

Low-Rank Matrix Regression via Least-Angle Regression

Mingzhou Yin and Matthias A. Müller

Abstract—Low-rank matrix regression is a fundamental problem in data science with various applications in systems and control. Nuclear norm regularization has been widely applied to solve this problem due to its convexity. However, it suffers from high computational complexity and the inability to directly specify the rank. This work introduces a novel framework for low-rank matrix regression that addresses both unstructured and Hankel matrices. By decomposing the low-rank matrix into rank-1 bases, the problem is reformulated as an infinite-dimensional sparse learning problem. The least-angle regression (LAR) algorithm is then employed to solve this problem efficiently. For unstructured matrices, a closed-form LAR solution is derived with equivalence to a normalized nuclear norm regularization problem. For Hankel matrices, a real-valued polynomial basis reformulation enables effective LAR implementation. Two numerical examples in network modeling and system realization demonstrate that the proposed approach significantly outperforms the nuclear norm method in terms of estimation accuracy and computational efficiency.

I. INTRODUCTION

Following the principle of parsimony, finding low-order structures from data is critical in data science. Such low-order structures can often be interpreted as low-rank model matrices. Thus, data modeling tasks can be posed as estimating unknown matrices from noisy measurements, subject to rank conditions and possibly structural constraints. This problem is referred to as low-rank matrix regression. Low-rank matrix regression has a wide range of applications in systems and control, including system identification [1], realization and model order reduction [2], and network modeling [3], among others. It is also a central problem in machine learning [4] and computer vision [5]. See [6], [7], [8] for an overview.

A well-studied case of low-rank matrix regression is when the regressor is an identity matrix. We refer to this case as the approximation problem. One of the earliest and most well-known results in this regard is the Eckart-Young-Mirsky (EYM) theorem [9]. It states that for unstructured matrices, the closed-form solution to the low-rank matrix approximation problem is given by truncated singular value decomposition (SVD). Beyond the unstructured approximation problem, however, no closed-form solution or convex formulation exists in general.

This work was supported by the Lower Saxony Ministry for Science and Culture within the program *zukunft.niedersachsen*.

The authors are with the Institute of Automatic Control, Leibniz University Hannover, 30167 Hannover, Germany (e-mail: yin@irt.uni-hannover.de; mueller@irt.uni-hannover.de).

© 2025 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.

Different algorithms have been proposed to obtain approximate solutions for low-rank matrix regression, including nonlinear optimization [10], [11], iterative truncated SVD approximation [12], [13], [14], and convex relaxation [1], [15], [16]. Among them, perhaps the most popular approach is nuclear norm regularization, which provides the tightest convex surrogate for the rank function. The nuclear norm regularization problem can be reformulated as a semidefinite program (SDP) and solved using standard SDP solvers [15]. However, despite being a convex problem, the nuclear norm approach has the following two drawbacks. 1) The computational complexity of SDPs scales unfavorably with the problem size, making it unsuitable for large-scale problems. 2) The rank of the estimates cannot be specified directly but relies on tuning the hyperparameter.

This work presents a novel approach to low-rank matrix regression for both unstructured and Hankel matrices with a general regressor. The Hankel matrix structure is of importance in various fields, including subspace identification [1], behavioral system modeling [17], signal processing [18], and image processing [19]. The proposed approach first reformulates the problem into an infinite-dimensional sparse learning problem by decomposing the low-rank matrix into a linear combination of rank-1 bases. The bases are selected as orthonormal ones for the unstructured case and polynomial ones for the Hankel case.

Then, the least-angle regression (LAR) algorithm [20] is applied to solve the sparse learning problems. LAR is a well-known algorithm in statistics for variable selection by constructing a solution path in the “least-angle” direction of all active variables. The algorithm is very efficient with a similar computational complexity as least squares. However, its application to systems and control [21], [22] is relatively limited. In this work, a closed-form LAR solution is derived for the unstructured case, which is equivalent to a normalized nuclear norm regularization problem. For the Hankel case, the LAR algorithm is applied after a real-valued reformulation of the polynomial basis. Two examples in network modeling and system realization are tested numerically. Numerical results demonstrate that the proposed LAR approaches perform significantly better than the nuclear norm solutions in terms of both estimation accuracy and computation time for both unstructured and Hankel matrices.

Notation. For a sequence $(x_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$, the infinite Hankel operator is defined as $\mathcal{H}(x)$ with the (i, k) -th element being x_{i+k-1} , and the finite Hankel operator of depth L is defined

as

$$\mathcal{H}_L(x_{[m,n]}) = \begin{bmatrix} x_m & x_{m+1} & \cdots & x_{n-L+1} \\ x_{m+1} & x_{m+2} & \cdots & x_{n-L+2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{m+L-1} & x_{m+L} & \cdots & x_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

The complex conjugate of z is denoted by z^* . The imaginary unit is denoted by j . The number of elements in a set A is indicated by $\#(A)$. The notation \mathbf{e}_i^n represents the unit vector along the i -th coordinate in \mathbb{R}^n .

