

Near-Optimal Entrywise Sampling of Numerically Sparse Matrices

Vladimir Braverman*
Johns Hopkins University
vova@cs.jhu.edu

Robert Krauthgamer†
Weizmann Institute of Science
robert.krauthgamer@weizmann.ac.il

Aditya Krishnan‡
Johns Hopkins University
akrish23@jhu.edu

Shay Sapir
Weizmann Institute of Science
shay.sapir@weizmann.ac.il

November 7, 2021

Abstract

Many real-world data sets are sparse or almost sparse. One method to measure this for a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the *numerical sparsity*, denoted $\text{ns}(A)$, defined as the minimum $k \geq 1$ such that $\|a\|_1/\|a\|_2 \leq \sqrt{k}$ for every row and every column a of A . This measure of a is smooth and is clearly only smaller than the number of non-zeros in the row/column a .

The seminal work of [Achlioptas and McSherry \[2007\]](#) has put forward the question of approximating an input matrix A by entrywise sampling. More precisely, the goal is to quickly compute a sparse matrix \tilde{A} satisfying $\|A - \tilde{A}\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2$ (i.e., additive spectral approximation) given an error parameter $\epsilon > 0$. The known schemes sample and rescale a small fraction of entries from A .

We propose a scheme that sparsifies an almost-sparse matrix A — it produces a matrix \tilde{A} with $O(\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(A) \cdot n \ln n)$ non-zero entries with high probability. We also prove that this upper bound on $\text{nnz}(\tilde{A})$ is *tight* up to logarithmic factors. Moreover, our upper bound improves when the spectrum of A decays quickly (roughly replacing n with the stable rank of A). Our scheme can be implemented in time $O(\text{nnz}(A))$ when $\|A\|_2$ is given. Previously, a similar upper bound was obtained by [Achlioptas et al. \[2013\]](#) but only for a restricted class of inputs that does not even include symmetric or covariance matrices. Finally, we demonstrate two applications of these sampling techniques, to faster approximate matrix multiplication, and to ridge regression by using sparse preconditioners.

1 Introduction

Matrices for various tasks in machine learning and data science often contain millions or even billions of dimensions. At the same time, they often possess structure that can be exploited to design more efficient

*This research was supported in part by NSF CAREER grant 1652257, NSF grant 1934979, ONR Award N00014-18-1-2364 and the Lifelong Learning Machines program from DARPA/MTO.

†Work partially supported by ONR Award N00014-18-1-2364, the Israel Science Foundation grant #1086/18, and a Minerva Foundation grant.

‡This research was supported in part by NSF CAREER grant 1652257, ONR Award N00014-18-1-2364 and the Lifelong Learning Machines program from DARPA/MTO.

algorithms. Sparsity in the rows and/or columns of the matrix is one such phenomenon for which many computational tasks on matrices admit faster algorithms, e.g., low-rank approximation [Ghashami et al., 2016; Huang, 2019], regression problems [Johnson and Zhang, 2013] and semi-definite programming [Arora et al., 2005; d’Aspremont, 2011]. Sparsity, however, is not a numerically smooth quantity. Specifically, for a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to be k -sparse, at least $n - k$ entries of x must be 0. In practice, many entries could be small but non-zero, e.g. due to noise, and thus the vector would be considered dense.

A smooth analogue of sparsity for a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ can be defined as follows. First, for a row (or column) vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define its *numerical sparsity* [Gupta and Sidford, 2018; Lopes, 2013] to be

$$\text{ns}(a) := \min\{k \geq 0 : \|a\|_1 \leq \sqrt{k}\|a\|_2\}. \quad (1)$$

This value is clearly at most the number of non-zeros in a , denoted $\|a\|_0$, but can be much smaller. Earlier work used variants of this quantity, referring to $\text{ns}(a)$ as the ℓ_1/ℓ_2 -sparsity of the vector [Hoyer, 2004; Hurley and Rickard, 2009]. We further define the numerical sparsity of a matrix A , denoted $\text{ns}(A)$, to be the maximum numerical sparsity of any of its rows and columns.

In order to take advantage of sparse matrices in various computational tasks, a natural goal is to approximate a matrix A with numerical sparsity $\text{ns}(A)$ with another matrix \tilde{A} of the same dimensions, that is k -sparse for $k = O(\text{ns}(A))$ (i.e., every row and column is k -sparse). The seminal work of Achlioptas and McSherry [2007] introduced a framework for matrix sparsification via entrywise sampling for approximating the matrix A in spectral-norm. Specifically, they compute a sparse matrix \tilde{A} by sampling and rescaling a small fraction of entries from A such that with high probability $\|A - \tilde{A}\|_2 \leq \epsilon\|A\|_2$ for some error parameter $\epsilon > 0$, where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the spectral-norm. This motivates the following definition.

Definition 1.1. An ϵ -spectral-norm approximation for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is a matrix $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ satisfying

$$\|\tilde{A} - A\|_2 \leq \epsilon\|A\|_2. \quad (2)$$

When \tilde{A} is obtained by sampling and rescaling entries from A , we call it an ϵ -spectral-norm sparsifier.

Before we continue, let us introduce necessary notations. Here and throughout, we denote the number of non-zero entries in a matrix A by $\text{nnz}(A)$, the Frobenius-norm of A by $\|A\|_F$, the stable-rank of A by $\text{sr}(A) := \|A\|_F^2/\|A\|_2^2$, the i -th row and the j -th column of A by A_i and A^j , respectively, and the row-sparsity and column-sparsity of A by $\text{rsp}(A) := \max_i \|A_i\|_0$ and $\text{csp}(A) := \max_j \|A^j\|_0$, respectively.

The framework of Achlioptas and McSherry [2007] can be used as a preprocessing step that “sparsifies” numerically sparse matrices in order to speed up downstream tasks. It thus motivated a line of work on sampling schemes [Achlioptas et al., 2013; Arora et al., 2006; Drineas and Zouzias, 2011; Gittens and Tropp, 2009; Kundu and Drineas, 2014; Kundu et al., 2017; Nguyen et al., 2015], in which the output \tilde{A} is an unbiased estimator of A , and the sampling distributions are simple functions of A and hence can be computed easily, say, in nearly $O(\text{nnz}(A))$ -time and with one or two passes over the matrix. Under these constraints, the goal is simply to minimize the sparsity of the ϵ -spectral-norm sparsifier \tilde{A} .

The latest work, by Achlioptas et al. [2013], provides a bound for a restricted class of “data matrices”. Specifically, they look at matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ such that $\min_i \|A_i\|_1 \geq \max_j \|A^j\|_1$, which can be a reasonable assumption when $m \ll n$. This restricted class does not include the class of square matrices, and hence does not include symmetric matrices such as covariance matrices. Hence, an important question is whether their results extend to a larger class of matrices. Our main result, described in the next section, resolves this concern in the affirmative.

1.1 Main Results

We generalize the sparsity bound of [Achlioptas et al. \[2013\]](#), which is the best currently known, to all matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Our main result is a sampling scheme to compute an ϵ -spectral-norm sparsifier for numerically sparse matrices A , as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *There is an algorithm that, given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a parameter $\epsilon > 0$, where $m \geq n$, computes with high probability an ϵ -spectral-norm sparsifier \tilde{A} for A with expected sparsity*

$$\mathbb{E}(\text{nnz}(\tilde{A})) = O\left(\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(A) \text{sr}(A) \log m + \epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{\text{ns}(A) \text{sr}(A) n \log m}\right).$$

Moreover, it runs in $O(\text{nnz}(A))$ -time when a constant factor estimate of $\|A\|_2$ is given.¹

We obtain this result by improving the main technique of [Achlioptas et al. \[2013\]](#). Their sampling distribution arises from optimizing a concentration bound, called the matrix-Bernstein inequality, for the sum of matrices formed by sampling entries independently. Our distribution is obtained by the same approach, but arises from considering the columns and rows simultaneously.

In addition to the sampling scheme in Theorem 1.2, we analyze ℓ_1 -sampling from every row (in Section 2.1).² This gives a worse bound than the above bound, roughly replacing the $\text{sr}(A)$ term with n , but has the added advantage that the sampled matrix has uniform row-sparsity.

Lower Bound. Our next theorem complements our main result with a lower bound on the sparsity of any ϵ -spectral-norm approximation of a matrix A in terms of its numerical sparsity $\text{ns}(A)$ and error parameter $\epsilon > 0$.³

Theorem 1.3. *Let $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ and $n, k \geq 1$ be parameters satisfying $k \leq O(\epsilon^2 n \log^2 \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. Then, there exists a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that $\text{ns}(A) = \Theta(k \log^2 \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ and, for every matrix B satisfying $\|A - B\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2$, the sparsity of every row and every column of B is at least $\Omega(\epsilon^{-2} k \log^{-2} \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = \tilde{\Omega}(\epsilon^{-2}) \cdot \text{ns}(A)$.*

While the lower bound shows that the worst-case dependence on the parameters $\text{ns}(A)$ and ϵ is optimal, it is based on a matrix with stable rank $\Omega(n)$. Settling the sample complexity when the stable rank is $o(n)$ is an interesting open question that we leave for future work.

