

Non-square matrix sensing without spurious local minima via the Burer-Monteiro approach

Dohyung Park, Anastasios Kyrillidis, Constantine Caramanis, and Sujay Sanghavi
The University of Texas at Austin

{dhpark, anastasios, constantine}@utexas.edu, sanghavi@mail.utexas.edu

December 14, 2021

Abstract

We consider the *non-square* matrix sensing problem, under restricted isometry property (RIP) assumptions. We focus on the non-convex formulation, where any rank- r matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is represented as UV^\top , where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$. In this paper, we complement recent findings on the non-convex geometry of the analogous PSD setting [5], and show that matrix factorization does not introduce any spurious local minima, under RIP.

1 Introduction and Problem Formulation

Consider the following matrix sensing problem:

$$\underset{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(X) := \|\mathcal{A}(X) - b\|_2^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \text{rank}(X) \leq r. \quad (1)$$

Here, $b \in \mathbb{R}^p$ denotes the set of observations and $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is the sensing linear map. The motivation behind this task comes from several applications, where we are interested in inferring an unknown matrix $X^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ from b . Common assumptions are (i) $p \ll m \cdot n$, (ii) $b = \mathcal{A}(X^*) + w$, i.e., we have a linear measurement system, and (iii) X^* is rank- r , $r \ll \min\{m, n\}$. Such problems appear in a variety of research fields and include image processing [12, 40], data analytics [13, 12], quantum computing [1, 19, 25], systems [30], and sensor localization [23] problems.

There are numerous approaches that solve (1), both in its original non-convex form or through its convex relaxation; see [27, 16] and references therein. However, satisfying the rank constraint (or any nuclear norm constraints in the convex relaxation) per iteration requires SVD computations, which could be prohibitive in practice for large-scale settings. To overcome this obstacle, recent approaches reside on non-convex parametrization of the variable space and encode the low-rankness directly into the objective [22, 2, 39, 44, 14, 4, 43, 38, 45, 24, 31, 42, 32, 33]. In particular, we know that a rank- r matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ can be written as a product UV^\top , where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$. Such a re-parametrization technique has a long history [41, 15, 35], and was popularized by Burer and Monteiro [8, 9] for solving semi-definite programs (SDPs). Using this observation in (1), we obtain the following *non-convex, bilinear* problem:

$$\underset{U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(UV^\top) := \|\mathcal{A}(UV^\top) - b\|_2^2. \quad (2)$$

Now, (2) has a different form of non-convexity due to the bilinearity of the variable space, which raises the question whether we introduce spurious local minima by doing this transformation.

Contributions: The goal of this paper is to answer negatively to this question: *We show that, under standard regulatory assumptions on \mathcal{A} , UV^\top parametrization does not introduce any spurious local minima.*

To do so, we non-trivially generalize recent developments for the square, PSD case [5] to the non-square case for X^* . Our result requires a different (but equivalent) problem re-formulation and analysis, with the introduction of an appropriate regularizer in the objective.

Related work. There are several papers that consider similar questions, but for other objectives. [36] characterizes the non-convex geometry of the *complete* dictionary recovery problem, and proves that all local minima are global; [6] considers the problem of non-convex phase synchronization where the task is modeled as a non-convex least-squares optimization problem, and can be globally solved via a modified version of power method; [37] show that a nonconvex fourth-order polynomial objective for phase retrieval has no local minimizers and all global minimizers are equivalent; [3, 7] show that the Burer-Monteiro approach works on smooth semidefinite programs, with applications in synchronization and community detection; [17] consider the PCA problem under streaming settings and use martingale arguments to prove that stochastic gradient descent on the factors reaches to the global solution with non-negligible probability; [20] introduces the notion of *strict saddle points* and shows that noisy stochastic gradient descent can escape saddle points for generic objectives f ; [28] proves that gradient descent converges to (local) minimizers almost surely, using arguments drawn from dynamical systems theory.

More related to this paper are the works of [21] and [5]: they show that matrix completion and sensing have no spurious local minima, for the case where X^* is square and PSD. For both cases, extending these arguments for the more realistic non-square case is a non-trivial task.

1.1 Assumptions and Definitions

We first state the assumptions we make for the matrix sensing setting. We consider the case where the linear operator \mathcal{A} satisfies the *Restricted Isometry Property*, according to the following definition [11]:

Definition 1.1 (Restricted Isometry Property (RIP)). *A linear operator $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfies the restricted isometry property on rank- r matrices, with parameter δ_r , if the following set of inequalities hold for all rank- r matrices X :*

$$(1 - \delta_r) \cdot \|X\|_F^2 \leq \|\mathcal{A}(X)\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta_r) \cdot \|X\|_F^2.$$

Characteristic examples are Gaussian-based linear maps [18, 34], Pauli-based measurement operators, used in quantum state tomography applications [29], Fourier-based measurement operators, which lead to computational gains in practice due to their structure [26, 34], or even permuted and sub-sampled noiselet linear operators, used in image and video compressive sensing applications [40].

In this paper, we consider sensing mechanisms that can be expressed as:

$$(\mathcal{A}(X))_i = \langle A_i, X \rangle, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, p, \text{ and } A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}.$$

E.g., for the case of a Gaussian map \mathcal{A} , A_i are independent, identically distributed (i.i.d.) Gaussian matrices; for the case of a Pauli map \mathcal{A} , $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are i.i.d. and drawn uniformly at random from a set of scaled Pauli “observables” $(P_1 \otimes P_2 \otimes \dots \otimes P_d)/\sqrt{n}$, where $n = 2^d$ and P_i is a 2×2 Pauli observable matrix [29].