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND BACKGROUND

Consider the problem of estimating an unknown matrix $X \in \mathbb{M}^{m \times n} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ from a noisy measurement $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$:

$$Y = \Phi X + E, \quad (1)$$

where $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ is the regressor, $E \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ denotes the noise matrix, and $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ represents the matrix structure. We assume that Φ has full column rank with $\text{rank}(\Phi) = m$. This work considers two types of matrix structures: the unstructured case where $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n} = \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and Hankel matrices. Let $\bar{n} = \min(m, n)$. The unknown matrix X is known to have a low rank with $\text{rank}(X) = r$, $r < \bar{n}$.

The estimation problem is usually solved by finding the best rank- r matrix that fits the measurement Y :

$$\hat{X} = \arg \min_{X \in \mathbb{M}^{m \times n}} \|Y - \Phi X\|_F^2 \quad (2)$$

s.t. $\text{rank}(X) \leq r$.

For the unstructured approximation problem, i.e., $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n} = \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\Phi = \mathbb{I}_m$, let $Y = \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{n}} \tilde{\sigma}_i \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top$ be the SVD of Y , where $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ are the singular values in decreasing order and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the left and right singular vectors, respectively. Then, the EYM theorem [9] shows that truncated SVD gives the closed-form solution to (2), i.e., $\hat{X} = \sum_{i=1}^r \tilde{\sigma}_i \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top$. Unfortunately, apart from this special case, (2) is NP-hard in general.

A widely-used convex surrogate to (2) is the nuclear norm regularization, given by

$$\hat{X}_{\text{nuc}} = \arg \min_{X \in \mathbb{M}^{m \times n}} \frac{1}{2} \|Y - \Phi X\|_F^2 + \lambda \|X\|_*, \quad (3)$$

where λ is a hyperparameter that controls the rank of \hat{X}_{nuc} and $\|\cdot\|_*$ denotes the nuclear norm, i.e., the sum of all singular values. However, as discussed in the introduction, this approach is not suitable for large-scale problems, and obtaining an estimate of a specific rank r requires tuning λ by trial and error.

A. Examples in Systems and Control

This work considers two problems in systems and control as motivating examples.

Example 1 considers a low-rank network modeling problem [3]. Let $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be an n -dimensional time series in a network with a first-order vector autoregressive model $x_{k+1} = B^\top x_k + e_k$, where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a low-rank transition matrix of rank r . Given $(p+1)$ consecutive observations

$(x_k)_{k=1}^{p+1}$, the transition matrix $X = B$ can be estimated by solving the unstructured low-rank regression problem with $m = n$, $Y = [x_2 \dots x_{p+1}]^\top$, and $\Phi = [x_1 \dots x_p]^\top$.

Example 2 concerns a system realization problem. Consider a discrete-time, strictly causal, single-input, single-output, linear time-invariant system with an order- r transfer function $G(q) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} g_i q^{-i}$, where g_i is the impulse response. Suppose the impulse response has been estimated with $\hat{g}_k = g_k + e_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, m+n-1$. Since the Hankel matrix of the impulse response has rank r , the impulse response can be estimated by solving the Hankel low-rank regression problem with $p = m$, $Y = \mathcal{H}_m(\hat{g}_{[1, m+n-1]})$, $\Phi = \mathbb{I}_m$, $X = \mathcal{H}_m(g_{[1, m+n-1]})$.

B. Low-Rank Matrix Regression by Sparse Learning

In this work, we study the problem by reformulating it into a sparse learning problem. In its standard form, sparse learning finds a sparse solution to a regression problem by solving

$$\hat{\sigma} = \arg \min_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n\sigma}} \|Y - \sum_{i=1}^{n\sigma} \sigma_i \tilde{X}_i\|^2 \quad (4)$$

s.t. $\text{card}(\sigma) \leq r$,

where $\text{card}(\cdot)$ denotes the cardinality function, which counts the number of nonzero elements in a vector.

We note that low-rank matrix regression can be regarded as finding a sparse combination of independent rank-1 matrices. This idea leads to the following sparse learning problem as a prototype:

$$(\hat{X}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i) = \arg \min_{(X_i, \sigma_i)} \|Y - \Phi \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i X_i\|_F^2 \quad (5)$$

s.t. $X_i = \bar{\mathbf{u}}_i \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top$, $i = 1, \dots, r$,
 $\text{rank}([\bar{\mathbf{u}}_1 \dots \bar{\mathbf{u}}_r]) = r$,
 $\text{rank}([\bar{\mathbf{v}}_1 \dots \bar{\mathbf{v}}_r]) = r$,
 $\sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i X_i \in \mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$,

where $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and X_i represents the independent rank-1 basis. It is easy to see that (5) is equivalent to (2).

Proposition 1: The optimal solution to (2) is given by $\hat{X} = \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{\sigma}_i \hat{X}_i$, where $(\hat{X}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i)$ is the optimal solution to (5).

Proof: The rank condition $\text{rank}(X) \leq r$ is satisfied iff there exist $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$ and rank- r matrices $\bar{U} = [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_1 \dots \bar{\mathbf{u}}_r]$, $\bar{V} = [\bar{\mathbf{v}}_1 \dots \bar{\mathbf{v}}_r]$, such that $X = \bar{U} \Sigma \bar{V}^\top = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i X_i$. This corresponds to the first three constraints in (5). ■

Problem (5) is very similar to the standard sparse learning problem (4) by considering the Frobenius norm and $\hat{X}_i = \Phi X_i$, except that (4) selects r bases from a finite set of covariates $(\tilde{X}_i)_{i=1}^{n\sigma}$, whereas (5) selects r independent bases from an infinite set of covariates. Such a problem is known as an infinite-dimensional sparse learning problem [23].

