

CP degeneracy in Tensor Regression

Ya Zhou¹, Raymond K. W. Wong² and Kejun He¹

¹*Institute of Statistics and Big Data, Renmin University of China*

²*Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA*

Abstract

Tensor linear regression is an important and useful tool for analyzing tensor data. To deal with high dimensionality, CANDECOMP/PARAFAC (CP) low-rank constraints are often imposed on the coefficient tensor parameter in the (penalized) M -estimation. However, we show that the corresponding optimization may not be attainable, and when this happens, the estimator is not well-defined. This is closely related to a phenomenon, called CP degeneracy, in low-rank tensor approximation problems. In this article, we provide useful results of CP degeneracy in tensor regression problems. In addition, we provide a general penalized strategy as a solution to overcome CP degeneracy. The asymptotic properties of the resulting estimation are also studied. Numerical experiments are conducted to illustrate our findings.

Keywords: High-dimensional regression; Low-rank modeling; Penalized regression

1 Introduction

Tensor linear regression (Raskutti et al., 2019; Guo et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2013; Hoff, 2015; Sun and Li, 2017; Lock, 2018; Miranda et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2019) has recently received an increasing amount of attention among the statistical researchers. In most existing work, low-rank constraints are imposed to overcome the curse of dimensionality (Chen et al., 2019; Guo et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2013; Lock, 2018; Li et al., 2018; Raskutti et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020). One popular low-rank modeling is based on CANDECOMP/PARAFAC (CP) decomposition (Harshman, 1970). However, the corresponding low-rank space may not be compact (De Silva and Lim, 2008). This raises questions about the well-posedness of the corresponding M -estimators, as the solution of their optimizations may not be attainable. Similar issues, known as CP degeneracy, have been discussed in the context of low-rank *approximation* problems (De Silva and Lim, 2008; Krijnen et al., 2008), which can be treated as a special case of tensor linear regression (see Example 1 in Section 3.1). However, such fundamental and important issues are seldomly discussed in the statistics literature. In this article, we aim to provide corresponding understanding and discussion in the context of tensor linear regression, from a statistical perspective. In particular, we will discuss the existence and characteristics of the CP degeneracy in tensor linear regression. We will also provide a solution to CP degeneracy and investigate the properties of the resulting estimation procedure.

The contribution of this article is threefold. First, we construct a set of examples to illustrate the possibility of CP degeneracy in tensor regression settings. Second, we theoretically

derive some important characteristics of CP degeneracy. A crucial characteristic of CP degeneracy is that the magnitude of the CP parameter will diverge, if an iterative algorithm is adopted to obtain an M -estimator of the CP parameter. Third, we propose a general penalized method with the theoretical guarantee to surmount the barrier of degeneracy. In particular, we provide an asymptotic analysis of the penalized estimation in the high-dimensional regime. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first analysis that does not require the assumption of the well-defined low-rank approximation. That is, in our analysis, the underlying low-rank approximation of the true tensor coefficient *does not* have to exist.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the background of CP decomposition and degeneracy, as well as tensor linear regression. Section 3 discusses the existence of CP degeneracy, its characteristics and a strategy to overcome it. Section 4 provides corresponding numerical experiments. Technical details are deferred to the Section S.1.

2 Preliminary

2.1 Tensor basics and CP degeneracy

In this article, we focus on tensors that are real-valued multidimensional array. For a tensor $\mathbf{A} = (A_{i_1, \dots, i_D}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_D}$ with $p_d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ for $d = 1, \dots, D$, there are D modes where D is often referred to as the order of the tensor. Vectors and matrices can be regarded as first-order and second-order tensors respectively. Often, tensors of order 3 or above are referred to as higher-order tensors. It is now well-known that higher-order tensors behave very differently from its lower-order counterparts, e.g., matrices. Indeed, many tensor problems are NP-hard (Hillar and Lim, 2013). Also, many matrix-related concepts cannot be directly generalized to higher-order tensors. The CP degeneracy problem (with details given below) — the major subject of this article — is an example. To avoid clutter, we will simply refer to a higher-order tensor as a tensor, and use vector and matrix specifically for first-order and second-order tensor.

One of the most important matrix tools is singular value decomposition (SVD). As for tensors, there are two commonly used tensor decompositions, CANDECOMP/PARAFAC (CP) decomposition (Harshman, 1970) and Tucker decomposition (Tucker, 1966), both of which can be regarded as higher-order generalizations of SVD. The major interest of this article centers around the CP decomposition. More specifically, the CP decomposition of a tensor $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_D}$ is written as

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{r=1}^R \beta_{1,r} \circ \dots \circ \beta_{D,r}, \quad (1)$$

where $\beta_{d,r} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_d}$, $d = 1, \dots, D$, and $\circ$ represents the outer product. We refer to the entries of $\beta_{d,r}$'s as CP parameters. The rank of a tensor $\mathbf{A}$, denoted by $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$, is the smallest R such that the CP decomposition (1) holds. In other words, it is the minimal number of rank-1 tensors (outer products of D vectors) that can represent the tensor. Despite its high similarity to the definition of matrix rank, tensor rank possesses surprisingly different properties. First, the rank of tensor may depend on whether the entries are real-valued or complex-valued (i.e., the fields). To date, this seems to be relatively less interesting to the statistical community,

as most of the statistical work related to tensors focus on real-valued tensors. Second, the rank determination is NP-hard (Johan, 1990). Third, the space of low-rank tensors may not be closed. More precisely, it has been shown by De Silva and Lim (2008) that the space

$$\{\mathbf{A} : \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R, \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_D}\}$$

is not closed regardless of the choice of norm, for $R = 2, \dots, \min\{p_1, \dots, p_D\}$ and $D \geq 3$. As a result, the best low-rank approximation for a higher order tensor may not exist. More specifically, the best rank- R approximation is defined as a solution to the following problem

$$\arg \min_{\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R} \|\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{A}\|_F. \quad (2)$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm, also called Hilbert-Schmidt norm, which is defined as $\|\mathbf{A}\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_D} A_{i_1, \dots, i_D}^2}$. The non-closedness of the feasible set in (2) has a significant impact on the existence of a solution. When the solution of (2) does not exist, it is generally referred to as a CP degeneracy problem (Kolda and Bader, 2009). Note that the degeneracy problem never happens for matrices (i.e., $D = 2$), and a best rank- R approximation for a matrix can be obtained efficiently by the R leading factors of the SVD (Eckart and Young, 1936). Indeed, the possible non-existence of a best low-rank approximation has a significant influence on the well-posedness of low-rank tensor modeling in statistical problems. The goal of this article is to investigate this in the low-rank tensor regression problems, and provide solutions to avoid the CP degeneracy in the regression settings.

To better understand this non-existence of best rank- R approximation for a higher-order tensor, *border rank* was introduced in Bini et al. (1980). The border rank of a tensor $\mathbf{A}$ is defined as

$$\text{rank}_B(\mathbf{A}) := \min\{R : \text{for any } \epsilon > 0, \text{ there exists a tensor } \mathbf{C} \text{ such that } \|\mathbf{C}\|_F < \epsilon \text{ and } \text{rank}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{C}) = R\}.$$

When $\text{rank}_B(\mathbf{A}) < \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$, $\mathbf{A}$ does not have a best rank- R approximation for $\text{rank}_B(\mathbf{A}) \leq R < \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$. Many examples of tensors with border rank smaller than the tensor rank can be found in the literature (e.g., Bini et al., 1980; Paatero, 2000; Stegeman, 2006, 2007; De Silva and Lim, 2008). For example, let

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{v}_1 \circ \mathbf{w}_2 \circ \mathbf{w}_3 + \mathbf{w}_1 \circ \mathbf{v}_2 \circ \mathbf{w}_3 + \mathbf{w}_1 \circ \mathbf{w}_2 \circ \mathbf{v}_3,$$

where the pair $\mathbf{w}_d, \mathbf{v}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{p_d}$ are linearly independent for each $d = 1, 2, 3$. As shown in De Silva and Lim (2008), $\text{rank}_B(\mathbf{G}) = 2$ while $\text{rank}(\mathbf{G}) = 3$. One can construct the rank-2 tensor sequence $\{\mathbf{G}_\gamma, \gamma = 1, 2, \dots\}$:

$$\mathbf{G}_\gamma = \gamma \left(\mathbf{w}_1 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathbf{v}_1 \right) \circ \left(\mathbf{w}_2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathbf{v}_2 \right) \circ \left(\mathbf{w}_3 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathbf{v}_3 \right) - \gamma \mathbf{w}_1 \circ \mathbf{w}_2 \circ \mathbf{w}_3. \quad (3)$$

One can see that $\|\mathbf{G}_\gamma - \mathbf{G}\|_F \rightarrow 0$ as $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$. In other words, this sequence of rank-2 tensors converges to a rank-3 tensor. Let us suppose (on the contrary that) there exists a solution $\mathbf{G}_0$ to the best rank-2 approximation problem (2). It follows from the assumption that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{G}_0) \leq 2$ and $\|\mathbf{G}_0 - \mathbf{G}\|_F > 0$. However, by (3), we can always find a γ such that

$\|\mathbf{G}_\gamma - \mathbf{G}\|_F < \|\mathbf{G}_0 - \mathbf{G}\|_F$, which leads to a contradiction. Therefore, (2) does not have a solution in this example. One interesting phenomenon in this example is that, as $\mathbf{G}_\gamma$ converges to $\mathbf{G}$, some CP parameters of $\mathbf{G}_\gamma$ diverge. Indeed, this example is not a special case. Krijnen et al. (2008) shows that if the low-rank approximation does not have a solution, then some CP parameters of the sequence whose objective value converging to the infimum will diverge. It is worth noting that for matrices (i.e. $D = 2$), rank and board rank always coincide. For higher-order tensors (i.e. $D \geq 3$), there exists a positive volume of the tensors which do not have a best low-rank approximation (De Silva and Lim, 2008). Therefore, it may result in numerical problems in practice, if one blindly computes the low-rank approximation.

