

# Polar Alignment and Atomic Decomposition\*

Zhenan Fan, Halyun Jeong, Yifan Sun, Michael P. Friedlander

December 11, 2019

## Abstract

Structured optimization uses a prescribed set of atoms to assemble a solution that fits a model to data. Polarity, which extends the familiar notion of orthogonality from linear sets to general convex sets, plays a special role in a simple and geometric form of convex duality. This duality correspondence yields a general notion of alignment that leads to an intuitive and complete description of how atoms participate in the final decomposition of the solution. The resulting geometric perspective leads to variations of existing algorithms effective for large-scale problems. We illustrate these ideas with many examples, including applications in matrix completion and morphological component analysis for the separation of mixtures of signals.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Atomic decomposition</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Alignment with respect to general convex sets</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Alignment with respect to atomic sets</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Alignment as optimality</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Alignment in convolution of atomic sets</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>35</b>

---

\*Department of Computer Science, University of British Columbia, 2366 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC, V6R 1Z4, Canada. Email: [zhenanf@cs.ubc.ca](mailto:zhenanf@cs.ubc.ca), [clatar1@gmail.com](mailto:clatar1@gmail.com), [yifan.0.sun@gmail.com](mailto:yifan.0.sun@gmail.com), [michael.friedlander@ubc.ca](mailto:michael.friedlander@ubc.ca). Research supported by ONR award N00014-17-1-2009.

# 1 Introduction

Convex optimization provides a valuable computational framework that renders many problems tractable because of the range of powerful algorithms that can be brought to the task. The key is that a certain mathematical structure—i.e., convexity of the functions and sets defining the problem—lays open an enormous range of theoretical and algorithmic tools that lend themselves astonishingly well to computation. There are limits, however, to the scalability of general-purpose algorithms for convex optimization. As has been recognized in the optimization and related communities for at least the past decade, significant efficiencies can be gained by acknowledging the latent structure in the solution itself, coupled with the overarching structure provided by convexity.

Structured optimization proceeds along these lines by using a prescribed set of atoms from which to assemble an optimal solution. In effect, the atoms selected to participate in forming the solution decompose the model into simpler parts, which offers opportunities for algorithmic efficiency in solving the optimization problem. From a modeling point of view, the particular atoms that constitute the computed solution often represent key explanatory components of a model. An atomic decomposition thus provides the principal components of a solution, i.e., its most informative features.

Our purpose with this paper is to describe the rich convex geometry that underlies atomic decomposition. The path we follow builds on the duality inherent in convex cones: every convex cone is paired with a polar cone. The extreme rays of any one of these cones is in some sense *aligned* with certain extreme rays of its polar cone. Brought into the context of atomic decomposition, this notion of polar alignment provides a theoretical framework for identifying the atoms that participate in a decomposition. This approach facilitates certain algorithmic design patterns that promote computational efficiency, as we demonstrate with concrete examples.

## 2 Atomic decomposition

The decomposition of a fixed vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with respect to a set of atoms  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is given by the sum

$$x = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c_a a, \quad c_a \geq 0 \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (2.1)$$

Each coefficient  $c_a$  measures the contribution of the corresponding atom  $a$  toward the construction of  $x$ . We are particularly interested in the question of determining which atoms are essential to expressing  $x$  as a positive superposition. Let

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \inf_{c_a} \left\{ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c_a \mid x = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c_a a, \quad c_a \geq 0 \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A} \right\} \quad (2.2)$$

be the minimal sum of weights over all valid atomic decompositions. The significant atoms (those that *support* the vector  $x$ ) are those that contribute positively in forming the minimal sum. We are thus led to the following definition.

**Definition 2.1** (Support set). A set  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subset \mathcal{A}$  is a *support set* for  $x$  with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  if every element  $a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  has a coefficient  $c_a$  from (2.1) that is strictly positive. That is,

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} c_a, \quad x = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} c_a a, \quad \text{and} \quad c_a > 0 \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x). \quad (2.3)$$

The set  $\mathbf{supp}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  is defined as the set of all support sets. Thus, any  $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbf{supp}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  is a valid support set.  $\square$

For any given atomic decomposition of the solution to an optimization problem, the atoms  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  with large coefficients  $c_a$  correspond to atoms that are most significant in the minimization process. In the simplest case, the atoms  $\mathcal{A}$  may be taken as the collection of canonical unit vectors  $\{\pm e_1, \dots, \pm e_n\}$ , and then the significant atoms correspond to the most significant variables  $x_j$  in the vector  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ . Under Definition 2.1, this interpretation extends to arbitrary atomic sets.

This generic model for atomic decompositions was promoted by Chen et al. [5, 6] in the context of sparse signal decomposition, and more recently by Chandrasekaran et al. [4], who are concerned with obtaining sparse solutions to linear inverse problems. In the general framework outlined by Chandrasekaran et al., the gauge function  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$  can be used to define a general convex optimization problem suitable for recovering a ground-truth solution from a relatively small number of observations.

## 2.1 Approach

The convex function  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$  is equivalent to the Minkowski functional [43, Section 15] to the convex hull  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \text{conv}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{0\})$ ; see Proposition 4.1. As we describe in Section 3, the Minkowski and support functions

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \inf \{ \lambda \geq 0 \mid x \in \lambda \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \sup \{ \langle x, z \rangle \mid z \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \} \quad (2.4)$$

to the set  $\mathcal{A}$  form a dual pairing under a polarity operation. One of the defining properties of this dual pairing is that it satisfies the *polar inequality* [43, Section 15]

$$\langle x, z \rangle \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z) \quad \forall (x, z) \in \text{dom } \gamma_{\mathcal{A}} \times \text{dom } \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}. \quad (2.5)$$

**Definition 2.2** (Alignment). A pair  $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  is *aligned* with respect to the atomic set  $\mathcal{A}$ , i.e.,  $x$  and  $z$  are  $\mathcal{A}$ -aligned, if the polar inequality (2.5) holds as an equation.

This general notion of alignment follows from the special case where  $\mathcal{A} = \{x \mid \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}$  is the unit 2-norm ball, which results in  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}} = \sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = \|\cdot\|_2$ . In that case, the polar inequality (2.5) then reduces to the well-known Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$\langle x, z \rangle \leq \|x\|_2 \cdot \|z\|_2,$$

which holds as an equation if and only if  $x$  and  $z$  are aligned in the usual sense: there exists a nonnegative scalar  $\alpha$  such that  $x = \alpha z$ . Our notion of alignment captures other important special cases, including the Hölder inequality, which is a special case of (2.5) in which  $\mathcal{A}$  is the unit  $p$ -norm ball, with  $p \in [1, \infty]$ .




Figure 2.1: The set of atoms in the set  $\mathcal{A}$  generally (but not necessarily) defines the boundary of the convex hull  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ . The essential atoms  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$  exposed by a vector  $z$  lie on the supporting hyperplane  $\{x \mid \langle x, z \rangle = \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z)\}$ .

A rich convex geometry underlies this general notion of alignment, and plays a role in identifying the atoms important for the decomposition (2.2). Suppose that a vector  $z$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -aligned with  $x$ . As we will demonstrate, all atoms  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  that participate significantly in a decomposition of  $x$  must be contained in the set of exposed atoms, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z) := \{a \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{0\} \mid \langle a, z \rangle = \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z)\}. \quad (2.6)$$

Note that the convex hull of the exposed set  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$  forms a face of  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  exposed by the vector  $z$ . Because all of the atoms  $a \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$  necessarily have unit gauge value, i.e.,  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(a) = 1$ , the condition  $\langle a, z \rangle = \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$  then implies that significant atoms must also be  $\mathcal{A}$ -aligned with  $z$ . Figure 2.1 presents a visualization of this concept.

## 2.2 Examples

There are many varieties of atomic sets and recognizable convex regularizers used to obtain sparse decompositions. Chandrasekaran et al. [4] and Jaggi [26] both give extensive lists of atoms and the norms that they induce, as well as their applications in practice. Here we provide several simple examples that illustrate the variety of ways in which vectors can be aligned.

**Example 2.3** (One norm). Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{\pm e_1, \dots, \pm e_n\}$  be the signed standard basis vectors. This atomic set induces the 1-norm, which is the canonical example of a sparsifying convex penalty, and is paired with its dual  $\infty$ -norm:

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \|x\|_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z) = \|z\|_{\infty}.$$

The polar inequality (2.5) reduces to Hölder's inequality for these norms—i.e.,  $\langle x, z \rangle \leq \|x\|_1 \cdot \|z\|_{\infty}$ . As is well known, this holds with equality—i.e.,  $x$  and  $z$  are  $\mathcal{A}$ -aligned—if and only if

$$x_i \neq 0 \implies \text{sign}(x_i)z_i = \max_j |z_j| \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Thus, alignment of the pair  $(x, z)$  with respect to the atomic set  $\mathcal{A}$  is equivalent to the statement that  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subset \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$ , with

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \{ \text{sign}(x_i)e_i \mid x_i \neq 0 \} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z) = \{ \text{sign}(z_i)e_i \mid |z_i| = \max_j |z_j| \}.$$

This condition also characterizes an optimality condition. For example, consider the LASSO [46] problem

$$\underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|x\|_1 \leq \tau,$$

where  $\tau$  is a non-negative parameter. It is straightforward to verify that  $x$  is optimal if and only if  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subset \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$  where  $z = A^T(b - Ax)$  is the negative gradient of the objective. Section 5 describes in more detail the connection between optimality and alignment.  $\square$

**Example 2.4** (Nuclear norm). The nuclear norm, or Schatten 1-norm, of a matrix is the spectral analog to the vector 1-norm. The nuclear norm and its dual spectral norm can be obtained via the atomic set  $\mathcal{A} = \{ uv^T \mid \|u\|_2 = \|v\|_2 = 1 \}$  of normalized  $n$ -by- $m$  rank-1 matrices. Then for matrices  $X$  and  $Z$ ,

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(X) = \|X\|_* \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(Z) = \sigma_{\max}(Z).$$

These are, respectively, the nuclear and spectral norms of  $X$  and  $Z$ —i.e., the sum of singular values of  $X$  and the maximum singular value of  $Z$ . The atomic description of these functions is consistent with the notion that the nuclear norm is a convex function that promotes low rank (e.g., sparsity with respect to rank-1 matrices) [41]. Define the trace inner product  $\langle X, Z \rangle := \text{tr } X^T Z$ . The alignment condition  $\langle X, Z \rangle = \|X\|_* \cdot \|Z\|_{\infty}$  holds when  $X$  and  $Z$  have a simultaneously ordered singular value decomposition (SVD). In particular, if  $X$  is rank  $r$ , then

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i u_i v_i^T \quad \text{and} \quad Z = \sum_{i=1}^{\min\{m,n\}} s_i u_i v_i^T$$

are the SVDs of  $X$  and  $Z$ , where the singular values are ordered as

$$c_1 \geq \dots \geq c_r > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad s_1 = \dots = s_d > s_{d+1} \geq \dots \geq s_{\min\{m,n\}} \geq 0.$$

By this description,

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(X) = \{ u_1 v_1^T, \dots, u_r v_r^T \} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(Z) = \{ u_1 v_1^T, \dots, u_d v_d^T \}.$$

The inclusion (2.6), which identifies the support as a subset of the exposed atoms, implies  $d \geq r$ . Thus, the singular vectors of  $Z$  corresponding to the  $d$  singular values  $s_1, \dots, s_d$  contain the singular values of  $X$ . Note that this can also be proven as a consequence of von Neumann's trace inequality [32, 48]. This property is used by Friedlander et al. [17] for the construction of dual methods for low-rank semidefinite optimization.  $\square$

**Example 2.5** (Linear subspaces). Suppose that the set of atoms  $\mathcal{A}$  contains all the elements of a linear subspace  $\mathcal{L}$ . In this case, the gauge  $\gamma_{\mathcal{L}}(x)$  is finite only if  $x$  is in  $\mathcal{L}$ , and similarly,

the support function  $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(z)$  is finite only if  $z$  is in its orthogonal complement  $\mathcal{L}^\perp$ . In particular, because  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^\perp$  are cones,

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{L}}(x) = \delta_{\mathcal{L}}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(z) = \delta_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}(z),$$

where  $\delta_{\mathcal{C}}(v)$  is the indicator to a set  $\mathcal{C}$ , which evaluates to 0 if  $v \in \mathcal{C}$  and to  $+\infty$  otherwise. The respective domains of the gauge and support functions are thus  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^\perp$ . It follows that, under the atomic set  $\mathcal{L}$ , the vectors  $x$  and  $z$  are  $\mathcal{L}$ -aligned if and only if  $x \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $z \in \mathcal{L}^\perp$ . Thus, the aligned vectors are orthogonal.  $\square$

### 2.3 Applications and prior work

One of the main implications of our approach is its usefulness in using dual methods for discovering atomic decompositions. A dual optimization method can be interpreted as solving for an aligning vector  $z$  that exposes the support of a primal solution  $x$ . If the number of exposed atoms is small, a solution  $x$  of the primal problem can be resolved over the reduced support, but without the atomic regularization, which may be computationally much cheaper [15] or better conditioned [36]. Alternatively, two-metric methods can be designed to act differently on a primal iterate’s suspected support [20]. In many applications, such as feature selection, knowing the support itself may be sufficient. The conditions under which such a  $z$  can often be found occurs in several applications, as we describe with various examples throughout the paper.

