

---

# Spectral-factorized Positive-definite Curvature Learning for NN Training

---

Wu Lin<sup>1</sup> Felix Dangel<sup>1</sup> Runa Eschenhagen<sup>2</sup> Juhan Bae<sup>1,3</sup> Richard E. Turner<sup>2</sup> Roger B. Grosse<sup>1,3</sup>

## Abstract

Many training methods, such as Adam(W) and Shampoo, learn a positive-definite curvature matrix and apply an inverse root before preconditioning. Recently, non-diagonal training methods, such as Shampoo, have gained significant attention; however, they remain computationally inefficient and are limited to specific types of curvature information due to the costly matrix root computation via matrix decomposition. To address this, we propose a Riemannian optimization approach that dynamically adapts spectral-factorized positive-definite curvature estimates, enabling the efficient application of arbitrary matrix roots and generic curvature learning. We demonstrate the efficacy and versatility of our approach in positive-definite matrix optimization and covariance adaptation for gradient-free optimization, as well as its efficiency in curvature learning for neural net training.

## 1. Introduction

Symmetric positive-definite (SPD) curvature learning is useful for designing training methods. Given the neural net (NN) weights  $\mu$ , the gradient  $\mathbf{g}$  and a SPD curvature estimate  $\mathbf{S} \succ 0$ , many training methods apply  $\mu \leftarrow \mu - \beta_1 \mathbf{S}^{-1/p} \mathbf{g}$  using a step size  $\beta_1$  and subjecting the curvature estimation to a fractional  $p$ -root before inversion. For example, adaptive methods like Adam(W) (Kingma & Ba, 2015; Loshchilov & Hutter, 2017) employ the gradient outer product (GOP, Duchi et al., 2011; Kingma & Ba, 2015; Agarwal et al., 2019) to estimate a diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  and apply a 2-root (i.e.,  $p = 2$ ) before preconditioning. Other well-known methods, like natural-gradient methods, use  $\mathbf{S}$  to estimate the Fisher matrix (Amari, 1998; Roux et al., 2007) as another type of curvature information and apply a 1-root before preconditioning. These methods highlight the need for an SPD curvature learning scheme for  $\mathbf{S}$  that supports generic curvature information and root computation.

Existing works (Martens & Grosse, 2015; Zhang et al.,

<sup>1</sup>Vector Institute, Canada <sup>2</sup>Cambridge University, United Kingdom <sup>3</sup>University of Toronto, Canada. Correspondence to: Wu Lin <yorker.lin@gmail.com >.

Technical Report. Working in Progress.

2018; Anil et al., 2020; Shi et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2024; Vyas et al., 2024) have demonstrated the great potential of Kronecker-based non-diagonal methods for training large neural networks because using Kronecker structures significantly reduces the memory consumption of non-diagonal methods. However, applying fractional roots for Kronecker-based methods such as Shampoo (Gupta et al., 2018; Anil et al., 2020; Shi et al., 2023) and its variants (Vyas et al., 2024) remains computationally and numerically challenging. This is because computing a *matrix* fractional root is computationally intensive and must be done in high precision to avoid numerical instabilities (Anil et al., 2020; Shi et al., 2023), preventing those methods from using fast, low-precision arithmetic (Micikevicius et al., 2018). Because of this bottleneck, fractional non-diagonal methods are often limited to a specific case of the root and particular curvature information. Making the matrix root computation for generic curvature learning fast and stable not only enables non-diagonal methods for modern low-precision training but also facilitates the investigation of new non-diagonal methods. Thus, it is essential to have a flexible and efficient approach that can (i) apply arbitrary fractional roots, (ii) circumvent the numerical instabilities of the root computation, and (iii) support generic curvature information.

We address this instability and inefficiency and present an update scheme to directly and dynamically adapt the spectral factorization  $\mathbf{B}\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d})\mathbf{B}^\top$  of a SPD estimation  $\mathbf{S}$  for generic curvature information. We call this parameterization a *spectral parameterization*, due to its connection to the spectral decomposition of symmetric matrices. Thanks to this parametrization, we can efficiently apply any matrix fractional root to  $\mathbf{S}$  through elementwise operations on the eigenvalues  $\mathbf{d}$ . Our approach directly adapts eigenfactors and maintains the factorization without performing matrix decomposition. This makes our scheme amenable to running in low precision because we do not rely on unstable matrix decomposition algorithms. However, directly optimizing the factors involves nontrivial constraints (i.e.,  $\mathbf{B}$  orthogonal and  $\mathbf{d}$  positive) that must be dealt with.

We overcome challenges and make these contributions:

- We propose an update scheme to dynamically adapt the spectral parameterization  $\mathbf{B}\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d})\mathbf{B}^\top$  of a SPD matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  for generic curvature information by extending the Riemannian idea (Glasmachers et al., 2010; Lin et al.,

2023; 2024) for estimating  $\mathbf{S}$ . Surprisingly, our scheme coincides with both diagonal and full-matrix AdaGrad and RMSprop up to first-order (Claim 2 and Sec. 3.2) when using the GOP as curvature information.

- We then extend our scheme to Kronecker-structured spectral factorizations, i.e.  $\mathbf{S} \approx (\mathbf{S}^{(C)} \otimes \mathbf{S}^{(K)})$ , where  $\otimes$  denotes a Kronecker product, and  $\mathbf{S}^{(l)} := \mathbf{B}^{(l)} \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{(l)}) \mathbf{B}^{(l)\top}$  for  $l \in \{C, K\}$ , which are crucial to scale the approach. The Kronecker structure introduces additional challenges, which we resolve by introducing an improved factorization  $\mathbf{S} \approx \alpha (\mathbf{S}^{(C)} \otimes \mathbf{S}^{(K)})$  with constraints  $\det(\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{(l)})) = 1$ .
- Empirically, we demonstrate the efficacy and versatility of our approach for generic curvature learning in SPD matrix optimization (Absil et al., 2009) and gradient-free optimization (Wierstra et al., 2008), and showcase its efficiency and numerical stability in low-precision NN training. Our experiments highlight the effectiveness of our scheme as a spectral-factorized adaptive method for NN training (See Fig. 4).

## 2. Background

To train an NN model, we solve an unconstrained optimization problem. The objective function of the problem is often expressed as a sum of cost functions with  $N$  observations:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}) := \sum_{i=1}^N c(f(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\mu}), y_i), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_i$  and  $y_i$  are features and a label for the  $i$ -th observation, respectively,  $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\mu})$  is an NN with learnable weights  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ , and  $c(\cdot, y_i)$  is a cost function (e.g., cross-entropy loss) to measure the mismatch between the NN’s output and  $y_i$ .

We consider adaptive methods to solve this problem, where we estimate a preconditioning matrix using a GOP. For many well-known adaptive methods such as RMSprop (Tieleman & Hinton, 2012) (see Eq. (2) with  $\gamma = 1$ ) and AdaGrad (Duchi et al., 2011) (see Eq. (2) with  $\gamma = 0$ ), a square root (i.e.,  $p = 2$ ) is introduced before inversion.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Diagonal : } \mathbf{S} &\leftarrow (1 - \beta_2 \gamma) \mathbf{S} + \beta_2 \text{Diag}(\text{diag}(\mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^T)), \\ \boldsymbol{\mu} &\leftarrow \boldsymbol{\mu} - \beta_1 \mathbf{S}^{-1/p} \mathbf{g}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\text{diag}(\cdot)$  returns a vector that contains diagonal entries of its input,  $\text{Diag}(\cdot)$  turns its input into a diagonal matrix,  $\mathbf{S}$  is a diagonal matrix,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  is the learnable weight vector,  $\mathbf{g} = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \ell$  is a gradient vector, and  $\mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^T$  is the GOP. We often estimate  $\mathbf{g}$  using a mini-batch of observations. Other works improve the performance of adaptive methods on CNNs using other roots of  $\mathbf{S}$ , for instance  $p = 4$  in Chen et al. (2021) and  $p = 1$  in Lin et al. (2024). Duchi et al. (2011) consider a full-matrix version of AdaGrad (i.e.,  $p = 2$ ) update scheme while Lin et al. (2024) consider a root-free and full-matrix version of AdaGrad (i.e.,  $p = 1$ ).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Full-matrix : } \mathbf{S} &\leftarrow (1 - \beta_2 \gamma) \mathbf{S} + \beta_2 \mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^T = \mathbf{S} - \beta_2 (\gamma \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^T), \\ \boldsymbol{\mu} &\leftarrow \boldsymbol{\mu} - \beta_1 \mathbf{S}^{-1/p} \mathbf{g}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where a fractional matrix  $p$ -root is needed.

Kronecker-based adaptive methods, like Shampoo (Gupta et al., 2018), also include a matrix root (e.g.  $p = 4$ ) in their update rule to update matrix weights.

**Challenges of Computing Matrix Roots** Computing a matrix root (e.g., a square root,  $p = 2$ ) requires matrix decomposition, such as eigendecomposition. As a numerical linear algebra algorithm, matrix decomposition can be numerically unstable in *discrete, finite-precision* arithmetic. Matrix decomposition is slow in single precision and unstable in half precision. Using low-precision data types (Micikevicius et al., 2018) is essential for training large NNs because it boosts training speed and lowers memory consumption. Existing methods like Shampoo (Gupta et al., 2018; Shi et al., 2023) and its variants (Vyas et al., 2024) often perform the matrix decomposition in single (rather than half) precision and ameliorate the cost by performing the decomposition less frequently. However, an infrequent update scheme can significantly degrade the curvature estimation (Vyas et al., 2024), often necessitating specific mitigations. For example, Shampoo often uses a pre-tuned Adam(W) to stabilize its infrequent update (Shi et al., 2023; Vyas et al., 2024) via grafting (Agarwal et al., 2021). Iterative methods for the root computation (Anil et al., 2020) also have been proposed for single precision but have not yet been used in half-precision due to numerical instability (Shi et al., 2023). For the Shampoo-based curvature information, Jordan (2024) propose the Newton-Schulz iteration based on spectral norm descent (Bernstein & Newhouse, 2024). However, this method is limited to a specific matrix root (i.e.,  $p = 4$ ) and is not easy to generalize to curvature information other than the Shampoo-based curvature.

### 2.1. Riemannian Idea for Generic Curvature Learning

Although existing non-diagonal methods primarily focus on the Shampoo-based approximation, it is equally important to explore other types of curvature information to develop new non-diagonal methods. Inspired by Lin et al. (2024), we will propose an efficient update scheme that supports generic curvature information and arbitrary matrix roots.

Lin et al. (2024) propose an update scheme for generic SPD curvature estimation of  $\mathbf{S}$ . When using the GOP as curvature information, they show that the scheme in (3) with  $p = 1$  is a simplified version of Riemannian gradient descent (RGD) on a Gaussian manifold (Amari, 2016), where  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  in (3) become Gaussian’s mean and inverse covariance, respectively. Concretely, they consider a Gaussian approximation problem and use the following procedure to obtain the scheme in (3).

**Step 1** They first reformulate the original problem in (1) as a variational Gaussian approximation problem:

$$\min_{\mu, \mathbf{S} \succ 0} \mathcal{L}(\mu, \mathbf{S}) := E_{w \sim q(w; \mu, \mathbf{S})}[\ell(\mathbf{w})] - \gamma \mathcal{Q}_q, \quad (4)$$

where  $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$  is defined in Eq. (3),  $\ell(\cdot)$  is the loss function in Eq. (1), a new symbol  $\mathbf{w}$  is used to denote the weights of the NN because they are no longer learnable,  $q(\mathbf{w}; \mu, \mathbf{S})$  is a Gaussian with mean  $\mu$  and covariance  $\mathbf{S}^{-1}$ , and  $\mathcal{Q}_q := E_{w \sim q}[-\log q(\mathbf{w}; \mu, \mathbf{S})] = -\frac{1}{2} \log \det(\mathbf{S})$  is the Gaussian’s differential entropy.

**Step 2** They then suggest performing RGD in this parameter space  $\tau := \{\mu, \mathbf{S}\}$  of the Gaussian.

$$\text{RGD} : \tau \leftarrow \tau - \beta [\mathbf{F}_\tau]^{-1} \nabla_\tau \mathcal{L}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{F}_\tau := E_{w \sim q}[\nabla_\tau \log q(\mathbf{w}; \tau) \nabla_\tau^\top \log q(\mathbf{w}; \tau)] \in \mathbb{R}^{(l+l^2) \times (l+l^2)}$  is the Fisher-Rao metric in coordinate  $\tau$  and  $l$  is the number of NN weights. This metric is high-dimensional. The Moore-Penrose inverse is used in Eq. (5) if  $\mathbf{F}_\tau$  is singular.