1.2 Comparison to Previous Work

The work of [Achlioptas and McSherry \[2007\]](#) initiated a long line of work on entrywise sampling schemes that approximate a matrix under spectral-norm [[Achlioptas et al., 2013](#); [Arora et al., 2006](#); [Drineas and Zouzias, 2011](#); [Gittens and Tropp, 2009](#); [Kundu and Drineas, 2014](#); [Kundu et al., 2017](#); [Nguyen et al., 2015](#)]. Sampling entries independently has the advantage that the output matrix can be seen as a sum of independent

¹A constant factor estimate of $\|A\|_2$ can be computed in $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(A))$ -time by the power method.

²Sampling entry A_{ij} with probability proportional to $|A_{ij}|/\|A_i\|_1$

³We write $\tilde{O}(f)$ as a shorthand for $O(f \cdot \text{polylog}(nm))$ where n and m are the dimensions of the matrix, and write $O_\epsilon(\cdot)$ when the hidden constant may depend on ϵ .

Table 1: Comparison between schemes for ϵ -spectral-norm sparsification. The first two entries in the third column present the ratio between the referenced sparsity and that of Theorem 1.2.

Expected Number of Samples	Reference	Compared to Thm. 1.2
$O(\epsilon^{-1}n\sqrt{\text{ns}(A)\text{sr}(A)})$	Arora et al. [2006]	$\tilde{O}_\epsilon\left(\min\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\text{ns}(A)\text{sr}(A)}}, \sqrt{n}\right)\right)$
$O(\epsilon^{-2}n\text{sr}(A) + n\text{polylog}(n))$	Achlioptas and McSherry [2007]	$\tilde{O}_\epsilon\left(\min\left(\frac{n}{\text{ns}(A)}, \sqrt{\frac{n\text{sr}(A)}{\text{ns}(A)}}\right)\right)$
$\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-2}n\text{sr}(A))$	Drineas and Zouzias [2011]; Kundu and Drineas [2014]	
$\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-2}\text{ns}(A)\text{sr}(A) + \epsilon^{-1}\sqrt{\text{ns}(A)\text{sr}(A)n})$	Achlioptas et al. [2013]; Theorem 1.2	Achlioptas et al. [2013] is only for data matrices
$\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-2}n\text{ns}(A))$	Theorem 2.2	bounded row-sparsity
$\Omega(\epsilon^{-2}n\text{ns}(A)\log^{-4}\frac{1}{\epsilon})$	Theorem 1.3	$\text{sr}(A) = \Theta(n)$

random matrices whose spectral-norm can be bounded using known matrix concentration bounds. All previous work uses such matrix concentration bounds with the exception of Arora et al. [2006] who bound the spectral-norm of the resulting matrix by analyzing the Rayleigh quotient of all possible vectors.

Natural distributions to sample entries are the ℓ_2 and ℓ_1 distributions, which correspond to sampling entry A_{ij} with probability proportional to $A_{ij}^2/\|A\|_F^2$ and $|A_{ij}|/\|A\|_1$ respectively.⁴

Prior work that use variants of the ℓ_2 sampling [Achlioptas and McSherry, 2007; Drineas and Zouzias, 2011; Kundu and Drineas, 2014; Nguyen et al., 2015] point out that sampling according to the ℓ_2 distribution causes small entries to “blow-up” when sampled. Some works, e.g. Drineas and Zouzias [2011], get around this by zeroing-out small entries or by exceptional handling of small entries, e.g. Achlioptas and McSherry [2007], while others used distributions that combine the ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 distributions, e.g. Kundu and Drineas [2014]. All these works sample $\Omega(\epsilon^{-2}n\text{sr}(A))$ entries in expectation to achieve an ϵ -spectral-norm approximation and our Theorem 1.2 provides an asymptotically better bound. For a full comparison see Table 1.

All these algorithms, including the algorithm of Theorem 1.2, sample a number of entries corresponding to $\text{sr}(A)$, hence they must have an estimate of it, which requires estimating $\|A\|_2$. An exception is the bound in Theorem 2.2, which can be achieved without this estimate. In practice, however, and in previous work in this area, there is a sampling budget $s \geq 0$ and s samples are drawn according to the stated distribution, avoiding the need for this estimate. In this case, the algorithm of Theorem 1.2 can be implemented in two-passes over the data and in $O(\text{nnz}(A))$ time.

⁴Here and henceforth we denote by $\|A\|_1$ the entry-wise l_1 norm.

1.3 Applications of Spectral-Norm Sparsification

We provide two useful applications of spectral-norm sparsification. More precisely, we use the sparsification to speed up two computational tasks on numerically sparse matrices: approximate matrix multiplication and approximate ridge regression. This adds to previous work, which showed applications to low-rank approximation [Achlioptas and McSherry, 2007], to semidefinite programming [Arora et al., 2006], and to PCA and sparse PCA [Kundu et al., 2017]. These applications work in a black-box manner, and can thus employ our improved sparsification scheme.

Application I: Approximate Matrix Multiplication (AMM). Given matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and error parameter $\epsilon > 0$, the goal is to compute a matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ such that $\|AB - C\| \leq \epsilon \|A\| \cdot \|B\|$, where the norm is usually either Frobenius-norm $\|\cdot\|_F$ or spectral-norm $\|\cdot\|_2$. In Section 3, we provide algorithms for both error regimes by combining our entrywise sampling scheme with previous AMM algorithms that sample a small number of columns of A and rows of B .

Theorem 1.4. *There exists an algorithm that, given matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ parameter $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ and constant factor estimates of $\|A\|_2$ and $\|B\|_2$, computes a matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ satisfying with high probability $\|AB - C\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2 \|B\|_2$ in time*

$$O(\text{nnz}(A) + \text{nnz}(B)) + \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-6} \sqrt{\text{sr}(A) \text{sr}(B)} \text{ns}(A) \text{ns}(B)).$$

Theorem 1.5. *There exists an algorithm that, given matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and parameter $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, computes a matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ satisfying $\mathbb{E} \|AB - C\|_F \leq \epsilon \|A\|_F \|B\|_F$ in time*

$$O(\text{nnz}(A) + \text{nnz}(B) + \epsilon^{-6} \text{ns}(A) \text{ns}(B)).$$

Approximate Matrix Multiplication (AMM) is a fundamental problem in numerical linear algebra with a long line of formative work [Clarkson and Woodruff, 2009; Cohen et al., 2016; Drineas et al., 2006; Frieze et al., 2004; Magen and Zouzias, 2011; Mroueh et al., 2017; Ye et al., 2016] and many others. These results fall into roughly three categories; sampling based methods, random projection based methods and a mixture of sampling and projection based methods. We focus on sampling based methods in our work.

There are two main error regimes considered in the literature: spectral-norm error and Frobenius-norm error. We focus on the results of Magen and Zouzias [2011] for spectral-norm error and Drineas et al. [2006] for Frobenius-norm error. Sampling based methods, including that of Drineas et al. [2006]; Magen and Zouzias [2011], propose sampling schemes that are linear time or nearly-linear time: specifically, they write the product of two matrices as the sum of n outer products $AB = \sum_{i \in [n]} A^i B_i$, and then sample and compute each outer product $A^i B_i / p_i$ with probability $p_i \propto \|A^i\|_2 \|B_i\|_2$. Computing each of these rank-1 outer products takes time bounded by $O(\text{csp}(A) \text{rsp}(B))$. This estimator is repeated sufficiently many times depending on the error regime under consideration.

Our entrywise-sampling scheme compounds well with this framework for approximate matrix multiplication by additionally sampling entries from the rows/columns sampled by the AMM algorithm. We essentially replace the $\text{csp}(A) \text{rsp}(B)$ term with $\text{ns}(A) \text{ns}(B)$, up to $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$ factors, for both Frobenius-norm and spectral-norm error regimes. It is plausible that the dependence on epsilon can be improved.

Application II: Approximate Ridge Regression. Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and a parameter $\lambda > 0$, the goal is to find a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that minimizes $\|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \lambda\|x\|_2^2$. This problem is λ -strongly convex, has solution $x^* = (A^\top A + \lambda I)^{-1} A^\top b$ and condition number $\kappa_\lambda(A^\top A) := \|A\|_2^2/\lambda$.

