

Learning equivariant tensor functions with applications to sparse vector recovery

Wilson G. Gregory¹, Josué Tonelli-Cueto¹, Nicholas F. Marshall², Andrew S. Lee³,
and Soledad Villar^{1,4}

¹Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, and Mathematical Institute for Data Science, Johns Hopkins University

²Department of Mathematics, Oregon State University

³School of STEM, St. Thomas Aquinas College

⁴Center for Computational Mathematics, Flatiron Institute, Simons Foundation

Abstract

This work characterizes equivariant polynomial functions from tuples of tensor inputs to tensor outputs. Loosely motivated by physics, we focus on equivariant functions with respect to the diagonal action of the orthogonal group on tensors. We show how to extend this characterization to other linear algebraic groups, including the Lorentz and symplectic groups.

Our goal behind these characterizations is to define equivariant machine learning models. In particular, we focus on the sparse vector estimation problem. This problem has been broadly studied in the theoretical computer science literature, and explicit spectral methods, derived by techniques from sum-of-squares, can be shown to recover sparse vectors under certain assumptions. Our numerical results show that the proposed equivariant machine learning models can learn spectral methods that outperform the best theoretically known spectral methods in some regimes. The experiments also suggest that learned spectral methods can solve the problem in settings that have not yet been theoretically analyzed.

This is an example of a promising direction in which theory can inform machine learning models and machine learning models could inform theory.

1 Introduction

Many recent theoretical and applied efforts have focused on the implementation of symmetries and other structural constraints in the design of machine learning models. This is the case of graph neural networks [45, 39], geometric deep learning [8, 56], and AI for science [61]. The goal is to design a hypothesis class of functions with good *inductive bias* that is aligned with the theoretical framework of the physical, mathematical, or algorithmic objects it aims to represent. This includes respecting coordinate freedoms [51], conservation laws [1], or internal symmetries (e.g. in the implicit neural representations framework [37]). Symmetries have also been used to provide interpretability to learned data representations [47, 24]. Mathematically, it has been shown that imposing symmetries can improve the generalization error and sample complexity of machine learning models [15, 54, 16, 4, 42, 48, 29].

In this work, we focus on implementing equivariant functions of tensor inputs and tensor outputs. Tensors are the subjects of study in many theoretical computer science and applied mathematics problems, including tensor factorization or decomposition [43], and planted tensor models [26]. Many of the algorithms to address these problems have underlying symmetries like the ones we study here. Tensors also have a broad set of uses in the natural sciences, where tensor-valued data appears as polarizations [40], permeabilities [14], and stresses [35], for instance. Finally, tensors are the preferred way to represent data for machine learning, where both models and multidimensional data with batches, channels, etc. are implemented as tensors. Sometimes, these tensor objects have underlying symmetries, like in implicit neural representations [36].

In this paper, we consider classical Lie groups acting diagonally on tensors. The groups we study arise naturally in physics and other settings, including the orthogonal group $O(d)$ (which typically appears in coordinate transformations), the indefinite orthogonal group $O(s, k-s)$ (which includes as a particular case the Lorentz group, a fundamental group for special relativity), and the symplectic group $Sp(d)$ (the underlying group in much of classical and quantum mechanics).

A variety of methods can be used for implementing invariances or equivariances, including group convolutions [9, 11, 53], irreducible representations [18, 33, 57, 10, 55], constraints on optimization [17], canonicalization [31], and invariant theory [23, 25, 50, 6, 52]. This work is closer to the line of research that constructs explicit equivariant functions from invariant features, and it generalizes results from [50] to tensors.

Closest to us is the concurrent work of Kunisky, Moore, and Wein on tensor cumulants [34]. Their focus is primarily on symmetric tensors, although they show that $O(d)$ -invariant polynomials on symmetric tensors can be turned into $O(d)$ -invariant polynomials over general tensors by symmetrizing over $O(d)$. Our results for equivariant tensor polynomials are slightly more general for inputs of tensors of different orders and parities as well as handling the indefinite orthogonal group and the symplectic group.

As an application, we consider the problem of sparse vector estimation. Let there be a sparse vector v_0 and vectors v_1, \dots, v_{d-1} sampled independently at random from some prior distribution. If we are given an orthonormal basis w_0, \dots, w_{d-1} of $\text{span}(\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\})$, can we recover the sparse vector v_0 ? The problem has roots in tensor PCA, also known as the spiked tensor model [41], as well as dictionary learning [46]. Solutions for this problem using sum-of-squares and spectral methods were investigated in [3] and further improvements were made in [27, 26, 21, 38].

In [26], the authors propose an algorithm that constructs a $d \times d$ matrix A , then uses the top eigenvector of A to estimate v_0 . They prove that this method recovers the planted vector under certain assumptions. A crucial observation is that the input to the problem is *any* orthonormal basis w_0, \dots, w_{d-1} of $\text{span}(\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\})$. This implies that a function that estimates v_0 should be invariant to certain transformations of the input basis. In this paper, we learn algorithms to recover planted sparse vectors from data. To this end, we use a machine learning model that learns an equivariant 2-tensor \hat{A} from data, and the estimator for the planted sparse vector \hat{v}_0 is obtained using \hat{A} 's top eigenvector following the same procedure as [26]. We empirically show that this approach can learn spectral methods for sparse vector recovery that can work under more general assumptions than the state-of-the-art.

The approach employed here can be seen as a particular case of the more ambitious research program of algorithmic alignment or algorithmic reasoning [49, 20]. In algorithmic alignment contexts, researchers design machine learning models that match known algorithmic strategies that are known to succeed at solving certain problems, such as dynamic programming [58, 13]. Here, the machine learning approach is structurally aligned with equivariant spectral methods arising from sum-of-squares. We believe that the connection between sum-of-squares and machine learning (in particular equivariant machine learning and graph neural networks) is a promising direction to be explored.

1.1 Our Contributions

We give explicit parameterizations for analytic functions (with globally convergent Taylor series) from tuples of tensor inputs to tensor outputs that are equivariant with respect to the orthogonal, indefinite orthogonal (which includes Lorentz), and symplectic groups. Section 3 derives the parameterization for $O(d)$, and Section 4 generalizes the construction to indefinite orthogonal and symplectic groups.

In the case of polynomial functions with vector inputs and 2-tensor outputs, the characterization above has a particularly nice form (Corollary 1 and 2) that uses invariant scalar features (cf. [50]).

In Section 5, we use the derived parameterization to learn algorithms for the planted sparse vector problem described above. We compare the performance of the learned methods to baseline sum-of-squares methods from [26] and [38] under different data generating models.

2 Definitions

To simplify the exposition, we start by focusing on the case of the orthogonal group before extending the result to the indefinite orthogonal and symplectic groups. We consider the orthogonal group $O(d)$, the isometries of Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d that fix the origin. It acts on vectors and pseudovectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in the following way:

$$g \cdot v = \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p}{2}} M(g) v, \quad (1)$$

where $g \in O(d)$, $M(g) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the standard matrix representation of g (i.e. $M(g)^\top M(g) = \mathbb{I}_d$, where \mathbb{I}_d is the identity matrix), and $p \in \{-1, +1\}$ is the parity of v . If $p = +1$ we obtain the standard $O(d)$ action on \mathbb{R}^d *vectors*. If $p = -1$ we obtain the $O(d)$ action on what in physics are known as *pseudovectors*.

Definition 1 ($k_{(p)}$ -tensors). We define the space of $1_{(p)}$ -tensors to be \mathbb{R}^d equipped with the action $O(d)$ defined by (1). If v_i is a $1_{(p_i)}$ -tensor for $i = 1, \dots, k$, then $a := v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_k \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}$ is a *rank-1 $k_{(p)}$ -tensor*, where $p = \prod_{i=1}^k p_i$ and the action of $O(d)$ is the diagonal action:

$$g \cdot (v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_k) = (g \cdot v_1) \otimes \dots \otimes (g \cdot v_k). \quad (2)$$

This definition generalizes to higher rank $k_{(p)}$ -tensors by linearity (see (5) below). The space of $k_{(p)}$ -tensors in d dimensions is denoted $\mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$.

Remark 1. Note that the definition of $k_{(p)}$ -tensor includes the selection of the $O(d)$ -action on the tensor. In this way, if a is a $k_{(+)}$ -tensor, we can see a as a $k_{(-)}$ -tensor by redefining the action as $g \cdot a = \det(M(g))(g \cdot a)$, where on the left we have the action as a $k_{(-)}$ -tensor and on the right the action as a $k_{(+)}$ -tensor.

Definition 2 (Einstein summation notation). Suppose that a is a $k_{(p)}$ -tensor. Let $[a]_{i_1, \dots, i_k}$ denote the (i_1, \dots, i_k) -th entry of a , where i_1, \dots, i_k range from 1 to d . The *Einstein summation notation* is used to represent tensor products¹ where repeated indices are summed over. In each product, a given index can appear either exactly once, in which case it appears in the result, or exactly twice, in which case it is summed over and does not appear in the result.

For example, in Einstein summation notation, the product of two $2_{(+)}$ -tensors (i.e., the matrix product ab of two $d \times d$ matrices a and b) is written as

$$[a b]_{i,j} = [a]_{i,\ell} [b]_{\ell,j} := \sum_{\ell=1}^d [a]_{i,\ell} [b]_{\ell,j}. \quad (3)$$

Using Einstein summation notation, the action of $g \in O(d)$ on rank-1 tensors can be extended to general tensors by linearity by expressing $b \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$ as a linear combination of (rank-1) standard basis tensors $e_{i_1, \dots, i_k} = e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_k}$, where $[e_i]_i = 1$ and $[e_i]_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$

$$[g \cdot b]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} = [b]_{j_1, \dots, j_k} [g \cdot (e_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{j_k})]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} = [b]_{j_1, \dots, j_k} [g \cdot e_{j_1}]_{i_1} \dots [g \cdot e_{j_k}]_{i_k}. \quad (4)$$

Note that the action (1) on a $k_{(p)}$ -tensor b can be written as

$$[g \cdot b]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} = \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p}{2}} [b]_{j_1, \dots, j_k} [M(g)]_{i_1, j_1} \dots [M(g)]_{i_k, j_k} \quad (5)$$

for all $g \in O(d)$. For example, a $2_{(+)}$ -tensor has the transformation property

$$[g \cdot b]_{i,j} = [b]_{k,\ell} [M(g)]_{i,k} [M(g)]_{j,\ell},$$

which, in normal matrix notation, is written as $g \cdot b = M(g) b M(g)^\top$.

When multiple tensors are combined, and all their indices appear in the result, we refer to that as the tensor product or outer product. When indices are summed over, we refer to that as the contraction or scalar product. We will further focus on a specific case of multiple tensor contractions that we will refer to as a k -contraction.

¹We will identify vectors with co-vectors in the usual way and will not distinguish lower vs upper scripts.

Definition 3 (Outer product of tensors). Given $a \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$ and $b \in \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$, the *outer product*, denoted $a \otimes b$, is a tensor in $\mathcal{T}_{k+k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, pp')$ defined as $[a \otimes b]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k+k'}} = [a]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} [b]_{i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{k+k'}}$. We write $a^{\otimes k}$ to denote the outer product of a with itself k times and use the convention for $k = 0$ that $a^{\otimes 0} \otimes b = b$.

Definition 4 (k -contraction). Given tensor $a \in \mathcal{T}_{2k+k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$, the k -*contraction* of a , denoted $\iota_k(a)$, is the $k'_{(p)}$ -tensor defined as:

$$[\iota_k(a)]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} := [a]_{i_1, \dots, i_k, i_1, \dots, i_k, j_1, \dots, j_{k'}}. \quad (6)$$

In other words, contract on indices $(1, k+1), (2, k+2)$, all the way to $(k, 2k)$.

Since $k_{(p)}$ -tensors are elements of the vector space $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}$, tensor addition and scalar multiplication are defined in the usual way. The final operation on tensors is the permutation of the indices.

Definition 5 (Permutations of tensor indices). Given $a \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$ and permutation $\sigma \in S_k$, the *permutation of tensor indices* of a by σ , denoted a^σ , is defined by

$$[a^\sigma]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} := [a]_{i_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, i_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}}. \quad (7)$$

Definition 6 (Invariant and equivariant functions). We say that $f : \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$ is $O(d)$ -invariant if

$$f(g \cdot a) = f(a), \quad \text{for all } g \in O(d). \quad (8)$$

We say that $f : \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$ is $O(d)$ -equivariant if

$$f(g \cdot a) = g \cdot f(a), \quad \text{for all } g \in O(d). \quad (9)$$

If f were instead a function with multiple inputs, then the same group element g would act on all inputs simultaneously.

Definition 7 (Isotropic tensors). We say that a tensor $a \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$ is $O(d)$ -isotropic if

$$g \cdot a = a, \quad \text{for all } g \in O(d). \quad (10)$$

There are two special tensors, the Kronecker delta, and the Levi-Civita symbol. These tensors are $O(d)$ -isotropic (see, for example, [22]) and, as we will show in Section 3, we can construct all $O(d)$ -isotropic tensors using only Kronecker deltas and Levi-Civita symbols.

Definition 8 (Kronecker delta). The *Kronecker delta*, δ , is the $O(d)$ -isotropic $2_{(+)}$ -tensor such that $[\delta]_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j$ and 0 otherwise. When considered as the matrix, it is the identity matrix \mathbb{I}_d .

Definition 9 (Levi-Civita symbol). The *Levi-Civita symbol*, ϵ , in dimension $d \geq 2$ is the $O(d)$ -isotropic $d_{(-)}$ -tensor such that $[\epsilon]_{i_1, \dots, i_d} = 0$ if any two of the i_1, \dots, i_d are equal, $[\epsilon]_{i_1, \dots, i_d} = +1$ if i_1, \dots, i_d is an even permutation of $1, \dots, d$, and $[\epsilon]_{i_1, \dots, i_d} = -1$ if i_1, \dots, i_d is an odd permutation of $1, \dots, d$. For example, when $d = 2$ this is simply the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

3 $O(d)$ -equivariant polynomial functions

In this section, we characterize $O(d)$ -equivariant polynomial functions mapping multiple tensor inputs to tensor outputs. This result generalizes the results of [50] from $1_{(+)}$ -tensors to general $k_{(p)}$ -tensors in the case of polynomials for the group $O(d)$.

It is straightforward to show that the outer product, k -contraction, and permutation of tensor indices as defined above are linear and $O(d)$ -equivariant operations (in the case of the outer product linear in each argument), see Appendix A. The following theorem characterizes $O(d)$ -equivariant polynomial functions.

Theorem 1. Let $f : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$ be an $O(d)$ -equivariant polynomial function of degree at most R . Then we may write f as follows:

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \sum_{r=0}^R \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}) \quad (11)$$

where $c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$ is an $O(d)$ -isotropic $(k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} + k')_{(p_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}, p')}$ -tensor for $k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} = \sum_{q=1}^r k_{\ell_q}$ and $p_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} = \prod_{q=1}^r p_{\ell_q}$.

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Appendix B. The main idea of the proof of Theorem 1 is to write out the polynomial f in a way that takes advantage of the tensor operations of Section 2, then show that each term must be $O(d)$ -equivariant (Lemmas 2 and 3 in Appendix B). We then use a group averaging argument to show that $c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$ can be written as an $O(d)$ -isotropic tensor.

