

GROUP-INVARIANT TENSOR TRAIN NETWORKS FOR SUPERVISED LEARNING*

BRENT SPRANGERS[†] AND NICK VANNIEUWENHOVEN[‡]

Abstract. Invariance has recently proven to be a powerful inductive bias in machine learning models. One such class of predictive or generative models are tensor networks. We introduce a new numerical algorithm to construct a basis of tensors that are invariant under the action of normal matrix representations of an arbitrary discrete group. This method can be up to several orders of magnitude faster than previous approaches. The group-invariant tensors are then combined into a group-invariant tensor train network, which can be used as a supervised machine learning model. We applied this model to a protein binding classification problem, taking into account problem-specific invariances, and obtained prediction accuracy in line with state-of-the-art deep learning approaches.

Key words. tensor networks, tensor trains, group-invariance, supervised learning, representation theory

AMS subject classifications. 15A69, 68T05, 68T09, 65F15, 20C30

1. Introduction. Tensors can be thought of as a higher-order generalization of matrices and vectors, which after choice of basis can be identified with a multidimensional array. By *order* we mean the number of indices, also called modes. *Tensor networks* break up a higher-order tensor into a network of low-order tensors. They originated in the physics community as a way to efficiently represent quantum wave functions that live in a vector space whose dimension scales exponentially with the order of the tensor by means of polynomially-scaling resources [2, 21]. Examples of commonly used tensor network architectures include *matrix product states* [21] or *tensor train networks* (TTN) [19], *tree tensor networks* or the *hierarchical Tucker decomposition* [10, 8], and *multiscale entanglement renormalization ansatz* networks (MERA) [30], among many others.

Stoudenmire and Schwab [25] showed how tensor networks can be used as discriminative machine learning models, and ever since they have been applied to machine learning tasks such as generative modelling [4], natural language processing [20, 26], and image segmentation [22]. Their use is similar to kernel methods: after data is mapped nonlinearly to an exponentially scaling space, the inputs are compared to a *feature tensor* by taking an inner product. The corresponding *kernel trick* is that this can be done efficiently both in terms of computational complexity and memory resources by imposing a suitable tensor network structure on the feature tensor.

The concept of *equivariance* asserts that when the input to a function or a layer of a neural network changes in some specific way, then the output of that function changes in a correspondingly predictable way. An example of this is a convolutional layer in a convolutional neural network. Such a layer is equivariant with respect to translations because if we shift the input image, then the resulting feature map shifts by the same amount. This translation-equivariance has long been an important property of convolutional networks without being noticed as such. However, since Cohen and Welling [5] introduced group-equivariant convolutional networks, research in exploiting equivariance in neural networks has boomed; an overview of works involving

*Submitted to the editors DATE.

[†]KU Leuven, Department of Computer science, NUMA division, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium (brent.sprangers@cs.kuleuven.be).

[‡]KU Leuven, Department of Computer Science, NUMA division, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium; Leuven.AI – KU Leuven Institute for AI, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium (nick.vannieuwenhoven@kuleuven.be).

equivariance in machine learning can be found in [31]. Besides providing better statistical efficiency for learning, equivariance, is a powerful inductive bias and models taking problem-specific equivariances into account tend to generalize better [3].

In this work, we investigate invariances originating from arbitrary finite group actions. We propose a numerical algorithm to combine such *group-invariance* and TTNs efficiently. Our contributions are twofold. First, we introduce a new way to construct group-invariant tensors that can be orders of magnitude more efficient than the previous state of the art by Finzi, Welling and Wilson [7]. Second, we employ this method to construct group-invariant TTNs that we apply as a machine learning model for classification tasks. Our numerical experiments on a supervised learning problem regarding the binding of transcription factors to DNA sequences indicate that the proposed method is competitive with respect to state-of-the-art invariant neural networks in terms of area under the ROC curve.

