

Useful Compact Representations for Data-Fitting*

Johannes J. Brust[†]

Abstract. For minimization problems without 2nd derivative information, methods that estimate Hessian matrices can be very effective. However, conventional techniques generate dense matrices that are prohibitive for large problems. Limited-memory compact representations express the dense arrays in terms of a low rank representation and have become the state-of-the-art for software implementations on large deterministic problems. We develop new compact representations that are parameterized by a choice of vectors and that reduce to existing well known formulas for special choices. We demonstrate effectiveness of the compact representations for large eigenvalue computations, tensor factorizations and nonlinear regressions.

Key words. compact representation, limited-memory, canonical polyadic decomposition, quasi-Newton, trust-region, line-search, SGD, L-BFGS, PSB

MSC codes. 65F05, 65F55, 68U05, 15A23, 15A69, 90C06, 90C15, 90C30, 90C53

1. Introduction. For large-scale data fitting one typically solves problems of the form

$$(1.1) \quad \underset{w \in \mathbb{R}^d}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(w)$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ represents a loss, objective or penalty function and w is a vector of parameters. Often the goal is to match a model's output as closely as possible to certain observed data, and therefore minimize the error between the two. Specific examples are e.g., tensor decompositions that minimize the distance between the factorization and data (Acar, Dunlavy and Kolda [1]), logistic regressions for machine learning (Malouf [29]), or nonlinear least-squares for model calibration in science and engineering (Dennis, Gay and Walsh [19]), among others. Typically, the gradient vector $\nabla f(w) = g(w)$ is available, however higher derivatives are not. Depending on the specific application, a variety of methods emerged as the de-facto standards. Specifically, for large deep neural networks stochastic gradient methods, like Adam (Kingma and Ba [25]) or versions of Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) (see e.g., Ma, Bassily and Belkin [28]) are very effective, as a consequence of the statistical nature of such problems. For nonlinear least-squares, special methods such as NL2SOL of Dennis, Gay and Walsh [20] can be effective, but for general large deterministic minimization tasks the limited memory BFGS (L-BFGS-B), method of Zhu, Byrd and Nocedal [36] is very popular. Because it is applicable to general problems as in eq. (1.1), it is also the go-to-method when computing tensor factorizations through optimization [2]. For large optimization, one typically exploits certain structures of the problem or designs judicious methods in order to effectively handle the large dimensions. For instance, when the problems are large and sparse and 2nd derivatives are available, then sparse Newton methods can converge rapidly, while maintaining efficient computations, (see e.g., Gill, Murray, Saunders and Wright [22] or Coleman [14]).

*Submitted to the editors Spring 2024.

Funding: This work was partially funded by the startup fund at Arizona State University.

[†]School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ (jjbrust@asu.edu).




Figure 1. The low-rank form of a compact representation for a dense Hessian approximation.

These methods are also applicable to large learning problems, such as recommender systems [27]. Yet, in machine learning with very large amounts of data, the objective function typically has an additional structure. Namely, the objective is typically a sum of individual functions that each are associated with an arbitrary data point. Methods that randomly select subsets of the functions at every iteration have proven to be very effective in practice. Therefore, optimization methods that exploit the stochasticity, like variations of Stochastic Gradients [26], are the default techniques in this domain. For dense problems, without stochastic properties, limited-memory quasi-Newton methods are widely used. Even though the underlying problems can have a dense Hessian matrix, a limited memory method estimates this structure with a low-rank representation, known as the so-called *compact representation* (see Fig. 1) An important property is that the compact representation uses $\mathcal{O}(d)$ memory to represent the d^2 elements in the estimate of the Hessian matrix. Because of this decomposition, operations like matrix vector products, linear system solves or eigenvalue computations can be performed with complexity that is linear in the number of variables.

1.1. Notation. We use Householder notation so that lower case greek symbols are scalars, lower Roman letters are column vectors and upper case Roman letters denote matrices: α, a, A . The main iteration index is $k \geq 0$. We denote orthogonal and orthonormal matrices by P and Q , interchangeably. R is reserved for upper triangular matrices, while L and D represent lower triangular and diagonals. At times we will use superscripts on a matrix, to make its relation to another matrix explicit. For instance, L^{VY} represents a lower triangular matrix in relation to V and S . An underline below a matrix Y means that its first column is removed \underline{Y} , while an overline represents the matrix without its first row \overline{Y} . We denote the identity matrix by I with columns e_i , and with dimensions that depend on the context.

2. Unconstrained Optimization. Many of the methods to generate iterates for minimizing eq. 1.1 can be described in terms of a symmetric matrix $B_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, a vector (which is related to the gradient and may be stochastic) h_k , and a set of nonnegative scalars: α_k, σ_k , and δ_k . At times it is most effective to work directly with the inverse $H_k = B_k^{-1}$. The matrix B_k may represent the Hessian of the objective, an estimate thereof, or it could be a diagonal. With this convention, Newton's method, quasi-Newton or gradient based methods like Adam can be described. In the stochastic setting the typical update is of the form

$$(2.1) \quad w_{k+1} = w_k - \alpha_k H_k h_k, \text{ where } h_k \text{ is stochastic.}$$

For instance, by setting in eq. (2.1) the inverse Hessian as the identity $H_k = I$, using a gradient associated with one random data point i.e., $h_k = \nabla f(w_k; \text{“data}_i\text{”}) = g_i(w_k)$, and a small or decreasing α_k yields the Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) iteration. When having nonrandom access to the objective, deterministic nonlinear unconstrained optimization approaches typically use line-searches (e.g. Zhang and Hager [35]) and/or trust-region strategies (e.g., Conn, Gould and Toint [15]). In this setting, typically the vector h_k is equal to the gradient $h_k = g(w_k) = g_k$. The steps in the two respective methods are determined in relation to the scalars: α_k and σ_k :

$$w_{k+1} = w_k - \alpha_k H_k h_k \quad (\text{line-search})$$

$$\text{Solve } (B_k + \sigma_k I) s_k = -h_k \quad (\text{trust-region})$$

$$w_{k+1} = w_k + s_k$$

In line-search methods one determines desirable step lengths by approximately solving the one dimensional problem $\alpha_k = \min_{\alpha} f(w_k - \alpha H_k h_k)$. In trust-region methods one solves a sequence of shifted systems in order find a shift $\sigma \geq 0$ that satisfies: $(B_k + \sigma I) s_k = -h_k$ subject to $\|s_k\| \leq \delta_k$ and $B_k + \sigma I \succeq 0$. There are further details for practical line-search and trust-region methods, but iterates are broadly selected to generate sufficient function reductions. Independent of which strategy is chosen, it is valuable to exploit structure in B_k and its inverse H_k for effective computation. Based on an initial matrix, the family of quasi-Newton methods uses low-rank updates (typically, rank-1 or rank-2) to maintain an estimate of the Hessian or its inverse. In particular, for two d -dimensional vectors and a symmetric initialization a matrix recursion specifies all remaining updates. Traditionally, the vectors and initial matrix have been defined by

$$(2.2) \quad s_k = w_{k+1} - w_k, \quad y_k = g_{k+1} - g_k, \quad H_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \text{ (symmetric)}.$$

However, when the objective function is stochastic, differences between gradients such as $g_{k+1} - g_k$ (or $w_{k+1} - w_k$) may be noisy. Therefore, in such cases further options for how to choose y_k have been introduced by Byrd et al. [11]. It will become clear later that the methods that we propose in this work are independent of the actual choice for s_k and y_k . The recursion of the inverse BFGS [4, 21, 23, 32] matrix is

$$(2.3) \quad H_{k+1} = (I - \rho_k s_k y_k^T) H_k (I - \rho_k y_k s_k^T) + \rho_k s_k s_k^T, \quad \rho_k = \frac{1}{s_k^T y_k}$$

Note that the matrix generated by this process is typically dense, with a pattern like the left hand side of Fig. 1. So long $s_k^T y_k > 0$ for all iterations (and the initialization is positive definite), the sequence of matrices formed in eq. (2.3) are also all positive definite.