The condition that $c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$ is $O(d)$ -isotropic is quite restrictive; the following lemma says that all such tensors can be constructed from the Kronecker delta δ , see Definition 8, and the Levi-Civita symbol, see Definition 9. This lemma, originally from Pastori, follows from [30].

Lemma 1 (Characterization of $O(d)$ -isotropic $k_{(p)}$ -tensors). Suppose $c \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$ is $O(d)$ -isotropic. Then the following holds:

Case $p = +1$: Assume $p = +1$. If k is even, then c can be written in the form

$$c = \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \alpha_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}} \right)^\sigma, \quad \text{for } \alpha_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (12)$$

where $\alpha_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$. Otherwise, if k is odd, then $c = 0$ is the zero tensor.

Case $p = -1$: Assume $p = -1$. If $k - d$ is even and $k \geq d$, then c can be written in the form

$$c = \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \beta_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon \right)^\sigma \quad (13)$$

where $\beta_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$. Otherwise, if $k - d$ is odd or $k < d$, then $c = 0$ is the zero tensor.

Remark 2. Note that while the sums in Lemma 1 are over the full symmetric group, we can reduce the number of terms by considering the symmetries of the summands. We develop this in detail in Appendix D.

Here is a quick example of Theorem 1 and Lemma 1 in action, with a longer example in Appendix E.

Example 1. Let $f : \mathcal{T}_1(\mathbb{R}^d, +) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_2(\mathbb{R}^d, +)$ be an $O(d)$ -equivariant polynomial of degree at most 2. By Theorem 1, we can write f in the form

$$f(a) = \iota_0(a^{\otimes 0} \otimes c_0) + \iota_1(a^{\otimes 1} \otimes c_1) + \iota_2(a^{\otimes 2} \otimes c_2), \quad (14)$$

where c_r is an $O(d)$ -isotropic $(r+2)_{(+)}$ -tensor for $r = 0, 1, 2$. By Lemma 1, we have $c_0 = \beta_0 \delta$, $c_1 = 0$ is trivial, and c_2 is a linear combination of $(\delta^{\otimes 2})^\sigma$ for $\sigma \in G_4 = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3\}$ where $\sigma_1 := (1, 2, 3, 4)$, $\sigma_2 = (1, 3, 2, 4)$, $\sigma_3 = (1, 3, 4, 2)$, see Appendix D. Observe that

$$\iota_2(a^{\otimes 2} \otimes (\beta_1(\delta^{\otimes 2})^{\sigma_1} + \beta_2(\delta^{\otimes 2})^{\sigma_2} + \beta_3(\delta^{\otimes 2})^{\sigma_3})) = \beta_1 \langle a, a \rangle + \beta_2 a \otimes a + \beta_3 a \otimes a, \quad (15)$$

where the terms associated with β_2 and β_3 are the same due to the symmetry of $a^{\otimes 2}$. We conclude

$$f(a) = \beta_0 \delta + \beta_1 \langle a, a \rangle \delta + \beta_2 a \otimes a,$$

for some scalars β_0, β_1 , and β_2 .

The result of Theorem 1 is a clean theoretical characterization of $O(d)$ -equivariant polynomial tensor functions with arbitrary order tensor inputs. However, in practice, computing large polynomials with all possible $O(d)$ -isotropic tensors is impractical. One option is considering low-degree

polynomials as in Example 2. Alternatively, in many applications, like the ones we consider in Section 5, we can restrict ourselves to functions that have $1_{(+)}$ -tensors (i.e. vectors) as the input and a $k_{(+)}$ -tensor as output, and the problem takes on a form more amenable to computation.

The following corollary says that $O(d)$ -equivariant functions whose inputs are multiple vectors can be written as a linear combination of basis elements given by the permutations of the input vectors and Kronecker deltas, and the coefficients are functions that only depend on all the pairwise inner products of the input vectors. The proofs of this corollary and Lemma 1 are in Appendix C.

Corollary 1. Let $f : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_1(\mathbb{R}^d, +) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, +)$ be an $O(d)$ -equivariant polynomial function. Then, we may write it as

$$f(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor \frac{k'}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{\sigma \in S_{k'}} \sum_{1 \leq J_1 \leq \dots \leq J_{k'-2t} \leq n} q_{t, \sigma, J} \left((\langle v_i, v_j \rangle_{i,j=1}^n)^n \right) \left(v_{J_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{J_{k'-2t}} \otimes \delta^{\otimes t} \right)^\sigma, \quad (16)$$

where $J = (J_1, \dots, J_{k'-2t})$, and the function $q_{t, \sigma, J}$ depends on the tuple (t, σ, J) and is a polynomial of all n^2 possible inner products between the input vectors.

The second factor is a permutation of the outer product of t Kronecker deltas and $k' - 2t$ of the input vectors v_1, \dots, v_n , possibly with repeats. The first sum is over the possible numbers of Kronecker deltas 0 to $\lfloor \frac{k'}{2} \rfloor$, where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function. The second sum is over the possible permutations of the k' axes, and the third sum is over choosing $k' - 2t$ vectors from v_1 to v_n , allowing repeated vectors.

Remark 3. Note that Corollary 1 characterizes polynomial functions, but if we allow the $q_{t, \sigma, J}$ to be more general (e.g. in the class of continuous or smooth functions), then we obtain a parameterization of a larger class of $O(d)$ -equivariant functions. In the experiments in Section 5, we set the $q_{t, \sigma, J}$ to be learnable multi-layer perceptrons (MLPs). We are unsure if a characterization of this sort can be stated for all continuous $O(d)$ -equivariant functions. However, since by Stone–Weierstrass theorem, any continuous function can be approximated by a polynomial function to arbitrary accuracy on any fixed compact set, constructing an architecture that can represent equivariant polynomial functions is sufficient to approximately represent equivariant continuous functions (see [59]).

Remark 4. One interesting potential extension of Corollary 1 is to parameterize the polynomials f that are simultaneously $O(d)$ -equivariant and S_n -invariant, where S_n is the symmetric group of order n acting by permuting the inputs v_1, \dots, v_n . Implementations of such models may be possible by adapting techniques from DeepSets [60] or graph neural networks [45]. However, parameterizing all permutation invariant polynomial functions q might be intractable. This is because the action by permutations on the inputs of q is the action of permutations in pairs, which is connected with the graph isomorphism problem. Recent work gives an efficient parameterization of a class of invariant functions that is almost separating and could potentially be used to implement the q functions [5].

4 Generalization to other groups

The results regarding $O(d)$ -equivariant tensor maps from Section 3 are a particular case of a more general result involving algebraic groups. We work the full generalization in Appendix F where we give all the details of the proofs.

Recall that we can define $O(d)$ as follows:

$$O(d) := \{g \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid g^\top g = \mathbb{I}_d\}, \quad (17)$$

where \mathbb{I} is the identity matrix. In other words, $O(d)$ is the subgroup of linear transformations preserving the Euclidean inner product. However, in some contexts, we might be interested in preserving more general bilinear products on \mathbb{R}^d , such as the *Minkowski inner product*

$$\langle u, v \rangle_s := u^\top \mathbb{I}_{s, d-s} v,$$

where $\mathbb{I}_{s,d-s} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_s & \\ & -\mathbb{I}_{d-s} \end{pmatrix}$, or, for d even, the *symplectic product*

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{\text{symp}} := u^\top J_d v$$

where $J_d := \begin{pmatrix} & \mathbb{I}_{d/2} \\ -\mathbb{I}_{d/2} & \end{pmatrix}$. The subgroups of linear maps preserving these bilinear products give respectively the *indefinite orthogonal group* (which is the linear part of the *Lorentz group* when $d = 4$ and $s \in \{1, 3\}$) given by

$$O(s, d-s) := \{g \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid g^\top \mathbb{I}_{s,d-s} g = \mathbb{I}_{s,d-s}\}, \quad (18)$$

and, when d is even, the *symplectic group* given by

$$Sp(d) := \{g \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid g^\top J_d g = J_d\}. \quad (19)$$

For any of these groups G , we can consider the modules $\mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi) := (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}$, where $\chi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^*$ is an algebraic group homomorphism, where the action is given by the linear extension of

$$g \cdot (v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_k) = \chi(g)(g \cdot v_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes (g \cdot v_k). \quad (20)$$

When $G = O(s, d-s)$, with $s \neq 0, d$, we have four possible χ : $\chi_{+,+}$ being always equal to 1, $\chi_{+,-}$ being the sign of the determinant of the bottom-right $(d-s) \times (d-s)$ submatrix, $\chi_{-,+}$ being the sign of the determinant of the top-left $s \times s$ submatrix, and $\chi_{-,-}$ being the determinant of the matrix. Hence, we can represent them by (p_1, p_2) , where $p_i \in \{-1, +1\}$. When $G = Sp(d)$, we have that χ can only be the trivial group-homomorphism. (It follows, for instance, from the representation theory of simple Lie algebras from [19, Part III] and a standard abelianization argument).

Additionally, we have G -equivariant contractions $\iota_k^G : \mathcal{T}_{2k+k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{2k+k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi)$ given by

$$\iota_k^{O(s,d-s)}(a) := [a]_{i_1, \dots, i_k, j_1, \dots, j_k, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_{k'}} [\mathbb{I}_{s,d-s}]_{i_1, j_1} \cdots [\mathbb{I}_{s,d-s}]_{i_k, j_k} \quad (21)$$

and

$$\iota_k^{Sp(d)}(a) := [a]_{i_1, \dots, i_k, j_1, \dots, j_k, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_{k'}} [J_d]_{i_1, j_1} \cdots [J_d]_{i_k, j_k}. \quad (22)$$

Under these notations, we can state the generalization of Theorem 1 as follows. Recall that an *entire function* is a function that is analytic and whose Taylor series converges globally at any point.

Theorem 2. Let G be either $O(s, d-s)$ or $Sp(d)$ and $f : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi')$ be a G -equivariant entire function. Then we may write f as follows:

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}^G(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}) \quad (23)$$

where $c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} \in \mathcal{T}_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} + k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}, \chi')$ is a G -isotropic tensor, that means a tensor invariant under the action of G ; for $k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} := \sum_{q=1}^r k_{\ell_q}$ and $\chi_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} = \prod_{q=1}^r \chi_{\ell_q}$.

Using the above theorem and an analogous version of Lemma 1 ([44, Theorem 5.3.3], see Proposition 7 in Appendix F), we can then prove the following corollary, which generalizes Corollary 1.

Corollary 2. Let G be either $O(s, d-s)$ or $Sp(d)$ and $f : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_1(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi_0)$, with χ_0 the constant map to 1, be a G -equivariant entire function. Then we may write f as follows:

$$f(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \sum_{1 \leq J_1 \leq \dots \leq J_{k-2t} \leq n} q_{t, \sigma, J} \left(\langle \langle v_i, v_j \rangle_G \rangle_{i,j=1}^n \right) (v_{J_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{J_{k-2t}} \otimes \theta_G^{\otimes t})^\sigma \quad (24)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_G = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_s$ and $\theta_G = [\mathbb{I}_{s,d-s}]_{i,j}$ if $G = O(s, d-s)$, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_G = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{symp}}$ and $\theta_G = [J_d]_{i,j}$ if $G = Sp(d)$.

5 Numerical Experiments

We define a machine learning model to learn algorithms for the sparse vector recovery problem (defined in Section 5.1). To this end, we use the $O(d)$ -equivariant function parameterization from Corollary 1. The code is built using the JAX library [7] and is available at

<https://github.com/WilsonGregory/TensorPolynomials>

5.1 Problem Setup

We consider the problem of finding a planted sparse vector in a linear subspace. This problem was introduced by Spielman, Wang, and Wright in [46], in the context of dictionary learning. It was further studied in [26] and [38].

Problem 1. Let $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be an (approximately) sparse vector of unit length. We sample $v_1, \dots, v_{d-1} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_n, \Sigma)$, where $\mathbf{0}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the zero vector and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a given covariance matrix. We consider S to be an $n \times d$ matrix whose columns form an orthonormal basis of $\text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\}$. The problem is to recover v_0 from S .

We consider four sampling procedures for v_0 : Accept/Reject (AR), Bernoulli-Gaussian (BG), Corrected Bernoulli-Gaussian (CBG), and Bernoulli-Rademacher (BR). All these procedures use the same sparsity parameter $\varepsilon \leq 1/3$ and aim to satisfy the approximate sparsity condition used in [26] of $\|v_0\|_4^4 \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon n}$ (either directly or in expectation). Smaller values of ε indicate vectors that are more sparse and consequently have larger $\|v_0\|_4^4$. Vectors sampled using AR are rejected if they do not satisfy this condition, while $\mathbb{E} \|v_0\|_4^4 = \frac{3}{\varepsilon n}$ for $v_0 \sim \text{BG}$ and $\mathbb{E} \|v_0\|_4^4 = \frac{1}{\varepsilon n}$ for $v_0 \sim \text{CBG}$ and for $v_0 \sim \text{BR}$. See Appendix H.1 for full details and proofs.

The theoretical settings in both [26] and [38] specify that v_1, \dots, v_{d-1} are sampled independently from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_n, \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{I}_n)$. We will also consider more general settings that have not been theoretically analyzed yet, such as sampling v_1, \dots, v_{d-1} from a normal distribution with diagonal non-identity covariance and with random covariance from a Wishart distribution. See Appendix H.2 for a more detailed description, as well as how we pick a random orthonormal basis for $\text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\}$.

5.2 Models

We consider a matrix $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ whose columns are an orthonormal basis for $\text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\}$ and denote its rows by $a_1^\top, \dots, a_n^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let \mathcal{S}_d be the space of $d \times d$ symmetric matrices. We consider $h : (\mathbb{R}^d)^n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_d$ and let $\lambda_{\text{vec}} : \mathcal{S}_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be the function that takes a symmetric matrix as input and outputs a normalized eigenvector corresponding to the top eigenvalue. Then, the estimate of the planted sparse vector will be given by

$$\hat{v} = S \lambda_{\text{vec}}(h(a_1, \dots, a_n)), \quad (25)$$

for an appropriate h that can be learned from data or derived by other means.

Since S may be any orthogonal basis of $\text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\}$, we would like (25) to be invariant to $O(d)$. It is sufficient for h to be $O(d)$ -equivariant to guarantee this invariance – see Appendix G.

The models we consider differ in their choice of function h . In [26] (SOS-I), the function h is

$$h(a_1, \dots, a_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\|a_i\|_2^2 - \frac{d}{n} \right) a_i a_i^\top, \quad (26)$$

and in [38] (SOS-II) h is defined as

$$h(a_1, \dots, a_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\|a_i\|_2^2 - \frac{d-1}{n} \right) a_i a_i^\top - \frac{3}{n} \mathbb{I}_n. \quad (27)$$

sampling	Σ	SOS-I [26]	SOS-II [38]	BL	SVH-Diag	SVH
A/R	Random	0.610±0.009	0.610±0.009	0.241±0.019	0.493±0.005	0.938±0.002
	Diagonal	0.448±0.012	0.448±0.012	0.196±0.011	0.589±0.026	0.465±0.027
	Identity	0.606±0.014	0.606±0.014	0.196±0.008	0.351±0.065	0.190±0.008
BG	Random	0.962±0.002	0.962±0.002	0.242±0.006	0.917±0.004	0.937±0.002
	Diagonal	0.949±0.005	0.949±0.005	0.205±0.013	0.914±0.006	0.463±0.018
	Identity	0.962±0.002	0.962±0.002	0.196±0.009	0.908±0.006	0.342±0.043
CBG	Random	0.412±0.017	0.412±0.017	0.239±0.012	0.372±0.011	0.935±0.002
	Diagonal	0.288±0.018	0.288±0.018	0.206±0.003	0.550±0.026	0.460±0.022
	Identity	0.412±0.011	0.412±0.011	0.198±0.005	0.239±0.025	0.197±0.011
BR	Random	0.526±0.020	0.526±0.020	0.923±0.004	0.437±0.034	0.957±0.001
	Diagonal	0.334±0.024	0.334±0.024	0.864±0.005	0.588±0.011	0.903±0.004
	Identity	0.524±0.010	0.524±0.010	0.845±0.006	0.317±0.046	0.889±0.003

Table 1: Test error comparison of different methods under different sampling schemes for v_0 and different covariances for v_1, \dots, v_{d-1} . The metric is $\langle v_0, \hat{v} \rangle^2$, which ranges from 0 to 1 with values closer to 1, meaning that the vectors are closer. For each row, the best value is **bolded**. For these experiments, $n = 100, d = 5, \epsilon = 0.25$, and the results were averaged over 5 trials with the standard deviation given by $\pm 0.xxx$.

