The Mixing method: low-rank coordinate descent for semidefinite programming with diagonal constraints

Po-Wei Wang POWEIW@CS.CMU.EDU
Machine Learning Department
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Wei-Cheng Chang WCHANG2@CS.CMU.EDU
Language Technologies Institute
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

J. Zico Kolter ZKOLTER@CS.CMU.EDU
Computer Science Department
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213, and
Bosch Center for Artificial Intelligence
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Editor:

arXiv:1706.00476v3 [math.OC] 4 Jul 2018

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a low-rank coordinate descent approach to structured semidefinite programming with diagonal constraints. The approach, which we call the Mixing method, is extremely simple to implement, has no free parameters, and typically attains an order of magnitude or better improvement in optimization performance over the current state of the art. We show that the method is strictly decreasing, converges to a critical point, and further that for sufficient rank all non-optimal critical points are unstable. Moreover, we prove that with a step size, the Mixing method converges to the global optimum of the semidefinite program almost surely in a locally linear rate under random initialization. This is the first low-rank semidefinite programming method that has been shown to achieve a global optimum on the spherical manifold without assumption. We apply our algorithm to two related domains: solving the maximum cut semidefinite relaxation, and solving a maximum satisfiability relaxation (we also briefly consider additional applications such as learning word embeddings). In all settings, we demonstrate substantial improvement over the existing state of the art along various dimensions, and in total, this work expands the scope and scale of problems that can be solved using semidefinite programming methods.

Keywords: semidefinite program, non-convex optimization, spherical manifold, convergence to global optimum, random initialization

1. Introduction

This paper considers the solution of large-scale, structured semidefinite programming problems (SDPs). A generic SDP can be written as the optimization problem

$$\underset{X \succeq 0}{\text{minimize}} \ \langle C, X \rangle, \ \text{ subject to } \ \langle A_i, X \rangle = b_i, \ \ i = 1 \dots p \tag{1}$$

where $X \in \mathbb{S}^n$ is the optimization variable (a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix), and $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, p$ are problem data. Semidefinite programs can encode a huge range of practical problems, including relaxations of many combinatorial optimization tasks (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004), approximate probabilistic inference (Jordan and Wainwright, 2004), metric learning (Yang, 2006), matrix completion (Candes and Recht, 2012), and many others. Unfortunately, generic semidefinite programs involve optimizing a *matrix-valued* variable X, where the number of variables grows quadratically so that it quickly becomes unaffordable for solvers employing exact methods such as primal-dual interior point algorithms.

Fortunately, a property of these problems, which has been recognized for some time now, is that the solution to such problems is often *low-rank*; specifically, the problem always admits an optimal solution with at most rank $\lceil \sqrt{2p} \rceil$ (Barvinok, 1995; Pataki, 1998), and many SDPs are set up to have even lower rank solutions in practice. This has motivated the development of non-convex low-rank solvers for these systems: that is, we can attempt to solve the equivalent (but now non-convex) formulation of the problem

$$\underset{V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}}{\text{minimize}} \ \langle C, V^T V \rangle, \ \text{ subject to } \ \langle A_i, V^T V \rangle = b_i, \ \ i = 1 \dots p$$

with the optimization variable $V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$. Here we are explicitly representing X by the matrix V of rank k (typically with $k \ll n$), $X = V^T V$. Note that because we are representing X in this way, we no longer need to explicitly enforce semidefiniteness, as it is implied by the change of variables. In a long series of work dating back several years, it has been shown that, somewhat surprisingly, this change to a non-convex problem does not cause as many difficulties as might be thought: in practice, local solutions to the problem tend to recover the optimal solution (Burer and Monteiro, 2003); assuming sufficient rank k, all second order local optima of the problem are also global optima (Boumal et al., 2016); and it even holds that approximated local optima also have good approximation properties (Mei et al., 2017) for convex relaxations of some combinatorial problems. Despite these advances, solving for V remains a practical challenge. Traditional methods for handling non-linear equality constraints, such as augmented Lagrangian methods and Riemannian manifold methods, suffer from slow convergence, difficulties in selecting step size, or other deficiencies.

In this paper, we present a low-rank coordinate descent approach to solving SDPs that have the additional specific structure of constraints (only) on the *diagonal* entries of the matrix (we consider the case of unit diagonal constraints, though we can easily extend to arbitrary positive numbers)

$$\underset{X \succeq 0}{\text{minimize}} \ \langle C, X \rangle, \ \text{ subject to } \ X_{ii} = 1, \ \ i = 1 \dots n. \tag{2}$$

This is clearly a very special case of the full semidefinite program, but it also captures some fundamental problems, such as the famous semidefinite relaxation of the maximum

cut (MAXCUT) combinatorial optimization problem; indeed, the MAXCUT relaxation will be one of the primary applications in this paper. In this setting, if we consider the above low-rank form of the problem, we show that we can derive the coordinate descent updates in a very simple closed form, resulting in an algorithm several times faster than the existing state of the art. We call our approach the Mixing method, since the updates have a natural interpretation in terms of giving each v_i as a mixture of the remaining v_j terms. We will also show, however, that the method can be applied to other problems as well, such as a (novel, to the best of our knowledge) relaxation of the MAXSAT problem, as well as an unconstrained quadratic SDP similar to the GloVe word embedding algorithm (Pennington et al., 2014).

On the theoretical side, we prove several strong properties about the Mixing method. Most notably, despite the fact that the method is solving a non-convex formulation of the original MAXCUT SDP, it nonetheless will converge to the true *global* optimum of the original SDP problem, provided the rank is sufficient, $k > \sqrt{2n}$ (which is of course much smaller than optimizing over the entire n^2 variables of the original SDP). We prove this by first showing that the method is strictly decreasing, and always converges to a first-order critical point. We then show that all non-optimal critical points (that is, all points which are critical point in the non-convex formulation in V, but not optimal in X in the original SDP), are *unstable*, i.e., they are saddle points in V and will be unstable under updates of the Mixing method; this means that, in practice, the Mixing method is extremely unlikely to converge to any non-optimal solution. However, to formally prove that the method *will* converge to the global optimum, we consider a slightly modified "step size" version of the algorithm, for which we can prove formally that the method indeed converges to the global optimum in all cases (although in practice such a step size is not needed). Finally, for both the traditional and step size versions of the algorithm, we show that the Mixing method attains *locally linear* convergence around the global optimum. The primary tools we use for these proofs require analyzing the spectrum of the Jacobian of the Mixing method at non-optimal critical points, showing that it is always unstable around those points; we combine these with a geometric analysis of critical points due to Boumal et al. (2016) and a convergence proof for coordinate gradient descent due to Lee et al. (2017) to reach our main result (both results require slight specialization for our case, so are included for completeness, but the overall thrust of those supporting points are due to these past papers).

Contributions of the current work In summary, the main contributions of this paper are: 1) We propose a low-rank coordinate descent method, the Mixing method, for the diagonally constrained SDP problem, which is extremely fast and simple to implement. 2) We prove that despite its non-convex formulation, the method is guaranteed to converge to global optimum of the original SDP with local linear convergence, provided that we use a small rank $k > \sqrt{2n}$. 3) We evaluate the proposed method on the MAXCUT SDP relaxation, showing that it is 10-100x times faster than the other state-of-the-art solvers and scales to millions of variables. 4) We extend the MAX-2SAT relaxation of Goemans and Williamson (1995) to general MAXSAT problems, showing that the proposed formulation can be solved by the Mixing method in linear time to the number of literals. Further, experiments show that the proposed method has much better approximation ratios than other approximation algorithms, and is even comparable to the best partial MAXSAT solvers in some instances.

2. Background and related work

Low-rank methods for semidefinite programming Given an SDP problem with p constraints, it was proven by Barvinok (1995); Pataki (1998) that, if the problem is solvable, it admits solutions of rank $k = \lceil \sqrt{2p} \rceil$. That is, we have solutions satisfying $X = V^T V$, such that $V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$. Thus, if we can solve the problem in the space of V, we can ignore the semidefinite constraint and also have many fewer variables. The idea of using this low-rank structure during optimization was first proposed by Burer and Monteiro (2003) in their solver SDPLR, in which they solve the low-rank problem with L-BFGS on the extended Lagrangian problem. Since then, many low-rank optimization algorithms have been developed. One of the most notable is the Riemannian trust region method introduced by Absil et al. (2009). They considered the Riemannian manifold of low-rank structures, and extended the non-linear conjugate gradient method to work on the manifold. Later, Boumal and Absil (2015) improved the method by including preconditioned CG; these methods are implemented in the popular Manopt package (Boumal et al., 2014).

Somewhat surprisingly, all the above low-rank methods are observed to converge to a global optimum in practice (Burer and Monteiro, 2003; Absil et al., 2009; Boumal et al., 2014). However, to the best of the authors' knowledge, there is not yet a general proof on convergence to the globally optimal solution without strong assumptions. Absil et al. (2009, Theorem 7.4.2) proved that their method converges to the critical point under a sufficient decrease condition, and super-linear convergence near an isolated local minimizer when the Riemannian Hessian is positive definite. Nonetheless, the results do not apply to the linear objective in our problem. Boumal et al. (2016, Theorem 2) proved that, for sufficiently large k, all second-order optimal solutions are globally optimal for almost all cost matrices C. However, this alone does not imply f converges to f^*. Sato and Iwai (2015) proved the convergence to a critical point without assumptions for a modified Riemannian conjugate gradient method, and Boumal et al. (2018, Theorem 12 and Proposition 19) proved that the Riemannian trust region method converges to a solution with Hessian larger than $-\gamma I$ in $O(1/\gamma^3)$ and provide bounds on $f - f^*$ when $k > n$. Recently, Bhojanapalli et al. (2018) proved the connection between γ, the norm of gradients, and $f_\mu - f_\mu^*$ for the unconstrained penalty form f_μ, but this does not state the relationship between $f - f^*$ after projecting the unconstrained solution back to the feasible space.

Other existing results on global convergence to the optimal on low-rank problems do not apply to our problem setting. For example, Bhojanapalli et al. (2016) proved that under a certain spectral initialization, the gradient descent method converges to the global optima for unconstrained low-rank SDP. Park et al. (2016) further proved that the method works for norm-constrained low-rank SDP problems when the feasible space of V is convex. Lee et al. (2016, 2017); O'Neill and Wright (2017) proved that, under random initialization, first-order methods converge to local minimizers for unconstrained problems. However, O'Neill and Wright (2017) only concerns the unconstrained optimization in Euclidean space, and results in Lee et al. (2016, 2017) do not work in the spherical manifold due to the singularity in the Jacobian (even with step size). Because of these issues, certifying global convergence for low-rank SDP methods typically requires a two-stage algorithm, where one iteratively solves the low-rank problem via some "inner" optimization, then checks for a certificate of (global) optimality via the dual objective of the original SDP and inflates the rank if the

solution is not optimal (i.e., the "outer" iteration) (Burer and Monteiro, 2003). Even here, a globally optimal solution is not theoretically guaranteed to be achieved with reduced rank in all cases, but at least can be verified after the fact. Computing this dual solution, however, typically requires solving an eigenvalue problem of the size of the original X matrix, so is often avoided entirely in practice in favor of just solving one low-rank problem, and this is the setting we consider here.

