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#### Abstract

We provide a maximum entropy derivation of a new family of BFGS-like methods. Similar results are then derived for block BFGS methods. This also yields an independent proof of a result of Fletcher 1991 and its generalisation to the block case.
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## 1. Introduction

Suppose $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a $C^{2}$ function to be minimized. Then Newton's iteration is

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{k+1}=x_{k}-\left[H\left(x_{k}\right)\right]^{-1} \nabla f\left(x_{k}\right), \quad k \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $H\left(x_{k}\right)=\nabla^{2} f\left(x_{k}\right)$ is the Hessian of $f$ at the point $x_{k}$. In quasi-Newton methods, one employs instead an approximation $B_{k}$ of $H\left(x_{k}\right)$ to avoid the costly operations of computing, storing and inverting the Hessian ( $B_{0}$ is often taken to be the identity $\left.I_{n}\right)$. These methods appear to perform well even in nonsmooth optimization, see [1]. Instead of (11), one uses

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{k+1}=x_{k}-\alpha_{k} B_{k}^{-1} \nabla f\left(x_{k}\right), \quad \alpha_{k}>0, \quad k \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\alpha_{k}$ chosen by a line search, imposing the secant equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{k}=B_{k+1} s_{k}, \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
y_{k}:=\nabla f\left(x_{k}+s_{k}\right)-\nabla f\left(x_{k}\right), \quad s_{k}:=\Delta x_{k}=x_{k+1}-x_{k} .
$$

The secant condition is motivated by the expansion

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nabla f\left(x_{k}+s_{k}\right) \approx \nabla f\left(x_{k}\right)+H\left(x_{k}\right) s_{k} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $n>1, B_{k+1}$ satisfying (3) is underdetermined. Various methods are used to find a symmetric $B_{k+1}$ that satisfies the secant equation (3) and is closest in some metric to the current approximation $B_{k}$. In several methods, $B_{k+1}$ or its inverse is a rank one or two update of the previous estimate [2].

Since for a strongly convex function the Hessian $H\left(x_{k}\right)$ is a symmetric positive definite matrix, we can think of its approximation $B_{k}$ as a covariance of a zero-mean, multivariate Gaussian distribution. Recall that in the case of two zero-mean multivariate normal distributions $p, q$ with nonsingular $n \times n$ covariance matrixes $P, Q$, respectively, the relative entropy (divergence, Kullback-Leibler index) can be derived in closed form

$$
\mathbb{D}(p \| q)=\int \log \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} p(x) d x=\frac{1}{2}\left[\log \operatorname{det}\left(P^{-1} Q\right)+\operatorname{tr}\left(Q^{-1} P\right)-n\right] .
$$

Since $P^{-1}$ and $Q^{-1}$ are the natural parameters of the Gaussian distributions, we write

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{D}\left(P^{-1} \| Q^{-1}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left[\log \operatorname{det}\left(P^{-1} Q\right)+\operatorname{trace}\left(Q^{-1} P\right)-n\right] \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 2. A maximum entropy problem

Consider minimizing $\mathbb{D}\left(B^{-1} \| B_{k}^{-1}\right)$ over symmetric, positive definite $B$ subject to the secant equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
B^{-1} y_{k}=s_{k} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In [3], Fletcher indeed showed that the solution to this variational problem is provided by the BFGS iterate thereby providing a variational characterization for it alternative to Goldfarb's classical one [4], [2, Section 6.1]. We take a different approach leading to a family of BFGS-like methods.

First of all, observe that $B^{-1} y_{k}$ must be the given vector $s_{k}$. Thus, it seems reasonable that $B_{k+1}^{-1}$ should approximate $B_{k}^{-1}$ only in directions different from $y_{k}$. We are then led to consider the following new problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{\left\{B=B^{T}, B>0\right\}} \mathbb{D}\left(B^{-1} \| P_{k}^{T} B_{k}^{-1} P_{k}\right) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

subject to (6), where $P_{k}$ is a rank $n-1$ matrix satisfying $P_{k} y_{k}=0$, subject to the secant equation (6). One possible choice for $P_{k}$ is the orthogonal projection

$$
P_{k}=I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} y_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} y_{k}}=I_{n}-\Pi_{y_{k}} .
$$

Since $P_{k} B_{k}^{-1} P_{k}$ is singular, however, (7) does not make sense. Thus, to regularize the problem, we replace $P_{k}$ with the nonsingular, positive definite matrix $P_{k}^{\epsilon}=P_{k}+\epsilon I_{n}$.