**Step 3** Simplifying the RGD step

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RGD} : \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S} \\ \mu \end{bmatrix} &\leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S} \\ \mu \end{bmatrix} - \beta \begin{bmatrix} -2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{S}^{-1}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{\mathbf{S}} \mathcal{L} \\ \partial_\mu \mathcal{L} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S} + \beta(2\partial_{\mathbf{S}^{-1}} \mathcal{L}) \\ \mu - \beta \mathbf{S}^{-1} \partial_\mu \mathcal{L} \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S} - \beta(\gamma \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^\top) \\ \mu - \beta \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{g} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

gives rise to the scheme in (3) with  $p = 1$ , where they use (i) the analytical inverse metric  $[\mathbf{F}_\tau]^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{S}^{-1}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$ , (ii) Stein’s estimator for the Gaussian (Opper & Archambeau, 2009), and (iii) the GOP as a Hessian approximation (Lin et al., 2024)  $\nabla_\mu^2 \ell \approx \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^\top$  with a delta evaluation at mean  $\mu$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 2\partial_{\mathbf{S}^{-1}} \mathcal{L} &\stackrel{\text{Stein}}{=} E_{w \sim q}[\nabla_w^2 \ell] - \gamma \mathbf{S} \stackrel{\text{delta}}{\approx} \nabla_\mu^2 \ell - \gamma \mathbf{S} \approx \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^\top - \gamma \mathbf{S}, \\ \partial_\mu \mathcal{L} &\stackrel{\text{Stein}}{=} E_{w \sim q}[\nabla_w \ell] \stackrel{\text{delta}}{\approx} \nabla_\mu \ell = \mathbf{g}. \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

**Other Types of Curvature Information** This approach supports other types of curvature information. For example, the RGD step becomes Newton’s method (Khan et al., 2018) if setting  $\beta = 1$  and  $\gamma = 1$  and using the Hessian curvature information as  $2\partial_{\mathbf{S}^{-1}} \mathcal{L} \approx \nabla_\mu^2 \ell - \mathbf{S}$ . Lin et al. (2021) shows that this step recovers covariance adaptation evolution strategy (Wierstra et al., 2008) for gradient-free optimization when setting  $\gamma = 0$  and using the curvature information obtained from the REINFORCE (Williams, 1992) estimation. When using curvature information obtained from Bayesian inference, SPD matrix optimization, and inverse problems, this update scheme corresponds to Kalman filtering (Khan & Rue, 2023), RGD (Lin et al., 2023), and ensemble Kalman filtering (Chen et al., 2024), respectively. This step also supports the reparametrization trick (Lin et al., 2020) and Gauss-Newton approximation (Osawa et al., 2019) as other types of curvature information for training Bayesian NNs.

**Reparametrization Invariance** The Gaussian reformulation reveals a Riemannian structure hidden in Eq. (3) and provides a new way to learn a decomposition of  $\mathbf{S}$  on the fly

by reparametrizing  $\mathbf{S}$  and exploiting the reparametrization invariance of RGD. Claim 1—proof in Appx. F—establishes the invariance for linear unconstrained reparametrization.

*Claim 1.* RGD is linearly invariant in smooth, unconstrained parameter spaces, including over-parametrized spaces.

**Limitations of Existing Methods** Generally, it is unclear if the reparametrization invariance holds for nonlinear and constrained reparametrizations. Lin et al. (2024) present a positive case for directly learning a (nonlinear) Cholesky factor of  $\mathbf{S}^{-1/p}$  with  $p = 1$  on the fly. However, their approach is not easy to extend to other fractional roots (i.e.,  $p \neq 1$ ). Other approaches, like Khan et al. (2018); Lin et al. (2020); Tran et al. (2021); Tan (2022); Godichon et al. (2024), also have difficulty efficiently computing fractional matrix roots without matrix decomposition. Moreover, most works do not preserve or demonstrate the invariance in nonlinear cases.

**Challenges of Learning Constrained Parametrizations via RGD** Performing RGD in a constrained coordinate is nontrivial because we have to satisfy parameter/coordinate constraints while taking a Riemannian metric into account. For example, consider learning a spectral parameterization of  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{B} \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}) \mathbf{B}^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{B}$  is an orthogonal matrix and  $\mathbf{d}$  is a vector with positive entries. The RGD step in Eq. (5) does not guarantee that these constraints are satisfied. Many Riemannian approaches do not apply to the Gaussian problem because they are limited to certain constraints and tied to specific metrics. For example, existing methods (Li et al., 2020; Kong et al., 2022) only consider the orthogonal constraint for canonical metrics (Tagare, 2011) studied in the Riemannian optimization literature. On the other hand, the Gaussian problem induces a new metric for the orthogonal matrix  $\mathbf{B}$  and the vector  $\mathbf{d}$  jointly. The metric is necessary as it allows us to leverage reparameterization invariance, enabling the design of efficient and stable adaptive methods. As another example, retraction-based Riemannian methods (Absil et al., 2009; Boumal et al., 2014) often use matrix decomposition to handle constraints, which contradicts our goal of solving the Gaussian problem efficiently and stably.

**Challenges of Efficient Riemannian Gradient Computation and Maintaining Parametrization Uniqueness**

Recall that the simplification step (i.e., Step 3) turns a computationally expensive RGD step in Eq. (5) involving the high-dimensional metric inversion into a more efficient adaptive update scheme. Without an analytical metric inversion, we cannot simplify or explicitly express the RGD step as an adaptive update scheme. When changing coordinates, the metric representation has to be changed accordingly (Lee, 2018). However, an ambiguous reparametrization can lead to a singular metric and thus complicate the metric inversion. For example, the metric is changed from block-diagonal and invertible  $\mathbf{F}_\tau = E_{w \sim q}[\nabla_\tau \log q(\mathbf{w}; \tau) \nabla_\tau^\top \log q(\mathbf{w}; \tau)]$  to non-block-diagonal and singular  $\mathbf{F}_\eta = E_{w \sim q}[\nabla_\eta \log q(\mathbf{w}; \eta) \nabla_\eta^\top \log q(\mathbf{w}; \eta)]$ , where

$\tau = \{\mu, \mathbf{S}\}$  is a canonical coordinate and  $\eta = \{\mu, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{B}\}$  is a spectral coordinate. This is because the spectral coordinate is not unique for permutation. In this case, simplifying the (Moore-Penrose) inverse of this non-block-diagonal and singular metric is nontrivial. In other words, the inverse metric no longer admits a *simple* and analytical form. The simplification step is more challenging in Kronecker-factorized cases because additional ambiguity (see Sec. 3.3) from Kronecker factorization renders the metric always singular and complicates the simplification step.

### 3. Spectral-factorized Curvature Learning

Our goal is to propose training schemes that support generic curvature information and offer the flexibility to apply arbitrary matrix roots and other matrix operations at a low cost. To do so, we propose directly learning  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{d}$  in a spectral parametrization of  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{B}\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d})\mathbf{B}^\top$  *without* storing  $\mathbf{S}$ , where  $\mathbf{B}$  is an orthogonal square matrix and  $\mathbf{d}$  is a vector with positive entries. Our learnable spectral factor allows us to easily compute any fractional root and inversion  $\mathbf{S}^{-1/p} = \mathbf{B}\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{-1/p})\mathbf{B}^\top$  through elementwise roots on  $\mathbf{d}$ , instead of matrix roots on  $\mathbf{S}$ . We then extend our approach to Kronecker cases to support large-scale applications. Our approach is efficient as updating  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{d}$  does not involve any matrix decomposition.

Our starting point is that the adaptive method in (3) is the Riemannian solution to the Gaussian problem discussed in Sec. 2.1. Because RGD is invariant under coordinate transformations (see Claims 1, 2), our idea is to change coordinates so that the Riemannian solution becomes an adaptive update rule for spectral coordinates. We propose using local coordinates to overcome the challenges of using spectral-constrained coordinates (see Sec. 2.1).

#### Constraint Satisfaction and Metric Diagonalization via Local Coordinate Transformations

Our local coordinates are inspired by generalized Riemannian (normal) local coordinates (Glasmachers et al., 2010; Lin et al., 2023) and Fermi coordinates (Manasse & Misner, 1963). The main idea is to construct local coordinates that handle constraints and facilitate the analytical metric inversion needed for the simplification. Using a local coordinate transformation can *iteratively* diagonalize the metric at a *single* evaluation. Given a global coordinate, such as a spectral coordinate, we construct, use, and discard a local coordinate system and its coordinate transformation map to the global coordinate at every iteration. In our approach, the coordinate and its transformation map satisfy these conditions: (i) The map is differentiable and satisfies the constraints. (ii) The local coordinate has no coordinate constraint for performing RGD and its origin represents a current iterate in the spectral coordinate. (iii) The metric evaluated at the origin is an easy-to-inverse matrix, such as an identity (Lin et al., 2023) or a diagonal matrix (Glasmachers et al., 2010).

**Our Technical Contributions** Existing local coordinates neither account for spectral constraints nor simplify the inverse of the *singular* metric for spectral parameterizations. We propose new local coordinates for spectral parameterization, demonstrate how they enable spectral-factorized adaptive schemes by satisfying spectral constraints and simplifying inverse metric computation, and extend our schemes to Kronecker cases. Moreover, our (nonlinear) scheme preserves the reparametrization invariance (see Claim 2).

**Versatility** While we focus on NN training using the GOP, our schemes are suitable for other curvature and applications mentioned in Sec. 2.1. For example, our schemes (see Sec. 4) can solve gradient-free optimization (Wierstra et al., 2008) and SPD matrix optimization (Absil et al., 2009).

**Notations** To handle the orthogonal constraint in  $\mathbf{B}$ , we use this Cayley map  $\text{Cayley}(\mathbf{N}) := (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1}$ . Claim 9 in the appendix shows why the inversion in the Cayley map always exists. We introduce a map denoted by  $\text{Skew}(\mathbf{M}) := \mathbf{M} - \mathbf{M}^\top$  to make its input  $\mathbf{M}$  skew-symmetric as required by the Cayley map and a lower-triangular restriction denoted by  $\text{Tril}(\mathbf{C})$  to make its input lower-triangular.

#### 3.1. Full-matrix Schemes via Full Gaussian Approx.

We present our scheme in the context of full-matrix preconditioners and use the GOP as curvature information. While full-matrix methods are generally impractical for modern NNs, this will serve to illustrate the core ideas that we later apply to structured cases. Our scheme is given in the top box of Fig. 1. It is a spectral-factorized adaptive scheme for solving problem (1) without matrix decomposition. Thus, our scheme enables more efficient and stable root computation than the original one in Eq. (3). Surprisingly, our scheme coincides with the original one (to first order):

**Claim 2. Reparametrization Invariance:** Our update scheme for  $\mathbf{S}$  in the top box of Fig 1 is equivalent to the scheme in Eq. (3) up to first-order in terms of  $\beta_2$  when  $\mathbf{d}$  does not have repeated entries (proof in Appx. G).

To obtain the update scheme (top box of Fig. 1), we consider the following procedure to convert an RGD step into an adaptive scheme. Our procedure follows similar steps in Sec. 2.1 except for using local coordinates.

**Step 1** We consider a Gaussian problem in (4) using a learnable spectral parametrization,  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{B}\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d})\mathbf{B}^\top$ , of the inverse covariance  $\mathbf{S}$ , where  $\mathcal{Q}_q = -\frac{1}{2} \log \det(\mathbf{S}) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_i (\log d_i)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mu, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{B}} \mathcal{L}(\mu, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{B}) &:= E_{w \sim q(w; \mu, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{B})} [\ell(\mathbf{w})] - \gamma \mathcal{Q}_q, \\ \text{s.t. } \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top &= \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I} \text{ and } \mathbf{d} > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

**Step 2** We construct a local coordinate at each iteration to remove the (spectral) constraints in (8) when performing RGD. We then take an unconstrained RGD step in this local coordinate, translate the update to the spectral coordinate, and discard the local coordinate. This coordinate generation

**Full-matrix** ( $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{B}\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d})\mathbf{B}^T$ )

- 1: Compute gradient  $\mathbf{g} := \nabla \ell(\boldsymbol{\mu})$   
 $\mathbf{d} \leftarrow \mathbf{d} \odot \exp\{\beta_2 \mathbf{d}^{-1} \odot [-\gamma \mathbf{d} + \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{B})]\}$   
 $\mathbf{B} \leftarrow \mathbf{B} \text{Cayley}(\beta_2 (\text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U}))))$
- 2:  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\mu} - \beta_1 \mathbf{B} \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{-1/p}) \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{g}$

**Kronecker** ( $\mathbf{S} = \alpha [\mathbf{B}^{(C)} \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{(C)}) (\mathbf{B}^{(C)})^T] \otimes [\mathbf{B}^{(K)} \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{(K)}) (\mathbf{B}^{(K)})^T]$ )

- 1: Compute gradient  $\mathbf{G} := \text{Mat}(\nabla \ell(\boldsymbol{\mu})) \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times m}$   
 $\mathbf{m}^{(C)} = (\mathbf{d}^{(C)})^{-1} \odot [-\gamma \mathbf{d}^{(C)} + \frac{1}{\alpha m} \text{diag}(\mathbf{W}^{(C)})]$   
 $\mathbf{m}^{(K)} = (\mathbf{d}^{(K)})^{-1} \odot [-\gamma \mathbf{d}^{(K)} + \frac{1}{\alpha n} \text{diag}(\mathbf{W}^{(K)})]$   
 $\mathbf{d}^{(C)} \leftarrow \mathbf{d}^{(C)} \odot \exp\{\beta_2 [\mathbf{m}^{(C)} - \text{mean}(\mathbf{m}^{(C)})]\}$   
 $\mathbf{d}^{(K)} \leftarrow \mathbf{d}^{(K)} \odot \exp\{\beta_2 [\mathbf{m}^{(K)} - \text{mean}(\mathbf{m}^{(K)})]\}$   
 $\mathbf{B}^{(C)} \leftarrow \mathbf{B}^{(C)} \text{Cayley}(\frac{\beta_2}{\alpha m} \text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U}^{(C)})))$   
 $\mathbf{B}^{(K)} \leftarrow \mathbf{B}^{(K)} \text{Cayley}(\frac{\beta_2}{\alpha n} \text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U}^{(K)})))$   
 $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha \exp(\frac{\beta_2}{2} [\text{mean}(\mathbf{m}^{(K)}) + \text{mean}(\mathbf{m}^{(C)})])$
- 2:  $\mathbf{M} \leftarrow \mathbf{M} - \beta_1 (\alpha^{-1/p}) (\mathbf{S}^{(C)})^{-1/p} \mathbf{G} (\mathbf{S}^{(K)})^{-1/p}$

process shares the same spirit as Cartan’s method of moving frames (Ivey & Landsberg, 2003).