Approximation algorithms for MAXCUT and MAXSAT Semidefinite programming has many applications in approximation algorithms for NP-complete problems. In particular, Goemans and Williamson (1995) proposed a classical SDP relaxation on the MAXCUT and MAX-2SAT problems, which has a 0.878 approximation guarantee. Experiments on MAX-2SAT (Gomes et al., 2006) show that the SDP upper bound and lower bound are much tighter than the classical linear programming relaxation for MAXSAT (Goemans and Williamson, 1994). While traditionally SDPs are more expensive to solve than linear programming, we will show here that with our approach, SDP relaxations can achieve substantially better results than linear programming in less time.

3. The Mixing method

As mentioned above, the goal of the Mixing method is to solve the semidefinite program (2) with a unit diagonal constraint. As discussed, we can replace the $X \succeq 0$ constraint with $X = V^T V$ for some $V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$; when we do this, the constraint $X_{ii} = 1$ translates to the constraint $\|v_i\| = 1$, where v_i is the ith column of V. This leads to the equivalent (non-convex) problem on the spherical manifold

$$\underset{V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}}{\text{minimize}} \ \langle C, V^\top V \rangle \quad \text{subject to } \|v_i\| = 1, \ i = 1 \dots n. \tag{3}$$

Although the problem is non-convex, it is known (Barvinok, 1995; Pataki, 1998) that when $k > \sqrt{2n}$, the optimal solution for $V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ can recover the optimal solution for X.

We consider solving the problem (3) via a coordinate descent method. The resulting algorithm is extremely simple to implement but, as we will show, it performs substantially better than existing approaches for the semidefinite problems of interest. Specifically, the objective terms that depend on v_i are given by $v_i^T(\sum_{j=1}^n c_{ij} v_j)$. However, because $\|v_i\| = 1$ we can assume that $c_{ii} = 0$ without affecting the solution of the optimization problem. Thus, the problem is equivalent to simply minimizing the inner product $v_i^T g_i$ (where $g_i = \sum_{j=1}^n c_{ij} v_j$), subject to the constraint that $\|v_i\| = 1$; this problem has a closed form solution, simply given by $v_i = -g_i / \|g_i\|$. Put in terms of the original v_j variable, this is simply the update

$$v_i := \text{normalize}\left(-\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{ij} v_j \right).$$

This way, we can initialize v_i on the unit sphere and perform cyclic updates over all the $i = 1 \dots n$ in closed-form. We call this the Mixing method, because for each v_i our update mixes and normalizes the remaining vectors v_j according to weight c_{ij}. In the case of sparse C (which is common for any large data problem), the time complexity for updating all variables once is $O(k \cdot m)$, where k is the rank of V and m is the number of nonzeros in C. This is

Algorithm 1: The Mixing method for MAXCUT problem

```
Initialize v_i randomly on a unit sphere;
while not yet converged do
    for i = 1, ..., n do
        v_i := normalize(− Σ_{j=1}^{n} c_ij v_j);
    end
end
```

significantly cheaper than the interior point method, which typically admits complexities cubic in n. However, the details for efficient computation differ depending on the precise nature of the SDP, so we will describe these in more detail in the subsequent application sections. A complete description of the generic algorithm is shown in Algorithm 1.

3.1 Convergence properties of the Mixing methods

This section presents the theoretical analysis of the Mixing methods, which constitutes four main properties:

- We prove that the Mixing method is strictly decreasing in objective value and always converges to a first-order critical point over iterations.
- Further, we show that for a rank[1] $k > \sqrt{2n}$, all non-optimal critical points $V \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times n}$ are unstable for the Mixing method. That is, when V^TV is non-optimal for the convex problem (2), the critical point V will sit on a saddle of the non-convex problem (3) and the Mixing method tends to *diverge* from the point *locally*.
- To rigorously prove the *global convergence*, we show that a variant of the Mixing method with a proper step size converges to a global optimum almost surely under random initialization for almost every cost matrix C, *without any assumptions*.
- Moreover, we prove that both Mixing methods (with or without step size) converge linearly to the global optimum when the solution is close enough, *regardless of the rank* or the existence of nearby non-optimal critical points.

In total, our method represents the *first low-rank semidefinite programming method which will provably converge to a global optimum under constraints, and further in a locally linear rate.* As mentioned above, our only assumption (satisfiable by picking a proper step size) is simply that the v_i updates will not lead to a v with zero norm before normalization.

Assumption 3.1 *Assume that for all $i = 1 \dots n$, $\|\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{ij}v_j\|$ do not degenerate in the procedure. That is, all norms are always greater than or equal to a constant $\delta > 0$.*

Convergence to a critical point. Our first property shows that the Mixing method strictly decreases, and always converges to a first-order critical point for any k. This is a relatively weak statement, but useful in the context of the further proofs.

1. The tightness of the $\sqrt{2n}$ rank (actually, rank satisfying $k(k+1)/2 \geq n$) is proved in Barvinok (2001).

Theorem 3.2 *Under Assumption 3.1, the Mixing method on the SDP problem (2) is strictly decreasing and always converges to a first-order critical point.*

The proof is in Appendix A, which mainly involves setting up the Mixing iteration in a matrix form, and showing that the difference in objective value between two iterations is given by a particular positive term based upon this form.

Instability of non-optimal critical points. Next we prove the main result of our approach, that not only is the function decreasing, but that every non-optimal critical point is unstable; that is, although the problem (3) is non-convex, the algorithm tends to diverge (locally) from any solution that is not globally optimal. Further, the local divergence from non-optimal critical points and the global convergence to a critical points hint that the Mixing method can only converges to a global optimal solution.

Theorem 3.3 *Pick $k > \sqrt{2n}$. Under Assumption 3.1, for almost all C, all non-optimal first-order critical points are unstable fixed points for the Mixing method.*

The full proof is provided in Section 3.2. The main idea is to show that the maximum eigenvalue of the dynamics Jacobian, evaluated at a critical point but when V is not optimal, is guaranteed to have a spectral radius (magnitude of the largest eigenvalue) greater than one. We do this by showing that the Jacobian of the Mixing method has the same structure as the Jacobian of a standard Gauss-Seidel update plus an additional projection matrix. By a property from Boumal et al. (2016), plus an analysis of the eigenvector of Kronecker products, we can then guarantee that the eigenvalues of the Mixing method Jacobian contains those of the Gauss-Seidel update. We then use an argument based upon Lee et al. (2017) to show that the Gauss-Seidel Jacobian is similarly unstable around non-optimal critical points, proving our main theorem.

Globally optimal convergence of Mixing method with a step size. Though the above two theorems in practice ensure convergence of the Mixing method to a global optimum, because the method makes discrete updates, there is the theoretical possibility that the method will "jump" directly to a non-optimal critical point (yet again, this has never been observed in practice). For completeness, however, in the next theorem we highlight the fact that a version of the Mixing method that is modified with a step size *will* always converge to a global optimum.

Theorem 3.4 *Consider the Mixing method with a step size $\theta > 0$. That is,*

$$v_i := \text{normalize}\left(v_i - \theta \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{ij} v_j\right), \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Take $k > \sqrt{2n}$ and $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{\max_i \|c_i\|_1})$, where $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the 1-norm. Then for almost every C, the method converges to a global optimum almost surely under random initialization.[2]

2. Any distribution will suffice if it maps zero volume in the spherical manifold to zero probability. For example, both spherical Gaussian distribution and normalized uniform distribution work.

The full proof is provided in Appendix C. The main difference in the proof from the step size free version is that, with a step size, we can prove the diffeomorphism of the Mixing method and thus are able to use the stable manifold theorem. Because the Jacobian of *any* feasible method on the spherical manifold is singular[3], we need to construct the inverse function explicitly and show the smoothness of such function. We can then use an analysis of the Gauss-Seidel method with a step size to show our result. To the best of our knowledge, this represents the first globally optimal convergence result for the low-rank method applied to (constrained) semidefinite programming, without additional assumptions such as the Cauchy decrease (Boumal et al., 2018, Assumption A3), or solving a sequence of "bounded" log-barrier subproblems exactly (Burer and Monteiro, 2005, Theorem 5.3).

Locally linear convergence. Finally, as a last point of analysis, we show that the convergence of the Mixing methods exhibits linear convergence to the global optimum whenever the solution is close enough, regardless of the rank and the existence of nearby non-optimal critical points, for both versions with or without the step size. This also echoes practical experience, where the Mixing method does exhibit this rate of convergence.

Theorem 3.5 *The Mixing methods converge linearly to the global optimum when close enough to the solution, with step size (no assumption) or without step size (under Assumption 3.1).*

The full proof is provided in Appendix D. We prove it by exploiting the Lipschitz smoothness (Lipschitz continuous gradient) of the Mixing mappings. The main difficulty here is that the corresponding linear system in the Gauss-Seidel method, $S^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, is semidefinite so that the corresponding Jacobian J_{GS} contains eigenvectors of magnitude 1 in the null space of S^*. We overcome the difficulty by proving the result directly in the function value space like Wang and Lin (2014) so that the eigenvectors in $\text{null}(S^*)$ can be ignored. This is the first local linear convergence on the spherical manifold without assumption.

Remark 3.6 *Assume there are m nonzeros in $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. With Theorem 3.4 and 3.5, for almost every C, the Mixing method with a step size admits an asymptotic complexity of $O(m\sqrt{n}\log\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ to reach the global optimality gap of $f - f^* \leq \epsilon$ almost surely under random initialization. This concludes the theoretical analysis of the Mixing method.*

Now we will prove one of our main result: the instability of non-optimal critical points.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.3: The instability of non-optimal criticals points

Before starting the proofs, we discuss our notations and reformulate the Mixing methods.

Notations. We use upper-case letters for matrix, and lower-case letters for vector and scalar. For a matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times n}$, $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$ refers to the i-th column of V, $\text{vec}(V)$ and $\text{vect}(V) \in \mathbb{R}^{nk}$ denote the vector stacking columns and rows of V, respectively. For a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $D_y = \text{diag}(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ denotes the matrix with y on the diagonal, $y_{\max}, y_{\min}, y_{\text{min-nz}} \in \mathbb{R}$ the

3. Note that on the spherical manifold, the Jacobian of any feasible method is singular because the Jacobian of $v_i/\|v_i\|$ is singular. Thus, the proof in Lee et al. (2017, Section 5.5) does not carry over to the case of the Mixing method, even with a step size. This past proof required a non-singular Jacobian, and thus different techniques are required in our setting.

maximum, the minimum, and the minimum nonzero element of y, respectively. The symbol $\otimes$ denotes the Kronecker product, $\dagger$ the Moore-Penrose inverse, $\sigma(\cdot)$ the vector of eigenvalues, $\rho(\cdot)$ the spectral radius, 1_n the 1-vector of length n, I_n the identity matrix of size n, $\mathrm{tr}(\cdot)$ the trace, $\langle A, B\rangle = \mathrm{tr}(A^T B)$ the dot product, and $\|V\| = \sqrt{\mathrm{tr}(VV^T)}$ the generalized L2 norm. Indices i, j are reserved for matrix element, and index r for iterations.

