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Abstract

Low rank approximation is a commonly occurring problem in many computer vision and machine learning applications. There are two common ways of optimizing the resulting models. Either the set of matrices with a given sought rank can be explicitly parametrized using a bilinear factorization, or low rank can be implicitly enforced using regularization terms penalizing non-zero singular values. While the former results in differentiable problems that can be efficiently optimized using local quadratic approximation the latter are typically not differentiable (sometimes even discontinuous) and require splitting methods such as Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM). It is well known that while ADMM makes rapid improvements the first couple of iterations convergence to the exact minimizer can be tediously slow. On the other hand regularization formulations can in certain cases come with theoretical optimality guarantees.

In this paper we show how many non-differentiable regularization methods can be reformulated into smooth objectives using bilinear parameterization. This opens up the possibility of using second order methods such as Levenberg-Marquardt (LM) and Variable Projection (VarPro) to achieve accurate solutions for ill-conditioned problems. We show on several real and synthetic experiments that our second order formulation converges to substantially more accurate solutions than what ADMM formulations provide in a reasonable amount of time.

1. Introduction

Learning low dimensional representations of high dimensional data is common in many branches of science. In computer vision, low rank models have been applied to diverse applications ranging from high level shape and deformation to pixel appearance models [40, 4, 43, 22, 2, 21, 42, 9]. When the sought rank is known, a commonly occurring formulation is the least squares minimization

$$\min_{\text{rank}(X) \leq r} \|AX - b\|^2,$$

where $A : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is a linear operator. In general this is a difficult non-convex problem and some versions are even known to be NP-hard [24]. If the objective function is of the form $\|X - M\|_F^2$, the problem has a closed form solution available through truncation of the SVD decomposition [14]. In structure from motion a popular approach [5] is to optimize over a bilinear factorization $X = BC^T$, where $B$ is $m \times r$ and $C$ is $n \times r$, and solve

$$\min_{B, C} \|ABC^T - b\|^2.$$

Since the rank is bounded by the number of columns in $B$ and $C$ this approach explicitly parametrizes the set of matrices of rank $r$. It is known that the special case $\|BC^T - M\|_F^2$ has no non-global minimizers [1]. While bilinear approaches often perform well [26, 15] they can have local minima [5]. Recent works [26, 27, 28, 30] have, however, shown that properly implemented, LM and VarPro approaches are robust to local minima, achieve quadratic convergence and give impressive reconstruction results.

An alternative approach is to optimize directly over the entries of $X$ and enforce low rank using regularization terms. Applying a robust function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to the singular values $\sigma_i(X) = 1, \ldots, N = \min(m, n)$ results in a low-rank inducing objective

$$\min_X R(X) + \|A(X) - b\|^2,$$

where

$$R(X) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} f(\sigma_i(X)).$$

There are many possible choices for $f$ (e.g. [9]), however, it is desirable to chose a function that penalizes small singular values (assumed to stem from measurement noise) proportionally harder than the large ones. This leads to functions
that have non-increasing derivatives, that is, are concave on \([0, \infty)\).

The most popular regularization approach is undoubtedly the nuclear norm, \(f(\sigma_i(X)) = \sigma_i(X)\), due to its convexity. Numerous results that guarantee exact or, in case of noise, approximate low rank recovery have been presented e.g. \([39, 38, 7, 8]\). On the other hand it penalizes all singular values equally hard. As a result, suppressing noise with the nuclear norm requires an equal suppression of signal. Recent works \([6, 9, 31]\) have highlighted the effects of this so-called shrinking bias motivating the use of stronger non-convex regularizers able to penalize smaller singular values harder \([37, 33, 29, 34, 35, 31]\).

The regularization term is generally not differentiable as a function of \(X\) since the singular values are constrained to be non-negative. Thus, optimization methods based on local quadratic approximation become infeasible when there are singular values close to zero. In recent years splitting methods, such as ADMM \([3]\), have emerged as the workhorse routine. Such methods circumvent the issue of non-differentiability by solving a sequence of simpler sub-problems. It is well known that these rapidly reduce the objective value the first couple of iterations, while convergence to the exact solution can be tediously slow. In this paper we further show that there are computer vision problems where ADMM makes very little improvements at all problems where ADMM makes very little improvements at all.

Furthermore, we show that objectives of the form (3) can be reformulated into smooth problems with the bilinear parameterization that can be effectively optimized. Our main contributions are:

- Under the assumption that \(f\) is concave and non-decreasing on \([0, \infty)\) we first show that

\[
\mathcal{R}(X) = \min_{X=BC^T} \sum_{i=1}^k f(\|B_i\|_F \|C_i\|_F),
\]

where \(B_i\) and \(C_i\) are the columns of \(B\) and \(C\) respectively and \(k\) is the number of columns in \(B\) and \(C\). This turns (3) into an optimization over the factors \(B,C\) of the parameterization \(X = BC^T\).

- To achieve differentiability at \(\|B_i\|_F \|C_i\|_F = 0\) we assume that \(f(x) = g(\|x\|)\), where \(g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) is differentiable and show that

\[
\mathcal{R}(X) = \min_{X=BC^T} \sum_{i=1}^k g\left(\frac{\|B_i\|_F^2 + \|C_i\|_F^2}{2}\right),
\]

resulting in a smooth objective that can be efficiently optimized. Figure 1 shows a few commonly occurring objectives that fit our framework.

- We finally develop an algorithm, based on the VarPro \([28]\) approach, and show that much more accurate solutions can be obtained compared to ADMM formulations optimizing the same energy.

Throughout this paper the Euclidean vector norm is denoted by \(\|\cdot\|\), the Frobenius norm by \(\|\cdot\|_F\) and the nuclear norm (or trace norm) by \(\|\cdot\|_*\).

1.1. Related Work

Our work is very much inspired by a recent series of papers by Hong et al. \([26, 27, 28, 30]\) which show that bilinear formulations can be made remarkably robust to local minima and achieve impressive reconstruction results for uncalibrated structure from motion problems. These works have studied a number of optimization methods that use bilinear formulations. The method of choice is the so called VarPro approach where one of the factors \(B\) and \(C\) is eliminated through marginalization and iterations are performed over the other. An explanation as to why VarPro does not exhibit the “stalling” typically observed in alternating approaches is given in \([28]\). It is also shown how to modify LM to achieve the same performance. In \([30]\) VarPro was applied to a formulation which allows projection models with non-parallel viewing rays of the form (1). High quality reconstruction and robustness to local minima was again illustrated starting from random initialization. Our work represents an attempt to unify this line of work with regularization based alternatives, leveraging the benefits of them both, namely efficient optimization and theoretical optimality guarantees.