2.1. Compact Representation. Remarkably, by unwinding the recursion in eq. (2.3), a closed matrix formula has been shown to exist in Byrd, Nocedal and Schnabel [12]. By collecting the vectors $\{(s_i, y_i)\}_{i=0}^{k-1}$ into matrices and defining a diagonal, a (strictly) lower triangular, and an upper triangular matrix one defines the basic components of this formula

$$(2.4) \quad S_k = [s_0 \quad \dots \quad s_{k-1}], \quad Y_k = [y_0 \quad \dots \quad y_{k-1}],$$

$$(2.5) \quad (D_k)_{ij} = s_i^T y_j \text{ for } i = j, \quad (L_k)_{ij} = s_i^T y_j \text{ for } i > j, \quad (R_k)_{ij} = s_i^T y_j \text{ for } i \leq j$$

With the definitions in eqs. (2.4) and (2.5), a symmetric positive definite initialization and positive $s_i^T y_i > 0$ the compact representation of the matrix recursion (2.3) is [12, Theorem 2.2]:

$$(2.6) \quad H_k = H_0 + \begin{bmatrix} S_k & H_0 Y_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R_k^{-T} (D_k + Y_k^T H_0 Y_k) R_k^{-1} & -R_k^{-T} \\ -R_k^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S_k^T \\ Y_k^T H_0 \end{bmatrix}$$

The main use of this formula is for the limited-memory setting where $l \ll d$ denotes the memory parameter, with typical values around $l = 5$ (see e.g., [9, Section 9]). Then, instead of storing the history of all vectors one limits this to the l most recent pairs $\{(s_i, y_i)\}_{i=k-l}^{k-1}$. Further, typically the initialization is chosen as an adaptive multiple of the identity $H_0^{(k)} = \gamma_k I$, with $\gamma_k = y_{k-1}^T s_{k-1} / y_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}$. Limited-memory methods are frequently used for large-scale problems with many variables (i.e., d can be large), in which the limited-memory matrices $S_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times l}$ and $Y_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times l}$ are tall and very skinny: $S_k = [s_{k-l-1}, \dots, s_{k-1}]$ and $Y_k = [y_{k-l-1}, \dots, y_{k-1}]$. The factorization pattern of a limited-memory representation of eq. (2.6) corresponds to the right hand side of Fig. 1. Besides being useful for constrained problems, the low rank representation is a significant reason why the compact representation is implemented in state-of-the-art software packages, such as KNITRO [13] or L-BFGS-B [36] and large-scale trust-region methods like L-SR1 [5]. Note that to obtain B_k from the compact representation of H_k one can apply the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury inverse to eq. (2.6). Even though the compact representation is derived from unwinding recursive matrix updates, such as in eq. (2.3), the number of known compact representations is modest. A main reason for this is that unwinding the recurrences involves nonlinear matrix relations and terms that may appear unintuitive (see, for example, the inverses in the middle matrix of eq. (2.6)). Nevertheless, the compact representation of the SR-1 update, as well as one of Broyden's updates for systems of nonlinear equations have been derived in [12, Theorems 5.1 & 6.1]. Incidentally, since the DFP (Davidon-Fletcher-Powell) update is dual to the BFGS by interchanging $B_k \leftrightarrow H_k$ and $s_k \leftrightarrow y_k$ in eq. (2.3), also the DFP representation is known. Another well known rank-2 update for the direct Hessian approximation is the Powell-Symmetric-Broyden (PSB) formula

$$(2.7) \quad B_{k+1} = B_k + \frac{(y_k - B_k s_k) s_k^T + s_k (y_k - B_k s_k)^T}{s_k^T y_k} - \frac{(y_k - B_k s_k)^T s_k}{(s_k^T s_k)^2} s_k s_k^T$$

For the PSB recursion, the compact representation has been discovered recently by Kanzow and Steck [24]. Further compact representations for the Broyden class of updates have been developed in DeGuchy, Erway and Marcia [16]. The compact representation of structured BFGS is proposed in Brust et al. [7] and for the multipoint-symmetric secant matrix a representation has been developed in Brudakov et al. [10] and [6]. Because each of the recursive update formulas is unique (with its own advantages), the compact representations, when they exist are also specific to the formula. More universally, in Dennis and Moré [18], two general rank-2 update formulas are proposed that as special cases include the BFGS formula (hence DFP), the PSB update and the multipoint symmetric secant matrix among others. For arbitrary vectors $v_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $c_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$, so long $v_k^T d_k \neq 0$ and $c_k^T s_k \neq 0$ a general rank-2 formula

for the inverse is given by [18, eq. 7.24]

$$(2.8) \quad H_{k+1} = H_k + \frac{(s_k - H_k y_k) v_k^T + v_k (s_k - H_k y_k)^T}{v_k^T y_k} - \frac{(s_k - H_k y_k)^T y_k}{(v_k^T y_k)^2} v_k v_k^T$$

and a general formula for the direct Hessian estimate is [18, eq. 7.9]

$$(2.9) \quad B_{k+1} = B_k + \frac{(y_k - B_k s_k) c_k^T + c_k (y_k - B_k s_k)^T}{c_k^T y_k} - \frac{(y_k - B_k s_k)^T s_k}{(c_k^T s_k)^2} c_k c_k^T$$

It is straightforward to see that when $c_k = s_k$ in eq. (2.9) then this update corresponds to the PSB formula in (2.7). Moreover, it is known that when $v_k = s_k$ in (2.8) then the update reduces to the inverse BFGS formula from eq. (2.3). However, because the updates are parametrized by arbitrary vectors one can easily develop new methods (like, for instance stochastic formulas), by replacing v_k or c_k by other vectors. Nonetheless, to make the formulas usable for large problems more effective representations than the dense formulas in 2.8 and 2.9 are needed. Similar to eqs. (2.4) one can define the matrices

$$(2.10) \quad V_k = [v_0 \ \cdots \ v_{k-1}], \quad C_k = [c_0 \ \cdots \ c_{k-1}].$$

2.2. Contributions. This work develops the compact representations of the dense matrix recurrences in equations 2.8 and 2.9. The representations enable effective limited-memory methods by storing only a small subset of previous vectors. In particular, because the update formulas are defined in terms of arbitrary vectors (i.e, v_k and c_k), the representations enable straightforward development of new methods, just by judiciously choosing particular sets of vectors in the representation. In this way, for instance, stochastic methods can be derived by replacing deterministic quantities by random vectors. Further, we demonstrate how the representations yield efficient eigenvalue computations, which make them viable for line-search as well as trust-region optimization strategies.

3. Compact Representations. To develop the compact representation of eqs. (2.8) and (2.9) we use the subsequent notation: For some matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ we decompose the product $X^T Y$ as

$$(3.1) \quad X^T Y = L^{XY} + R^{XY}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{diag}(X^T Y) = D^{XY},$$

where L^{XY} is the strictly lower triangular part and R^{XY} is the upper triangular part (including the diagonal). These decompositions correspond to the element-wise definitions from eqs. (2.4) and (2.5), by generalizing the $\{s_i\}$'s with $\{x_i\}$'s and using the $\{y_i\}$'s. The only exception of the notation in (3.1) is when $X = S_k$ and $Y = Y_k$, in which case we omit the superscripts to be consistent with the notation in literature and simply write $S_k^T Y_k = L_k + R_k$, with D_k denoting the diagonal. But for any other value, e.g., $X = V_k$ and $Y = Y_k$ we write $V_k^T Y_k = L_k^{VY} + R_k^{VY}$. The result of the compact representation for the first rank-2 formula is stated as Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.1. *Applying the recursive update in eq. (2.8) to a symmetric initialization $H_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, with sequences $\{s_i = w_i - w_{i-1}\}_{i=0}^{k-1}$ and $\{y_i = g_i - g_{i-1}\}_{i=0}^{k-1}$ and arbitrary vectors $\{v_i\}_{i=0}^{k-1}$*

(so long $v_i^T y_i \neq 0$) is equivalent to the compact representation

$$(3.2) \quad H_k = H_0 + [V_k \quad S_k - H_0 Y_k] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{k \times k} & R_k^{VY} \\ (R_k^{VY})^T & R_k + R_k^T - (D_k + Y_k^T H_0 Y_k) \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} V_k^T \\ (S_k - H_0 Y_k)^T \end{bmatrix},$$

where V_k , S_k , Y_k , R_k and D_k are defined in eqs. (2.10), (2.4), (2.5) and R_k^{VY} is the upper triangular part of $V_k^T Y_k$.

