

Polynomial-Time Algorithms for Weaver's Discrepancy Problem in a Dense Regime

Ben Jourdan*

Peter Macgregor†

He Sun‡

February 14, 2024

Abstract

Given $v_1, \dots, v_m \in \mathbb{C}^d$ with $\|v_i\|^2 = \alpha$ for all $i \in [m]$ as input and suppose $\sum_{i=1}^m |\langle u, v_i \rangle|^2 = 1$ for every unit vector $u \in \mathbb{C}^d$, Weaver's discrepancy problem asks for a partition S_1, S_2 of $[m]$, such that $\sum_{i \in S_j} |\langle u, v_i \rangle|^2 \leq 1 - \theta$ for some universal constant θ , every unit vector $u \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and every $j \in \{1, 2\}$. We prove that this problem can be solved deterministically in polynomial time when $m \geq 49d^2$.

*School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, UK. ben.jourdan@ed.ac.uk

†School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, UK. peter.macgregor@ed.ac.uk

‡School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, UK. h.sun@ed.ac.uk

1 Introduction

The Kadison-Singer problem is a central problem in operator theory, and has close connections to a number of problems in quantum mechanics, pure and applied mathematics, engineering, and computer science. Among several formulations of the Kadison-Singer problem, Weaver [Wea04] shows that it is equivalent to the following discrepancy problem (the KS_2 problem): there exists a universal constant $\theta > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $v_1, \dots, v_m \in \mathbb{C}^d$ satisfy $\|v_i\|^2 = \alpha$ for all $i \in [m]$, and suppose $\sum_{i=1}^m |\langle u, v_i \rangle|^2 = 1$ for every unit vector $u \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Then, there exists a partition S_1, S_2 of $[m]$, such that $\sum_{i \in S_j} |\langle u, v_i \rangle|^2 \leq 1 - \theta$ for every unit vector $u \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and every $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

In their breakthrough result, Marcus, Spielman, and Srivastava [MSS15] present a non-constructive proof and show that the partition promised by the KS_2 problem exists, leading to an affirmative answer to the Kadison-Singer problem. On the other side, due to a close connection between the KS_2 problem and many algorithmic problems (e.g., constructing unweighted spectral sparsifiers, and spectrally thin trees), they ask whether such a partition of the KS_2 problem can be found in polynomial time. After a decade-long research (e.g., [AGSS18, JMS23, SZ22]), this problem remains wide open and has become a very important open problem in algorithmic spectral graph theory.

This paper studies the KS_2 problem in the regime of $m \geq 221d^2$. Under this condition, we present two deterministic polynomial-time algorithms that solve the KS_2 problem. These two algorithms achieve the same approximation guarantee, and their performance is summarised as follows:

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{I} = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be vectors in \mathbb{C}^d , such that m is even and $\sum_{i=1}^m |\langle u, v_i \rangle|^2 = 1$ for every unit vector $u \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Moreover, assume that $\|v_i\|^2 = \alpha$ for every $i \in [m]$ and $m \geq 221d^2$. Then, there is a deterministic algorithm that finds a partition S_1, S_2 of $[m]$ such that $|S_1| = |S_2|$ and*

$$\sum_{i \in S_j} |\langle u, v_i \rangle|^2 \leq \frac{3}{4}$$

for every unit vector $u \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and every $j \in \{1, 2\}$. The algorithm runs in time $O(\text{poly}(m, d))$.

Remark 1. *Our second algorithm requires $m \geq 49d^2$ instead. Both constants might be further optimised.*

Remark 2. *Our presented algorithms can be easily adjusted to work when m is odd. In this case, $|S_1| \neq |S_2|$ but the other stated properties from Theorem 1 hold.*

We discuss the significance of the result. First of all, our result shows that, when $m \geq 49d^2$, the KS_2 problem can be solved by a deterministic and polynomial-time algorithm. To the best of our knowledge, this presents the first such algorithm which does not rely on random sampling and de-randomization techniques [WX08]. Secondly, our work draws a novel connection between the KS_2 problem and the determinant optimisation problem, and demonstrates how potential functions can be used for the KS_2 problem. Potential functions of various forms are common tools used in constructing spectral sparsifiers [BSS12, LS17, LS18]; however, all of the previous works (i) might choose the same vector multiple times, and (ii) need to reweight the chosen vector. Hence, the previous analyses cannot be directly applied for the KS_2 problem. In our point of view, overcoming these two ‘‘bottlenecks’’ is significant, and our presented technique could motivate more research on this important problem.

1.1 Overview of our Techniques

The First Algorithm. At a very high level, our algorithm proceeds in $m/2$ iterations, and picks one vector in each iteration. Formally, starting with $A_0 = \mathbf{0}_{d \times d}$ and $\mathcal{A}_0 = \emptyset$, the algorithm picks some vector $v \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{A}_j$ in iteration j , and adds it into \mathcal{A}_{j+1} , i.e., $\mathcal{A}_{j+1} \triangleq \mathcal{A}_j \cup \{v\}$; the algorithm also sets $A_{j+1} = A_j + vv^*$. Despite the similarity, it is important to notice the difference between our framework and the BSS one [BSS12]: first of all, in each iteration our algorithm only picks a vector that hasn’t been chosen yet, while the BSS algorithm might pick the same vector multiple times. Secondly, our algorithm doesn’t scale the chosen vector, while the BSS algorithm scales the chosen

vector in each iteration. Hence, during the execution of our algorithm, the set of the chosen vectors and the set of the remaining ones always form a partition of \mathcal{I} .

