

Comparison of Matrix Norm Sparsification*

Robert Krauthgamer Shay Sapir
Weizmann Institute of Science

{robert.krauthgamer,shay.sapir}@weizmann.ac.il

February 1, 2022

Abstract

Matrix sparsification is a well-known approach in the design of efficient algorithms, where one approximates a matrix A with a sparse matrix A' . Achlioptas and McSherry [2007] initiated a long line of work on spectral-norm sparsification, which aims to guarantee that $\|A' - A\| \leq \epsilon \|A\|$ for error parameter $\epsilon > 0$. Various forms of matrix approximation motivate considering this problem with a guarantee according to the Schatten p -norm for general p , which includes the spectral norm as the special case $p = \infty$.

We investigate the relation between fixed but different $p \neq q$, that is, whether sparsification in Schatten p -norm implies (existentially and/or algorithmically) sparsification in Schatten q -norm with similar sparsity. An affirmative answer could be tremendously useful, as it will identify which value of p to focus on. Our main finding is a surprising contrast between this question and the analogous case of ℓ_p -norm sparsification for vectors: For vectors, the answer is affirmative for $p < q$ and negative for $p > q$, but for matrices we answer negatively for almost all $p \neq q$.

1 Introduction

Large graphs and matrices are ubiquitous in modern computations. If the graphs and matrices are sparse, then many computations are more efficient in terms of time, space and/or communication resources. A well-known approach for leveraging this efficiency is sparsification, where an input object (graph, vector, matrix, etc.) is approximated using a sparse object. This idea is used in a broad range of domains, from combinatorics (e.g., graph spanners) through signal processing (e.g., sampling) and statistics (e.g., Principal Component Analysis), to numerical linear algebra (matrix sparsification). We study this last domain, which focuses on the matrix spectrum, as formalized next.

In matrix sparsification, the goal is to approximate a matrix A using a matrix A' that is sparse. However, the notion of approximate matrix, or even vector, is not straightforward. For vectors, a commonly used measure of approximation is the ℓ_p -norm for $p \geq 1$, defined for a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as $\|x\|_p := (\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p)^{1/p}$. Its matrix analogue is the Schatten p -norm, defined for a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as $\|A\|_{S_p} := (\sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i^p)^{1/p}$, where $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ are the singular values of A . These definitions extend to $p < 1$, although they do not yield a norm. Special cases of Schatten p -norm include $p = 1, 2, \infty$, which are the trace norm, Frobenius norm and spectral norm, respectively. Another special case is Schatten 0-norm, defined as the rank of A . It is well-known that various forms of

*Work partially supported by ONR Award N00014-18-1-2364, the Israel Science Foundation grant #1086/18, the Israeli Council for Higher Education (CHE) via the Weizmann Data Science Research Center, and a Minerva Foundation grant.

matrix approximation can be derived by approximating in Schatten p -norm for different values of p . For instance, Schatten norms were used to approximate spectral sum functions [KO19], and to approximate the entire spectrum [KV17].

Achlioptas and McSherry [AM07] initiated a long line of work [AHK06, GT09, DZ11, NDT15, AKL13, KD14, KDM17, BKKS21] that aims to find a sparse matrix A' such that $\|A' - A\| \leq \epsilon \|A\|$ for $\epsilon > 0$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the spectral norm, which is also the largest singular value or Schatten ∞ -norm. The main algorithmic technique in this line of work is to sample entries according to a well-crafted distribution. The error matrix $E = A' - A$ is then analyzed using tools from random matrix theory and is often of high rank. An undesired byproduct is that if the original matrix A is of low rank, A' might be of full rank, i.e., it is a bad approximation in Schatten 0-norm. Additionally, there is no guarantee that the Frobenius norm of A' would be similar to that of A , and indeed there are simple counterexamples.

This raises the question whether sparsification with respect to one norm, say S_∞ , implies sparsification with respect to a different norm, say S_p for $p < \infty$. An affirmative answer could be tremendously useful, because of the already large body of work on sparsification with respect to Schatten ∞ -norm. We now define matrix approximation with respect to a general norm N , although our results deal only with Schatten norms.

Definition 1.1. *Given norm $N : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and accuracy parameter $\epsilon > 0$, an (ϵ, N) -norm approximation of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is any vector $x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|x - x'\|_N \leq \epsilon \|x\|_N$. If x' has at most $s > 0$ non-zero entries, we call it an (ϵ, N, s) -norm sparsifier of x .*

We now instantiate this definition to Schatten p -norm for $p \geq 0$. An (ϵ, S_p, s) -norm sparsifier of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ is a matrix $A' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ that has at most $s > 0$ non-zero entries and satisfies

$$\|A - A'\|_{S_p} \leq \epsilon \|A\|_{S_p}.$$

One may wonder if such a sparsification is even possible (except for trivial matrices). However, the rich literature on spectral sparsification of graph Laplacians [ST11, BSS12] implies that every graph Laplacian admits an $(\epsilon, S_p, O(\epsilon^{-2}n))$ -norm sparsifier, in fact simultaneously for all $p > 0$, see Section 1.3. With the above terminology at hand, the question raised earlier can be formulated as follows.

Question 1.2. *For $p \neq q$, does an (ϵ, S_p, s) -norm sparsifier for a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ necessarily imply (existentially and/or algorithmically) also an (ϵ, S_q, s') -norm sparsifier with $s' = \tilde{O}(s)$?*

As a first step, it is instructive to consider (ϵ, ℓ_p) -norm sparsifiers for vectors, since ℓ_p norm is analogous to Schatten p -norm, but for vectors instead of matrices.