Proof. To simplify the expressions, we view the compact representation in eq. (3.2) as

$$(3.3) \quad H_k = H_0 + U_k M_k^{-1} U_k^T,$$

where $U_k = [V_k \quad Z_k]$ and $Z_k = S_k - H_0 Y_k$ with columns $z_i = s_i - H_0 y_i$ and M_k being the middle matrix (e.g., the (1,2) block element is $(M_k)_{12} = R_k^{VY}$ and $(M_k)_{11} = 0_{k \times k}$). The proof is by induction. We start with the base case, $k = 1$. In this case $R_1^{VY} = v_0^T y_0$, $D_1 = s_0^T y_0$ and $R_1 = s_0^T y_0$, and the middle matrix M_1 from eq. (3.3) becomes

$$M_1^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & v_0^T y_0 \\ y_0^T v_0 & s_0^T y_0 - y_0^T H_0 y_0 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \frac{-1}{(v_0^T y_0)^2} \begin{bmatrix} s_0^T y_0 - y_0^T H_0 y_0 & -v_0^T y_0 \\ -y_0^T v_0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Using the latter expression for M_1^{-1} and $U_1 = [v_0 \quad z_0]$, the product $U_1 M_1^{-1} U_1^T$ is

$$U_1 M_1^{-1} U_1^T = -\frac{s_0^T y_0 - y_0^T H_0 y_0}{(y_0^T v_0)^2} v_0 v_0^T + \frac{v_0 z_0^T}{y_0^T v_0} + \frac{z_0 v_0^T}{y_0^T v_0}.$$

Substituting $z_0 = s_0 - H_0 y_0$ and adding the initial matrix, one can see that

$$H_1 = H_0 + U_1 M_1^{-1} U_1^T = H_0 - \frac{s_0^T y_0 - y_0^T H_0 y_0}{(y_0^T v_0)^2} v_0 v_0^T + \frac{v_0 (s_0 - H_0 y_0)^T}{y_0^T v_0} + \frac{(s_0 - H_0 y_0) v_0^T}{y_0^T v_0}$$

The last equality for H_1 is the same as the recursive update formula in eq. (2.8), and therefore the compact formula holds in the base case. Assuming that the representation in eq. (3.3) is true for some $k \geq 1$, we now show that applying the rank-2 update in eq. (2.8) yields the representation at index $k + 1$. We start with the vector $s_k - H_k y_k$:

$$(3.4) \quad s_k - H_k y_k = s_k - (H_0 + U_k M_k^{-1} U_k^T) y_k = s_k - H_0 y_k - U_k M_k^{-1} U_k^T y_k = z_k - U_k M_k^{-1} U_k^T y_k,$$

where $z_k = s_k - H_0 y_k$. Next define the scalars

$$(3.5) \quad \rho_k = v_k^T y_k, \quad \beta_k = y_k^T z_k, \quad \theta_k = y_k^T (s_k - H_k y_k) = \beta_k - y_k^T U_k M_k^{-1} U_k^T y_k.$$

We now substitute eqs. (3.4), (3.5) and (3.3) into the recursive formula eq. (2.8) in order to

rewrite it in terms of the compact representation

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{k+1} &= H_k + \frac{(s_k - H_k y_k) v_k^T + v_k (s_k - H_k y_k)^T}{v_k^T y_k} - \frac{(s_k - H_k y_k)^T y_k}{(v_k^T y_k)^2} v_k v_k^T \\
&= H_k + \frac{(z_k - U_k M_k^{-1} U_k^T y_k) v_k^T + v_k (z_k - U_k M_k^{-1} U_k^T y_k)^T}{v_k^T y_k} - \frac{(s_k - H_k y_k)^T y_k}{(v_k^T y_k)^2} v_k v_k^T \\
&= H_k + \frac{1}{\rho_k} \left([U_k \quad v_k \quad z_k] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{2k \times 2k} & -M_k^{-1} U_k^T y_k & 0_{2k \times 1} \\ -y_k^T U_k M_k^{-1} & 0 & 1 \\ 0_{1 \times 2k} & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U_k^T \\ v_k^T \\ z_k^T \end{bmatrix} \right) - \frac{\theta_k}{\rho_k^2} v_k v_k^T \\
(3.6) \quad &= H_0 + [U_k \quad v_k \quad z_k] \begin{bmatrix} M_k^{-1} & -\frac{1}{\rho_k} M_k^{-1} U_k^T y_k & 0_{2k \times 1} \\ -\frac{1}{\rho_k} y_k^T U_k M_k^{-1} & -\frac{\theta_k}{\rho_k} & \frac{1}{\rho_k} \\ 0_{1 \times 2k} & \frac{1}{\rho_k} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U_k^T \\ v_k^T \\ z_k^T \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Next we compute an inverse representation of the block 3×3 middle matrix in (3.6) by inverting its upper $(2k+1) \times (2k+1)$ block first

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_k^{-1} & -\frac{1}{\rho_k} M_k^{-1} U_k^T y_k \\ -\frac{1}{\rho_k} y_k^T U_k M_k^{-1} & -\frac{\theta_k}{\rho_k} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_k - \frac{1}{\beta_k} U_k^T y_k y_k^T U_k & -\frac{\rho_k}{\beta_k} U_k^T y_k \\ -\frac{\rho_k}{\beta_k} y_k^T U_k & -\frac{\rho_k^2}{\beta_k} \end{bmatrix}^{-1}$$

Therefore, eq. (3.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{k+1} &= H_0 + [U_k \quad v_k \quad z_k] \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} M_k^{-1} & -\frac{1}{\rho_k} M_k^{-1} U_k^T y_k & 0_{2k \times 1} \\ -\frac{1}{\rho_k} y_k^T U_k M_k^{-1} & -\frac{\theta_k}{\rho_k} & \frac{1}{\rho_k} \\ \hline 0_{1 \times 2k} & \frac{1}{\rho_k} & 0 \end{array} \right] \begin{bmatrix} U_k^T \\ v_k^T \\ z_k^T \end{bmatrix} \\
&= H_0 + [U_k \quad v_k \quad z_k] \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} \left[M_k - \frac{1}{\beta_k} U_k^T y_k y_k^T U_k & -\frac{\rho_k}{\beta_k} U_k^T y_k \right]^{-1} & 0_{2k \times 1} \\ -\frac{\rho_k}{\beta_k} y_k^T U_k & -\frac{\rho_k^2}{\beta_k} & \frac{1}{\rho_k} \\ \hline 0_{1 \times 2k} & \frac{1}{\rho_k} & 0 \end{array} \right] \begin{bmatrix} U_k^T \\ v_k^T \\ z_k^T \end{bmatrix} \\
(3.7) \quad &= H_0 + [U_k \quad v_k \quad z_k] \begin{bmatrix} M_k & 0_{2k \times 1} & U_k^T y_k \\ 0_{1 \times 2k} & 0 & \rho_k \\ y_k^T U_k & \rho_k & \beta_k \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} U_k^T \\ v_k^T \\ z_k^T \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Next we recall that $U_k = [V_k \quad Z_k]$, and decompose M_k into 2×2 blocks, with $(M_k)_{ij}, 1 \leq$