The analysis of our algorithm is based on a novel potential function defined by

$$\Phi^u(A) \triangleq \text{tr} \log(u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1}$$

for some positive semi-definite matrix A and barrier value $u \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Since $\text{tr} \log(A) = \log \det(A)$ holds for any positive definite matrix A , one can rewrite $\Phi^u(A)$ as

$$\Phi^u(A) = -\log \det(u\mathbb{I} - A) = -\log \left(\prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_i(u\mathbb{I} - A) \right), \quad (1)$$

i.e., the potential function $\Phi^u(A)$ is a function of the determinant of the matrix $u\mathbb{I} - A$. Our objective is to apply this potential function to keep track of the algorithm's progress in each iteration. To achieve this, we set the initial barrier value as $u_0 \triangleq 1/2$, which increases by δ_u after each iteration. That is, $u_{j+1} \triangleq u_j + \delta_u$, and we set $\delta_u \triangleq \alpha/d$.

Next, we reason about the use of $\Phi^u(A)$ and our choices of the barrier values. As we set $\delta_u = \alpha/d$, it holds that

$$\text{tr}(u_j\mathbb{I} - A_j) = \left(u_0 + \frac{\alpha}{d} \cdot j \right) \cdot d - \alpha \cdot j = \text{tr}(u_0 \cdot \mathbb{I}), \quad (2)$$

hence the trace of $u_j\mathbb{I} - A_j$ remains constant during the execution of the algorithm. On the other side, by the AM-GM inequality we have that

$$\det(u_j\mathbb{I} - A_j)^{1/d} \leq \frac{1}{d} \cdot \text{tr}(u_j\mathbb{I} - A_j). \quad (3)$$

Combining (2) with (3), we know that the potential function $\Phi^{u_j}(A_j)$ has the same upper bound for all the iterations; moreover, the closer $\Phi^{u_j}(A_j)$ is to this upper bound, the more balanced are the eigenvalues of $u_j\mathbb{I} - A_j$. Hence, in every iteration j the algorithm picks the vector $v \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{A}_j$ that maximises $\det(u_{j+1}I - A_j - vv^*)$. We show that after $m/2$ iterations the left and right sides of (3) are sufficiently close. Due to a tight bound of the condition number of any Hermitian positive definite matrix $B \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ based on $\det(B)$, $\text{tr}(B)$ and d [MUV⁺97], we show that the algorithm finds the partition promised by the KS_2 problem.

The Second Algorithm. Our second algorithm proceeds in $m/2$ iterations as well, and picks one vector in each iteration. Formally, starting with $A_0 = \mathbf{0}_{d \times d}$ and $\mathcal{A}_0 = \emptyset$, the algorithm picks some vector $v \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{A}_j$ in iteration j , and adds it into \mathcal{A}_{j+1} ; the algorithm sets $A_{j+1} = A_j + vv^*$. However, in each iteration j the algorithm picks v that minimises $v^*(\mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1}v$. Instead of applying a potential function, we analyse the second algorithm by directly lower bounding $\det(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2})$. We prove that such a lower bound of $\det(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2})$ is sufficient to bound the condition number of $A_{m/2}$ and $\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}$, implying that our algorithm's output is the partition promised by the KS_2 problem.

1.2 Related Work

Our result directly relates to the quest for efficient algorithms for the the KS_2 problem. Anari et al. [AGSS18] show that a valid partition promised by the KS_2 problem can be found in $d^{O(m^{1/3}\alpha^{-1/4})}$ time. Jourdan et al. [JMS23] present a randomised algorithm for the problem, which runs in time quasi-polynomial in m and exponential in d . Compared with their results, we show that the KS_2 problem can be solved in polynomial time when $m \geq 49d^2$. Weaver [Wea13] gives a polynomial-time algorithm for a one-sided version of the KS_2 problem based on the BSS framework for spectral sparsification [BSS12]. In comparison, we give a two-sided guarantee in a more restricted setting.

Our work is also linked to hardness results for the KS_2 problem [SZ22, JMS23]. These results show that the optimisation version of the KS_2 problem is NP-hard. It's worth mentioning that the two reductions shown in [SZ22, JMS23] are based on instances satisfying $m = \Theta(d)$.

Our approach further relates to the determinant maximisation problem which has been extensively studied in the field of experimental design [BLP⁺22, BLS24, SX18]. Compared with the state-of-the-art determinant maximisation algorithm, our approach can be applied to a wider range of instances. We further discuss this connection in Section 4.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{I} \triangleq \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ be the set of input vectors, where $\|v_i\|^2 = \alpha$ and $v_i \in \mathbb{C}^d$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$. We use \mathcal{A}_j to represent the set of vectors picked till the j th iteration, and let $\mathcal{B}_j \triangleq \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{A}_j$ be the set of unpicked vectors; hence, it holds that $|\mathcal{A}_j| = j$ and $|\mathcal{B}_j| = m - j$. We always use A_j to represent the matrix constructed in the j th iteration, i.e., $A_j \triangleq \sum_{v \in \mathcal{A}_j} vv^*$. We write the eigenvalues of any Hermitian matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ as $\lambda_{\max}(A) = \lambda_1(A) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d(A) = \lambda_{\min}(A)$, and the condition number of A as

$$\kappa(A) \triangleq \frac{\lambda_1(A)}{\lambda_d(A)}.$$

The following relationship between α , d and m will be repeatedly used in our analyses.

Lemma 2.1. *It holds that $m \cdot \alpha = d$.*

Proof. Let e_1, \dots, e_d be the vectors forming the standard orthonormal basis, and we have that

$$m \cdot \alpha = \sum_{i=1}^m \|v_i\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^d \langle v_i, e_j \rangle^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{i=1}^m \langle v_i, e_j \rangle^2 = d,$$

which proves the statement. □

Next we list the facts on matrices that will be used in our analyses.