The work that is most closely related to ours is that of \([6]\) which uses the variational formulation of the nuclear norm

\[
\|X\|_* = \min_{BC^T=X} \frac{1}{2} (\|B\|_F^2 + \|C\|_F^2),
\]

see \([39]\). The work \([6]\) unifies the use of a regularized objective and factorization. They show that if the obtained solution has lower rank than the number of columns it is globally optimal. In practice \([6]\) observes that the shrinking bias of the nuclear norm makes it too weak to enforce a low rank when the data is noisy. Therefore, a “continuation” approach where the size of the factorization is gradually reduced is proposed. While this yields solutions with lower rank, the optimality guarantees no longer apply.

As mentioned, the nuclear norm has been used extensively in regularization approaches due to its convexity \([39, 7]\). It was first observed that this is the convex envelope of the rank function over the set \(\{X: \sigma_1(X) \leq 1\}\) in \([17]\). Since then, a number of generalizations that give performance guarantees for the nuclear norm relaxation have appeared, e.g. \([39, 38, 7, 8]\). Typically, one assumes the existence of a restricted isometry constant \(\delta_r\), fulfilling

\[
(1 - \delta_r)\|X\|_F^2 \leq \|AX\|_F^2 \leq (1 + \delta_r)\|X\|_F^2,
\]

where \(A\) is a given matrix.
with \(0 \leq \delta_r < 1\), if \(\text{rank}(X) \leq r\).

Non-convex alternatives that penalize smaller singular values harder than larger ones have been shown to improve performance [37, 33, 29, 34]. In [31] the problem

\[
\mu \text{rank}(X) + \|X - X_0\|_F^2,
\]

was studied. It was shown that its convex envelope is

\[
\mathcal{R}_\mu(X) + \|AX - b\|_F^2
\]

Global minimizers of (9) are therefore global minimizers of (10) and in addition (10) is continuous and convex. The poor effect of the shrinking bias of the nuclear norm was highlighted on structure from motion type problems with realistic missing data patterns. In [35, 12] the formulation

\[
\mathcal{R}_\mu(X) + \|AX - b\|_F^2
\]

was proposed. It was shown that if a RIP (8) constraint holds there can only be one stationary point of low rank (see [12, 35] for technical conditions). In [11] it was further shown that if the operator norm \(\|A\| < 1\) then (11) and \(\mu \text{rank}(X) + \|AX - b\|_F^2\) have the same global minimizers.

2. Non-Convex Singular Value Penalties

In this section we will derive a variational formulation for regularizers of the type

\[
\mathcal{R}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^r f(\sigma_i(X)).
\]

**Theorem 1.** If \(f\) is concave, non-decreasing on \([0, \infty)\) and \(f(0) = 0\) then

\[
\mathcal{R}(X) = \min_{BC^T = X} \sum_{i=1}^k f(\|B_i\|\|C_i\|),
\]

where \(B_i\) and \(C_i\), \(i = 1, \ldots, k\) are the columns of \(B\) and \(C\) respectively.

**Proof.** The result is a consequence of the fact that \(\mathcal{R}\) will fulfill a triangle inequality \(\mathcal{R}(X + Y) \leq \mathcal{R}(X) + \mathcal{R}(Y)\) under the assumptions on \(f\). This is clear from Theorem 4.4 in [41] which shows that

\[
\sum_{i=1}^N f(\sigma_i(X + Y)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N f(\sigma_i(X)) + \sum_{i=1}^N f(\sigma_i(Y)).
\]

Applying this to \(X = BC^T = \sum_{i=1}^k B_i C_i^T\) we see that

\[
\mathcal{R}(X) = \mathcal{R}(\sum_{i=1}^k B_i C_i^T) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{R}(B_i C_i^T).
\]

Since \(\text{rank}(B_i C_i^T) = 1\) we also have

\[
\mathcal{R}(B_i C_i^T) = f(\sigma_1(B_i C_i^T)) = f(\|B_i C_i^T\|_F).
\]

Lastly, since \(\|B_i C_i^T\|_F = \|B_i\|\|C_i\|\) we get

\[
\mathcal{R}(X) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k f(\|B_i\|\|C_i\|).
\]

To see that equality can be achieved, let \(B_i = \sqrt{\sigma_i(X)} U_i\) and \(C_i = \sqrt{\sigma_i(X)} V_i\), where \(X = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(X) U_i V_i^T\) is the SVD of \(X\). Then \(BC^T = X\) and \(f(\|B_i\|\|C_i\|) = f(\sigma_i(X))\).

While the above result allows optimization over the factors \(B\) and \(C\) we note that it yields an objective that is non-differentiable at \(\|B_i\|\|C_i\| = 0\). Next we reformulate the objective to achieve a differentiable problem formulation.

**Corollary 1.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, it follows that \(\mathcal{R}(X) = \min_{X = BC^T} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(B, C)\), where

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(B, C) = \sum_{i=1}^k f \left( \frac{\|B_i\|^2 + \|C_i\|^2}{2} \right).
\]

If in addition \(f\) can be written \(f(x) = g(|x|)\) where \(g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) is differentiable then \(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(B, C)\) is also differentiable.

**Proof.** By the rule of arithmetic and geometric means

\[
\|B_i\|\|C_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|B_i\|^2 + \|C_i\|^2),
\]

where \(\mu \text{rank}(X) + \|X - X_0\|_F^2\),
with equality if $\|B_i\| = \|C_i\|$. Since $f$ is assumed to be non-decreasing, it follows from (13), that $\mathcal{R}(X) = \min_{X = B C^T} \mathcal{R}(B, C)$. We also have that $f\left(\frac{\|B_i\|^2 + \|C_i\|^2}{2}\right) = g\left(\frac{\|B_i\|^2 + \|C_i\|^2}{2}\right)$, which is clearly differentiable.

We are particularly interested in the case where

$$f_\mu(x) = \mu - \max(\sqrt{\mu - |x|}, 0)^2. \tag{20}$$

since with this choice is known to have the give global minimizer as the rank function if $\|A\| < 1$, see [11]. Note that $f_\mu$ is a special case of the MCP class [44]. It can be written $f_\mu(x) = 2\sqrt{\mu}|x| - h(x)$, where $h$ is a Huber function defined as

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} 2\sqrt{\mu}|x| - \mu & |x| \geq \sqrt{\mu} \\ x^2 & |x| \leq \sqrt{\mu} \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

which makes $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\mu(B, C)$ differentiable. Its second derivatives are also defined almost everywhere except at points where $\|B_i\|^2 + \|C_i\|^2 = \sqrt{\mu}$, since in the transition between linear and quadratic the second derivative of the Huber function is undefined.