**Machine learning** The regularized optimization problem described in Section 5 frequently appear in applications of machine learning for the purpose of model complexity reduction. The most popular use cases are the vector 1-norm  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \|x\|_1$  in feature selection [47], its group-norm variant [25], and the nuclear norm  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(X) = \|X\|_*$  in matrix completion [41]. However, many other sparsity-promoting regularizers appear in practice [53]. Although the unconstrained formulation is most popular, particularly when the proximal operator is computationally convenient [39], the gauge-constrained formulation is frequently used and solved via the conditional gradient method [12, 14, 26]. Popular dual methods, which iterate over a dual variable  $z^{(k)} \equiv -\nabla f(x^{(k)})$  but maintain the corresponding primal variable  $x^{(k)}$  only implicitly, include bundle methods [31] and dual averaging [11, 51].

**Linear conic optimization** Conic programs are a cornerstone of convex optimization. The nonnegative cone  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ , the second-order cone  $\mathcal{Q}_+^{n+1} = \{(x, \tau) \mid \|x\|_2 \leq \tau\}$ , and the semidefinite cone  $\mathcal{S}_+^n = \{X \mid u^T X u \geq 0 \ \forall u\}$ , respectively, give rise to linear, second-order, and semidefinite programs. These problem classes capture an enormous range of important models, and can be solved efficiently by a variety of algorithms, including interior methods [28, 37, 42]. Conic programs and their associated solvers are key ingredients for general purpose optimization software packages such as YALMIP [33] and CVX [22]. The alignment conditions for these specific cones have been exploited in dual methods, such as in the spectral bundle method for large-scale semidefinite programming [23]. Example 3.6 demonstrates this alignment principle in the context of conic optimization.

**Gauge optimization** The class of gauge optimization problems, as defined by Freund’s 1987 seminal work [16], can be simply stated: find the element of a convex set that is minimal with respect to a gauge. These conceptually simple problems appear in a remarkable array of applications, and include parts of sparse optimization and all of conic optimization [18, Example 1.3]. This class of optimization problems admits a duality relationship different from classical Lagrange duality, and is founded on the polar inequality. In this context, the polar inequality provides an analogue to weak duality, well-known in Lagrange duality, which guarantees that any feasible primal value provides an upper bound for any feasible dual value. In the gauge optimization context, a primal-dual pair  $(x, z)$  is optimal if and only if the polar inequality holds as an equation, which under Definition 2.2 implies that  $x$  and  $z$  are aligned. The connection between polar alignment and optimality is discussed further in Section 5.2.

**Two-stage methods** In sparse optimization, two-stage methods first identify the primal variable support, and then solve the problem over a reduced support [8, 29]. If the support is sparse enough, the second problem may be computationally much cheaper, either because it allows for faster Newton-like methods, or because of better conditioning [36]. The atomic alignment principles we describe in Section 4 give a general recipe for extracting primal variable support from a computed dual variable, which at optimality is aligned with the primal variable; see Section 5. This property forms the basis for our approach to morphological component analysis, described in Section 6.1.4.

### 3 Alignment with respect to general convex sets

The alignment principles we develop depend on basic notions of convex sets and their supporting hyperplanes. Gauges and support functions, defined in (2.4), facilitate many of the needed derivations. Define the conic extension of any set  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  by

$$\text{cone } \mathcal{D} = \{ \alpha d \mid d \in \mathcal{D}, \alpha \geq 0 \}.$$

Throughout the paper, we use the symbol  $\mathcal{C}$  to denote a general convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The following blanket assumption, which holds throughout the paper, ensures a desirable symmetry between a set and its polar, as explained in Section 3.1. This assumption considerably simplifies our analysis and fortunately holds for many of the most important and relevant examples.

**Assumption 3.1** (Origin containment). *The set  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is closed convex and contains the origin.*

#### 3.1 Polarity

Our notion of alignment is based on the polarity of convex sets. Polarity is most intuitive in the context of convex cones, which are convex sets closed under positive scaling, i.e., the set  $\mathcal{K}$  is a convex cone if  $\alpha \mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{K}$  for all  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\mathcal{K} + \mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{K}$ . Its polar

$$\mathcal{K}^\circ = \{ z \mid \langle x, z \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall x \in \mathcal{K} \} \tag{3.1}$$

is also a convex cone, and its vectors make an oblique angle (i.e., a nonpositive inner product) with every vector in  $\mathcal{K}$ . For a general convex set  $\mathcal{C}$ , its polar is defined as the convex set

$$\mathcal{C}^\circ = \{ z \mid \langle x, z \rangle \leq 1 \ \forall x \in \mathcal{C} \}. \quad (3.2)$$

One way to connect the polarity definitions (3.1) and (3.2) is by “lifting” the set  $\mathcal{C}$  and its polar  $\mathcal{C}^\circ$  and embedding them into opposing cones in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ :

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{C}} := \text{cone}(\mathcal{C} \times \{1\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{C}^\circ} := \text{cone}(\mathcal{C}^\circ \times \{-1\}).$$

Then for any nonzero  $(n+1)$ -vectors  $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{K}^\circ$ , there exist positive scalars  $\alpha_x$  and  $\alpha_z$ , and vectors  $x \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $z \in \mathcal{C}^\circ$ , such that

$$\langle \bar{x}, \bar{z} \rangle = \left\langle \alpha_x \begin{pmatrix} x \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \alpha_z \begin{pmatrix} z \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = \alpha_x \cdot \alpha_z (\langle x, z \rangle - 1) \leq 0, \quad (3.3)$$

where the last inequality follows from the polar definition in (3.2). This last inequality confirms that the cones  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}$  are polar to each other under definition (3.1).

The blanket assumption that  $\mathcal{C}$  is closed and contains the origin (Assumption 3.1) yields a special symmetry because then the polar  $\mathcal{C}^\circ$  also contains the origin and  $\mathcal{C}^{\circ\circ} = \mathcal{C}$  [43, Theorem 14.5]. This is one of the reasons why we define  $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = \text{conv}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{0\})$  to include the origin.

The polar pair  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C}^\circ$  can be said to generate the corresponding gauge and support functions  $\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ , as we show below. It follows immediately from (2.4) that the gauge and support functions are positively homogeneous, i.e.,  $\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(\alpha x) = \alpha \gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x)$  for all  $\alpha \geq 0$ , and similarly for  $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ . Thus the epigraphs for these functions are convex cones. Moreover, the unit level sets for these functions are the sets that define them:

$$\mathcal{C} = \{ x \mid \gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \leq 1 \} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}^\circ = \{ z \mid \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(z) \leq 1 \}. \quad (3.4)$$

It thus follows that

$$\text{epi } \gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \text{cone}(\mathcal{C} \times \{1\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{epi } \sigma_{\mathcal{C}} = \text{cone}(\mathcal{C}^\circ \times \{1\}). \quad (3.5)$$

Figure 3.1 shows a visualization of the epigraph of the gauge to  $\mathcal{C}$ .

For a set  $\mathcal{C}$ , the recession cone contains the set of unbounded directions:

$$\text{rec } \mathcal{C} := \{ d \mid x + \lambda d \in \mathcal{C} \text{ for every } \lambda \geq 0 \text{ and } x \in \mathcal{C} \}. \quad (3.6)$$

See Figure 3.2 for an illustration. Vectors in the recession cone can also be thought of as “horizon points” of  $\mathcal{C}$  [43, p. 60]. With respect to the gauge and support functions to the set  $\mathcal{C}$ , vectors  $u \in \text{rec } \mathcal{C}$  have the property that  $\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(u) = 0$  and  $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(u) = +\infty$ ; see Proposition 3.2. We must therefore be prepared to consider cases where these functions can take on infinite values. Far from being a nuisance, this property is useful in modelling important cases in optimization.

The following proposition collects standard results regarding gauge and support functions and establishes the polarity correspondence between these two functions. The proofs of these claims can be found in standard texts, notably Rockafellar [43] and Hiriart-Urruty and Lemarechal [24]. These proofs typically rely on properties of conjugate functions. Because our overall theoretical development does not require conjugacy, we provide self-contained proofs that depend only on properties of closed convex sets.






Figure 3.1: The epigraph of the gauge  $\gamma_C$  is the cone in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$  generated by the set  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ; see (3.5).

**Proposition 3.2** (Properties of gauges and support functions). *Let  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a closed convex set that contains the origin, and  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be an arbitrary set. The following statements hold.*

- a) (Closure and convex hull)  $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}} = \sigma_{\text{cl conv } \mathcal{D}}$ .
- b) (Polarity)  $\gamma_C = \sigma_{C^\circ}$ .
- c) (Linear transformation) For a linear operator  $M$  with adjoint  $M^*$ ,

$$\gamma_{M^{-1}C}(x) = \gamma_C(Mx), \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{MC}(z) = \sigma_C(M^*z),$$

where we interpret  $M^{-1}C = \{x \mid Mx \in C\}$  and  $MC = \{Mx \mid x \in C\}$ .

- d) (Scaling)  $\alpha\gamma_C = \gamma_{\frac{1}{\alpha}C}$  and  $\alpha\sigma_C = \sigma_{\alpha C}$  for all  $\alpha > 0$ .
- e) (Domains)  $\text{dom } \gamma_C = \text{cone } C$  and  $\text{dom } \sigma_C = (\text{rec } C)^\circ$ .
- f) (Bijection)  $C = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle x, z \rangle \leq \sigma_C(z) \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ .
- g) (Subdifferential)  $\partial\sigma_C(z) = \{x \in C \mid \langle x, z \rangle = \sigma_C(z)\}$ .
- h) (Recession cones)  $\gamma_C(x) = 0$  if and only if  $x \in \text{rec } C$ .

*Proof.* (a) Because  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \text{cl conv } \mathcal{D}$ , it follows that  $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(z) \leq \sigma_{\text{cl conv } \mathcal{D}}(z)$  for all  $z$ . Hence it is sufficient to prove that  $\sigma_{\text{cl conv } \mathcal{D}}(z) \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(z)$  for all  $z$ . Fix any  $d \in \text{cl conv } \mathcal{D}$  and choose an arbitrary sequence  $\{d_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \text{conv } \mathcal{D}$  such that  $d_k \rightarrow d$ . Each element of the sequence  $\{d_k\}$  is a convex combination of points in  $\mathcal{D}$ , and so it follows that  $\langle d_k, z \rangle \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(z)$  for all  $k$  and  $z$ . Since  $d_k \rightarrow d$  and  $\langle d_k, z \rangle \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(z)$  for all  $n$ , it follows that  $\langle d, z \rangle \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(z)$ . But  $d$  is arbitrary, and so we can conclude that  $\sigma_{\text{cl conv } \mathcal{D}}(z) \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(z)$ .

- (b) The gauge to  $\mathcal{C}^\circ$  (see (2.4)) can be expressed as  $\gamma_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}(x) = \inf \{ \lambda > 0 \mid \lambda^{-1}x \in \mathcal{C}^\circ \}$ . Thus, from the definition of the polar set (3.2),

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}(x) &= \inf \{ \lambda > 0 \mid \langle \lambda^{-1}x, y \rangle \leq 1, \forall y \in \mathcal{C} \} \\ &= \left[ \sup \{ \mu > 0 \mid \langle \mu x, y \rangle \leq 1, \forall y \in \mathcal{C} \} \right]^{-1} \\ &= \left[ \sup \{ \mu > 0 \mid \langle x, y \rangle \leq \mu^{-1}, \forall y \in \mathcal{C} \} \right]^{-1} \\ &= \sup_{y \in \mathcal{C}} \langle x, y \rangle = \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(x).\end{aligned}$$

- (c) From the Minkowski functional expression for the gauge function,

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(Mx) &= \inf \{ \lambda \mid Mx \in \lambda \mathcal{C} \} \\ &= \inf \{ \lambda \mid x \in M^{-1}(\lambda \mathcal{C}) \} \\ &= \inf \{ \lambda \mid x \in \lambda M^{-1}\mathcal{C} \} = \gamma_{M^{-1}\mathcal{C}}(x).\end{aligned}$$

Also, from the definition of the adjoint of a linear operator,

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{M\mathcal{C}}(z) &= \sup \{ \langle Mx, z \rangle \mid x \in \mathcal{C} \} \\ &= \sup \{ \langle x, M^*z \rangle \mid x \in \mathcal{C} \} = \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(M^*z).\end{aligned}$$

- (d) By defining  $M = \alpha$ , the proof follows directly from Proposition 3.2(c).  
(e) It follows from the definition of the domain that  $\text{dom } \gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \text{cone } \mathcal{C}$ . So we only need to show that  $\text{dom } \sigma_{\mathcal{C}} = (\text{rec } \mathcal{C})^\circ$ . First we show that  $\text{dom } \sigma_{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq (\text{rec } \mathcal{C})^\circ$ . For any  $x \in \text{dom } \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ , the support  $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(x)$  is finite. Thus for any  $d \in \text{rec } \mathcal{C}$ ,

$$\langle c + \lambda d, x \rangle < \infty, \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{C}, \lambda \geq 0;$$

see (3.6). It follows that  $\langle d, x \rangle \leq 0$ , and thus  $x \in (\text{rec } \mathcal{C})^\circ$ . For the other direction, instead we will show that  $(\text{dom } \sigma_{\mathcal{C}})^\circ \subseteq \text{rec } \mathcal{C}$ . Assume  $x \in (\text{dom } \sigma_{\mathcal{C}})^\circ$ , then for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,  $y \in \text{dom } \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ , we have

$$\langle c + \lambda x, y \rangle = \langle c, y \rangle + \lambda \langle x, y \rangle \leq \langle c, y \rangle \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(y).$$

Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is a closed convex set, we can conclude that  $c + \lambda x \in \mathcal{C}$ , for all  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\lambda \geq 0$ . Therefore,  $x \in \text{rec } \mathcal{C}$ .

