following least-squares problem

$$\arg \min_{\eta \in \mathbb{T}_{\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t)}} \mathcal{M}} \|DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t)})[\eta] + F(\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t)})\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2.$$

3: Update $\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t+1)} = \vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t)} + \eta^{(t)}$; $t = t + 1$.

4: **end while**

Output: $\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{M}$.

6.2 Numerical validation

We compare Algorithm 7 with the Riemannian gradient descent (TR-RGD) and the Riemannian conjugate gradient (TR-RCG) methods in [12] under the metric

$$g_{\vec{\mathbf{W}}}(\xi, \eta) := \sum_{k=1}^d \langle \xi_k, \eta_k (\mathbf{W}_{\neq k}^\top \mathbf{W}_{\neq k} + \delta \mathbf{I}_{r_{k-1} r_k}) \rangle \quad \text{for } \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{T}_{\vec{\mathbf{W}}} \mathcal{M},$$

where $\delta > 0$ is a constant. Specifically, a tensor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times \dots \times n_d}$ is constructed by $\mathcal{A} = \tau(\vec{\mathbf{W}}^*)$, where τ is defined in (6.4), and each entry of $\vec{\mathbf{W}}^* \in \mathcal{M}$ is uniformly sampled from $[0, 1]$. The initial guess $\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{M}$ is generated in the same fashion. Given the sampling rate p , we randomly select $pn_1 n_2 \dots n_d$ samples from $[n_1] \times [n_2] \times \dots \times [n_d]$ to formulate the sampling set Ω . We set $d = 3$, $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 100$, $p = 0.05$, TR rank $\mathbf{r}^* = (1, 1, 1), (2, 2, 2), \dots, (8, 8, 8)$, and $\delta = 10^{-15}$.

We specify the default settings of all methods. The stepsize rule for TR-RGD method and the TR-RCG method is the Armijo backtracking line search (2.2). The conjugate gradient parameter is set to be the Riemannian version [6] of the modified Hestenes–Stiefel rule. The parameters in (2.2) is $\rho = 0.3$, $a = 2^{-13}$, and $s_0 = 1$. The performance of each method is evaluated by the training error

$$\varepsilon_{\Omega}(\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t)}) := \frac{\|\text{Proj}_{\Omega}(\tau(\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t)})) - \text{Proj}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{A})\|_{\text{F}}}{\|\text{Proj}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{A})\|_{\text{F}}}$$

and the test error $\varepsilon_{\Gamma}(\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t)})$, where Γ is a test set different from Ω and we set $|\Gamma| = 100$. A method is terminated if one of the following stopping criteria is achieved: 1) training error $\varepsilon_{\Omega}(\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t)}) < 10^{-14}$; 2) the maximum iteration 1000; 3) the relative change $|(\varepsilon_{\Omega}(\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t)}) - \varepsilon_{\Omega}(\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t-1)})) / \varepsilon_{\Omega}(\vec{\mathbf{W}}^{(t-1)})| < \varepsilon$; 4) the stepsize $s^{(t)} < 10^{-10}$.




Fig. 7 Training and test errors for TR rank $\mathbf{r}^* = (5, 5, 5)$. Each method is tested for 10 runs




Fig. 8 Computation time required for each method to reach the stopping criteria for TR rank $\mathbf{r}^* = (1, 1, 1), (2, 2, 2), \dots, (8, 8, 8)$

Numerical results are illustrated in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8. On the one hand, we observe that the TR-GN method has faster convergence than TR-RGD and TR-RCG since TR-GN exploits more second-order information of $\nabla^2 f(\vec{\mathbf{W}})$, while the preconditioned metric in TR-RGD and TR-RCG only takes advantage of its diagonal blocks. On the other hand, Figure 8 suggests that the computation time for

TR-GN to reach the stopping criteria grows faster than TR-RGD and TR-RCG as TR rank \mathbf{r}^* increases. In other words, there is a trade-off between exploiting second-order information and the computational efficiency.

