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#### Abstract

Multiview representation learning is very popular for latent factor analysis. It naturally arises in many data analysis, machine learning, and information retrieval applications to model dependent structures between a pair of data matrices. For computational convenience, existing approaches usually formulate the multiview representation learning as convex optimization problems, where global optima can be obtained by certain algorithms in polynomial time. However, many evidences have corroborated that heuristic nonconvex approaches also have good empirical computational performance and convergence to the global optima, although there is a lack of theoretical justification. Such a gap between theory and practice motivates us to study a nonconvex formulation for multiview representation learning, which can be efficiently solved by two stochastic gradient descent (SGD) methods. Theoretically, by analyzing the dynamics of the algorithms based on diffusion processes, we establish global rates of convergence to the global optima with high probability. Numerical experiments are provided to support our theory.


## 1 Introduction

Multiview data have become increasingly available in many popular real-world data analysis and machine learning problems. The "views" can be considered as multiple measurement modalities, obtained from multiple data sources. For instance, existing literature has demonstrated different scenarios, especially for image data in computer vision, text and linguistic data in natural language processing, and speech data in acoustic recognition. Typical applications usually involve two or more data sets simultaneously, and more details can be found in (Hardoon et al., 2004; Socher and Fei-Fei, 2010; Kidron et al., 2005; Chaudhuri et al., 2009; Arora and Livescu, 2012; Bharadwaj et al., 2012; Vinokourov et al., 2002; Dhillon et al., 2011). Although these data are usually unlabeled, there exist underlying association and dependency between different views, which allow

[^0]us to learn useful representations in a unsupervised manner. Here we are interested in finding a representation that reveals intrinsic low-dimensional structures and dis-entangles underlying factors of variation. One ubiquitous approach is partial least square (PLS) for multiview representation learning. Specifically, given a data set of $n$ samples of two sets of random variables (views), $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$, PLS aims to find an $r$-dimensional subspace $(r \ll \min (m, d))$ that preserves most of the covariance between two views. Existing literature Gu et al. (2016) has shown that such a subspace is spanned by the leading $r$ components of the singular value decomposition (SVD) of $\Sigma_{X Y}=\mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}}\left[X Y^{\top}\right]$, where we sample $(X, Y)$ from some unknown distribution $\mathcal{D}$. Throughout the rest of the paper, if not clear specified, we denote $\mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}}$ by $\mathbb{E}$ for notational simplicity.

A straightforward approach for PLS is "Sample Average Approximation" (SAA, Abdi (2003); Ando and Zhang (2005)), where we run an offline (batch) SVD algorithm on the empirical covariance matrix after seeing sufficient data samples. However, in the "big data" regime, this approach requires unfeasible amount of storage and computation time. Therefore, it is much more practical to consider the multiview learning problem in a "data laden" setting, where we draw independent samples from an underlying distribution $\mathcal{D}$ over $\mathbb{R}^{m} \times \mathbb{R}^{d}$, one at a time. This further enables us to formulate PLS as a stochastic (online) optimization problem:

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\widehat{U}, \widehat{V})=\underset{U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}, V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\left(V^{\top} Y X^{\top} U\right) \quad \text { s.t. } U^{\top} U=I_{r}, V^{\top} V=I_{r} . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here we only consider the rank-1 case ( $r=1$ ) for simplicity, where we rewrite $U$ as a vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$. We will explain more details on the rank- $r$ case in the later section.

Several nonconvex stochastic approximation (SA) algorithms have been proposed in Arora et al. (2012). These algorithms work great in practice, but are lack of theoretic justifications, since the nonconvex nature of (1.1) makes the theoretical analysis very challenging. To overcome this obstacle, Arora et al. (2016) propose a convex relaxation of (1.1). Specifically, by a reparametrization $M=u v^{\top}$ (Recall that we are interested in the rank-1 PLS), they rewrite (1.1) as ${ }^{1}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{M}=\underset{M}{\operatorname{argmax}}\left\langle M, \Sigma_{X Y}\right\rangle \text { s.t. }\|M\|_{*} \leq 1 \text { and }\|M\|_{2} \leq 1 . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Sigma_{X Y}=\mathbb{E} X Y^{\top}$, and $\|M\|_{2}$ and $\|M\|_{*}$ are the spectral (i.e., the largest singular value of $M$ ) and nuclear (i.e., the sum of all singular values of $M$ ) norms of $M$ respectively. By examining the KKT conditions of (1.2), one can verify that $\widehat{M}=\widehat{u} \widehat{v}^{\top}$ is the optimal solution, where $\widehat{u}, \widehat{v}$ are the leading left and right singular vectors of $\Sigma_{X Y}$, i.e., a pair of global optimal solutions to (1.1) for $r=1$. Accordingly, they propose a projected stochastic gradient-type algorithm to solve (1.2), which is often referred to the Matrix Stochastic Gradient (MSG) algorithm. Particularly, at the ( $k+1$ )-th iteration, MSG takes

$$
M^{(k+1)}=\Pi_{\mathrm{Fantope}}\left(M^{(k)}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top}\right),
$$

where $X_{k}$ and $Y_{k}$ are independently sampled from $\mathcal{D}$, and $\Pi_{\text {Fantope }}(\cdot)$ is a projection operator to the feasible set of (1.2). They further prove that given a pre-specified accuracy $\epsilon$, MSG requires $T=\mathcal{O}\left(\epsilon^{-2} \log (1 / \epsilon)\right)$ iterations such that $\left\langle\widehat{M}, \mathbb{E} x y^{\top}\right\rangle-\left\langle M_{T}, \mathbb{E} x y^{\top}\right\rangle \leq \epsilon$ with high probability.

[^1]Despite of the attractive theoretic guarantee, MSG does not present superior performance to other heuristic nonconvex stochastic optimization algorithms for solving (1.1). Although there is a lack of theoretical justification, many evidences have corroborated that heuristic nonconvex approaches not only converge to the global optima in practice, but also enjoy better empirical computational performance than the convex approaches (Zhao et al., 2015; Candes et al., 2015; Ge et al., 2015; Cai et al., 2016). Another drawback of MSG is the complicated projection step at each iteration. Although Arora et al. (2016) further propose an algorithm to compute the projection with a computational cost cubically depending on the rank of the iterates (the worst case: $\mathcal{O}\left(d^{3}\right)$ ), such a sophisticated implementation significantly decreases the practicability of MSG. Furthermore, MSG is also unfavored in a memory-restricted scenario, since storing the update $M_{t}$ requires $\mathcal{O}(m d)$ real number storage. In contrast, the heuristic algorithms analyzed in this paper require only $\mathcal{O}(m+d)$ real number storage, or $\mathcal{O}(r m+r d)$ in the rank- $r$ case.

We aims to bridge the gap between theory and practice for solving multiview representation learning problems by nonconvex approaches. Specifically, we analyze the convergence properties of two heuristic stochastic optimization algorithms for solving (1.1) based on diffusion processes. Our analysis takes advantage of the strong Markov properties of the stochastic optimization algorithm updates and casts the trajectories of the algorithms as a diffusion processes (Ethier and Kurtz, 2009; Li et al., 2016b). By leveraging the weak convergence from discrete Markov chains to their continuous time limits, we demonstrate that the trajectories are essentially the solutions to stochastic differential equations (SDE). Such SDE-type analysis automatically incorporates the geometry of the objective and the randomness of the algorithm, and eventually demonstrate three phases of convergence.

1. Starting from an unstable equilibrium with negative curvature, the dynamics of the algorithm can be described by an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with a steady driven force pointing away from the initial.
2. When the algorithm is sufficiently distant from initial unstable equilibrium, the dynamics can be characterized by a deterministic ordinary differential equation (ODE). The trajectory of this phase is evolving directly toward the desired global maximum until it reaches a small basin around the global maximum.
3. In this phase, the trajectory can be also described by an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process oscillating around the global maximum. The process has a drifting term that gradually dies out and eventually becomes a biased random walk in which it is more likely to move in directions to the maximum.

The sharp characterization in these three phases eventually allows us to establish strong convergence guarantees. Particularly, we show that the nonconvex stochastic gradient algorithm guarantees an $\epsilon$-optimal solution in $\mathcal{O}\left(\epsilon^{-1} \log (1 / \epsilon)\right)$ iterations with high probability, which is a significant improvement over convex MSG by a factor of $\epsilon^{-1}$. Our theoretical analysis reveals the power of the nonconvex optimization in PLS. The simple heuristic algorithms drop the convexity, but achieve much better efficiency.

Our convergence analysis also has important implications on stochastic optimization algorithm for Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA). Specifically, CCA considers a similar setting to PLS, and solves

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\widehat{u}, \widehat{v})=\underset{u, v}{\operatorname{argmax}} u^{\top} \mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v \quad \text { s.t. } \mathbb{E}\left(X^{\top} u\right)^{2}=1, \mathbb{E}\left(Y^{\top} v\right)^{2}=1 . \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

From an optimization perspective, CCA is equivalent to PLS with linear transformations, but more challenging. We will explain more details on CCA in our later discussions.
Notations: Given a vector $v=\left(v^{(1)}, \ldots, v^{(d)}\right)^{\top} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$, we define vector norms: $\|v\|_{1}=\sum_{j}\left|v v_{j}\right|,\|v\|_{2}^{2}=$ $\sum_{j} v_{j}^{2}$, and $\|v\|_{\infty}=\max _{j}\left|v_{j}\right|$. Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we use $A_{j}=\left(A_{1 j}, \ldots, A_{d j}\right)^{\top}$ to denote the $j$-th column of $A$ and define the matrix norms $\|A\|_{\mathrm{F}}^{2}=\sum_{j}\left\|A_{j}\right\|_{2}^{2}$ and $\|A\|_{2}$ as the largest singular value of $A$.

