

Analysis of the Identifying Regulation with Adversarial Surrogates Algorithm

Ron Teichner¹, Ron Meir¹ and Michael Margaliot²

Abstract—Given a time-series of noisy measured outputs of a dynamical system $\{z^k\}_{k=1}^N$, the Identifying Regulation with Adversarial Surrogates (IRAS) algorithm aims to find a non-trivial first integral of the system, namely, a scalar function g such that $g(z^i) \approx g(z^j)$, for all i, j . IRAS has been suggested recently and was used successfully in several learning tasks in models from biology and physics. Here, we give the first rigorous analysis of this algorithm in a specific setting. We assume that the observations admit a linear first integral and that they are contaminated by Gaussian noise. We show that in this case the IRAS iterations are closely related to the self-consistent-field (SCF) iterations for solving a generalized Rayleigh quotient minimization problem. Using this approach, we derive several sufficient conditions guaranteeing local convergence of IRAS to the linear first integral.

Index Terms—Rayleigh quotient, eigenvalue problems, self-consistent-field iteration, learning algorithms, ribosome flow model.

I. INTRODUCTION

A conserved quantity of a dynamical system is a quantity that can be expressed using the time-varying variables of the system, but remains constant along each trajectory of the system. A classical example is the Hamiltonian in a mechanical system [1].

An important challenge in systems and control theory is to discover conserved quantities in dynamical systems in a *data-driven* way, i.e. based on observed trajectory data, and assuming that the underlying dynamical equations are unknown. Machine learning (ML) algorithms for addressing this problem have found applications in several important domains of science. In physics, they are used to find symmetries and conservation laws [2], [3], [4], [5], for example, by parameterizing possible Hamiltonians using a learning neural network [4]. It is important to note that even if the dynamical equations of a system are known, the problem of analytically determining conserved quantities is non-trivial.

Determining conserved quantities is also important in biological systems [6]. Classical models in population dynamics (e.g., the Lotka-Volterra model) and in mathematical epidemiology (e.g., the Kermack and McKendrick model) admit a conserved quantity (or a first integral) and this has important biological implications (see, e.g. [6]). Living systems maintain stability against internal and external

perturbations, a phenomenon known as homeostasis [7]. In particular, closed-loop control schemes tightly regulate *internal* conserved quantities, and explicitly determining these quantities is an important and non-trivial problem [8].

The underlying assumption behind ML algorithms for the discovery of conserved quantities is that there exists a function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the observed variables that is conserved along trajectories (but may have a different constant value along different trajectories). Note that optimizing for conservation alone can (and does) lead to trivial quantities such as predicting a constant function $g(z) \equiv c$, independently of z .

The difficulties in deriving data-driven algorithms for detecting conserved quantities include: (1) the learning is based on a finite data set; (2) the measured data is typically noisy, thus violating any exact conservation law; (3) the conserved quantities may vary in time, for example, in a physical system drifting over time to higher or lower energy states; and (4) the algorithm may output a trivial result such as a function $g(z) \equiv c$, independent of z . Alet *et al.* [9] refer to a non-trivial $g(\cdot)$ as a *useful* conservation law.

Often, the presentation of such algorithms is accompanied by demonstrating their empirical success in various test cases, but with no rigorous analysis of convergence, robustness to noise, etc.

IRAS [10] is an iterative data-driven algorithm for detecting conserved quantities. In each iteration, it solves a min-max optimization problem. IRAS was used successfully [10] in the discovery of the conserved quantity in several examples including: a kinetic model of protein interactions from [8]; a psycho-physical experiment in which a PID controller regulated a stimulus signal (see the description in [11]); a model of interactions in an ecological system from [12]; and a Hamiltonian system from physics. Yet, theoretical analysis of IRAS is lacking.

Here, we analyze IRAS in a specific probabilistic setting, assuming a linear first integral and Gaussian noise. Linear first integrals are common in closed compartmental systems, like epidemiological models assuming a constant population size [13] and gross-substitute systems in economics [14]. We demonstrate our theoretical results using an important model from systems biology called the ribosome flow model on a ring (RFMR) [15].

We provide explicit sufficient conditions for IRAS convergence that depend on the signal to noise ratio. To the best of our knowledge, a rigorous analysis of convergence, even in simple cases, has not been performed for any of the ML algorithms mentioned above.

¹RT and RM are with the Viterbi Dept. of Elec. & Computer Eng., Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, ron.teichner@gmail.com. They are partially supported by ISF grant 1693/22 and by the Skillman chair (RM).

²MM is the incumbent of the Systems and Control Theory Chair at the School of Elec. Eng., Tel-Aviv University, Israel 6997801.

The analysis also shows that in the specific setting that we consider, IRAS solves in each iteration a *generalized Rayleigh quotient problem*. This problem plays an important role in many algorithms in data science and ML, including generalized eigenvalue classifiers [16], the common spatial pattern (CSP) algorithm [17], and Fisher's linear discriminant analysis [18] (see [19] for more details). Thus, the analysis also creates the first link between IRAS and other ML algorithms.