7 Conclusions and future works

The performance of the Riemannian methods varies with different metrics. We have shown that an exquisitely constructed metric is indeed helpful to accelerate the Riemannian methods. Specifically, we have proposed a general framework for optimization on product manifolds endowed with a preconditioned metric. The metric is developed by designing an operator that aims to approximate the diagonal blocks of the Riemannian Hessian. In particular, the block-Jacobi preconditioning in numerical linear algebra can be viewed as an instance in our framework. Moreover, we explain that the proposed framework is essentially not a variable metric method since a preconditioned metric is pre-defined without previous iterates. Conceptually, various existing methods including the Riemannian Gauss–Newton method can be interpreted by the proposed framework with specific metrics. We have tailored novel preconditioned metrics for canonical correlation analysis and truncated singular value decomposition and have shown the effect of the proposed metric by computing the condition number of the Riemannian Hessian at the local minimizer. Numerical results verify that a delicate metric does improve the performance of the Riemannian optimization methods.

In the future, we intend to specify the proposed framework to other problems, e.g., the distributed PCA. Moreover, taking into account the block structure of product manifolds, parallel computing is capable of further accelerating the Riemannian optimization methods.

A Computational details in Example 1

In Example 1, we investigate a class of preconditioned metrics defined by

$$g_{\lambda, \mathbf{x}} = \langle \xi, (\lambda \mathbf{I}_n + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{B}) \eta \rangle \quad \text{for } \xi, \eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{M},$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the matrix $\lambda \mathbf{I}_n + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{B}$ is positive definite. Specifically, we compare the Riemannian gradient descent method under two metric selections 1) the Euclidean metric $g_{1, \mathbf{x}}(\xi, \eta) := \langle \xi, \eta \rangle$; 2) the scaled metric $g_{0, \mathbf{x}}(\xi, \eta) := \langle \xi, \mathbf{B} \eta \rangle$ for $\xi, \eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{M}$. The Riemannian gradients at $x \in \mathcal{M}$ under these metrics can be computed by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad}_{g_{1, \mathbf{x}}} f(x) &= -(\mathbf{I}_n - (\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{B}^2 \mathbf{x})^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{B}) \mathbf{b}, \\ \text{grad}_{g_{0, \mathbf{x}}} f(x) &= -(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{B}) \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{b}. \end{aligned}$$

The update rule for RGD under any metric $g_{\lambda, \mathbf{x}}$ is based on the polar retraction [24, eq. (3.3)]

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} &= \mathbf{x}^{(t)} - s^{(t)} \text{grad}_{g_{\lambda, \mathbf{x}}} f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}), \\ \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} &= \frac{\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}\|_{\mathbf{B}}}. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, given an initial point $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{x}^{(0)} \neq 0$, if we carefully choose the initial stepsize $s^{(0)} = 1/(\mathbf{x}^{(0)})^\top \mathbf{b}$ for the RGD method under the metric $g_{0, \mathbf{x}}$, RGD can even converge

in one iteration

$$\mathbf{x}^{(1)} = \frac{\mathbf{x}^{(0)} - s^{(0)} \text{grad}_{g_0, \mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}^{(0)})}{\|\mathbf{x}^{(0)} - s^{(0)} \text{grad}_{g_0, \mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}^{(0)})\|_{\mathbf{B}}} = \frac{\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{b}}{\|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{B}}} = \mathbf{x}^*.$$