## 2 Stochastic Nonconvex Optimization

Recall that we solve (1.1) for $r=1$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\widehat{u}, \widehat{v})=\underset{u, v}{\operatorname{argmax}} u^{\top} \mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v \quad \text { s.t. }\|u\|_{2}^{2}=1,\|v\|_{2}^{2}=1, \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $(X, Y)$ follows some unknown distribution $\mathcal{D}$. Due to the symmetrical structure of (2.1), $(-\widehat{u},-\widehat{v})$ is also a pair of global optimum. All our analysis holds for both optima. Throughout the rest of the paper, if not clearly specified, we consider $(\widehat{u}, \widehat{v})$ as the global optimum for simplicity.

We apply a straightforward projected stochastic gradient method (PSG). Specifically, at the $k$-th iteration, we have the iterates $u_{k}$ and $v_{k}$. We then independently sample $X_{k}$ and $Y_{k}$ from $\mathcal{D}$, and take

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{k+1}=\Pi\left(u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad v_{k+1}=\Pi\left(v_{k}+\eta Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} u_{k}\right), \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\eta>0$ is the step size parameter, and $\Pi(\cdot)$ is the projection operator on the unit sphere. As can be seen from (2.2), we have $X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}$ as a unbiased estimator of the gradient of the objective function. The projected stochastic gradient method has been extensively studied for convex optimization, and their rates of convergence have been characterized in Ben-Tal and Nemirovski (2001); Nemirovski et al. (2009). The problem (2.1), however, is nonconvex, existing literature in optimization only shows that the stochastic gradient methods converge to a stationary solution.

Besides the projected stochastic gradient method, we can apply other stochastic optimization algorithms to solve (2.1) such as stochastic gradient method over the Riemannian manifolds. Specifically, we consider the Lagrangian function of (2.1) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(u, v, \mu, \sigma)=u^{\top} \mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v-\mu\left(u^{\top} u-1\right)-\sigma\left(v^{\top} v-1\right), \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu$ and $\sigma$ are Lagrangian multipliers. We then check the optimal KKT conditions,

$$
\mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v-2 \mu u=0, \quad \mathbb{E} Y X^{\top} u-2 \sigma v=0, \quad u^{\top} u=1 \quad \text { and } \quad v^{\top} v=1,
$$

which further imply

$$
u^{\top} \mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v-2 \mu u^{\top} u=u^{\top} \mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v-2 \mu=0 \quad \text { and } \quad v^{\top} \mathbb{E} Y X^{\top} u-2 \sigma v^{\top} v=v^{\top} \mathbb{E} Y X^{\top} u-2 \sigma=0 .
$$

Solving the above equations, we obtain the optimal Lagrangian multipliers as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu=\sigma=\frac{1}{2} u^{\top} \mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Plugging (2.4) into (2.3), we can convert the original optimization problem to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max _{u, v} 2 u^{\top} \mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v-\frac{1}{2} u^{\top} \mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v \cdot u^{\top} u-\frac{1}{2} u^{\top} \mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v \cdot v^{\top} v . \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We then apply the stochastic gradient method to solve (2.5). Specifically, at the $k$-th iteration, we take

$$
\begin{align*}
& u_{k+1}=u_{k}+\eta\left[\left(2-\frac{1}{2} u_{k}^{\top} u_{k}-\frac{1}{2} v_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right) \cdot X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}-u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k} \cdot u_{k}\right],  \tag{2.6}\\
& v_{k+1}=v_{k}+\eta\left[\left(2-\frac{1}{2} v_{k}^{\top} v_{k}-\frac{1}{2} u_{k}^{\top} u_{k}\right) \cdot Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} u_{k}-v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} u_{k} \cdot v_{k}\right] . \tag{2.7}
\end{align*}
$$

Different from projected stochastic gradient method, (2.6) and (2.7) do not need a projection operation. Although these two methods look very different from each other, our theory shows that they share the same algorithmic dynamics and trajectory.

## 3 Global Convergence by ODE

Before we proceed with our analysis, we first impose some mild assumptions on the problem.
Assumption 1. $X_{k}, Y_{k}, k=1,2, \ldots T$ are data samples identically independently distributed as $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, Y \in$ $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ respectively satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\mathbb{E} X=\mathbb{E} Y=0$;
2. $\|X\|_{2}^{2} \leq B,\|Y\|_{2}^{2} \leq B$ for a constant $B$;
3. $\lambda_{1}>\lambda_{2} \geq \lambda_{3} \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_{d}>0$, where $\lambda_{i}$ 's are the singular values of $\Sigma_{X Y}=\mathbb{E} X Y^{\top}$.

Note that we assume $X$ and $Y$ are of the same dimensions (i.e., $m=d$ ) and $\Sigma_{X Y}$ is full rank for convenience of analysis. The extension to $m \neq d$ in a rank deficient setting is straightforward, but more involved. Moreover, for a multiview learning problem, it is also natural to impose additional assumptions.

Assumption 2. Given the observed random variables $X$ and $Y$, there exist two orthogonal matrices $O_{X} \in$ $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, O_{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $X=O_{X} \bar{X}, Y=O_{Y} \bar{Y}$, where $\bar{X}=\left(\bar{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \bar{X}^{(d)}\right)^{\top} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ and $\bar{Y}=\left(\bar{Y}^{(1)}, \ldots, \bar{Y}^{(d)}\right)^{\top} \in$ $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ are the latent variables satisfying:

1. $\bar{X}^{(i)}$ and $\bar{Y}^{(j)}$ are independent if $i \neq j$, so that $O_{X}$ and $O_{Y}$ are the left and right singular matrices of $\Sigma_{X Y}$ respectively;
2. $\operatorname{Var}\left(\bar{X}^{(i)}\right)=\gamma_{i}, \operatorname{Var}\left(\bar{Y}^{(i)}\right)=\omega_{i}, \mathbb{E}\left(\bar{X}^{(i)} \bar{Y}^{(i)} \bar{X}^{(j)} \bar{Y}^{(j)}\right)=\alpha_{i, j}$.

The next proposition characterizes the strong Markov property of our algorithm.
Proposition 3.1. Using (2.2), we get a sequence of $\left(u_{k}, v_{k}\right), k=1,2, \ldots, T$. They form a discrete-time Markov process. Moreover, for (2.2), each $u_{k}$ and $v_{k}$ are on the $\mathcal{S}^{d-1}$.

With Proposition 3.1, we can construct a continuous time process to derive an ordinary differential equation to analyze the algorithmic convergence. Before that, we first compute $u_{k+1}-u_{k}$ and $v_{k+1}-v_{k}$ to see how much they change in each iteration. We denote the $i$-th coordinate of $u_{k}$ and $v_{k}$ by $u_{k}^{(i)}$ and $v_{k}^{(i)}$.

Proposition 3.2. Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Given $B \eta<\frac{1}{4}$, the following results hold:
(1) There exists a random variable $R_{k}^{i}$ with $\left|R_{k}^{i}\right| \leq 20 B^{2} \eta^{2}$ and $Q_{k}^{i}$ with $\left|Q_{k}^{i}\right| \leq 20 B^{2} \eta^{2}$, such that the increments $u_{k+1}^{(i)}-u_{k}^{(i)}$ and $v_{k+1}^{(i)}-v_{k}^{(i)}$ are

$$
\begin{aligned}
& u_{k+1}^{(i)}-u_{k}^{(i)}=\eta\left(Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k} X_{k}^{(i)}-u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k} u_{k}^{(i)}\right)+R_{k}^{i}, \\
& v_{k+1}^{(i)}-v_{k}^{(i)}=\eta\left(X_{k}^{\top} u_{k} Y_{k}^{(i)}-v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} u_{k} v_{k}^{(i)}\right)+Q_{k}^{i} .
\end{aligned}
$$

(2) Furthermore, there are two deterministic functions $f_{k}(u, v)$ and $g_{k}(u, v)$ satisfying

$$
\max \left\{\left|f_{k}(u, v)\right|,\left|g_{k}(u, v)\right|\right\} \leq 20 B^{2} \eta^{2} \text { for } \forall u, v \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1} \text {, }
$$

such that conditioning on $u_{k}$ and $v_{k}$, the expectation of the increments in (1) can be represented as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbb{E}\left[u_{k+1}-u_{k} \mid u_{k}, v_{k}\right]=\eta\left(\Sigma_{X Y} v_{k}-u_{k}^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y} v_{k} u_{k}\right)+f_{k}\left(u_{k}, v_{k}\right),  \tag{3.1}\\
& \mathbb{E}\left[v_{k+1}-v_{k} \mid u_{k}, v_{k}\right]=\eta\left(\Sigma_{X Y}^{\top} u_{k}-v_{k}^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y}^{\top} u_{k} v_{k}\right)+g_{k}\left(u_{k}, v_{k}\right) . \tag{3.2}
\end{align*}
$$

Proposition 3.2 is obtained by Taylor expansion. Its proof is presented in Appendix A.1. Result (2) enables us to compute the infinitesimal mean and variance for the projected stochastic gradient algorithm. Specifically, as the fixed step size $\eta \rightarrow 0^{+}$, two processes $U_{\eta}(t)=u_{\left\lfloor\eta^{-1} t\right\rfloor}, V_{\eta}(t)=v_{\left\lfloor\eta^{-1} t\right\rfloor}$ based on the sequence generated by (2.2), weakly converge to the solution of the following ODE system in probability (see more details in Ethier and Kurtz (2009)),

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d U}{d t}=\left(\Sigma_{X Y} V-U^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y} V U\right),  \tag{3.3}\\
& \frac{d V}{d t}=\left(\Sigma_{X Y}^{\top} U-V^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y}^{\top} U V\right), \tag{3.4}
\end{align*}
$$

where $U(0)=u_{0}$ and $V(0)=v_{0}$. To highlight the sequence generated by (2.2) depending on $\eta$, we redefine $u_{\eta, k}=u_{k}, v_{\eta, k}=v_{k}$.