- (f) Let  $\mathcal{D} = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle x, z \rangle \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(z) \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^n \}$ . By the definition of support function, it can be easily shown that  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ . So we only need to prove that  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . Assume there is some  $x \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $x \notin \mathcal{C}$ . Then by the separating hyperplane theorem, there exists  $s \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$\langle s, x \rangle > \sup \{ \langle s, y \rangle \mid y \in \mathcal{C} \} = \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(s).$$

This leads to a contradiction. Therefore, we can conclude that  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{D}$ .

(g) Let  $\mathcal{D} = \{x \in \mathcal{C} \mid \langle x, z \rangle = \sigma_c(z)\}$ . First, we show that  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \partial\sigma_c(z)$ . Assume  $x \in \mathcal{D}$ , then for any  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\sigma_c(w) \geq \langle x, w \rangle = \sigma_c(z) + \langle x, w - z \rangle.$$

Thus,  $x \in \partial\sigma_c(z)$ . Next, we prove that  $\partial\sigma_c(z) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ . Assume  $x \in \partial\sigma_c(z)$ , then

$$\sigma_c(w) \geq \sigma_c(z) + \langle x, w - z \rangle, \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (3.7)$$

By the subadditivity of support functions, we must have

$$\sigma_c(z) + \sigma_c(w - z) \geq \sigma_c(w), \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (3.8)$$

It then follows from (3.7) and (3.8) that  $\sigma_c(v) \geq \langle x, v \rangle$  for all  $v$ . By part (d), we can thus conclude that  $x \in \mathcal{C}$ . Now let  $w = 0$  in (3.7), it follows that  $\langle x, z \rangle \geq \sigma_c(z)$ . Therefore, it follows that  $\langle x, z \rangle = \sigma_c(z)$  and thus  $x \in \mathcal{D}$ .

(h) First, assume  $\gamma_c(x) = 0$ . Then for any  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,

$$\gamma_c(\hat{x} + \lambda x) \leq \gamma_c(\hat{x}) + \lambda \gamma_c(x) = \gamma_c(\hat{x}).$$

It follows that  $\hat{x} + \lambda x \in \mathcal{C}$  and therefore  $x \in \text{rec}\mathcal{C}$ . Next, assume  $x \in \text{rec}\mathcal{C}$ . Then by the definition of recession cone, we have  $\lambda x \in \mathcal{C}$  for all  $\lambda \geq 0$ , which implies  $\gamma_c(x) = 0$ .  $\square$

### 3.2 Exposed faces

A face  $\mathcal{F}_c$  of a convex set  $\mathcal{C}$  is a subset with the property that for all elements  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  both in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and for all  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\theta x_1 + (1 - \theta)x_2 \in \mathcal{F}_c \iff x_1 \in \mathcal{F}_c \text{ and } x_2 \in \mathcal{F}_c.$$

Note that the face must itself be convex. A particular face  $\mathcal{F}_c(d)$  is *exposed* by a direction  $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$  if the face is contained in the supporting hyperplane with normal  $d$ :

$$\mathcal{F}_c(d) = \{c \in \mathcal{C} \mid \langle c, d \rangle = \sigma_c(d)\} = \partial\sigma_c(d), \quad (3.9)$$

where the second equality follows from [Proposition 3.2\(g\)](#). The elements of the exposed face  $\mathcal{F}_c(d)$  are thus precisely those elements of  $\mathcal{C}$  that achieve the supremum for  $\sigma_c(d)$ .

In [Section 4](#) we will consider atomic sets that are not convex. In that case, the exposed face of the convex hull of those atoms coincides with the convex hull of the exposed atoms. In particular, if  $\mathcal{A} = \{a_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  is any collection of atoms and  $\mathcal{C} = \text{conv}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{0\})$ , then

$$\mathcal{F}_c(d) = \text{conv } \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(d).$$

It follows from positive homogeneity of the support function  $\sigma_c$  that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha c}(d) = \alpha \mathcal{F}_c(d) \text{ and } \mathcal{F}_c(\alpha d) = \mathcal{F}_c(d) \quad \forall \alpha > 0. \quad (3.10)$$

For nonpolyhedral sets, it is possible that some faces may not be exposed [[43](#), p. 163].

### 3.3 Alignment characterization

The definition of alignment in [Definition 2.2](#) rests on the tightness of the polar inequality (2.5). In this section we tie the alignment condition to a more geometric concept based on exposed faces, which uncovers the dual relationship between a pair of aligned vectors. We proceed in two steps. First, we characterize alignment for a pair of vectors that are in the unit level sets, respectively, for a gauge and its polar. Second, we generalize this result to any vectors in the respective domains.

**Proposition 3.3** (Normalized alignment). *For any elements  $x \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $z \in \mathcal{C}^\circ$ , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- a)  $\langle x, z \rangle = 1$ ,
- b)  $z \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}(x)$ ,
- c)  $x \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(z)$ .

Moreover, these statements imply that  $x \in \text{bnd } \mathcal{C}$  and  $z \in \text{bnd } \mathcal{C}^\circ$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that (a) holds. By the definition (3.2) of the polar set  $\mathcal{C}^\circ$ ,

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}(x) = \sup \{ \langle x, u \rangle \mid u \in \mathcal{C}^\circ \} \leq 1 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Then (a) implies that  $z$  achieves the supremum above, and so by (3.9), this holds if and only if  $z \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}(x)$ . Thus (b) holds. The fact that (b) implies (a) follows by simply reversing this chain of arguments.

To prove that (a) is equivalent to (c), we only need to use the assumption that  $\mathcal{C}$  is closed and contains the origin, and hence that  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^{\circ\circ}$ . This allows us to reuse the arguments above by exchanging the roles of  $x$  and  $z$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C}^\circ$ .  $\square$

The following corollary characterizes the general alignment condition without assuming that the vector pair  $(x, z)$  is normalized.

**Corollary 3.4** (Alignment). *Let  $x \in \text{cone } \mathcal{C}$  and  $z \in \text{cone } \mathcal{C}^\circ$  be any two vectors. The pair  $(x, z)$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned if any of the following equivalent conditions holds:*

- a)  $\langle x, z \rangle = \gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(z)$ ,
- b)  $z \in \text{cone } \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}(x) + \text{rec } \mathcal{C}^\circ$ ,
- c)  $x \in \text{cone } \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(z) + \text{rec } \mathcal{C}$ .

*Proof.* First suppose that  $\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x)$  and  $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(z)$  are positive. Then the equivalence of the statements follows by applying [Proposition 3.3](#) to the normalized pair of vectors  $\hat{x} := x/\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x)$  and  $\hat{z} := z/\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(z)$ . In that case Part 1 follows immediately after multiplying  $\langle \hat{x}, \hat{z} \rangle = 1$  by the quantity  $\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(z)$ . Parts 2 and 3 follow from the fact that for any convex set  $\mathcal{D}$  and any vector  $d$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(d) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha d)$  for any positive scalar  $\alpha$ ; see (3.10).

We now show equivalence of the statements in the case where  $\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) = 0$ . By [Proposition 3.2\(h\)](#), this holds if and only if  $x \in \text{rec } \mathcal{C}$ , but not in  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(z)$ . Thus Part 3 holds. But




Figure 3.2: The contours of the gauge function of  $\mathcal{C}$  (left) and of  $\mathcal{C}^\circ$  (right). All vectors  $x$  in the recession cone of  $\mathcal{C}$  have gauge value  $\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) = 0$ . A vector  $x_1$  can only be  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned with another vector  $z_1$  if they are orthogonal to each and each is an extreme ray, respectively, of  $\text{rec } \mathcal{C}$  and  $\text{dom } \gamma_{\mathcal{C}^\circ} = (\text{rec } \mathcal{C})^\circ$ . Each of the pairs  $(x_1, z_1)$  and  $(x_2, z_2)$  are  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned.

because  $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(z)$  is finite,  $x$  and  $z$  together satisfy  $\langle x, z \rangle = 0$ . Thus, Part 1 holds. To show that Part 2 holds, notice that  $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}(x) = \gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) = 0$ , and so by (3.9),

$$\text{cone } \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}(x) = \{ u \mid \langle x, u \rangle = 0 \},$$

which certainly contains  $z$ . Thus, Part 2 holds. The case with  $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(z) = 0$  follows using the same symmetric argument used in the proof of Proposition 3.3.  $\square$

Relative to Proposition 3.3, this last result is most interesting when one of the elements in the aligned pair  $(x, z)$  belongs to the recession cones of  $\mathcal{C}$  or its polar  $\mathcal{C}^\circ$ . In that case, the alignment condition in Corollary 3.4(a) requires the vectors to be orthogonal, i.e.,  $\langle x, z \rangle = 0$ . But if  $x \in \text{rec } \mathcal{C}$ , the requirement that  $z$  is in the polar  $(\text{rec } \mathcal{C})^\circ$  implies that  $x$  and  $z$  are extreme rays of their respective recession cones that are orthogonal to each other. This situation is illustrated in Figure 3.2.

**Example 3.5** (Convex cones). Suppose that  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{K}$  is a cone. Because a cone is its own recession cone,  $\text{rec } \mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}$ . Then for any pair  $(x, z)$  that is  $\mathcal{K}$ -aligned, Corollary 3.4 asserts

$$\langle x, z \rangle = 0 \iff x \in \mathcal{K} \iff z \in \mathcal{K}^\circ.$$

This assertion effectively generalizes Example 2.5, which made the same assertion for linear subspaces.

For convex cones, we thus see that alignment is equivalent to orthogonality. This principle applies to general convex sets  $\mathcal{C}$  using the lifting technique described in Section 3.1. Take any pair  $(x, z) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}^\circ$  that is  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned, which implies  $\langle x, z \rangle = 1$ . Then  $\bar{x} := (x, 1) \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\bar{z} := (z, -1) \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}$ , and

$$\langle \bar{x}, \bar{z} \rangle = \langle x, z \rangle - 1 = 0.$$

This coincides with tightness of the inequality (3.3), which characterizes polarity of cones.  $\square$

The next example shows how the alignment property is connected to complementarity in conic programming [2, Section 5.3.6]. Section 5 explores a more general connection between alignment and optimality in convex optimization.




Figure 3.3: Any vector  $(s, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$  can be decomposed into orthogonal components in the cones generated by a convex set  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and its polar. The components of the decomposition  $s = \alpha_x x + \alpha_z z$  are  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned.

**Example 3.6** (Alignment as optimality in conic optimization). Consider the pair of dual linear conic optimization problems

$$\begin{array}{ll} \underset{x}{\text{minimize}} & \langle c, x \rangle \\ \text{subject to} & Fx = b, \quad x \in \mathcal{K}, \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ll} \underset{y, z}{\text{maximize}} & \langle b, y \rangle \\ \text{subject to} & F^T y - z = c, \quad z \in \mathcal{K}^\circ, \end{array}$$

where  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is a linear operator,  $(b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$  are arbitrary vectors, and  $\mathcal{K}^\circ$  is the polar cone of  $\mathcal{K}$ .

The feasible triple  $(x, y, z)$  is optimal if strong duality holds, i.e.,

$$0 = \langle c, x \rangle - \langle b, y \rangle = \langle F^T y - z, x \rangle - \langle Fx, y \rangle = \langle x, z \rangle.$$

But because  $x \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $z \in \mathcal{K}^\circ$ , it follows from [Example 3.5](#) that  $x$  and  $z$  are  $\mathcal{K}$ -aligned.  $\square$

### 3.4 Alignment as orthogonal decomposition

The Moreau decomposition for cones [\[24, Theorem 3.2.5\]](#) can be used to separate an arbitrary vector into components that are aligned with respect to any convex set  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Every element, respectively, in  $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}$  is a nonnegative multiple of  $(x, 1)$  and  $(z, -1)$  for some vectors  $x \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $z \in \mathcal{C}^\circ$ . Thus, for any vector  $(s, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ , Moreau's decomposition implies unique nonnegative scalars  $\alpha_x$  and  $\alpha_z$  such that

$$(s, \alpha) = \text{proj}_{\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{C}}(s, \alpha) + \text{proj}_{\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{C}^\circ}}(s, \alpha) = \alpha_x(x, 1) + \alpha_z(z, -1).$$

Orthogonality of the decomposition implies  $\alpha_x \cdot \alpha_z (\langle x, z \rangle - 1) = 0$ . Then the pair of vectors  $\hat{x} = \alpha_x x$  and  $\hat{z} = \alpha_z z$  are  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned because

$$\langle \hat{x}, \hat{z} \rangle = \alpha_x \cdot \alpha_z$$

and their corresponding gauge and support values are  $\alpha_x = \gamma_\mathcal{C}(\hat{x})$  and  $\alpha_z = \sigma_\mathcal{C}(\hat{z})$ . See [Figure 3.3](#).