Both models are proven to recover the planted sparse vector under different sampling assumptions described in Appendix H.1.

In comparison to these fixed methods, we propose two machine learning-based models defined using the results of Section 3. The first model, SparseVectorHunter (SVH), will parameterize

$$h(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i}^n q_{i,j} \left((\langle a_\ell, a_m \rangle)_{\ell,m=1}^n \right) \frac{1}{2} (a_i \otimes a_j + a_j \otimes a_i) \right] + q_{\mathbb{I}} \left((\langle a_\ell, a_m \rangle)_{\ell,m=1}^n \right) \mathbb{I}_d, \quad (28)$$

and the second model, SparseVectorHunterDiagonal (SVH-Diag), will parameterize

$$h(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \left[\sum_i^n q_i \left((\|a_\ell\|_2^2)_{\ell=1}^n \right) a_i \otimes a_i \right] + q_{\mathbb{I}} \left((\|a_\ell\|_2^2)_{\ell=1}^n \right) \mathbb{I}_d, \quad (29)$$

where $q_{i,j}$, q_i , and $q_{\mathbb{I}}$ are $O(d)$ -invariant scalar functions. By Corollary 1, they should be polynomials, but we will approximate them with dense neural networks. The SparseVectorHunter model also differs from Corollary 1 by using a basis of $\frac{1}{2}(a_i \otimes a_j + a_j \otimes a_i)$ rather than just $a_i \otimes a_j$ so that h produces a symmetric matrix. The inputs to the networks are $(\langle a_\ell, a_m \rangle)_{\ell,m=1}^n$ or $(\|a_\ell\|_2^2)_{\ell=1}^n$ respectively, and the outputs are the coefficients of $\frac{1}{2}(a_i \otimes a_j + a_j \otimes a_i)$, $a_i \otimes a_i$, or \mathbb{I}_d . The networks themselves are multi-layer perceptrons (MLP) with 2 hidden layers, width of 128, and ReLU activation functions.

To demonstrate the benefits of equivariance, we also implement a non-equivariant baseline model (BL), which takes as input the nd components of S and outputs the $d + \binom{d}{2}$ components of a symmetric $d \times d$ matrix. This is implemented as a multi-layer perceptron with 2 hidden layers, width of 128, and ReLU activation functions to match the architecture of the SVH. For training details on all these models, see Appendix H.3.

5.3 Results

The training errors are reported in the Appendix in Table 3, while the test errors are displayed in Table 1. The training results show that the machine learning models can be expressive enough to fit the training data, but the testing results show that they do not always generalize well. In particular, the baseline model performs best for some of the training data sets but generalizes poorly compared to all other models. This is consistent with the claim that enforcing symmetries improves generalization performance [4, 42, 16]. Typically, SVH does best when the covariance matrix is random, SVH-Diag does best when the covariance matrix is diagonal non-identity, and

the sum-of-squares methods do best when the covariance matrix is the identity. One exception is the Bernoulli-Rademacher sparse vectors, where the SVH model does best for all tested covariance matrices.

Another exception is that when we have Bernoulli-Gaussian sparse vectors, SOS-I and SOS-II do better than the SVH methods. This is likely because $\mathbb{E}[\|v_0\|_4^4] = \frac{3}{\varepsilon n}$ (Appendix H.1). When this value gets larger, the sparse vectors are more sparse, which makes the problem easier. By contrast, the Corrected Bernoulli-Gaussian and Bernoulli-Rademacher have $\mathbb{E}[\|v_0\|_4^4] = \frac{1}{\varepsilon n}$, which is a harder setting for all algorithms. Since this is in expectation, individual sparse vectors may have $\|v_0\|_4^4 < \frac{1}{\varepsilon n}$, which is outside the theoretical guarantees for the sum-of-squares method in [26].

The learned SVH methods are an interesting development for settings where we do not have theoretical guarantees (e.g., non-identity covariance). They may even be useful for generating conjectures for spectral algorithms that may work under more general assumptions.

We also note that SOS-I and SOS-II perform identically for these experiments. We observed some small differences between the two methods for n very large.

6 Discussion

This paper provides a characterization of polynomial functions from multiple tensor inputs to tensor outputs that are equivariant with respect to the diagonal action by classical Lie groups, including the orthogonal group, the symplectic group, and the Lorentz group.

Our main goal behind this characterization is to define equivariant machine learning models. We applied the resulting models to learning algorithms for the sparse vector recovery problem. In the spirit of the neural algorithmic reasoning framework [49], the proposed machine learning methods are “aligned” to known algorithms with provable performance guarantees. The learned algorithms outperform state-of-the-art algorithms for this problem in several regimes. And they also seem to work under assumptions where there are no known algorithms with theoretical guarantees.

The application of our characterization is especially useful when the input consists of $1_{(+)}$ -tensors, and the output is a $k_{(+)}$ -tensor. For these problems, a parameterization based on invariant scalars, similar to [50], is available and easy to implement. For problems where the input tensors have higher order or there is a mixture of parities between the input and output, the implementation would be less efficient. We also assume no additional structure on the relationship between the input tensors; in those situations, other techniques may be required. For instance, to extend the models to be permutation invariant as well as $O(d)$ -equivariant (see Remark 4).

Acknowledgements This project started as part of the 2022 AMS-MRC (Math Research Communities) on “Data Science at the Crossroads of Analysis, Geometry, and Topology”. JTC, NFM, ASL and SV acknowledge support from NSF through grant DMS-1916439. The authors would like to thank Ben Blum-Smith and Daniel Packer for helpful discussions. WGG and SV are partially supported by NSF CCF 2212457 and the NSF–Simons Research Collaboration on the Mathematical and Scientific Foundations of Deep Learning (MoDL) (NSF DMS 2031985). SV is also funded by NSF CAREER 2339682 and ONR N00014-22-1-2126.

References

- [1] Ferran Alet, Dylan Doblar, Allan Zhou, Josh Tenenbaum, Kenji Kawaguchi, and Chelsea Finn. Noether networks: meta-learning useful conserved quantities. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:16384–16397, 2021.
- [2] P. G. Appleby, B. R. Duffy, and R. W. Ogden. On the classification of isotropic tensors. *Glasgow Mathematical Journal*, 29(2):185–196, 1987.

- [3] Boaz Barak, Jonathan A. Kelner, and David Steurer. Dictionary learning and tensor decomposition via the sum-of-squares method. *Proceedings of the forty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2014.
- [4] Alberto Bietti, Luca Venturi, and Joan Bruna. On the sample complexity of learning under geometric stability. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:18673–18684, 2021.
- [5] Ben Blum-Smith, Ningyuan Huang, Marco Cuturi, and Soledad Villar. Learning functions on symmetric matrices and point clouds via lightweight invariant features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08097*, 2024.
- [6] Ben Blum-Smith and Soledad Villar. Machine learning and invariant theory. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, 70(8):1205–1213, 2023.
- [7] James Bradbury, Roy Frostig, Peter Hawkins, Matthew James Johnson, Chris Leary, Dougal Maclaurin, George Necula, Adam Paszke, Jake VanderPlas, Skye Wanderman-Milne, and Qiao Zhang. JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs, 2018.
- [8] Michael M Bronstein, Joan Bruna, Taco Cohen, and Petar Veličković. Geometric deep learning: Grids, groups, graphs, geodesics, and gauges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.13478*, 2021.
- [9] Taco Cohen and Max Welling. Group equivariant convolutional networks. In Maria Florina Balcan and Kilian Q. Weinberger, editors, *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 48 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2990–2999, New York, New York, USA, 20–22 Jun 2016. PMLR.
- [10] Taco S. Cohen, Mario Geiger, Jonas Köhler, and Max Welling. Spherical CNNs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [11] Taco S. Cohen and Max Welling. Steerable CNNs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [12] David A. Cox, John Little, and Donal O’Shea. *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms: An Introduction to Computational Algebraic Geometry and Commutative Algebra*. Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- [13] Andrew J Dudzik and Petar Veličković. Graph neural networks are dynamic programmers. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:20635–20647, 2022.
- [14] Louis J Durlofsky. Numerical calculation of equivalent grid block permeability tensors for heterogeneous porous media. *Water resources research*, 27(5):699–708, 1991.
- [15] Bryn Elesedy. Provably strict generalisation benefit for invariance in kernel methods. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 17273–17283. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [16] Bryn Elesedy. Provably strict generalisation benefit for invariance in kernel methods. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [17] Marc Finzi, Max Welling, and Andrew Gordon Gordon Wilson. A practical method for constructing equivariant multilayer perceptrons for arbitrary matrix groups. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3318–3328. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021.
- [18] Fabian Fuchs, Daniel Worrall, Volker Fischer, and Max Welling. Se(3)-transformers: 3d roto-translation equivariant attention networks. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1970–1981. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.

- [19] William Fulton and Joe Harris. *Representation theory: a first course*, volume 129. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [20] Bruno Gavranović, Paul Lessard, Andrew Dudzik, Tamara von Glehn, João GM Araújo, and Petar Veličković. Categorical deep learning: An algebraic theory of architectures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15332*, 2024.
- [21] Rong Ge and Tengyu Ma. Decomposing Overcomplete 3rd Order Tensors using Sum-of-Squares Algorithms. In Naveen Garg, Klaus Jansen, Anup Rao, and José D. P. Rolim, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2015)*, volume 40 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 829–849, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2015. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [22] Wilson Gregory, David W. Hogg, Ben Blum-Smith, Maria Teresa Arias, Kaze W. K. Wong, and Soledad Villar. Geometricimagenet: Extending convolutional neural networks to vector and tensor images, 2023.
- [23] Ben Gripaios, Ward Haddadin, and Christopher G Lester. Lorentz- and permutation-invariants of particles. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 54(15):155201, March 2021.
- [24] Sharut Gupta, Joshua Robinson, Derek Lim, Soledad Villar, and Stefanie Jegelka. Structuring representation geometry with rotationally equivariant contrastive learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [25] Ward Issa Jereis Haddadin. *Invariant polynomials and machine learning*. PhD thesis, Cambridge U., 2022.
- [26] Samuel B. Hopkins, Tselil Schramm, Jonathan Shi, and David Steurer. Fast spectral algorithms from sum-of-squares proofs: tensor decomposition and planted sparse vectors. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '16, page 178–191, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [27] Samuel B. Hopkins, Jonathan Shi, and David Steurer. Tensor principal component analysis via sum-of-square proofs. In Peter Grünwald, Elad Hazan, and Satyen Kale, editors, *Proceedings of The 28th Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 40 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 956–1006, Paris, France, 03–06 Jul 2015. PMLR.
- [28] Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [29] Ningyuan Huang, Ron Levie, and Soledad Villar. Approximately equivariant graph networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [30] Harold Jeffreys. On isotropic tensors. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 73(1):173–176, 1973.
- [31] Sékou-Oumar Kaba, Arnab Kumar Mondal, Yan Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, and Siamak Ravanbakhsh. Equivariance with learned canonicalization functions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 15546–15566. PMLR, 2023.
- [32] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization, 2017.
- [33] Risi Kondor. N-body networks: a covariant hierarchical neural network architecture for learning atomic potentials. *CoRR*, abs/1803.01588, 2018.
- [34] Dmitriy Kunisky, Cristopher Moore, and Alexander S. Wein. Tensor cumulants for statistical inference on invariant distributions, 2024.
- [35] Valery I Levitas, Mehdi Kamrani, and Biao Feng. Tensorial stress- strain fields and large elastoplasticity as well as friction in diamond anvil cell up to 400 gpa. *NPJ Computational Materials*, 5(1):94, 2019.

- [36] Xingyi Li, Chaoyi Hong, Yiran Wang, Zhiguo Cao, Ke Xian, and Guosheng Lin. Symmnerf: Learning to explore symmetry prior for single-view view synthesis. In *Proceedings of the Asian conference on computer vision*, pages 1726–1742, 2022.
- [37] Derek Lim, Haggai Maron, Marc T Law, Jonathan Lorraine, and James Lucas. Graph metanetworks for processing diverse neural architectures. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [38] Cheng Mao and Alexander S. Wein. Optimal spectral recovery of a planted vector in a subspace, 2022.
- [39] Haggai Maron, Heli Ben-Hamu, Nadav Shamir, and Yaron Lipman. Invariant and equivariant graph networks. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net, 2019.
- [40] DB Melrose and RJ Stoneham. The polarization tensor for a magnetized vacuum. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 10(7):1211, 1977.
- [41] Andrea Montanari and Emile Richard. A statistical model for tensor pca. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 2, NIPS’14*, page 2897–2905, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2014. MIT Press.
- [42] Mircea Petrache and Shubhendu Trivedi. Approximation-generalization trade-offs under (approximate) group equivariance. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [43] Stephan Rabanser, Oleksandr Shchur, and Stephan Günnemann. Introduction to tensor decompositions and their applications in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.10781*, 2017.
- [44] Nolan R. Wallach Roe Goodman. *Symmetry, Representations, and Invariants*. Springer International Publishing, 2009.
- [45] Franco Scarselli, Marco Gori, Ah Chung Tsoi, Markus Hagenbuchner, and Gabriele Monfardini. The graph neural network model. *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, 20(1):61–80, 2008.
- [46] Daniel A. Spielman, Huan Wang, and John Wright. Exact recovery of sparsely-used dictionaries. In Shie Mannor, Nathan Srebro, and Robert C. Williamson, editors, *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 23 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 37.1–37.18, Edinburgh, Scotland, 25–27 Jun 2012. PMLR.
- [47] Xavier Suau, Federico Danieli, T Anderson Keller, Arno Blaas, Chen Huang, Jason Ramapuram, Dan Busbridge, and Luca Zappella. Duet: 2d structured and approximately equivariant representations. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 32749–32769, 2023.
- [48] Behrooz Tahmasebi and Stefanie Jegelka. The exact sample complexity gain from invariances for kernel regression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023.
- [49] Petar Veličković and Charles Blundell. Neural algorithmic reasoning. *Patterns*, 2(7), 2021.
- [50] Soledad Villar, David W Hogg, Kate Storey-Fisher, Weichi Yao, and Ben Blum-Smith. Scalars are universal: Equivariant machine learning, structured like classical physics. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:28848–28863, 2021.
- [51] Soledad Villar, David W Hogg, Weichi Yao, George A Kevrekidis, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Towards fully covariant machine learning. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [52] Soledad Villar, Weichi Yao, David W Hogg, Ben Blum-Smith, and Bianca Dumitrascu. Dimensionless machine learning: Imposing exact units equivariance. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(109):1–32, 2023.