Theorem 3.3. As $\eta \rightarrow 0^{+}$, the processes $u_{\eta, k}, v_{\eta, k}$ weakly converge to the solution of the ODE system in (3.3) and (3.4) with initial $U(0)=u_{0}, V(0)=v_{0}$.

The proof of Theorem 3.3 is presented in Appendix A.2. Under Assumption 1, the above ODE system admits a closed form solution. Specifically, we solve $U$ and $V$ simultaneously, since they are coupled together in (3.3) and (3.4). To simplify (3.3) and (3.4), we define $W=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(U^{\top} V^{\top}\right)^{\top}$ and $w_{k}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(u_{k}^{\top} v_{k}^{\top}\right)^{\top}$. We then rewrite (3.3) and (3.4) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d W}{d t}=Q W-W^{\top} Q W W, \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $Q=\left(\begin{array}{cc}0 & \Sigma_{X Y} \\ \Sigma_{X Y}^{\top} & 0\end{array}\right)$. By Assumption $2, O_{X}$ and $O_{Y}$ are the left and right singular matrices of $\Sigma_{X Y}$ respectively, i.e., $\Sigma_{X Y}=\mathbb{E} X Y^{\top}=O_{X} \mathbb{E} \overline{X Y}^{\top} O_{Y}^{\top}$, where $\mathbb{E} \overline{X Y}^{\top}$ is diagonal. For notational simplicity, we define $D=\operatorname{diag}\left(\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \ldots, \lambda_{d}\right)$ such that $\Sigma_{X Y}=O_{X} D O_{Y}^{\top}$. One can verify $Q=P \Lambda P^{\top}$, where

$$
P=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
O_{X} & O_{X} \\
O_{Y} & -O_{Y}
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \Lambda=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
D & 0 \\
0 & -D
\end{array}\right) .
$$

By left multiplying $P^{\top}$ both sides of (3.5), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
H(t)=P^{\top} W(t) \text { with } \frac{d H}{d t}=\Lambda H-H^{\top} \Lambda H H, \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is a coordinate separable ODE system. Accordingly, we define $h_{k}^{(i) \text {,s as: }}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{k}=P^{\top} w_{k} \quad \text { and } \quad h_{k}^{(i)}=P_{i}^{\top} w_{k} . \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, we can obtain a closed form solution to (3.6) based on the following theorem.
Theorem 3.4. Given (3.6), we write the ODE in each component $H^{(i)}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d}{d t} H^{(i)}=H^{(i)} \sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(\lambda_{i}-\lambda_{j}\right)\left(H^{(j)}\right)^{2}, \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda_{i}=-\lambda_{i-d}$ when $i>d$. This ODE System has a closed form solution as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
H^{(i)}(t)=(C(t))^{-\frac{1}{2}} H^{(i)}(0) \exp \left(\lambda_{i} t\right), \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $i=1,2, \ldots, 2 d$, where

$$
C(t)=\sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{j} t\right)\right)
$$

is a normalization function such that $\|H(t)\|_{2}=1$.

The proof of Theorem 3.4 is presented in Appendix A.3. Without loss of generalization, we assume $H^{(1)}(0)>0$. As can be seen, $H_{1}(t) \rightarrow 1$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$. We have successfully characterized the global convergence performance of our algorithm with an approximate error $o(1)$. The solution to the ODE system in (3.9), however, does not fully reveals the algorithmic behavior (more precisely, the rate of convergence) near the equilibria of the ODE system. This further motivates us to exploit the stochastic differential equation approach to characterize the dynamics of the algorithm.
Remark 3.5. If we start from $u_{0}, v_{0} \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$, then two algorithms, i.e. (2.6)+(2.7) and (2.2), share the same trajectory. The proof is straightforward.

## 4 Global Dynamics by SDE

We analyze the dynamics of the algorithm near the equilibria based on stochastic differential equation by rescaling analysis. Specifically, we characterize three stages for the trajectories of solutions: [a] Neighborhood around unstable equilibria - minimizers and saddle points of (2.1), [b] Neighborhood around stable equilibria - maximizers of (2.1), and [c] deterministic traverses between equilibria. Moreover, we provide the approximate the number of iterations in each phase until convergence.

### 4.1 Phase I: Escaping from unstable equilibria

Suppose that the algorithm starts to iterate around a unstable equilibrium, (e.g. saddle point). Different from our previous analysis, we rescale two aforementioned processes $U_{\eta}(t)$ and $V_{\eta}(t)$ rescaled by a factor of $\eta^{-1 / 2}$. This eventually allows us to capture the uncertainty of the algorithm updates by stochastic differential equations. Roughly speaking, the ODE approximation is essentially a variant of law of large number for Markov process, while the SDE approximation serves as a variant of central limit theorem accordingly.

Recall that $P$ is an orthonormal matrix for diagonalizing $Q$, and $H$ is defined in (3.6). Let $Z_{\eta}^{(i)}$ and $z_{\eta, k}^{(i)}$ denote the $i$-th coordinates of $Z_{\eta}=\eta^{-1 / 2} H_{\eta}$ and $z_{\eta, k}=\eta^{-1 / 2} h_{\eta, k}$ respectively. The following theorem characterizes the dynamics of the algorithm around the unstable equilibrium.

Theorem 4.1. Suppose $z_{\eta, 0}$ is initialized around some saddle point or minimizer ( $j$-th column of $P$ with $j \neq 1$ ), i.e., $Z^{(j)}(0) \approx \eta^{-1}$ and $Z^{(i)}(0) \approx 0$ for $i \neq j$. Then as $\eta \rightarrow 0^{+}$, for all $i \neq j, z_{\eta, k}^{(i)}$ weakly converges to a diffusion process $Z^{(i)}(t)$ satisfying the following SDE,

$$
\begin{equation*}
d Z^{(i)}(t)=-\left(\lambda_{j}-\lambda_{i}\right) Z^{(i)}(t) d t+\beta_{i, j} d B(t), \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $B(t)$ is a brownian motion, and

$$
\beta_{i, j}= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\gamma_{i} \omega_{j}+\gamma_{j} \omega_{i}+2 \alpha_{i, j}} & \text { if } 1 \leq i, j \leq d \\ \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\gamma_{i} \omega_{j}+\gamma_{j} \omega_{i}-2 \alpha_{i, j}} & \text { orherwise. }\end{cases}
$$

where $\gamma_{i}=\gamma_{i-d}$ for $i>d, \omega_{j}=\omega_{j-d}$ for $j>d$, similar definition of $\alpha_{i, j}$ for $i>d$ or $j>d$.

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is provided in Appendix B.1. Note that (4.1) is a Fokker-Planck equation, which admits a closed form solution as follows,

$$
\begin{align*}
Z^{(i)}(t) & =Z^{(i)}(0) \exp \left[-\left(\lambda_{j}-\lambda_{i}\right) t\right]+\beta_{i, j} \int_{0}^{t} \exp \left[\left(\lambda_{j}-\lambda_{i}\right)(s-t)\right] d B(s) \\
& =[\underbrace{Z^{(i)}(0)+\beta_{i, j} \int_{0}^{t} \exp \left[\left(\lambda_{j}-\lambda_{i}\right) s\right] d B(s)}_{T_{1}}] \underbrace{\exp \left[\left(\lambda_{i}-\lambda_{j}\right) t\right]}_{T_{2}} \text { for } i \neq j . \tag{4.2}
\end{align*}
$$

Such a solution is well known as the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process ( $\varnothing$ ksendal, 2003), and also implies that the distribution of $z_{\eta, k}^{(i)}$ can be well approximated by the normal distribution of $Z^{(i)}(t)$ for a sufficiently small step size. This continuous approximation further has the following implications:

1. For $\lambda_{i}>\lambda_{j}, T_{1}=\beta_{i, j} \int_{0}^{t} \exp \left[\left(\lambda_{j}-\lambda_{i}\right) s\right] d B(s)+Z^{(i)}(0)$ is essentially a random variable with mean $Z^{(i)}(0)$ and variance smaller than $\frac{\beta_{i, j}^{2}}{2\left(\lambda_{i}-\lambda_{j}\right)}$. The larger $t$ is, the closer its variance gets to this upper bound. While $T_{2}=\exp \left[\left(\lambda_{i}-\lambda_{j}\right) t\right]$ essentially amplifies $T_{1}$ by a factor exponentially increasing in $t$. This tremendous amplification forces $Z^{(i)}(t)$ to quickly get away from 0 , as $t$ increases.
2. For $\lambda_{i}<\lambda_{j}$, we have

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[Z^{(i)}(t)\right]=Z^{(i)}(0) \exp \left[-\left(\lambda_{j}-\lambda_{i}\right) t\right] \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{Var}\left[Z^{(i)}(t)\right]=\frac{\beta_{i, j}^{2}}{2\left(\lambda_{j}-\lambda_{i}\right)}\left[1-\exp \left[-2\left(\lambda_{j}-\lambda_{i}\right) t\right]\right] .
$$

As has been shown in 1 that $t$ does not need to be large for $Z^{(i)}(t)$ to get away from 0 . Here we only consider relatively small $t$. Since the initial drift for $Z^{(i)}(0) \approx 0$ is very small, $Z^{(i)}$ tends to stay at 0 . As $t$ increases, the exponential decay term makes the drift quickly become negligible. Moreover, by mean value theorem, we know that the variance is bounded, and increases far slower than the variance in 1 . Thus, roughly speaking, $Z^{(i)}(t)$ oscillates near 0 .
3. For $\lambda_{j}=\lambda_{i}$, we have $\mathbb{E}\left[Z^{(i)}(t)\right]=Z^{(i)}(0)$ and $\operatorname{Var}\left[Z^{(i)}(t)\right]=\beta_{i, j}^{2}$. This implies that $Z^{(i)}(t)$ also tends to oscillate around 0 , as $t$ increases.