Lemma 2.2 (Theorem 3.30, [NS18]). *It holds for any square matrices A, B of the same size that $\det(AB) = \det(A) \cdot \det(B)$.*

Lemma 2.3. *It holds for any Hermitian positive definite matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ that*

$$\det(A)^{1/d} \leq \frac{1}{d} \cdot \text{tr}(A).$$

Proof. Since we can write $\det(A) = \prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_i(A)$ and $\text{tr}(A) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i(A)$, the statement holds by the AM-GM inequality. □

Lemma 2.4 (Matrix Determinant Lemma, [DZ07]). *If A is an invertible matrix and u, v are vectors, then*

$$\det(A + uv^*) = (1 + v^* A^{-1} u) \cdot \det(A).$$

Lemma 2.5. *Let A, B be positive definite matrices. Then, the following statements hold:*

1. $\text{tr} \log(A) = \log \det(A)$;
2. $\text{tr} \log(AB) = \text{tr} \log(A) + \text{tr} \log(B)$;
3. *if A and B commute, then $\log(AB) = \log(A) + \log(B)$;*
4. $\log(A^{-1}) = -\log(A)$.

Proof. Let $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d > 0$ be the eigenvalues of A . Then, we have that

$$\text{tr} \log(A) = \sum_{i=1}^d \log(\lambda_i) = \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \right) = \log(\det(A)),$$

which proves the first statement. By the first statement and Lemma 2.2, we have that

$$\text{tr} \log(AB) = \log(\det(AB)) = \log \det(A) + \log \det(B) = \text{tr} \log(A) + \text{tr} \log(B),$$

hence the second statement holds. The proofs of the third and fourth statements can be found in Theorems 11.2 and 11.3 of Chapter 11 of [Hig08]. □

Lemma 2.6 ([MUV⁺97]). *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ be a Hermitian positive definite matrix. Then, the condition number $\kappa(A)$ of A satisfies that*

$$\kappa(A) \leq \frac{1+x}{1-x}, \quad x \triangleq \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{d}{\text{tr}(A)}\right)^d \cdot \det(A)}.$$

3 The First Algorithm and Analysis

This section presents and analyses our first algorithm, and is organised as follows. Section 3.1 gives the formal description of our first algorithm, whose correctness is analysed in Section 3.2; Section 3.3 proves a key lemma used in our analysis.

3.1 Algorithm Description

Our designed algorithm proceeds in $m/2$ iterations, and picks one vector in each iteration. At the initialisation step, the algorithm sets

$$A_0 = \mathbf{0}_{d \times d}, \quad \mathcal{A}_0 = \emptyset, \quad \mathcal{B}_0 = \mathcal{I},$$

and $u_0 = 1/2, \delta_u = \alpha/d$. Then, in iteration $0 \leq j < m/2$, the algorithm selects a vector $v \in \mathcal{B}_j$ and performs the following operations:

$$A_{j+1} = A_j + vv^*, \quad \mathcal{A}_{j+1} = \mathcal{A}_j \cup \{v\}, \quad \mathcal{B}_{j+1} = \mathcal{B}_j \setminus \{v\}.$$

The vector v is chosen such that the increase of the potential function from $\Phi^{u_j}(A_j)$ to $\Phi^{u_j+\delta_u}(A_j + vv^*)$ is minimised. That is, the algorithm picks v that minimises the function

$$\Phi^{u_j+\delta_u}(A_j + vv^*) = -\log \left(\det((u_j + \delta_u) \cdot \mathbb{I} - A_j - vv^*) \right).$$

After this, the algorithm sets $u_{j+1} = u_j + \delta_u$, and moves to the next iteration. See Algorithm 1 for formal description.

Algorithm 1

```

1 Input:  $\mathcal{I} = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m$ , where  $v_i \in \mathbb{C}^d$  and  $\|v_i\|^2 = \alpha$ 
2  $A_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{0}_{d \times d}, \mathcal{A}_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3  $\mathcal{B}_0 \leftarrow \mathcal{I}$ 
4  $u_0 \leftarrow 1/2$ 
5  $\delta_u \leftarrow \alpha/d$ 
6  $j \leftarrow 0$ 
7 while  $j < m/2$  do
8    $u_{j+1} \leftarrow u_j + \delta_u$ 
9    $v_j \leftarrow \arg \max_{v \in \mathcal{B}_j} \det(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_j - vv^*)$ 
10   $A_{j+1} \leftarrow A_j + v_j v_j^*$ 
11   $\mathcal{A}_{j+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_j \cup \{v_j\}$ 
12   $\mathcal{B}_{j+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_j \setminus \{v_j\}$ 
13   $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
14 end
15 return  $\mathcal{A}_{m/2}$ 

```

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1

We introduce $c_j \triangleq u_j - \lambda_{\max}(A_j)$, which is the difference between u_j and the maximum eigenvalue of A_j constructed by the algorithm in iteration j . Recall that Theorem 1 assumes that $m \geq 221d^2$, which is equivalent to

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1}{221d};$$

we assume that this holds throughout the rest of the section. We first claim that the constructed A_j in every iteration satisfies the following:

1. the maximum eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}(A_j)$ is *far away* from u_j in every iteration;
2. the condition number $\kappa(u_j\mathbb{I} - A_j)$ is at most $3/2$ in every iteration.

These facts are summarised in Lemma 3.1, which will be proven in the next subsection.