Given an initial vector $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a parameter $\epsilon > 0$, an ϵ -approximate solution to the ridge regression problem is a vector $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $\|\hat{x} - x^*\|_{A^\top A + \lambda I} \leq \epsilon \|x_0 - x^*\|_{A^\top A + \lambda I}$, where we write $\|x\|_M := x^\top M x$ when M is a PSD matrix. We provide algorithms for approximate ridge regression by using our sparsification scheme as a preconditioner for known linear-system solvers in composition with a black-box acceleration framework by [Frostig et al. \[2015\]](#). The following theorem is proved in Section 4.

Theorem 1.6. *There exists an algorithm that, given $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, computes with high probability an ϵ -approximate solution to the ridge regression problem in time*

$$O_\epsilon(\text{nnz}(A)) + \tilde{O}_\epsilon \left((\text{nnz}(A))^{2/3} (\text{ns}(A) \text{sr}(A))^{1/3} \sqrt{\kappa_\lambda(A^\top A)} \right).$$

Moreover, when the input matrix A has uniform column (or row) norms, the running time in Theorem 1.6 can be reduced by a factor of roughly $(\text{sr}(A)/n)^{1/6}$, for details see Section 4.2.

Solving linear systems using preconditioning has a rich history that is beyond the scope of this work to summarize. Recently, the work of [Gupta and Sidford \[2018\]](#) designed algorithms with improved running times over popular methods using the Stochastic Variance Reduced Gradient Descent (SVRG) framework of [Johnson and Zhang \[2013\]](#). They adapt it using efficient subroutines for numerically sparse matrices. They also suggested the idea of using spectral-norm sparsifiers as preconditioners for linear regression. While they considered the sparsification of [Achlioptas et al. \[2013\]](#) for computing the preconditioners, they required a stronger bound on the spectral-norm approximation than Theorem 1.6 does.

Our result is in general incomparable to that of [Gupta and Sidford \[2018\]](#). In the case when the input has uniform column (or row) norms, our running time is roughly an $(\text{ns}(A)/n)^{1/6}$ -factor smaller than theirs, for details see Theorem 4.4 in Section 4.2.

Very recently, [Carmon et al. \[2020\]](#) have developed, independently of our work and as part of a suite of results on bilinear minimax problems, an algorithm for ridge regression with improved running time $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(A) + \sqrt{\text{nnz}(A) \text{ns}(A) \text{sr}(A) \kappa_\lambda(A^\top A)})$. Their approach is different and their techniques are more involved than ours.

2 Spectral-Norm Sparsification

In this section we state and prove our main results. We first prove the upper bound in Theorem 1.2. Then we analyze ℓ_1 sampling from the rows in Theorem 2.2, Section 2.1 that gives a slightly weaker bound but has the property that the resulting matrix has uniform row sparsity. In Section 2.2, we prove the lower bound in Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 1.2. *There is an algorithm that, given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a parameter $\epsilon > 0$, where $m \geq n$, computes with high probability an ϵ -spectral-norm sparsifier \tilde{A} for A with expected sparsity*

$$\mathbb{E}(\text{nnz}(\tilde{A})) = O \left(\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(A) \text{sr}(A) \log m + \epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{\text{ns}(A) \text{sr}(A) n \log m} \right).$$

Moreover, it runs in $O(\text{nnz}(A))$ -time when a constant factor estimate of $\|A\|_2$ is given.⁵

Before we prove Theorem 1.2, we start by stating a result on the concentration of sums of independent random matrices; the Matrix Bernstein Inequality.

Theorem 2.1 (Matrix Bernstein, Theorem 1.6 of Tropp [2012]). *Consider a finite sequence $\{Z_k\}$ of independent, random $d_1 \times d_2$ real matrices, such that there is $R > 0$ satisfying $\mathbb{E} Z_k = 0$ and $\|Z_k\|_2 \leq R$ almost surely. Define*

$$\sigma^2 = \max \left\{ \left\| \sum_k \mathbb{E}(Z_k Z_k^\top) \right\|_2, \left\| \sum_k \mathbb{E}(Z_k^\top Z_k) \right\|_2 \right\}.$$

Then for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \sum_k Z_k \right\|_2 \geq t \right) \leq (d_1 + d_2) \exp \left(\frac{-t^2/2}{\sigma^2 + Rt/3} \right).$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Given a matrix A , define sampling probabilities as follows.

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} p_{ij}^{(1)} &= \frac{|A_{ij}|}{\sum_{i',j'} |A_{i'j'}|} \\ p_{ij}^{(2)} &= \frac{\|A_i\|_1^2}{\sum_{i'} \|A_{i'}\|_1^2} \cdot \frac{|A_{ij}|}{\|A_i\|_1} \\ p_{ij}^{(3)} &= \frac{\|A^j\|_1^2}{\sum_{j'} \|A^{j'}\|_1^2} \cdot \frac{|A_{ij}|}{\|A^j\|_1} \\ p_{ij}^* &= \max_{\alpha} (p_{ij}^{(\alpha)}). \end{aligned}}$$

Observe that each $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ yields a probability distribution because $\sum_{ij} p_{ij}^{(\alpha)} = 1$.

Let $s < mn$ be a parameter that we will choose later. Now sample each entry of A independently and scale it to get an unbiased estimator, i.e., compute \tilde{A} by

$$\boxed{\tilde{A}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{A_{ij}}{p_{ij}} & \text{with prob. } p_{ij} = \min(1, s \cdot p_{ij}^*); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}}$$

To bound the expected sparsity, observe that $p_{ij}^* \leq \sum_{\alpha} p_{ij}^{(\alpha)}$, and thus

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{nnz}(\tilde{A})] = \sum_{ij} p_{ij} \leq s \sum_{ij} \sum_{\alpha} p_{ij}^{(\alpha)} \leq 3s.$$

We show that each of the above distributions bounds one of the terms in matrix Bernstein bound. For each pair of indices (i, j) define a matrix Z_{ij} that has a single non-zero at the (i, j) entry, with value $\tilde{A}_{ij} - A_{ij}$. Its spectral-norm is $\|Z_{ij}\|_2 = |\tilde{A}_{ij} - A_{ij}|$. If $p_{ij} = 1$, this is 0. If $p_{ij} < 1$ then

$$|\tilde{A}_{ij} - A_{ij}| \leq |A_{ij}| \max(1, \frac{1}{p_{ij}} - 1)$$

⁵A constant factor estimate of $\|A\|_2$ can be computed in $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(A))$ -time by the power method.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{|A_{ij}|}{p_{ij}} \leq \frac{|A_{ij}|}{sp_{ij}^{(1)}} = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{i'j'} |A_{i'j'}| \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{\text{ns}(A)}}{s} \sum_j \|A^j\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{\text{ns}(A)n}}{s} \|A\|_F =: R,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

In order to bound σ^2 , first notice that $\text{var}(\tilde{A}_{ij}) \leq \mathbb{E}(\tilde{A}_{ij}^2) = \frac{A_{ij}^2}{sp_{ij}^*}$. Now, since $Z_{ij}Z_{ij}^\top$ has a single non-zero entry at (i, i) , and $Z_{ij}^\top Z_{ij}$ has a single non-zero entry at (j, j) , both $\sum_{i,j} Z_{ij}Z_{ij}^\top$ and $\sum_{i,j} Z_{ij}^\top Z_{ij}$ are diagonal, where the (i, i) entry is $\sum_j (\tilde{A}_{ij} - A_{ij})^2$ in the former and the (j, j) entry is $\sum_i (\tilde{A}_{ij} - A_{ij})^2$ in the latter. Since these are diagonal matrices, their spectral-norm equals their largest absolute entry, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}(Z_{ij}Z_{ij}^\top) \right\|_2 &\leq \max_i \left(\sum_j \frac{A_{ij}^2}{sp_{ij}^*} \right) \leq \max_i \left(\sum_j \frac{A_{ij}^2}{sp_{ij}^{(2)}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{s} \max_i \left(\sum_j \frac{|A_{ij}| \sum_{i'} \|A_{i'}\|_1^2}{\|A_i\|_1} \right) = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{i'} \|A_{i'}\|_1^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{s} \sum_{i'} \text{ns}(A) \|A_{i'}\|_2^2 = \frac{\text{ns}(A)}{s} \|A\|_F^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The same bound can be shown for $\sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}(Z_{ij}^\top Z_{ij})$ by using $p_{ij}^* \geq p_{ij}^{(3)}$, thus by the definition of σ^2 , $\sigma^2 \leq \frac{\text{ns}(A)}{s} \|A\|_F^2$. Finally, by the matrix-Bernstein bound,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \sum_{i,j} Z_{ij} \right\|_2 \geq \epsilon \|A\|_2 \right) \leq 2m \exp \left(- \frac{\epsilon^2 \|A\|_2^2 / 2}{\frac{\text{ns}(A)}{s} \|A\|_F^2 + \epsilon \frac{\sqrt{\text{ns}(A)n}}{s} \|A\|_F \|A\|_2 / 3} \right),$$

and since $\text{sr}(A) = \frac{\|A\|_F^2}{\|A\|_2^2}$, by setting $s = O(\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(A) \text{sr}(A) \log m + \epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{\text{ns}(A) \cdot n \cdot \text{sr}(A)} \log m)$ we conclude that with high probability $\|\tilde{A} - A\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2$, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. \square

2.1 A Second Sampling Scheme

We analyze ℓ_1 row sampling, i.e. sampling entry (i, j) with probability $\frac{|A_{ij}|}{\|A_i\|_1}$, as was similarly done for numerically sparse matrices in Gupta and Sidford [2018], although they employed this sampling (i) in a different setting and (ii) on one row at a time. Here, we analyze how to employ this sampling on all the rows simultaneously for ϵ -spectral-norm sparsification. This sampling is inferior to the one in Theorem 1.2 in terms of $\text{nnz}(\tilde{A})$, but has the additional property that the sparsity of every row is bounded. By applying this scheme to A^\top , we can alternatively obtain an ϵ -spectral-norm sparsifier where the sparsity of every column is bounded.