In recent years, the research of tensor regression has gained popularity. Due to its empirical successes, the low-rank assumption is among the most popular modeling strategies used to overcome the “large- p -small- n ” problem of the underlying tensor parameter estimations (e.g., Zhou et al., 2013; Rabusseau and Kadri, 2016; Guhaniyogi et al., 2017; Hao et al., 2019; Lock, 2018; Raskutti et al., 2019). The low-rank assumption is often just a working assumption, and may only hold approximately. In this case, the well-posedness of the low-rank modeling hinges on the existence of low-rank *approximation*. However, the related CP degeneracy problem in tensor regression is rarely mentioned. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, there is virtually no work for understanding this issue in the context of tensor regression, which we hope to address in this article. We will also provide strategies to avoid the CP degeneracy in this statistical setup.

2.2 Tensor linear regression

We briefly review the tensor linear regression model (e.g., Guo et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2013; Hoff, 2015; Suzuki, 2015; Yu and Liu, 2016; Sun and Li, 2017; Li and Zhang, 2017; Guhaniyogi et al., 2017; Li et al., 2018; Lock, 2018; Kang et al., 2018; Raskutti et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020). Suppose we have a data set $\{(y_i, \mathbf{X}_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$, where $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a response variable and $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_D}$ is a tensor covariate. The tensor linear model assumes

$$y_i = \langle \mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{X}_i \rangle + \epsilon_i, \quad (4)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the entry-wise inner product, $\mathbf{A}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_D}$ is an unknown fixed coefficient tensor, and $\epsilon_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a random error of mean zero. The commonly used squared loss function leads us to

$$F(\mathbf{A}) := \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}_i \rangle)^2. \quad (5)$$

In some applications, it is reasonable to assume $\mathbf{A}_0$ admits a low-rank structure (Guo et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2013). One can directly impose the rank restriction $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R$ in (5) and estimate the coefficient tensor by solving

$$\arg \min_{\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R} F(\mathbf{A}). \quad (6)$$

Another way to integrate the rank- R assumption is to reparametrize $\mathbf{A}$ using the CP decomposition form (1), i.e.,

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{r=1}^R \beta_{1,r} \circ \dots \circ \beta_{D,r}.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\mathbf{B}_d$ be the collections of all CP parameters and those in the d -th dimension respectively. In other words, we write

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\text{vec}(\mathbf{B}_1)^\top, \dots, \text{vec}(\mathbf{B}_D)^\top) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B}_d = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{d,1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{d,R}). \quad (7)$$

The squared loss w.r.t. $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can then be written as

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \left\langle \sum_{r=1}^R \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1,r} \circ \dots \circ \boldsymbol{\beta}_{D,r}, \mathbf{X}_i \right\rangle \right)^2 \quad (8)$$

and the corresponding estimator is obtained by solving

$$\arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} f(\boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (9)$$

From (6) and (9), we can see there are two ways to parametrize the low-rank coefficient tensors: (i) the tensor $\mathbf{A}$ itself with the rank restriction; (ii) the CP parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ defined as in (7). Without further penalization, these two parametrizations are equivalent, in the sense that if one of the corresponding optimizations cannot attain the infimum, the other one cannot either. However, as will be seen in Subsections 3.1 and 3.2, using CP parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ helps characterizing the problem of CP degeneracy. Moreover, we will show (in Subsections 3.3 and 3.4) that adding a correct form of penalization on the CP parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ will solve the degeneracy issue, but not necessarily true when the penalization is directly applied to the coefficient tensor. Although we mainly focus on the least squares problem in this article, the results in the following sections can be generalized to other commonly used convex objective functions.

3 Examples, theory and solution

3.1 Existence of degeneracy

Obviously, the first and the most natural question to ask is whether degeneracy would occur in tensor linear regression. Compared with the best low-rank approximation problem (2), tensor linear regression involves an additional component, i.e., the predictors. Whether the degeneracy occurs is also affected by the value of the predictors. Indeed, it is easy to see that the classical degeneracy in (2) is a special case of the degeneracy in the regression setting, as follows.

Example 1. Consider the noiseless case in tensor linear regression, i.e., $\epsilon_i = 0$ in (4). Suppose $n = \prod_d p_d$ and the set of design matrices $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}$ is chosen as

$$\{\mathbf{X}_i\} = \{\mathbf{e}_{1,i_1} \circ \mathbf{e}_{2,i_2} \cdots \circ \mathbf{e}_{D,i_D} : i_d \in \{1, \dots, p_d\}, d = 1, \dots, D\},$$

where $\mathbf{e}_{d,i_d}$ is the standard basis of Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{p_d}$ such that its i_d -th component equals 1 and the rest are 0. If the true coefficient tensor $\mathbf{A}_0$ in (4) does not have a best rank- R approximation, then the corresponding least squares problem (6) does not have a solution.

Example 1 shows that when $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}$ are the full standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_D}$, the optimization (6) can be written as

$$\arg \min_{\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R} \|\mathbf{A}_0 - \mathbf{A}\|_F, \quad (10)$$

which recovers the low-rank approximation form as in (2). If $\mathbf{A}_0$ does not have the best rank- R approximation, then (10) has no solution and thus the original least squares problem does not have a solution. Although we only consider the noiseless case in Example 1, it can also be shown that the degeneracy could happen with a positive probability for the noisy cases; see Theorem 8.4 of De Silva and Lim (2008) for the details.

Next, we will give more interesting examples of the degeneracy in unpenalized tensor linear regressions. We will also consider the penalized regressions with, e.g., the ridge penalty, in Section 3.4. For simplicity, we denote

$$\mathbf{Z} = (\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_1), \dots, \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_n))^T \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T, \quad (11)$$

where $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ is the vectorization operator. Using the notations defined in (11), the squared loss function $F(\mathbf{A})$ in (5) can be rewritten as

$$F(\mathbf{A}) = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z} \text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|^2,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm. Without the rank restriction, the classical theory of least squares estimation shows that the set of solutions to minimize $F(\mathbf{A})$ is

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{A} : \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}) = (\mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{Z})^+ \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{y} + \{\mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{Z})^+ \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{Z}\} \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{\prod_d p_d}\}, \quad (12)$$

where $(\cdot)^+$ denotes a generalized inverse for a matrix and $\mathbf{I}$ is an identity matrix of compatible dimension.

Lemma 1. *Suppose*

$$R_m = \min\{\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) : \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}\} \quad \text{and} \quad R_b = \min\{\text{rank}_B(\mathbf{A}) : \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}\},$$

where $\mathcal{S}$ is the set of solutions of tensor linear model as defined in (12). If $R_b \leq R < R_m$, then the optimizations (6) and (9) do not have a solution.

The proof Lemma 1 can be found in Section S.1.2. Using Lemma 1, we can give the next two concrete examples (Examples 2 and 3) that illustrate the existence of degeneracy problems.

Example 2. Suppose one observes data $(\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3}, y_i \in \mathbb{R}), i = 1, \dots, n$, satisfying $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{Z} \text{vec}(\mathbf{G}_b)$ for some $\mathbf{G}_b \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3}$, where $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ are defined in (11). If $\text{rank}(\mathbf{Z}) = \prod_{d=1}^3 p_d$ and the tensor $\mathbf{G}_b$ can be represented as

$$\mathbf{G}_b = \mathbf{v}_1 \circ \mathbf{w}_2 \circ \mathbf{w}_3 + \mathbf{w}_1 \circ \mathbf{v}_2 \circ \mathbf{w}_3 + \mathbf{w}_1 \circ \mathbf{w}_2 \circ \mathbf{v}_3,$$

where $\mathbf{w}_d, \mathbf{v}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{p_d}$ are pairs of linearly independent vectors for $d = 1, 2, 3$, then there is no solution to (6) with $R = 2$. To see this, we only need to confirm the setting satisfies the condition of Lemma 1. By definition, we have $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{G}_b\}$. By Corollary 5.12 of De Silva and Lim (2008), $\text{rank}(\mathbf{G}_b) = 3$ and $\text{rank}_B(\mathbf{G}_b) = 2$. Thus, this setting satisfies the condition of Lemma 1.