Lemma 3.1. *It holds for every $0 \leq j \leq m/2$ that $c_j \geq 1/3$ and $\kappa(u_j\mathbb{I} - A_j) \leq 3/2$.*

Lemma 3.1 is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. After $m/2$ iterations of Algorithm 1 we have

$$u_{m/2} = u_0 + \frac{m}{2} \cdot \delta_u = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\alpha}{d} = 1,$$

using the fact $d = m\alpha$ (Lemma 2.1). By Lemma 3.1, we have that $\lambda_{\max}(A_{m/2}) \leq 2/3$ and $\kappa(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}) \leq 3/2$. This implies that

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}) \leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot \lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}),$$

which is equivalent to

$$1 - \lambda_{\min}(A_{m/2}) \leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot (1 - \lambda_{\max}(A_{m/2})).$$

Combining this with the fact that

$$\lambda_{\max}(A_{m/2}) \geq \frac{1}{d} \cdot \text{tr}(A_{m/2}) = \frac{1}{d} \cdot \frac{\alpha m}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$$

gives us that $\lambda_{\min}(A_{m/2}) \geq 1/4$. The algorithm performs $O(m)$ iterations, each of which consists of elementary matrix operations, and $O(m)$ determinant computations, each of which has running time $O(d^3)$. Thus, the running time of the algorithm is $O(\text{poly}(m, d))$. \square

3.3 Proof of Lemma 3.1

This subsection analyses the average change of the potential function $\Phi^{u_j}(A_j)$ in each iteration, and proves by induction that Lemma 3.1 holds for every iteration. We first assume that Lemma 3.1 holds for any iteration $j' \leq j$ for some fixed j , and only study the j th iteration of Algorithm 1. For simplicity, we write

$$A = A_j, \quad B = B_j, \quad \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_j, \quad \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_j,$$

as well as $u = u_j$ and $\hat{u} = u_{j+1} = u_j + \delta_u$.

Lemma 3.2. *Assuming Lemma 3.1 holds up to iteration j , we have for the constructed matrix $A = A_j$ that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \Phi^u(A) - \Phi^{\hat{u}}(A + vv^*) \\ &= (m - j) \cdot \text{tr} \left[\log \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A) \right) \right] + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \log \left(1 - v^* (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 we have that $\lambda_{\min}(u\mathbb{I} - A) = u - \lambda_{\max}(A) \geq 1/3 > 0$ and

$$\lambda_{\min}(u\mathbb{I} - A - vv^*) \geq \lambda_{\min}(u\mathbb{I} - A - \alpha\mathbb{I}) \geq \frac{1}{3} - \alpha \geq \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{221d} > 0;$$

as such both of $(u\mathbb{I} - A)$ and $(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A - vv^*)$ are invertible. Hence, it holds for any matrix A and vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^u(A) - \Phi^{\hat{u}}(A + vv^*) &= \text{tr} \left[\log \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right) - \log \left((\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - (A + vv^*))^{-1} \right) \right] \\ &= \text{tr} \left[\log \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right) + \log \left(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - (A + vv^*) \right) \right] \\ &= \text{tr} \left[\log \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - (A + vv^*)) \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we apply the definition of $\Phi^u(A)$ and Lemma 2.5. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \Phi^u(A) - \Phi^{\hat{u}}(A + vv^*) &= \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \text{tr} \left[\log \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - (A + vv^*)) \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \log \left[\det \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - (A + vv^*)) \right) \right] \\ &= \log \left[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \det \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - (A + vv^*)) \right) \right] \\ &= \log \left[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \det \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right) \det \left(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - (A + vv^*) \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \log \left[\det \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right)^{m-j} \prod_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \det \left(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - (A + vv^*) \right) \right] \\ &= \log \left[\det \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right)^{m-j} \prod_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \det \left(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A \right) (1 - v^* (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \log \left[\det \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right)^{m-j} \det \left(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A \right)^{m-j} \prod_{v \in \mathcal{B}} (1 - v^* (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v) \right] \\ &= \log \left[\det \left(\left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A) \right)^{m-j} \right) \prod_{v \in \mathcal{B}} (1 - v^* (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \log \left[\det \left(\left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A) \right)^{m-j} \right) \right] + \log \left[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{B}} (1 - v^* (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v) \right] \\ &= \text{tr} \left[\log \left(\left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A) \right)^{m-j} \right) \right] + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \log \left(1 - v^* (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v \right) \\ &= (m-j) \cdot \text{tr} \left[\log \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A) \right) \right] + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \log \left(1 - v^* (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v \right), \end{aligned}$$

where (5) and (7) follow by Lemma 2.2, and (6) follows by Matrix Determinant Lemma (Lemma 2.4). This completes the proof. \square

We examine the second term in (4), which involves the set of all the unpicked vectors $v \in \mathcal{B}$. The following lemma derives a ‘‘universal’’ lower bound of this term, in the sense that this bound is only a function of A instead of individual vectors in \mathcal{B} .

Lemma 3.3. *Assuming Lemma 3.1 holds up to iteration j , we have for the constructed $A = A_j$ that*

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \log \left(1 - v^* (\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v \right) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \text{tr} \left[(\mathbb{I} - A) \cdot \log \left(\mathbb{I} - \alpha (\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right) \right].$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 we have that

$$v^* (\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v \leq \alpha \lambda_{\max}((\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1}) = \frac{\alpha}{\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)} = \frac{\alpha}{\delta_u + (u - \lambda_{\max}(A))} \leq \frac{\alpha}{\delta_u + 1/3} \leq 3\alpha < 1.$$