Overall speaking, 1 is dominative so that it is the major driving force for the algorithm to escape from this unstable equilibrium. More precisely, let us consider the worst case for Phase I, i.e., we start from the second maximum singular value, with $h_{\eta, k}^{(2)}(0)=1$. We then approximately calculate the number of iterations to escape Phase I using the algorithmic behavior of $h_{\eta, k}^{(1)}=\eta^{1 / 2} z_{\eta, k}^{(1)} \approx \eta^{1 / 2} Z_{\eta}^{(1)}(t)$ with $t=k \eta$ by the following proposition.
Proposition 4.2. Given pre-specified $v>0$ and $\delta>0$, the number of iterations is at most

$$
N_{1}=\frac{\eta^{-1}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} \log \left(\frac{2 \eta^{-1} \delta^{2}\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)}{\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1+v}{2}\right)^{2} \beta_{1,2}^{2}}+1\right),
$$

where $\Phi(x)$ is the CDF of standard normal distribution, such that $\left(h_{\eta, N_{1}}^{(2)}\right)^{2} \leq 1-\delta^{2}$ with probability approximately at least $1-v$.

The proof of Proposition 4.2 is provided in Appendix B.2. Proposition 4.2 suggests that SGD can escape from unstable equilibria within a few iterations. After escaping from the saddle, SGD gets into the next phase, which is a deterministic traverse between equilibria.

### 4.2 Phase II: Traverse between equilibria

When the algorithm is close to neither the saddle points nor the optima, the algorithm's performance is nearly deterministic. Since $Z(t)$ is a rescale version of $H(t)$, their trajectories are similar. Like before, we have the following proposition to calculate the approximate iterations, $N_{2}$, following our results in Section 3. We restart the counter of iteration by Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 4.3. After restarting counter of iteration, given a pre-specified $\delta>0$, the number of iterations is at most

$$
N_{2}=\frac{\eta^{-1}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} \log \frac{1-\delta^{2}}{\delta^{2}}
$$

such that $\left(h_{\eta, N_{2}}^{(1)}\right)^{2} \geq\left(1-\delta^{2}\right)$.
The proof of Proposition 4.3 is provided in Appendix B.3. Combining Propositions 4.2 and 4.3, we know that after $N_{1}+N_{2}$ iteration numbers, SGD is close to the optimum with high probability, and gets into its third phase, i.e., convergence to stable equilibria.

### 4.3 Phase III: Convergence to stable equilibria

Again, we restart the counter of iteration by the strong Markov property. The trajectory and analysis are similar to Phase I, since we also characterize the convergence using an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. The following theorem characterizes the dynamics of the algorithm around the stable equilibrium.

Theorem 4.4. Suppose $z_{\eta, 0}$ is initialized around some maximizer (the first column of $P$ ), i.e., $Z^{(1)}(0) \approx \eta^{-1}$ and $Z^{(i)}(0) \approx 0$ for $i \neq 1$. Then as $\eta \rightarrow 0^{+}$, for all $i \neq 1, z_{\eta, k}^{(i)}$ weakly converges to a diffusion process $Z^{(i)}(t)$ satisfying the following SDE for $i \neq 1$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
d Z^{(i)}(t)=-\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right) Z^{(i)}(t) d t+\beta_{i, 1} d B(t), \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $B(t)$ is a brownian motion, and

$$
\beta_{i, 1}= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\gamma_{i} \omega_{1}+\gamma_{1} \omega_{i}+2 \alpha_{i, 1}} & \text { if } 1 \leq i \leq d, \\ \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\gamma_{i} \omega_{1}+\gamma_{1} \omega_{i}-2 \alpha_{i, 1}} & \text { otherwise. }\end{cases}
$$

The proof of Theorem 4.4 is provided in Appendix B.4. Similar to (4.2), the closed form solution to (4.3) for $i \neq 1$ is as follow:

$$
\begin{equation*}
Z^{(i)}(t)=Z^{(i)}(0) \exp \left[-\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right) t\right]+\beta_{i, 1} \int_{0}^{t} \exp \left[\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right)(s-t)\right] d B(s) \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the property of the O-U process, we characterize the expectation and variance of $Z^{(i)}(t)$ for $i \neq 1$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} Z^{(i)}(t)=Z^{(i)}(0) \exp \left[-\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right) t\right], \\
& \mathbb{E}\left(Z^{(i)}(t)\right)^{2}=\frac{\beta_{i, 1}^{2}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right)}+\left[\left(Z^{(i)}(0)\right)^{2}-\frac{\beta_{i, 1}^{2}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right)}\right] \exp \left[-2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right) t\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Recall that the distribution of $z_{\eta, k}^{(i)}$ can be well approximated by the normal distribution of $Z^{(i)}(t)$ for a sufficiently small step size. This further implies that after sufficiently many iterations, SGD enforces $z_{\eta, k}^{(i)} \rightarrow 0$ except $i=1$. Meanwhile, SGD behaves like a biased random walk towards the optimum, when it iterates within a small neighborhood the optimum. But unlike Phase I, the variance gradually becomes a constant.

Based on theorem 4.4, we further establishes an iteration complexity bound for SGD in following proposition.

Proposition 4.5. After restarting counter of iteration, given pre-specified error $\epsilon>0$ and sufficiently small $\eta$, the number of iterations is at most

$$
N_{3}=\frac{\eta^{-1}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} \log \left(\frac{4\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \delta^{2}}{\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \epsilon \eta^{-1}-4 d \max _{1 \leq i \leq d} \beta_{i, 1}^{2}}\right)
$$

such that $\sum_{i=2}^{2 d}\left(h_{\eta, N_{3}}^{(i)}\right)^{2} \leq \epsilon$ with probability approximately at least 3/4.
The proof of Proposition 4.5 is provided in Appendix B.5. Combining Propositions 4.2, 4.3, and 4.5 , we obtain a more refined result in the following corollary.

Corollary 4.6. Given a sufficiently large sample size n for solving (2.1), we choose

$$
\eta=\frac{C \log n}{\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) n}
$$

for a generic constant $C$. Then we have

$$
\left\|u_{\eta, n}-\widehat{u}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left\|v_{\eta, n}-\widehat{v}\right\|_{2}^{2}=\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d \log n}{\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)^{2} n}\right),
$$

with probability approximately at least 3/4.
The proof of Corollary 4.6 is provided in Appendix B.6. We can further improve the probability to $1-v$ for some $v>0$ by repeating $\mathcal{O}(\log 1 / v)$ replicates of SGD. We then compute the geometric median of all output solutions. See more details in Cohen et al. (2016).

## 5 Numerical Experiments

We first provide a simple example to illustrate our theoretical analysis. Specifically, we choose $m=d=3$. We first generate the joint covariance matrix for the latent factors $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{Y}$ as

$$
\operatorname{Cov}(\bar{X})=\Sigma_{\overline{X X}}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
6 & 2 & 1 \\
2 & 6 & 2 \\
1 & 2 & 6
\end{array}\right], \quad \operatorname{Cov}(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})=\Sigma_{\overline{X Y}}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
4 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0.5
\end{array}\right],
$$

and $\Sigma_{\overline{Y Y}}=\Sigma_{\overline{X X}}$. We then generate two matrices $\widetilde{U}$ and $\widetilde{V}$ with each entry independently sampled from $N(0,1)$. Then we convert $\widetilde{U}$ and $\widetilde{V}$ to orthonormal matrices $U$ and $V$ by Grand-Schmidt transformation. At last, we generate the joint covariance matrix for the observational random vectors $X$ and $Y$ using the following covariance matrix

$$
\operatorname{Cov}(X)=U^{\top} \Sigma_{\overline{X X}} U, \quad \operatorname{Cov}(X, Y)=U^{\top} \Sigma_{\overline{X Y}} V \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{Cov}(Y)=V^{\top} \Sigma_{\overline{Y Y}} V .
$$

We consider the total sample size as $n=2 \times 10^{5}$ and choose $\eta=5 \times 10^{-5} \approx n \log n /\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)$. The initialization solution $\left(u_{0}, v_{0}\right)$ is a pair of singular vectors associated with the second largest singular value of $\Sigma_{X Y}$, i.e., saddle point. We repeat the simulation for 100 times, and plot the obtained results.