Example 2 illustrates a case when the corresponding design matrix $\mathbf{Z}$ in (11) has full column rank. Next, we give a more general example that does not require full column rankness of $\mathbf{Z}$, and so $\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z}$ is not necessarily invertible. Note that, when $j = (i_1 - 1)(p_2 p_3) + (i_2 - 1)p_3 + i_3$, the j -th column of $\mathbf{Z}$ consists of the predictor values at the (i_1, i_2, i_3) -th entry in the covariate tensor $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3}$.

Example 3. Suppose one observes data $(\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3}, y_i \in \mathbb{R})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Collect the columns of $\mathbf{Z}$ that correspond to entries of the predictors with positions $\mathcal{I} := \{(i_1, i_2, i_3), i_d = 1, \dots, \tilde{p}_d, \tilde{p}_d < p_d, d = 1, 2, 3\}$ to form $\mathbf{Z}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \prod_d \tilde{p}_d}$, and the rest of the columns to form $\mathbf{Z}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (\prod_d p_d - \prod_d \tilde{p}_d)}$. Now we suppose $(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ satisfies $\mathbf{Z}_1^\top \mathbf{Z}_1 = \mathbf{I}_s$, $\mathbf{Z}_1^\top \mathbf{Z}_2 = \mathbf{0}$, where $\mathbf{I}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times s}$ is the identity matrix, $s = \tilde{p}_1 \tilde{p}_2 \tilde{p}_3$. If $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{Z}_1 \text{vec}(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b)$ for some $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{p}_1 \times \tilde{p}_2 \times \tilde{p}_3}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b$ can be represented as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_3 + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_3 + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_d, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{p}_d}$ is a pair of linearly independent vectors, $d = 1, 2, 3$, then there is no solution when one uses (6) with $R = 2$ to fit the low-rank tensor linear regression. The proof of this result is given in Section S.1.1.

After demonstrating the possibility of CP degeneracy in tensor linear regression, it is important to understand this phenomenon so as to avoid it. The following subsection will provide some helpful characteristics of CP degeneracy.

3.2 Characterization of degeneracy

Next, we provide some useful and important characteristics of CP degeneracy in tensor regression. First, Theorem 1 below shows that if the degeneracy occurs, the CP parameters will diverge. Note that there is a scaling indeterminacy in the CP decomposition, e.g.,

$$\beta_{1,r} \circ \dots \circ \beta_{D,r} = \frac{1}{S} \beta_{1,r} \circ \dots \circ (S \beta_{D,r}), \quad \text{for any } S \neq 0,$$

which will affect the magnitude of the CP parameters. To avoid the effect of scaling indeterminacy, we use

$$\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{r=1}^R \prod_{d=1}^D \|\beta_{dr}\|,$$

to quantify the magnitude of CP parameters in (7).

Theorem 1. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_t : \boldsymbol{\theta}_t = (\text{vec}(\mathbf{B}_{1,t})^\top, \dots, \text{vec}(\mathbf{B}_{D,t})^\top), \mathbf{B}_{d,t} = (\beta_{d1,t}, \dots, \beta_{dr,t})\}_t$ be a sequence satisfying $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \rightarrow \inf f$ in (9). If the infimum in the optimization (9) is not attainable, then $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \rightarrow \infty$.

The proof of Theorem 1 can be found in Section S.1.3. From a practical perspective, this theorem can be best linked with a situation when an iterative algorithm is (blindly) adopted to minimize f . Indeed, most existing methods to solve the optimization over a low-CP-rank space are iterative algorithms (e.g. Guo et al., 2011; Tan et al., 2012; Zhou et al., 2013; Lock, 2018; Zhang et al., 2018; Hao et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2020). Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$ represent the output value of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ at the t -th iteration of the algorithm. For such an algorithm, a reasonable expectation

is that $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \rightarrow \inf f$. As shown in Theorem 1, a characteristic of CP degeneracy is that $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \rightarrow \infty$. Practically this indeed can be checked, and will be illustrated in Section 4. In the case of CP degeneracy, these algorithms may produce overflow problems, if one does not limit the maximum number of iterations. Note that terminating the algorithm after some number of iterations without convergence is an early stopping strategy, which can be regarded as a form of regularization. Therefore, to be precise, the resulting estimator is no longer the one defined by (9), and would require a separate analysis of their statistical behavior.

Next, we provide Theorems 2 and 3 which present minimum eigenvalue (upper) bounds on the CP parameters. These bounds indicate the approximate linear dependency in the CP parameters when degeneracy occurs. We use C with or without subscripts to denote a positive constant which may change values from line to line.

Assumption 1. *There exists a constant S_1 such that*

$$0 < S_1 \leq \inf_{\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}_i \rangle \right|^2,$$

where

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{A}, \|\mathbf{A}\|_F = 1, \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R\}. \quad (13)$$

Assumption 1 can be regarded as a restricted eigenvalue condition with respect to the design $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}$.

For notational simplicity, we write $\mathbf{D}_t = (\mathbf{d}_{1,t}, \dots, \mathbf{d}_{R,t})$, where

$$\mathbf{d}_{r,t} = \frac{1}{\prod_d \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{dr,t}\|} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1r,t} \otimes \dots \otimes \boldsymbol{\beta}_{Dr,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{\prod p_d}.$$

In the above, $\otimes$ denotes Kronecker product and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{dr,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_d}$ is the component of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$ defined in Theorem 1. We use $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ to denote the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of a matrix respectively.

Theorem 2. *Under Assumption 1, there exists a constant t_0 depending on the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_t\}$ such that if $t \geq t_0$, then*

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{D}_t^\top \mathbf{D}_t) \leq \frac{R(C_1 + C_2 \|\mathbf{y}\|^2)}{n\mathcal{M}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)},$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\prod_r \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{dr,t}\|^2} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}_{d,t}^\top \mathbf{B}_{d,t}) \leq \frac{R(C_1 + C_2 \|\mathbf{y}\|^2)}{n\mathcal{M}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)}, \quad \text{for } d = 1, \dots, D.$$

The proof of Theorem 2 is presented in Section S.1.4. By Theorem 1, $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)$ diverges if the degeneracy occurs. Therefore, in the degeneracy cases, the ranks of the CP component matrices are nearly rank-deficient.

We next show in Lemma S.1 that Assumption 1 holds with high probability in random design settings (Assumption 2). Consequently, an analogously non-asymptotic result is shown in Theorem 3. We begin by presenting the definitions of sub-Gaussian random variables and vectors.

Definition 1 (Sub-Gaussian random variables (Vershynin, 2018)). *The sub-Gaussian norm of a random variable X , denoted by $\|X\|_{\psi_2}$, is defined as*

$$\|X\|_{\psi_2} = \inf\{V > 0 : \mathbb{E} \exp(X^2/V^2) \leq 2\}. \quad (14)$$

We say $\|X\|_{\psi_2} = \infty$ when there is no such positive V satisfying (14). A random variable X is called sub-Gaussian if $\|X\|_{\psi_2} < \infty$.

Definition 2 (Sub-Gaussian random vectors (Vershynin, 2018)). *A random vector $\mathbf{x}$ in $\mathbb{R}^p$ is called sub-Gaussian if the one-dimensional marginals $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a} \rangle$'s are sub-Gaussian random variables for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. The sub-Gaussian norm of $\mathbf{x}$ is defined to be*

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\psi_2} = \sup_{\|\mathbf{a}\|=1} \|\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a} \rangle\|_{\psi_2}.$$

Assumption 2. *Assume $\mathbf{X}_i$ are i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}\{\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_i)\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_i)^\top\} = \Sigma$, which satisfies*

$$0 < S_{\min} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma) \leq S_{\max} < \infty,$$

and

$$\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_i)^\top \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{\psi_2} \leq \kappa < \infty,$$

where $S_{\min}$, $S_{\max}$ and κ are constants.

Definition 3 (Gaussian width). *For any subset $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \cdots \times p_D}$, the Gaussian width of $\mathcal{A}$ is defined to be $w(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}), \mathbf{x} \rangle$, where $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{\prod p_d})$.*

Theorem 3. *Under Assumption 2, if $n > C_1 w^2(\mathcal{P})$, two statements in Theorem 2 will hold with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp\{-C_2 w^2(\mathcal{P})\}$, where $\mathcal{P}$ is a low-rank space defined in (13).*

Here we provide an upper bound of $w(\mathcal{P})$ as follows.