C. Least-Angle Regression

The sparse learning problem (4) is also NP-hard. In this regard, the least-angle regression approach provides a computationally efficient method to find approximate solutions to (4). Unlike the nuclear norm approach, LAR obtains the




Fig. 1. Graphical illustration of least-angle regression. The solution first goes along \tilde{X}_3 , and then the equiangular direction bisecting \tilde{X}_3 and \tilde{X}_1 .

complete solution path for all values of r in one run. This subsection summarizes the standard procedure of LAR.

The idea of LAR is as follows, with a graphical illustration shown in Fig. 1 for $p = 2$, $n_\sigma = 3$. It starts with zero coefficients $\sigma = \mathbf{0}$ and finds the covariate \tilde{X}_{i_1} (\tilde{X}_3 in Fig. 1) most correlated with the response. We take the direction of this covariate until another covariate \tilde{X}_{i_2} (\tilde{X}_1 in Fig. 1) is correlated with the model residual as much as \tilde{X}_{i_1} . Then the algorithm continues along the bisecting direction between \tilde{X}_{i_1} and \tilde{X}_{i_2} until a third covariate \tilde{X}_{i_3} comes in with the same residual correlation as \tilde{X}_{i_1} and \tilde{X}_{i_2} . Fig. 1 ends at this step since the model residual is zero before \tilde{X}_2 can join. If not, LAR proceeds along the “least-angle direction” equiangular between \tilde{X}_{i_1} , \tilde{X}_{i_2} , and \tilde{X}_{i_3} until the fourth covariate enters, and so on until all covariates are active or the model residual is zero.

A computationally efficient algorithm of this idea is described in [20, Section 2], when $Y, \tilde{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are vector-valued, l_2 -norm is used in (4), and \tilde{X}_i has been normalized with $\|\tilde{X}_i\|_2 = 1$. The computational complexity of the algorithm is $O(k^3 + pk^2)$ for k steps, which is the same as solving a least-squares problem with k covariates [20, Section 7].

LAR is closely related to l_1 -norm regularization, also known as lasso, i.e., $\hat{\sigma} = \arg \min_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\sigma}} \frac{1}{2} \|Y - \sum_{i=1}^{n_\sigma} \sigma_i \tilde{X}_i\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\sigma\|_1$. With a minor modification to the algorithm, the LAR solution path provides all critical solutions of lasso when the solution sparsity changes as λ decreases [20, Section 3.1]. In particular, the modification states that whenever σ_i flips its sign along the solution path, the algorithm pauses at $\sigma_i = 0$, eliminates σ_i from the active set, and continues with the equiangular direction without σ_i .

III. UNSTRUCTURED MATRIX REGRESSION WITH LEAST-ANGLE REGRESSION

This section generalizes the LAR algorithm presented in Section II-C to the infinite-dimensional problem (5) for the unstructured case where $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n} = \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$.

For the unstructured case, it is natural to follow the idea of SVD and consider orthonormal bases. Let $\Phi = U_\Phi S_\Phi V_\Phi^\top$ be the SVD of Φ , where $U_\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ and $S_\Phi, V_\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. Since $\text{rank}(\Phi) = m$, S_Φ is invertible. Then, we consider a

special case of (5) with $S_\Phi V_\Phi^\top X_i$ taking orthonormal bases:

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{X}_i^u, \hat{\sigma}_i^u) = \arg \min_{(X_i^u, \sigma_i^u)} & \|Y - U_\Phi \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i^u X_i^u\|_F^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & X_i^u \in \mathcal{X}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where

$$\mathcal{X}_i = \{\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mid \|\mathbf{u}_i\|_2 = \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2 = 1, \mathbf{u}_i^\top \mathbf{u}_k = \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_k = 0, k = 1, \dots, i-1\}$$

constructs the set of rank-1 orthonormal bases. Similar to Proposition 1, (6) is equivalent to (2) for the unstructured case.

Proposition 2: The optimal solution to (2) is given by $\hat{X} = V_\Phi S_\Phi^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{\sigma}_i^u \hat{X}_i^u$, where $(\hat{X}_i^u, \hat{\sigma}_i^u)$ is the optimal solution to (6), when $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n} = \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$.

Proof: The rank condition $\text{rank}(X) \leq r$ is satisfied iff $S_\Phi V_\Phi^\top X$ has no more than r non-zero singular values, i.e., $S_\Phi V_\Phi^\top X = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i^u \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$, where \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{v}_i are orthonormal bases. This corresponds to the constraint in (6). ■

Due to the favorable property of the orthonormal bases, the LAR solution to (6) can be calculated in closed form, as shown in the following theorem.

