

A SHERMAN–MORRISON–WOODBURY APPROACH TO SOLVING LEAST SQUARES PROBLEMS WITH LOW-RANK UPDATES

STEFAN GÜTTEL*, YUJI NAKATSUKASA†, MARCUS WEBB*, AND
ALBAN BLOOR RILEY*

Abstract. We present a simple formula to update the pseudoinverse of a full-rank rectangular matrix that undergoes a low-rank modification, and demonstrate its utility for solving least squares problems. The resulting algorithm can be dramatically faster than solving the modified least squares problem from scratch, just like the speedup enabled by Sherman–Morrison–Woodbury for solving linear systems with low-rank modifications.

Key words. least squares problem, pseudoinverse, low-rank update

1. Introduction. The Sherman–Morrison–Woodbury formula (or simply the Woodbury formula)

$$(A + UV^T)^{-1} = A^{-1} - A^{-1}U(I + V^T A^{-1}U)^{-1}V^T A^{-1},$$

discovered in the 1950s [14, 15], has become a fundamental tool in numerical computation and can be found in many popular textbooks; see, e.g., [3, §2.1.4] or [5, Thm. 18.2.8] or [10, Thm. 2.3.10]. It allows us to efficiently update the inverse of a matrix A when it undergoes a low-rank modification $A + UV^T$. Here $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $U, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ where usually $r \ll n$. The Woodbury formula is particularly useful when A is easy to invert or solve linear systems with, and often applied for solving linear systems of the form $(A + UV^T)x = b$. It has been used in numerous applications in scientific computing, including quasi-Newton methods [11, Ch. 6], Kalman filtering [7], and Gaussian processes [13]. See also [4] for more applications.

This work was motivated by research into deflation techniques for finding multiple local minima of a nonlinear least squares problem. The proposed deflation operation induces a rank-one update to the associated linear least squares problem at each iteration of a Gauss–Newton algorithm [2]. The Woodbury formula does not apply to the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse, so cannot be directly applied to these updated least squares problems.

In the 1970s, Meyer [9] developed an extension of the Sherman–Morrison formula to the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse of rectangular matrices when the update is rank one. Generalized inverses of square (but possibly singular) matrices updated with blocks of vectors have been discussed in [6].

Despite the prevalence of least squares problems in data science and scientific computing, and despite the existence of Meyer’s formula and its variants, to our knowledge pseudoinverse update formulas have not been applied practically to solve least squares problems. In this paper, using only linear algebra tools accessible to undergraduate students, we show that such an extension is readily possible, and propose an efficient algorithm WoodburyLS for solving least squares problems wherein the matrix undergoes a low-rank update. The algorithm essentially requires $2r$ solutions of overdetermined least squares problems of the form $\min_x \|Ax - b\|_2$, and $2r$

*Department of Mathematics, The University of Manchester, M13 9PL Manchester, United Kingdom, stefan.guettel@manchester.ac.uk, marcus.webb@manchester.ac.uk, alban.bloorriley@manchester.ac.uk. SG is supported by Royal Society Industry Fellowship IF/R1/231032.

†Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, OX2 6GG Oxford, United Kingdom, nakatsukasa@maths.ox.ac.uk. Supported by EPSRC grants EP/Y010086/1 and EP/Y030990/1.

solutions of underdetermined problems of the form minimize $\|x\|_2$ subject to $A^T x = b$, and in both cases we can reuse a factorization of A that may have been pre-computed. Alternatively, WoodburyLS can be executed using r solutions of linear systems with the matrix $A^T A$. In a typical situation where the QR factorization of A is available, the arithmetic cost is reduced by a factor of $O(n/r)$ over the classical solution based on the QR factorization of $A + UV^T$. We also present a simpler version of Meyer's formula that extends to updates of rank higher than one. We illustrate the performance of the new formula in a simple numerical test, when applied to solving a least squares problem with a low-rank update.