- [53] Binghui Wang, Jinyuan Jia, Xiaoyu Cao, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. Certified robustness of graph neural networks against adversarial structural perturbation. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, KDD '21. ACM, August 2021.
- [54] Rui Wang, Robin Walters, and Rose Yu. Incorporating symmetry into deep dynamics models for improved generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [55] Maurice Weiler and Gabriele Cesa. General $e(2)$ -equivariant steerable cnns. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [56] Maurice Weiler, Patrick Forré, Erik Verlinde, and Max Welling. Coordinate independent convolutional networks—*isometry and gauge equivariant convolutions on riemannian manifolds*. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.06020*, 2021.
- [57] Maurice Weiler, Mario Geiger, Max Welling, Wouter Boomsma, and Taco Cohen. 3d steerable cnns: learning rotationally equivariant features in volumetric data. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS'18, page 10402–10413, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2018. Curran Associates Inc.
- [58] Keylu Xu, Jingling Li, Mozhi Zhang, Simon S Du, Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi, and Stefanie Jegelka. What can neural networks reason about? *ICLR 2020*, 2020.
- [59] Dmitry Yarotsky. Universal approximations of invariant maps by neural networks. *Constructive Approximation*, 55(1):407–474, 2022.
- [60] Manzil Zaheer, Satwik Kottur, Siamak Ravanbakhsh, Barnabas Poczos, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Alexander J Smola. Deep sets. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [61] Xuan Zhang, Limei Wang, Jacob Helwig, Youzhi Luo, Cong Fu, Yaochen Xie, Meng Liu, Yuchao Lin, Zhao Xu, Keqiang Yan, Keir Adams, Maurice Weiler, Xiner Li, Tianfan Fu, Yucheng Wang, Haiyang Yu, YuQing Xie, Xiang Fu, Alex Strasser, Shenglong Xu, Yi Liu, Yuanqi Du, Alexandra Saxton, Hongyi Ling, Hannah Lawrence, Hannes Stärk, Shurui Gui, Carl Edwards, Nicholas Gao, Adriana Ladera, Tailin Wu, Elyssa F. Hofgard, Aria Mansouri Tehrani, Rui Wang, Ameya Daigavane, Montgomery Bohde, Jerry Kurtin, Qian Huang, Tuong Phung, Minkai Xu, Chaitanya K. Joshi, Simon V. Mathis, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Ada Fang, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, Erik Bekkers, Michael Bronstein, Marinka Zitnik, Anima Anandkumar, Stefano Ermon, Pietro Liò, Rose Yu, Stephan Günnemann, Jure Leskovec, Heng Ji, Jimeng Sun, Regina Barzilay, Tommi Jaakkola, Connor W. Coley, Xiaoning Qian, Xiaofeng Qian, Tess Smidt, and Shuiwang Ji. Artificial intelligence for science in quantum, atomistic, and continuum systems, 2023.

A Basic properties of $O(d)$ actions on tensors

In this section, we will show that the basic operations are $O(d)$ -equivariant and linear by direct computation. We do so explicitly by performing routine computations. However, the universal property of tensor products, which we use in Appendix F, would give immediate proofs of these statements.

Proposition 1. The outer product is a $O(d)$ -equivariant bilinear map. In other words, for $g \in O(d)$, $a, a' \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$, $b, b' \in \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $g \cdot (a \otimes b) = (g \cdot a) \otimes (g \cdot b)$, $(\alpha a + \beta a') \otimes b = \alpha(a \otimes b) + \beta(a' \otimes b)$, and $a \otimes (\alpha b + \beta b') = \alpha(a \otimes b) + \beta(a \otimes b')$. In particular, if $c \in \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$ is an $O(d)$ -isotropic tensor, then the function mapping

$$\mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k+k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, pp') \quad \text{by} \quad a \mapsto a \otimes c \quad (30)$$

is an $O(d)$ -equivariant linear map.

Proposition 2. The k -contraction $\iota_k : \mathcal{T}_{2k+k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$, see Definition 4, is an $O(d)$ -equivariant linear map.

Proposition 3. For fixed $\sigma \in S_k$, the tensor index permutation mapping $\mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$ by $a \mapsto a^\sigma$ is an $O(d)$ -equivariant linear map.

Proof of Proposition 1. First, we establish equivariance. Let $a \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$, $b \in \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$, and $g \in O(d)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & [g \cdot (a \otimes b)]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k+k'}} \\ &= \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-pp'}{2}} [(a \otimes b)_{i_1, \dots, i_{k+k'}} [M(g)]_{j_1, i_1} \cdots [M(g)]_{j_{k+k'}, i_{k+k'}}] \\ &= \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p}{2}} \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p'}{2}} [a]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} [b]_{i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{k+k'}} [M(g)]_{j_1, i_1} \cdots \\ & \quad \cdots [M(g)]_{j_k, i_k} [M(g)]_{j_{k+1}, i_{k+1}} \cdots [M(g)]_{j_{k+k'}, i_{k+k'}}] \\ &= \left(\det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p}{2}} [a]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} [M(g)]_{j_1, i_1} \cdots [M(g)]_{j_k, i_k} \right) \\ & \quad \left(\det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p'}{2}} [b]_{i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{k+k'}} [M(g)]_{j_{k+1}, i_{k+1}} \cdots [M(g)]_{j_{k+k'}, i_{k+k'}} \right) \\ &= [g \cdot a]_{j_1, \dots, j_k} [g \cdot b]_{j_{k+1}, \dots, j_{k+k'}} \\ &= [g \cdot a \otimes g \cdot b]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k+k'}} \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses the fact that

$$\det(M(g))^{\frac{1-pp'}{2}} = \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p}{2}} \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p'}{2}},$$

which is straightforward to verify via a case analysis over possible parameter values (i.e., $p, p' \in \{+1, -1\}$ and $\det(M(g)) \in \{+1, -1\}$).

Next, we verify linearity. Let $a, a' \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$, $b \in \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$, and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} [(\alpha a + \beta a') \otimes b]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k+k'}} &= [(\alpha a + \beta a')]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} [b]_{i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{k+k'}} \\ &= \alpha [a]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} [b]_{i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{k+k'}} + \beta [a']_{i_1, \dots, i_k} [b]_{i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{k+k'}} \\ &= \alpha [a \otimes b]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k+k'}} + \beta [a' \otimes b]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k+k'}}. \end{aligned}$$

The linearity in the second argument follows in the same manner.

Finally, (30) follows immediately from the fact that the bilinear $O(d)$ -equivariance. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. To establish equivariance, let $a \in \mathcal{T}_{2k+k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$ and let $g \in O(d)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& [g \cdot \iota_k(a)]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} \\
&= \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p}{2}} [a]_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_k, i_1, \dots, i_{k'}} [M(g)]_{j_1, i_1} \cdots [M(g)]_{j_{k'}, i_{k'}} \\
&= \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p}{2}} [a]_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{2k}, i_1, \dots, i_{k'}} [\delta]_{\ell_1, \ell_{k+1}} \cdots [\delta]_{\ell_k, \ell_{2k}} [M(g)]_{j_1, i_1} \cdots [M(g)]_{j_{k'}, i_{k'}} \\
&= \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p}{2}} [a]_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{2k}, i_1, \dots, i_{k'}} [M(g)]_{\ell_1, m_1} [M(g)]_{\ell_{k+1}, m_1} \cdots \\
&\quad \cdots [M(g)]_{\ell_k, m_k} [M(g)]_{\ell_{2k}, m_k} [M(g)]_{j_1, i_1} \cdots [M(g)]_{j_{k'}, i_{k'}} \\
&= [g \cdot a]_{m_1, \dots, m_k, m_1, \dots, m_k, j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} \\
&= [\iota_k(g \cdot a)]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k'}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality uses the fact that $\delta = M(g)M(g)^\top$.

Next, to establish linearity, let $a, b \in \mathcal{T}_{2k+k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$ and let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
[\iota_k(\alpha a + \beta b)]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} &= [\alpha a + \beta b]_{i_1, \dots, i_k, i_1, \dots, i_k, j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} \\
&= \alpha [a]_{i_1, \dots, i_k, i_1, \dots, i_k, j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} + \beta [b]_{i_1, \dots, i_k, i_1, \dots, i_k, j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} \\
&= \alpha [\iota_k(a)]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} + \beta [\iota_k(b)]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. Fix $\sigma \in S_k$. To establish equivariance, let $a \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$ and $g \in O(d)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
[g \cdot (a^\sigma)]_{j_1, \dots, j_k} &= \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p}{2}} [a^\sigma]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} [M(g)]_{j_1, i_1} \cdots [M(g)]_{j_k, i_k} \\
&= \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p}{2}} [a]_{i_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, i_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}} [M(g)]_{j_1, i_1} \cdots [M(g)]_{j_k, i_k} \\
&= \det(M(g))^{\frac{1-p}{2}} [a]_{i_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, i_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}} [M(g)]_{j_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, i_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}} \cdots [M(g)]_{j_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}, i_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}} \\
&= [g \cdot a]_{j_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, j_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}} \\
&= [(g \cdot a)^\sigma]_{j_1, \dots, j_k},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality holds since we are merely reordering the $M(g)$ components—which is allowed because they are scalars.

To show linearity, let $a, b \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, p)$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
[(\alpha a + \beta b)^\sigma]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} &= [\alpha a + \beta b]_{i_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, i_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}} \\
&= \alpha [a]_{i_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, i_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}} + \beta [b]_{i_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, i_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}} \\
&= \alpha [a^\sigma]_{i_1, \dots, i_k} + \beta [b^\sigma]_{i_1, \dots, i_k}.
\end{aligned}$$

\square

B Proof of Theorem 1

In this section, we prove Theorem 1. To prove this theorem, we require two lemmas, allowing us to decompose our equivariant function into simpler equivariant functions. We state the lemmas, prove the theorem, and then prove the lemmas.

Lemma 2. Let $f : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$ be a polynomial map of degree R , and write

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \sum_{r=0}^R f_r(a_1, \dots, a_n),$$

where $f_r : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$ is homogeneous degree r polynomial. If f is $O(d)$ -equivariant, then each f_r is $O(d)$ -equivariant.

Lemma 3. Let $f_r : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$ be a homogeneous polynomial of degree r . Then, we can write f_r as

$$f_r(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}), \quad (31)$$

where $f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} : \prod_{i=1}^r \mathcal{T}_{k_{\ell_i}}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_{\ell_i}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$ is the composition of the map

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^r \mathcal{T}_{k_{\ell_i}}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_{\ell_i}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\sum_{i=1}^r k_{\ell_i}}\left(\mathbb{R}^d, \prod_{i=1}^r p_{\ell_i}\right) \\ (a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}) &\mapsto a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \end{aligned}$$

with a linear map $\mathcal{T}_{\sum_{i=1}^r k_{\ell_i}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \prod_{i=1}^r p_{\ell_i}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$.

Moreover, if f_r is $O(d)$ -equivariant, then so are the $f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$.

Remark 5. Note that Lemma 3 is nothing more than the decomposition of f_r as a sum of multi-homogeneous maps in the inputs a_1, \dots, a_n .

Proof of Theorem 1. Combining Lemmas 2 and 3, we can write f as follows:

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \sum_{r=0}^R \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}), \quad (32)$$

where the $f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$ is the composition of a linear map $\mathcal{T}_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$ with the map $(a_1, \dots, a_{\ell_r}) \mapsto a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r}$. Recall that $k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} = \sum_{q=1}^r k_{\ell_q}$ and $p_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} = \prod_{q=1}^r p_{\ell_q}$. Moreover, by the lemmas, each $f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$ is $O(d)$ -equivariant. Hence, without loss of generality, it is enough to prove the theorem in the special case

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \lambda(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r}), \quad (33)$$

where $\lambda : \mathcal{T}_{\sum_{i=1}^r k_{\ell_i}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \prod_{i=1}^r p_{\ell_i}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p')$ is linear.

Now, in coordinates, we can write this map as

$$[f(a_1, \dots, a_n)]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} = \lambda_{i_1, \dots, i_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}, j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} [a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r}]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}}. \quad (34)$$

Consider now the tensor $c \in \mathcal{T}_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} + k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} p')$ given by

$$[c]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} + k'}} = \lambda_{i_1, \dots, i_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}, i_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} + 1}, \dots, i_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} + k'}} \quad (35)$$

Then we have that

$$[f(a_1, \dots, a_n)]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} = [c]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}, j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} [a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r}]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}} \quad (36)$$

$$= [a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes c]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}, i_1, \dots, i_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}, j_1, \dots, j_{k'}} \quad (37)$$

$$= [\iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes c)]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k'}}, \quad (38)$$

after using the definition of k -contraction. Hence

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes c). \quad (39)$$

Since f is $O(d)$ -equivariant, we have that for all $g \in O(d)$,

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes g \cdot c). \quad (40)$$

To see this, we argue as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &f(a_1, \dots, a_n) \\ &= f(g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot a_1), \dots, g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot a_n)) \\ &= g \cdot f((g^{-1} \cdot a_1), \dots, (g^{-1} \cdot a_n)) && (f \text{ } O(d)\text{-equivariant}) \\ &= g \cdot \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}((g^{-1} \cdot a_{\ell_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes (g^{-1} \cdot a_{\ell_r}) \otimes c) \\ &= \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}(g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot a_{\ell_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot a_{\ell_r}) \otimes (g \cdot c)) && (\iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}} \text{ } O(d)\text{-equivariant}) \\ &= \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes (g \cdot c)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by taking the expectation with respect to the Haar probability measure of $O(d)$ and linearity of contractions, we have that

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}} \left(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{g} \in O(d)} \mathfrak{g} \cdot c \right) \right), \quad (41)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{g} \in O(d)}$ is the expectation with respect the Haar probability measure of $O(d)$. This holds because

$$\begin{aligned} f(a_1, \dots, a_n) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{g} \in O(d)} f(a_1, \dots, a_n) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{g} \in O(d)} \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}} (a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes (\mathfrak{g} \cdot c)) \\ &= \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}} \left(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{g} \in O(d)} \mathfrak{g} \cdot c \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{g} \in O(d)} \mathfrak{g} \cdot c$ is an $O(d)$ -isotropic tensor. Hence, we have shown that we can write f in the desired form. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$, since each f_r is homogeneous of degree r , we have

$$f(t a_1, \dots, t a_n) = \sum_{r=0}^R f_r(t a_1, \dots, t a_n) = \sum_{r=1}^R t^r f_r(a_1, \dots, a_n).$$

Let now $g \in O(d)$, then, by equivariance of f , we have

$$\sum_{r=0}^R t^r f_r(g \cdot a_1, \dots, g \cdot a_n) = \sum_{r=0}^R t^r g \cdot f_r(a_1, \dots, a_n), \quad (42)$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=0}^R t^r f_r(g \cdot a_1, \dots, g \cdot a_n) &= f(t(g \cdot a_1), \dots, t(g \cdot a_n)) \\ &= f(g \cdot t a_1, \dots, g \cdot t a_n) \\ &= g \cdot f(t a_1, \dots, t a_n) \\ &= g \cdot \sum_{r=0}^R t^r f_r(a_1, \dots, a_n) \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^R t^r g \cdot f_r(a_1, \dots, a_n). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all $g \in O(d)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_i)$, we have that

$$0 = \sum_{r=0}^R t^r (g \cdot f_r(a_1, \dots, a_n) - f_r(g \cdot a_1, \dots, g \cdot a_n)). \quad (43)$$

Now, the only way in which the univariate polynomial in t of degree R is identically zero is if it is the zero polynomial (cf. [12, Chapter 1 §1 Proposition 5]). Therefore for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $g \in O(d)$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_i)$,

$$f_r(g \cdot a_1, \dots, g \cdot a_n) = g \cdot f_r(a_1, \dots, a_n), \quad (44)$$

i.e., for each r , f_r is $O(d)$ -equivariant, as we wanted to show. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. First, we will show that if the decomposition exists, each summand is equivariant. Then, we will show that the decomposition exists.