$i, j \leq 2$. Hence, the expression from (3.7) is

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.8) \quad H_{k+1} &= H_0 + \begin{bmatrix} U_k & v_k & z_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_k & 0_{2k \times 1} & U_k^T y_k \\ 0_{1 \times 2k} & 0 & \rho_k \\ y_k^T U_k & \rho_k & \beta_k \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} U_k^T \\ v_k^T \\ z_k^T \end{bmatrix} \\
&= H_0 + \begin{bmatrix} V_k & Z_k & v_k & z_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (M_k)_{11} & (M_k)_{12} & 0_{k \times 1} & V_k^T y_k \\ (M_k)_{21} & (M_k)_{22} & 0_{k \times 1} & Z_k^T y_k \\ 0_{1 \times k} & 0_{1 \times k} & 0 & \rho_k \\ y_k^T V_k & y_k^T Z_k & \rho_k & \beta_k \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} V_k^T \\ Z_k^T \\ v_k^T \\ z_k^T \end{bmatrix} \\
&= H_0 + \begin{bmatrix} V_k & v_k & Z_k & z_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (M_k)_{11} & 0_{k \times 1} & (M_k)_{12} & V_k^T y_k \\ 0_{1 \times k} & 0 & 0_{1 \times k} & \rho_k \\ (M_k)_{21} & 0_{k \times 1} & (M_k)_{22} & Z_k^T y_k \\ y_k^T V_k & \rho_k & y_k^T Z_k & \beta_k \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} V_k^T \\ v_k^T \\ Z_k^T \\ z_k^T \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $Z_k = S_k - H_0 Y_k$, $z_k = s_k - H_0 y_k$, $\rho_k = v_k^T y_k$ and $\beta_k = z_k^T y_k = (s_k - H_0 y_k)^T y_k$ we now verify the form of the matrices for $k+1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{bmatrix} V_k & v_k \end{bmatrix} &= V_{k+1} \\
\begin{bmatrix} Z_k & z_k \end{bmatrix} &= Z_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} S_k - H_0 Y_k & s_k - H_0 y_k \end{bmatrix} = S_{k+1} - H_0 Y_{k+1} \\
\begin{bmatrix} (M_k)_{11} & 0_{k \times 1} \\ 0_{1 \times k} & 0 \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{k \times k} & 0_{k \times 1} \\ 0_{1 \times k} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = 0_{(k+1) \times (k+1)} \\
\begin{bmatrix} (M_k)_{21} & 0_{k \times 1} \\ y_k^T V_k & \rho_k \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} (R_k^{VY})^T & \\ y_k^T V_k & y_k^T v_k \end{bmatrix} = (R_{k+1}^{VY})^T \\
\begin{bmatrix} (M_k)_{12} & V_k^T y_k \\ 0_{1 \times k} & \rho_k \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} (R_k^{VY}) & V_k^T y_k \\ & y_k^T v_k \end{bmatrix} = R_{k+1}^{VY} \\
\begin{bmatrix} (M_k)_{22} & Z_k^T y_k \\ y_k^T Z_k & \beta_k \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} R_k + R_k^T - (D_k + Y_k^T H_0 Y_k) & (S_k - H_0 Y_k)^T y_k \\ y_k^T (S_k - H_0 Y_k) & y_k^T (s_k - H_0 y_k) \end{bmatrix} = R_{k+1} + R_{k+1}^T - (D_{k+1} + Y_{k+1}^T H_0 Y_{k+1})
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from eq. (3.8) and the matrices at $k+1$ the compact representation in eq. (3.3) becomes

$$H_{k+1} = H_0 + U_{k+1} M_{k+1}^{-1} U_{k+1}^T,$$

with $U_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} V_{k+1} & Z_{k+1} \end{bmatrix}$ and the corresponding blocks for M_{k+1} . The explicit components are given in eq. (3.2), completing the induction. \blacksquare

We note a few further observations about the compact representation in eq. (3.2). In a direct implementation one stores and updates a few matrices that grow with $k \geq 1$, and uses a constant initialization. We will describe the updating techniques in more detail in [subsection 3.3](#), but focus here on general memory properties. Suppose that $H_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a constant diagonal, with d nonzeros. Moreover, suppose one stores and updates $V_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$, $Z_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ (where $z_i = s_i - H_0 y_i$), and the triangular matrices $R_k^{VY} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ and $R_k^{ZY} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$.

Storing these quantities accounts for all terms of the compact representation, because $D_k^{ZZT} = \text{diag}(R_k^{ZY})$ and $R_k + R_k^T - (D_k + Y_k^T H_0 Y_k) = R_k^{ZY} + (R_k^{ZY})^T - D_k^{ZY}$. The memory of eq. (3.2) with this storage scheme is

$$(3.9) \quad d + 2dk + 2 \left(\frac{k(k+1)}{2} \right) = \mathcal{O}(2(kd + k^2/2))$$

For large and difficult problems, where d is large and many iterations k are computed the memory complexity of eq. (3.9) is not practical. However, for such situations, a limited-memory technique can be efficiently implemented with the compact representation. The initialization is typically chosen as a multiple of the identity, which is updated each iteration $H_k^{(0)} = \gamma_k I$, $\gamma_k \in \mathbb{R}$. Because the initialization changes every iteration V_k , S_k and Y_k have to be stored separately. However, for a small constant memory parameter $l \ll d$ (say, $l = 5$), the matrices V_k , S_k and Y_k are stored and are defined only by the l most recent updates, hence each being of size ld . The limited memory sizes of R_k^{VY} , R_k and Y_k^{YY} (the upper triangular part of $Y_k^T Y_k$) are $\frac{(l+1)l}{2}$, respectively. Therefore, the storage of the limited memory compact representation in eq. (3.2) is independent of k and is given by

$$(3.10) \quad 1 + 3ld + 3 \left(\frac{l(l+1)}{2} \right) = \mathcal{O}(3(ld + l^2/2))$$

Since $l \ll d$ for most practical applications, the memory requirement is linear (a small constant multiple) in the size of the problem, i.e., $\mathcal{O}(3ld)$. This setting corresponds to the factored form in the right hand side of Fig. 1. In addition, note that the middle matrix in the compact representation eq. (3.2) can also be expressed with its explicit inverse

$$(3.11) \quad M_k^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -(R_k^{VY})^{-T} (R_k + R_k^T - (D_k + Y_k^T H_0 Y_k)) (R_k^{VY})^{-1} & (R_k^{VY})^{-T} \\ (R_k^{VY})^{-1} & 0_{k \times k} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(3.12) \quad M_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{k \times k} & R_k^{VY} \\ (R_k^{VY})^T & R_k + R_k^T - (D_k + Y_k^T H_0 Y_k) \end{bmatrix}$$

(To verify these identities, compute e.g., $M_k^{-1} M_k = I$). The explicit inverse in eq. (3.11) shows that solves with M_k^{-1} can be computed efficiently with solves of two triangular matrices $(R_k^{VY})^T$ and R_k^{VY} , and overall multiplication complexity of $\mathcal{O}(l^2)$. Furthermore, because $(R_k^{VY})_{ii} = v_i^T y_i$ and R_k^{VY} is upper triangular, eq. (3.11) implies that $v_i^T y_i \neq 0$ is a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of the compact representation in eq. (3.2). As a useful by-product we can use the derivations for Theorem 3.1 to deduce the compact representation of the recursive update formula for the direct Hessian approximation B_k in eq. (2.9). The following theorem is symmetric to the previous result:

Theorem 3.2. *Applying the recursive update in eq. (2.9) to a symmetric initialization $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, with sequences $\{y_i = g_i - g_{i-1}\}_{i=0}^{k-1}$ and $\{s_i = w_i - w_{i-1}\}_{i=0}^{k-1}$ and arbitrary vectors $\{c_i\}_{i=0}^{k-1}$ (so long $c_i^T s_i \neq 0$) is equivalent to the compact representation*

$$(3.13) \quad B_k = B_0 + [C_k \quad Y_k - B_0 S_k] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{k \times k} & R_k^{CS} \\ (R_k^{CS})^T & R_k + R_k^T - (D_k + S_k^T B_0 S_k) \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} C_k^T \\ (Y_k - B_0 S_k)^T \end{bmatrix},$$

where C_k, S_k, Y_k, R_k and D_k are defined in eqs. (2.10), (2.4), (2.5) and R_k^{CS} is the upper triangular part of $C_k^T S_k$.

Proof. Observe that the recursive update for B_{k+1} in eq. (2.9) can be obtained from eq. (2.8) by interchanging $H_k \leftrightarrow B_k$, $y_k \leftrightarrow s_k$ and $v_k \leftrightarrow c_k$. We now apply the same changes to the compact representation in eq. (3.2). Specifically, $H_0 \leftrightarrow B_0$, $Y_k \leftrightarrow S_k$ and $V_k \leftrightarrow C_k$ gives the representation in eq. (3.13). ■

We note that when $C_k = S_k$ in (3.13) then this representation reduces to the PSB compact representation.

