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Abstract  This work considers a super-resolution framework for overcomplete tensor decomposition. Specifically, we view tensor decomposition as a super-resolution problem of recovering a sum of Dirac measures on the sphere and solve it by minimizing a continuous analog of the $\ell_1$ norm on the space of measures. The optimal value of this optimization defines the tensor nuclear norm. Similar to the separation condition in the super-resolution problem, by explicitly constructing a dual certificate, we develop incoherence conditions of the tensor factors so that they form the unique optimal solution of the continuous analog of $\ell_1$ norm minimization. Remarkably, the derived incoherence conditions are satisfied with high probability by random tensor factors uniformly distributed on the sphere, implying global identifiability of random tensor factors.
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1 Introduction

Tensors provide natural representations for massive multi-mode datasets encountered in many applications including image and video processing [7], collaborative filtering [27], array signal processing [39], convolutional networks design [24] and psychometrics [40]. Tensor methods also form the backbone of many machine learning, signal processing, and statistical algorithms, including independent component analysis (ICA) [15], latent graphical model learning [2], dictionary learning [3], and Gaussian mixture estimation [37]. The utility of tensors in such diverse applications is mainly due to the ability to identify overcomplete, non-orthogonal factors from tensor data as already suggested by Kruskal’s theorem [31]. This is known as tensor decomposition, which describes the problem of decomposing a tensor into a linear combination of a small number of rank-1 tensors. The identifiability of tensor factors is in sharp contrast to the inherent ambiguous nature of matrix decompositions without additional assumptions such as orthogonality and non-negativity.

In addition to its practical applicability, tensor decomposition is also of fundamental theoretical interest in solving linear inverse problems involving low-rank tensors. For one thing, theoretical results for tensor decompo-
osition inform what types of rank-1 tensor combinations are identifiable given full observations. For another, a dual polynomial is constructed to certify a particular decomposition, which is useful in investigating the regularization power of the tensor nuclear norm for tensor inverse problems, including tensor completion, tensor denoising, and robust tensor principal component analysis. We expect that the dual certificate constructed in this work will play an important role in these tensor inverse problems similar to that of the subdifferential characterization of matrix nuclear norm in matrix completion and low-rank matrix recovery [14, 36].

1.1 The Tensor Decomposition Problem

In this work, we focus on third-order nonsymmetric tensors that can be decomposed into a linear combination of unit-norm, rank-1 tensors of the form \( u \otimes v \otimes w \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_3} \). More precisely, consider the following nonsymmetric tensor decomposition

\[
T = \sum_{p=1}^{r} \lambda_p^* u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^*.
\]  

(1)

Through this work, we assume the rank-1 tensor factors \( \{(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)\} \) are living on the unit spheres and might be overcomplete, that is, \( r \) is potentially greater than the individual tensor dimensions \( n_1, n_2 \) and \( n_3 \). Without loss of generality, we assume that the coefficients \( \{\lambda_p^*\} \) are positive as their signs can be absorbed into the factors.

**Problem 1** The tensor decomposition problem is the inverse problem of retrieving those ground-truth rank-1 tensor factors \( \{(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)\}_{p=1}^{r} \) from the tensor data \( T \) in (1).

1.2 The Super-Resolution Framework

Tensor decomposition is an extremely challenging problem [26]. This is because we lack proper theories for basic tensor concepts and operations such as singular values, vectors, and singular value decompositions. To address these challenging issues, we will consider a super-resolution framework for tensor decomposition. More precisely, we can view tensor decomposition as a problem of measure estimation from moments. This is because we can rewrite the tensor decomposition (1) as a integral on the unit spheres \( \mathbb{K} := S^{n_1-1} \times S^{n_2-1} \times S^{n_3-1} \):

\[
T = \int_{\mathbb{K}} u \otimes v \otimes w \ d \mu^*.
\]  

(2)

and then the problem of retrieving the rank-1 tensor factors \( \{(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)\} \) from the observed tensor entries in \( T \) is equivalent to recovering a linear combination of Dirac measures defined on the unit spheres \( \mathbb{K} \):

\[
\mu^* = \sum_{p=1}^{r} \lambda_p^* \delta(u - u_p^*, v - v_p^*, w - w_p^*)
\]  

(3)

Several advantages are offered by this super-resolution framework. First, it provides a natural way to extend the \( \ell_1 \) norm minimization in finding sparse representations for finite dictionaries [18] to tensor decomposition. By viewing the set of rank-1 tensors \( \mathcal{A} = \{u \otimes v \otimes w : (u, v, w) \in \mathbb{K}\} \) as a dictionary with an infinite number of atoms, this formulation allows us to find a sparse\(^1\) representation of \( T \) by minimizing the \( \ell_1 \) norm of the representation coefficients with respect to the dictionary \( \mathcal{A} \). More precisely, we recover \( \mu^* \) from the tensor \( T \) by solving a continuous analog of \( \ell_1 \) norm minimization (a.k.a. the total mass minimization over the space of measures)

\[
\text{minimize } \mu(\mathbb{K}) \text{ subject to } T = \int_{\mathbb{K}} u \otimes v \otimes w \ d \mu
\]  

(4)

where \( \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{K}) \) is the set of (nonnegative) Borel measures on \( \mathbb{K} \), and \( \mu(\mathbb{K}) \) is the total measure/mass of the set \( \mathbb{K} \) measured by the Borel measure \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{K}) \). Second, the optimal value of the total mass minimization defines precisely the tensor nuclear norm [22, Proposition 3.1], which is a special case of atomic norms [16, Eq. (2)] corresponding to the atomic set \( \mathcal{A} \). The tensor nuclear norm is useful in many tensor inverse problems, such as, tensor completion [7], robust tensor principal component analysis [33], and stable tensor recovery [48].

\(^1\) The decomposition (1) is sparse, because in most practical scenarios, we are interested in the case where \( r \) is much smaller than the product \( n_1 n_2 n_3 \).
2 Main Results

The main focus of this work is on characterizing the conditions when the tensor factors \{(u_p^r, v_p^r, w_p^r)\}_{p=1}^r correspond to the unique optimal solution of the continuous analog of \(\ell_1\) norm minimization (4), which is extension of the incoherence condition in matrix completion problem [14], the minimum separation condition in mathematical super-resolution [13], and the wrap-around distance condition in line spectral estimation [43]. More precisely, we develop the following three assumptions, namely, incoherence condition, bounded spectral norm condition, and Gram isometry condition. For ease of exposition, in what follows, these assumptions and the main result of this work will be presented for square tensors with \(n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = n\).

Assumption I: Incoherence condition. The tensor factors are incoherent, i.e., the incoherence \(\Delta\) defined below satisfies

\[
\Delta := \max_{p \neq q} \max \{ |\langle u_p^r, u_q^r \rangle|, |\langle v_p^r, v_q^r \rangle|, |\langle w_p^r, w_q^r \rangle| \} \leq \frac{\tau(\log n)}{\sqrt{n}},
\]

where \(\tau(\cdot)\) is a polynomial function of its argument\(^2\).

Assumption II: Bounded spectral norm condition. Assume

\[
\max \{ \|U\|, \|V\|, \|W\| \} \leq 1 + c \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}}
\]

for some constant \(c > 0\), where \(U := [u_1 \cdots u_n^r], V := [v_1 \cdots v_n^r],\) and \(W := [w_1 \cdots w_n^r]\).

Assumption III: Gram isometry condition. The Hadamard product (denoted as \(\odot\)) of the Gram matrices of \(U\) and \(V\) satisfies an isometric condition:

\[
\| (U^\top U) \odot (V^\top V) - I \| \leq \kappa(\log n) \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}},
\]

where \(\kappa(\cdot)\) is a polynomial. Similar bounds hold for \(U, W,\) and \(V, W\) (without loss of generality with the same polynomial \(\kappa(\cdot)\)).

With these assumptions, we are ready to address the super-resolution framework for tensor decomposition in the following theorem:

**Theorem 1** Suppose the target tensor \(\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n \times n}\) admits a decomposition (1) with the normalized tensor factors \(\{(u_p^r, v_p^r, w_p^r)\}_{p=1}^r\) satisfying Assumptions I, II, III and

\[
\frac{r}{n} \leq \frac{17/16}{32c^2 \sqrt{15 \tau(\log n)}}
\]

with the polynomial \(\tau(\cdot)\) given in (5), the constant \(c\) given in (6), and \(n\) being large enough. Then the true factors \(\{(u_p^r, v_p^r, w_p^r)\}_{p=1}^r\) correspond to the unique optimal solution of the continuous analog of \(\ell_1\) norm minimization (4) up to a sign ambiguity.

We note that Assumptions I, II and III hold with high probability if the tensor factors \(\{(u_p^r, v_p^r, w_p^r)\}_{p=1}^r\) are generated independently according to uniform distributions on the unit spheres [1, Lemmas 25, 31].

**Corollary 1** If we have the tensor decomposition (1) with the true tensor factors \(\{(u_p^r, v_p^r, w_p^r)\}_{p=1}^r\) uniformly distributed on the unit spheres, and if \(r\) satisfies (8), then with high probability, the true tensor factors correspond to the unique optimal solution of the continuous analog of \(\ell_1\) norm minimization (4) up to a sign ambiguity.

We close this section with some comments on Theorem 1 and Corollary 1.

**Remark 1** Tensor decomposition using total mass minimization is an atomic decomposition problem [16, Section 2.2], which studies the conditions under which a decomposition in terms of atoms in an atomic set \(\mathcal{A}\) achieves the corresponding atomic norm. For example, the singular value decomposition is an atomic decomposition for the set of unit-norm, rank-1 matrices. As shown in [41], for a large class of atomic sets, only decompositions composed of sufficiently different atoms are valid atomic decompositions. In particular, a necessary condition for tensor atomic decomposition is that the incoherence \(\Delta\) defined in (5) is less than \(\cos(\frac{\pi}{3})\) [45, Theorem 2]. However, our sufficient incoherence condition (5) is still significantly stronger than this necessary condition.

\(^2\) Hence \(\tau(\log n)\) is a polylogarithmic function of \(n\).
Remark 2 The tensor decomposition with the smallest number of rank-1 tensors is called a Canonical Polyadic (CP) decomposition and the corresponding number of rank-1 tensors is the CP-rank of the tensor, or simply the rank of the tensor. The number of factors \( r \) achieved in the optimal solution of the total mass minimization (4) may be different from the CP rank, which is called the tensor nuclear rank [22, Eq. (4.3)], the optimal value of the total mass minimization (4) defines the tensor nuclear norm, and the according tensor decomposition is a tensor nuclear decomposition.

Remark 3 Since \( r \) could be as large as \( O(n^{17/16}/\sqrt{\tau \log n}) \gg n \) (i.e., the number of factors \( r \) could be far more than the dimension \( n \)), the developed super-resolution framework can resolve an even overcomplete number of tensor factors.

Remark 4 Assumptions I-III are reasonable since they are satisfied with high probability for tensor factors uniformly lying on the unit spheres [1, Lemmas 25, 31]. Moreover, it is well-known that the incoherence for an over-complete matrix \( \mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2 \cdots \mathbf{u}_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r} \) with \( n \leq r \) is bounded below: \( \max_{p \neq q} |\langle \mathbf{u}_p, \mathbf{u}_q \rangle| \geq \sqrt{\frac{r-n}{r(r-1)}} \) [21, Chapter 1.3] and the upper bound in Assumption I is clearly larger than this lower bound for properly defined polynomial \( \tau(\cdot) \).

Remark 5 The sign ambiguity is inherent in the problem formulation. In particular, we can replace the factor \( (\mathbf{u}_p^*, \mathbf{v}_p^*, \mathbf{w}_p^*) \) with \( (a_p \mathbf{u}_p^*, b_p \mathbf{v}_p^*, c_p \mathbf{w}_p^*) \) without changing the decomposition (1), provided that \( |a_p| = |b_p| = |c_p| = 1 \) and \( a_p b_p c_p = 1 \) (there are four such \( (a_p, b_p, c_p) \) for each \( p \)). However, this transformation gives rise to different measure representations \( \mu' \) of the decomposition (there are \( 4^r \) of them). Therefore, the optimal solutions to (4) can only be unique up to this form of ambiguity.

Remark 6 It is worth commenting on the relationship between Theorem 1 and the classical Kruskal’s uniqueness theorem for tensor decompositions. The Kruskal rank of matrix \( \mathbf{U} \) of size \( n \times r \) is defined as the maximal number \( kU \) such that any \( kU \) columns of \( \mathbf{U} \) are linearly independent. Kruskal’s theorem states that if \( r \) in the expansion (1) satisfies

\[
r \leq \frac{1}{2}(kU + kV + kW) - 1,
\]

then \( \mathbf{T} \) has a unique rank-\( r \) decomposition (up to permutation and sign ambiguities). Since the inequalities \( kU \leq n \), \( kV \leq n \), and \( kW \leq n \) are achievable for generic matrices \( \mathbf{U} \), \( \mathbf{V} \) and \( \mathbf{W} \) in \( \mathbb{R}^{n \times r} \), Kruskal’s theorem ensures an unique decomposition involving up to \( r = \frac{3}{2}n - 1 \) rank-1 (generic) factors. Note that our result holds for \( r \) up to the order \( n^{17/16} \), which can be significantly larger than \( \frac{3}{2}n \) for large \( n \). Recently, the Kruskal rank \( r \) is improved to order \( O(n^2) \) in [9, Corollary 6.2]. Our result on \( r \) still cannot match this bound. One might wonder whether Theorem 1 is trivial given the uniqueness of the decomposition. The caveat here is that the uniqueness holds when the decomposition involves exactly \( r \) terms, while the tensor nuclear norm, i.e., the optimal value of (4), can potentially be achieved by decompositions involving more than \( r \), even an infinite number of terms. In fact, the formulation takes into account decompositions with continuous supports. Theorem 1 excludes such possibility under the given conditions.

3 Prior Art and Inspirations

Despite the advantages provided by tensor methods in many applications, their widespread adoption has been slow due to inherent computational intractability. Although the decomposition (1) is a multi-mode generalization of the singular value decomposition for matrices, extracting the decomposition from a given tensor is a nontrivial problem that is still under active investigation (cf. [17, 30]). Indeed, even determining the rank of a third-order tensor is an NP-hard problem [26]. A common strategy used to compute a tensor decomposition is to apply an alternating minimization scheme. Although efficient, this approach has the drawback of not providing global convergence guarantees [17]. Recently, an approach combining alternating minimization with power iteration has gained popularity due to its ability to guarantee the tensor decomposition results under certain assumptions [1, 29].

Tensor decomposition is a special case of atomic decomposition which is to determine when a decomposition with respect to some given atomic set \( \mathcal{A} \) achieves the atomic norm [16]. For finite atomic sets, it is now well-known that if the atoms satisfy certain conditions such as the restricted isometry property, then a sparse decomposition achieves the atomic norm [12]. For the set of rank-1, unit-norm matrices, the atomic norm (the matrix nuclear norm), is achieved by orthogonal decompositions [36]. When the atoms are complex sinusoids parameterized by
the frequency, Candès and Fernandez-Granda showed that atomic decomposition is solved by atoms with well-separated frequencies [13]. Similar separation conditions also show up when the atoms are translations of a known waveform [6, 44], spherical harmonics [5], and radar signals parameterized by translations and modulations [25]. Tang and Shah in [45] employed the same atomic norm idea but focused on symmetric tensors. In addition, the result of [45] does not apply to overcomplete decompositions. Under a set of conditions, including the incoherence condition ensuring the separation of tensor factors, this work characterizes a class of nonsymmetric and overcomplete tensor decompositions that achieve the tensor nuclear norm $\|T\|_\text{nuc}$.

