

Generalized SURE for optimal shrinkage of singular values in low-rank matrix denoising

Jérémie Bigot, Charles Deledalle & Delphine Féral

Institut de Mathématiques de Bordeaux et CNRS (UMR 5251)
Université de Bordeaux

March 1, 2024

Abstract

We consider the problem of estimating a low-rank signal matrix from noisy measurements under the assumption that the distribution of the data matrix belongs to an exponential family. In this setting, we derive generalized Stein's unbiased risk estimation (SURE) formulas that hold for any spectral estimators which shrink or threshold the singular values of the data matrix. This leads to new data-driven shrinkage rules, whose optimality is discussed using tools from random matrix theory and through numerical experiments. Our approach is compared to recent results on asymptotically optimal shrinking rules for Gaussian noise. It also leads to new procedures for singular values shrinkage in matrix denoising for Poisson-distributed or Gamma-distributed measurements.

Keywords: matrix denoising, singular value decomposition, low-rank model, spectral estimator, Stein's unbiased risk estimate, random matrix theory, exponential family, optimal shrinkage rule, degrees of freedom.

AMS classifications: 62H12, 62H25.

1 Introduction

In various applications, it is of interest to estimate a signal matrix from noisy data. Typical examples include the case of data that are produced in a matrix form, while others are concerned with observations from multiple samples that can be organized in a matrix form. In such setting, a typical inference problem involves the estimation of an unknown (non-random) signal matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ from a noisy data matrix \mathbf{Y} satisfying the model:

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{W}, \tag{1.1}$$

where \mathbf{W} is an $n \times m$ noise matrix with real entries \mathbf{W}_{ij} assumed to be independent random variables with $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{W}_{ij}) = 0$ and $\text{Var}(\mathbf{W}_{ij}) = \tau_{ij}^2$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$. In this paper, we focus on the situation where the signal matrix \mathbf{X} is assumed to have a low rank structure, and we consider the general setting where the distribution of \mathbf{Y} belongs to an exponential family.

The low rank assumption on \mathbf{X} is often met in practice when there exists a significant correlation between the columns of \mathbf{X} . This can be the case when the columns of \mathbf{X} represent 2D images at different wavelength of hyperspectral data, since images at nearby wavelengths are strongly correlated [CSLT13]. Further applications, where low-rank modeling of \mathbf{X} is relevant, can be found in genomics [WDB01, ABB00], NMR spectroscopy [NPDL11], collaborative filtering [CR09] or medical imaging [BD06, LBH⁺12], among many others.

The standard approach to estimate a low rank matrix relies on the singular value decomposition (SVD) of the data matrix

$$\mathbf{Y} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t,$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \geq \tilde{\sigma}_2 \geq \dots \geq \tilde{\sigma}_{\min(n,m)} \geq 0$ denote its singular values, and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k$ denote the associated singular vectors. In this paper, we propose to consider the class of spectral estimators $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f = f(\mathbf{Y})$, where $f: \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is a (possibly data-dependent) mapping that acts on the singular values of the data matrix \mathbf{Y} while leaving its singular vectors unchanged. More precisely, we consider estimators that take the form

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f = f(\mathbf{Y}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} w_k(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t, \quad (1.2)$$

where, for each $1 \leq k \leq \min(n, m)$, $w_k(\mathbf{Y})$ is a real weight that may depend on the whole data. When all the weights $w_k(\mathbf{Y})$ belong to the interval $[0, 1]$, the spectral estimator $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f$ is said to shrink or threshold the singular values of the data matrix \mathbf{Y} . Classical principal component analysis (PCA) applied to matrix denoising corresponds to the choice of spectral estimator $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^r = \sum_{k=1}^r \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$, namely $w_k(\mathbf{Y}) = 1$ for all $1 \leq k \leq r$ and $w_k(\mathbf{Y}) = 0$ for $k \geq r+1$ for some $1 \leq r \leq \min(n, m)$. Another typical spectral estimator in matrix denoising with Gaussian measurements is soft-thresholding [CSLT13] which corresponds to the choice

$$w_k(\mathbf{Y}) = \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\tilde{\sigma}_k}\right)_+, \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq \min(n, m),$$

where $\lambda = \lambda(\mathbf{Y}) > 0$ is a possibly data-dependent threshold parameter, and $(x)_+ = \max(x, 0)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

1.1 Main contributions

Under the assumption that the distribution of \mathbf{Y} belongs to an exponential family, the main goal of this paper is to derive data-driven choices for the weights $w_k(\mathbf{Y})$ which lead to optimal shrinkage rules of the noisy singular values $\tilde{\sigma}_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq \min(n, m)$. For this purpose, we use the principle of Stein's unbiased risk estimation (SURE) [Ste81] to derive unbiased estimation formulas for the mean squared error (MSE) risk or the mean Kullback-Leibler (MKL) risk of spectral estimators. Minimizing Generalized SURE (GSURE) formulas over an appropriate class of spectral estimators is shown to lead to data-driven shrinkage of the singular values of \mathbf{Y} . Using tools from random matrix theory, this approach is shown to be connected to existing asymptotic

optimal shrinkage rules [SN13, GD14, Nad14] when the noise matrix \mathbf{W} is Gaussian. This approach also leads to new data-driven choices of spectral estimators for Gamma-distributed or Poisson-distributed measurements. As an illustrative example, let us consider spectral estimators of the form

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 = f(\mathbf{Y}) = w_1(\mathbf{Y})\tilde{\sigma}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t, \quad (1.3)$$

which only act on the first singular value $\tilde{\sigma}_1$ of the data while setting all the other ones to zero. In this paper, examples of data-driven choices for the weight $w_1(\mathbf{Y})$ are the following ones :

- for Gaussian measurements with $n \leq m$ and known homoscedastic variance τ^2 , namely $\mathbf{W}_{ij} \sim_{iid} \mathcal{N}(0, \tau^2)$, we propose to take

$$w_1(\mathbf{Y}) = \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2} \left(1 + |m - n| + 2 \sum_{\ell=2}^n \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} \right) \right)_+ \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_1 > \tau(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})\}}, \quad (1.4)$$

- for Gamma measurements with known shape parameter $L > 0$ (see Section 3.1 for a precise definition), we propose to take

$$w_1(\mathbf{Y}) = \frac{L}{L-1} \left(\frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1 \alpha_{ij}}{\mathbf{Y}_{ij}} + \frac{1}{mn(L-1)} \left(1 + |m - n| + 2 \sum_{\ell=2}^{\min(n,m)} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} \right) \right)^{-1}, \quad (1.5)$$

where α_{ij} denotes the (i, j) -th entry of the $n \times m$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$,

- for Poisson measurements, namely when each \mathbf{Y}_{ij} is a Poisson random variables with mean parameter \mathbf{X}_{ij} , we propose to take

$$w_1(\mathbf{Y}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\sigma}_1 \alpha_{ij}}. \quad (1.6)$$

In the general case, when no a priori is available on the rank of the signal matrix \mathbf{X} , we construct estimators via a two-step procedure. First, an active set $s^* \subseteq \mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \dots, \min(n, m)\}$ of singular values is defined as the minimizer of a penalized log-likelihood criterion that is inspired by the Akaike information criterion (AIC)

$$s^* = \arg \min_{s \subseteq \mathcal{I}} -2 \log q(\mathbf{Y}; \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s) + 2|s|p_{n,m}, \quad \text{with} \quad p_{n,m} = \frac{1}{2} (\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})^2,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s = \sum_{k \in s} \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$, $|s|$ is the cardinal of s , and $q(\mathbf{Y}; \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s)$ is the likelihood of the data in a given exponential family with estimated parameter $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s$. Then, in a second step, we compute a spectral estimator of the form

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w = \sum_{k \in s^*} w_k(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t, \quad (1.7)$$

where optimal weights $w_k(\mathbf{Y})$ for $k \in s^*$ are obtained by minimizing an unbiased estimation formula of either the MSE or MKL risks.

In the case of Gaussian measurements with homoscedastic variance $\tau^2 = 1/m$, one has that $q(\mathbf{Y}; \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s) = m \|\mathbf{Y} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s\|_F^2$, and we show that the active set of singular values is

$$s^* = \{k ; \tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+^{n,m}\}$$

where $c_+^{n,m} = 1 + \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}$ is a sequence converging to the so-called bulk edge $c_+ = 1 + \sqrt{c}$ in random matrix theory in the asymptotic setting $c = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{n}{m}$ with $m = m_n \geq n$. Moreover, for Gaussian measurements, the optimal shrinking weights in (1.7) for $k \in s^*$ are given by

$$w_k(\mathbf{Y}) = \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2} \left(1 + |m - n| + 2 \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^{\min(n,m)} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} \right) \right)_+.$$

In the case of Gamma or Poisson distributed measurements, formulas for the active set s^* and the optimal weights cannot be obtained in a closed-form. Nevertheless, we propose fast algorithms for their numerical approximations.

We discuss the optimality of this novel procedure for choosing data-driven spectral estimators in low-rank models for \mathbf{X} and in various numerical experiments. One novelty of our approach is to study the behavior of spectral estimators in situations where the variances τ_{ij}^2 of the entries \mathbf{W}_{ij} of the noise matrix are not necessarily equal, and may depend on the signal matrix \mathbf{X} . For example, τ_{ij}^2 can be proportional to \mathbf{X}_{ij}^2 (Gamma-distributed measurements) or \mathbf{X}_{ij} (Poisson-distributed measurements).

1.2 Related results in the literature

Early work on singular value thresholding began with the work in [EY36] on the best approximation of fixed rank to the data matrix \mathbf{Y} . Spectral estimators with different amounts of shrinkage for each singular value of the data matrix have then been proposed in [EM72, EM76]. In the case of Gaussian measurements with homoscedastic variance, the problem of estimating \mathbf{X} under a low-rank assumption has recently received a lot of attention in the literature on high-dimensional statistics, see e.g. [CSLT13, DG14, JS15, SN13]. Recent works [GD14, Nad14] also consider the more general setting where the distribution of the additive noise matrix \mathbf{W} is orthogonally invariant, and such that its entries are iid random variables with zero mean and finite fourth moment. In all these papers, the authors have focused on spectral estimators which shrink or threshold the singular values of \mathbf{Y} , while its singular vectors are left unchanged. In this setting, the main issue is to derive an optimal shrinkage procedure that depends on the class of spectral estimators that is considered, on the loss function used to measure the risk of an estimator of \mathbf{X} , and on appropriate assumptions for the distribution of the additive noise matrix \mathbf{W} .

In this perspective, one can mainly distinguish two approaches. For Gaussian errors, a first class of methods is based on a SURE formula that holds for any smooth spectral estimators [CSLT13], [DG14]. This SURE formula provides a data-driven way to choose the threshold parameter for singular value soft-thresholding [CSLT13]. This approach can also be used to automatically calibrate several regularization parameters when using more complex shrinking

procedures than soft-thresholding [JS15]. In the case of a noise matrix \mathbf{W} whose distribution is orthogonally invariant, another approach to derive optimal shrinking rules [SN13, GD14, Nad14] relies on the use of random matrix theory (RMT). It is based on existing results in RMT on the asymptotic behavior of the singular values and the singular vectors of a matrix \mathbf{Y} satisfying model (1.1). In RMT, this low rank perturbation model has received considerable attention in recent years [BN12, Nad08, Deb07, BS06]. The study of the convergence of the singular values and singular vectors of \mathbf{Y} is classically carried out in the asymptotic setting where $\min(n, m) \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\lim \frac{n}{m} = c \in]0, 1]$, and under the assumption that \mathbf{W} is a random matrix with iid Gaussian entries with an appropriate variance scaling [Nad08, Deb07, BS06]. An extension of these asymptotic results to a much larger class of distributions for the noise matrix \mathbf{W} has been proposed in [BN12]. These results of the asymptotic behavior of perturbation models in RMT have then been used in [SN13, GD14, Nad14] to derive asymptotically optimal shrinkage rules (for a given class of spectral estimators) which depends on the loss function (e.g. Frobenius norm) chosen to define the risk of an estimator.

1.3 Organization of the paper

In Section 2, we first restrict our attention to Gaussian noise. We study the asymptotic behavior of the SURE formula proposed in [CSLT13, DG14] for spectral estimators using tools from RMT. This result allows to make a connection between data-driven estimators minimizing the SURE, and the asymptotically optimal shrinkage rules proposed in [BN12, Nad14] and [GD14]. Section 3 is devoted to the analysis of a data matrix whose distribution belongs to an exponential family. SURE formulas are first given for the mean squared error risk, and then for the Kullback-Leibler risk. The derivation of optimal shrinkage rules is also given for Gamma-distributed measurements and for Poisson noise. In Section 4, we study the penalized log-likelihood criterion that we propose to select an active set of singular values, and we discuss its connection to the degrees of freedom of spectral estimators. Various numerical experiments are finally proposed in Section 5 to illustrate the usefulness of the approach developed in this paper for low-rank denoising and to compare its performances with existing methods. The proofs of the main results of the paper are gathered in a technical Appendix.

2 Matrix denoising from Gaussian measurements

In this section, it is assumed that we observe an $n \times m$ data matrix \mathbf{Y} with real entries Y_{ij} satisfying the Gaussian model:

$$Y_{ij} = X_{ij} + W_{ij}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad 1 \leq j \leq m, \quad (2.1)$$

where the W_{ij} 's are iid Gaussian random variables with zero mean and known variance τ^2 , and the X_{ij} 's are the entries of an unknown $n \times m$ matrix \mathbf{X} that has a low rank structure, meaning that it admits the SVD

$$\mathbf{X} = \sum_{k=1}^{r^*} \sigma_k \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{v}_k^t,$$

where \mathbf{u}_k and \mathbf{v}_k are the left and right singular vectors associated to the singular value $\sigma_k > 0$, for each $1 \leq k \leq r^*$. Throughout the paper, the rank r^* of the matrix \mathbf{X} is assumed to be fixed, and it is typically much smaller than n and m (rows and columns dimension). Moreover, the singular values of \mathbf{X} are assumed to be distinct and such that $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \dots > \sigma_{r^*}$.