Hence, we can apply the scalar and matrix Maclaurin series of $\log(1 - x)$ and have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \log \left(1 - v^* (\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v \right) &= - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(v^* (\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v \right)^k}{k} \\ &= - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{tr} \left[\left((\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} v v^* \right)^k \right]}{k} \\ &\geq - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{tr} \left[(\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-k} (v v^*)^k \right]}{k} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{\text{tr} \left[(\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-k} (v v^*)^k \right]}{k} \\ &= - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{\text{tr} \left[\alpha^{k-1} (\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-k} (v v^*) \right]}{k} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$= - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{tr} \left[\alpha^{k-1} (\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-k} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} (v v^*) \right]}{k}$$

$$= - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{tr} \left[\alpha^{k-1} (\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-k} (\mathbb{I} - A) \right]}{k}$$

$$= - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{tr} \left[\frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} (\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A) \right)^{-k} (\mathbb{I} - A) \right]}{k}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \text{tr} \left[- \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\alpha (\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right)^k}{k} \cdot (\mathbb{I} - A) \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{\alpha} \text{tr} \left[(\mathbb{I} - A) \cdot \log \left(\mathbb{I} - \alpha (\widehat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right) \right],$$

where (8) holds by the fact that $\text{tr}((XY)^k) \leq \text{tr}(X^k Y^k)$ holds for PSD matrices X, Y and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and (9) holds by the fact that $\|v\|^2 = \alpha$ for every $v \in \mathcal{B}$. \square

Next we apply Chebyshev's sum inequality to replace the factor of $(\mathbb{I} - A)$ in the lower bound given in Lemma 3.3 with the scalar $(m - j)/m$.

Lemma 3.4 (Chebyshev's Sum Inequality). *Let $f(x) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g(x) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be both monotone increasing (or both monotone decreasing) functions on x . Then, it holds for $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ that*

$$\sum_{x \in S} g(x)f(x) \geq \frac{1}{|S|} \left(\sum_{x \in S} g(x) \right) \left(\sum_{x \in S} f(x) \right).$$

Lemma 3.5. *Assuming Lemma 3.1 holds up to iteration j , we have for the constructed $A = A_j$ that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \Phi^u(A) - \Phi^{\hat{u}}(A + vv^*) \\ & \geq (m - j) \cdot \text{tr} \left[\log \left((u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} (\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A) \right) \right] + \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{m - j}{m} \cdot \text{tr} \left[\log \left(\mathbb{I} - \alpha(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, it is sufficient to show that

$$\text{tr} \left[(\mathbb{I} - A) \cdot \log \left(\mathbb{I} - \alpha(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right) \right] \geq \frac{m - j}{m} \cdot \text{tr} \left[\log \left(\mathbb{I} - \alpha(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right) \right].$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.3, we have $\|\alpha(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1}\| < 1$ and

$$\text{tr} \left[(\mathbb{I} - A) \cdot \log \left(\mathbb{I} - \alpha(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^d (1 - \lambda_i(A)) \cdot \log \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\hat{u} - \lambda_i(A)} \right).$$

Applying Lemma 3.4 with $g(x) = (1 - x)$ and $f(x) = \log(1 - \alpha(\hat{u} - x)^{-1})$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr} \left[(\mathbb{I} - A) \cdot \log \left(\mathbb{I} - \alpha(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right) \right] & \geq \frac{1}{d} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d (1 - \lambda_i(A)) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \log \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\hat{u} - \lambda_i(A)} \right) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{d} \text{tr}(\mathbb{I} - A) \text{tr} \left[\log \left(\mathbb{I} - \alpha(\hat{u}\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In iteration j , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d} \cdot \text{tr}(\mathbb{I} - A) & = \frac{1}{d} \cdot (d - j \cdot \alpha) \\ & = \frac{1}{d} \cdot ((m - j) \cdot \alpha) \\ & = \frac{m - j}{m}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $\text{tr}(A_j) = j\alpha$ and $m\alpha = d$. Combining the two inequalities above proves the statement. \square

Now we are ready to apply Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 3.5 to prove Lemma 3.1. For this proof, we explicitly use index j for all the matrices, sets, and variables used in iteration $0 \leq j < m/2$.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We proceed by induction. For the base case $j = 0$, we have $u_0 = 1/2$ and $\lambda_i(A_0) = 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq d$ and therefore the the statement holds.

For the inductive step, we assume that the statement holds for all $j' \leq j$ and show that $c_{j+1} \geq 1/3$ and $\kappa(\hat{u}_{j+1} - A_{j+1}) \leq 2/3$ as long as $j < m/2$. We achieve this using Lemma 2.6, which will first require us to lower bound $\det(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1})$. We show that we can arrive at a lower bound for $\det(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1})$ as a consequence of upper bounding the average potential increase. We first upper bound the average potential increase in terms of α

and c_j . From Lemma 3.5, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}_j|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_j} \Phi^{u_j}(A_j) - \Phi^{u_{j+1}}(A_j + vv^*) \\
& \geq \text{tr} [\log ((u_j \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1} (u_{j+1} \mathbb{I} - A_j))] + \frac{1}{\alpha m} \cdot \text{tr} [\log (\mathbb{I} - \alpha (u_{j+1} \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1})] \\
& = \text{tr} [\log ((u_j \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1} (u_{j+1} \mathbb{I} - A_j))] + \frac{1}{d} \cdot \text{tr} [\log (\mathbb{I} - \alpha (u_{j+1} \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1})] \\
& = \frac{1}{d} [d \cdot \text{tr} [\log ((u_j \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1} (u_{j+1} \mathbb{I} - A_j))] + \text{tr} [\log (\mathbb{I} - \alpha (u_{j+1} \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1})]].
\end{aligned}$$