Another closely related line of work is matrix completion and tensor completion. Low-rank matrix completion and recovery based on the idea of nuclear norm minimization has received a great deal of attention in recent years [14, 35, 36]. A direct generalization of this approach to tensors would have been using tensor nuclear norm to perform low-rank tensor completion and recovery. However, this approach was not pursued due to the NP-hardness of computing the tensor nuclear norm [26] and the lack of analysis tools for tensor problems. The mainstream tensor completion approaches are based on various forms of matricization and application of matrix completion to the flattened tensor [7, 23, 34]. Alternating minimization can also be applied to tensor completion and recovery with performance guarantees established in recent work [28].

In contrast, we expect that the atomic norm, when specialized to tensors, will achieve the information theoretical limit for tensor completion as it does for compressive sensing, matrix completion [35], and line spectral estimation with missing data [43]. Given a set of atoms, the atomic norm is an abstraction of $\ell_1$-type regularization that favors simple models. Using the notion of descent cones, Chandrasekaran et al. in [16] argued that the atomic norm is the best possible convex proxy for recovering simple models. Particularly, atomic norms are shown in many problems beyond compressive sensing and matrix completion to be able to recover simple models from minimal number of linear measurements. For example, when specialized to the atomic set formed by complex exponentials, the atomic norm can recover signals having sparse representations in the continuous frequency domain with the number of measurements approaching the information theoretic limit without noise [43], as well as achieving near minimax denoising performance [42].

Continuous frequency estimation using the atomic norm is also an instance of measure estimation from (trigonometric) moments.

## 4 Tensor Decomposition, Atomic Norms, and Duality

### 4.1 A Super-resolution Framework for Tensor Decomposition

In this work, we view tensor decomposition in the frameworks of both atomic norms and measure estimation. The unit sphere of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $S^{n-1}$, and the direct product of three unit spheres $S^{n-1} \times S^{n-1} \times S^{n-1}$ by $K$. The tensor atomic set is denoted by $A = \{u \otimes v \otimes w : (u, v, w) \in K\}$ parameterized by the set $K$, where $u \otimes v \otimes w$ is a rank-1 tensor with the $(i, j, k)$th entry being $u_{i} v_{j} w_{k}$. For any tensor $T$, its atomic norm with respect to $A$ is defined by [16, Eq. (2)]

$$
\|T\|_A = \inf \{ t : T \in t \text{ conv}(A) \} = \inf \left\{ \sum_p \lambda_p : T = \sum_p \lambda_p u_p \otimes v_p \otimes w_p, \lambda_p > 0, (u_p, v_p, w_p) \in K \right\},
$$

where $\text{conv}(A)$ is the convex hull of the atomic set $A$, and a scalar multiplying a set scales every element in the set. Therefore, the tensor atomic norm is the minimal $\ell_1$ norm of its expansion coefficients among all valid expansions in terms of unit-norm, rank-1 tensors. The atomic norm $\|T\|_A$ defined in (9) is also called the tensor nuclear norm and denoted by $\|T\|_\text{nuc}$ in [22, Eq. (2.7)]. We will use these two names and notations interchangeably in the following.

The way of defining the tensor nuclear norm is precisely the same as that of defining the matrix nuclear norm.

We argue that the two lines in the definition (9) are consistent and are also equivalent to (4) as follows. Since $\text{conv}(A) = \{ T : T = \int_K u \otimes v \otimes w \, d \mu, \mu \in M_+(K), \mu(K) \leq 1 \}$, the first line in the definition (9) implies that $\|T\|_A$ is equal to the optimal value of (4). Compared with the measure optimization (4), the feasible region of the minimization defining the atomic norm in the second line of (9) is restricted to discrete measures. However, these two optimizations share the same optimal value as a consequence of Carathéodory’s convex hull theorem, which states that if a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ lies in the convex hull of a set, then $x$ can be written as a convex combination.
of at most \( d + 1 \) points of that set [4, Theorem 2.3]. Since \( \mathcal{T} \in \| \mathcal{T} \|_{A_{\text{conv}}} = \text{conv}(\| \mathcal{T} \|_{A_A}) \), \( \mathcal{T} \) can be expressed as a convex combination of at most \( n^3 + 1 \) points of the set \( \| \mathcal{T} \|_{A_A} \), implying that the optimal value is achieved by a discrete measure with support size at most \( n^3 + 1 \). This argument establishes that the two lines in (9) as well as the measure optimization (4) are equivalent. Therefore, the atomic norm framework and the measure optimization framework are two different formulations of the same problem, with the former setting the stage in the finite dimensional space and the latter in the infinite-dimensional space of measures.

Given an abstract atomic set, the problem of atomic decomposition seeks the conditions under which a decomposition in terms of the given atoms achieves the atomic norm. In this sense, the tensor decomposition considered in this work is an atomic decomposition problem.

4.2 Duality

Duality plays an important role in analyzing atomic tensor decomposition. We again approach duality from both perspectives of atomic norms and measure estimation.

First, we find the dual problem of the optimization problem (4). Given \( \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n \times n} \), we define the tensor inner product \( \langle \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{T} \rangle := \sum_{i,j,k} Q_{ijk} T_{ijk} \). Standard Lagrangian analysis shows that the dual problem of (4) is the following semi-infinite program, which has an infinite number of constraints:

\[
\text{maximize } \langle \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{T} \rangle \\
\text{subject to } \langle \mathcal{Q}, u \otimes v \otimes w \rangle \leq 1, \forall (u, v, w) \in \mathcal{K} \tag{10}
\]

The polynomial \( q(u, v, w) := \langle \mathcal{Q}, u \otimes v \otimes w \rangle = \sum_{i,j,k} Q_{ijk} u_{ij} v_{jk} w_k \) corresponding to a dual feasible solution \( \mathcal{Q} \) of (10) is called a dual polynomial. The dual polynomial associated with an optimal dual solution can be used to certify the optimality of a particular decomposition, as demonstrated by the following proposition.

**Proposition 1** Suppose the set of rank-1 tensors \( \{ u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* \}_{p=1}^r \) given in (1) is linearly independent. If there exists a dual solution \( \mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n \times n} \) to (10) such that the corresponding dual polynomial \( q : \mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{R} \)

\[
q(u, v, w) := \langle \mathcal{Q}, u \otimes v \otimes w \rangle \tag{11}
\]

satisfies the following Boundedness and Interpolation Property (BIP):

\[
q(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*) = 1 \quad \text{for } p \in [r] \quad \text{(Interpolation)} \tag{12a}
\]

\[
q(u, v, w) < 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{K} \setminus S^* \quad \text{(Boundedness)} \tag{12b}
\]

where \( [r] := \{1, \ldots, r\} \) and

\[
S^* := \{ (a_p, u_p^*, b_p, v_p^*, c_p, w_p^*) : |a_p| = |b_p| = |c_p| = a_p b_p c_p = 1, p \in [r] \}, \tag{13}
\]

then \( \mu^* \) given in (3) is the unique optimal solution to (4) up to sign ambiguity.

**Proof** In view of (10), any \( \mathcal{Q} \) that satisfies the BIP in (12) is a dual feasible solution. We also have

\[
\langle \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{T} \rangle = \left\langle \mathcal{Q}, \sum_{p=1}^r \lambda_p^* u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* \right\rangle = \sum_{p=1}^r \lambda_p^* q(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*) = \mu^*(\mathcal{K})
\]

establishing a zero-duality gap of the primal-dual feasible solution \( (\mu^*, \mathcal{Q}) \). As a consequence, \( \mu^* \) is a primal optimal solution to (4) and \( \mathcal{Q} \) is a dual optimal solution to (10).

For uniqueness, suppose \( \hat{\mu} \) is another primal optimal solution to (4). If \( \hat{\mu}(\mathcal{K} \setminus S^*) > 0 \), then

\[
\langle \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{T} \rangle = \left\langle \mathcal{Q}, \int_{\mathcal{K}} u \otimes v \otimes w \ d \hat{\mu} \right\rangle = \sum_{(u,v,w) \in S^*} \hat{\mu}(u, v, w) q(u, v, w) + \int_{\mathcal{K} \setminus S^*} q(u, v, w) \ d \hat{\mu} < \hat{\mu}(S^*) + \int_{\mathcal{K} \setminus S^*} 1 \ d \hat{\mu} = \hat{\mu}(\mathcal{K})
\]

contradicting the optimality of \( \hat{\mu} \). So all optimal solutions are supported on \( S^* \). To remove the sign ambiguity, we can assume an optimal solution is supported on \( \{ u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* \}_{p=1}^r \). Since \( \{ u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* \}_{p=1}^r \) is linearly independent by assumption, the coefficients \( \lambda_p^* \) can be uniquely determined from solving the linear system of equations encoded in \( T = \sum_{p=1}^r \lambda_p^* u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* \). This proves the uniqueness (up to sign ambiguity).
4.3 Dual Certificate and Subdifferential

The dual optimal solution \( \mathcal{Q} \) satisfying the BIP is called a dual certificate, which is used frequently as the starting point to derive several atomic decomposition and super-resolution results [5, 13, 43, 45]. In Section 5, we will explicitly construct a dual certificate to prove Theorem 1. In this subsection, we will relate the dual certificate with the subdifferential of the tensor nuclear norm.

First, the dual norm of the tensor nuclear norm, i.e., the tensor spectral norm, of a tensor \( \mathcal{Q} \) is given by

\[
\| \mathcal{Q} \| := \sup_{\| T \|_* \leq 1} \langle \mathcal{Q}, T \rangle = \sup_{(u,v,w) \in \mathbb{K}} \langle \mathcal{Q}, u \otimes v \otimes w \rangle. \tag{14}
\]

The equality is due to the fact that the atomic set \( \mathcal{A} \) are the extreme points of the unit nuclear norm ball \( \{ T : \| T \|_* \leq 1 \} \). In light of the spectral norm definition, we rewrite the dual problem (10) as

\[
\text{maximize } \langle \mathcal{Q}, T \rangle \text{ subject to } \| \mathcal{Q} \| \leq 1 \tag{15}
\]

which is precisely the definition of the dual norm of the tensor spectral norm, i.e., the tensor nuclear norm.

The subdifferential (the set of subgradients) of the tensor nuclear norm is defined by [21, Definition B.20]

\[
\partial \| \cdot \|_* (T) = \{ \mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n \times n} : \| \mathcal{R} \|_* \geq \| T \|_* + \langle \mathcal{R} - T, \mathcal{Q} \rangle, \text{ for all } \mathcal{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n \times n} \}, \tag{16}
\]

which has an equivalent representation [47, Section 1]

\[
\partial \| \cdot \|_* (T) = \{ \mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n \times n} : \| \mathcal{R} \|_* = \langle \mathcal{Q}, T \rangle, \| \mathcal{Q} \| \leq 1 \}. \tag{17}
\]

For \( T \) having an atomic decomposition given in (1), it can be established that the defining properties of subdifferential (17) are equivalent to

\[
\langle \mathcal{Q}, u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* \rangle = 1, \text{ for } p \in [r] \tag{18a}
\]

\[
\langle \mathcal{Q}, u \otimes v \otimes w \rangle \leq 1, \text{ for } (u, v, w) \in \mathbb{K} \tag{18b}
\]

We recognize that the BIP in (12) is a strengthened version of the subdifferential conditions (18). Therefore, a dual certificate, i.e., any \( \mathcal{Q} \) satisfying the BIP, is an element of the subdifferential \( \partial \| \cdot \|_* (T) \). The BIP in fact means that \( \mathcal{Q} \) is an interior point of \( \partial \| \cdot \|_* (T) \). Our proof strategy for Theorem 1 is to construct such an interior point in Section 5. This is in contrast to the matrix case, for which we have an explicit characterization of the entire subdifferential of the nuclear norm using the singular value decomposition (more explicit than the one given in (17)). More specifically, suppose \( X = UV^\top \) is the (compact) singular value decomposition of \( X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \) with \( U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \), \( V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r} \) and \( \Sigma \) being an \( r \times r \) diagonal matrix. Then the subdifferential of the matrix nuclear norm at \( X \) is given by [36, Eq. (2.9)]

\[
\partial \| \cdot \|_* (X) = \{ UV^\top + W : U^\top U = 0, WV = 0, \| W \| \leq 1 \}.
\]

It is challenging to obtain such a characterization for tensors unless the tensor admits an orthogonal rank-1 decomposition.

4.4 Extension: Regularization Using Tensor Nuclear Norm

Independent from practical considerations, we investigate tensor decomposition for theoretical reasons. Similar to regularizing matrix inverse problems using the matrix nuclear norm, the tensor nuclear norm can be used to regularize tensor inverse problems. Suppose we observe an unknown low-rank tensor \( T^* \) through the linear measurement model \( y = B(T^*) \), we would like to recover the tensor \( T^* \) from the observation \( y \). For instance, when \( B \) samples the individual entries of \( T^* \), we are looking at a tensor completion problem. We propose recovering \( T^* \) by solving

\[
\text{minimize } \| T \|_* \text{ subject to } y = B(T) \tag{19}
\]

which favors a low-rank solution. To establish recoverability, we can construct a dual certificate \( \mathcal{Q} \) of the form \( B^*(\lambda) \), whose corresponding dual polynomial satisfies the BIP. Here \( B^* \) is the adjoint operator of \( B \). When the operator \( B \) is random, the concentration of measure guarantees that we can construct a dual certificate \( B^*(\lambda) \) that
is close to the one constructed in the full data case. This fact can then be exploited to verify the BIP of $B^*(\lambda)$ and to establish exact recovery. When the atoms are complex exponentials parameterized by continuous frequencies, this strategy is adopted to establish the compressed sensing off the grid result (the completion problem) [43] building upon the dual polynomial constructed for the super-resolution problem (the full data case) [13]. It shows that the number of random linear measurements required for exact recovery approaches the information theoretical limit. In addition to exact recovery from noise-free measurements, the dual certificate for the full data case can also be utilized to derive near-minimax denoising performance [8,42], approximate support recovery [19,32], and robust recovery from observations corrupted by outliers [20,46]. We expect that the dual polynomial constructed for tensor decomposition will play a similar role for tensor inverse problems, enabling the development of tensor results parallel to their matrix counterparts such as matrix completion, denoising, and robust principal component analysis. We leave these as our future work.

5 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof of Theorem 1 relies on the construction of a dual polynomial that satisfies the Boundedness and Interpolation Property (12). The constructed dual polynomial is also essential to the development of tensor completion and denoising using the atomic norm approach.