Theorem 1: Let $U_\Phi^\top Y = U^u S^0 (V^u)^\top$ be the SVD of $U_\Phi^\top Y$, where $U^u = [\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1 \dots \hat{\mathbf{u}}_m] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $S^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $V^u = [\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 \dots \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Let the (i, i) -th element of S^0 be σ_i^0 . The LAR solution to (6) is given by $\hat{X}_i^u = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top$ and $\hat{\sigma}_i^u = \sigma_i^0 - \sigma_{r+1}^0$.

Proof: We prove the theorem by induction. Similar to Section II-C, we start with an empty model and find $X_1^u \in \mathcal{X}_1$ that maximizes the correlation between $U_\Phi X_1^u$ and the model residual $\mu_1 = Y$ in terms of the Frobenius inner product:

$$\arg \max_{X_1^u \in \mathcal{X}_1} \frac{\langle U_\Phi X_1^u, Y \rangle_F}{\|U_\Phi X_1^u\|_F \|Y\|_F} = \arg \max_{X_1^u \in \mathcal{X}_1} \langle U_\Phi X_1^u, Y \rangle_F,$$

since $\|U_\Phi X_1^u\|_F = 1$. From the definition of \mathcal{X}_1 , the problem is equivalent to

$$\arg \max_{\|\mathbf{u}_1\|_2 = \|\mathbf{v}_1\|_2 = 1} \text{tr}(\mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{u}_1^\top U_\Phi^\top Y) = \arg \max_{\|\mathbf{u}_1\|_2 = \|\mathbf{v}_1\|_2 = 1} \mathbf{u}_1^\top U_\Phi^\top Y \mathbf{v}_1 = (\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1).$$

In the first iteration, we go along the direction of $\zeta_1 = U_\Phi X_1^u$ until the new model residual $\mu_2 = \mu_1 - \eta_1 U_\Phi X_1^u$ correlates with $U_\Phi X_1^u$ as much as a new covariate $U_\Phi X_2^u$. Note that $U_\Phi^\top \mu_2 = U_\Phi^\top \mu_1 - \eta_1 X_1^u = U^u S^1 (V^u)^\top$, where $S^1 = S^0 - \eta_1 \mathbf{e}_1^m (\mathbf{e}_1^n)^\top$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{X_2^u \in \mathcal{X}_2} \langle U_\Phi X_2^u, \mu_2 \rangle_F &= \langle U_\Phi X_1^u, \mu_2 \rangle_F, \\ \max_{\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2} \mathbf{u}_2^\top U^u S^1 (V^u)^\top \mathbf{v}_2 &= \sigma_1^0 - \eta_1. \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \|\mathbf{u}_2\|_2 = \|\mathbf{v}_2\|_2 = 1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2^\top \mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{v}_2^\top \mathbf{v}_1 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2$ are perpendicular to $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1$, respectively, the maximum of the left-hand side is σ_2^0 , obtained when $\mathbf{u}_2 = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2$ and $\mathbf{v}_2 = \hat{\mathbf{v}}_2$. This leads to $\eta_1 = \sigma_1^0 - \sigma_2^0$.

Suppose $\mathbf{u}_i = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i, \mathbf{v}_i = \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $\eta_i = \sigma_i^0 - \sigma_{i+1}^0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k-1$. Since all X_i^u 's are perpendicular, the equiangular direction at the k -th iteration is given by $\zeta_k =$

$U_{\Phi} \sum_{i=1}^k X_i^u$. Following a similar procedure as the first iteration, we have $\mu_{k+1} = \mu_k - \eta_k \zeta_k$, $S^k = S^{k-1} - \eta_k \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{e}_i^m (\mathbf{e}_i^m)^\top$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{u}_{k+1}, \mathbf{v}_{k+1}} \quad & \mathbf{u}_{k+1}^\top U^u S^k (V^u)^\top \mathbf{v}_{k+1} = \sigma_k^0 - \eta_k. \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \|\mathbf{u}_{k+1}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{v}_{k+1}\|_2 = 1 \\ & \mathbf{u}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{v}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{v}_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, k \end{aligned}$$

This leads to $\mathbf{u}_{k+1} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k+1}$, $\mathbf{v}_{k+1} = \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{k+1}$ and $\eta_k = \sigma_k^0 - \sigma_{k+1}^0$.

Finally, we note $\hat{\sigma}_i^u = \sum_{k=i}^r \eta_k = \sigma_i^0 - \sigma_{r+1}^0$, which completes the proof. \blacksquare

Therefore, the LAR algorithm gives the following rank- r solution for unstructured low-rank matrix regression:

$$\hat{X}_{\text{LAR}} = V_{\Phi} S_{\Phi}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^r (\sigma_i^0 - \sigma_{r+1}^0) \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top. \quad (7)$$

It has been well-known that for the unstructured approximation case with $\Phi = \mathbb{I}_m$, (3) admits a closed-form solution [24, Theorem 2.1]: $\hat{X}_{\text{nuc}} = \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{n}} \max(\tilde{\sigma}_i - \lambda, 0) \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top$. Using the close relation between LAR and lasso, this result can be generalized to regression problems with a general Φ .

Corollary 1: Consider the normalized nuclear norm regularization problem:

$$\hat{X}_{\text{nuc,n}}(\lambda) = \arg \min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \frac{1}{2} \|Y - \Phi X\|_F^2 + \lambda \left\| S_{\Phi} V_{\Phi}^\top X \right\|_*. \quad (8)$$

The best rank- r solution, i.e., $\min_{\lambda} \lambda$ s.t. $\text{rank}(\hat{X}_{\text{nuc,n}}(\lambda)) = r$ is given by \hat{X}_{LAR} in (7).