The Lagrangian for this problem is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{L}(B, \lambda)=\frac{1}{2}\left[\log \operatorname{det}\left(B^{-1}\left(P_{k}^{\epsilon}\right)^{-1} B_{k} P_{k}^{\epsilon}\right)+\operatorname{tr}\left(P_{k}^{\epsilon} B_{k}^{-1} P_{k}^{\epsilon} B\right)-n\right]+\lambda_{k}^{T}\left[B s_{k}-y_{k}\right]= \\
& \frac{1}{2}\left[\log \operatorname{det}\left(B^{-1} B_{k}\right)+\frac{1}{2} \log \operatorname{det}\left(\left(P_{k}^{\epsilon}\right)^{-2}\right)+\operatorname{tr}\left(P_{k}^{\epsilon} B_{k}^{-1} P_{k}^{\epsilon} B\right)-n\right]+\lambda_{k}^{T}\left[B s_{k}-y_{k}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Observe that the term

$$
\frac{1}{2} \log \operatorname{det}\left(\left(P_{k}^{\epsilon}\right)^{-2}\right)
$$

does not depend on $B$ and therefore plays no role in the variational analysis. To compute the first variation of $\mathcal{L}$ in direction $\delta B$, we first recall a simple result. Consider the map $J$ defined on nonsingular, $n \times n$ matrices $M$ by $J(M)=\log |\operatorname{det}[M]|$. Let $\delta J(M ; \delta M)$ denote the directional derivative of $J$ in direction $\delta M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. We then have the following result :

Lemma 2.1. [5, Lemma 2] If $M$ is nonsingular then, for any $\delta M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$,

$$
\delta J(M ; \delta M)=\operatorname{trace}\left[M^{-1} \delta M\right]
$$

Observe also that any positive definite matrix $B$ is an interior point in the cone $\mathcal{C}$ of positive semidefinite matrices in any symmetric direction $\delta B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Imposing $\delta \mathcal{L}(B, \lambda ; \delta B)=0$ for all such $\delta B$, we get, in view of Lemma 2.1 ,

$$
\operatorname{trace}\left[\left(-\left(B_{k+1}^{\epsilon}\right)^{-1}+P_{k}^{\epsilon} B_{k}^{-1} P_{k}^{\epsilon}+2 s_{k} \lambda_{k}^{T}\right) \delta B\right]=0, \quad \forall \delta B
$$

which gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(B_{k+1}^{\epsilon}\right)^{-1}=P_{k}^{\epsilon} B_{k}^{-1} P_{k}^{\epsilon}+2 s_{k} \lambda_{k}^{T} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

As $\epsilon \searrow 0$, we get the iteration

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{k+1}^{-1}=P_{k} B_{k}^{-1} P_{k}+2 s_{k} \lambda_{k}^{T} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $P_{k} y_{k}=0$, in order to satisfy the secant equation

$$
B_{k+1}^{-1} y_{k}=s_{k}
$$

it suffices to choose the multiplier $\lambda_{k}$ so that

$$
2 \lambda_{k}^{T} y_{k}=1
$$

We need, however, to also guarantee symmetry and positive definiteness of the solution. We are then led to choose $\lambda_{k}$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{k}=\frac{s_{k}}{2 y_{k}^{T} s_{k}} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, notice that, under the curvature assumption

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{k}^{T} s_{k}>0 \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

if $B_{k}>0$, indeed $B_{k+1}$ in (9) is symmetric, positive definite justifying the previous calculations. We have therefore established the following result.