3. Overparameterization and Optimality

The results of the previous section show that the global optimizers of (3) are also optimal in

$$\min_{B, C} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\mu(B, C) + \|A B C^T - b\|^2. \tag{22}$$

On the other hand optimizing (22) over $B$ and $C$ introduces additional stationary points, due to the non-linear parameterization, that are not present in (3). One such point is $(B, C) = (0, 0)$ where the gradients of $\|A B C^T - b\|^2$ with respect to $B$ and $C$ vanish (in contrast to the gradient w.r.t. $X$). In this section we show that by overparametrizing, in the sense that we use $B$ and $C$ that are larger than the rank of the solution we seek, it is still possible to use properties of (3) to show optimality in (22). In the entire section, we exclusively use

$$f(x) = f_\mu(x) := \mu - \max(\sqrt{\mu - x}, 0)^2. \tag{23}$$

We assume that $B$ and $C$ have $2k$ columns and study locally optimal solutions with $\text{rank}(B C^T) < k$. The size of $B$ and $C$ makes it possible to parametrize line segments between such points and utilize convexity properties, see proof of Theorem 3. The following result (which is proven in Section ??) gives conditions that ensure that local minimality in (22) implies that “low rank” directional derivatives of (3) are zero.

**Theorem 2.** Assume that $(\bar{B}, \bar{C}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times 2k} \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times 2k}$ is a local minimizer of (22) with $r < k$ non-zero columns and let $\mathcal{N}(X) = \mathcal{R}_\mu(X) + \|A X - b\|^2$. If $\mathcal{R}_\mu(B C^T) = \mathcal{R}_\mu(\bar{B}, \bar{C})$ then the directional derivatives $\mathcal{N}^*_\mathcal{D}(B C^T)$, where $\mathcal{D} = \bar{X} - B C^T$, $\text{rank}(\bar{X}) \leq k$ are non-negative. Note that there can be local minimizers for which $\mathcal{R}(\bar{B}, \bar{C}) > \mathcal{R}(B C^T)$. From an algorithmic point of view we can however escape such points by taking the current iterate and recompute the factorization of $B C^T$ using SVD. If the SVD of $B C^T = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i U_i V_i^T$ we update $\bar{B}$ and $\bar{C}$ to $\bar{B}_i = \sqrt{\sigma_i} U_i$ and $\bar{C}_i = \sqrt{\sigma_i} V_i$ which we know reduces the energy and gives $\mathcal{R}(\bar{B}, \bar{C}) = \mathcal{R}(B C^T)$.

Theorem 2 allows us to derive optimality conditions using the properties of (3). As a simple example consider the case where $\|A X\|^2 \geq \|X\|^2$, which makes (3) convex [11], and let $B$ and $C$ have $2k$ columns. Suppose that we find a local minimizer $(\bar{B}, \bar{C})$, with $\mathcal{R}_\mu(B, C) = \mathcal{R}_\mu(B C^T)$ and $\text{rank}(B C^T) < k$. Then the derivative along a line segment towards any other low rank matrix is non-decreasing, and therefore $B C^T$ is the global optimum of (3) over the set of matrices with rank $\leq k$ by convexity.

Below we give a result that goes beyond convexity and applies to the important class [39] of problems that obey the RIP constraint

$$\left(1 - \delta_{2k}\right)\|X\|^2_F \leq \|A X\|^2 \leq \left(1 + \delta_{2k}\right)\|X\|^2_F. \tag{24}$$

Let $A^*$ denote the adjoint operator of $A$, then:

**Theorem 3.** Assume that $(\bar{B}, \bar{C})$ is a local minimizer of (22) fulfilling the assumptions of Theorem 2. If the singular values of $Z = (I - A^* A) B C^T + A^* b$ fulfill $\sigma_r(Z) \notin \left[(1 - \delta_{2k})\sqrt{\mu}, \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{1 - \delta_{2k}}\right]$ then

$$B C^T \in \arg\min_{\text{rank}(X) \leq k} \mathcal{R}_\mu(X) + \|A X - b\|^2. \tag{25}$$

The proof builds on the results of [35] and is given in the next section. The assumption that the singular values of $Z$ are not too close to the threshold $\sqrt{\mu}$ is a natural restriction which is valid when the noise level is not too large. In case of exact data, that is, $b = A X_0$, where $\text{rank}(X_0) = r$ it is trivially fulfilled for any choice of $\mu$ such that $\sqrt{\mu} < (1 - \delta_{2k})\sigma_r(X_0)$ since we have $Z = X_0$. For additional details on $Z$’s dependence on noise see [12].

4. Implementation

In this section we present our algorithm for minimizing of the form (3) with a regularization term that fulfills the assumptions of Corollary 1. The proposed algorithm is based on the VarPro method, which is an iterative algorithm that works directly with the low-rank factors $B$ and $C$ instead of their product. The algorithm essentially marginalizes over
one of the factors reducing the minimization to a search over the remaining factor. If \( C(B) = \arg \min_B \|ABC^T - b\|^2 \), then VarPro uses a linearization \( ABC(B)^T - b \approx l + \delta B \) around the current iterate \( B(t) \), essentially solves
\[
\min_{\delta B} \| l + \delta B \|^2 + \lambda \|\delta B\|^2, \tag{26}
\]
and sets \( B(t+1) = B(t) + \delta B \) in each iteration. Here \( \lambda \) is a parameter that controls the step length. In our implementation we use the so called Ruhe and Wedin (RW2) approximation. See [28] for details on the VarPro implementation. It is not clear how to apply VarPro directly to (3) because the regularization term generally does not admit a closed form solution when marginalizing over one of the factors. In each step we therefore linearize the function \( f \) in (18) and replace the regularization term with
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i(t) (\| B_i(t) \|^2 + \| C_i(t) \|^2), \tag{27}
\]
where \( w_i(t) = \frac{1}{2} f'(\| B_i(t) \|^2 + \| C_i(t) \|^2) \), where \( B_i(t) \) and \( C_i(t) \) are the \( i \)-th columns of the current iterates \( B(t) \) and \( C(t) \), respectively. It is now clear that
\[
C(B) = \arg \min_C \sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i \| C_i \|^2 + \| ABC^T - b \|^2, \tag{28}
\]
has a closed for solution since it is quadratic. Our approach can be seen as iteratively reweighted nuclear norm minimization [10], however, we will exclusively use the bilinear formulation instead of ADMM, thus gaining differentiability, as well as benefiting from second order convergence in the neighborhood of a local minimum.

This choice also introduces a sparsity pattern in the VarPro update that enables efficient solutions. To see this, separate the data contribution and the regularization contribution of the Jacobians
\[
J_b = \begin{bmatrix} J_{b_{\text{reg}}} \\ J_{b_{\text{data}}} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{29}
\]
and similarly for \( J_c \). The approximate Hessian
\[
J_b^T J_b = J_{b_{\text{reg}}}^T J_{b_{\text{reg}}} + J_{b_{\text{data}}}^T J_{b_{\text{data}}}, \tag{30}
\]
where the first term does not affect a possible block structure, since it is diagonal
\[
J_{b_{\text{reg}}}^T J_{b_{\text{reg}}} = \text{diag}( (w_1(t))^2 \odot 1_n, \ldots, (w_k(t))^2 \odot 1_n), \tag{31}
\]
where \( \text{diag}(v) \) is the diagonal matrix with \( v \) on the main diagonal and \( 1_n \) is the vector of length \( n \) with all ones.