Vectors (matrices) are denoted by small (capital) letters. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, A' is the transpose of A . For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is the i th entry of x , and $\|x\|_2 := \sqrt{x'x}$. The vector x is called normalized if $\|x\|_2 = 1$. If $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric, then the ordered eigenvalues of A are $\lambda_1(A) \geq \lambda_2(A) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(A)$, with corresponding eigenvectors $v^1(A), v^2(A), \dots, v^n(A)$.

The remainder of this note is organized as follows. Section II reviews the IRAS algorithm. Section III presents the specific setting that we analyze here, and the main theoretical results. All the proofs are placed in the Appendix. Section IV describes an application to a model from systems biology. The final section concludes and describes possible directions for further research.

II. IRAS ALGORITHM

We briefly review the IRAS algorithm. For more details, see [10]. The input to the algorithm is a sequence $\{z^k\}_{k=1}^N$. Typically, z^k is the noisy n -dimensional output of a continuous-time dynamical system measured at time $k\Delta t$. For example, it may be the noisy full state-vector $z^k = x(k\Delta t) + \eta^k$, where η^k is a noise vector.

IRAS determines, in an iterative manner, a parametric function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^b \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The goal is to converge to a parameter vector $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^b$ such that $g(z^i; \theta^*) = g(z^j; \theta^*)$ for all times i, j . The parametric function can be linear, that is, $g(z; \theta) = \theta'z$, polynomial, or, more generally, it may be the output of a neural network, and then θ is the set of parameters in this network. Of course, the goal is to find a parameter vector θ^* such that $g(\cdot; \theta^*)$ is *non-trivial*.

Since measurements are always noisy, IRAS is based on probabilistic assumptions. The first assumption is that the noisy samples z^k admit a probability density function (PDF) $f_z : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. For any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^b$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$f_z^\theta(x) := \int_{\{z | g(z; \theta) = x\}} f_z(z) dz. \quad (1)$$

This defines a scalar PDF by projecting with $g(\cdot; \theta)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P(c_1 \leq g(z; \theta) \leq c_2) &= \int_{D_{c_1, c_2}^\theta} f_z(z_1, \dots, z_m) dz_1 \dots dz_m \\ &= \int_{c_1}^{c_2} f_z^\theta(p) dp, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $D_{c_1, c_2}^\theta := \{z \mid c_1 \leq g(z; \theta) \leq c_2\}$. In what follows, we use the notation $\text{var}(f_z^\theta)$ to denote the variance of the scalar random variable $g(z; \theta)$. From here on, for any PDF $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ we denote by $f^\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ [$\text{var}(f^\theta)$] the scalar PDF [variance] of its projection by $g(\cdot; \theta)$.

A natural idea is to find a parameter vector θ^* that minimizes $\text{var}(f_z^\theta)$, but such an approach usually leads to a trivial solution. For example, if $g(z; \theta) = \theta'z$ this may lead to the trivial solution $\theta^* = 0$.

To find a non-trivial θ^* , IRAS uses also a surrogate PDF $f_{\bar{z}} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, corresponding to a random variable $\bar{z}$. Roughly speaking, the idea is then to find a vector θ that minimizes the ratio

$$\frac{\text{var}(f_z^\theta)}{\text{var}(f_{\bar{z}}^\theta)} = \frac{\text{var}(g(z^k; \theta))}{\text{var}(g(\bar{z}^k; \theta))}. \quad (3)$$

Then IRAS will not converge to a trivial θ as this will give a ratio of 0/0 in (3).

The algorithm initializes $f_{\bar{z}}$ such that the following weak requirement holds

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}(f_z) &\subseteq \text{supp}(f_{\bar{z}}), \text{ and} \\ 0 &< \int_D f_z(z) dz \neq \int_D f_{\bar{z}}(z) dz \text{ for at least one set } D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Remark 1. Instead of using a constant PDF $f_{\bar{z}}$, IRAS updates the surrogate PDF at each iteration. To explain why, assume that there exists a set $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\int_D f_{\bar{z}}(q) dq > 0, \text{ and } \int_D f_z(q) dq = 0$$

then any vector θ for which $g(z; \theta) = 0$ for all $z \notin D$ and $g(z; \theta) \neq 0$ for $z \in D$, minimizes the ratio in (3) (achieving a value zero). Updating the surrogate PDF is needed to avoid such trivial solutions for θ .

IRAS iterates between two steps. At iteration i the algorithm already has an estimate θ^{i-1} for the parameter vector in g , and the two steps are:

Step 1. Update the current surrogate PDF $f_{\bar{z}}$ to a surrogate PDF $f_{\bar{z}} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^b \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$f_{\bar{z}}(q; \theta^{i-1}) := f_{\bar{z}}(q) \zeta(g(q; \theta^{i-1}); \theta^{i-1}), \quad (5)$$

where $\zeta : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^b \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a weighting function that depends on the current estimate θ^{i-1} . The weighting function is chosen such that the modified surrogate PDF satisfies

$$f_{\bar{z}}^{\theta^{i-1}}(p; \theta^{i-1}) = f_{\bar{z}}^{\theta^{i-1}}(p) \text{ for almost all } p \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (6)$$

In other words, the goal is to shift $f_{\bar{z}}$ to a PDF $f_{\bar{z}}$ such that the projection of $f_{\bar{z}}$ and f_z under $g(\cdot; \theta^{i-1})$ are identical. This overcomes the difficulty described in Remark 1. A closed-form expression for ζ is given in Lemma 1 below.