A useful property derived from the RIP definition is the following [10]:

Proposition 1.2 (Useful property due to RIP). *For a linear operator $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ that satisfies the restricted isometry property on rank- r matrices, the following inequality holds for any two rank- r matrices $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$:*

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^p \langle A_i, X \rangle \cdot \langle A_i, Y \rangle - \langle X, Y \rangle \right| \leq \delta_{2r} \cdot \|X\|_F \cdot \|Y\|_F.$$

An important issue in optimizing f over the factored space is the existence of non-unique possible factorizations for a given X . Since we are interested in obtaining a low-rank solution in the original space,

we need a notion of distance to the low-rank solution X^\star over the factors. Among infinitely many possible decompositions of X^\star , we focus on the set of “equally-footed” factorizations [39]:

$$\mathcal{X}_r^\star = \left\{ (U^\star, V^\star) : U^\star \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}, V^\star \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}, \right. \\ \left. U^\star V^{\star\top} = X^\star, \sigma_i(U^\star) = \sigma_i(V^\star) = \sigma_i(X^\star)^{1/2}, \forall i \in [r] \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Given a pair (U, V) , we define the distance to X^\star as:

$$\text{DIST}(U, V; X^\star) = \min_{(U^\star, V^\star) \in \mathcal{X}_r^\star} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} U \\ V \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} U^\star \\ V^\star \end{bmatrix} \right\|_F.$$

1.2 Problem Re-formulation

Before we delve into the main results, we need to further reformulate the objective (2) for our analysis. First, we use a well-known trick to reduce (2) to a semidefinite optimization. Let us define auxiliary variables

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} U \\ V \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times r}, \quad \tilde{W} = \begin{bmatrix} U \\ -V \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times r}.$$

Based on the auxiliary variables, we define the linear map $\mathcal{B} : \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (m+n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $(\mathcal{B}(WW^\top))_i = \langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle$, and $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (m+n)}$. To make a connection between the variable spaces (U, V) and W , \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are related via matrices A_i and B_i as follows:

$$B_i = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A_i \\ A_i^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This further implies that:

$$(\mathcal{B}(WW^\top))_i = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A_i \\ A_i^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} UU^\top & UV^\top \\ VU^\top & VV^\top \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle = \langle A_i, UV^\top \rangle.$$

Given the above, we re-define $f : \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$f(W) := \|\mathcal{B}(WW^\top) - b\|_2^2. \quad (4)$$

It is important to note that \mathcal{B} operates on $(m+n) \times (m+n)$ matrices, while we assume RIP on \mathcal{A} and $m \times n$ matrices. Making no other assumptions for \mathcal{B} , we cannot directly apply [5] on (4), but a rather different analysis is required.

In addition to this redefinition, we also introduce a *regularizer* $g : \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$g(W) := \lambda \left\| \tilde{W}^\top W \right\|_F^2 = \lambda \|U^\top U - V^\top V\|_F^2.$$

This regularizer was first introduced in [39] to prove convergence of its algorithm for non-square matrix sensing, and it is also used in this paper to analyze local minima of the problem. After setting $\lambda = \frac{1}{4}$, (2) can be *equivalently* written as:

$$\underset{W \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times r}}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(W) + g(W) := \|\mathcal{B}(WW^\top) - b\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left\| \tilde{W}^\top W \right\|_F^2. \quad (5)$$

By equivalent, we note that the addition of g in the objective does not change the problem, since for any rank- r matrix X there is a pair of factors (U, V) such that $g(W) = 0$. It merely reduces the set of optimal points from all possible factorizations of X^\star to *balanced* factorizations of X^\star in \mathcal{X}_r^\star . U^\star and V^\star have the same set of singular values, which are the square roots of the singular values of X^\star . A key property of the balanced factorizations is the following.

Proposition 1.3. *For any factorization of the form (3), it holds that*

$$\tilde{W}^{\star\top} W^{\star} = U^{\star\top} U^{\star} - V^{\star\top} V^{\star} = 0$$

Proof. By “balanced factorizations” of $X^{\star} = U^{\star} V^{\star\top}$, we mean that factors U^{\star} and V^{\star} satisfy

$$U^{\star} = A \Sigma^{1/2} R, \quad V^{\star} = B \Sigma^{1/2} R \quad (6)$$

where $X^{\star} = A \Sigma B^{\top}$ is the SVD, and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is an orthonormal matrix. Apply this to $\tilde{W}^{\star\top} W^{\star}$ to get the result. \square

Therefore, we have $g(W^{\star}) = 0$, and (U^{\star}, V^{\star}) is an optimal point of (5).

2 Main Results

This section describes our main results on the function landscape of the non-square matrix sensing problem. The following theorem bounds the distance of any local minima to the global minimum, by the function value at the global minimum.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose W^{\star} is any target matrix of the optimization problem (5), under the balanced singular values assumption for U^{\star} and V^{\star} . If W is a critical point satisfying the first- and the second-order optimality conditions, i.e., $\nabla(f + g)(W) = 0$ and $\nabla^2(f + g)(W) \succeq 0$, then we have*

$$\frac{1 - 5\delta_{2r} - 544\delta_{4r}^2 - 1088\delta_{2r}\delta_{4r}^2}{8(40 + 68\delta_{2r})(1 + \delta_{2r})} \|WW^{\top} - W^{\star}W^{\star\top}\|_F^2 \leq \left\| \mathcal{A}(U^{\star}V^{\star\top}) - b \right\|^2. \quad (7)$$

Observe that for this bound to make sense, the term $\frac{1 - 5\delta_{2r} - 544\delta_{4r}^2 - 1088\delta_{2r}\delta_{4r}^2}{8(40 + 68\delta_{2r})(1 + \delta_{2r})}$ needs to be positive. We provide some intuition of this result next. Combined with Lemma 5.14 in [39], we can also obtain the distance between (U, V) and (U^{\star}, V^{\star}) .