Theorem 2.2. *There is an algorithm that, given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a parameter $\epsilon > 0$, computes in time $O(\text{nnz}(A))$ with high probability an ϵ -spectral-norm sparsifier \tilde{A} for A such that the sparsity of every row of \tilde{A} is bounded by $O(\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(A) \log(m + n))$.*

The algorithm is as follows. Given a matrix A and $\epsilon > 0$, define the sampling probabilities

$$p_{ij} = \frac{|A_{ij}|}{\|A_i\|_1},$$

and observe that for every i this induces probability distribution, i.e., $\sum_j p_{ij} = 1$. Let $s = O(\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(A) \log(m+n))$. Now from each row of A sample s entries independently with replacement according to the above distribution, and scale it to get an unbiased estimator of that row; formally, for each row i and each $t = 1, \dots, s$ draw a row vector

$$Q_i^{(t)} = \left\{ \frac{A_{ij}}{p_{ij}} e_j^\top \quad \text{with prob. } p_{ij}, \right.$$

where $\{e_j\}_j$ is the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n . Next, average the t samples for each row, and arrange these rows in a matrix \tilde{A} that is an unbiased estimator for A ; formally,

$$\tilde{A} = \sum_{i=1}^m e_i \frac{1}{s} \sum_{t=1}^s Q_i^{(t)}.$$

Clearly $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{A}) = A$ and every row of \tilde{A} has at most s non-zeros. In order to bound the probability that \tilde{A} is an ϵ -spectral-norm sparsifier of A , similarly to the proof of Theorem 1.2, we employ the matrix-Bernstein bound stated in Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Given a matrix A , $\epsilon > 0$, let $k = \text{ns}(A)$ and apply the algorithm of Theorem 2.2. Note that by the definition of $\text{ns}(A)$ and by spectral-norm properties, the i -th row of A satisfies

$$\|A_i\|_1 \leq \sqrt{k} \|A_i\|_2 \leq \sqrt{k} \|A\|_2. \quad (3)$$

For each random draw, define a matrix $Z_{(it)}$ with exactly one non-zero row formed by placing $A_i - Q_i^{(t)}$ at the i -th row; formally, let $Z_{(it)} = e_i (A_i - Q_i^{(t)})$. Where it is clear from context we will omit the superscript from $Q_i^{(t)}$. The spectral-norm of $Z_{(it)}$ is

$$\|Z_{(it)}\|_2 = \|A_i - Q_i^{(t)}\|_2 \leq \|A_i\|_2 + \|Q_i^{(t)}\|_2 = \|A_i\|_2 + \|A_i\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{k} \|A\|_2 =: R.$$

To bound σ^2 , notice that $Z_{(it)} Z_{(it)}^\top$ has a single non-zero at the (i, i) entry with value $\|A_i - Q_i^{(t)}\|_2^2$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{E} \sum_{i,t} Z_{(it)} Z_{(it)}^\top \right\|_2 &= s \max_i \mathbb{E} \|A_i - Q_i\|_2^2 = s \max_i \mathbb{E} \|Q_i\|_2^2 - \|A_i\|_2^2 \\ &\leq s \max_i \sum_j \|A_i\|_1 \cdot |A_{ij}| \leq sk \|A\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

The other term $Z_{(it)}^\top Z_{(it)}$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}(Z_{(it)}^\top Z_{(it)}) = \mathbb{E}(Q_i^\top (Q_i - A_i)) = \mathbb{E}(Q_i^\top Q_i) - A_i^\top A_i$. The matrix $\mathbb{E}(Q_i^\top Q_i)$ is diagonal with value $|A_{ij}| \cdot \|A_i\|_1$ at the (j, j) entry, hence

$$\left\| \sum_{i,t} \mathbb{E}(Z_{(it)}^\top Z_{(it)}) \right\|_2 = s \left\| \sum_i (\mathbb{E}(Q_i^\top Q_i) - A_i^\top A_i) \right\|_2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= s \left\| \sum_i \mathbb{E}(Q_i^\top Q_i) - A^\top A \right\|_2 \\
&\leq s \left(\left\| \sum_i \mathbb{E}(Q_i^\top Q_i) \right\|_2 + \|A^\top A\|_2 \right) \\
&= s \left(\max_j \sum_i |A_{ij}| \cdot \|A_i\|_1 + \|A\|_2^2 \right) \\
&\leq s \sqrt{k} \left(\|A\|_2 \max_j \sum_i |A_{ij}| + \|A\|_2^2 \right) \\
&= s \sqrt{k} \left(\|A\|_2 \max_j \|A^j\|_1 + \|A\|_2^2 \right) \leq 2s \cdot k \cdot \|A\|_2^2 =: \sigma^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by the matrix-Bernstein bound as stated in Theorem 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\|A - \tilde{A}\|_2 \geq \epsilon \|A\|_2) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\left\| \sum_{i,t} Z_{(it)} \right\|_2 \geq s\epsilon \|A\|_2\right) \\
&\leq (m+n) \exp\left(-\frac{s\epsilon^2 \|A\|_2^2/2}{2k\|A\|_2^2 + \frac{2\epsilon}{3}\sqrt{k}\|A\|_2^2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and by setting $s = O(\epsilon^{-2} k \log(m+n))$ we conclude that with high probability $\|\tilde{A} - A\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2$. \square

2.2 Lower Bounds

We provide a lower bound in Theorem 1.3 for spectral-norm sparsification, which almost matches the bound in Theorem 1.2 for a large range of ϵ and $\text{ns}(A)$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ and $n, k \geq 1$ be parameters satisfying $k \leq O(\epsilon^2 n \log^2 \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. Then, there exists a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that $\text{ns}(A) = \Theta(k \log^2 \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ and, for every matrix B satisfying $\|A - B\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2$, the sparsity of every row and every column of B is at least $\Omega(\epsilon^{-2} k \log^{-2} \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = \tilde{\Omega}(\epsilon^{-2}) \cdot \text{ns}(A)$.*

Proof. We shall assume that k divides n , and that both are powers of 2, which can be obtained with changing the bounds by a constant factor. Let $m = \frac{n}{k}$, and notice it is a power of 2 as well.

Construct first a vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ by concatenating blocks of length 2^i whose coordinates have value $2^{-(1+\alpha)i}$, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, \log m - 1\}$, where $1 > \alpha \geq \Omega(\log^{-1} m)$ is a parameter that we will set later. The last remaining coordinate have value 0. Formally, the coordinates of a are given by $a_j = 2^{-(1+\alpha)\lfloor \log j \rfloor}$, except the last one which is 0. Its ℓ_1 norm is

$$\|a\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^m a_j = \sum_{i=0}^{\log m - 1} 2^i \cdot 2^{-(1+\alpha)i} = \frac{1 - 2^{-\alpha \log m}}{1 - 2^{-\alpha}} = \Theta(\alpha^{-1}).$$

A similar computation shows that $\|a\|_2 = \Theta(1)$, and thus $\text{ns}(a) = \Theta(\alpha^{-2})$. Denote by $a_{\text{tail}(c)}$ the vector a without its c largest entries, then its ℓ_2 norm is

$$\|a_{\text{tail}(c)}\|_2^2 \geq \sum_{i=\lfloor \log c \rfloor + 1}^{\log m - 1} 2^i \cdot 2^{-2(1+\alpha)i} = \Omega(c^{-(1+2\alpha)}), \tag{4}$$

which almost matches the upper bound of Lemma 3 in [Gupta and Sidford \[2018\]](#).