Question 1.3. *For $p \neq q$, does an (ϵ, ℓ_p, s) -norm sparsifier for a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ necessarily imply (existentially and/or algorithmically) also an (ϵ, ℓ_q, s') -norm sparsifier with $s' = \tilde{O}(s)$?*

Our main finding is a surprising contrast in these two questions: a *mostly affirmative answer* for Question 1.3 (roughly for all $p < q$), but a *resounding negative answer* for Question 1.2 (roughly for all $p \neq q$).

An easy case is when p and q are sufficiently close, and then the answer is affirmative for both ℓ_p and S_p , as follows. For all $p < q$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, Hölder's inequality implies that $\|a\|_q \leq \|a\|_p \leq n^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}} \|a\|_q$. If $n^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}}$ is small, say at most $1 + \epsilon$, the two norms are approximately equal, and thus sparsification in one norm immediately implies sparsification in the other norm. The same holds for Schatten p -norm as well. The questions remain interesting when $n^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}}$ is not small, particularly when $p \neq q$ are fixed and n tending to infinity.

1.1 Main Results

Vectors. We show that if $p < q$ then the answer to Question 1.3 is *affirmative*, i.e., an (ϵ, ℓ_p) -norm sparsifier implies also an (ϵ, ℓ_q) -norm sparsifier using similar sparsity. This is stated in the next theorem, whose simple proof appears in Section 2.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $1 \leq p < q$. Then for all $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ and $s > 0$, if $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ has an (ϵ, ℓ_p, s) -norm sparsifier, then it also has an $(\epsilon, \ell_q, O(s))$ -norm sparsifier.*

However, if $p > q$ then the answer to Question 1.3 is *negative* whenever $n^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}} \geq \epsilon^{-1}$. Indeed, consider the vector $x = (1, \frac{1}{n^{1/q}}, \dots, \frac{1}{n^{1/q}})$. Without the first coordinate, it satisfies $\|x - e_1\|_q \approx 1$ and $\|x - e_1\|_p = ((n-1)n^{-\frac{p}{q}})^{1/p} \approx n^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}} \leq \epsilon$, hence e_1 is a $(2\epsilon, \ell_p, 1)$ -norm sparsifier, but not a $(0.1, \ell_q)$ -norm approximation, and even taking more entries, say $x' = x_{\text{head}(n/2)}$, will not give a $(0.1, \ell_q)$ -norm approximation.¹

Matrices. One may hope to extend the above result about ℓ_p norms of vectors to Schatten norms of matrices. Unfortunately, this is not possible, and in fact we answer Question 1.2 negatively for all fixed $p \neq q$, as follows. Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ be a sufficiently small fixed constant ($\epsilon_0 = 0.1$ works).²

Theorem 1.5. *Fix $p \neq q \geq 1$. Then for all n and $\epsilon_0 \geq \epsilon > (\log n)^{-|\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}|}$, there is a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that has an $(\epsilon, S_p, O(n))$ -norm sparsifier, but every (ϵ_0, S_q) -norm approximation of A must have $\tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$ non-zero entries.*

We prove Theorem 1.5 in Section 3 by providing explicit matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, for infinitely many n . We actually need four families of matrices, for different ranges of the parameters p and q . We can further extend our results to many cases where $p < 1$ or $q < 1$, including the important but exceptional case of Schatten 0-norm, as discussed next.

1.2 Schatten 0-norm

Perhaps the most important Schatten p -norm is Schatten 0-norm, which is the rank and is actually not a norm. For this S_0 , Definition 1.1 instantiates to the following: given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, decompose it into $A = S + R$ where S is sparse and $\text{rank}(R) \leq \epsilon \cdot \text{rank}(A)$. This is known from the optimization literature as sparse and low-rank decomposition [CSPW09], and from circuit complexity theory as Valiant's rigidity [Val77]. Hence, there is interest in the range $p < 1$ (even though it is not a norm), in part as a relaxation for the rank [NHD12]. Notice however that $\|A\|_{S_0}$ is not the limit of $\|A\|_{S_p}$ as $p \rightarrow 0$, but rather of $\|A\|_{S_p}^p$. Thus, we must treat Schatten 0-norm separately, rather than let $p \rightarrow 0$ in our results for $p > 0$.

We show that Theorem 1.5 holds even for $0 \leq p, q < 1$, except for $0 < q < \min(p, 1)$ where we do not have a proof. See Section 4 for formal statements and proofs.

1.3 Related Work

Low-rank approximation Instead of sparsifying a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, a different goal is to decompose it as $A \approx UV$ where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$. If k is small, this is called a low-rank approximation. Storing it only takes $O(k(n+d))$ space, and every multiplication by A can be done by first applying V and then applying U , which saves up on computation time. One often measure

¹We denote by e_1 the first vector in the standard basis.

²We write $\tilde{\Omega}(f)$ as a shorthand for $\Omega(f/\text{polylog } n)$.

the quality of this approximation in the Frobenius norm, and sometimes in other matrix norms. Li and Woodruff [LW20] provide fast algorithms for low-rank approximation in Schatten p -norm for all $p \geq 1$ by using dimension reduction for Ky-Fan p -norms.