The paper is organized as follows. [Section 2](#) introduces group-invariant and group-equivariant tensors and demonstrates the equivalence of these two concepts. In [section 3](#) we briefly recall the state-of-the-art group-invariant tensor basis construction method of [7]. [Section 4](#) explains how TTNs can be used as machine learning models and derives our novel method to construct G -invariant TTNs. A key ingredient of our approach concerns the choice of the first generator of the group for which the TTN is invariant; a good heuristic is presented in [section 5](#) for cyclic, dihedral, symmetric, and dicyclic groups and their products. In [section 6](#), the practical performance of our new group-invariant tensor basis construction is compared with the state of the art, and the group-invariant TTNs are compared with non-invariant neural and tensor networks in two benchmark problems. In particular, we compare with a recent deep learning method on a protein binding classification problem and attain state-of-the-art performance with a group-invariant TTN that takes certain application-specific invariances into account. Finally, [section 7](#) presents our conclusions.

Notation. Scalars will be denoted by lowercase letters (d), vectors by boldface lowercase letters (\mathbf{v}), matrices by boldface uppercase letters (\mathbf{A}), and tensors by boldface calligraphic letters (\mathcal{T}). The tensor product is denoted by \otimes . Throughout the paper, we let

$$\mathbb{T}_{k,d} = \mathbb{V}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{V}_k \otimes \mathbb{V}_{k+1}^* \cdots \otimes \mathbb{V}_d^*,$$

where the \mathbb{V}_i are vector spaces of dimension n_i . The identity matrix and map are denoted by $\mathbf{1}$; a subscript is sometimes added to indicate the size of this matrix. The dual vector space of \mathbb{V}_i is denoted by \mathbb{V}_i^* . The transpose of a linear map $L : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}$ is $L^* : \mathbb{W}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^*$. The transpose of a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is denoted by \mathbf{A}^\top and its conjugate transpose is denoted by \mathbf{A}^H .

Acknowledgments. Part of the resources and services used in this work were provided by the VSC (Flemish Supercomputer Center), funded by the Research Foundation—Flanders (FWO) and the Flemish Government.

2. Group-invariant tensors. This section explains group-invariant tensor networks. First, we recall tensors, and then groups and their representations. Next, we describe how discrete groups can act on tensors. Finally, definitions of invariance and equivariance of tensors under these group actions are introduced.

2.1. Tensors and tensor operations. Although the dual of a finite dimensional vector space can be identified (noncanonically) with itself, we will differentiate between these two types of spaces for reasons that will become clear. For example,

a square matrix lives in $\mathbb{V} \otimes \mathbb{V}^* \cong L(\mathbb{V})$, where $L(\mathbb{V})$ is the vector space of linear endomorphisms on the vector space \mathbb{V} .

An $(k, d - k)$ -tensor is defined to be an element of $\mathbb{T}_{k,d}$. The tensor product of the bases of the individual vector spaces forms a basis for the tensor space [9]; hence, a tensor can be written as

$$\mathcal{T} = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d=1}^{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d} \mathcal{T}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d} \mathbf{e}_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{e}_{i_k}^{(k)} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{i_{k+1}}^{*(k+1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{e}_{i_d}^{*(d)},$$

where $n_i = \dim \mathbb{V}_i$, $\mathbf{e}_i^{(m)}$ is the i th basis element of the m th vector space, and $\mathbf{e}_i^{*(m)}$ denotes the dual basis vector such that $\mathbf{e}_i^{*(m)} \mathbf{e}_j^{(m)} = \delta_{ij}$, the Kronecker delta.

Let the tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{k,d}$, and assume we have linear maps $U_i : \mathbb{V}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{W}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, and linear maps $U_i^* : \mathbb{V}_i^* \rightarrow \mathbb{W}_i^*$, $i = k+1, \dots, d$. The *tensor product* of these linear maps $U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_k \otimes U_{k+1}^* \otimes \dots \otimes U_d^*$ is a linear map that lives in

$$L(\mathbb{V}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{V}_k \otimes \mathbb{V}_{k+1}^* \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{V}_d^*; \mathbb{W}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{W}_k \otimes \mathbb{W}_{k+1}^* \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{W}_d^*),$$

where $L(\mathbb{V}; \mathbb{W})$ is the vector space of linear maps from \mathbb{V} to \mathbb{W} ; see Greub [9, Chapter 1]. This map is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} & (U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_k \otimes U_{k+1}^* \otimes \dots \otimes U_d^*)(\mathcal{T}) \\ & := \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^{n_1, \dots, n_d} \mathcal{T}_{i_1, \dots, i_d} (U_1 \mathbf{e}_{i_1}^{(1)}) \otimes \dots \otimes (U_k \mathbf{e}_{i_k}^{(k)}) \otimes (U_{k+1}^* \mathbf{e}_{i_{k+1}}^{*(k+1)}) \otimes \dots \otimes (U_d^* \mathbf{e}_{i_d}^{*(d)}). \end{aligned}$$