Now, for $k = 1$ we construct a circulant matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ by letting the vector a be its first row, and the j -th row is a cyclic shift of a with offset j . By well-known properties of circulant matrices, the t -th eigenvalue of A is given by $\lambda_t = \sum_j a_j (\omega_t)^j$ where $\omega_t = \exp\left(i \frac{2\pi t}{m}\right)$ and i is the imaginary unit, so $\|A\|_2 = \|a\|_1 = \Theta(\alpha^{-1})$. Consider $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ satisfying $\|A - B\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2$, and suppose some row B_j of B has s non-zeros. Then using (4),

$$\|A - B\|_2 \geq \|A_j - B_j\|_2 \geq \|a_{\text{tail}(s)}\|_2 = \Omega(s^{-(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha)}).$$

By the error bound $\|A - B\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2$, we must have $s \geq (\Omega(\epsilon/\alpha))^{-\frac{2}{1+2\alpha}} \geq \Omega((\epsilon/\alpha)^{-\frac{2}{1+2\alpha}})$, which bounds from below the sparsity of every row, and similarly also of every column, of B .

To generalize this to larger numerical sparsity, consider as a first attempt constructing a vector $a' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by concatenating k copies of a . Then clearly $\text{ns}(a') = \Theta(k \text{ns}(a))$. The circulant matrix of a' is equivalent to $A \otimes C$, where C is the all-ones matrix of dimension $k \times k$, and \otimes is the Kronecker product. But this matrix has low rank, and thus might be easier to approximate. We thus construct a different matrix $A' = A \otimes H_k$, where H_k is the $k \times k$ Hadamard matrix. Its numerical sparsity is the same as of the vector a' , thus $\text{ns}(A') = \Theta(k \text{ns}(a))$. The eigenvalues of H_k are $\pm\sqrt{k}$. By properties of the Kronecker product, every eigenvalue of A' is the product of an eigenvalue of A with $\pm\sqrt{k}$, thus $\|A'\|_2 = \Theta(\sqrt{k} \|A\|_2) = \Theta(\sqrt{k} \alpha^{-1})$. We now apply the same argument we made for $k = 1$. Let $B' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be an ϵ -spectral-norm sparsifier of A' . If some row B'_j has s non-zeros then using (4),

$$\|A' - B'\|_2 \geq \|A'_j - B'_j\|_2 \geq \|a'_{\text{tail}(s)}\|_2 = \Omega(\sqrt{k}(s/k)^{-(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha)}).$$

By the error bound $\|A' - B'\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A'\|_2$, we must have $s \geq \Omega(k(\epsilon/\alpha)^{-\frac{2}{1+2\alpha}})$, which bounds the sparsity of every row and every column of B' .

We can set $\alpha = \log^{-1} \frac{1}{\epsilon} > \epsilon$. Note that this choice for α is in the range $[\log^{-1} \frac{n}{k}, 1]$, hence the construction hold. Now since $\frac{1}{1+2\alpha} \geq 1 - 2\alpha$, the lower bound on the sparsity of each row and each column of B' is $k(\epsilon/\alpha)^{-\frac{2}{1+2\alpha}} \geq k(\epsilon/\alpha)^{-2+4\alpha} \geq \Omega(k\epsilon^{-2} \log^{-2} \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. \square

3 Application I: Approximate Matrix Multiplication

In this section, we show how to use ℓ_1 row/column sampling for fast approximate matrix multiplication (AMM). Given matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and error parameter $\epsilon > 0$, the goal is to compute a matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ such that $\|AB - C\| \leq \epsilon \|A\| \cdot \|B\|$, where the norm is usually either the Frobenius-norm $\|\cdot\|_F$ or spectral-norm $\|\cdot\|_2$. We provide the first results on AMM for numerically sparse matrices with respect to both norms.

Theorem 1.4. *There exists an algorithm that, given matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ parameter $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ and constant factor estimates of $\|A\|_2$ and $\|B\|_2$, computes a matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ satisfying with high probability $\|AB - C\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2 \|B\|_2$ in time*

$$O(\text{nnz}(A) + \text{nnz}(B)) + \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-6} \sqrt{\text{sr}(A) \text{sr}(B)} \text{ns}(A) \text{ns}(B)).$$

Theorem 1.5. *There exists an algorithm that, given matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and parameter $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, computes a matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ satisfying $\mathbb{E} \|AB - C\|_F \leq \epsilon \|A\|_F \|B\|_F$ in time*

$$O(\text{nnz}(A) + \text{nnz}(B) + \epsilon^{-6} \text{ns}(A) \text{ns}(B)).$$

The proofs of these theorems combine Theorem 2.2 with previous results on numerical sparsity and with previous results on AMM.

Lemma 3.1 (Lemma 4 of Gupta and Sidford [2018]). *Given a vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a parameter $\epsilon > 0$, independently sampling $(\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(a))$ entries according to the distribution $\{p_i = \frac{|a_i|}{\|a\|_1}\}_i$ and re-weighting the sampled coordinates by $\frac{1}{p_i} \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(a)}$, outputs a $(\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(a))$ -sparse vector $a' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $\mathbb{E} a' = a$ and $\mathbb{E}(\|a'\|_2^2) \leq (1 + \epsilon^2) \|a\|_2^2$.*

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.4 (Spectral-Norm AMM)

In order to prove Theorem 1.4, we will use a result from Magen and Zouzias [2011]. Given matrices A, B , their product is $AB = \sum_i A^i B_i$. The algorithm in Magen and Zouzias [2011] samples corresponding pairs of columns from A and rows from B , hence the time it takes to compute an approximation of AB depends on the sparsity of these rows and columns.

Lemma 3.2 (Theorem 3.2 (ii) of Magen and Zouzias [2011]). *There exists an algorithm that, given matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, a parameter $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ and constant factor estimates of $\|A\|_2$ and $\|B\|_2$, computes in time*

$$O\left(\text{nnz}(A) + \text{nnz}(B) + \epsilon^{-2} \text{csp}(A) \text{rsp}(B) \sqrt{\text{sr}(A) \text{sr}(B)} \log(\epsilon^{-1} \text{sr}(A) \text{sr}(B))\right)$$

a matrix C that satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}(\|C - AB\|_2 \geq \epsilon \|A\|_2 \|B\|_2) \leq \frac{1}{\text{poly}(\text{sr}(A) \text{sr}(B))}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Given $\epsilon > 0$, our algorithm is as follows.

1. Apply the algorithm in Theorem 2.2 on A with parameter $\epsilon/4$ to compute a matrix A' satisfying $\|A' - A\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4} \|A\|_2$ and $\text{csp}(A') \leq O(\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(A) \log(m+n))$, and apply it on B with parameter $\epsilon/4$ to compute a matrix B' satisfying $\|B' - B\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4} \|B\|_2$ and $\text{rsp}(B') \leq O(\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(B) \log(n+p))$.
2. Apply the algorithm in Lemma 3.2 on A', B' with parameter $\epsilon/4$ to produce a matrix C . Output C .

The sampling in Theorem 2.2 satisfies the conditions for Lemma 3.1, hence $\mathbb{E} \|A'\|_F^2 \leq (1 + O(\frac{\epsilon^2}{\log(m+n)})) \|A\|_F^2$. Thus, with high probability, $\text{sr}(A') \in (1 \pm O(\epsilon)) \text{sr}(A)$, and similarly for B' . Ignoring the $\text{nnz}(\cdot)$ terms, the time it takes for the algorithm from Lemma 3.2 on A', B' is

$$O\left(\epsilon^{-6} \text{ns}(A) \text{ns}(B) \log(m+n) \log(n+p) \sqrt{\text{sr}(A) \text{sr}(B)} \log(\epsilon^{-1} \text{sr}(A) \text{sr}(B))\right),$$

hence the stated overall running time. The output C satisfies with high probability

$$\begin{aligned} \|AB - C\|_2 &\leq \|(A - A')B\|_2 + \|A'(B - B')\|_2 + \|A'B' - C\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{4} \|A\|_2 \|B\|_2 + \frac{\epsilon}{4} \|B\|_2 (1 + \frac{\epsilon}{4}) \|A\|_2 + \frac{\epsilon}{4} (1 + \frac{\epsilon}{4})^2 \|A\|_2 \|B\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2 \|B\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

□

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.5 (Frobenius-Norm AMM)

We provide a sampling lemma for estimating outer products in the Frobenius-norm.

Lemma 3.3. *There exists an algorithm that, given vectors $a \in \mathbb{R}^n, b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and parameter $0 < \epsilon < 1$, computes in time $O(\|a\|_0 + \|b\|_0)$ vectors $a', b' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with sparsity $\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(a)$ and $\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(b)$, respectively, satisfying $\mathbb{E}(a'b'^\top) = ab^\top$ and $\mathbb{E} \|a'b'^\top - ab^\top\|_F^2 \leq \epsilon^2 \|a\|_2^2 \|b\|_2^2$.*

Proof. Given $0 < \epsilon < 1$, our algorithm is as follows.

