arXiv:2208.05013v2 [math.OC] 11 Oct 2022

Computing Brascamp-Lieb Constants through the lens of Thompson Geometry

Melanie Weber mweber@seas.harvard.edu
Harvard University
Suvrit Sra suvrit@mit.edu
MIT, Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems

Abstract

This paper studies algorithms for efficiently computing *Brascamp-Lieb* constants, a task that has recently received much interest. In particular, we reduce the computation to a nonlinear matrix-valued iteration, whose convergence we analyze through the lens of fixed-point methods under the well-known Thompson metric. This approach permits us to obtain (weakly) polynomial time guarantees, and it offers an efficient and transparent alternative to previous state-of-the-art approaches based on Riemannian optimization and geodesic convexity.

Keywords. Brascamp-Lieb inequalities, Optimization on manifolds, Thompson geometry, Positive definite matrices

Mathematics Subject Classification. 46N10, 49Q99, 53Z50, 68W40

1 Introduction

In a seminal paper, Brascamp and Lieb (1976) introduced a class of inequalities (*Brascamp-Lieb inequalities*) that generalizes many well-known inequalities, including Hölder's inequality, the sharp Young convolution inequality, and the Loomis-Whitney inequality. As such, the class of Brascamp-Lieb inequalities provides a valuable tool of use to many areas of mathematics (Bennett et al., 2007). Brascamp-Lieb inequalities have also been applied in Machine Learning (Dvir et al., 2016; Hardt and Moitra, 2013) and Information Theory (Carlen and Cordero-Erausquin, 2009; Liu et al., 2016).

Each Brascamp-Lieb (BL) inequality is characterized by a *BL-datum* $(\mathcal{A}, w)$, where $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m)$ is a tuple of linear transformations and $w = \{w_j\}$ is a set of exponents. Of central importance is the feasibility of a BL-datum, which is characterized by the following quantity:

Definition 1.1 (Brascamp-Lieb Constant)**.** Let $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m)$ be a tuple of surjective linear transformations $A_j : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ and $\boldsymbol{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_m)$ a real vector with non-negative entries. For each BL-datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ there exists a constant $C(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ (finite or

infinite) such that for any set of real-valued, non-negative, Lebesgue-measurable functions $f_j : \mathbb{R}^{d'} \to \mathbb{R}$, the following (*Brascamp-Lieb*) inequality holds

$$\int_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \Big(\prod_{j\in[m]} f_j(A_j x)^{w_j}\Big) dx \leq C(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}) \prod_{j\in[m]} \Big(\int_{x\in\mathbb{R}^{d'}} f_j(x)dx\Big)^{w_j}. \tag{1.1}$$

The smallest such constant that satisfies (1.1) for a BL-datum $(\mathcal{A}, w)$ and for any choice of $\{f_j\}$, is called the *Brascamp-Lieb constant* $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$. We further say that the datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ is *feasible*, if $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}) < \infty$, and *infeasible* otherwise.

Our aim is to characterize Brascamp-Lieb constants of feasible data; in particular, we want to compute the value

$$\sup_{Z\in\prod_{j\in[m]}\mathbb{P}_{d'}} \left[\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}; Z) := \left(\frac{\prod_{j\in[m]} \det(Z_j)^{w_j}}{\det\big(\sum_{j\in[m]} w_j A_j^* Z_j A_j\big)}\right)^{1/2}\right]. \tag{1.2}$$

Then, the key question is whether there exists a solution to the following problem:

Problem 1.2. *Given a datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$, can we efficiently compute an ϵ-approximation to $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$, in time that is polynomial in the number of bits required to represent the datum. That is, for any $\epsilon > 0$, can we compute a constant C, such that*

$$\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}) \leq C \leq (1+\epsilon)\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}),$$

in time that is polynomial in the bit length of the datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ and $\log(1/\epsilon)$.

We will see below that the computation of the supremum in (1.2) is equivalent to solving

$$\min_{X\in\mathbb{P}_d} F(X) := \sum\nolimits_j w_j \log\det\left(A_j^* X A_j\right) - \log\det(X), \tag{1.3}$$

where $\boldsymbol{w} = (w_1, \ldots, w_n)$ with $w_j \in (0,1)$ and $\sum_j w_j = 1$. A seminal result by Lieb (1990) ensures that the optimum is positive definite, which allows for solving (1.3) over the positive definite matrices $(\mathbb{P}_d)$. Importantly, problem (1.3) turns out to be a geodesically convex optimization problem on the manifold of Hermitian positive definite matrices (under a suitable Riemannian metric (Sra et al., 2018)).

Given that $F(X)$ in (1.3) is geodesically convex, it is natural to consider Riemannian optimization approaches. For using first-order methods such as Riemannian Gradient Descent (Absil et al., 2009; Zhang and Sra, 2016), geodesic convexity proves key to ensuring sublinear rates, such as $O\big(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\big)$, on *function suboptimality* $F(X_k) - F(X^*) \leq \epsilon$. We will see below that the optimum lies in a compact convex set; hence (1.3) could also be viewed as a constrained optimization task with a geodesic ball constraint. We can exploit this constraint by using first-order methods such as Projected Riemannian Gradient Descent (Absil et al., 2009; Zhang and Sra, 2016) or Riemannian Frank-Wolfe (Weber and Sra, 2022b, 2021), both of which again achieve only sublinear convergence rates on function suboptimality. Furthermore, for a different geodesically convex formulation of (1.2) due to Garg et al. (2018), it is known that second-order methods can attain a faster $O\big(\mathrm{poly}\big(\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\big)\big)$ convergence rate (Allen-Zhu et al., 2018). Under additional spectral assumptions, even linear convergence at rate $O\big(\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\big)$ is possible (Kwok et al., 2019).




Figure 1: Empirical performance of iterating G (1.4) in comparison with Riemannian Gradient Descent (using the Manopt toolbox (Boumal et al., 2014)). The Brascamp-Lieb datum consists of a set of n linear transformations $A_j : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^k$ and an n-dimensional vector that characterizes the exponents.

Our approach. We take a different route in this paper; our idea is to analyze a *fixed-point iteration* that solves (1.3). In particular, we study Picard iterations obtained by iterating a nonlinear map $G : \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_d \to \mathcal{X}$, defined as

$$G: \quad X \mapsto \left(\sum_j w_j A_j \left(A_j^* X A_j \right)^{-1} A_j^* \right)^{-1}. \tag{1.4}$$

The simplicity of the map (1.4) makes a fixed-point approach particularly attractive, since it avoids expensive Riemannian operations such as exponential maps and parallel transports, which are required by standard Riemannian optimization approaches. Empirically, iterating map 1.4 exhibits linear convergence – see Figure 1 for a numerical experiment. The faster convergence in comparison with Riemannian gradient descent illustrates the attractiveness of our approach.

We will present a detailed non-asymptotic convergence analysis of a fixed-point approach based on iterating (1.4). The key insight of our work is to analyze the nonlinear map G through the lens of nonlinear Perron-Frobenius theory, which views $\mathbb{P}_d$ as a metric space endowed with the Thompson part metric. Our initial convergence analysis hinges on establishing *non-expansivity* of G with respect to the Thompson part metric, as well as *asymptotic regularity* of G, i.e., $\delta_T\big(G(X_{k+1}), G(X_k)\big) \to 0$. More precisely, we make use of the following result that adapts a classical result on the convergence of non-expansive maps in Banach spaces (see, e.g., Baillon et al. (1978, Theorem 1.2)) to Thompson geometry:

Theorem 1.3. *Let G be non-expansive and asymptotically regular, and let the set of its fixed points* $\mathrm{Fix}(G) := \{X^* \in \mathbb{P}_d : \ X^* = G(X^*)\}$ *be non-empty. Then the iterative procedure defined by G converges to a point in* $\mathrm{Fix}(G)$.

Our plan is as follows: We show that G has a fixed point in a compact and convex set D. Establishing the non-expansivity and asymptotic regularity of G then ensures asymptotic

convergence (following Theorem 1.3). Subsequently, we refine our convergence analysis to seek non-asymptotic guarantees that ensure an $O\big(\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\big)$ convergence rate. To this end, we show that a regularized variant of G is *strictly* contractive with respect to the Thompson part metric. Finally, we describe how this analysis implies a convergence rate for solving the original problem (1.3), completing the analysis.

1.1 Summary of contributions

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

1. We propose a fixed-point approach for computing Brascamp-Lieb constants that is obtained by analyzing the first-order optimality conditions of the geodesically convex problem (1.3).
2. We analyze the proposed approach and derive non-asymptotic guarantees on its convergence. Specifically, we study a regularized variant of our fixed-point approach that solves the original problem (1.3) to ϵ-accuracy with an iteration complexity of $O\Big(\log\big(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, \frac{\Delta}{\delta^{3/2}}, \sqrt{d}, \frac{1}{R}\big)\Big)$. Here, d, δ, Δ, R[1] are constants, which depend on the input datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ only.

Our analysis leverages the Thompson part metric on the manifold of positive definite matrices to model convergence of the fixed-point iteration. To our knowledge, this is the first work that analyzes the computation of Brascamp-Lieb constants via Thompson geometry. We note that a similar Finslerian lens can be employed to understand other Picard iterations arising from problem 1.3. We discuss this observation in more detail below. Our proof techniques build on ideas from nonlinear Perron-Frobenius theory (Lemmens and Nussbaum, 2012), and may be of independent interest for related problems. Moreover, the simplicity of our approach and its ease of implementation make it attractive for applications.