**Step 2.1** Concretely, at iteration  $k$ , we create a local coordinate  $\boldsymbol{\eta} := (\boldsymbol{\delta}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{M})$  at the current point  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_k := (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \mathbf{d}_k, \mathbf{B}_k)$  and use this local transformation map

$$\tau(\boldsymbol{\eta}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{m}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \\ \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\delta}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_k \odot \exp(\mathbf{m}) \\ \mathbf{B}_k \text{Cayley}(\text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{M}))) \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_k + \mathbf{B}_k \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_k^{-1/2}) \boldsymbol{\delta} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

to translate the change from the local coordinate to the spectral coordinate (see Claims 3, 4), where  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_k = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \mathbf{d}_k, \mathbf{B}_k)$  is considered as a constant in this map and  $\odot$  denotes the elementwise product. Inspired by the Riemannian normal coordinates (Lin et al., 2023), we construct the map (9) so that Claims 3, 4, and 5 are satisfied. As discussed in Sec. 2.1, the uniqueness in local coordinates (see Claim 4) makes it easy to compute the inverse of the metric.

*Claim 3.* The map in (9) satisfies the constraints in (8).

*Claim 4. Uniqueness of the Local Coordinates* The map (9) is one-to-one, which is like the eigendecomposition, is unique, if  $\mathbf{d}$  has no repeated entries (see Appx. I for a proof).

**Step 2.2** We then take an (unconstrained) RGD step in the local coordinate  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RGD} : \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{new}} &\leftarrow \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}} - \beta [\mathbf{F}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}})]^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mathcal{L}|_{\boldsymbol{\eta}=\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}}}, \\ &= \mathbf{0} - \beta [\mathbf{F}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{0})]^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mathcal{L}|_{\boldsymbol{\eta}=\mathbf{0}}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and translate the change  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{new}}$  from the local coordinate

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_{k+1} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\tau}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{new}}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k), \quad (11)$$

to the spectral coordinate, where the Fisher-Rao metric  $\mathbf{F}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}})$  evaluated at  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}}$  is diagonal (see Claim 5) in the local coordinate and the origin  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}} \equiv \mathbf{0}$  represents the current  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_k = \boldsymbol{\tau}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \equiv \boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{0}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k)$  in the spectral coordinate. Notably, evaluating the metric at the origin can greatly simplify the metric computation.

**Step 3** We obtain the scheme in the top box of Fig. 1 by

Figure 1. Adaptive update schemes for full-matrix and Kronecker-based spectral factorization.

**Full-matrix scheme:**  $\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U})$  is a lower-triangular matrix with the  $(i, j)$ -th entry  $[\mathbf{U}]_{ij} := -[\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{B}]_{ij} / (d_i - d_j)$  when  $d_i \neq d_j$  and 0 otherwise.

**Kronecker-based scheme:** For simplicity, we assume NN weights take a matrix form:  $\mathbf{M} := \text{Mat}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , where  $\text{Mat}(\cdot)$  is a matrix representation of vector  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ . We define  $\mathbf{W}^{(C)} := (\mathbf{B}^{(C)})^T \mathbf{G} (\mathbf{S}^{(K)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{B}^{(C)}$ , and  $\mathbf{W}^{(K)} := (\mathbf{B}^{(K)})^T \mathbf{G}^T (\mathbf{S}^{(C)})^{-1} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{B}^{(K)}$ , where  $\mathbf{S}^{(l)} := \mathbf{B}^{(l)} \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{(l)}) (\mathbf{B}^{(l)})^T$  for  $l \in \{C, K\}$ . To update a Kronecker factor  $\mathbf{S}^{(l)}$ , the scheme uses a lower-triangular matrix  $\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U}^{(l)})$  with its  $(i, j)$ -th entry  $[\mathbf{U}^{(l)}]_{ij} := -[\mathbf{W}^{(l)}]_{ij} / (d_i^{(l)} - d_j^{(l)})$  if  $d_i^{(l)} \neq d_j^{(l)}$  and 0 otherwise, where  $d_i^{(l)}$  denotes the  $i$ -th entry of vector  $\mathbf{d}^{(l)}$ . For numerical stability, we set  $[\mathbf{U}^{(l)}]_{ij} = 0$  if  $|d_i^{(l)} - d_j^{(l)}|$  is near 0.

simplifying the RGD step in (10)-(11), and making the approximations in (7) (see Appx. N). Notably, this approximation can be changed to include other types of curvature information while keeping the root computation efficient.

Our procedure satisfies parameter constraints (see Claim 3) and simplifies the metric inversion (see Claim 5). The simplification is easy because the metric  $\mathbf{F}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}}) := \mathbf{F}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\boldsymbol{\eta})|_{\boldsymbol{\eta}=\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}}}$  evaluated at the origin (in the local coordinate) is diagonal. The metric diagonalization allows us to simplify the inverse metric computation in Eq. (10) even when the metric is singular (e.g.,  $\mathbf{d}$  has repeated entries, see Appx. D for a discussion). Moreover, the gradient  $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mathcal{L}|_{\boldsymbol{\eta}=\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}}}$  required by RGD is easy to compute via the chain rule and has an analytical expression (see Appx. N). Furthermore, our update scheme can be used for other applications, such as gradient-free optimization and SPD matrix optimization (see Sec. 4).

*Claim 5. Closed-form Metric Diagonalization:* The exact Fisher-Rao metric  $\mathbf{F}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}})$  (for a full-matrix Gaussian) evaluated at the origin  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}} \equiv \mathbf{0}$  is *diagonal* and has a closed-form expression (see Eq. (26) in Appx. J).

### 3.2. Connections to Diagonal Adaptive Methods

Our full-matrix scheme in Fig. 1 also applies in diagonal cases by forcing  $\mathbf{B}$  to be a diagonal matrix. We achieve that by changing map  $\text{Tril}(\cdot)$  to  $\text{Diag}(\cdot)$  in the update rule. Consequently,  $\mathbf{B}$  becomes a constant identity matrix (up to sign changes) that can be ignored. Similar to the full matrix case, we can obtain this scheme through a diagonal Gaussian approximation. When truncating the exponential map, our scheme becomes the root-free RMSprop and AdaGrad (Lin et al., 2024) for  $p = 1$ . If applying other fractional  $p$ -root, our scheme also recovers RMSprop and AdaGrad for  $p = 2$  and the fractional diagonal method (Chen et al., 2021) for  $p = 4$ . See Appx. E for the details.

### 3.3. Kronecker Schemes via Matrix Gaussian Approx.

Using Kronecker-structured preconditioners (Martens & Grosse, 2015; Gupta et al., 2018) is necessary for large




Figure 2. Empirical validation of our update schemes for SPD curvature learning. **Full-matrix Scheme:** The first plot on the left shows that the scheme converges to a fixed-point solution as fast as the default scheme in Eq. (3) (with  $\gamma = 1$ ) to update  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{100 \times 100}$  and the Cholesky-based scheme. The second plot illustrates how closely our scheme matches the iterates generated by the default update scheme at each iteration. **Kronecker-based Scheme:** The third plot shows that our update scheme gives a structural approximation  $\mathbf{S}^{(C)} \otimes \mathbf{S}^{(K)}$  of a fixed-point solution obtained by the default full-matrix update scheme for  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{R}^{99 \times 99}$ , where  $\mathbf{S}^{(C)} \in \mathbb{R}^{9 \times 9}$  and  $\mathbf{S}^{(K)} \in \mathbb{R}^{11 \times 11}$ . Our scheme converges as fast as Kronecker-structured baseline methods, including the impractical projection-based method. The last plot illustrates how closely our scheme matches the unstructured iterates generated by the default one at each iteration. See Figs. 5-6 for more results.

models, as a full-matrix preconditioner is too large to store. Many Kronecker-based methods (Zhang et al., 2018; Ren & Goldfarb, 2021; Lin et al., 2023; 2024) are based on a (matrix) Gaussian family with Kronecker-structured inverse covariance  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}^{(C)} \otimes \mathbf{S}^{(K)}$ . Thus, we want to extend the procedure in Sec. 3.1 to Kronecker cases. However, the Fisher-Rao metric for a Kronecker structure is singular because Kronecker factorization is not unique. In other words, Claim 4 no longer holds in Kronecker cases. Thus, we cannot use the procedure in Sec. 3.1 to obtain an adaptive scheme in these cases. Existing works such as Zhang et al. (2018); Lin et al. (2019; 2024) make an additional approximation for the metric to tackle this. Instead, we overcome this without approximation by imposing a determinant constraint on each Kronecker factor and introducing a learnable scalar  $\alpha$  to make the factorization unique (see Claim 6).

**Claim 6.** A Kronecker-structured positive-definite matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  can be uniquely expressed as  $\mathbf{S} = \alpha[\mathbf{S}^{(C)} \otimes \mathbf{S}^{(K)}]$  with constraints  $\det(\mathbf{S}^{(C)}) = \det(\mathbf{S}^{(K)}) = 1$  and  $\alpha > 0$ . (see Appx. K)

We then propose a spectral parametrization and local coordinates for each Kronecker factor  $\mathbf{S}^{(l)} = \mathbf{B}^{(l)} \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{(l)}) (\mathbf{B}^{(l)})^T$  for  $l \in \{C, K\}$ , where  $\det(\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{(l)})) = 1$  is the determinant constraint. Thanks to our local coordinates, we can again make the parametrization unique (see Claim 7) and simplify the inverse metric computation (see Claim 8). We then follow a similar procedure in Sec. 3.1 to obtain an update scheme for Kronecker cases (see bottom box of Fig. 1).

### Handling New Constraints via Local Transformations

For the positive scalar  $\alpha$ , we introduce a local coordinate  $n$  and use an exponential map in the coordinate transformation:  $\alpha(n; \alpha_k) = \alpha_k \exp(n)$  at each iteration  $k$ . We drop the Kronecker factor index  $l$  for simplicity. The coordinate transformation map for each factor is similar to the map in full-matrix cases, except that for vector  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{m}; \mathbf{d}_k) = \mathbf{d}_k \odot \exp(\mathbf{m})$ , we require  $\text{sum}(\mathbf{m}) = 0$  to satisfy the determinant constraint (i.e.,  $\det(\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{m}))) = 1$ ), where  $j$  is the length of vector  $\mathbf{d}_k$  and the local coordinate  $\mathbf{m} := [m_1, \dots, m_{j-1}, -\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} m_i]$  has only  $(j-1)$  free variables.

**Claim 7. Uniqueness of the Local Coordinates** The transformation map (see Eq. (27) in the appendix) is one-to-one if  $\mathbf{d}^{(l)}$  has no repeated entries for each Kronecker factor  $l$ .

**Claim 8. Closed-form Metric Block Diagonalization:** The Fisher-Rao metric  $\mathbf{F}_{\eta}(\eta_{\text{cur}})$  (for a matrix Gaussian) and its inverse evaluated at  $\eta_{\text{cur}} \equiv \mathbf{0}$  are block-diagonal and have closed form (see Eq. (29) in Appx. M).

Similarly, we can derive a spectral scheme via a tensor Gaussian approximation (Lin et al., 2024) for tensor weights.

### 3.4. Practical Considerations for NN Training

#### Low-precision Training Using a Truncated Cayley Map

Recall that our schemes in Fig. 1 use the Cayley map that involves matrix inversion. To work with half-precision and further reduce the computational cost, we use a truncated Cayley map, similar to Liu et al. (2021); Li et al. (2020); Qiu et al. (2023), for NN problems. Our truncation is based on a Neumann series for the matrix inversion (Krishnan et al., 2017; Lorraine et al., 2020; Qiu et al., 2023). This is possible because we can approximate the matrix inversion in the Cayley map  $\text{Cayley}(\beta\mathbf{N}) = (\mathbf{I} + \beta\mathbf{N})(\mathbf{I} - \beta\mathbf{N})^{-1} = (\mathbf{I} + \beta\mathbf{N}) \prod_{t=0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{I} + (\beta\mathbf{N})^{2^t})^{-1} \approx (\mathbf{I} + \beta\mathbf{N})^2 (\mathbf{I} + (\beta\mathbf{N})^4)$  based on a convergent Neumann series, when  $\beta$  is small enough so that the Frobenius norm  $\|\beta\mathbf{N}\|_{\text{Frob}} < 1$ . Consequently, we use a nonconstant step size, similar to Lin et al. (2024), to keep the norm bounded as required by the truncation. Fig. 8 in the appendix shows that using the truncation significantly reduces running time while maintaining performance.

#### Stabilizing Training using Preconditioned Gradient Clipping or Grafting

For training transformers, it is common practice to use preconditioned gradient clipping (Liu et al., 2023; Shen et al., 2024) or grafting (Agarwal et al., 2019; Shi et al., 2023; Vyas et al., 2024) so that the norm of their descent direction is either bounded layerwisely (Zhang et al., 2024) or bounded as the norm of Adam (Shi et al., 2023; Vyas et al., 2024). This is needed because of heavy-tailed noise (Zhang et al., 2020). We use the preconditioned gradi-




Figure 3. Experiments showcase the efficacy and versatility of our approach for generic curvature learning. Our update scheme matches the equivalent Riemannian baselines, empirically illustrating the reparametrization invariance. **SPD Matrix Optimization:** The first two plots on the left show the performance of our full-matrix update scheme for learning SPD matrices. Our update scheme matches the baselines, as our scheme is RGD in local coordinates. **Gradient-free Optimization:** The last three plots show the performance of our scheme for gradient-free optimization problems on Ackley (multimode), Rosenbrock (flat valley), and Griewank (multimode) functions. See Fig. 7 in the appendix for more results.

ent clipping in our experiments to train transformers. Other approaches like sign descent (Chen et al., 2023), normalized gradient descent (Cutkosky & Mehta, 2020), and spectral norm descent (Bernstein & Newhouse, 2024; Jordan, 2024) also implicitly bound the norm of their descent direction.