## 4 Alignment with respect to atomic sets

The discussion in [Section 3](#) applies to any convex set, and used the symbol  $\mathcal{C}$  to refer to such general sets. We now turn our attention to properties of gauges and support functions generated by atomic sets  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  not necessarily convex. As we did with [\(2.4\)](#), we thus adopt the notation

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}} := \gamma_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}, \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{A}} := \sigma_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}} := \mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}.$$

### 4.1 Atomic decomposition

Two different expressions are given in [\(2.2\)](#) and [\(2.4\)](#) for a gauge function  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$ . The next result highlights the decomposition implicit in the Minkowski functional to an atomic set. This decomposition allows us to establish other useful results that involve only the atomic set, rather than its convex hull, as in [Section 3](#). This equivalence is used by Chandrasekaran [\[4\]](#) and others.

**Proposition 4.1** (Gauge equivalence). *For any set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}} := \text{conv}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{0\})$ , the following equivalence holds:*

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) := \inf \{ \lambda \geq 0 \mid x \in \lambda \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \} = \inf_{c_a} \left\{ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c_a \mid x = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c_a a, \ c_a \geq 0 \ \forall a \in \mathcal{A} \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

*Proof.* Take any  $x \in \text{cone } \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ , since otherwise the sets above are empty, and by convention, both expressions have infinite value. Then, because we can exclude a convex combination of the elements of  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf \{ \lambda \geq 0 \mid x \in \lambda \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \} &= \inf_{\lambda, \bar{c}_a} \left\{ \lambda \geq 0 \mid x = \lambda \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \bar{c}_a a, \ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \bar{c}_a = 1, \ \bar{c}_a \geq 0 \ \forall a \in \mathcal{A} \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\lambda, c_a} \left\{ \lambda \mid x = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c_a a, \ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c_a = \lambda, \ c_a \geq 0 \ \forall a \in \mathcal{A} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which, after eliminating  $\lambda$ , yields the required equivalence shown in [\(4.1\)](#).  $\square$

Some atomic sets, such as the set of rank-1 outer products used to define the nuclear-norm ball (cf. [Example 2.4](#)), may be uncountably infinite. However, when  $x \in \text{cone } \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ , the gauge value is always finite and the sum  $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c_a$  necessarily converges to a finite value. This “sum form” of the gauge function is useful because it provides a “one-norm-like” interpretation of gauges in terms of the minimal conic decomposition  $\{c_a a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$ , which further suggests that gauges are the natural promoters of atomic sparsity.

**Proposition 4.2** (Finite support). *For any point  $x \in \text{cone } \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ , a finite support set  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \in \text{supp}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  always exists.*

*Proof.* If  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = 0$ , the assertion is trivially true, since the empty set is the only element of  $\text{supp}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ . Now suppose  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) > 0$ , and define the normalized vector  $\widehat{x} = x/\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ . Then  $\widehat{x} \in \text{cl conv } \mathcal{A}$ , and  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(\widehat{x}) = 1$ . By Carathéory’s Theorem [\[43, Theorem 17.1\]](#), there exists a

finite convex decomposition of  $\hat{x}$  in terms of at most  $n + 1$  atoms in  $\mathcal{A}$ . That is, there exists a set  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{A}$  with  $n + 1$  elements such that

$$\hat{x} = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{c}_a a, \quad \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{c}_a = 1, \quad \hat{c}_a > 0, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Taking  $c_a = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \hat{c}_a$  for each  $a \in \mathcal{S}$  gives a solution to the equations in (2.3), showing that  $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbf{supp}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ .  $\square$

The support may not be unique, even if it is minimal, e.g., there exist no other supports with smaller cardinality.

**Example 4.3** (Non-uniqueness). Consider the atomic set  $\mathcal{A} = \{(\pm 1, \pm 1, 1)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ . The point  $x = (0, 0, 2)$  can be expressed in at least three different ways,

$$\begin{aligned} x &= (1, 1, 1) + (-1, -1, 1) \\ &= (1, -1, 1) + (-1, 1, 1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[(1, 1, 1) + (-1, -1, 1) + (1, -1, 1) + (-1, 1, 1)], \end{aligned}$$

all of which give gauge value  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = 2$ . In this case, we write

$$\mathbf{supp}_{\mathcal{A}} \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \left\{ \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}, \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \right\}.$$

Any element of  $\mathbf{supp}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  is a valid support set of  $x$  with respect to the atomic set  $\mathcal{A}$ . However, for functions commonly used to promote sparsity, often the support set is always unique.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.1** establishes that the gauge value  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  of a vector  $x$  yields a conical decomposition whose coefficient sum is minimal. If another vector  $v$  can be conically decomposed as a subset of the atoms of  $x$ , then the support for  $v$  is a subset of the support of  $x$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(v) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ . This is established in the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.4** (Same support sets). *Suppose that  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  is a support set for some vector  $x \in \text{cone } \mathcal{A}$  with  $\gamma(x) > 0$ . Then any vector  $v$  that has a valid conic decomposition in terms of the support  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ , i.e.,*

$$v = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} c_a a, \quad c_a \geq 0, \tag{4.2}$$

*has gauge value*

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(v) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} c_a.$$

*Proof.* Suppose, by way of contradiction, that there exists a conic decomposition of  $v$  with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  that is not given by (4.2), i.e.,

$$v = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c'_a a, \quad c'_a \geq 0, \quad \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c'_a < \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} c_a.$$



Because  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  is the support set of  $x$ , there exist positive coefficients  $\widehat{c}_a$  where

$$x = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} \widehat{c}_a a, \quad \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} \widehat{c}_a.$$

But a valid decomposition of  $x$  is

$$x = \beta v + x - \beta v = \beta \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c'_a a + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} (\widehat{c}_a - \beta c_a) a,$$

where we pick  $\beta = [\min_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} \widehat{c}_a] / [\max_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} c_a]$  to guarantee that all the coefficients are nonnegative. Then by definition of gauges,

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} \widehat{c}_a \leq \beta \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c'_a + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} (\widehat{c}_a - \beta c_a) \iff \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c'_a \geq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} c_a.$$

This implies that the decomposition of  $v$  with respect to  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  is in fact the *minimal* decomposition of  $v$  with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$ , and the sum of the coefficients indeed giving its gauge value.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5** (Support identification). *For any set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the elements  $x$  and  $z$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are  $\mathcal{A}$ -aligned if and only if  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$  for all  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \in \mathbf{supp}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ .*

*Proof.* First, we show that if  $x$  and  $z$  are  $\mathcal{A}$ -aligned, then  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$  for all  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \in \mathbf{supp}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ . Because the elements  $x$  and  $z$  are  $\mathcal{A}$ -aligned,

$$\langle x, z \rangle = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z). \quad (4.3)$$

Now suppose that  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) > 0$ . Then all support sets  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \in \mathbf{supp}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  are nonempty. Suppose that  $a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  but  $a \notin \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$ . We will show that this leads to a contradiction. By definition,  $a \notin \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$  implies that

$$\langle a, z \rangle < \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z). \quad (4.4)$$

Define  $v = x - c_a a$ , which is the vector that results from deleting the atom  $a$  from the support of  $x$ . Then by [Proposition 4.4](#),

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(v) = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) - c_a. \quad (4.5)$$

Thus,

$$\langle x, z \rangle \stackrel{(a)}{=} \underbrace{\langle v, z \rangle}_{\leq \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(v) \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z)} + \underbrace{c_a \langle a, z \rangle}_{< c_a \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z)} \stackrel{(b)}{<} (\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(v) + c_a) \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z) \stackrel{(c)}{=} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$$

where (a) follows by construction ( $x = v + c_a a$ ); (b) follows from the polar inequality [\(2.5\)](#) and assumption [\(4.4\)](#); and (c) follows from [\(4.5\)](#). But this contradicts [\(4.3\)](#), and therefore  $a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  implies  $a \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$ .

Now assume  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = 0$ . Then  $x \in \text{rec } \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathbf{supp}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  contains only the empty set. Since empty sets are also a subset of  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$  for any  $z$ , the statement is trivially true.

Next, we show that if  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$  for all  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \in \mathbf{supp}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ , then  $x$  and  $z$  are  $\mathcal{A}$ -aligned. By the definition of support set 2.3, we can assume that

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} c_a, \quad x = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} c_a a, \quad c_a > 0 \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x).$$

Then by Corollary 3.4, we only need to show that  $\langle x, z \rangle = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, z \rangle &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} c_a \langle a, z \rangle \\ &= \left( \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)} c_a \right) \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z) = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the assumption that  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$ .  $\square$

## 4.2 Examples

The general alignment result described by Corollary 3.4 includes the possibility that aligned vectors may contain elements from the recession cone of the atomic set. Elements in the recession cone may be interpreted as directions, rather than just points in the set. The presence of a non-trivial recession cone must be considered in practice, and is exhibited, for example, by all seminorms: these are nonnegative functions that behave like norms with the exception that they may be zero at nonzero points and are not necessarily symmetric. The next example describes a common atomic set that is composed by points and directions.

**Example 4.6** (Total variation). The anisotropic total-variation norm of an  $n$ -vector  $x$  is defined as

$$\|x\|_{\text{TV}} = \sum_{i=2}^n |x_i - x_{i-1}| = \|Dx\|_1, \quad D = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The matrix  $D$  has a 1-dimensional nullspace spanned by the constant vector of all ones  $e$ , and so  $De = 0$ . The TV norm is then a seminorm, and thus the atomic set must include a direction of recession, given by the range of  $e$ . Interestingly, the atomic set that induces this norm is not unique: for any matrix  $A = [a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}]$  where  $DA = I$ , the corresponding TV norm is the gauge with respect to the atoms

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\pm a_1, \dots, \pm a_{n-1}\} + \text{cone}(\pm e).$$

To see this, write

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i a_i + c_e e = Ac + c_e e$$

for some scalars  $c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}$  and  $c_e$ . (The scalars are not restricted to be nonnegative because the set of atoms includes vectors with both positive and negative signs.) Note that

the  $n - 1$  vectors  $a_i$  span  $\text{null}(e)$ , so the above decomposition always exists, with unique values for  $c_i$  and  $c_e$ . The solution to (2.3) thus determines the unique decomposition

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \underbrace{(s_i c_i)}_{c_a} \cdot \underbrace{(s_i a_i)}_a + c_e e, \quad s_i = \text{sign}(c_i),$$

where  $(s_i c_i)$  are the coefficients for the atoms  $(s_i a_i) \in \mathcal{A}$ , and  $c_e$  is the coefficient for the recession direction  $e$ . Then

$$\|Dx\|_1 = \|DAc\|_1 = \|c\|_1 = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x).$$

If  $x \in \text{cone}(\pm e) = \text{rec } \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ , then  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = 0$ .

To see that the atomic set is not unique, note that  $DA = I$  for any matrix of the form  $A = B + es^T$ , where

$$B = [b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}] := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and  $s \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  is an arbitrary vector. However, the gauge function with respect to the atomic set formed by the columns of  $B$  and  $e$  is well defined. Specifically, note that the range of the matrix  $[B \ e]$  spans all of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Thus the decomposition

$$x = Bc + c_e e \tag{4.6}$$

uniquely defines the vector  $c$  and the scalar  $c_e$ , and  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \|Dx\|_1 = \|c\|_1$ , as before.

The support function for this set of atoms is

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z) &= \sup \{ \langle x, z \rangle \mid x = Bc + c_e e, \|c\|_{\infty} \leq 1 \} \\ &= \sup \{ \langle c, B^T z \rangle + c_e \langle e, z \rangle \mid \|c\|_{\infty} \leq 1 \}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if  $z \notin \text{null}(e)$ , then  $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$  clearly unbounded because  $c_e$  is not constrained. This confirms the fact that the domain of  $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$  is  $(\text{rec } \widehat{\mathcal{A}})^{\circ} = \text{null}(e)$ , as shown by [Proposition 3.2\(e\)](#). [Corollary 3.4](#) asserts that if  $z$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -aligned with  $x$ , then it exposes all of the atoms that contribute non-trivially towards the decomposition (4.6). In particular,  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subset \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$ , where one such decomposition gives

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \{ \text{sign}((Dx)_i) b_i \mid x_i \neq 0 \} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z) = \{ \text{sign}(\langle b_i, z \rangle) b_i \mid \max_j \langle b_j, z \rangle = |\langle b_i, z \rangle| \}.$$

Notice that these alignment conditions do not depend on the specific choice of the representation  $\mathcal{A}$ , and are defined only with respect to the columns of  $B$ , which are fixed.  $\square$

Group norms arise in applications where the nonzero entries of a vector are concentrated in patterns across the vector. Applications include source localization, functional magnetic resonance imaging, and others [\[7, 21, 25\]](#). One interesting feature of group norms is that they are not polyhedral.