3.1. Implications. We develop further consequences of the compact representations in this section. Initially we focus on the inverse representation from eq. (3.2), since many results carry over to the direct factorization in eq. (3.13) by symmetrically interchanging variables. Moreover, most proofs are given in the appendix in order to avoid distraction from the main observations. First, for limited-memory implementations it is standard to use a multiple of the identity initialization that dynamically varies for every iteration, $H_k^{(0)} = \gamma_k I$. In this situation, and whenever the initialization dynamically changes, one has to store S_k and Y_k separately in order to define $S_k - H_k^{(0)} Y_k$. However, it can be desirable to not form $S_k - H_k^{(0)} Y_k$ explicitly (see e.g. [24], [8, Theorem 2]). The main approach to achieve this, is by expressing $S_k - H_k^{(0)} Y_k$ as a product

$$S_k - H_k^{(0)} Y_k = \begin{bmatrix} S_k & H_k^{(0)} Y_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ -I \end{bmatrix}$$

In a Corollary to Theorem 3.2 we describe a formulation that decouples $S_k - H_k^{(0)} Y_k$, by storing S_k and $H_k^{(0)} Y_k$ with a non-constant initialization $H_k^{(0)}$.

Corollary 3.3. *An alternative to the compact representation in Theorem 3.2 with $H_0 = H_k^{(0)}$ and M_k^{-1} in (3.11) is given by*

$$(3.14) \quad H_k = H_k^{(0)} + \begin{bmatrix} V_k & S_k & | & H_k^{(0)} Y_k \end{bmatrix} \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \begin{bmatrix} M_k^{-1} \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} -(R_k^{VY})^{-T} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \hline \begin{bmatrix} -(R_k^{VY})^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} & 0 \end{array} \right] \begin{bmatrix} V_k^T \\ S_k^T \\ Y_k^T H_k^{(0)} \end{bmatrix}$$

Proof. The proof is in appendix A. ■

Corollary 3.3 separates S_k from $H_0 Y_k$, but it also establishes a connection to the inverse BFGS compact representation from eq. (2.6), because it also stores S_k and $H_0 Y_k$ as the BFGS representation does. In fact, when $V_k = S_k$ the representation in Corollary 3.3 (and hence Theorem 3.2) is equivalent to the compact representation of the BFGS formula:

Corollary 3.4. *By choosing $V_k = S_k$ in eqs. (3.14) or equivalently (3.2) the representation reduces to the compact BFGS formula in eq. (2.6).*

Proof. The proof is in the supplemental materials. ■

Recall, since V_k can be determined by choice other representations can therefore be designed by substituting for this matrix. For instance, when $v_k = y_k$ in the recursive update

k	Error 1	Error 2
1	5.63e-16	5.17e-16
2	1.17e-15	9.15e-16
3	6.88e-16	1.12e-15
4	1.2e-15	1.28e-15
5	1.75e-15	1.47e-15
6	1.64e-15	1.69e-15
7	2.74e-15	2.06e-15
8	3.6e-15	2.58e-15

Table 1

Differences between the recursive rank-2 update eq. (2.8), H_k^R with $v_k = y_k$ and the compact representation in Corollary 3.5, H_k^C . Error 1 denotes the residual $\|H_k^C y_{k-1} - s_{k-1}\|_2$, and Error 2 is the difference $\|H_k^C - H_k^R\|_F$.

eq. (2.8) then this formula is known as Greenstadt's update. However, to the best of our knowledge, no compact representation for this update has been discovered yet. In corollary 3.5 we describe the compact representation for this recursion.

Corollary 3.5. *The compact representation of the recursive update (2.8) with $v_k = y_k$, also known as Greenstadt's formula [18, Section 7.3], is given by*

$$(3.15) \quad H_k = H_0 + [S_k \quad H_0 Y_k] N_k^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} S_k^T \\ Y_k^T H_0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(3.16) \quad N_k = \begin{bmatrix} R_k + R_k^T - (D_k + Y_k^T H_0 Y_k) + R_k^{YY} + (R_k^{YY})^T & (R_k^{YY})^T \\ R_k^{YY} & 0_{k \times k} \end{bmatrix},$$

where S_k, Y_k, R_k and D_k are defined in eqs. (2.4) and (2.5) and R_k^{YY} is the upper triangular part of $Y_k^T Y_k$.

Proof. The proof is in appendix B. ■

Because the compact formula in eq. (3.16) is new we verify the validity of it by comparing it to the recursive update from eq. (2.8) in Table 1.

3.2. Eigendecomposition. For limited-memory methods it is common to use a multiple of the identity initialization $B_k^{(0)} = (H_k^{(0)})^{-1} = \gamma_k^{-1} I$ so that the compact representation (e.g., for the direct Hessian) can be viewed as

$$(3.17) \quad B_k = B_k^{(0)} + J_k K_k^{-1} J_k^T = \frac{1}{\gamma_k} I + J_k K_k^{-1} J_k^T,$$

where J_k and K_k are specified by appropriate formulae (for instance, eq. (3.13)). Nonetheless, J_k is typically very tall and skinny with dimension, say $d \times 2l$ and $l \ll d$. Hence, K_k is a small symmetric square of size $2l \times 2l$. We suppress the iteration index for the moment, and assume that J is of size $d \times 2l$. It is possible to exploit the representation in eq. (3.17) in order to

compute and *implicit* eigendecomposition with complexity that is linear in d . Suppose the “thin” QR factorization of J is $J = QR$ (at about $\mathcal{O}(4dl^2)$ multiplications). Then compute a small eigendecomposition of $RK^{-1}R^T$ at $\mathcal{O}(16l^3)$ multiplications

$$RK^{-1}R^T = \widehat{P}\widehat{\Lambda}\widehat{P}^T,$$

where $\widehat{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{2l \times 2l}$ is orthogonal and $\widehat{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{2l \times 2l}$ is diagonal. Define the thin orthonormal matrix $P_{(1)} = Q\widehat{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 2l}$ and also its orthogonal complement $P_{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times (d-2l)}$ (so that $P_{(2)}^T P_{(1)} = 0$ and $P_{(2)}^T P_{(2)} = I$). Note that the factors of $P_{(1)}$, i.e., Q and \widehat{P} are explicitly computed, however the potentially very large $P_{(2)}$ is never formed (it is only defined implicitly). Denote the eigenvalues corresponding to the eigenvectors in $P_{(1)}$ by

$$\lambda_i = \widehat{\lambda}_i + \frac{1}{\gamma}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq 2l,$$

and the remaining eigenvalues corresponding to the eigenvectors in $P_{(2)}$ by

$$\lambda_i = \frac{1}{\gamma}, \quad 2l + 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

Representing the orthogonal matrix $P = [P_{(1)} \ P_{(2)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and the diagonal matrix of λ_i 's as $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d) = \text{blkdiag}(\Lambda_{(1)}, \frac{1}{\gamma}I) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, the eigendecomposition of B is

$$(3.18) \quad B = \frac{1}{\gamma}I + JKJ^T = \frac{1}{\gamma}I + QRKR^TQ^T = \frac{1}{\gamma}I + Q\widehat{P}\widehat{\Lambda}\widehat{P}^TQ^T = P\Lambda P^T$$

The factorization in eq. (3.18) is implicit, because $P_{(2)}$ is never fully computed. Since, $\frac{1}{\gamma}$ is a repeated eigenvalue corresponding to the eigenspace of $P_{(2)}$ one can compute the scaled projections $\frac{1}{\gamma}P_{(2)}P_{(2)}^T$ using the available $P_{(1)} = Q\widehat{P}$ only

$$\frac{1}{\gamma}P_{(2)}P_{(2)}^T = \frac{1}{\gamma}(I - P_{(1)}P_{(1)}^T) = \frac{1}{\gamma}(I - QQ^T).$$

This latter identity uses the orthogonality of P , that is $I = PP^T = P_{(1)}P_{(1)}^T + P_{(2)}P_{(2)}^T$. For limited memory methods with large d and small l , the main computational cost in computing the implicit eigendecomposition of the compact representation is a thin QR factorization with linear complexity in the dimension of the problem. Therefore, the eigendecomposition can be computed efficiently. Especially, for trust-region optimization methods computing the eigendecomposition is useful, because it enables effective shifting strategies that ensure positive definiteness of the matrix.