For brevity, it is common in numerical multilinear algebra to write

$$(2.1) \quad (U_1, \dots, U_k, U_{k+1}^*, \dots, U_d^*) \cdot \mathcal{T} := (U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_k \otimes U_{k+1}^* \otimes \dots \otimes U_d^*)(\mathcal{T}).$$

Evaluating this linear map at \mathcal{T} is often referred to as a *multilinear multiplication*.

2.2. Representation of finite groups. For defining invariant tensors, the transformations we consider satisfy the structure of a mathematical group. By means of a group representation we can let a group act on a vector space.

A *group* $(G, *)$ is a set G equipped with a binary operation $* : G \times G \rightarrow G$ for which the following properties hold:

1. *Associativity*: $\forall a, b, c \in G : (a * b) * c = a * (b * c)$;
2. *Neutral element*: $\exists e \in G, \forall a \in G : a * e = e * a = a$;
3. *Inverses*: $\forall a \in G, \exists b \in G : a * b = b * a = e$.

Example 2.1. The set of integers $\{0, 1\}$ with the addition modulo 2, $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +)$, form a group. This group is often called the *parity group*.

Somewhat related to a basis for a linear space, are the *generators* of a group. If all the elements of a group $(G, *)$ can be constructed from the composition of elements of $\{g_1, \dots, g_k\} \subset G$ and their inverses, the group is said to be generated by $\{g_1, \dots, g_k\}$. This is usually denoted by $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_k \rangle$. A group that is generated by a single element is called a *cyclic group*, i.e., $G = \langle g_1 \rangle$ is cyclic.

Example 2.2. The symmetry group of an equilateral triangle can be generated by one single rotation over 120° and the mirror operation around an axis perpendicular to any of the sides.

An n -dimensional *group representation* ρ of a group G is a *group-homomorphism* from G to the group of linear automorphisms $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{V})$ of an n -dimensional vector space \mathbb{V} with composition of maps as binary operation [14, Chapter XVIII, section 1]. More concretely, after choosing an (orthonormal) basis for \mathbb{V} , each automorphism can be represented by an $n \times n$ invertible matrix in the *general linear group* $\text{GL}(n)$ (with matrix multiplication as operation), so that we can identify ρ with

$$\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(n), \quad g \mapsto \mathbf{U}_g,$$

so the homomorphism condition $\mathbf{U}_{g*h} = \rho(g*h) = \rho(g) \cdot \rho(h) = \mathbf{U}_g \cdot \mathbf{U}_h$ is satisfied.

We call a representation *normal* if, after choosing an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{V} to identify $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{V})$ and $\text{GL}(n)$, the image of ρ is contained in the set of normal matrices. A representation is *orthogonal* if the image is contained in the orthogonal group. Orthogonal representations are normal.

Example 2.3. Consider the parity group introduced earlier. An orthogonal representation, which is also normal, of $\rho : \mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow \text{GL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ is given by:

$$(2.2) \quad \rho(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A representation $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathbb{V})$ induces a *dual representation* $\rho^* : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathbb{V}^*)$ [14, Chapter XVIII, section 1]. When representing the automorphisms with respect to the dual basis of \mathbb{V} , this dual representation satisfies

$$(2.3) \quad \rho^* : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(n), \quad g \mapsto \mathbf{U}_g^{-\top}$$

with $\mathbf{U}_{g*h}^{-\top} = \rho^*(g*h) = \rho^*(g) \cdot \rho^*(h) = \mathbf{U}_g^{-\top} \cdot \mathbf{U}_h^{-\top}$. For normal representations, the dual representation is also normal. For orthogonal representations, the dual representation coincides with the original representation: $\rho^* = \rho$.