Proof: Note that (8) is equivalent to the lasso version of (6): $\min_{(X_i^u, \sigma_i^u)} \frac{1}{2} \|Y - U_{\Phi} \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{n}} \sigma_i^u X_i^u\|_F^2 + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{n}} \sigma_i^u$, s.t. $X_i^u \in \mathcal{X}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, \bar{n}$. As can be seen from the proof of Theorem 1, the coefficients of the active bases are monotonically increasing, so the lasso modification in [20, Section 3.1] cannot be triggered. Therefore, [20, Theorem 1] completes the proof. \blacksquare

IV. HANKEL MATRIX REGRESSION WITH LEAST-ANGLE REGRESSION

This section further considers the Hankel structure constraint in (5) by employing rank-1 Hankel bases for X_i . Unlike the unstructured case, we cannot employ orthonormal bases since the SVD of a Hankel matrix is not Hankel. Instead, complex polynomial bases are considered. Define, with a slight abuse of notation,

$$\bar{\mathbf{u}}_z = [1 \ z \ \dots \ z^{m-1}]^\top, \quad \bar{\mathbf{v}}_z = [1 \ z \ \dots \ z^{n-1}]^\top, \quad X_z = \bar{\mathbf{u}}_z \bar{\mathbf{v}}_z^\top,$$

where $z \in \mathbb{C}$. We would like to show that any rank- r Hankel matrix X can be expressed as $X = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_{z_i} X_{z_i}$, where $\sigma_{z_i} \in \mathbb{C}$. However, this statement is not true. A trivial counter example is $X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, which has rank 1 but cannot be expressed as $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_z \bar{\mathbf{v}}_z^\top$. Thus, this section focuses on a particular type of Hankel matrices that can be decomposed with polynomial bases, specified by the following lemmas.

Lemma 1: An infinite Hankel matrix $\mathcal{H}(x)$ satisfies $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}(x)) \leq r$ iff $(x_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ satisfies the homogeneous linear difference equation $x_{k+r} + \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_i x_{k+i} = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$.

Proof: Let s_i be the i -th column of $\mathcal{H}(x)$. Suppose s_{k+1} is dependent on s_1, \dots, s_k . Then, due to the shift property of Hankel matrices, s_i is dependent on s_{i-k}, \dots, s_{i-1} for all $i \geq k+1$. This is equivalent to $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}(x)) \leq k$. Therefore, $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}(x)) \leq r$ is equivalent to s_{r+1} depending on s_1, \dots, s_r . The latter is further equivalent to $x_{k+r} + \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_i x_{k+i} = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$. \blacksquare

Lemma 2: A Hankel matrix $X = \mathcal{H}_m(x_{[1, m+n-1]})$ with $\text{rank}(X) \leq r$ can be decomposed as $X = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_{z_i} X_{z_i}$ if 1) X is a submatrix of an infinite Hankel matrix $\mathcal{H}(x)$ with $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}(x)) \leq r$, and 2) the characteristic polynomial $p(q) = q^r + \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_i q^i$ of the linear difference equation $x_{k+r} + \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_i x_{k+i} = 0$ has no repeated roots.

Proof: The decomposition $X = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_{z_i} X_{z_i}$ is equivalent to $x_k = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_{z_i} z_i^{k-1}$ for $k = 1, \dots, m+n-1$. From Lemma 1, condition 1) implies that $x_{[1, m+n-1]}$ is a subsequence of $(x_k)_{k=1}^{\infty} : x_{k+r} + \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_i x_{k+i} = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$. Let the non-repeated roots of $p(q)$ be $(z_i)_{i=1}^r$. The general solution of the linear difference equation [25, Theorem 3.6] is given by $x_k = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_{z_i} z_i^{k-1}$, which completes the proof. \blacksquare

The first condition is naturally satisfied in most problems in systems and control, such as Example 2 in Section II-A. The second condition is often assumed in partial fraction expansion analysis, such as [26], [27], and repeated poles can be approximated by a combination of close distinct poles with arbitrarily high accuracy.

Since real-valued matrices X are considered, if X_z is in the decomposition, X_{z^*} should also be included with $\sigma_{z^*} = \sigma_z^*$. Let $z = |z| \exp(j\theta)$ and $\sigma_z = |\sigma_z| \exp(j\psi)$. We have $\sigma_z z + \sigma_z^* z^* = 2|\sigma_z||z| \cos(\psi + \theta)$. So, the decomposition can be reparametrized with real-valued modes $\sigma_{z_i} X_{z_i} + \sigma_{z_i}^* X_{z_i^*} = 2|\sigma_{z_i}| X_{z_i^{\psi_i}}$, where

$$X_{z_i^{\psi_i}} = \mathcal{H}_m \left(\xi_{[1, m+n-1]}^i \right), \quad \xi_k^i = |z_i|^{k-1} \cos(\psi_i + (k-1)\theta_i). \quad (9)$$

This observation leads to the following proposition that provides a real-valued reformulation of (2) for X that satisfies the conditions in Lemma 2.