2 Background and Notation

2.1 Thompson geometry on positive definite matrices

We start by recalling some background and notation. Throughout, we consider optimization tasks on the manifold of positive definite matrices, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}_d := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d} : \ X \succ 0\}\,.$$

Here, "$\succ$" denotes the Löwner partial order on $\mathbb{P}_d$, such that "$X \succ Y$" ("$X \succeq Y$") indicates that $X - Y$ is positive definite (semidefinite); similarly, "$X \succ 0$" implies that

[1]Note that the constants δ, Δ, R are not necessary independent of each other. In particular, to be more precise, we should write $R(\delta)$, to indicate that R may depend on δ. However, to keep notation simple, we write just R.

X has only positive eigenvalues. With a slight abuse of notation, we use $\mathbb{P}_d$ to denote *Hermitian* positive definite matrices. Recall the *Schatten p-norm*, which on $\mathbb{P}_d$ becomes $\|X\|_p := \left(\operatorname{tr} X^p\right)^{1/p}$. Important cases are the *trace norm* $\|X\|_1 = \operatorname{tr}(X)$ ($p = 1$) and the *Frobenius norm* $\|X\|_F = \left(\operatorname{tr} X^2\right)^{1/2}$ ($p = 2$). We further use the usual operator norm $\|\cdot\|$; note that $\|X\| \leq \|X\|_F \leq \sqrt{d}\|X\|$.

Most Riemannian optimization literature that studies problems on the manifold $\mathbb{P}_d$ considers the Riemannian geometry induced by the following metric:

$$\langle A, B\rangle_X := \operatorname{tr}(X^{-1}AX^{-1}B), \quad X \in \mathbb{P}_d, A, B \in T_X(\mathbb{P}_d) = \mathbb{H}_d\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where the tangent space $\mathbb{H}_d$ is the space of Hermitian matrices. Equipped with this metric, $\mathbb{P}_d$ is a Cartan-Hadamard manifold. Its (global) non-positive sectional curvature gives rise to many desirable properties, including geodesic convexity.

While we use the Riemannian lens above for exploiting the geodesic convexity of (1.3), our algorithm design and analysis views $\mathbb{P}_d$ through the lens of nonlinear Perron-Frobenius theory (Lemmens and Nussbaum, 2012) instead. Here, we view $\mathbb{P}_d$ as a convex cone that is endowed with the Thompson part metric, which induces a Finsler geometry on $\mathbb{P}_d$. Our analysis does not require any specific Finslerian properties; hence, we recall only basic definitions and some key properties below.

Definition 2.1 (Thompson metric)**.** The Thompson metric δ_T is defined as

$$\delta_T(X, Y) := \log \max\{M(X/Y), M(Y/X)\}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $M(X/Y) := \inf\{\lambda > 0 : X \preceq \lambda Y\}$.

Lemma 2.2 (Properties of the Thompson metric)**.** *We assume $X, Y \in \mathbb{P}_d$.*

1. $\delta_T(X^{-1}, Y^{-1}) = \delta_T(X, Y)$;
2. $\delta_T(B^*XB, B^*YB) = \delta_T(X, Y)$ *for* $B \in GL_n(\mathbb{C})$;
3. $\delta_T(A^*XA, A^*YA) \leq \delta_T(X, Y)$ *for* $A \in \mathbb{C}^{d\times r}$, *having full rank;*
4. $\delta_T(X^t, Y^t) \leq |t|\delta_T(X, Y)$ *for* $t \in [-1, 1]$;
5. $\delta_T(A + B, C + D) \leq \max\{\delta_T(A, C), \delta_T(B, D)\}$, *which can be recursively generalized to sums with m terms, i.e.*

$$\delta_T\Big(\sum_j X_j, \sum_j Y_j\Big) \leq \max_{1\leq j\leq m} \delta_T(X_j, Y_j)\,;$$

6. $\delta_T(X + A, Y + A) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}\delta_T(X, Y)$, *where* $A \succeq 0$, $\alpha = \|X\| \vee \|Y\|$, *and* $\beta = \lambda_{min}(A)$.

For a proofs of Lemma 2.2 we refer the reader to (Sra and Hosseini, 2015).

Furthermore, we will use the following notions of non-expansitivity and contractivity with respect to the Thompson metric.

Definition 2.3. We say that a map G on $\mathcal{X}$ is

1. *non-expansive*, if $\delta_T(G(X), G(Y)) \leq \delta_T(X, Y)$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}$;
2. *contractive*, if $\delta_T(G(X), G(Y)) < \delta_T(X, Y)$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}$.

Lastly, recall that the *Kronecker product* $X \otimes Y$ of matrices $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$ is given as $(X \otimes Y)_{\alpha\beta} = a_{ij}b_{kl}$, where $\alpha = p(i-1)+k$, $\beta = q(j-1)+l$. The Kronecker product is bilinear and associative.

2.2 Brascamp-Lieb inequalities

2.2.1 Basic notation

The goal of the present paper is the computation of Brascamp-Lieb constants for feasible data. The following seminal result by Lieb (1990) allows for phrasing this problem as an optimization task on $\mathbb{P}_d$.

Theorem 2.4 (Lieb (1990))**.** *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ denote a BL-datum, where $A_j : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ for all $A_j \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\boldsymbol{w} = \{w_j\}$ $(1 \leq j \leq m)$. Consider the function*

$$\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}; Z) := \left(\frac{\prod_{j\in[m]} \det(Z_j)^{w_j}}{\det\left(\sum_{j\in[m]} w_j A_j^* Z_j A_j\right)} \right)^{1/2}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $Z := \{Z_j\} \in \prod_{j\in[m]} \mathbb{P}_{d'}$. The Brascamp-Lieb constant *for $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ can be computed as*

$$\sup_{Z\in\prod_{j\in[m]}\mathbb{P}_{d'}} \mathrm{BL}\left(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}; Z\right). \tag{2.4}$$

Bennett et al. (2007) characterized the feasibility of $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ as follows:

Theorem 2.5 (Bennett et al. (2007))**.** *$(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ is feasible if and only if*

1. $d = \sum_{j\in[m]} w_j d'$,
2. $\dim(H) \leq \sum_{j\in[m]} w_j \dim(A_j H)$ *for any subspace $H \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$.*

This result renders the feasibility of Brascamp-Lieb data into a constrained optimization problem: It induces linear constraints on $\boldsymbol{w}$ as H varies over different subspaces. Importantly, since $\dim(A_j H) \leq d$, the set of constraints is finite. Therefore, the feasible set is a convex polytope $\mathcal{X}_\mathcal{A}$ (also known as *Brascamp-Lieb polytope*). If $\boldsymbol{w}$ lies on the boundary of $\mathcal{X}_\mathcal{A}$, then there exists a non-trivial subspace H for which the inequality constraints in Theorem 2.5 are tight.

Definition 2.6 (Simple Brascamp-Lieb data)**.** Let $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ feasible. A subspace $H \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is *critical*, if

$$\dim(H) = \sum_{j\in[m]} w_j \dim(A_j H). \tag{2.5}$$

We say that $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ is *simple*, if there exists no non-trivial, critical subspace.

Geometrically, simple Brascamp-Lieb data lie in the interior of $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Importantly, Problem 1.2 has a unique global solution for simple data.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ as before and $X := \sum_{j\in[m]} w_j A_j^* Z_j A_j$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *Z is a global maximizer for $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}, Z)$;*
2. *Z is a local maximizer for $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}, Z)$;*
3. *X is invertible and $Z_j^{-1} = A_j X^{-1} A_j^*$.*

Theorem 2.7 implies that the feasibility of a BL datum can be characterized by maximizing $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}, Z)$. Moreover, Theorem 2.7(3) allows us to rewrite (2.4) with respect to X, which results in the formulation that we will analyze in this work (see (Sra et al., 2018, Definition 7)):

$$\min_{X\in\mathbb{P}_d} F(X) := \sum\nolimits_j w_j \log\det\left(A_j^* X A_j\right) - \log\det(X)\,. \tag{2.6}$$

2.2.2 Examples

Many well-known inequalities in mathematics can be written as Brascamp-Lieb inequalities. In this section, we recall a few key examples. A more comprehensive list of examples can be found in (Bennett et al., 2007).

Example 2.8 (Hölder)**.** Consider $A_j = \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}$ for all j, i.e., $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}\}_{1\le j\le m}$. Then the multilinear *Hölder inequality* asserts that $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}) = 1$, if $\sum_j w_j = 1$ and $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}) = +\infty$ otherwise.

Example 2.9 (Sharp Young inequality)**.** Consider $A_j : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$ with

$$\begin{cases} A_1(x,y) := x \\ A_2(x,y) := y \\ A_3(x,y) := x - y. \end{cases}$$

Then the *Sharp Young inequality* asserts that

$$\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}) = \Big(\prod_{j=1}^{3} \frac{(1-w_j)^{1-w_j}}{w_j^{w_j}}\Big)^{d/2},$$

if $\sum_{j=1}^3 w_j = 2$ and $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}) = +\infty$ otherwise.