Note that there can be stationary points for which \( \mathcal{R}(B, C) > \mathcal{R}(BC^T) \). From an algorithmic point of view we can however escape such points by taking the current iterate and recompute the factorization of \( BC^T \) using SVD. If the SVD of \( BC^T = \sum_{i=1}^s \sigma_i U_i V_i^T \) we update \( B \) and \( C \) to \( B_i = \sqrt{\sigma_i} U_i \) and \( C_i = \sqrt{\sigma_i} V_i \) which we know reduces the energy and gives \( \mathcal{R}(B, C) = \mathcal{R}(BC^T) \). Therefore we proceed by refactorizing the current iterate using SVD in each iteration. The steps of the bilinear method are summarized in Algorithm 1, where \( \mathcal{E} \) denotes the energy.

**Input:** Robust penalty function \( f \), linear operator \( A \) and regularization parameter \( \mu \), damping parameter \( \lambda \).

Initialize \( b \) and \( c \) with random entries

while not converged do

- Compute residual \( r_{\text{data}} \) and Jacobians \( J_{b_{\text{data}}} \) and \( J_{c_{\text{data}}} \) depending on \( A \).
- Compute residual \( r_{\text{reg}} \) and Jacobians \( J_{b_{\text{reg}}} \) and \( J_{c_{\text{reg}}} \).
- Create full residual \( r \) and Jacobians \( J_b \) and \( J_c \).
- Compute residual \( r' \) and Jacobians \( J'_b \) and \( J'_c \) using \( r' \).
- Compute \( c' = c - (J'_c)^{-1} r' \).
- if \( \mathcal{E}(b', c') < \mathcal{E}(b, c) \) then
  - Update \( b = b' \) and \( c = c' \).
  - Decrease \( \lambda \).
else
  - Increase \( \lambda \).
end

Algorithm 1: Outline of the bilinear method.

5. Experiments

In this section we will show the versatility of the proposed method, focusing on computer vision problems, where state-of-the-art methods using ADMM fail to achieve a value closed to global optimality in a reasonable amount of time. In all experiments, for all methods, the initial solutions are randomly generated with zero mean and unit variance.

5.1. Synthetic Missing Data Problem

Let \( \odot \) denote the Hadamard product, and consider the missing data formulation
\[
\min_X \mu \text{rank}(X) + \| W \odot (X - M) \|_F^2, \tag{32}
\]
where \( M \) is a measurement matrix and \( W \) a missing data mask with entries \( w_{ij} = 1 \) if the entry is known, and zero otherwise. More specifically, we will use a missing data pattern commonly occurring in computer vision application, that arises due to tracking failures. The sparsity pattern is generated by randomly removing blocks in the lower triangular region, with decreasing height and increasing width, which is illustrated in Figure 3.
We generate random ground truth matrices $M_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{32 \times 512}$ of rank 4, which can be expressed as $M_0 = UV^T$, where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{32 \times 4}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{512 \times 4}$. The entries of $U$ and $V$ are normal distributed with zero mean and unit variance. The measurement matrix $M = M_0 + N$, where $N$ simulates noise and has normal distributed entries with zero mean and variance $\sigma^2$, which is varied in the interval $\sigma \in [0, 0.3]$.

All five robust penalties in Figure 1, are used to relax (32), which yields

$$\min_X \mathcal{R}(X) + \| W \odot (X - M) \|_F^2, \quad (33)$$

where $\mathcal{R}(X) = \sum_i f(\sigma_i(X))$. As a special case of MCP we use $f_\mu$, defined in (20), and run the bilinear formulation to convergence. The ADMM equivalent is then given the same runtime in seconds. Note that the bilinear formulation and the ADMM equivalent minimize the same energy. In all tests, the number of columns for the bilinear methods are set to $k = 8$. The results are shown in Figure 2. The bilinear method is able to find a better optimum for all penalties and noise levels, with the exception for Geman and high noise levels, in which case ADMM converges to a high rank solution larger than $k$. In such cases, the distance to ground truth of the solution obtained by ADMM is generally larger than for the bilinear methods.

To get a better understanding of the energies of the synthetic experiment we show the rank and distance to ground truth, in Figure 3. For SCAD, Log and $f_\mu$, the bilinear consistently finds a small rank, except for very high noise levels $\sigma > 0.2$. In all cases ADMM struggles to find a (sufficiently) low rank solution, and the distance to ground truth is significantly larger for ADMM. In the case of ETP, we see an impact of shrinking bias – to get better performance one would have to use a different regularizing parameter $\mu$. This is seen in the plots as ADMM consistently returns a full rank solution, and the bilinear method a rank $k = 8$ solution for noise levels $\sigma > 0.1$. The main point, however, is that the energy minimizing of the bilinear method still performs better – the other parameters, such as $\mu$, and how well the problem formulation is able to reconstruct the ground truth, is secondary. A similar problem occurs for high noise levels with Geman, however, the shrinking bias is not as dominant. Note, that this phenomenon does not occur for Log, which, most likely, is due to the sublinearity, causing a smaller impact of the penalization of large singular values.
5.2. Photometric Stereo

Photometric stereo can be used for estimating depth and surface orientation from images of the same object and view with varying lighting directions. Assuming $M$ lighting directions and $N$ pixels define $I \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, where $I_{ij}$ is the light intensity for lighting direction $i$ and pixel $j$. Assuming Lambertian reflectance, uniform albedo and a distant light source, $I = LN$, where $L \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times 3}$ contain the lighting directions and $N \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times N}$ the unknown surface normals. Thus, the resulting problem is to find a rank 3 approximation of the intensity matrix $I$.

We use the Harvard Photometric Stereo testset [18], which contains images of various objects from varying lighting direction. The images are scaled to $160 \times 125$ pixels, and only the foreground pixels are used in the optimization. Similar to [6], we introduce missing data by thresholding dark pixels with pixel value less than 40 and bright pixels with pixel value more than 205. The measurement matrix is reconstructed using the bilinear method and the ADMM equivalent with the $\mathcal{R}_\mu$ regularizer. The result is shown in Figure 4. We let the bilinear method run until convergence and let the ADMM equivalent run for the same time in seconds, at which point the objective value is still decreasing when ADMM is interrupted; however, the reduction is almost negligible. In all cases ADMM fails to converge to a low rank solution in the same time as the bilinear method, which yields a consistent result.

5.3. Background Extraction

The missing data problem formulation can also be used in e.g. background extraction, where the goal is to separate the foreground from the background in a video sequence. For this experiment, security footage of an airport is used. The frame size is $144 \times 176$ pixels, and we use the first 200 frames, as in [25]. The camera does not move, hence the background is static.