Proposition 3: Let $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ be the set of Hankel matrices that satisfy the conditions 1) and 2) in Lemma 2. The optimal solution to (2) is given by $\hat{X} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_r} \hat{\sigma}_{z_i}' \hat{X}_{z_i}^{\psi_i}$, where $(\hat{X}_{z_i}^{\psi_i}, \hat{\sigma}_{z_i}')$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_{(X_{z_i}^{\psi_i}, \sigma_{z_i}') } \quad & \|Y - \Phi \sum_{i=1}^{n_r} \sigma_{z_i}' X_{z_i}^{\psi_i}\|_F^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (9), \theta_i \in [0, \pi], i = 1, \dots, n_r, \\ & z_i \neq z_j, \forall i \neq j, \\ & n_r + \#\{i | z_i \text{ is complex}\} = r. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Proof: According to Lemma 2, X can be decomposed as $X = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_{z_i} X_{z_i}$. Let $n_{\text{real}} = \#\{i | z_i \text{ is real}\}$. Without loss of generality, assume that z_i is real for $i = 1, \dots, n_{\text{real}}$ and $z_i = z_{i+n_r-n_{\text{real}}}^*$, $\theta_i \in (0, \pi)$ for $i = n_{\text{real}} + 1, \dots, n_r$. Then, we

have

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_{z_i} X_{z_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{real}}} \sigma_{z_i} X_{z_i} + \sum_{i=n_{\text{real}}+1}^{n_r} \sigma_{z_i} X_{z_i} + \sigma_{z_i}^* X_{z_i}^* \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{real}}} |\sigma_{z_i}| X_{z_i}^{\psi_i} + \sum_{i=n_{\text{real}}+1}^{n_r} 2|\sigma_{z_i}| X_{z_i}^{\psi_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Selecting $\sigma'_{z_i} = |\sigma_{z_i}|$ for $i = 1, \dots, n_{\text{real}}$ and $\sigma'_{z_i} = 2|\sigma_{z_i}|$ for $i = n_{\text{real}} + 1, \dots, n_r$ completes the proof. ■

Remark 1: If we focus on the case where $(x_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded, z_i can be further constrained with $|z_i| \leq 1$. This is useful when analyzing stable systems.

Then, we are ready to apply the LAR algorithm to (10). Unfortunately, a closed-form solution like Theorem 1 does not exist for the Hankel case, but a similar procedure to the proof of Theorem 1 can be adopted, which is summarized in Algorithm 1. Algorithm 1 only considers positive correlations without loss of generality, since one can take $X_z^{\psi+\pi} = -X_z^{\psi}$. Note that X_z^{ψ} can be decomposed as $X_z^{\psi} = U_z R_{\psi} V_z^{\top}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} U_z &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & |z| \cos \theta & \dots & |z|^{m-1} \cos((m-1)\theta) \\ 0 & -|z| \sin \theta & \dots & -|z|^{m-1} \sin((m-1)\theta) \end{bmatrix}^{\top}, \\ R_{\psi} &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos \psi & -\sin \psi \\ \sin \psi & \cos \psi \end{bmatrix}, \\ V_z &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & |z| \cos \theta & \dots & |z|^{n-1} \cos((n-1)\theta) \\ 0 & |z| \sin \theta & \dots & |z|^{n-1} \sin((n-1)\theta) \end{bmatrix}^{\top}. \end{aligned}$$

For computational efficiency, the Frobenius inner product can be calculated as $\langle \Phi X_z^{\psi}, \Gamma \rangle_F = \text{tr}(U_z^{\top} \Phi^{\top} \Gamma V_z R_{\psi}^{\top})$. Algorithm 1 requires solving non-convex optimization problems in lines 1 and 5. However, the dimension of the optimization variable is small and does not depend on the problem size. In line 5, $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small constant that guarantees the selection of a distinct z_{i+1} .

The step size selection of η_i in Algorithm 1 is conservative to allow the inclusion of further covariates, which induces a negative bias. When a desired rank is achieved, the estimate can be debiased by solving a least-squares problem:

$$\min_{(\sigma'_{z_i})} \|Y - \Phi \sum_{i=1}^{n_r} \sigma'_{z_i} X_{z_i}^{\psi_i}\|_F^2 \quad (11)$$

where z_i and ψ_i are given by Algorithm 1.

V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

This section demonstrates the performance of the LAR solutions (7) and Algorithm 1 and compares them with the nuclear norm solution (3), for both unstructured and Hankel matrix regression.¹

In both examples, 120 Monte Carlo simulations are conducted. The error e_k is zero-mean and i.i.d. Gaussian with a standard deviation of 0.01. The convex programs are solved by YALMIP and Mosek, whereas the non-convex programs are solved by the MATLAB function `fmincon` with the interior point method. The estimation accuracy is evaluated by $\|\hat{X} - X_0\|_F^2$, where X_0 is the true low-rank matrix.