Sparsification in other matrix norms Gittens and Tropp [GT09] considered sparsification in $\ell_\infty \rightarrow \ell_p$ operator norms, defined as $\|A\|_{\ell_\infty \rightarrow \ell_p} = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Ax\|_p}{\|x\|_\infty}$. They focus on $\ell_\infty \rightarrow \ell_1$, which has strong equivalence to the cut norm, and on $\ell_\infty \rightarrow \ell_2$, which is relevant to applications such as column subset selection.

Spectral sparsification Graph Laplacians admit very good spectral sparsification, as follows. A positive semi-definite matrix (PSD) $A' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is said to be an ϵ -spectral approximation of a PSD matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ if $(1 - \epsilon)A \preceq A' \preceq (1 + \epsilon)A$ [ST11].³ This notion is stronger than S_p -norm approximation, by the following observation.

Lemma 1.6. *For all PSD matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, every ϵ -spectral approximation A' of A is also an (ϵ, S_p) -norm approximation of A , simultaneously for all $p \geq 1$.*

A proof of Lemma 1.6 is provided in Appendix A for completeness. For a graph Laplacian, one can compute an ϵ -spectral sparsifier that has $O(\epsilon^{-2}n)$ non-zero entries [BSS12], see also [LS18] for the latest bounds.

1.4 Notations

For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, we denote the i -th row by A_i and the j -th column by A^j . For sets $S \in [n]$ and $T \in [d]$, we denote by $A_{(S)}$ the submatrix made of rows of A indexed by S , and by $A^{(T)}$ the submatrix made of columns of A indexed by T . Similarly, $A_{(S)}^{(T)}$ is the submatrix made of rows indexed by S and columns indexed by T . We denote the number of non-zero entries in A by $\text{nnz}(A)$. We assume that n is a power of 2, which can be obtained by changing the derived bounds by a constant factor. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and integer $c < n$, we denote $x_{\text{head}(c)}$ the vector x after zeroing out all but the c largest entries in absolute value, breaking ties arbitrary, and $x_{\text{tail}(c)} = x - x_{\text{head}(c)}$, i.e. the vector x after zeroing out the c largest entries in absolute value.

2 Simple Case: Vectors

In this section we study the simpler case of (ϵ, ℓ_p) -norm sparsification. We now restate and prove Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $1 \leq p < q$. Then for all $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ and $s > 0$, if $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ has an (ϵ, ℓ_p, s) -norm sparsifier, then it also has an $(\epsilon, \ell_q, O(s))$ -norm sparsifier.*

As was discussed in Section 1.1, this does not hold for fixed $p > q$. Our proof of Theorem 1.4 will use the following generalization of Lemma 3 from [GS18].

Lemma 2.1. *For all $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $1 \leq p < q$ and integer $c < n$, we have $\|a_{\text{tail}(c)}\|_q \leq c^{-\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right)} \|a\|_p$.*

³For symmetric matrices A, B , we denote $A \preceq B$ if $B - A$ is PSD.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Without loss of generality, assume that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n \geq 0$. Note that $\|a_{\text{tail}(c)}\|_\infty = a_{c+1} \leq \frac{\|a\|_p}{c^{1/p}}$, which proves the $q = \infty$ case. For finite q ,

$$\|a_{\text{tail}(c)}\|_q^q = a_{c+1}^q + \dots + a_n^q \leq a_{c+1}^{q-p} (a_{c+1}^p + \dots + a_n^p) \leq a_{c+1}^{q-p} \|a\|_p^p \leq c^{-\frac{q-p}{p}} \|a\|_p^q.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Denote by x' an (ϵ, ℓ_p, s) -norm sparsifier of x . Thus,

$$\|x_{\text{tail}(s)}\|_p \leq \|x' - x\|_p \leq \epsilon \|x\|_p \leq \epsilon (\|x_{\text{tail}(s)}\|_p + \|x_{\text{head}(s)}\|_p).$$

Hence

$$\|x_{\text{tail}(s)}\|_p \leq \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} \|x_{\text{head}(s)}\|_p \leq \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} s^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}} \|x_{\text{head}(s)}\|_q.$$

Take $c = (\frac{1}{1-\epsilon})^{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}}} \cdot s$ more entries from x , i.e, let $x'' = x_{\text{head}(c+s)}$. By Lemma 2.1,

$$\|x_{\text{tail}(c+s)}\|_q \leq c^{-\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right)} \|x_{\text{tail}(s)}\|_p \leq \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} \left(\frac{s}{c}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}} \|x_{\text{head}(s)}\|_q \leq \epsilon \|x_{\text{head}(s)}\|_q.$$

We can bound $c \leq 2^{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}}} \cdot s$.

□

3 Schatten Norms

In this section we restate and prove Theorem 1.5. It shows that Schatten norms do not behave like ℓ_p norms, and even for $p < q$, the existence of an (ϵ, S_p) -norm sparsifier does not mean existence of an (ϵ, S_q) -norm sparsifier.

Theorem 1.5. *Fix $p \neq q \geq 1$. Then for all n and $\epsilon_0 \geq \epsilon > (\log n)^{-|\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}|}$, there is a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that has an $(\epsilon, S_p, O(n))$ -norm sparsifier, but every (ϵ_0, S_q) -norm approximation of A must have $\tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$ non-zero entries.*

The proof is made of four cases, depending on whether $p > q$ (or $p < q$) and on whether $q \geq 2$ (or $1 \leq q < 2$). Of these four cases, perhaps the two most interesting ones are when $p < q$, because they stand in contrast to vectors (for vectors we know by Theorem 1.4 that an (ϵ, ℓ_p) -norm sparsifier implies an (ϵ, ℓ_q) -norm sparsifier with a similar number of non-zero entries). While it would make sense to start with the proof of these two most interesting cases ($p < q$), due to some similarities in the proof technique, we organize our proof as described in Table 1 (starting with the two cases where $q \geq 2$, and then the two cases where $q < 2$).