By writing $(u_j - x)^{-1}(u_j + \delta_u - x) = 1 + \delta_u(u_j - x)^{-1}$ we have that

$$\text{tr} [\log ((u_j \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1} (u_{j+1} \mathbb{I} - A_j))] = \text{tr} [\log (\mathbb{I} + \delta_u (u_j \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1})],$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}_j|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_j} \Phi^{u_j}(A_j) - \Phi^{u_{j+1}}(A_j + vv^*) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{d} [d \cdot \text{tr} [\log (\mathbb{I} + \delta_u (u_j \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1})] + \text{tr} [\log (\mathbb{I} - \alpha (u_{j+1} \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1})]] \\
& = \frac{1}{d} [\text{tr} [\log (\mathbb{I} + \delta_u (u_j \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1})^d] + \text{tr} [\log (\mathbb{I} - \alpha (u_{j+1} \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1})]] \\
& \geq \frac{1}{d} [\text{tr} [\log (\mathbb{I} + \alpha (u_j \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1})] + \text{tr} [\log (\mathbb{I} - \alpha (u_{j+1} \mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1})]] \\
& = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \left[\log \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{u_j - \lambda_i(A_j)} \right) + \log \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{u_j + \delta_u - \lambda_i(A_j)} \right) \right] \\
& \geq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \left[\log \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{u_j - \lambda_i(A_j)} \right) + \log \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{u_j - \lambda_i(A_j)} \right) \right] \\
& = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \log \left(1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{(u_j - \lambda_i(A_j))^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\log(1 - \alpha^2 x^{-2})$ is increasing on x , we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}_j|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_j} \Phi^{u_j}(A_j) - \Phi^{u_{j+1}}(A_j + vv^*) & \geq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \log \left(1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{(u_j - \lambda_i(A_j))^2} \right) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \log \left(1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{c_j^2} \right) \\
& = \log \left(1 - \alpha^2 c_j^{-2} \right) \\
& \geq -\frac{\alpha^2 c_j^{-2}}{1 - \alpha^2 c_j^{-2}} \\
& \geq -\frac{2\alpha^2}{c_j^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the assumption that $c_j \geq 1/3 > \sqrt{2}\alpha$. Since the vector picked by Algorithm 1 increases the potential value no more than the average, we have that

$$-\log \det(u_j \mathbb{I} - A_j) + \log \det(u_{j+1} \mathbb{I} - A_{j+1}) \geq -\frac{2\alpha^2}{c_j^2},$$

which is equivalent to

$$\det(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1}) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{2\alpha^2}{c_j^2}\right) \cdot \det(u_j\mathbb{I} - A_j).$$

By combining these inequalities for every iteration up to j , we have

$$\det(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1}) \geq \exp\left(-\sum_{j'=0}^j \frac{2\alpha^2}{c_{j'}^2}\right) \cdot \det(u_0\mathbb{I}). \quad (10)$$

Now we apply the condition number inequality in Lemma 2.6. Let

$$x_{j+1} = \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{d}{\operatorname{tr}(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1})}\right)^d \cdot \det(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1})}.$$

From (10), we have

$$x_{j+1} \leq \sqrt{1 - \exp\left(-\sum_{j'=0}^j \frac{2\alpha^2}{c_{j'}^2}\right) \left(\frac{d}{\operatorname{tr}(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1})}\right)^d \cdot \det(u_0\mathbb{I})}.$$

Furthermore, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{tr}(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1}) &= d \cdot (u_0 + (j+1) \cdot \delta_u) - (j+1) \cdot \alpha \\ &= \frac{d}{2} + (j+1) \cdot (d\delta_u - \alpha) \\ &= \frac{d}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality follows by the definition of $\delta_u = \alpha/d$. We also have that

$$\det(u_0\mathbb{I}) = \frac{1}{2^d}.$$

Combined with the inductive hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_{j+1} &\leq \sqrt{1 - \exp\left(-\sum_{j'=0}^j \frac{2\alpha^2}{c_{j'}^2}\right)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{1 - \exp\left(-18 \sum_{j'=0}^j \alpha^2\right)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{1 - \exp(-9m\alpha^2)} \\ &= \sqrt{1 - \exp(-9d\alpha)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{9}{221}\right)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{5}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, it holds by Lemma 2.6 that

$$\kappa(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1}) \leq \frac{1 + x_{j+1}}{1 - x_{j+1}} \leq \frac{3}{2}.$$

We also have that

$$\lambda_{\max}(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1}) \geq \frac{1}{d} \cdot \text{tr}(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1}) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then,

$$c_{j+1} = \lambda_{\min}(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1}) \geq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1})}{\kappa(u_{j+1}\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1})} \geq \frac{1}{3},$$

which completes the inductive step. \square

We believe the tools used to prove Theorem 1 are interesting in their own right. It is known that the only non-trivial matrix function with a simple formula for rank-1 updates is $f(x) = x^{-1}$ [BKS18]. Previous potential function-based sparsification algorithms exploit this formula and the potential function $\Psi^u(A) = \text{tr}(u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1}$ in their analysis [BSS12]. Sparsification can be seen as a relaxation of the KS_2 problem in the sense that sparsification algorithms are free to add different scalar multiples of some vv^* in each iteration and use the same vector multiple times. The analyses of these algorithms appear to become intractable when these relaxations are removed, partly due to the use of the Sherman-Morrison formula for the inverse of rank-1 updates. We overcome this apparent intractability using the logarithmic potential function $\Phi^u(A) = \text{tr} \log(u\mathbb{I} - A)^{-1}$, the Matrix Determinant Lemma and Lemma 3.3. In addition, instead of examining all the vectors of \mathcal{I} in each iteration, we analyse the change of potential functions over all the unpicked vectors in each iteration, ensuring that the set of picked vectors and the set of unpicked ones always forms a partition; this is another key difference between our analysis and the related ones in the literature.

4 The Second Algorithm and Analysis

In this section, we present Algorithm 2 which also achieves the theoretical guarantees stated in Theorem 1. We can view Algorithm 2 as a modification of Algorithm 1 in which we fix the barrier value to be 1, and set δ_u to be 0. Thus, in each iteration we select the vector v which maximizes the determinant $\det(\mathbb{I} - A_j - vv^*)$. By the Matrix Determinant Lemma (Lemma 2.4), this is equivalent to choosing v to minimize the quadratic form $v^*(\mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1}v$ in each iteration.