5.1 Proof Outline

The key is to show the constructed dual polynomial satisfies the BIP (12). Towards that end, we first partition $\mathbb{K}$ into the far region (controlled by Lemma 4) and the near region. To control the dual polynomial in the near region, we use an angular parameterization to further divide it into near vertex region (controlled by Lemma 6) and near band region (controlled by Lemma 7). In the end, we can show the constructed dual polynomial satisfies the BIP in the whole region $\mathbb{K}$. See Fig. 1 for the proof outline.

5.2 Minimal Energy Construction

Since the BIP in (12) (especially the Boundedness property (12b)) is hard to enforce directly, we start from a candidate dual certificate or pre-certificate $\mathcal{Q}$ in the subdifferential set $\partial \|T\|_*$ defined by (18):

$$\langle \mathcal{Q}, u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* \rangle = 1, \text{ for } p \in [r]$$

$$\langle \mathcal{Q}, u \otimes v \otimes w \rangle \leq 1, \text{ for } (u, v, w) \in \mathbb{K}$$
which essentially characterizes the optimal solution set of following optimization

\[
\max_{(u,v,w) \in \mathbb{R}} (Q, u \otimes v \otimes w)
\]  

(20)

Then applying the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions to the constrained optimization (20), we can further relax the subdifferential conditions (18) to a set of linear constraints.

**Lemma 1** The following conditions are necessary for (18):

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{j,k} Q_{ijk} v_p(j) w_p^*(k) &= u_p^*(i), \forall i \in [n], \forall p \in [r]; \\
\sum_{i,k} Q_{ijk} u_p^*(i) w_p^*(k) &= v_p^*(j), \forall i \in [n], \forall p \in [r]; \\
\sum_{i,j} Q_{ijk} u_p^*(i) v_p^*(j) &= w_p^*(k), \forall i \in [n], \forall p \in [r]
\end{align*}
\]

or in tensor notation

\[
\begin{align*}
Q \times_2 v_p \times_3 w_p^* &= u_p^*, \forall p \in [r]; \\
Q \times_1 u_p^* \times_3 w_p^* &= v_p^*, \forall p \in [r]; \\
Q \times_1 u_p^* \times_2 v_p &= w_p^*, \forall p \in [r]
\end{align*}
\]

(21)

where \{\times_k\} are the k-mode tensor-vector products [30] whose definitions are apparent from context.

The proof of Lemma 1 is given in Appendix A.

Apparently, the subdifferential conditions (18) is necessary for the BIP (12), but generally not sufficient, by comparing the second line of (18) and the Boundedness Property (12b). Indeed, as we argued before, any \(Q\) satisfying the BIP is an interior point of the subdifferential \(\partial \| \cdot \|_\infty(T)\). To satisfy the Boundedness Property (12b), we further minimize the energy \(\|Q\|_F^2 = \sum_{i,j,k} Q_{ijk}^2\) in the hope that this will push \(q(u, v, w)\) towards zero such that \(Q\) is an interior point of \(\partial \| \cdot \|_\infty(T)\). Thus, we propose solving the following minimum-energy problem to obtain a pre-certificate:

\[
\min_Q \frac{1}{2} \|Q\|_F^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad (21)
\]

(22)

**Lemma 2** (Explicit form of the pre-certificate) The solution of the least-norm problem (22) has the form (normal equation)

\[
Q = \sum_{p=1}^r (\alpha_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* + u_p^* \otimes \beta_p^* \otimes v_p^* + u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes \gamma_p^*)
\]

(23)

with the unknown coefficients \(\{\alpha_p^*, \beta_p^*, \gamma_p^*\}_{p=1}^r\) being chosen such that \(Q\) in (23) satisfies (21). So we get an explicit form of a pre-certificate

\[
q(u, v, w) = (Q, u \otimes v \otimes w) = \sum_{p=1}^r [(\alpha_p^*, u) (v_p^*, v) (w_p^*, w) + (u_p^*, u) (v_p^*, v) (w_p^*, w) + (u_p^*, u) (v_p^*, v) (\gamma_p^*, w)]
\]

(24)

The proof of Lemma 2 is given in Appendix B.

To obtain some intuition of what these dual-polynomial coefficients \(\{\alpha_p^*, \beta_p^*, \gamma_p^*\}_{p=1}^r\) would look like, let us assume \(\{u_p^*\}_{p=1}^r, \{v_p^*\}_{p=1}^r, \{w_p^*\}_{p=1}^r\) are almost orthogonal and plug the explicit form of \(Q\) (23) into the first equation in (21)

\[
\alpha_p^* + u_p^* (\beta_p^* v_p^*) + u_p^* (\gamma_p^* w_p^*) \approx u_p^*
\]

(25)

Then multiplying \(u_p^*\) on both sides gives

\[
(\alpha_p^*, u_p^*) + (\beta_p^*, v_p^*) + (\gamma_p^*, w_p^*) \approx 1.
\]

(26)

Finally combining (25) and (26) together with the symmetry property of (23), we get these coefficients \(\{\alpha_p^*, \beta_p^*, \gamma_p^*\}_{p=1}^r\) are located approximately at \(\{u_p^*/3, v_p^*/3, w_p^*/3\}_{p=1}^r\). The accurate description of this phenomenon is given by the following lemma with the proof listed in Appendix C.
Lemma 3 (Control the dual polynomial coefficients) Under Assumptions II and III together with \( r = o(n^2 / \kappa (\log n)^2) \), the following estimates are valid for sufficiently large \( n \):

\[
\| A - \frac{1}{3} U \| \leq 2\kappa (\log n) \left( \frac{\sqrt{r}}{n} + c \frac{r}{n^{1+\gamma}} \right);
\]

\[
\| B - \frac{1}{3} V \| \leq 2\kappa (\log n) \left( \frac{\sqrt{r}}{n} + c \frac{r}{n^{1+\gamma}} \right);
\]

\[
\| C - \frac{1}{3} W \| \leq 2\kappa (\log n) \left( \frac{\sqrt{r}}{n} + c \frac{r}{n^{1+\gamma}} \right)
\]

where

\[
A = [\alpha_1^*, \cdots, \alpha_r^*], \quad U = [u_1^*, \cdots, u_r^*];
\]

\[
B = [\beta_1^*, \cdots, \beta_r^*], \quad V = [v_1^*, \cdots, v_r^*];
\]

\[
C = [\gamma_1^*, \cdots, \gamma_r^*], \quad W = [w_1^*, \cdots, w_r^*]
\]

and the norm \( \| \cdot \| \) is the matrix spectral norm.

5.3 Far Region

For a parameter \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), the far region is defined by

\[
\mathcal{F}(\delta) := \bigcap_{p=1}^r \{ (u, v, w) \in \mathbb{K} : |\langle u, u_p^* \rangle| \leq \delta \text{ or } |\langle v, v_p^* \rangle| \leq \delta \text{ or } |\langle w, w_p^* \rangle| \leq \delta \},
\]

which consists of points \((u, v, w)\) in \( \mathbb{K} \) that are far away (in the angular sense) from

\[
\hat{S}^* = \{(\pm u_p^*, \pm v_p^*, \pm w_p^*) : p = 1, \ldots, r\}
\]

in at least one coordinate of \((u, v, w)\). For \( n = 3 \) and \( r = 2 \), the far region projected onto the unit sphere \( \{ u : \|u\|_2 = 1 \} \) is shown in Fig. 2.

![Fig. 2 Projection of the far region in the u coordinate. The blue band represents the region \( \{ u : |\langle u, u_1^* \rangle| \leq \delta \} \) that is far away from \( u_1^* \), while the green region \( \{ u : |\langle u, u_2^* \rangle| \leq \delta \} \) is the far-region associated with \( u_2^* \). The far region is their intersection \( \bigcap_{p=1}^r \{ u : |\langle u, u_p^* \rangle| \leq \delta \} \), consisting of the two black diamonds.](image-url)
5.3.1 Controlling in Far Region

Instead of bounding the dual polynomial \( q \) directly, we will bound its absolute value \(|q|\). To obtain some intuition of how to bound it, we rewrite the explicit form (24) as follows

\[
q(u, v, w) = \sum_{p=1}^{r} \left( (\alpha_p^* - \frac{1}{3} u_p^* u) (v_p^*, v) (w_p^*, w) + (u_p^*, u) (\beta_p^* - \frac{1}{3} v_p^* v) (w_p^*, w) + (u_p^*, u) (\gamma_p^* - \frac{1}{3} w_p^* w) \right) + \sum_{p=1}^{r} (u_p^*, u) (v_p^*, v) (w_p^*, w).
\]

The main idea is first using the closeness of \( \{ \alpha_p^*, \beta_p^*, \gamma_p^* \}_{p=1}^{r} \) and \( \{ u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^* \}_{p=1}^{r} \) to bound (29) and then using angular-distance between \( F(\delta) \) and \( (u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*) \), \( \forall p \) to bound (30).

The accurate argument is made by the following lemma with the proof given in Appendix D.

**Lemma 4** (Controlling in Far Region) **Under Assumptions I, II, III, if** \( r \ll n^{1.25} \) **and** \( r \leq \frac{n}{250} \) **for** \( \delta \in (0, \frac{1}{25}] \), **then for sufficiently large** \( n \), **we have** \(|q(u, v, w)| < 1 \) **in** \( F(\delta) \).

5.4 Near Region

For the union of the far and near regions to cover the entire region \( \mathbb{K} \), we define the near region as

\[
\mathcal{N}(\delta) := \mathbb{K} \setminus F(\delta) = \bigcup_{p=1}^{r} \{ (u, v, w) \in \mathbb{K} : |(u_p^*, u)| \geq \delta, |(v_p^*, v)| \geq \delta, |(w_p^*, w)| \geq \delta \} \tag{31}
\]

using De Morgan’s Law. One can also treat the whole near region as a union of all individual ones

\[
\mathcal{N}(\delta) = \bigcup_{p=1}^{r} \mathcal{N}_p(\delta)
\]

with each individual near region defined by

\[
\mathcal{N}_p(\delta) := \{ (u, v, w) \in \mathbb{K} : |(u_p^*, u)| \geq \delta, |(v_p^*, v)| \geq \delta, |(w_p^*, w)| \geq \delta \} \tag{32}
\]

which is composed of all the points that is closed to at least one point in \( S^n \) in all coordinate of \( (u, v, w) \). For \( n = 3, r = 2 \), we plot the near region \( \mathcal{N}_1(\delta) \) projected onto the sphere \( \{ u : \| u \|_2 = 1 \} \) in Fig. 3.

5.4.1 Angular Parameterization of Near Region

In order to show the dual polynomial satisfying the BLP in the entire near region \( \mathcal{N}(\delta) \), we use the “Divide-and-conquer” idea to bound the dual polynomial in each individual near region \( \mathcal{N}_p(\delta) \) for \( p \in [r] \). The main technique used to control each individual near region is applying angular parameterization to each individual near region.

As the domain \( \mathbb{K} \) is essentially a direct product of spheres, we re-parameterize each individual near region \( \mathcal{N}_p(\delta) \) in the angular sense. Without loss of generality, let us consider \( p = 1 \). Pick \( (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{K} \) such that \( x \perp u_1^*, y \perp v_1^*, z \perp w_1^* \) and consider the parameterized points

\[
(u(\theta_1), v(\theta_2), w(\theta_3)) \in \mathbb{K}
\]

with

\[
u(\theta_1) = u_1^* \cos(\theta_1) + x \sin(\theta_1), \\
v(\theta_2) = v_1^* \cos(\theta_2) + y \sin(\theta_2), \\
w(\theta_3) = w_1^* \cos(\theta_3) + z \sin(\theta_3). \tag{33}
\]

When \( \theta_1 \) ranges from 0 to \( \pi \), \( u(\theta_1) \) traces out a 2D semi-circle that starts at \( u_1^* \), passes through \( x \), and finally reaches \( -u_1^* \); while for a fixed \( \theta_1 \in [0, \pi] \), the set \( \bigcup_{x \perp u_1^*} \{ u(\theta_1) \} \) parameterizes all the points on \( S^{n-1} \) having...
The two yellow spherical caps form the near region $N_1(\delta)$ around the point $(u_1^\ast, v_1^\ast, w_1^\ast)$ projected onto the $u$ coordinates. $N_2(\delta)$, which is not shown here, consists of another two spherical caps. The union of $N_1(\delta), N_2(\delta)$ and the far region $F(d)$ shown in Fig. 2 will cover the entire sphere $\{u : \|u\| = 1\}$.

In fact, using this angular parametrization, the individual near region $N_1(\delta)$ in (32) can be expressed as

$$N_1(\delta) = \bigcup_{(x,y,z) : x \perp u_1^\ast, y \perp v_1^\ast, z \perp w_1^\ast} \{(u(\theta_1), v(\theta_2), w(\theta_3)) : |\cos(\theta_i)| \geq \delta, \theta_i \in [0,\pi], i = 1,2,3\}. \quad (34)$$

**Proposition 2 (Near Angular Region)** For any $\delta \in (0,1)$, the near region $N_1(\delta)$ is contained in the following set

$$N_1(\delta) \subset \bigcup_{(x,y,z) : x \perp u_1^\ast, y \perp v_1^\ast, z \perp w_1^\ast} \{(u(\theta_1), v(\theta_2), w(\theta_3)) : (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \in \mathbb{N}(\delta)\} \quad (35)$$
with the near angular region $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ defined by

$$
\mathcal{N}(\delta) := \left\{ (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) : \theta_i \in \left[ 0, \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta \right] \cup \left[ \frac{\pi}{2} + \delta, \pi \right], i = 1, 2, 3 \right\}.
$$

**Proof** Since the function $|\cos(\theta)|$ is symmetric at $\frac{\pi}{2}$ on the interval $[0, \pi]$ and is decreasing on $[0, \pi/2]$, we know that $\{ \theta : |\cos(\theta)| \geq \delta \} \cap [0, \pi] = [0, \arccos(\delta)] \cup \left[ \pi - \arccos(\delta), \pi \right]$. Note that $\arccos(\delta) = \frac{\pi}{2} - \arcsin(\delta)$ and $\delta < \arcsin(\delta)$, so we get $\{ \theta : |\cos(\theta)| \geq \delta \} \cap [0, \pi] \subset \left[ 0, \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta \right] \cup \left[ \frac{\pi}{2} + \delta, \pi \right]$. The inclusion (35) follows from (34) immediately.

The near angular region $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ contains total eight cubes with side length $\frac{\pi}{2} - \delta$, located at the eight corners of the cube $[0, \pi] \times [0, \pi] \times [0, \pi]$. Moreover, one can see that the smaller the parameter $\delta$ is, the larger the near angular region $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ will be. In particular, when $\delta$ approaches to zero, the near angular region $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ becomes the whole cube $\mathcal{N}(0) = [0, \pi] \times [0, \pi] \times [0, \pi]$. The near angular region $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ is plotted in Fig. 5.