Moreover, the Riemannian Hessian of f at \mathbf{x}^* along $\eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}^*} \mathcal{M}$ can be computed by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hess}_{g_{\lambda, \mathbf{x}}} f(\mathbf{x}^*)[\eta] &= \Pi_{g_{\lambda, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*}} \left(\text{Dgrad}_{g_{\lambda, \mathbf{x}}} f(\mathbf{x}^*)[\eta] \right) \\ &= \Pi_{g_{\lambda, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*}} \left(\|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{B}} (\lambda \mathbf{I}_n + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{B})^{-1} \mathbf{B} \eta \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2.4) that the Rayleigh quotient reads

$$q(\eta) = \|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{B}} \cdot \frac{\langle \eta, \mathbf{B} \eta \rangle}{\langle \eta, (\lambda \mathbf{I}_n + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{B}) \eta \rangle} \quad \text{for } \eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}^*} \mathcal{M}.$$

Note that if $\lambda = 0$, the Rayleigh quotient boils down to a constant $\|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{B}}$, which indicates that $\kappa_{g_0, \mathbf{x}}(\text{Hess}_{g_0, \mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}^*)) = 1$ due to (2.3).

B Proof of Proposition 4

Proposition 4 gives the condition number of the Riemannian Hessian of f at $(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)$ under the metric (4.3). A concrete proof of Proposition 4 is given as follows.

Proof Since $(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)$ is a critical point of f , it follows from $\text{grad}_g f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*) = 0$ that

$$\Sigma_{xx}^{-1} \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{V}^* = \mathbf{U}^* \Sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_{yy}^{-1} \Sigma_{xy}^T \mathbf{U}^* = \mathbf{V}^* \Sigma,$$

where $\Sigma := \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_m)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}^* (\text{sym}(\eta_1^T \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{V}^* \mathbf{N}) + \text{sym}((\mathbf{U}^*)^T \Sigma_{xy} \eta_2 \mathbf{N})) &\in (T_{\mathbf{U}^*} \text{St}_{\Sigma_{xx}}(m, d_x))^\perp, \\ \mathbf{V}^* (\text{sym}(\eta_2^T \Sigma_{xy}^T \mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{N}) + \text{sym}((\mathbf{V}^*)^T \Sigma_{xy}^T \eta_1 \mathbf{N})) &\in (T_{\mathbf{V}^*} \text{St}_{\Sigma_{yy}}(m, d_y))^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} g_{(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)}(\eta, \text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)[\eta]) &= \langle \eta_1, \Sigma_{xx} \eta_1 \Sigma \mathbf{N} \rangle + \langle \eta_1, \Sigma_{xx} \mathbf{U}^* \text{sym}(\eta_1^T \Sigma_{xy} \mathbf{V}^* \mathbf{N}) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \eta_1, \Sigma_{xx} \mathbf{U}^* \text{sym}((\mathbf{U}^*)^T \Sigma_{xy} \eta_2 \mathbf{N}) \rangle - \langle \eta_1, \Sigma_{xy} \eta_2 \mathbf{N} \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \eta_2, \Sigma_{yy} \eta_2 \Sigma \mathbf{N} \rangle + \langle \eta_2, \Sigma_{yy} \mathbf{V}^* \text{sym}(\eta_2^T \Sigma_{xy}^T \mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{N}) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \eta_2, \Sigma_{yy} \mathbf{V}^* \text{sym}((\mathbf{V}^*)^T \Sigma_{xy}^T \eta_1 \mathbf{N}) \rangle - \langle \eta_2, \Sigma_{xy}^T \eta_1 \mathbf{N} \rangle \\ &= \langle \eta_1, \Sigma_{xx} \eta_1 \Sigma \mathbf{N} \rangle - 2 \langle \eta_1, \Sigma_{xy} \eta_2 \mathbf{N} \rangle + \langle \eta_2, \Sigma_{yy} \eta_2 \Sigma \mathbf{N} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we calculate the Rayleigh quotient of $\text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)$ by (2.4), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} q(\eta) &= \frac{g_{(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)}(\eta, \text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)[\eta])}{g_{(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)}(\eta, \eta)} \\ &= \frac{\langle \eta_1, \Sigma_{xx} \eta_1 \Sigma \mathbf{N} \rangle - 2 \langle \eta_1, \Sigma_{xy} \eta_2 \mathbf{N} \rangle + \langle \eta_2, \Sigma_{yy} \eta_2 \Sigma \mathbf{N} \rangle}{\langle \eta_1, \Sigma_{xx} \eta_1 \rangle + \langle \eta_2, \Sigma_{yy} \eta_2 \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\langle \tilde{\eta}_1, \tilde{\eta}_1 \Sigma \mathbf{N} \rangle - 2 \langle \tilde{\eta}_1, \Sigma_{xx}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy} \Sigma_{yy}^{-1/2} \tilde{\eta}_2 \mathbf{N} \rangle + \langle \tilde{\eta}_2, \tilde{\eta}_2 \Sigma \mathbf{N} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\eta}_1, \tilde{\eta}_1 \rangle + \langle \tilde{\eta}_2, \tilde{\eta}_2 \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\left[\text{vec}(\tilde{\eta}_1)^T \quad \text{vec}(\tilde{\eta}_2)^T \right] \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma \mathbf{N} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_x} & -\mathbf{N} \otimes \mathbf{M} \\ -\mathbf{N} \otimes \mathbf{M}^T & \Sigma \mathbf{N} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_y} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \text{vec}(\tilde{\eta}_1) \\ \text{vec}(\tilde{\eta}_2) \end{bmatrix}}{\langle \tilde{\eta}_1, \tilde{\eta}_1 \rangle + \langle \tilde{\eta}_2, \tilde{\eta}_2 \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \left[(\tilde{\eta}_1(:, i))^T \quad (\tilde{\eta}_2(:, i))^T \right] \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_i \mathbf{I}_{d_x} & -\mathbf{M} \\ -\mathbf{M}^T & \sigma_i \mathbf{I}_{d_y} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\eta}_1(:, i) \\ \tilde{\eta}_2(:, i) \end{bmatrix}}{\langle \tilde{\eta}_1, \tilde{\eta}_1 \rangle + \langle \tilde{\eta}_2, \tilde{\eta}_2 \rangle}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