The Mixing methods. We denote $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ the cost matrix of the problem

$$\underset{V\in\mathbb{R}^{k\times n}}{\text{minimize}}\ f(V) \equiv \langle C, V^T V\rangle \quad \text{subject to } \|v_i\| = 1,\ i = 1\dots n,$$

and w.l.o.g. assume that $c_{ii} = 0$ in all proofs. Matrices V and $\hat{V}$ refer to the current and the next iterate, and V^* the global optimum attaining an optimal value f^* in the semidefinite program (2).[4] Let

$$g_i = \sum_{j<i} c_{ij}\hat{v}_j + \sum_{j>i} c_{ij} v_j \tag{4}$$

and matrix L be the strict lower triangular part of C. With these notations, the mapping of the Mixing method $M : \mathbb{R}^{k\times n} \to \mathbb{R}^{k\times n}$ and its variant M_θ with step size θ can be written as[5]

$$M(V)^T = -(L + D_y)^{-1} L^T V^T, \qquad \text{where } y_i = \|g_i\|, \qquad i = 1\dots n, \quad \text{and} \tag{5}$$

$$M_\theta(V)^T = (\theta L + D_y)^{-1}(I - \theta L)^T V^T, \quad \text{where } y_i = \|v_i - \theta g_i\|,\ i = 1\dots n. \tag{6}$$

Note that both M and M_θ are valid functions of V because y can be calculated from V by the original algorithmic definitions in Section 3. This formulation is similar to the classical analysis of the Gauss-Seidel method for linear equation in Golub and Van Loan (2012), where the difference is that y here is not a constant to V and thus the evolution is not linear.

Proof of technical lemmas.

We start by analyzing the Jacobian of the Mixing method.

Lemma 3.7 *Using the notation in (5), the Jacobian of the Mixing method is*

$$J(V) = -(L + D_y)^{-1} \otimes I_k \; P \; L^T \otimes I_k,$$

in which P is the rejection matrix of V. That is,

$$P = \mathrm{diag}(P_1, \dots, P_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{nk\times nk}, \quad \textit{where } P_i = I_k - \hat{v}_i \hat{v}_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}.$$

Proof Denote V and $\hat{V}$ the current and the next iterate. Taking total derivatives on the update of the Mixing method (7), we have

$$y_i d\hat{v}_i = -P_i dg_i = -P_i\Big(\sum_{j<i} c_{ij} d\hat{v}_j + \sum_{j>i} c_{ij} dv_j\Big), \quad i = 1\dots n.$$

4. By Pataki (1998), the optimality in (2) is always attainable by $V \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times n}$ when $k > \sqrt{2n}$.
5. The reason to reformulate here is to avoid the "overwrite" of variables in the algorithmic definition. Moving the inverse term to the left-hand side, the reader can recover the original sequential algorithm.

Moving $d\hat{v}_j$ to the left-hand side. By the implicit function theorem, we have the Jacobian

$$J(V) = -\begin{pmatrix} y_1 I_k & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ c_{12}P_2 & y_2 I_k & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ c_{1n}P_n & c_{2n}P_n & \dots & y_n I_k \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & c_{12}P_1 & \dots & c_{1n}P_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & c_{(n-1)n}P_{n-1} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The implicit function theorem holds here because the triangular matrix is always inversible. Rewrite $J(V)$ with Kronecker product, we have equivalently

$$J(V) = -(PL \otimes I_k + D_y \otimes I_k)^{-1} PL^T \otimes I_k.$$

Further, we can push P into the inverse so that

$$(PL \otimes I_k + D_y \otimes I_k)^{-1} P = (PL \otimes I_k + PD_y \otimes I_k)^{\dagger} = ((L + D_y) \otimes I_k)^{-1} P.$$

Thus, $J(V)$ can be reformulated as

$$J(V) = -(L + D_y)^{-1} \otimes I_k P L^T \otimes I_k. \qquad \blacksquare$$

Note that $V = \hat{V}$ on critical points, which is also a fixed point of the Mixing method. Now we demonstrate how to analyze the Jacobian. Remember the notation $\text{vect}(Z) = \text{vec}(Z^T)$. This way, we have the following convenient property by the Kronecker product.

Lemma 3.8 *For matrices A, B, Q, R, we have $A \otimes B \,\text{vect}(QR^T) = \text{vect}((AQ)(BR)^T)$.*

Proof $A \otimes B \,\text{vect}(QR^T) = A \otimes B \,\text{vec}(RQ^T) = \text{vec}(BRQ^T A^T) = \text{vect}((AQ)(BR)^T)$. $\blacksquare$

By the above property, part of the spectrum of the Jacobian can be analyzed.

Lemma 3.9 (Overlapping Eigenvalues) *Assume $V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ has $\text{rank}(V) < k$. Let*

$$P = \text{diag}(P_1, \dots, P_n), \quad \textit{where } P_i = I_k - v_i v_i^T.$$

Then for any $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, any eigenvalue of AB is also an eigenvalue of

$$J = A \otimes I_k P B \otimes I_k.$$

Proof Because $\text{rank}(V) < k$, by linear dependency there is a nonzero $r \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that

$$r^T v_i = 0 \;\text{ for } i = 1 \dots n \quad \Longrightarrow \quad P_i r = r \;\text{ for } i = 1 \dots n.$$

Let $q \in \mathbb{C}^k$ be an eigenvector of AB with eigenvalue $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Let $Z = qr^T$. With Lemma 3.8,

$$\begin{aligned} J \,\text{vect}(Z) &= A \otimes I_k P \,\text{vect}((Bq)r^T) = A \otimes I_k \left(P_i r (Bq)_i^T\right)_{i=1\dots n} \\ &= A \otimes I_k \,\text{vect}((Bq)r^T) = \text{vect}((ABq)r^T) \\ &= \lambda \,\text{vect}(qr^T). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, every eigenvalue λ of AB is also an eigenvalue of J. $\blacksquare$

By the above lemma, the spectral radius of $J = -(L + D_y)^{-1} \otimes I_k P L^T \otimes I_k$ is lower bounded by $J_{GS} = -(L + D_y)^{-1} L^T$, which can be again lower bounded as follows.

Lemma 3.10 *For a positive vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, consider a matrix under the notation in (5)*

$$J_{GS} = -(L + D_y)^{-1} L^T.$$

Let $S = C + D_y$. When $S \not\succeq 0$, the spectral radius $\rho(J_{GS}) > 1$.[6]

Proof The proof is more technical and is given in Appendix B. ■

Further, the assumption in Lemma 3.9 is fulfilled by the following property of critical points.

Lemma 3.11 *(Boumal et al., 2016, Lemma 9) Let $\frac{k(k+1)}{2} > n$. Then, for almost all $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, all first-order critical points $V \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times n}$ have rank smaller than k.*

Proof The proof is listed in Appendix E for completeness. ■

Next, we characterize the optimality of V by proving all non-optimal V admits an $S \not\succeq 0$.

Lemma 3.12 *For a critical solution V, denote $S = C + \operatorname{diag}(y)$, where $y_i = \|Vc_i\|$, $\forall i$. Then*

$$S \succeq 0 \iff V \text{ is optimal.}$$

Further, if V is optimal, all y_i are positive except when $c_i = 0$.[7]

Proof Consider the dual problem of the SDP problem (2),

$$\underset{y\in\mathbb{R}^n}{\text{maximize}} \ -1_n^T y, \quad \text{subject to } \ C + \operatorname{diag}(y) \succeq 0.$$

If $S = C + \operatorname{diag}(y) \succeq 0$, variable y becomes a feasible solution of the above dual problem. Further, since V is a critical solution, we have

$$VS = 0 \implies V^T VS = 0 \implies \operatorname{tr}(V^T VC) = -\operatorname{tr}(V^T V \operatorname{diag}(y)) = -1_n^T y,$$

which means that $V^T V$ and y are primal and dual optimal solutions that close the duality gap. Thus, for critical V, $S \succeq 0$ implies optimality, and non-optimality implies $S \not\succeq 0$.

On the other direction, when the solution V is optimal, there will be a corresponding dual optimal solution y satisfying

$$V^T V(C + \operatorname{diag}(y)) = 0 \implies v_i^T V(C + \operatorname{diag}(y)) = 0, \ \forall i \implies y_i = \|Vc_i\|, \ \forall i.$$

And $S = C + \operatorname{diag}(y) \succeq 0$ follows from the dual feasibility. By the characterization of SPSD matrix, all submatrix of $S \succeq 0$ are SPSD. Thus, $y_i \geq 0$. If equality $y_i = 0$ holds, by the same reason all 2×2 submatrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & c_{ij} \\ c_{ij} & y_{jj} \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0$, $\forall j$. This means $c_i = 0$. ■

6. If $S \succeq 0$, we can prove that the spectral radius $\rho(J_{GS}) \leq 1$, in which all eigenvectors with magnitude 1 reside in the null of S, see Wang and Lin (2014, Corollary 3.4). However, the result is not used here.
7. Let $y_i^* = \|V^* c_i\|$ and $S^* = C + \operatorname{diag}(y^*) \succeq 0$. An immediate consequence of the lemma is that, for any feasible U, $f(U) - f^* = \operatorname{tr}(UCU^T) + 1_n^T y^* = \operatorname{tr}(US^*U^T)$. Further, suppose U is also an optimum, then $f(U) - f^* = \operatorname{tr}(US^*U^T) = 0 \iff US^* = 0 \iff \|Uc_i\| = y_i^* = \|V^* c_i\|$, $\forall i$. That is, y^* is unique.

Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof Consider the non-optimal critical point V. If $\|Vc_i\|$ degenerates for any i, by Assumption 3.1, the Mixing method would not converge to the solution. Thus, we only need to discuss the critical point with $y_i = \|Vc_i\| \geq \delta > 0,\ i = 1 \dots n$.

We first derive the Jacobian J of the Mixing method in Lemma 3.7, which gives

$$J = -(L + D_y)^{-1} \otimes I_k P L^T \otimes I_k,$$

where $P = \mathrm{diag}(P_1, \dots, P_n)$ and $P_i = I - v_i v_i^T$ because $\hat{v}_i = v_i$ on the critical point (also a fixed point). In Lemma 3.9, we prove that when $\mathrm{rank}(V) < k$, the eigenvalues of J contain the eigenvalues of

$$J_{GS} = -(L + D_y)^{-1} L^T.$$

The assumption in Lemma 3.9 is fulfilled by Lemma 3.11, which guarantees that for almost every C, all the first-order critical point must have $\mathrm{rank}(V) < k$. Further, Lemma 3.10 and 3.12 show that J_{GS} happens to be the Jacobian of the Gauss-Seidel method on a linear system, which has a spectral radius $\rho(J_{GS}) > 1$ on the non-optimal first-order critical point V. Thus, Lemma 3.9 implies $\rho(J) \geq \rho(J_{GS}) > 1$, which means that all non-optimal first-order critical points are unstable for the Mixing method. ■

4. Applications

4.1 Maximum cut problem

The SDP MAXCUT relaxation is indeed the motivating example of the Mixing method, so we consider it first. In this section, we demonstrate how to apply our method to this problem, which originated from Goemans and Williamson (1995).