Each of these four cases is proved by providing a matrix $A = A' + B$ that satisfies the following properties:

(P1) $\text{nnz}(A') = O(n)$.

(P2) $\|B\|_{S_p} < \epsilon \|A'\|_{S_p}$.

(P3) $\|A'\|_{S_q} = \|B\|_{S_q}$.

(P4) Any $(2\epsilon_0, S_q)$ -norm approximation of B must have $\tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$ non-zero entries.

By **(P2)** and the triangle inequality, $\|A - A'\|_{S_p} = \|B\|_{S_p} < \epsilon(1 + \epsilon) \|A\|_{S_p}$ and thus by **(P1)**, A' is a $(2\epsilon, S_p, O(n))$ -norm sparsifier of A . By **(P3)** and the triangle inequality, $\|A\|_{S_q} \leq 2\|B\|_{S_q}$. Hence, any matrix \tilde{A} that is an (ϵ_0, S_q) -norm approximation of A , satisfies $\|A - \tilde{A}\|_{S_q} \leq \epsilon_0 \|A\|_{S_q} \leq 2\epsilon_0 \|B\|_{S_q}$. Thus, $\tilde{A} - A'$ is a $(2\epsilon_0, S_q)$ -norm approximation of B . By **(P1)** and **(P4)**, it follows that $\text{nnz}(\tilde{A}) \geq \tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$.

Table 1: The four cases proved in Theorem 1.5 and the sections containing their proofs.

	$1 \leq p < q$	$p > q$
$q \geq 2$	Section 3.1	Section 3.2
$1 \leq q < 2$	Section 3.3	Section 3.4

3.1 Case $q \geq 2$ and $1 \leq p < q$

Theorem 3.1. Fix $q \geq 2$ and $1 \leq p < q$. Then for all n and $\epsilon > (\log n)^{-2(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})}$, there is a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that has an (ϵ, S_p, n) -norm sparsifier, but every (ϵ_0, S_q) -norm approximation of A must have $\tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$ non-zero entries.

Our proof is based on constructing matrices A', B satisfying (P1)-(P4). We set $A' = aI$ with parameter $a > 0$ chosen specifically to satisfy (P3). We construct a matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, having entries in $\{+1, -1\}$ and $m = n^{2(1-\alpha)}$ non-zero singular values all equal to $n^\alpha := \sqrt{n} \cdot \log n$ for a parameter $1 > \alpha > 1/2$. Note that $\|B\|_{S_2}^2 = n^{2(1-\alpha)}(n^\alpha)^2 = n^2$. The construction is as follows: let v be the all-ones column vector of dimension $n^{2\alpha-1}$ and $H_{[m]}$ the matrix made of the first m rows of the $n \times n$ Hadamard matrix. Then, construct $B = H_{[m]} \otimes v$, where \otimes denotes the Kronecker product, i.e, all the rows of B_{U_i} are equal to the i -th row of H , where $U_i = [(i-1)n^{2\alpha-1} + 1, i \cdot n^{2\alpha-1}]$ for $i \in [1, m]$, and the number of rows in B is $n^{2\alpha-1}m = n$. Since the vector v has a single singular value who is just its ℓ_2 -norm and $H_{[m]}$ has m singular values of equal value \sqrt{n} , by properties of Kronecker product, B has m singular values all equal to $\sqrt{n^{2\alpha-1}}\sqrt{n} = n^\alpha$, as desired.

We use the following lemmas to show that this matrix B satisfies (P4).

Lemma 3.2. Every matrix $(B')_{U_i}$ that is an (ϵ, S_∞) -norm approximation of B_{U_i} , must have $\text{nnz}((B')_{U_i}) \geq \frac{n}{2}$, even for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $(B')_{U_i}$ is an $(\frac{1}{2}, S_\infty)$ -norm approximation of B_{U_i} and that $\text{nnz}((B')_{U_i}) < \frac{n}{2}$. Then, there is a set of columns Z of size at least $\frac{n}{2}$, such that $(B')_{U_i}^Z = 0$. Hence

$$\|(B' - B)_{U_i}\|_{S_\infty} \geq \|(B' - B)_{U_i}^Z\|_{S_\infty} = \|B_{U_i}^Z\|_{S_\infty} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2} \cdot n^{2\alpha-1}} = \frac{n^\alpha}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{\|B_{U_i}\|_{S_\infty}}{\sqrt{2}},$$

a contradiction. Hence every $(\frac{1}{2}, S_\infty)$ -norm approximation of B_{U_i} must have at least $\frac{n}{2}$ non-zero entries. \square

Lemma 3.3. For $q \geq 2$, a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and a disjoint collection of sets $U_i \subset [d]$, it holds that $\|A\|_{S_q}^q \geq \sum_i \|A^{(U_i)}\|_{S_\infty}^q$.