2.1 Asymptotic location of singular values

We summarize below the asymptotic behavior of the singular values $\tilde{\sigma}_k$ of \mathbf{Y} in the asymptotic framework $\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$, where the sequence $m = m_n$ is such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{n}{m} = c$ with $0 < c \leq 1$. In the case where $\mathbf{X} = 0$, it is well known [AGZ10, BS10] that the empirical distribution of the singular values of $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{W}$ (with $\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$) converges, as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, to the quarter circle distribution if $c = 1$ and to its generalized version if $c < 1$. This distribution is supported on the compact interval $[c_-, c_+]$ with

$$c_{\pm} = 1 \pm \sqrt{c}$$

where c_+ is the so-called bulk (right) edge.

In this setting, the asymptotic behavior of the singular values of $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{W}$ in the Gaussian model (2.1) is now well known [BN12, DS07, SN13], and generalization to noise matrix \mathbf{W} whose distribution is orthogonally invariant have also been recently considered in [BN12]. Below, we recall some of these results that will be needed in this paper. To this end, let us introduce the real-valued function ρ defined by

$$\rho(\sigma) = \sqrt{\frac{(1 + \sigma^2)(c + \sigma^2)}{\sigma^2}} \text{ for any } \sigma > 0.$$

Then, the following result holds (see e.g. Theorem 2.8 in [BN12] and Proposition 9 in [SN13]).

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{W}$ is a random matrix sampled from the Gaussian model (2.1) with $\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$, and $\mathbf{X} = \sum_{k=1}^{r^*} \sigma_k \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{v}_k^t$. Then, for any fixed $k \geq 1$, one has that, almost surely,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{\sigma}_k = \begin{cases} \rho(\sigma_k) & \text{if } k \leq r^* \text{ and } \sigma_k > c^{1/4}, \\ c_+ & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{\sigma}_{\min(n,m)} = c_-.$$

In what follows, we shall also use the relation

$$\frac{1}{\sigma^2} = \frac{\rho^2(\sigma) - (c + 1) - \sqrt{(\rho^2(\sigma) - (c + 1))^2 - 4c}}{2c} \text{ that holds for any } \sigma > c^{1/4}, \quad (2.2)$$

which is a consequence of e.g. the results in Section 3.1 in [BN12].

2.2 A SURE formula for spectral estimators

Recall that $\tilde{\sigma}_k$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k$) denote the singular values (resp. singular vectors) of the data matrix \mathbf{Y} . Let

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f = f(\mathbf{Y}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$$

be a given spectral estimator, where each function $f_k : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is assumed to be (almost everywhere) differentiable for $1 \leq k \leq \min(n, m)$. The resulting mapping $f : \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ will be referred to as a smooth spectral function. Let us consider the standard squared error $\text{SE}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f, \mathbf{X}) = \|\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f - \mathbf{X}\|_F^2$ as a measure of risk, where $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm of a matrix. The set of spectral functions minimizing this risk is given by $f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k^t \mathbf{X} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq \min(n, m)$. However, it cannot be used in practice since \mathbf{X} is obviously unknown.

A first alternative suggested in [GD14] and [Nad14] is to rather study the asymptotic risk $\text{SE}_\infty(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{SE}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f, \mathbf{X})$ (in the almost sure sense) in the asymptotic setting described above (namely $m = m_n \geq n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{n}{m} = c$). Then, it is proposed in [GD14] and [Nad14] to find an asymptotically optimal choice of f by minimizing $\text{SE}_\infty(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f)$ among a given class of smooth spectral functions. The results in [GD14] show that, among spectral estimators of the form $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^\eta = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} \eta(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$, where $\eta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a continuous shrinker such that $\eta(\sigma) = 0$ whenever $\sigma \leq c_+$, an asymptotically optimal shrinkage rule is given by the choice

$$\eta^*(\sigma) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma} \sqrt{(\sigma^2 - (c+1))^2 - 4c} & \text{if } \sigma > c_+, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

In [Nad14], it is proposed to consider spectral estimators of the form $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^\delta = \sum_{k=1}^r \delta_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$ where $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_r$ are positive weights. By Theorem 2.1 in [Nad14], it follows that, if $\sigma_k > c^{1/4}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq r$, then the weights which minimize $\text{SE}_\infty(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^\delta)$ over \mathbb{R}_+^r are given by

$$\delta_k^* = \delta_k(\sigma_k) = \frac{\sigma_k^4 - c}{\sigma_k \sqrt{(1 + \sigma_k^2)(c + \sigma_k^2)}}, \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq r. \quad (2.4)$$

In what follows, the shrinkage rules given by (2.3) and (2.4) are shown to be equivalent, and they will serve as a reference of asymptotic optimality.

A second alternative to choose an optimal spectral function is to study the problem of selecting a set of functions $(f_k)_{1 \leq k \leq \min(n,m)}$ that minimize the mean-squared error (MSE)

$$\text{MSE}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f, \mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{E} \left(\|\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f - \mathbf{X}\|_F^2 \right).$$

Since this MSE is unknown, it has been proposed in [CSLT13] to construct an unbiased estimate of this quantity via the principle of Stein's Unbiased Risk Estimate (SURE) [Ste81]. For any $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$, we denote by $f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})$ the (i, j) -th entry of the matrix $f(\mathbf{Y})$, which is a mapping from $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ to \mathbb{R} . For the spectral estimator $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f$, we assume that the following

condition holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left(|\mathbf{Y}_{ij} f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})| + \left| \frac{\partial f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}} \right| \right) < +\infty, \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m. \quad (2.5)$$

Then, the results in [CSLT13] imply that

$$\text{SURE}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f) = -mn\tau^2 + \|f(\mathbf{Y}) - \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2 + 2\tau^2 \text{div}(f(\mathbf{Y})), \quad (2.6)$$

is an unbiased estimate of the MSE, in the sense that $\mathbb{E}(\text{SURE}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f)) = \text{MSE}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f, \mathbf{X})$, where the divergence $\text{div}(f(\mathbf{Y})) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}$ of f admits the closed-form expression

$$\text{div}(f(\mathbf{Y})) = |m-n| \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} \frac{f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k)}{\tilde{\sigma}_k} + \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} f'_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^{\min(n,m)} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_k}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2}. \quad (2.7)$$

Note that it is implicitly understood in the formulation of condition (2.5) that each mapping $f_{ij} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable. The differentiability of the spectral function f (and thus of its components f_{ij}) is a consequence of the assumption that the functions f_1, \dots, f_n (acting on the singular values) are supposed to be differentiable. For further details, on the differentiability of f and the f_{ij} 's, we refer to Section IV in [CSLT13]. From the arguments in [CSLT13], it follows that formula (2.7) for the divergence of f is also valid under the assumption that each function f_k is almost everywhere differentiable on \mathbb{R}_+ except on a set of Lebesgue measure zero. This allows to cover the case of singular values shrinkage by soft-thresholding which corresponds to the choice

$$f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) = (\tilde{\sigma}_k - \lambda)_+, \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq \min(n, m),$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a threshold parameter.

2.3 Asymptotic behavior of the SURE

We study now the asymptotic behavior of the SURE formula (2.6). To this end, we shall use Proposition 2.1, but we will also need the following result (whose proof can be found in the Appendix) to study some of the terms in expression (2.7) of the divergence of $f(\mathbf{Y})$.

Proposition 2.2. *Assume that \mathbf{Y} is a random matrix sampled from the Gaussian model (2.1) with $\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$ and $m = m_n \geq n$. Suppose that $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \dots > \sigma_{r^*}$. Then, for any fixed $1 \leq k \leq r^*$ such that $\sigma_k > c^{1/4}$, one has that, almost surely,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^n \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_k}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} = \frac{1}{\rho(\sigma_k)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_k^2} \right).$$

We will now restrict our analysis to the following class of spectral estimators (the terminology in the definition below is borrowed from [GD14]).

Definition 2.1. Let $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f = f(\mathbf{Y}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$ be a spectral estimator. For a given $1 \leq r \leq \min(n, m)$, the estimator f is said to be a spectral shrinker of order r that collapses the bulk to 0 if

$$\begin{cases} f_k(\sigma) = 0 & \text{whenever } \sigma \leq c_+ \text{ and } 1 \leq k \leq r, \\ f_k(\sigma) = 0 & \text{for all } \sigma \geq 0 \text{ and } k > r. \end{cases}$$

Now, for a spectral shrinker $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f$ of order r that collapses the bulk to 0, we study the asymptotic behavior of the terms in expression (2.6) that only depend on f , namely

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{SURE}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f) &= \sum_{k=1}^r (f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) - \tilde{\sigma}_k)^2 + 2 \left(1 - \frac{n}{m}\right) \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k)}{\tilde{\sigma}_k} + \frac{2}{m} \sum_{k=1}^r f'_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \\ &\quad + 4 \frac{n}{m} \sum_{k=1}^r f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^n \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_k}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

The reason for studying $\overline{\text{SURE}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f)$ is that finding an optimal shrinkage rule that minimizes $\text{SURE}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f)$ is equivalent to minimize expression (2.8) over spectral shrinkers of order r that collapses the bulk to 0. Then, using Proposition 2.1, Proposition 2.2, and the assumption that the f_k 's are continuously differentiable functions on \mathbb{R}_+ (except on a set of Lebesgue measure zero), we immediately obtain the following result.

Lemma 2.1. Assume that \mathbf{Y} is a random matrix sampled from the Gaussian model (2.1) with $\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$ and $m = m_n \geq n$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f$ be a spectral shrinker of order $r \leq r^*$ that collapses the bulk to 0, such that each function f_k , for $1 \leq k \leq r$, is continuously differentiable on $]c_+, +\infty[$. Moreover, assume that $\sigma_k > c^{1/4}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq r$. Then, one has that, almost surely,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{\text{SURE}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f) = \sum_{k=1}^r (f_k(\rho(\sigma_k)) - \rho(\sigma_k))^2 + 2f_k(\rho(\sigma_k)) \left(\frac{\sigma_k^2(1+c) + 2c}{\sigma_k^2 \rho(\sigma_k)} \right) \quad (2.9)$$

2.4 Asymptotically optimal shrinking rules of singular values

Thanks to Lemma 2.1, one may determine an asymptotic optimal spectral shrinker. For this purpose, let us define the class of estimators

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r = \sum_{k=1}^r w_k \tilde{\sigma}_k \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+\}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t, \quad (2.10)$$

where $1 \leq r \leq r^*$ is a given integer, and the w_k 's are positive weights. In practice, the estimator $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ is computed by replacing the bulk edge c_+ by its approximation $c_+^{n,m} = 1 + \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}$ in eq. (2.10). For moderate to large values of n and m , the quantities c_+ and $c_+^{n,m}$ are very close, and this replacement does not change the numerical performances of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$.

Then, provided that $\sigma_k > c^{1/4}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq r$, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{\text{SURE}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r) = \sum_{k=1}^r \rho^2(\sigma_k) (w_k - 1)^2 + 2w_k \left(\frac{\sigma_k^2(1+c) + 2c}{\sigma_k^2} \right).$$

Differentiating the above expression with respect to each weight w_k leads to the following choice of asymptotically optimal weights

$$w_k^* = 1 - \frac{\sigma_k^2(1+c) + 2c}{\sigma_k^2 \rho^2(\sigma_k)} \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq r. \quad (2.11)$$

Therefore, if the singular values of the matrix \mathbf{X} to be estimated are sufficiently large (namely $\sigma_k > c^{1/4}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq r$), by using Proposition 2.1 and eq. (2.11), one has that an asymptotically optimal spectral shrinker order $r \leq r^*$ is given by the choice of functions

$$f_k^*(\rho(\sigma_k)) = \begin{cases} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_k^2(1+c) + 2c}{\sigma_k^2 \rho^2(\sigma_k)}\right) \rho(\sigma_k) & \text{if } \rho(\sigma_k) > c_+, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq r. \quad (2.12)$$

Using, the relation (2.2) one may also express the asymptotically optimal shrinking rule (2.12) either as a function of $\rho(\sigma_k)$ only,

$$f_k^*(\rho(\sigma_k)) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\rho(\sigma_k)} \sqrt{(\rho^2(\sigma_k) - (c+1))^2 - 4c} & \text{if } \rho(\sigma_k) > c_+, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

or as function of σ_k only (using that $\rho(\sigma_k) > c_+$ is equivalent to $\sigma_k > c^{1/4}$),

$$f_k^*(\rho(\sigma_k)) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma_k^4 - c}{\sigma_k \sqrt{(1+\sigma_k^2)(c+\sigma_k^2)}} & \text{if } \sigma_k > c^{1/4}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

Therefore, we remark that the shrinkage rule (2.13) coincide with the rule (2.3) which has been obtained in [GD14]. Similarly, when the quantity $f_k^*(\rho(\sigma_k))$ is expressed as a function of σ_k only in (2.14), then we retrieve the shrinking rule (2.4) derived in [Nad14]. Therefore, it appears that minimizing either the asymptotic behavior of the SURE or the SE risk lead to the same choice of an asymptotically optimal spectral function.