Given representations $\rho_i : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathbb{V}_i)$ of the same group G to vector spaces \mathbb{V}_i , there is a natural action of these representations of G on $(k, d-k)$ -tensors in $\mathbb{T}_{k,d}$ [14, Chapter XVIII, section 1]: For $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{k,d}$ the action of the representations ρ_i of $g \in G$ is given by the multilinear multiplication

$$(\rho_1(g), \dots, \rho_k(g), \rho_{k+1}^*(g), \dots, \rho_d^*(g)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_k \otimes \mathbf{v}_{k+1}^* \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_d^*),$$

interpreting $\rho_i(g)$ as the linear map $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \rho_i(g)\mathbf{x}$. Since this action is multilinear and defined on rank-1 tensors, it extends linearly to all tensors [9, Section 1.20].

2.3. Group-equivariant and group-invariant tensors. We can now introduce the notion of *G-invariant* and *G-equivariant tensors*. We will show that both concepts are equivalent for tensors.

DEFINITION 2.4 (*G-invariant tensor* [17]). *Let G be a finite group with representations $\rho_i : G \mapsto \text{Aut}(\mathbb{V}_i)$. A tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{k,d}$ is called *G-invariant* if*

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{T} = (\rho_1(g), \dots, \rho_k(g), \rho_{k+1}^*(g), \dots, \rho_d^*(g)) \cdot \mathcal{T}$$

for all $g \in G$.

DEFINITION 2.5 (*G-equivariant tensor*). *Let G be a finite group with representations $\rho_i : G \mapsto \text{Aut}(\mathbb{V}_i)$. A tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{k,d}$ is called *G-equivariant* if*

$$(\rho_1(g), \dots, \rho_k(g), \mathbb{1}, \dots, \mathbb{1}) \cdot \mathcal{T} = (\mathbb{1}, \dots, \mathbb{1}, \rho_{k+1}(g)^\top, \dots, \rho_d(g)^\top) \cdot \mathcal{T}$$

for all $g \in G$.

LEMMA 2.6. *A $(k, d - k)$ -tensor is G -invariant if and only if it is G -equivariant.*

Proof. The equivalence follows from multilinearly multiplying both sides of (2.4) with $(\mathbb{1}, \dots, \mathbb{1}, \rho_{k+1}(g)^\top, \dots, \rho_d(g)^\top)$ and recalling that $\rho_i^*(g) = \rho_i^{-\top}(g)$. \square

Henceforth, we will exclusively use “invariance” to denote the equivalent concepts of equivariance and invariance.¹

The above concepts are closely linked with the corresponding concepts in (convolutional) neural networks. Neural networks are compositions of layers of affine maps composed with non-linear activation functions. The linear part of each affine map is represented by a $(1,1)$ -tensor, i.e., a matrix, $\mathcal{T} = \sum_{i=1}^r \mathcal{T}_i \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{f}_i^* \in \mathbb{V}_1 \otimes \mathbb{V}_2^*$. We claim that invariance of \mathcal{T} as in Definition 2.5 is equivalent to the usual notion of invariance in neural networks [5]. Recall from linear algebra that the transpose map L^\top of any linear map L is defined to satisfy $\mathbf{f}^*(L\mathbf{v}) = (L^\top \mathbf{f}^*)(\mathbf{v})$ for all vectors \mathbf{v} and dual vectors \mathbf{f}^* [14, Chapter XIII, section 5]. Hence, \mathcal{T} applied to the transformed input $\rho(g)\mathbf{v}$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{T}\rho(g)\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^r \mathcal{T}_i \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \rho(g)^\top \mathbf{f}_i^*(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^r \mathcal{T}_i \rho(g) \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{f}_i^*(\mathbf{v}) = \rho(g) \mathcal{T} \mathbf{v},$$

where the second equality is by Definition 2.5. As the foregoing holds for all \mathbf{v} , we have $\rho(g)\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}\rho(g)$, which is the common formulation of the invariance condition in neural networks, as long as the activation function is applied coordinate-wise [5].