2. An update formula for the pseudoinverse. Given a real¹ matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $m \geq n$, $\text{rank}(A) = n$, and a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we consider the linear least squares problem: find a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\|b - Ax\|_2^2 \rightarrow \min_x.$$

It is well known that the solution to this problem is given in terms of the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse by $x = A^\dagger b$ [3, §5.5.2]. The standard algorithm is to perform the thin QR factorization $A = QR$ and compute $x = R^{-1}Q^T b$.

Let us now consider a low-rank modification of A , namely $A + UV^T$ with $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$. We now would like to solve the modified least squares problem,

$$\|b - (A + UV^T)\hat{x}\|_2^2 \rightarrow \min_{\hat{x}}.$$

The vector b could also be different. To address this problem we first present the following theorem, which can be seen as a natural generalization of the Woodbury formula from updates of the matrix inverse to the pseudoinverse.

THEOREM 2.1. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ with $m \geq n \geq r$. Assume that $\text{rank}(A) = \text{rank}(A + UV^T) = n$. Then*

$$(2.1) \quad (A + UV^T)^\dagger = A^\dagger - MA^\dagger + (I - M)(A^T A)^{-1}VU^T,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M &= (A^T A)^{-1}X(I + Y^T(A^T A)^{-1}X)^{-1}Y^T, \\ X &= [V, A^T U], \quad Y = [(A + UV^T)^T U, V]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Write $\hat{A} = A + UV^T$. As \hat{A} has full rank by assumption, we have

$$\hat{A}^\dagger = (\hat{A}^T \hat{A})^{-1} \hat{A}^T.$$

Expanding,

$$\hat{A}^T \hat{A} = A^T A + VU^T A + A^T UV^T + VU^T UV^T.$$

Now, writing $VU^T A + A^T UV^T + VU^T UV^T = XY^T$ where (for example) $X = [V, A^T U]$ and $Y^T = \begin{bmatrix} U^T A + U^T UV^T \\ V^T \end{bmatrix}$, we can apply the Woodbury formula to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{A}^T \hat{A})^{-1} &= (A^T A)^{-1} - (A^T A)^{-1}X(I + Y^T(A^T A)^{-1}X)^{-1}Y^T(A^T A)^{-1} \\ &= (I - M)(A^T A)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

¹For simplicity we assume A, U, V are real. For complex matrices, the formulas are valid after replacing the transpose $(\cdot)^T$ with the Hermitian transpose $(\cdot)^*$.

where $M = (A^T A)^{-1} X (I + Y^T (A^T A)^{-1} X)^{-1} Y^T$.

Let us convince ourselves that $I + Y^T (A^T A)^{-1} X$ is indeed nonsingular. By definition, $\hat{A}^T \hat{A} = A^T A + XY^T$ and so $\text{rank}(\hat{A}^T \hat{A}) = \text{rank}(A^T A + XY^T) = n$. Using Sylvester's determinant theorem (see, e.g., [5, §18.1]), we have $\det(A^T A + XY^T) = \det(A^T A) \det(I + Y^T (A^T A)^{-1} X) \neq 0$ and hence $I + Y^T (A^T A)^{-1} X$ is indeed nonsingular.

Following on from the above expression for $(\hat{A}^T \hat{A})^{-1}$, we have

$$\hat{A}^\dagger = (I - M)(A^T A)^{-1}(A + UV^T)^T.$$

Finally, we rewrite this in terms of $A^\dagger = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T$:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}^\dagger &= (I - M)(A^T A)^{-1}(A + UV^T)^T \\ &= (I - M)(A^T A)^{-1} A^T + (I - M)(A^T A)^{-1} V U^T \\ &= (I - M)A^\dagger + (I - M)(A^T A)^{-1} V U^T. \end{aligned}$$

This is the update formula for the pseudoinverse given in equation (2.1). \square

Note that (2.1) is generically a rank- $2r$ update of A^\dagger . The range of the update is contained within the range of $(A^T A)^{-1} X = [(A^T A)^{-1} V, (A^T A)^{-1} A^T U]$, so is of dimension at most $2r$. By contrast, when A is square the standard Woodbury formula shows that the update to A^{-1} is rank r . This is a genuine difference to keep in mind, but it does not stop us from designing an efficient algorithm for solving least squares problems with respect to $\hat{A} = A + UV^T$ that has a lower computational cost.