1. Independently sample (with repetitions) $9\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(a)$ entries from a according to the distribution $\{p_i^{(a)} = \frac{|a_i|}{\|a\|_1}\}_i$ and $9\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(b)$ entries from b according to the distribution $\{p_i^{(b)} = \frac{|b_i|}{\|b\|_1}\}_i$.
2. Re-weight the sampled entries of a by $\frac{1}{p_i^{(a)}} \cdot \frac{1}{9\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(a)}$ and similarly for b . Output the sampled vectors.

Denote the sampled vectors a' and b' . They satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.1, hence they satisfy $\mathbb{E}(a'b'^\top) = ab^\top$ and $\mathbb{E}(\|a'\|_2^2) \leq (1 + \epsilon^2/3)\|a\|_2^2$ and similarly for b' . Thus,

$$\mathbb{E} \|a'b'^\top - ab^\top\|_F^2 = \mathbb{E} \|a'b'^\top\|_F^2 - \|ab^\top\|_F^2 = \mathbb{E} \|a'\|_2^2 \|b'\|_2^2 - \|a\|_2^2 \|b\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon^2 \|a\|_2^2 \|b\|_2^2.$$

□

In order to prove Theorem 1.5, we will use a result from Drineas et al. [2006]. The algorithm in Drineas et al. [2006] samples corresponding pairs of columns from A and rows from B , hence the time it takes to compute an approximation of AB depends on the sparsity of these rows and columns.

Lemma 3.4 (Lemma 4 of Drineas et al. [2006]). *There exists an algorithm that, given matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and parameter $0 < \epsilon < 1$, computes in time $O(\text{nnz}(A) + \text{nnz}(B) + \epsilon^{-2} \text{csp}(A) \text{rsp}(B))$ a matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ satisfying $\mathbb{E} \|AB - C\|_F \leq \epsilon \|A\|_F \|B\|_F$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Recall that $AB = \sum_i A^i B_i$. Our algorithm is as follows.

1. Apply the algorithm in Lemma 3.3 on each pair of vectors A^i, B_i with parameter $\epsilon/3$ to obtain their sparse estimates \hat{A}^i and \hat{B}_i .
2. Arrange the column vectors $\{\hat{A}^i\}$ in a matrix \hat{A} and the row vectors $\{\hat{B}_i\}$ in a matrix \hat{B} .
3. Apply the algorithm in Lemma 3.4 on the matrices \hat{A} and \hat{B} with parameter $\epsilon/3$ to obtain their approximate product C . Output C .

The sparsity of the columns of \hat{A} is bounded by $\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(A)$ and the sparsity of the rows of \hat{B} is bounded by $\epsilon^{-2} \text{ns}(B)$. By the triangle inequality, Jensen inequality, Lemma 3.3 and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|AB - \hat{A}\hat{B}\|_F &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_i A^i B_i - \hat{A}^i \hat{B}_i \right\|_F \leq \sum_i \mathbb{E} \|A^i B_i - \hat{A}^i \hat{B}_i\|_F \\ &\leq \sum_i \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \|A^i B_i - \hat{A}^i \hat{B}_i\|_F^2} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3} \sum_i \|A^i\|_2 \|B_i\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3} \|A\|_F \|B\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, by Jensen's inequality and Lemma 3.1,

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{A}\|_F \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \|\hat{A}\|_F^2} \leq \sqrt{\sum_i (1 + \frac{\epsilon^2}{9}) \|A^i\|_2^2} \leq (1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3}) \|A\|_F,$$

and similarly for \hat{B} . By the triangle inequality and Lemma 3.4,

$$\mathbb{E} \|C - AB\|_F \leq \mathbb{E} (\|C - \hat{A}\hat{B}\|_F + \|\hat{A}\hat{B} - AB\|_F) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3} (1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3})^2 \|A\|_F \|B\|_F + \frac{\epsilon}{3} \|A\|_F \|B\|_F \leq \epsilon \|A\|_F \|B\|_F.$$

Except for the $\text{nnz}(\cdot)$ terms, the time it takes to compute the last step is $O(\epsilon^{-6} \text{ns}(A) \text{ns}(B))$, and the claimed running time follows. \square

4 Application II: Preconditioning for Ridge Regression

Often, problem-specific preconditioners are used to reduce the condition number of the problem, since the time it takes for iterative methods to converge depends on the condition number. Specifically, for a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and a linear-system $Mx = b$, any *invertible* matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ has the property that the solution to the preconditioned linear-system $P^{-1}Mx = P^{-1}b$, is the same as that of the original problem. Using iterative methods to solve the preconditioned problem requires to apply $P^{-1}M$ to a vector in each iteration. In the case of ridge regression, $M = A^\top A + \lambda I$. Applying $(A^\top A + \lambda I)$ to a vector can be done in $O(\text{nnz}(A))$ time, and applying P^{-1} to a vector is equivalent to solving a linear-system in P , i.e. $\arg \min_x \|Px - y\|_2^2$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. There is a trade-off between the number of iterations taken to converge for the preconditioned problem, and the time taken to (approximately) solve a linear-system in P . We show in this section how to use the sparsification scheme of Theorem 1.2 to construct a preconditioner for ridge-regression, and couple it with an acceleration framework by Frostig et al. [2015].

Theorem 1.6. *There exists an algorithm that, given $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, computes with high probability an ϵ -approximate solution to the ridge regression problem in time*

$$O_\epsilon(\text{nnz}(A)) + \tilde{O}_\epsilon \left((\text{nnz}(A))^{2/3} (\text{ns}(A) \text{sr}(A))^{1/3} \sqrt{\kappa_\lambda(A^\top A)} \right).$$

Since the term Ax is a linear combination of the columns of A , and the regularization term $\lambda \|x\|_2^2$ penalizes each coordinate of x equally, in practice, the columns of A are often pre-processed to have uniform norms before solving ridge-regression. For this case, in section 4.2, we show an improvement of roughly $(n/\text{ns}(A))^{1/6}$ over Theorem 1.6.

We start by showing that given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and parameter $\lambda > 0$, if $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is an ϵ -spectral-norm sparsifier for A , for small enough ϵ , the preconditioned problem has a constant condition number, hence requires only a constant number of iterations as described above. This was explored by Gupta and Sidford [2018], but they demanded ϵ to be $O(\frac{\lambda}{\|A\|_2})$, which is much smaller than necessary. In the next lemma we provide a tighter bound for ϵ .

Lemma 4.1. *Given matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, parameters $\lambda > 0$ and $0 < \epsilon' < \frac{1}{2}$, then if a matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ satisfies $\|A - P\|_2 < \epsilon \|A\|_2$ where $\epsilon = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda} \epsilon'}{\|A\|_2}$, then*

$$(1 - 2\epsilon')(A^\top A + \lambda I) \preceq P^\top P + \lambda I \preceq (1 + 2\epsilon')(A^\top A + \lambda I).$$

Setting $\epsilon' = 1/4$ yields that all the eigenvalues of $(P^\top P + \lambda I)^{-1}(A^\top A + \lambda I)$ are in the range $[\frac{2}{3}, 2]$. Using our sampling scheme in Theorem 1.2 with parameter ϵ as described here, denoting its output as P , provides a preconditioner for ridge regression with constant condition number. Hence solving this preconditioned problem, i.e, the linear-system $(P^\top P + \lambda I)^{-1}(A^\top A + \lambda I)x = (P^\top P + \lambda I)^{-1}b$ for some vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, with any iterative method, takes $O_\epsilon(\text{nnz}(A) + T_P^\lambda)$ time, where T_P^λ is the time it takes to compute an approximate solution to $\arg \min_x \|(P^\top P + \lambda I)x - y\|_2^2$ for some vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, by the Triangle inequality,

$$\|Px\|_2 \leq \|Ax\|_2 + \|(P - A)x\|_2 \leq \|Ax\|_2 + \sqrt{\lambda\epsilon'}\|x\|_2.$$

By squaring both sides and applying the AM-GM inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Px\|_2^2 &\leq \|Ax\|_2^2 + \lambda\epsilon'^2\|x\|_2^2 + 2\|Ax\|_2\sqrt{\lambda\epsilon'}\|x\|_2 \\ &\leq \|Ax\|_2^2 + \lambda\epsilon'^2\|x\|_2^2 + \epsilon' \left(\|Ax\|_2^2 + \lambda\|x\|_2^2 \right) \\ &= (1 + \epsilon')\|Ax\|_2^2 + \lambda\epsilon'(1 + \epsilon')\|x\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

and since $\epsilon' < 1$,

$$\|Px\|_2^2 + \lambda\|x\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon')\|Ax\|_2^2 + \lambda(1 + 2\epsilon')\|x\|_2^2.$$

Hence $P^\top P + \lambda I \preceq (1 + 2\epsilon')(A^\top A + \lambda I)$.