![Fig. 5 The eight gray cubes of side-length $\pi/2 - \delta$ at the corners form the near angular region $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$.](image)

### 5.4.2 Angular Parametrization of Dual Polynomial

Evaluating the dual polynomial $q(u, v, w)$ at $(u(\theta_1), v(\theta_2), w(\theta_3))$ in (33), we get the angular dual polynomial $F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) := q(u(\theta_1), v(\theta_2), w(\theta_3))$ as

$$
F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = q(u_1^*, v_1^*, w_1^*) \cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3) + q(u_2^*, v_1^*, z) \cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)
$$

$$
+ q(u_3^*, y, w_1^*) \cos(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3) + q(x, v_1^*, w_1^*) \sin(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3)
$$

$$
+ q(x, v_1^*, z) \sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3) + q(x, y, w_1^*) \sin(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)
$$

$$
+ q(x, y, z) \sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3) + q(x, y, z) \sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3).
$$

Among these 8 terms, the first term is $\cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3)$ since $q(u_1^*, v_1^*, w_1^*) = 1$. The next three terms involving one sine function are zero as, for example,

$$
q(u_1^*, v_1^*, z) = Q \times_1 u_1^* \times_2 v_1^* \times_3 z = w_1^* \times_3 z = w_1^* \top z = 0,
$$

$$
q(u_1^*, y, w_1^*) = 0,
$$

$$
q(x, v_1^*, z) = 0,
$$

$$
q(x, y, w_1^*) = 0,
$$

$$
q(x, y, z) = 0.
$$
where we have used $Q \times 1 \mathbf{u}_1^\ast \times 2 \mathbf{v}_1^\ast = \mathbf{w}_1^\ast$ and the third equality of (21). Hence, we get a more concise form of $F$:

$$F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = \cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3) + q(\mathbf{u}_1^\ast, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \cos(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)$$

$$+ q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}_1^\ast, \mathbf{z}) \sin(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)$$

$$+ q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}_1^\ast) \sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3)$$

$$+ q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3).$$

(37)

By further bounding the other quantities $q(\mathbf{u}_1^\ast, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}), q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}_1^\ast, \mathbf{z}), q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}_1^\ast)$ and $q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$, we get the following lemma to uniformly upper-bound $F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)$ with the proof given in Appendix E.

**Lemma 5 (Upper Bound of Angular Dual Polynomial)** Under Assumptions I, II, III, if $r \leq n^{1.25-1.5\epsilon}$ with $r_c \in (0, \frac{1}{6})$, then for sufficiently large $n$, we have

$$|F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)| \leq |\cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3)| + |\sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)| + \frac{4}{3^n} (\log n) n^{-r_c}.$$

(38)

### 5.4.3 Angular Parametrization of Boundedness and Interpolation Property

By Proposition 2, a sufficient condition for the BIP (12) to hold in the individual near region $\mathcal{N}_1(\delta)$, is the following Angular Boundedness and Interpolation Property (Angular-BIP):

$$F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = 1 \text{ in } S^* \quad \text{(Angular Interpolation)}$$

$$F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) < 1 \text{ in } \mathbb{N}(\delta) \setminus S^* \quad \text{(Angular Boundedness)}$$

with $S^* := \{(0, 0, 0), (0, \pi, \pi), (\pi, 0, \pi), (\pi, \pi, 0)\}$ such that $\mathbf{u}(\theta_1) \otimes \mathbf{v}(\theta_2) \otimes \mathbf{w}(\theta_3) = \mathbf{u}_1^\ast \otimes \mathbf{v}_1^\ast \otimes \mathbf{w}_1^\ast$ for any $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \in S^*$.

Similar as before, the Angular Interpolation property (39a) is a consequence of the construction process. In the rest of the paper, we will focus on showing the Angular Boundedness property (39b). Specifically, we will divide the near angular region into near vertex region and near band region, and then control the angular dual polynomial $F$ in both near vertex region and near band region.

### 5.4.4 Near Vertex Region

The near vertex region, denoted by $\mathcal{N}_v(\delta_v)$, is defined as the union of the eight small cubes all with side length $\delta_v$ in 8 corners of the cube $[0, \pi]^3$. We plot the near vertex region $\mathcal{N}_v(\delta_v)$ in Fig. 6. Comparing with the definition of the near angular region $\mathcal{N}(\cdot)$, the near vertex region is also an angular region but with a different parameter:

$$\mathcal{N}_v(\delta_v) = \mathcal{N}(\frac{\pi}{2} - \delta_v).$$

(40)

Without loss of generality, we can always assume the near vertex region $\mathcal{N}_v(\delta_v)$ is included in the near angular region $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$; otherwise, we only need to show the Angular-BIP holds in $\mathcal{N}_v(\delta_v)$. This assumption together with (40) implies

$$\delta_v \leq \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta.$$

(41)

Note that $\pi/2 - \delta$ is the side length of the corner-cubes in $\mathbb{N}(\delta)$.

**Controlling in Near Vertex Region** To control the angular dual polynomial $F$ in the near vertex region $\mathcal{N}_v(\delta_v)$, we further classify the eight small cubes in $\mathcal{N}_v(\delta_v)$ into two groups depending on if their vertices are in $S^*$ or not.

**Lemma 6 (Controlling in Near Vertex Region)** Under Assumptions I, II, III, if $r \ll n^{1.25}$, then for any $\xi_i \in \left(-\frac{\sqrt{2}-1}{3}, \frac{\sqrt{2}-1}{3}\right)$, we have

$$F(\theta_1 + \xi_1, \theta_2 + \xi_2, \theta_3 + \xi_3) \leq 1$$

(42)

for $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \in \{(0, 0, 0), (0, \pi, \pi), (\pi, 0, \pi), (\pi, \pi, 0)\}$ and

$$F(\theta_1 + \xi_1, \theta_2 + \xi_2, \theta_3 + \xi_3) < 0$$

(43)

for $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \in \{(\pi, \pi, \pi), (\pi, 0, 0), (0, \pi, 0), (0, 0, \pi)\}$. Here, equality in (72) holds only if $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = \xi_3 = 0$.
Fig. 6 The eight colored cubes of size $\delta_v \times \delta_v \times \delta_v$ form the near vertex region $N_v(\delta_v)$: the red ones are corresponding to the vertexes in $S^*$ while the blue ones are corresponding to other vertexes in the cube. Note that these colored corner-cubes are possibly much smaller than those gray ones in Fig. 5, whose side length is $\pi/2 - \delta$.

The proof of Lemma 6 is in Appendix F.

Remark 7 Lemma 6 proves the Angular-BIP holds in the near vertex region $N_v(\delta_v)$ with $\delta_v = \sqrt{\frac{7}{3}}$: $F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = 1$ in $S^*$ $F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) < 1$ in $N_v(\delta_v) \setminus S^*$

5.4.5 Near Band Region

The near band region is introduced to cover the remaining region $N(\delta) \setminus N_v(\delta_v)$. Invoking the definitions of the near angular region (36) and the near vertex region (40):

\[
N(\delta) = \left\{ (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) : \theta_i \in \left[ 0, \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta \right] \cup \left[ \frac{\pi}{2} + \delta, \pi \right] \right\}
\]
\[
N_v(\delta_v) = \left\{ (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) : \theta_i \in [0, \delta_v] \cup [\pi - \delta_v, \pi] \right\}
\]

we have

\[
N(\delta) \setminus N_v(\delta_v) = \left\{ (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) : \theta_i \in \left( \delta_v, \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta \right) \cup \left( \frac{\pi}{2} + \delta, \pi - \delta_v \right) \right\} \cap N(\delta), \tag{44}
\]

which is nonempty since $\delta_v \leq \pi/2 - \delta$ by the assumption (41). We plot the remaining region $N(\delta) \setminus N_v(\delta_v)$ projected onto the $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-coordinates in Fig. 7.

To let the near band region cover $N(\delta) \setminus N_v(\delta_v)$, we define it as

\[
N_b(\delta_b) := \left\{ (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) : \theta_i \in \left( \delta_b, \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta_b \right) \cup \left( \frac{\pi}{2} + \delta_b, \pi - \delta_b \right), i = 1, 2, 3 \right\}. \tag{45}
\]

We plot the near band region $N_b(\delta_b)$ projected onto the $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-coordinates in Fig. 8.

Remark 8 From (44) and (45), we have $N_b(\delta_b)$ covers $N(\delta) \setminus N_v(\delta_v)$ if $\delta_b \leq \min\{\delta_v, \delta\}$, or equivalently,

\[
N(\delta) \subset N_b(\delta_b) \cup N_v(\delta_v), \text{ if } \delta_b \leq \min\{\delta_v, \delta\}. \tag{46}
\]
Controlling in Near Band Region  We start with the uniform upper-bound in Lemma 5:

\[
|F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)| \\
\leq |\cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3)| + |\sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)| + \frac{4}{3} \tau (\log n) n^{-r_c} \\
\leq \frac{1}{3}(|\cos(\theta_1)|^3 + |\cos(\theta_2)|^3 + |\cos(\theta_3)|^3) + \frac{1}{3}(|\sin(\theta_1)|^3 + |\sin(\theta_2)|^3 + |\sin(\theta_3)|^3) + \frac{4}{3} \tau (\log n) n^{-r_c} \\
\leq \frac{1}{3}(|\cos(\theta_i)|^3 + |\sin(\theta_i)|^3) + \frac{2}{3} + \frac{4}{3} \tau (\log n) n^{-r_c}, \forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\}
\]

(47)

where the first inequality follows from (38) in Lemma 5 (under Assumptions I-III and \( r \leq n^{1.25} - 1.5r_c \) with \( r_c \in (0, \frac{1}{n}) \)), the second inequality follows from the inequality of arithmetic and geometric means, and the last one is a consequence of \( |\sin(\theta)|^3 + |\cos(\theta)|^3 \leq 1 \). So, \( |F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)| < 1 \) in \( \mathbb{N}_b(\delta_0) \) if

\[
|\cos(\theta_i)|^3 + |\sin(\theta_i)|^3 < 1 - 4 \tau (\log n) n^{-r_c}
\]

(48)

for some \( i \in \{1, 2, 3\} \). The final result is summarized in the following lemma, with the proof listed in Appendix G.
Lemma 7 (Controlling in Near Band Region) Under Assumptions I, II, III, if \( r \leq n^{1.25-1.5r_c} \) with \( r_c \in (0, \frac{1}{6}) \), then for sufficiently large \( n \), we have \( |F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)| < 1 \) in \( \mathbb{N}_b(\delta_b) \) for \( \delta_b = \sqrt[3]{\frac{80\tau(\log n)^3}{3}n^{-0.5r_c}} \).

5.4.6 Combining the Near Vertex Region and Near Band Region

Finally the Angular-BIP (39) follows from Lemma 6 and Lemma 7 if the union of the near vertex region \( \mathbb{N}_v(\delta_v) \) and the near band region \( \mathbb{N}_b(\delta_b) \) covers the near angular region \( \mathbb{N}(\delta) \):

\[
\mathbb{N}(\delta) \subset \mathbb{N}_v(\delta_v) \cup \mathbb{N}_b(\delta_b).
\]

From (46), this happens when

\[
\delta_b \leq \min\{\delta, \delta_v\},
\]

which is equivalent to

\[
\delta_b \leq \delta, \tag{49}
\]

since

\[
\delta_b = \sqrt[3]{\frac{80\tau(\log n)^3}{3}n^{-0.5r_c}} \ll \frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{3} \delta_v.
\]

Then by Proposition 2, \( q \) satisfies the BIP in \( \mathcal{N}_v(\delta) \). Similar results apply to all individual near region \( \mathcal{N}_p(\delta) \), for \( p \in [r] \). Therefore we claim the BIP holds in the whole near region \( \mathcal{N}(\delta) = \bigcup_{p=1}^{r} \mathcal{N}_p(\delta) \).

Lemma 8 (Near-Region Bound) Under Assumptions I, II, III, if \( r \leq n^{1.25-1.5r_c} \) with \( r_c \in (0, \frac{1}{6}) \), then for sufficiently large \( n \), the dual polynomial \( q \) satisfies the BIP in \( \mathcal{N}(\delta) \) for any \( \delta \geq \delta_b \).

5.5 Combining the Far Region and Near Region

Combining Lemma 4 (for far region) and Lemma 8 (for near region), we conclude that the BIP holds in the whole domain \( \mathbb{K} \) if Assumptions I, II, III are satisfied and

\[
r \leq \frac{n}{24c^2} \delta \quad \text{for } \delta \in \left[\delta_b, \frac{1}{24}\right], \tag{50}
\]

\[
r \leq n^{1.25-1.5r_c} \quad \text{for } \delta_c \in \left(0, \frac{1}{6}\right) \tag{51}.
\]

Then letting \( \delta = \delta_b \) (to maximize \( r \)) and \( \delta_c = \frac{1}{8} \), the requirements on \( r \) ((50) and (51)) are reduced to the desired bound (8):

\[
r \leq n^{17/16} \frac{1}{32c^2 \sqrt{15\tau(\log n)}}.
\]

The proof of Theorem 1 is completed.

6 Application to Tensor Decomposition

Our main theorem shows that when the tensor factors \( \{(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)\}_{p=1}^{r} \) satisfy Assumptions I, II, III, we can recover the tensor decomposition of \( r \) up to the order of \( n^{17/16} \) by solving the convex, infinite-dimensional optimization (4). However, as a measure optimization problem, optimization problem (4) is not directly solvable on a computer. In this section, we first propose a computational method based on the popular Burer-Monteiro factorization method [11] and then test it by numerical experiments.
6.1 Burer-Monteiro Method

When dealing with convex programs involved with a large matrix variable $X$, Burer and Monteiro in [11] proposed factoring the variable $X$ into the product of two smaller rectangular matrices $X = UV^\top$ and then treating them as the new optimization variables. As a typical example, Recht et al. in [36] used this approach to get that the matrix nuclear norm for any $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ equals the optimum value of the following optimization

$$
\min_{U \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times r}, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times r}} \frac{1}{2} (\|U\|^2_F + \|V\|^2_F) \text{ subject to } X = UV^\top
$$

with $\hat{r} \geq \text{rank}(X)$. Similarly, when applying this idea to the tensor nuclear norm, we have the following result.

**Theorem 2** Suppose the decomposition that achieves the tensor nuclear norm $\|\mathcal{T}\|_*$ involves $r$ terms and $\hat{r} \geq r$, then $\|\mathcal{T}\|_*$ is equal to the optimal value of the following optimization:

$$
\min_{\{u_p, v_p, w_p\}_{p=1}^{\hat{r}}} \frac{1}{3} \sum_{p=1}^{\hat{r}} \left( \|u_p\|^2_2 + \|v_p\|^2_2 + \|w_p\|^2_2 \right)
\text{ subject to } \mathcal{T} = \sum_{p=1}^{\hat{r}} u_p \otimes v_p \otimes w_p.

(52)

**Proof** Suppose the tensor nuclear norm is achieved by the decomposition $\mathcal{T} = \sum_{p=1}^{r} \lambda_p u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^*$. Then we note that $\{\lambda_p^{1/3} u_p^*, \lambda_p^{1/3} v_p^*, \lambda_p^{1/3} w_p^*\}_{p=1}^{\hat{r}}$ forms a feasible solution to (52) when $\hat{r} = r$. When $\hat{r} > r$, we can zero-pad the remaining factors $\{u_p, v_p, w_p\}_{p=r+1}^{\hat{r}}$. The objective function value at this feasible solution is $\frac{1}{3}(\sum_{p=1}^{\hat{r}} 3\lambda_p) = \|\mathcal{T}\|_*$. This shows that $\|\mathcal{T}\|_*$ is greater than the optimal value of (52).