**Example 4.7** (Group norms). Consider the  $\ell$  subsets  $g_i \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  such  $\cup_{i=1}^{\ell} g_i = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Define the *group norm* with respect to the groups  $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1, \dots, g_{\ell}\}$  as the solution of the convex optimization problem

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{G}} = \min_{y_i} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \|y_i\|_2 \mid x = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} P_{g_i} y_i \right\}, \quad (4.7)$$

where the linear operator  $P_{\mathcal{I}} : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  scatters the elements of a vector into an  $n$  vector at positions indexed by  $\mathcal{I}$ , i.e.,  $\{(P_{\mathcal{I}}y)_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} = y$ , and  $(P_{\mathcal{I}}y)_k = 0$  for any  $k \notin \mathcal{I}$ . This norm is induced by the atomic set

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ P_{g_i} s_i \mid s_i \in \mathbb{R}^{|g_i|}, \|s_i\|_2 = 1, i = 1, \dots, \ell \right\},$$

which yields the decomposition

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} c_i (P_{g_i} s_i), \quad (4.8)$$

where  $c_i$  and  $(P_{g_i} s_i)$  are, respectively, the coefficients and atoms of the decomposition.

If the sets in  $\mathcal{G}$  form a partition of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  then the (non-overlapping) group norm is simply

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{G}} = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \|x_{g_i}\|_2.$$

A common example is the matrix (1,2) norm, which is the sum of the Euclidean norms of the columns of a matrix [9]. In the non-overlapping group case, the support set is unique, and for all  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ , the coefficients and atoms of the decomposition (4.8) are given by

$$c_i = \|x_{g_i}\|_2, \quad \text{and} \quad (P_{g_i} s_i) \quad \text{with} \quad s_i = (c_i)^{-1} x_{g_i}.$$

More generally, the support sets  $g_i$  may overlap, and thus the gauge value of  $x$  must be obtained as the solution of the convex optimization problem (4.7).

The conditions under which a vector  $z$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -aligned with  $x$  is similar to the 1-norm case. We first decompose by each group  $g_i$ :

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{A}} \langle x, z \rangle \stackrel{(a)}{=} \max_{i=1, \dots, \ell} \sup \left\{ \langle s_i, z_{g_i} \rangle \mid \|s_i\|_2 \leq 1, s_i \in \mathbb{R}^{|g_i|} \right\} \stackrel{(b)}{=} \max_{i=1, \dots, \ell} \|z_{g_i}\|_2,$$

where (a) follows from applying the supremum to each atom in  $\mathcal{A}$  and (b) follows from the definition of the 2-norm. That is to say,  $x$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -aligned with  $z$  if the decomposition (4.8) has  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \subset \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z)$ , where

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \{P_{g_i} x_{g_i} / \|x_{g_i}\|_2 \mid \|x_{g_i}\|_2 > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(z) = \{z_{g_i} / \|z_{g_i}\|_2 \mid \|z_{g_i}\|_2 = \max_j \|z_{g_j}\|_2\}.$$

□

The next two examples are for gauges that encourage sparsity (i.e., low-rank) for matrices.

**Example 4.8** (Trace norm for semidefinite matrices). An important gauge function is generated by the spectrahedron

$$\mathcal{A} = \{ uu^T \mid u \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|u\|_2 = 1 \},$$

which is a subset of the nuclear-norm ball that only includes symmetric rank-1 matrices. As with the nuclear-norm, this gauge encourages sparsity with respect to the set of rank-1 matrices—i.e., low-rank—and only admits positive definite matrices.

We first derive the support function with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(Z) = \sup_{X \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}} \langle X, Z \rangle = \max \left\{ 0, \sup_{\|u\|_2=1} \langle u, Zu \rangle \right\} = \max\{0, \lambda_{\max}(Z)\},$$

which vanishes only if  $Z$  is negative semidefinite, and otherwise is achieved when  $u$  is a maximal eigenvector of  $Z$ . Let  $X = U\Lambda U^T$  be the eigenvalue decomposition of  $X$ . Using [Proposition 3.2\(b\)](#) together with [\(3.4\)](#), which gives us  $\mathcal{A}^\circ = \{z \mid \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(z) \leq 1\}$ , the gauge function can be expressed as the support function over  $\mathcal{A}^\circ$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(X) &= \sup \{ \langle X, Z \rangle \mid \lambda_{\max}(Z) \leq 1 \} \\ &= \sup \{ \langle U\Lambda U^T, Z \rangle \mid \lambda_{\max}(Z) \leq 1 \} \\ &= \sup \{ \langle \text{diag}(\Lambda), \text{diag}(U^T Z U) \rangle \mid \lambda_{\max}(Z) \leq 1 \}, \\ &= \text{tr}(\Lambda) + \delta_{\geq 0}(X), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because the supremum is achieved by  $Z = UU^T$ . The indicator on the semidefinite cone arises because the supremum is infinite if any component of  $\Lambda$  is negative. In other words, indefinite matrices cannot be conically decomposed with respect to the atomic set  $\mathcal{A}$ , which is indicated by the infinite value of the gauge. Moreover, it follows that the nontrivial eigenvectors provide a support set for  $X$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(X) \supseteq \{u_1 u_1^T, \dots, u_r u_r^T\},$$

where  $r$  is the rank of  $X$ .

This support is not unique, however, and in fact the set of supports of  $X$  is very large. To see this, consider any valid conic atomic decomposition

$$X = c_1 v_1 v_1^T + \dots + c_k v_k v_k^T = V C V^T,$$

where  $c_i$  and  $v_i$ , respectively, are the  $i$ th diagonal entry of the diagonal matrix  $C$  and  $i$ th column of the matrix  $V$ . Then

$$\text{tr}(X) = \text{tr}(V C V^T) = \text{tr}(C V^T V) = \langle \text{diag}(C), \text{diag}(V^T V) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i,$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that each  $v_i v_i^T$  is in  $\mathcal{A}$  and thus has unit norm. Therefore any conic atomic decomposition of  $X$  yields the same gauge value, which is the

trace of  $X$ . Specifically, the support of  $X$  with respect to the spectrahedron  $\mathcal{A}$  can be characterized as

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(X) = \{ v_1 v_1^T, \dots, v_k v_k^T \mid \|v_i\|_2 = 1, \text{ range}(V) = \text{range}(X) \}.$$

Because we do not impose orthonormality among the vectors  $v_i$ , this set is not unique.

According to (2.6), the essential atoms are given by the eigenvectors corresponding to the maximal eigenvalue of  $Z$ , including all of their convex combinations:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(Z) = \text{conv} \{ uu^T \mid u^T Z u = \lambda_{\max}(Z) \}.$$

This set coincides with the exposed face  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(Z)$ ; cf. (3.10).  $\square$

**Example 4.9** (Weighted trace norm for semidefinite matrices). We describe a generalization of the trace norm for positive semidefinite matrices, which was covered by Example 4.8. The weighted trace norm is given by the function

$$\kappa(X) = \langle L, X \rangle + \delta_{\succeq 0}(X),$$

where  $L$  is positive semidefinite. Write the decomposition of  $L$  as

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} V & \bar{V} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V^T \\ \bar{V}^T \end{bmatrix} = V \Lambda V^T,$$

where  $\Lambda$  is diagonal with strictly positive elements and  $V$  and  $\bar{V}$ , respectively, span the range and nullspace of  $L$ .

We claim that  $\kappa$  is the gauge to the atomic set

$$\mathcal{A} = \{ rr^T \mid r = Vp, p^T \Lambda p = 1 \} + \{ ss^T \mid s = \bar{V}q \text{ for all } q \}, \quad (4.9)$$

which we establish by showing that  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  implies  $\kappa(X) = 1$ , and vice versa.

Take any element  $X \in \mathcal{A}$ , and observe

$$\kappa(X) = \langle L, X \rangle = \langle L, Vpp^T V^T \rangle = p^T V^T L V p = p^T \Lambda p = 1.$$

Conversely, take any  $X$  such that  $\kappa(X) = 1$ . Then,  $X$  is PSD. The orthogonal decomposition of  $X$  onto the range and nullspace of  $L$  is given by

$$X = VV^T X V V^T + \bar{V} \bar{V}^T X \bar{V} \bar{V}^T.$$

Then,

$$1 = \kappa(X) = \langle L, X \rangle = \langle L, VV^T X V V^T \rangle = \langle \Lambda, V^T X V \rangle,$$

which implies that  $V^T X V \in \text{conv} \{ pp^T \mid p^T \Lambda p = 1 \}$ . Therefore,  $X$  is in the convex hull of  $\mathcal{A}$ . The second set in the sum (4.9) is in the nullspace of  $L$  and thus can be ignored. This establishes the claim, and also provides an expression for the support set to  $X$ :

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(X) = \{ (Vp_i)(Vp_i)^T \mid p_i^T \Lambda p_i = 1, \text{ range}(V[p_1 \cdots p_k]) = \text{range}(X) \}.$$

The minimal set of vectors needed to complete the support is equal to the rank of  $X$ .

The support function with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  can be reduced to a maximum generalized eigenvalue problem, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(Z) &= \sup \{ \langle X, Z \rangle \mid X \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \} \\
&= \sup \{ \langle Vpp^T V^T, Z \rangle \mid p^T \Lambda p \leq 1 \} \\
&= \sup \{ \langle V^T Z V, \Lambda^{-1/2} u u^T \Lambda^{-1/2} \rangle \mid u^T u \leq 1 \} \\
&= \sup \{ \langle \Lambda^{-1/2} V^T Z V \Lambda^{-1/2}, u u^T \rangle \mid u^T u \leq 1 \} \\
&= \max \left\{ 0, \lambda_{\max}(\Lambda^{-1/2} V^T Z V \Lambda^{-1/2}) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We recognize that the expression inside the supremum is the generalized eigenvalue of the pencil  $(Z, L)$ , so that

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(Z) = \max \{ 0, \lambda_{\max}(Z, L) \}.$$

Hence, the essential atoms are given by the maximal generalized eigenvectors and their convex combinations:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(Z) = \text{conv} \{ u u^T \mid \langle u, Z u \rangle = \lambda_{\max}(Z, L) \cdot \langle u, L u \rangle \}.$$

□

## 5 Alignment as optimality

A pair of vectors  $(x, z)$  that is aligned with respect to an atomic set inform each other about their respective supports. If the two vectors are related through a gradient map of a convex function, then the alignment condition can be interpreted as an optimality condition for a constrained or regularized optimization problem. The alignment condition can also be interpreted as providing an optimality certificate for the problem of finding minimum gauge elements of a convex set. This section describes both perspectives.

### 5.1 Regularized smooth problems

Consider the three related convex optimization problems

$$\underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x) + \rho \gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x), \tag{5.1a}$$

$$\underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \leq \alpha, \tag{5.1b}$$

$$\underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad \gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \quad \text{subject to} \quad f(x) \leq \tau, \tag{5.1c}$$

where  $\rho$ ,  $\alpha$ , and  $\tau$  are positive parameters. Note that the constraint  $\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \leq \alpha$  is equivalent to the constraint that  $x$  is in the set  $\alpha\mathcal{C}$ . [Assumption 3.1](#) on  $\mathcal{C}$  continues to hold throughout.

**Theorem 5.1** (Optimality). *Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a differentiable convex function and  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . Assume that (5.1c) is strictly feasible. For each of the problems in (5.1), a feasible point  $x^*$  is optimal if and only if it is  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned with  $z^* := -\nabla f(x^*)$ .*

*Proof.* First consider the unconstrained problem (5.1a). A vector  $x^*$  is a solution if and only if

$$0 \in \nabla f(x^*) + \rho \partial \gamma_c(x^*).$$

Equivalently,

$$\rho^{-1} z^* \in \partial \gamma_c(x^*) = \partial \sigma_{c^\circ}(x^*) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{c^\circ}(x^*).$$

Then by Corollary 3.4, this condition is equivalent to the  $\mathcal{C}$ -alignment of the pair  $(x^*, z^*)$ .

Next, consider the gauge constrained problem (5.1b). Because  $\gamma_c(x) \leq \alpha$  is equivalent to  $\alpha^{-1}x \in \mathcal{C}$ , a feasible vector  $x^*$  is optimal if and only if

$$0 \in \nabla f(x^*) + \partial \delta_c(\alpha^{-1}x^*) \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad -\nabla f(x^*) \in \partial \delta_c(\alpha^{-1}x^*),$$

where  $\delta_c$  is the indicator function for set  $\mathcal{C}$ . By [43, Theorem 23.5] it follows that  $x^* \in \alpha \partial \sigma_c(z^*)$ , and thus by Corollary 3.4, the pair  $(x^*, z^*)$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned.

Finally, consider the level constrained problem (5.1c). Let  $\mathcal{P} = \{x \mid f(x) \leq \tau\}$ . The hypothesis on  $f$  ensures that  $\mathcal{P}$  has a non-empty relative interior. Then a feasible vector  $x^*$  is optimal if and only if

$$0 \in \partial(\gamma_c(x^*) + \delta_{\mathcal{P}}(x^*)) = \partial \gamma_c(x^*) + \partial \delta_{\mathcal{P}}(x^*),$$

where the equality follows from Rockafellar [43, Theorem 23.8].