Corollary 2.2. *For $W = \begin{bmatrix} U \\ V \end{bmatrix}$ and given the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, we have*

$$\sigma_r(X^{\star}) \cdot \frac{1 - 5\delta_{2r} - 544\delta_{4r}^2 - 1088\delta_{2r}\delta_{4r}^2}{10(40 + 68\delta_{2r})(1 + \delta_{2r})} \cdot \text{DIST}(U, V; X^{\star})^2 \leq \left\| \mathcal{A}(U^{\star}V^{\star\top}) - b \right\|^2. \quad (8)$$

Implications of these results are described next, where we consider specific settings.

Remark 1 (Noiseless matrix sensing). Suppose that $W^{\star} = \begin{bmatrix} U^{\star} \\ V^{\star} \end{bmatrix}$ is the underlying unknown true matrix, i.e., $X^{\star} = U^{\star}V^{\star\top}$ is rank- r and $b = \mathcal{A}(U^{\star}V^{\star\top})$. We assume the noiseless setting, $w = 0$. If $0 \leq \delta_{2r} \leq \delta_{4r} \lesssim 0.0363$, then $\frac{1 - 5\delta_{2r} - 544\delta_{4r}^2 - 1088\delta_{2r}\delta_{4r}^2}{10(40 + 68\delta_{2r})(1 + \delta_{2r})} > 0$ in Corollary 2.2. Since the RHS of (8) is zero, this further implies that $\text{DIST}(U, V; X^{\star}) = 0$, i.e., any critical point W that satisfies first- and second-order optimality conditions is global minimum.

Remark 2 (Noisy matrix sensing). Suppose that W^{\star} is the underlying true matrix, such that $X^{\star} = U^{\star}V^{\star\top}$ and is rank- r , and $b = \mathcal{A}(U^{\star}V^{\star\top}) + w$, for some noise term w . If $0 \leq \delta_{2r} \leq \delta_{4r} < 0.02$, then it follows from (7) that for any local minima W the distance to $U^{\star}V^{\star\top}$ is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{500} \|WW^{\top} - W^{\star}W^{\star\top}\|_F \leq \|w\|.$$

Remark 3 (High-rank matrix sensing). Suppose that X^{\star} is of arbitrary rank and let X_r^{\star} denote its best rank- r approximation. Let $b = \mathcal{A}(X^{\star}) + w$ where w is some noise and let (U^{\star}, V^{\star}) be a balanced factorization of X_r^{\star} . If $0 \leq \delta_{2r} \leq \delta_{4r} < 0.005$, then it follows from (8) that for any local minima (U, V) the distance to (U^{\star}, V^{\star}) is bounded by

$$\text{DIST}(U, V; X^{\star}) \leq \frac{1250}{3\sigma_r(X^{\star})} \cdot \|\mathcal{A}(X^{\star} - X_r^{\star}) + w\|.$$

3 Proof of Main Results

We first describe the first- and second-order optimality conditions for $f + g$ objective with W variable. Then, we provide a detailed proof of the main results: by carefully analyzing the conditions, we study how a local optimum is related to the global optimum.

3.1 Gradient and Hessian of f and g

The gradients of f and g w.r.t. W are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla f(W) &= \sum_{i=1}^p (\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - b_i) \cdot B_i \cdot W \\ \nabla g(W) &= \frac{1}{4} \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top W \quad \left(\equiv \frac{1}{4} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} U \\ -V \end{bmatrix} \cdot (U^\top U - V^\top V) \right)\end{aligned}$$

Regarding Hessian information, we are interested in the positive semi-definiteness of $\nabla^2(f + g)$; for this case, it is easier to write the second-order Hessian information with respect to some matrix direction $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times r}$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{vec}(Z)^\top \cdot \nabla^2 f(W) \cdot \text{vec}(Z) &= \left\langle \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left[\frac{\nabla f(W+tZ) - \nabla f(W)}{t} \right], Z \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^p \langle B_i, ZW^\top + WZ^\top \rangle \cdot B_i W, Z \right\rangle + \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^p (\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - b_i) \cdot B_i Z, Z \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p \langle B_i, ZW^\top + WZ^\top \rangle \cdot \langle B_i, ZW^\top \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^p (\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - b_i) \cdot \langle B_i, ZZ^\top \rangle \\ \text{vec}(Z)^\top \cdot \nabla^2 g(W) \cdot \text{vec}(Z) &= \left\langle \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left[\frac{\nabla g(W+tZ) - \nabla g(W)}{t} \right], Z \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \tilde{Z} \tilde{W}^\top W, Z \right\rangle + \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \tilde{W} \tilde{Z}^\top W, Z \right\rangle + \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top Z, Z \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \tilde{Z} \tilde{W}^\top, ZW^\top \right\rangle + \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \tilde{W} \tilde{Z}^\top, ZW^\top \right\rangle + \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top, ZZ^\top \right\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

3.2 Optimality conditions

Given the expressions above, we now describe first- and second-order optimality conditions on the composite objective $f + g$.