Proof. By the pinching inequality [Bha00], for $t \geq 1$, it holds that $\|A^\top A\|_{S_t} \geq \|D\|_{S_t}$, where D is the block diagonal matrix whose i -th block is $(A^\top A)_{U_i}^{U_i}$. Thus $\|A^\top A\|_{S_t}^t \geq \sum_i \|(A^\top A)_{U_i}^{U_i}\|_{S_\infty}^t$, and

$$\|A\|_{S_q}^q = \|A^\top A\|_{S_{q/2}}^{q/2} \geq \sum_i \|(A^\top A)_{U_i}^{U_i}\|_{S_\infty}^{q/2} = \sum_i \|A^{(U_i)}\|_{S_\infty}^q.$$

\square

Lemma 3.4. For all $q \geq 2$, every $(\frac{1}{4}, S_q)$ -norm approximation of the matrix B must have $\Omega(nm)$ non-zero entries.

Proof. Note that $\|B\|_{S_q} = m^{1/q}n^\alpha$. Consider B' that has s_i non-zero entries in the rows indexed by U_i . By Lemma 3.3,

$$\|B' - B\|_{S_q}^q \geq \sum_i \|(B' - B)_{U_i}\|_{S_\infty}^q.$$

Even if $\text{nnz}(B') = \frac{nm}{4}$, there are at least $\frac{m}{2}$ sets U_i where $s_i \leq \frac{n}{2}$. Hence, for these sets, by Lemma 3.2, $\|(B' - B)_{U_i}\|_{S_\infty} > \frac{1}{2}\|(B)_{U_i}\|_{S_\infty} = \frac{1}{2}n^\alpha$, thus the sum above is at least $\frac{m}{2}(\frac{1}{2})^q n^{\alpha q} = (\frac{1}{2})^{q+1}\|B\|_{S_q}^q$, which concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Since $n^\alpha = \sqrt{n} \log n$, then $m = \frac{n}{\log^2 n}$ and $\|B\|_{S_p} = m^{\frac{1}{p}}n^\alpha = n^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}}(\log n)^{1 - \frac{2}{p}}$. The statement of the theorem holds when $\epsilon > (\log n)^{-2(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})}$.

Let $A = \sqrt{n}(\log n)^{1 - \frac{2}{q}}I + B$, i.e, set $A' := \sqrt{n}(\log n)^{1 - \frac{2}{q}}I$. We now verify

P1 $\text{nnz}(A') = n$.

P2 $\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}(\log n)^{1 - \frac{2}{q}}}B\|_{S_p} = n^{\frac{1}{p}}(\log n)^{-2(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})} < \epsilon \|I\|_{S_p}$.

P3 $\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}(\log n)^{1 - \frac{2}{q}}}B\|_{S_q} = n^{\frac{1}{q}} = \|I\|_{S_q}$.

P4 follows from Lemma 3.4.

The matrices A' and B satisfy **(P1)**-**(P4)**, which concludes the proof of Theorem 3.1. \square

3.2 Case $p > q \geq 2$

Theorem 3.5. Fix $p > q \geq 2$. Then for all n and $\epsilon > n^{-(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p})}$, there is a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that has an $(\epsilon, S_p, 1)$ -norm sparsifier, but every (ϵ_0, S_q) -norm approximation of A must have $\Omega(n^2)$ non-zero entries.

Again, the proof is based on constructing matrices A', B satisfying **(P1)**-**(P4)**. We set $A' = J^1$, a matrix having a single non-zero entry of value 1 located in an arbitrary entry; and set $B = aH$, a Hadamard matrix scaled by suitable $a > 0$ to satisfy **(P3)**.

We get the following from Lemma 3.4, by setting $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m = n$.

Lemma 3.6. For all $q \geq 2$, every $(\frac{1}{4}, S_q)$ -norm approximation of an $n \times n$ Hadamard matrix H must have $\Omega(n^2)$ non-zero entries.

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Set $a = n^{-\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{2}}$, i.e, set $A' := J^1$ and $B := n^{-\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{2}}H$. We now verify

P1 $\text{nnz}(J^1) = 1$.

P2 $\|n^{-\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{2}}H\|_{S_p} = n^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}} \leq \epsilon = \epsilon \|J^1\|_{S_p}$.

P3 $\|J^1\|_{S_q} = 1 = \|n^{-\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{2}}H\|_{S_q}$.

P4 follows from Lemma 3.6.

The matrices A' and B satisfy **(P1)**-**(P4)**, which concludes the proof of Theorem 3.5. \square

3.3 Case $1 \leq p < q \leq 2$

Theorem 3.7. Fix $1 \leq p < q \leq 2$. Then for all n and $\epsilon > n^{-(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})}$, there is a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that has an (ϵ, S_p, n) -norm sparsifier, but every (ϵ_0, S_q) -norm approximation of A must have $\Omega(n^2)$ non-zero entries.

Again, our proof is based on constructing matrices A', B satisfying **(P1)**-**(P4)**. Let J_n denote the $n \times n$ all-ones matrix. We set $A' = I$ and $B = aJ_n$, with scalar $a > 0$ chosen specifically to satisfy **(P3)**.

Lemma 3.8. For all $0 < q \leq 2$, every (ϵ_0, S_q) -norm approximation of J_n must have $\Omega(n^2)$ non-zero entries.