Finally, we stress the difference between G -invariant tensors and (partially) symmetric tensors. In this work, the group action on a tensor is defined through the action of the representations on the underlying vector spaces, yielding G -invariant tensors. On the other hand, partially symmetric tensors can be viewed as tensors that are invariant under a subgroup of the permutation group acting on the vector spaces in the tensor product [13].

3. Related work. Finzi, Welling, and Wilson developed a way to construct invariant linear maps and tensors for any group in [7]. Since our construction method builds on their ideas, we recall their approach here, applied to the tensor setting (by exploiting that multilinear maps can be identified with linear maps [9, Chapter 1]).

It follows from Definition 2.4 and (2.1) that a G -invariant tensor satisfies the *joint eigenproblem*

$$(3.1) \quad (\rho_1(g) \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_k(g) \otimes \rho_{k+1}^*(g) \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_d^*(g)) (\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{T}$$

for all group elements $g \in G$ simultaneously. In fact, if $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_s \rangle$, then it suffices that (3.1) holds for all generators g_i to imply that it holds for all $g \in G$. The approach adopted by [7] consists of finding a basis of this joint eigenspace corresponding to eigenvalue 1. This is accomplished by rewriting the above system of equations as

$$(3.2) \quad 0 = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}_1^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{U}_1^{(d)} - \mathbb{1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{U}_s^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{U}_s^{(d)} - \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{C}} \mathcal{T}, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{U}_j^{(\ell)} = \begin{cases} \rho_\ell(g_j) & \text{if } 1 \leq \ell \leq k, \\ (\rho_\ell(g_j))^{-\top} & \text{if } k < \ell \leq d, \end{cases}$$

¹ *Group*-invariance may appear to be a misnomer because the invariance is not characterized by the group exclusively, but rather by the representation of the groups. Nevertheless, this is the standard terminology in representation theory [14, Chapter XVIII, section 1].

$\mathbb{1}$ is the identity on $\mathbb{T}_{k,d}$ and $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_s \rangle$. The valid tensors \mathcal{T} are thus the elements in the kernel of the *constraint matrix* \mathbf{C} . This defines a standard problem in numerical linear algebra: Compute a basis of the kernel. After extracting a basis, every G -invariant tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{k,d}$ is a linear combination of these basis elements.

Let $N = n_1 \dots n_d$ be the dimension of $\mathbb{T}_{k,d}$. Then, \mathbf{C} above is an $sN \times N$ -matrix. Computing an orthonormal basis of the kernel of this matrix directly with the singular value decomposition would require $\mathcal{O}(sN^3)$ operations. The work [7] attempts to circumvent this cost by employing a (nonstandard) Krylov method similar to gradient descent. In their approach only the action of \mathbf{C} on a tensor is required, which essentially amounts to applying s multilinear multiplications to \mathcal{T} and then subtracting \mathcal{T} from each of them. This avoids constructing the constraint matrix \mathbf{C} explicitly. Some algorithms for the multilinear multiplication or dense tensor times matrix (TTM) are known [29, 16, 15, 1]. The usual algorithm consists of d successive matrix multiplications and requires $\mathcal{O}(N(n_1 + \dots + n_d))$ operations, so that \mathbf{C} could be applied with cost $\mathcal{O}(sN(n_1 + \dots + n_d))$. Unless the spectrum of \mathbf{C} is exceptionally well-clustered, one should expect that the number of iterations for any Krylov method to reliably extract a vector in the kernel is an appreciable fraction $\alpha > 0$ of the size of the matrix [27]. Hence, the practical time complexity to find one vector in the kernel is expected to be $\mathcal{O}(\alpha s(n_1 + \dots + n_d)N^2)$, and for r vectors the cost is (ideally) multiplied by r . Ultimately, this approach reduces the complexity from cubic in N for a straightforward singular value decomposition to only quadratically in $N = \dim \mathbb{T}_{k,d}$.

Another drawback of the method from [7] is that an initial guess about the dimension r of the kernel of \mathbf{C} needs to be made. If the guess is too small, the procedure is repeated with a doubled rank r until the rank is big enough [7].