First-order optimality condition. By the first-order optimality condition of a pair (U, V) such that $W = \begin{bmatrix} U \\ V \end{bmatrix}$, we have $\nabla(f + g)(W) = 0$. This further implies:

$$\nabla(f + g)(W) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{i=1}^p (\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - b_i) \cdot B_i \cdot W + \frac{1}{4} \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top W = 0 \quad (9)$$

Second-order optimality condition. For a point W that satisfies the second-order optimality condition $\nabla^2(f+g)(W) \succeq 0$, the following holds for any $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times r}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(Z)^\top \cdot \nabla^2(f+g)(W) \cdot \text{vec}(Z) &\geq 0 \\ \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^p \langle B_i, ZW^\top + WZ^\top \rangle \cdot \langle B_i, ZW^\top \rangle &+ \sum_{i=1}^p (\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - b_i) \cdot \langle B_i, ZZ^\top \rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{Z}\tilde{W}^\top + \tilde{W}\tilde{Z}^\top, ZW^\top \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top, ZZ^\top \rangle \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

3.3 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Suppose that W is a critical point satisfying the optimality conditions (9) and (10). The second order optimality is again written as

$$\begin{aligned} \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^p \langle B_i, ZW^\top + WZ^\top \rangle \cdot \langle B_i, ZW^\top \rangle}_{(A)} &+ \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^p (\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - b_i) \cdot \langle B_i, ZZ^\top \rangle}_{(B)} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{Z}\tilde{W}^\top, ZW^\top \rangle}_{(C)} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{Z}^\top, ZW^\top \rangle}_{(D)} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top, ZZ^\top \rangle}_{(E)} \geq 0, \quad \forall Z = \begin{bmatrix} Z_U \\ Z_V \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times r}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

As in [5], we sum up the above condition for $Z_1 \triangleq (W - W^*R)e_1e_1^\top, \dots, Z_r \triangleq (W - W^*R)e_re_r^\top$. For simplicity, we first assume $Z = W - W^*R$.

Bounding terms (A), (C) and (D). The following bounds work for any Z .

$$\begin{aligned} (A) &= \sum_{i=1}^p \langle B_i, ZW^\top \rangle^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p \langle B_i, ZW^\top \rangle \cdot \langle B_i, WZ^\top \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^p \langle B_i, ZW^\top \rangle^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^p (\langle A_i, Z_U V^\top \rangle + \langle A_i, U Z_V^\top \rangle)^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1 + \delta_{2r}}{2} \|Z_U V^\top\|_F^2 + \frac{1 + \delta_{2r}}{2} \|U Z_V^\top\|_F^2 + \langle Z_U V^\top, U Z_V^\top \rangle + \delta_{2r} \cdot \|Z_U V^\top\|_F \cdot \|U Z_V^\top\|_F \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \underbrace{\frac{1 + 2\delta_{2r}}{2} \|Z_U V^\top\|_F^2 + \frac{1 + 2\delta_{2r}}{2} \|U Z_V^\top\|_F^2}_{(A1)} + \underbrace{\langle Z_U V^\top, U Z_V^\top \rangle}_{(A2)} \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from that every B_i is symmetric, (b) follows from Proposition 1.2, and (c) follows from the AM-GM inequality. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} (C) &= \langle \tilde{Z}\tilde{W}^\top, ZW^\top \rangle = \|Z_U U^\top\|_F^2 + \|Z_V V^\top\|_F^2 - \|Z_U V^\top\|_F^2 - \|Z_V U^\top\|_F^2, \\ (A1) + \frac{1}{4}(C) &\leq \frac{1 + 4\delta_{2r}}{4} \|ZW^\top\|_F^2, \\ (D) &= \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{Z}^\top, ZW^\top \rangle = \langle U Z_U^\top, Z_U U^\top \rangle + \langle V Z_V^\top, Z_V V^\top \rangle - \langle U Z_V^\top, Z_U V^\top \rangle - \langle V Z_U^\top, Z_V U^\top \rangle, \\ (A2) + \frac{1}{4}(D) &= \frac{1}{4} \langle WZ^\top, ZW^\top \rangle, \\ (A) + \frac{1}{4}(C) + \frac{1}{4}(D) &\leq \frac{1}{8} \|WZ^\top + ZW^\top\|_F^2 + \delta_{2r} \|ZW^\top\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

Bounding terms (B) and (E). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(B) &= \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - y_i \right) \cdot \langle B_i, ZZ^\top \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - y_i \right) \cdot \langle B_i, (W - W^*R)(W - W^*R)^\top \rangle \\
&= \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - y_i \right) \cdot B_i, WW^\top + W^*W^{*\top} - 2W^*RW^\top \right\rangle \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} - \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - y_i \right) \cdot \langle B_i, WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top, (W - W^*R)W^\top \rangle \\
&= - \sum_{i=1}^p \langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle^2 - \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top, (W - W^*R)W^\top \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle B_i, W^*W^{*\top} \rangle - y_i \right) \cdot \langle B_i, WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \underbrace{-(1 - \delta_{2r}) \|UV^\top - U^*V^{*\top}\|_F^2}_{(B1)} - \frac{1}{4} \cdot \underbrace{\langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top, 2ZW^\top \rangle}_{(B2)} - \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle B_i, W^*W^{*\top} \rangle - y_i \right) \cdot \langle B_i, WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \rangle}_{(B3)}
\end{aligned}$$

where at (a) we add the first-order optimality equation

$$\left\langle \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - y_i \right) \cdot B_i \cdot W, 2W - 2W^*R \right\rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top W, W - W^*R \rangle,$$