Theorem 4. *We have $w(\mathcal{P}) \leq C(R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d)$.*

The proofs of Theorems 3 and 4 are presented in Sections S.1.5 and S.1.6, respectively. Overall, these characteristics demonstrated in Theorems 1–3 can be used in practice to detect degeneracy. In fact, they lead to solutions to prevent degeneracy in both theory and practice. We will discuss such a solution rigorously in the next subsection.

3.3 Strategy to overcome the problem

As suggested by Theorem 1, to avoid the degeneracy problem of tensor linear regression, we should restrict the magnitude measure $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. A simple solution is to impose penalty:

$$\arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \lambda g(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (15)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the penalty parameter and g is the penalty function. In this article, we let $g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be a continuous function and satisfies the following assumption.

Assumption 3 (Conditions on the penalty function). *The function g satisfies*

1. $g(\mathbf{0}) < \infty$;
2. $g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \rightarrow \infty$ for any sequence $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_t, t = 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \rightarrow \infty$;
3. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_t, t = 1, 2, \dots\}$ be any sequence such that $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \leq S_1$ for all t and some S_1 . Then there exists another sequence $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}'_t, t = 1, 2, \dots\}$ and a constant $S_2 < \infty$, depending on S_1 , such that for all t , $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}'_t) \leq S_1$, $g(\boldsymbol{\theta}'_t) \leq g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)$, and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}'_t\| \leq S_2$.

Note that the above assumption on $g(\cdot)$ is mild and is satisfied with many commonly used penalty functions with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. For example, LASSO (Tibshirani, 1996)

$$\sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{r=1}^R \sum_{l_d=1}^{p_d} |\beta_{d,r,l_d}|,$$

the group LASSO (Yuan and Lin, 2006) $\sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{l_d=1}^{p_d} \sqrt{\sum_{r=1}^R \beta_{d,r,l_d}^2}$, and the Ridge (Hastie et al., 2013)

$$\sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{r=1}^R \sum_{l_d=1}^{p_d} \beta_{d,r,l_d}^2, \quad (16)$$

where β_{d,r,l_d} is l_d -th element of $\beta_{d,r}$. In fact, they have been used in previous work (Guo et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2013; Hao et al., 2019) but without any consideration of the CP degeneracy. With Assumption 3, the infimum of $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \lambda g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is attainable for any positive λ . Formally, the following Corollary 1 shows that CP degeneracy does not occur in (15) and its proof is given in Section S.1.7.

Corollary 1. *Suppose Assumption 3 is satisfied. If $\lambda > 0$, then the optimization (15) has a solution.*

As mentioned before, the low-rank approximation of higher-order tensor may not exist and the least squares estimation of tensor linear regression restricted on a low-rank space may not be attainable. Thus, when the degeneracy occurs, the numerical results are unstable over the iterations of any iterative algorithms and the solution of the optimization is not well-defined. Borrowing the idea of Corollary 1, the following Theorem 5 bypasses the rank- R assumption and presents the asymptotic properties of the estimation (15). We note that such an assumption occurs in most existing convergence analyses for tensor linear regression methods (e.g., Zhou et al., 2013; Suzuki, 2015; Lock, 2018). To the best of our knowledge, ours is the first result that does not require such condition, and works even when the best low-rank assumption does not exist. Before presenting the theorem, we need some assumption on the observational errors which are intrinsic in many statistical applications.

Assumption 4. *The observational errors $\epsilon_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ are i.i.d. mean zero sub-Gaussian random variables with sub-Gaussian norm $S_\epsilon < \infty$.*

Due to Example 1, the low-rank approximation problem can be treated as a special case of tensor linear regression model without observational noise. Thus, using the proof of Corollary 1 also guarantees the existence of restricted low-rank approximation. In particular, for given $R > 0$ and $G > 0$, denote the low-rank approximation error δ as

$$\delta^2 = \min_{\substack{\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R, \\ g(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq G}} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_0\|_F^2.$$

Theorem 5. Suppose $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ is the coefficient tensor reconstructed from a solution $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ of (15). Under Assumptions 2–4, we have

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A}_0\|_F^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_p\left(\frac{R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d}{n}\right) + \mathcal{O}_p(\delta^2) + \mathcal{O}_p\left(\lambda \frac{G}{n}\right). \quad (17)$$

The proof of Theorem 5 is given in Section S.1.8. The first term in the right hand side (RHS) of (17) is due to the estimation error. In many real applications, $D = 3, 4$, and R is very small, e.g., $R = 3$ (Zhou et al., 2013). Thus, $(R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d)/n$ is very close to $R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d/n$ in terms of order, which is the minimax lower bound shown in Suzuki (2015). The second term in the RHS of (17) is due to the approximation error. Note that we do not make any assumptions on the relationship between R and the true rank R_0 . That is, this theorem allows $R_0 - R$ to be arbitrarily large. If $R \geq R_0$ and $G = g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is CP parameters of $\mathbf{A}_0$, we have $\delta^2 = 0$. The third term in the RHS of (17) is the bias due to penalization. Using a λ satisfying $\lambda \leq C \max\{(R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d)/G, n\delta^2/G\}$, the bias term is dominated by the first two terms in the RHS.

In addition to the tensor $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$, we are also interested in the asymptotic behavior of the corresponding CP parameters. For a given set of data, Assumption 3 can be used to show $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is bounded whenever $\lambda > 0$. However, in the asymptotic framework, we are considering a sequence of data sets and λ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, the result is not straightforwardly followed from Corollary 1. Since a generic penalty function g is considered in this article, we show the rate of convergence of $\hat{G}$ to obtain a general result, where $\hat{G} := g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ for an attainable $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$.

Corollary 2. Using the same assumptions of Theorem 5 and taking

$$\lambda = \max\{(R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d)/G, n\delta^2/G\},$$

we have

$$\hat{G} = \mathcal{O}_p(G).$$

The proof of Corollary 2 is in Section S.1.9.

3.4 Not every penalty works

Assumption 3 gives a sufficient condition of the penalty function that prevents the CP degeneracy. The crux is to control the magnitude of the estimator. In this subsection, we will give an example that the choice of parametrization of which the magnitude is being controlled is crucial. More specifically, we will focus on the original tensor parameterization $\mathbf{A}$ instead of the CP parametrization $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. A natural way to control its magnitude is to impose the element-wise ridge penalty (l_2) on the regression coefficient tensor $\mathbf{A}$ (e.g., Guo et al., 2011). In other words, consider

$$\arg \min_{\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}_i \rangle)^2 + \alpha \|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2. \quad (18)$$

Proposition 1. The optimization (18) is not guaranteed to have a solution.

The following Example 4 serves as a proof of Proposition 1. We will also compare the estimators using (9) and (15) in Section 4 of the simulation study.

Example 4. If $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ satisfy the conditions of Example 2, then there does not exist any solution when one uses (18) with $R = 2$ to estimate the low-rank coefficient tensor in tensor linear model (4). The proof of this result is given in Section S.1.1.

If the optimization (18) cannot attain the infimum, similar to Theorem 1, the magnitude of CP parameters may diverge. This phenomenon is confirmed by our simulation study (Table 1).

In practice, most algorithms impose an upper bound on the number of iteration, which prevents various numerical issues due to CP degeneracy. The resulting estimators could still perform well in practice. However, the effect of such early stopping strategy requires more understanding.

4 Numerical experiments

To further understand the CP degeneracy in tensor linear regression, we performed numerical experiments via synthetic data generated from a variety of settings. According to our discussion in Section 3, we compared three methods: tensor linear regression without penalization, that with l_2 penalty on the CP parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and that with l_2 penalty on the coefficient tensor $\mathbf{A}$. All of the corresponding optimization problems were solved by a block updating algorithm (Guo et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2013; Lock, 2018) and the details are stated in Algorithm 1 with the following notations. Recall the definition of $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (8) and the notation $\mathbf{B}_d$ in (7),

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \left\langle \sum_{r=1}^R \beta_{1,r} \circ \cdots \circ \beta_{D,r}, \mathbf{X}_i \right\rangle \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B}_d = (\beta_{d,1}, \dots, \beta_{d,R}).$$

For notational simplicity, when the tuning parameters λ and α are given, we respectively rewrite the least squares method (9), CP parameters penalized method (15) with g specified as the ridge penalty (16), and the coefficient tensor penalized method in (18) as

$$L_1(\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_D) := f(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

$$L_2(\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_D) := f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \lambda \sum_{d=1}^D \|\mathbf{B}_d\|_F^2,$$

and

$$L_3(\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_D) := f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \alpha \left\| \sum_{r=1}^R \beta_{1,r} \circ \cdots \circ \beta_{D,r} \right\|^2.$$

We randomly generated the initial value $\mathbf{B}_d^0$ and then ran Algorithm 1 to get an estimate from each method. Since all of the optimizations are non-convex, we used 5 random initial values and chose the one that minimized the corresponding objective value for each method.