where $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2) \in \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*)$, \mathcal{M} , $\mathbf{M} := \Sigma_{xx}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy} \Sigma_{yy}^{-1/2}$, $\tilde{\eta}_1 := \Sigma_{xx}^{1/2} \eta_1$ and $\tilde{\eta}_2 := \Sigma_{yy}^{1/2} \eta_2$. It follows from [13] that the eigenvalues of $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{M}^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ are $\pm\sigma_1, \dots, \pm\sigma_r, 0$ and the eigenvectors $[\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i^\top, \pm\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top]^\top$ correspond to the eigenvalues $\pm\sigma_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, where $r := \text{rank}(\mathbf{M})$. Next, taking (4.2) into (B.1), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} q(\eta) &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \left[(\sum_{j=1}^{d_x} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j)^\top (\sum_{j=1}^{d_y} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i) \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j)^\top \right] \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_i \mathbf{I}_{d_x} & -\mathbf{M} \\ -\mathbf{M}^\top & \sigma_i \mathbf{I}_{d_y} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^{d_x} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \\ \sum_{j=1}^{d_y} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i) \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j \end{bmatrix}}{\langle \tilde{\eta}_1, \tilde{\eta}_1 \rangle + \langle \tilde{\eta}_2, \tilde{\eta}_2 \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \left(-\sum_{j=1}^r 2\sigma_j \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i) \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i) + \sum_{j=1}^{d_x} \sigma_i \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d_y} \sigma_i \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2 \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^{d_x} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d_y} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2 \right)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_\ell := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Omega}_\ell \\ \mathbf{K}_\ell \end{bmatrix}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. Since $\kappa_g(\text{Hess}_g f(\mathbf{U}^*, \mathbf{V}^*))$ is computed by the lower and upper bound of the Rayleigh quotient (B.2), we calculate its upper bound as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} q(\eta) &\leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j (\bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2) + \sum_{j=1}^{d_x} \sigma_i \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d_y} \sigma_i \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2 \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^{d_x} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d_y} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2 \right)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^r \bar{s}_{ij} (\bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2) + \sum_{j=r+1}^{d_x} \mu_i \sigma_i \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \sum_{j=r+1}^{d_y} \mu_i \sigma_i \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2 \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^{d_x} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d_y} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2 \right)} \\ &\leq \max \{ (\mu_1 + \mu_2)(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)/2, \mu_1(\sigma_1 + \sigma_{m+1}) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where $\bar{s}_{ij} := \begin{cases} (\mu_i + \mu_j)(\sigma_i + \sigma_j)/2, & j = 1, 2, \dots, m; \\ \mu_i(\sigma_i + \sigma_j), & j = m+1, m+2, \dots, r \end{cases}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Noticing that $\mathbf{\Omega}_1$ and $\mathbf{\Omega}_2$ are skew-symmetric matrices, we compute the lower bound of Rayleigh quotient in the same fashion as (B.3).