Step 2. Update the estimate of the vector of parameters by setting

$$\theta^i := \underset{\theta}{\text{argmin}} \frac{\text{var}(f_z^\theta)}{\text{var}(f_{\bar{z}}^\theta(\theta^{i-1}))}. \quad (7)$$

Note that (6) implies that

$$\left. \frac{\text{var}(f_z^\theta)}{\text{var}(f_{\bar{z}}^\theta(\theta^{i-1}))} \right|_{\theta=\theta^{i-1}} = 1,$$

so the first step of the algorithm given in (5) may be regarded as an “adversarial” step, in the sense that it is

“opposite” to the second step in (7) that minimizes the ratio $\text{var}(f_z^\theta)/\text{var}(f_{\bar{z}}^\theta)$.

The iterations continue until the difference between θ^{i-1} and θ^i is sufficiently small. The IRAS algorithm has been introduced in the context of identifying what is actually regulated (i.e., what is the invariant function g) in biological systems, hence the terminology *Identifying Regulation with Adversarial Surrogates Algorithm*.

III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we rigorously analyze the behaviour of IRAS in a specific setting.

For the analysis, we require the following fact.

Lemma 1. [10] *The function ζ guaranteeing that (6) holds is given by*

$$\zeta(x; \theta) = \begin{cases} f_z^\theta(x)/f_{\bar{z}}^\theta(x), & \text{if } f_{\bar{z}}^\theta(x) \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, this ζ also guarantees that $f_{\bar{z}}(q; \theta^{i-1})$ in (5) is indeed a PDF.

Note that this provides a closed-form expression for the weighting function ζ used in Step 1 of IRAS.

The next result addresses the case of a trivial solution described in Remark 1.

Proposition 1. *Suppose that: (a) there exists a set D that is not a subset of $\text{supp}(f_z)$ for which*

$$f_{\bar{z}}(q; \theta^{i-1}) > 0 \text{ for all } q \in D, \text{ and } \int_{q \in D} f_z(q) dq = 0;$$

and (b) θ^i is a trivial minimizer of the optimization problem in Step 2, i.e. it satisfies $g(z; \theta^i) = 0$ for all $z \notin D$ and $g(z; \theta^i) \neq 0$ for all $z \in D$. Then

$$\int_{q \in D} f_{\bar{z}}(q; \theta^i) dq = 0.$$

Note that this implies that the i th iteration of IRAS eliminated the trivial solution θ^{i-1} .

We now analyze IRAS in the case where the n -dimensional output admits a linear first integral (so the output belong to a subspace), and the measurements include Gaussian noise.

A. The model

Fix a normalized vector $v^1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Consider the subspace $H \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by $H := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (v^1)'x = 0\}$. Fix normalized vectors $v^2, \dots, v^n$ such that $\{v^1, \dots, v^n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then $H = \{\sum_{i=2}^n c_i v^i \mid c_i \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Any vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be decomposed as

$$z = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(z) v^i, \text{ with } c_i(z) := z'v^i. \quad (9)$$

Thus, $z \in H$ if and only if (iff) $c_1(z) = 0$.

Let $\mathcal{N}_n(x|\mu, G)$ denote the n -dimensional Gaussian distribution with mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and positive-definite covariance matrix $G \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. We assume that the invariant is that

the measurements are in H i.e., they satisfy a linear first integral, but are contaminated with noise. Specifically, the measurements $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, decomposed in the form (9), are drawn according to the PDF

$$f_z(z) = \mathcal{N}_1(c_1(z)|0, \sigma^2) \prod_{i=2}^n \mathcal{N}_1(c_i(z)|0, 1), \quad (10)$$

with $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. The term $\prod_{i=2}^n \mathcal{N}_1(c_i(z)|0, 1)$ corresponds to points in H . The Gaussian distribution with zero average favors smaller values of $c_i(z)$, corresponding to the fact that typically the outputs tend to be bounded. The term $\mathcal{N}_1(c_1(z)|0, \sigma^2)$ corresponds to noise in the direction that is perpendicular to H . The assumption that $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ implies that the variance of the noise is smaller than the variance of the signal.

We assume that IRAS searches over the family of linear functions

$$g(z; \theta) = \theta'z, \quad (11)$$

with parameter vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and that it initializes the surrogate PDF by

$$f_{\bar{z}}(\bar{z}) = \mathcal{N}_n(\bar{z}; 0, \bar{\Sigma}), \text{ with } \bar{\Sigma} = \bar{\sigma}^2 I_n, \bar{\sigma} > 0.$$

Note that this implies that (4) holds. This completes the description of the IRAS setting. We now analyze IRAS for this case.