Figure 1(a) illustrates the three phases of the SGD algorithm. Specifically, the horizontal axis is the number of iterations, and the vertical axis is $h_{k}^{(1)}$ defined in (3.7). As $h_{k}^{(1)} \rightarrow \pm 1$, we have $u_{k} \rightarrow \pm \widehat{u}$ and $v_{k} \rightarrow \pm \widehat{v}$, e.g., global optima. This is due to the symmetric structure of the problem as mentioned in Section 1. Figure 1(a) is consistent with our theory: In Phase I, the algorithm gradually escapes from the saddle point; In Phase II, the algorithm quickly moves towards the optimum; In Phase III, the algorithm gradually converges to the optimum.

Figure 1(b) further zooms in Phase I of Figure 1(a). We see that the trajectories of all 100 simulations behave very similar to an O-U process. Figure 1(c) illustrates the three phases by $h_{k}^{(2)}$. As our analysis suggests, when $h_{k}^{(1)} \rightarrow \pm 1$, we have $h_{k}^{(2)} \rightarrow 0$. We see that the trajectories of all 100 simulations also behave very similar to an O-U process in Phase III. These experimental results are consistent with our theory.

Also, we illustrate $h^{(1)}$ in Phase I and $h^{(2)}$ in Phase III are O-U process by showing that 100 simulations of $h^{(1)}$ follow a gaussian distribution in 10, 100 and 1000 iteration and those of $h^{(1)}$ follow a gaussian distribution in $10^{5}, 1.5 \times 10^{5}$ and $2 \times 10^{5}$ iteration. This is consistent with the Theorems 4.4 and 4.1 in Section 4. Also as we can see that in the Phase I, the variance of $h^{(1)}$ becomes larger and larger when iteration number increases. Similarly, in the Phase III, the variance of $h^{(2)}$ becomes closer to a fixed number.

We then provide a real data experiment for comparing the computational performance our nonconvex stochastic gradient algorithm for solving (2.1) with the convex stochastic gradient algorithm for solving (1.2). We choose a subset of the MNIST dataset, whose labels are 3,4,5, or 9 . The total sample size is $n=23343$, and $m=d=392$. As Arora et al. (2016) suggest, we choose $\eta_{k}=0.05 / \sqrt{k}$ or $2.15 \times 10^{-5}$, for the convex stochastic gradient algorithm. For our nonconvex stochastic gradient algorithm, we choose either $\eta_{k}=0.05 / k$ or $10^{-4}, 2 \times 10^{-5}, 3 \times 10^{-5}$. Figure 3 illustrates the


Figure 1: An illustrative examples of the stochastic gradient algorithm. The three phases of the algorithm are consistent with our theory: In Phase I, the algorithm gradually escapes from the saddle point; In Phase II, the algorithm quickly iterates towards the optimum; In Phase III, the algorithm gradually converges to the optimum.


Figure 2: The estimated density based on 100 simulations (obtained by kernel density estimation using 10fold cross validation) at different iterations in Phase I and Phase III shows that $h_{k}^{(1)}$ 's in Phase I and $h_{k}^{(2)}$ 's in Phase III behave very similar to O-U processes. how their their variance change, which is consistent our theory.
computational performance in terms of iterations and wall clock time. As can be seen, our nonconvex stochastic gradient algorithm outperforms the convex counterpart in iteration complexity, and significantly outperforms in wall clock time, since the nonconvex algorithm does not need the computationally expensive projection in each iteration. This suggests that dropping convexity for PLS can boost both computational scalability and efficiency.


Figure 3: Comparison between nonconvex SGD and convex MSG with different step sizes. We see that SGD not only has a better iteration complexity, but also is more computationally efficient in wall clock time than convex MSG.

## 6 Discussions

We establish the convergence rate of stochastic gradient descent (SGD) algorithms for solving online partial least square (PLS) problems based on diffusion process approximation. Our analysis indicates that for PLS, dropping convexity actually improves efficiency and scalability. Our convergence results are tighter than existing convex relaxation based method by a factor of $O(1 / \epsilon)$, where $\epsilon$ is a pre-specified error. We believe the following directions should be of wide interests:

1. Our current results hold only for the top pair of left and right singular vectors, i.e., $r=1$. For $r>1$, our approximations using ODE and SDE do not admit unique solution due to rotation or permutation. Thus, extension of our analysis to $r>1$ is a challenging, but also important future direction.
2. Our current results are only applicable to a fixed step size $\eta \asymp n^{-1}\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)^{-1} \log n$. Our experiments suggest that $\eta_{k} \asymp k^{-1}\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)^{-1} \log n$ achieves better empirical performance. One possible probability tool is Stein's method.
3. Our current results rely on the classical central limit theorem-type analysis by taking $\eta \rightarrow 0^{+}$. Connecting our analysis to discrete algorithmic proofs such as Jain et al. (2016);Shamir (2015); Li et al. (2016a) is an important direction (Barbour and Chen, 2005).

Moreover, our proposed SGD algorithm for PLS is also closely related to Canonical Correlation Analysis. Specifically, CCA solves a similar problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\widehat{u}, \widehat{v})=\underset{u, v}{\operatorname{argmax}} u^{\top} \mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v \quad \text { s.t } \mathbb{E}\left(X^{\top} u\right)^{2}=1, \mathbb{E}\left(Y^{\top} v\right)^{2}=1 . \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For notational simplicity, we denote $\Sigma_{X Y}=\mathbb{E} X Y^{\top}, \Sigma_{X X}=\mathbb{E} X X^{\top}$, and $\Sigma_{Y Y}=\mathbb{E} Y Y^{\top}$. Since computing $\mathbb{E} X X^{\top}$ and $\mathbb{E} Y Y^{\top}$ is not affordable, the projected stochastic gradient algorithms are not
applicable. Thus we consider an alternative approach to avoid the projection operation. We consider the Lagrangian function of (6.1) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(u, v, \mu, \sigma)=u^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y} v-\mu\left(u^{\top} \Sigma_{X X} u-1\right)-\sigma\left(v^{\top} \Sigma_{Y Y} v-1\right), \tag{6.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu$ and $\sigma$ are Lagrangian multipliers. We then check the optimal KKT conditions,

$$
\Sigma_{X Y} v-2 \Sigma_{X X} \mu u=0, \quad \Sigma_{X Y} u-2 \Sigma_{Y Y} \sigma v=0, \quad u^{\top} \Sigma_{X X} u=1 \quad \text { and } \quad v^{\top} \Sigma_{Y Y} v=1,
$$

which further imply

$$
u^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y} v-2 \mu u^{\top} \Sigma_{X X} u=u^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y} v-2 \mu=0 \quad \text { and } \quad v^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y} u-2 \sigma v^{\top} \Sigma_{Y Y} v=v^{\top} \mathbb{E} Y X^{\top} u-2 \sigma=0 .
$$

Solving the above equations, we obtain the optimal Lagrangian multipliers as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu=\sigma=\frac{1}{2} u^{\top} \mathbb{E} X Y^{\top} v . \tag{6.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Plugging (6.3) into (6.2), we can convert the original optimization problem to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max _{u, v} 2 u^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y} v-\frac{1}{2} u^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y} v \cdot u^{\top} \Sigma_{X X} u-\frac{1}{2} u^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y} v \cdot v^{\top} \Sigma_{Y Y} v . \tag{6.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We then apply the stochastic gradient method to solve (6.4). Specifically, at the $k$-th iteration, we independently sample $\left(X_{k}, Y_{k}\right)$ and $\left(\widetilde{X}_{k}, \widetilde{Y}_{k}\right)$ from $\mathcal{D}$, and take

$$
\begin{align*}
& u_{k+1}=u_{k}+\eta\left[\left(2-\frac{1}{2} u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} X_{k}^{\top} u_{k}-\frac{1}{2} v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right) \widetilde{X}_{k} \widetilde{Y}_{k}^{\top} v_{k}-u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k} \cdot \widetilde{X}_{k} \widetilde{X}_{k}^{\top} u_{k}\right],  \tag{6.5}\\
& v_{k+1}=v_{k}+\eta\left[\left(2-\frac{1}{2} v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}-\frac{1}{2} u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} X_{k}^{\top} u_{k}\right) \widetilde{Y}_{k} \widetilde{X}_{k}^{\top} u_{k}-v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} u_{k} \cdot \widetilde{Y}_{k} \widetilde{Y}_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right] . \tag{6.6}
\end{align*}
$$

Here we sample two pairs of $X$ and $Y$, because we need to ensure the stochastic gradient is a unbiased estimator of the gradient.

Then we can convert (6.5) and (6.6) to ordinary differential equations by taking $\eta \rightarrow 0^{+}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d U}{d t}=\left(2-\frac{1}{2} U^{\top} \Sigma_{X X} U-\frac{1}{2} V \Sigma_{Y Y} V\right) \Sigma_{X Y} V-U^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y} V \cdot \Sigma_{X X} U, \\
& \frac{d V}{d t}=\left(2-\frac{1}{2} U^{\top} \Sigma_{X X} U-\frac{1}{2} V \Sigma_{Y Y} V\right) \Sigma_{X Y}^{\top} U-V^{\top} \Sigma_{X Y}^{\top} U \cdot \Sigma_{Y Y} V .
\end{aligned}
$$

Different from PLS, the above ordinary differential equations do not admit a closed form solution, which makes our ODE/SDE-type convergence analysis not applicable in a straightforward manner. An possible alternative approach is to establish the lower bounds for $\left|\widehat{u}^{\top} U(t)\right|$ and $\left|\widehat{v}^{\top} V(t)\right|$, and further prove that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we have $U(t) \rightarrow \widehat{u}$ and $V(t) \rightarrow \widehat{v}$. We will leave this option for further investigation.