Similarly, we get $\|Px\|_2 \geq \|Ax\|_2 - \sqrt{\lambda\epsilon'}\|x\|_2$, thus $\|Px\|_2^2 \geq (1 - \epsilon')\|Ax\|_2^2 - \lambda\epsilon'(1 - \epsilon')\|x\|_2^2$ and

$$\|Px\|_2^2 + \lambda\|x\|_2^2 \geq (1 - \epsilon')\|Ax\|_2^2 + \lambda(1 - 2\epsilon')\|x\|_2^2.$$

□

4.1 Proof of Theorem 1.6

Solving the linear-system in $P^\top P + \lambda I$ can be done by the Conjugate Gradient (CG) method, and can be accelerated by the framework of Frostig et al. [2015], that, given an algorithm to compute an approximate solution to an Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM) problem, uses the algorithm to provide acceleration in a black-box manner. We restate the guarantees for these algorithms below.

Fact 4.2. For a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and parameters $\epsilon, \lambda > 0$, the Conjugate Gradient algorithm returns an ϵ -approximate solution to $\min_x \|Mx - y\|_2^2 + \lambda\|x\|_2^2$ in time $O(\text{nnz}(M)\sqrt{\kappa_\lambda(M)}\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$, which we will denote by $T_{\text{CG}}^\lambda(M, \epsilon)$.

Lemma 4.3 (Acceleration. Theorem 1.1 of Frostig et al. [2015]). Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a λ strongly convex function and for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n, c > 1, \lambda' > 0$, let $f_{\min} = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (f(x) + \frac{\lambda'}{2}\|x - x_0\|_2^2)$, assume we can compute $x_c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in time T_c such that

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x_c)) - f_{\min} \leq \frac{1}{c}(f(x_0) - f_{\min}),$$

then, given any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n, c > 1, \lambda' \geq 2\lambda$, we can compute x_1 such that

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x_1)) - \min_x (f(x)) \leq \frac{1}{c}(f(x_0) - \min_x (f(x)))$$

in time $O\left(T_{4(\frac{2\lambda' + \lambda}{\lambda})^{1.5}} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda'}{\lambda}} \log c\right)$.

The measure of error in the above theorem coincides with the definition we gave for ϵ -approximation to ridge regression, since if $f(x) = \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \lambda\|x\|_2^2$ and $x^* = \operatorname{argmin}_x f(x)$ then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $(x - x^*)^T (A^T A + \lambda I)(x - x^*) = 2(f(x) - f(x^*))$. For a proof, see for example [Musco et al., 2018, Fact 39].

Note that the term $\frac{\lambda'}{2}\|x - x_0\|_2^2$ is not exactly of the same shape as the ridge term $\lambda'\|x\|_2^2$, but since

$$\|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \lambda\|x\|_2^2 + \lambda'\|x - x_0\|_2^2 = \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + (\lambda + \lambda')\|x\|_2^2 - 2\lambda'x_0^T x + \lambda'\|x_0\|_2^2,$$

solving $\min_x (\|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \lambda\|x\|_2^2 + \lambda'\|x - x_0\|_2^2)$ is at most as hard as solving ridge regression with vector $A^T b + \lambda'x_0$ and parameter $\lambda + \lambda'$. We are now ready to prove the result for preconditioned ridge-regression using our sparsifier as a preconditioner.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. We first explain how to compute an approximate solution for ridge regression with parameter $\lambda > 0$ and then apply the acceleration framework of Lemma 4.3 as a black-box.

Apply the sparsification scheme of Theorem 1.2 on A with parameter $\epsilon = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{4\|A\|_2}$ as specified in Lemma 4.1 and denote its output by P . Solve the preconditioned linear-system $(P^T P + \lambda I)^{-1}(A^T A + \lambda I)x = (P^T P + \lambda I)^{-1}b$ by any iterative method. As was described earlier, this takes $O_\epsilon(\operatorname{nnz}(A) + T_P^\lambda)$ time. Use Conjugate gradients to solve each linear-system in $P^T P + \lambda I$. It takes $O_\epsilon(\sqrt{\kappa_\lambda(P^T P)} \operatorname{nnz}(P))$ time. Since $\|P\|_2 \in (1 \pm \epsilon)\|A\|_2$ and $\kappa_\lambda(P^T P) = \frac{\|P\|_2^2}{\lambda}$, by Theorem 1.2,

$$T_{CG}^\lambda(P, \epsilon) = O_\epsilon\left(\operatorname{nnz}(P)\sqrt{\kappa_\lambda(P^T P)}\right) = O_\epsilon\left(\frac{\|A\|_2^3}{\lambda^{1.5}} \operatorname{ns}(A) \operatorname{sr}(A) \log n + \frac{\|A\|_2^2}{\lambda} \sqrt{\operatorname{ns}(A)n \cdot \operatorname{sr}(A)} \log n\right).$$

Applying the acceleration framework (Lemma 4.3) yields a running time of

$$\tilde{O}\left(\left(\operatorname{nnz}(A) + \frac{\|A\|_2^3}{\lambda^{1.5}} \operatorname{ns}(A) \operatorname{sr}(A) + \frac{\|A\|_2^2}{\lambda'} \sqrt{\operatorname{ns}(A)n \cdot \operatorname{sr}(A)}\right) \sqrt{\frac{\lambda'}{\lambda}}\right).$$

Set $\lambda' = \|A\|_2^2 \left(\frac{\operatorname{ns}(A) \operatorname{sr}(A)}{\operatorname{nnz}(A)}\right)^{2/3}$. If $n < \operatorname{ns}(A) \operatorname{sr}(A) \frac{\|A\|_2^2}{\lambda'} = (\operatorname{ns}(A) \operatorname{sr}(A))^{1/3} (\operatorname{nnz}(A))^{2/3}$, which is a reasonable assumption in many cases (for example, if $\operatorname{nnz}(A) > n^{3/2}$), then this choice for λ' balances the two major terms, resulting in the stated running time. \square

4.2 Faster Algorithm for Inputs with Uniform Row Norms

The best running time, to our knowledge, for the ridge-regression problem on sparse matrices in general is using Stochastic Variance Reduced Gradient Descent (SVRG), originally introduced by Johnson and Zhang [2013], coupled with the acceleration framework of Frostig et al. [2015]. We utilize this method for solving the linear-system for $P^T P + \lambda I$, where P is the preconditioner. This method is fastest if the norms of the rows/columns of the input matrix A are uniform. We show the following theorem for solving ridge-regression on numerically sparse matrices with uniform row/column norms.

Theorem 4.4. *There exists an algorithm that, given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ having uniform rows norms or uniform columns norms, a vector $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and parameters $\lambda > 0, \epsilon > 0$, computes an ϵ -approximate solution to the ridge regression problem in expected time*

$$O_\epsilon(\operatorname{nnz}(A)) + \tilde{O}_\epsilon\left(\operatorname{nnz}(A)^{2/3} \sqrt{\operatorname{sr}(A)} \operatorname{ns}(A)^{1/3} n^{-1/6} \sqrt{\kappa_\lambda(A^T A)}\right).$$

Note that $(A^\top A + \lambda I)^{-1} A^\top = A^\top (AA^\top + \lambda I)^{-1}$. Hence, for any vector v , one can compute an ϵ -approximation for $(A^\top A + \lambda I)^{-1} A^\top v$ in time $O(\text{nnz}(A)) + T^\lambda(A^\top, \epsilon)$. This doesn't change the condition number of the problem, i.e., $\kappa_\lambda(A^\top A) = \kappa_\lambda(AA^\top)$. Hence we only analyze the case where A is pre-processed such that the norms of the rows are uniform.

We provide a theorem from Musco et al. [2018] that summarizes the running time of accelerated-SVRG.