$$\begin{aligned} q(\eta) &\geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \left(-\sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j (\bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2) + \sum_{j=1}^{d_x} \sigma_i \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d_y} \sigma_i \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2 \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^{d_x} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d_y} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2 \right)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^r \bar{s}_{ij} (\bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2) + \sum_{j=r+1}^{d_x} \mu_i \sigma_i \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \sum_{j=r+1}^{d_y} \mu_i \sigma_i \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2 \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^{d_x} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1(j, i)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d_y} \bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_2(j, i)^2 \right)} \\ &\geq \min \{ \min_{i, j \in [m], i \neq j} (\mu_i - \mu_j)(\sigma_i - \sigma_j)/2, \mu_m(\sigma_m - \sigma_{m+1}) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where $\underline{s}_{ij} := \begin{cases} (\mu_i - \mu_j)(\sigma_i - \sigma_j)/2, & j = 1, 2, \dots, m; \\ \mu_i(\sigma_i - \sigma_j), & j = m + 1, m + 2, \dots, r \end{cases}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

Note that the inequalities in (B.3) and (B.4) are tight and the proof is completed. \square

C Implementation details of TR-GN

Recall that the search direction $\eta^{(t)}$ in Algorithm 7 is determined by the following Gauss–Newton equation [2, §8.4.1]:

$$\left\langle DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}})[\xi], DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}})[\eta^{(t)}] \right\rangle + \left\langle DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}})[\xi], F(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) \right\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in T_x \mathcal{M}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Since the operator $DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}})$ is full-rank, equation (C.1) reads

$$\eta^{(t)} = \left((DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}}))^* DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) \right)^{-1} [(DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}}))^* F(\vec{\mathbf{W}})],$$

which is also the solution of the following least-squares problem

$$\arg \min_{\eta \in T_{\vec{\mathbf{W}}} \mathcal{M}} \|DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}})[\eta] + F(\vec{\mathbf{W}})\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Specifically, the directional derivative $DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}})[\xi]$ in (C.2) can be computed by

$$\begin{aligned} DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}})[\xi] &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Proj}_{\Omega}(\tau(\vec{\mathbf{W}} + h\xi) - \mathcal{A}) - \text{Proj}_{\Omega}(\tau(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) - \mathcal{A})}{\sqrt{p}h} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}h} \sum_{k=1}^d \left(\text{Proj}_{\Omega}(\tau(\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{k-1}, h\xi_k, \mathbf{W}_{k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_d)) + \mathcal{O}(h^2) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \sum_{k=1}^d \text{Proj}_{\Omega}(\tau(\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{k-1}, \xi_k, \mathbf{W}_{k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_d)). \end{aligned}$$