Invariant tensors for specific groups are investigated in the physics literature as well [23], but the focus lies on how tensor products of different representations decompose as direct sums of other representations, resulting in invariant tensors that decompose in a structural part and a part containing only the degrees of freedom that are not fixed by the group action. Our work essentially provides a computational method to find the structural parts of the group, whereas in the physics literature this is usually done by representation-theoretic arguments.

4. Efficiently constructing group-invariant tensor networks. We first recall the use of tensor networks as machine learning models. Next, we introduce a new efficient method to find a basis of invariant tensors. Finally, we explain how they can be utilized in tensor networks and applied in a traditional machine learning pipeline.

4.1. Tensor networks as supervised learning models. Tensor networks originated in quantum physics as an efficient way to describe quantum-mechanical wave functions [2]. A tensor network is a graph in which the vertices represent tensors and labeled edges between tensors indicate the *contraction* of the two tensors along the pair of dual vector spaces that constitutes the label of the edge [32]. The tensor represented by a tensor network is the one obtained from evaluating the contractions described by the computational graph. With a properly chosen graph, a tensor network can represent (a subset of) high-order tensors by means of low-order tensors. We refer to the tensors appearing in a tensor network as *cores*. Often used tensor networks include TT, which have a chain-like structure of order-3 tensors, or HT networks which have a hierarchical structure.

For unburdening the notation, we explain only how a TTN can be used as a supervised machine learning approach. However, the same ideas can be used for any tensor network architecture. The TTN we consider represents a tensor in $\mathbb{T} =$




Fig. 1: Illustration of how tensor networks can be used as machine learning models in graphical notation [2]. The grey nodes denote the rank-1 input tensor $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ formed by the tensor product of the local feature maps $\phi_i(x_i)$. The contraction of $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ with the *feature tensor* (the rectangles with rounded edges) yields the feature vector (the single output edge at the top of both graphs). In the left figure, the feature tensor is a single order-6 tensor (5 input modes and one output mode). In the right figure, the feature tensor has a TTN structure and is represented by two matrices (the leftmost and rightmost rectangles), an order-4 tensor (middle rectangle), and two order-3 tensors.

$\mathbb{V}_1^* \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{V}_d^* \otimes \mathbb{W}$ using $d-1$ auxiliary vector spaces \mathbb{B}_i as follows. At the left and right end (see Figure 1b) of the TTN, we have matrices $\mathbf{A}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{V}_1^* \otimes \mathbb{B}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}^{(d)} \in \mathbb{B}_{d-1} \otimes \mathbb{V}_d^*$, respectively. The *output core tensor* $\mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{V}_\ell^* \otimes \mathbb{B}_{\ell-1}^* \otimes \mathbb{B}_\ell^* \otimes \mathbb{W}$ is assumed to appear at position $1 < \ell < d$ in the TTN. This is usually taken to be the core in the middle as in Figure 1b. The core tensors on the left are $\mathcal{A}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{V}_i^* \otimes \mathbb{B}_{i-1}^* \otimes \mathbb{B}_i$ for $1 < i < \ell$, and the ones on the right are $\mathcal{A}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{V}_i^* \otimes \mathbb{B}_{i-1} \otimes \mathbb{B}_i^*$ for $\ell < i < d$. This TTN $(\mathbf{A}^{(1)}, \mathcal{A}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathcal{A}^{(d-1)}, \mathbf{A}^{(d)})$ represents the tensor $\mathcal{T} = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathcal{T}^j \otimes \mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{T}$, where $(\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_m)$ is a basis of the m -dimensional vector space \mathbb{W} . The tensors \mathcal{T}^j live in $\mathbb{V}_1^* \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{V}_d^* \cong L(\mathbb{V}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{V}_d; \mathbb{R})$, and are, hence, defined through their action on rank-1 tensors, because a basis of rank-1 tensors exists for this vector space. Let $(\mathbf{e}_{i,1}^*, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{i,n_i}^*)$ be a basis of \mathbb{V}_i^* . The action of \mathcal{T}^j on $\mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{v}_d$ is defined to be:

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{T}^j(\mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{v}_d) = \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{v}_\ell}^{(\ell),j} \left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{v}_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)} \cdots \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{v}_2}^{(2)} \mathbf{A}^{(1)} \mathbf{v}_1, \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{v}_{\ell+1}}^{(\ell+1)} \cdots \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{v}_{d-1}}^{(d-1)} \mathbf{A}^{(d)} \mathbf{v}_d \right),$$

where, for $1 \leq p \neq \ell \leq d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{v}_p}^{(p)} &:= \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbf{e}_{p,i}^*(\mathbf{v}_p) \cdot \mathbf{A}_{p,i} & \text{if } \mathcal{A}^{(p)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbf{e}_{p,i}^* \otimes \mathbf{A}_{p,i}, \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{v}_\ell}^{(\ell),j} &:= \sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} \mathbf{e}_{\ell,i}^*(\mathbf{v}_\ell) \cdot \mathbf{A}_{\ell,i} & \text{if } \mathcal{A}^{(\ell)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{e}_{\ell,i}^* \otimes \mathbf{A}_{\ell,i} \otimes \mathbf{e}_j. \end{aligned}$$

In coordinates, $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{v}_p}^{(p)}$ is obtained by taking a linear combination with the coordinates of \mathbf{v}_ℓ of the appropriate “slices” of the tensor $\mathcal{A}^{(p)}$. For more details see [19].

The dimensions of the auxiliary vector spaces \mathbb{B}_i are called the *bond dimensions*. Hence, \mathcal{T} above is said to have bond dimensions (r_1, \dots, r_{d-1}) where $r_i = \dim \mathbb{B}_i$. Every tensor can be represented exactly in TTN format with sufficiently large bond dimensions [28]. Note that the minimal bond dimension with which a tensor \mathcal{T} can be represented is called the TTN rank [32]. We do not assume minimality of the bond dimensions, hence we consistently refer to r_i as a bond dimension rather than a rank.

The application of tensor networks to machine learning resembles kernel methods. It starts by mapping the data to an exponentially large space with a *feature map* $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$, usually by taking the tensor product of *local feature maps*, $\phi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, so that

$$(4.2) \quad \Phi(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_1(x_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \phi_d(x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{R}^{n_d},$$

where x_i denotes the i th element of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

For an input vector of length d , the feature map in (4.2) results in an order- d tensor of rank 1 with a total of $\prod_{k=1}^d n_k$ entries. Because of the rank-1 structure, however, this tensor can be stored as $(\phi_1(x_1), \dots, \phi_d(x_d))$ with only $\sum_{k=1}^d n_k$ entries.

Subsequently, the kernelized input is provided as input to a *feature tensor* in $(\mathbb{R}^{n_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{R}^{n_d})^* \otimes \mathbb{R}^m$, which can be viewed as a linear map from the input space $\mathbb{R}^{n_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{R}^{n_d}$ to \mathbb{R}^m . To keep this computationally tractable, additional structure, such as a TTN, must be imposed on the feature tensor (compare Figures 1a and 1b). This TTN structure underpins the *kernel trick* in our approach. Indeed, the tensor \mathcal{T} , viewed as linear map, can be applied efficiently to rank-1 tensors since

$$\mathcal{T}(\phi_1(x_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \phi_d(x_d)) = \sum_{j=1}^m \mathcal{T}^j(\phi_1(x_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \phi_d(x_d)) \otimes \mathbf{e}_j,$$

and applying the tensors \mathcal{T}^j to rank-1 vectors involves only small-scale tensors by (4.1). Through this nonlinear process, which is called a *feature map*, an input $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is mapped to a *output vector* in \mathbb{R}^m . These output vectors can then be used in standard machine learning pipelines; see subsection 4.3.

Note that the choice of bond dimensions controls the complexity of the feature map. These bond dimensions are generally treated as hyperparameters that should be optimized as part of a machine learning pipeline.

4.2. G -invariant tensor networks. The goal is to introduce an efficient scheme to construct tensor networks that represent tensors invariant under a finite discrete group G . The construction of such networks is simplified by the next result.