and (b) follows from Proposition 1.2. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(B2) - (E) &= \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top, 2ZW^\top - ZZ^\top \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top, 2WW^\top - W^*RW^\top - WR^\top W^{*\top} - (W - W^*R)(W - W^*R)^\top \rangle \\
&= \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top, WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top, WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \rangle + \langle \tilde{W}^*\tilde{W}^{*\top}, W^*W^{*\top} \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top, WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \rangle + \langle \tilde{W}^*\tilde{W}^{*\top}, W^*W^{*\top} \rangle - \langle \tilde{W}^*\tilde{W}^{*\top}, WW^\top \rangle \\
&= \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top - \tilde{W}^*\tilde{W}^{*\top}, WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from that $\tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top$ is symmetric, (b) follows from Proposition 1.3, (c) follows from that the inner product of two PSD matrices is non-negative. We then have,

$$\begin{aligned}
(B1) + \frac{1}{4}(B2) - \frac{1}{4}(E) &\geq (1 - \delta_{2r}) \|UV^\top - U^*V^{*\top}\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top - \tilde{W}^*\tilde{W}^{*\top}, WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \rangle \\
&= \left(1 - \delta_{2r} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \|UV^\top - U^*V^{*\top}\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{4} \|UU^\top - U^*U^{*\top}\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{4} \|VV^\top - V^*V^{*\top}\|_F^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1 - 2\delta_{2r}}{4} \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F^2
\end{aligned}$$

For (B3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-(B3) &= \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle B_i, W^*W^{*\top} \rangle - b_i \right) \cdot \langle B_i, WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \left\| \mathcal{A}(U^*V^{*\top}) - b \right\| \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \langle B_i, WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \rangle^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sqrt{1 + \delta_{2r}} \cdot \left\| \mathcal{A}(U^*V^{*\top}) - b \right\| \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and (b) follows from Proposition 1.2. We finally get

$$\begin{aligned} (B) + \frac{1}{4}(E) &\leq -\frac{1-2\delta_{2r}}{4} \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F^2 + \sqrt{1+\delta_{2r}} \cdot \|\mathcal{A}(U^*V^{*\top}) - b\| \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F \\ &\leq -\frac{3-8\delta_{2r}}{16} \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F^2 + 16(1+\delta_{2r}) \cdot \|\mathcal{A}(U^*V^{*\top}) - b\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the last inequality follows from the AM-GM inequality.

Summing up the inequalities for Z_1, \dots, Z_r . Now we apply $Z_j = Ze_j e_j^\top$. Since $ZZ^\top = \sum_{j=1}^r Z_j Z_j^\top$ in (11), the analysis does not change for (B) and (E). For (A), (C), and (D), we obtain

$$(A) + \frac{1}{4}(C) + \frac{1}{4}(D) \leq \sum_{j=1}^r \left\{ \frac{1}{8} \|WZ_j^\top + Z_j W^\top\|_F^2 + \delta_{2r} \|Z_j W^\top\|_F^2 \right\}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^r \|WZ_j^\top + Z_j W^\top\|_F^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^r \|We_j e_j^\top Z^\top + Ze_j e_j^\top W^\top\|_F^2 \\ &= 2 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^r \|We_j e_j^\top Z^\top\|_F^2 + 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^r \langle We_j e_j^\top Z^\top, Ze_i e_i^\top W^\top \rangle \\ &= 2 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^r \|We_j e_j^\top Z^\top\|_F^2 + 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^r (e_j^\top Z^\top We_i)^2 \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^r \|We_j e_j^\top Z^\top\|_F^2 + 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^r \|Ze_i\|^2 \cdot \|We_j\|^2 \\ &= 4 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^r \|We_j e_j^\top Z^\top\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Applying this bound, we get

$$(A) + \frac{1}{4}(C) + \frac{1}{4}(D) \leq \frac{1+2\delta_{2r}}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r \|We_j e_j^\top (W - W^*R)\|_F^2. \quad (13)$$

Next, we re-state [5, Lemma 4.4]:

Lemma 3.1. *Let W and W^* be two matrices, and Q is an orthonormal matrix that spans the column space of W . Then, there exists an orthonormal matrix R such that, for any stationary point W of $g(W)$ that satisfies first and second order condition, the following holds:*

$$\sum_{j=1}^r \|We_j e_j^\top (W - W^*R)\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{8} \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F^2 + \frac{34}{8} \cdot \|(WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top\|_F^2 \quad (14)$$

And we have the following variant of [5, Lemma 4.2].

Lemma 3.2. *For any pair of points (U, V) that satisfies the first-order optimality condition, and \mathcal{A} be a linear operator satisfying the RIP condition with parameter δ_{4r} , the following inequality holds:*

$$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \|(WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top\|_F \leq \delta_{4r} \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F + \sqrt{\frac{1+\delta_{2r}}{2}} \cdot \|\mathcal{A}(U^*V^{*\top}) - b\| \quad (15)$$

Applying the above two lemmas, we can get

$$(A) + \frac{1}{4}(C) + \frac{1}{4}(D) \leq \frac{(1+2\delta_{2r}) \cdot (1+1088\delta_{4r}^2)}{16} \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F^2 + 34(1+2\delta_{2r})(1+\delta_{2r}) \|\mathcal{A}(U^*V^{*\top}) - b\|^2. \quad (16)$$

Final inequality. Plugging (16) and (12) to (11), we get

$$\frac{-1 + 5\delta_{2r} + 544\delta_{4r}^2 + 1088\delta_{2r}\delta_{4r}^2}{8} \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F^2 + (40 + 68\delta_{2r})(1 + \delta_{2r}) \cdot \|\mathcal{A}(U^*V^{*\top}) - b\|^2 \geq 0.$$

Finally we have

$$\frac{1 - 5\delta_{2r} - 544\delta_{4r}^2 - 1088\delta_{2r}\delta_{4r}^2}{8(40 + 68\delta_{2r})(1 + \delta_{2r})} \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F^2 \leq \|\mathcal{A}(U^*V^{*\top}) - b\|^2,$$

which completes the proof.