2.5 Optimal shrinkage of empirical singular values

Let us now consider the problem of finding a data-based spectral shrinker of the (empirical) singular values of the data matrix \mathbf{Y} under the assumption that $\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$. To this end, we consider again the class of spectral estimators $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ defined by eq. (2.10). By applying the SURE formula (2.6), we obtain the following unbiased estimator of $\text{MSE}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r, \mathbf{X})$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SURE}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r) &= -mn\tau^2 + \sum_{k=1}^r (w_k - 1)^2 \tilde{\sigma}_k^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+\}} + \tilde{\sigma}_k^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_k \leq c_+\}} + \sum_{k=r+1}^{\min(n,m)} \tilde{\sigma}_k^2 \\ &\quad + 2\tau^2 \sum_{k=1}^r \left(1 + |m - n| + 2 \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^{\min(n,m)} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} \right) w_k \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+\}}. \end{aligned}$$

For each $1 \leq k \leq r$, if $\tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+$, then, by differentiating the above expression with respect to w_k , it follows that an optimal weighting of the k -th empirical singular value is given by

$$w_k(\mathbf{Y}) = \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2} \left(1 + |m - n| + 2 \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^{\min(n, m)} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} \right) \right)_+.$$

These calculations finally lead to the following data-based choice of spectral function of order r that collapses the bulk to 0

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r = \sum_{k=1}^r \hat{f}_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t, \quad (2.15)$$

where $\hat{f}_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) = w_k(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_k \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+\}}$, for all $1 \leq k \leq r$. From Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.2 that, if $\sigma_k > c^{1/4}$, then, almost surely,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \hat{f}_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) = \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_k^2(1+c) + 2c}{\sigma_k^2 \rho^2(\sigma_k)} \right) \rho(\sigma_k), \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq r \leq r^*.$$

Therefore, the data-driven spectral estimator $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ (2.15) asymptotically leads to the optimal shrinking rule of singular values given by (2.12). Note that when $\tau \neq 1/\sqrt{m}$, it suffices to replace the condition $\tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+$ by $\tilde{\sigma}_k > \tau(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})$ in the definition of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$.

3 Beyond the Gaussian model

In this section, we extend the approach developed in Section 2 to the case of data sampled from an exponential family for the purpose of obtaining data-driven shrinkage rules of the singular values of \mathbf{Y} using unbiased risk estimates. For an introduction to exponential families, we refer to [Bro86]. The idea of unbiased risk estimation in exponential families dates back to [Hud78]. More recently, generalized SURE formulas, in either continuous or discrete exponential families, have been proposed in [Eld09] for the estimation of the MSE risk in inverse problems, and in [Del15] for the estimation of the Kullback-Leibler risk. In what follows, we borrow some ideas and results from these works.

3.1 Data sampled from an exponential family

We recall that \mathbf{Y} is an $n \times m$ matrix with independent and real entries \mathbf{Y}_{ij} . For each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$, we assume that the random variable \mathbf{Y}_{ij} is sampled from a given exponential family of distributions on \mathbb{R} . We distinguish two classical settings:

- the continuous case, where each random variable \mathbf{Y}_{ij} admits a probability density function (pdf) $q(y; \mathbf{X}_{ij})$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure dy on the real line $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$,
- the discrete case, where each random variable \mathbf{Y}_{ij} takes its value in the discrete set $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{Z}$, and is such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_{ij} = y) = q(y; \mathbf{X}_{ij})$ where $q(\cdot; \mathbf{X}_{ij})$ denotes a discrete probability measure on \mathbb{Z} .

In both settings, we assume that the pdf (or the discrete measure) $q(y; \mathbf{X}_{ij})$ of \mathbf{Y}_{ij} can be written in the general form:

$$q(y; \mathbf{X}_{ij}) = h(y) \exp(\eta(\mathbf{X}_{ij})y - A(\eta(\mathbf{X}_{ij}))), \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (3.1)$$

where η (the link function) is a one-to-one and smooth function, A (the log-partition function) is a twice differentiable mapping, h is a known function, and \mathbf{X}_{ij} is an unknown parameter of interest belonging to some open subset \mathcal{X} of \mathbb{R} . Throughout the paper, we will suppose that the following assumption holds:

Assumption 3.1. *The link function η and the log-partition function A are such that*

$$A'(\eta(x)) = x \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X},$$

where A' denotes the first derivative of A .

Since $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Y}_{ij}) = A'(\eta(\mathbf{X}_{ij}))$ for exponential families in the general form (3.1), Assumption 3.1 implies that $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Y}_{ij}) = \mathbf{X}_{ij}$. Now, if we let $\Theta = \eta(\mathcal{X})$, it will be also convenient to consider the expression of the pdf (or the discrete measure) of \mathbf{Y}_{ij} in the canonical form:

$$p(y; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}) = h(y) \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}y - A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij})), \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij} = \eta(\mathbf{X}_{ij}) \in \Theta$ is usually called the canonical parameter of the exponential family. Finally, we also recall the relation $\text{Var}(\mathbf{Y}_{ij}) = A''(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}) = A''(\eta(\mathbf{X}_{ij}))$.

We still denote by \mathbf{X} the $n \times m$ matrix whose entries are the \mathbf{X}_{ij} 's, and we let $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ be the $n \times m$ matrix whose entries are the $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}$'s. Examples of data satisfying model (3.1) are the following ones:

Gaussian noise with known variance τ^2 :

$$q(y; \mathbf{X}_{ij}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y - \mathbf{X}_{ij})^2}{2\tau^2}\right), \quad \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Y}_{ij}) = \mathbf{X}_{ij}, \quad \text{Var}(\mathbf{Y}_{ij}) = \tau^2,$$

$$\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}, \quad \Theta = \mathbb{R}, \quad h(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\tau}} \exp\left(-\frac{y^2}{2\tau^2}\right), \quad \eta(x) = \frac{x}{\tau^2}, \quad A(\theta) = \tau^2 \frac{\theta^2}{2}.$$

Gamma-distributed measurements with known shape parameter $L > 0$:

$$q(y; \mathbf{X}_{ij}) = \frac{L^L y^{L-1}}{\Gamma(L) \mathbf{X}_{ij}^L} \exp\left(-L \frac{y}{\mathbf{X}_{ij}}\right) \mathbb{1}_{]0, +\infty[}(y), \quad \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Y}_{ij}) = \mathbf{X}_{ij}, \quad \text{Var}(\mathbf{Y}_{ij}) = \frac{\mathbf{X}_{ij}^2}{L},$$

$$\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathcal{X} =]0, +\infty[, \quad \Theta =]-\infty, 0[, \quad h(y) = \frac{L^L y^{L-1}}{\Gamma(L)} \mathbb{1}_{]0, +\infty[}(y), \quad \eta(x) = -\frac{L}{x}, \quad A(\theta) = -L \log\left(-\frac{\theta}{L}\right).$$

Poisson distributed measurements:

$$q(y; \mathbf{X}_{ij}) = \frac{\mathbf{X}_{ij}^y}{y!} \exp(-\mathbf{X}_{ij}) \mathbb{1}_{y \in \mathbb{N}}, \quad \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Y}_{ij}) = \mathbf{X}_{ij}, \quad \text{Var}(\mathbf{Y}_{ij}) = \mathbf{X}_{ij},$$

$$\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{Z}, \mathcal{X} =]0, +\infty[, \Theta =]0, +\infty[, h(y) = \frac{1}{y!} \mathbb{1}_{y \in \mathbb{N}}, \eta(x) = \log(x), A(\theta) = \exp(\theta).$$

We let $\mathbf{Y} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$ denote the SVD decomposition of a matrix \mathbf{Y} whose entries are independently sampled from the model (3.1). To estimate the matrix \mathbf{X} , we will consider again spectral estimators of the form

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f = f(\mathbf{Y}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} w_k(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t,$$

where the $w_1(\mathbf{Y}), w_2(\mathbf{Y}), \dots, w_{\min(n,m)}(\mathbf{Y})$ are (possibly data-driven) weights chosen in such a way that each (i, j) -th entry $f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})$ of the matrix $f(\mathbf{Y})$ belongs to the space of parameters \mathcal{X} . For Gamma or Poisson distributed measurements, this implies the condition $f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$. Such a condition is not always straightforward to obtain, and we shall discuss this issue in Section 5 on numerical experiments where various strategies to search for optimal values of the weights $w_k(\mathbf{Y})$ are discussed.

The matrix $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can then be estimated via the $n \times m$ matrix $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f(\mathbf{Y})$ whose entries are given by

$$\hat{\theta}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) = \eta(f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})), \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m. \quad (3.3)$$

In the rest of this section, we follow the arguments in [Eld09] and [Del15] to derive generalized SURE formulas in an exponential family for the estimators $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f$, using either the mean-squared error (MSE) risk or the Kullback-Leibler (KL) risk.

3.2 Unbiased estimation of the MSE risk

Continuous exponential family: for data sampled from a continuous exponential family, we consider the following MSE risk which provides a measure of discrepancy in the space Θ of natural parameters, and then indirectly in the space of interest \mathcal{X} .

Definition 3.1. The squared error (SE) risk of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f$ is $\text{SE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F^2$, and the mean-squared error (MSE) risk of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f$ is defined as $\text{MSE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F^2)$.

Using the above MSE risk to compare $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ implies that the discrepancy between the estimator $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f$ and the matrix of interest \mathbf{X} is measured by the quantity $\text{MSE}_\eta(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f, \mathbf{X}) = \text{MSE}(\eta(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f), \eta(\mathbf{X}))$, where the mapping $\eta : \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ has to be understood as the entry-wise application of the link function η to each entry of either $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f$ or \mathbf{X} . For Gaussian noise, one has that $\text{MSE}_\eta(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f, \mathbf{X}) = \frac{1}{\tau^2} \mathbb{E}(\|\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f - \mathbf{X}\|_F^2)$, while in the case of Gamma distributed measurements with known shape parameter $L > 0$, it follows that $\text{MSE}_\eta(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f, \mathbf{X}) = L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_{ij} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f}{\mathbf{X}_{ij} \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f} \right)^2$. In the continuous case, the following proposition gives a SURE formula to estimate the MSE risk introduced in Definition 3.1.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that the data are sampled from a continuous exponential family. Assume that the function h , in the definition (3.2) of the exponential family, is twice continuously differentiable on $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$. If the following condition holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) \right| \right) < +\infty, \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m, \quad (3.4)$$

then, the quantity

$$\text{GSURE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f(\mathbf{Y})\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(2 \frac{h'(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) + \frac{h''(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} \right) + 2 \operatorname{div} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f(\mathbf{Y}) \right)$$

is an unbiased estimator of $\text{MSE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta})$, where $\operatorname{div} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f(\mathbf{Y}) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}$.

It can be checked that the condition $\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) \right| \right) < +\infty$ is equivalent to the condition $\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \frac{h'(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) \right| + \left| \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}} \right| \right) < +\infty$. Therefore, in the case of Gaussian measurements, the condition (3.4) is equivalent to the condition (2.5).

Discrete exponential family: in the case of data sampled from a discrete exponential family (with $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{Z}$), the key result to obtain unbiased estimate of a given risk is the following lemma which dates back to the work in [Hud78].

Lemma 3.1. *Let $F : \mathbb{Z}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be a measurable mapping. Let $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$, and denote by $F_{ij} : \mathbb{Z}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a measurable function. Let $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times m}$ be a matrix whose entries are independently sampled from a discrete distribution on $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{Z}$ that belongs to the exponential family (3.2) in canonical form. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}) F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij} - 1)}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^t) \right),$$

where, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$, $F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})$ denotes the (i, j) -th entry of the matrix $F(\mathbf{Y})$, and \mathbf{e}_i (resp. \mathbf{e}_j) denotes the vector of \mathbb{R}^n (resp. \mathbb{R}^m) with the i -th entry (resp. j -th entry) equals to one and all others equal to zero.

Hence, Hudson's lemma provides a way to estimate (in an unbiased way) the expectation of the Frobenius inner product between the matrix $\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and the matrix $F(\mathbf{Y})$, where $\exp : \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ denotes the entry-wise exponential. To see the usefulness of this result, we shall consider the following mean-squared error for the "exp-natural" parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE}_{\exp}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \exp(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) - \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|_F^2 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \exp(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) \right\|_F^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) + \left\| \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|_F^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.1, one immediately obtains that an unbiased (and data-driven) estimate of the quantity $\text{MSE}_{\text{exp}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \|\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_F^2$ is given by

$$\text{GSURE}_{\text{exp}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) = \left\| \exp(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) \right\|_F^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij} - 1)}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^t). \quad (3.5)$$

This approach is essentially meaningful for the case of Poisson distributed measurements since, in this setting, one has that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f = \log(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f)$, and thus the MSE for the “exp-natural” parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ coincides with the usual MSE in the space of interest \mathcal{X} , namely $\text{MSE}_{\text{exp}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E} \left(\|\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f - \mathbf{X}\|_F^2 \right)$. Therefore, for Poisson noise, the generalized SURE formula (3.5) leads to the estimator

$$\text{PURE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) = \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}^f \right\|_F^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{Y}_{ij} f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^t), \quad (3.6)$$

which is an unbiased estimate of the quantity $\mathbb{E}(\|\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f - \mathbf{X}\|_F^2) - \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2$.

3.3 Unbiased estimation of KL risks

Following the terminology in [Del15], let us now introduce two different notions of Kullback-Leibler risk, which arise from the non-symmetry of this discrepancy measure.