Proof. J_n is rank-1, hence $\|J_n\|_{S_2} = \|J_n\|_{S_q} = n$. It is clear that every Frobenius norm approximation J' of J_n must have at least $\Omega(n^2)$ non-zero entries. Since $\|J' - J_n\|_{S_q} \geq \|J' - J_n\|_{S_2}$, the conclusion follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.7. Let $A = I + n^{\frac{1}{q}-1}J_n$ and set $A' := I$ and $B := n^{\frac{1}{q}-1}J_n$. We now verify

P1 $\text{nnz}(I) = n$.

P2 $\|n^{\frac{1}{q}-1}J_n\|_{S_p} = n^{\frac{1}{q}} = n^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}}\|I\|_{S_p} < \epsilon\|I\|_{S_p}$.

P3 $\|n^{\frac{1}{q}-1}J_n\|_{S_q} = n^{\frac{1}{q}} = \|I\|_{S_q}$.

P4 follows from Lemma 3.8.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.7. \square

3.4 Case $1 \leq q < \min(p, 2)$

Theorem 3.9. Fix $1 \leq q < \min(p, 2)$. Then for all n and $\epsilon > (\log n)^{-(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p})}$, there is a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that has an $(\epsilon, S_p, 1)$ -norm sparsifier, but every (ϵ_0, S_q) -norm sparsifier of A must have $\tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$ non-zero entries.

Again, our proof is based on constructing matrices A', B satisfying **(P1)**-**(P4)**. We set $A' = J^1$ and $B = aC$, with scalar $a > 0$ chosen specifically to satisfy **(P3)**, and C a block-diagonal matrix described next.

Proof of Theorem 3.9. Let C be an $n \times n$ block-diagonal matrix, whose blocks are the matrices $\frac{1}{m}J_m$ with parameter m to be specified. It has n/m singular values, each one equals $\frac{1}{m}\|J_m\| = 1$, and $\text{nnz}(C) = nm$. For every matrix C' , it holds by the pinching inequality [Bha00] that $\|C' - C\|_{S_q} \geq \|\text{blockdiag}(C' - C)\|_{S_q}$, where $\text{blockdiag}(C' - C)$ denotes the block-diagonal matrix that is 0 in all locations where C is zero, and otherwise has the same value as $C' - C$ (i.e, it has the same structure as C). Hence, in order for C' to be a $(\frac{1}{4}, S_q)$ -norm approximation, $\Omega(n/m)$ of the blocks on its diagonal have to be at least $(\frac{1}{2}, S_q)$ -norm approximation of $\frac{1}{m}J_m$, thus by Lemma 3.8, $\text{nnz}(C') \geq \Omega(nm)$.

Set $m = \frac{n}{\log n}$, let $A = J^1 + (\log n)^{-\frac{1}{q}}C$ and set $A' := J^1$ and $B := (\log n)^{-\frac{1}{q}}C$. We now verify

P1 $\text{nnz}(J^1) = 1$.

P2 $\|(\log n)^{-\frac{1}{q}}C\|_{S_p} = (\log n)^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}} < \epsilon\|J^1\|_{S_p}$.

P3 $\|(\log n)^{-\frac{1}{q}}C\|_{S_q} = 1 = \|J^1\|_{S_q}$.

P4 was verified in the preceding paragraph.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.9. \square

4 When $p, q < 1$

When $0 < p < 1$, the Schatten p -norm does not satisfy the triangle inequality and is thus not a norm, but it nevertheless seems natural to extend the results of Theorem 1.5 to $p, q < 1$. Unfortunately, our proof for each case in Theorem 1.5 constructs matrices A' and B satisfying **(P1)**-**(P4)** and then employs the triangle inequality. However, we can replace the triangle inequality with the next lemma, incurring an inflation $1 + \epsilon \rightarrow (1 + \epsilon^p)^{1/p}$ when using **(P2)** and deflation $2 \rightarrow 2^{1/q}$ when using **(P3)**. As mentioned in Section 1.2, we treat $p = 0$ and $q = 0$ separately.

Lemma 4.1. *For all $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $0 < p \leq 1$, we have $\|A + B\|_{S_p}^p \leq \|A\|_{S_p}^p + \|B\|_{S_p}^p$.*

Before proving this lemma, we use it to prove the following claim: For all $0 < p, q < 1$ and $0 < \epsilon < (2^p - 1)^{1/p}$, if $A = A' + B$ satisfies **(P1)**-**(P4)**, then A' is a $(2\epsilon, S_p, O(n))$ -norm sparsifier of A and every $(2^{-1/q}\epsilon_0, S_q)$ -norm approximation of A must have $\tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$ non-zero entries. Let us now verify this claim. By **(P2)** and Lemma 4.1, $\|A - A'\|_{S_p} = \|B\|_{S_p} < \epsilon(1 + \epsilon^p)^{1/p}\|A\|_{S_p} \leq 2\epsilon\|A\|_{S_p}$, and thus by **(P1)**, A' is a $(2\epsilon, S_p, O(n))$ -norm sparsifier of A . By **(P3)** and Lemma 4.1, $\|A\|_{S_q} \leq 2^{1/q}\|B\|_{S_q}$. Hence, any matrix \tilde{A} that is a $(2^{-1/q}\epsilon_0, S_q)$ -norm approximation of A , satisfies $\|A - \tilde{A}\|_{S_q} \leq 2^{-1/q}\epsilon_0\|A\|_{S_q} \leq \epsilon_0\|B\|_{S_q}$, meaning that $\tilde{A} - A'$ is an (ϵ_0, S_q) -norm approximation of B . By **(P1)** and **(P4)** it follows that $\text{nnz}(\tilde{A}) \geq \tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. It suffices to prove the case where A and B are symmetric matrices, because the general case follows by considering $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and similarly for B , since $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{S_p}^p = 2\|A\|_{S_p}^p$.