Barthe (1998) introduced a class of *Reverse Brascamp-Lieb inequalities* that generalize several important inequalities that cannot be encoded with the original Brascamp-Lieb framework. A key example is the *Gaussian Brunn-Minkowski inequality* (Barthe and Huet, 2008). Importantly, since Reverse Brascamp-Lieb inequalities have the same data as

the standard Brascamp-Lieb inequalities, there exists an intrinsic relation between their constants: The optimal constants of standard and Reverse Brascamp-Lieb inequalities multiply to 1, if the datum is feasible. Infeasible data have Brascamp-Lieb constants of $+\infty$ and Reverse Brascamp-Lieb constants of 0 (Barthe, 1998). This connection ensures that the algorithmic results presented here and in the related work translate from standard to Reverse Brascamp-Lieb inequalities.

3 Overview of our results

We start with a derivation of the map (1.4) with the goal of establishing that its Picard iteration solves Problem (1.3). We start by computing the (Euclidean) gradient of F:

$$\nabla F(X) = \sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j^* - X^{-1} . \tag{3.1}$$

Since the constraint set $\mathbb{P}_d$ is open, $\nabla F(X) = 0$ is necessary for X to be a local minimum. Importantly, since F is geodesically convex, this local minimum must be global. Thus, to solve (1.3), it suffices to solve the equation $\nabla F(X) = 0$, or equivalently $\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j^* - X^{-1} = 0$, which can be rewritten as the nonlinear matrix equation

$$X = \left(\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j^*\right)^{-1}. \tag{3.2}$$

Once written as (3.2), it is natural to consider the following iterative map:

$$G : \; X_{k+1} \leftarrow \left(\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X_k A_j)^{-1} A_j^*\right)^{-1} . \tag{3.3}$$

Remarkably, this naïve consideration turns out to be a meaningful algorithm. That is, we can show that the sequence of iterates $(X_k)_{k>0}$ produced by iterating (3.3) has a fixed point under the usual assumptions. A crucial ingredient of our analysis is the observation that the solution of Problem (1.3) is contained in a compact convex set of the form

$$D_{\delta,\Delta} := \left\{ \delta I_d \preceq X \preceq \Delta I_d \right\} , \tag{3.4}$$

where $\delta, \Delta > 0$ are parameters that depend only on the input datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ only. The upper and lower bounds on the solution are implied by (Bennett et al., 2007, Proposition 5.2). Formally, we will show the following convergence result:

Theorem 3.1. *Let $X_0 \in D_{\delta,\Delta}$; the sequence $\{X_k\}$ generated by iterating G converges to a solution of (1.3) as $k \to \infty$.*

The proof of this key result relies on Theorem 1.3. We have to show the three conditions of the theorem, (1) that G has a fixed point in $D_{\delta,\Delta}$, (2) that G is non-expansive on $D_{\delta,\Delta}$, and (3) that G is asymptotically regular. Proofs for all three conditions will be given in Section 5.1. The existence of a suitable set $D_{\delta,\Delta}$ and its dependency on the input datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ via δ and Δ will be discussed in Section 5.3.

However, to establish stronger, *non-asymptotic* convergence guarantees, *strict* contractivity (see Definition 2.3(2)) of the iterative map is typically required. Unfortunately,

G only fulfills the weaker notion of non-expansivity (Definition 2.3(1)). Therefore, we cannot hope to develop non-asymptotic convergence guarantees with the tools proposed so far. To mitigate this problem, we introduce a regularization of G, which instead of minimizing F directly, minimizes a perturbed objective. Consider thus the regularized problem

$$\min_{X \succ 0} \; F_\mu(X) := F(X) + \mu \operatorname{tr}(X) \,, \tag{3.5}$$

for some $\mu > 0$. By analyzing the gradient of F_μ, we can derive an iterative procedure for solving Problem (3.5) as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla F_\mu(X) &= \nabla F(X) + \mu I = 0, \\ X^{-1} &= \mu I + \textstyle\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j^* \\ X &= \left(\mu I + \textstyle\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j^*\right)^{-1} , \end{aligned}$$

using which we can define the regularized map

$$G_\mu : \quad X_{k+1} \mapsto \left(\mu I + \textstyle\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X_k A_j)^{-1} A_j^*\right)^{-1} . \tag{3.6}$$

We show now that the regularized map is indeed contractive.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $\mu > 0$, the map G_μ is contractive on $D_{\delta,\Delta}$, i.e., $\delta_T(G_\mu(X), G_\mu(Y)) < \delta_T(X, Y)$ for all $X, Y \in D_{\delta,\Delta}$.*

Finally, we analyze the convergence rate of the proposed fixed-point approach. The central result of the paper gives the following non-asymptotic convergence guarantee:

Theorem 3.3. *For a suitable choice of μ, G_μ computes an ϵ-approximate solution to problem (1.3), i.e., a constant C, such that $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w}) \leq C \leq (1+\epsilon)\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$, with iteration complexity $O\Big(\log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, \frac{\Delta}{\delta^{3/2}}, \sqrt{d}, \frac{1}{R}\right)\Big)$, where d, δ, Δ, R depend on the input datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ only.*

We discuss the complexity of the algorithm in more detail in Section 5.2. The proof relies on a convergence analysis of the regularized map G_μ and quantifies the approximation error of G_μ with respect to G. The latter relies on the smoothness of F_μ, which is characterized by the following lemma:

Lemma 3.4. $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla F_\mu) \leq \frac{2}{\delta}$, *i.e.,* $\|\nabla F_\mu(X) - \nabla F_\mu(Y)\| \leq \frac{2}{\delta}\|X - Y\|$.

Putting both results together yields the claim. The proofs of Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.2 are given in Section 5.2.

A practical implementation of our fixed-point approach requires an initialization in the set $D_{\delta,\Delta}$ and in turn an explicit computation of the parameters δ and Δ for a given input datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$. We discuss the difficulty of this problem, as well as its connection to constrained subdeterminant maximization in Section 5.3.

4 Related work

Computing Brascamp-Lieb constants has been an actively studied problem for many years. Following seminal work by Brascamp and Lieb (1976); Brascamp et al. (1974); Lieb (1990) and Bennett et al. (2007), recent work has analyzed the problem through a geometric lens, exploiting geodesic convexity to utilize tools from Riemannian Optimization.

A growing body of literature has analyzed a formulation of the problem, which links to the more general *operator scaling problem* (Allen-Zhu et al., 2018; Garg et al., 2015, 2018; Kwok et al., 2019; Franks, 2018; Bürgisser et al., 2018). We briefly recall some of the key results in this line of work and comment on their relation to the current paper.

The *operator scaling problem* introduced by Gurvits (2004) asks to compute, for a given operator Φ, left and right scaling matrices, such that the scaled operator Φ' is doubly stochastic. Formally, let $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m)$ be a tuple of matrices with $A_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d'}$ that define a postive operator

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}(X) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} A_j X A_j^* \, .$$

Furthermore, consider the notion of *capacity* for an operator $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$, defined as

$$\operatorname{cap}(\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}(X)) := \inf_{X \succ 0, \det(X)=1} \det(\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}(X)) \, . \tag{4.1}$$

If an infimum X^* can be attained in (4.1), then the scaling $A'_j = \left(\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}(X^*)^{-1}\right)^{1/2} A_j (X^*)^{1/2}$ gives $\sum_j A'_j (A'_j)^* = 1$ and $\sum_j (A'_j)^* A'_j = 1$. In consequence, the scaled operator

$$\Phi'_{\mathcal{A}}(X) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} A'_j X (A'_j)^* \tag{4.2}$$

is doubly stochastic as desired. Therefore, minimizing the capacity provides a means to computing a suitable scaling. A simple method for this task is Gurvits' algorithm (Gurvits, 2004), which can be viewed as a generalization of Sinkhorn's algorithm (Sinkhorn, 1964). The operator scaling problem itself can be viewed as a generalization of the *matrix scaling problem* for which Sinkhorn's algorithm provides a simple, iterative solution. A convergence analysis of Gurvits' algorithm was later presented by Garg et al. (2015, 2018). They give a $O\big(\operatorname{poly}\big(b, d, \frac{1}{\epsilon}\big)\big)$ guarantee, where b denotes the bit complexity of the Brascamp-Lieb datum, which can be exponential in m, d (Garg et al. (2018), Theorem 1.5). A second-order approach by Allen-Zhu et al. (2018) reduces the dependency on $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ to $\operatorname{poly}(\log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ (Allen-Zhu et al. (2018), Theorem M1). Furthermore, under the additional assumption that $\mathcal{A}$ fulfills the *λ-spectral gap condition* (σ_2 is the 2$^{\text{nd}}$ singular value):

$$\sigma_2\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{m} A_j \otimes A_j\Big) \leq (1-\lambda) \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \|A_j\|_F^2}{\sqrt{dd'}} \, ,$$

stronger results can be shown. Indeed, Kwok et al. (2019) show that a gradient-based method achieves a factor $\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ (Kwok et al. (2019), Theorem 1.5).

The formulation of the Brascamp-Lieb problem utilized in these approaches differs from ours (1.3). Notably, their formulation has an *exponential* dependency on the bit complexity of the Brascamp-Lieb datum. In contrast, (1.3) is only *polynomial* in the bit complexity of the datum (Sra et al., 2018). In addition, while these approaches employ a more commonly used Riemannian structure on $\mathbb{P}_d$ induced by the Frobenius norm, our analysis uses the Thompson metric on $\mathbb{P}_d$.