In this study, each simulated dataset $\{(y_i, \mathbf{X}_i), i = 1, \dots, n\}$ was generated from one of the following four cases including both noiseless and noisy ones:

$$\text{Case 1a: } y = \langle \mathbf{A}_0^a, \mathbf{X} \rangle;$$

$$\text{Case 1b: } y = \langle \mathbf{A}_0^b, \mathbf{X} \rangle;$$

Algorithm 1: Block Updating Algorithm

Initialize: $i, T, \mathbf{B}_d^0, d = 1, \dots, D$.
repeat
 for $d = 1, \dots, D$ **do**
 $\mathbf{B}_d^{t+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{B}_d} L_i(\mathbf{B}_1^{t+1}, \dots, \mathbf{B}_{d-1}^{t+1}, \mathbf{B}_d, \mathbf{B}_{d+1}^t, \dots, \mathbf{B}_D^t)$
 end for
until $t = T$

Case 2a: $y = \langle \mathbf{A}_0^a, \mathbf{X} \rangle + \epsilon;$

Case 2b: $y = \langle \mathbf{A}_0^b, \mathbf{X} \rangle + \epsilon.$

In the above, $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_0 \times p_0 \times p_0}$ was randomly generated with independent $Unif(0, 1)$ entries, and the error ϵ was an independent $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ random variable. The variance σ^2 was chosen such that the signal-to-noise ratio $\text{SNR} = \text{Var}\{m(\mathbf{X})\}/\sigma^2 = 4$, where m is the regression function (i.e., $\langle \mathbf{A}_0^a, \mathbf{X} \rangle$ or $\langle \mathbf{A}_0^b, \mathbf{X} \rangle$). We set $R_0 = 3$ and the true coefficient tensor $\mathbf{A}_0^a$ and $\mathbf{A}_0^b$ were constructed in the following ways:

$$\mathbf{A}_0^a = \mathbf{w}_1 \circ \mathbf{v}_2 \circ \mathbf{v}_3 + \mathbf{v}_1 \circ \mathbf{w}_2 \circ \mathbf{v}_3 + \mathbf{v}_1 \circ \mathbf{v}_2 \circ \mathbf{w}_3 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{A}_0^b = \mathbf{u}_1 \circ \mathbf{u}_2 \circ \mathbf{u}_3 + \mathbf{v}_1 \circ \mathbf{v}_2 \circ \mathbf{v}_3 + \mathbf{w}_1 \circ \mathbf{w}_2 \circ \mathbf{w}_3,$$

where $\mathbf{w}_d, \mathbf{u}_d, \mathbf{v}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{p_0}$ with $p_0 = 5$, and their entries were independently drawn from $Unif(-5, 5)$, $d = 1, 2, 3$, for every simulated dataset. It can be seen from the data generating processes that $\mathbf{w}_d, \mathbf{u}_d, \mathbf{v}_d$ are linear independent, for $d = 1, 2, 3$, with probability 1. Although both $\mathbf{A}_0^a$ and $\mathbf{A}_0^b$ have CP rank 3, they behave differently in the sense of border rank. The border rank of $\mathbf{A}_0^a$ is strictly less than its CP rank, which is called a degenerate tensor (De Silva and Lim, 2008). We considered two different sample sizes $n = 100$ and 200 for each case. In the experiments, Algorithm 1 was applied to the simulated datasets with $R = 2$ and 3 for each of these three methods. We varied the tuning parameters λ and α , with values chosen from $\{0.001, 0.01, 0.1\}$. For each setting, the experiments were replicated 50 times.

We investigated the CP degeneracy in the experiments by checking whether the magnitude of the CP parameters diverges as the iteration number goes to infinity. We note that this is not a perfect rule, since the underlying optimizations are non-convex and the iteration sequences may not converge to a global optimum even with multiple initializations. However, we will see in later results that our empirical rule of determining the CP degeneracy is fairly accurate and does not affect the overall conclusion of our experiments.

Next we construct this empirical rule. In practice, we only have access to a finite number of iterations due to the limitation of computational resources. In our experiments, we let the algorithm run for 100000 iterations. In order to numerically identify CP degeneracy, we calculated $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)$ to measure the magnitude of CP parameters (see also Theorem 1), and therefore we have

$$\{t, \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)\}, t = 1, \dots, 100000. \quad (19)$$

Two examples for Case 1a with $(n, p, R, R_0) = (200, 5, 2, 3)$ and Case 2a with $(n, p, R, R_0) = (100, 5, 3, 3)$ are depicted in the first row of Figure 1. Determining whether the underlying iteration sequence of (19) is divergent can be regarded as a classification problem. We propose a simple classification rule to conservatively identify the divergent curves. First, as shown in

the Figure 1, the initial iterations are usually of different patterns and clearly not crucial in determining the divergence. So we focus on $t \geq 50000$. If $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{100000}) \leq \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{50000})$, the curve will be simply classified as non-divergent. The difficult situations are that $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{100000}) > \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{50000})$, where our rule is based on the estimation of the gradient of a continuous surrogate. Consider a differentiable function defined on $[50000, \infty)$ that passes through the points $\{(t, \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t))\}_{t=50000}^{100000}$, with its gradient approximated by an exponential function

$$h_{a,b,c}(t) = at^b + c, \quad (20)$$

where a , b and c are parameters crucial for determining the divergence. These parameters are estimated by the applications of least squares estimation to the numerical proxies of the gradient:

$$\left\{ \left(t, \frac{\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+100}) - \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)}{100} \right) : t = 50000, 50100, \dots, 99900 \right\}. \quad (21)$$

Theoretically, when the gradient function has the form of (20), one can use the values of a , b , and c to simply determine whether $\int_{50000}^{\infty} h_{a,b,c}(t)dt = \infty$ or not. It is known that either when $\{a > 0, c > 0\}$ or $\{a > 0, c = 0, b > -1\}$, the integral will be infinity. Let $\hat{a}$, $\hat{b}$, and $\hat{c}$ be the fitted values of a , b , and c , respectively. Due to our discussion, we use the following rule

$$\hat{a} > 0, \hat{c} > \gamma_c \quad \text{or} \quad \hat{a} > 0, \hat{b} \geq \gamma_b, \eta_c \leq \hat{c} \leq \gamma_c$$

to quantitatively identify whether the magnitude curve $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)$ is divergent to infinity, where γ_c , $\eta_c > 0$ and $\gamma_b > -1$ are the pre-chosen cutoffs. One example of such fitting is depicted in the bottom panels of Figure 2. Since there exist estimation and approximation errors, due to fitting an exponential model, we set $(\gamma_b, \eta_c, \gamma_c) = (-0.5, 0, 0.0015)$ to obtain a conservative classification rule of divergence.

The results of the identified number of diverging curves using the aforementioned rule are summarized in Table 1. For the noiseless cases (Cases 1a and 1b), when the coefficient tensor is degenerate and a misspecified rank is used in optimization ($R = 2$ in Case 1a), the methods (9) and (18) have identified 50 divergences out of 50 replications. This result is consistent with our discussions in Subsection 3.1. For CP parameters penalized method (15) with g specified as the ridge penalty (16), there is only one case that is identified as divergence for small λ ($\lambda = 0.001$), which confirms that CP penalization is able to overcome the problem of degeneracy as in Subsection 3.3. For the noisy situations, i.e., Cases 2a and 2b, though CP parameters penalized method (15) has some rare cases to be identified as divergence, it is significantly less than the numbers of divergent cases of the other two methods. Again, we note that the empirical rule of divergence identification is not perfect, and so the very small number of identified divergences does not necessarily contradict with our theory in Section 3.3. Figure 2 shows an example that the least squares and the coefficient penalized methods provide divergent iteration sequences, while the results of CP parameters penalized methods are identified as convergence. Overall, the simulation study demonstrates that the divergence in tensor regression can occur in both noiseless and noised cases, if one directly uses the least squares method or the coefficient penalized method to estimate the unknown coefficient tensor. One way to overcome this challenge is to use CP parameters penalized method as we discussed in Subsection 3.3 and confirmed in our numerical experiments.




Figure 1: Examples of numerical experiments. The figures are the magnitude $\mathcal{M}(\theta_t)$ versus the iteration number t . The top corresponds to Case 1a with $(n, p, R, R_0) = (200, 5, 2, 3)$, and the bottom corresponds to Case 2a with $(n, p, R, R_0) = (100, 5, 3, 3)$. The results with respect to (9) and (18) with $\alpha = 0.001, 0.01, 0.1$ are grouped together in the first column using different colors. The results with respect to (15) with $\lambda = 0.001, 0.01, 0.1$ are depicted in the second column using different colors. .