Definition 3.2. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be a smooth spectral function. Consider the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f$ defined by (3.3), where \mathbf{Y} is a matrix whose entries \mathbf{Y}_{ij} are independent random variables sampled from the exponential family (3.2) in canonical form:

- the Kullback-Leibler synthesis (KLS) risk of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f$ is defined as

$$\text{KLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \log \left(\frac{p(y; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f)}{p(y; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij})} \right) p(y; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f) dy \right),$$

and the mean KLS risk of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f$ is defined as $\text{MKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E} \left(\text{KLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)$,

- the Kullback-Leibler analysis (KLA) risk of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f$ is defined as

$$\text{KLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \log \left(\frac{p(y; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij})}{p(y; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f)} \right) p(y; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}) dy \right),$$

and the mean KLA risk of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f$ is defined as $\text{MKLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E} \left(\text{KLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)$.

A key advantage of the Kullback-Leibler risk is that it measures the discrepancy between the unknown distribution $p(y; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij})$ and its estimate $p(y; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f)$. It is thus invariant with respect to the reparametrization $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f = \eta(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f)$ (unlike the MSE risk). As suggested in [Del15], the MKLA risk represents how well the distribution $p(y; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f)$ explain a random variable \mathbf{Y}_{ij} sampled from the pdf $p(y; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij})$. The MKLA risk is a natural loss function in many statistical problems since it takes as a reference measure the true distribution of the data, see e.g. [Hal87]. The MKLS risk represents how well one may generate an independent copy of \mathbf{Y}_{ij} by sampling a random variable from the pdf $p(y; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f)$. The MKLS risk has also been considered in various inference problems in statistics [HL06, Yan94].

By simple calculation, it follows that

$$\text{MKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij} \right) A'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f) \right) + A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}) - \mathbb{E} \left(A(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f) \right), \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$\text{MKLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f \right) A'(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(A(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f) \right) - A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}). \quad (3.8)$$

Hence, in the case of Gaussian measurements with known variance τ^2 , we easily retrieve that $\text{MKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \text{MKLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\tau^2}{2} \text{MSE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2\tau^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\|\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f - \mathbf{X}\|_F^2 \right)$. In the case of Gamma distributed measurements with known shape parameter $L > 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= L \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f}{\mathbf{X}_{ij}} - \log \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f}{\mathbf{X}_{ij}} \right) - 1 \right), \\ \text{MKLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= L \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_{ij}}{\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f} - \log \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_{ij}}{\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f} \right) - 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

while for Poisson noise, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{X}_{ij} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f \log \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_{ij}}{\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f} \right) \right), \\ \text{MKLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f - \mathbf{X}_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{ij} \log \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f}{\mathbf{X}_{ij}} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Below, we use some of the results in [Del15] whose main contributions are the derivation of new unbiased estimators of the MKLS and MKLA risks.

Continuous exponential family: in the continuous case, the risk estimate derived in [Del15] is unbiased for the MKLS risk, while it is only asymptotically unbiased for the MKLA risk with

respect to the signal-to-noise ratio. For data sampled from a continuous exponential family, this makes simpler the use of the MKLS risk to derive optimal shrinking rules in low rank matrix denoising, and we have therefore chosen to concentrate our study on this risk in this setting. The following proposition establishes a SURE formula to estimate the MKLS risk in the continuous case.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that the data are sampled from a continuous exponential family. Assume that the function h , in the definition (3.2) of the exponential family, is continuously differentiable on $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that the function A , in the definition (3.2) of the exponential family, is twice continuously differentiable on Θ . If the following condition holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| A'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) \right| \right) < +\infty, \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m, \quad (3.10)$$

then, the quantity

$$\text{SUKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) + \frac{h'(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} \right) A'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) - A(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) \right) + \text{div}(f(\mathbf{Y})), \quad (3.11)$$

is an unbiased estimator of $\text{MKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij})$, where $\text{div}(f(\mathbf{Y})) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}$.

Discrete exponential family: from the arguments in [Del15], there does not currently exist an approach to derive a SURE formula for the MKLS risk in the discrete case since Hudson's Lemma 3.1 only provides an unbiased estimator of $\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}) F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})$ which is not a quantity of interest when estimating the MKLS risk because of its expression (3.8) in exponential families. Nevertheless, as shown in [Del15], it is possible to unbiasedly estimate the MKLA risk for Poisson distributed measurements.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose that the data are sampled from a Poisson distribution. Then, the quantity*

$$\text{PUKLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f - \mathbf{Y}_{ij} \log(f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^t)) \quad (3.12)$$

is an unbiased estimator of $\text{MKLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{X}_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{ij} \log(\mathbf{X}_{ij})$, where \mathbf{e}_i (resp. \mathbf{e}_j) denotes the vector of \mathbb{R}^n (resp. \mathbb{R}^m) with the i -th entry (resp. j -th entry) equals to one and all others equal to zero.

3.4 Optimal shrinkage in low-rank matrix denoising for some exponential families

To show how the generalized SURE formula given above lead to optimal shrinkage rules, we first consider estimators of the form

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 = f(\mathbf{Y}) = w_1 \tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t, \quad (3.13)$$

where w_1 is a weight (to be chosen), and we let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_w^1 = \eta \left(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 \right)$.

Gamma distributed measurements with known shape parameter $L > 2$

Assuming that $L > 2$ implies that the conditions on the function h in Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 are satisfied. Let $\mathbf{X}^f = f(\mathbf{Y}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$ be a given spectral estimator such that all its entries $f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})$ are positive (i.e. they belong to the set $\mathcal{X} =]0, +\infty[$), and where each function $f_k : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is assumed to be differentiable. Assuming that conditions (3.4) and (3.10) hold, and using that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) = -\frac{L}{f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})}$ and $\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}} = \frac{L}{|f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})|^2} \frac{\partial f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}$, it follows that

$$\text{GSURE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{L^2}{|f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})|^2} - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\frac{L(L-1)}{\mathbf{Y}_{ij} f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})} - L \frac{\frac{\partial f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}}{|f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})|^2} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m -\frac{(L-1)(L-2)}{|\mathbf{Y}_{ij}|^2}.$$

and that

$$\text{SUKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left((L-1) \frac{f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})}{\mathbf{Y}_{ij}} - L \log(f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})) \right) - Lmn + \text{div}(f(\mathbf{Y})),$$

where

$$\text{div}(f(\mathbf{Y})) = |m-n| \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} \frac{f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k)}{\tilde{\sigma}_k} + \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} f'_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^{\min(n,m)} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_k}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2},$$

by the results in [CSLT13] that are recalled in Section 2.

For Gamma distributed measurements, all the entries of the matrix \mathbf{Y} are strictly positive, and thus, by the Perron-Frobenius theorem, all the entries of the first singular vectors $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1$ are strictly positive. Therefore, for any positive weight w_1 , all the entries of the spectral estimator $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1$ belong to the set $\mathcal{X} =]0, +\infty[$. Therefore, finding an optimal weight may be found by optimizing either $w_1 \mapsto \text{GSURE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_w^1)$ or $w_1 \mapsto \text{SUKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_w^1)$ over the set of positive reals.

However, from the above formula for GSURE, it is not possible to obtain, in a closed form, the optimal value of the weight w_1 that minimizes the criterion $\text{GSURE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_w^1)$. An algorithm to find a numerical approximation of this optimal value is thus given in Section 5. To the contrary, it follows by simple calculations that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SUKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_w^1) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m (L-1) w_1 \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1 \alpha_{ij}}{\mathbf{Y}_{ij}} - mnL \log(w_1) - L \log \left(\frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1 \alpha_{ij}}{\mathbf{Y}_{ij}} \right) - Lmn \\ &\quad + (1 + |m-n|) w_1 + 2w_1 \sum_{\ell=2}^{\min(n,m)} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2}. \end{aligned}$$

where α_{ij} denotes the (i, j) -th entry of the $n \times m$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$. Hence, since all the α_{ij} 's are positive by the Perron-Frobenius theorem, the optimal value of w_1 minimizing $\text{SUKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_w^1)$ is given by

$$w_1(\mathbf{Y}) = \frac{L}{L-1} \left(\frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1 \alpha_{ij}}{\mathbf{Y}_{ij}} + \frac{1}{mn(L-1)} \left(1 + |m-n| + 2 \sum_{\ell=2}^{\min(n,m)} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} \right) \right)^{-1}$$

which yields the optimal shrinking rule (1.5) stated in the Introduction.

Poisson distributed measurements

Let us now consider the case of Poisson distributed measurements, in the situation where all the entries of the data matrix \mathbf{Y} are strictly positive. Under this assumption, by the Perron-Frobenius theorem, the entries of the spectral estimator $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1$ are strictly positive provided that $w_1 > 0$. Then, the generalized SURE formula (3.6) and Proposition 3.3 applied with the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_w^1 = \log(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1)$ yield to

$$\text{PURE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_w^1) = w_1^2 \tilde{\sigma}_1^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{Y}_{ij} w_1 \tilde{\sigma}_1^{(ij)} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}^{(ij)} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,j}^{(ij)},$$

and

$$\text{PUKLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_w^1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m w_1 \tilde{\sigma}_1 \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ij} - \mathbf{Y}_{ij} \left(\log(w_1) + \log \left(\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(ij)} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}^{(ij)} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,j}^{(ij)} \right) \right)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ij} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,j}$, $\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(ij)}$ is the largest singular value of the matrix $\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^t$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1^{(ij)}$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^{(ij)}$) denotes its left (resp. right) singular vectors. Therefore, an optimal value for w_1 which minimizes $\text{PURE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_w^1)$ is given by

$$\tilde{w}_1 = \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{Y}_{ij} \tilde{\sigma}_1^{(ij)} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}^{(ij)} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,j}^{(ij)}.$$

However, this optimal shrinking rule cannot be used in practice since evaluating the values of $\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(ij)}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1^{(ij)}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^{(ij)}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$ is not feasible from a computational point of view for large values of n and m . Nevertheless, a fast algorithm to find a numerical approximation of the optimal value \tilde{w}_1 is proposed in Section 5.

To the contrary, using again that all the $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ij}$'s are positive by the Perron-Frobenius theorem, the value of w_1 minimizing $\text{PUKLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_w^1)$ is

$$w_1(\mathbf{Y}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\sigma}_1 \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ij}},$$

which is straightforward to compute. This corresponds to the optimal shrinkage rule (1.6) given in the Introduction.

Beyond the case $r = 1$

For spectral estimators of the form $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f = f(\mathbf{Y}) = \sum_{k=1}^r w_k \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$ which act on the first r singular value $\tilde{\sigma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_r$ with $r \geq 2$, it is not possible to follow the same strategy to derive optimal shrinking rule in a closed-form using the GSURE and SUKLS formulas. Nevertheless, we shall investigate how optimal shrinking rules for $r \geq 2$ can be approximated in Section 5 on numerical experiments.

4 Estimating the active set of singular values in exponential families

In this section, we propose to formulate a new Akaike information criterion (AIC) to select an appropriate set of singular values over which a shrinkage procedure might be applied. To this end, we shall consider the estimator defined for a subset $s \subseteq \mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \dots, \min(n, m)\}$ as $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s = \sum_{k \in s} \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$, and we address the problem of selecting an optimal subset s^* from the data \mathbf{Y} .

In the case of Gaussian measurements, the shrinkage estimators that we use in our numerical experiments are of the form $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \sum_{k \in s^*} \hat{f}_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$ where

$$s^* = \{k ; \tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+^{n,m}\} \text{ with } c_+^{n,m} = 1 + \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}},$$

for some (possibly data-dependent) shrinkage functions \hat{f}_k . The set s^* is based on the knowledge of an approximation $c_+^{n,m}$ of the bulk edge c_+ . Thanks to Proposition 2.1, the bulk edge c_+ is interpreted as the threshold which allows to distinguish the locations of significant singular values in the data from those due to the presence of additive noise. Interestingly, the following result shows that the active set s^* may be interpreted through the prism of model selection using the minimisation of a penalized log-likelihood criterion.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{W}$ where the entries of \mathbf{W} are iid Gaussian variables with zero mean and standard deviation $\tau = 1/\sqrt{m}$. Then, we have*

$$s^* = \arg \min_{s \subseteq \mathcal{I}} m \|\mathbf{Y} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s\|_F^2 + 2|s|p_{n,m} \text{ with } p_{n,m} = \left(\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})^2\right), \quad (4.1)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s = \sum_{k \in s} \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$ for $s \in \mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \dots, \min(n, m)\}$, and $|s|$ is the cardinal of s .

Proof. We remark that $\mathbf{Y} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s = \sum_{k \notin s} \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$. It results that

$$m \|\mathbf{Y} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s\|_F^2 + 2|s|p_{n,m} = m \sum_{k \notin s} \tilde{\sigma}_k^2 + 2|s|p_{n,m} = \sum_{k=1}^n \begin{cases} m\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 & \text{if } k \notin s \\ 2p_{n,m} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (4.2)$$

Using that $\sqrt{2p_{n,m}/m} = c_+^{n,m}$, it follows that the set $s^* = \{k ; \tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+^{n,m}\}$ is by definition such that $k \in s^*$ if and only if $2p_{n,m} < m\tilde{\sigma}_k^2$. Therefore, by (4.2), the criterion $s \mapsto m \|\mathbf{Y} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s\|_F^2 + 2|s|p_{n,m}$ is minimum at $s = s^*$ which concludes the proof. \square

In the model $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{W}$, where the entries of \mathbf{W} are iid Gaussian variables with zero mean and variance τ^2 , it is well known that the degrees of freedom (DOF) of a given estimator $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ is defined as

$$\text{DOF}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}) = \frac{1}{\tau^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}, \mathbf{Y}_{ij}) = \frac{1}{\tau^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij} \mathbf{W}_{ij}).$$

The DOF is widely used in statistics to define various criteria for model selection among a collection of estimators, see e.g. [Efr04]. In low rank matrix denoising, the following proposition shows that it is possible to derive the asymptotic behavior of the DOF of spectral estimators.