To show the other direction, suppose an optimal solution of (52) is $\{u_p, v_p, w_p\}_{p=1}^{\hat{r}}$. Define $\lambda_p := \|u_p\|_2 \|v_p\|_2 \|w_p\|_2$, for $p \in [\hat{r}]$. Then,

$$
\mathcal{T} = \sum_{p: \lambda_p \neq 0} \lambda_p \frac{u_p}{\|u_p\|_2} \otimes \frac{v_p}{\|v_p\|_2} \otimes \frac{w_p}{\|w_p\|_2}.
$$

Finally, by definition of the tensor nuclear/atomic norm (9), we have

$$
\|\mathcal{T}\|_* \leq \sum_{p: \lambda_p \neq 0} \lambda_p = \sum_{p=1}^{\hat{r}} \lambda_p = \sum_{p=1}^{\hat{r}} \|u_p\|_2 \|v_p\|_2 \|w_p\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{3} \sum_{p=1}^{\hat{r}} \left( \|u_p\|^2_2 + \|v_p\|^2_2 + \|w_p\|^2_2 \right),
$$

which is the optimal value of (52). Therefore, the optimal value of (52) is equal to $\|\mathcal{T}\|_*$.

Theorem 2 implies that when an upper bound on $r$ is known, we can solve the nonlinear (and non-convex) program (52) to compute the tensor nuclear norm (and obtain the corresponding decomposition). Numerical simulations suggest that the nonlinear program (52), when solved using the ADMM approach [10], has superior performance and we observe that for tensors generated with uniformly random tensor factors, the decomposition can almost always be recovered by the ADMM implementation of (52).

6.2 Numerical Experiments

Now we perform some numerical results to test the performance of the proposed Burer-Monteiro factorization method. In particular, we will examine the phase transition of the rate of success for the ADMM implementation of the proposed Burer-Monteiro factorization approach (52) with random initialization. The phase transition of the rate of success is plotted in Fig. 9. In preparing this figure, the $r$ tensor factors $\{(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)\}_{p=1}^{r}$ were generated following i.i.d. Gaussian distribution, and then each $u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*$ was normalized to have a unit norm. We set the coefficients $\lambda_p^* = (1 + \varepsilon_p^2)/2$, where $\varepsilon_p$ is chosen from the standard normal distribution, to ensure a minimal coefficient of at least 1/2. With the generated ground-truth factors $\{(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)\}_{p=1}^{r}$ and coefficients $\{\lambda_p^*\}_{p=1}^{r}$, we generated the tensor $\mathcal{T} = \sum_{p=1}^{r} \lambda_p^* u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^*$. To generate the phase transition plot, we varied the dimension $n$ and factor-number $r$, and for each fixed $(r, n)$ pair, 20 instances of such tensor were generated. We then ran the ADMM algorithm for each instance and declared success if the relative recovery error $\text{Err} \left( \{(\hat{u}_p, \hat{v}_p, \hat{w}_p)\}_{p=1}^{r} \right)$
of the output tensor factors \( \{ (\hat{u}_p, \hat{v}_p, \hat{w}_p) \}_{p=1}^r \) (after removing sign and permutation ambiguities) is within \( 10^{-3} \) where

\[
\text{Err} \left( \{ (\hat{u}_p, \hat{v}_p, \hat{w}_p) \}_{p=1}^r \right) := \sum_{p=1}^r \left( \frac{\|\hat{u}_p - u^*_p\|_2}{\|u^*_p\|_2} + \frac{\|\hat{v}_p - v^*_p\|_2}{\|v^*_p\|_2} + \frac{\|\hat{w}_p - w^*_p\|_2}{\|w^*_p\|_2} \right)
\]

From Fig. 9, we observe that the ADMM method has amazingly satisfying performance even when \( r \) is much larger than \( n \).

![Fig. 9 Rate of success using ADMM implementation of (52) for tensor decomposition.](image)

### 7 Conclusion

By explicitly constructing a dual certificate, we derive similar incoherence conditions (as the separation conditions in super-resolution problem) for a tensor decomposition to achieve the tensor nuclear norm. This implies that the infinite dimensional total mass minimization can globally identify those decompositions satisfying the developed incoherence conditions. Computational method based on Burer-Monteiro factorization approach is used to solve the measure optimization. Numerical experiments show that the Burer-Monteiro factorization approach achieves amazingly superior performance. Future work will analyze the nonconvex landscape of the Burer-Monteiro factorization approach.

### References

A Proof of Lemma 1

Lemma 9 (Lemma 1) The following conditions are necessary for (18):

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{j,k} Q_{ijk} v_p^*(j) w_p^*(k) &= u_p^*(i), \forall i \in [n], \forall p \in [r]; \\
\sum_{i,k} Q_{ijk} u_p^*(i) w_p^*(k) &= v_p^*(j), \forall i \in [n], \forall p \in [r]; \\
\sum_{i,j} Q_{ijk} u_p^*(i) v_p^*(j) &= w_p^*(k), \forall i \in [n], \forall p \in [r]
\end{align*}
\]

or in tensor notation

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{Q} \times_2 v_p^* \times_3 w_p^* &= u_p^*, \forall p \in [r]; \\
\mathcal{Q} \times_1 u_p^* \times_2 w_p^* &= v_p^*, \forall p \in [r]; \\
\mathcal{Q} \times_1 u_p^* \times_2 v_p^* &= w_p^*, \forall p \in [r]
\end{align*}
\]

where \{\times_k\} are the k-mode tensor-vector product \cite{30} whose definitions are apparent from context.

Proof From the KKT conditions of the constrained optimization \cite{20}, we have the partial derivatives of its Lagrangian

\[
\mathcal{L}(u, v, w) = \frac{1}{2} ||u||_2^2 - a||v||_2^2 - b||w||_2^2 - c(||u||_2^2 - 1) - \frac{1}{2} (||v||_2^2 - 1) - \frac{1}{2} (||w||_2^2 - 1)
\]

at \(u = u_p^*, v = v_p^*,\) and \(w = w_p^*, p = 1, \ldots, r,\) must vanish. Therefore,

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*, a, b, c)}{\partial u} &= \frac{\partial q(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)}{\partial u} - 2a u_p^* = 0, \\
\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*, a, b, c)}{\partial v} &= \frac{\partial q(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)}{\partial v} - 2b v_p^* = 0, \\
\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*, a, b, c)}{\partial w} &= \frac{\partial q(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)}{\partial w} - 2c w_p^* = 0.
\end{align*}
\]

Hence, \(2a = \left(\frac{\partial q(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)}{\partial u}, u_p^*\right), 2b = \left(\frac{\partial q(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)}{\partial v}, v_p^*\right),\) and \(2c = \left(\frac{\partial q(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*)}{\partial w}, w_p^*\right).\) Note that \(q\) satisfies the Interpolation condition and \(\frac{\partial q(u, v, w)}{\partial u} = \sum_{j,k} Q_{ijk} v_p^*(j) w_p^*(k) = q(u_p^*, v_p^*, w_p^*) = 1.\)

That is \(a = 1/2.\) With similar arguments, one can show that \(b = c = 1/2.\) The conclusion of this lemma follows from (53).

B Proof of Lemma 2

Lemma 10 (Lemma 2) The solution of the least-norm problem \cite{22} has the form (equation 22)

\[
\mathcal{Q} = \sum_{p=1}^{r} \left(\alpha_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* + u_p^* \otimes \beta_p^* \otimes w_p^* + u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes \gamma_p^*\right)
\]

with the unknown coefficients \(\{\alpha_p^*, \beta_p^*, \gamma_p^*\}_{p=1}^{r}\) being chosen such that \(\mathcal{Q}\) in (23) satisfies (21). So we get an explicit form of a pre-certificate

\[
\begin{align*}
q(u, v, w) &= \langle \mathcal{Q}, u \otimes v \otimes w \rangle \\
&= \sum_{p=1}^{r} \left[\langle \alpha_p^*, u \rangle \langle v_p^*, v \rangle \langle w_p^*, w \rangle + \langle u_p^*, u \rangle \langle \beta_p^*, v \rangle \langle w_p^*, w \rangle + \langle u_p^*, u \rangle \langle v_p^*, v \rangle \langle \gamma_p^*, w \rangle\right].
\end{align*}
\]

Proof First, the Lagrangian form of (22) is

\[
\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Q}, \{\alpha_p^*, \beta_p^*, \gamma_p^*\}_{p=1}^{r}) = \frac{1}{2} ||\mathcal{Q}||_2^2 - \sum_{p=1}^{r} \left(\mathcal{Q} \times_1 \alpha_p^* \times_2 v_p^* \times_3 w_p^* + \mathcal{Q} \times_1 u_p^* \times_2 \beta_p^* \times_3 w_p^* + \mathcal{Q} \times_1 u_p^* \times_2 v_p^* \times_3 \gamma_p^*\right)
\]

with the Lagrangian multipliers \(\{\alpha_p^*, \beta_p^*, \gamma_p^*\}_{p=1}^{r}\) to be chosen such that \(\mathcal{Q}\) satisfies (21). Then, by the KKT necessary conditions, the solution of the least-norm problem (22) should satisfy

\[
0 = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Q}, \{\alpha_p^*, \beta_p^*, \gamma_p^*\}_{p=1}^{r})}{\partial \mathcal{Q}}
\]

\[
= \sum_{p=1}^{r} \left(\alpha_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* + u_p^* \otimes \beta_p^* \otimes w_p^* + u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes \gamma_p^*\right).
\]
C Proof of Lemma 3

Lemma 11 (Lemma 3) Under Assumptions II and III together with \( r = o(\sqrt{n}/\kappa((\log n)^2)) \), the following estimates are valid for sufficiently large \( n \):

\[
\|A - \frac{1}{3} U\| \leq 2\kappa(\log n) \left( \frac{\sqrt{r}}{n} + \frac{r}{n^{1.5}} \right); \\
\|B - \frac{1}{3} V\| \leq 2\kappa(\log n) \left( \frac{\sqrt{r}}{n} + \frac{r}{n^{1.5}} \right); \\
\|C - \frac{1}{3} W\| \leq 2\kappa(\log n) \left( \frac{\sqrt{r}}{n} + \frac{r}{n^{1.5}} \right)
\]

where

\[
A = [\alpha_1^*, \cdots, \alpha_r^*], \quad U = [u_1^*, \cdots, u_r^*]; \\
B = [\beta_1^*, \cdots, \beta_r^*], \quad V = [v_1^*, \cdots, v_r^*]; \\
C = [\gamma_1^*, \cdots, \gamma_r^*], \quad W = [w_1^*, \cdots, w_r^*]
\]

and the norm \( \| \cdot \| \) is the matrix spectral norm.

Proof We need to find coefficient vectors \( \{\alpha_p^*, \beta_p^*, \gamma_p^*\}_{p=1}^r \) so that the tensor

\[
Q = \sum_{p=1}^r (\alpha_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* + u_p^* \otimes \beta_p^* \otimes w_p^* + u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes \gamma_p^*)
\]

satisfies (21):

\[
Q \times_2 v_p^* \times_3 w_p^* = u_p^*, \quad \forall p \in [r], \\
Q \times_1 u_p^* \times_3 w_p^* = v_p^*, \quad \forall p \in [r], \\
Q \times_1 u_p^* \times_2 v_p^* = w_p^*, \quad \forall p \in [r],
\]

(54)

C.1 An Iteration Scheme

We adopt the following iterative scheme to find such \( \{\alpha_p^*, \beta_p^*, \gamma_p^*\}_{p=1}^r \):

\[
\alpha_q^{i+1} = \alpha_q^i - \rho (Q \times_2 v_q^* \times_3 w_q^* - u_q^*), \quad q \in [r], \\
\beta_q^{i+1} = \beta_q^i - \rho (Q \times_1 u_q^* \times_3 w_q^* - v_q^*), \quad q \in [r], \\
\gamma_q^{i+1} = \gamma_q^i - \rho (Q \times_1 u_q^* \times_2 v_q^* - w_q^*), \quad q \in [r],
\]

(55)

initialized by \( \alpha_1^0 = \frac{1}{3} u_1^*, \beta_1^0 = \frac{1}{3} v_1^* \), and \( \gamma_1^0 = \frac{1}{3} w_1^* \) with \( q \in [r] \). Here the parameter \( \rho \) is a step size to be chosen later and the tensors

\[
Q_1^i := \sum_{p=1}^r (\alpha_p^i \otimes v_p^i \otimes w_p^i + u_p^i \otimes \beta_p^i \otimes w_p^i + u_p^i \otimes v_p^i \otimes \gamma_p^i), \\
Q_2^i := \sum_{p=1}^r (\alpha_p^i \otimes v_p^i \otimes w_p^i + u_p^i \otimes \beta_p^i \otimes w_p^i + u_p^i \otimes v_p^i \otimes \gamma_p^i), \\
Q_3^i := \sum_{p=1}^r (\alpha_p^i \otimes v_p^i \otimes w_p^i + u_p^i \otimes \beta_p^i \otimes w_p^i + u_p^i \otimes v_p^i \otimes \gamma_p^i).
\]

(56)

Note that the above iterative scheme is for theoretical analysis only as we used \( \{\alpha_p^*, \beta_p^*, \gamma_p^*\}_{p=1}^r \) in the definitions of \( Q_1^i \), \( Q_2^i \) and \( Q_3^i \).