Then, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|DF(\vec{\mathbf{W}})[\eta] + F(\vec{\mathbf{W}})\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1 n_2 \dots n_d} \left\langle \left\langle \text{Proj}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{B}_i), \sum_{k=1}^d \tau(\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{k-1}, \eta_k, \mathbf{W}_{k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_d) + \tau(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) - \mathcal{A} \right\rangle \right\rangle^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1 n_2 \dots n_d} \left(\sum_{k=1}^d \left\langle \text{Proj}_{\Omega(k)}((\mathcal{B}_i)_{(k)} \mathbf{W}_{\neq k}), \eta_k \right\rangle + \left\langle \mathcal{B}_i, \tau(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) - \mathcal{A} \right\rangle \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_d) \in \Omega} \left(\sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k(i_k, \cdot)^\top \text{vec} \left(\left(\prod_{j=k+1}^d \mathbf{U}_j(i_j) \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{U}_j(i_j) \right)^\top \right) + \mathcal{S}(i_1, \dots, i_d) \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\mathcal{B}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_1 n_2 \dots n_d}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times \dots \times n_d}$ defined by $(\mathcal{B}_i)(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) = 1$ if $i = \sum_{j=1}^d (i_j - 1) \prod_{\ell=1}^{j-1} n_\ell$, otherwise $(\mathcal{B}_i)(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) = 0$, and $\mathcal{S} := \text{Proj}_{\Omega}(\tau(\vec{\mathbf{W}}) - \mathcal{A})$ refers to the residual tensor. Consequently, the problem (C.2) is a least-squares problem of $\sum_{k=1}^d n_k r_{k-1} r_k$ variables.

Declaration

The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

1. Absil, P., Trunpf, J., Mahony, R., Andrews, B.: All roads lead to Newton: Feasible second-order methods for equality-constrained optimization (2009)
2. Absil, P.A., Mahony, R., Sepulchre, R.: Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds. In: Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds. Princeton University Press (2009). DOI 10.1515/9781400830244
3. Bian, F., Cai, J.F., Zhang, R.: A preconditioned Riemannian gradient descent algorithm for low-rank matrix recovery. arXiv preprint [arXiv:2305.02543](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.02543) (2023)
4. Boumal, N.: An introduction to optimization on smooth manifolds. Cambridge University Press (2023). DOI 10.1017/9781009166164. URL <https://www.nicolasboumal.net/book>
5. Boumal, N., Absil, P.A.: Low-rank matrix completion via preconditioned optimization on the Grassmann manifold. Linear Algebra and its Applications **475**, 200–239 (2015). DOI 10.1016/j.laa.2015.02.027
6. Boumal, N., Mishra, B., Absil, P.A., Sepulchre, R.: Manopt, a Matlab toolbox for optimization on manifolds. The Journal of Machine Learning Research **15**(1), 1455–1459 (2014). URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v15/boumal14a.html>
7. Cai, J.F., Huang, W., Wang, H., Wei, K.: Tensor completion via tensor train based low-rank quotient geometry under a preconditioned metric. arXiv preprint [arXiv:2209.04786](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.04786) (2022). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.04786>
8. Candes, E., Recht, B.: Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. Communications of the ACM **55**(6), 111–119 (2012). DOI 10.1145/2184319.2184343
9. Davidon, W.C.: Variable metric method for minimization. SIAM Journal on Optimization **1**(1), 1–17 (1991). DOI 10.1137/0801001
10. Demmel, J.: Nearly optimal block-Jacobi preconditioning. SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications **44**(1), 408–413 (2023). DOI 10.1137/22M1504901
11. Dong, S., Gao, B., Guan, Y., Glineur, F.: New Riemannian preconditioned algorithms for tensor completion via polyadic decomposition. SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications **43**(2), 840–866 (2022). DOI 10.1137/21M1394734
12. Gao, B., Peng, R., Yuan, Y.x.: Riemannian preconditioned algorithms for tensor completion via tensor ring decomposition. arXiv preprint [arXiv:2302.14456](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.14456) (2023)
13. Golub, G.H., Zha, H.: The canonical correlations of matrix pairs and their numerical computation. Springer (1995). URL <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/978-1-4612-4228-4.pdf#page=41>
14. Horn, R.A., Johnson, C.R.: Matrix analysis. Cambridge university press (2012)
15. Kasai, H., Mishra, B.: Low-rank tensor completion: a Riemannian manifold preconditioning approach. In: M.F. Balcan, K.Q. Weinberger (eds.) Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning, *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 48, pp. 1012–1021. PMLR, New York, New York, USA (2016). URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v48/kasai16.html>
16. Kressner, D., Steinlechner, M., Vandereycken, B.: Preconditioned low-rank Riemannian optimization for linear systems with tensor product structure. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing **38**(4), A2018–A2044 (2016). DOI 10.1137/15M1032909
17. Liu, J., Musialski, P., Wonka, P., Ye, J.: Tensor completion for estimating missing values in visual data. IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence **35**(1), 208–220 (2012). DOI 10.1109/TPAMI.2012.39
18. Mishra, B., Apuroop, K.A., Sepulchre, R.: A Riemannian geometry for low-rank matrix completion. arXiv preprint [arXiv:1211.1550](https://arxiv.org/abs/1211.1550) (2012). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1211.1550>
19. Mishra, B., Sepulchre, R.: Riemannian preconditioning. SIAM Journal on Optimization **26**(1), 635–660 (2016). DOI 10.1137/140970860
20. Powell, M.J.D.: Variable Metric Methods for Constrained Optimization, pp. 288–311. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (1983). DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-68874-4_12. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-68874-4_12
21. Sato, H.: Riemannian conjugate gradient methods: General framework and specific algorithms with convergence analyses. SIAM Journal on Optimization **32**(4), 2690–2717 (2022). DOI 10.1137/21M1464178
22. Sato, H., Aihara, K.: Cholesky QR-based retraction on the generalized Stiefel manifold. Computational Optimization and Applications **72**, 293–308 (2019). DOI 10.1007/s10589-018-0046-7