3.3. Limited-Memory Updating. For large problems, limited-memory approaches store only a small number of vectors to define the representations. Depending on the initialization strategy, specifically whether $H_k^{(0)}$ varies between iterations or is constant the matrices can be stored and updated in different ways (see the discussion following [Theorem 3.1](#)). We will describe some general techniques that apply to any initialization strategy in this section. By

setting the parameter $l \ll d$ limited-memory techniques enable inexpensive computations, and replace or insert one column at each iteration in Y_k , S_k and V_k . Let an underline below a matrix represent the matrix with its first column removed. That is, \underline{S}_k represents S_k without its first column. With this notation, a column update of a matrix, say S_k , by a vector s_k is defined as follows.

$$\text{colUpdate}(S_k, s_k) \equiv \begin{cases} [S_k \ s_k] & \text{if } k < l \\ [\underline{S}_k \ s_k] & \text{if } k \geq l. \end{cases}$$

This column update can be implemented efficiently, without copying large amounts of memory, by appropriately updating the relevant index information. Certain matrix products can also be efficiently updated. As such, products like $S_k^T Y_k$ do not have to be re-computed from scratch. In order to describe the matrix product updating mechanism, let an overline above a matrix represent the matrix with its first row removed. That is, $\overline{S_k^T Y_k}$ represents $S_k^T Y_k$ without its first row. With this notation, a product update of, say $S_k^T Y_k$, by matrices S_k , Y_k and vectors s_k , y_k is defined as:

$$\text{prodUpdate}(S_k^T Y_k, S_k, Y_k, s_k, y_k) \equiv \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} S_k^T Y_k & S_k^T y_k \\ s_k^T Y_k & s_k^T y_k \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } k < l \\ \begin{bmatrix} \overline{S_k^T Y_k} & \underline{S_k^T y_k} \\ s_k^T \underline{Y_k} & s_k^T y_k \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } k \geq l. \end{cases}$$

This product update can be implemented without recomputing potentially large multiplications, by storing previous products and information about the column order in S_k and Y_k . In particular, updating the matrix product can be done by storing $S_k^T Y_k$, S_k , Y_k and an appropriate vector of indices. Note that such a product update is computationally much more efficient, than recomputing the product from scratch. Specifically, when $l \leq k$, the direct product $S_k^T Y_k$ is done at $\mathcal{O}(l^2 d)$ multiplications. However, an implementation of “prodUpdate” does this update with $\mathcal{O}(2ld)$ multiplications, by reusing previous values represented by $\overline{S_k^T Y_k}$. Moreover, when the product is symmetric, e.g. prodUpdate is invoked by e.g., $\text{prodUpdate}(S_k^T S_k, S_k, S_k, s_k, s_k)$, then $\underline{S_k^T s_k}$ can be stored and reused in two places (thus only one matrix-vector product is needed, instead of two). Updates to diagonal, lower or upper triangular matrices can be described in a similar way. For instance, an update to the upper triangular matrix R_k can be computed via: $\text{prodUpdate}(R_k, S_k, 0, 0, y_k)$. These updating techniques ensure that limited-memory computations retain their linear complexity with regards to problem dimension.

4. Numerical Experiments. In a set of numerical experiments we demonstrate the efficacy of the compact representations for a series of data fitting tasks. A dedicated implementation of the corresponding algorithms is content for future research. The methods are implemented in MATLAB and Python 3 on a linux machine with intel 13th Gen Intel Core i9-13900KS (24 cores) processor and 128 GiB RAM. All software is available in the public domain <https://github.com/johannesbrust/CR>




Figure 2. Computing the eigenvalues of a compact representation in an optimization algorithm for the Rosenbrock function with $d = 2^3, 2^4, \dots, 2^{13}$. Using `eig` [33] scales cubically, while a thin QR algorithm grows linearly with problem size (left figure blue axis). The magnitude of the errors remains low: $\text{error} = (\sum_{i=1}^d (\lambda_i^{\text{eig}} - \lambda_i^{\text{qr}})^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}/d$ (left figure red axis). For $d = 2^9$ the first 8 eigenvalues are computed using `eig` and the proposed QR approach in the right hand figure.

4.1. Eigenfactorization. This experiment demonstrates the scalability of eigenfactorizations with the proposed representations. To generate relevant matrices, we apply an optimization algorithm combined with the compact representation from eq. (2.6) with $V_k = S_k$ to the even Rosenbrock function

$$f(w) = \sum_{i=1}^{d/2} 100(w_{2i-1}^2 - w_{2i})^2 + (w_{2i-1} - 1)^2$$

We compute the eigenvalues of the compact representation using a thin QR factorization as described in Sec. 3.2. The dimensions are $d \in \{2^3, 2^4, \dots, 2^{13}\}$, and the limited-memory parameter is $l = 5$. At iteration $k = 10$ the eigenfactorization is computed by `eig` [33] and by the thin QR factorization. We record the time for each of the approaches and the corresponding errors in Figure 2. Since trust-region algorithms may use eigenvalues to compute subproblem solutions, and the factorizations scale favorably with problem dimensions, the compact representation appears well suited for large trust-region strategies.

4.2. Tensor fitting. In this experiment we use the compact representation to compute tensor factorizations. In particular, we compute the Canonical polyadic decomposition (CP decomposition) with a given target rank r . The decomposition for a tensor in $\mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times \dots \times d_m}$ is

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{A} = \sum_{i=1}^r a_{d_1} \otimes a_{d_2} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{d_m}$$

This generalizes a low rank matrix approximation to higher order tensors. In order to fit the factorization to a given data tensor $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ a nonlinear least-squares objective is effective




Figure 3. The compact representation and algorithm *l-bfgs-b* are used to fit CP tensors.

$\min \|\widehat{\mathcal{A}} - \mathcal{A}\|_F$. Because of the nonlinear form of the factorization, however, the problem is typically nonconvex and multiple local solutions exist. An optimization solver of choice for this fitting problem is L-BFGS [1]. We use the compact representation with $V_k = S_k$ in a strong Wolfe line-search to compute the tensor factorization. The limited-memory parameter is $l = 5$ and the stopping condition is $\|g_k\|_\infty \leq 1 \times 10^{-5}$ for all solvers. We use the Tensor Toolbox (Sandia Natl Labs & MathSci.ai) [2] to generate the problems; the data tensors are of size $250 \times 250 \times 250$ and the target rank is $r = 2$. The default optimization solver in the toolbox is L-BFGS-B [36] with a wrapper of the C implementation from [3]. Five hundred tensor factorizations are solved for which we record the results. Figure 3 shows the distributions of the final fitted objective values and the number of function evaluations. Using the compact solver results in a slightly higher frequency of lowest objective values (and therefore more robust tensor reconstructions). Our compact implementation is effective in terms of total function evaluations (Figure 3 right hand plot), which can be the main computational cost for large tensors.