5 Proofs of the results

5.1 Convergence of the fixed-point iteration using map G

We begin by showing that the sequence of iterates $(X_k)_{k>0}$ produced by the map G converges to a solution of Problem 1.3:

Theorem 5.1 (Theorem 3.1). *Let $X_0 \in D_{\delta,\Delta}$; the sequence $\{X_k\}$ generated by iterating G converges to a solution of problem 1.3 as $k \to \infty$.*

We first show the existence of a fixed point:

Lemma 5.2. *G has a fixed point in $D_{\delta,\Delta}$.*

Proof. From Theorem 2.7 we know that the minimum is attained in problem 1.3, i.e., there exists a point X^*, such that $F(X^*) = \inf_X F(X)$. X^* must be a stationary point, i.e., $\nabla F(X^*) = 0$. Hence, by construction $X^* = G(X^*)$. Moreover, Bennett et al. (2007, Prop. 5.2) implies that the minimum lies in a set of the form $D_{\delta,\Delta}$ (see sec. 5.3 for more details). This implies that G has a fixed point in $D_{\delta,\Delta}$. □

For proving Theorem 3.1 we need a few additional auxiliary results that we now present. We start by showing that G is homogeneous and order-preserving:

Lemma 5.3. *Let G be as defined in (1.4). Then:*

1. *For a scalar $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $G(\alpha X) = \alpha G(X)$, i.e., G is* homogeneous.
2. *For $X, Y \in \mathbb{P}_d$ with $X \preceq Y$ ($X \prec Y$) we have $G(X) \preceq G(Y)$ ($G(X) \prec G(Y)$), i.e., G is* order-preserving.

Proof. Property (1) is trivial. We therefore move directly to property (2). First, note that for $X \preceq Y$, we have $A_j^* X A_j \preceq A_j^* Y A_j$. Assuming that $A_j^* X A_j$ is invertible, this implies

$$(A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} \succeq (A_j^* Y A_j)^{-1} \;\Rightarrow\; \left(\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j^*\right)^{-1} \preceq \left(\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* Y A_j)^{-1} A_j^*\right)^{-1}.$$

The same arguments apply in the $\prec$ case. □

A direct consequence of this property is that G is non-expansive.

Lemma 5.4. *G is non-expansive.*

Proof. We must prove that $\delta_T(G(X), G(Y)) \leq \delta_T(X, Y)$. By Definition 2.1(2) we have $M(Y/X)^{-1}Y \preceq X \preceq M(X/Y)Y$, and also

$$M(G(Y)/G(X))^{-1}G(Y) \preceq G(X) \preceq M(G(X)/G(Y))G(Y) \,. \tag{5.1}$$

Furthermore, since G is order-preserving and homogeneous (Lemma 5.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(X) &\preceq G(M(X/Y)Y) = M(X/Y)G(Y) \\ G(X) &\succeq G(M(Y/X)^{-1}Y) = M(Y/X)^{-1}G(Y) \,. \end{aligned}$$

Since $M(G(Y)/G(X)), M(G(X)/G(Y))$ are extremal in inequality (5.1), this implies

$$\begin{aligned} M(X/Y) &\geq M(G(X)/G(Y)) \\ M(Y/X) &\geq M(G(Y)/G(X)) \,, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\max\{M(X/Y), M(Y/X)\} \geq \max\{M(G(X)/G(Y)), M(G(Y)/G(X))\}$$

and thereby the claim. □

Next, we establish asymptotic regularity of G.

Lemma 5.5. *G is asymptotically regular with respect to the Thompson metric, i.e.,*

$$\delta_T\big(G(X_{k+1}), G(X_k)\big) \to 0 \,.$$

Proof. From Lemma 5.2 we know that $\mathrm{Fix(G)} \neq \emptyset$. Let $X^* \in \mathrm{Fix}(G)$. Due to the non-expansivity of G (Lemma 5.4), we have Fejér-monotonicity at X^*:

$$\delta_T\big(X_{k+1}, X^*\big) = \delta_T\big(G(X_k), G(X^*)\big) \leq \delta_T\big(X_k, X^*\big) \,.$$

Thus, the iterates $\{G(X_k)\}_{k\geq 0}$ must remain bounded, which in turn implies asymptotic regularity of G. □

The proof further implies that G is bounded, which we summarize in the following corollary:

Corollary 5.6. *G is bounded on $D_{\delta,\Delta}$, i.e., there exists a $R > 0$ depending on the input datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ only, such that $\|G(X_k)\| < R$ for all $k \geq 0$.*

Remark 5.7. We note that it is a well-known fact that non-expansive maps either do not have a fixed point or are bounded. Classical versions of this result can be found in (Pazy, 1971) (for Hilbert spaces) and in (Reich, 1973) (for Banach spaces).

In summary, we obtain our asymptotic convergence result (Theorem 3.1) as a direct consequence of Theorem 1.3: With initialization at any $X \in D_{\delta,\Delta}$ the sequence produced by the map G converges to a solution of problem (1.3).

Finally, we want to give a lower bound on the sequence of iterates produced by the map G, which is needed for the subsequent analysis. Recall the definition of *operator convexity*. Consider a function f defined on a real interval. We say that f is operator convex, if for all $\lambda \in [0,1]$ and Hermitian matrices A, B, we have

$$f((1-\lambda)A + \lambda B) \leq (1-\lambda)f(A) + \lambda f(B)\ . \tag{5.2}$$

Furthermore, recall the following facts on the convexity of matrix operators (see, e.g., Nordström (2011); Bhatia (2013)):

Lemma 5.8 (Convex matrix operators)**.**

1. $(\lambda X + \bar{\lambda} Y)^{-1} \preceq \lambda X^{-1} + \bar{\lambda} Y^{-1}$ *for* $\lambda \in (0,1)$, $\bar{\lambda} = 1-\lambda$, X, Y *HPD.*
2. *If* f *is operator convex, then* $f(X^* L X) \preceq X^* f(L) X$ *for* L *PSD.*

Finally, we need the following classical result on eigenvalue maps:

Lemma 5.9 (Problem III.6.14, (Bhatia, 2013))**.** *Let* X, Y *be HPD matrices. Then*

$$\lambda^{\downarrow}(X) \cdot \lambda^{\uparrow}(Y) \prec_w \lambda(XY) \prec_w \lambda^{\downarrow}(X) \cdot \lambda^{\downarrow}(Y),$$

which implies in particular that

$$\langle \lambda^{\downarrow}(X), \lambda^{\uparrow}(Y) \rangle \leq \operatorname{tr}(XY) \leq \langle \lambda^{\downarrow}(X), \lambda^{\downarrow}(Y) \rangle\ ,$$

where $\lambda^{\downarrow}(X)$ *(*$\lambda^{\uparrow}(X)$*) denotes eigenvalues of* X *arranged in decreasing (increasing) order,* $\prec_w$ *denotes the weak-majorization order, and* $\cdot$ *denotes elementwise product. In the second inequality, we have equality, if* XY *is symmetric.*

Recall that for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote with $x^{\downarrow} = (x_1^{\downarrow}, \ldots, x_d^{\downarrow})$ the vector with entries of x in decreasing order, i.e., $x_1^{\downarrow} \geq \ldots \geq x_d^{\downarrow}$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we say that x is *majorized* by y ($x \prec y$), if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_i^{\downarrow} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} y_i^{\downarrow} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq d \tag{5.3}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i^{\downarrow} = \sum_{i=1}^{d} y_i^{\downarrow}\ . \tag{5.4}$$

If only the first condition holds, we say that x is *weakly majorized* by y ($x \prec_w y$). We show the following bound:

Lemma 5.10. *Let* $X_0 \in D_{\delta,\Delta}$*. The sequence* $\{X_k\}$ *generated by iterating* G *is bounded from below, i.e.,* $G(X_k) \succeq \delta I$*.*

Proof. Let $X \in D_{\delta,\Delta}$ be arbitrary; we want to show that $G(X) \succeq \delta I$. From Lemma 5.3(2) we know that G is order-preserving, i.e.

$$X \succeq \delta I \quad \Rightarrow \quad G(X) \succeq G(\delta I) \,.$$

Therefore, it remains to be shown that $G(\delta I) \succeq \delta I$. Recall the following lemma:

Lemma 5.11 (Sra and Hosseini (2015)). *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{d\times d'}$ ($d' \leq d$) be of full rank. Then the function $f : \mathbb{P}_d \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f(Z) = \log\det(A^*ZA) - \log\det(Z)$ is operator decreasing.*

This lemma implies in particular that

$$A(A^*ZA)^{-1}A^* \preceq Z^{-1} \,.$$

For $Z = \delta I$, this gives (together with the min-max theorem)

$$\lambda_{\max}\big(\big(G(\delta I)\big)^{-1}\big) = \lambda_{\max}\big(A_j^*\big(A_j^*(\delta I)A_j\big)^{-1}A_j\big) \leq \lambda_{\max}\big(\delta^{-1}I\big) \,.$$

With $\sum_j w_j = 1$, this implies $\lambda_{\max}\big(\big(G(\delta I)\big)^{-1}\big) \leq \delta^{-1}$, i.e. $(G(\delta I))^{-1} \preceq \delta^{-1}I$. This gives $G(\delta I) \succeq \delta I$. □

5.2 Non-asymptotic convergence analysis of G_μ

We start by showing that the regularized map G_μ has the crucial contractivity property.