Now we consider two cases. If  $f(x^*) < \tau$ , then it follows that  $0 \in \partial \gamma_c(x^*)$ , and thus  $x^* \in \text{rec } \mathcal{C}$ . Then by Corollary 3.4, the pair  $(x^*, z^*)$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned. If  $f(x^*) = \tau$ , then by [24, Theorem 1.3.5], there exists a positive scalar  $\lambda$  such that

$$0 \in \partial \gamma_c(x^*) + \lambda \nabla f(x^*) \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad z^* \in \text{cone } \partial \gamma_c(x^*).$$

Then by Corollary 3.4, the pair  $(x^*, z^*)$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned. □

### 5.1.1 Objective value bound

With only slightly more effort, Theorem 5.1 implies that the residual

$$g_c(x) = \alpha^* \sigma_c(z_x) - \langle x, z_x \rangle, \quad \text{with} \quad z_x := -\nabla f(x),$$

of the polar inequality, where  $\alpha^*$  is an upper bound on the gauge value  $\gamma_c(x^*)$  of any optimal solution, bounds the difference between the objective value of  $f(x)$  and the optimal value  $f(x^*)$ . Generally a bound  $\alpha^*$  is not available. The notable exception, however, is for problems of the form (5.1b), where feasibility implies that  $\gamma_c(x^*) \leq \alpha$ , and in that case we may simply take  $\alpha^* = \alpha$ . To see how  $g_c$  provides the bound on the optimal value of  $f$ , note that

$$\begin{aligned} f(x^*) &\geq f(x) + \langle x^* - x, \nabla f(x) \rangle \\ &\geq f(x) + \min_{a \in \alpha^* \mathcal{C}} \langle a - x, \nabla f(x) \rangle \\ &= f(x) + \langle x, z \rangle - \alpha^* \sigma_c(z), \end{aligned}$$



---

**Algorithm 5.1:** Conditional gradient method for (5.2)

---

**Input:**  $x^{(0)} \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$   
**1 for**  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  **do**  
**2**     $z^{(k)} = -\nabla f(x^{(k)})$   
**3**     $a^{(k)} \in \tau \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(z^{(k)})$   
**4**    **if**  $\langle a^{(k)} - x^{(k)}, z^{(k)} \rangle < \epsilon$  **then stop**  
**5**     $x^{(k+1)} = \theta^{(k)} a^{(k)} + (1 - \theta^{(k)}) x^{(k)}, \quad \theta^{(k)} \in (0, 1)$   
**6 return**  $x^{(k)}$

---

where the first inequality follows from the subgradient inequality. Rearranging terms and using the definition of  $g_c$ , we obtain the bound

$$g_c(x) \geq f(x) - f(x^*) \quad \forall x.$$

A similar bound is derived by Jaggi [26] in the context of the conditional gradient method applied to (5.1b) and by Ndiaye et al. [35].

### 5.1.2 Conditional gradient and atomic alignment

Conditional gradient (CG) methods [12, 14, 26] naturally exhibit the atomic alignment property in several ways. Here we describe one property related to alignment that can be used to develop computationally efficient variations for this class of methods.

In its simplest form, the CG method applies to problems such as (5.1b). Because here we wish to make the atomic set explicit, we express that problem as

$$\underset{x \in \mathcal{A}}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x). \tag{5.2}$$

We adopt the simplifying assumption that  $\mathcal{A}$  is compact so that every direction exposes a face. The iterates of the basic CG method are summarized in Algorithm 5.1. The linear minimization oracle (LMO) in Step 3 selects an atom or a convex combination of atoms from the set  $\mathcal{A}$  exposed by the current negative gradient  $z^{(k)} \equiv -\nabla f(x^{(k)})$ . In the language of atomic alignment, the LMO step selects an atom  $a^{(k)}$  that is aligned with  $z^{(k)}$ . In particular, observe that

$$\langle a^{(k)}, z^{(k)} \rangle = \sigma_c(z^{(k)}) = \gamma_c(a^{(k)}) \cdot \sigma_c(z^{(k)}),$$

where the second equality follows because  $a^{(k)} \in \mathcal{C}$ , and so  $\gamma_c(a^{(k)}) \leq 1$ .

Step 5 merges the selected element  $a^{(k)}$  with the collection of atoms that have been exposed through iteration  $k$ , and which are represented as an aggregate in the iterate  $x^{(k)}$ . Various choices for the steplength  $\theta^{(k)}$  exist, including linesearch, which requires additional evaluations of the function  $f$  to ensure sufficient decrease, and a decaying steplength that follows a predetermined schedule.

The recent appeal of these methods lies with the computational efficiency of the linear minimization oracle for many important special cases, especially cases where projections or proximal operations are not computationally feasible. The unit nuclear-norm ball described

in [Example 2.4](#) illustrates the point: projection of an  $n$ -by- $m$  matrix  $X$  onto the set  $\mathcal{A}_* := \{Z \mid \|Z\|_* \leq 1\}$  is the matrix

$$\text{proj}_{\mathcal{A}_*}(X) = U\bar{\Sigma}V^T \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{\Sigma} = \text{Diag}(\min\{1, \sigma_i(X)\}_{i=1}^{\min\{m,n\}}).$$

where  $X = U \text{Diag}(\{\sigma_i(X)\}_{i=1}^{\min\{m,n\}})V^T$  is the singular-value decomposition of  $X$ . Thus, the projection operation requires computing all singular triples of  $X$  larger than 1. In contrast, the linear minimization oracle in [Step 3](#) requires only computing one of the maximal singular triples of the negative gradient (a matrix, in this case). For this reason, the CG method often features in applications of matrix completion [\[27, 30, 45\]](#).

We express the merge step at iteration  $k$  recursively as

$$x^{(k)} = \sum_{i=1}^k \widehat{\theta}^{(i)} a^{(i)}, \quad \widehat{\theta}^{(i)} := \theta^{(i)} \prod_{j=1}^i (1 - \theta^{(j)}). \quad (5.3)$$

This expression makes explicit the one-atom-at-a-time construction of the current iterate  $x^{(k)}$ , each taken from a face exposed by the negative gradients. Thus,

$$x^{(k)} \in \sum_{i=1}^k \widehat{\theta}^{(i)} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(z^{(i)}).$$

In an idealized, perfectly greedy run of the algorithm, the sequence of exposed faces  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(z^{(k)})$  are expanding, i.e.,  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(z^{(k)}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(z^{(k+1)})$ , and converge to an optimal face  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(z^*)$ , where  $z^* := -\nabla f(x^*)$ . But in general, we do not expect such efficiency, and may inadvertently collect many sets of atoms that are not at all related to the optimal face, so that some atoms  $a^{(k)} \notin \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x^*)$ . Thus, the computed decomposition [\(5.3\)](#) at any iteration  $k$  may contain atoms not in the optimal support  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(x^*)$ . In applications such as matrix-completion, described in [Example 5.2](#) below, the cost of storing intermediate atoms  $a^{(k)}$ —say, as singular pairs  $(u^{(k)}, v^{(k)})$ —can be prohibitively expensive for large problems. Various modifications of the basic CG method aim to compress or trim the collected atoms to alleviate unnecessary storage [\[40\]](#).

In the case of a least-squares objective function, the alignment principle provides a simple device that short-circuits the need for storing intermediate atoms, as illustrated in the following example.

**Example 5.2** (Delayed atom generation). Consider the low-rank matrix completion problem

$$\underset{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \|\Omega \circ (X - B)\|_F^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|X\|_* \leq \tau.$$

This problem appears in recommender systems [\[1\]](#), where the  $(i, j)$ th element of the sparse matrix  $B$  records the ratings score given by user  $i$  for product  $j$ . Ratings are observed only for a subset of user-product pairs indexed by the binary mask

$$\Omega_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if user } i \text{ has rated product } j; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

---

**Algorithm 5.2:** Dual conditional gradient for (5.2) with least-squares objective. The linear operator  $\Omega$ .

---

**Input:**  $\Omega, B, \ell$

```

1  $R^{(k)} = \Omega \circ B; Q^{(k)} = 0$ 
2 for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  do
3    $Z^{(k)} = \Omega \circ R^{(k)}$ 
4    $(u, v) = \text{svds}(Z^{(k)}, 1)$  [expose atom  $A^{(k)} \equiv \tau uv^T$ ]
5    $\Delta R^{(k)} = \Omega \circ (\tau uv^T) - Q^{(k)}$  [ $\Omega \circ (\tau uv^T) = \tau(u_i v_i)_{(ij) \in \Omega}$ ]
6   if  $\langle \Delta R^{(k)}, R^{(k)} \rangle < \epsilon$  then stop
7    $\theta^{(k)} = \min\{1, \langle \Delta R^{(k)}, R^{(k)} \rangle / \|\Delta R^{(k)}\|^2\}$  [exact linesearch on quadratic]
8    $R^{(k+1)} = R^{(k)} - \theta^{(k)} \Delta R^{(k)}$ 
9    $Q^{(k+1)} = Q^{(k)} + \theta^{(k)} \Delta R^{(k)}$ 
10  $(U_\ell, V_\ell, \Sigma_\ell) = \text{svds}(Z^{(k)}, \ell)$  [top  $\ell$  singular vectors]
11  $S_\ell \in \arg \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|\Omega \circ (U_\ell S V_\ell^T) - b\|_2^2 \mid \text{tr}(S) \leq \tau, S \succeq 0 \right\}$ 
12 return  $(U_\ell, S_\ell, V_\ell)$ 

```

---

The goal is to predict the unseen ratings, captured in the dense unknown matrix  $X$ . A structural low-rank assumption is used to capture an “archetype” phenomenon—users who often like the same movies serve as good predictors for one another, and movies that are liked by the same users probably are also similar. Therefore, we can consider each user as a sparse linear combination of archetypal individuals (and similarly with products), where the inner product of their feature vectors give the same prediction rating. The nuclear-norm constraint on  $X$  is a common approach for encouraging low-rank solutions [41].

Most of the computational cost of Algorithm 5.1 applied to this problem is represented in Step 3, which requires calculating a maximal singular pair of the current negative gradient  $Z^{(k)} := -\nabla f(X^{(k)}) = \Omega \circ (B - X^{(k)})$ . This is a sparse matrix indexed by  $\Omega$ . (Algorithm 5.1 is written with lower-case symbols to denote vectors, but we use upper-case symbols here to denote the matrix iterates for this problem.) Thus, the atoms  $a^{(k)}$  are outer products of the unit-norm vector pairs  $(u^{(k)}, v^{(k)})$  that satisfy  $\langle u, Z^{(k)} v \rangle = \tau \sigma_{\max}(Z^{(k)})$ . The key limitation of this approach is that either the atoms are aggregated into a dense iteration matrix  $X^{(k)}$ , or are stored as a sequence of pairs  $\{(u^{(i)}, v^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^k$ . In either case, the memory requirements are prohibitive for anything but small problems.

Algorithm 5.2 describes a “dual” version of the CG method shown in Algorithm 5.1, similar to the approach used by Yursey et al. [52], who maintain a low-memory random sketch of the primal iterate. Instead, here we completely forgo any reference of the primal iterate during the CG iterations, and only update a sequence of dual vectors  $Z^{(k)} \rightarrow Z^* \equiv -\nabla f(X^*)$ . The corresponding primal solution  $X^*$  is subsequently recovered using the alignment between  $X^*$  and  $Z^*$ , as spelled out by Theorem 5.1. This technique was used by Friedlander and Macêdo [17] for low-rank SDPs.

The sequence of iterates  $Z^{(k)}$ ,  $R^{(k)}$ , and  $Q^{(k)}$  respectively, coincide with the negative gradient  $-\nabla f(X^{(k)})$ , residual  $R^{(k)} = \Omega \circ (X^{(k)} - B)$ , and restricted primal iterate  $Q^{(k)} = \Omega \circ X^{(k)}$ , where the feasible primal iterate  $X^{(k)}$  is held implicitly. At the termination of the loop, Steps 10 and 11 use the fact that the latest iterate  $Z^{(k)}$  exposes the range and column

size $m = n$	primal CG			dual CG		
	residual	rank	time	residual	rank	time
100	10.3	6	0.0	10.3	1	0.0
250	25.2	6	0.1	25.2	1	0.1
1,000	100.4	6	1.3	100.4	1	0.3
5,000	501.7	6	48.3	501.7	1	11.4
10,000	998.9	6	242.9	998.9	1	63.3

Table 5.1: Performance of the primal and dual variants of conditional gradient for the matrix-completion problem (Example 5.2) after 10 iterations of Algorithm 5.1 (primal CG) and Algorithm 3 (dual CG). Estimated rank of final solution is computed as the smallest number of singular values that account for 90% of its Frobenious norm. Time is measured in seconds.

spaces of the solution. Thus, it can be used recover a rank- $\ell$  matrix that best approximates (in the sense of the Frobenious norm) the corresponding primal iterate  $X^{(k)}$ ; see Example 2.4. Step 5 is equivalent to the optimality test in Algorithm 5.1 because

$$\langle \Delta R^{(k)}, R^{(k)} \rangle = \langle \Omega \circ (\tau uv^T + X^{(k)}), R^{(k)} \rangle = \langle A^{(k)} - X^{(k)}, Z^{(k)} \rangle,$$

where  $A^{(k)} := \tau uv^T$ . The linesearch parameter  $\theta^{(k)}$  is an exact minimizer of  $\|R^{(k)} - \theta \Delta R^{(k)}\|_F$  over  $\theta$ .