Problem description. The maximum cut problem is an NP-hard binary optimization problem, which seeks a partition over a set of vertices $i = 1 \dots n$, so that the sum of edge weights c_{ij} across the partition is maximized. If we denote the two partitions as ± 1, we can formulate the assignment v_i of vertex i as the following binary optimization problem

$$\underset{v_i \in \{\pm 1\},\, \forall i}{\text{maximize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} c_{ij} \left(\frac{1 - v_i v_j}{2} \right).$$

Goemans and Williamson (1995) proposed that we can approximate the above solution by "lifting" the assignment v_i from $\{\pm 1\}$ to a unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^k$ for sufficiently large k as

$$\underset{\|v_i\| = 1,\, \forall i}{\text{maximize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} c_{ij} \left(\frac{1 - v_i^T v_j}{2} \right).$$

To recover the binary assignment, we can do a randomized rounding by picking a random vector $r \in \mathbb{R}^k$ on the unit sphere, and letting the binary assignment of vertex i be $\mathrm{sign}(r^T v_i)$. Their analysis shows that the approximation ratio for the NP-hard problem is 0.878, which means that the expected objective from the randomized rounding scheme is at least 0.878 times the optimal binary objective.

Algorithm Design. Because the problem can be solved by the unit diagonal SDP (2), we can apply the Mixing method directly, as presented in Algorithm 1. Further, for a sparse adjacency matrix C, the coefficient $\sum_j c_{ij} v_j$ can be constructed in time proportional to the nonzeros in column i of C. Thus, the time complexity of running a round of updates for all v_i is $O(k \cdot \#\text{edges})$, in which k is at most $\sqrt{2n}$.

4.2 Maximum satisfiability problem

Using similar ideas as in the previous section, Goemans and Williamson (1995) proposed that we can use SDP to approximate the maximum 2-satisfiability problem. In this section, we propose a formulation that generalizes this idea to the general maximum satisfiability problem, and apply the Mixing method to this problem. The proposed relaxation here is novel, to the best of our knowledge, and (as we will show) achieves substantially better approximation results than existing relaxations.

Problem description. The MAXSAT problem is an extension of the well-known satisfiability problem, where the goal is to find an assignment that *maximizes* the number of satisfied clauses. Let $v_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ be a binary variable and $s_{ij} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the sign of variable i in clause j. The goal of MAXSAT can then be written as the optimization problem

$$\underset{v \in \{-1,1\}^n}{\text{maximize}} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{m} \bigvee_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}\{s_{ij} v_i > 0\}.$$

Note that most clauses will contain relatively few variables, so the s_j vectors will be sparse. To avoid the need for an additional bias term, we introduce an auxiliary "truth" variable v_0, and define $z_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_{ij} v_i - 1 = \sum_{i=0}^{n} s_{ij} v_i = V s_j$. Then the MAXSAT problem can be approximated as

$$\underset{v \in \{-1,1\}^n}{\text{maximize}} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{m} 1 - \frac{\|V s_j\|^2 - (|s_j| - 1)^2}{4|s_j|}.$$

Although we will not derive it formally, the reader can verify that for any configuration $v \in \{-1, 1\}^n$, this term represents an upper bound on the exact MAXSAT solution.[8] Similar to the MAXCUT SDP, we can relax the v_is to be vectors in $\mathbb{R}^k$ with $\|v_i\| = 1$. This leads to the full MAXSAT semidefinite programming relaxation

$$\underset{X \succeq 0}{\text{minimize}} \ \langle C, X \rangle, \ \text{ subject to } \ C = \sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j s_j s_j^T, \ \ X_{ii} = 1, \ i = 0 \dots n,$$

where $w_j = 1/(4|s_j|)$.

Algorithm Design. Because the C matrix here is not sparse ($s_j s_j^T$ has $|s_j|^2$ non-sparse entries), we need a slightly more involved approach than for MAXCUT, but the algorithm is still extremely simple. Specifically, we maintain $z_j = V s_j$ for all clauses j. Because in each subproblem only one variable v_i is changed, z_j can be maintained in $O(k \cdot m_i)$ time, where m_i denotes the number of clauses that contain variable i. In total, the iteration time complexity is $O(k \cdot m)$, where m is the number of literals in the problem. Also, because

8. Actually, the formula matches the approximation of Goemans and Williamson (1995) for MAX-2SAT.

Algorithm 2: The Mixing method for MAXSAT problem

Initialize all v_i randomly on a unit sphere, $i = 1 \dots n$.;
Let $z_j = \sum_{i=0}^{n} s_{ij} v_i$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$;
while *not yet converged* **do**
  for $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**
    foreach $s_{ij} \neq 0$ **do** $z_j := z_j - s_{ij} v_i$;
    $v_i :=$ normalize $\left(- \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{s_{ij}}{4|s_j|} z_j \right)$;
    foreach $s_{ij} \neq 0$ **do** $z_j := z_j + s_{ij} v_i$;
  end
end

applying arbitrary rotations $R \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ to V does not change the objective value of our problem, we can avoid updating v_0. Algorithm 2 shows the complete algorithm. To recover the binary assignment, we apply the following classic rounding scheme: sample a random vector r from a unit sphere, then assign binary variable i as true if $\text{sign}(r^T v_i) = \text{sign}(r^T v_0)$ and false otherwise.

5. Experimental results

Running time comparison for MAXCUT Figure 1 shows the results of running the Mixing method on several instances of benchmark MAXCUT problems. These range in size from approximately 1000 nodes and 20000 edges to approximately 2 million nodes and 3 million edges. For this application, we are largely concerned with evaluating the runtime of our Mixing method versus other approaches for solving the same semidefinite program. Specifically, we compare to DSDP (Benson and Ye, 2005), a mature interior point solver; SDPLR (Burer and Monteiro, 2003), one of the first approaches to exploit low-rank structures; Pure-RBR (Wen et al., 2009, 2012), a coordinate descent method in the X space, which outputs the best rank-1 update at each step; and Manopt (Boumal et al., 2014), a recent toolkit for optimization on Riemannian manifolds, with specialized solvers dedicated to the MAXCUT problem.[9] To be specific, we use DSDP 5.8, SDPLR 1.03-beta, and Manopt 3.0 with their default parameters. For Manopt, we compare to a subroutine "elliptopefactory", specially designed for diagonal-constrained SDP. For Pure-RBR, we implement the specialized algorithm (Wen et al., 2009, Algorithm 2) for MAXCUT SDP with a sparse graph in C++, which only requires a single pass of the sparse matrix per iteration. We omit the log barrier and initialize the RBR with full-rank X. All experiments are run on an Intel Xeon E5-2670 machine with 256 GB memory, and all solvers are run in the single-core mode to ensure fair comparisons. As the results show, in all cases the Mixing method is substantially faster than other approaches: for reaching modest accuracy (defined as 10^{-4} times the difference between the initial and optimal value), we are typically 10-100x faster than all competing approaches; only the Manopt algorithm ever surpasses our approach, and this happens only

9. We didn't compare to commercial software like MOSEK, an interior-point solver like DSDP, because it is not open-source and Boumal (2015) already showed that SDPLR is faster than MOSEK on diagonally constrained problems.




Figure 1: Objective value difference versus training time for the MAXCUT problems (log-log plot, lower is better). The horizontal lines mark the default stopping precision of the Mixing method, which is 10^{-4} times the starting relative objective of the Mixing method. Experiments show that our method (the blue line) is 10-100x faster than other solvers on our default stopping precision. Note that sometimes curves for SDPLR, DSDP, and RBR are not plotted because they either crashed or did not output any solution after an hour.

once both methods have achieved very high accuracy. Crucially, on the largest problems, we remain about 10x (or more) faster than Manopt over the entire run, which allows the Mixing method to scale to substantially larger problems.

Effectiveness of the Mixing method on approximating MAXSAT problems. Unlike the previous experiment (where the focus was solely on optimization performance), in this section we highlight the fact that with the Mixing method we are able to obtain MAXSAT results with a high approximation ratio on challenging domains (as the problems are similar, relative optimization performance is similar to that of the MAXCUT evaluations). Specifically, we evaluate examples from the 2016 MAXSAT competition (Argelich et al., 2016) and compare our result to the best heuristic *complete* and *partial* solvers. Note that the complete solver produces a verified result, while the partial solver outputs a non-verified solution. Out of 525 problems solved in the complete track (every problem solved exactly by some solvers within 30 minutes during the competition), our method achieves an average approximation ratio of 0.978, and usually finds such solutions within seconds or less. Further, in some instances we obtain perfect solution faster than the best partial solvers. Figure 2 shows the progress of the approximate quality versus the running time. Beside the best heuristic solvers in MAXSAT 2016, we also show the approximation ratio over time for the well-known linear programming approximation (Goemans and Williamson, 1994) (solved via the Gurobi solver). Note that each point in the blue and green curves denote the




Figure 2: Approximated ratio versus (log) running time for the MAXSAT problems (higher is better). The horizontal line marks the perfect approximation ratio (1.00), and the curves mark the approximation ratio of different approximation algorithms over time. Experiments indicate that our proposed formulation/method (blue curves) achieves better approximation ratios in less time compared to LP. Further, it is sometimes faster than the best partial solvers (purple vertical lines) and complete solvers (black vertical lines) in the MAXSAT 2016 competition.

approximation ratio of the output solution at the time, and the starting points of the curves denote the time that the solver output the first solution. In all cases the Mixing method gives better and faster solutions than the LP approximations.

6. Conclusion

In this paper we have presented the Mixing method, a low-rank coordinate descent approach for solving diagonally constrained semidefinite programming problems. The algorithm is extremely simple to implement, and involves no free parameters such as learning rates. In theoretical aspects, we have proved that the method converges to a first-order critical point and all non-optimal critical points are unstable under sufficient rank. With a proper step size, the method converges to the global optimum almost surely under random initialization. This is the first convergence result to the global optimum on the spherical manifold without assumption. Further, we have shown that the proposed methods admit local linear convergence in the neighborhood of the optimum regardless of the rank. In experiments, we have demonstrated the method on three different application domains: the MAXCUT SDP, a MAXSAT relaxation, and a word embedding problem (in the appendix). In all cases we show positive results, demonstrating that the method performs much faster than existing approaches from an optimization standpoint (for MAXCUT and word embeddings), and that

the resulting solutions have high quality from an application perspective (for MAXSAT). In total, the method substantially raises the bar as to what applications can be feasibly addressed using semidefinite programming, and also advances the state of the art in structured low-rank optimization.

Acknowledgement

We thank Gary L. Miller for his helpful discussion on the geometry of the unit sphere, and Simon S. Du for pointing out many recent references.

References

P-A Absil, Robert Mahony, and Rodolphe Sepulchre. *Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds*. Princeton University Press, 2009.

Josep Argelich, Chu Min Li, Felip Manya, and Jordi Planes. Max-sat-2016 eleventh max-sat evaluation. http://maxsat.ia.udl.cat/, 2016.

Sanjeev Arora, Yuanzhi Li, Yingyu Liang, Tengyu Ma, and Andrej Risteski. Rand-walk: A latent variable model approach to word embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.03520*, 2015.