4.3. A Multiclass model. In this experiment we implement a model, as well as stochastic minimization algorithms for a multiclass logistic regression of the images in the MNIST dataset [17]. In particular, the model should predict the correct label for a handwritten digit as accurately as possible. Each of the images corresponds to an 28×28 pixel array, X_i . Each label is a digit, $y_i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 9\}$. The MNIST dataset contains $N = 60,000$ images and labels as part of its training set. There are another 10,000 pairs for a testset. A conventional model first transforms the images into vectors $X_i \rightarrow x_i$ where each vector is in $\mathbb{R}^{28^2 \times 1}$ (e.g., by stacking the array columns onto each other) and then applies a parameter matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{10 \times 28^2}$ to the image Wx_i . In order for the model to use something that resembles probabilities one uses element-wise exponentiation to obtain nonnegative values. Specifically, the probability

that the i^{th} image has label y_i is modeled by

$$\frac{e^{[Wx_i]_{y_i+1}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{10} e^{[Wx_i]_j}}$$

By applying the natural log to these probabilities and summing over all data points the loss and corresponding fitting problem is given by

$$(4.2) \quad \underset{W}{\text{minimize}} \sum_{i=1}^N \ln \left(\sum_{j=1}^{10} e^{[Wx_i]_j} \right) - [Wx_i]_{y_i+1}$$

The minimization problem in eq. (4.2) is of the form $\min \sum_i f_i(W)$ with appropriate f_i . In order to implement an (stochastic) optimization algorithm one typically computes a gradient with respect to the parameters represented as a vector. Thus we reparametrize the weight matrix as a vector $W \rightarrow w$ and then find the corresponding gradient $\nabla_w f_i$. Note that these gradients can also be used if a mini-batch method is used with subsampled gradients

$$\frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} \nabla_w f_{i_j},$$

and where N_i is the size of the i^{th} batch and the indices occur exactly once in the whole data set $i_j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Using minibatch techniques results in stochastic problems, since every function evaluation is based on a (random) subset of the whole dataset. This means that traditional methods, such as line-search algorithms, are typically not advisable, because they rely on deterministic changes in function values. For a stochastic variation of the compact representation, we fix a constant learning rate (step size), $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ at every iteration and update the iterates as $w_{k+1} = w_k + \alpha p_k$. The step p_k is computed via the compact representation $p_k = H_k \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} -\nabla_w f_{i_j} / N_i \right)$ from [Theorem 3.1](#). We set a minibatch size of $N_i = 256$, which means that every epoch (i.e, a pass over all N data pairs) contains $235 = \text{ceil}(N/N_i)$ batches. For a starting vector of all zeros, we run stochastic gradient descent (sgd), and two compact representations with $v_k = s_k$ and $v_k = y_k$. Because of the stochastic properties of the problem we set the initialization to be a constant identity $H_k^{(0)} = I$ and the memory parameter to $l = 1$. [Figure 4](#) displays the results of minimizing the training loss, and the accuracy for the test set.

4.4. A Second Multiclass model. The Fashion MNIST dataset [\[34\]](#) is considered to be more detailed when compared to the MNIST dataset. Like MNIST it consists of $N = 60,000$ images and labels as part of its training set and another 10,000 pairs for a testset. However, the images are greyscale pictures of 10 fashion items from the online retailer Zalando and can be harder to distinguish from each other. We use a fully connected neural network with one hidden layer (size 512×512), input layer (784×512) and output layer (512×10) to process each of the vectorized images with $784 = 28 * 28$ pixels. We interface the compact solver with the PyTorch library for machine learning [\[30\]](#). SGD and the compact solver with $v_k = y_k$ and $l = 5$ are used to train the model. Since using a larger memory value can be considered as a

solver	result	epoch									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
sgd	loss	0.566	0.487	0.466	0.457	0.618	0.421	0.406	0.412	0.373	0.437
	acc.	78.40%	81.50%	83.20%	84.00%	81.10%	84.60%	85.20%	85.20%	86.70%	84.90%
compact	loss	0.472	0.415	0.397	0.383	0.381	0.365	0.361	0.368	0.368	0.367
	acc.	82.50%	84.60%	85.80%	86.20%	86.30%	86.90%	87.30%	87.40%	87.50%	87.80%

Table 2

Comparison of sgd [30] and a compact representation algorithm on Fashion MNIST.




Figure 4. Two compact representation algorithms and sgd [31] are used on a stochastic machine learning model.

form of regularization the compact solver can enable a larger learning rate α . The algorithms are tested with a minibatch size of 64, 10 epochs and a learning rate of 0.5.

5. Conclusion. This manuscript develops compact representations for two general recursive rank-2 matrix updates. Limited-memory techniques can be efficiently implemented on top of the representations so that computations scale linearly with the problem dimensions. By making special choices for the vector parameters, we draw connections with known representations and enable the development of new methods by a simple substitution for the relevant vectors. The methods scale well on large eigenvalue computations and appear effective for tensor factorization and regression tasks.

Appendix A. Proof of Corollary 3.3.

Proof. In order to derive eq. (3.14) in Corollary 3.3 first represent $\begin{bmatrix} V_k & S_k - H_k^{(0)} Y_k \end{bmatrix}$ from eq. (3.2) as a product

$$\begin{bmatrix} V_k & S_k - H_k^{(0)} Y_k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} V_k & S_k & H_k^{(0)} Y_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & & \\ & I & \\ & & -I \end{bmatrix}$$

The inverse of the middle matrix in eq. (3.2), i.e. M_k^{-1} , has an explicit expression as a block 2×2 system (given in eq. (3.11)). Note further that the block element $(M_k^{-1})_{22} = 0_{k \times k}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & & \\ & I & \\ & & -I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_k^{-1} \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & & \\ & I & \\ & & -I \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \begin{bmatrix} M_k^{-1} \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} & M_k^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -I \end{bmatrix} \\ \hline [0 \quad -I] M_k^{-1} & 0_{k \times k} \end{array} \right]$$

Since $[0 \quad -I] M_k^{-1}$ selects the negative of the 2nd block row of M_k^{-1} one obtains for the product $[0 \quad -I] M_k^{-1} = [-(R_k^{YY})^{-1} \quad 0]$. In a similar way, $M_k^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -(R_k^{YY})^{-T} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$. This establishes the formula in eq. (3.14). \blacksquare

Appendix B. Proof of Corollary 3.5.

Proof. Let $V_k = Y_k$ in eq. (3.14), an arbitrary symmetric initialization $H_0 = H_k^{(0)}$ and consider the block lower triangular L

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} H_0 & & \\ & I & \\ -I & & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad L^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} B_0 & & \\ & I & \\ & & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_0 = H_0^{-1}$$

Then

$$[Y_k \quad S_k \quad H_0 Y_k] L = [0 \quad S_k \quad H_0 Y_k]$$

Moreover, $R_k^{VY} = \text{triu}(Y_k^T Y_k) = R_k^{YY}$ and the expanded middle matrix in eq. (3.14) is $N_k =$

$$\begin{bmatrix} (R_k^{YY})^{-T} (R_k + R_k^T - (D_k + Y_k^T H_0 Y_k)) (R_k^{YY})^{-1} & (R_k^{YY})^{-T} & -(R_k^{YY})^{-T} \\ & (R_k^{VY})^{-1} & 0 \\ & -(R_k^{VY})^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} (N_k)_{11} & (N_k)_{21} & -(N_k)_{21} \\ (N_k)_{21}^T & 0 & 0 \\ -(N_k)_{21}^T & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then computing $L^{-1} N_k L^{-T}$ yields

$$(B.1) \quad L^{-1} N_k L^{-T} = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} \frac{B_0 (N_k)_{11} B_0}{(N_k)_{21}^T B_0} & B_0 (N_k)_{21} & B_0 ((N_k)_{11} - (N_k)_{21}) \\ \hline ((N_k)_{11} - (N_k)_{21}^T) B_0 & (N_k)_{21} & (N_k)_{11} - (N_k)_{21} - (N_k)_{21}^T \end{array} \right]$$

First, we consider the (3,3) block of $L^{-1} N_k L^{-T}$

$$(N_k)_{11} - (N_k)_{21} - (N_k)_{21}^T = -(R_k^{YY})^{-T} (R_k + R_k^T - (D_k + Y_k^T H_0 Y_k)) + R_k^{YY} + (R_k^{YY})^T (R_k^{YY})^{-1}$$

Next we develop the the inverse of the lower 2×2 block

$$(B.2) \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & (N_k)_{21}^T \\ (N_k)_{21} & (N_k)_{11} - (N_k)_{21} - (N_k)_{21}^T \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} R_k + R_k^T - (D_k + Y_k^T H_0 Y_k) + R_k^{YY} + (R_k^{YY})^T & (R_k^{YY})^T \\ R_k^{YY} & 0_{k \times k} \end{bmatrix}$$