By concatenating the vectorization of the frames into a matrix we expect it to be additively decomposable in terms of a low rank matrix (background) and a sparse matrix (foreground). We follow the setup used in [6], and crop the width to half of the height, and shift it 20 pixels to the right after 100 frames to simulate a virtual pan of the camera. This increases the complexity of the background, as it is no longer static. Lastly, we randomly drop 70\% of the entries. To allow for smaller singular values, we use Geman, as it is a
robust penalty with shrinking bias. The results are shown in Figure 5.

Initially ADMM struggles to find the correct balance between lowering the rank and fitting the data, which is seen in Figure 6, where the objective is almost unaffected the first forty seconds. At this point, the bilinear method has already converged.

![Figure 5. Background extraction using Geman. Samples from frame no. 40, 70, 100, 130, 170 and 200. Top row: Original images. Middle row: Training data with 70 % missing data. Bottom row: Reconstruction of background (bilinear method).](image)

![Figure 6. Energy minimization comparison for the background extraction experiment.](image)

### 5.4. pOSE: Pseudo Object Space Error

The Pseudo Object Space Error (pOSE) objective combines affine and projective camera models

\[
\ell_{\text{OSE}} = \sum_{(i,j) \in \Omega} \left\| (P_{i,1:2}\tilde{x}_j - (P_{i,3}^T\tilde{x}_j)m_{i,j}) \right\|^2 , \\
\ell_{\text{Affine}} = \sum_{(i,j) \in \Omega} \left\| P_{i,1:2}\tilde{x}_j - m_{i,j} \right\|^2 , \\
\ell_{\text{pOSE}} = (1 - \eta)\ell_{\text{OSE}} + \eta\ell_{\text{Affine}},
\]

where \(\ell_{\text{OSE}}\) is the object space error and \(\ell_{\text{Affine}}\) is the affine projection error. Here \(P_{i,1:2}\) denotes the first two rows, \(P_{i,3}\) the third row of the \(i\)th camera matrix, and \(\tilde{x}_j\) is the \(j\)th 3D point in homogeneous coordinates. The control parameter \(\eta \in [0, 1]\) determines the impact of the respective camera model. This objective was introduced in [30] to be used in a first stage of an initialization-free bundle adjustment pipeline, optimized using VarPro.

The \(\ell_{\text{pOSE}}\) objective is linear, and acts on low-rank components \(P\) and \(X\), which are constrained by rank(\(PX^T\)) = 4. Instead of enforcing the rank constraint we replace it as before with the relaxation \(R_\mu\). By not enforcing the rank constraint we demonstrate the ability of the methods to make accurate trade-offs between minimizing the rank and fitting the data. As before, we let the bilinear method run until convergence, and let ADMM execute the same time in seconds. As a comparison we use the nuclear norm relaxation and the non-convex rank regularization. The results of the experiment are shown in Figure 8.

Note that the bilinear method optimizes the same energy as ADMM-\(R_\mu\), and that, despite the initial fast lowering of the objective value, the ADMM approach fails to reach the global optimum, within the allotted 150 seconds. This holds true for all methods employing ADMM. In all experiments, the control parameter \(\eta = 0.5\), and the \(\mu\) parameter was chosen to be smaller than all non-zero singular values of the best known optimum (obtained using VarPro). For a fair comparison, the \(\mu\)-value for the nuclear norm relaxation, was modified due to the shrinking bias, and was chosen to be the smallest value of \(\mu\) for which a solution with accurate rank was obtained. Due to this modification, the energy it minimizes is not directly correlated to the others, but is shown for completeness. Furthermore, the iteration speed of ADMM is significantly faster than for VarPro, and therefore we show the elapsed time (in seconds) for all methods. The reported values are averaged over 50 instances with random initialization. To visualize the results, we show the reprojected points and the corresponding measured points obtained from the different methods, see Figure 7.

### 5.5. Non-Rigid Structure From Motion

In this section we test our approach on non-rigid reconstruction (NRSfM) with the CMU Motion Capture (MOCAP) data. In NRSfM, the complexity of the deformations are controlled by some mild assumptions of the object shapes. Bregler et al., [4] suggested that the set of all possible configurations of the objects are spanned by a low dimensional linear basis of dimension \(K\). In this setting, the non-rigid shapes \(X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times n}\) can be represented as \(X_i = \sum_{k=1}^{K} c_{ik}B_k\), where \(B_k \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times n}\) are the basis shapes and \(c_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}\) the shape coefficients. This way, the matrix \(X_i\) contains the world coordinates of point \(i\), hence the observed image points are given by \(x_i = R_iX_i\). We will assume orthographic cameras, i.e. \(R_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 3}\)

---

\(^1\) The datasets are available here: [http://www.maths.lth.se/matematiklth/personal/calle/dataset/dataset.html](http://www.maths.lth.se/matematiklth/personal/calle/dataset/dataset.html)
Figure 7. Comparison of reprojection error obtained using the bilinear formulation and ADMM, for datasets Door and Vercingetorix [36]. The red circles mark the feature points and the green dots the projected image points obtained from the different methods.

Figure 8. The average energy for the pOSE problem over 50 instances with random initializations, for test sequence Door. (Note that the energy for ADMM-Rank and ADMM-R$_\mu$ are very similar).

where $R_i R_i^T = I_2$.

Dai et al. [13] showed that the problem can be turned into a low-rank factorization problem by reshaping and stacking the matrices $X_i$. Let $X_i^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 3n}$ denote the concatenation of the rows in $X_i$, and create $X^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^{F \times 3n}$ by stacking $X_i^\dagger$. This allows us to decompose the matrix $X^\dagger$ in the low-rank factors $X^\dagger = CB^\dagger$, where $C \in \mathbb{R}^{F \times K}$ contains the shape coefficients $c_{ik}$ and $B^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times 3n}$ is constructed as $X^\dagger$ and contains the basis elements.

A suitable objective function is thus given by

$$\mu \text{rank}(X^\dagger) + \|RX - M\|_F^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)

where $R \in \mathbb{R}^{2F \times 3F}$ is a block-diagonal matrix with the camera matrices $R_i$ on the main diagonal, $X \in \mathbb{R}^{3F \times n}$ is the concatenation of the 3D points $X_i$, and $M \in \mathbb{R}^{2F \times n}$ is the concatenated observed image points $x_i$. We again replace the non-convex rank penalty with $R_\mu$, and minimize it using the bilinear method and ADMM. As a comparison, we include the nuclear norm regularization. The results can be seen in Figure 9.