Let $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, by the linearity, we have that

$$f_r(t_1 a_1, \dots, t_n a_n) = \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} t_{\ell_1} \cdots t_{\ell_r} f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}), \quad (45)$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} f_r(t_1 a_1, \dots, t_n a_n) &= \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(t_{\ell_1} a_{\ell_1}, \dots, t_{\ell_r} a_{\ell_r}) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} t_{\ell_1} \cdots t_{\ell_r} f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}). \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $g \in O(d)$. Then, by the equivariance of f_r , we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} t_{\ell_1} \cdots t_{\ell_r} f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(g \cdot a_{\ell_1}, \dots, g \cdot a_{\ell_r}) = \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} t_{\ell_1} \cdots t_{\ell_r} g \cdot f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}), \quad (46)$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} t_{\ell_1} \cdots t_{\ell_r} f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(g \cdot a_{\ell_1}, \dots, g \cdot a_{\ell_r}) \\ &= f_r(t_1 (g \cdot a_1), \dots, t_n (g \cdot a_n)) \\ &= f_r(g \cdot t_1 a_1, \dots, g \cdot t_n a_n) \\ &= g \cdot f_r(t_1 a_1, \dots, t_n a_n) \\ &= g \cdot \left(\sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} t_{\ell_1} \cdots t_{\ell_r} f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} t_{\ell_1} \cdots t_{\ell_r} g \cdot f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all $g \in O(d)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_i)$, we have that

$$0 = \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} t_{\ell_1} \cdots t_{\ell_r} [g \cdot f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}) - f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(g \cdot a_{\ell_1}, \dots, g \cdot a_{\ell_r})]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k'}}. \quad (47)$$

Now, each of these is a polynomial in t_1, \dots, t_n that vanishes on \mathbb{R}^n . Moreover, note that no two $t_{\ell_1} \cdots t_{\ell_r}$ give the same monomial. Hence, by [12, Chapter 1 §1 Proposition 5], all these polynomials are the zero polynomial, i.e., their coefficients are zero. In this way, we conclude that for each $f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$, and all $g \in O(d)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(\mathbb{R}^d, p_i)$,

$$f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(g \cdot a_{\ell_1}, \dots, g \cdot a_{\ell_r}) = g \cdot f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}), \quad (48)$$

i.e., each $f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$ is $O(d)$ -equivariant.

Now, we show how to obtain the decomposition. Recall that f_r is homogeneous of degree r . Therefore each entry of $f_r(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is an homogeneous polynomial of degree r in the $[a_i]_{j_1, \dots, j_{k_i}}$, i.e., a linear combination of products of the form

$$\prod_{q=1}^r [a_{\ell_q}]_{j_{q,1}, \dots, j_{q, k_{\ell_q}}},$$

where, without loss of generality, we can assume that $\ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r$. Hence, in coordinates, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &[f_r(a_1, \dots, a_n)]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k'}} \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} \lambda_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r; i_1, \dots, i_{k'}; j_{1,1}, \dots, j_{1, k_{\ell_1}}, \dots, j_{r,1}, \dots, j_{r, k_{\ell_r}}} \prod_{q=1}^r [a_{\ell_q}]_{j_{q,1}, \dots, j_{q, k_{\ell_q}}} \quad (49) \end{aligned}$$

And so, we can consider the map $f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$ given in coordinates by

$$[f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r})]_{i_1, \dots, i_{k'}} := \lambda_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r; i_1, \dots, i_{k'}; j_1, 1, \dots, j_1, k_{\ell_1}, \dots, j_r, 1, \dots, j_r, k_{\ell_r}} \prod_{q=1}^r [a_{\ell_q}]_{j_q, 1, \dots, j_q, k_{\ell_q}}, \quad (50)$$

which, by construction, is the composition of the linear map given by

$$b \mapsto \lambda_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r; i_1, \dots, i_{k'}; j_1, \dots, j_{\sum_{q=1}^r k_{\ell_q}}} [b]_{j_1, \dots, j_{\sum_{q=1}^r k_{\ell_q}}},$$

in coordinates, and $(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}) \mapsto a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r}$. Hence the desired decomposition of f_r has been obtained. \square

C Proof of Corollary 1

In this section, we will prove Corollary 1 using Lemma 1, which we prove afterward.

Proof of Corollary 1. By Theorem 1 and Lemma 1, we can assume, without loss of generality, it suffices to consider the special case where f consists of a single term

$$f(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \iota_r \left(v_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{\ell_r} \otimes \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{r+k'}{2}} \right)^\sigma \right), \quad (51)$$

for some $\sigma \in S_{r+k'}$ and $r+k'$ even. To simplify notation, set $t := \frac{r+k'}{2}$.

Now, note that

$$\delta = e_i \otimes e_i,$$

where $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ is the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^d . Hence we get

$$f(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \iota_r (v_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{\ell_r} \otimes (e_{i_1} \otimes e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_t} \otimes e_{i_t})^\sigma) \quad (52)$$

Let's write

$$(e_{i_1} \otimes e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_t} \otimes e_{i_t})^\sigma = e_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{j_{2t}}$$

where each (j_1, \dots, j_{2t}) is some permutation of $(i_1, i_1, \dots, i_t, i_t)$ and so, by Einstein notation, we are still adding over repeated indexes. Then we have that

$$f(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \langle v_{\ell_1}, e_{j_1} \rangle \dots \langle v_{\ell_r}, e_{j_r} \rangle e_{j_{r+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{j_{2t}}. \quad (53)$$

Now, we can freely rearrange the $\langle v_\ell, e_j \rangle$ as they are scalars. There are three cases for each of the original indices i_q : (a) e_{i_q} appears in an inner product twice, (b) e_{i_q} appears in an inner product once, or (c) e_{i_q} does not appear in an inner product.

In the case (a), we will get

$$\langle v_\ell, e_i \rangle \langle v_{\ell'}, e_i \rangle = \langle v_\ell, v_{\ell'} \rangle.$$

In the case (b), we will get

$$\langle v_\ell, e_i \rangle e_i = v_\ell.$$

And, in the case (c), we will get

$$e_i \otimes e_i = \delta.$$

Now, assume that we have α of the case (a), β of the case (b) and γ of the case (c). By permuting the i_q , which does not change the result, we can write for some permutation $\tilde{\sigma} \in S_{\beta+\gamma}$ and some permutation J_1, \dots, J_r some permutation of ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_r that

$$\begin{aligned} f(v_1, \dots, v_n) &= \langle v_{J_1}, e_{i_1} \rangle \langle v_{J_2}, e_{i_1} \rangle \dots \langle v_{J_{2\alpha-1}}, e_{i_\alpha} \rangle \langle v_{J_{2\alpha}}, e_{i_\alpha} \rangle \\ &\quad \left(\langle v_{J_{2\alpha+1}}, e_{i_{\alpha+1}} \rangle e_{i_{\alpha+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \langle v_{J_{2\alpha+\beta}}, e_{i_{\alpha+\beta}} \rangle e_{i_{\alpha+\beta}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \otimes e_{i_{\alpha+\beta+1}} \otimes e_{i_{\alpha+\beta+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_{\alpha+\beta+\gamma}} \otimes e_{i_{\alpha+\beta+\gamma}} \right)^{\tilde{\sigma}} \\ &= \langle v_{J_1}, v_{J_2} \rangle \dots \langle v_{J_{2\alpha-1}}, v_{J_{2\alpha}} \rangle (v_{J_{2\alpha+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{2\alpha+\beta} \otimes \delta^{\otimes \gamma})^{\tilde{\sigma}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the desired claim follows, and we finish the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 1. We will prove each case separately. However, note that no matter the value of p , an $O(d)$ -isotropic tensor is always an $SO(d)$ -isotropic tensor since $\det(M(g)) = 1$ for all $g \in SO(d)$. Now, by [30, Theorem §2] (cf. [2, Eq. (4.10)]), any $SO(d)$ -isotropic tensor z can be written as a linear combination of the form

$$z = \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \alpha_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}} \right)^\sigma + \beta_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon \right)^\sigma, \quad (54)$$

where δ is the Kronecker delta (Definition 8), and ϵ is the Levi-Civita symbol (Definition 9), with the convention that the coefficients α_σ and β_σ are zero when the expressions $\delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}}$ and $\delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}}$ do not make sense. More precisely, the $\alpha_\sigma = 0$ if k is odd, and the $\beta_\sigma = 0$ if $k-d$ is odd.

Note that under the $SO(d)$ -action, we don't need to worry about the parity, and so both δ and ϵ are $SO(d)$ -invariant. However, for the $O(d)$ -action, the parity matters. Suppose $\gamma \in O(d)$ is a hyperplane reflection, and let T be an $O(d)$ -isotropic $k_{(-)}$ -tensor. If \hat{T} is a $k_{(+)}$ -tensor whose components equal T , then

$$\gamma \cdot \hat{T} = -\hat{T}.$$

Likewise, if T is an $O(d)$ -isotropic $k_{(+)}$ -tensor and \hat{T} is a $k_{(-)}$ -tensor whose components equal T , then

$$\gamma \cdot \hat{T} = -\hat{T}.$$

Note that being isotropic depends on the parity because it affects the considered action.

Case $p = -1$: Let $z \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, +)$ be $O(d)$ -isotropic. In particular, z is also $SO(d)$ -isotropic, and so we can write it using (54).

Recall that $O(d)$ is generated by all the (hyperplane) reflections. Hence, to show that z is an $O(d)$ -isotropic, we need only to show that for every (hyperplane) reflection $\gamma \in O(d)$,

$$\gamma \cdot z = z.$$

Now, by our observation above, inside $\mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, +)$, we have that

$$\gamma \cdot \delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon = -\delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon, \quad (55)$$

since $\delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon$ is an $O(d)$ -isotropic $k_{(-)}$ -tensor. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \cdot z &= \gamma \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \alpha_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}} \right)^\sigma + \beta_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon \right)^\sigma \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \alpha_\sigma \left((\gamma \cdot \delta)^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}} \right)^\sigma + \beta_\sigma \left((\gamma \cdot \delta)^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \gamma \cdot \epsilon \right)^\sigma \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \alpha_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}} \right)^\sigma - \beta_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon \right)^\sigma \\ &= z - 2 \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \beta_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon \right)^\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by assumption, z is $O(d)$ -isotropic, so we can conclude $\sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \beta_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon \right)^\sigma = 0$, and so z has the desired form.

Case $p = 1$: We argue as above, but using that for a (hyperplane) reflection $\gamma \in O(d)$, we have, inside $\mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, -)$,

$$\gamma \cdot \delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}} = -\delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}}, \quad (56)$$

since $\delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}}$ is an $O(d)$ -isotropic $k_{(+)}$ -tensor. Hence, arguing similarly as in the previous case, we conclude that $\sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \alpha_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}} \right)^\sigma = 0$, and so that z has the desired form. \square

D Smaller parameterization of $O(d)$ -isotropic tensors

In Lemma 1, the sum does not have to be over all permutations. The reason for this is that the tensors

$$\delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon$$

do not have a trivial stabilizer under the action of S_k . One can easily see the following proposition. Recall that the *stabilizer of a k -tensor $\pm T$ in S_k* is the following subgroup:

$$\text{Stab}_{S_k}(\pm T) := \{\sigma \in S_k \mid T^\sigma = \pm T\}, \quad (57)$$

where $T^\sigma = \pm T$ means that either $T^\sigma = T$ or $T^\sigma = -T$. Note that the laxity in the signs comes from the fact that positive summands and their negative counterparts can be combined.

Proposition 4. (a) If k is even, $\text{Stab}_{S_k}(\pm \delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}})$ is generated by the transpositions

$$(1, 2), (3, 4), \dots, (k-1, k)$$

and all permutations of the form

$$(i, j)(i+1, j+1)$$

with $i, j < k$ odd. In particular, $\#\text{Stab}_{S_k}(\pm \delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}}) = (k/2)! 2^{k/2}$.

(b) If $k-d$ is even, $\text{Stab}_{S_k}(\pm \delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon)$ is generated by the transpositions

$$(1, 2), (3, 4), \dots, (k-d-1, k-d),$$

all permutations of the form

$$(i, j)(i+1, j+1)$$

with $i, j < k-d$ odd, and all transpositions of the form

$$(i, j)$$

with $k-d < i, j$. In particular, $\#\text{Stab}_{S_k}(\pm \delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon) = ((k-d)/2)! 2^{(k-d)/2} d!$.

Proof. This follows from [44, Theorem 5.3.4]. □

Using these proposition, we can write any $O(d)$ -isotropic $k_{(+)}$ -tensor as

$$\sum_{\sigma \in G_k} \alpha_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k}{2}} \right)^\sigma$$

with the α_σ real and

$$G_k = \left\{ \sigma \in S_k : \sigma(1) < \sigma(3) < \dots < \sigma(k-1) \text{ and for all } i \leq \frac{k}{2}, \sigma(2i-1) < \sigma(2i) \right\}$$

of size $\frac{k!}{(k/2)! 2^{k/2}}$; and any $O(d)$ -isotropic $k_{(-)}$ -tensor as

$$\sum_{\sigma \in H_k} \beta_\sigma \left(\delta^{\otimes \frac{k-d}{2}} \otimes \epsilon \right)^\sigma \quad (58)$$

with the β_σ real and

$$H_k = \left\{ \sigma \in S_k : \sigma(1) < \sigma(3) < \dots < \sigma(k-d-1), \text{ for all } i \leq \frac{k-d}{2}, \sigma(2i-1) < \sigma(2i) \right. \\ \left. \text{and for all } j > k-d, \sigma(j) < \sigma(j+1) \right\}.$$

of size $\frac{k!}{\left(\frac{k-d}{2}\right)! 2^{\frac{k-d}{2}} d!}$.

E Example of Theorem 1

In this section, we give a second example of Theorem 1.