Alexander Barvinok. A remark on the rank of positive semidefinite matrices subject to affine constraints. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 25(1):23–31, 2001.

Alexander I. Barvinok. Problems of distance geometry and convex properties of quadratic maps. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 13(2):189–202, 1995.

Steven J. Benson and Yinyu Ye. DSDP5: Software for semidefinite programming. Technical Report ANL/MCS-P1289-0905, Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL, September 2005. URL http://www.mcs.anl.gov/~benson/dsdp. Submitted to ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software.

Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Anastasios Kyrillidis, and Sujay Sanghavi. Dropping convexity for faster semi-definite optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 530–582, 2016.

Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Nicolas Boumal, Prateek Jain, and Praneeth Netrapalli. Smoothed analysis for low-rank solutions to semidefinite programs in quadratic penalty form. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.00186*, 2018.

Nicolas Boumal. A riemannian low-rank method for optimization over semidefinite matrices with block-diagonal constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.00575*, 2015.

Nicolas Boumal and P-A Absil. Low-rank matrix completion via preconditioned optimization on the grassmann manifold. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 475:200–239, 2015.

Nicolas Boumal, Bamdev Mishra, Pierre-Antoine Absil, Rodolphe Sepulchre, et al. Manopt, a matlab toolbox for optimization on manifolds. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1455–1459, 2014.

Nicolas Boumal, Vlad Voroninski, and Afonso Bandeira. The non-convex burer-monteiro approach works on smooth semidefinite programs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2757–2765, 2016.

Nicolas Boumal, P-A Absil, and Coralia Cartis. Global rates of convergence for nonconvex optimization on manifolds. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, page drx080, 2018. doi: 10.1093/imanum/drx080. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drx080.

Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.

Samuel Burer and Renato DC Monteiro. A nonlinear programming algorithm for solving semidefinite programs via low-rank factorization. *Mathematical Programming*, 95(2): 329–357, 2003.

Samuel Burer and Renato DC Monteiro. Local minima and convergence in low-rank semidefinite programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 103(3):427–444, 2005.

Emmanuel Candes and Benjamin Recht. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Communications of the ACM*, 55(6):111–119, 2012.

Michel X Goemans and David P Williamson. New 3/4-approximation algorithms for the maximum satisfiability problem. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 7(4):656–666, 1994.

Michel X Goemans and David P Williamson. Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 42(6):1115–1145, 1995.

Gene H Golub and Charles F Van Loan. *Matrix computations*, volume 3. JHU Press, 2012.

Carla P Gomes, Willem-Jan van Hoeve, and Lucian Leahu. The power of semidefinite programming relaxations for max-sat. In *International Conference on Integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Operations Research (OR) Techniques in Constraint Programming*, pages 104–118. Springer, 2006.

Michael I Jordan and Martin J Wainwright. Semidefinite relaxations for approximate inference on graphs with cycles. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 369–376, 2004.

Jason D Lee, Max Simchowitz, Michael I Jordan, and Benjamin Recht. Gradient descent only converges to minimizers. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1246–1257, 2016.

Jason D Lee, Ioannis Panageas, Georgios Piliouras, Max Simchowitz, Michael I Jordan, and Benjamin Recht. First-order methods almost always avoid saddle points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.07406*, 2017.

Song Mei, Theodor Misiakiewicz, Andrea Montanari, and Roberto I Oliveira. Solving sdps for synchronization and maxcut problems via the grothendieck inequality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.08729*, 2017.

Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013a.

Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3111–3119, 2013b.

Michael O'Neill and Stephen J Wright. Behavior of accelerated gradient methods near critical points of nonconvex problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.07993*, 2017.

Ioannis Panageas and Georgios Piliouras. Gradient descent only converges to minimizers: Non-isolated critical points and invariant regions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.00405*, 2016.

Dohyung Park, Anastasios Kyrillidis, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Constantine Caramanis, and Sujay Sanghavi. Provable burer-monteiro factorization for a class of norm-constrained matrix problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01316*, 2016.

Gábor Pataki. On the rank of extreme matrices in semidefinite programs and the multiplicity of optimal eigenvalues. *Mathematics of operations research*, 23(2):339–358, 1998.

Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *EMNLP*, volume 14, pages 1532–1543, 2014.

Hiroyuki Sato and Toshihiro Iwai. A new, globally convergent riemannian conjugate gradient method. *Optimization*, 64(4):1011–1031, 2015.

Michael Shub. *Global stability of dynamical systems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

Po-Wei Wang and Chih-Jen Lin. Iteration complexity of feasible descent methods for convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1523–1548, 2014.

Zaiwen Wen, Donald Goldfarb, Shiqian Ma, and Katya Scheinberg. Row by row methods for semidefinite programming. *Industrial Engineering*, pages 1–21, 2009.

Zaiwen Wen, Donald Goldfarb, and Katya Scheinberg. Block coordinate descent methods for semidefinite programming. In *Handbook on Semidefinite, Conic and Polynomial Optimization*, pages 533–564. Springer, 2012.

Liu Yang. Distance metric learning: A comprehensive survey. 2006.

Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 3.2: Convergence to a critical point

Lemma A.1 *Let $\hat{V} = M(V)$ for the Mixing method $M : \mathbb{R}^{k\times n} \to \mathbb{R}^{k\times n}$ defined in (4) and (5). Then*

$$f(V) - f(\hat{V}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \|v_i - \hat{v}_i\|^2.$$

Proof Recall the objective function f w.r.t. variable v_i while fixing all other variables v_j is

$$\langle C, V^T V\rangle = \sum_i \sum_j c_{ij} v_i^T v_j = 2v_i^T (\sum_j c_{ij} v_j) + \text{constant}.$$

Note that the $\sum_j c_{ij} v_j$ term is independent of v_i because $c_{ii} = 0$. Now consider the inner cyclic iteration of the Mixing method updating v_i to $\hat{v}_i$. Because only those v_j with $j < i$ are updated to $\hat{v}_j$, the objective value before updating v_i to $\hat{v}_i$ equals $2v_i^T(\sum_{j<i} c_{ij}\hat{v}_j + \sum_{j>i} c_{ij} v_j) = 2g_i^T v_i$ plus constants, Thus, the updates of the Mixing method can be written as

$$\hat{v}_i = -g_i/y_i, \quad \text{where } y_i = \|g_i\| \text{ and } g_i = \sum_{j<i} c_{ij}\hat{v}_j + \sum_{j>i} c_{ij} v_j, \quad i = 1\dots n. \tag{7}$$

and the objective difference after updating v_i to $\hat{v}_i$ is

$$2g_i^T(v_i - \hat{v}_i) = -2\|g_i\|\hat{v}_i^T(v_i - \hat{v}_i) = 2y_i(1 - v_i^T\hat{v}_i) = y_i\|v_i - \hat{v}_i\|^2.$$

The result follows from summing above equation over $i = 1\dots n$. ■

Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof By Assumption 3.1 y does not degenerate over iterations, so Lemma A.1 implies that the Mixing method is strictly decreasing and admits a unique limit point $\bar{V} = \lim_{r\to\infty} V^r$ for the sequence $\{V^r\}$ generated by the algorithm. Denote $\bar{y}$ the corresponding y for $\bar{V}$. Then $\bar{V}$ being a fixed point of (5) implies

$$\bar{V}(C + \text{diag}(\bar{y})) = 0,$$

which means the projected gradient of $\langle C, V^T V\rangle$ at $\bar{V}$ is zero. Thus, together with the feasibility of V^r, we prove that the Mixing method converges to a critical point. ■

Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 3.10: Divergence of Gauss-Seidel methods

Proof Because the dynamics of the Gauss-Seidel method (GS) on the system

$$\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n} f(x), \quad \text{where } f(x) \equiv x^T S x,$$

has the same Jacobian as J_{GS}, proving $\rho(J_{GS}) > 1$ is equivalent to proving the "linear divergence" of the Gauss-Seidel method, which cyclically optimizes each coordinate of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Further, since $S \not\succeq 0$, there is an eigenvector $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of S such that $q^T S q < 0$.

Consider the sequence $\{x_r\}_{r=0,1,\dots}$ generated by the GS. That is, $x_r = (J_{GS})^r x_0$, $\forall r > 0$, where $(J_{GS})^r$ is J_{GS} to the r-th power. Let the initial solution of the system be $x_0 = q$ so that $f(x_0) < 0$. Because the Gauss-Seidel method is greedy in every coordinate updates, it is monotonically deceasing in the function value. Thus, there are only two cases for the sequence of function values: 1) the function value converges below zero; 2) the function value goes to negative infinity.

Denote z_i^r the x_r before updating the i-th coordinate and let $z_1^r = x_r$ and $z_{n+1}^r = x_{r+1}$. This way, only the i-th coordinate between z_i^r and z_{i+1}^r is changed and the inner cyclic updates can be flattened as

$$x_r = z_1^r \to z_2^r \to \ldots \to z_n^r \to z_{n+1}^r = x_{r+1}. \tag{8}$$

1) When the function value converges. The monotonic decreasing property of GS implies that the function difference converges to zero. By the same analysis in Lemma A.1,[10] we have

$$f(x_r) - f(x_{r+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \|z_i^r - z_{i+1}^r\|^2.$$

Thus, the flattened sequence $\{z_i^r\}$ convergences, which implies $\{x^r\}$ also converges. Let $\bar{x}$ be the limit of the sequence $\{x^r\}$. Being a limit of the GS sequence means that $\bar{x}$ is a fixed point of GS, which implies $S\bar{x} = 0$ and $f(\bar{X}) = \bar{x}^T S\bar{x} = 0$. This contradicts with the monotonic decreasing property of GS and the fact that $f(x_0) < 0$.

2) When the function value $x_r^T S x_r$ goes to negative infinity. Because the spectrum of S is bounded, we know that $\|x_r\|$ also goes to infinity. For simplicity, we focus on the r-th iterate and write z_i^r as z_i. From the GS, $z_{i,i}$ is updated to $z_{i+1,i} = \frac{-1}{y_i}\sum_j c_{ij} z_{j,i}$, and we have

$$f(z_i) - f(z_{i+1}) = y_i \|z_i - z_{i+1}\|^2 = y_i (z_{i,i} + \frac{1}{y_i}(\sum_j c_{ij} z_{j,i}))^2 = |e_i^T S z_i|^2 / y_i, \tag{9}$$

where e_i is the i-th coordinate vector and the first equality is from $f(x) = x^T S x$. Then we have the following claim from Lee et al. (2017, cliam 1).