Taking our result for PLS as an initial start, we expect more sophisticated and stronger follow-up work that applies to CCA and other online optimization problems with similar structures, which eventually benefits the learning community in both practice and theory.
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## A Proof Detailed Proofs in Section 3

## A. 1 Proof of Proposition 3.2

Proof. Before we proceed, we first introduce the following lemma.
Lemma A.1. For $|x| \leq \frac{5}{9}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|(1+x)^{\frac{1}{2}}-1+\frac{x}{2}\right| \leq 3 x^{2} . \tag{A.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof of Lemma A.1. Using the Taylor Expansion with Lagrange remainder, we have that $\left(1+x_{0}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}=$ $1-\frac{1}{2} x_{0}+\left.\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+x}}\right|_{x=\theta x_{0}} x_{0}^{2}$, where $\theta \in(0,1)$. Therefore, for $|x| \leq \frac{5}{9}$

$$
\left|(1+x)^{-\frac{1}{2}}-1+\frac{1}{2} x\right|=\frac{3}{8} \frac{1}{(1+\theta x)^{\frac{5}{2}}} x^{2} \leq \frac{3}{8} \frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{5}{9}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}}} x^{2}=\frac{3^{6}}{2^{8}} x^{2} \leq 3 x^{2} .
$$

We then proceed with the proof of Proposition 3.2, first claim because of the symmetric of $u$ and $v$, we just prove for $u$. To do that, we first compute $u_{n+1}-u_{n}$. Before that let's get $u_{n+1}$.

With the update (2.2), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{k+1}=\frac{u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}}{\left\|u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right\|_{2}} \tag{A.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\eta B \leq \frac{1}{4}$, then with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|x| & =\left|2 \eta u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}+\eta^{2} v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right| \\
& \leq 2 \eta\left\|u_{k}\right\|_{2}\left\|X_{k}\right\|_{2}\left\|Y_{k}\right\|_{2}\left\|v_{k}\right\|_{2}+\eta^{2}\left\|v_{k}\right\|_{2}\left\|Y_{k}\right\|_{2}\left\|X_{k}\right\|_{2}^{2}\left\|Y_{k}\right\|_{2}\left\|v_{k}\right\|_{2} \\
& =2 \eta B+\eta^{2} B^{2}<\frac{5}{9},
\end{aligned}
$$

which satisfies the condition of Lemma A.1. Under the assumption that $\|X\|_{2}^{2} \leq B,\|Y\|_{2}^{2} \leq B$, if we denote that
$Q_{1}=\left(1+2 \eta u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}+\eta^{2} v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}-1+\eta u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}+\frac{1}{2} \eta^{2} v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}-\frac{1}{2} \eta^{2} v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}$,
then $\left|Q_{1}\right| \leq 3\left(\left|2 \eta u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}+\eta^{2} v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right|\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \eta^{2} B^{2}$. Therefore, we can compute $u_{k+1}-u_{k}$ using the Taylor Expansion, we get the following equation.

$$
\begin{align*}
u_{k+1}-u_{k} & =\left\|u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right\|_{2}^{-1}\left(u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)-u_{k} \\
& =\left[\left(u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)^{\top}\left(u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)-u_{k} \\
& =\left(1+2 \eta u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}+\eta^{2} v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)-u_{k} \\
& =\left(1-\eta u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)\left(u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)-u_{k}+Q_{1}\left(u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right) \\
& =\left(1-\eta u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)\left(u_{k}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)-u_{k}+R_{k} \\
& =\eta\left(X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}-u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k} u_{k}\right)+R_{k}, \tag{A.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where $R_{k}=\left(R_{k}^{(1)}, R_{k}^{(2)} \ldots R_{k}^{(d)}\right)^{\top}$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|R_{k}^{(i)}\right| & \leq\left|\left(3\left(2 \eta u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}+\eta^{2} v_{k}^{\top} Y_{k} X_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \eta^{2} B^{2}\right)\left(u_{k}^{(i)}+\eta X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)\right| \\
& \leq\left(3 \eta^{2} B^{2}(2+\eta B)^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \eta^{2} B^{2}\right)(1+\eta B) \\
& \leq\left(3 \eta^{2} B^{2} \frac{9^{2}}{4}+\frac{1}{2} \eta^{2} B^{2}\right) \frac{4}{5} \\
& \leq 20 \eta^{2} B^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

## A. 2 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof. By Section 4 of Chapter 7 in Ethier and Kurtz (2009), we can prove by bounding the infinitesimal variance calculated from (3.1) and (3.2). Using the symmetric property we just show for $u$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\frac{d}{d t} \mathbb{E}\left(U_{\eta}^{(j)}(t)-U_{\eta}^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2}\right|_{t=0} \\
= & \eta^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_{\eta}^{(j)}(\eta)-U_{\eta}^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \mid U_{\eta}(0)=u_{k}, V_{\eta}(0)=v_{k}\right] \\
= & \eta^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_{\eta}^{(j)}(\eta)-U_{\eta}^{(j)}(0)\right)\left(U_{\eta}^{(j)}(\eta)-U_{\eta}^{(j)}(0)\right) \mid U_{\eta}(0)=u_{k}, V_{\eta}(0)=v_{k}\right] \\
\leq & \eta^{-1} \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_{\eta}(\eta)-U_{\eta}(0)\right)\left(U_{\eta}(\eta)-U_{\eta}(0)\right)^{\top}\right) \mid U_{\eta}(0)=u_{k}, V_{\eta}(0)=v_{k}\right] \\
= & \eta^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_{\eta}(\eta)-U_{\eta}(0)\right)^{\top}\left(U_{\eta}(\eta)-U_{\eta}(0)\right) \mid U_{\eta}(0)=u_{k}, V_{\eta}(0)=v_{k}\right] \\
= & \eta^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\eta\left(X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} u_{k}-u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k} u_{k}\right)+f_{k}\left(u_{k}, v_{k}\right)\right)^{\top}\left(\eta\left(X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} u_{k}-u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k} u_{k}\right)+f_{k}\left(u_{k}, v_{k}\right)\right)\right] \\
= & \eta \mathbb{E}\left(u_{k}^{\top} Y X_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} u_{k}-2 u_{k}^{\top} Y X_{k}^{\top} u_{k} u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}+u_{k}^{\top} u_{k}\left(u_{k}^{\top} X_{k} Y_{k}^{\top} v_{k}\right)^{2}\right)+O\left(\eta^{2}\right) \\
\leq & \eta \mathbb{E}\left(B^{2}+2 B^{2}+B^{2}\right)+O\left(\eta^{2}\right), \quad \quad \text { Using Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality } \\
\leq & \eta 4 B^{2}+O\left(\eta^{2}\right) \\
= & O(\eta) .
\end{aligned}
$$

As $\eta \rightarrow 0^{+}, U_{\eta}(t), V_{\eta}(t)$ weakly converge to the solution of (3.3) and (3.4) with the same initial. Then considering the definition of the $U_{\eta}(t), V_{\eta}(t)$, we know that the conclusion holds.

## A. 3 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Proof. Notice that $P$ is an orthonormal matrix, which leads to $\|H\|_{2}=\|W\|_{2}=1$, then

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{d t} H^{(i)} & =\lambda_{i} H^{(i)}-\sum_{j=1}^{2 d} \lambda_{j}\left(H^{(j)}\right)^{2} H^{(i)} \\
& =\lambda_{i} \sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(H^{(j)}\right)^{2} H^{(i)}-\sum_{j=1}^{2 d} \lambda_{j}\left(H^{(j)}\right)^{2} H^{(i)} \\
& =H^{(i)} \sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(\lambda_{i}-\lambda_{j}\right)\left(H^{(j)}\right)^{2} . \tag{A.4}
\end{align*}
$$

To prove the conclusion, we verify the solution (3.9) satisfies (3.8). With the knowledge of ODE, we know that in the $C^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ class, this solution is unique.

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{d t} H^{(i)}(t) & =\frac{\left(\lambda_{i} H^{(i)}(0) \exp \left(\lambda_{i} t\right)\right) \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{j} t\right)}-\frac{\left(2 \sum_{j=1}^{2 d} \lambda_{j}\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{j} t\right)\right)^{(i)}(0) \exp \left(\lambda_{i} t\right)}{2 \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{j} t\right)}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{j} t\right)} \\
& =\lambda_{i} \frac{H^{(i)}(0) \exp \left(\lambda_{i} t\right)}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{j} t\right)}}-\sum_{j=1}^{2 d} \lambda_{j} \frac{\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{j} t\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{j} t\right)} \frac{H^{(i)} \exp \left(\lambda_{i} t\right)}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{j} t\right)}} \\
& =\lambda_{i} H^{(i)}(t)-\sum_{j=1}^{2 d} \lambda_{j}\left(H^{(j)}(t)\right)^{2} H^{(i)}(t) . \tag{A.5}
\end{align*}
$$

This is exactly is the (3.8).