Lemma 5.12 (Lemma 3.2). *G_μ is contractive.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_T(G_\mu(X), G_\mu(Y)) &= \delta_T\big(\mu I + G^{-1}(X), \mu I + G^{-1}(Y)\big) \\
&\overset{(1)}{\leq} \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\mu}\delta_T\big(G^{-1}(X), G^{-1}(Y)\big) \\
&\overset{(2)}{=} \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\mu}\delta_T\big(G(X), G(Y)\big) \\
&\overset{(3)}{\leq} \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\mu}\delta_T\big(X, Y\big) \,,
\end{aligned}$$

where (1) follows from Lemma 2.2(6) with $\gamma = \max\{\|G^{-1}(X)\|, \|G^{-1}(Y)\|\} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}$ by Lemma 5.10. (2) follows from Lemma 2.2(1) and (3) from G being log-nonexpansive (Lemma 5.4). Since $\mu > 0$, this implies $\delta_T(G_\mu(X), G_\mu(Y)) < \delta_T(X, Y)$. □

The contractivity of the regularized map furthermore allows us to quantify its convergence rate non-asymptotically.

Theorem 5.13. *For a suitable choice of μ, G_μ computes an ϵ-approximate solution to problem (Eq. 1.3) with iteration complexity $O\Big(\log\big(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, \frac{\Delta}{\delta^{3/2}}, \sqrt{d}, \frac{1}{R}\big)\Big)$, where d, δ, Δ, R depend on the input daturm $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ only.*

Proof. Our plan is as follows: We start by analyzing the choice of the parameter μ and the convergence rate of the regularized approach. This will allow us to develop a non-asymptotic convergence result for problem 1.3.

The optimality gap is given by

$$|F(X_k) - F(X^*)| \leq |F(X_k) - F_\mu(X_k)| + |F_\mu(X_k) - F_\mu(X^*)| + |F_\mu(X^*) - F(X^*)| \,,$$

where the first and third term represent the *approximation error* of F_μ and the second term the *convergence rate* of G_μ in terms of the function values. Therefore, we have to perform the following steps:

1. bound the approximation error of F_μ, i.e., bound $|F(X) - F_\mu(X)|$;
2. characterize the convergence rate of G_μ, i.e., bound $|F_\mu(X) - F_\mu(X^*)|$.

Approximation error of F_μ. By construction we have $F_\mu(X) - F(X) = \mu \operatorname{tr}(X)$. Note that at a fixed point X, we have

$$\operatorname{tr}(X) = \operatorname{tr}(G_\mu(X)) = \operatorname{tr}\left(\big(\mu I + \underbrace{\textstyle\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j^*}_{=:G^{-1}(X)} \big)^{-1} \right) .$$

Let $\{\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n\}$ denote the eigenvalues of $G^{-1}(X)$. Then the eigenvalues of $G^{-1}(X) + \mu I$ are $\{\nu_1 + \mu, \ldots, \nu_n + \mu\}$, which gives (for a fixed point X)

$$\operatorname{tr} X = \operatorname{tr}\left[\big(\mu I + G^{-1}(X)\big)^{-1} \right] = \sum_i \frac{1}{\lambda_i\big(\mu I + G^{-1}(X)\big)} = \sum_i \frac{1}{\mu + \nu_i} \,.$$

Let $\nu_{\min}$ be the minimal eigenvalue of $G^{-1}(X)$. Then

$$\operatorname{tr} X = \sum_i \frac{1}{\mu + \nu_i} \leq \sum_i \frac{1}{\mu + \nu_{\min}} = \frac{d}{\mu + \nu_{\min}} \,.$$

Due to the boundedness of G (Lemma 5.6), we have that $\nu_{\min} \geq \frac{1}{R}$. Inserting this above, we obtain the bound

$$\operatorname{tr}(X) = \frac{d}{\mu + \nu_{\min}} \leq \frac{d}{\mu + \frac{1}{R}} \,,$$

which in turn implies the bound

$$F_\mu(X) - F(X) = \mu \operatorname{tr}(X) \leq \frac{\mu d}{\mu + \frac{1}{R}} \,. \tag{5.5}$$

This bound gives a means for choosing μ (d, δ, R are determined by the input $(\mathcal{A}, w)$), such that a solution to the regularized problem gives an $\frac{\epsilon}{4}$-accurate solution to the original one. We defer the further discussion to the end of the proof.

Convergence rate of F_μ. From Lemma 3.2 we know that G_μ is log-contractive, i.e., we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_T(\underbrace{G_\mu(X_k)}_{=X_{k+1}}, \underbrace{G_\mu(X^*)}_{=X^*}) &\leq \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\mu}\delta_T(X_k, X^*) \\ \Rightarrow \delta_T(X_{k+1}, X^*) &\leq \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\mu}\delta_T(X_k, X^*)\,,\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma := \max\{\|G^{-1}(X_k)\|, \|G^{-1}(X^*)\|\}$. Recursively, this gives

$$\delta_T(X_k, X^*) \leq \Big(\frac{\tilde{\gamma}}{\tilde{\gamma}+\mu}\Big)^k \delta_T(X_0, X^*)\,, \tag{5.6}$$

where we set $\tilde{\gamma} := \max\{\max_{1\leq i\leq k}\|G^{-1}(X_i)\|, \|G^{-1}(X^*)\|\}$, which is bounded as $\frac{1}{R} \leq \tilde{\gamma} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}$ by construction of the set $D_{\delta,\Delta}$ and the boundedness of G. If F_μ is L-smooth, then the following bound holds:

$$\begin{aligned}F_\mu(X^*) &\leq F_\mu(X_k) + \langle \nabla F_\mu(X_k),\, X_k - X^*\rangle_F + \frac{L}{2}\|X^* - X_k\|_F^2 \\ \Rightarrow \big|F_\mu(X^*) - F_\mu(X_k)\big| &\leq \big|\langle \nabla F_\mu(X_k),\, X_k - X^*\rangle_F\big| + \frac{L}{2}\|X^* - X_k\|_F^2;\end{aligned}$$

here, $\langle\cdot,\,\cdot\rangle_F$ denotes the usual Frobenius product $\langle X,\, Y\rangle_F = \operatorname{tr}\big(X^*Y\big)$. In order to use this bound in our analysis, we must show that F_μ is indeed L-smooth. To that end, recall that

$$\nabla F_\mu(X) = \textstyle\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j^* - X^{-1} + \mu I$$

and let $H_1(X) := \sum_j w_j A_j \big(A_j^* X A_j\big)^{-1} A_j^*$ and $H_2(X) := -X^{-1}$. Then $\operatorname{Lip}(\nabla F_\mu) \leq L$, if $\operatorname{Lip}(H_1) + \operatorname{Lip}(H_2) \leq L$ for some L. For $\operatorname{Lip}(H_1)$ note that

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla\Big(\textstyle\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j^*\Big) &= -\textstyle\sum_j w_j \big[\big(A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j^*\big) \otimes \big(A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j^*\big)\big] \\ &= -\Big(\textstyle\sum_j w_j A_j \big(A_j^* X A_j\big)^{-1} A_j^*\Big) \otimes \Big(\textstyle\sum_j w_j A_j \big(A_j^* X A_j\big)^{-1} A_j^*\Big) \\ &= -G^{-1}(X) \otimes G^{-1}(X)\,,\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the distributive law. Then the construction of $D_{\delta,\Delta}$ and the fact that G is a self-map imply

$$\|\nabla H_1(X)\| = \|G^{-1}(X)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\delta}\,.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\nabla\big(-X^{-1}\big) = (X^{-1}) \otimes (X^{-1})\,,$$

which implies that $\|\nabla H_2(X)\| = \|X^{-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\delta}$, again by contruction of $D_{\delta,\Delta}$. This implies $L = \frac{2}{\delta}$ and therefore Lemma 3.4.