3.3.1 Proof of Lemma 3.2

The first-order optimality condition can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle \nabla(f + g)(W), Z \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - b_i \right) \cdot \langle B_i W, Z \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top W, Z \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p \langle B_i, WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \rangle \langle B_i, ZW^\top \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle B_i, W^*W^{*\top} \rangle - b_i \right) \cdot \langle B_i, ZW^\top \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top, ZW^\top \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^p \langle A_i, UV^\top - U^*V^{*\top} \rangle \langle A_i, Z_U V^\top + U Z_V^\top \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle A_i, U^*V^{*\top} \rangle - b_i \right) \cdot \langle A_i, Z_U V^\top + U Z_V^\top \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top, ZW^\top \rangle, \quad \forall Z = \begin{bmatrix} Z_U \\ Z_V \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times r}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 1.2 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to the condition, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \cdot \underbrace{\langle UV^\top - U^*V^{*\top}, Z_U V^\top + U Z_V^\top \rangle}_{(A)} + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \underbrace{\langle \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top, ZW^\top \rangle}_{(B)} \\ &\leq \delta_{4r} \cdot \underbrace{\|UV^\top - U^*V^{*\top}\|_F}_{(C)} \cdot \underbrace{\|Z_U V^\top + U Z_V^\top\|_F}_{(D)} + \frac{\sqrt{1 + \delta_{2r}}}{2} \cdot \underbrace{\|\mathcal{A}(U^*V^{*\top}) - b\|}_{(D)} \cdot \underbrace{\|Z_U V^\top + U Z_V^\top\|_F}_{(D)} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Let $Z = (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QR^{-1\top}$ where $W = QR$ is the QR decomposition. Then we obtain

$$ZW^\top = (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} 2(A) &= 2 \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} 0 & UV^\top - U^*V^{*\top} \\ VU^\top - V^*U^{*\top} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, ZW^\top \right\rangle \\ &= \langle (WW^\top - \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top) - (W^*W^{*\top} - \tilde{W}^* \tilde{W}^{*\top}), (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \rangle, \\ (B) &= \langle \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top, (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \langle \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top, (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \rangle + \langle \tilde{W}^* \tilde{W}^{*\top}, W^*W^{*\top}QQ^\top \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \langle \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top, (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \rangle - \langle \tilde{W}^* \tilde{W}^{*\top}, (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \rangle \\ &= \langle \tilde{W} \tilde{W}^\top - \tilde{W}^* \tilde{W}^{*\top}, (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Proposition 1.3, and (b) follows from that the inner product of two PSD matrices is non-negative. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
2(A) + (B) &\geq \left\langle WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}, (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \right\rangle \\
&= \left\| (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})Q \right\|_F^2 \\
&= \left\| (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \right\|_F^2
\end{aligned}$$

For (C), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(C) &= \left\| UV^\top - U^*V^{*\top} \right\|_F \cdot \left\| Z_U V^\top + U Z_V^\top \right\|_F \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \left\| WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \right\|_F \cdot \sqrt{2\|Z_U V^\top\|_F^2 + 2\|U Z_V^\top\|_F^2} \\
&\leq \left\| WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \right\|_F \cdot \sqrt{\|ZW^\top\|_F^2} \\
&= \left\| WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \right\|_F \cdot \left\| (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \right\|_F
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging the above bounds into (17), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{4} \cdot \left\| (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \right\|_F^2 &\leq \delta_{4r} \cdot \left\| WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \right\|_F \cdot \left\| (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \right\|_F \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\frac{1+\delta_{2r}}{2}} \cdot \left\| \mathcal{A}(U^*V^{*\top}) - b \right\| \cdot \left\| (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \right\|_F
\end{aligned}$$

In either case of $\left\| (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \right\|_F$ being zero or positive, we can obtain

$$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \left\| (WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top})QQ^\top \right\|_F \leq \delta_{4r} \cdot \left\| WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top} \right\|_F + \sqrt{\frac{1+\delta_{2r}}{2}} \cdot \left\| \mathcal{A}(U^*V^{*\top}) - b \right\|$$

This completes the proof.

4 What About Saddle Points?

Our discussion so far concentrates on whether UV^\top parametrization introduces spurious local minima. Our main results show that any point (U, V) that satisfies both first- and second-order optimality conditions¹ should be (or lie close to) the global optimum. However, we have not discussed what happens with saddle points, *i.e.*, points (U, V) where the Hessian matrix contains both positive and negative eigenvalues.² This is important for practical reasons: first-order methods rely on gradient information and, thus, can easily get stuck to saddle points that may be far away from the global optimum.

[20] studied conditions of the objective that guarantee that stochastic gradient descent—randomly initialized—converges to a local minimum; *i.e.*, we can avoid getting stuck to non-degenerate saddle points. These conditions include $f + g$ being bounded and smooth, having Lipschitz Hessian, being locally strongly convex, and satisfying the strict saddle property, according to the following definition.