23. Sato, H., Iwai, T.: A Riemannian optimization approach to the matrix singular value decomposition. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **23**(1), 188–212 (2013). DOI [10.1137/120872887](https://doi.org/10.1137/120872887)
24. Shustin, B., Avron, H.: Riemannian optimization with a preconditioning scheme on the generalized Stiefel manifold. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **423**, 114953 (2023). DOI <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2022.114953>
25. Tong, T., Ma, C., Chi, Y.: Accelerating ill-conditioned low-rank matrix estimation via scaled gradient descent. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **22**(1), 6639–6701 (2021). DOI [10.5555/3546258.3546408](https://doi.org/10.5555/3546258.3546408)
26. Udriste, C.: *Convex functions and optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds*, vol. 297. Springer Science & Business Media (1994). DOI [10.1007/978-94-015-8390-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-8390-9)
27. Usevich, K., Li, J., Comon, P.: Approximate matrix and tensor diagonalization by unitary transformations: convergence of Jacobi-type algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **30**(4), 2998–3028 (2020). DOI [10.1137/19M125950X](https://doi.org/10.1137/19M125950X)
28. Wright, J.N.S.J.: *Numerical optimization* (2006)
29. Yamamoto, M.S., Yger, F., Chevallier, S.: Subspace oddity-optimization on product of Stiefel manifolds for EEG data. In: *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 1080–1084. IEEE (2021). DOI [10.1109/ICASSP39728.2021.9413730](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP39728.2021.9413730)
30. Yger, F., Berar, M., Gasso, G., Rakotomamonjy, A.: Adaptive canonical correlation analysis based on matrix manifolds. *arXiv preprint [arXiv:1206.6453](https://arxiv.org/abs/1206.6453)* (2012)
31. Zhao, Q., Zhou, G., Xie, S., Zhang, L., Cichocki, A.: Tensor ring decomposition. *arXiv preprint [arXiv:1606.05535](https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.05535)* (2016). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.05535>