¹The codes are available at <https://doi.org/10.25835/dx2jik11>

Algorithm 1 Least-angle regression for Hankel matrix regression

1: **Initialization:** active set $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{(z_1, \psi_1)\}$, where

$$(z_1, \psi_1) = \arg \max_{(z, \psi)} \langle \Phi X_z^{\psi}, Y \rangle_F / \|\Phi X_z^{\psi}\|_F \quad \text{s.t. } \theta \in [0, \pi],$$

prediction $\hat{Y}_1 = \mathbf{0}$, parameter $\hat{\sigma}'_{z_1} = 0$

2: **for** $i = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

3: Model residual: $M_i = Y - \hat{Y}_i$.

4: Equiangular direction: $Z_i = \sum_{(z, \psi) \in \mathcal{A}_i} \chi_z^{\psi} \Phi X_z^{\psi}$, such that $\langle \Phi X_z^{\psi}, Z_i \rangle_F = \|\Phi X_z^{\psi}\|_F$, for all $(z, \psi) \in \mathcal{A}_i$.

5: Next covariate: $(z_{i+1}, \psi_{i+1}, \eta_i)$ are obtained by

$$\begin{aligned} &\arg \min_{(z, \psi, \eta)} \eta \\ &\text{s.t.} \quad \frac{\langle \Phi X_z^{\psi}, M_i - \eta Z_i \rangle_F}{\|\Phi X_z^{\psi}\|_F} = \frac{\langle \Phi X_{z_1}^{\psi_1}, M_i - \eta Z_i \rangle_F}{\|\Phi X_{z_1}^{\psi_1}\|_F}, \\ &\eta \geq 0, |z - z'| \geq \varepsilon, \forall (z', \cdot) \in \mathcal{A}_i, \theta \in [0, \pi]. \end{aligned}$$

6: $\mathcal{A}_{i+1} = \mathcal{A}_i \cup \{(z_{i+1}, \psi_{i+1})\}$, $\hat{Y}_{i+1} = \hat{Y}_i + \eta_i Z_i$

7: $\hat{\sigma}'_{z_i, i+1} = \hat{\sigma}'_{z_i, i} + \eta_i \chi_z^{\psi}$ for all $(z, \psi) \in \mathcal{A}_i$, $\hat{\sigma}'_{z_{i+1}, i+1} = 0$

8: **end for**

For unstructured matrix regression, Example 1 in Section II-A is considered with $m = n = 40$, $p = 80$, and $r = 10$. The rank- r transition matrix B is generated by $B = b_0 B_1 B_2^{\top}$, where $B_1, B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ contain unit i.i.d. Gaussian entries and b_0 is selected such that the spectral radius of B is 0.95. We also compare a two-step approach of first estimating \hat{X}_{LS} by least squares and subsequently applying truncated SVD of rank r . To obtain a specific rank r , the nuclear norm estimate \hat{X}_{nuc} is calculated on a 20-point grid of λ , logarithmically spaced between 0.01 and 0.1. If multiple solutions of rank r exist, the one with the smallest λ value is selected.

The boxplots of estimation errors and computation time are illustrated in Fig. 2. It can be seen that the LAR solution gives closer estimates compared to the other two methods, with median prediction error reductions of 28% and 38% compared to nuclear norm regularization and LS-TSVD, respectively. The computation time of the LAR solution is similar to LS-TSVD and significantly shorter than nuclear norm regularization.

For Hankel matrix regression, Example 2 in Section II-A is considered with a sixth-order ($r = 6$) system:

$$G(q) = d_0 \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left(\frac{d_i}{q - q_i} + \frac{d_i^*}{q - q_i^*} \right), \quad (12)$$

where $n_p = 3$, $q_1 = -0.6 + 0.6j$, $q_2 = 0.9 + 0.2j$, $q_3 = 0.2 + 0.9j$, $d_1 = 1$, $d_2 = 1 - 2j$, $d_3 = -1 - j$, and d_0 is selected such that $G(q)$ has an \mathcal{H}_2 -norm of 1. The impulse response of $G(q)$ is given by $g_k = d_0 \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} (d_i q_i^{k-1} + d_i^* (q_i^*)^{k-1})$, so q_i and the angle of d_i correspond to the optimal choices of z_i and ψ_i , respectively. The following parameters are used in simulations: $m = 80$, $n = 20$, $\varepsilon = 0.01$. It is assumed that the system is known to be stable, so z_i is constrained by $|z_i| \leq 1$ in Algorithm 1 as discussed in Remark 1. The nuclear norm




Fig. 2. Comparison of estimation errors and computation time for unstructured matrix regression. LAR: closed-form solution (7), Nuclear: nuclear norm regularization (3), LS-TSVD: successive least-squares estimate and truncated SVD.

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF z_i AND ψ_i AGAINST THEIR OPTIMAL VALUES

Poles	1	2	3	
$ z_i $	Estimated	0.865 ± 0.012	0.921 ± 0.002	0.923 ± 0.004
	True	0.849	0.922	0.922
θ_i	Estimated	2.339 ± 0.023	0.214 ± 0.003	1.354 ± 0.004
	True	2.356	0.219	1.352
ψ_i	Estimated	0.153 ± 0.115	-1.030 ± 0.031	-2.390 ± 0.037
	True	0	-1.107	-2.356

estimates are obtained similarly to the previous example, except that the λ -grid is selected between 0.1 and 1.