Proposition 4.2. Assume that $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{W}$ where the entries of \mathbf{W} are iid Gaussian variables with zero mean and standard deviation $\tau = 1/\sqrt{m}$, with $m = m_n \geq n$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f$ be a spectral shrinker of order $r \leq r^*$ that collapses the bulk to 0, such that each function f_k , for $1 \leq k \leq r$, is continuously differentiable on $]c_+, +\infty[$. Moreover, assume that $\sigma_k > c^{1/4}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq r$. Then, one has that, almost surely,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} \text{DOF}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f) = \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{f_k(\rho(\sigma_k))}{\rho(\sigma_k)} \left(1 + c + \frac{2c}{\sigma_k^2}\right).$$

Proof. Thanks to the derivation of the SURE in [Ste81] and formula (2.7) on the divergence of spectral estimators, one has that

$$\text{DOF}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f) = \mathbb{E} \left(\text{div} \left(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f \right) \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(|m - n| \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k)}{\tilde{\sigma}_k} + \sum_{k=1}^r f'_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^r f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^n \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_k}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} \right).$$

By Proposition 2.1, Proposition 2.2, and our assumptions on the f_k 's, one has that, almost surely,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} \text{div} \left(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^f \right) = \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{f_k(\rho(\sigma_k))}{\rho(\sigma_k)} \left(1 + c + \frac{2c}{\sigma_k^2}\right).$$

which completes the proof. \square

Hence, by Proposition 4.2 and using that $\sigma_k^2 > \sqrt{c}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq r$, it follows that if $s \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} \text{DOF}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^s) = |s| \left(1 + c + \frac{2c}{\sigma_k^2}\right) \leq |s| (1 + \sqrt{c})^2 = |s| c_+^2. \quad (4.3)$$

Hence, the quantity $2|s| \left(\frac{1}{2} (\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})^2 \right)$ is asymptotically an upper bound of $\text{DOF}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^s)$ (when normalized by $1/m$) for any given set $s \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$.

Let us now consider the more general case where the entries of \mathbf{Y} are sampled from an exponential family. To the best of our knowledge, extending the notion of the bulk edge to non-Gaussian data sampled from an exponential family has not been considered so far in the literature on random matrices and low rank perturbation model. Therefore, except in the Gaussian case, it is far from being trivial to find an appropriate threshold value \bar{c} to define an active set in the form $\bar{s} = \{k ; \tilde{\sigma}_k > \bar{c}\}$.

Nevertheless, to select an appropriate active set of singular values, we introduce the following criterion that is inspired by the previous results on the DOF of the estimator $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s$ in the Gaussian case and the statistical literature on the well known AIC for model selection [Aka74].

Definition 4.1. The AIC associated to $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s = \sum_{k \in s} \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$ is

$$\text{AIC}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s) = -2 \log q(\mathbf{Y}; \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s) + 2|s| p_{n,m} \quad \text{with} \quad p_{n,m} = \frac{1}{2} (\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})^2. \quad (4.4)$$

where $|s|$ is the cardinal of s , and $q(\mathbf{Y}; \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s) = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^m q(\mathbf{Y}_{ij}; \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^s)$ is the likelihood of the data in the general form (3.1) at the estimated parameters $\mathbf{X}_{ij} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^s$.

In the above definition of $\text{AIC}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s)$, the quantity $2|s|p_{n,m}$ is an approximation of the degree of freedom of $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s$, i.e., of the numbers of its free parameters as it is justified by Proposition 4.2 in the case of Gaussian measurements. The AIC allows us to define an optimal subset of active variables as

$$s^* = \arg \min_{s \subseteq \mathcal{I}} \text{AIC}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^s).$$

For Gaussian measurements, Proposition 4.1 gives the value of the optimal set s^* in a closed-form. To the contrary, for Gamma or Poisson measurements, the search of an optimal subset s^* remains a combinatorial problem. In our numerical experiments, we thus choose to construct an approximation \tilde{s} of s^* with a greedy search strategy that reads as follows

$$\tilde{s} = \left\{ k \in \mathcal{I} ; \text{AIC}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathcal{I} \setminus \{k\}}) \leq \text{AIC}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathcal{I}}) \right\} \quad (4.5)$$

For Gaussian measurements, $\tilde{s} = s^*$ since the optimisation problem (4.5) becomes separable. In our numerical experiments, we have found that \tilde{s} selects a relevant set of active singular values which separates well the structural content of \mathbf{X} while removing most of the noise component. Further details are given in Section 5 below.

5 Numerical experiments

In this section, we present numerical experiments to illustrate the performances of the novel data-driven shrinkage rules of singular values proposed in this paper for matrix denoising from Gaussian, Gamma and Poisson measurements.

5.1 An algorithmic approach to find data-based spectral estimators

First, we discuss on how to compute data-based spectral estimators from the expression of risk estimators. For SURE and SUKLS, eq. (2.6) and (3.11) provide respectively a closed-form solution that can be evaluated in linear time $O(nm)$. On the contrary, the computations of $\text{GSURE}_{\text{exp}}$, PURE and PUKLA, given respectively in eq. (3.5), (3.6) and (3.12), cannot be evaluated in reasonable time. They rely respectively on the computation of the divergence $\text{div}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f(\mathbf{Y}))$, $\sum \sum \mathbf{Y}_{ij} f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^t)$ and $\sum \sum \mathbf{Y}_{ij} \log(f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^t))$. Without further assumptions, such quantities requires $O(n^2 m^2)$ operations in general. A standard approach for the computation of the divergence, suggested in [Gir89, RBU08], is to unbiasedly estimate it with Monte-Carlo simulations by sampling the following relation

$$\text{div}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f(\mathbf{Y})) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \left[\text{tr} \left(\boldsymbol{\delta}^t \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}} \boldsymbol{\delta} \right) \right]$$

at random directions $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\delta}] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\delta}_i \boldsymbol{\delta}_i] = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\delta}_i \boldsymbol{\delta}_j] = 0$. Following [Del15], a similar first order approximation can be used for the other two quantities as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum \sum Y_{ij} f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^t) &\approx \sum \sum Y_{ij} \left[f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) - \boldsymbol{\delta}_{i,j} \left(\frac{\partial f(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}} \boldsymbol{\delta} \right)_{i,j} \right], \quad \text{and} \\ \sum \sum Y_{ij} \log(f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^t)) &\approx \sum \sum Y_{ij} \log \left[f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) - \boldsymbol{\delta}_{i,j} \left(\frac{\partial f(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}} \boldsymbol{\delta} \right)_{i,j} \right] \end{aligned}$$

where the entries of $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ should be chosen Bernoulli distributed with parameter $p = 0.5$. The advantage of these three approximations is that they can be computed in linear time $O(nm)$ by making use of the results of [LS01, SS03, Ede05, CSLT13, DVP⁺12] that provide an expression for the directional derivative given by

$$\frac{\partial f(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}} \boldsymbol{\delta} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}(\mathbf{D} + \mathbf{S} + \mathbf{A})\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^t \quad (5.1)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$ are the matrices whose columns are $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k$, and \mathbf{D} , \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{A} are $n \times m$ matrices defined, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$, as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_{i,j} &= \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{i,j} \times \begin{cases} f'_i(\tilde{\sigma}_i) & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{S}_{i,j} &= \frac{\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{i,j} + \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{j,i}}{2} \times \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = j \\ \frac{f_i(\tilde{\sigma}_i) - f_j(\tilde{\sigma}_j)}{\tilde{\sigma}_i - \tilde{\sigma}_j} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{A}_{i,j} &= \frac{\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{i,j} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{j,i}}{2} \times \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = j \\ \frac{f_i(\tilde{\sigma}_i) + f_j(\tilde{\sigma}_j)}{\tilde{\sigma}_i + \tilde{\sigma}_j} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_k$ and $f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k)$ are extended to 0 for $k > \min(n, m)$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^t \boldsymbol{\delta} \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$.

5.2 The case of a signal matrix of rank one

We consider the simple setting where the rank r^* of the matrix \mathbf{X} is known and equal to one meaning that

$$\mathbf{X} = \sigma_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^t,$$

where $\mathbf{u}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{v}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are vectors with unit norm that are fixed in this numerical experiment, and σ_1 is a positive real that we will let varying. We also choose to fix $n = m = 100$, and so to take $c = \frac{n}{m} = 1$ and $c_+ = 2$. For the purpose of sampling data from Gamma and Poisson distribution, we took singular vectors \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{v}_1 with positive entries. The i -th entry (resp. j -th entry) of \mathbf{u}_1 (resp. \mathbf{v}_1) is chosen to be proportional to $1 - (i/n - 1/2)^2$ (resp. $1 - (j/m - 1/2)^2$).

Let $\mathbf{Y} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$ be an $n \times m$ matrix whose entries are sampled from model (3.1), with $\mathbf{X} = \sigma_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^t$. In the following numerical experiments, we study the behavior of the spectral estimator

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = f_1(\tilde{\sigma}_1) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t, \quad (5.2)$$

where f_1 is a possibly data-driven weight whose choice is either determined by an asymptotically optimal shrinkage rule, or by minimizing an unbiased estimate of the MSE, MKLS, or MKLA risks. In the previous sections, we have suggested different strategies to evaluate such risks for various spectral estimators. In this section, we propose to perform Monte-Carlo simulations to analyze these strategies when the (population) singular value σ_1 is let varying.

Gaussian measurements

For a given positive weight w_1 , we consider a shrinkage function of the form $f_1(\tilde{\sigma}_1) = w_1 \tilde{\sigma}_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_1 > c_+\}}$. As shown in Section 2.5, in the case of Gaussian measurements with $\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$ and $m = n$, the value of w_1 which minimizes the SURE, when $\tilde{\sigma}_1 > c_+$, is

$$w_1(\mathbf{Y}) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2} \left(\frac{1}{m} + \frac{2}{m} \sum_{\ell=2}^n \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} \right) \right)_+,$$

which leads to the data-based choice $\hat{f}_1(\tilde{\sigma}_1) = w_1(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_1 > c_+\}}$. Another data-based spectral estimator is given by soft-thresholding with the shrinkage function $f_1(\tilde{\sigma}_1) = (\tilde{\sigma}_1 - \hat{\lambda}(\mathbf{Y}))_+$ where the value of $\hat{\lambda}(\mathbf{Y})$ is chosen by minimizing the SURE over the set of soft-thresholding estimators.

Using the results in [Nad14] and [GD14] on the derivation of asymptotically optimal shrinkage rules, we compare the spectral estimators

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 = w_1(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_1 > c_+\}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t \text{ and } \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}^1 = (\tilde{\sigma}_1 - \lambda(\mathbf{Y}))_+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t,$$

with the estimator

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_*^1 = f_1^*(\tilde{\sigma}_1) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t, \text{ where } f_1^*(\tilde{\sigma}_1) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2 - 4} & \text{if } \tilde{\sigma}_1 > c_+, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where the above formula follows from the results in Section 2.4 using that $c = 1$ and $c_+ = 2$ in these numerical experiments. To highlight the benefits of these shrinking rules over standard PCA, we also analyze the performances of the estimator $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1 = \tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$.

For given value of σ_1 , we generate $M = 100$ independent realizations $\mathbf{Y}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}^{(M)}$ of data from the Gaussian model (2.1), and we define the quantities

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_1 &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M w_1(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}) \tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)} > c_+\}} & \text{and} & \quad \hat{w}_1 = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M w_1(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)} > c_+\}}, \\ \hat{\sigma}_1^{soft} &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M (\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)} - \lambda(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}))_+ & \text{and} & \quad \hat{w}_1^{soft} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{\lambda(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)})}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}} \right)_+, \\ \hat{\sigma}_1^* &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M f_1^*(\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}) & \text{and} & \quad \hat{w}_1^* = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}} f_1^*(\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}$ is the largest singular value of the matrix $\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}$.

In Figure 1, we compare these quantities as functions of σ_1 , with the curves

$$\sigma_1 \mapsto f_1^*(\rho(\sigma_1)) = \sqrt{\rho(\sigma_1)^2 - 4\mathbb{1}_{\{\rho(\sigma_1) > c_+\}}} \text{ and } \sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{f_1^*(\rho(\sigma_1))}{\rho(\sigma_1)},$$

which corresponds to the asymptotically optimal shrinking rule (2.13) as a function of $\rho(\sigma_k)$ in the setting $c = 1$. It can be seen that the curves (corresponding to the above quantities) which are displayed in Figure 1 coincide for $\sigma_1 > c^{1/4} = 1$, which is in agreement with the asymptotic analysis of shrinkage rules that has been carried out in Section 2.5.




Figure 1: The case of Gaussian measurements. (a) Curve $\sigma_1 \mapsto \hat{\sigma}_1$, (b) curve $\sigma_1 \mapsto \hat{\sigma}_1^{soft}$, (c) Curve $\sigma_1 \mapsto \hat{\sigma}_1^*$. In all the figures of the first row, the black curve is $\sigma_1 \mapsto f_1^*(\tilde{\sigma}_1) = \sqrt{\rho(\sigma_1)^2 - 4\mathbb{1}_{\{\rho(\sigma_1) > c_+\}}}$, while blue curve is $\sigma_1 \mapsto \rho(\sigma_1)$. (d) Curve $\sigma_1 \mapsto \hat{w}_1$, (e) curve $\sigma_1 \mapsto \hat{w}_1^{soft}$, (f) curve $\sigma_1 \mapsto \hat{w}_1^*$. In all the figures of the second row, the black curve is $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{f_1^*(\rho(\sigma_1))}{\rho(\sigma_1)}$, while the blue curve is the constant weight function equal to one.