Generally, ADMM performs well; and, in cases where the rank of the obtained solution coincides with the one obtained by the bilinear method, the difference in energy is negligible. In the cases, however, where the rank is not the same, ADMM tunes to the data more than the bilinear method. This is clearly shown in the figure, as for all values of $\mu$—in all sequences—the rank of the final solution obtained by the bilinear method is smaller than or equal to the one obtained using ADMM. The distance to ground truth, however, is not the main interest of this paper, but rather the energy minimization step. In this case, the objective is not ideal for NRSfM, and, in some cases, promotes non-physical high-rank solutions. Other solutions, such as further penalizing the derivative of the 3D projections have been suggested to increase performance [13].

6. Conclusions

In this paper we presented a unification of bilinear parametrization and rank regularization. Robust penalties for rank regularization has often been used together with ADMM, but it has been shown that such methods yield unsatisfactory results for ill-posed problems in pattern recognition and computer vision. By using the bilinear formulation, the objective functions become differentiable, and convergence rates in the neighborhood of a local minimum are faster.

Lastly, the generality of the proposed framework allows for a wide range of problems, some of which, have not been amenable by standard splitting methods such as ADMM, but have been proven successful using the proposed method.
Figure 9. Top row: Example frames from the MOCAP dataset of the drink, pickup, stretch and yoga sequences. Remaining rows: The bilinear method finds the same or a smaller energy compared to ADMM for all values of the regularizing parameter $\mu$.
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A. Proofs

In this section we will prove the lemmas of Theorems 2 and 3. Our analysis will make use of the differentiable objective \(D(B, C) := \mathcal{R}(B, C) + \|ABC^T - b\|_F^2\), the non-convex \(\mathcal{N}(X) := \mathcal{R}(X) + \|AX - b\|_F^2\) and the convex \(\mathcal{C}(X) = \mathcal{R}(X) + \|X - Z\|_F^2\). We will also use the functions \(G(B, C) = \mathcal{R}_\mu(B, C) + \|BC^T\|_F^2\), \(G(X) = \mathcal{R}_\mu(X) + \|X - Z\|_F^2\) and \(H(X) = \|AX - b\|_F^2\). Note that \(D(B, C) = G(B, C) + H(BC^T)\) and \(N(X) = G(X) + H(X)\).

We will need some basic results, summarized in the following lemmata. The proofs are given in the end of this section.

Furthermore, the subdifferential \(\partial G(X)\) of \(G\) is of importance. Let \(g(x) = f([x]) + x^2\). The scalar function \(g\) has
\[
\partial g(x) = \begin{cases} 2x & |x| \geq \sqrt{\mu} \\ 2\sqrt{\mu} \text{sign}(x) & 0 < |x| \leq \sqrt{\mu} \\ 2\sqrt{\mu}[-1, 1] & x = 0 \end{cases}.
\]

The following lemma shows how to compute \(\partial G\) for the matrix case using \(\partial g\).

**Lemma 1.** The subdifferential of \(G(X)\) is given by
\[
\partial G(X) = \left\{ U\partial g(\Sigma) V^T + M : \sigma_1(M) \leq 2\sqrt{\mu}, \right. \\
U^T M = 0 \text{ and } MV^T = 0 \left. \right\}
\]
where \(X = U\Sigma V^T\) is the SVD and \(\partial g(\Sigma)\) is the matrix of same size as \(\Sigma\) with diagonal elements \(\partial g(\sigma_i)\).

Next we give the stationary point conditions for \(D\).

**Lemma 2.** If \((B, C)\) is a stationary point of \(D\), then
\[
0 = B\partial G(\Sigma) + \nabla H(BC^T)C, \quad \text{(40)}
\]
\[
0 = \partial G(\Sigma)C^T + B^T\nabla H(BC^T). \quad \text{(41)}
\]

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** Let \(\tilde{X} = \tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T\) and \(\Delta X = \tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T - B\tilde{C}^T\), then
\[
\mathcal{N}_\Delta X = \max_{2Z \in \partial G(B\tilde{C}^T)} \langle 2Z, \Delta X \rangle + \langle \nabla H(\tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T), \Delta X \rangle. \quad \text{(42)}
\]
Using Lemma 1, the first term becomes
\[
\langle U\partial g(\Sigma) V^T + M, B\tilde{C}^T - B\tilde{C}^T \rangle = \langle U\partial g(\Sigma) V^T, B\tilde{C}^T \rangle + \langle M, B\tilde{C}^T \rangle - \langle U\partial g(\Sigma) V^T, B\tilde{C}^T \rangle. \quad \text{(43)}
\]
For the last term of (43) we have
\[
\langle U\partial g(\Sigma) V^T, B\tilde{C}^T \rangle = \langle \partial g(\Sigma), U^T B\tilde{C}^TV \rangle = \langle \partial g(\Sigma), \Sigma \rangle. \quad \text{(44)}
\]
The matrix \(\tilde{B}\) may not be orthogonal to \(\tilde{B}\). Its columns can be written as a linear combination of the columns in \(B\) and those of \(B_{\perp}\) with at most \(k\) columns that are perpendicular to \(B\). Similarly, the columns of \(\tilde{C}\) can be written as a linear combination of the columns in \(C\) and those of a matrix \(C_{\perp}\) with at most \(k\) columns that are perpendicular to \(C\). Therefore, we may write
\[
\tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{B} & \bar{B}_1 \\ K_{11} & K_{12} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_{11}^T & K_{12}^T \\ \bar{C}_{\perp}^T \end{bmatrix}
= \bar{B}K_{11}C^T + \bar{B}K_{12}\bar{C}_{\perp}^T + \bar{B}_1K_{21}\bar{C}_{\perp}^T + \bar{B}_1K_{22}\bar{C}_{\perp}^T,
\]
where \(\bar{B}^T\bar{B} = 0\) and \(\bar{C}^T\bar{C}_{\perp} = 0\). In what follows we will show that the terms \(K_{12}\) and \(K_{21}\) and the off diagonal elements of \(K_{11}\) vanishes from (42) and can be assumed to be zero.