Theorem 2.2. Assume $B_{k}>0$ and $y_{k}^{T} s_{k}>0$. A solution $B^{*}$ of

$$
\min _{\left\{B=B^{T}, B>0\right\}} \mathbb{D}\left(B^{-1} \| P_{k}^{T} B_{k}^{-1} P_{k}\right),
$$

subject to constraint (6), in the regularized sense described above, is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(B^{*}\right)^{-1}=\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} y_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} y_{k}}\right) B_{k}^{-1}\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} y_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} y_{k}}\right)+\frac{s_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}} . \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 3. BFGS-like methods

From Theorem 2.2, we get the following quasi-Newton iteration:

$$
\begin{align*}
x_{k+1} & =x_{k}-\alpha_{k} B_{k}^{-1} \nabla f\left(x_{k}\right), \quad x_{0}=\bar{x},  \tag{13}\\
B_{k+1}^{-1} & =\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} y_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} y_{k}}\right) B_{k}^{-1}\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} y_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} y_{k}}\right)+\frac{s_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}, \quad B_{0}=I_{n} . \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that, for limited-memory iterations, this method has the same storage requirement as standard limited-memory BFGS, say $\left(s_{j}, y_{j}\right), j=k, k-1, \ldots, k-m+1$. Now let $v_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be any vector not orthogonal to $y_{k}$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{k}\left(v_{k}\right):=\frac{y_{k} v_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} v_{k}} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

is an oblique projection onto $y_{k}$. Employing $P_{k}\left(v_{k}\right)$ and its transpose in place of $\Pi_{y_{k}}$ in (7) and performing the variational analysis after regularisation, we get a BFGS-like iteration

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{k+1}^{-1}=\left(I_{n}-P_{k}\left(v_{k}\right)\right)^{T} B_{k}^{-1}\left(I_{n}-P_{k}\left(v_{k}\right)\right)+\frac{s_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, if $v_{k}=s_{k}$, the corresponding oblique projection is

$$
P_{k}\left(s_{k}\right)=\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}
$$

In such case, (16) is just the standard (BFGS) iteration for the inverse approximate Hessian

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{k+1}^{-1}=\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}\right)^{T} B_{k}^{-1}\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}\right)+\frac{s_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}} . \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $T_{k}=I_{n}-P_{k}\left(s_{k}\right)$ is a rank $n-1$ matrix satisfying $T_{k} y_{k}=0$ as is $I-\Pi_{y_{k}}$. We now get an alternative derivation of Fletcher's result [3].

Corollary 3.1. Assume $B_{k}>0$ and $y_{k}^{T} s_{k}>0$. A solution $B^{*}$ of

$$
\min _{\left\{B=B^{T}, B>0\right\}} \mathbb{D}\left(B^{-1} \| B_{k}^{-1}\right),
$$

subject to constraint (6) is given by the standard (BFGS) iteration (17).
Proof. We show that in the limit, as $\epsilon \searrow 0, \mathbb{D}\left(B^{-1} \| B_{k}^{-1}\right)$ and $\mathbb{D}\left(B^{-1} \|\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}+\epsilon I_{n}\right)^{T} B_{k}^{-1}\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}+\epsilon I_{n}\right)\right)$ only differ by terms not depending on $B$. Indeed,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{D}\left(B^{-1} \|\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}+\epsilon I_{n}\right)^{T} B_{k}^{-1}\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}+\epsilon I_{n}\right)\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{2}\left\{\log \operatorname{det}\left(B^{-1} B_{k}\right)+\log \operatorname{det}\left[\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}+\epsilon I_{n}\right)^{-1}\left(I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}+\epsilon I_{n}\right)^{-T}\right]\right. \\
& \left.+\operatorname{trace}\left[\left((1+\epsilon) I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}\right)^{T} B_{k}^{-1}\left((1+\epsilon) I_{n}-\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}\right) B\right]-n\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that, by the circulant property of the trace,

$$
\operatorname{trace}\left[-\frac{s_{k} y_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}} B_{k}^{-1}(1+\epsilon) B\right]=\operatorname{trace}\left[-B \frac{s_{k} y_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}} B_{k}^{-1}(1+\epsilon)\right]
$$