As discussed in the introduction, the topic of low-rank updates of the pseudoinverse has been studied in the literature [6, 9]. However, the expressions there appear less suitable for designing an algorithm for least squares problems. Note that updating the pseudoinverse of a fat matrix where $m < n$ is simply a matter of transposing the equation (2.1). However, cases in which A or $A + UV^T$ is rank-deficient are a non-trivial extension we will not discuss in this paper.

3. Solving updated least squares problems. To apply Theorem 2.1 for the purpose of solving an updated least squares problem $\hat{A}^\dagger b = (A + UV^T)^\dagger b$, we directly use the formula

$$(3.1) \quad \hat{A}^\dagger b = (I - M)(A^\dagger b - (A^T A)^{-1} V U^T b).$$

First note that M involves $(I + Y^T (A^T A)^{-1} X)^{-1}$, which is merely the inverse of a $2r \times 2r$ matrix.

Note also that M involves $(A^T A)^{-1} X = A^\dagger (A^T)^\dagger X$, which requires $2r$ solves with respect to $A^T A$ (one for each column of X). At first glance it appears that one would also need to compute $(A^T A)^{-1} V$ directly, but that is unnecessary because $(A^T A)^{-1} V$ can be obtained from the first r columns of $(A^T A)^{-1} X$.

How to do the computation of $(A^T A)^{-1} X$ depends on the situation. For example, if a QR factorization $A = QR$ is available, we can efficiently compute $(A^T A)^{-1} X = R^{-1} R^{-T} X$ via two triangular solves. Otherwise, for example when a preconditioner for A is available for use in an iterative least squares solver (e.g., as in [1]), we could perform $(A^T A)^{-1} X = A^\dagger (A^T)^\dagger X$ by $2r$ solves with respect to A^T and $2r$ solves with respect to A using, e.g., LSQR [12] and LSRN [8].

To summarize, to solve the least squares problem for $A + UV^T$, we need the solution x_0 to the least squares problem for A , the solution to a $2r \times 2r$ linear system, and the solution to $2r$ linear systems with the matrix $A^T A$. We provide pseudocode in Algorithm 3.1, and MATLAB code in Figures 3.1 and 4.1.

3.1. Solving for multiple low-rank updates and right-hand sides. When the right-hand side b stays the same and U, V are modified multiple times, further efficiency savings can be made by precomputing and storing x_0 and the machinery for efficiently solving the required least squares systems such as QR factors.

When one needs to solve least squares problems with $A + UV^T$ for multiple right-hand sides, say k right-hand sides, the cost becomes $2r$ linear systems with $A^T A$ (same as when $k = 1$), and the solution of k least squares problems with A .

In a typical situation where A 's QR factorization is given, this means a least squares problem with $A + UV^T$ can be solved in $O((r + k)mn)$ operations instead of the $O(mn^2 + kmn)$ with a standard QR-based approach. In a typical case where $k = O(1)$, this represents a speedup of $O(n/r)$. The complexity of WoodburyLS can be even lower, for example, when A is sparse and well-conditioned so that A -solves and A^T -solves can be done in $O(\text{nnz}(A))$ operations using an iterative solver.

Algorithm 3.1 WoodburyLS: Solve $\min_x \|b - (A + UV^T)x\|_2$ where $A, b, U,$ and V are as in Theorem 2.1. Efficient solvers are required for computing $A^\dagger b$ and $(A^T)^\dagger c$, given $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, or a routine for computing $(A^T A)^{-1}c$.