Table 5.1 lists the results of applying the primal and dual CG variants on a random matrix-completion problem. For varying problem sizes with  $m = n$ , we generate the binary mask  $\Omega$  with 10% nonzeros, and the observation matrix is generated

$$B = \Omega \circ (UV^T + 0.1 \cdot N),$$

where  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ ,  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ , and  $N$  are generated i.i.d. from a normal Gaussian distribution. The “true rank”  $r = \text{round}(m/100)$ . Interestingly, the multiplicity of the computed dual solution  $Z^*$  was always 1, which made the primal-recovery phase (Step 11 of Example 5.2) trivial. The residual values between the two variants are the same, confirming that they recover solutions of similar quality, but the dual variant is significantly faster because it does not need to manipulate storage for the dual iterate  $X^{(k)}$ . □

## 5.2 Alignment in gauge optimization

The alignment property characterizes the optimality for the polar dual pair

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad \gamma_c(x) & \underset{z}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sigma_c(z) \\ & \text{subject to } x \in \mathcal{D}, & \text{subject to } z \in \mathcal{D}', \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

where  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  is any closed convex set and  $\mathcal{D}' := \{z \mid \langle x, z \rangle \geq 1 \ \forall x \in \mathcal{D}\}$  is its antipolar. This class of problems and its applications is described in detail by Freund [16] and by Friedlander, Macêdo, and Pong [18].

**Proposition 5.3** (Polar duality). *A pair of primal-dual feasible vectors  $(x, z) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}'$  is primal-dual optimal for (5.4) if and only if they are  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned and  $\langle x, z \rangle = 1$ .*

*Proof.* First, assume that the pair  $(x, z)$  is primal-dual optimal for (5.4), then by the strong duality [18, Corollary 5.2], we have

$$1 = \langle x, z \rangle = \gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(z). \quad (5.5)$$

We prove the other direction by contradiction. Assume  $(x, z)$  are  $\mathcal{C}$ -aligned and  $\langle x, z \rangle = 1$  and suppose there exists  $\hat{x} \in C$  such that  $\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{x}) < \gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x)$ . Then it follows that

$$\langle \hat{x}, z \rangle \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} 1 \stackrel{(b)}{=} \gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(z) > \gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{x}) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(z),$$

where the inequality (a) follows from the definition of the antipolar  $\mathcal{D}'$ , and the equality (b) follows from (5.5). This violates the polar gauge inequality, and thus leads to a contradiction.  $\square$

## 6 Alignment in convolution of atomic sets

The notions of atomic decomposition and alignment that we have discussed thus far are all tied to a single atomic set  $\mathcal{A}$ . Correspondingly, the regularized optimization problems considered in Section 5 involve only a single regularization function  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$  meant to encourage minimizers sparse with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$ . Richer atomic decompositions and regularized formulations, however, may be obtained by combining different atomic sets. We describe in this section approaches that combine multiple atomic sets  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$ . Informally, we seek to decompose a vector  $x$  as the additive decomposition of the form

$$x = x_1 + x_2 \quad \text{where each } x_i \text{ is } \mathcal{A}_i \text{ sparse.} \quad (6.1)$$

This operation appears often in models for separating signals, also known as demixing [3, 10, 34, 38, 49, 50].

A common approach is to directly construct an aggregate atomic set as the union of simpler sets  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$ , each with a special structure that reflects a useful decomposition. The union of atomic sets, in fact, corresponds to the infimal sum convolution of their corresponding gauge functions, as we show below.

Our main focus, however, is an alternative and less-often used approach that forms the aggregate atomic set as the Minkowski sum

$$\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2 = \{ a_1 + a_2 \mid a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2 \}$$

of the simpler atomic sets, which directly mirrors the desired decomposition in (6.1). As with the union operation, the sum of atomic sets also corresponds to a convolution operation of the corresponding gauge functions, except that in this case it is *polar convolution* [19], rather than sum convolution.

The sum of atomic sets and the connection to polar convolution allows us to deduce properties of alignment for the constituent sets, and thus to suggest dual approaches similar to Algorithm 5.2 for solving the optimization formulations that arise in demixing applications.

Below we only consider two distinct atomic sets  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$ . The convolution of three or more sets is an obvious extension. Recall our notational convention that for any set  $\mathcal{D}$ ,

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{D}} \equiv \gamma_{\text{conv } \mathcal{D}}.$$

## 6.1 Atomic sum and polar convolution

One important application of the alignment principles that we discuss in this section is in the analysis of the various demixing problems

$$\underset{x_1, x_2}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x_1 + x_2) + \rho \max \{ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1), \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x_2) \} \quad (6.2a)$$

$$\underset{x_1, x_2}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x_1 + x_2) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \max \{ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1), \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x_2) \} \leq \alpha, \quad (6.2b)$$

$$\underset{x_1, x_2}{\text{minimize}} \quad \max \{ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1), \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x_2) \} \quad \text{subject to} \quad f(x_1 + x_2) \leq \tau. \quad (6.2c)$$

These three problems are in fact just special cases of the regularized formulations in (5.1), where  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$  is replaced by the function  $\max \{ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1), \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x_2) \}$ . One of the main goals of this section is to prove the following corollary to [Theorem 5.1](#).

**Corollary 6.1** (Optimality and atomic sums). *Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a differentiable convex function and  $\mathcal{A}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Assume that at least one set  $\mathcal{A}_i$  contains the origin in its interior, and that the problem (6.2c) is strictly feasible. For each of the problems in (6.2), a feasible pair  $(x_1^*, x_2^*)$  is optimal if and only if  $x_i^*$  is  $\mathcal{A}_i$ -aligned with  $z^* := -\nabla f(x_1^* + x_2^*)$ .*

Before we can establish the proof of this result, however, we first establish the close relationship between the sum of atomic sets and polar convolution. This connection is an important analytical tool in its own right.

### 6.1.1 Polar convolution

The polar convolution of two gauges  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}$  and  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}$  results in the function

$$(\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1} \diamond \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2})(x) = \inf_w \max \{ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(w), \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x - w) \}. \quad (6.3)$$

This operation first appears in Rockafellar [43, Theorem 5.8] for general convex functions, and is subsequently analyzed by Seeger and Volle [44]. When specialized to gauge functions, as shown in (6.3), this convolution operation is tightly connected to the polarity operation on the defining atomic sets. In that case, Friedlander et al. [19] refer to the operation as *polar convolution*.

Polar convolution is in fact the functional counterpart to set addition.

**Proposition 6.2** (Polar convolution of gauges). *Let  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  be non-empty closed convex sets that contain the origin. If at least one set contains the origin in its interior, then the polar convolution of the gauges  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}$  and  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}$  is the gauge*

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1} \diamond \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2} = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}.$$

*Proof.* The hypothesis that one of the sets  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  contains the origin implies that the corresponding gauge (say,  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}$ ) is finite and therefore continuous. Thus,

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1} \diamond \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2} = (\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\circ + \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}^\circ)^\circ = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2},$$

where the first equality follows from [19, Lemma 3.3] and the continuity of  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}$ , and the second equality follows from [19, Lemma 3.4].  $\square$

For the remainder of this section, we assume that one of the gauges  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_i}$  is continuous, which holds if the origin is contained in the interior of  $\mathcal{A}_i$ .

### 6.1.2 Alignment to the sum of sets

The polar convolution operation, which mixes atoms via the sum of sets, has the appealing property that it explicitly decomposes a vector as a sum of elements, each belonging to one of the atomic sets. In particular, evaluating the polar convolution

$$(\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1} \diamond \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2})(x) = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}(x) = \inf_{x_1, x_2} \max \{ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1), \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x_2) \mid x = x_1 + x_2 \} \quad (6.4)$$

at a point  $x$  implicitly generates a decomposition

$$x = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2} c_a a = \sum_{\substack{a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \\ a_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2}} c_a (a_1 + a_2) = x_1 + x_2,$$

where each  $x_i \in \text{cone } \mathcal{A}_i$ . Moreover, it is a straightforward consequence of optimality for (6.4) that  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}(x) = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1) = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x_2)$ .

**Theorem 6.3** (Alignment in polar convolution). *Suppose that the pair  $(x, z)$  is  $(\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$ -aligned and*

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}(x) = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1) = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x_2), \quad \text{where } x = x_1 + x_2.$$

*Then the pair  $(x_i, z)$  is  $\mathcal{A}_i$ -aligned for  $i = 1, 2$ .*

*Proof.* Because  $x$  and  $z$  are  $(\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$ -aligned,

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}(z) = \langle x, z \rangle = \langle x_1, z \rangle + \langle x_2, z \rangle.$$

Use the fact that  $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2} = \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1} + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_2}$  and rearrange terms to deduce that

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(z) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(z) = \left\langle \frac{x_1}{\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1)}, z \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{x_2}{\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x_2)}, z \right\rangle.$$

But because  $x_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$  and  $x_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$ , it follows that

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(z) = \langle x_1, z \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x_2) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(z) = \langle x_2, z \rangle,$$

which establish, respectively, that each  $(x_i, z)$  is  $\mathcal{A}_i$ -aligned.  $\square$

### 6.1.3 Proof of Corollary 6.1

The first step in the proof is to establish that the regularized optimization problems in (6.2) are equivalent, respectively, with the problems

$$\underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x) + \rho \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}(x) \quad (6.5a)$$

$$\underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x) \quad \text{subject to } \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}(x) \leq \alpha, \quad (6.5b)$$

$$\underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}(x) \quad \text{subject to } f(x) \leq \tau. \quad (6.5c)$$




Figure 6.1: Illustration of the polar alignment principle for atomic sums, as described by [Theorem 6.3](#) (alignment in polar convolution). The vector  $z$  simultaneously exposes atoms, indicated by black dots, in the atomic sets  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$ , and also in the sum of atomic sets  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ .

We establish the equivalence for (6.5a); the equivalence for (6.5b) and (6.5c) follows the same line of reasoning. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{x_1, x_2} \left\{ f(x_1 + x_2) + \rho \max \{ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1), \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x_2) \} \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x, x_1} \left\{ f(x) + \rho \max \{ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1), \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x - x_1) \} \right\} \\
&= \inf_x \left\{ f(x) + \rho \inf_{x_1} \max \{ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1), \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x - x_1) \} \right\} \\
&= \inf_x \left\{ f(x) + \rho \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}(x) \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of polar convolution (6.3) and [Proposition 6.2](#).

Next, we use [Theorem 5.1](#) to establish that a point  $x^*$  is a solution to one of the three problems (6.5) if and only if  $x^*$  is  $(\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$ -aligned with  $z^* := -\nabla f(x^*)$ . The equivalence of the formulations (6.5) and (6.2) means that  $x^* = x_1^* + x_2^*$ , where  $x_1^*$  and  $x_2^*$  are optimal for (6.2). Moreover, optimality of  $x_1^*$  and  $x_2^*$  implies that  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}(x^*) = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(x_1^*) = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x_2^*)$ . Thus, [Theorem 6.3](#) applies in this case and each pair  $(x_i^*, z^*)$  is  $\mathcal{A}_i$ -aligned.  $\square$

#### 6.1.4 Morphological component analysis

We show how the alignment principle can be used as part of a demixing application in signal separation, also known as morphological component analysis [10]. Our discussion below



focuses on demixing using the constrained formulation (6.5b), but can be easily extended to the other two formulations.

Suppose that  $x^*$  is the solution of (6.5b). Then we know  $x^* = x_1 + x_2$  for some  $x_i \in \alpha \mathcal{A}_i$ . We recover the constituent components  $x_i$  using two stages. In the first stage, we apply the conditional gradient method (Algorithm 5.1) to (6.5b) with  $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$  to obtain the negative gradient  $z^* = -\nabla f(x^*)$ . (The primal iterate  $x^{(k)}$  does not need to be stored.) The key to the efficient application of this method is to recognize that the exposed face of the sum of sets is equal to the sum of exposed faces, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2}(z) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(z) + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(z).$$

Thus, Step 3 in the CG method can be implemented using separate procedures available for exposing a face in each of the atomic sets  $\mathcal{A}_i$ .

In the second stage, we use  $z^*$  to expose the atoms in each component  $x_i$ . Theorem 6.3 asserts that each  $x_i$  is  $\mathcal{A}_i$ -aligned with the negative gradient  $z^* := -\nabla f(x^*)$ , and therefore exposes the atoms in  $\mathcal{A}_i$  that supports  $x_i$ . Thus, each component  $x_i$  can be recovered as the solution of the reduced optimization problem

$$\underset{x_1, x_2}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x_1 + x_2) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \gamma_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_i}(z^*)}(x_i) \leq \alpha, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The underlying assumption, of course, is that the exposed face  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_i}(z^*)$  containing the relevant atoms has small dimension, since otherwise this problem could be as expensive as the original problem. A variety of algorithms can be applied to solve this reduced problem.

Although our discussion above considered only two atomic sets, the analysis extends trivially to any number of atomic sets.