Assuming henceforth that A and B are symmetric, consider the spectral decomposition $A = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i P_i$, where λ_i is the i -th eigenvalue, and P_i is the corresponding projection into the eigenspace of the i -th eigenvector u_i .⁴ We can ensure that $\sum_{i=1}^n P_i = I$ by adding the projections into the null space of A . Assume that u_i is normalized and denote $\beta_i = u_i^\top B u_i$. Then, by the Schatten p -norm definition, the fact $\sum_{i=1}^n P_i = I$, and linearity and cyclicity of the trace,

$$\|A + B\|_{S_p}^p = \text{Tr}(|A + B|^p) = \text{Tr}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n P_i |A + B|^p\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr}(P_i |A + B|^p) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr}(P_i |A + B|^p P_i)$$

and by the spectral theorem, the definition of the projections $\{P_i\}$ and the fact that every $a, b > 0$ satisfy $(a + b)^p \leq a^p + b^p$,

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr}(|P_i(A + B)P_i|^p) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr}(|P_i \lambda_i + P_i \beta_i|^p) = \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i + \beta_i|^p \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i|^p + |\beta_i|^p$$

and wrapping everything back up,

$$= \|A\|_{S_p}^p + \text{Tr}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |P_i B P_i|^p\right) = \|A\|_{S_p}^p + \|B\|_{S_p}^p,$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma 4.1. \square

⁴If u_i is normalized, then $P_i = u_i u_i^\top$.

Similarly to Section 3, we treat $p < q$ and $p > q$ separately, and in the case $p < q$ we treat subcases $q > 2$ and $q < 2$ separately.

4.1 Case $0 \leq p < 1$ and $q \geq 2$

We use the same construction as in Section 3.1. For $p > 0$, the same proof of (P1)-(P4) works, as most of the effort in Section 3.1 was in proving that the matrix B satisfies (P4), which does not depend on p and hence still holds. For $p = 0$, note that A is of full rank ($\|A\|_{S_0} = n$), and B is of rank $m = \frac{n}{\log^2 n}$. Thus A' is a $(\log^{-2} n, S_0, n)$ -norm sparsifier of A . We have thus proved the following.

Corollary 4.2. *Fix $q \geq 2$ and $0 \leq p < 1$. Then for all n and $\frac{1}{\log n} < \epsilon < (2^p - 1)^{1/p}$, there is a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that has an (ϵ, S_p, n) -norm sparsifier, but every (ϵ_0, S_q) -norm approximation of A must have $\tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$ non-zero entries.*

4.2 Case $0 \leq p < q < 2$

We use the same construction as in Section 3.3. For $p > 0$, the same proof of (P1)-(P3) works immediately, and (P4) follows since Lemma 3.8 applies for $0 < q < 1$. For $p = 0$, it is easy to see that A' is a $(\frac{1}{n}, S_0, n)$ -norm sparsifier of A since J_n is of rank 1 and A is of full rank, resulting with even better bounds.

Corollary 4.3. *Fix $0 \leq p < 1$ and $p < q \leq 2$. Then for all n and $n^{-(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} < \epsilon < (2^p - 1)^{1/p}$, there is a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that has an (ϵ, S_p, n) -norm sparsifier, but every $(\epsilon_0(q), S_q)$ -norm approximation of A must have $\Omega(n^2)$ non-zero entries, where $\epsilon_0(q) = \epsilon_0$ if $q \geq 1$ and $2^{-1/q}\epsilon_0$ if $q < 1$.*

4.3 Case $0 \leq q < \min(1, p)$

One could hope to use the same construction as in Section 3.4, but the proof of (P4) no longer works, since it relies on the pinching inequality of [Bha00], which in turn relies on the fact that the Schatten p -norm is indeed a norm. We do not have a proof for all q in this range. For $q = 0$, there is a known non-explicit hard instance, as follows.

Lemma 4.4 (Proposition 3.3 of [PR94]). *There are constants $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$ and a matrix $B \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$, such that in order to reduce its rank to $\epsilon_1 n$, one must change at least $\epsilon_2 n^2$ entries.*

For all $p > 0$, let $A' = \frac{n}{\epsilon} I$. Since all the singular values of B are bounded by n , then all the singular values of $A = A' + B$ are in $(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \pm 1)n$. Thus, A' is a $(2\epsilon, S_p, n)$ -sparsifier of A , and by [PR94], every (ϵ_1, S_0) -approximation of A must have $\Omega(n^2)$ non-zero entries.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $p > 0$. Then for all n and $\epsilon > 1/\text{poly}(n)$, there is a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that has a $(2\epsilon, S_p, n)$ -norm sparsifier, but every (ϵ_1, S_0) -norm approximation of A must have $\Omega(n^2)$ non-zero entries.*

A Proof of Lemma 1.6

In this section, we prove Lemma 1.6.