## 4. Experiments

### 4.1. SPD Curvature Learning from the GOP

#### Empirical Validation of the Full-matrix Update Scheme

First, we empirically evaluate our scheme for using the GOP as curvature information to demonstrate how our update scheme relates to the default scheme (see Eq. (3)) by indirectly learning  $\mathbf{S}^{(\text{spectral})} := \mathbf{B}\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d})\mathbf{B}^T$ . We compare our scheme to the default one on  $\mathbf{S}$  as  $\mathbf{S}_{k+1}^{(\text{default})} \leftarrow (1 - \beta)\mathbf{S}_k^{(\text{default})} + \beta\mathbf{g}_k\mathbf{g}_k^T$ , and the inverse-free scheme (Lin et al., 2024) for a learnable Cholesky factor  $\mathbf{C}$  of  $\mathbf{S}^{-1}$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{S}^{(\text{chol})} := (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{C}^T)^{-1}$ ). We focus on the curvature estimation of  $\mathbf{S}$  based on a fixed gradient sequence  $\{\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_T\}$  and initialized by the same  $\mathbf{S}_0$ . We consider two scenarios: (1) fixed-point matching and (2) iterate matching.

**Fixed-point matching** The ground truth is a fixed-point solution,  $\mathbf{S}_* = E[\mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^T] = \Sigma$ , to the default update scheme as  $\mathbf{S}_* = (1 - \beta)\mathbf{S}_* + \beta\mathbf{g}_k\mathbf{g}_k^T$ , where  $\mathbf{g}_k$  is independently generated from a Gaussian distribution  $\mathbf{g}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$  at each iteration  $k$ . We evaluate each scheme at iteration  $k$  by comparing its current estimate denoted by  $\mathbf{S}_k^{(\text{est})}$  to the fixed point. We use a relative Frobenius norm  $\frac{\|\mathbf{S}_* - \mathbf{S}_k^{(\text{est})}\|_{\text{Frob}}}{\|\mathbf{S}_*\|_{\text{Frob}}}$  to measure the difference.

**Iterate matching** The ground truth is a sequence of matrices  $\{\mathbf{S}_1^{(\text{true})}, \dots, \mathbf{S}_T^{(\text{true})}\}$  generated by the default scheme when applying the scheme to the gradient sequence. We want to match the iterate the default scheme generates at every step. We use a relative Frobenius norm  $\frac{\|\mathbf{S}_k^{(\text{true})} - \mathbf{S}_k^{(\text{est})}\|_{\text{Frob}}}{\|\mathbf{S}_k^{(\text{true})}\|_{\text{Frob}}}$  to measure the discrepancy between an update scheme and the default one at every iteration  $k$ .

From the first two plots in Fig. 2, we can see that our update scheme performs similarly to the default update scheme in

the two scenarios. Together with Claim 2, these results show that our scheme coincides with the default one theoretically and empirically. See Appx. A and Fig. 5 for more details.

### Empirical Evaluation of the Kronecker-based Update Scheme

We compare our Kronecker scheme to the default full-matrix scheme on  $\mathbf{S}$ :  $\mathbf{S}_{k+1} \leftarrow (1 - \beta)\mathbf{S}_k + \beta\mathbf{g}_k\mathbf{g}_k^T$ . As baselines, we consider the curvature estimation used in the structured Cholesky factorization (Lin et al., 2024), and an impractical projection-based method (Van Loan & Pitsianis, 1993):  $(\mathbf{S}_{k+1}^{(\mathbf{C})}, \mathbf{S}_{k+1}^{(\mathbf{K})}) \leftarrow \text{Proj}((1 - \beta)(\mathbf{S}_k^{(\mathbf{C})} \otimes \mathbf{S}_k^{(\mathbf{K})}) + \beta\mathbf{g}_k\mathbf{g}_k^T)$ . We use a similar experimental setup and consider two similar scenarios discussed in the full-matrix case. Here, we initialized all update schemes by a Kronecker structured matrix  $\mathbf{S}_0$  to remove the difference introduced by initialization.

From the last two plots in Fig. 2, we can see that our structural scheme performs as well as existing structural baselines. Our approach performs similarly to the impractical method that requires storing a full matrix and solving a projection optimization problem at every iteration. This illustrates the effectiveness of our approach in Kronecker cases. See Appx. A and Fig. 6 for more details.

### 4.2. Full-matrix Case: SPD Matrix Optimization

We consider SPD matrix optimization problems to demonstrate the versatility of our scheme. We aim to learn an SPD matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  from another type of curvature information that can be negative-definite. Therefore, the (linear) original scheme of  $\mathbf{S}$  in Eq. (3) is unsuitable in this setting because the original scheme assumes the curvature (i.e., the GOP) is positive-semi-definite. In Riemannian optimization, we introduce a non-linear retraction map in the original scheme so that the updated  $\mathbf{S}$  is guaranteed to be SPD. This is known as RGD with retraction (Absil et al., 2009; Boumal et al., 2014). We consider this retraction-based RGD (Boumal et al., 2014) and the Cholesky-based RGD (Lin et al., 2023) as baselines. We consider a metric nearness problem (Brickell et al., 2008)  $\min_{\mathbf{S} \succ \mathbf{0}} \ell(\mathbf{S}) := \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2$  and a log-det optimization problem (Han et al., 2021)  $\min_{\mathbf{S} \succ \mathbf{0}} \ell(\mathbf{S}) := \text{Tr}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q}) - \log \det(\mathbf{S})$ , where  $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is a




Figure 4. Experiments demonstrate the efficiency of our update schemes for low-precision NN training. The plots show the performance of our Kronecker-based scheme for training vision transformers with half precision. All models are trained for 210 epochs, including 10 epochs for warmup. For SOAP and our method, we update their preconditioners every two iterations. SOAP performs much slower than the other methods because it has to run in single precision to use matrix decomposition. Using a different matrix root can affect the performance. Our method not only matches Muon’s performance but also opens the door to using curvature information and matrix roots beyond Muon. See Figs. 9 and 10 in Appx. C for a comparison of the methods based on iteration efficiency and wall-clock time.

known SPD matrix and only a subset of  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are observed at each iteration. The optimal solution is  $\mathbf{S}_* = \mathbf{Q}^{-1}$  for these two problems. We measure the difference between an estimate  $\mathbf{S}_{\text{est}}$  and the ground truth  $\mathbf{S}_*$  using  $\ell(\mathbf{S}_{\text{est}}) - \ell(\mathbf{S}_*)$  as the evaluation loss. We consider a case for  $d = 60$  and generate  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . As we can see from the first two plots in Fig. 3, our method performs as well as the baseline methods. Our approach works well for estimating SPD matrices even when the curvature information is not SPD. This shows that our approach can incorporate other types of curvature information for learning  $\mathbf{S}$ .

### 4.3. Full-matrix Case: Gradient-free Optimization

We consider classic gradient-free problems to demonstrate the flexibility of our approach for preconditioning (i.e., learning  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$ ). We learn  $\mathbf{S}$  from a new type of curvature information to solve an original problem  $\min_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ , where we only allow to evaluate the value of  $\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ . We consider natural evolution strategies (NES) (Wierstra et al., 2008) and the Cholesky-based NES (Glasmachers et al., 2010; Fukushima et al., 2011; Lin et al., 2021) as our baselines. Like these methods, we consider a Gaussian problem in Eq. (4) with  $\gamma = 0$  to approximate the original problem. We can solve this Gaussian problem using the procedure in Sec. 3.1, where we use the REINFORCE estimator in Eq. (7), which only evaluates the function value of  $\ell(\mathbf{w})$  and uses samples  $\mathbf{w}$  generated from the Gaussian  $q$ . We use the techniques of Wierstra et al. (2008) and Fukushima et al. (2011) to reduce the number of Monte Carlo samples and function evaluations. We use  $\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu})$  as the evaluation loss. From the last three plots of Fig. 3, we can observe that our update scheme is competitive with existing Riemannian methods. This further illustrates the efficacy and versatility of our approach. See Appx. B and Fig. 7 for more details.

### 4.4. Kronecker-based Case: Low-precision NN Training

Now, we examine our Kronecker-based update scheme for training transformers in half precision. We use our update

scheme to train vision transformers with half-precision from scratch. Training transformers in half-precision allows us to evaluate the numerical stability of our approach because matrix inversion and decomposition are unstable and thus unavailable in half precision. We then show the effectiveness and efficiency of our approach by comparing our method to strong baselines like AdamW and two recently proposed Shampoo variants, SOAP (Vyas et al., 2024) and Muon (Jordan, 2024). Both SOAP and Muon are limited to a specific matrix root and Shampoo-based curvature information. In contrast, our approach supports arbitrary matrix roots and generic types of curvature information. We consider training two vision transformers, PlainViT (85.6M parameters) (Beyer et al., 2022) and HieraViT (50.7M parameters) (Ryali et al., 2023), on ImageWoof-10 and ImageNet-25 datasets. These ViT models only contain transformer modules except for their embedding layers. All training methods except for SOAP support half-precision training. SOAP has to use single precision data types due to matrix decomposition. To demonstrate the efficiency of our approach, we update the preconditioners of our method and SOAP every two iterations. We use random search (Choi et al., 2019) to tune all available hyperparameters for each method on each dataset using 80 runs. See Appx. C for the details of the experimental setup. From the plots in Fig. 4, we can see that our method effectively trains transformers in half-precision and matches the performance of state-of-the-art methods like Muon. Compared to SOAP, we can clearly see the computational advantages of fast root computation without matrix decomposition. The plots also show that using a different matrix root can affect the performance of matrix methods. Finally, these results highlight the benefits of matrix methods and underscore the need for their further development. See Figs. 9 and 10 for more results.

## 5. Conclusion

We present spectral-factorized curvature learning schemes for designing training methods. Our approach addresses the

instability and inefficiency of using matrix fractional roots in low-precision training, enabling non-diagonal methods to support other fractional roots and generic curvature information. An interesting direction for future work is to evaluate our schemes in large-scale settings and explore the potential benefits of using different roots and curvature information.

## References

- Absil, P.-A., Mahony, R., and Sepulchre, R. *Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Agarwal, N., Bullins, B., Chen, X., Hazan, E., Singh, K., Zhang, C., and Zhang, Y. Efficient full-matrix adaptive regularization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 102–110. PMLR, 2019.
- Agarwal, N., Anil, R., Hazan, E., Koren, T., and Zhang, C. Learning rate grafting: Transferability of optimizer tuning. 2021.
- Amari, S.-I. Natural gradient works efficiently in learning. *Neural computation*, 10(2):251–276, 1998.
- Amari, S.-i. *Information geometry and its applications*, volume 194. Springer, 2016.
- Anil, R., Gupta, V., Koren, T., Regan, K., and Singer, Y. Scalable second order optimization for deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09018*, 2020.
- Bernstein, J. and Newhouse, L. Old optimizer, new norm: An anthology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.20325*, 2024.
- Beyer, L., Zhai, X., and Kolesnikov, A. Better plain vit baselines for imagenet-1k. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01580*, 2022.
- Boumal, N., Mishra, B., Absil, P.-A., and Sepulchre, R. Manopt, a matlab toolbox for optimization on manifolds. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1455–1459, 2014.
- Brickell, J., Dhillon, I. S., Sra, S., and Tropp, J. A. The metric nearness problem. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 30(1):375–396, 2008.
- Chen, J., Zhou, D., Tang, Y., Yang, Z., Cao, Y., and Gu, Q. Closing the generalization gap of adaptive gradient methods in training deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 3267–3275, 2021.
- Chen, X., Liang, C., Huang, D., Real, E., Wang, K., Liu, Y., Pham, H., Dong, X., Luong, T., Hsieh, C.-J., et al. Symbolic discovery of optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06675*, 2023.
- Chen, Y., Huang, D. Z., Huang, J., Reich, S., and Stuart, A. M. Efficient, multimodal, and derivative-free bayesian inference with fisher–rao gradient flows. *Inverse Problems*, 40(12):125001, 2024.
- Choi, D., Shallue, C. J., Nado, Z., Lee, J., Maddison, C. J., and Dahl, G. E. On empirical comparisons of optimizers for deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.05446*, 2019.
- Cutkosky, A. and Mehta, H. Momentum improves normalized sgd. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2260–2268. PMLR, 2020.
- Duchi, J., Hazan, E., and Singer, Y. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *Journal of machine learning research*, 12(7), 2011.
- Fukushima, N., Nagata, Y., Kobayashi, S., and Ono, I. Proposal of distance-weighted exponential natural evolution strategies. In *2011 IEEE Congress of Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, pp. 164–171. IEEE, 2011.
- Glasmachers, T., Schaul, T., Yi, S., Wierstra, D., and Schmidhuber, J. Exponential natural evolution strategies. In *Proceedings of the 12th annual conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation*, pp. 393–400, 2010.
- Godichon, Baggioni, A., Nguyen, D., and Tran, M.-N. Natural gradient variational bayes without fisher matrix analytic calculation and its inversion. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pp. 1–12, 2024.
- Gupta, V., Koren, T., and Singer, Y. Shampoo: Preconditioned Stochastic Tensor Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1842–1850, 2018.
- Han, A., Mishra, B., Jawanpuria, P. K., and Gao, J. On riemannian optimization over positive definite matrices with the bures-wasserstein geometry. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:8940–8953, 2021.
- Ivey, T. A. and Landsberg, J. M. *Cartan for beginners: differential geometry via moving frames and exterior differential systems*, volume 61. American Mathematical Society Providence, RI, 2003.
- Jordan, K. NanoGPT (124M) quality in 8.2 minutes. <https://github.com/KellerJordan/modded-nanogpt>, 2024.
- Khan, M. E. and Rue, H. The bayesian learning rule. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(281):1–46, 2023.
- Khan, M. E., Nielsen, D., Tangkaratt, V., Lin, W., Gal, Y., and Srivastava, A. Fast and scalable Bayesian deep learning by weight-perturbation in Adam. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2611–2620, 2018.

- Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- Kong, L., Wang, Y., and Tao, M. Momentum stiefel optimizer, with applications to suitably-orthogonal attention, and optimal transport. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14173*, 2022.
- Krishnan, S., Xiao, Y., and Saurous, R. A. Neumann optimizer: A practical optimization algorithm for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.03298*, 2017.
- Lee, J. M. *Introduction to Riemannian manifolds*, volume 2. Springer, 2018.
- Li, J., Fuxin, L., and Todorovic, S. Efficient riemannian optimization on the stiefel manifold via the cayley transform. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.01113*, 2020.
- Lin, W., Khan, M. E., and Schmidt, M. Fast and simple natural-gradient variational inference with mixture of exponential-family approximations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3992–4002, 2019.
- Lin, W., Schmidt, M., and Khan, M. E. Handling the positive-definite constraint in the bayesian learning rule. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 6116–6126. PMLR, 2020.
- Lin, W., Nielsen, F., Emtiyaz, K. M., and Schmidt, M. Tractable structured natural-gradient descent using local parameterizations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 6680–6691. PMLR, 2021.
- Lin, W., Duruisseaux, V., Leok, M., Nielsen, F., Khan, M. E., and Schmidt, M. Simplifying momentum-based positive-definite submanifold optimization with applications to deep learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 21026–21050. PMLR, 2023.
- Lin, W., Dangel, F., Eschenhagen, R., Bae, J., Turner, R. E., and Makhzani, A. Can we remove the square-root in adaptive gradient methods? a second-order perspective. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Liu, H., Li, Z., Hall, D., Liang, P., and Ma, T. Sophia: A scalable stochastic second-order optimizer for language model pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14342*, 2023.
- Liu, W., Lin, R., Liu, Z., Rehg, J. M., Paull, L., Xiong, L., Song, L., and Weller, A. Orthogonal over-parameterized training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 7251–7260, 2021.
- Lorraine, J., Vicol, P., and Duvenaud, D. Optimizing millions of hyperparameters by implicit differentiation. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pp. 1540–1552. PMLR, 2020.
- Loshchilov, I. and Hutter, F. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017.
- Maddocks, J. Lecture Notes: Mathematical Modelling of DNA. [https://lcvmwww.epfl.ch/teaching/modelling\\_dna/index.php?dir=exercises&file=corr03.pdf](https://lcvmwww.epfl.ch/teaching/modelling_dna/index.php?dir=exercises&file=corr03.pdf), 2021. Accessed: 2024/09/25.
- Manasse, F. K. and Misner, C. W. Fermi normal coordinates and some basic concepts in differential geometry. *Journal of mathematical physics*, 4(6):735–745, 1963.
- Martens, J. and Grosse, R. Optimizing neural networks with Kronecker-factored approximate curvature. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2408–2417, 2015.
- Micikevicius, P., Narang, S., Alben, J., Diamos, G., Elsen, E., Garcia, D., Ginsburg, B., Houston, M., Kuchaiev, O., Venkatesh, G., et al. Mixed precision training. *ICLR*, 2018.
- Opper, M. and Archambeau, C. The variational Gaussian approximation revisited. *Neural computation*, 21(3):786–792, 2009.
- Osawa, K., Swaroop, S., Khan, M. E. E., Jain, A., Eschenhagen, R., Turner, R. E., and Yokota, R. Practical deep learning with Bayesian principles. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 4287–4299, 2019.
- Petersen, K. B., Pedersen, M. S., et al. The matrix cookbook. *Technical University of Denmark*, 7(15):510, 2008.
- Qiu, Z., Liu, W., Feng, H., Xue, Y., Feng, Y., Liu, Z., Zhang, D., Weller, A., and Schölkopf, B. Controlling text-to-image diffusion by orthogonal finetuning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:79320–79362, 2023.
- Ren, Y. and Goldfarb, D. Tensor normal training for deep learning models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:26040–26052, 2021.
- Roux, N., Manzagol, P.-A., and Bengio, Y. Topmoumoute online natural gradient algorithm. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 20, 2007.
- Ryali, C., Hu, Y.-T., Bolya, D., Wei, C., Fan, H., Huang, P.-Y., Aggarwal, V., Chowdhury, A., Poursaeed, O., Hoffman, J., et al. Hiera: A hierarchical vision transformer without the bells-and-whistles. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 29441–29454. PMLR, 2023.

- Shen, Y., Daheim, N., Cong, B., Nickl, P., Marconi, G. M., Bazan, C., Yokota, R., Gurevych, I., Cremers, D., Khan, M. E., et al. Variational learning is effective for large deep networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17641*, 2024.
- Shi, H.-J. M., Lee, T.-H., Iwasaki, S., Gallego-Posada, J., Li, Z., Rangadurai, K., Mudigere, D., and Rabbat, M. A distributed data-parallel pytorch implementation of the distributed shampoo optimizer for training neural networks at-scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06497*, 2023.
- Tagare, H. D. Notes on optimization on stiefel manifolds. *Yale University, New Haven*, 2011.
- Tan, L. S. Analytic natural gradient updates for cholesky factor in gaussian variational approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00375*, 2022.
- Tieleman, T. and Hinton, G. Rmsprop: Divide the gradient by a running average of its recent magnitude. *Coursera*, 2012.
- Tran, M.-N., Nguyen, D. H., and Nguyen, D. Variational bayes on manifolds. *Statistics and Computing*, 31:1–17, 2021.
- Van Loan, C. F. and Pitsianis, N. *Approximation with Kronecker products*. Springer, 1993.
- van Oostrum, J., Müller, J., and Ay, N. Invariance properties of the natural gradient in overparametrised systems. *Information geometry*, 6(1):51–67, 2023.
- Vyas, N., Morwani, D., Zhao, R., Shapira, I., Brandfonbrener, D., Janson, L., and Kakade, S. Soap: Improving and stabilizing shampoo using adam. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.11321*, 2024.
- Wierstra, D., Schaul, T., Peters, J., and Schmidhuber, J. Natural evolution strategies. In *2008 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (IEEE World Congress on Computational Intelligence)*, pp. 3381–3387. IEEE, 2008.
- Williams, R. J. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning*, 8(3-4):229–256, 1992.
- Yun, S., Han, D., Oh, S. J., Chun, S., Choe, J., and Yoo, Y. Cutmix: Regularization strategy to train strong classifiers with localizable features. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pp. 6023–6032, 2019.
- Zhang, G., Sun, S., Duvenaud, D., and Grosse, R. Noisy natural gradient as variational inference. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5847–5856, 2018.
- Zhang, H. mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.09412*, 2017.
- Zhang, J., Karimireddy, S. P., Veit, A., Kim, S., Reddi, S., Kumar, S., and Sra, S. Why are adaptive methods good for attention models? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15383–15393, 2020.
- Zhang, Y., Chen, C., Ding, T., Li, Z., Sun, R., and Luo, Z.-Q. Why transformers need adam: A hessian perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16788*, 2024.




Figure 5. Empirical validation of our full-matrix update scheme on estimating preconditioning matrix  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{100 \times 100}$ . The first two figures on the left show that our update scheme converges to a fixed-point solution as fast as the default update scheme in  $\mathbf{S}$  and the Cholesky-based scheme. The last two figures illustrate how closely our update scheme matches the iterates generated by the default update scheme at each iteration. Our update scheme and the Cholesky-based scheme perform similarly for matching the preconditioner estimates generated by the default scheme.

## A. Additional Results for the Empirical Validation

### A.1. Full-matrix Update Scheme

**Fixed-point matching** The ground truth in this setting is a fixed-point solution,  $\mathbf{S}_* = E[\mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^T] = \Sigma$ , to the default update scheme as  $\mathbf{S}_* = (1 - \beta)\mathbf{S}_* + \beta\mathbf{g}_k\mathbf{g}_k^T$ , where  $\mathbf{g}_k$  is independently generated from a Gaussian distribution  $\mathbf{g}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$  at each iteration  $k$ . We evaluate each scheme at iteration  $k$  by comparing its current estimate denoted by  $\mathbf{S}_k^{(est)}$  to the fixed point. We use a relative Frobenius norm  $\frac{\|\mathbf{S}_* - \mathbf{S}_k^{(est)}\|_{\text{Frob}}}{\|\mathbf{S}_*\|_{\text{Frob}}}$ , and the Wasserstein-2 distance for positive-definite matrices to measure the difference.

**Iterate matching** The ground truth is a sequence of matrices  $\{\mathbf{S}_1^{(\text{true})}, \dots, \mathbf{S}_T^{(\text{true})}\}$  generated by the default scheme when applying the scheme to the gradient sequence. We want to match the iterate that the default scheme generates at every step. We use a relative Frobenius norm  $\frac{\|\mathbf{S}_k^{(\text{true})} - \mathbf{S}_k^{(est)}\|_{\text{Frob}}}{\|\mathbf{S}_k^{(\text{true})}\|_{\text{Frob}}}$ , and the Wasserstein-2 distance to measure the discrepancy between an update scheme and the default update scheme at every iteration  $k$ .

### A.2. Kronecker-based Update Scheme

**Fixed-point matching** The ground truth is an unstructured fixed-point solution,  $\mathbf{S}_* = E[\mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^T] = \Sigma$ . We evaluate a Kronecker-structured scheme in every iteration  $k$  by comparing its current structured estimate to the fixed point. We measure the difference using the same metrics considered previously.

**Iterate matching** The ground truth is a sequence of unstructured matrices generated by the default scheme. Our goal is to match the iterate that the default scheme generates using Kronecker structured approximations. We use the same metrics to measure the difference.

## B. Results on Gradient-free Evolutionary Problems

We consider five test problems: the Ackley function  $\ell_{\text{Ackley}}(\mathbf{w}) = 20 - 20 \exp(-0.2\sqrt{\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d w_i^2}) + e - \exp(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \cos(2\pi w_i))$ , the Rosenbrock function  $\ell_{\text{Rosenbrock}}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} (100(w_{i+1} - w_i^2)^2 + (w_i - 1)^2)$ , the Bohachevsky function  $\ell_{\text{Bohachevsky}}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} (w_i^2 + 2w_{i+1}^2 - 0.3 \cos(3\pi w_i) - 0.4 \cos(4\pi w_{i+1}) + 0.7)$ , the Schaffer function  $\ell_{\text{Schaffer}}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} (w_i^2 + w_{i+1}^2)^{0.25} [\sin^2(50(w_i^2 + w_{i+1}^2)^{0.1}) + 1]$  and the Griewank function  $\ell_{\text{Griewank}}(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{4000} \sum_{i=1}^d w_i^2 - \prod_{i=1}^d \cos(\frac{w_i}{\sqrt{i}}) + 1$ . These problems represent diverse optimization settings, including multimodality and narrow curvature. From Fig. 7, we can see that our method performs similarly to the baseline methods and demonstrates the efficacy of our update scheme.




Figure 6. Empirical validation of our structured update scheme on estimating a preconditioner  $\mathbf{S}$  using a Kronecker product  $\mathbf{S}^{(C)} \otimes \mathbf{S}^{(K)}$ , where  $\mathbf{S}^{(C)} \in \mathbb{R}^{9 \times 9}$  and  $\mathbf{S}^{(K)} \in \mathbb{R}^{11 \times 11}$ . The first two figures on the left show that our update scheme gives a structural approximation of a fixed-point solution obtained by the default full-matrix update scheme. Our scheme converges as fast as Kronecker-structured baseline methods, including the impractical projection-based method. The last two figures illustrate how closely our scheme matches the unstructured iterates generated by the default scheme at each iteration. All update schemes perform similarly due to the structural approximation gap.




Figure 7. Experiments demonstrate the efficacy of our update schemes for gradient-free optimization problems. These problems represent diverse optimization settings, including multimodality and narrow curvature. We can see that our method performs similarly to Riemannian baseline methods.




Figure 8. Comparison of our Kronecker-based update schemes with  $p = 2$  (see the bottom box of Fig. 1) using the exact Cayley and the truncated Cayley maps. We use nonconstant  $\beta_2^{(l)} := \frac{\tilde{\beta}_2 \alpha \kappa^{(l)}}{\|\text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U}^{(l)}))\|_{\text{Frob}}}$  and use the same hyperparameters in both cases, where  $\kappa^{(C)} = m, \kappa^{(K)} = n, \mathbf{U}^{(C)} \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$ , and  $\mathbf{U}^{(K)} \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$ . Note that  $\tilde{\beta}_2$  is a constant hyperparameter. We can see that both maps work equally well in terms of iterations/epochs. However, using the exact Cayley map is much slower regarding running time because it uses matrix inversion.




Figure 9. Comparison of the methods on the ImageWoof-10 dataset in terms of iteration efficiency and wall-clock time. These plots demonstrate the efficiency of our update schemes for low-precision NN training compared to state-of-the-art methods such as Muon and SOAP.