- 1: Compute $x_0 = A^\dagger b$, if not already available.
 - 2: Set $X = [V, A^T U]$, and $Y = [(A + UV^T)U, V]$.
 - 3: Compute $Z = A^\dagger((A^T)^\dagger X)$, or alternatively, $Z = (A^T A)^{-1}X$.
 - 4: Set $w = x_0 + Z_1 U^T b$, where Z_1 is the first r columns of Z .
 - 5: Compute $\hat{w} = Z(I_{2r} + Y^T Z)^{-1} Y^T w$.
 - 6: $x = w - \hat{w}$ is the solution.
-

```
function [x,AtAsolver] = WoodburyLS(A,b,U,V,x0,AtAsolver)
%WoodburyLS Solves the least squares problem min_x ||b-(A+UV')x||
% where A is an m x n matrix, m >= n, and U and V have r columns.
% Requires A and A+UV' to be full rank.
%
% First call:
%   [x0,AtAsolver] = WoodburyLS(A,b) returns LS solution x0 = A\b
%   and a function AtAsolver that solves A'A x = b for a given b.
%
% Every follow-up call:
%   x = WoodburyLS(A,b,U,V,x0,AtAsolver) returns the LS solution
%   x = (A+U*V')\b using a given solution x0 = A\b and AtAsolver.

if nargin < 3
    [Q,R] = qr(A,0); x = R \ (Q'*b);
    AtAsolver = @(X) R \ (R' \ X);
    return
end
r = size(U,2);
X = [V, A'*U];
Yt = [X(:,r+1:2*r)' + (U'*U)*V'; V']; % X = [V, A'*U]
Z = AtAsolver(X); % Y = [(A+UV')'U, V]
w = x0 + Z(:,1:r) * (U'*b); % Z = (A'A)\X
Mw = Z * ((eye(2*r)+Yt*Z) \ (Yt*w)); % Z(:,1:r) = (A'A)\V
x = w - Mw; % M = (A'A)\X(I+Y'(A'A)\X)\Y'
```

FIG. 3.1. MATLAB function implementing WoodburyLS described in Algorithm 3.1.

4. Numerical experiment. To demonstrate the efficiency gain from using an update formula instead of solving modified problems $(A + UV^T)\dagger b$ from scratch, we perform a simple experiment as follows.² Keeping the number of A 's rows, $m = 10^5$, fixed, we vary both the number of columns $n = 100, 200, \dots, 1000$ and the rank $r = 10, 20, 30$ of the update. All matrices A are generated in MATLAB with `randn(m,n)` and `b=randn(m,1)`. The MATLAB code we used for the timings is essentially given in Figure 4.1, except that we have run each algorithm ten times and averaged the runtimes. We then plot the quotient of the time to compute x_1 (solving the updated least squares problem from scratch via a QR decomposition of $\hat{A} = A + UV^T$) over the time required to compute x_2 (using WoodburyLS).

The results are shown in Figure 4.2. In the ranges of parameters tested, we obtain between 20 to over 130-fold speedup. The speedup generally increases with the number of columns n , and it decreases with the rank r . Given that computing x_1 via QR requires $O(mn^2)$ flops while computing x_2 via WoodburyLS costs $O(mnr)$, one might expect the speedup in Figure 4.2 to behave like $O(n/r)$. We find that this is only approximately the case, most likely because flop counts do not directly translate into runtimes due to many other aspects such as memory swaps, blocking and communication costs. Specifically, the dominant costs are the matrix-matrix product $A^T U$ (costing $O(nmr)$ operations) and the triangular solves (costing $O(n^2r)$ operations), which are both highly optimized in MATLAB in the ways just described. In any case, the practical speedup is significant across the board. The relative forward error of the computed solution, $\text{norm}(x_2 - x_1) / \text{norm}(x_1)$, was below 3×10^{-14} in all cases.

```

m = 1e5; n = 500; r = 20;
A = randn(m,n); b = randn(m,1);
U = randn(m,r); V = randn(n,r);

% solve unmodified LS problem via QR
[x0,AtAsolver] = WoodburyLS(A,b);           % 2.340 seconds

% inefficient: min ||b-(A+UV')x|| via QR
Ahat = A + U*V';
[Qhat,Rhat] = qr(Ahat,0);
x1 = Rhat \ (Qhat'*b);

% better solve modified LS problem like this:
x2 = WoodburyLS(A,b,U,V,x0,AtAsolver);     % 0.037 seconds