Figure 2: An example of a numerical experiment for Case 1a with $(n, p, R, R_0) = (200, 5, 2, 3)$. The top are the plots of the magnitude $\mathcal{M}(\theta_t)$ versus the iteration number t for $t \geq 50000$. The bottom are plots of $\{(\mathcal{M}(\theta_{t+100}) - \mathcal{M}(\theta_t))/100\}$ and the fitted values $h_{\hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}}(t)$ versus t . The results with respect to (9) and (18) with $\alpha = 0.001, 0.01, 0.1$ are grouped together and presented in the first column using different colors and point shapes. The results with respect to (15) with $\lambda = 0.001, 0.01, 0.1$ are depicted in the second column using different colors and point shapes. The dotted lines with the same color in the bottom are the corresponding fitted curves using (20).

Table 1: The number of curves that are identified as diverging cases. Reported are based on 50 data replications for each setting. The columns LS , λ 's, and α 's correspond to the least squares method (9), CP parameters penalized method (15) with g specified as the ridge penalty (16), and the coefficient penalized method (18), respectively.

	(n, p_0)	(R, R_0)	LS	$\lambda = 0.001$	$\lambda = 0.01$	$\lambda = 0.1$	$\alpha = 0.001$	$\alpha = 0.01$	$\alpha = 0.1$
Case 1a	(100, 5)	(2, 3)	50	0	0	0	50	50	50
	(100, 5)	(3, 3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(200, 5)	(2, 3)	50	1	0	0	50	50	50
	(200, 5)	(3, 3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Case 1b	(100, 5)	(2, 3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(100, 5)	(3, 3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(200, 5)	(2, 3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(200, 5)	(3, 3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Case 2a	(100, 5)	(2, 3)	20	1	0	0	20	20	20
	(100, 5)	(3, 3)	25	1	1	0	20	18	22
	(200, 5)	(2, 3)	21	1	1	0	21	21	21
	(200, 5)	(3, 3)	25	1	1	0	25	25	27
Case 2b	(100, 5)	(2, 3)	3	0	0	0	1	2	1
	(100, 5)	(3, 3)	8	0	0	0	9	6	9
	(200, 5)	(2, 3)	2	0	0	0	2	2	2
	(200, 5)	(3, 3)	1	0	0	0	2	1	2

S.1 Proof details

S.1.1 Proof of the results of Examples

Proof of the result of Example 3. To save notations, for a tensor $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_3}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\text{vec}}(\mathbf{G}) = & (G_{1,1,1}, \dots, G_{1,1,\tilde{p}_1}, G_{1,2,\tilde{p}_1}, \dots, G_{1,\tilde{p}_2,\tilde{p}_1}, \dots, \\ & G_{\tilde{p}_1,\tilde{p}_2,\tilde{p}_1}, \dots, G_{\tilde{p}_1,\tilde{p}_2,\tilde{p}_1+1}, \dots, G_{\tilde{p}_1,\tilde{p}_2,p_3}, \dots, G_{p_1,p_2,p_3}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\prod_d p_d}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.1})$$

Let

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = (\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2). \quad (\text{S.2})$$

Without loss of generality, $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ can be written as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = (\widetilde{\text{vec}}(\mathbf{X}_1), \dots, \widetilde{\text{vec}}(\mathbf{X}_n))^\top.$$

Now, suppose $\mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is defined as (12). By definition, there exists $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 p_2 p_3}$ such that

$$\widetilde{\text{vec}}(\mathbf{G}) = (\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{Z}})^+ \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \mathbf{y} + (\mathbf{I} - (\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{Z}})^+ \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}) \mathbf{b}. \quad (\text{S.3})$$

Recall

$$\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_3 + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_3 + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \circ \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_3, \quad (\text{S.4})$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_d, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{p}_d}$ are pairs of linearly independent vectors, $d = 1, 2, 3$. Using (S.2), (S.3) and (S.4), we have

$$\widetilde{\text{vec}}(\mathbf{G}) = \begin{pmatrix} \text{vec}(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b) \\ (\mathbf{Z}_2^\top \mathbf{Z}_2)^+ \mathbf{Z}_2^\top \mathbf{Z}_2 \mathbf{b}_{p-s} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S.5})$$

where $\mathbf{b}_{p-s} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-s}$, $s = \tilde{p}_1 \tilde{p}_2 \tilde{p}_3$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{p}_1 \times \tilde{p}_2 \times \tilde{p}_3}$ is a sub-tensor of $\mathbf{G}$ with elements $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{b, \tilde{i}_1, \tilde{i}_2, \tilde{i}_3} = \mathbf{G}_{i_1, i_2, i_3}$ for $\tilde{i}_d = 1, \dots, \tilde{p}_d$.

Firstly, we will show $\text{rank}(\mathbf{G}) \geq 3$. If it does not hold, then $\text{rank}(\mathbf{G}) \leq 2$. We then have the sub-tensor $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b$ satisfying $\text{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b) \leq 2$. However, using the definition S.4 and Corollary 5.12 of De Silva and Lim (2008), we have

$$\text{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b) = 3,$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, $\text{rank}(\mathbf{G}) \geq 3$. Secondly, we will show there exists a tensor in the form of (S.5) has border rank 2. Indeed, it can be obtained by taking $\mathbf{b}_{p-s} = \mathbf{0}$. In summary, this setting satisfies the condition in Lemma 1, which completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of the result of Example 4. The optimization (18) can be reformulated as

$$\min_{\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R} \|\mathbf{y}_\alpha - \mathbf{Z}_\alpha \text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_2^2,$$

where $\mathbf{y}_\alpha = (\mathbf{y}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)^\top$ and $\mathbf{Z}_\alpha = (\mathbf{Z}^\top, \sqrt{\alpha} \mathbf{I}_p)^\top$. To use Lemma 1, we firstly define $\widetilde{\text{vec}}(\cdot)^{-1}$, with is the inverse of the vectorization S.1. The set of solutions can be written as

$$\mathcal{S} = \left[\left\{ \frac{1}{1+\alpha} \widetilde{\text{vec}}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \text{vec}(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b) \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \right\} \right],$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_b$ is defined as (S.4). It is straightforward to see $\mathcal{S}$ satisfies the condition of Lemma 1, which completes the proof. $\square$

S.1.2 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Recall that

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{A} : \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}) = (\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z})^+ \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{y} + (\mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z})^+ \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z}) \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \cdots p_D}\}, \quad (\text{S.6})$$

$$R_m = \min\{\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) : \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}\}, \quad (\text{S.7})$$

and

$$R_b = \min\{\text{rank}_B(\mathbf{A}) : \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}\}. \quad (\text{S.8})$$

Suppose $\mathbf{A}_m \in \mathcal{S}$, $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_m) = R_m$. By definition, $R_b \leq R < R_m$. Recall

$$F(\mathbf{A}) = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|^2.$$

It is trivial to see $\inf f = \inf F$. Let $\mathbf{A}_t$ be the corresponding tensor of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$. We will show two facts, i.e.,

$$F(\mathbf{A}) > \inf F \quad \text{if} \quad \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R, \quad (\text{S.9})$$

and there exists $\{\mathbf{A}_t\}$ satisfying

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_t) \leq R \quad \text{and} \quad F(\mathbf{A}_t) \rightarrow \inf F. \quad (\text{S.10})$$

The two facts, i.e., (S.9) and (S.10), lead that the optimization (6) does not have a solution.