The first term of (43) reduces to
\[
\langle U\partial g(\Sigma)V^T, \bar{B}\bar{C}^T \rangle = \langle U\partial g(\Sigma)V^T, \bar{B}K_{11}\bar{C}_{\perp}^T \rangle = \langle \bar{B}^T U\partial g(\Sigma)V^T \bar{C}_{\perp}, K_{11} \rangle \quad \text{(46)}
\]
Note that the off diagonal elements of \(K_{11}\) vanishes from this expression. Similarly, the second term of (43) reduces to
\[
\langle \partial g(\Sigma), \bar{B}\bar{C}^T \rangle = \langle \partial g(\Sigma), \bar{B}K_{11}\bar{C}_{\perp}^T \rangle = \langle \partial g(\Sigma), K_{11} \rangle \quad \text{(47)}
\]
We now consider the second term of (42)
\[
\nabla H(BC^T), \Delta X = \nabla H(\tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T), \tilde{B}K_{11}\tilde{C}_{\perp}^T + \tilde{B}K_{12}\tilde{C}_{\perp}^T + \bar{B}_1K_{21}\tilde{C}_{\perp}^T + \bar{B}_1K_{22}\tilde{C}_{\perp}^T - B\tilde{C}^T. \quad \text{(48)}
\]
For the first term we have
\[
\nabla H(\tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T), \tilde{B}K_{11}\tilde{C}_{\perp}^T = \nabla H(\tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T), \bar{B}K_{11} = -\langle \partial g(\Sigma), \bar{B}K_{11} \rangle = -\langle \bar{B}^T \partial g(\Sigma), K_{11} \rangle \quad \text{(49)}
\]
Again the off diagonal elements of \(K_{11}\) vanish. For the second term of (48) we have
\[
\nabla H(\tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T), \bar{B}K_{12}\bar{C}_{\perp}^T = \nabla H(\tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T), \tilde{B}K_{12}\tilde{C}_{\perp}^T = -\langle \partial g(\Sigma)\bar{C}_{\perp}^T, K_{12} \rangle = -\langle \partial g(\Sigma)\bar{C}_{\perp}^T, K_{12} \rangle = 0. \quad \text{(50)}
\]
Similarly, the third term is \(\nabla H(\tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T), \bar{B}_1K_{21}\tilde{C}_{\perp}^T \) = 0.

Thus
\[
\nabla H(\tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T), \Delta X = \nabla H(\tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T), \bar{B}_1K_{22}\tilde{C}_{\perp}^T - \langle \partial g(\Sigma), K_{11} \rangle - \nabla H(\tilde{B}\tilde{C}^T), \bar{B}_1\tilde{C}_{\perp}^T. \quad \text{(51)}
\]
We therefore conclude that $K_{12}, K_{21}$ and the off diagonal terms of $K_{11}$ do not affect the value of $N_{\Delta X}$ and we may therefore assume that they are zero. Therefore, we can write $\Delta X$ as

$$
\Delta X = [U \quad U_\perp ] \begin{bmatrix} (D - I) \Sigma & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V^T \\ V_\perp \end{bmatrix},
$$

(52)

where $D$ are the diagonal elements of $K_{11}$ and $U_\perp \Sigma V_\perp^T$ is the SVD of $B_1 C_2 \tilde{C}_1^T$. Note that $U_\perp^T U = 0$ since $U$ and $U_\perp$ span orthogonal subspaces. Similarly $V_\perp^T V = 0$.

By definition, the directional derivative is given by

$$
N_{\Delta X} = \lim_{t \to 0} \frac{N(X + t \Delta X) - N(X)}{t},
$$

with $X$ and $\Delta X$ as in the previous section and let $\tilde{B} = U \tilde{\Sigma}^T, \ C = V \tilde{\Sigma}$. It is clear that for small $t$ the matrix $X + t \Delta X$ has the singular value decomposition

$$
\begin{bmatrix} U & U_\perp \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} ((1 - t)I + t D) \Sigma & 0 \\ 0 & t \Sigma \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V^T \\ V_\perp \end{bmatrix}.
$$

(53)

We now let

$$
B(t) = \begin{bmatrix} U & U_\perp \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} ((1 - t)I + t D) \Sigma & 0 \\ 0 & t \Sigma \end{bmatrix},
$$

(54)

$$
C(t) = \begin{bmatrix} V & V_\perp \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} ((1 - t)I + t D) \Sigma & 0 \\ 0 & t \Sigma \end{bmatrix}.
$$

(55)

Then we clearly have $\tilde{R}_{\mu}(B(t), C(t)) = \mathcal{R}_{\mu}(X + t \Delta X)$ for small enough $t$. Therefore, we get

$$
N(X + t \Delta X) - N(X) = \mathcal{D}(B(t), C(t)) - \mathcal{D}(B, C) \geq 0,
$$

(56)

for small $t$ since $(\tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$ is a local minimum. This shows that the limit (53) is non-negative. \hfill \Box

Next we will prove Theorem 3. Our results build on those of [35] and we will exclusively use $f_\mu(\sigma) = \mu - \max(\sqrt{\mu - \sigma}, 0)^2$ throughout the rest of the section, but suppress the subscript $\mu$. We will use the fact that the directional derivatives are (locally) positive for all low rank directions to show that $(\tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$ minimizes the non-convex $N$ over matrices of rank $< k$ in Theorem 3. For this we will need the following result:

**Lemma 3.** If $\tilde{X}$ has rank $(\tilde{X}) < k$, is a solution to $\min_{\text{rank}(X) \leq k} \mathcal{C}(X)$ and the singular values of $Z$ fulfill $\sigma_i(Z) \notin [(1 - \delta_2k)\sqrt{\mu}, (1 + \delta_2k)\sqrt{\mu}]$ then $\tilde{X}$ also solves $\min_X \mathcal{C}(X)$.

**Proof of Lemma 3.** By von Neumann’s trace theorem it is easy to see that the problem reduces to a minimization over the singular values of $X$. We should find $\sigma_i(X)$ such that

$$
\sum_{i=1}^n \max(\sqrt{\mu} - \sigma_i(X), 0)^2 + (\sigma_i(X) - \sigma(i))^2
$$

is minimized and at most $k$ singular values are non-zero. The unconstrained minimizers of $g_i$ can be written down in closed form: If $0 \leq \sqrt{\mu} < \sigma_i(Z)$ then $\sigma_i(X) = \sigma_i(Z)$ is optimal giving $g_i(\sigma_i(X)) = 0$. If $0 \leq \sigma_i(Z) < \sqrt{\mu}$ then $\sigma_i(X) = 0$ is optimal giving $g_i(\sigma_i(X)) = -\mu + \sigma_i(Z)^2$. Hence for any solution of $\min_{\text{rank}(X) \leq k} \mathcal{C}(X)$ we have $\sigma_i(X) = 0$ if $0 \leq \sigma_i(Z) \leq \sqrt{\mu}$. There are now two cases:

1. If $\sigma_{k+1}(Z) < \sqrt{\mu}$ then the sequence of unconstrained minimizers has at most $k$ non-zero values. Thus, in this case the resulting $X$ solves both $\min_X \mathcal{C}(X)$ and $\min_{\text{rank}(X) \leq k} \mathcal{C}(X)$.

2. If $\sigma_{k+1} > \sqrt{\mu}$ we will not be able to select $\sigma_i = \sigma_i(Z)$ for all $i$ where $0 \leq \sqrt{\mu} < \sigma_i(Z)$.

Choosing $\sigma_i(X) = 0$ give $g_i(0) = -\mu + \sigma_i(Z)^2 < 0$. Since $\sigma_i(Z)$ is decreasing with $i$ it is clear that the optimal choice is to select $\sigma_i(X) = \sigma_i(Z)$ for $i = 1, ..., k$.