In Figure 2, for each of the four spectral estimators above, we display, as functions of σ_1 , the following normalized MSE

$$\text{NMSE}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{(q)} - \mathbf{X}\|_F^2}{\|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2},$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{(q)} = \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)})$ denotes any of the spectral estimator above that is computed from the data matrix $\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}$. The normalized MSE of the four estimators are the same for $\sigma_1 > c^{1/4} = 1$, and they only differ for value of σ_1 below the threshold $c^{1/4}$ (corresponding to values of $\rho(\sigma_1)$ below the bulk edge).




Figure 2: The case of Gaussian measurements. Comparison of normalized MSE for the estimators $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1$, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1$, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}^1$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_*^1$.

Gamma distributed measurements

Let us now consider the case where the entries of \mathbf{Y}_{ij} of the data matrix \mathbf{Y} are independently sampled from a Gamma distribution with mean \mathbf{X}_{ij} and shape parameter $L = 3$. We recall that $\mathbf{X} = \sigma_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^t$, and the parameter σ_1 is again let varying from 0.25 to 5.

Let us consider again spectral estimators of the form $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = f_1(\tilde{\sigma}_1) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ with a shrinkage function either of the form $f_1(\tilde{\sigma}_1) = w_1 \tilde{\sigma}_1$ (with $w_1 > 0$) or $f_1(\tilde{\sigma}_1) = (\tilde{\sigma}_1 - \hat{\lambda})_+$ (soft-thresholding with $\hat{\lambda} > 0$). From the results of Section 3.4, the value of w_1 which minimizes the SUKLS criterion is (when $n = m$)

$$w_1^{sukls}(\mathbf{Y}) = \frac{L}{L-1} \left(\frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1 \alpha_{ij}}{\mathbf{Y}_{ij}} + \frac{1}{mn(L-1)} \left(1 + 2 \sum_{\ell=2}^n \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} \right) \right)^{-1},$$

while the value $w_1^{gsure}(\mathbf{Y})$ which minimizes the GSURE criterion can be approximated by using the algorithmic approach described in Section 5.1. Similarly, one may numerically find an approximation to the value $\hat{\lambda}^{sukls}(\mathbf{Y})$ (resp. $\hat{\lambda}^{gsure}(\mathbf{Y})$) which minimizes the SUKLS criterion (resp. GSURE criterion) for soft-thresholding. To compare these estimators with standard PCA, we also consider $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1 = \tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$.

To evaluate the performances of these estimators, we perform again a Monte Carlo study that is similar to the one carried out in the case of Gaussian measurements by generating M independent realizations $\mathbf{Y}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}^{(M)}$ of data from a Gamma distribution (with $\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}$ still denoting the largest singular value of the matrix $\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}$). The results are reported in Figure 3 and Figure 4.

It can be seen that the spectral estimators $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 = w_1^{gsure}(\mathbf{Y})\tilde{\sigma}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 = w_1^{pukla}(\mathbf{Y})\tilde{\sigma}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ achieve better results than data-dependent soft-thresholding in terms of MSE and MKLA risks. The performances of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1$ and $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1$ are similar meaning that optimizing either the GSURE or the SUKLS criterions for Gamma distributed measurements seems to lead to a spectral estimator closed to $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1 = \tilde{\sigma}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ which corresponds to matrix denoising by ordinary PCA.




Figure 3: The case of Gamma distributed measurements with the MSE risk. (a) Comparison of the curves $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}$, $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M w_1^{gsure}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)})\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}$ and $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \left(\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)} - \lambda^{gsure}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}) \right)_+$ (b) Comparison of the curves $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M w_1^{gsure}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)})$ and $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{\lambda^{gsure}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)})}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}} \right)_+$, (c) NMSE risks for the estimators $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1$, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 = w_1^{gsure}(\mathbf{Y})\tilde{\sigma}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}^1 = (\tilde{\sigma}_1 - \hat{\lambda}^{gsure}(\mathbf{Y}))_+\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$.

Poisson distributed measurements

To generate data from a Poisson distribution with mean value $\mathbf{X} = \sigma_1\mathbf{u}_1\mathbf{v}_1^t$, we took the scaling $\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{u}_{1,i}\mathbf{v}_{1,j}$ with ρ_1 ranging from 20 to 400. For this range of values for σ_1 , we observe very few realizations (if any) of zeros in the data matrix \mathbf{Y} sampled from such a Poisson distribution.

We still consider spectral estimators of the form $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = f_1(\tilde{\sigma}_1)\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ with a shrinkage function either of the form $f_1^{w_1}(\tilde{\sigma}_1) = w_1\tilde{\sigma}_1$ (with $w_1 > 0$) or $f_1^\lambda(\tilde{\sigma}_1) = (\tilde{\sigma}_1 - \lambda)_+$ (soft-thresholding with $\lambda > 0$). From the results of Section 3.4, the value of w_1 which minimizes the PUKLA criterion is

$$w_1^{pukla}(\mathbf{Y}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\sigma}_1 \alpha_{ij}},$$

while the value $w_1^{pure}(\mathbf{Y})$ which minimizes the PURE criterion can be approximated thanks to the algorithm described in Section 5.1. Similarly, one uses the same algorithmic approach to




Figure 4: The case of Gamma distributed measurements with the MKLS risk. (a) Comparison of the curves $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}$, $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M w_1^{sukls}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}) \tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}$ and $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \left(\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)} - \lambda^{sukls}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}) \right)_+$ (b) Comparison of the curves $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M w_1^{sukls}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)})$ and $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{\lambda^{sukls}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)})}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}} \right)_+$, (c) MKLS risks for the estimators $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1$, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 = w_1^{sukls}(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}^1 = (\tilde{\sigma}_1 - \lambda^{sukls}(\mathbf{Y}))_+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$.

find the value $\lambda^{pukla}(\mathbf{Y})$ (resp. $\lambda^{pure}(\mathbf{Y})$) which minimizes the PUKLA criterion (resp. PURE criterion) for soft-thresholding. To compare these estimators with standard PCA, we again consider $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1 = \tilde{\sigma}_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^t$.

To evaluate the performances of these resulting estimators, for a given value of ρ_1 , we perform again Monte Carlo experiments by generating M independent realizations $\mathbf{Y}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}^{(M)}$ of data from a Poisson distribution (with $\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}$ still denoting the largest singular value of the matrix $\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}$). The results are reported in Figure 5 and Figure 6. In this experiment, the spectral estimators $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 = w_1^{pure}(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 = w_1^{pukla}(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ achieve better results than data-dependent soft-thresholding in terms of MSE and MKLA risks. Moreover, the expectation of the optimal (and data-driven) weights $w_1^{pure}(\mathbf{Y})$ and $w_1^{pukla}(\mathbf{Y})$ is close to one. In the numerical experiments we also found that the variance of these weights (estimated by Monte-Carlo simulations) is very small, meaning that no shrinkage of the singular value $\tilde{\sigma}_1$ is done. Therefore, optimizing either the PURE or the PUKLA criterions leads to a spectral estimator closed to $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1 = \tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ which again amounts to apply standard PCA.

5.3 The case of a signal matrix of rank larger than two

We now consider the more complex setting where the rank r^* of the matrix \mathbf{X} is unknown and larger than two, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{X} = \sum_{k=1}^{r^*} \sigma_k \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{v}_k^t,$$




Figure 5: The case of Poisson distributed measurements with the MSE risk. (a) Comparison of the curves $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}$, $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M w_1^{pure}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}) \tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}$ and $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \left(\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)} - \lambda^{pure}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}) \right)_+$ (b) Comparison of the curves $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M w_1^{pure}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)})$ and $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{\lambda^{pure}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)})}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}} \right)_+$, (c) NMSE risks for the estimators $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1$, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 = w_1^{pure}(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}^1 = (\tilde{\sigma}_1 - \lambda^{pure}(\mathbf{Y}))_+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$.




Figure 6: The case of Poisson distributed measurements with the MKLA risk. (a) Comparison of the curves $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}$, $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M w_1^{pukla}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}) \tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}$ and $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \left(\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)} - \lambda^{pukla}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)}) \right)_+$ (b) Comparison of the curves $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M w_1^{pukla}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)})$ and $\sigma_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{M} \sum_{q=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{\lambda^{pukla}(\mathbf{Y}^{(q)})}{\tilde{\sigma}_1^{(q)}} \right)_+$, (c) MKLA risks for the estimators $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1$, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^1 = w_1^{pukla}(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}^1 = (\tilde{\sigma}_1 - \lambda^{pukla}(\mathbf{Y}))_+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$.

where $\mathbf{u}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{v}_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are vectors with unit norm that are fixed in this numerical experiment, and σ_k are positive real values also fixed in this experiment. We also choose to fix $n = 100$ and $m = 200$.

Let $\mathbf{Y} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} \tilde{\sigma}_k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t$ be an $n \times m$ matrix whose entries are sampled from model (3.1).




Figure 7: (a) Zoom on a 100×200 noise-free matrix and (d) a single realization of corrupted version by Gaussian noise ($\tau = 80$). (b,c) Oracle soft-thresholding \mathbf{X}_{soft} and data-driven soft-thresholding $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$. (e,f,g) Oracle full rank, i.e., $r = \min(n, m)$, approximation \mathbf{X}_w^r , and data-driven full rank estimation $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_*^r$. (h) Their corresponding singular values averaged over 200 noise realizations (k) NMSE of the various approximations averaged over 200 noise realizations as a function of the rank r . (j) Same but without knowledge the bulk edge, namely $c_+ = 0$. In all the figures, the solid curves correspond to oracle estimators, while the dashed curves correspond to data-driven estimators.

In the following numerical experiments, we study the behavior of the spectral estimator

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} \hat{f}_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t, \quad (5.3)$$

where \hat{f}_k are data-driven shrinkage functions whose choice will be determined by minimizing an unbiased estimate of either the MSE or MKL risks. In this section, we propose to perform Monte-Carlo simulations to analyze the behavior of such strategies.

Gaussian distributed measurements

For given positive weights w_k , we consider shrinkage functions of the form $f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) = w_k \tilde{\sigma}_k \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+\}}$. As shown in Section 2.5, in the case of Gaussian measurements with $\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$, the value of w_k which minimizes the SURE, when $\tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+$, is

$$w_k(\mathbf{Y}) = \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2} \left(1 + |m - n| + 2 \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^{\min(n, m)} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} \right) \right)_+.$$

which leads to the data-based choice $\hat{f}_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) = w_k(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_k \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+\}}$. Another data-based spectral estimator is given by soft-thresholding with the shrinkage function $f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) = (\tilde{\sigma}_k - \hat{\lambda}(\mathbf{Y}))_+$ where the value of $\hat{\lambda}(\mathbf{Y})$ is chosen as minimizing the SURE over the set of soft-thresholding estimators.

Using the results in [Nad14] and [GD14] on the derivation of asymptotically optimal shrinkage rules, we compare the spectral estimators

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r = \sum_{k=1}^r \hat{f}_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n, m)} (\tilde{\sigma}_k - \hat{\lambda}(\mathbf{Y}))_+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t,$$

where $r \in [1, \min(n, m)]$, with the asymptotic optimal estimator

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_*^r = \sum_{k=1}^r f_k^*(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t, \quad \text{where } f_k^*(\tilde{\sigma}_k) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_k} \sqrt{(\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - (c+1))^2 - 4c} & \text{if } \tilde{\sigma}_k > c_+, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where the above formula follows from the results in Section 2.4. In order to assess the quality of SURE as an estimator of the MSE, we also compare the aforementioned approach with their oracle counterparts given by

$$\mathbf{X}_w^r = \sum_{k=1}^r f_k(\mathbf{X}) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{X}_{soft} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n, m)} (\tilde{\sigma}_k - \lambda(\mathbf{Y}))_+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t,$$

where $f_k(\mathbf{X}) = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t \mathbf{X} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k$ and $\lambda(\mathbf{Y})$ minimize the squared error SE (non-expected risk) over the sets of rank r matrices and soft-thresholding approximations respectively. Note that \mathbf{X}_w^r and \mathbf{X}_{soft} are ideal approximations of \mathbf{X} that cannot be used in practice but serve as benchmarks to evaluate the performances of the data-driven estimators $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_*^r$.

The results are reported on Figure 7.(a) to 7.(i). It can be observed that $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_*^r$ and \mathbf{X}_w^r achieve comparable performances for all $r \in [1, \min(m, n)]$ even though the two first do not rely on the unknown matrix \mathbf{X} . Similarly $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$ and \mathbf{X}_{soft} achieve also comparable performances showing again that the SURE accurately estimates the MSE. In terms of NMSE, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_*^r$ and \mathbf{X}_w^r outperform $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$ and \mathbf{X}_{soft} provided that r is large enough. Moreover, the performance of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ plateaus to its optimum when the rank r becomes large. This allows us to choose $r = \min(n, m)$ when we do not have *a priori* on the effective rank r^* .