B. Analysis

Proposition 2. *Define a matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as the inverse of the matrix*

$$\Sigma^{-1} := \sigma^{-2} v^1 (v^1)' + v^2 (v^2)' + \dots + v^n (v^n)'. \quad (12)$$

For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let

$$s(\theta) := \theta' \Sigma \theta, \quad \bar{s}(\theta) := \theta' \bar{\Sigma} \theta,$$

and

$$\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta) := \bar{\Sigma} - ((\bar{s}(\theta))^{-1} - (\bar{s}(\theta))^{-2} s(\theta)) \bar{\Sigma} \theta \theta' \bar{\Sigma}. \quad (13)$$

Under the assumptions specified above, the i th iteration of IRAS yields

$$\theta^i = \underset{\theta}{\text{argmin}} \frac{\theta' \Sigma \theta}{\theta' \tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^{i-1}) \theta}. \quad (14)$$

Note that for any scalar $c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ we have $\frac{(c\theta)' \Sigma (c\theta)}{(c\theta)' \tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^{i-1})(c\theta)} = \frac{\theta' \Sigma \theta}{\theta' \tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^{i-1}) \theta}$, so we may assume, without loss of generality (WLOG), that $\|\theta^i\|_2 = 1$ for all i . This implies in particular that IRAS does not converge to the trivial solution corresponding to $\theta = 0$.

The right-hand side in (14) is a generalized Rayleigh quotient, and the iteration generating θ^i from θ^{i-1} is widely used. In computational physics and chemistry it is known as the self-consistent-field (SCF) iteration (see, e.g., [20]). However, as noted in [19], its convergence behavior is not well-understood.

It is well-known [21], [19] that the solution θ^i of (14) is the eigenvector corresponding to the minimal eigenvalue λ in the generalized eigenvalue problem:

$$\Sigma\theta^i = \lambda\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^{i-1})\theta^i.$$

Equivalently,

$$\lambda^{-1}\theta^i = \Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^{i-1})\theta^i, \quad (15)$$

so θ^i is the eigenvector of $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^{i-1})$ corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^{i-1})$ (i.e., the dominant eigenvector of $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^{i-1})$).

Eq. (15) implies that $\theta^e \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an equilibrium of IRAS iff it is the dominant eigenvector of $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^e)$. To determine when this happens, we first analyze the spectral properties of $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta)$.

Lemma 2. Fix a normalized vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\theta_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a normalized vector such that $\theta'\theta_\perp = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta)\theta &= s(\theta)\Sigma^{-1}\theta, \\ \Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta)\theta_\perp &= \bar{\sigma}^2\Sigma^{-1}\theta_\perp. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Remark 2. The proof of Lemma 2 (see the Appendix) implies that $\det(\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta)) = s(\theta)\bar{\sigma}^{2(n-1)}$. Note also that if $\theta_\perp = \sum_{i=2}^n d_i v^i$, with $d_i \in \mathbb{R}$, then (16) gives $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta)\theta_\perp = \bar{\sigma}^2\theta_\perp$, i.e. $\theta_\perp$ is an eigenvector of $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta)$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\bar{\sigma}^2$.

The next result analyzes the steady-state of IRAS, and provides a condition guaranteeing that the vector v^1 is indeed an equilibrium of the iterative algorithm.

Theorem 3. Under the assumptions specified above, the vector v^1 is a steady-state of IRAS iff $\bar{\sigma} < 1$.

Remark 3. Let $V := [v^1 \dots v^n]$. Note that $V' = V^{-1}$. By the proof of Thm. 3 (see the Appendix), $V'\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(v^1)V = \text{diag}(1, \bar{\sigma}^2, \dots, \bar{\sigma}^2)$. Taking transpose yields $V'(\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(v^1))'V = \text{diag}(1, \bar{\sigma}^2, \dots, \bar{\sigma}^2)$, implying in particular that $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(v^1)$ is symmetric.

The next step is to analyze convergence of IRAS to the vector v^1 , that is, to the linear first integral. The next result shows that for some initial conditions IRAS converges to v^1 in a single iteration.

Proposition 4. Suppose that

$$\sigma^2 < \bar{\sigma}^2 < 1. \quad (17)$$

If the initial condition is $\theta^0 = \sum_{i=2}^n d_i v^i$, with $d_i \in \mathbb{R}$, then the first iteration of IRAS yields $\theta^1 = v^1$.

The next result shows that, at least in some directions, IRAS locally converges to the desired value v^1 .

Proposition 5. Suppose that condition (17) holds and, in addition,

$$2\bar{\sigma}^2 < 1 + \sigma^2. \quad (18)$$

Assume that θ^0 is proportional to $v^1 + \varepsilon v^k$, with $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$, and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$. There exists $\eta > 0$ such that for any $|\varepsilon| < \eta$ IRAS converges to v^1 .