### C. Additional Details and Results for Low-precision NN training

We consider two vision transformer-based (ViT) models to demonstrate the effectiveness of our methods in half precision. We train ViTs for 210 epochs with mini-batch size 128 for ImageWoof-10 and 256 for ImageNet-25. The ImageWoof-10 dataset is obtained from <https://github.com/fastai/imagenette>. The ImageNet-25 dataset is a subset of the ImageNet-1k dataset by randomly sampling 25 classes from the 1000 classes. We use data augmentation techniques such as MixUp (Zhang, 2017) and CutMix (Yun et al., 2019) during training. We use a cosine learning rate schedule suggested by Chen et al. (2023). We use PyTorch’s built-in AdamW and official implementation for SOAP (<https://github.com/nikhilvyas/SOAP>) and Muon (<https://github.com/KellerJordan/modded-nanogpt>). For SOAP and our method, we update their matrix preconditioners at each 2 iterations. We tune each optimizer’s available hyperparameters (HPs) using random search (Choi et al., 2019). We use 80 runs for the search. We use Pytorch’s mixed precision with BFP-16 for NN training. All methods except SOAP can use BFP-16 data types and perform updates in BFP-16. SOAP has to internally cast BFP-16 gradients into FP-32 and performs matrix decomposition (e.g., QR and eigendecomposition) in FP-32. This is because matrix decomposition is numerically unstable in half-precision and, therefore, unsupported/unavailable in PyTorch, JAX, Julia, Scipy/Numpy, and LAPACK. Figs. 9 and 10 illustrate the performance of our Kronecker-based update scheme.

### D. Handling Redundancy due to Repeated Entries of $\mathbf{d}$

Recall that eigendecomposition is not unique when having repeated eigenvalues. Our spectral parametrization is also not unique when  $\mathbf{d}$  has duplicate entries. In this case, the Fisher-Rao metric (coordinate representation) is singular. We




Figure 10. Comparison of the methods on the ImageNet-25 dataset in terms of iteration efficiency and wall-clock time. These plots demonstrate the efficiency of our update schemes for low-precision NN training compared to state-of-the-art methods such as Muon and SOAP.

allow  $\mathbf{d}$  to have repeated entries and address the singularity using the Moore–Penrose inversion (van Oostrum et al., 2023). Computing this inversion is easy because we diagonalize the metric at evaluation points. We also use this inversion to improve numerical stability if  $\mathbf{d}$  has very close entries.

## E. Connection to Diagonal Methods

Here, we show the connections between our scheme and the RMSprop method (i.e.,  $\gamma = 1$ ). Similarly, we can recover AdaGrad by setting  $\gamma = 0$ . Observe that eigenvalues are diagonal entries of a diagonal preconditioning matrix (i.e.,  $\mathbf{d} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{S})$ ). Because  $\mathbf{B}$  is now a diagonal and orthogonal matrix, each diagonal entry can only be 1 or -1. Using this result, we can further simplify our update scheme with  $p = 2$  and recover the RMSprop update rules when using a first-order truncation of the exponential map.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{d} &\leftarrow \mathbf{d} \odot \exp\{\beta_2 \mathbf{d}^{-1} \odot [-\gamma \mathbf{d} + \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{B})]\} \approx \mathbf{d} + \beta_2 [-\gamma \mathbf{d} + \text{diag}(\mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^T)] = (1 - \beta_2 \gamma) \mathbf{d} + \beta_2 \text{diag}(\mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^T) \\
 \mathbf{B} &\leftarrow \mathbf{B} \text{Cayley}\left(\frac{\beta_2}{2} \text{Skew}(\text{Diag}(\mathbf{U}))\right) = \mathbf{B} \text{Cayley}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{B} \\
 \boldsymbol{\mu} &\leftarrow \boldsymbol{\mu} - \beta_1 \mathbf{B} \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{-1/p}) \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{g} = \boldsymbol{\mu} - \beta_1 \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{-1/p}) \mathbf{g},
 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{B}) = \text{diag}(\mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^T)$ ,  $\mathbf{B} \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{-1/p}) \mathbf{B}^T = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{-1/p})$ , and we use a first-order truncation of the exponential map  $\mathbf{d} \odot \exp(\mathbf{d}^{-1} \odot \mathbf{n}) \approx \mathbf{d} \odot (\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{d}^{-1} \odot \mathbf{n}) = \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{n}$ . Due to the skew-symmetrization,  $\text{Skew}(\text{Diag}(\mathbf{U}))$  is always a zero matrix. Thus, according to our update scheme,  $\mathbf{B}$  remains unchanged in diagonal cases because  $\text{Cayley}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{I}$ . Note that in our notation,  $\beta_2 := 1 - \hat{\beta}_2$ , where  $\hat{\beta}_2$  is Adam’s beta2.

Our connections rely on a valid Hessian approximation (Lin et al., 2024)  $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \approx \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^T$ . This requires the loss function in Eq. (1) to be expressed as a *normalized* negative log-likelihood such as the cross entropy loss.

## F. Proof of Claim 1

**(Formal) Claim 1** Consider an unconstrained parameterization  $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathcal{R}^d$  and a linear reparametrization  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{R}^p$  so that  $\boldsymbol{\tau} := \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ , where the metric  $\mathbf{F}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$  in coordinate  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  is nonsingular (and thus SPD) everywhere,  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{R}^{d \times p}$  is a constant matrix with rank  $d$ , and  $p \geq d$ . Then performing (unconstrained) RGD (see (5)) in coordinate  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  is equivalent to performing RGD in coordinate  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  (i.e.,  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_k = \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k$  for each iteration  $k$ )

**Remark 1:** If a linear reparametrization is written as  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ , we can define  $\mathbf{U}$  as follows, where  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{R}^{p \times d}$  with rank  $d$ . We define  $\mathbf{U} := \mathbf{V} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}^T$ , where  $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}$ , and  $\mathbf{K}$  are obtained via the singular value decomposition of  $\mathbf{A}$  so that  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{K} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^T$ . Recall that  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{R}^{p \times p}$  and  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{R}^{d \times d}$  are orthogonal matrices. Moreover,  $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{R}^{d \times d}$  is a non-singular

diagonal matrix because of the rank of  $\mathbf{A}$ . It is easy to verify that  $\mathbf{U}$  is well-defined because

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\lambda} &= \mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\tau} \\ &= \mathbf{V} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \underbrace{\mathbf{K}^T \mathbf{K}}_{=\mathbf{I}_p} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^T \boldsymbol{\tau} \\ &= \underbrace{\mathbf{V}\mathbf{I}_d\mathbf{V}^T}_{=\mathbf{I}_d} \boldsymbol{\tau} = \boldsymbol{\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 2:** Recall that by the definition of the Riemannian metric, we have  $\mathbf{F}_\lambda = \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{F}_\tau \mathbf{U}$ . Moreover, we have  $\mathbf{g}_\tau := \nabla_\tau \mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda = \nabla_\lambda \mathcal{L} = \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{g}_\tau$  by the chain rule. Note that when  $p > d$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  is in a linear over-parametrized space. The claim implies that the over-parametrized  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  preserves the invariance when  $\boldsymbol{\tau} = \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ . Thus, we can see that the metric  $\mathbf{F}_\lambda \in \mathcal{R}^{p \times p}$  in coordinate  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  is singular when  $p > d$ .

*Proof.* We will use proof by induction. We initialize  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  so that  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_0 = \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0$ . Thus, the base case holds. At iteration  $k$ , by induction, we have  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_k = \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k$ . Now, we show that this relationship holds at iteration  $k + 1$ .

By (5),  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{k+1}$  is updated by following this expression:

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\tau}_k - \beta [\mathbf{F}_\tau(\boldsymbol{\tau}_k)]^{-1} \mathbf{g}_\tau(\boldsymbol{\tau}_k)$$

Since  $\mathbf{F}_\lambda$  is singular, we have to use the Moore-Penrose inverse and it is computed as

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{F}_\lambda]^{-1} &= [\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{F}_\tau \mathbf{U}]^{-1} \\ &= [\underbrace{\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{L}}_{:=\mathbf{C}} \underbrace{\mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{U}}_{:=\mathbf{D}}]^{-1} \\ &= \mathbf{D}^T (\mathbf{D}\mathbf{D}^T)^{-1} (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{C}^T)^{-1} \mathbf{C}^T \quad (\text{according to Eq. 224 of Petersen et al. (2008)}) \\ &= \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{L} (\mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{L})^{-1} (\mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{U} \\ &= \mathbf{U}^T (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^T)^{-1} \mathbf{F}_\tau^{-1} (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^T)^{-1} \mathbf{U}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the Cholesky decomposition for  $\mathbf{F}_\tau = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}^T$  since  $\mathbf{F}_\tau$  is SPD.

Likewise,  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}$  is updated by RGD. We have the following this expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}\} &= \mathbf{U}\{\underbrace{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k - \beta [\mathbf{F}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k)]^{-1} \mathbf{g}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k)}_{\text{by the definition of RGD}}\} \\ &= \mathbf{U}\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k - \beta [\mathbf{F}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k)]^{-1} (\underbrace{\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{g}_\tau(\boldsymbol{\tau}_k)}_{\text{by the chain rule}})\} \\ &= \mathbf{U}\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k - \beta [\mathbf{U}^T (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^T)^{-1} \mathbf{F}_\tau^{-1} (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^T)^{-1} \mathbf{U}] (\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{g}_\tau(\boldsymbol{\tau}_k))\} \quad (\text{using the Moore-Penrose inverse}) \\ &= \mathbf{U}\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k - \beta \mathbf{U}^T (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^T)^{-1} \mathbf{F}_\tau^{-1} \mathbf{g}_\tau(\boldsymbol{\tau}_k)\} \\ &= \underbrace{\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k}_{=\boldsymbol{\tau}_k} - \beta \mathbf{F}_\tau^{-1} \mathbf{g}_\tau(\boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \quad (\text{by induction}) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\tau}_{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by induction, we show the claim holds. □

## G. Proof of Claim 2

**(Formal) Claim 2** Our update scheme for  $\mathbf{S}$  in the top box of Fig 1 is equivalent to the scheme in Eq. (3) up to first-order in terms of  $\beta_2$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{B}_k \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_k) \mathbf{B}_k^T = \mathbf{S}_k + O(\beta_2^2)$ ) when  $\mathbf{d}$  does not have repeated entries and using the same sequence of GOPs  $\{\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_T\}$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_k := \mathbf{g}_k \mathbf{g}_k^T$  is a GOP.

*Proof.* We will use proof by induction. When  $k = 0$ , we initialize  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{d}$ , and define  $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_0$  so that  $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_0 := \mathbf{B}_0 \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_0) \mathbf{B}_0^T = \mathbf{S}_0$ . Thus, the base case holds.

By induction, the claim holds at iteration  $k$ . That is  $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_k := \mathbf{B}_k \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_k) \mathbf{B}_k^T = \mathbf{S}_k + O(\beta_2)$ . We want to show that the claim also holds  $k + 1$  at iteration. Recall that we update the spectral factors using the following rule at iteration  $k$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_{k+1} &\leftarrow \mathbf{d}_k \odot \exp\{\beta_2 \mathbf{d}_k^{-1} \odot [-\gamma \mathbf{d}_k + \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_k^T \mathcal{H}_k \mathbf{B}_k)]\} \\ \mathbf{B}_{k+1} &\leftarrow \mathbf{B}_k \text{Cayley}\left(\frac{\beta_2}{2} \text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U}))\right), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_k = \mathbf{g}_k \mathbf{g}_k^T$  and the  $(i, j)$ -th entry of  $\mathbf{U}$  is  $[\mathbf{U}]_{ij} := -[\mathbf{B}_k^T \mathcal{H}_k \mathbf{B}_k]_{ij} / (d_i - d_j)$ , where  $\mathbf{d}$  has no repeated entries by our assumption. We want to show that the above update scheme is equivalent to the default update scheme in (3) up to first order in terms of  $O(\beta_2)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_{k+1} &\leftarrow (1 - \beta_2 \gamma) \mathbf{S}_k + \beta_2 \underbrace{\mathcal{H}_k}_{=\mathbf{g}_k \mathbf{g}_k^T} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Let  $\mathbf{Q}_k := \mathbf{B}_k \mathcal{H}_k \mathbf{B}_k^T$ . Recall that the Cayley map is defined as  $\text{Cayley}(\mathbf{N}) = (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1}$ . Using the first-order approximation of  $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1}$ , we have  $(\mathbf{I} - \beta_2 \mathbf{N})^{-1} = \mathbf{I} + \beta_2 \mathbf{N} + O(\beta_2^2)$ . Thus, we have  $\mathbf{B}_{k+1} = \mathbf{B}_k \text{Cayley}\left(\frac{\beta_2}{2} \text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U}))\right) = \mathbf{B}_k (\mathbf{I} + \frac{\beta_2}{2} \mathbf{N})(\mathbf{I} + \frac{\beta_2}{2} \mathbf{N} + O(\beta_2^2)) = \mathbf{B}_k (\mathbf{I} + \beta_2 \mathbf{N} + O(\beta_2^2))$ , where  $\mathbf{N} := \text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U}))$ . Similarly, we have  $\mathbf{d}_{k+1} = \mathbf{d}_k \odot [1 + \beta_2 \mathbf{d}_k^{-1} \odot (-\gamma \mathbf{d}_k + \text{diag}(\mathbf{Q}_k)) + O(\beta_2^2)] = \mathbf{d}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{w}_k + O(\beta_2^2)$  by using the first-order truncation of the exponential map, where  $\mathbf{w}_k := -\gamma \mathbf{d}_k + \text{diag}(\mathbf{Q}_k)$ . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{k+1} \\ &:= \mathbf{B}_{k+1} \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_{k+1}) \mathbf{B}_{k+1}^T \\ &= \mathbf{B}_k \left[ (\mathbf{I} + \beta_2 \mathbf{N} + O(\beta_2^2)) \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{w}_k + O(\beta_2^2)) \right] (\mathbf{I} + \beta_2 \mathbf{N} + O(\beta_2^2))^T \mathbf{B}_k^T \\ &= \mathbf{B}_k \left[ \mathbf{D}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{N} \mathbf{D}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{W}_k + O(\beta_2^2) \right] (\mathbf{I} + \beta_2 \mathbf{N} + O(\beta_2^2))^T \mathbf{B}_k^T \\ &= \mathbf{B}_k \left[ \mathbf{D}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{N} \mathbf{D}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{W}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{N}^T + O(\beta_2^2) \right] \mathbf{B}_k^T \\ &= \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{B}_k^T + \beta_2 \mathbf{B}_k (\mathbf{N} \mathbf{D}_k + \mathbf{W}_k + \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{N}^T) \mathbf{B}_k^T + O(\beta_2^2) \\ &= \bar{\mathbf{S}}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{B}_k (\mathbf{N} \mathbf{D}_k + \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{N}^T) \mathbf{B}_k^T + \beta_2 \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{B}_k^T + O(\beta_2^2), \quad (\mathbf{N} \text{ is skew-symmetric}) \\ &= \bar{\mathbf{S}}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{B}_k (\mathbf{N} \mathbf{D}_k - \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{N}) \mathbf{B}_k^T + \beta_2 \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{B}_k^T + O(\beta_2^2) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{D}_k := \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_k)$  and  $\mathbf{W}_k := \text{Diag}(\mathbf{w}_k)$