With that, the Lipschitz bound above implies

$$|F_\mu(X^*) - F_\mu(X_k)| \leq |\langle \nabla F_\mu(X_k),\, X_k - X^* \rangle_F| + \frac{1}{\delta}\|X^* - X_k\|_F^2 \,.$$

Hence, for the first term on the right hand side, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies

$$|\langle \nabla F_\mu(X_k),\, X_k - X^* \rangle_F| \leq \|\nabla F_\mu(X_k)\|_F \|X^* - X_k\|_F \leq \sqrt{d}\|\nabla F_\mu(X_k)\| \|X^* - X_k\|_F \,.$$

It remains to derive bounds on (a) $\|\nabla F_\mu(X_k)\|$ and (b) the convergence rate of $\{\|X^* - X_k\|_F\}_k$. For (a), we have

$$\|\nabla F_\mu(X)\| = \|\nabla\big(F(X) + \mu \operatorname{tr}(X)\big)\| = \|\underbrace{\big(\sum_j w_j A_j (A_j^* X A_j)^{-1} A_j\big)}_{=G^{-1}(X)} - X^{-1} + \mu I\| \,.$$

Recall that for X, Y Hermitian, Weyl's Perturbation Theorem (see, e.g., (Bhatia, 2013), III.2.7) gives

$$\|X - Y\| \leq \max_i |\lambda_i(X) - \lambda_{n-i+1}(Y)| \,.$$

With that, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|(G^{-1}(X) + \mu I) - X^{-1}\| &\leq \max_i |\lambda_i(G^{-1}(X) + \mu I) - \lambda_{n-i+1}(X^{-1})| \\ &\leq \max\left\{\lambda_{\max}(G^{-1}(X) + \mu I), \lambda_{\max}(X^{-1})\right\} \,.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $G(X), X \succeq \delta I$ by Lemma 5.10 and the construction of the set $D_{\delta,\Delta}$. This implies $\lambda_{\min}(G(X)), \lambda_{\min}(X) \geq \delta$ and therefore $\lambda_{\max}(G^{-1}(X)), \lambda_{\max}(X^{-1}) \leq \frac{1}{\delta}$. Inserting this above, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla F_\mu(X)\| &\leq \max\left\{\lambda_{\max}\big(G^{-1}(X) + \mu I\big), \lambda_{\max}(X^{-1})\right\} &(5.7)\\ &\leq \max\left\{\frac{1}{\delta} + \mu, \frac{1}{\delta}\right\} = \left(\frac{1}{\delta} + \mu\right) =: C_1 \,. &(5.8)\end{aligned}$$

For (b), quantifying the convergence rate of $\left\{\|X^* - X_k\|_F\right\}_k$, we recall an inequality of Snyder that relates the Thompson metric to Schatten norms.

Theorem 5.14 (Snyder (2016)). *Let X, Y HPD and $\|\cdot\|_p$ denotes the Schatten p-norm. Then:*

$$\|X - Y\|_p \leq 2^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{e^{\delta_T(X,Y)} - 1}{e^{\delta_T(X,Y)}} \max\left\{\|X\|_p, \|Y\|_p\right\} \,.$$

Since $\|\cdot\|_F$ is Schatten 2-norm, we therefore get

$$\begin{aligned}\|X_k - X^*\|_F &\leq \sqrt{2}\max\left\{\|X_k\|_F, \|X^*\|_F\right\} \frac{e^{\delta_T(X_k,X^*)} - 1}{e^{\delta_T(X_k,X^*)}} &(5.9)\\ &\leq \sqrt{2d}\max\left\{\|X_k\|, \|X^*\|\right\} \frac{e^{\delta_T(X_k,X^*)} - 1}{e^{\delta_T(X_k,X^*)}} \,. &(5.10)\end{aligned}$$

For ease of notation, we introduce the shorthand $\delta_{T,k} := \delta_T(X_k, X^*)$. We have seen above that G_μ is strictly contractive and that in particular $\delta_{T,k} \leq \left(\frac{\tilde{\gamma}}{\tilde{\gamma}+\mu}\right)^k \delta_{T,0}$. If we initialize $X_0 \in D_{\delta,\Delta}$, then the initial distance from the optimum must be bounded due to the boundedness of G. Hence, there is some constant $C_2 > 0$, such that $\delta_{T,0} \leq C_2$. With this, we can analyze the exponential terms in (5.9). From the above inequality and the monotonicity of the exponential function, we have $e^{\delta_{T,k}} \leq e^{\left(\frac{\tilde{\gamma}}{\tilde{\gamma}+\mu}\right)^k \delta_{T,0}} = e^{C_2 \alpha^k}$, where we set $\left(\frac{\tilde{\gamma}}{\tilde{\gamma}+\mu}\right)^k =: \alpha^k$. Inserting this into the Lipschitz bound above, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|F_\mu(X^*) - F_\mu(X_k)\right| &\leq \sqrt{d}\left\|\nabla F_\mu(X_k)\right\|\left\|X^* - X_k\right\|_F + \frac{1}{\delta}\left\|X^* - X_k\right\|_F^2 \\
&\overset{(1)}{\leq} \left(\sqrt{2}C_1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)\left\|X^* - X_k\right\|_F \\
&\overset{(2)}{\leq} \underbrace{\left(\sqrt{2}C_1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)\sqrt{\frac{2d}{\delta}}}_{=:\widehat{C}_1} \frac{e^{\delta_{T,k}} - 1}{e^{\delta_{T,k}}} ,
\end{aligned}$$

where (1) follows since $\left\{\left(\frac{e^{\delta_{T,k}}-1}{e^{\delta_{T,k}}}\right)^2\right\}_k$ decays faster than $\left\{\frac{e^{\delta_{T,k}}-1}{e^{\delta_{T,k}}}\right\}_k$ and (2) follows from Snyder's theorem, and upon noting that

$$\max\left\{\max_{1\leq i\leq k}\left\|X_i^{-1}\right\|, \left\|\left(X^*\right)^{-1}\right\|\right\} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}},$$

by construction of $D_{\delta,\Delta}$. The constant $\widehat{C}_1$ summarizes the dependency on the input datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ and the regularization parameter μ.

We want to bound the iteration complexity of an ϵ'-accurate solution ($\epsilon' := \frac{\epsilon}{2}$) of F_μ, so let $\epsilon' = \left|F_\mu(X^*) - F_\mu(X_k)\right|$. Then with the above, we have

$$\epsilon' \leq \widehat{C}_1 \frac{e^{\delta_{T,k}} - 1}{e^{\delta_{T,k}}} .$$

Furthermore, with the constants α and C_2 as introduced above, we get

$$\epsilon' \leq \widehat{C}_1 \frac{e^{C_2\alpha^k} - 1}{e^{C_2\alpha^k}} = \widehat{C}_1\left(1 - \frac{1}{e^{C_2\alpha^k}}\right) .$$

This can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\epsilon'}{\widehat{C}_1} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{e^{C_2\alpha^k}} \Leftrightarrow e^{C_2\alpha^k} \geq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\epsilon'}{\widehat{C}_1}} \Leftrightarrow \alpha^k \geq \frac{1}{C_2}\log\left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{\epsilon'}{\widehat{C}_1}}\right) \\
\Leftrightarrow \left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^{-k} \geq \frac{1}{C_2}\log\left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{\epsilon'}{\widehat{C}_1}}\right) \Leftrightarrow -k \geq \frac{\log\left(\frac{1}{C_2}\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{\epsilon'}{\widehat{C}_1}}\right)\right)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)} .
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have the following bound on the number of iterations needed to achieve an ϵ-accurate solution.

$$k \leq -\frac{\log\left(\frac{1}{C_2}\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{\epsilon'}{\widehat{C}_1}}\right)\right)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)}\,. \tag{5.11}$$

We first evaluate the dependency on $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$. Assuming ϵ is small, we get for the inner term

$$-\log\left(1-\frac{\epsilon'}{\widehat{C}_1}\right) \geq \frac{\epsilon'}{\widehat{C}_1}\,.$$

This implies a $\log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ dependency as

$$\boxed{k \leq \frac{\log\left(\frac{\widehat{C}_1 C_2}{\epsilon'}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)}} \tag{5.12}$$

Constants. The result above depends on three constants $\widehat{C}_1, C_2, \alpha$, which we relate to the complexity of the input $(\mathcal{A}, w)$, characterized by the constants d, δ, Δ, R.

Remark 5.15. As stated earlier, those constants are not necessary mutually independent. In particular, we expect that R may dependent on δ, i.e., a more precise notation would read $R(\delta)$. However, to keep notation simply, we just write R. For feasible BL data, we expect δ to be small and $R \geq 1$ (?).

For $\widehat{C}_1$, note that

$$\widehat{C}_1 = \left(\sqrt{2}C_1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)\sqrt{\frac{2d}{\delta}} \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{d}{\delta}}\left(\frac{1}{\delta}+\mu\right) + \frac{\sqrt{2d}}{\delta^{3/2}} \overset{(1)}{=} O\left(\sqrt{d}, \frac{1}{\delta^{3/2}}, \frac{1}{R}\right)\,.$$

To see (1), recall that to control the approximation error (Eq. 5.5), we set $\mu := \frac{\epsilon'}{2R(d-\epsilon'/2)}$. Since $\widehat{C}_1$ enters logarithmically, this introduces a $O\Big(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta^{3/2}}, \sqrt{d}, \frac{1}{R}\right)\Big)$ dependency. Furthermore, we have that

$$C_2 = \delta_T(X_0, X^*) \leq \operatorname{diam}(D_{\delta,\Delta}) \leq \log\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\,,$$

since by construction

$$\operatorname{diam}(D_{\delta,\Delta}) = \max_{X,Y\in D_{\delta,\Delta}} \delta_T(X,Y) = \log M(\Delta I_d/\delta I_d) = \log\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\,,$$

which only depends on the parameters δ, Δ. Finally, we have

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} = \frac{\tilde{\gamma}+\mu}{\tilde{\gamma}} \geq \frac{\frac{1}{R}+\mu}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}} \geq \sqrt{\delta}\left(\frac{1}{R}+\frac{\epsilon'}{2Rd}\right) = O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{R}\right)\,.$$

This implies that the contribution of the factor $\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\right)^{-1}$ is dominated by the other terms.