Lemma 1.6. *For all PSD matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, every ϵ -spectral approximation A' of A is also an (ϵ, S_p) -norm approximation of A , simultaneously for all $p \geq 1$.*

Proof. Let $A' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be an ϵ -spectral approximation of A , i.e., $-\epsilon A \preceq A' - A \preceq \epsilon A$. Observe that the matrix $A' - A$ is symmetric. Let the eigendecomposition of $A' - A$ be UDU^\top , including zero eigenvalues so that $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is unitary. Denote the i -th column of U by u_i (which is a normalized eigenvector). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|A' - A\|_{S_p}^p &= \sum_i |u_i^\top (A' - A)u_i|^p \leq \sum_i |u_i^\top (\epsilon A)u_i|^p = \epsilon^p \sum_i (u_i^\top A u_i)^p \\ &= \epsilon^p \|\text{diag}(U^\top A U)\|_{S_p}^p \leq \epsilon^p \|U^\top A U\|_{S_p}^p = \epsilon^p \|A\|_{S_p}^p, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{diag}(U^\top A U)$ is a diagonal matrix with the same diagonal as $U^\top A U$ (and zeros otherwise), and the last inequality holds by the pinching inequality of [Bha00]. \square

References

- [AHK06] Sanjeev Arora, Elad Hazan, and Satyen Kale. A fast random sampling algorithm for sparsifying matrices. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 272–279. Springer, 2006. doi:10.1007/11830924_26.
- [AKL13] Dimitris Achlioptas, Zohar S. Karnin, and Edo Liberty. Near-optimal entrywise sampling for data matrices. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1565–1573, 2013. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2013/hash/6e0721b2c6977135b916ef286bcb49ec-Abstract.html>
- [AM07] Dimitris Achlioptas and Frank McSherry. Fast computation of low-rank matrix approximations. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 54(2):9–es, 2007. doi:10.1145/1219092.1219097.
- [Bha00] Rajendra Bhatia. Pinching, trimming, truncating, and averaging of matrices. *Am. Math. Mon.*, 107(7):602–608, 2000. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2589115>.
- [BKKS21] Vladimir Braverman, Robert Krauthgamer, Aditya Krishnan, and Shay Sapir. Near-optimal entrywise sampling of numerically sparse matrices. In *Conference on Learning Theory, COLT*, volume 134 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 759–773. PMLR, 2021. URL: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v134/braverman21b.html>.
- [BSS12] Joshua Batson, Daniel A. Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava. Twice-ramanujan sparsifiers. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(6):1704–1721, 2012. doi:10.1137/090772873.
- [CSPW09] Venkat Chandrasekaran, Sujay Sanghavi, Pablo A. Parrilo, and Alan S. Willsky. Sparse and low-rank matrix decompositions. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 42(10):1493–1498, 2009. 15th IFAC Symposium on System Identification. doi:https://doi.org/10.3182/20090706-3-FR-2004.00249.
- [DZ11] Petros Drineas and Anastasios Zouzias. A note on element-wise matrix sparsification via a matrix-valued Bernstein inequality. *Information Processing Letters*, 111(8):385–389, 2011. doi:10.1016/j.ipl.2011.01.010.
- [GS18] Neha Gupta and Aaron Sidford. Exploiting numerical sparsity for efficient learning: faster eigenvector computation and regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5269–5278, 2018. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2018/hash/4a1590df1d5968d41b855005bb8b67bf-Abstract.html>

- [GT09] Alex Gittens and Joel A Tropp. Error bounds for random matrix approximation schemes. 2009. [arXiv:0911.4108](https://arxiv.org/abs/0911.4108).
- [KD14] Abhisek Kundu and Petros Drineas. A note on randomized element-wise matrix sparsification. 2014. [arXiv:1404.0320](https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.0320).
- [KDM17] Abhisek Kundu, Petros Drineas, and Malik Magdon-Ismail. Recovering PCA and sparse PCA via hybrid- (l_1, l_2) sparse sampling of data elements. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(75):1–34, 2017. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v18/16-258.html>.
- [KO19] Ashish Khetan and Sewoong Oh. Spectrum estimation from a few entries. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(21):1–55, 2019. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v20/18-027.html>.
- [KV17] Weihao Kong and Gregory Valiant. Spectrum estimation from samples. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45(5):2218 – 2247, 2017. doi:10.1214/16-AOS1525.
- [LS18] Yin Tat Lee and He Sun. Constructing linear-sized spectral sparsification in almost-linear time. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 47(6):2315–2336, 2018. doi:10.1137/16M1061850.
- [LW20] Yi Li and David P. Woodruff. Input-sparsity low rank approximation in Schatten norm. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6001–6009, 2020. URL: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/li20q.html>.
- [NDT15] Nam H. Nguyen, Petros Drineas, and Trac D. Tran. Tensor sparsification via a bound on the spectral norm of random tensors. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 4(3):195–229, 2015. doi:10.1093/imaiai/iav004.
- [NHD12] Feiping Nie, Heng Huang, and Chris H. Q. Ding. Low-rank matrix recovery via efficient Schatten p -norm minimization. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2012. URL: <http://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/AAAI/AAAI12/paper/view/5165>.
- [PR94] P. Pudlák and V. Rödl. Some combinatorial-algebraic problems from complexity theory. *Discrete Math.*, 136(1–3):253–279, 1994. doi:10.1016/0012-365X(94)00115-Y.
- [ST11] Daniel A. Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. Spectral sparsification of graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(4):981–1025, 2011. doi:10.1137/08074489X.
- [Val77] Leslie G. Valiant. Graph-theoretic arguments in low-level complexity. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, 6th Symposium*, volume 53 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 162–176. Springer, 1977. doi:10.1007/3-540-08353-7_135.