We now conclude that if rank$(\tilde{X}) < k$ then we are in case 1 and therefore $\tilde{X}$ solves the unconstrained problem. \hfill \Box

We are now ready to give the proof.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** Since $C$ and $N$ has the same subdifferential (see [31]) at $X = B\tilde{C}^T$ it is clear that the directional derivatives $C_{\Delta X}(\tilde{X}) = N''_{\Delta X}(X) \geq 0$, where $\Delta X = \tilde{X} - B\tilde{C}^T$ and $\text{rank}(X) \leq k$. By convexity of $C$ it is then also clear that

$$
B\tilde{C}^T \in \arg \min_{\text{rank}(X) \leq k} \mathcal{C}(X).
$$

(59)

Since $\text{rank}(B\tilde{C}^T) < k$, $B\tilde{C}^T$ is also the unrestricted global minimizer of $\mathcal{C}(X)$ according to Lemma 3. By Lemma 3.1 of [35] it is then a stationary point of $N(X)$.

What remains now is to prove that $\tilde{X} = B\tilde{C}^T$ is a minimizer over all line segments $\tilde{X} + t \Delta X$. This can be done by estimating the growth of the directional derivatives along such lines. For this purpose let $\mathcal{G}(X) = \mathcal{R}(X) + \|X\|^2_F$ and $\mathcal{H}(X) = \|AX - B\|^2_F - \|X\|^2_F$. Note that $\tilde{X}$ is a stationary point of $N(X) = \mathcal{G}(X) + \mathcal{H}(X)$ if and only if $-\nabla \mathcal{H}(\tilde{X}) = 2Z \in \partial \mathcal{G}(\tilde{X})$.

Since $\nabla \mathcal{H}(\tilde{X} + t \Delta X) = t \nabla \mathcal{H}(\Delta X)$ we have

$$
\nabla \mathcal{H}(\tilde{X} + t \Delta X) - \nabla \mathcal{H}(\tilde{X}) = t \nabla \mathcal{H}(\Delta X) = 2t(A^*A\Delta X - \Delta X) \quad (60)
$$
and due to RIP $\|A\Delta X\|^2 - \|\Delta X\|_F^2 \geq -\delta_{2r}\|\Delta X\|^2$. From Corollary 4.2 of [35] we see that for any $2Z' \in \partial G(X + t\Delta X)$ we have

$$
(Z' - Z, t\Delta X) > t^2\delta_{2r}\|\Delta X\|_F^2,
$$

(61)
as long as $t \neq 0$. Since $G'_{\Delta X}(X) = \max_{2Z \in \partial G(X)}(2Z, \Delta X)$, $H'_{\Delta X}(X) = \langle \nabla H(X), \Delta X \rangle$ and $2Z + \nabla H'(X) = 0$ we get

$$
N'_{\Delta X}(X + t\Delta X) \geq \langle 2Z' + \nabla H(X + t\Delta X), \Delta X \rangle > 0
$$

(62)

For completeness we give the proofs that were previously omitted.

Proof of Lemma 1. With some abuse of notation we define the function $g: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ by $g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n g(x_i)$, where $x_i$, $i = 1,...,n$ are the elements of $x$ and $g(x) = f(|x|) + x^2$. The function $g$ is an absolutely symmetric convex function and $G$ can be written $G(X) = g \circ \sigma(X)$, where $\sigma(X)$ is the vector of singular values of $X$. Then according to [32] the matrix $Y \in \partial G(X)$ if and only if $Y = U'\text{diag}(\partial g \circ \sigma(X))V'^T$ when $X = U'\text{diag}(\sigma(X))V'^T$. (Here we use the full SVD with square orthogonal matrices $U'$ and $V'$.) Now given a thin SVD $X = U\Sigma V^T$ all possible full SVD’s of $X$ can be written

$$
X = \begin{bmatrix} U & U_\perp \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V^T \\ V_\perp \end{bmatrix}
$$

(63)

where $U_{\perp}$ and $V_{\perp}$ are singular vectors corresponding to singular values that are zero. Note that $U_{\perp}$ and $V_{\perp}$ are not uniquely defined since their corresponding singular values are all zero. Therefore we get

$$
Y = \begin{bmatrix} U' & U_\perp \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \partial g(\Sigma) & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V'^T \\ V_\perp \end{bmatrix}
= U'\partial g(\Sigma)V'^T + U_\perp DV_\perp^T,
$$

(64)

where $D$ is a diagonal matrix with elements in $2\sqrt{\mu}[-1,1]$. It is clear that $\sigma_1(D) = \sigma_1(U_\perp DV_\perp^T) \leq 1$. Furthermore, since $U_{\perp}$ and $V_{\perp}$ can be any orthogonal bases of the spaces perpendicular to the column and row spaces of $X$, it is clear that any matrix $M$ fulfilling $U^TM = 0$, $MV = 0$ and $\sigma_1(M) \leq 2\sqrt{\mu}$ can be written $M = U_\perp DV_\perp^T$, hence

$$
\partial G(X) = \{ U\partial g(\Sigma)V'^T + M : \sigma_1(M) \leq 2\sqrt{\mu}, U^TM = 0, MV = 0 \}.
$$

(65)


Proof of Lemma 2. The gradients of $\tilde{G}$ are given by

$$
\nabla_B \tilde{G}(B, C) = \nabla_B (\tilde{R}(B, C)) + \nabla_B (\|BC^T\|_F^2).
$$

(66)

For the first term we get

$$
\nabla_B \tilde{R}(B, C) = f' \left( \frac{\|B\|^2 + \|C\|^2}{2} \right) B_i.
$$

(67)

Assuming $B = U\sqrt{\Sigma}$ and $C = V\sqrt{\Sigma}$ we get

$$
\nabla_B \tilde{R}(B, C) = B \begin{bmatrix} f'(\sigma_1) & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & f'(\sigma_2) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} = Bf'(\Sigma),
$$

(68)

which gives

$$
\nabla_B \tilde{G}(B, C) = Bf'(\Sigma) + 2BC^TB = B(f'(\Sigma) + 2\Sigma).
$$

(69)

For a non-zero $\sigma$ we have $\partial g(\sigma) = \{ f'(\sigma) + 2\sigma \}$ and therefore

$$
\nabla_B \tilde{G}(B, C) = B(\partial g(\Sigma)),
$$

(70)

where $g(X) = R_\mu(x) + \|x\|_F^2$. Similarly we get

$$
\nabla_C \tilde{G}(B, C) = C(\partial g(\Sigma)).
$$

(71)

If $(B, C)$ is a stationary point then

$$
0 = B\partial g(\Sigma) + \nabla H(BC^T)C, \quad 0 = C\partial g(\Sigma) + (\nabla H(BC^T))^TB.
$$

(72)

(73)

The second equation can be re-written to the form stated in the lemma.