IV. AN APPLICATION

The ribosome flow model on a ring (RFMR) has been used to analyze the flow of ribosomes along a circular mRNA molecule during translation [15], [22]. In this nonlinear dynamical model, the mRNA molecule is divided into n sites, where each site corresponds to a set of consecutive codons along the mRNA. The state-variable $x_i(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, describes the density of ribosomes at site i at time t . The densities are normalized so that $x_i(t) \in [0, 1]$ for all t , with $x_i(t) = 0$ [$x_i(t) = 1$] implying that the site is empty [completely full]. The flow of ribosomes from site i to site $i + 1$ is $\lambda_i x_i(1 - x_{i+1})$, i.e. the flow increases with the density at site i , and decreases with the density at the next site x_{i+1} . The parameter $\lambda_i > 0$ is the transition rate from site i to site $i + 1$ (λ_i is proportional to the reciprocal of the decoding time of the ribosome at site i). The RFMR equations are thus

$$\dot{x}_i = \lambda_{i-1}x_{i-1}(1 - x_i) - \lambda_i x_i(1 - x_{i+1}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

with all indexes modulo n (for example, $x_0 = x_n$ and $x_{n+1} = x_1$). Thus, the change in the density at site i is the flow from site $i - 1$ to site i minus the flow from site i to site $i + 1$.

It follows from these equations that $\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{x}_i(t) \equiv 0$, so $H(x) := 1'_n x$ is a linear first integral of the dynamics, where $1_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector with all entries one. This represents the fact that ribosomes do not enter or leave the circular chain, so their total density is conserved.

We applied IRAS to this model¹ with (the arbitrarily chosen) parameters $n = 5$, $\lambda = [2 \ 5 \ 5 \ 0 \ 1]'$ and initial condition $x(0) = [0.71 \ 0.9 \ 0.28 \ 0.8 \ 0.76]'$. The data used by IRAS consists of noisy samples of the state vector $z^k = x(0.001 * k) + \eta^k$, $k = 1, \dots, N$, with $N = 2000$, and $\eta^k \sim \mathcal{N}_5(0, \sigma^2 I_5)$, $\sigma^2 = 10^{-5}$. The surrogate distribution was initialized to $f_{\bar{z}} = \mathcal{N}_5(\mu, \bar{\Sigma})$ where $\mu := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N z^k$, and $\bar{\Sigma} = \bar{\sigma}^2 I_5$.

Props. 4 and 5 suggest that setting $\bar{\sigma}^2 = 2 \times 10^{-5}$, i.e. slightly higher than σ^2 , would lead to convergence. Iterating IRAS for this value of $\bar{\sigma}^2$, with the initial condition $\theta^0 = [-0.12 \ 0.20 \ 0.41 \ 0.76 \ 0.45]'$ gives the sequence of normalized vectors:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^1 &= [0.43 \ 0.45 \ 0.43 \ 0.47 \ 0.45]', \\ \theta^2 &= [0.46 \ 0.44 \ 0.44 \ 0.45 \ 0.44]', \end{aligned}$$

where all numerical values are to 2 digit accuracy. Thus, the algorithm quickly converges to a solution proportional to 1_5 .

V. DISCUSSION

ML algorithms have achieved considerable empirical success, providing efficient solutions to complex problems across various domains. However, their theoretical understanding is still lacking. Here, we analyzed the recently suggested IRAS algorithm in a specific setting of measurements that admit a linear invariant up to Gaussian noise.

¹The code for the simulations is available at <https://github.com/RonTeichner/IRAS>

We showed that in this case IRAS minimizes a generalized Rayleigh quotient at each iteration, linking it to several other important ML algorithms. We proved that the linear invariant is an equilibrium point of IRAS, and that it is locally stable, at least with respect to some perturbation directions.

Topics for further research include studying IRAS when the data satisfies a non-linear invariant, e.g. those that are a linear combination of known, nonlinear, basis functions. Another potential research direction is to use the theoretical analysis to improve the algorithm.

Acknowledgements: We thank the editor and the anonymous referees for their detailed and helpful comments.

APPENDIX: PROOFS

Proof of Lemma 1. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} f_z^\theta(x; \theta) &= \int_{\{z|g(z;\theta)=x\}} f_z(z; \theta) dz \\ &= \int_{\{z|g(z;\theta)=x\}} f_z(z) \zeta(g(z; \theta)) dz \\ &= \int_{\{z|g(z;\theta)=x\}} f_z(z) \zeta(x) dz \\ &= \zeta(x) \int_{\{z|g(z;\theta)=x\}} f_z(z) dz \\ &= \zeta(x) f_z^\theta(x) \\ &= (f_z^\theta(x)/f_z^\theta(x)) f_z^\theta(x) = f_z^\theta(x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that (4) implies that the ratio $f_z^\theta(x)/f_z^\theta(x)$ is well-defined. We now show that $f_z(q; \theta^{i-1})$ in (5) is indeed a PDF. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int f_z(q; \theta) dq &= \int f_z(q) \zeta(g(q; \theta)) dq \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \int_{\{q|g(q;\theta)=x\}} f_z(q) \zeta(g(q; \theta)) dq \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \zeta(x) dx \int_{\{q|g(q;\theta)=x\}} f_z(q) dq \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{f_z^\theta(x)}{f_z^\theta(x)} dx f_z^\theta(x) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_z^\theta(x) dx = 1, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