Algorithm 2

```

1 Input:  $\mathcal{I} = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m$ , where  $v_i \in \mathbb{C}^d$  and  $\|v_i\|^2 = \alpha$ 
2  $A_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{0}_{d \times d}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3  $\mathcal{B}_0 \leftarrow \mathcal{I}$ 
4 for  $j = 0$  to  $m/2 - 1$  do
5    $v_j \leftarrow \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{B}_j} v^*(\mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1}v$ 
6    $A_{j+1} \leftarrow A_j + v_j v_j^*$ 
7    $\mathcal{A}_{j+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_j \cup \{v_j\}$ 
8    $\mathcal{B}_{j+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_j \setminus \{v_j\}$ 
9 end
10 return  $\mathcal{A}_{m/2}$ 

```

Rather than considering the change in the potential function $\Phi^1(A_j)$ in each iteration, in Lemma 4.1 we directly bound the value of

$$\Phi^1(A_{m/2}) = \text{tr} \log(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2})^{-1} = -\log \det(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}),$$

where $A_{m/2}$ is the matrix corresponding to the output of Algorithm 1.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $A_{m/2}$ be the matrix corresponding to $\mathcal{A}_{m/2}$. Then, it holds that*

$$\log \det(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}) \geq -d \log(2) - \frac{2d^2}{m}.$$

Proof. In each iteration of Algorithm 2, we have that

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_j} v^*(\mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1}v = \text{tr}((\mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1}(\mathbb{I} - A_j)) = \text{tr}(\mathbb{I}) = d.$$

Therefore, it holds for the selected v_j that

$$v_j^*(\mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1}v_j \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}_j|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_j} v^*(\mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1}v = \frac{d}{m-j}. \quad (11)$$

By the Matrix Determinant Lemma (Lemma 2.4), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\mathbb{I} - A_{j+1}) &= (1 - v_j^*(\mathbb{I} - A_j)^{-1}v_j) \det(\mathbb{I} - A_j) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{d}{m-j}\right) \det(\mathbb{I} - A_j) \\ &\geq \left[\prod_{i=0}^j \left(1 - \frac{d}{m-i}\right)\right] \det(\mathbb{I} - A_0) \\ &= \prod_{i=0}^j \left(1 - \frac{d}{m-i}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows by applying (11) a further j times. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \det(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}) &\geq \sum_{i=0}^{m/2-1} \log \left(1 - \frac{d}{m-i}\right) \\ &\geq \int_{i=0}^{\frac{m}{2}} \log \left(1 - \frac{d}{m-i}\right) di \\ &= \int_{i=0}^{\frac{m}{2}} \log(m-i-d) di - \int_{i=0}^{\frac{m}{2}} \log(m-i) di \\ &= \left[-(m-i-d) \log(m-i-d) + (m-i-d) + (m-i) \log(m-i) - (m-i) \right]_{i=0}^{m/2} \\ &= \left[(m-i-d+d) \log(m-i) - (m-i-d) \log(m-i-d) - d \right]_{i=0}^{m/2} \\ &= \left[d \log(m-i) - (m-i-d) \log \left(1 - \frac{d}{m-i}\right) - d \right]_{i=0}^{m/2} \\ &= d \log \left(\frac{m}{2}\right) - \left(\frac{m}{2} - d\right) \log \left(1 - \frac{2d}{m}\right) - d \log(m) + (m-d) \log \left(1 - \frac{d}{m}\right) \\ &\geq -d \log(2) + \left(\frac{m}{2} - d\right) \frac{2d}{m} - \frac{(m-d)(d/m)}{1 - (d/m)} \\ &= -d \log(2) + d - \frac{2d^2}{m} - d \\ &= -d \log(2) - \frac{2d^2}{m}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows since $\log(1 - d/(m-i))$ is a decreasing function on i , the second equality follows since $\int \log(x-y)dy = -(x-y) \log(x-y) + (x-y) + C$, and for the final inequality we use the fact that $-x/(1-x) \leq \log(1-x) \leq -x$ for all $0 \leq x < 1$. This completes the proof. \square

With this bound on the determinant of $(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2})$, we are able to apply Lemma 2.6 to show that Algorithm 2 also achieves the guarantee given in Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Since $m\alpha = d$, we have that

$$\text{tr}(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}) = d - \frac{m\alpha}{2} = \frac{d}{2}.$$

Then, by Lemma 4.1 and the condition of $m \geq 49d^2$, we have that

$$\log \left[\left(\frac{d}{\text{tr}(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2})} \right)^d \det(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}) \right] \geq d \log(2) - d \log(2) - \frac{2d^2}{m} = -\frac{2d^2}{m} \geq \log \left(\frac{24}{25} \right).$$

Then, let

$$x \triangleq \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{d}{\text{tr}(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2})} \right)^d \det(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2})} \leq \sqrt{1 - \frac{24}{25}} = \frac{1}{5}.$$

By Lemma 2.6, we can bound the condition number of $\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}$ as

$$\kappa(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}) \leq \frac{1+x}{1-x} \leq \frac{3}{2}.$$

Then, we have that

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}) \leq \kappa(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}) \cdot \lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}) \leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{3}{4},$$

and

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2}) \geq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2})}{\kappa(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2})} \geq \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{3}.$$