Table I shows the estimated values of z_i , ψ_i from Algorithm 1 against their optimal values from the true model (12). The close match of the values validates the effectiveness of the LAR algorithm. The boxplots of estimation errors and computation time are illustrated in Fig. 3. The results demonstrate that the LAR algorithm obtains closer estimates to the true impulse response with significantly shorter computation time. The advantage becomes more obvious when applying the least-squares debiasing (11). The reductions in median estimation errors are 49% and 70% for LAR and LAR-LS, respectively.




Fig. 3. Comparison of estimation errors and computation time for Hankel matrix regression. LAR: Algorithm 1, LAR-LS: Algorithm 1 plus least-squares debiasing (11), Nuclear: nuclear norm regularization (3).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, the low-rank matrix regression problem is reformulated as an infinite-dimensional sparse learning problem and solved by least-angle regression (LAR). When the matrix is unstructured, the LAR algorithm admits a closed-form solution, only requiring two singular value decomposition operations. For Hankel matrices, LAR is implemented by considering a real-valued reformulation of polynomial bases. Significant improvements in both accuracy and efficiency are observed numerically for both cases, compared to nuclear norm regularization.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. S. Smith, "Frequency domain subspace identification using nuclear norm minimization and Hankel matrix realizations," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 2886–2896, 2014.
- [2] B. Schutter, "Minimal state-space realization in linear system theory: an overview," *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 121, no. 1–2, pp. 331–354, 2000.
- [3] S. Basu, X. Li, and G. Michailidis, "Low rank and structured modeling of high-dimensional vector autoregressions," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 1207–1222, 2019.
- [4] M. B. Cohen, S. Elder, C. Musco, C. Musco, and M. Persu, "Dimensionality reduction for k-means clustering and low rank approximation," in *ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2015, pp. 163–172.
- [5] H. Yuan, J. Li, L. L. Lai, and Y. Y. Tang, "Low-rank matrix regression for image feature extraction and feature selection," *Information Sciences*, vol. 522, pp. 214–226, 2020.
- [6] I. Markovsky and K. Ueivich, *Low-rank approximation*. Springer, 2012, vol. 139.
- [7] I. Markovsky, "Structured low-rank approximation and its applications," *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 891–909, 2008.
- [8] M. Fazel, T. K. Pong, D. Sun, and P. Tseng, "Hankel matrix rank minimization with applications to system identification and realization," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 946–977, 2013.
- [9] C. Eckart and G. Young, "The approximation of one matrix by another of lower rank," *Psychometrika*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 211–218, 1936.
- [10] I. Markovsky and K. Ueivich, "Software for weighted structured low-rank approximation," *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 256, pp. 278–292, 2014.
- [11] H. Park, L. Zhang, and J. B. Rosen, "Low rank approximation of a Hankel matrix by structured total least norm," *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, vol. 39, pp. 757–779, 1999.
- [12] J. Cadzow, "Signal enhancement—a composite property mapping algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 49–62, 1988.
- [13] C. Wang, Z. Zhu, H. Gu, X. Wu, and S. Liu, "Hankel low-rank approximation for seismic noise attenuation," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 561–573, 2019.
- [14] M. Yin and R. S. Smith, "On low-rank Hankel matrix denoising," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 198–203, 2021.
- [15] M. Fazel, H. Hindi, and S. Boyd, "A rank minimization heuristic with application to minimum order system approximation," in *American Control Conference*, vol. 6, 2001, pp. 4734–4739.
- [16] —, "Log-det heuristic for matrix rank minimization with applications to Hankel and Euclidean distance matrices," in *American Control Conference*, vol. 3, 2003, pp. 2156–2162.
- [17] I. Markovsky, J. C. Willems, S. Van Huffel, and B. De Moor, *Exact and approximate modeling of linear systems: A behavioral approach*. SIAM, 2006.
- [18] L. L. Scharf, "The SVD and reduced rank signal processing," *Signal Processing*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 113–133, 1991.
- [19] K. H. Jin and J. C. Ye, "Annihilating filter-based low-rank Hankel matrix approach for image inpainting," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 3498–3511, 2015.
- [20] B. Efron, T. Hastie, I. Johnstone, and R. Tibshirani, "Least angle regression," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 407–499, 2004.

- [21] L. Zhang and K. Li, "Forward and backward least angle regression for nonlinear system identification," *Automatica*, vol. 53, pp. 94–102, 2015.
- [22] A. Chiuso and G. Pillonetto, "A Bayesian approach to sparse dynamic network identification," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 1553–1565, 2012.
- [23] M. Yin, M. Tolga Akan, A. Iannelli, and R. S. Smith, "Infinite-dimensional sparse learning in linear system identification," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2022, pp. 850–855.
- [24] J.-F. Cai, E. J. Candès, and Z. Shen, "A singular value thresholding algorithm for matrix completion," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 1956–1982, 2010.
- [25] W. G. Kelley and A. C. Peterson, *Difference equations: an introduction with applications*. Academic press, 2001.
- [26] W. Gragg and L. Reichel, "On singular values of Hankel operators of finite rank," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 121, pp. 53–70, 1989.
- [27] P. Shah, B. N. Bhaskar, G. Tang, and B. Recht, "Linear system identification via atomic norm regularization," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2012, pp. 6265–6270.