Since $R < R_m$, it follows from (S.6) and (S.7) that (S.9) holds. Now, let us prove (S.10). It is trivial to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \inf F + \|\mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m) - \mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|^2 \\ & \leq \inf F + C\|\mathbf{A}_m - \mathbf{A}\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.11})$$

for all $\mathbf{A}$ satisfying $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R$. Since $R \geq R_{bm}$, there exists a sequence $\{\mathbf{A}_t\}$ satisfying

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_t) \leq R \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{A}_m - \mathbf{A}_t\| \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{S.12})$$

Using (S.9), (S.11) and (S.12) we finished the proof of (S.10). Thus, we prove the argument. $\square$

S.1.3 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can fix one representation of CP decomposition. Denote

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t = \{\text{vec}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_1^t)^\top, \dots, \text{vec}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_D^t)^\top\},$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_d^t = \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{d,1}^t}{\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{d,1}^t\|}, \dots, \frac{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{d,R}^t}{\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{d,R}^t\|} \right), \text{ for } d = 1, \dots, D-1$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_D^t = \left(\prod_{d=1}^{D-1} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{d,1}^t\| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{D,1}^t, \dots, \prod_{d=1}^{D-1} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{d,R}^t\| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{D,R}^t \right).$$

It is straightforward that

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) = f(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t) \text{ and } \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) = \mathcal{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t). \quad (\text{S.13})$$

The flowing proof is similar to Lemma 1 of [Krijnen et al. \(2008\)](#). Assume $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_t\}$ is a sequence such that $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \rightarrow \inf f$ and $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) < \infty$. Using (S.13), $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t\}$ is a bounded sequence. By Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem, there exists a further convergent subsequence $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{t_j}\}$. It follows from the continuity of f that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{t_j}) = f(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \inf f,$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{t_j}$ and it attains the infimum of f . By assumptions, it leads to a contradiction. Thus, any subsequence of $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t\}$ is unbounded, which leads to $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) = \mathcal{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t) \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

S.1.4 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Recall

$$\mathbf{D}_t = (\mathbf{d}_{1,t}, \dots, \mathbf{d}_{R,t}),$$

where

$$\mathbf{d}_{r,t} = \frac{1}{\prod_d \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{dr,t}\|} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1r,t} \otimes \dots \otimes \boldsymbol{\beta}_{Dr,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{\prod p_d}.$$

There exists a vectorization rule $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ for a tensor, such that

$$\text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_t) = \mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{h}_t, \quad (\text{S.14})$$

where $\mathbf{A}_t$ is the corresponding tensor of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$ and

$$\mathbf{h}_t = \left(\prod_d \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{d1,t}\|, \dots, \prod_d \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{dR,t}\| \right)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^R. \quad (\text{S.15})$$

For simplicity, we denote

$$\bar{\mathbf{Z}} = (\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_1)^\top, \dots, \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_n)^\top)^\top. \quad (\text{S.16})$$

Using the specific rearrange rule (S.16), (5) at iteration t can be written as

$$F(\mathbf{A}_t) = \|\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{h}_t\|^2.$$

We will see the performance of $\mathbf{D}_t$ when the infimum does not attain as follow.

Firstly, we note that there exists a constant t_0 , if $t \geq t_0$, then

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{h}_t\| = \|\bar{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{h}_t - \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{y}\| \leq \|\bar{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{h}_t - \mathbf{y}\| + \|\mathbf{y}\| < 1 + \|\mathbf{y}\| \quad (\text{S.17})$$

Secondly, we will show the final result. Using Assumption 1, we have

$$\|\mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{h}_t\|_2^2 \leq \frac{C \|\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{h}_t\|_2^2}{n}.$$

By definition, we have

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{D}_t^\top \mathbf{D}_t) \|\mathbf{h}_t\|_2^2 \leq \|\mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{h}_t\|_2^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{D}_t^\top \mathbf{D}_t) \leq \frac{C_1 + C_2 \|\mathbf{y}\|^2}{n \|\mathbf{h}_t\|^2}.$$

The proof about $\mathbf{D}_t$ can be finished by noting $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) = \|\mathbf{h}_t\|_1 \leq \sqrt{R} \|\mathbf{h}_t\|$, where $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the l_1 -norm of a vector. The proof of $\mathbf{B}_{d,t}$ can be finished by using the proof of Corollary 2 in [Krijnen et al. \(2008\)](#). □

S.1.5 Proof of Theorem 3

We first present the argument about restricted eigenvalue.

Lemma S.1. *Under Assumptions 2 and 4, if $n > Cw^2(\mathcal{P})$, we have*

$$C_1 \leq \inf_{\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}_i \rangle \right|^2 \leq \sup_{\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}_i \rangle \right|^2 \leq C_2,$$

with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-C_3 w^2(\mathcal{P}))$. Further, $w(\mathcal{P})$ in the lemma can be replaced by V with $V \geq w(\mathcal{P})$.

Proof of Lemma S.1. Using Theorem 10 and 12 of [Banerjee et al. \(2015\)](#) and Assumption 2, we will finish the proof. □

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 3.

Proof. Using Lemma S.1 and the same arguments in the proof of Theorem 2, we obtain

$$Cn \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{D}_t^\top \mathbf{D}_t) \|\mathbf{h}_t\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{h}_t\|_2^2,$$

with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp\{-C_3 w^2(\mathcal{P})\}$, which implies

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{D}_t^\top \mathbf{D}_t) \leq \frac{C}{n \|\mathbf{h}_t\|^2},$$

with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp\{-C_3 w^2(\mathcal{P})\}$. We then will finish the proof by following the arguments in the proof of Theorem 2. □

S.1.6 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. The proof of Theorem 4 can be finished by using Lemma S.2 and S.3. □

Lemma S.2. *We have*

$$w(\mathcal{P}) \leq C \int_0^2 \{\log N(\xi, \mathcal{P}, l_2)\}^{1/2} d\xi.$$

Proof of Lemma S.2. This is a direct result of Dudley's integral entropy bound ([Koltchinskii, 2011](#); [Vershynin, 2018](#)) □

Lemma S.3. *Suppose $N(\xi, \mathcal{P}, l_2)$ is the covering number of $\mathcal{P}$. We then have*

$$N(\xi, \mathcal{P}, l_2) \leq (C/\xi)^{R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d}. \quad (\text{S.18})$$

Proof of Lemma S.3. Note that CP decomposition is a special Tucker Decomposition, which will lead a higher-order singular value decomposition (HOSVD)(see, e.g., De Lathauwer et al., 2000). By Lemma 2 of Rauhut et al. (2017), we obtain (S.18). $\square$

S.1.7 Proof of Corollary 1

Proof. Let

$$f_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \lambda g(\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Assume the optimization (15) does not have a solution, which yields that f_λ can not attain the infimum. By definition, there exists a sequence $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\lambda,t}\}_t$ satisfying

$$f_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\lambda,t}) \rightarrow \inf f_\lambda \quad (\text{S.19})$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

If $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\lambda,t}) < \infty$, then there exists a constant $S_1 < \infty$ such that $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\lambda,t}) \leq S_1$. By Assumption 3 and (S.19), we have a bounded sequence $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\lambda,t}\}$ satisfying $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\lambda,t}\| \leq S_2$ and $f_\lambda(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\lambda,t}) \rightarrow \inf f_\lambda$. Using the arguments of Theorem 1, the infimum of f_λ is attainable, which contradicts the assumption. Now, we continue the proof. If

$$\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\lambda,t}) \rightarrow \infty,$$

using Assumption 3, we then have

$$f_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\lambda,t}) = f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\lambda,t}) + \lambda g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\lambda,t}) \geq \lambda g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\lambda,t}) \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{S.20})$$

However,

$$\inf f_\lambda \leq f_\lambda(\mathbf{0}) = f(\mathbf{0}) + \lambda g(\mathbf{0}) = \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 + \lambda g(\mathbf{0}) < \infty.$$

which contradict to (S.19) and (S.20). Thus, we have finished the proof. $\square$

S.1.8 Proof of Theorem 5

Suppose

$$\mathbf{A}_m \in \arg \min_{\substack{\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq R, \\ g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_A) \leq G}} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_0\|_{HS}^2.$$

By definition

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \langle \hat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{X}_i \rangle)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \langle \mathbf{A}_m, \mathbf{X}_i \rangle)^2 + \lambda g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{A_m}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{A_m}$ is one CP parameterization of $\mathbf{A}_m$. We then have

$$\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z} \text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}})\|_2^2 \leq \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z} \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m)\|_2^2 + \lambda G.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{Z}(\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m))\|_2^2 &\leq 2\langle \epsilon, \mathbf{Z} \text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \mathbf{Z} \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m) \rangle + \\ &\quad 2\langle \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{r}_{0m}, \mathbf{Z} \text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \mathbf{Z} \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m) \rangle + \lambda G, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.21})$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{0m} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_0) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m)$ and $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)^\top$.