and this completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Prop. 1. Note that $g(z; \theta^i) = 0$ for all $z \in \text{supp}(f_z)$, yielding $f_z^{\theta^i}(p) = \delta(p)$, where δ is the Dirac delta function. By Lemma 1, Step 1 of the next iteration yields

$$\zeta(g(q; \theta^i); \theta^i) = \frac{f_z^{\theta^i}(g(q; \theta^i))}{f_z^{\theta^i}(g(q; \theta^i))} = \frac{\delta(g(q; \theta^i))}{f_z^{\theta^i}(g(q; \theta^i))}.$$

This implies that for any $q \in D$, we have $\zeta(g(q; \theta^i); \theta^i) = 0$, as θ^i satisfies $g(q; \theta^i) \neq 0$ for all $q \in D$. It follows that the updated surrogate PDF satisfies

$$\int_{q \in D} f_z(q; \theta^i) dq = \int_{q \in D} f_z(q) \zeta(g(q; \theta^i); \theta^i) dq = 0,$$

and this completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Prop. 2. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} f_z(z) &= c_z \exp(-\frac{1}{2}(\sigma^{-2}c_1^2(z) + c_2^2(z) + \dots + c_n^2(z))) \\ &= c_z \exp(-\frac{1}{2}z' \Sigma^{-1} z), \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

with $c_z := \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n \sqrt{\sigma^2}}$, and Σ^{-1} in (12). The eigenvalues of Σ^{-1} are $\lambda_1 = \sigma^{-2}$, $\lambda_2 = 1, \dots, \lambda_n = 1$, with corresponding eigenvectors $v^1, v^2, \dots, v^n$, so $\det(\Sigma^{-1}) = \sigma^{-2}$. Hence, $\det(\Sigma) = \sigma^2$, and we can write (20) as $f_z(z) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n \sqrt{\det(\Sigma)}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}z' \Sigma^{-1} z)$, i.e., a Gaussian distribution with average zero and covariance matrix Σ . Note that $\Sigma = \sigma^2 v^1(v^1)' + v^2(v^2)' + \dots + v^n(v^n)'$.

By (11), $\text{var}(f_z^\theta) = \theta' \Sigma \theta$, and Lemma 1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(x; \theta) &= \frac{f_z^\theta(x)}{f_z^\theta(x)} = \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta'\Sigma\theta}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}x'(\theta'\Sigma\theta)^{-1}x)}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta'\Sigma\theta}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}x'(\theta'\Sigma\theta)^{-1}x)} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{\bar{s}(\theta)}{s(\theta)}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}x'((s(\theta))^{-1} - (\bar{s}(\theta))^{-1})x). \end{aligned}$$

Using (5) gives

$$\begin{aligned} f_z(q; \theta^{i-1}) &= f_z(q) \zeta(q' \theta^{i-1}; \theta^{i-1}) \\ &= c \exp(-\frac{1}{2}q'(\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^{i-1}))^{-1}q), \end{aligned}$$

with $c := \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\det(\Sigma)}} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{s}(\theta)}{s(\theta)}}$, and

$$\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta) = ((\bar{\Sigma})^{-1} + ((s(\theta))^{-1} - (\bar{s}(\theta))^{-1})\theta(\theta)')^{-1}.$$

Lemma 1 guarantees that $f_z(\theta)$ is a PDF, implying that it is Gaussian with zero average and covariance matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^{i-1})$. The Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula [23, Ch. 0] gives (13). Since in the i th iteration, IRAS sets $\theta^i = \text{argmin}_\theta \frac{\text{var}(f_z^\theta)}{\text{var}(f_z^\theta(\theta^{i-1}))}$, this completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 2. Since $\bar{\Sigma} = \bar{\sigma}^2 I_n$, we have $\bar{s}(\theta) = \theta' \bar{\Sigma} \theta = \bar{\sigma}^2 \theta' \theta = \bar{\sigma}^2$, and (13) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Sigma}(\theta) &= \bar{\sigma}^2 I_n - (\bar{\sigma}^{-2} - (\theta)' \Sigma \theta \bar{\sigma}^{-4}) \bar{\sigma}^4 \theta \theta' \\ &= \bar{\sigma}^2 I_n - (\bar{\sigma}^2 - \theta' \Sigma \theta) \theta \theta'. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Hence, $\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta)\theta = s(\theta)\theta$, and for any vector $\theta_\perp$ that is orthogonal to θ , we have $\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta)\theta_\perp = \bar{\sigma}^2 \theta_\perp$. $\square$