It now suffices to observe that, for symmetric matrices $B$ satisfying (6) $B s_{k}=y_{k}$, the products

$$
B \frac{s_{k} y_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}=\frac{y_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}} B=\frac{y_{k} y_{k}^{T}}{y_{k}^{T} s_{k}}
$$

are independent of $B$.
Iterations (13)-(14) and (13)-(16) are expected to enjoy the same convergence properties as the canonical BFGS method [2, Chapter 6]. They can, in principle, be applied also to nonsmooth cases along the lines of [1] with an exact line search to compute $\alpha_{k}$ at each step.

## 4. Block BFGS-like methods

In some large dimensional problems, it is prohibitive to calculate the full gradient at each iteration. Consider for instance deep neural networks. A deep network consists of a nested composition of a linear transformation and a nonlinear one $\sigma$. In the learning phase of a deep network, one compares the predictions $y\left(x, \xi^{i}\right)$ for the input sample $\xi^{i}$ with the actual output $y^{i}$. This is done through a cost function $f_{i}(x)$, e.g.

$$
f_{i}(x)=\left\|y^{i}-y\left(x ; \xi^{i}\right)\right\|^{2} .
$$

The goal is to learn the weights $x$ through minimization of the empirical loss function

$$
f(x)=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_{i}(x)
$$

In modern datasets, $N$ can be in the millions and therefore calculation of the full gradient $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \nabla f_{i}(x)$ at each iteration to perform gradient descent is unfeasible. One can then resort to stochastic gradients by sampling uniformly from the set $\{1, \ldots, N\}$ the index $i_{k}$ where to compute the gradient at iteration $k$. In alternative, one can also average the gradient over a set of randomly chosen samples called a "mini-batch". In [6], a so-called block BFGS was proposed. Let $S_{k}$ be a sketching matrix of directions [6] and let $\mathcal{T} \subset[N]$. Rather than taking differences of random gradients, one computes the action of the sub-sampled Hessian on $S_{k}$ as

$$
Y_{k}:=\frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}} \nabla^{2} f_{i}\left(x_{k}\right) S_{k}
$$

To update $B_{k}^{-1}$, we can now consider the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{\left\{B=B^{T}, B>0\right\}} \mathbb{D}\left(B^{-1} \| P_{k}^{T} B_{k}^{-1} P_{k}\right) \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $I-P_{k}$ projects onto the space spanned by the columns of $Y_{k}$, subject to the block-secant equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
B^{-1} Y_{k}=S_{k} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Again, one possible choice for $S_{k}$ is $I-\Pi_{Y_{k}}$ where $\Pi_{Y_{k}}=Y_{k}\left(Y_{k}^{T} Y_{k}\right)^{-1} Y_{k}^{T}$ is the orthogonal projection. The same variational argument as in Section 2 leads to the iteration

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{k+1}^{-1}=\left(I-\Pi_{Y_{k}}\right) B_{k}^{-1}\left(I-\Pi_{Y_{k}}\right)+S_{k}\left(S_{k}^{T} Y_{k}\right)^{-1} S_{k}^{T} . \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Another choice for $P_{k}$ is the oblique projection $I-Y_{k}\left(S_{k}^{T} Y_{k}\right)^{-1} S_{k}^{T}$ leading to the iteration in [6]

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{k+1}^{-1}=\left(I-Y_{k}\left(S_{k}^{T} Y_{k}\right)^{-1} S_{k}^{T}\right)^{T} B_{k}^{-1}\left(I-Y_{k}\left(S_{k}^{T} Y_{k}\right)^{-1} S_{k}^{T}\right)+S_{k}\left(S_{k}^{T} Y_{k}\right)^{-1} S_{k}^{T} . \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

We then obtain a variational characterisation of the iteration (21) alternative to the one of [6, Appendix A] and generalizing Fletcher [3].