Claim B.1 *Assume x_r be in the range of S. There exists an index j such that $\frac{1}{y_j}|e_j^T S z_j| \geq \omega \|z_j\|$ for some global constant $\omega > 0$ that only depends on S and n.*

The full proof of the claim is listed after this lemma for completeness. To fulfill the assumption, we can decompose $x_r = x_r^{\parallel} + x_r^{\perp}$, where $x_r^{\parallel}$ is in the range of S and $x_r^{\perp}$ is in the null of S. Consider the flattened inner cyclic update $z_i^{\parallel}$ like (8) but starting from $x_r^{\parallel}$ such that[11]

$$x_r^{\parallel} = z_1^{\parallel} \to z_2^{\parallel} \to \ldots \to z_n^{\parallel} \to z_{n+1}^{\parallel}.$$

Because J_{GS} map the null space of S to itself,[12]

$$f(x_r) - f(x_{r+1}) = f(x_r^{\parallel}) - f(J_{GS}(x_r^{\parallel} + x_r^{\perp})) = f(z_1^{\parallel}) - f(z_{n+1}^{\parallel} + x_r^{\perp}) = f(z_1^{\parallel}) - f(z_{n+1}^{\parallel}).$$

10. We can obtain the result by fixing y in Lemma A.1 to be a constant and let $V \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times n}$. The result can also be obtained by examining the coordinate updates of GS, which is already known in the literature.
11. Note that only x_r is decomposed to $x_r^{\parallel}$ in range(S) and $x_r^{\perp}$ in null(S). Symbols $z_i^{\parallel}$ are the GS iterates generated from $x_r^{\parallel}$ and might not be in the range of S.
12. Consider p such that $Sp = 0$. Then $(J_{GS})p = -(L+y)^{-1}L^T p = -(L+y)^{-1}Sp + p = p$.

Further, because GS is coordinate-wise monotonic decreasing and the function decrease of a coordinate update is smaller than the whole cyclic update, by above equality and (9) we have

$$f(x_r) - f(x_{r+1}) = f(z_1^{\parallel}) - f(z_{n+1}^{\parallel}) \geq \frac{(e_j^T S z_j^{\parallel})^2}{y_j} \geq y_j \omega^2 \|z_j^{\parallel}\|^2.$$

The last inequality is from Claim B.1. Thus,

$$f(x_{r+1}) \leq f(x_r) - y_j \omega^2 \|z_j^{\parallel}\|^2 \tag{10}$$

Further, because $\|z_j^{\parallel}\|^2 \geq |z_j^{\parallel T} S z_j^{\parallel}|/\rho(S)$ and $z_j^{\parallel T} S z_j^{\parallel} = f(z_j^{\parallel}) \leq f(x_r^{\parallel}) = f(x_r) \leq f(x_0) < 0$,

$$f(x_r) - y_j \omega^2 \|z_j^{\parallel}\|^2 \leq f(x_r) + \frac{y_j \omega^2}{\rho(S)} z_j^{\parallel T} S z_j^{\parallel} \leq (1 + \frac{y_{min} \omega^2}{\rho(S)}) f(x_r). \tag{11}$$

Combining (10) and (11), we obtain the exponential divergence to negative infinity

$$f(x_{r+1}) \leq (1 + \frac{y_{min}\omega^2}{\rho(S)}) f(x_r) \leq (1 + \frac{y_{min}\omega^2}{\rho(S)})^{r+1} f(x_0), \quad \forall r \geq 0. \tag{12}$$

The last inequality is from applying the first inequality recursively. Because $S \succeq \sigma_{\min}(S) I_n$ and $\sigma_{min}(S) < 0$,

$$f(x_r) = ((J_{GS})^r x_0)^T S((J_{GS})^r x_0) \geq \sigma_{min}(S) \|(J_{GS})^r x_0\|^2 \geq \sigma_{min}(S) \|(J_{GS})^r\|^2 \|x_0\|^2. \tag{13}$$

Combining (12) and (13), we have

$$\sigma_{\min}(S) \|(J_{GS})^r\|^2 \|x_0\|^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{y_{\min}\omega^2}{\rho(S)}\right)^r f(x_0), \quad \forall r > 0.$$

Applying Gelfand's theorem for spectral radius, we conclude that

$$\rho(J_{GS}) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \|(J_{GS})^r\|^{1/r} \geq \sqrt{1 + \frac{y_{min}\omega^2}{\rho(S)}},$$

which means that the spectral radius $\rho(J_{GS})$ is strictly larger than 1. ■

Proof of the Claim B.1 in the above lemma. Note that the following proof is essentially the same with Lee et al. (2017, cliam 1), where their α is our $\frac{1}{y_i}$ and their y_t is our x_r. The only difference here is that we prove the result for the exact Gauss-Seidel method, and they prove the result for the coordinate gradient descent method with a step size. The proof is listed here for completeness.

Proof We will prove by contradiction. Assume that

$$\frac{1}{y_j} |e_j^T S z_j| < \omega \|z_j\| \text{ for all } j = 1 \ldots n \text{ for certain } \omega. \tag{14}$$

Now we show the following result by induction, that for $j = 2 \ldots n+1$,

$$\|x_r - z_j\| < 2(j-1)\omega \|x_r\|. \tag{15}$$

Remember from (9) we have

$$y_j\|z_j - z_{j+1}\|^2 = |e_j^T S z_j|^2/y_j. \tag{16}$$

For $j = 2$, we have the induction basis for (15) from the above equality and (14), that

$$\|x_r - z_2\| = \|z_1 - z_2\| = \frac{1}{y_1}|e_1^T S z_1| < \omega\|z_1\| = \omega\|x_r\| < 2\omega\|x_r\|,$$

and accordingly $\|z_2\| \le \|z_2 - z_1\| + \|z_1\| < (1 + 2\omega)\|x_r\|$. Now we do the induction. Suppose the hypothesis (15) holds for a j. This implies

$$\|z_j\| \le \|z_j - x_r\| + \|x_r\| < (1 + 2(j-1)\omega)\|x_r\|. \tag{17}$$

Then at $j + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_r - z_{j+1}\| &\le \|x_r - z_j\| + \|z_j - z_{j+1}\| && \text{by the triangular inequality}\\
&< 2(j-1)\omega\|x_r\| + \frac{1}{y_j}|e_j^T S z_j| && \text{by hypothesis (15) at } j \text{ and (16)}\\
&< 2(j-1)\omega\|x_r\| + \omega\|z_j\| && \text{by assumption (14)}\\
&< 2(j-1)\omega\|x_r\| + \omega(1 + 2(j-1)\omega)\|x_r\| && \text{by (17)}\\
&\le 2j\omega\|x_r\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds from picking $\omega \in (0, \frac{1}{2n})$ so that $\omega(1 + 2(j-1)\omega - 2) < 0$. Thus, the induction on (15) holds. With the result (15), for $j = 2 \dots n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{y_{max}}|e_j^T S x_r| &\le \frac{1}{y_j}|e_j^T S x_r| && \text{by } y_{max} \ge y_j\\
&\le \frac{1}{y_j}(|e_j^T S z_j| + |e_j^T S(x_r - z_j)|) && \text{by the triangular inequality}\\
&< \omega\|z_j\| + \frac{1}{y_j}\|Se_j\|\|x_r - z_j\| && \text{by (14) and Cauchy inequality}\\
&< \omega(1 + 2(j-1)\omega)\|x_r\| + \frac{1}{y_j}2(j-1)\omega\|Se_j\|\|x_r\| && \text{by (17) and (15)}\\
&\le \omega(1 + 2n\omega + 2n\frac{1}{y_{min}}\rho(S))\|x_r\|, && (18)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is from $\|Se_j\| \le \|S\|\|e_j\| \le \rho(S)$, $y_{\min} \le y_j$, and $j \le n + 1$. Note that the result of (18) for $j = 1$ also holds because (14) and $x_r = z_1$. Summing the square of (18) over $j = 1 \dots n$ and put it in a square root, we have

$$\sqrt{n}\omega(1 + 2n\omega + 2n\frac{\rho(S)}{y_{min}})\|x_r\| > \frac{1}{y_{max}}\|Sx_r\| \ge \kappa_{\text{min-nz}}(S)\|x_r\|,$$

where $\kappa_{\text{min-nz}}(S) = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{min-nz}}(S^T S)} > 0$ is the minimum nonzero singular value of S and the last inequality holds because $\kappa_{\text{min-nz}}(S)\|x_r\| \le \|Sx_r\|$ from $x_r \in \text{range}(S)$. Cancelling $\|x_r\|$ from both sides of the above inequality, the left-hand side goes to 0 when $\omega \to 0$ but the right-hand side stays constant. Thus, picking small enough ω such that $\kappa_{\text{min-nz}}(S) \ge y_{max}\sqrt{n}\omega(1 + 2n\omega + 2n\frac{\rho(S)}{y_{min}})$ leads to a contradiction.[13] So the claim holds. ■

13. Note that the choice of ω only depends on n and S.

Appendix C. Proof of Theorem 3.4: Global convergence with a step size

Lemma C.1 *The Mixing method M_θ with a step size $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{\max_i \|c_i\|_1})$ never degenerates. That is, there is a constant $\delta \in (0,1)$ such that*

$$\|\theta V c_i\| \leq 1 - \delta < 1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \|v_i - \theta V c_i\| \geq \delta > 0.$$

Proof Taking a constant $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{\max_i \|c_i\|_1})$ is equivalent to taking $\theta = \frac{1-\delta}{\max_i \|c_i\|_1}$ for a constant $\delta \in (0,1)$. From the triangular inequality,

$$\|Vc_i\| = \|\sum_j c_{ij} v_j\| \leq \sum_j |c_{ij}| \|v_j\| = \|c_i\|_1.$$

So we have $\|\theta V c_i\| \leq 1 - \delta < 1$. The second result follows from $\|v_i - \theta V c_i\| \geq 1 - \|\theta V c_i\|$. ■

Lemma C.2 *The Mixing method M_θ with a step size $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{\max_i \|c_i\|_1})$ is a diffeomorphism.*

Proof Note that M_θ can be decomposed to

$$M_\theta(V) = \Phi^n(\Phi^{n-1}(\dots \Phi^1(V))),$$

where the column update $\Phi^i(V) : \mathbb{R}^{k \times n} \to \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ is defined as

$$(\Phi^i(V))_{s=1\dots n} = \begin{cases} \frac{v_i - \theta V c_i}{\|v_i - \theta V c_i\|} & \text{if } s = i \\ v_s & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, if we can prove that $\Phi^i(V)$ is a diffeomorphism for $i = 1 \dots n$, then M_θ is a diffeomorphism because compositions of diffeomorphisms are still diffeomorphism. Specifically, because all variables v_j except for v_i are given and stay the same, proving diffeomorphism of $\Phi^i(V)$ is equivalent to proving the diffeomorphism of the projective mapping $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\phi(v) = \frac{v - g}{\|v - g\|},$$

where $g = \theta V c_i$ is known. Let $\phi(v) = z$. We claim the inverse function $\phi^{-1}(z)$ is

$$\phi^{-1}(z) = \alpha z + g, \quad \text{where } \alpha = -z^T g + \sqrt{(z^T g)^2 + 1 - \|g\|^2}.$$

The square root is valid because of Lemma C.1. We prove the claim by validation. First,

$$\phi^{-1}(\phi(v)) = \phi^{-1}\left(\frac{v - g}{\|v - g\|}\right).$$

By using the property that $\|v\| = 1$, the α for the above function is

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \frac{-(v-g)^T g}{\|v-g\|} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{(v-g)^T g}{\|v-g\|}\right)^2 + 1 - \|g\|^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\|v-g\|}\left(-(v-g)^T g + \sqrt{((v-g)^T g)^2 + \|v-g\|^2(1-\|g\|^2)}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\|v-g\|}\left(-v^T g + \|g\|^2 + 1 - v^T g\right) \\ &= \|v - g\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\phi^{-1}(\phi(v)) = \|v-g\|\frac{v-g}{\|v-g\|} + g = v$ is indeed the inverse function. The diffeomorphism follows from the smoothness of $\phi(v)$ and $\phi^{-1}(z)$ when $\|v-g\| \geq \delta > 0$ by Lemma C.1. ■

Lemma C.3 *For the Mixing method M_θ with step size $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{\max_i \|c_i\|})$, let $\hat{V} = M_\theta(V)$. Following the notation in (4) and (6), we have*

$$f(V) - f(\hat{V}) = \sum_i \frac{1+y_i}{\theta}\|v_i - \hat{v}_i\|^2,$$

where $y_i = \|v_i - \theta g_i\|$ and $g_i = \sum_{j<i} c_{ij}\hat{v}_j + \sum_{j>i} c_{ij} v_j$.