## B Proof Detailed Proofs in Section 4

## B. 1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Proof. We calculate the infinitesimal conditional expectation and variance for $Z_{\eta}^{(i)}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left.\frac{d}{d t} \mathbb{E} Z_{\eta}^{(i)}(t)\right|_{t=0} & =\eta^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[Z_{\eta}^{(i)}(\eta)-Z_{\eta}^{(i)}(0) \mid H_{\eta}(0)=h\right] \\
& =\eta^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\eta^{-1 / 2}\left(H_{\eta}^{(i)}(\eta)-H_{\eta}^{(i)}(0)\right) \mid H_{\eta}(0)=h\right] \\
& =\eta^{-1 / 2} h^{(i)} \sum_{l=1}^{2 d}\left(\lambda_{i}-\lambda_{l}\right)\left(h^{(l)}\right)^{2} \\
& =Z_{\eta}^{(i)}\left(\lambda_{i}-\lambda_{j}\right)+o(1) . \tag{B.1}
\end{align*}
$$

The reason of last equation is that we assume the algorithm is starting near $j^{\text {th }}$ column of $P, j \neq 1$, meaning $h \approx e_{j}, i \neq j$. To compute variance, we first compute $\widehat{\Lambda}$. Recall that we define $Q$ in (3.5).

$$
\widehat{\Lambda}=P^{\top} Q P=\frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\bar{Y} \bar{X}^{\top}+\bar{X} \bar{Y}^{\top} & \bar{Y} \bar{X}^{\top}-\bar{X} \bar{Y}^{\top}  \tag{B.2}\\
-\bar{Y} \bar{X}^{\top}+\bar{X} \bar{Y}^{\top} & -\bar{Y} \bar{X}^{\top}-\bar{X} \bar{Y}^{\top}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Then we consider the results of $e_{i}^{\top} \widehat{\Lambda} e_{j}$ case by case:

$$
\begin{align*}
& e_{i}^{\top} \widehat{\Lambda} e_{j}=\left\{\begin{array}{lr}
\frac{1}{2}\left(\bar{X}^{(i)} \bar{Y}^{(j)}+\bar{X}^{(j)} \bar{Y}^{(i)}\right), & \max (i, j) \leq d \\
\frac{1}{2}\left(-\bar{X}^{(j)} \bar{Y}^{(i-d)}+\bar{X}^{(i-d)} \bar{Y}^{(j)}\right), & j \leq d<i \\
\frac{1}{2}\left(\bar{X}^{(j-d)} \bar{Y}^{(i)}-\bar{X}^{(i)} \bar{Y}^{(j-d)}\right), & i \leq d<j \\
\frac{1}{2}\left(-\bar{X}^{(i-d)} \bar{Y}^{(j-d)}-\bar{X}^{(j-d)} \bar{Y}^{(i-d)}\right), & \min (i, j)>d . \\
\left.\frac{d}{d t} \mathbb{E}\left(Z_{\eta}^{(i)}(t)-Z_{\eta}^{(i)}(0)\right)^{2}\right|_{t=t_{0}} & \left.=\eta^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[Z_{\eta}^{(i)}(\eta)-Z_{\eta}^{(i)}(0)\right)^{2} \mid H_{\eta}(0)=h\right] \\
& =\eta^{-2} \mathbb{E}\left[\eta^{2}\left(\widehat{\Lambda} h-h^{\top} \widehat{\Lambda} h h\right)\left(\widehat{\Lambda} h-h^{\top} \widehat{\Lambda} h h\right)^{\top}\right]_{i, i}+O(\eta) \\
& =\mathbb{E}\left(e_{i}^{\top} \widehat{\Lambda} e_{j} e_{j}^{\top} \widehat{\Lambda}^{\top} e_{i}\right)+o(1) \\
& =\frac{1}{4}\left(\gamma_{i} \omega_{j}+\gamma_{j} \omega_{i}+2 \operatorname{sgn} n(i-d-1 / 2) * \operatorname{sgn}(j-1 / 2-d) \alpha_{i, j}\right) .
\end{array}\right. \tag{B.3}
\end{align*}
$$

With B. 1 and B. 4 we get the limit stochastic differential equation.

$$
\begin{equation*}
d Z^{(i)}(t)=-\left(\lambda_{j}-\lambda_{i}\right) Z^{(i)}(t) d t+\beta_{i, j} d B(t) . \tag{B.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

## B. 2 Proof of Proposition 4.2

Proof. We use the approximate normal property of $z_{\eta, k}^{(1)}$ to prove this. First we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{P}\left(\left(h_{\eta, N_{1}}^{(2)}\right)^{2} \leq 1-\delta^{2}\right) & =\mathbb{P}\left(\left(z_{\eta, N_{1}}^{(2)}\right)^{2} \leq \eta^{-1}\left(1-\delta^{2}\right)\right) \\
& \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|z_{\eta, N_{1}}^{(1)}\right| \geq \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta\right) . \tag{B.6}
\end{align*}
$$

Then, we consider that $P\left(\left|z_{\eta, N_{1}}^{(1)}\right| \geq \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta\right) \geq 1-v$. As we know that at time $\mathrm{t}, z_{\eta, k}^{(1)}$ approximates to a normal distribution with mean 0 and Variance $\frac{\beta_{1,2}^{2}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)}\left[\exp \left(2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \eta N_{1}\right)-1\right]$. Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\left|z_{\eta, N_{1}}^{(1)}\right|}{\sqrt{\frac{\beta_{1,2}^{2}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} \times\left[\exp \left(2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \eta N_{1}\right)-1\right]}} \geq \Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1+v}{2}\right)\right)=1-v . \tag{B.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

This means if $\eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta \leq \Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1+v}{2}\right) * \sqrt{\frac{\beta_{1,2}^{2}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} *\left[\exp \left(2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \eta N_{1}\right)-1\right]}$, the conclusion holds. We get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta^{-1} \delta^{2} \leq\left(\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1+v}{2}\right)\right)^{2} * \frac{\beta_{1,2}^{2}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} *\left[\exp \left(2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \eta N_{1}\right)-1\right] . \tag{B.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

After we simplify this inequality, we get $N_{1}$, that is

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{1}=\frac{\eta^{-1}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} \log \left(\frac{2 \eta^{-1} \delta^{2}\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)}{\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1+v}{2}\right)^{2} \beta_{1,2}^{2}}+1\right), \quad \text { where } \Phi(x) \text { is the CDF of } N(0,1) \tag{B.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

## B. 3 Proof of Proposition 4.3

Proof. Using the result of (3.9) and the first phase, we restart our counter, i.e. $h_{\eta, 0}^{(1)}=\delta$, since $h_{\eta, N_{2}}^{(1)}$ approximates to process $H^{(1)}\left(\eta N_{3}\right)$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\left(h_{\eta, N_{2}}^{(1)}(t)\right)^{2} & =\left(H^{(1)}\left(\eta N_{2}\right)\right)^{2}=\left(\sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{j} \eta N_{2}\right)\right)\right)^{-1}\left(H^{(1)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{1} \eta N_{2}\right) \\
& \geq\left(\delta^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{1} \eta N_{2}\right)+\left(1-\delta^{2}\right) \exp \left(2 \lambda_{2} \eta N_{2}\right)\right)^{-1} \delta^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{1} \eta N_{2}\right) . \tag{B.10}
\end{align*}
$$

If $\left(\delta^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{1} \eta N_{2}\right)+\left(1-\delta^{2}\right) \exp \left(2 \lambda_{2} \eta N_{2}\right)\right)^{-1} \delta^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{1} \eta N_{2}\right) \geq \eta^{-1}\left(1-\delta^{2}\right)$ holds, then the result is right. Solving the condition, the number of iterations is as follow: $N_{2}=\frac{\eta^{-1}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} \log \frac{1-\delta^{2}}{\delta^{2}}$.

## B. 4 Proof of Theorem 4.4

Proof. Using (3.9), we get $T_{2}$ such that $H^{(1)} \geq 1-\delta$

$$
\begin{aligned}
(1-\delta)^{2} & \leq \frac{\left(H^{(1)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{1} t\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{1} t\right)} \\
& \leq \frac{\left(H^{(1)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{1} t\right)}{\left(H^{(1)}(0)\right)^{2} \exp \left(2 \lambda_{1} t\right)+\left(1-\left(H^{(j)}(0)\right)^{2}\right) \exp \left(2\left|\lambda_{d}\right| t\right)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then we if we set $T_{2}=\frac{\lambda_{1}}{\lambda_{d}} \log \frac{(1-\delta)^{2}\left(1-\left(H^{(1)}(0)\right)^{2}\right)}{\left(2 \delta-\delta^{2}\right)\left(H^{(1)}(0)\right)}$, then when $t \geq T_{2}$, we have $H^{(1)}(t)$ is near the optimal
For $k=2, \ldots, 2 d, t_{0} \geq T_{2}$, compute infinitesimal conditional expectation and variance like in
proof of Theorem 4.1

$$
\begin{align*}
\left.\frac{d}{d t} \mathbb{E} Z_{\eta}^{(i)}(t)\right|_{t=t_{0}} & =\eta^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[Z_{\eta}^{(i)}\left(t_{0}+\eta\right)-Z_{\eta}^{(i)}\left(t_{0}\right) \mid H^{\eta}\left(t_{0}\right)=h\right] \\
& =\eta^{-1 / 2} h_{i} \sum_{j=1}^{2 d}\left(\lambda_{i}-\lambda_{j}\right) h_{j}^{2}+O(\eta) \\
& =Z^{(i)}\left(\lambda_{i}-\lambda_{1}\right)+o(1) .  \tag{B.11}\\
\left.\frac{d}{d t} \mathbb{E}\left(Z_{\eta}^{(i)}(t)-Z_{\eta}^{(i)}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)^{2}\right|_{t=t_{0}} & =\eta^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(Z_{\eta}^{(i)}\left(t_{0}+\eta\right)-Z_{\eta}^{(i)}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)^{2} \mid H^{\eta}\left(t_{0}\right)=h\right] \\
& =\eta^{-2} \mathbb{E}\left[\eta^{2}\left(\widehat{\Lambda} h-h^{\top} \widehat{\Lambda} h h\right)\left(\widehat{\Lambda} h-h^{\top} \widehat{\Lambda} h h\right)^{\top}\right]_{i, i}+O(\eta) \\
& =\mathbb{E}\left(e_{i}^{\top} \widehat{\Lambda} e_{1} e_{1}^{\top} \widehat{\Lambda}^{\top} e_{i}\right)+o(1) \\
& =\frac{1}{4}\left(\gamma_{i} \omega_{1}+\gamma_{1} \omega_{i}-2 \operatorname{sgn}(i-d-1 / 2) \alpha_{i, 1}\right)+o(1) . \tag{B.12}
\end{align*}
$$