Since $\lambda_{\max}(A_{m/2}) = 1 - \lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2})$ and $\lambda_{\min}(A_{m/2}) = 1 - \lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{I} - A_{m/2})$, we have that

$$\frac{1}{4} \leq u^* A_{m/2} u \leq \frac{2}{3},$$

for all unit vectors $u \in \mathbb{C}^d$. The time complexity analysis of the algorithm follows the one for Algorithm 1. \square

Finally, as our presented algorithms are based on maximizing the determinant of the constructed matrix A (or $\mathbb{I} - A$) and applying the condition number inequality (Lemma 2.6), we discuss the difference between our technique with a direct application of more general determinant maximisation algorithms. Recall that in the cardinality-based determinant maximisation problem, we are given as input a set of vectors $\mathcal{I} = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and an integer k , and the objective is to find

$$\hat{S} = \arg \max_{\substack{S \subset \mathcal{I} \\ |S| \leq k}} \det \left(\sum_{v \in S} vv^* \right).$$

The state-of-the-art polynomial-time approximation algorithm is presented by Singh and Xie [SX18] and achieves an $\exp(d)$ -approximation of the optimal solution.

By the result of Marcus et al. [MSS15], we know that for any set $\mathcal{I} = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m$ such that $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}} vv^* = \mathbb{I}$ and $\|v_i\| = \alpha$ for all $i \in [m]$, there exists a partition S_1, S_2 of \mathcal{I} such that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbb{I} - \sum_{i \in S_j} v_i v_i^* \right\| \leq 3\sqrt{\alpha}$$

for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Without loss of generality, let $|S_1| \geq |S_2|$. Then, we have that

$$\det \left(\sum_{i \in S_1} v_i v_i^* \right) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - 3\sqrt{\alpha} \right)^{d/2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + 3\sqrt{\alpha} \right)^{d/2} = 2^{-d} \exp \left(-\Theta \left(\frac{d^2}{m} \right) \right).$$

Thus, the guarantee on the determinant given by Lemma 4.1 matches the determinant guarantee implied by [MSS15]. Applying Lemma 2.6, we achieve a non-trivial bound on the eigenvalues of the constructed matrix when $m = \Omega(d^2)$. On the other hand, applying the algorithm by Singh and Xie [SX18] returns a set S such that $\det(\sum_{i \in S} v_i v_i^*) \geq 2^{-d} \exp(-O(d^3/m))$, and gives a non-trivial bound on the eigenvalues of the constructed matrix only when $m = \Omega(d^3)$.

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by EPSRC Early Career Fellowship (EP/T00729X/1) and EPSRC Doctoral Training Studentship (2590711). Part of this work was done when Peter Macgregor and He Sun were visiting the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing in Fall 2023.

References

- [AGSS18] Nima Anari, Shayan Oveis Gharan, Amin Saberi, and Nikhil Srivastava. Approximating the largest root and applications to interlacing families. In *29th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA'18)*, pages 1015–1028, 2018.
- [BKS18] Bernhard Beckermann, Daniel Kressner, and Marcel Schweitzer. Low-rank updates of matrix functions. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 39(1):539–565, 2018.
- [BLP⁺22] Adam Brown, Aditi Laddha, Madhusudhan Pittu, Mohit Singh, and Prasad Tetali. Determinant maximization via matroid intersection algorithms. In *63rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'22)*, pages 255–266, 2022.
- [BLS24] Adam Brown, Aditi Laddha, and Mohit Singh. Maximizing the minimum eigenvalue in constant dimension. *arXiv:2401.14317*, 2024.
- [BSS12] Joshua Batson, Daniel A. Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava. Twice-ramanujan sparsifiers. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(6):1704–1721, 2012.
- [DZ07] Jiu Ding and Aihui Zhou. Eigenvalues of rank-one updated matrices with some applications. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 20(12):1223–1226, 2007.
- [Hig08] Nicholas J. Higham. *Functions of Matrices*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2008.
- [JMS23] Ben Jourdan, Peter Macgregor, and He Sun. Is the algorithmic Kadison-Singer problem hard? In *34th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC'23)*, pages 43:1–43:18, 2023.
- [LS17] Yin Tat Lee and He Sun. An sdp-based algorithm for linear-sized spectral sparsification. In *49th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'17)*, page 678–687, 2017.
- [LS18] Yin Tat Lee and He Sun. Constructing linear-sized spectral sparsification in almost-linear time. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 47(6):2315–2336, 2018.
- [MSS15] Adam W. Marcus, Daniel A. Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava. Interlacing families II: Mixed characteristic polynomials and the Kadison—Singer problem. *Annals of Mathematics*, 182(1):327–350, 2015.
- [MUV⁺97] Jorma Kaarlo Merikoski, Uoti Urpala, Ari Virtanen, Tin-Yau Tam, and Frank Uhlig. A best upper bound for the 2-norm condition number of a matrix. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 254(1):355–365, 1997.
- [NS18] M. Thamban Nair and Arindama Singh. *Linear Algebra*. Springer Singapore, 2018.

- [SX18] Mohit Singh and Weijun Xie. Approximate positive correlated distributions and approximation algorithms for D -optimal design. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA'18)*, pages 2240–2255, 2018.
- [SZ22] Daniel A. Spielman and Peng Zhang. Hardness Results for Weaver’s Discrepancy Problem. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2022)*, volume 245, pages 40:1–40:14, 2022.
- [Wea04] Nik Weaver. The Kadison-Singer problem in discrepancy theory. *Discrete Mathematics*, 278(1-3):227–239, 2004.
- [Wea13] Nik Weaver. The Kadison-Singer problem in discrepancy theory, II. *arXiv:1303.2405*, 2013.
- [WX08] Avi Wigderson and David Xiao. Derandomizing the Ahlswede-Winter matrix-valued Chernoff bound using pessimistic estimators, and applications. *Theory of Computing*, 4(1):53–76, 2008.