Definition 4.1. [20] *A twice differentiable function $f + g$ is strict saddle, if all its stationary points, that are not local minima, satisfy $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2(f + g)(W)) < 0$.*

[28] relax some of these conditions and prove the following theorem (for standard gradient descent).

¹Note here that the second-order optimality condition includes positive *semi*-definite second-order information; *i.e.*, Theorem 2.1 also handles saddle points due to the semi-definiteness of the Hessian at these points.

²Here, we do not consider the harder case where saddle points have Hessian with positive, negative and zero eigenvalues.

Theorem 4.2 ([28] - Informal). *If the objective is twice differentiable and satisfies the strict saddle property, then gradient descent, randomly initialized and with sufficiently small step size, converges to a local minimum almost surely.*

In this section, based on the analysis in [5], we show that $f + g$ satisfy the strict saddle property, which implies that gradient descent can avoid saddle points and converge to the global minimum, with high probability.

Theorem 4.3. *Consider noiseless measurements $b = \mathcal{A}(X^*)$, with \mathcal{A} satisfying RIP with constant $\delta_{4r} \leq \frac{1}{100}$. Assume that $\text{rank}(X^*) = r$. Let (U, V) be a pair of factors that satisfies the first order optimality condition $\nabla f(W) = 0$, for $W = \begin{bmatrix} U \\ V \end{bmatrix}$, and $UV^\top \neq X^*$. Then,*

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2(f + g)(W)) \leq -\frac{1}{7} \cdot \sigma_r(X^*).$$

Proof. Let $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times r}$. Then, by (10), the proof of Theorem 2.1 and the fact that $b = \mathcal{A}(X^*)$ (noiseless), $\nabla^2(f + g)(W)$ satisfies the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(Z)^\top \cdot \nabla^2(f + g)(W) \cdot \text{vec}(Z) &= \sum_{i=1}^p \langle B_i, ZW^\top + WZ^\top \rangle \cdot \langle B_i, ZW^\top \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\langle B_i, WW^\top \rangle - b_i \right) \cdot \langle B_i, ZZ^\top \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{Z}\tilde{W}^\top, ZW^\top \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{Z}^\top, ZW^\top \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{W}\tilde{W}^\top, ZZ^\top \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(13),(12)}{\leq} \frac{1 + 2\delta_{2r}}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r \|We_j e_j^\top (W - W^*R)\|_F^2 - \frac{3 - 8\delta_{2r}}{16} \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F^2 \\ &\stackrel{(14),(15)}{\leq} \left(\frac{1 + 2\delta_{2r}}{16} \cdot (1 + 34 \cdot 16\delta_{4r}^2) - \frac{3 - 8\delta_{2r}}{16} \right) \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \frac{-1 + 5\delta_{4r} + 272\delta_{4r}^2 + 544\delta_{4r}^3}{8} \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{10} \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where the last inequality is due to the requirement $\delta_{4r} \leq \frac{1}{100}$. For the LHS of (18), we can lower bound as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(Z)^\top \cdot \nabla^2(f + g)(W) \cdot \text{vec}(Z) &\geq \|Z\|_F^2 \cdot \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2(f + g)(W)) \\ &= \|W - W^*R\|_F^2 \cdot \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2(f + g)(W)) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by setting $Z = W - W^*R$. Combining this expression with (18), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2(f + g)(W)) &\leq -\frac{1/10}{\|W - W^*R\|_F^2} \cdot \|WW^\top - W^*W^{*\top}\|_F \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.4, [39]}}{\leq} -\frac{1/10}{\|W - W^*R\|_F^2} \cdot 2(\sqrt{2} - 1) \cdot \sigma_r(X^*) \cdot \|W - W^*R\|_F^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{7} \cdot \sigma_r(X^*). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

References

- [1] S. Aaronson. The learnability of quantum states. In *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, volume 463, pages 3089–3114. The Royal Society, 2007.

- [2] A. Anandkumar and R. Ge. Efficient approaches for escaping higher order saddle points in non-convex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.05908*, 2016.
- [3] A. Bandeira, N. Boumal, and V. Voroninski. On the low-rank approach for semidefinite programs arising in synchronization and community detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.04426*, 2016.
- [4] S. Bhojanapalli, A. Kyrillidis, and S. Sanghavi. Dropping convexity for faster semi-definite optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.03917*, 2015.
- [5] S. Bhojanapalli, B. Neyshabur, and N. Srebro. Global optimality of local search for low rank matrix recovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07221*, 2016.
- [6] N. Boumal. Nonconvex phase synchronization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.06114*, 2016.
- [7] N. Boumal, V. Voroninski, and A. Bandeira. The non-convex Burer-Monteiro approach works on smooth semidefinite programs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04970*, 2016.
- [8] S. Burer and R. Monteiro. A nonlinear programming algorithm for solving semidefinite programs via low-rank factorization. *Mathematical Programming*, 95(2):329–357, 2003.
- [9] S. Burer and R. Monteiro. Local minima and convergence in low-rank semidefinite programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 103(3):427–444, 2005.
- [10] E. Candes. The restricted isometry property and its implications for compressed sensing. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, 346(9):589–592, 2008.
- [11] E. Candes and Y. Plan. Tight oracle inequalities for low-rank matrix recovery from a minimal number of noisy random measurements. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 57(4):2342–2359, 2011.
- [12] E. Candes, X. Li, Y. Ma, and J. Wright. Robust principal component analysis? *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 58(3):11, 2011.
- [13] V. Chandrasekaran, S. Sanghavi, P. Parrilo, and A. Willsky. Sparse and low-rank matrix decompositions. In *Communication, Control, and Computing, 2009. Allerton 2009. 47th Annual Allerton Conference on*, pages 962–967. IEEE, 2009.
- [14] Y. Chen and M. Wainwright. Fast low-rank estimation by projected gradient descent: General statistical and algorithmic guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.03025*, 2015.
- [15] A. Christoffersson. *The one component model with incomplete data*. Uppsala., 1970.
- [16] M. Davenport and J. Romberg. An overview of low-rank matrix recovery from incomplete observations. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 10(4):608–622, 2016.
- [17] C. De Sa, K. Olukotun, and C. Re. Global convergence of stochastic gradient descent for some non-convex matrix problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.1134*, 2014.
- [18] M. Fazel, E. Candes, B. Recht, and P. Parrilo. Compressed sensing and robust recovery of low rank matrices. In *Signals, Systems and Computers, 2008 42nd Asilomar Conference on*, pages 1043–1047. IEEE, 2008.
- [19] S. Flammia, D. Gross, Y.-K. Liu, and J. Eisert. Quantum tomography via compressed sensing: Error bounds, sample complexity and efficient estimators. *New Journal of Physics*, 14(9):095022, 2012.
- [20] R. Ge, F. Huang, C. Jin, and Y. Yuan. Escaping from saddle points—online stochastic gradient for tensor decomposition. In *Proceedings of The 28th Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 797–842, 2015.
- [21] R. Ge, J. Lee, and T. Ma. Matrix completion has no spurious local minimum. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07272*, 2016.