Firstly, we find the upper bound of the first term on the right hand side of (S.21). Using the Dudley's integral entropy bound (Koltchinskii, 2011; Vershynin, 2018), Assumption 4, and Lemmas S.1 – S.3, we will obtain

$$\langle \epsilon, \mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m) \rangle \leq C\sqrt{n}\|\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m)\| \left(R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d \right)^{1/2}, \quad (\text{S.22})$$

with probability at least

$$1 - C_1 \exp \left\{ -C_2 \left(R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d \right) \right\}.$$

Secondly, we obtain the upper bound of the second term on the right hand side of (S.21). Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\langle \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{r}_{0m}, \mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m) \rangle \leq \|\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{r}_{0m}\| \|\mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m)\|. \quad (\text{S.23})$$

We will assume $n \geq C(R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d)$ in the following proof. By Assumptions, $\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_i)$ is a sub-Gaussian random vector and

$$\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_i)\|_{\psi_2} \leq C.$$

Suppose $\|\mathbf{r}_{0m}\| \neq 0$, we then have

$$\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_i)^\top \mathbf{r}_{0m}\|_{\psi_2} / \|\mathbf{r}_{0m}\| \leq C.$$

By Lemma 2.7.6 of Vershynin (2018), $\{\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_i)^\top \mathbf{r}_{0m}\}^2 / \|\mathbf{r}_{0m}\|^2$ is sub-exponential and

$$\|\{\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_i)^\top \mathbf{r}_{0m}\}^2 / \|\mathbf{r}_{0m}\|^2\|_{\psi_1} \leq C,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_1}$ is the sub-exponential norm (Vershynin, 2018). Using Proposition 2.7.1 of Vershynin (2018), we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{r}_{0m}\|_2^2 / \|\mathbf{r}_{0m}\|^2 \right\|_{\psi_1} \leq C,$$

which leads to

$$\frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{r}_{0m}\|_2^2 / \|\mathbf{r}_{0m}\|^2 \leq v,$$

with probability at least $1 - 2\exp(-Cv)$ for $v > 0$. Thus

$$\frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{r}_{0m}\|_2^2 \leq v \|\mathbf{r}_{0m}\|^2, \quad (\text{S.24})$$

with probability at least $1 - 2\exp(-Cv)$ for all $v \geq 0$. Using Lemmas S.1 – S.3, we have

$$C_1\sqrt{n}\|\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m)\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \mathbf{Z}\text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m)\|_2 \leq C_2\sqrt{n}\|\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m)\|_2, \quad (\text{S.25})$$

with probability at least $1 - C_1 \exp\{-C_2(R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d)\}$. Applying (S.22), (S.23), (S.24) and (S.25) to (S.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m)\|_2^2 &\leq C\delta\sqrt{v}\|\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m)\|_2 + \\ &\quad C\|\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m)\|_2 \sqrt{\frac{R^D + \sum_{d=1}^D R p_d}{n}} + \lambda G, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least

$$1 - C_1 \exp\left\{-C_2\left(R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d\right)\right\} - C_3 \exp\{-C_4 v\}. \quad (\text{S.26})$$

Solving the inequality yields,

$$\|\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_m)\|_2^2 \leq C_1 \frac{R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d}{n} + C_2 v \delta^2 + \lambda C_3 \frac{G}{n},$$

which implies

$$\|\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_0)\|_2^2 \leq C_1 \frac{R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d}{n} + (C_2 v + C) \delta^2 + \lambda C_3 \frac{G}{n},$$

with probability at least (S.26). We then finish the proof.

S.1.9 Proof of Corollary 2

By definition, G in (S.21) can be replaced by $G - \hat{G}$. Using the same arguments, have

$$\|\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_0)\|_2^2 \leq C_1 \frac{R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d}{n} + (C_2 v + C) \delta^2 + \lambda C_3 \frac{G - \hat{G}}{n},$$

with probability at least (S.26). Note that $\|\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) - \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_0)\|_2^2 \geq 0$. We then have

$$\lambda C \hat{G} \leq R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d + (C_2 v + C) n \delta^2 + \lambda C_3 G,$$

with probability at least (S.26), which completes the proof by taking

$$\lambda = \max\{(R^D + R \sum_{d=1}^D p_d)/G, n \delta^2/G\}.$$

References

- Banerjee, A., Chen, S., Fazayeli, F. and Sivakumar, V. (2015) Estimation with norm regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.02294*.
- Bini, D., Lotti, G. and Romani, F. (1980) Approximate solutions for the bilinear form computational problem. *Siam Journal on Computing*, **9**, 692–697.

- Chen, H., Raskutti, G. and Yuan, M. (2019) Non-convex projected gradient descent for generalized low-rank tensor regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **20**, 172–208.
- De Lathauwer, L., De Moor, B. and Vandewalle, J. (2000) A multilinear singular value decomposition. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, **21**, 1253–1278.
- De Silva, V. and Lim, L.-H. (2008) Tensor rank and the ill-posedness of the best low-rank approximation problem. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, **30**, 1084–1127.
- Eckart, C. and Young, G. (1936) The approximation of one matrix by another of lower rank. *Psychometrika*, **1**, 211–218.
- Guhaniyogi, R., Qamar, S. and Dunson, D. B. (2017) Bayesian tensor regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **18**, 2733–2763.
- Guo, W., Kotsia, I. and Patras, I. (2011) Tensor learning for regression. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, **21**, 816–827.
- Hao, B., Wang, B., Wang, P., Zhang, J., Yang, J. and Sun, W. W. (2019) Sparse tensor additive regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.00479*.
- Harshman, R. A. (1970) Foundations of the parafac procedure : Models and conditions for an "explanatory" multimodal factor analysis. *Ucla Working Papers in Phonetics*, **16**, 1–84.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R. and Friedman, J. (2013) *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Hillar, C. J. and Lim, L.-H. (2013) Most tensor problems are np-hard. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, **60**, 1–39.
- Hoff, P. D. (2015) Multilinear tensor regression for longitudinal relational data. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, **9**, 1169–1193.
- Johan, H. (1990) Tensor rank is np-complete. *Journal of Algorithms*, **4**, 644–654.
- Kang, J., Reich, B. J. and Staicu, A.-M. (2018) Scalar-on-image regression via the soft-thresholded gaussian process. *Biometrika*, **105**, 165–184.
- Kolda, T. G. and Bader, B. W. (2009) Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM Review*, **51**, 455–500.
- Koltchinskii, V. (2011) *Oracle inequalities in empirical risk minimization and sparse recovery problems*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Krijnen, W. P., Dijkstra, T. K. and Stegeman, A. (2008) On the non-existence of optimal solutions and the occurrence of “degeneracy” in the candecomp/parafac model. *Psychometrika*, **73**, 431–439.
- Li, L. and Zhang, X. (2017) Parsimonious tensor response regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **112**, 1131–1146.

- Li, X., Xu, D., Zhou, H. and Li, L. (2018) Tucker tensor regression and neuroimaging analysis. *Statistics in Biosciences*, **10**, 520–545.
- Lock, E. F. (2018) Tensor-on-tensor regression. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **27**, 638–647.
- Miranda, M. F., Zhu, H. and Ibrahim, J. G. (2018) Tprm: Tensor partition regression models with applications in imaging biomarker detection. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, **12**, 1422–1450.
- Paatero, P. (2000) Construction and analysis of degenerate parafac models. *Journal of Chemometrics: A Journal of the Chemometrics Society*, **14**, 285–299.
- Rabusseau, G. and Kadri, H. (2016) Low-rank regression with tensor responses. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 1867–1875.
- Raskutti, G., Yuan, M., Chen, H. et al. (2019) Convex regularization for high-dimensional multiresponse tensor regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, **47**, 1554–1584.
- Rauhut, H., Schneider, R. and Stojanac, Ž. (2017) Low rank tensor recovery via iterative hard thresholding. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, **523**, 220–262.
- Stegeman, A. (2006) Degeneracy in candecomp/parafac explained for $p \times p \times 2$ arrays of rank $p+1$ or higher. *Psychometrika*, **71**, 483–501.
- (2007) Degeneracy in candecomp/parafac and indscal explained for several three-sliced arrays with a two-valued typical rank. *Psychometrika*, **72**, 601–619.
- Sun, W. W. and Li, L. (2017) Store: sparse tensor response regression and neuroimaging analysis. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **18**, 4908–4944.
- Suzuki, T. (2015) Convergence rate of bayesian tensor estimator and its minimax optimality. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 1273–1282.
- Tan, X., Zhang, Y., Tang, S., Shao, J., Wu, F. and Zhuang, Y. (2012) Logistic tensor regression for classification. In *International Conference on Intelligent Science and Intelligent Data Engineering*, 573–581. Springer.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996) Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, **58**, 267–288.
- Tucker, L. R. (1966) Some mathematical notes on three-mode factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, **31**, 279–311.
- Vershynin, R. (2018) *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Yu, R. and Liu, Y. (2016) Learning from multiway data: Simple and efficient tensor regression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 373–381.

- Yuan, M. and Lin, Y. (2006) Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **68**, 49–67.
- Zhang, A. R., Luo, Y., Raskutti, G. and Yuan, M. (2020) Islet: Fast and optimal low-rank tensor regression via importance sketching. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, **2**, 444–479.
- Zhang, J., Liu, Y. and Jiang, J. (2018) Tensor learning and automated rank selection for regression-based video classification. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, **77**, 29213–29230.
- Zhou, H., Li, L. and Zhu, H. (2013) Tensor regression with applications in neuroimaging data analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **108**, 540–552.
- Zhou, Y., Wong, R. K. W. and He, K. (2020) Broadcasted nonparametric tensor regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.12927*.