Proof Consider the inner iteration of the Mixing method with a step size. With the same analysis to Lemma A.1, the function value before updating the variable v_i is $2g_i^T v_i$, and the function difference after updating v_i to $\hat{v}_i = (v_i - \theta g_i)/y_i$ is

$$\begin{aligned} 2g_i^T(v_i - \hat{v}_i) &= 2(g_i + \frac{v_i - \theta g_i}{\theta})^T(v_i - \hat{v}_i) - 2(\frac{v_i - \theta g_i}{\theta})^T(v_i - \hat{v}_i) \\ &= 2\frac{1}{\theta}v_i^T(v_i - \hat{v}_i) - 2\frac{y_i}{\theta}\hat{v}_i^T(v_i - \hat{v}_i) \\ &= \frac{1+y_i}{\theta}2(1 - v_i^T\hat{v}_i) = \frac{1+y_i}{\theta}\|v_i - \hat{v}_i\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the result holds from summing the above equation over $i = 1 \dots n$. ■

Proof of Theorem 3.4

Proof Similar to Lemma 3.7, the Jacobian of the Mixing method M_θ with step size θ is

$$J(V) = (D_y + \theta L)^{-1} \otimes I_k P (I_n - \theta L^T) \otimes I_k, \quad \text{where} \quad P = \operatorname{diag}(P_1, \dots, P_n) \quad \text{and} \quad P_i = I - \hat{v}_i \hat{v}_i^T.$$

By Lemma 3.9, the spectral radius $\rho(J)$ at a critical point is lower bounded by $J_{CGD} = (D_y + \theta L)^{-1}(I_n - \theta L^T)$, which equals the Jacobian of coordinate gradient descent (CGD) on a linear system $S = C + \operatorname{diag}(\|Vc_i\|)$. Because CGD admits a Jacobian with $\rho(J_{CGD}) > 1$ when $S \not\succeq 0$ (Lee et al., 2017, Proposition 5), Lemma 3.12 implies all non-optimal critical points are unstable fixed points for M_θ. Further, since M_θ is a diffeomorphism by Lemma C.2, we can apply the center-stable manifold theorem (Shub, 2013, Theorem III.5) to the mapping M_θ. To be specific, because the non-optimal critical points are unstable fixed points and M_θ is a diffeomorphism, Lee et al. (2017, Theorem 2)[14] implies that the Mixing method M_θ escapes all non-optimal critical points almost surely under random initialization.[15] Further, because M_θ is strictly decreasing (Lemma C.3) and the objective value is lower bounded, M_θ converges to a first-order critical points (with the same analysis to Theorem 3.2). In conclusion, the almost surely divergence from the non-optimal critical points and the convergence to a critical point imply that M_θ almost surely converges to a global optimum. ■

14. Note that Lee et al. (2017, Lemma 1) use only the property of diffeomorphism, so their assumption on the non-singular Jacobian is not necessary. Actually, non-singular Jacobian is a sufficient condition for the existence of one-to-one mapping but not the necessary condition.
15. Note that the critical points here is non-isolated because they are invariant to rotations in R^k. While Lee et al. (2017, Theorem 2) suffices for our result, interested reader can also refer to Panageas and Piliouras (2016) on how they use the Lindelöf lemma to solve the non-isolation issue.

Appendix D. Proof of Theorem 3.5: Local Linear convergence

Lemma D.1 *Composition of Lipschitz continuous functions is Lipschitz continuous. That is, if mapping F is λ_F-Lipschitz continuous and G is λ_G-Lipschitz continuous, then $G(F(\cdot))$ is $\lambda_G\lambda_F$-Lipschitz continuous.*

Proof Mapping F being λ_F-Lipschitz continuous means for variables X, Y in its domain,

$$\|F(X) - F(Y)\| \leq \lambda_F \|X - Y\|.$$

Consequently, for the λ_G-Lipschitz continuous mapping G

$$\|G(F(X)) - G(F(Y))\| \leq \lambda_G \|F(X) - F(Y)\| \leq \lambda_G\lambda_F \|X - Y\|,$$

which establishes the proof. ■

Lemma D.2 *Under Assumption 3.1, the Mixing method $M : \mathbb{R}^{k\times n} \to \mathbb{R}^{k\times n}$ and its normalizer*[16] *$y : \mathbb{R}^{k\times n} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ are Lipschitz continuous to any optimum V^*. Further, there are constants $\beta, \gamma > 0$ such that,*

$$\|V - M(V)\|^2 \geq (\beta - \gamma\|y(V) - y(V^*)\|)(f(V) - f^*). \tag{19}$$

Proof By Lemma D.1, proving the Lipschitz continuity of the mapping $y(V)$ and the corresponding $M(V)$ is equivalent[17] to proving the Lipschitz continuity of

$$\psi^i(V) = \|Vc_i\| \quad \text{and} \quad \phi^i(V) = \frac{-1}{\psi^i(V)} Vc_i.$$

First, from the definition of ψ^i and the Cauchy inequality, there is

$$|\psi^i(V) - \psi^i(V^*)| \leq \|Vc_i - V^*c_i\| \leq \|c_i\|\|V - V^*\|.$$

Further, from $\phi^i(V^*) = v_i^*$, the Cauchy inequality, and the above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi^i(V) - \phi^i(V^*)\| &= \left\| \frac{-1}{\psi^i(V)} Vc_i - \frac{-1}{\psi^i(V)} V^*c_i - \left(\frac{\psi^i(V)}{\psi^i(V)} - \frac{\psi^i(V^*)}{\psi^i(V)} \right) v_i^* \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\psi^i(V)} \big(\|c_i\|\|V - V^*\| + \|\psi^i(V) - \psi^i(V^*)\|\|v_i^*\| \big) \leq \frac{2\|c_i\|}{\delta} \|V - V^*\|,\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is from Assumption 3.1 that $\psi^i(V) \geq \delta > 0$. Thus, the Lipschitz continuity holds from applying Lemma D.1 recursively. Now we prove result (19). Let $S^* = C + D_{y^*}$ and $S = C + D_y$, where $y^* = y(V^*)$ and $y = y(V)$. Under the notation in (5),

$$V - M(V) = V(L^T + D_y)(L^T + D_y)^{-1} + VL(L^T + D_y)^{-1} = VS(L^T + D_y)^{-1}.$$

16. The coefficient y defined in (5) is also a function of V.
17. Because y and M can be composed by ψ^i and ϕ^i like Lemma C.2.

For simplicity, let $R := (L^T + D_y)^{-1}$. Expand the square using $S = S^* + D_y - D_{y^*}$ and drop the last squared term after the expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|V - M(V)\|^2 &\geq \|VS^*R\|^2 + 2\operatorname{tr}\left(V^TVS^*RR^T(D_y - D_{y^*})\right)\\ &\geq \sigma_{\min}^2(R)\sigma_{\text{min-nz}}(S^*)\operatorname{tr}(V^TVS^*) - 2\|y - y^*\|\sigma_{\max}^2(R)\operatorname{tr}(V^TVS^*).\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is from $\|y-y^*\|I_n + (D_y - D_{y^*}) \succeq 0$ and Lemma 3.12 ($S^* \succeq 0$). Note that the term $\operatorname{tr}(V^TVS^*) = \operatorname{tr}(V^TVC) - (-1^Ty^*) = f(V) - f^*$ by the analysis in Lemma 3.12. With $\sigma_{\min}(R) = \frac{1}{y_{\max}}$ and $\sigma_{\max}(R) = \frac{1}{y_{\min}}$, the result (19) follows from

$$\|V - M(V)\|^2 \geq \left(\frac{\sigma_{\text{min-nz}}(S^*)}{y_{\max}^2} - \frac{2\|y - y^*\|}{y_{\min}^2}\right)(f(V) - f^*)\,. \qquad \blacksquare$$

Lemma D.3 *The Mixing method $M_\theta : \mathbb{R}^{k\times n} \to \mathbb{R}^{k\times n}$ with step size θ and its normalizer $y : \mathbb{R}^{k\times n} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ are Lipschitz continuous to any optimum V^*. Further, there are constants $\beta, \gamma > 0$ such that*

$$\|V - M_\theta(V)\|^2 \geq (\beta - \gamma\|y(V) - y(V^*)\|)(f(V) - f^*). \tag{20}$$

Proof Similar to the proof of Lemma D.2, proving the Lipschitz continuity of $y(V)$ and $M_\theta(V)$ is to prove the Lipschitz continuity of the mappings

$$\psi^i(V) = \|v_i - \theta V c_i\| \quad \text{and} \quad \phi^i(V) = \frac{1}{\psi^i(V)}(v_i - \theta V c_i).$$

First, the Lipschitz continuity of $\psi^i(V)$ follows by applying the Cauchy inequality

$$|\psi^i(V) - \psi^i(V^*)| \leq \|v_i - \theta V c_i - (v_i^* - \theta V^* c_i)\| \leq (1 + \theta\|c_i\|)\|V - V^*\|.$$

Combining the above inequality and $\phi^i(V^*) = v_i^*$, we have the Lipschitz continuity

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi^i(V) - \phi^i(V^*)\| &= \left\|\frac{1}{\psi^i(V)}(v_i - \theta V c_i) - \frac{1}{\psi^i(V)}(v_i^* - \theta V^* c_i) - \left(\frac{\psi^i(V)}{\psi^i(V)} - \frac{\psi^i(V^*)}{\psi^i(V)}\right)v_i^*\right\|\\ \leq \frac{1}{\psi^i(V)}\big((1 + \theta\|c_i\|)\|V - V^*\| + \|\psi^i(V) - \psi^i(V^*)\|\big) &\leq \frac{2(1 + \theta\|c_i\|)}{\delta}\|V - V^*\|.\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is from Lemma C.1. Next, we prove result (20). Under notations in (6),

$$V - M_\theta(V) = V - V(I_n - \theta L)(\theta L^T + D_y)^{-1} = V(D_y - I_n + \theta C)(\theta L^T + D_y)^{-1}. \tag{21}$$