- [22] P. Jain, C. Jin, S. Kakade, and P. Netrapalli. Computing matrix squareroot via non convex local search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.05854*, 2015.
- [23] A. Javanmard and A. Montanari. Localization from incomplete noisy distance measurements. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 13(3):297–345, 2013.
- [24] C. Jin, S. Kakade, and P. Netrapalli. Provable efficient online matrix completion via non-convex stochastic gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.08370*, 2016.
- [25] A. Kalev, R. Kosut, and I. Deutsch. Quantum tomography protocols with positivity are compressed sensing protocols. *Nature partner journals (npj) Quantum Information*, 1:15018, 2015.
- [26] F. Krahmer and R. Ward. New and improved Johnson-Lindenstrauss embeddings via the restricted isometry property. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 43(3):1269–1281, 2011.
- [27] A. Kyrillidis and V. Cevher. Matrix recipes for hard thresholding methods. *Journal of mathematical imaging and vision*, 48(2):235–265, 2014.
- [28] J. Lee, M. Simchowitz, M. Jordan, and B. Recht. Gradient descent converges to minimizers. In *Proceedings of The 29th Conference on Learning Theory*, 2016.
- [29] Y.-K. Liu. Universal low-rank matrix recovery from Pauli measurements. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1638–1646, 2011.
- [30] Z. Liu and L. Vandenberghe. Interior-point method for nuclear norm approximation with application to system identification. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 31(3):1235–1256, 2009.
- [31] D. Park, A. Kyrillidis, S. Bhojanapalli, C. Caramanis, and S. Sanghavi. Provable non-convex projected gradient descent for a class of constrained matrix optimization problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01316*, 2016.
- [32] D. Park, A. Kyrillidis, C. Caramanis, and S. Sanghavi. Finding low-rank solutions to matrix problems, efficiently and provably. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.03168*, 2016.
- [33] D. Park, A. Kyrillidis, C. Caramanis, and S. Sanghavi. Finding low-rank solutions to convex smooth problems via the Burer-Monteiro approach. In *54th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, 2016.
- [34] B. Recht, M. Fazel, and P. Parrilo. Guaranteed minimum-rank solutions of linear matrix equations via nuclear norm minimization. *SIAM review*, 52(3):471–501, 2010.
- [35] A. Ruhe. *Numerical computation of principal components when several observations are missing*. Univ., 1974.
- [36] J. Sun, Q. Qu, and J. Wright. Complete dictionary recovery over the sphere I: Overview and the geometric picture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.03607*, 2015.
- [37] J. Sun, Q. Qu, and J. Wright. A geometric analysis of phase retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.06664*, 2016.
- [38] R. Sun and Z.-Q. Luo. Guaranteed matrix completion via nonconvex factorization. In *IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2015*, pages 270–289, 2015.
- [39] S. Tu, R. Boczar, M. Soltanolkotabi, and B. Recht. Low-rank solutions of linear matrix equations via Procrustes flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.03566v2*, 2016.
- [40] A. Waters, A. Sankaranarayanan, and R. Baraniuk. SpaRCS: Recovering low-rank and sparse matrices from compressive measurements. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1089–1097, 2011.

- [41] H. Wold and E. Lyttkens. Nonlinear iterative partial least squares (NIPALS) estimation procedures. *Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute*, 43(1), 1969.
- [42] Xinyang Yi, Dohyung Park, Yudong Chen, and Constantine Caramanis. Fast algorithms for robust PCA via gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07784*, 2016.
- [43] T. Zhao, Z. Wang, and H. Liu. A nonconvex optimization framework for low rank matrix estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*, pages 559–567. 2015.
- [44] Q. Zheng and J. Lafferty. A convergent gradient descent algorithm for rank minimization and semidefinite programming from random linear measurements. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 109–117, 2015.
- [45] Q. Zheng and J. Lafferty. Convergence analysis for rectangular matrix completion using burer-monteiro factorization and gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07051*, 2016.