Observation (1): Since  $\mathbf{W}_k = \text{Diag}(-\gamma \mathbf{d}_k + \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_k^T \mathcal{H}_k \mathbf{B}_k)) = -\gamma \mathbf{D}_k + \text{Diag}(\text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_k^T \mathcal{H}_k \mathbf{B}_k))$ , we have

$$\mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{B}_k^T = -\gamma \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{B}_k^T + \mathbf{B}_k \text{Ddiag}(\mathbf{Q}_k) \mathbf{B}_k^T \quad (15)$$

where  $\text{Ddiag}(\mathbf{Q}_k)$  denotes the diagonal part of  $\mathbf{Q}_k = \mathbf{B}_k \mathcal{H}_k \mathbf{B}_k^T$

Observation (2): Since  $\mathbf{N} = \text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U}))$  and  $[\mathbf{U}]_{ij} = -[\mathbf{B}_k^T \mathcal{H}_k \mathbf{B}_k]_{ij} / (d_i - d_j) = -[\mathbf{Q}_k]_{ij} / (d_i - d_j)$ , we can show that  $\mathbf{N} \mathbf{D}_k - \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{N}$  is indeed a symmetric matrix with zero-diagonal entries. Moreover, the low-triangular half ( $i > j$ ) of the matrix can be expressed as

$$[\mathbf{N} \mathbf{D}_k - \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{N}]_{ij} = (d_j - d_i) [\mathbf{U}]_{ij} = [\mathbf{Q}_k]_{ij}. \quad (16)$$

where  $d_j \neq d_i$  since  $\mathbf{d}$  has no repeated entries. Thus, we have  $\mathbf{N} \mathbf{D}_k - \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{N} = \mathbf{Q}_k - \text{Ddiag}(\mathbf{Q}_k)$ .

Using Observations (1) and (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{k+1} \\
 &= \mathbf{B}_k \left[ \mathbf{D}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{N} \mathbf{D}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{W}_k + \beta_2 \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{N}^T + O(\beta_2^2) \right] \mathbf{B}_k^T \\
 &= \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{B}_k^T + \beta_2 \left[ \mathbf{B}_k \left( \mathbf{Q}_k - \text{Ddiag}(\mathbf{Q}_k) \right) \mathbf{B}_k^T - \gamma \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{B}_k^T + \mathbf{B}_k \text{Ddiag}(\mathbf{Q}_k) \mathbf{B}_k^T \right] + O(\beta_2^2) \\
 &= (1 - \beta_2 \gamma) \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{B}_k^T + \beta_2 \mathbf{B}_k \left[ \mathbf{Q}_k \right] \mathbf{B}_k^T + O(\beta_2^2), \text{ (Note: } \mathbf{Q}_k = \mathbf{B}_k^T \mathcal{H}_k \mathbf{B}_k \text{)} \\
 &= (1 - \beta_2 \gamma) \bar{\mathbf{S}}_k + \beta_2 \mathcal{H}_k + O(\beta_2^2) = (1 - \beta_2 \gamma) \mathbf{S}_k + \beta_2 \mathcal{H}_k + O(\beta_2^2).
 \end{aligned}$$

By induction, we can show the claim holds.  $\square$

## H. Proof of Claim 3

**Claim 3** The map in (9) satisfies the constraints in (8).

*Proof.* Now, we show the map satisfies the spectral parameter constraints in (8). Since  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  is unconstrained, we only consider the update on  $\mathbf{d}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ .

Recall that the current point  $(\mathbf{d}_k, \mathbf{B}_k)$  is in the spectral coordinate. Thus, we have  $\mathbf{d}_k > 0$  and  $\mathbf{B}_k$  is orthogonal. According to the map (9), it is easy to see that  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{d}_k \odot \exp(\mathbf{m}) > 0$  because  $\mathbf{d}_k > 0$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{m})$  satisfies the parameter constraints. Now, we show that  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M})$  is also orthogonal. Notice that a product of two orthogonal matrices is also orthogonal. Because  $\mathbf{B}_k$  is orthogonal, we only need to show that the output of the Cayley map,  $\text{Cayley}(\text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{M})))$ , is orthogonal. Let  $\mathbf{N} := \text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{M}))$ . We know that  $\mathbf{N}$  is skew-symmetric. We can verify that the Cayley map satisfies the orthogonal constraint. Consider the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\text{Cayley}(\mathbf{N}))^T \text{Cayley}(\mathbf{N}) &= (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-T} (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N})^T (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N}) (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1} \\
 &= (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-T} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N}) (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N}) (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1} \\
 &= (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-T} (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N}) (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N}) (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1} \\
 &= (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-T} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^T (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N}) (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1} = \mathbf{I}
 \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that  $\mathbf{N}$  is skew-symmetric such as  $\mathbf{N}^T = -\mathbf{N}$ .

Likewise, we can show  $\text{Cayley}(\mathbf{N}) (\text{Cayley}(\mathbf{N}))^T = \mathbf{I}$ . Thus, the output of the Cayley map is a square orthogonal matrix.  $\square$

## I. Proof of Claim 4

**Claim 4** The map in (9) is one-to-one, which is like the eigendecomposition, is unique if  $\mathbf{d}$  has no repeated entries, where  $\mathbf{M}$  is a lower-triangular matrix with zero diagonal entries.

*Proof.* It is easy to show that the map is one-to-one/injective for  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ .

Now, we show that the map is also injective for  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$ . Let  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}) := \mathbf{B}_k \text{Cayley}(\text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{M})))$  and  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{m}) := \mathbf{d}_k \odot \exp(\mathbf{m})$

We want to show  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_1) \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_1) \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_1)^T = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_2) \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_2) \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_2)^T$  implies  $\mathbf{M}_1 = \mathbf{M}_2$  and  $\mathbf{d}_1 = \mathbf{d}_2$ .

Since  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_1)$  and  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_2)$  are orthogonal, we define  $\mathbf{Q} := [\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_2)]^{-1} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_1)$ , which is also orthogonal.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_1)\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_1)\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_1)^T &= \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_2)\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_2)\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_2)^T \\
 &= \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_2)\underbrace{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^T}_{=\mathbf{I}}\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_2)\underbrace{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^T}_{=\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_2)^T \\
 &= \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_1)[\mathbf{Q}^T\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_2)\mathbf{Q}]\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_1)^T,
 \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_1) = \mathbf{Q}^T\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_2)\mathbf{Q}$ .

Because of the diagonal structure, we know that  $\mathbf{Q}$  must be a permutation matrix (up to sign changes). Notice that  $\mathbf{d}_1$  and  $\mathbf{d}_2$  are vectors with positive entries. Thus,  $\mathbf{Q}$  is a permutation matrix (no sign change).

Now, we show that  $\mathbf{Q}$  must be an identity matrix. Let  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{M}_i) := \text{Cayley}(\text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{M}_i)))$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . By the definition of  $\mathbf{Q}$ , we have  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_1) = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{M}_2)\mathbf{Q}$ , which implies  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{M}_1) = \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{M}_2)\mathbf{Q}$ . By our assumption,  $\mathbf{M}_1$  and  $\mathbf{M}_2$  are low-triangular matrices with zero diagonal entries. Thus,  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{M}_1)$  and  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{M}_2)$  are also low-triangular due to the definition of the Cayley map. Notice that  $\mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{M}_2))^{-1}\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{M}_1)$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{Q}$  is also a lower-triangular matrix. Because  $\mathbf{Q}$  is a permutation matrix and a lower-triangular matrix,  $\mathbf{Q}$  must be an identity matrix.

Since  $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{I}$ , we have  $\mathbf{d}_1 = \mathbf{d}_2$  because of  $\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_1) = \mathbf{Q}^T\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_2)\mathbf{Q} = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_2)$ .

Notice that  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{M}_i) = \text{Cayley}(\text{Skew}(\mathbf{M}_i))$  becomes the Cayley map when  $\mathbf{M}_i$  is a lower-triangular matrix with zero diagonal entries. In other words  $\mathbf{M}_i = \text{Tril}(\mathbf{M}_i)$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{M}_1) = \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{M}_2)\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{M}_2)$ .

Since the Cayley map is injective w.r.t. to its skew-symmetric input (see Claim 9), we have  $\text{Skew}(\mathbf{M}_1) = \text{Skew}(\mathbf{M}_2)$ .  $\text{Skew}(\mathbf{M}_1) = \text{Skew}(\mathbf{M}_2)$  implies  $\mathbf{M}_1 = \mathbf{M}_2$  since  $\mathbf{M}_1$  and  $\mathbf{M}_2$  are lower-triangular matrices with zero diagonal entries.

Thus, the map in (9) is injective.  $\square$

*Claim 9.* The Cayley map  $\text{Cayley}(\mathbf{N}) = (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1}$  is well-defined for skew-symmetric  $\mathbf{N}$ . Moreover, this map is injective.

*Proof.* To show the map is well-defined, we want to show  $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})$  is non-singular. Suppose not, we have  $\det(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N}) = 0$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{N}$  has an eigenvalue with 1. By the definition of the eigenvalue, there exists a non-zero vector  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$  so that  $\mathbf{N}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$ . Notice that Given that  $\mathbf{N}$  is skew-symmetric, we have

$$\mathbf{N} + \mathbf{N}^T = \mathbf{0} \quad (17)$$

and

$$0 = \mathbf{x}^T(\mathbf{N} + \mathbf{N}^T)\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^T(\mathbf{N}\mathbf{x}) + (\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{N}^T)\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{x} \quad (18)$$

The above expression implies  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ , which is a contradiction. Thus,  $\det(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N}) \neq 0$  and  $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})$  is non-singular.

Now, we show that the Cayley map is injective if  $\mathbf{N}$  is skew-symmetric. Let  $\mathbf{Q} = \text{Cayley}(\mathbf{N})$ . We first assume  $(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{I})$  is non-singular, and then we prove it. Given  $(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{I})$  is non-singular, we have

$$\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N}) = (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N}) \iff \mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{I} = (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{I})\mathbf{N} \iff (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{I})^{-1}(\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{I}) = \mathbf{N},$$

This implies the map is injective and its inverse is

$$\mathbf{N} = \text{Cayley}^{-1}(\mathbf{Q}) := (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{I})^{-1}(\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{I}) \quad (19)$$

Now, we show that  $(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{I})$  is non-singular. We use proof by contradiction. If not, there exists a non-zero vector  $\mathbf{v}$  (Maddocks, 2021) so that

$$\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{v} \iff (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1}\mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{v} \quad (20)$$

$$\iff (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N})\mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{v} \quad (21)$$

$$\iff (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N})\mathbf{v} = -(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})\mathbf{v} \quad (22)$$

$$\iff \mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{v}, \text{ (another contradiction since } \mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{0}) \quad (23)$$

where we use the following identity in the second step in the above expression.

$$(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1} = -(-2\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1} = 2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1} - \mathbf{I} \quad (24)$$

$$= (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1}(2\mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})) = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N})^{-1}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{N}) \quad (25)$$

□

## J. Proof of Claim 5

**Claim 5** The exact Fisher-Rao metric  $\mathbf{F}_\eta(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}})$  (for a full-matrix Gaussian) evaluated at the origin  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{cur}} \equiv \mathbf{0}$  is *diagonal* and has the following closed-form expression:

$$\mathbf{F}_\eta(\mathbf{m}, \text{vecTril}(\mathbf{M}), \boldsymbol{\delta}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\delta}=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m}=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{M}=\mathbf{0}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{mm} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{F}_{MM} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{F}_{\delta\delta} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

where  $\mathbf{F}_{\delta\delta} = \mathbf{I}$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{mm} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I}$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{MM} = \text{Diag}(\text{vecTril}(\mathbf{C}))$ ,  $\text{vecTril}(\mathbf{C})$  represents the vectorization of the low-triangular half of  $\mathbf{C}$  excluding diagonal entries and its  $(i, j)$ -th entry is  $4(\frac{d_i}{d_j} + \frac{d_j}{d_i} - 2) \geq 0$  and  $d_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th entry of  $\mathbf{d}_k$ . The metric becomes singular when  $\mathbf{d}$  has repeated entries (i.e.,  $d_i = d_j$  for  $i \neq j$ ). In this case, we use the Moore-Penrose inversion to inverse the metric.