C.2 Convergence Analysis

We next establish the convergence of the iterations (55). Plugging the tensor eigenvalue equations (54) into (55) followed by subtracting the true solutions from both sides yields for \( q \in [r] \)

\[
\alpha_q^{i+1} - \alpha_q^i = \alpha_q - \alpha_q - \rho (Q_1^i - Q_2^i) \times_2 v_q^* \times_3 w_q^*, \\
\beta_q^{i+1} - \beta_q^i = \beta_q - \beta_q - \rho (Q_2^i - Q_3^i) \times_1 u_q^* \times_3 w_q^*, \\
\gamma_q^{i+1} - \gamma_q^i = \gamma_q - \gamma_q - \rho (Q_3^i - Q_1^i) \times_1 u_q^* \times_2 v_q^*.
\]

(57)
Then plugging the definitions of $Q_1^t$, $Q_2^t$, $Q_3^t$ (56) into (57) and using the following matrix notations
\[ A^t := [\alpha_1^t, \ldots, \alpha_t^t], \quad B^t := [\alpha_1^t, \ldots, \alpha_t^t], \quad C^t := [\gamma_1^t, \ldots, \gamma_t^t], \]
we have
\[ A^{t+1} - A = (A^{t} - A)(I - \rho \left[ (V^T V) \otimes (W^T W) \right]), \]
\[ B^{t+1} - B = (B^{t} - B)(I - \rho \left[ (U^T U) \otimes (W^T W) \right]) - \rho V \left[ ((A^{t+1} - A)^T U) \otimes (W^T W) \right], \]
\[ C^{t+1} - C = (C^{t} - C)(I - \rho \left[ (U^T U) \otimes (V^T V) \right]) - \rho W \left[ ((A^{t+1} - A)^T U) \otimes (V^T V) \right] + \left[ (U^T U) \otimes ((B^{t+1} - B)^T V) \right]. \] (58)

Denoting $e^t_a = \|A^t - A\|$, $e^t_b = \|B^t - B\|$, $e^t_c = \|C^t - C\|$ and
\[ \hat{\rho} := \rho \min \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{\min}(V^T V) \otimes (W^T W)}{\lambda_{\min}(U^T U) \otimes (W^T W)}, \frac{\lambda_{\min}(U^T U) \otimes (W^T W)}{\lambda_{\min}(U^T U) \otimes (V^T V)} \right\}, \]
it follows from (58) that
\[ e^{t+1}_a \leq (1 - \hat{\rho})e^t_a, \]
\[ e^{t+1}_b \leq \rho \|U\|V\|W\|^2 e^t_a + (1 - \hat{\rho})e^t_b, \]
\[ e^{t+1}_c \leq \rho \|U\|V\|W\|e^t_a + \rho \|U\|^2 \|V\|\|W\|e^t_b + (1 - \hat{\rho})e^t_c, \] (59)
where we have used triangle inequality and properties of spectral norms such as $\|P \otimes Q\| \leq \|P\| \|Q\|$. Converting (59) into matrix form gives
\[ \begin{bmatrix} e^{t+1}_a \\ e^{t+1}_b \\ e^{t+1}_c \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \hat{\rho} & 0 & 0 \\ \rho \|U\|V\|W\|^2 & 1 - \hat{\rho} & 0 \\ \rho \|U\|V\|W\| \|U\|^2 \|V\|\|W\| & 1 - \hat{\rho} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} e^t_a \\ e^t_b \\ e^t_c \end{bmatrix}, \]
where the lower triangular system matrix share the same value
\[ \eta = 1 - \hat{\rho} \]
\[ \in \left[ 1 - \rho \left( 1 + \frac{\kappa(\log n)^{\sqrt{T}}}{n} \right), 1 - \frac{\kappa(\log n)^{\sqrt{T}}}{n} \right]. \] (60)
where (60) follows from applying Weyl's inequality to (7) in Assumption III and the last line holds for any $\rho \in \left( 0, 1 + \frac{\kappa(\log n)^{\sqrt{T}}}{n} \right)^{-1}$.

**The Conclusion** The error sequence $(e^t_a, e^t_b, e^t_c)$ is convergent to $(0, 0, 0)$ geometrically with a rate $\eta \in (0, 1)$. Thus,
\[ \lim_{t \to \infty} (A^t, B^t, C^t) = (A, B, C). \]

C.3 Convergence of $\{\|A^t - A^{t-1}\|, \|B^t - B^{t-1}\|, \|C^t - C^{t-1}\|\}$

Subtracting the following two consecutive iterations for $\{A^t\}$ in (58):
\[ A^{t+1} - A = (A^{t} - A)(I - \rho \left[ (V^T V) \otimes (W^T W) \right]), \]
\[ A^t - A = (A^{t-1} - A)(I - \rho \left[ (V^T V) \otimes (W^T W) \right]) \]
yields
\[ A^{t+1} - A^t = (A^t - A^{t-1})(I - \rho \left[ (V^T V) \otimes (W^T W) \right]). \]
Similar manipulations applied to $\{B^t\}$ and $\{C^t\}$ lead to
\[ B^{t+1} - B^t = (B^{t} - B^{t-1})(I - \rho \left[ (U^T U) \otimes (W^T W) \right]) - \rho V \left[ ((A^{t+1} - A^{t-1})^T U) \otimes (W^T W) \right], \]
\[ C^{t+1} - C^t = (C^{t} - C^{t-1})(I - \rho \left[ (U^T U) \otimes (V^T V) \right]) - \rho W \left[ ((A^{t+1} - A^{t-1})^T U) \otimes (V^T V) \right] + \left[ (U^T U) \otimes ((B^{t+1} - B^{t-1})^T V) \right]. \]
Defining $e^{t}_a = \|A^t - A^{t-1}\|$, $e^{t}_b = \|B^t - B^{t-1}\|$, $e^{t}_c = \|C^t - C^{t-1}\|$, we can get the same form as (59) and therefore claim that $(\hat{e}^t_a, \hat{e}^t_b, \hat{e}^t_c)$ converge to $(0, 0, 0)$ geometrically with the same rate $\eta \in (0, 1)$ in (60).

---

1 Hadamard product $P \otimes Q$ is a principal submatrix of $P \otimes Q$, whose singular values are the products of the individual singular values of $P$ and $Q$. 
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C.4 Controlling the Accumulative Errors

The geometric convergence of \( \| C^t - C^{t-1} \| \) implies
\[
\| C^t - C^{t-1} \| \leq \eta^{t-1} \| C^1 - C^0 \|
\]
which together with the triangle inequality gives
\[
\| C^t - C^0 \| \leq \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \| C^{s+1} - C^s \| \leq \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \eta^s \| C^1 - C^0 \| \leq \frac{1}{1-\eta} \| C^1 - C^0 \|
\]

Letting \( T \) go to infinity on the left-hand side gives
\[
\| C - C^0 \| \leq \frac{1}{1-\eta} \| C^1 - C^0 \|.
\]

We next bound \( \| C^1 - C^0 \| \). From (55), we have
\[
\gamma^0_0 - \gamma^0_q = \rho(\mathbf{Q}^0_1 \times 1 \mathbf{u}_q^* \times 2 \mathbf{v}_q^* - \mathbf{w}_q^*) = \rho \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r} (\mathbf{u}_j^*, \mathbf{u}_q^*) (\mathbf{v}_j^*, \mathbf{v}_q^*) \mathbf{w}_j^* - \mathbf{w}_q^* \right)
\]
implying
\[
C^1 - C^0 = \rho \mathbf{W} ((\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U}) \odot (\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{V}) - I).
\]

Then from Assumptions II and III, we have
\[
\| C^1 - C^0 \| \leq \rho \mathbf{W} \|((\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U}) \odot (\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{V}) - I) \| \leq \rho \left( 1 + c \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \frac{\kappa(\log n) \sqrt{T}}{n} \right).
\]

C.5 Combining All

Finally, combining (60), (61) and (62) and using \( C_0 = \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{W} \), we have
\[
\left\| \mathbf{C} - \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{W} \right\| \leq \frac{1 + c \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \frac{\kappa(\log n) \sqrt{T}}{n}}{1 - \frac{\kappa(\log n) \sqrt{T}}{n}} \leq 2 \left( 1 + c \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \frac{\kappa(\log n) \sqrt{T}}{n} \right) = 2 \kappa(\log n) \left( \frac{\sqrt{T}}{n} + c \frac{r}{n^2} \right)
\]
where the second line follows from the assumption \( r = o(n^2/\kappa(\log n)^2) \) which implies \( 1 - \frac{\kappa(\log n) \sqrt{T}}{n} \geq \frac{1}{4} \) for a sufficiently large \( n \).
Similar arguments and bounds apply to \( \| A - \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{U} \| \) and \( \| B - \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{V} \| \).

D Proof of Lemma 4

**Lemma 12** *(Lemma 4)* Under Assumptions I, II, III, if \( r \ll n^{1.25} \) and \( r \leq \frac{n}{\epsilon \times 2^{3.25}} \) for \( \delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}] \), then for sufficiently large \( n \), we have \( |q(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})| < 1 \) in \( \mathcal{F}(\delta) \).

**Proof.** The following lemma is required in the proof of Lemma 4. Let us first admit Lemma 13 to prove Lemma 4. Since \( q \) is the sum of two parts given in (29) and (30), to bound \( |q| \), we will control these parts separately.

**Lemma 13** Under Assumptions I and II, if \( r \leq n^{1.25-1.5r_c} \) with \( r_c \in (0, 1/6) \), then for any integer \( p \geq 3 \),
\[
\| \mathbf{U}^\top \|_{2-p} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{p} \tau(\log n) n^{-r_c}
\]
The same bounds hold for \( \mathbf{V} \) and \( \mathbf{W} \). Here, we define \( \| \mathbf{H} \|_{2-p} := \sup \{ \| \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x} \|_p : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \} \).

**Proof.** *(Proof of Lemma 13)* See Appendix D.1.
Bounding absolute value of (29):

\[
\sum_{p=1}^{r} |(\alpha_{p}^* - \frac{1}{3} u_{p}^*, u)(\nu_{p}^*, v)(w_{p}^*, w)| \leq \sum_{p=1}^{r} (\alpha_{p}^* - \frac{1}{3} u_{p}^*, u)^2 \cdot \sum_{p=1}^{r} (\nu_{p}^*, v)^2 \cdot (w_{p}^*, w)^2 \\
\leq \sum_{p=1}^{r} (\alpha_{p}^* - \frac{1}{3} u_{p}^*, u)^2 \cdot \sum_{p=1}^{r} (\nu_{p}^*, v)^4 \cdot (w_{p}^*, w)^4 \\
= \|A - \frac{1}{3} U\|_2 \|V^T v\|_4 \|W^T w\|_4 \\
\leq \|A - \frac{1}{3} U\| \|V^T\|_2 \|W^T\|_2 \leq 2 \varepsilon (\log n) \left( \frac{r^7}{n} + c \frac{r}{n^{1+\varepsilon}} \right) \left( 1 + o(1) \right) \\
= o(1),
\]

where the last second line follows from Lemma 3 and Lemma 13 when \( r \ll n^{1.25} \) (by letting \( r \ll n^{1.25} - r_{c}^{*} \) approach to zero). The last line holds for \( r \ll \frac{n^{1.5}}{\varepsilon \log n} \).

Similar bounds hold for the other two terms in (29).

**Bounding the absolute value of (30):** First, for all, for any \((u, v, w) \in \mathcal{F}(\delta)\), there exists a division of \([r] = \Omega_u \cup \Omega_v \cup \Omega_w\) such that

\[
|\langle u^*_p, u \rangle| \leq \delta, \quad \forall p \in \Omega_u, \\
|\langle v^*_p, v \rangle| \leq \delta, \quad \forall p \in \Omega_v, \\
|\langle w^*_p, u \rangle| \leq \delta, \quad \forall p \in \Omega_w. \tag{63}
\]

We will denote by \( U_{\Omega_u} \) the submatrix of \( U \) forming from those columns of \( U \) with indexes in \( \Omega_u \). Similarly, we can define \( V_{\Omega_v} \) and \( W_{\Omega_w} \). With these preparation, we have that

\[
\sum_{p=1}^{r} |\langle u^*_p, u \rangle \langle v^*_p, v \rangle \langle w^*_p, w \rangle| = \sum_{p \in \Omega_u \cup \Omega_v \cup \Omega_w} |\langle u^*_p, u \rangle \langle v^*_p, v \rangle \langle w^*_p, w \rangle| \\
\leq \delta \| V_{\Omega_u} \| \| W_{\Omega_v} \| \| U_{\Omega_w} \| + \| U_{\Omega_u} \| \| W_{\Omega_v} \| \| V_{\Omega_w} \| \\
\leq 3 \delta \left( 1 + c \sqrt{\frac{n}{r}} \right)^2 \\
\leq 12 \delta \max \{ 1, c^2 \sqrt{r/n} \} \\
\leq \frac{1}{2},
\]

where the first inequality follows from (63) and \( \sum_{p \in \Omega_u} |\langle v^*_p, v \rangle \langle w^*_p, w \rangle| \leq \| V_{\Omega_u} \| \| W_{\Omega_u} \| \), etc. The second inequality uses the fact that the spectral norm of any submatrix is smaller than the original one and Assumption II. The last inequality holds when \( \delta \leq \frac{1}{27} \) and \( r \ll n^{1} \).

**Combining All** Under Assumptions I, II, III, if \( r \ll n^{1.25} \) and \( r \leq \frac{n}{2 \varepsilon \log n} \) for \( \delta \in (0, \frac{1}{27}] \), we have \( |\eta| \leq o(1) + \frac{1}{2} < 1 \) in \( \mathcal{F}(\delta) \) for sufficiently large \( n \).

### D.1 Proof of Lemma 13

The proof refines the one for Lemma 4 of [1]. We only prove it for \( U \) since the same arguments apply to \( W \) and \( V \). We start with a general integer \( p \geq 3 \).

\[
\| U^T \|_2 \geq p = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \| U^T x \|_p := \| U^T x^* \|_p \tag{64}
\]

where we define \( x^* \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \) to be the optimal solution of \( \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \| U^T x \|_p \). Further note that

\[
\| U^T x^* \|_p^p = \| U_S^T x^* \|_p^p + \| U_{S^C}^T x^* \|_p^p \tag{65}
\]

where \( S \) denotes the indices of the largest (in absolute value) \( L \) entries of \( U^T x^* \) and \( U_S \) denotes the column submatrix of \( U \) indexed by \( S \). Similar notations apply to its complement set \( S^C = [r] \setminus S \).

**Bound the first term:**

\[
\| U_S^T x^* \|_p^p \leq \| U_S^T x^* \|_2 \leq \| U_S U_S^T \| \leq 1 + \sum_{i \in S \setminus \{ j \}} |\langle u_i, u_j \rangle| \leq 1 + (L - 1) \frac{\tau (\log n)}{\sqrt{n}}. \tag{66}
\]
Note this upper-bound is independent of \( p \). Here, the first inequality is because \( |u_i^* x^*| \leq \|u_i^*\|_2 \|x^*\|_2 = 1 \) and the last second inequality follows from Gershgorin’s circle theorem. Finally, the last inequality is from Assumption I and \( L \) being the cardinality of the set \( S \).