Interestingly, Fig. 7.(j) shows that when the above estimators are used without the knowledge of the bulk edge (i.e. by taking $c_+^{n, m} = 0$ in their computation instead of $c_+^{n, m} = 1 + \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}$), the

performance of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ actually decreases when the rank r becomes too large. This can be explained by the fact that the SURE suffers from estimation variance in the case of over parametrization, hence, it cannot be used to estimate jointly a too large number of weights. Therefore, the knowledge of the bulk edge seems to provide a relevant upper bound on the number of weights that can be jointly and robustly estimated with the SURE.

Gamma and Poisson measurements

We now consider shrinkage functions of the form $f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) = w_k \tilde{\sigma}_k \mathbb{1}_{\{k \in \tilde{s}\}}$ where \tilde{s} is the approximated active subset as defined in Section 4. As shown in Section 3.4, in the case of Gamma (resp. Poisson) measurements, the value of w_k for $k \in \tilde{s}$ which minimizes the GSURE (resp. PURE) or the SUKLS (resp. PUKLA), cannot be obtained in closed form. As an alternative, we adopt a greedy one-dimensional optimization strategy starting from the matrix $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$ and next updating the weights w_ℓ sequentially by starting $\ell = 1$ to $\ell = \min(n, m)$, with the constraint that, for all $\ell \geq 2$ such that $\ell \notin \tilde{s}$, the weight w_ℓ is set to zero. Recall that under Gamma or Poisson measurements $\mathbf{X}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{X} =]0, +\infty[$. It is thus required to ensure that, when looking for the next weight w_ℓ to optimize, the resulting matrix remains positive. By virtue of Perron-Frobenius theorem, we have $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{i,j}^1 \geq 0$ where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^1 = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^t$. We can thus optimize w_1 by one-dimensional optimization on $]0, +\infty[$ (we have used Matlab's command `fminsearch`). For $\ell \geq 2$, we necessarily have $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{i,j}^\ell \leq 0$ for some i, j , and then w_ℓ should be chosen such that, for all i, j , the following holds true

$$\sum_{k \in \tilde{s}; k < \ell} w_k \tilde{\sigma}_k \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{i,j}^k + w_\ell \tilde{\sigma}_\ell \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{i,j}^\ell \geq 0. \quad (5.4)$$

To this end, the search should be performed on the range $[w_\ell^{\min}, w_\ell^{\max}]$ where

$$w_\ell^{\min} = \max_{i,j; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{i,j}^\ell > 0} \left(\frac{-1}{\tilde{\sigma}_\ell \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{i,j}^\ell} \sum_{k \in \tilde{s}; k < \ell} w_k \tilde{\sigma}_k \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{i,j}^k \right) \quad \text{and} \quad w_\ell^{\max} = \min_{i,j; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{i,j}^\ell < 0} \left(\frac{-1}{\tilde{\sigma}_\ell \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{i,j}^\ell} \sum_{k \in \tilde{s}; k < \ell} w_k \tilde{\sigma}_k \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{i,j}^k \right). \quad (5.5)$$

which can also be obtained by one-dimensional optimization techniques (we have used Matlab's command `fminbnd`). This strategy is used for GSURE, SUKLS, PURE and PUKLA by evaluating them as described in Section 5.1. The obtained weight w_k hence leads to the data-based choice $\hat{f}_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) = w_k(\mathbf{Y}) \tilde{\sigma}_k \mathbb{1}_{\{k \in \tilde{s}\}}$. Other data-based spectral estimators are given by soft-thresholding with the shrinkage function $f_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) = (\tilde{\sigma}_k - \hat{\lambda}(\mathbf{Y}))_+$ where the value of $\hat{\lambda}(\mathbf{Y})$ is chosen either as minimizing the GSURE or SUKLS (reps. PURE or PUKLA) for Gamma measurements (resp. Poisson measurements) over the set of soft-thresholding estimators (also obtained by one-dimensional optimization).

As in the Gaussian setting, we compare the spectral estimators

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r = \sum_{k=1}^r \hat{f}_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n,m)} (\tilde{\sigma}_k - \hat{\lambda}(\mathbf{Y}))_+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t,$$




Figure 8: (a) Zoom on a 100×200 noise-free matrix and (f) a single realization of corrupted version by Gamma noise ($L = 80$). (b,c,d,e) Oracle soft-thresholding \mathbf{X}_{soft} and data-driven soft-thresholding $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$ respectively for SE_η , GSURE, KLS and SUKLS. (g,h,i,j) Oracle full rank, i.e., $r = \min(n, m)$, approximation \mathbf{X}_w^r and data-driven full rank estimation $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ respectively for SE_η , GSURE, KLS and SUKLS. (k) Their corresponding singular values averaged over 200 noise realizations. (l,m) NMSE averaged over 200 noise realizations as a function of the rank r with and without using the active set. (n,o) Same but with respect to MKLS.




Figure 9: (a) Zoom on a 100×200 noise-free matrix and (f) a single realization of corrupted version by Poisson noise. (b,c,d,e) Oracle soft-thresholding \mathbf{X}_{soft} and data-driven soft-thresholding $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$ respectively for SE, PURE, KLA and PUKLA. (g,h,i,j) Oracle full rank, i.e., $r = \min(n, m)$, approximation \mathbf{X}_w^r , and data-driven full rank estimation $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ respectively for SE, PURE, KLA and PUKLA. (k) Their corresponding singular values averaged over 200 noise realizations. (l,m) NMSE averaged over 200 noise realizations as a function of the rank r with and without using the active set. (n,o) Same but with respect to MKLA. (Matrix entries are displayed in log-scale for better visual assessment.)

where $r \in [1, \min(n, m)]$, with their oracle counterparts given by

$$\mathbf{X}_w^r = \sum_{k=1}^r f_k(\mathbf{X}) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{X}_{soft} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n, m)} (\tilde{\sigma}_k - \lambda(\mathbf{Y}))_+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k^t,$$

where $f_k(\mathbf{X})$ and $\lambda(\mathbf{Y})$ minimizes one of the objective SE_η , KLS, SE or KLA (non-expected risks) over the set of matrices sharing with \mathbf{Y} the same r first left and right singular vectors, and soft-thresholding approximations respectively. Note again that \mathbf{X}_w^r and \mathbf{X}_{soft} are ideal approximations of \mathbf{X} that cannot be used in practice but serve as benchmarks to evaluate the performances of the data-driven estimators $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$.

The results for the Gamma noise are reported on Figure 8. As for the Gaussian setting, it can be observed that $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ and \mathbf{X}_w^r achieve comparable performances, as well as $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$ and \mathbf{X}_{soft} showing that the GSURE (resp. SUKLS) accurately estimates the MSE_η (resp. KLS). Visual inspection of the restored matrices tends to show that the estimators driven by MSE_η or GSURE produce less relevant results compared to KLS or SUKLS, as confirmed by the curves of NMSE and MKLS. Performance in terms of NMSE also illustrates that minimizers of SE_η do not coincide with those of SE. As in the Gaussian setting, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ and \mathbf{X}_w^r outperform $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$ and \mathbf{X}_{soft} provided that r is large enough. Moreover, the performance of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ obtained with KL objectives plateaus to its optimum when the rank r becomes large. Again, this allows us to choose $r = \min(n, m)$ when we do not have *a priori* on the effective rank r^* .

The results for the Poisson noise are reported on Figure 9. The conclusions are similar to the Gaussian and Gamma cases. Obviously, the NMSE is smaller for approximations that minimize SE (or PURE) than for those minimizing KLA (or PUKLA). However, visual inspection of the obtained matrices tends to demonstrate that minimizing such objectives might be less relevant than minimizing KL objectives. In this setting, the performance of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ is on a par with the one of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$ based on PUKLA. In fact, for other choices of matrices \mathbf{X} , $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ based on PUKLA might improve, in terms of MKLS, much more on $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$, and might improve not as much on $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ based on PURE. Nevertheless, whatever \mathbf{X} , we observed that $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ driven by PUKLA always reaches at least as good performance in terms of MKLS as the best of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ driven by SE and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{soft}$.

Fig. 8.(m), Fig. 8.(o), Fig. 9.(m) and Fig. 9.(o) show that when the above estimators are used without the active set (i.e., by choosing $\tilde{s} = [1, \min(n, m)]$), the performance of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_w^r$ actually decreases when the rank r becomes too large. As for the Gaussian setting, this can be explained by the fact that the GSURE, SUKLS, PURE and PUKLA suffer from estimation variance in the case of over parametrization, hence, they cannot be used to estimate jointly a too large number of weights. The active set (in the same manner as the bulk edge) seems to provide a relevant selection of the weights that can be jointly and robustly estimated in a data driven way.

A Appendix

A.1 Proof of Proposition 2.2

Let us first introduce some notation and definitions to be used in the proof. For all $1 \leq \ell \leq n$, let $\tilde{\lambda}_\ell$ be the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}^t$ namely $\tilde{\lambda}_\ell = \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2$. For a fixed $1 \leq k \leq r^*$ such that $\sigma_k > c^{1/4}$,

let us introduce the complex-valued function g_k defined by

$$g_k(z) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^n \frac{1}{z - \tilde{\lambda}_\ell} \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu_k),$$

where $\text{supp}(\mu_k) = \{\tilde{\lambda}_\ell; 1 \leq \ell \leq n, \ell \neq k\}$ is the support of the random measure $\mu_k = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^n \delta_{\tilde{\lambda}_\ell}$ on \mathbb{R}_+ , where δ_λ denotes the Dirac measure at λ . It is clear that

$$g_k(z) = \int \frac{1}{z - \lambda} d\mu_k(\lambda).$$

The main difficulty in the proof is to show that, almost surely,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} g_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k^2) = \frac{1}{\rho^2(\sigma_k)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_k^2} \right),$$

which is the purpose of what follows.

For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ (with $n \leq m$), we denote its singular values by $\sigma_1(A) \geq \sigma_2(A) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_n(A) \geq 0$. Hence, one has that $\tilde{\sigma}_\ell = \sigma_\ell(\mathbf{Y})$ for all $1 \leq \ell \leq n$. Now, we recall that $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{W}$ where \mathbf{X} is a fixed matrix of rank r^* and \mathbf{W} is a random matrix with iid entries sampled from a Gaussian distribution with zero mean and variance $\frac{1}{n}$. The first step in the proof is to show that the random measure μ_k behaves asymptotically as the almost sure limit of the empirical spectral measure $\mu_{\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^t}$ of the Wishart matrix $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^t$. By definition, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^t$ are $\lambda_\ell(\mathbf{W}) = \sigma_\ell^2(\mathbf{W})$ for all $1 \leq \ell \leq n$ and $\mu_{\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^t}$ is thus defined as

$$\mu_{\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^t} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \delta_{\lambda_\ell(\mathbf{W})}.$$

It is well known (see e.g. Theorem 3.6 in [BS10]) that, once $m = m_n \geq n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{n}{m} = c$ with $0 < c \leq 1$, then, almost surely, the empirical spectral measure $\mu_{\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^t}$ converges weakly to the so-called Marchenko-Pastur distribution μ_{MP} which is deterministic and has the following density $\frac{d\mu_{MP}(\lambda)}{d\lambda} = \frac{1}{2\pi c\lambda} \sqrt{(c_+^2 - \lambda)(\lambda - c_-^2)} \mathbf{1}_{[c_-^2, c_+^2]}(\lambda)$. We recall that such a convergence can also be characterized through the so-called Cauchy or Stieltjes transform which is defined for any probability measure μ on \mathbb{R} as

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{C} \text{ outside the support of } \mu, \quad g_\mu(z) = \int \frac{1}{z - \lambda} d\mu(\lambda).$$

By equation (3.3.2) in [BS10], one obtains that, almost surely,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{1}{z - \lambda} d\mu_{\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^t}(\lambda) = g_{MP}(z) \text{ for any } z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where g_{MP} is the Cauchy transform of μ_{MP} and

$$g_{MP}(z) = \int \frac{1}{z - \lambda} d\mu_{MP}(\lambda) = \frac{z - (1 - c) - \sqrt{(z - (c + 1))^2 - 4c}}{2cz} \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [c_-^2, c_+^2].$$

Moreover, by Proposition 6 in [PL03], the convergence (A.1) is uniform over any compact subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$.