Using $LL^{-1} = I$ and $V_k = Y_k$ means that eq. (3.14) becomes

$$(B.3) \quad H_k = H_0 + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & S_k & H_0 Y_k \end{bmatrix} (L^{-1} N_k L^{-T}) \begin{bmatrix} 0^T \\ S_k^T \\ Y_k^T H_0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Finally, substituting eq. (B.1) in (B.3), using the inverse from eq. (B.2) and relabeling the resulting middle matrix, yields the compact representation from Corollary 3.5. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] E. ACAR, D. M. DUNLAVY, AND T. G. KOLDA, *A scalable optimization approach for fitting canonical tensor decompositions*, Journal of Chemometrics, 25 (2011), pp. 67–86, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/cem.1335>, <https://analyticalsciencejournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cem.1335>.
- [2] B. W. BADER, T. G. KOLDA, ET AL., *Tensor toolbox for matlab, version 3.6*. www.tensortoolbox.org, September 28, 2023.
- [3] S. BECKER, *LFBGSSB (L-BFGS-B) mex wrapper*. <https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/35104-lbfgsb--l-bfgs-b--mex-wrapper>, 2012–2015.
- [4] C. G. BROYDEN, *The convergence of a class of double-rank minimization algorithms 1. General considerations*, IMA J. Applied Mathematics, 6 (1970), pp. 76–90, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imamat/6.1.76>, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imamat/6.1.76>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/http://oup.prod.sis.lan/imamat/article-pdf/6/1/76/2233756/6-1-76.pdf>.
- [5] J. BRUST, O. BURDAKOV, J. ERWAY, AND R. MARCIA, *Algorithm 1030: Sc-sr1: Matlab software for limited-memory sr1 trust-region methods*, ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software, 48 (2022), pp. 1–33.
- [6] J. J. BRUST, *Large-Scale Quasi-Newton Trust-Region Methods: High-Accuracy Solvers, Dense Initializations, and Extensions*, PhD thesis, UC Merced, 2018.
- [7] J. J. BRUST, Z. DI, S. LEYFFER, AND C. G. PETRA, *Compact representations of structured bfgs matrices*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 80 (2021), pp. 55–88.
- [8] J. J. BRUST, J. B. ERWAY, AND R. F. MARCIA, *Shape-changing trust-region methods using multipoint symmetric secant matrices*, Optimization Methods and Software, (2024), pp. 1–18.
- [9] J. J. BRUST, R. F. MARCIA, C. G. PETRA, AND M. A. SAUNDERS, *Large-scale optimization with linear equality constraints using reduced compact representation*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 44 (2022), pp. A103–A127.
- [10] O. BURDAKOV, J. MARTINEZ, AND E. PILOTTA, *A limited-memory multipoint symmetric secant method for bound constrained optimization*, Annals Of Operations Research, 117 (2002), pp. 51–70.
- [11] R. H. BYRD, S. L. HANSEN, J. NOCEDAL, AND Y. SINGER, *A stochastic quasi-newton method for large-scale optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 26 (2016), pp. 1008–1031.
- [12] R. H. BYRD, J. NOCEDAL, AND R. B. SCHNABEL, *Representations of quasi-Newton matrices and their use in limited-memory methods*, Math. Program., 63 (1994), pp. 129–156, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01582063>.
- [13] R. H. BYRD, J. NOCEDAL, AND R. A. WALTZ, *Knitro: An Integrated Package for Nonlinear Optimization*, Springer US, Boston, MA, 2006, pp. 35–59, https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-30065-1_4, https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-30065-1_4.
- [14] T. F. COLEMAN, ed., *Chapter 5 Large unconstrained optimization problems*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1984, pp. 68–97, https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-12914-6_5, https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-12914-6_5.
- [15] A. R. CONN, N. I. M. GOULD, AND P. L. TOINT, *Trust-Region Methods*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2000.
- [16] O. DEGUCHY, J. B. ERWAY, AND R. F. MARCIA, *Compact representation of the full broyden class of quasi-newton updates*, Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications, 25 (2018), p. e2186, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/nla.2186>, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/nla.2186>.

- [17] L. DENG, *The mnist database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research*, IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 29 (2012), pp. 141–142.
- [18] J. E. DENNIS, JR AND J. J. MORÉ, *Quasi-newton methods, motivation and theory*, SIAM review, 19 (1977), pp. 46–89.
- [19] J. E. DENNIS JR, D. M. GAY, AND R. E. WALSH, *An adaptive nonlinear least-squares algorithm*, ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS), 7 (1981), pp. 348–368.
- [20] J. E. DENNIS JR, D. M. GAY, AND R. E. WALSH, *An adaptive nonlinear least-squares algorithm*, ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS), 7 (1981), pp. 348–368.
- [21] R. FLETCHER, *A new approach to variable metric algorithms*, The Computer Journal, 13 (1970), pp. 317–322, <https://doi.org/10.1093/comjnl/13.3.317>, <https://doi.org/10.1093/comjnl/13.3.317>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/http://oup.prod.sis.lan/comjnl/article-pdf/13/3/317/988678/130317.pdf>.
- [22] P. E. GILL, W. MURRAY, M. A. SAUNDERS, AND M. H. WRIGHT, *Sparse matrix methods in optimization*, SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing, 5 (1984), pp. 562–589.
- [23] D. GOLDFARB, *A family of variable-metric methods derived by variational means*, Math. Comp., 24 (1970), pp. 23–26, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-1970-0258249-6>, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-1970-0258249-6>.
- [24] C. KANZOW AND D. STECK, *Regularization of limited memory quasi-newton methods for large-scale nonconvex minimization*, Mathematical Programming Computation, (2023), pp. 1–28.
- [25] D. P. KINGMA AND J. BA, *Adam: A method for stochastic optimization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980, (2014).
- [26] J. LIU AND S. J. WRIGHT, *Asynchronous stochastic coordinate descent: Parallelism and convergence properties*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 25 (2015), pp. 351–376.
- [27] X. LUO, M. ZHOU, S. LI, Y. XIA, Z. YOU, Q. ZHU, AND H. LEUNG, *An efficient second-order approach to factorize sparse matrices in recommender systems*, IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics, 11 (2015), pp. 946–956, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TII.2015.2443723>.
- [28] S. MA, R. BASSILY, AND M. BELKIN, *The power of interpolation: Understanding the effectiveness of sgd in modern over-parametrized learning*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2018, pp. 3325–3334.
- [29] R. MALOUF, *A comparison of algorithms for maximum entropy parameter estimation*, in Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Natural Language Learning - Volume 20, COLING-02, USA, 2002, Association for Computational Linguistics, p. 1–7, <https://doi.org/10.3115/1118853.1118871>, <https://doi.org/10.3115/1118853.1118871>.
- [30] A. PASZKE, S. GROSS, F. MASSA, A. LERER, J. BRADBURY, G. CHANAN, T. KILLEEN, Z. LIN, N. GIMELSHEIN, L. ANTIGA, A. DESMAISON, A. KOPF, E. YANG, Z. DEVITO, M. RAISON, A. TEJANI, S. CHILAMKURTHY, B. STEINER, L. FANG, J. BAI, AND S. CHINTALA, *Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32, Curran Associates, Inc., 2019, pp. 8024–8035, <http://papers.neurips.cc/paper/9015-pytorch-an-imperative-style-high-performance-deep-learning-library.pdf>.
- [31] H. ROBBINS AND S. MONRO, *A Stochastic Approximation Method*, The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 22 (1951), pp. 400 – 407, <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729586>, <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729586>.
- [32] D. F. SHANNO, *Conditioning of quasi-Newton methods for function minimization*, Math. Comp., 24 (1970), pp. 647–656, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-1970-0274029-X>, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-1970-0274029-X>.
- [33] THE MATHWORKS INC., *Matlab version: 9.14.0 (r2023a)*, 2024, <https://www.mathworks.com>.
- [34] H. XIAO, K. RASUL, AND R. VOLLGRAF, *Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms*, 2017, <https://arxiv.org/abs/cs.LG/1708.07747>.
- [35] H. ZHANG AND W. W. HAGER, *A nonmonotone line search technique and its application to unconstrained optimization*, SIAM journal on Optimization, 14 (2004), pp. 1043–1056.
- [36] C. ZHU, R. BYRD, AND J. NOCEDAL, *Algorithm 778: L-BFGS-B: Fortran subroutines for large-scale bound-constrained optimization*, ACM Trans. Math. Softw., 23 (1997), pp. 550–560.