Overall, the regularized approach has a complexity of $O\Big(\log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, \frac{\Delta}{\delta^{3/2}}, \sqrt{d}, \frac{1}{R}\right)\Big)$ with respect to the accuracy ϵ and d, δ, Δ, R, which depend on the input datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ only. We will discuss the dependency on the parameter δ, Δ in more detail in the following section. □

5.3 Dependency on the input datum $(\mathcal{A}, w)$

Our convergence guarantees rely on the existence of suitable parameters $\Delta, \delta > 0$ for a given Brascamp-Lieb datum $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$, such that the global optimum X^* of Eq. 1.3 is contained in a set of the form $D_{\delta,\Delta}$. The existence of such a δ follows from a result in (Bennett et al., 2007), which ensures that the X^* is bounded from above and below. In this section, we recall the argument by Bennett et al. (2007) and highlight its connection to our parameters δ, Δ. Furthermore, we discuss a conjectured connection to the *subdeterminant maximization* problem. The development of an efficient approach for computing δ (and hence determining $D_{\delta,\Delta}$ explicitely) is left for future work.

We recall some crucial properties of the optimum X^* from Bennett et al. (2007). The existence of suitable upper and lower bounds on X^* is implied by (Bennett et al., 2007, Proposition 5.2), which relies on the following lemma:

Lemma 5.16 (Bennett et al. (2007), Lemma 5.1)**.** *Assume that $(\mathcal{A}, \boldsymbol{w})$ is feasible, i.e., the conditions in Theorem 2.5 hold. Then there exists a $c > 0$ and an ONB $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$, such that there exists an index set I_j with $|I_j| = \dim(H_j) = \dim(A_j H)$, such that $\sum_j w_j |I_j \cap \{1, \dots, k\}| \leq k \quad \forall\, 0 \leq k \leq d$ and*

$$\Big\| \bigwedge_{i \in I_j} A_j e_i \Big\| \geq c \quad \forall\, 1 \leq j \leq m\,. \tag{5.13}$$

Furthermore,

$$\sum_j w_j \left| I_j \cap \{k+1, \dots, d\} \right| \leq d - k \quad \forall\, 0 \leq k \leq d\,. \tag{5.14}$$

The connection to our parameters δ, Δ follows from a crucial property, which is implicitly established in the proof of (Bennett et al., 2007, Proposition 5.2):

Corollary 5.17. *The optimizer X^* for Problem 1.3 is bounded from above and below, with both bounds depending on the input datum $(\mathcal{A}, w)$ only.*

In short, the argument is as follows: We again consider Gaussian inputs $(Z_j)_{j\in[m]}$ and set $\sum_j w_j (A_j^* Z_j A_j) =: X$.[2] By Lemma 5.16, this transformation is self-adjoint, since the matrices $(A_j)_{j\in[m]}$ are non-degenerate and $w_j > 0$. Therefore, we can diagonalize

[2]Note that here, again, we perform a variable change as in Theorem 2.7 to be consistent with our geodesically convex formulation (problem 1.3).

$X = P^{-1}\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d)P$, where $\lambda_d > 0$. As a consequence, there must exists a $\delta > 0$, such that $\lambda_d \geq \delta$.

Furthermore, from Eq. 5.13, we see that $\{A_j e_i\}_{i \in I_j}$ forms a basis of H_j with a lower bound on degeneracy. Therefore

$$\det(Z_j) \leq C \prod_{i \in I_j} \lambda_i$$

for some $C > 0$, which depends only on the input datum. This further implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{j=1}^{m} \big(\det Z_j\big)^{w_j} &\leq C \prod_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i^{\sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j \left| I_j \cap \{i\} \right|} \\
&\overset{(1)}{\leq} C\lambda_1^d \prod_{0 \leq k \leq d-1} \left(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\right)^{\sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j \left| I_j \cap \{k+1, \ldots, d\} \right|} \\
&\overset{(2)}{\leq} C\lambda_1^d \prod_{0 \leq k \leq d-1} \left(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\right)^{d-k} \\
&\overset{(3)}{\leq} C\lambda_1 \cdot \cdots \cdot \lambda_k \,,
\end{aligned}$$

where (1) follows from telescoping and applying the scaling condition (Theorem 2.5(2)), (2) from Eq. 5.14 and (3) from reverse telescoping. Since we have restricted ourselves to simple BL input data (see Theorem 2.7), Eq. 5.14 holds with inequality (see also Definition 2.6). A refinement of the above argument then implies that

$$\prod_{j=1}^{m} \big(\det(Z_j)\big)^{w_j} \leq C \det(X) \prod_{1 \leq k \leq d-1} \left(\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}\right)^{c} , \tag{5.15}$$

for $c > 0$ as in Lemma 5.16, which again depends only on the input datum. This implies that Eq. 2.3 goes to zero as $\frac{\lambda_d}{\lambda_1}$ goes to zero. Hence, the supremum (Eq. 2.4) must lie in a region with $\lambda_1 \leq C\lambda_d$. This implies upper and lower bounds on X^* and thus the existence of a compact convex set of the form $D_{\delta,\Delta}$ that contains X^*.

To implement our proposed algorithm, we need to find a good initialization $X_0 \in D_\delta$, which requires the explicit computation of δ and Δ. We leave this as an open problem.

We conjecture that there is a close relation between our δ and the parameter c in Theorem 5.16 (via Eq. 5.13), which is characterized by the bit complexity of the input datum $(\mathcal{A}, w)$. In contrast to δ, c can be directly computed by solving a constrained subdeterminant maximization problem over the set of linear transforms $\big(A_j\big)_{j \in [m]}$. This observation may serve as a starting point for future investigation into the computation of the parameter δ. Given δ and c, the parameter Δ could then be inferred from Eq. 5.15.

To see that c can be computed via subdeterminant maximization, note that with an ONB and the index sets I_j in Theorem 5.16, we have

$$\langle Z_j A_j e_i,\, A_j e_i \rangle_{H_j} = \langle e_i,\, A_j^* Z_j A_j e_i \rangle_H \leq \frac{1}{w_j} \langle e_i,\, X e_i \rangle_H = \frac{\lambda_i}{w_j} \,. \tag{5.16}$$

Furthermore, we have with Eq. 5.13 that $\left(A_j e_i\right)_{i \in I_j}$ forms a basis of H_j with a lower bound on degeneracy, characterized by c. Recall that c is defined, such that we can find for each $j \in [m]$ an index set $I_j \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $|I_j| = d'$, such that

$$\left\| \bigwedge_{i \in I_j} A_j e_i \right\|_{d'} > c \, .$$

Consider first the case where the A_j are vectors $(a_1^j, \dots, a_d^j)$, i.e. $|I_j| = 1$. Then $\|a_j e_i\| \geq |a_i^j|$ and therefore $c = \min_{j \in [m]} |a_i^j| = \min_{j \in [m]} \|a^j\|_\infty$, i.e., each A_j has an entry with absolute value at least c. In the general case $A_j : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ we have ($\mathrm{row}_k A$ indicating the kth row of A)

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \bigwedge_{i \in I_j} A_j e_i \right\|_{d'} &= \left\| A_j e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_j e_{i_{d'}} \right\|_{d'} \\
&= \left\| \mathrm{row}_{i_1} A_j \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathrm{row}_{d'} A_j \right\|_{d'} \\
&= \left\| \det\left((\mathrm{row}_{i_1} A_j)^T, \dots, (\mathrm{row}_{d'} A_j)^T \right) e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_{d'}} \right\|_{d'} \\
&= \left| \det\left((\mathrm{row}_{i_1} A_j)^T, \dots, (\mathrm{row}_{d'} A_j)^T \right) \right| \, .
\end{aligned}$$

For each j, this translates to an optimization problem of the form

$$\max_{|I| = d'} \left| \det\left((A_j)_I \right) \right| \, , \tag{5.17}$$

which corresponds to a constrained *subdeterminant maximization*. For computing c, we simply take the minimum of all subdeterminant maximizers, i.e.

$$c := \min_{j \in [m]} \max_{|I| = d'} \left| \det\left((A_j)_I \right) \right| \, .$$

Problem 5.17 is known to be NP-hard. An approximation algorithm, which achieves accuracy up to a factor of $O(e^{d'})$ was given by Nikolov (2015):

Theorem 5.18 (Nikolov (2015), Theorem 3)**.** *There exists a deterministic polynomial time algorithm, which approximates problem 5.17 within a factor of* $e^{d' + o(d')}$.

For a detailed analysis of the algorithmic aspects of this problem and Nikolov's approach, see also (Ebrahimi et al., 2017).

6 Other Picard iterations for computing Brascamp-Lieb constants

This paper analyzes a specific Picard iteration, generated by the map G, for computing Brascamp-Lieb constants and analyzes its convergence via the Thompson part metric.

We note that neither the choice of the Picard iteration, nor the specific Finslerian lens employed in the analysis is unique. Our particular choice is motivated by the observation that one can establish *strict contractivity* of G with respect to the Thompson part metric, which allows for developing *non-asymptotic* convergence guarantees. In this section we discuss one other Picard iteration that arises from problem 1.3 and establish asymptotic convergence.

Consider the map

$$\tilde{G} := \frac{G}{\|G\|}, \tag{6.1}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ may denote any matrix norm. We want to analyze $\tilde{G}$ with respect to the *Hilbert projective metric*, which is given by

$$\delta_H(X, Y) := \log\big(M(X/Y)M(Y/X)\big), \tag{6.2}$$

where again $M(X/Y) := \inf\{\lambda > 0 : X \preceq \lambda Y\}$. We note the close relationship between the Thompson part metric δ_T (see Definition 2.1) and the Hilbert projective metric δ_H. Both metrics induce a Finslerian geometry on manifold of positive definite matrices $\mathbb{P}_d$.