Example 2. Let $f : \mathcal{T}_1(\mathbb{R}^d, +) \times \mathcal{T}_2(\mathbb{R}^d, +) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_2(\mathbb{R}^d, +)$ be $O(d)$ -equivariant polynomial of degree at most 2. By Theorem 1 we can write f in the form

$$f(a_1, a_2) = \sum_{r=0}^2 \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq 2} \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}), \quad (59)$$

where $c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$ is an $O(d)$ -isotropic $(k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} + 2)_{(+)}$ -tensor. By Lemma 1, $c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$ is nontrivial only when $k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} + 2$ is even. Recall that $k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} = \sum_{q=1}^r k_{\ell_q}$. The inputs are a $1_{(+)}$ -tensor and $2_{(+)}$ -tensor. The even combinations of 1 and 2 with at most 2 terms are $\emptyset, 2, 1 + 1, 2 + 2$ so we have

$$f(a_1, a_2) = \beta_0 \delta + \iota_2(a_2 \otimes c_2) + \iota_2(a_1 \otimes a_1 \otimes c'_2) + \iota_4(a_2 \otimes a_2 \otimes c_3), \quad (60)$$

where c_2, c'_2 are $O(d)$ -isotropic $4_{(+)}$ -tensors and c_3 is an $O(d)$ -isotropic $6_{(+)}$ -tensor. By similar reasoning to Example 1, we can write

$$\iota_2(a_2 \otimes c_2) = \beta_1 \operatorname{tr}(a_2) \delta + \beta_2 a_2 + \beta_3 a_2^\top \quad (61)$$

for constants $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$ and

$$\iota_2(a_1 \otimes a_1 \otimes c'_2) = \beta_4 \langle a_1, a_1 \rangle \delta + \beta_5 a_1 \otimes a_1, \quad (62)$$

for constants β_4, β_5 (there are only two terms due to the symmetry of $a_1 \otimes a_1$). It remains to consider $\iota_4(a_2 \otimes a_2 \otimes c_3)$. By Lemma 1, we can write

$$c_3 = \sum_{\sigma \in G_6} \beta_\sigma (\delta^{\otimes 3})^\sigma, \quad (63)$$

where $|G_6| = 6!/(3!2^3) = 15$. In particular, we have

$$G_6 = \{(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), (1, 2, 3, 5, 4, 6), (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 4), (1, 3, 2, 4, 5, 6), (1, 3, 2, 5, 4, 6), \\ (1, 3, 2, 5, 6, 4), (1, 3, 4, 2, 5, 6), (1, 3, 4, 5, 2, 6), (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 2), (1, 3, 5, 2, 4, 6), \\ (1, 3, 5, 2, 6, 4), (1, 3, 5, 4, 2, 6), (1, 3, 5, 4, 6, 2), (1, 3, 5, 6, 2, 4), (1, 3, 5, 6, 4, 2)\}.$$

However, due to the symmetry of $a_2 \otimes a_2$, when we compute $\iota_4(a_2 \otimes a_2 (\delta^{\otimes 3})^\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in G_6$, there are only 7 distinct terms

$$\iota_4(a_2 \otimes a_2 \otimes c_3) = \beta_6 \operatorname{tr}(a_2)^2 \delta + \beta_7 \operatorname{tr}(a_2) a_2 + \beta_8 \operatorname{tr}(a_2) a_2^\top + \beta_9 a_2^\top a_2 + \beta_{10} a_2 a_2^\top + \beta_{11} a_2 a_2 + \beta_{12} a_2^\top a_2^\top. \quad (64)$$

In summary,

$$f(a_1, a_2) = \beta_0 \delta + \beta_1 \operatorname{tr}(a_2) \delta + \beta_2 a_2 + \beta_3 a_2^\top + \beta_3 \langle a_1, a_1 \rangle \delta + \beta_4 a_1 \otimes a_1 + \beta_5 \operatorname{tr}(a_2)^2 \delta \\ + \beta_6 \operatorname{tr}(a_2) a_2 + \beta_7 \operatorname{tr}(a_2) a_2^\top + \beta_8 a_2^\top a_2 + \beta_9 a_2 a_2^\top + \beta_{10} a_2 a_2 + \beta_{11} a_2^\top a_2^\top,$$

for some coefficients $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{11}$.

F Generalization to other linear algebraic groups

In this section, we will show how Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 can be extended to the indefinite orthogonal and the symplectic group as Theorem 2 and Corollary 2.

The main idea to extend Theorem 1 to other groups is to use some form of averaging. On $O(d)$, the compactness guarantees the existence of a Haar probability measure. However, to apply

the same trick over non-compact groups such as $O(s, d - s)$ and $Sp(d)$, we need to use technical machinery to imitate the averaging strategy.

First, we introduce some definitions and examples regarding complex and real linear algebraic groups. The main point will be to establish how to get a compact subgroup over which to average. Basically the results will generalize to real linear algebraic groups such that their complexifications have a Zariski-dense compact subgroup. For instance reductive connected complex algebraic groups satisfy this assumption. Second, we prove a generalization of Theorem 1 for complex linear algebraic groups with a Zariski-dense compact subgroup acting on complex tensors. Third, we prove a generalization of Theorem 1 for real linear algebraic groups that are compact or such that their complexification has a Zariski-dense compact subgroup. Finally, we prove Corollary 2.

F.1 Reductive complex and real linear algebraic groups

Recall that a *complex linear algebraic group* is a subgroup G of $GL(V)$, where V is a finite-dimensional complex vector space, such that G is the zero set of some set of complex polynomial functions over $End(V)$, the set of (complex) linear maps $V \rightarrow V$. Recall also that a *rational G -module* of G is a vector space U together with a linear action of G on U such that the map $G \times U \ni (g, x) \mapsto g \cdot x \in U$ is polynomial², and that a G -submodule U_0 of U is a vector subspace $U_0 \subseteq U$ such that for all $g \in G$, $g \cdot U_0 \subseteq U_0$.

Definition 10. [44, Def. 3.3.1] A *reductive complex linear algebraic group* is a complex linear algebraic group $G \subset GL(V)$ such that every rational G -module U is *completely reducible*, i.e., for every G -submodule U_0 of U , there is a G -submodule U_1 such that $U = U_0 + U_1$ and $U_0 \cap U_1 = 0$.

Example 3. Given any finite-dimensional vector space, the classical complex groups $GL(V)$ and $SL(V)$ are reductive complex linear algebraic groups.

Example 4. Given any finite-dimensional vector space V together with a symmetric non-degenerate bilinear form³ $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, the (complex) orthogonal group

$$O(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) := \{g \in GL(V) \mid \text{for all } v, w \in V, \langle g \cdot v, g \cdot w \rangle = \langle v, w \rangle\} \quad (65)$$

is a reductive complex linear algebraic group. We will pay special attention to the following family of complex orthogonal groups:

$$O^{\mathbb{C}}(s, d - s) := \{g \in GL(\mathbb{C}^d) \mid g^{\top} \mathbb{I}_{s, d-s} g = \mathbb{I}_{s, d-s}\} = O(\mathbb{C}^d, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_s) \quad (66)$$

where $\langle u, v \rangle_s := u^{\top} \mathbb{I}_{s, d-s} v$. Note that all these groups are isomorphic, satisfying that

$$O^{\mathbb{C}}(s, d - s) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_s & \\ & i\mathbb{I}_{d-s} \end{pmatrix} O^{\mathbb{C}}(d, 0) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_s & \\ & i\mathbb{I}_{d-s} \end{pmatrix}^{-1}.$$

Moreover, this is true in general: any two complex orthogonal groups are isomorphic if they are of the same order—this follows from the fact that all symmetric non-degenerate bilinear forms are equivalent over the complex numbers.

Example 5. Given any finite-dimensional vector space V together with an anti-symmetric non-degenerate bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, the (complex) symplectic group

$$Sym(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) := \{g \in GL(V) \mid \text{for all } v, w \in V, \langle g \cdot v, g \cdot w \rangle = \langle v, w \rangle\} \quad (67)$$

is a reductive complex linear algebraic group. We will pay special attention to the following special case:

$$Sp^{\mathbb{C}}(d) := \{g \in GL(\mathbb{C}^d) \mid g^{\top} J_d g = J_d\} = Sp(\mathbb{C}^d, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{symp}}) \quad (68)$$

²To be precise, we mean that the map $G \times U \rightarrow U$ is a morphism of algebraic varieties. Choose basis for U and V , so that we can identify V with \mathbb{C}^d and U with \mathbb{C}^n . Then, being a morphism between algebraic varieties, just means that the map $G \times \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ is the restriction of a map $\mathbb{C}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ that can be written componentwise as $(p_l((g_{i,j})_{i,j}, (u_k)_k)) / (\det g)^{a_l}$ where each p_l is a polynomial in the $g_{i,j}$ and u_k and each a_l an integer.

³Recall that this means that for all $u, v, w \in V$ and $t, s \in \mathbb{C}$: (a) $\langle u, v \rangle = \langle v, u \rangle$, (b) for all $x \in V$, $\langle u, x \rangle = 0$ if and only if $u = 0$, and (c) $\langle tu + sv, w \rangle = t\langle u, w \rangle + s\langle v, w \rangle$.

where $\langle u, v \rangle_{\text{symp}} := u^\top J_d v$. Note that any symplectic group of order d is isomorphic to $Sp^{\mathbb{C}}(d)$ because any two antisymmetric non-degenerate bilinear forms are equivalent over the complex numbers.

Example 6. The complex linear algebraic group

$$H = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mid t \in \mathbb{C} \right\}$$

is not reductive, since \mathbb{C}^2 is an H -module that is not completely reducible. Note that $\mathbb{C} \times 0$ is the only H -submodule of \mathbb{C}^2 , so we cannot find a complementary H -submodule.

Recall that a subset X of a set \tilde{X} is *Zariski-dense* in \tilde{X} if every polynomial function that vanishes in X vanishes in \tilde{X} , i.e. if every polynomial function that does not vanish on \tilde{X} does not vanish in X . The following theorem allows us to use the power of averaging for reductive connected complex linear algebraic groups.

Theorem 3. [44, Theorem 11.5.1] Let G be a reductive connected complex algebraic group. Then there exists a Zariski-dense compact subgroup K . More precisely, there is a subgroup $U(G)$ of G that is Zariski-dense in G and that, with respect to the usual topology⁴, is compact.

Remark 6. Note that using this compact subgroup K , we can consider expressions of the form

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u} \in U(G)} \mathbf{u} \cdot T$$

by taking the expectation with respect to the unique Haar probability measure of K . Now, since $U(G)$ is Zariski-dense in G , we have that the fact that for all $u \in U(G)$, $u \cdot (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u} \in U(G)} \mathbf{u} \cdot T) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u} \in U(G)} \mathbf{u} \cdot T$ implies that for all $g \in G$,

$$g \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u} \in U(G)} \mathbf{u} \cdot T \right) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u} \in U(G)} \mathbf{u} \cdot T.$$

Note that $U(G)$ is not necessarily unique.

Example 7. In $GL(\mathbb{C}^d)$, the Zariski-dense compact subgroup is the group of unitary matrices:

$$U(\mathbb{C}^d) := \{g \in GL(\mathbb{C}^d) \mid g^* g = \mathbb{I}_d\}$$

where $*$ denotes the conjugate transpose. In $SL(\mathbb{C}^d)$, it is the group of special unitary transformations:

$$SU(\mathbb{C}^d) := \{g \in U(\mathbb{C}^d) \mid \det g = 1\}.$$

Example 8. In $O^{\mathbb{C}}(s, d-s)$, the Zariski-dense compact subgroup is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_s & \\ & i\mathbb{I}_{d-s} \end{pmatrix} O(d) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_s & \\ & i\mathbb{I}_{d-s} \end{pmatrix}^{-1}.$$

Note that when $s = 0$ or $s = d$, this is the orthogonal group over the reals. Moreover, this does not follow from Theorem 3 as $O^{\mathbb{C}}(s, d-s)$ is not connected.

Example 9. In $Sp^{\mathbb{C}}(d)$, the Zariski-dense compact subgroup is the so-called compact symplectic group:

$$USp(d) := Sp^{\mathbb{C}}(d) \cap U(\mathbb{C}^d).$$

Recall that a *real linear algebraic group* is a subgroup G of $GL(V)$, where V is a finite-dimensional real vector space, such that G is the zero set of some set of real polynomial functions over $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Similarly, as we did with complex linear algebraic groups, we can talk about *rational modules* and about *reductive real linear algebraic groups*.

However, given a reductive real linear algebraic group we cannot necessarily guarantee the existence of a Zariski-dense compact subgroup. This means that we cannot apply the averaging trick directly, but we can do so by passing to the Zariski-dense compact subgroup of the complexification of the real linear algebraic group.

⁴The topology inherited from the Euclidean topology of $GL(\mathbb{C}^d)$.

Definition 11. Let $G \subset GL(V)$ be a real linear algebraic group. The *complexification* $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ of G is the complex linear algebraic group given by

$$G^{\mathbb{C}} := \{g \in GL(V^{\mathbb{C}}) \mid \text{for every polynomial } f \text{ such that } f(G) = 0, f(g) = 0\} \quad (69)$$

where $V^{\mathbb{C}} := V \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$ is the complexification of V , i.e., the complex vector space obtained from V by extending scalars.

Remark 7. In essence, we complexify the underlying real algebraic variety. Group multiplication preserves its structure as a complex variety as it is given by polynomial functions of the matrix entries.

Definition 12. A real linear algebraic group G is *complexly averageable* if it's Zariski-dense in its complexification and its complexification admits a Zariski-dense compact subgroup closed under complex conjugation.

Remark 8. Recall that the complexification of \mathbb{R}^d is naturally isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^d .

Example 10. The complexification of $GL(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is $GL(\mathbb{C}^d)$, and the complexification of $SL(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is $SL(\mathbb{C}^d)$.

Example 11. We have that

$$O(s, d-s)^{\mathbb{C}} = O^{\mathbb{C}}(s, d-s)$$

and that

$$Sp(d)^{\mathbb{C}} = Sp^{\mathbb{C}}(d).$$

Hence, both the indefinite orthogonal group and symplectic group are complexly averageable. The symplectic group is connected but the indefinite orthogonal group is not connected. However, it does have a Zariski-dense compact subgroup (see Example 8).

The following proposition shows that complexly averageable real linear algebraic groups are common.

Proposition 5. Let $G \subset GL(V)$ be a real linear algebraic group. (1) G is Zariski-dense in $G^{\mathbb{C}}$. (2) If the complexification $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ of G is connected and reductive, then G is complexly averageable.

Proof. (1) Let f be a complex polynomial vanishing on G . Then, we can write this polynomial as $f = f_r + if_i$ for some polynomials f_r and f_i with real coefficients. Now, since f vanishes on G , then f_r and f_i vanish also on G —as otherwise there would be $g \in G$ such that either $f_r(g) \neq 0$ or $f_i(g) \neq 0$, contradicting $f(g) = 0$. But then, by definition of $G^{\mathbb{C}}$, f_r and f_i vanish on G and so $f = f_r + if_i$ vanishes on $G^{\mathbb{C}}$. Hence we have just proven that a complex polynomial vanishes on G if and only if vanishes on $G^{\mathbb{C}}$, i.e., we have proven that G is Zariski-dense in $G^{\mathbb{C}}$.

(2) This follows from Theorem 3. □

Example 12. Observe that the Zariski-dense compact subgroups of $O^{\mathbb{C}}(s, d-s)$ and $Sp^{\mathbb{C}}(d)$ that have been given satisfy that they are closed under the complex conjugation.

F.2 Complex equivariant tensor maps

We will consider vector spaces on which a non-degenerate bilinear form has been chosen.