Similarly with proof of theorem 4.1, by Section 4 of Chapter 7 in Ethier and Kurtz (2009), we have for each $k=2, \ldots, 2 d$, if $Z^{(i)}(0)=\eta^{-1 / 2} h_{\eta, 0}^{(i)}$ as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ then the stochastic process $\eta^{-1 / 2} h_{\eta,\left\lfloor t \eta^{-1}\right\rfloor}^{(k)}$, converges weakly to the solution of the stochastic differential equation (4.3).

## B. 5 Proof of Proposition 4.5

Proof of Proposition 4.5. Since we restart our counter, we have $\sum_{i=2}^{2 d}\left(z_{\eta, 0}^{(i)}\right)^{2}=\eta^{-1} \delta^{2}$. By the fact that $z_{\eta, k}^{(i)}$ approximates to $Z^{(i)}(\eta k)$ and its following property:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{E}\left(Z^{(i)}(t)\right)^{2}=\frac{\beta_{i, 1}^{2}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right)}+\left(\left(Z^{(i)}(0)\right)^{2}-\frac{\beta_{i, 1}^{2}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right)}\right) \exp \left[-2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right) t\right], \quad \text { for } i \neq 1 \tag{B.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the Markov inequality and $z_{\eta, N_{3}}^{(i)}$ approximates to the $Z^{(i)}\left(\eta N_{3}\right)$ like in B.2, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=2}^{2 d}\left(h_{\eta, N_{3}}^{(i)}\right)^{2}>\epsilon\right) \leq & \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=2}^{2 d}\left(h_{\eta, N_{3}}^{(i)}\right)^{2}\right)}{\epsilon}=\frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=2}^{2 d}\left(z_{\eta, N_{3}}^{(i)}\right)^{2}\right)}{\eta^{-1} \epsilon} \\
= & \frac{1}{\eta^{-1} \epsilon} \sum_{i=2}^{2 d} \frac{\beta_{i, 1}^{2}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right)}\left(1-\exp \left(-2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right) \eta N_{3}\right)\right)+\left(z_{\eta, 0}^{(i)}\right)^{2} \exp \left[-2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{i}\right) \eta N_{3}\right] \\
\leq & \frac{1}{\eta^{-1} \epsilon}\left(\frac{d \max _{2 \leq i \leq d}\left(\beta_{i, 1}^{2}\right)}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)}\left(1-\exp \left(-2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{d}\right) \eta N_{3}\right)\right)\right. \\
& \left.\quad \begin{array}{l}
\quad \max _{d+1 \leq i \leq 2 d}\left(\beta_{i, 1}^{2}\right) \\
2\left(\lambda_{1}+\lambda_{d}\right) \\
\hline
\end{array}\left(1-\exp \left(-4 \lambda_{1} \eta N_{3}\right)\right)+\delta^{2} \exp \left[-2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \eta N_{3}\right]\right) \\
\leq & \frac{1}{\eta^{-1} \epsilon}\left(\frac{d \max _{1 \leq i \leq d}\left(\beta_{i, 1}^{2}\right)}{\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)}+\delta^{2} \exp \left[-2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \eta N_{3}\right]\right) . \tag{B.14}
\end{align*}
$$

Then we consider that $\frac{1}{\eta^{-1} \epsilon}\left(\frac{d \max _{1 \leq i \leq d}\left(\beta_{i, 1}^{2}\right)}{\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)}+\delta^{2} \exp \left[-2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \eta N_{3}\right]\right) \leq \frac{1}{4}$, by solving this, we get:

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{3} \geq \frac{\eta^{-1}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} \log \left(\frac{4\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \delta^{2}}{\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \epsilon \eta^{-1}-4 d \max _{1 \leq i \leq d} \beta_{i, 1}^{2}}\right) \tag{B.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

## B. 6 Proof of Corollary 4.6

Proof of Corollary 4.6. First, we prove that $\left\|u_{\eta, n}-\widehat{u}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left\|v_{\eta, n}-\widehat{v}\right\|_{2}^{2}$ can be bounded by $\sum_{i=2}^{2 d}\left(h_{\eta, k}^{(i)}\right)^{2}$, when it is near the optima. Recall that $h_{\eta, k}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} P^{\top}\left(u_{\eta, k}^{\top} v_{\eta, k}^{\top}\right)^{\top}$ and $e_{1}=\widehat{h}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} P\left(\widehat{u}^{\top} \widehat{v}^{\top}\right)^{\top}$. From the above analysis, we know that when $k$ is large enough, the SGD is near the optima, then the following holds,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|u_{\eta, k}-\widehat{u}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left\|v_{\eta, k}-\widehat{v}\right\|_{2}^{2} & =4-2\left\langle u_{\eta, k}, \widehat{u}\right\rangle-2\left\langle v_{\eta, k}, \widehat{v}\right\rangle \\
& =4-4\left\langle h_{\eta, k}, \widehat{h}\right\rangle \\
& =4-4 h_{\eta, k}^{1} \\
& =4-4 \sqrt{1-\sum_{i=2}^{2 d}\left(h_{\eta, k}^{(i)}\right)^{2}} \\
& =\frac{16 \sum_{i=2}^{2 d}\left(h_{\eta, k}^{(i)}\right)^{2}}{4+4 \sqrt{1-\sum_{i=2}^{2 d}\left(h_{\eta, k}^{(i)}\right)^{2}}} \\
& \leq 3 \sum_{i=2}^{2 d}\left(h_{\eta, k}^{(i)}\right)^{2} \tag{B.16}
\end{align*}
$$

The last inequality is because $k$ is so large that $\sum_{i=2}^{2 d}\left(h_{\eta, k}^{(i)}\right)^{2}$ is small enough to hold the inequality. And from the Propositions 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5, we know the total iteration number:

$$
\begin{equation*}
T=N_{1}+N_{2}+N_{3} . \tag{B.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, we bound $T$ in (B.17) with sample size n by adding the following constraints:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N_{1}=\frac{\eta^{-1}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} \log \left(\frac{2 \eta^{-1} \delta^{2}\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)}{\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1+v}{2}\right)^{2} \beta_{1,2}^{2}}+1\right) \leq \frac{n}{3} \\
& N_{2}=\frac{\eta^{-1}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} \log \frac{1-\delta^{2}}{\delta^{2}} \leq \frac{n}{3} \\
& N_{3}=\frac{\eta^{-1}}{2\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)} \log \left(\frac{4\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \delta^{2}}{\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \epsilon \eta^{-1}-4 d \max _{1 \leq i \leq d} \beta_{i, 1}^{2}}\right) \leq \frac{n}{3} .
\end{aligned}
$$

With a sufficiently large enough sample size $n$, after we plug $\eta=\frac{C \log n}{\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) n}$ into the above equations,

$$
\begin{align*}
& N_{1}=\frac{n}{2 C \log n} \log \left(\frac{2 n\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)^{2} \delta^{2}}{\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1+v}{2}\right)^{2} \beta_{1,2}^{2} \log n}+1\right) \leq \frac{n}{3}  \tag{B.18}\\
& N_{2}=\frac{n}{2 C \log n} \log \frac{1-\delta^{2}}{\delta^{2}} \leq \frac{n}{3}  \tag{B.19}\\
& N_{3}=\frac{n}{2 C \log n} \log \left(\frac{4\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \delta^{2}}{\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right) \epsilon \frac{n\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)}{C \log n}-4 d \max _{1 \leq i \leq d} \beta_{i, 1}^{2}}\right) \leq \frac{n}{3} . \tag{B.20}
\end{align*}
$$

For (B.18) and (B.19), we choose suitable $C$ to make these two equations hold. We need choose a suitable $\epsilon$ such that (B.20) holds. In this case, we choose $\epsilon=\frac{4 d \log n \max _{1 \leq i \leq d} \beta_{1, i}^{2} .}{C\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)^{2} n}$. Since n is large enough, then with results of Propsition 4.5 and (B.16), we have that with probability larger than $\frac{3}{4}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u_{\eta, n}-\widehat{u}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left\|v_{\eta, n}-\widehat{v}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq 3\left\|h_{\eta, n}-\widehat{h}\right\|_{2}^{2}=\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d \log n}{\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right)^{2} n}\right) \tag{B.21}
\end{equation*}
$$
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