Then, by arguing as in the proof of Theorem 2.9 in [BN12], it follows from Weyl's interlacing inequalities (see e.g. Theorem 3.1.2 in [HJ91]) that for all $1 \leq \ell \leq n$

$$\sigma_{\ell+r^*}(\mathbf{W}) \leq \sigma_\ell(\mathbf{Y}) \leq \sigma_{\ell-r^*}(\mathbf{W}), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

with the convention that $\sigma_k(\mathbf{W}) = -\infty$ if $k > n$ and $\sigma_k(\mathbf{W}) = +\infty$ if $k \leq 0$. Thanks to the results that have been recalled above on the asymptotic properties of $\mu_{\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^t}$, one may use inequalities (A.2) to prove that, almost surely, the random measure μ_k converges weakly to the Marchenko-Pastur distribution μ_{MP} . Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.2 and using Proposition 2.1, it can be shown that there exists $\eta_k > 0$ such that, almost surely and for all sufficiently large n

$$\tilde{\lambda}_\ell \notin K_k := [\rho^2(\sigma_k) - \eta_k, \rho^2(\sigma_k) + \eta_k]$$

for any $1 \leq \ell \leq n$ with $\ell \neq k$. Now, recall that the support $\text{supp}(\mu_k)$ of the random measure μ_k is $\{\tilde{\lambda}_\ell; 1 \leq \ell \leq n, \ell \neq k\}$, and that $\text{supp}(\mu_{MP}) = [c_-^2, c_+^2]$. Hence, for all sufficiently large n , one has that

$$\text{supp}(\mu_k) \cap K_k = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}(\mu_{MP}) \cap K_k = \emptyset.$$

Therefore, thanks to the weak convergence of μ_k to μ_{MP} and using Ascoli's Theorem, one may prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \in K_k} |g_k(z) - g_{MP}(z)| = 0 \text{ almost surely.} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Thanks to our assumptions, one has that, almost surely, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\sigma}_k^2 = \rho^2(\sigma_k)$ by Proposition 2.1. Hence, almost surely and for all sufficiently large n , one has that $\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 \in K_k$ and so

$$|g_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k^2) - g_{MP}(\rho^2(\sigma_k))| \leq \sup_{z \in K_k} |g_k(z) - g_{MP}(z)| + |g_{MP}(\tilde{\sigma}_k^2) - g_{MP}(\rho^2(\sigma_k))|.$$

Therefore, using the uniform convergence (A.3) of g_k to g_{MP} and the continuity of g_{MP} at $z = \rho^2(\sigma_k)$, one obtains that, almost surely,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k^2) = g_{MP}(\rho^2(\sigma_k)) = \frac{1}{\rho^2(\sigma_k)} \times \frac{\rho^2(\sigma_k) - 1 + c - \sqrt{(\rho^2(\sigma_k) - (c+1))^2 - 4c}}{2c}.$$

Since $g_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k^2) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^n \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2}$, using the above equation and relation (2.2), it follows immediately that $g_{MP}(\rho^2(\sigma_k)) = \frac{1}{\rho^2(\sigma_k)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_k^2}\right)$ so that, almost surely,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1; \ell \neq k}^n \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_k}{\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_\ell^2} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\sigma}_k g_k(\tilde{\sigma}_k^2) = \rho(\sigma_k) g_{MP}(\rho^2(\sigma_k)) = \frac{1}{\rho(\sigma_k)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_k^2}\right),$$

which completes the proof.

A.2 A technical result to prove GSURE formulas

We recall the key lemma needed to prove the generalized SURE formulas in an exponential family in the continuous case. Similar results have already been formulated in different papers in the literature, see e.g. the review proposed in [Del15].

Lemma A.1. *Let $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be a random matrix whose entries \mathbf{Y}_{ij} are independently sampled from the continuous exponential family (3.2) in canonical form (that is the distribution of \mathbf{Y}_{ij} is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure dy on \mathbb{R}). Suppose that the function h is continuously differentiable on $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$. Let $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$, and denote by $F_{ij} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a continuously differentiable function such that*

$$\mathbb{E}(|F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})|) < +\infty. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Then, the following relation holds

$$\mathbb{E}(\theta_{ij} F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})) = -\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{h'(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) + \frac{\partial F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}\right).$$

Proof. Using the expression (3.2) of the pdf of the random variables \mathbf{Y}_{ij} , one has that

$$\mathbb{E}(\theta_{ij} F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}} F_{ij}(Y) h(y_{ij}) \theta_{ij} \exp(\theta_{ij} y_{ij} - A(\theta_{ij})) dy_{ij} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n, 1 \leq \ell \leq m; (k, \ell) \neq (i, j)}^n p(y_{k\ell}; \theta_{k\ell}) dy_{k\ell}.$$

where $Y = (y_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k \leq n, 1 \leq \ell \leq m}$. Thanks to condition (A.4), it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}} F_{ij}(Y) h(y_{ij}) \exp(\theta_{ij} y_{ij} - A(\theta_{ij})) dy_{ij} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n, 1 \leq \ell \leq m; (k, \ell) \neq (i, j)}^n p(y_{k\ell}; \theta_{k\ell}) dy_{k\ell} < +\infty. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Therefore, given that $\theta_{ij} \exp(\theta_{ij} y_{ij} - A(\theta_{ij})) = \frac{\partial \exp(\theta_{ij} y_{ij} - A(\theta_{ij}))}{\partial y_{ij}}$, an integration by part and eq. (A.5) imply that

$$\mathbb{E}(\theta_{ij} F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}} \frac{\partial F_{ij}(Y) h(y_{ij})}{\partial y_{ij}} \exp(\theta_{ij} y_{ij} - A(\theta_{ij})) dy_{ij} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq m, 1 \leq \ell \leq n; (k, \ell) \neq (i, j)}^n p(y_{k\ell}; \theta_{k\ell}) dy_{k\ell}.$$

Now, since $\frac{\partial F_{ij}(Y) h(y_{ij})}{\partial y_{ij}} = h'(y_{ij}) F_{ij}(Y) + \frac{\partial F_{ij}(Y)}{\partial y_{ij}} h(y_{ij})$, we finally obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}(\theta_{ij} F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})) = -\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{h'(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) + \frac{\partial F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}\right),$$

which completes the proof. \square

A.3 Proof of Proposition 3.1

We remark that

$$\text{MSE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\mathbb{E} \left(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})|^2 - 2\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) \right) + \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}^2 \right). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Using Lemma A.1 with $F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})$ and condition (3.4), it follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{h'(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}} \right). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Then, by definition (3.2) of the exponential family, we remark that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{h''(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} \right) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} h''(y_{ij}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij} y_{ij} - A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij})) dy_{ij}.$$

Hence, using an integration by parts twice, we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{h''(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} \right) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(y_{ij}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij} y_{ij} - A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij})) dy_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}^2. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

To complete the proof, it suffices to insert equalities (A.7) and (A.8) into (A.6).

A.4 Proof of Proposition 3.2

Thanks to eq. (3.8), one has that

$$\text{MKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) A'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij} A'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) - A(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) \right) + A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Using Lemma A.1 with $F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) = A'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}))$ and condition (3.10), it follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij} A'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) \right) = -\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{h'(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} A'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) \right) - \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}} A''(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) \right). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Thus, inserting equality (A.10) into (A.9) implies that

$$\text{SUKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) + \frac{h'(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} \right) A'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) - A(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m A''(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}$$

is an unbiased estimator of $\text{MKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij})$. Now recall that $f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) = \eta^{-1} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) \right)$ and that $A'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) = \eta^{-1} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) \right)$ by Assumption 3.1. Therefore, $\frac{\partial f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}} =$

$A''(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}}$, and thus

$$\text{SUKLS}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y}) + \frac{h'(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} \right) A'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) - A(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{Y})) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\partial f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})}{\partial \mathbf{Y}_{ij}},$$

which completes the proof.

A.5 Proof of Proposition 3.3

Thanks to the expression (3.9) of the MKLA risk for data sampled from a Poisson distribution, it follows that

$$\text{MKLA}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^f, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{X}_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{ij} \log(\mathbf{X}_{ij}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f - \mathbf{X}_{ij} \log(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f) \right)$$

In the case of Poisson data, one has that $\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}) = \mathbf{X}_{ij}$ and $\frac{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij}-1)}{h(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})} = \mathbf{Y}_{ij}$. Therefore, by applying Hudson's Lemma 3.1 with $F_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) = \log(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f)$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{X}_{ij} \log(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{ij}^f) \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{Y}_{ij} \log(f_{ij}(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^t)) \right),$$

which completes the proof.

References

- [ABB00] O. Alter, P. O. Brown, and D. Botstein. Singular value decomposition for genome-wide expression data processing and modeling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)*, 97(18), august 2000.
- [AGZ10] G. W. Anderson, A. Guionnet, and O. Zeitouni. *An introduction to random matrices*, volume 118 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [Aka74] Hirotugu Akaike. A new look at the statistical model identification. *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, 19(6):716–723, 1974.
- [BD06] M. Bydder and J. Du. Noise reduction in multiple-echo data sets using singular value decomposition. *Magn Reson Imaging*, 24(7):849–56, 2006.
- [BN12] F. Benaych-Georges and R. R. Nadakuditi. The singular values and vectors of low rank perturbations of large rectangular random matrices. *J. Multivariate Analysis*, 111:120–135, 2012.

- [Bro86] L. D. Brown. *Fundamentals of statistical exponential families: with applications in statistical decision theory*. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 1986.
- [BS06] J. Baik and J. W. Silverstein. Eigenvalues of large sample covariance matrices of spiked population models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 97(6):1382 – 1408, 2006.
- [BS10] Zhidong Bai and Jack W. Silverstein. *Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, second edition, 2010.
- [CR09] D. J. Candès and B. Recht. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 9(6):717–772, 2009.
- [CSLT13] E. J. Candès, C. A. Sing-Long, and J. D. Trzasko. Unbiased risk estimates for singular value thresholding and spectral estimators. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 61(19):4643–4657, 2013.
- [Deb07] P. Debashis. Asymptotics of sample eigenstructure for a large dimensional spiked covariance model. *Statistica Sinica*, 17:1617–1642, 2007.
- [Del15] C. Deledalle. Estimation of Kullback-Leibler losses for noisy recovery problems within the exponential family. *Preprint, arXiv:1512.08191*, 2015.
- [DG14] D. Donoho and M. Gavish. Minimax risk of matrix denoising by singular value thresholding. *Ann. Statist.*, 42(6):2413–2440, 12 2014.
- [DS07] R. B. Dozier and J. W. Silverstein. On the empirical distribution of eigenvalues of large dimensional information-plus-noise-type matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 98(4):678–694, 2007.
- [DVP⁺12] C.-A. Deledalle, S. Vaiteer, G. Peyré, J. Fadili, and C. Dossal. Risk estimation for matrix recovery with spectral regularization. In *arXiv:1205.1482*, 2012. Presented at ICML’2012 workshop on Sparsity, Dictionaries and Projections in Machine Learning and Signal Processing, Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 2012.
- [Ede05] A. Edelman. Matrix jacobians with wedge products. *MIT Handout for 18.325*, 2005.
- [Efr04] Bradley Efron. The estimation of prediction error: Covariance penalties and cross-validation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 99–467, 2004.
- [Eld09] Y. C. Eldar. Generalized sure for exponential families: Applications to regularization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 57(2):471–481, 2009.
- [EM72] B. Efron and C. Morris. Empirical Bayes on Vector Observations: An Extension of Stein’s Method. *Biometrika*, 59(2):335–347, 1972.
- [EM76] B. Efron and C. Morris. Multivariate empirical bayes and estimation of covariance matrices. *Ann. Statist.*, 4(1):22–32, 01 1976.
- [EY36] C. Eckart and G. Young. The approximation of one matrix by another of lower rank. *Psychometrika*, 1(3):211–218, 1936.

- [GD14] M. Gavish and D.L. Donoho. Optimal shrinkage of singular values. *Preprint arXiv:1405.7511*, 2014.
- [Gir89] A Girard. A fast monte-carlo cross-validation procedure for large least squares problems with noisy data. *Numerische Mathematik*, 56(1):1–23, 1989.
- [Hal87] Peter Hall. On Kullback-Leibler loss and density estimation. *Ann. Statist.*, 15(4):1491–1519, 1987.
- [HJ91] Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson. *Topics in matrix analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, 1991. Suite de : Matrix analysis. 1985.
- [HL06] Jan Hannig and Thomas C. M. Lee. On Poisson signal estimation under Kullback-Leibler discrepancy and squared risk. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 136(3):882–908, 2006.
- [Hud78] H. M. Hudson. A natural identity for exponential families with applications in multiparameter estimation. *Ann. Statist.*, 6(3):473–484, 05 1978.
- [JS15] J. Josse and S. Sardy. Adaptive shrinkage of singular values. *Statistics and Computing*, pages 1–10, 2015.
- [LBH⁺12] F. Lam, S. D. Babacan, J. P. Haldar, N Schuff, and Z.-P. Liang. Denoising diffusion-weighted MR magnitude image sequences using low rank and edge constraints. In *ISBI*, pages 1401–1404. IEEE, 2012.
- [LS01] A.S. Lewis and H.S. Sendov. Twice differentiable spectral functions. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 23:368–386, 2001.
- [Nad08] B. Nadler. Finite sample approximation results for principal component analysis: A matrix perturbation approach. *Ann. Statist.*, 36(6):2791–2817, 12 2008.
- [Nad14] R. R. Nadakuditi. OptShrink: an algorithm for improved low-rank signal matrix denoising by optimal, data-driven singular value shrinkage. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 60(5):3002–3018, 2014.
- [NPDL11] H. M. Nguyen, X. Peng, M. N. Do, and Z.-P. Liang. Spatiotemporal denoising of mr spectroscopic imaging data by low-rank approximations. In *ISBI*, pages 857–860. IEEE, 2011.
- [PL03] L. Pastur and A. Lejay. Matrices aléatoires: statistique asymptotique des valeurs propres. In *Séminaire de Probabilités, XXXVI*, volume 1801 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 135–164. Springer, Berlin, 2003.
- [RBU08] S. Ramani, T. Blu, and M. Unser. Monte-Carlo SURE: a black-box optimization of regularization parameters for general denoising algorithms. *IEEE Trans. on Image Processing*, 17(9):1540–1554, 2008.

- [SN13] A. A. Shabalin and A. B. Nobel. Reconstruction of a low-rank matrix in the presence of Gaussian noise. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 118:67–76, 2013.
- [SS03] D. Sun and J. Sun. Nonsmooth matrix valued functions defined by singular values. Technical report, Department of Decision Sciences, National University of Singapore, 2003.
- [Ste81] C. M. Stein. Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. *Ann. Statist.*, 9(6):1135–1151, 1981.
- [WDB01] M.E. Wall, P.A. Dyck, and T.S. Brettin. Svdman-singular value decomposition analysis of microarray data. *Bioinformatics*, 17(6):566–568, 2001.
- [Yan94] Takemi Yanagimoto. The Kullback-Leibler risk of the Stein estimator and the conditional MLE. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, 46(1):29–41, 1994.