Definition 13. A *self-paired vector space* $(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ is a finite-dimensional vector space V together with a non-degenerate bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

Recall the *universal property* of tensor products of vector spaces, by which multilinear maps $V_1 \times \cdots \times V_k \rightarrow W$ can be lifted to linear maps $V_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_k \rightarrow W$. Using the universal property, we can see that from a self-paired vector space $(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$, we get the family

$$(V^{\otimes k}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$$

of self-paired spaces of tensors, by extending by linearity the expression

$$\langle v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_k, \tilde{v}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{v}_k \rangle = \langle v_1, \tilde{v}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle v_k, \tilde{v}_k \rangle. \quad (70)$$

And again, by the universal property, we get a k -contraction

$$\iota_k : V^{\otimes(2k+k')} \cong V^{\otimes k} \otimes V^{\otimes k} \otimes V^{k'} \rightarrow V^{k'} \quad (71)$$

by extending by linearity, the expression

$$a \otimes b \otimes c \mapsto \langle a, b \rangle c. \quad (72)$$

Now, in the above setting, let G be a group acting in a structure-preserving way on $(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$, meaning that the action is linear and preserves $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, i.e., for all $g \in G$, $v, \tilde{v} \in V$, $\langle g \cdot v, g \cdot \tilde{v} \rangle = \langle v, \tilde{v} \rangle$. Then, by the universal property, we get that G acts also on $(V^{\otimes k}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ by extending linearly the expression

$$g(v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_k) = \chi(g)(gv_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes (gv_k). \quad (73)$$

Moreover, by considering all (rational)⁵ unidimensional representations $\chi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ of G , we get the following family of self-paired (rational) G -modules:

$$\mathcal{T}_k(V, \chi) := (V^{\otimes k}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) \quad (74)$$

where the action by G is given by

$$g \cdot T := \chi(g)M(g) \cdot T \quad (75)$$

in a structure-preserving way. For the sake of distinction, we will denote the k -contraction as

$$\iota_k^G : \mathcal{T}_{2k+k'}(V, \chi) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V, \chi) \quad (76)$$

in this setting to emphasize the dependence on the group G , as we will be choosing the original $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ in terms of the group. Using the universal property, we can easily see the following:

Proposition 6. The following statements hold:

(a) The outer product map

$$\mathcal{T}_k(V, \chi) \times \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V, \chi') \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k+k'}(V, \chi\chi')$$

is a G -equivariant bilinear map.

(b) The k -contraction $\iota_k^G : \mathcal{T}_{2k+k'}(V, \chi) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V, \chi)$ is a G -equivariant linear map.

(c) For any $\sigma \in S_k$, the tensor index permutation by σ , $\mathcal{T}_k(V, \chi) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_k(V, \chi)$ given by $v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_k \mapsto v_{\sigma^{-1}(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}$, is a G -equivariant linear map.

Finally, recall that a G -isotropic tensor of $\mathcal{T}_\ell(V, \chi)$ is a G -invariant tensor in $\mathcal{T}_\ell(V, \chi)$. Further, recall that an *entire* function is an analytic function whose Taylor series at any point has an infinite radius of convergence. We can now state the theorem.

Theorem 4. Let $G \subset GL(V)$ be a reductive connected complex linear algebraic group (or more generally, a complex linear algebraic group with a Zariski-dense compact subgroup) acting rationally on a structure-preserving way on a self-paired complex vector space $(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ and $f : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V, \chi')$ a G -equivariant entire function. Then we may write f as follows:

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}^G (a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}) \quad (77)$$

where $c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} \in \mathcal{T}_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} + k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}, \chi')$ is a G -isotropic tensor for $k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} := \sum_{q=1}^r k_{\ell_q}$ and $\chi_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} = \prod_{q=1}^r \chi_{\ell_q}$.

⁵Recall that rational means that the homomorphism is given by polynomials.

To prove this, we proceed as in the orthogonal case: we reduce to the multihomogeneous case and then prove the result using averaging over the Zariski-dense compact subgroup.

Lemma 4. Let $G \in GL(V)$ be any subgroup acting linearly on a self-paired complex vector space $(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ and $f : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V, \chi')$ an entire function. Then, we can write f as

$$f_r(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}), \quad (78)$$

where $f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} : \prod_{i=1}^r \mathcal{T}_{k_{\ell_i}}(V, \chi_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V, \chi')$ is the composition of the map

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^r \mathcal{T}_{k_{\ell_i}}(V, \chi_{\ell_i}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\sum_{i=1}^r k_{\ell_i}} \left(V, \prod_{i=1}^r \chi_{\ell_i} \right) \\ (a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}) &\mapsto a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \end{aligned}$$

with a linear map $\mathcal{T}_{\sum_{i=1}^r k_{\ell_i}}(V, \prod_{i=1}^r \chi_{\ell_i}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi')$.

Moreover, for the above decomposition, if f is G -equivariant, then so are the $f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$.

Remark 9. Note that we don't need to assume anything about G in the above lemma.

Proof of Theorem 4. By Lemma 4, we can assume without loss of generality that f is of the form

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \lambda(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r})$$

for some non-negative integer r , $1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n$ and $\lambda : \mathcal{T}_{\sum_{i=1}^r k_{\ell_i}}(V, \prod_{i=1}^r \chi_{\ell_i}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V, \chi')$ is linear.

The above map can be written as a linear combination of maps of the form

$$(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mapsto \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_i(a_{\ell_i}) \right) v_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{j_{k'}}$$

where the $\lambda_{i,j}$ are linear and $v_j \in V$, due to the universal property—the factor $(\prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_{i,j}(a_{\ell_i}))$ just corresponds to a linear map $\mathcal{T}_{\sum_{i=1}^r k_{\ell_i}}(V, \prod_{i=1}^r \chi_{\ell_i}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Moreover,

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_i(a_{\ell_i}) \right) v_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{j_{k'}} = \iota_{\sum_{i=1}^r k_{\ell_i} + k'}^G(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes c_1 \otimes \dots \otimes c_r \otimes v_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{j_{k'}})$$

where the $c_i \in \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i)$ are the unique tensors so that for all $a_{\ell_i} \in \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i)$,

$$\lambda_i(a_{\ell_i}) = \langle a_{\ell_i}, c_i \rangle.$$

These c_i exist, because $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is non-degenerate. Hence for some $c \in \mathcal{T}_{\sum_{i=1}^r k_{\ell_i} + k'}(V, \prod_{i=1}^r \chi_i \chi')$, we have

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \iota_{\sum_{i=1}^r k_{\ell_i} + k'}^G(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes c). \quad (79)$$

Since f and $\iota_{k_{\ell} + k'}(\cdot)$ are G -equivariant, we have that for all $g \in G$ and $a \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{k_{\ell} + k'}(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes c_{\ell}) &= f(a_1, \dots, a_n) \\ &= f(g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot a_1), \dots, g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot a_n)) \\ &= g \cdot f((g^{-1} \cdot a_1), \dots, (g^{-1} \cdot a_n)) \\ &= g \cdot \iota_{k_{\ell} + k'}((g^{-1} \cdot a_{\ell_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes (g^{-1} \cdot a_{\ell_r}) \otimes c_{\ell}) \\ &= \iota_{k_{\ell} + k'}(a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes (g \cdot c_{\ell})). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, G has a Zariski-dense compact subgroup $U(G)$. Hence, averaging over $U(G)$, we can substitute c by the $U(G)$ -isotropic tensor

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u} \in U(G)} \mathbf{u} \cdot c$$

where the expectation is taken with respect the unique Haar probability measure of $U(G)$. But, since $U(G)$ is Zariski-dense in G and the action rational, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u} \in U(G)} \mathbf{u} \cdot c$ is also G -isotropic, as we wanted to show. \square

Proof of Lemma 4. Recall that, since f is entire, we have, by Taylor's theorem, that

$$f(a) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r!} D_0^r f(a, \dots, a) \quad (80)$$

where $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i)$ and $D_0^k f : (\prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i))^k \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V, \chi')$ is the k -multilinear map given by k th order partial derivatives of f at 0. Now, write $a = a_1 + \dots + a_n$ as an abuse of notation for

$$a = (a_1, 0, \dots, 0) + \dots + (0, \dots, 0, a_n).$$

We will further use this abuse of notation to write a_i instead of $(0, \dots, 0, a_i, 0, \dots, 0)$. Now, since $D_0^k f$ is k -multilinear and symmetric, we have that

$$\frac{1}{r!} D_0^r f(a, \dots, a) = \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} \frac{1}{\alpha_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}!} D_0^r f(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}) \quad (81)$$

where $\alpha_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} \in \mathbb{N}^r$ is the vector given by $(\alpha_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r})_i := \#\{j \mid \ell_j = i\}$ and $\alpha! := \alpha_1! \dots \alpha_r!$. Note that this term appears when we reorder $(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r})$ so that the subindices are in order.

Summing up, we can write f as (78), with

$$f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \frac{1}{\alpha_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}!} D_0^r f(a_{\ell_1}, \dots, a_{\ell_r}), \quad (82)$$

where this has the desired form by the universal property of tensor products. Now, observe that for $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathbb{C}$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i)$,

$$f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(t_1 a_1, \dots, t_n a_n) = t^{\alpha_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}} f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \quad (83)$$

where $t^{\alpha_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}} := t_1^{\alpha_1} \dots t_n^{\alpha_n}$. Hence, arguing as in Lemma 3, we have that for any $g \in G$ and all $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} t^{\alpha_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}} g \cdot f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \\ = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} t^{\alpha_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}} f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(g \cdot a_1, \dots, g \cdot a_n). \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Hence, by the uniqueness of coefficients for entire functions that are equal⁶, we conclude that for any $g \in G$ and all $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i)$,

$$g \cdot f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(g \cdot a_1, \dots, g \cdot a_n), \quad (85)$$

and so that the $f_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$ are G -equivariant. \square

F.3 Real equivariant tensor maps (and proof of Theorem 2)

All the definitions in the previous subsection can be specialized to the real case. Hence we will have a self-paired real vector space $(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ on which a group G acts (rationally) in a structure-preserving way. Then we get the family of (rational) G -modules:

$$\mathcal{T}_k(V, \chi) := (V^{\otimes k}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$$

where $\chi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^*$ is a one-dimensional (rational) group-homomorphism of G . Together with this family, we have the k -contractions given by

$$\iota_k^G : \mathcal{T}_{2k+k'}(V, \chi) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V, \chi), \quad (86)$$

which are G -equivariant linear maps. Then we get a very similar theorem to Theorem 4 from which Theorem 2 follows.

⁶The statement is qualitatively different from [12, Chapter 1 §1 Proposition 5], but its proof is similar. We only need to use that a univariate entire function which vanishes in an infinite set with an accumulation point has to vanish everywhere.

Theorem 5. Let $G \subset GL(V)$ be either a compact or a complexly averagable real linear algebraic group acting rationally in a structure-preserving way on a self-paired vector space $(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ and $f : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V, \chi')$ a G -equivariant entire function. Then we may write f as follows:

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n} \iota_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}^G (a_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\ell_r} \otimes c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}) \quad (87)$$

where $c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} \in \mathcal{T}_{k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} + k'}(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}, \chi')$ is a G -isotropic tensor for $k_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} := \sum_{q=1}^r k_{\ell_q}$ and $\chi_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} = \prod_{q=1}^r \chi_{\ell_q}$.

Proof of Theorem 2. This is just a particular case of Theorem 5 as both $O(s, d-s)$ and $Sp(d)$ are both real linear algebraic groups and their complexifications have a Zariski-dense compact subgroup. \square

Proof of Theorem 5. When G is compact, we can just repeat the proof for the orthogonal group. When G is a linear algebraic group such that its complexification has a Zariski-dense compact subgroup, we can extend, using the same analytic expression evaluated in the complex tensors, the G -equivariant map $f : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V, \chi')$ to a complex $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ -equivariant map $f_{\mathbb{C}} : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V^{\mathbb{C}}, \chi_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{k'}(V^{\mathbb{C}}, \chi')$. The map becomes $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ -equivariant, because G is Zariski-dense inside $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ by Proposition 5.

But for $a \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{k_i}(V, \chi_i)$, we have that

$$f(a) = \frac{1}{2} f^{\mathbb{C}}(a) + \frac{1}{2} \overline{f^{\mathbb{C}}(a)}, \quad (88)$$

by reality of the input and output. Hence, by linearity, we can change the non-necessarily real $c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}$ by the still G -isotropic and real $\frac{1}{2} c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{c_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}}$. The latter is G -isotropic, finishing the proof. \square

F.4 Proof of Corollary 2

The following proposition is needed to prove the above corollary.

Proposition 7. [44, Theorem 5.3.3] Let G be either $O(s, k-s)$ or $Sp(d)$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the corresponding non-degenerate bilinear form fixed by the usual action of G on \mathbb{R}^d , i.e., $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_s$ for $O(s, k-s)$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{symp}}$ for $Sp(d)$. The subspace of G -isotropic tensors in $\mathcal{T}_k(\mathbb{R}^d, \chi_0)$, where χ_0 the constant map to 1, consist only of the zero tensor if k is odd, and it is of the form

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \alpha_{\sigma} \left(\theta_G^{\otimes k/2} \right)^{\sigma} \quad (89)$$

with the $\alpha_{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta_G \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes 2}$ the only tensor such that for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\iota_1^G(v \otimes \theta_G) = v$, if k is even.

Remark 10. Recall that $\theta_G = [\mathbb{I}_{s, d-s}]_{i,j}$ if $G = O(s, d-s)$ and $\theta_G = [J_d]_{i,j}$ if $G = Sp(d)$.

Remark 11. Note that the above sum can be written with less summands using the methods of Appendix D.

Proof of Corollary 2. By Theorem 2, Proposition 7 and linearity, we can assume, without loss of generality, that

$$f(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \iota_{r+k} \left(v_{\ell_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{\ell_r} \otimes \theta_G^{\frac{r+k'}{2}} \right)$$

with $1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_r \leq n$ and $r+k'$ even.

Now, the proof is very similar to that of Corollary 1. However, note that now, we write

$$\theta = e_i \otimes \tilde{e}_i,$$

where $\{e_i \mid i \in [d]\}$ and $\{\tilde{e}_i \mid i \in [d]\}$ are dual basis to each other, i.e., for all i, j , $\langle e_i, \tilde{e}_j \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$. The reason we have to pick a couple of bases is that the bilinear form is not necessarily an inner product.

Now, the proof becomes the same as that of Corollary 1, but we have to be careful regarding the e_i and the \tilde{e}_i . However, after making the pairings for contraction, we get four cases:

1. $\langle v, e_j \rangle \langle w, \tilde{e}_j \rangle = \pm \langle v, w \rangle$, where the sign depends on whether $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is symmetric or antisymmetric.
2. $\langle v, \tilde{e}_j \rangle e_j = v$.
3. $\langle v, e_j \rangle \tilde{e}_j = \pm v$, where the sign depends on whether $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is symmetric or antisymmetric.
4. $e_j \otimes \tilde{e}_j = \pm \theta$, where the sign depends on whether $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is symmetric or antisymmetric, or $\sum_j \tilde{e}_j \otimes e_j = \theta_G$.

Now, putting these back together as we did in the proof of Corollary 1 gives the desired statement. \square

G Equivariance in sparse vector recovery

In this section, we show a sufficient condition for the $O(d)$ -invariance of sparse vector estimation. We start with a lemma on the equivariance of finding an eigenvector.

Lemma 5. Let b be a $2_{(+)}$ -tensor and let $g \in O(d)$. If u is an eigenvector for eigenvalue λ of $M(g) b M(g)^\top$, then $M(g)^\top u$ is an eigenvector for eigenvalue λ of b .