Lemma 4.5 (Theorem 49 of Musco et al. [2018]). *For a matrix M , vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda, \epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm that computes with high probability an ϵ -approximate solution to $\min_x \|Mx - y\|_2^2 + \lambda \|x\|_2^2$ in time $T^\lambda(M, \epsilon)$ such that*

$$T^\lambda(M, \epsilon) \leq O_\epsilon(\text{nnz}(M)) + \tilde{O}_\epsilon\left(\sqrt{\text{nnz}(M) \cdot \frac{\|M\|_F^2}{\lambda} \cdot \text{rsp}(M)}\right).$$

Before we prove Theorem 4.4, note the following properties of the sampling in Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 4.6. *Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, parameter $\epsilon > 0$ and a random matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ satisfying $\|P - A\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2$ and $\mathbb{E} P = A$, then the expected ℓ_2 -norm of the i -th row and of the j -th column of P are bounded as*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|P_i\|_2^2 &\leq \|A_i\|_2^2 + \epsilon^2 \|A\|_2^2, \\ \mathbb{E} \|P^j\|_2^2 &\leq \|A^j\|_2^2 + \epsilon^2 \|A\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By properties of the spectral-norm, $\|P_i - A_i\|_2 \leq \|P - A\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|A\|_2$. Squaring this and taking the expectation yields $\mathbb{E}(\|P_i\|_2^2) - \|A_i\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon^2 \|A\|_2^2$ as desired. The same holds for the columns. One can similarly get an high probability statement. \square

Summing over all the rows or columns yields an immediate corollary,

Corollary 4.7. *The expected Frobenius-norm of P is bounded as $\mathbb{E} \|P\|_F^2 \leq \|A\|_F^2 + \epsilon^2 \min(n, m) \|A\|_2^2$.*

We are now ready to show the result for ridge-regression in the case that the norms of the rows of the input matrix A are uniform.

Proof of Theorem 4.4. We first explain how to compute an approximate solution for ridge regression with parameter $\lambda > 0$ and then apply the acceleration framework of Lemma 4.3 as a black-box.

Apply the sparsification scheme of Theorem 1.2 on A with parameter $\epsilon = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{4\|A\|_2}$ as specified in Lemma 4.1 and denote its output by P . Solve the preconditioned linear-system $(P^\top P + \lambda I)^{-1} (A^\top A + \lambda I)x = (P^\top P + \lambda I)^{-1}b$ by any iterative method. As was described earlier, this takes $O_\epsilon(\text{nnz}(A) + T_P^\lambda)$ time. Use Accelerated-SVRG (Lemma 4.5) to solve each linear-system in $P^\top P + \lambda I$.

The bulk of the running time of the Accelerated-SVRG method is in applying vector-vector multiplication in each iteration, where one of the vectors is a row of P . The number of iterations have dependence on $\text{sr}(P)$, which by Corollary 4.7 is bounded by $O(\text{sr}(A) + \frac{n}{\kappa_\lambda})$. The running time of each iteration is usually bounded by the maximum row sparsity, i.e., $\text{rsp}(P)$. Instead, we can bound the expected running time with the expected row sparsity, denote as $s^*(P)$. The distribution for sampling each row is $p_i = \frac{\|P_i\|_2^2}{\|P\|_F^2}$ [Musco et al.,

2018]. Hence, the expected running time will depend on $\sum_i p_i \|P_i\|_0$ instead of $\text{rsp}(P)$. By Lemma 4.6 and the assumption that the norms of the rows of A are uniform,

$$s^*(P) = \sum_i p_i \|P_i\|_0 \leq \sum_i \frac{\|A_i\|_2^2 + \lambda}{\|P\|_F^2} \|P_i\|_0 \leq \text{nnz}(P) \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\lambda}{\|P\|_F^2} \right) \quad (5)$$

Now, by Lemma 4.5, equation 5 and corollary 4.7,

$$\begin{aligned} T^\lambda(P, \epsilon) &\leq O_\epsilon \left(\text{nnz}(P) + \sqrt{\text{nnz}(P) s^*(P) \text{sr}(P) \cdot \kappa_\lambda(P^\top P)} \right) \\ &\leq O_\epsilon \left(\text{nnz}(P) + \text{nnz}(P) \sqrt{\frac{\text{sr}(P) \cdot \kappa_\lambda(P^\top P)}{n} + 1} \right) \\ &\leq O_\epsilon \left(\text{nnz}(P) + \text{nnz}(P) \sqrt{\frac{\text{sr}(A) \cdot \kappa_\lambda(A^\top A)}{n}} \right) \\ &\leq O_\epsilon(\text{nnz}(P)) + \tilde{O}_\epsilon \left(\frac{\kappa_\lambda(A^\top A)^{3/2} \text{ns}(A) \text{sr}(A)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is by plugging in $\text{nnz}(P)$ for the second term. Applying the acceleration framework (Lemma 4.3) to the preconditioned problem (i.e, P is a $\frac{c}{\sqrt{\kappa_{\lambda'}(A^\top A)}}$ -spectral-norm sparsifier of A), yields running time of

$$\tilde{O}_\epsilon \left(\text{nnz}(A) + \left(\text{nnz}(A) + \frac{\kappa_{\lambda'}(A^\top A)^{3/2} \text{ns}(A) \text{sr}(A)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\lambda'}{\lambda}} \right)$$

Setting $\lambda' = \frac{\|A\|_2^2 \text{ns}(A)^{2/3} \text{sr}(A)}{n^{1/3} \text{nnz}(A)^{2/3}}$ results in the stated running time. \square

References

- D. Achlioptas and F. McSherry. Fast computation of low-rank matrix approximations. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 54(2):9–es, 2007.
- D. Achlioptas, Z. S. Karnin, and E. Liberty. Near-optimal entrywise sampling for data matrices. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1565–1573, 2013.
- S. Arora, E. Hazan, and S. Kale. Fast algorithms for approximate semidefinite programming using the multiplicative weights update method. In *46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'05)*, pages 339–348. IEEE, 2005.
- S. Arora, E. Hazan, and S. Kale. A fast random sampling algorithm for sparsifying matrices. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 272–279. Springer, 2006.
- Y. Carmon, Y. Jin, A. Sidford, and K. Tian. Coordinate methods for matrix games. In *61st Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS*, pages 283–293. IEEE, 2020.
- K. L. Clarkson and D. P. Woodruff. Numerical linear algebra in the streaming model. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 205–214, 2009.

- M. B. Cohen, J. Nelson, and D. P. Woodruff. Optimal approximate matrix product in terms of stable rank. In *43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2016)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2016.
- A. d’Aspremont. Subsampling algorithms for semidefinite programming. *Stochastic Systems*, 1(2):274–305, 2011.
- P. Drineas and A. Zouzias. A note on element-wise matrix sparsification via a matrix-valued Bernstein inequality. *Information Processing Letters*, 111(8):385–389, 2011.
- P. Drineas, R. Kannan, and M. W. Mahoney. Fast Monte Carlo algorithms for matrices I: Approximating matrix multiplication. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 36(1):132–157, 2006.
- A. Frieze, R. Kannan, and S. Vempala. Fast Monte-Carlo algorithms for finding low-rank approximations. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 51(6):1025–1041, 2004.
- R. Frostig, R. Ge, S. Kakade, and A. Sidford. Un-regularizing: approximate proximal point and faster stochastic algorithms for empirical risk minimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2540–2548, 2015.
- M. Ghashami, E. Liberty, and J. M. Phillips. Efficient frequent directions algorithm for sparse matrices. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 845–854, 2016.
- A. Gittens and J. A. Tropp. Error bounds for random matrix approximation schemes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0911.4108*, 2009.
- N. Gupta and A. Sidford. Exploiting numerical sparsity for efficient learning: faster eigenvector computation and regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5269–5278, 2018.
- P. O. Hoyer. Non-negative matrix factorization with sparseness constraints. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5(9), 2004.
- Z. Huang. Near optimal frequent directions for sketching dense and sparse matrices. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(56):1–23, 2019.
- N. Hurley and S. Rickard. Comparing measures of sparsity. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(10):4723–4741, 2009.
- R. Johnson and T. Zhang. Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 315–323, 2013.
- A. Kundu and P. Drineas. A note on randomized element-wise matrix sparsification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.0320*, 2014.
- A. Kundu, P. Drineas, and M. Magdon-Ismail. Recovering PCA and sparse PCA via hybrid-(l1, l2) sparse sampling of data elements. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):2558–2591, 2017.
- M. Lopes. Estimating unknown sparsity in compressed sensing. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 28, pages 217–225. PMLR, 2013.
- A. Magen and A. Zouzias. Low rank matrix-valued Chernoff bounds and approximate matrix multiplication. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1422–1436. SIAM, 2011.

- Y. Mroueh, E. Marcheret, and V. Goel. Co-Occurring Directions Sketching for Approximate Matrix Multiply. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 54, pages 567–575. PMLR, 2017.
- C. Musco, P. Netrapalli, A. Sidford, S. Ubaru, and D. P. Woodruff. Spectrum approximation beyond fast matrix multiplication: Algorithms and hardness. In *9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2018)*, volume 94 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPICS)*, pages 8:1–8:21. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.
- N. H. Nguyen, P. Drineas, and T. D. Tran. Tensor sparsification via a bound on the spectral norm of random tensors. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 4(3):195–229, 2015.
- J. A. Tropp. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 12(4):389–434, 2012.
- Q. Ye, L. Luo, and Z. Zhang. Frequent direction algorithms for approximate matrix multiplication with applications in CCA. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI*, pages 2301–2307. IJCAI/AAAI Press, 2016.