One can show that $\tilde{G}$ is non-expansive and asymptptically regular with respect to δ_H and that it has a (not necessary unqiue) fixed point in the compact set $\tilde{D} := \{X : \frac{X}{\|X\|}$. Asymptotic convergence of $\tilde{G}$ is then guaranteed by a Hilbert geometry version of Theorem 1.3. Such a result can be obtained by specializing the more general Banach space version of the theorem (Baillon et al., 1978, Theorem 1.2) to Hilbert geometry.

We can show that the Picard iteration defined by the map $\tilde{G}$ convergences to the same fixed point as that of the map G: Let X^* denote a fixed point of $\tilde{G}$. Then $G(X^*) = \lambda X^*$ for some $\lambda > 0$. Corollary 5.17 implies that $\lambda = 1$, which gives the claim.

It remains an open question to show, whether $\tilde{G}$ is strictly contractive with respect to the Hilbert projective norm. This would allow to adapt our non-asymptotic convergence analysis to the map $\tilde{G}$ as well.

7 Discussion

In this paper, we introduced a novel fixed-point approach for computing Brascamp-Lieb constants, which is grounded in nonlinear Perron-Frobenius theory. In contrast to much of the prior literature, which has analyzed the problem through a Riemannian lens, our approach utilizes a Finslerian geometry on the manifold of Hermitian, positive definite matrices, which arises from the Thompson part metric. To the best of our knowledge, this introduces a novel geometric perspective on the problem of computing Brascamp-Lieb constants.

We establish convergence of our proposed fixed-point approach and present a full convergence analysis for a regularized variant. Importantly, we show that the regularized approach attains a non-asymptotic convergence rate of $O\Big(\log\big(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, \frac{\Delta}{\delta^{3/2}}, \sqrt{d}, \frac{1}{R}\big)\Big)$, where d, δ, Δ, R depend on the size and structure of the input datum only. A shortcoming of

the present approach lies in the difficulty of characterizing the structural dependency on the input datum more explicitly. In particular, while a result by Bennett et al. (2007) guarantees the existence of suitable $\delta, \Delta > 0$ for each (feasible) Brascamp-Lieb datum, we were unable to develop an approach for explicitly computing their values. Access to suitable δ, Δ would allow us to find a good initialization for our proposed algorithm and therefore render our approach into a practical method. In addition, we expect the parameter R to depend on δ, but were unable to derive a precise relation. The mutual dependency of the parameters d, δ, Δ, R is left for future work.

In future work, we hope to further investigate approaches for computing δ, Δ explicitly. In addition, we hope to apply the techniques presented here to geodesically convex optimization problems similar to (1.3), such as the operator scaling problem Garg et al. (2018) and difference of convex functions (Weber and Sra, 2022a). Other avenues for future investigation include practical applications of our fixed-point approach. Due to the strong connections of Brascamp-Lieb inequalities to important questions in machine learning and information theory, this approach could be of wider interest.

More generally, we hope that the Finslerian lens on fixed point iterations provides a new perspective on the problem of computing Brascamp-Lieb constants. We believe that the tools developed in this work can be applied to a wider class of Picard iterations that arise in the context of Brascamp-Lieb constants (such as those described in sec. 6).

Acknowledgments

This project was started during a visit of MW to MIT, supported by an Amazon Research Award. Part of this work was done while MW visited the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing in Berkeley, CA, supported by a Simons-Berkeley Research Fellowship. SS acknowledges support from an NSF-CAREER award (1846088).

The authors thank Brian Lins for helpful comments.

References

Pierre-Antoine Absil, Robert Mahony, and Rodolphe Sepulchre. *Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds*. Princeton University Press, 2009.

Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Ankit Garg, Yuanzhi Li, Rafael Oliveira, and Avi Wigderson. Operator scaling via geodesically convex optimization, invariant theory and polynomial identity testing. *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing - STOC 2018*, 2018.

J B Baillon, R E Bruck, and S Reich. On the asymptotic behavior of nonexpansive mappings and semigroups in Banach Spaces. *Houston Journal of Mathematics*, 4(1), 1978.

Franck Barthe. On a reverse form of the Brascamp-Lieb inequality. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 134(2):335–361, 1998.

Franck Barthe and Nolwen Huet. On Gaussian Brunn-Minkowski inequalities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0804.0886*, 2008.

Jonathan Bennett, Anthony Carbery, Michael Christ, and Terence Tao. The Brascamp–Lieb inequalities: Finiteness, Structure and Extremals. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 17 (5):1343–1415, Aug 2007.

Rajendra Bhatia. *Matrix analysis*, volume 169. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

Nicolas Boumal, Bamdev Mishra, P.-A. Absil, and Rodolphe Sepulchre. Manopt, a Matlab Toolbox for Optimization on Manifolds. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(42): 1455–1459, 2014. ISSN 1533-7928.

Herm Jan Brascamp and Elliott H. Lieb. Best constants in Young's inequality, its converse, and its generalization to more than three functions. *Advances in Mathematics*, 20(2):151 – 173, 1976.

Herm Jan Brascamp, Elliott H. Lieb, and Joaquin Mazdak Luttinger. A general rearrangement inequality for multiple integrals. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 17(2):227 – 237, 1974.

Peter Bürgisser, Cole Franks, Ankit Garg, Rafael Oliveira, Michael Walter, and Avi Wigderson. Efficient algorithms for tensor scaling, quantum marginals, and moment polytopes. In *2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 883–897. IEEE, 2018.

Eric A Carlen and Dario Cordero-Erausquin. Subadditivity of the entropy and its relation to Brascamp–Lieb type inequalities. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 19(2):373–405, 2009.

Zeev Dvir, Ankit Garg, Rafael Oliveira, and József Solymosi. Rank bounds for design matrices with block entries and geometric applications. *arXiv:1610.08923*, 2016.

Javad B. Ebrahimi, Damian Straszak, and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. Subdeterminant maximization via nonconvex relaxations and anti-concentration. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1020–1031, 2017. doi: 10.1109/FOCS.2017.98.

Cole Franks. Operator scaling with specified marginals. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 190–203, 2018.

Ankit Garg, Leonid Gurvits, Rafael Oliveira, and Avi Wigderson. Operator Scaling: Theory and Applications. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, pages 1–68, 2015.

Ankit Garg, Leonid Gurvits, Rafael Oliveira, and Avi Wigderson. Algorithmic and optimization aspects of brascamp-lieb inequalities, via operator scaling. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 28(1):100–145, 2018.

Leonid Gurvits. Classical complexity and quantum entanglement. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 69(3):448 – 484, 2004. ISSN 0022-0000. Special Issue on STOC 2003.

Moritz Hardt and Ankur Moitra. Algorithms and hardness for robust subspace recovery. In Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Ingo Steinwart, editors, *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 30 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 354–375, Princeton, NJ, USA, 12–14 Jun 2013. PMLR.

Tsz Chiu Kwok, Lap Chi Lau, and Akshay Ramachandran. Spectral analysis of matrix scaling and operator scaling. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1184–1204, 2019.

Bas Lemmens and Roger Nussbaum. *Nonlinear Perron–Frobenius Theory*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Elliott H. Lieb. Gaussian kernels have only Gaussian maximizers. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 102(1):179–208, December 1990.

Jingbo Liu, Thomas A Courtade, Paul Cuff, and Sergio Verdú. Smoothing Brascamp-Lieb inequalities and strong converses for common randomness generation. In *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 1043–1047. IEEE, 2016.

Aleksandar Nikolov. Randomized rounding for the largest simplex problem. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '15, page 861–870, New York, NY, USA, 2015. Association for Computing Machinery.

Kenneth Nordström. Convexity of the inverse and Moore-Penrose inverse. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 434(6):1489 – 1512, 2011.

A. Pazy. Asymptotic behavior of contractions in hilbert space. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 9(2):235–240, March 1971.

Simeon Reich. Asymptotic behavior of contractions in Banach spaces. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 44(1):57–70, October 1973.

Richard Sinkhorn. A Relationship Between Arbitrary Positive Matrices and Doubly Stochastic Matrices. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35(2):876 – 879, 1964.

David A. Snyder. On the relation of Schatten norms and the Thompson metric. *arXiv:1608.03301*, 2016.

Suvrit Sra and Reshad Hosseini. Conic geometric optimization on the manifold of positive definite matrices. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25:713–739, 2015.

Suvrit Sra, Nisheeth K. Vishnoi, and Ozan Yildiz. On Geodesically Convex Formulations for the Brascamp-Lieb Constant. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2018)*, volume 116, pages 25:1–25:15, 2018.

Melanie Weber and Suvrit Sra. Projection-free nonconvex stochastic optimization on Riemannian manifolds. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 2021.

Melanie Weber and Suvrit Sra. On a class of geodesically convex optimization problems solved via Euclidean MM methods. *Under Review*, 2022a.

Melanie Weber and Suvrit Sra. Riemannian Optimization via Frank-Wolfe Methods. *Mathematical Programming*, 2022b.

Hongyi Zhang and Suvrit Sra. First-order methods for geodesically convex optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1617–1638, 2016.