```

FIG. 4.1. An example demonstrating the use of WoodburyLS in MATLAB. Both x_1 and x_2 are solutions to the modified least squares problem $\min_x \|b - (A + UV^T)x\|_2$, but x_2 is computed significantly faster.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to the organisers of the British Mathematical Colloquium 2024, held at The University of Manchester in June 2024, where much of the research for this paper took place.

REFERENCES

²Code available at <https://github.com/nla-group/WoodburyLS>. The timings reported here have been produced on a 2023 Windows laptop with an Intel i7-1255U CPU and 32 GB RAM.




FIG. 4.2. Speedup obtained with WoodburyLS compared to solving the modified least squares problem from scratch by computing a QR factorization of $A + UV^T$.

- [1] H. AVRON, P. MAYMOUNKOV, AND S. TOLEDO, *Blendenpik: Supercharging LAPACK's least-squares solver*, SIAM J. Sci. Comp., 32 (2010), pp. 1217–1236.
- [2] A. BLOOR RILEY, M. WEBB, AND M. BAKER, *Deflation techniques for finding multiple local minima of a nonlinear least squares problem*, in prep., (2024).
- [3] G. H. GOLUB AND C. F. VAN LOAN, *Matrix Computations, 4th Edition*, John Hopkins University Press, 2013.
- [4] W. W. HAGER, *Updating the inverse of a matrix*, SIAM Rev., 31 (1989), pp. 221–239.
- [5] D. A. HARVILLE, *Matrix Algebra from a Statistician's Perspective*, Taylor & Francis, 1998.
- [6] H. V. HENDERSON AND S. R. SEARLE, *On deriving the inverse of a sum of matrices*, SIAM Rev., 23 (1981), pp. 53–60.
- [7] J. HUMPHERYS, P. REDD, AND J. WEST, *A fresh look at the kalman filter*, SIAM Rev., 54 (2012), pp. 801–823.
- [8] X. MENG, M. A. SAUNDERS, AND M. W. MAHONEY, *LSRN: A parallel iterative solver for strongly over-or underdetermined systems*, SIAM J. Sci. Comp., 36 (2014), pp. C95–C118.
- [9] C. D. MEYER, *Generalized inversion of modified matrices*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 24 (1973), pp. 315–323.
- [10] C. D. MEYER, *Matrix Analysis and Applied Linear Algebra, 2nd Edition*, SIAM, 2023.
- [11] J. NOCEDAL AND S. J. WRIGHT, *Numerical Optimization*, Springer New York, second ed., 1999.
- [12] C. C. PAIGE AND M. A. SAUNDERS, *LSQR: An algorithm for sparse linear equations and sparse least squares*, ACM Trans. Math. Soft., 8 (1982), pp. 43–71.
- [13] C. E. RASMUSSEN AND C. K. I. WILLIAMS, *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*, MIT Press Cambridge, 2006.
- [14] J. SHERMAN AND W. J. MORRISON, *Adjustment of an inverse matrix corresponding to a change in one element of a given matrix*, Ann. Math. Stat., 21 (1950), pp. 124–127.
- [15] M. A. WOODBURY, *Inverting modified matrices*, Stat. Res. Group Memo Repos., Princeton University, 42 (1950), pp. 1–4.