Let $y^* = y(V^*)$ and $y = y(V)$. We have $y_i^* = 1 + \theta\|V^*c_i\|$ by $M_\theta(V^*) = V^*$, thus $S^* = C + \frac{1}{\theta}(D_{y^*} - I) \succeq 0$ by Lemma 3.12. Further,

$$D_y - I_n + \theta C = \theta S^* + D_y - D_{y^*}. \tag{22}$$

Expand $\|V - M_\theta\|^2$ with equality (21) and (22) and follow the same analysis in Lemma D.2, then result (20) holds with

$$\|V - M_\theta(V)\|^2 \geq \theta\left(\frac{\theta\sigma_{\text{min-nz}}(S^*)}{y_{\max}^2} - \frac{2\|y - y^*\|}{y_{\min}^2}\right)(f(V) - f^*). \qquad \blacksquare$$

Lemma D.4 *For both Mixing methods M (with Assumption 3.1) and M_θ (no assumption), there is a constant $\tau > 0$ such that, for their normalizers $y^* = y(V^*)$ and $y = y(V)$,*

$$\|y - y^*\|^2 \le \tau(f(V) - f^*).$$

Proof First we prove the result for the Mixing method M. Denote Z_i the (flattened) inner cyclic iterate before updating v_i to $\hat{v}_i$ so that only vector v_i is changed between Z_i and Z_{i+1}. That is,

$$V = Z_1 \to Z_2 \to \ldots \to Z_n \to Z_{n+1} = M(V).$$

Let $S^* = C + \operatorname{diag}(\|V^* c_i\|)$ for an optimum solution V^*. Observe that

$$(y_i - y_i^*)\hat{v}_i = -Z_i c_i - y_i^* \hat{v}_i = -Z_i s_i^* + y_i^*(v_i - \hat{v}_i).$$

The terms $Z_i s_i^*$ and $v_i - \hat{v}_i$ can be bounded by Lemma 3.12 and A.1 (with Assumption 3.1):

$$f(V) - f^* \ge f(Z_i) - f^* = \operatorname{tr}(Z_i^T Z_i S^*) \ge \frac{1}{\rho_{\max}(S^*)}\|Z_i S^*\|^2 \ge \frac{1}{\rho_{\max}(S^*)}\|Z_i s_i^*\|^2 \quad \text{and}$$
$$f(V) - f^* \ge f(Z_i) - f(Z_{i+1}) \ge \delta\|v_i - \hat{v}_i\|^2.$$

Thus, by $(y_i - y_i^*)^2 \le 2\|Z_i s_i\|^2 + 2(y_i^*)^2\|v_i - \hat{v}_i\|^2$ and the above two inequalities, $(y_i - y_i^*)^2$ is bounded by $f(V) - f^*$ times a constant. Summing over $i = 1 \ldots n$ we have the result for a constant $\tau > 0$. The result for the Mixing method M_θ with step size $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{\max_i \|c_i\|_1})$ follows from the same analysis and Lemma C.3 (no assumption). ■

Proof of Theorem 3.5

Proof By Lemma D.2, there are constants $\beta, \gamma > 0$ for the Mixing method M such that

$$\|V - M(V)\|^2 \ge (\beta - \gamma\|y - y^*\|)(f(V) - f^*).$$

By Lemma D.4, we can pick a neighborhood close enough to the optimum where $f(V) - f^*$ is sufficiently small so that $\beta - \gamma\|y - y^*\| \ge \kappa > 0$ for a constant $\kappa > 0$. Consequently,

$$\|V - M(V)\|^2 \ge \kappa(f(V) - f^*).$$

Further, the above inequality holds for all subsequent iterates, because $f(V) - f^*$ is strictly decreasing, thus still sufficiently small so that $\beta - \gamma\|y - y^*\| \ge \kappa > 0$ holds. Together with Lemma A.1 (under Assumption 3.1), there is another constant $\delta > 0$ such that $f(V) - f(M(V)) \ge \delta\|V - M(V)\|^2$, and thus

$$f(V) - f(M(V)) \ge \delta\kappa(f(V) - f^*) \implies (1 - \delta\kappa)(f(V) - f^*) \ge f(M(V)) - f^*.$$

That is, the Mixing method M converges R-linearly to the optimal objective value in the neighborhood of the optimum. The same result follows for the Mixing method M_θ with step size $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{\max_i \|c_i\|_1})$ from Lemma C.3 (no assumption) and Lemma D.3.

Further, because $f(V) - f^* = \operatorname{tr}(VS^*V^T)$ and $S^* = C + \operatorname{diag}(\|V^* c_i\|) \succeq 0$ by Lemma 3.12, above R-linear convergence in objective value implies the Q-linear convergence of rows of V to the null of S^*. Together with the Mixing methods being feasible methods, we obtain the Q-linear convergence of V to the global optimum in the neighborhood of the optimum. ■

Appendix E. Proof of Lemma 3.11: Rank Deficiency in Critical Points

The proof is a specialized version of (Boumal et al., 2016, Lemma 9) for the MAXCUT SDP, in which their Y is our V and their $\mu(V)$ is our y. We list it here for completeness.

Proof Let V be a first-order critical point of problem (2), which means that there is a corresponding $y_i = \|Vc_i\|,\ i = 1 \dots n$ such that

$$VS = 0, \quad \text{where } S \equiv C + D_y.$$

This implies

$$\operatorname{rank}(V) \leq \operatorname{null}(C + D_y) \leq \max_{\nu} \operatorname{null}(C + D_\nu).$$

Note that the right-hand side is independent of V, so we can use it to bound the rank of all critical V. Let ν be a solution of the right-hand side, $M \equiv C + D_\nu$, and $\operatorname{null}(M) \equiv \ell$. Writing $C = M - D_\nu$, we have

$$C \in \mathcal{N}_\ell + im(D),$$

in which the $+$ denotes the set-sum, $im(D)$ denotes the image of all diagonal matrices of size n, and $\mathcal{N}_\ell$ denotes the set of symmetric matrices of size n with nullity ℓ. Because of the symmetricity of $\mathcal{N}_\ell$,

$$\dim(\mathcal{N}_\ell) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{2}.$$

Further, because $\operatorname{rank}(V) \leq k$, we can assume that $\ell \geq k$. Union all possible ℓ,

$$C \in \bigcup_{\ell=k\dots n} \mathcal{N}_\ell + im(D).$$

Note that the right-hand side is now independent of C. Because the dimension of a finite union is at most the maximal dimension, and the dimension of a finite set sum is at most the sum of set dimensions,

$$\dim\left(\bigcup_{\ell\in k\dots n} \mathcal{N}_\ell + im(D)\right) \leq \dim(\mathcal{N}_k + im(D)) \leq \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - \frac{k(k+1)}{2} + \operatorname{rank}(D). \quad (23)$$

We know that $\operatorname{rank}(D) = n$ because the space of diagonal matrix has n free dimensions. Because the symmetric matrix C lives in the space $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}$, almost no C satisfies the right-hand side of (23) if we take large enough k so that

$$\frac{n(n+1)}{2} - \frac{k(k+1)}{2} + n < \frac{n(n+1)}{2}.$$

Thus, almost no C has critical point of rank k if $\frac{k(k+1)}{2} > n$, which means for almost all C, the critical point has at most rank $k-1$. ■

Algorithm 3: The Mixing method for Word embedding problem

Initialize v_i randomly on a unit sphere;
Initialize $b_i := 0$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, m$;
while *not yet converged* **do**
  for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ **do**
    Solve $Hd + g = 0$ approximately by conjugate gradient method using $Hd := \sum_j w_{ij}(v_j^T d)v_j$ and $g := \sum_j w_{ij} e_{ij} v_j$, where $e_{ij} = v_i^T v_j + b_i + b_j - \log(c_{ij})$;
    Let $v_i := v_i + d$;
    Update bias term $b_i := b_i - (\sum_j w_{ij} e_j)/(\sum_j w_{ij}^2)$;
  end
end

Appendix F. Application: Word embedding problem

The word embedding is a feature learning technique to embed the meanings of words as low-dimensional vectors. For example, the popular Word2vec model (Mikolov et al., 2013b,a) successfully embeds similarities and analogies between words using a shallow neural network. Another popular model, GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014), uses a factorization-based formulation and achieves better accuracy in analogies tasks compared to Word2vec. The theoretical justifications of these two models are discussed in RANDWALK (Arora et al., 2015). Here, we show that our coordinate descent approach can also be applied to learning word embeddings with the GloVe objective function, highlighting the fact that the Mixing methods can be applied to problems typically considered in the domain of solely non-convex optimization.


Problem description. Let C be the co-occurrence matrix such that c_{ij} is the number of times word i and j co-occur within the same window in the corpus. We consider solving a slightly modified version of the GloVe objective function (Pennington et al., 2014)

$$\min_{V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} w_{ij} \Big(v_i^T v_j + b_i + b_j - \log c_{ij} \Big)^2,$$


where n is size of the vocabulary, k is the number of latent factors and $w_{ij} = \min\{C_{w,w'}^{3/4}, 100\}$ is a tuning factor to suppress high-frequency words. The only difference with GloVe is that we do not include the self-loop, i.e., $i = j$ terms, in the formulation.

Application of Mixing method. Focusing on the subproblem involving only variable v_i and take a step $d \in \mathbb{R}^k$, we can see that the subproblem $\min_d f(v_i + d)$ becomes:

$$\underset{d \in \mathbb{R}^k}{\text{minimize}} \ \frac{1}{2} \sum_j w_{ij} \Big((v_i + d)^T (v_j) + b_i + b_j - \log c_{ij} \Big)^2$$



(a) wiki8 (n=1332, nnz=1678046, k=50)



(b) enwiki (n=75317, nnz=875447516, k=300)

Figure 3: $(f - f_{\min})$ v.s. training time for the word embedding problem, where $f_{\min}$ is minimum objective value we have. The experiments show that the Mixing method can be generalized to nonlinear objective function and is faster than SGD.

Define $e_{ij} = v_i^T v_j + b_i + b_j - \log c_{ij}$. Then the above subproblem can be reformulated as

$$\underset{d \in \mathbb{R}^k}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} d^T \Big(\overbrace{\sum_j w_{ij} v_j v_j^T}^{H} \Big) d + \Big(\overbrace{\sum_j w_{ij} e_{ij} v_j}^{g} \Big)^T d,$$

which is an unconstrained quadratic program solvable in $O(n^3)$ time. In practice, we apply the conjugate gradient method with a stopping condition on $\|\nabla_d f(v_i + d)\|$ to obtain good enough approximations and cyclically update all the v_i. Totally, updating all the variables once takes $O(k \cdot m \cdot (\#\text{ CG iterations}))$ time, where m is the number of nonzeros in C and typically $(\#\text{ CG iteration}) < 10$ in our settings. Algorithm 3 contains a complete description.

Results. Figure 3 shows the result of comparing the proposed Mixing method with the stochastic gradient method, which is the default solver for GloVe. We consider the wiki8 and the enwiki corpus, which are widely-used benchmarks for word embeddings. The corpus is pre-processed following Pennington et al. (2014) (removing non-textual elements, sentence splitting, and tokenization), and words that appeared fewer than 1000 times in the corpus are ignored. Figure 3 shows the results of the Mixing method versus the SGD on the two corpora. For both datasets, the Mixing method converges substantially faster, achieving a lower function value than the SGD method.