**Bound the second term:** First note that

\[
\min_{i \in S} |u_i^* x^*|^2 \leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in S} |u_i^* x^*|^2 \leq \frac{1}{L} \|U_S U_S^T \| \|x^*\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{L} (1 + o(1)) \leq \frac{2}{L}
\]

for sufficiently large \( n \). The last second inequality follows from (66) and an additional assumption on \( L \)

\[
(L - 1) \frac{\tau (\log n)}{\sqrt{n}} = o(1).
\]  

We conclude that

\[
\max_{i \in S} |u_i^* x^*|^2 \leq \min_{i \in S} |u_i^* x^*|^2 \leq \frac{2}{L},
\]

since \( S \) consists of the indices of the \( L \) largest (in absolute value) elements of \( U^T x^* \). As a consequence, we have

\[
\|U_S^T x^*\|^p = \sum_{i \in S} |u_i^* x^*|^p \leq (\max_{i \in S} |u_i^* x^*|^{p-2}) \sum_{i \in S} |u_i^* x^*|^2 = (\max_{i \in S} |u_i^* x^*|^{p-2}) \|U_S^T x^*\|^2 
\]

\[
\leq \left( \frac{2}{L} \right)^{\frac{p}{2} - 1} \left( 1 + c \sqrt{\frac{T}{n}} \right)^2
\]

(68)

where the last inequality follows from the fact that \( \|U_S^T x^*\|^2 \leq \|U_S x^*\|^2 \leq \|U\|^2 \leq (1 + c \sqrt{\frac{T}{n}})^2 \) by Assumption II. Furthermore, since \((1 + c \sqrt{\frac{T}{n}})^2 \leq 4 \max\{1, c^2 \frac{T}{n} \}, c^2 \frac{T}{n} \leq c^2 n^{0.25-1.5r_c} \) from the condition of \( r \leq n^{1.25-1.5r_c} \), and \( 1 \ll c^2 n^{0.25-1.5r_c} \) for \( r_c \in (0, 1/6) \), we have \((1 + c \sqrt{\frac{T}{n}})^2 \leq 4 c^2 n^{0.25-1.5r_c} \) for \( r_c \in (0, 1/6) \). So from (68), we get

\[
\|U_S^T x^*\|^p \leq 4 \left( \frac{2}{L} \right)^{\frac{p}{2} - 1} c^2 n^{0.25-1.5r_c}.
\]  

(69)

From (65), (66), and (69), we have

\[
\|U^T x^*\|^p \leq 1 + (L - 1) \frac{\tau (\log n)}{\sqrt{n}} + 4 \left( \frac{2}{L} \right)^{\frac{p}{2} - 1} c^2 n^{0.25-1.5r_c}.
\]

By choosing

\[
L = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} n^{0.5-r_c} + 1 \right\rfloor \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} L \leq \frac{1}{2} n^{0.5-r_c} + 1 & \text{for } r_c \leq \frac{1}{2} n^{0.5-r_c} \\ L \geq \frac{1}{2} n^{0.5-r_c} & \text{for } r_c \leq \frac{1}{2} n^{0.5-r_c} \end{array} \right.
\]

which satisfies the condition (67), we have that

\[
\|U^T x^*\|^p \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2} \tau (\log n) n^{-r_c} + 4 \frac{2}{L} c^2 n^{(1 - \frac{r_c}{2}) + (1 - \frac{r_c}{2}) r_c}.
\]

Then from the assumptions \( p \geq 3 \) and \( r_c \in (0, \frac{1}{8}) \), we get

\[
\left( \frac{3}{4} - \frac{p}{4} \right) r_c + \left( \frac{p}{2} - \frac{5}{2} \right) r_c \leq \left( \frac{3}{4} - \frac{p}{4} \right) 6 r_c + \left( \frac{p}{2} - \frac{5}{2} \right) r_c = (2 - p) r_c \leq -r_c.
\]

(70)

So, we have

\[
\|U^T x^*\|^p \leq 1 + \left( \frac{1}{2} \tau (\log n) + 4 \frac{2}{L} c^2 \right) n^{-r_c}.
\]

Since \( 4 \frac{2}{L} c^2 \ll \frac{1}{2} \tau (\log n) \) and \((1 + t)^{1/p} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{p} t \) for all \( t \geq 0 \), then

\[
\|U^T x^*\|^p \leq 1 + \frac{1}{p} \tau (\log n) n^{-r_c}
\]

holds for any \( p \geq 3 \). This completes the proof since \( \|U^T\|_{2 \rightarrow p} = \|U^T x^*\|^p \) by (64).
E Proof of Lemma 5

Lemma 14 (Lemma 5) Under Assumptions I, II, III, if \( r \leq n^{1.25 - 1.5\epsilon} \) with \( r_\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{3}) \), then for sufficiently large \( n \), we have

\[
|F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)| \leq |\cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3)| + |\sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)| + \frac{4}{3} \tau (\log n)n^{-r}. \tag{38}
\]

Proof. We start by the angular dual polynomial (37)

\[
q(u(\theta_1), v(\theta_2), w(\theta_3)) = \cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3) + q(u^*_1, y, z) \cos(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)
\]

numerically,

\[
+ q(x, v^*_1, z) \sin(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)
\]

and

\[
+ q(x, y, z) \sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3).
\]

To bound \( q \), we only need to bound the coefficients \( q(u^*_1, y, z) \), \( q(x, v^*_1, z) \), \( q(x, y, w^*_1) \), and \( q(x, y, z) \).

We first show that \( q(u^*_1, y, z) \), \( q(x, v^*_1, z) \), and \( q(x, y, w^*_1) \) are close to zero. To see this, we examine

\[
q(x, y, w^*_1) = \sum_{p=1}^{r} (\langle \alpha_p^*, x \rangle \langle v_p^*, y \rangle \langle w_p^*, w^*_1 \rangle + \langle u_p^*, x \rangle \langle \beta_p^*, y \rangle \langle w_p^*, w^*_1 \rangle
\]

+ \langle u_p^*, x \rangle \langle v_p^*, y \rangle \langle \gamma_p^*, w^*_1 \rangle
\]

= \( x^T \left[ A \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)V^T + U \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)B^T + U \text{diag}(C^Tw^*_1)V^T \right] y \)

= \( x^T \left( A \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)V^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1 + U \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)B^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1 + U \text{diag}(C^Tw^*_1)V^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1 \right) y \),

since \( x \perp u^*_1, y \perp v^*_1 \). This implies

\[
|q(x, y, w^*_1)| \leq \left\| A \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)V^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1 \right\| + \left\| U \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)B^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1 \right\| + \left\| x^T \left( U \text{diag}(C^Tw^*_1)V^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1 \right) y \right\|.
\]

We first bound \( \left\| A \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)V^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1 \right\| \).

\[
\left\| A \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)V^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1 \right\| \leq \left\| A \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)V^T - \frac{1}{3} U \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)V^T \right\|
\]

+ \left\| \frac{1}{3} U \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)V^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1 \right\|
\]

\[
\leq \left\| A - \frac{1}{3} U \right\| \| \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1) \| \| V \| + \frac{1}{3} \| U \| \| \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1 - e_1) \| \| V \|
\]

\[
\leq 2\epsilon (\log n) \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n} + \frac{r \epsilon}{n} \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{n}{r}} \right) \left( 1 + c_r \frac{n}{\sqrt{r}} \right)^2
\]

\[
= 2\epsilon (\log n) \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n} + \frac{\tau (\log n)}{3n} \left( 1 + c_r \frac{n}{\sqrt{r}} \right)^2,
\]

where the third inequality first uses the facts \( \| \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1) \| = 1 \) and \( \| \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1 - e_1) \| = \max_{p \neq 1} |\langle w^*_1, w^*_1 \rangle| \) and then follows from Assumptions I and II and Lemma 3.

Similarly,

\[
\left\| U \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1)B^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1 \right\| \leq 2\epsilon (\log n) \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n} + \tau (\log n) \left( 1 + c_r \frac{n}{\sqrt{r}} \right)^2.
\]

The similar arguments also apply to bounding \( |x^T (U \text{diag}(C^Tw^*_1)V^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1) y| \). Note that

\[
x^T \left( U^* \text{diag}(C^Tw^*_1)V^T - \frac{1}{3} u^*_1 v^*_1 \right) y = x^T \left( U \text{diag}((C - W^3/3)^Tw^*_1)V^T \right) y + \frac{1}{3} x^T (U \text{diag}(W^Tw^*_1 - e_1)V^T) y \]

and the first term can be rewritten as

\[
x^T (U \text{diag}((C - W^3/3)^Tw^*_1)V^T) y = \sum_{i=1}^{r} x^T \left( (c_i - w^*_1/3) w^*_1 u_i v^*_i \right) y
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{r} \langle x^T u_i \rangle \langle v^*_1 y \rangle (c_i - w^*_1/3) w^*_1
\]

\[
= x^T \sum_{i=1}^{r} \langle u_i \rangle \langle v^*_1 y \rangle (c_i - w^*_1/3) w^*_1
\]

\[
= x^T \left( U \text{diag}(V^T y)(C - W^3/3)^Tw^*_1 \right) w^*_1.
\]
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and so
\[
\left|x^T \left( U^* \text{diag}(C^T w_i^*) V^T - \frac{1}{3} u_i^* v_i^T \right) y \right| \leq \|U\| \|\text{diag}(V^T y)\| \|C - W/3\| + \frac{1}{3} \|U\| \|\text{diag}(W^T w_i^* - e_1)\| \|V^T\|.
\]

Finally, we obtain
\[
|q(x, y, w_i^*)| \leq \left[ \frac{6\kappa (\log n) \sqrt{T}}{n} + \frac{\tau (\log n)}{\sqrt{n}} \right] \left( 1 + c \sqrt{\frac{T}{n}} \right)^2
= O \left( \frac{\kappa (\log n) \sqrt{T}}{n} + \frac{\kappa (\log n) r^{1.5}}{n^2} \cdot \frac{\kappa (\log n) r}{n^{1.5}} \right)
= O \left( \frac{\kappa (\log n) n^{-3r}}{n^{1.5}} \cdot \frac{\kappa (\log n) n}{n^{1.5}} \right)
= O(\kappa (\log n) n^{-3r}, \tau (\log n) n^{-3r}) = o(n^{-2r}),
\]
with the notation \(O(f(n), g(n)) := \max\{O(f(n)), O(g(n))\}\). The last second line holds if \(r \leq n^{1.25 - 1.5r} \) and the last line follows from the assumption \(r_c \in (0, 1/6)\).

The same bound holds for \(|q(x, v_i^*, z)|\) and \(|q(u_i^*, y, z)|\).

The coefficient of the last term of (37) is \(q(x, y, z)\) and its absolute value is bounded by the tensor spectral norm of \(Q\), and should be close to constant as \(Q\) is close to \(\sum_{p=1}^{r} u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^*\), the spectral norm of which is \(1 + O(n^{-r})\) by the following lemma.

**Lemma 15** Under Assumptions I and II, and if \(r \leq n^{1.25 - 1.5r_c}\) with \(r_c \in (0, 1/6)\),
\[
\left\| \sum_{p=1}^{r} u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* \right\| \leq 1 + \frac{5}{4} \tau (\log n) n^{-r_c}.
\]

**Proof (Proof of Lemma 15)**
\[
\left\| \sum_{p=1}^{r} u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* \right\| = \sup_{(a, b, c) \in K} (U^T a, (V^T b) \odot (W^T c))
\leq \sup_{(a, b, c) \in K} \|U^T a\|_3 \|V^T b\|_3 \|W^T c\|_3
\leq \|U^T\|_{2 \rightarrow 3} \|V^T\|_{2 \rightarrow 3} \|W^T\|_{2 \rightarrow 3}
\leq \left( 1 + \frac{1}{3} \tau (\log n) n^{-r_c} \right)^3
= 1 + \tau (\log n) n^{-r_c} + \frac{1}{3} \tau (\log n)^2 n^{-2r_c} + \frac{1}{9} \tau (\log n)^3 n^{-3r_c}
\leq 1 + \frac{5}{4} \tau (\log n) n^{-r_c}.
\]
where the first inequality follows from Hölder’s inequality and the second inequality follows from Cauchy’s inequality. The fourth inequality follows from Lemma 13 when \(r \leq n^{1.25 - 1.5r_c}\) with \(r_c \in (0, 1/6)\). The last inequality holds since \(\frac{5}{4} \tau (\log n)^2 n^{-r_c} + \frac{1}{9} \tau (\log n)^3 n^{-3r_c} \ll \frac{5}{4} n^{-r_c}\).

It remains to bound the difference between \(Q\) and \(\sum_{p=1}^{r} u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^*\):
\[
\left\| Q - \sum_{p=1}^{r} u_p^* \otimes v_p^* \otimes w_p^* \right\| \leq \sum_{p=1}^{r} \left( \|u_p^* \|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right) \left( \|v_p^* \|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \right) \left( \|w_p^* \|_{\mathcal{H}_3} \right)
+ \sum_{p=1}^{r} \left( \|u_p^* \|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right) \left( \|v_p^* \|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \right) \left( \|w_p^* \|_{\mathcal{H}_3} \right)
+ \sum_{p=1}^{r} \left( \|u_p^* \|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right) \left( \|v_p^* \|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \right) \left( \|w_p^* \|_{\mathcal{H}_3} \right)
\]
First we bound $\Pi_1$:

$$\Pi_1 = \sup_{(a,b,c) \in K} \frac{1}{3} U^\top (V^\top b) \cap (W^\top c)$$

$$\leq \sup_{(a,b,c) \in K} \left\| (\frac{1}{3} U)^\top x \right\|_2 \left\| (V^\top b) \cap (W^\top c) \right\|_2$$

$$\leq \sup_{(a,b,c) \in K} \left\| (\frac{1}{3} U)^\top x \right\|_2 \left\| (V^\top b) \right\|_4 \left\| (W^\top c) \right\|_4$$

$$\leq \|A - \frac{1}{3} U\| \left\| (\frac{1}{3} U)^\top \right\|_2 \|W^\top c\|_4 (\Pi_1, (\Pi_2, \Pi_3))$$

$$\leq 2\varepsilon (\log n) \left( \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n} + \frac{\varepsilon r}{n^\tau} \right) (1 + o(1)) \leq 8\varepsilon (\log n) \max \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n}, \frac{\varepsilon r}{n^\tau} \right\} \leq 8\varepsilon (\log n)n^{-3r_c} = o(n^{-2r_c})$$

where the first and second inequalities follow from Cauchy’s inequality and the fourth inequality follows from Lemma 3 and Lemma 13 when $r \ll n^{1.25}$. The last inequality follows by plugging $r \leq n^{1.25-1.5r_c}$ with $r_c \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

The same bound also holds for $\Pi_2$ and $\Pi_3$.

**Combining All** If $r \leq n^{1.25-1.5r_c}$ with $r_c \in (0, 1/6)$, we have

$$|q(u^*_i, y, z)| = o(n^{-2r_c})$$

$$|q(x, v^*_i, z)| = o(n^{-2r_c})$$

$$|q(x, y, w^*_i)| = o(n^{-2r_c})$$

$$|q(x, y, z)| \leq 1 + \frac{5}{2} \tau (\log n)n^{-r_c} + o(n^{-2r_c})$$

which together with (37) gives

$$|q(u(\theta_1), v(\theta_2), w(\theta_3))|$$

$$\leq |\cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3)| + |\sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)| + \frac{5}{2} \tau (\log n)n^{-r_c} + o(n^{-2r_c})$$

$$\leq |\cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3)| + |\sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)| + \frac{4}{3} \tau (\log n)n^{-r_c}$$

where the last inequality follows from $o(n^{-2r_c}) \ll \frac{1}{12} \tau (\log n)n^{-r_c}$.

**F Proof of Lemma 6**

**Lemma 16 (Lemma 6)** Under Assumptions I, II, III, if $r \ll n^{1.25}$, then for any $\xi_i \in \left( -\frac{\sqrt{n} - 1}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{\sqrt{n} - 1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$, we have

$$F(\theta_1 + \xi_1, \theta_2 + \xi_2, \theta_3 + \xi_3) \leq 1$$

(72)

for $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \in \{(0, 0, 0), (0, \pi, \pi), (\pi, 0, \pi), (\pi, \pi, 0)\}$ and

$$F(\theta_1 + \xi_1, \theta_2 + \xi_2, \theta_3 + \xi_3) < 0$$

(43)

for $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \in \{(\pi, \pi, \pi), (\pi, 0, 0), (0, 0, \pi), (0, 0, \pi)\}$. Here, equality in (72) holds only if $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = \xi_3 = 0$.