To verify this statement, we can analytically compute the Fisher-Rao metric according to the following expression.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}_\eta(\boldsymbol{\eta}) &= E_{\mathbf{w} \sim q}[\nabla_\eta \log q(\mathbf{w}; \boldsymbol{\eta}) \nabla_\eta^\top \log q(\mathbf{w}; \boldsymbol{\eta})] \\ &= -E_{\mathbf{w} \sim q}[\nabla_\eta^2 \log q(\mathbf{w}; \boldsymbol{\eta})], \end{aligned}$$

where we use the expression in the last line to compute the metric and obtain the simplified expression in Eq. (26).

## K. Proof of Claim 6

**Claim 6** A Kronecker-structured positive-definite matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  can be uniquely expressed as  $\mathbf{S} = \alpha[\mathbf{S}^{(C)} \otimes \mathbf{S}^{(K)}]$  with constraints  $\det(\mathbf{S}^{(C)}) = \det(\mathbf{S}^{(K)}) = 1$  and  $\alpha > 0$ .

*Proof.* We will show that  $\mathbf{S}_1 := \alpha_1[\mathbf{S}_1^{(C)} \otimes \mathbf{S}_1^{(K)}] = \mathbf{S}_2 := \alpha_2[\mathbf{S}_2^{(C)} \otimes \mathbf{S}_2^{(K)}]$  implies  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ , and  $\mathbf{S}_1^{(l)} = \mathbf{S}_2^{(l)}$  for  $l \in \{C, K\}$ , where  $\mathbf{S}_1^{(l)}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_2^{(l)}$  are assumed to have the same shape.

Thanks to the determinant constraint, we have  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$  because of  $\det(\mathbf{S}_1) = \det(\mathbf{S}_2)$ .

Since  $\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{S}_2$  is SPD, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I} &= \mathbf{S}_1^{-1} \mathbf{S}_2 \\ &= \{(\mathbf{S}_1^{(C)})^{-1} \mathbf{S}_2^{(C)}\} \otimes \{(\mathbf{S}_1^{(K)})^{-1} \mathbf{S}_2^{(K)}\} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that  $\det((\mathbf{S}_1^{(l)})^{-1} \mathbf{S}_2^{(l)}) = 1$  due to the determinant constraint for  $l \in \{C, K\}$ . By the definition of the Kronecker structure, the above expression only holds when  $(\mathbf{S}_1^{(K)})^{-1} \mathbf{S}_2^{(K)} = \mathbf{I}^{(K)}$  and  $(\mathbf{S}_1^{(C)})^{-1} \mathbf{S}_2^{(C)} = \mathbf{I}^{(C)}$  for regardless of the shapes of  $\mathbf{S}^{(C)}$  and  $\mathbf{S}^{(K)}$ .

Thus, we have  $\mathbf{S}_1^{(l)} = \mathbf{S}_2^{(l)}$  for  $l \in \{C, K\}$ . □

## L. Proof of Claim 7

**Claim 7** The transformation map (see Eq. (27)) is one-to-one if  $\mathbf{d}^{(l)}$  has no repeated entries for each Kronecker factor  $l$ .

*Proof.* It is easy to see that the map is injective for the local coordinate for  $\alpha$ . The remaining proof is similar to the proof of Claim 4 in Appx. I. □

## M. Proof of Claim 8

In a Kronecker case, we consider this spectral factorization  $\mathbf{S} = \alpha[(\mathbf{B}^{(C)}\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{(C)})(\mathbf{B}^{(C)})^T) \otimes (\mathbf{B}^{(K)}\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}^{(K)})(\mathbf{B}^{(K)})^T)]$ . At iteration  $k$ , we create a local coordinate  $\boldsymbol{\eta} := (\delta, n, \mathbf{m}^{(C)}, \mathbf{M}^{(C)}, \mathbf{m}^{(K)}, \mathbf{M}^{(K)})$  at the current point  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_k := (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \alpha_k, \mathbf{d}_k^{(C)}, \mathbf{B}_k^{(C)}, \mathbf{d}_k^{(K)}, \mathbf{B}_k^{(K)})$  and use this local transformation map

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}(\boldsymbol{\eta}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) := \begin{bmatrix} \alpha(n; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \\ \mathbf{d}^{(C)}(\mathbf{m}^{(C)}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \\ \mathbf{B}^{(C)}(\mathbf{M}^{(C)}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \\ \mathbf{d}^{(K)}(\mathbf{m}^{(K)}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \\ \mathbf{B}^{(K)}(\mathbf{M}^{(K)}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\delta}; \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_k \exp(n) \\ \mathbf{d}_k^{(C)} \odot \exp(\mathbf{m}^{(C)}) \\ \mathbf{B}_k^{(C)} \text{Cayley}(\text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{M}^{(C)}))) \\ \mathbf{d}_k^{(K)} \odot \exp(\mathbf{m}^{(K)}) \\ \mathbf{B}_k^{(K)} \text{Cayley}(\text{Skew}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{M}^{(K)}))) \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_k + (\mathbf{B}_k^{(C)} \otimes \mathbf{B}_k^{(K)})(\text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_k^{(C)}) \otimes \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_k^{(K)}))^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\delta} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

where  $\mathbf{m}^{(C)} = [m_1^{(C)}, m_2^{(C)}, \dots, m_{l-1}^{(C)}, -\sum_i^{l-1} m_i^{(C)}]$  has  $l$  entries but only  $(l-1)$  free variables since  $\sum(\mathbf{m}^{(C)}) = 0$ .

To verify this statement, we can analytically compute the Fisher-Rao metric according to its definition.

$$\mathbf{F}_\eta(n, \text{Free}(\mathbf{m}^{(C)}), \text{vecTril}(\mathbf{M}^{(C)}), \text{Free}(\mathbf{m}^{(K)}), \text{vecTril}(\mathbf{M}^{(K)}), \boldsymbol{\delta}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\eta}=\mathbf{0}} \quad (28)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{\alpha\alpha} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{F}_{m^{(C)}m^{(C)}} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{F}_{M^{(C)}M^{(C)}} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{F}_{m^{(K)}m^{(K)}} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{F}_{M^{(K)}M^{(K)}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{F}_{\delta\delta} \end{bmatrix} \quad (29)$$

where  $\text{vecTril}(\mathbf{C})$  represents the low-triangular half of  $\mathbf{C}$  excluding diagonal entries and  $\text{Free}(\mathbf{m})$  extracts free variables from  $\mathbf{m}$ .

We can see that the Fisher-Rao is block diagonal with six blocks.

The first two blocks are  $\mathbf{F}_{\delta\delta} = \mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{F}_{\alpha\alpha} = \frac{1}{2}$ . For each Kronecker factor, we have two blocks. For notation simplicity, we drop the factor index  $C$  in  $\mathbf{F}_{m^{(C)}m^{(C)}}$  and  $\mathbf{F}_{M^{(C)}M^{(C)}}$ .

For each Kronecker factor,  $\mathbf{F}_{MM} = \text{Diag}(\text{vecTril}(\mathbf{W}))$ ,  $\text{vecTril}(\mathbf{W})$  represents the low-triangular half of  $\mathbf{W}$  excluding diagonal entries and its  $(i, j)$ -th entry is  $[W]_{ij} = 4(\frac{d_i}{d_j} + \frac{d_j}{d_i} - 2) \geq 0$  and  $d_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th entry of  $\mathbf{d}_k$  for the factor. The

$\mathbf{F}_{mm}$  is non-diagonal but its inverse can be computed as  $\mathbf{F}_{mm}^{-1} = 2 \begin{bmatrix} \frac{l-1}{l} & \frac{1}{l} & \cdots & \frac{1}{l} \\ \frac{1}{l} & \frac{l-1}{l} & \cdots & \frac{1}{l} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot \\ \frac{1}{l} & \frac{1}{l} & \cdots & \frac{l-1}{l} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(l-1) \times (l-1)}$  for the  $(l-1)$

free variables in  $\mathbf{m}$  denoted by  $\text{Free}(\mathbf{m})$ . Furthermore, the natural-gradient w.r.t.  $\mathbf{m}$  can also be simplified.

## N. Complete Derivation for the Full-matrix Update

According to Claim 5, the Fisher-Rao metric under this local coordinate system is diagonal as

$$\mathbf{F}_\eta(\mathbf{m}, \text{vecTril}(\mathbf{M}), \boldsymbol{\delta}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\delta}=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m}=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{M}=\mathbf{0}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{mm} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{F}_{MM} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{F}_{\delta\delta} \end{bmatrix} \quad (30)$$

where  $\mathbf{F}_{\delta\delta} = \mathbf{I}$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{mm} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I}$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{MM} = \text{Diag}(\text{vecTril}(\mathbf{C}))$ ,  $\text{vecTril}(\mathbf{C})$  represents the low-triangular half of  $\mathbf{C}$  excluding diagonal entries and its  $(i, j)$ -th entry is  $[C]_{ij} = 4(\frac{d_i}{d_j} + \frac{d_j}{d_i} - 2) \geq 0$  and  $d_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th entry of  $\mathbf{d}_k$ .

Use the approximation in Eq. (7)

$$\mathbf{g}_\mu := \partial_\mu \mathcal{L} \stackrel{\text{Stein}}{=} E_{w \sim q} [\nabla_w \ell] \stackrel{\text{delta}}{\approx} \nabla_\mu \ell = \mathbf{g} \quad (31)$$

$$2\mathbf{g}_{S^{-1}} := 2\partial_{S^{-1}} \mathcal{L} \stackrel{\text{Stein}}{=} E_{w \sim q} [\nabla_w^2 \ell] - \mathbf{S} \stackrel{\text{delta}}{\approx} \nabla_\mu^2 \ell - \mathbf{S} \approx \mathcal{H} - \mathbf{S}. \quad (32)$$

where  $\mathbf{g} := \nabla_\mu \ell(\boldsymbol{\mu})$  is the gradient of  $\ell$ ,  $\mathcal{H} := \mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^T$  is a Hessian approximation.

The Euclidean gradient w.r.t local coordinate  $(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{M})$  are

$$\mathbf{g}_\delta|_{\delta=0} = \mathbf{D}_k^{-1/2} \mathbf{B}_k^T \mathbf{g}_\mu \quad (33)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_m|_{m=0} = -\mathbf{d}_k^{-1} \odot \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_k^T \mathbf{g}_{S^{-1}} \mathbf{B}_k) \quad (34)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_{\text{vecTril}(M)}|_{M=0} = 4\text{vecTril}(\mathbf{B}_k^T \mathbf{g}_{S^{-1}} \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{D}_k^{-1} - \mathbf{D}_k^{-1} \mathbf{B}_k^T \mathbf{g}_{S^{-1}} \mathbf{B}_k) \quad (35)$$

where  $\mathbf{D}_k := \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_k)$ . Recall that we use a gradient outer product  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^T$  as a Hessian approximation.

The metric can still be singular when  $\mathbf{d}$  has repeated entries (i.e.,  $d_i = d_j$  for  $i \neq j$ ) since  $\mathbf{F}_{MM}$  can be singular. This is because the local coordinate is not unique when  $\mathbf{d}$  has repeated entries. We can use the Moore-Penrose inverse when computing the inverse. Thanks to this coordinate system,  $\mathbf{F}_{MM}$  is indeed a diagonal matrix.

Thus, we can simplify the RGD update as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{m} \\ \text{vecTril}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \boldsymbol{\delta} \end{bmatrix} \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} - \beta_2 \mathbf{F}_{mm}^{-1} \mathbf{g}_m|_{m=0} \\ \mathbf{0} - \beta_2 \mathbf{F}_{MM}^{-1} \mathbf{g}_{\text{vecTril}(M)}|_{M=0} \\ \mathbf{0} - \beta_1 \mathbf{F}_{\mu\mu}^{-1} \mathbf{g}_\delta \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} - 2\beta_2 \mathbf{g}_m|_{m=0} \\ \mathbf{0} - \beta_2 \mathbf{F}_{MM}^{-1} \mathbf{g}_{\text{vecTril}(M)}|_{M=0} \\ \mathbf{0} - \beta_1 \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d})^{-1/2} \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{g}_\mu \end{bmatrix}, \quad (36)$$

where we introduce another learning rate  $\beta_2$  when updating  $\mathbf{d}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ .

Note that when  $d_i \neq d_j$  for  $i \neq j$ , the  $(i, j)$ -th entry of the natural gradient w.r.t.  $\mathbf{M}$  is

$$[\mathbf{F}_{MM}^{-1} \mathbf{g}_{\text{vecTril}(M)}|_{M=0}]_{ij} = (\mathbf{B}_k^T \mathbf{g}_{S^{-1}} \mathbf{B}_k)_{ij} / (d_i - d_j). \quad (37)$$

When  $d_i = d_j$ , we simply set the corresponding entry to be zero due to the Moore-Penrose inverse.

Finally, we can re-express the above update as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_{k+1} \\ \mathbf{B}_{k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_k \odot \exp[0 + 2\beta_2 \mathbf{d}_k^{-1} \odot \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_k^T \mathbf{g}_{S^{-1}} \mathbf{B}_k)] \\ \mathbf{B}_k \text{Cayley}(\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U}) - [\text{Tril}(\mathbf{U})]^T) \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \beta_1 \mathbf{B}_k \text{Diag}(\mathbf{d}_k)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_k^T \mathbf{g}_\mu \end{bmatrix} \quad (38)$$

where the  $(i, j)$  entry of  $\mathbf{U}$  is  $[\mathbf{U}]_{ij} = 0 - \beta_2 [\mathbf{B}_k^T \mathbf{g}_{S^{-1}} \mathbf{B}_k]_{ij} / (d_i - d_j)$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $[\mathbf{U}]_{ij} = 0$  when  $d_i = d_j$  thanks to the Moore-Penrose inverse.