Proof of Thm. 3. By Lemma 2, $\Sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}(v^1)v^1 = v^1$, and for any $i > 1$, we have $\Sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}(v^1)v^i = \bar{\sigma}^2 v^i$. We conclude that 1 is a simple dominant eigenvalue of $\Sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}(v^1)$ iff $\bar{\sigma} < 1$. The corresponding eigenvector is v^1 . $\square$

Proof of Prop. 4. Let $d := [d_2 \dots d_n]' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Since we may assume that θ_0 is normalized, $d'd = 1$. Fix $n-2$ linearly independent and normalized vectors $p^1, \dots, p^{n-2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that $(p^k)'d = 0$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$. Then the vector $w^k := \sum_{i=2}^n p_{i-1}^k v^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is orthogonal to θ^0 for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$. By Lemma 2,

$$\Sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^0)\theta^0 = \theta^0, \quad \Sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^0)v^1 = \sigma^{-2} \bar{\sigma}^2 v^1,$$

and

$$\Sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^0)w^k = \bar{\sigma}^2 w^k, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}.$$

Thus, the eigenvalue-eigenvector pairs of $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^0)$ are: $(\sigma^{-2}\bar{\sigma}^2, v^1), (1, \theta^0), (\bar{\sigma}^2, w^1), \dots, (\bar{\sigma}^2, w^{n-2})$. Eq. (17) implies that v^1 is the dominant eigenvector of $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^0)$. $\square$

Proof of Prop. 5. Assume, WLOG, that $k = 2$, and that θ^0 is normalized, that is, $\theta^0 = \frac{v^1 + \varepsilon v^2}{(1 + \varepsilon^2)^{1/2}}$. The proof is based on determining the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^0)$. By Remark 2, $(\bar{\sigma}^2, v^k)$ is an eigenvalue-eigenvector pair of $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^0)$ for any $k \in \{3, \dots, n\}$. Our goal is to determine the other two eigenvalues denoted λ_1, λ_2 .

Note that

$$\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^0)\theta^0 = (\sigma^2 + \varepsilon^2)(1 + \varepsilon^2)^{-3/2}(\sigma^{-2}v^1 + \varepsilon v^2). \quad (22)$$

The normalized vector $\theta_\perp^0 := \frac{\varepsilon v^1 - v^2}{(1 + \varepsilon^2)^{1/2}}$ is orthogonal to θ^0 , and using (16) gives

$$\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^0)\theta_\perp^0 = \bar{\sigma}^2(1 + \varepsilon^2)^{-1/2}(\varepsilon\sigma^{-2}v^1 - v^2). \quad (23)$$

Our goal now is to find an eigenvector of $\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^0)$ in the form $\theta^0 + c\theta_\perp^0$, that is, to determine $\lambda, c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}(\theta^0)(\theta^0 + c\theta_\perp^0) = \lambda(\theta^0 + c\theta_\perp^0).$$

Using (22) and (23), and comparing the coefficients of v^1 and v^2 yields the two equations:

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma^2 + \varepsilon^2)\sigma^{-2}(1 + \varepsilon^2)^{-1} + c\varepsilon\bar{\sigma}^2\sigma^{-2} &= (1 + \varepsilon c)\lambda, \\ (\sigma^2 + \varepsilon^2)\varepsilon(1 + \varepsilon^2)^{-1} - c\bar{\sigma}^2 &= \lambda(\varepsilon - c). \end{aligned}$$

The first equation yields

$$c(\lambda) = \frac{(\sigma^2 + \varepsilon^2)\sigma^{-2} - \lambda(1 + \varepsilon^2)}{\varepsilon(1 + \varepsilon^2)(\lambda - \bar{\sigma}^2\sigma^{-2})}, \quad (24)$$

and substituting this in the second equation and simplifying gives $a_1\lambda^2 + a_2\lambda + a_3 = 0$, with $a_1 := (1 + \varepsilon^2)^2$, $a_2 := -(\sigma^2 + \varepsilon^2)(\varepsilon^2 + \sigma^{-2} + (1 + \varepsilon^2)\bar{\sigma}^2\sigma^{-2})$, and $a_3 := (\sigma^2 + \varepsilon^2)(1 + \varepsilon^2)\sigma^{-2}\bar{\sigma}^2$. Solving this quadratic equation gives the two eigenvalues

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{-a_2 + \sqrt{\Delta}}{2(1 + \varepsilon^2)^2}, \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{-a_2 - \sqrt{\Delta}}{2(1 + \varepsilon^2)^2}, \quad (25)$$

with $\Delta := a_2^2 - 4a_1a_3$.