Proof. Let b be a $2_{(+)}$ -tensor, let $g \in O(d)$, and let λ, u be an eigenvalue, eigenvector pair of $M(g) b M(g)^\top$.

$$(M(g) b M(g)^\top) u = \lambda u \Rightarrow b(M(g)^\top u) = \lambda(M(g)^\top u) .$$

Thus $M(g)^\top u$ is an eigenvector for eigenvalue λ of b . \square

Proposition 8. Let $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ with rows $a_i^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$ so that a_i are column vectors. We define the action of $O(d)$ on S for all $g \in O(d)$ as $S M(g)$, and therefore $M(g)^\top a_i$ for the rows. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, h : (\mathbb{R}^d)^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ symmetric such that $f(S) = S \lambda_{\text{vec}}(h(a_1, \dots, a_n))$ where $\lambda_{\text{vec}}(\cdot)$ returns a normalized eigenvector for the top eigenvalue of the input symmetric matrix. If h is $O(d)$ -equivariant, then f is $O(d)$ -invariant.

Proof. Let S, h , and f be defined as above. Suppose that h is $O(d)$ -equivariant. Suppose

$$\lambda_{\text{vec}}(M(g)^\top h(a_1, \dots, a_n) M(g)) = u,$$

then by lemma 5, up to a sign flip, we have:

$$\lambda_{\text{vec}}(M(g)^\top h(a_1, \dots, a_n) M(g)) = u = M(g)^\top M(g) u = M(g)^\top \lambda_{\text{vec}}(h(a_1, \dots, a_n)) \quad (90)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} f(g \cdot S) &= (g \cdot S) \lambda_{\text{vec}}(h(g^{-1} \cdot a_1, \dots, g^{-1} \cdot a_n)) \\ &= (g \cdot S) \lambda_{\text{vec}}(g^{-1} \cdot h(a_1, \dots, a_n)) \\ &= S M(g) \lambda_{\text{vec}}(M(g)^\top h(a_1, \dots, a_n) M(g)) \\ &= S M(g) M(g)^\top \lambda_{\text{vec}}(h(a_1, \dots, a_n)) \\ &= S \lambda_{\text{vec}}(h(a_1, \dots, a_n)) \\ &= f(S) . \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

H Experimental Details

H.1 Sparse Vector Samplings

We consider the following sampling procedures for v_0 . All these procedures use the same sparsity parameter $\varepsilon \leq 1/3$.

Accept/Reject (A/R). A random vector $v_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_n, \mathbb{I}_n)$ is sampled and normalized to unit ℓ_2 length. We accept it if $\|v_0\|_4^4 \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon n}$ and otherwise reject it. Note that the sparsity of v_0 is not explicitly imposed, but the 4-norm condition suggests that v_0 is approximately sparse. The 4-norm condition of sparsity is used in [26].

Bernoulli-Gaussian (BG) This sampling procedure, considered in [38], defines v_0 as

$$\begin{cases} [v_0]_i = 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - \varepsilon \\ [v_0]_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\varepsilon n}) & \text{with probability } \varepsilon. \end{cases} \quad (91)$$

Note that under this sampling procedure $\mathbb{E}\|v_0\|_4^4 = \frac{3}{\varepsilon n}$.

Corrected Bernoulli-Gaussian (CBG) We consider a modified version of the Bernoulli-Gaussian that replaces the values set to exactly 0 in the Bernoulli-Gaussian distribution with values sampled from a Gaussian with small variance. Under this distribution we have $\mathbb{E}\|v_0\|_2 = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}\|v_0\|_4^4 = \frac{1}{\varepsilon n}$.

$$\begin{cases} [v_0]_i \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{1-\varepsilon-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}(1-\varepsilon)(1-3\varepsilon)}}{(1-\varepsilon)n}\right) & \text{with probability } 1 - \varepsilon \\ [v_0]_i \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\varepsilon+\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}(1-\varepsilon)(1-3\varepsilon)}}{\varepsilon n}\right) & \text{with probability } \varepsilon. \end{cases}, \quad (92)$$

Bernoulli-Rademacher (BR) This sampling procedure, studied in [38], defines v_0 as

$$[v_0]_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - \varepsilon \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon n}} & \text{with probability } \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon n}} & \text{with probability } \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (93)$$

Under this distribution we have $\mathbb{E}\|v_0\|_2 = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}\|v_0\|_4^4 \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon n}$.

Since the BG, CBG, and BR distributions have $\mathbb{E}\|v_0\|_2 = 1$, we also normalize these vectors to unit ℓ_2 length after generating them.

Proposition 9. Let v_0 be a Bernoulli-Gaussian vector. Then $\mathbb{E}\left[\|v_0\|_2^2\right] = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[\|v_0\|_4^4\right] = \frac{3}{\varepsilon n}$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and let v_0 be a Bernoulli-Gaussian sparse vector. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|v_0\|_2^2\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n [v_0]_i^2\right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[[v_0]_i^2\right]. \quad (94)$$

Thus, we need to find the 2nd moment of an entry of $[v_0]_i$, which we will do by first calculating its moment generating function. If Z is a Bernoulli-Gaussian random variable, then $Z = XY$ where X and Y are random variables with $X \sim \text{Bern}(\varepsilon)$ and $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\varepsilon n})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp\{tXY\}] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\exp\{tXY\}|X]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\exp\{tXY\}|X=0]P(X=0) + \mathbb{E}[\exp\{tXY\}|X=1]P(X=1) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\exp\{0\}](1-\varepsilon) + \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[\exp\{tY\}] \\ &= (1-\varepsilon) + \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[\exp\{tY\}]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[\exp\{tY\}]$ is the moment generating function of Y , a Gaussian random variable, we can see that the 2nd moment of Z is the 2nd moment of Y multiplied by ε . Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[[v_0]_i^2 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} = 1. \quad (95)$$

Now, for the sparsity condition, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|v_0\|_4^4 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[[v_0]_i^4 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon \left(3 \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n} \right)^2 \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{3}{\varepsilon n^2} = \frac{3}{\varepsilon n}. \quad (96)$$

This follows because our previous analysis shows that the 4th moment of an entry of $[v_0]_i$ is $3\sigma^4 = 3\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right)^2$. This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 10. Let v_0 be a Corrected Bernoulli-Gaussian vector. Then $\mathbb{E} \left[\|v_0\|_2^2 \right] = 1$ and $\mathbb{E} \left[\|v_0\|_4^4 \right] = \frac{1}{\varepsilon n}$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in \left(0, \frac{1}{3}\right]$ and let $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a Corrected Bernoulli-Gaussian sparse vector. Thus

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|v_0\|_2^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n [v_0]_i^2 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[[v_0]_i^2 \right]. \quad (97)$$

Thus, we need to find the 2nd moment of an entry of $[v_0]_i$, which we will do by first calculating its moment-generating function. If Z is a Corrected Bernoulli-Gaussian random variable, then $Z = XY + (1 - X)W$ where X, Y , and W are random variables with $X \sim \text{Bern}(\varepsilon)$, $Y \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\varepsilon+q}{\varepsilon n}\right)$, and $W \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{1-\varepsilon-q}{n(1-\varepsilon)}\right)$ where $q = \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}(1-\varepsilon)(1-3\varepsilon)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp\{t(XY + (1 - X)W)\}] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\exp\{t(XY + (1 - X)W)\}|X]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\exp\{tW\}|X = 0]P(X = 0) + \mathbb{E}[\exp\{tY\}|X = 1]P(X = 1) \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon)\mathbb{E}[\exp\{tW\}] + \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[\exp\{tY\}] \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[\exp\{tW\}]$ is the moment generating function of W and $\mathbb{E}[\exp\{tY\}]$ is the moment generating function of Y , we can immediately get the moments of Z . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[[v_0]_i^2 \right] &= \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon \left(\frac{\varepsilon + q}{n\varepsilon} \right) + (1 - \varepsilon) \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon - q}{n(1 - \varepsilon)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon + q + 1 - \varepsilon - q}{n} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

For the sparsity condition, we use the same result above but now for the 4th moment

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\|v_0\|_4^4\right] &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[[v_0]_i^4\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon \left(3 \left(\frac{\varepsilon+q}{n\varepsilon}\right)^2\right) + (1-\varepsilon) \left(3 \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon-q}{n(1-\varepsilon)}\right)^2\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n 3\varepsilon \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2+2\varepsilon q+q^2}{n^2\varepsilon^2}\right) + 3(1-\varepsilon) \left(\frac{(1-\varepsilon)^2-2(1-\varepsilon)q+q^2}{n^2(1-\varepsilon)^2}\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{3\varepsilon^2(1-\varepsilon)+6\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)q+3(1-\varepsilon)q^2+3\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)^2-6\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)q+3\varepsilon q^2}{n^2\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)}\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{3\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)+3q^2}{n^2\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)}\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{3\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)+3\left(\frac{1}{3}(1-\varepsilon)(1-3\varepsilon)\right)}{n^2\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)}\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{3\varepsilon+(1-3\varepsilon)}{n^2\varepsilon}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 11. Let v_0 be a Bernoulli-Rademacher vector. Then $\mathbb{E}\left[\|v_0\|_2^2\right] = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[\|v_0\|_4^4\right] = \frac{1}{\varepsilon n}$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and let v_0 be a Bernoulli-Rademacher sparse vector. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\|v_0\|_2^2\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n [v_0]_i^2\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[[v_0]_i^2\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (1-\varepsilon)(0)^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon n}}\right)^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(\frac{-1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon n}}\right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon n} \\
&= 1.
\end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\|v_0\|_4^4\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n [v_0]_i^4\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[[v_0]_i^4\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (1-\varepsilon)(0)^4 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon n}}\right)^4 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(\frac{-1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon n}}\right)^4 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2 n^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{\varepsilon n}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

H.2 Covariance and Noise Vectors

Suppose we want an $n \times n$ covariance matrix Σ that is diagonal but not necessarily the identity matrix. We generate Σ by sampling the diagonal entries $[\Sigma]_{i,j} \sim \text{Unif}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2})$ and setting the off-diagonal entries to 0. Instead, suppose Σ is a random covariance matrix. First, we sample an $n \times n$ matrix M with entries $[M]_{i,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Then we set $\Sigma = M M^\top + 0.00001 \mathbb{I}_n$ which ensures that Σ is symmetric and positive definite. In all cases, we don't worry about the scaling because the sampled vectors v_1, \dots, v_{d-1} will be normalized to unit length.

Now suppose we have a set of vectors $v_0, \dots, v_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and we would like to get a random orthonormal basis of $\text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\}$. To do this, we form the matrix B whose columns are the vectors v_0, \dots, v_{d-1} . If we right multiply B by a random orthogonal matrix and take the Q-R factorization, then Q is a random orthonormal basis of v_0, \dots, v_{d-1} as we show below. We will add an assumption that the v_0, \dots, v_{d-1} are linearly independent, which is reasonable given that $d \ll n$ and we are generating these vectors randomly.

Proposition 12. Let $n \geq d$, and let B be the $n \times d$ matrix with v_0, \dots, v_{d-1} as the columns. Assume that v_0, \dots, v_{d-1} are linearly independent, so $\text{rank } B = d$. Let O be a $d \times d$ orthogonal matrix and $QR = BO$ be a Q-R factorization of BO . Then the columns of Q form an orthonormal basis of $\text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\}$.

Proof. The Q-R factorization gives us that the columns of Q are orthonormal. Thus we just have to show that $\text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\} = \text{span}\{Q_0, \dots, Q_{d-1}\}$

Let $a \in \text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\}$, so for some $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{d-1}$ we have $a = \alpha_0 v_0 + \dots + \alpha_{d-1} v_{d-1}$. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the vector of these coefficients, and then we have,

$$a = B\alpha = BOO^\top\alpha = QRO^\top\alpha = Q\hat{\alpha}. \quad (98)$$

Thus $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector of coefficients, so $a \in \text{span}\{Q_0, \dots, Q_{d-1}\}$. Therefore, $\text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\} \subseteq \text{span}\{Q_0, \dots, Q_{d-1}\}$.

Now let $b \in \text{span}\{Q_0, \dots, Q_{d-1}\}$, so for some $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{d-1}$ we have $b = \beta_0 Q_0 + \dots + \beta_{d-1} Q_{d-1}$. Let $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a vector of the coefficients $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{d-1}$. Now, since $\text{rank } B = d$, $\text{rank } BO = d$, so in the Q-R factorization, the upper triangular R has positive diagonal entries, so it is invertible [[28], Theorem 2.1.14]. Then we have,

$$b = Q\beta = QR R^{-1}\beta = BOR^{-1}\beta = B\hat{\beta}. \quad (99)$$

Thus $\hat{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector of coefficients, so $b \in \text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\}$. Therefore, $\text{span}\{Q_0, \dots, Q_{d-1}\} \subseteq \text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}\}$ which completes the proof. \square

H.3 Training Details

For training our models, we used $1 - \langle \hat{v}, v_0 \rangle^2$ as the loss function. The train dataset size was 5000, and the validation and testing dataset sizes were both 500. We used the Adam optimizer [32] with exponential decay of 0.999 per epoch, batch size 100, and we trained until the validation error had not improved for 20 epochs. See Table 2 for the learning rate and number of parameters for each model. We did a small exploration to find these hyper-parameters. These hyper-parameters seemed to work well, but it is always possible that better ones could be found with more exploration.

The experiments were run on a single RTX 6000 Ada GPU and took 18 hours.

	Baseline	SparseVectorHunter-Diagonal	SparseVectorHunter
parameter count	99 087	58 981	1 331 131
learning rate	1e-3	5e-4	3e-4

Table 2: Parameter count and learning rate for each model. Since all models have the same number of hidden layers of the same width, the difference in the number of parameters is driven by the different inputs to each model.

H.4 Further Results

sampling	Σ	SOS-I [26]	SOS-II [38]	BL	SVH-Diag	SVH
A/R	Random	0.610±0.011	0.610±0.011	0.647±0.177	0.768±0.045	0.966±0.001
	Diagonal	0.444±0.012	0.444±0.012	0.561±0.262	0.698±0.034	0.755±0.057
	Identity	0.611±0.002	0.611±0.002	0.494±0.285	0.622±0.201	0.647±0.289
BG	Random	0.963±0.001	0.963±0.001	0.783±0.090	0.970±0.003	0.965±0.002
	Diagonal	0.949±0.002	0.949±0.002	0.672±0.260	0.974±0.004	0.775±0.078
	Identity	0.963±0.000	0.963±0.000	0.681±0.241	0.966±0.004	0.999±0.001
CBG	Random	0.409±0.005	0.409±0.005	0.836±0.149	0.490±0.089	0.965±0.002
	Diagonal	0.292±0.005	0.292±0.005	0.835±0.150	0.597±0.027	0.722±0.013
	Identity	0.418±0.006	0.418±0.006	0.558±0.216	0.368±0.119	0.750±0.288
BR	Random	0.523±0.006	0.523±0.006	0.975±0.005	0.669±0.150	0.970±0.002
	Diagonal	0.340±0.010	0.340±0.010	0.943±0.008	0.701±0.041	0.913±0.002
	Identity	0.526±0.005	0.526±0.005	0.949±0.006	0.570±0.199	0.898±0.001

Table 3: Train error comparison of different methods under different sampling schemes for v_0 and different covariances for v_1, \dots, v_{d-1} . The metric is $\langle v_0, \hat{v} \rangle^2$, which ranges from 0 to 1 with values closer to 1, meaning that the vectors are closer. For each row, the best value is **bolded**. For these experiments, $n = 100, d = 5, \epsilon = 0.25$, and the results were averaged over 5 trials with the standard deviation given by $\pm 0.xxx$.