**Example 6.4** (Separating background from foreground in a noisy image). We give a concrete example from morphological component analysis that illustrates how this approach can be used in practice to separate background and foreground from a noisy image. Suppose that the  $m$ -vector  $b = x_s + x_\ell + \epsilon$  encodes a 2-dimensional image comprised of a sparse component  $x_s$ , a low-rank component  $x_\ell$ , and structured noise  $\epsilon$ . The ability to decouple  $b$  into these three components rests on their incoherence [34, 38, 50]. Because our aim here is only to illustrate the polar-alignment property, we make the simplifying assumption that the noise  $\epsilon$  is sparse in the Fourier basis, which is known to be incoherent with sparsity and low-rank. Based on these assumptions, we choose  $\mathcal{A}_1$  to be the unit 1-norm ball (Example 2.3),  $\mathcal{A}_2$  to be the nuclear-norm ball (Example 2.4), and  $\mathcal{A}_3 = D^T \mathcal{A}_1$ , where  $D$  is the discrete cosine transform. Use Proposition 3.2(c) to deduce that the gauge that corresponds to  $\mathcal{A}_3$  is the transformed 1-norm:

$$\gamma_{D^T \mathcal{A}_1} = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(D \cdot) = \|D \cdot\|_1.$$

We follow the approach outlined in Section 6.1.4. For the first stage, we apply the dual CG method to the problem

$$\underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \|x - b\|_2^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3}(x) \leq \tau$$

to obtain the negative gradient  $z^* = b - x^*$  (without storing the primal iterates  $x^{(k)}$  or solution  $x^*$ ). In the second stage, the primal solution  $x^*$  is recovered by solving the problem

$$\underset{c_a^{(1)}, c_a^{(2)}, c_a^{(3)}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \|x - b\|_2^2 \quad \text{with} \quad x = \sum_{i=1,2,3} \sum_{a^{(i)} \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_i}(z^*)} c_a^{(i)} a^{(i)}$$




Figure 6.2: Morphological component analysis via polar convolution is used to denoise and separate foreground from background in an image. The chess-board image in panel (a) has been corrupted with noise. Panels (b) and (c) show the extracted low-rank and sparse parts of the image, which are assembled in panel (d) as the final reconstruction of the observed image (a). See [Example 6.4](#).

over the coefficients  $c_a^{(i)}$ . (Because in this case the atomic sets are centrosymmetric, we may ignore the nonnegativity requirements of the coefficients.)

The first panel in [Example 6.4](#) shows a noisy 500-by-500 pixel image of a chess board. The remaining panels show the separated images obtained after 2000 iterations of the CG algorithm as described above.

□

## 6.2 Atomic unions and sum convolution

The infimal sum convolution between two gauges  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}$  and  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}$  is defined through the optimization problem

$$(\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1} \square \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2})(x) = \inf_w \{ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(w) + \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}(x - w) \},$$

Although here we define this operation only for gauges, it can be applied to any two convex functions and always results in another convex function [43, Theorem 5.4]. Normally the operation is simply called *infimal convolution*, but here we use the term *sum convolution* to distinguish it from another form of infimal convolution that we use in [Section 6.1](#).

**Proposition 6.5** (Sum convolution of gauges). *Let  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  be non-empty closed convex sets that contain the origin. The sum convolution of the gauges  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1}$  and  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2}$  is the gauge*

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1} \square \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2} = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2}.$$

*Proof.* Using [Proposition 4.1](#), we are led to the following equivalent expressions:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1} \square \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_2})(x) &= \inf_w \left\{ \inf_{c_a} \left\{ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_1} c_a \mid w = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_1} c_a a, c_a \geq 0 \right\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \inf_{c_a} \left\{ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_2} c_a \mid x - w = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_2} c_a a, c_a \geq 0 \right\} \right\} \\
&= \inf_{w, c_a} \left\{ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2} c_a \mid w = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_1} c_a a, x - w = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_2} c_a a, c_a \geq 0 \right\} \\
&= \inf_{c_a} \left\{ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2} c_a \mid x = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2} c_a a, c_a \geq 0 \right\} = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2}(x),
\end{aligned}$$

which establishes the claim.  $\square$

## 7 Conclusions

The theory of polar alignment and its relationship with atomic decompositions offers a rich grammar with which to think about structured optimization. Of course, the underlying ideas are not entirely new and many of the conclusions can be derived using standard arguments from Lagrange multiplier theory, but we have found that the notions of polarity and alignment offer a clarifying viewpoint. Indeed, concepts such as active sets and supports, which are intuitive for polyhedral constraints and vectors, easily extend to more abstract settings when we adopt the vocabulary of alignment, exposed faces, and the machinery of gauges and support functions.

Further research opportunities remain. For example, most (if not all) of the ideas we have presented could be generalized to the infinite-dimensional setting, which would accommodate more general decompositions. Also, other standard algorithms, such as splitting and bundle methods [13], seem to exhibit properties that can easily be explained using the language of polar alignment.

## Acknowledgments

The last author (MPF) is indebted to James Burke at the University of Washington, who over years of collaboration and discussion, and through his mastery of convex analysis and optimization, helped to influence many of the ideas in this manuscript.

## References

- [1] Robert M Bell and Yehuda Koren. Lessons from the Netflix prize challenge. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, 9(2):75–79, 2007.
- [2] Dimitri P Bertsekas. *Convex optimization theory*. Athena Scientific Belmont, 2009.

- [3] Emmanuel J Candès, Xiaodong Li, Yi Ma, and John Wright. Robust principal component analysis? *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 58(3):11, 2011.
- [4] Venkat Chandrasekaran, Benjamin Recht, PabloA. Parrilo, and Alan S. Willsky. The convex geometry of linear inverse problems. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 12(6):805–849, 2012.
- [5] S. S. Chen, D. L. Donoho, and M. A. Saunders. Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 20(1):33–61, 1998.
- [6] S. S. Chen, D. L. Donoho, and M. A. Saunders. Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit. *SIAM Rev.*, 43(1):129–159, 2001.
- [7] S. F. Cotter, B. D. Rao, K. Engan, and K. Kreutz-Delgado. Sparse solutions to linear inverse problems with multiple measurement vectors. *IEEE Trans. Sig. Proc.*, 53:2477–2488, 2005.
- [8] Andrea Cristofari, Marianna De Santis, Stefano Lucidi, and Francesco Rinaldi. A two-stage active-set algorithm for bound-constrained optimization. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 172(2):369–401, 2017.
- [9] Chris Ding, Ding Zhou, Xiaofeng He, and Hongyuan Zha. R 1-PCA: Rotational invariant l1-norm principal component analysis for robust subspace factorization. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 281–288. ACM, 2006.
- [10] David L. Donoho, Yaakov Tsaig, Iddo Drori, and Jean-Luc Starck. Sparse solution of underdetermined linear equations by stagewise orthogonal matching pursuit. Technical Report 2006-2, Dept. of Statistics, Stanford University, April 2006.
- [11] John C Duchi, Alekh Agarwal, and Martin J Wainwright. Dual averaging for distributed optimization: Convergence analysis and network scaling. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, 57(3):592–606, 2012.
- [12] Joseph C Dunn and S Harshbarger. Conditional gradient algorithms with open loop step size rules. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 62(2):432–444, 1978.
- [13] Zhenan Fan, Yifan Sun, and Michael P. Friedlander. Bundle methods for dual atomic pursuit. In *Proc. 2019 Asilomar Conf. Signals, Systems, and Comp.*, 2019. arXiv:1910.13650.
- [14] Marguerite Frank and Philip Wolfe. An algorithm for quadratic programming. *Naval Research Logistics (NRL)*, 3(1-2):95–110, 1956.
- [15] R. M. Freund, P. Grigas, and R. Mazumder. An extended Frank-Wolfe method with “in-face” directions, and its application to low-rank matrix completion. *ArXiv e-prints*, November 2015.
- [16] Robert M. Freund. Dual gauge programs, with applications to quadratic programming and the minimum-norm problem. *Math. Program.*, 38(1):47–67, 1987.

- [17] M. P. Friedlander and I. Macêdo. Low-rank spectral optimization via gauge duality. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 38(3):A1616–A1638, 2016.
- [18] M. P. Friedlander, I. Macêdo, and T. K. Pong. Gauge optimization and duality. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 24(4):1999–2022, 2014.
- [19] M. P. Friedlander, I. Macêdo, and T. K. Pong. Polar convolution. *SIAM J. Optimization*, 29(4):1366–1391, 2018.
- [20] Eli M Gafni and Dimitri P Bertsekas. Two-metric projection methods for constrained optimization. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 22(6):936–964, 1984.
- [21] Irina F. Gorodnitsky, John S. George, and Bhaskar D. Rao. Neuromagnetic source imaging with FOCUSS: A recursive weighted minimum norm algorithm. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, 95(4):231–251, October 1995.
- [22] M. Grant and S. Boyd. CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming (web page and software). <http://stanford.edu/~boyd/cvx>, February 2009.
- [23] Christoph Helmberg and Franz Rendl. A spectral bundle method for semidefinite programming. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 10(3):673–696, 2000.
- [24] J.-B. Hiriart-Urruty and C. Lemaréchal. *Fundamentals of Convex Analysis*. Springer, New York, NY, USA, 2001.
- [25] Laurent Jacob, Guillaume Obozinski, and Jean-Philippe Vert. Group lasso with overlap and graph lasso. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pages 433–440. ACM, 2009.
- [26] Martin Jaggi. Revisiting Frank-Wolfe: Projection-free sparse convex optimization. In *Proc. 30th Intern. Conf. Machine Learning (ICML-13)*, pages 427–435, 2013.
- [27] Martin Jaggi, Marek Sulovsk, et al. A simple algorithm for nuclear norm regularized problems. In *Proceedings of the 27th international conference on machine learning (ICML-10)*, pages 471–478, 2010.
- [28] Narendra Karmarkar. A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear programming. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 302–311. ACM, 1984.
- [29] M Ko, Jochem Zowe, et al. An iterative two-step algorithm for linear complementarity problems. *Numerische Mathematik*, 68(1):95–106, 1994.
- [30] Kiryung Lee and Yoram Bresler. Efficient and guaranteed rank minimization by atomic decomposition. In *Information Theory, 2009. ISIT 2009. IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 314–318. IEEE, 2009.
- [31] Claude Lemarechal, Jean-Jacques Strodiot, and André Bihain. On a bundle algorithm for nonsmooth optimization. In *Nonlinear programming 4*, pages 245–282. Elsevier, 1981.

- [32] Adrian S. Lewis. The convex analysis of unitarily invariant matrix functions. *J. Convex Anal.*, 2(1):173–183, 1995.
- [33] Johan Lofberg. Yalmip: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in matlab. In *Computer Aided Control Systems Design, 2004 IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 284–289. IEEE, 2004.
- [34] Michael B. McCoy and Joel A. Tropp. Sharp recovery bounds for convex demixing, with applications. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 14(3):503–567, Jun 2014.
- [35] Eugene Ndiaye, Olivier Fercoq, Alexandre Gramfort, and Joseph Salmon. Gap safe screening rules for sparse-group lasso. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 388–396, 2016.
- [36] Sahand Negahban and Martin J Wainwright. Restricted strong convexity and weighted matrix completion: Optimal bounds with noise. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(May):1665–1697, 2012.
- [37] Y. E. Nesterov and A. Nemirovski. *Interior-Point Polynomial Algorithms in Convex Programming*, volume 13 of *Stud. Appl. Math.* Society of Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 1994.
- [38] Samet Oymak and Joel A Tropp. Universality laws for randomized dimension reduction, with applications. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 7(3):337–446, 2017.
- [39] Neal Parikh and Stephen Boyd. Proximal algorithms. *Foundations and Trends in Optimization*, 1(3):123–231, 2013.
- [40] Nikhil Rao, Parikshit Shah, and Stephen Wright. Forward–backward greedy algorithms for atomic norm regularization. *IEEE Trans. Sig. Proc.*, 63(21):5798–5811, 2015.
- [41] Benjamin Recht, Maryam Fazel, and Pablo A. Parrilo. Guaranteed minimum-rank solutions of linear matrix equations via nuclear norm minimization. *SIAM Rev.*, 52(3):471–501, 2010.
- [42] J. Renegar. *A Mathematical View of Interior-Point Methods in Convex Optimization*. MPS/SIAM Series on Optimization. Society of Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 2001.
- [43] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1970.
- [44] A. Seeger and M. Volle. On a convolution operation obtained by adding level sets: classical and new results. *RAIRO. Recherche opérationnelle*, 29:131–154, 1995.
- [45] Shai Shalev-Shwartz, Alon Gonen, and Ohad Shamir. Large-scale convex minimization with a low-rank constraint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1106.1622*, 2011.
- [46] R. Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the Lasso. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B.*, 58(1):267–288, 1996.

- [47] Robert Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *J. Royal Stat. Soc. Ser. B*, pages 267–288, 1996.
- [48] J. von Neumann. Some matrix inequalities and metrization of matric-space. In *Univ. Tomsk. Rev.*, volume IV of *Collected Works*, pages 205–218. Pergamon, Oxford, 1962.
- [49] John Wright, Arvind Ganesh, Kerui Min, and Yi Ma. Compressive principal component pursuit. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 2(1):32–68, 2013.
- [50] John Wright, Arvind Ganesh, Shankar Rao, Yigang Peng, and Yi Ma. Robust principal component analysis: Exact recovery of corrupted low-rank matrices via convex optimization. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2080–2088, 2009.
- [51] Lin Xiao. Dual averaging methods for regularized stochastic learning and online optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Oct):2543–2596, 2010.
- [52] A. Yurtsever, M. Udell, J. A. Tropp, and V. Cevher. Sketchy decisions: Convex low-rank matrix optimization with optimal storage. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, pages 1188–1196, 2017.
- [53] Xiangrong Zeng and Mário AT Figueiredo. The ordered weighted  $\ell_1$  norm: Atomic formulation, projections, and algorithms. *arXiv:1409.4271*, 2014.