**Proof** Recall that

$$F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = \cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3) + q(u^*_i, y, z) \cos(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)$$

$$+ q(x, v^*_i, z) \sin(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3)$$

$$+ q(x, y, w^*_i) \sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3)$$

$$+ q(x, y, z) \sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3).$$

(73)

The points of special interest are the eight vertices of the cube $[0, \pi] \times [0, \pi] \times [0, \pi]$, i.e.,

$$\{(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) : \theta_i \in \{0, \pi\}, i = 1, 2, 3\}$$

which we classify into two sets:

1. The first set of vertices involve an even number of $\pi$: $(0, 0, 0), (0, \pi, \pi), (\pi, 0, \pi), (\pi, \pi, 0)$;
2. The second set of vertices involve an odd number of $\pi$: $(\pi, 0, 0), (0, 0, \pi), (0, \pi, 0), (\pi, \pi, \pi)$. 
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F.1 Control the First Vertex Set

For the first set of points, we only show that

$$F(\theta_1 + \xi_1, \theta_2 + \xi_2, \theta_3 + \xi_3) \leq 1, \quad \forall \xi_i \in \left( -\frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{3}, \frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{3} \right) \cup \left( \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{3}, \pi + \frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{3} \right)$$

holds for \((\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = (0, 0, 0)\). The same arguments apply to the other cases \((\pi, 0, \pi), (0, \pi, \pi), (\pi, \pi, \pi)\) since (73) implies

$$F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) = F(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \pi + \xi_3) = F(\pi + \xi_1, \pi + \xi_2, \xi_3)$$

for all \(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3 \in \mathbb{R}\).

Let us apply the first-order Taylor expansion to \(F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)\) over some smaller cube \([-\theta_0, \theta_0] \times [-\theta_0, \theta_0] \times [-\theta_0, \theta_0]\) with \(\theta_0 \in (0, \pi/2)\) to be determined later,

$$F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = F(0, 0, 0) + \theta^T \nabla F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \geq 1 - \|\theta\|_1 \sup_{|\xi_1| \leq \theta_0, |\xi_2| \leq \theta_0, |\xi_3| \leq \theta_0} \|\nabla F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)\|_\infty,$$

where \(\theta = [\theta_1 \, \theta_2 \, \theta_3]^T\). Since

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) = \sin(\xi_1) \cos(\xi_2) \cos(\xi_3) - q(u^*_1, y, z) \sin(\xi_1) \sin(\xi_2) \sin(\xi_3) + q(x, v^*_1, z) \cos(\xi_1) \cos(\xi_2) \sin(\xi_3) + q(x, y, w^*_1) \cos(\xi_1) \sin(\xi_2) \cos(\xi_3) + q(x, y, z) \cos(\xi_1) \sin(\xi_2) \sin(\xi_3),$$

we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \right| \leq |\sin(\theta_0)| + o(1)(|\sin(\theta_0)|^3 + 2|\sin(\theta_0)| + (1 + o(1))|\sin(\theta_0)|)^2 \leq 3|\sin(\theta_0)|$$

(74)

where the first inequality follows from (71), and so

$$|q(u^*_1, y, z)| = o(1), \quad |q(x, v^*_1, z)| = o(1), \quad |q(x, y, w^*_1)| = o(1), \quad |q(x, y, z)| = 1 + o(1)$$

(75)

under Assumptions I-III and \(r \ll n^{1.25}\) (by letting \(r_c\) in \(r > n^{1.25-r_c} n\) approach to zero). The inequality (74) uses the facts that \(|\sin(\theta_0)|^2 \leq |\sin(\theta_0)|\) and \(o(1) \leq |\sin(\theta_0)|\) for sufficiently large \(n\). The same bound holds for \(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_1^2} F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)\) and \(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_2^2} F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)\).

We therefore have

$$F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \geq 1 - 3\|\theta\|_1|\sin(\theta_0)| \geq 1 - 9\theta_0^2. \quad (76)$$

Let us compute the second-order Taylor expansion of \(F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)\):

$$F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = F(0, 0, 0) + \theta^T \nabla F(0, 0, 0) + \frac{1}{2} \theta^T \nabla^2 F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \theta$$

where \((\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \in [-\theta_0, \theta_0]^3\). As a consequence of the construction process of the dual polynomial, we have \(F(0, 0, 0) = 1\) and \(\nabla F(0, 0, 0) = 0\), implying

$$F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \theta^T \nabla^2 F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \theta,$$

Therefore, as long as we can find \(\theta_0\) such that the Hessian matrix \(\nabla^2 F\) is negative definite over the region \([-\theta_0, \theta_0]^3\), then \(F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \leq 1\) for any \((\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \in [-\theta_0, \theta_0]^3\) with equality holds only if \((\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = (0, 0, 0)\).

We next estimate the Hessian matrix \(\nabla^2 F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)\). Direct computation gives

$$\nabla^2 F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) = \begin{bmatrix}
-F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) & * & * \\
* & -F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) & * \\
* & * & -F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)
\end{bmatrix}$$

whose off-diagonal elements are nonsymmetric partial derivatives of \(F\), for example,

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_1 \partial \theta_2} F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = \sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_3) - q(u^*_1, y, z) \sin(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3) + q(x, y, w^*_1) \cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3) - q(x, v^*_1, z) \cos(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3) + q(x, y, z) \cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_3),$$
which implies by (75) that
\[
\left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_1 \partial \theta_2} F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \right| \leq |\sin(\theta_0)|^2 + o(1)(1 + 2|\sin(\theta_0)|^2) + (1 + o(1))|\sin(\theta_0)|
\leq |\sin(\theta_0)| + |\sin(\theta_0)|^2 + o(1)
\leq 3|\sin(\theta_0)|.
\]

The same bound holds for other mixed partial derivatives \( \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \right| \) with \( i, j = 1, 2, 3 \) and \( i \neq j \).

To make \( \nabla^2 F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \) negative definite, by Gersgorin’s circle theorem and the bound (76), we only need
\[-F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_1) + 6|\sin(\theta_0)| \leq -1 + 9\theta_0^2 + 6\theta_0 < 0
\]
which holds for \( \theta_0 \in (\frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{3}, \frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{3}) \), including \( (\frac{-\sqrt{2} - 1}{3}, \frac{-\sqrt{2} - 1}{3}) \). This completes the first part of the proof.

F.2 Control the Second Vertex Set

Similarly as before, we first show
\[F(\pi + \xi_1, \pi + \xi_2, \pi + \xi_3) < 0, \forall |\xi_i| < \frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{3}.
\]

It follows from the intermediate result (76): 
\[F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \geq 1 - 9\theta_0^2 > 0, \forall |\xi_i| \leq \theta_0
\]
by recognizing that \( F(\pi + \xi_1, \pi + \xi_2, \pi + \xi_3) = -F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3), \forall \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3 \) and choosing \( \theta_0 = (\sqrt{2} - 1)/3 \). Finally, we claim the same conclusion applies to the remaining three cases since
\[F(\pi + \xi_1, \pi + \xi_2, \pi + \xi_3) = F(\pi + \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) = F(\xi_1, \pi + \xi_2, \pi + \xi_3) = F(\xi_1, \xi_2, \pi + \xi_3)
\]
for all \( \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3 \in \mathbb{R} \).

G Proof of Lemma 7

**Lemma 17 (Lemma 7)** Under Assumptions I, II, III, if \( r \leq n^{1.25-1.5r_c} \) with \( r_c \in (0, \frac{1}{6}) \), then for sufficiently large \( n \), we have \( |F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)| < 1 \) in \( \mathbb{R}(\delta_b) \) for \( \delta_b = \sqrt{\frac{80r(\log n)}{3}} n^{-0.5r_c} \).

**Proof** First, solve for \( \theta \) such that
\[|\cos(\theta)^3| + |\sin(\theta)|^3 < 1 - 4r(\log n)n^{-r_c}. \quad (77)
\]
To this end, we define \( f(\theta) := |\cos(\theta)^3| + |\sin(\theta)|^3 \) for \( \theta \in [0, \pi] \). It can be verified directly that \( f \) is symmetric around \( \frac{\pi}{2} \) on \([0, \pi] \), symmetric around \( \frac{\pi}{4} \) on \([0, \frac{\pi}{2}] \), and strictly decreasing on \([0, \frac{\pi}{4}] \). Since \( 1 - 4r(\log n)n^{-r_c} \in (0, 1) \), there exists a unique \( \omega \in (0, \frac{\pi}{4}) \) such that \( f(\omega) = 1 - 4r(\log n)n^{-r_c} \in (0, 1) \). Thus the inequality (77) holds on \((\omega, \frac{\pi}{4} - \omega) \cup (\frac{\pi}{4} + \omega, \pi - \omega) \).

To have an approximation of \( \omega \), we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 18** Let \( f \) and \( g \) be any two real functions with \( g \) being strictly decreasing in some interval \( (\alpha, \beta) \) and satisfying \( g(x) \geq f(x), \forall x \in (\alpha, \beta) \). Suppose both equations \( f(x) = b \) and \( g(x) = b \) admit one root in \( [\alpha, \beta] \), denoted by \( x_f \) and \( x_g \) respectively. Then \( x_f \geq x_g \).

**Proof (Proof of Lemma 18)** Since \( g(x) > g(x_f) \geq f(x_f) = b \) for any \( x \in [\alpha, x_f] \), \( g(x_g) = b \) could only happen within \( [x_f, \beta] \).

We recognize that
\[f(\theta) \leq 1 - \frac{3}{20} \theta^2, \text{ for } \theta \in [0, \pi/4]
\]
and \( g(\theta) := 1 - \frac{3}{20} \theta^2 \) is strictly decreasing \([0, \pi/4] \). Clearly,
\[\delta_b := \sqrt{\frac{80r(\log n)}{3}} n^{-0.5r_c}
\]
is the root of \( g(\theta) = 1 - 4r(\log n)n^{-r_c} \) over the interval \([0, \frac{\pi}{4}] \). By Lemma 18, \( \delta_b \geq \omega \). Therefore, (77) holds on \((\delta_b, \frac{\pi}{4} - \delta_b) \cup (\frac{\pi}{4} + \delta_b, \pi - \delta_b) \). By (47), we obtain
\[F(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) < 1 \text{ for } (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \in \mathbb{R}(\delta_b).
\]
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G.1 Proof of (78)

Showing (78) is equivalent to showing
\[ \sin^3(x) + \cos^3(x) \leq 1 - \frac{3}{20} x^2, \quad \forall x \in [0, \pi/4] \]  \tag{79}

since \( \sin(x), \cos(x) > 0 \) for \( x \in [0, \pi/4] \). Before moving on, we need the following lemma to prove (79).

**Lemma 19** The following inequality
\[ \frac{(3^{2n-1} - 3)}{4 \cdot (2n - 1)!} x^{2n-1} + \frac{(3^{2n} + 3)}{4 \cdot (2n)!} x^{2n} - \frac{(3^{2n+1} - 3)}{4 \cdot (2n + 1)!} x^{2n+1} - \frac{(3^{2n+2} + 3)}{4 \cdot (2n + 2)!} x^{2n+2} \geq 0 \]  \tag{80}
holds for all \( x \in [0, \pi/4] \) and \( n \geq 2 \).

**Proof** Let \( p \) equal the expression on the left side of Equation (80). A simplification on \( p \) yields
\[ p(x) = q_1(x) \frac{x^{2n-1}}{4(2n-1)!} + q_2(x) \frac{x^{2n+2}}{4(2n)!}, \]
where \( q_1(x) = (3^{2n-1} - 3) - \frac{3^{2n+1} - 3}{2(2n+1)!} x^2 \) and \( q_2(x) = (3^{2n+3}) - \frac{3^{2n+2} + 3}{(2n+1)(2n+2)} x^2 \).

As functions of \( x \), \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) have roots at
\[ \pm \sqrt{\frac{2n(2n+1)(3^{2n-1} - 3)}{3^{2n+1} - 3}} \quad \text{and} \quad \pm \sqrt{\frac{(2n+1)(2n+2)(3^{2n+3})}{3^{2n+2} + 3}}, \]
respectively, provided \( n \geq 1 \). Since \( 10(3^{2n-1} - 3) \geq 3^{2n+1} - 3 \) and \( 9(3^{2n+3}) > (3^{2n+2} + 3) \) for all \( n \geq 2 \), it follows that the positive root of \( q_1 \) satisfies
\[ \sqrt{\frac{2n(2n+1)(3^{2n-1} - 3)}{3^{2n+1} - 3}} > \sqrt{\frac{20(2n+1)}{10}} > \sqrt{\frac{10}{3}} > \frac{\pi}{4} \quad \text{for } n \geq 2, \]
and the positive root of \( q_2 \) satisfies
\[ \sqrt{\frac{(2n+1)(2n+2)(3^{2n+3})}{3^{2n+2} + 3}} > \sqrt{\frac{12(2n+1)(2n+2)}{9}} > \sqrt{\frac{10}{3}} > \frac{\pi}{4} \quad \text{for } n \geq 2. \]

Therefore both \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) are positive on \([0, \pi/4]\) for all \( n \geq 2 \), and Equation (80) holds.

**Lemma 20** The following statement
\[ \sin^3(x) + \cos^3(x) \leq 1 - \frac{3}{20} x^2 \]
holds for all \( x \in [0, \pi/4] \).

**Proof** Recall that \( \sin^3(x) = \frac{1}{4} (3 \sin(x) - \sin(3x)) \) and \( \cos^3(x) = \frac{1}{4} (3 \cos(x) + \cos(3x)) \), and therefore
\[ \sin^3(x) = x^3 + \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} (-1)^n \frac{3^{2n-1} - 3}{4(2n-1)!} x^{2n-1}, \]
and\[ \cos^3(x) = 1 - \frac{3}{2} x^2 + \frac{7}{8} x^4 + \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} (-1)^n \frac{3^{2n} + 3}{4(2n)!} x^{2n}. \]

Thus\[ \sin^3(x) + \cos^3(x) \leq 1 - \frac{3}{2} x^2 + x^3 + \frac{7}{8} x^4, \]
for all \( x \in [0, \pi/4] \) since by Lemma 19
\[ \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} (-1)^n \frac{3^{2n-1} - 3}{4(2n-1)!} x^{2n-1} + \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} (-1)^n \frac{3^{2n} + 3}{4(2n)!} x^{2n} = - \sum_{n=3, \text{n odd}}^{\infty} \left( \frac{3^{2n-1} - 3}{4(2n-1)!} x^{2n-1} + \frac{3^{2n} + 3}{4(2n)!} x^{2n} - \frac{3^{2n+1} - 3}{4(2n+1)!} x^{2n+1} - \frac{3^{2n+2} + 3}{4(2n+2)!} x^{2n+2} \right) \leq 0. \]

Finally, note that
\[ 1 - \frac{3}{2} x^2 + x^3 + \frac{7}{8} x^4 = 1 - \frac{3}{20} x^2 + x^3 h(x), \]
with\[ h(x) = - \frac{27}{20} + x + \frac{7}{8} x^2 \]
being negative in \([0, \pi/4]\). So the proof is complete.