Corollary 4.1. Assume $B_{k}>0$ and $S_{k}^{T} Y_{k}>0$. A solution $B^{*}$ of

$$
\min _{\left\{B=B^{T}, B>0\right\}} \mathbb{D}\left(B^{-1} \| B_{k}^{-1}\right),
$$

subject to constraint (19) is given by $B_{k+1}$ in (21).
The proof is analogous to the proof of Corollary 3.1.

## 5. Numerical Experiments

The algorithm (13)-(14) has the form:

```
procedure BFGS-LIkE \(\left(f, G f, x_{0}\right.\),tolerance \()\)
    \(B \leftarrow I_{d} \quad \triangleright d\) is the dimension of \(x_{0}\) and \(I_{d}\) is the identity in \(R^{d}\)
    \(x \leftarrow x_{0}\)
    for \(n=1, \ldots\), MaxIterations do
        \(y \leftarrow G f(x)\)
        if \(\|y\|<\) tolerance then
            break
            SearchDirection \(\leftarrow-B y\)
            \(\alpha \leftarrow \operatorname{LineSearch}(f, G F, x\), SearchDirection \()\)
            \(\Delta x \leftarrow \alpha\) SearchDirection
            \(S \leftarrow I_{d}-\frac{y y^{T}}{y^{T} y}\)
            \(B \leftarrow S^{T} B S+\frac{\Delta x \Delta x^{T}}{y^{T} d x}\)
            \(x \leftarrow x+\Delta x\)
    return \(x\)
```

Algorithm 1: BFGS-like algorithm (13)-(14)

While the effectiveness of the BFGS-like algorithms introduced in Section 3 needs to be tested on a significant number of large scale benchmark problems, we provide below two examples where the BFGS-like algorithm (13)-(14) appears to perform better than standard BFGS. Consider the strictly convex function $f$ on $\mathbb{R}^{2}$

$$
f\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)=e^{x_{1}-1}+e^{-x_{2}+1}+\left(x_{1}-x_{2}\right)^{2}
$$

whose minimum point is $x^{*} \approx(0.8,1.2)$. Take as starting point: $(5,-7)$. Figure 1 illustrates the decay of the error $\left\|x^{n}-x^{*}\right\|_{2}$ over 50 iterations for the classical BFGS and for algorithm (13)-(14).


Figure 1. Plot of $\left\|x^{n}-x^{*}\right\|_{2}$ for each iteration $n$

Consider now the (nonconvex) Generalized Rosenbrock function in 10 dimensions:

$$
f(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{9}\left[100\left(x_{i+1}-x_{i}^{2}\right)^{2}+\left(x_{i}-1\right)^{2}\right], \quad-30 \leq x_{i} \leq 30, i=1,2, \ldots, 10
$$

It has an absolute minumum at $x_{i}^{*}=1, i=1, \ldots, 10$ and $f\left(x^{*}\right)=0$. Taking as initial point $x_{0}=(0,0, \ldots, 0)$ the origin, both methods get stuck in a local minimum, see Figure 2.


Figure 2. Plot of $\left\|x^{n}-x^{*}\right\|_{2}$ for each iteration $n$

Instead, initiating the recursions at $x_{0}=(0.9,0.9, \ldots, 0.9)$, both algorithms converge to the absolute minimum (Figure 3 depicts 100 iterations). After a few initial steps, BFGS-like appears to perform better than BFGS.


Figure 3. Plot of $\left\|x^{n}-x^{*}\right\|_{2}$ for each iteration $n$

## 6. Closing comments

We have proposed a new family of BFGS-like iterations of which (13)-(14) is a most natural one. The entropic variational derivation provides theoretical support for these methods and a new proof of Fletcher's classical derivation 3]. Further study is needed to exploit the flexibility afforded by this new family (the vector $v_{k}$ determining the oblique projection in (15) appears as a "free parameter"). Similar results have been established for block BFGS. A few numerical experiments seem to indicate that (13)(14) may perform better in some problems than standard BFGS.
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