For $\varepsilon = 0$, we get $a_2|_{\varepsilon=0} = -1 - \bar{\sigma}^2$ and $\Delta|_{\varepsilon=0} = (1 - \bar{\sigma}^2)^2$, so (17) implies that $\Delta > 0$ for any $|\varepsilon|$ sufficiently small. Also, $\lambda_1|_{\varepsilon=0} = 1$. Thus, λ_1, λ_2 are real, and since $\lambda_3 = \dots = \lambda_n = \bar{\sigma}^2$, we conclude that λ_1 is the dominant and simple eigenvalue for any $|\varepsilon|$ sufficiently small. Using (24) implies that the normalized dominant eigenvector is

$$\begin{aligned} w &:= \frac{\theta^0 + c(\lambda_1)\theta_\perp^0}{\|\theta^0 + c(\lambda_1)\theta_\perp^0\|_2} \\ &= \frac{(1 + \varepsilon c(\lambda_1))v^1 + (\varepsilon - c(\lambda_1))v^2}{\sqrt{(1 + \varepsilon c(\lambda_1))^2 + (\varepsilon - c(\lambda_1))^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Expanding this as a Taylor series in ε yields $w = v^1 + r\varepsilon v^2 + o(\varepsilon)$, with $r := (\bar{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2)/(\bar{\sigma}^2 - 1)$. The conditions in the proposition imply that $|r| < 1$, and hence, $|r\varepsilon| < \varepsilon$. By (26), $w \in \text{span}(v^1, v^2)$, and this completes the proof. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics*, 2nd ed. Addison-Wesley, 1980.
- [2] Z. Liu and M. Tegmark, "Machine learning conservation laws from trajectories," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 126, no. 18, p. 180604, 2021.
- [3] Y.-i. Mototake, "Interpretable conservation law estimation by deriving the symmetries of dynamics from trained deep neural networks," *Physical Review E*, vol. 103, no. 3, p. 033303, 2021.
- [4] S. Greydanus, M. Dzamba, and J. Yosinski, "Hamiltonian neural networks," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [5] E. Dierkes and K. Flaßkamp, "Learning Hamiltonian systems considering system symmetries in neural networks," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 54, no. 19, pp. 210–216, 2021, Proc. 7th IFAC Workshop on Lagrangian and Hamiltonian Methods for Nonlinear Control (LHMNC 2021).
- [6] Y. Kakizoe, S. Morita, S. Nakaoka, Y. Takeuchi, K. Sato, T. Miura, C. A. Beauchemin, and S. Iwami, "A conservation law for virus infection kinetics in vitro," *J. Theoretical Biology*, vol. 376, pp. 39–47, 2015.
- [7] G. E. Billman, "Homeostasis: the underappreciated and far too often ignored central organizing principle of physiology," *Frontiers in Physiology*, p. 200, 2020.
- [8] H. El-Samad, "Biological feedback control-respect the loops," *Cell Syst.*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 477–487, 2021.
- [9] F. Alet, D. Doblar, A. Zhou, J. Tenenbaum, K. Kawaguchi, and C. Finn, "Noether networks: meta-learning useful conserved quantities," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 16384–16397, 2021.
- [10] R. Teichner, A. Shomar, O. Barak, N. Brenner, S. Marom, R. Meir, and D. Eytan, "Identifying regulation with adversarial surrogates," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 120, no. 12, p. e2216805120, 2023.
- [11] S. Marom and A. Wallach, "Relational dynamics in perception: impacts on trial-to-trial variation," *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, vol. 5, p. 16, 2011.
- [12] J. D. Murray, *Mathematical Biology I. An Introduction*, 3rd ed., ser. Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics. New York: Springer, 2002, vol. 17.
- [13] W. Liu, H. Hethcote, and S. A. Levin, "Dynamical behavior of epidemiological models with non-linear incidence rate," *J. Math. Biology*, vol. 25, pp. 359–380, 1987.
- [14] F. Nakajima, "Periodic time dependent gross-substitute systems," *SIAM J. Applied Mathematics*, vol. 36, pp. 421–427, 1979.
- [15] A. Raveh, Y. Zarai, M. Margaliot, and T. Tuller, "Ribosome flow model on a ring," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Computational Biology and Bioinformatics*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 1429–1439, 2015.
- [16] O. L. Mangasarian and E. W. Wild, "Multisurface proximal support vector machine classification via generalized eigenvalues," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 27, pp. 1–6, 2005.
- [17] B. Blankertz, R. Tomioka, S. Lemm, M. Kawanabe, and K.-R. Muller, "Optimizing spatial filters for robust EEG single-trial analysis," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 25, pp. 41–56, 2008.
- [18] R. O. Duda, P. E. Hart, and D. G. Stork, *Pattern Classification*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- [19] Z. Bai, D. Lu, and B. Vandereycken, "Robust Rayleigh quotient minimization and nonlinear eigenvalue problems," *SIAM J. Scientific Computing*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. A3495–A3522, 2018.
- [20] C. L. Bris, "Computational chemistry from the perspective of numerical analysis," *Acta Numer.*, vol. 14, pp. 363–444, 2005.
- [21] B. Ghogh, F. Karray, and M. Crowley, "Eigenvalue and generalized eigenvalue problems: Tutorial," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.11240*, 2019.
- [22] Y. Zarai, A. Ovseevich, and M. Margaliot, "Optimal translation along a circular mRNA," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 9464, 2017.
- [23] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2013.