LEMMA 4.1 (Singh, Pfeifer, and Vidal [23]). *Let G be a finite discrete group. The tensor represented by a tensor network with G -invariant cores is G -invariant.*

Moreover, a G -invariant tensor decomposed as a tree tensor network (which includes TT) with G -invariant cores has the minimal bond dimension achievable by any tree tensor network decomposition with the same tree architecture [24].

The problem of finding a tree tensor network representing a G -invariant tensor is thus reduced to finding a tree tensor network with G -invariant cores. We call such tensor networks *G -invariant tensor networks*. In section 3 we already explained that the G -invariant tensors live in a linear subspace. Hence, if we can efficiently construct an orthonormal basis of this subspace, then each core of the tensor network could be expressed as a linear combination of such G -invariant basis tensors.

As noted in section 3, Finzi, Welling, and Wilson [7] stated the problem of finding G -invariant tensors as a problem of finding the kernel of a constraint matrix \mathbf{C} in (3.2). For normal representations, we can take a different viewpoint, starting from the joint eigenproblem (3.1). Consider the simplest case of a cyclic group $G = \langle g_0 \rangle$ for which we want to find a basis of the solution space \mathbf{X} of the following eigenproblem:

$$(4.3) \quad (\mathbf{U}_0^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}_0^{(d)})\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X},$$

where the matrices $\mathbf{U}_0^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ are normal representation matrices for the generator g_0 on \mathbb{V}_i or \mathbb{V}_i^* , defined as in (3.2). Since the representation matrices are normal, they are unitarily diagonalizable as $\mathbf{U}_0^{(i)} = \mathbf{V}^{(i)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(i)} \mathbf{V}^{(i)H}$ where $\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(i)}$ is diagonal (with all eigenvalues on the complex unit circle) and $\mathbf{V}^{(i)}$ a unitary matrix (so $\mathbf{V}^{(i)H} \mathbf{V}^{(i)} = \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{V}^{(i)} \mathbf{V}^{(i)H}$). Consequently, because of the tensor product, we have

$$(4.4) \quad (\mathbf{V}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{V}^{(d)}) (\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(d)}) (\mathbf{V}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{V}^{(d)})^H \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}.$$

Hence, the solutions of (4.3) are the tensor products of eigenvectors for which the product of corresponding eigenvalues equals 1. Let $\{(i_{1q}, \dots, i_{dq})\}_{q=1}^p$ be all the indices such that $\Lambda_{i_{1q}, i_{1q}}^{(1)} \dots \Lambda_{i_{dq}, i_{dq}}^{(d)} = 1$. Then, the corresponding solutions are $\mathbf{v}_{i_{1q}}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_{i_{dq}}^{(d)}$, where $\mathbf{v}_{i_{jq}}^{(j)}$ is the i_{jq} th column of $\mathbf{V}^{(j)}$. Let $\mathbf{V}_*^{(j)} = [\mathbf{v}_{i_{j1}} \dots \mathbf{v}_{i_{jp}}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times p}$. Then, all the solutions of (4.3) can be put as columns into the $n_1 \dots n_d \times p$ matrix

$$\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)} \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(2)} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_{i_{11}}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_{i_{d1}}^{(d)} & \dots & \mathbf{v}_{i_{1p}}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_{i_{dp}}^{(d)} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \odot is called the (columnwise) Khatri–Rao product. Note that $\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)}$ contains a subset of the columns of $\mathbf{V}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{V}^{(d)}$, from which it follows that the columns of $\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)}$ form an orthonormal (in the Hermitian inner product) basis of the solution space of (4.3).

For a group $G = \langle g_0, g_1, \dots, g_s \rangle$ with multiple generators the problem we have to solve is a joint eigenproblem

$$(4.5) \quad (\mathbf{U}_0^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{U}_0^{(d)}) \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}, \quad \dots, \quad (\mathbf{U}_s^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{U}_s^{(d)}) \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}.$$

where the matrix $\mathbf{U}_j^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ is a normal representation matrix for the generator g_j on \mathbb{V}_i , as before. From the cyclic case, we know that \mathbf{X} must live in the space spanned by the columns of $\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)}$. That is, we can *restrict to this subspace* and impose that $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)}) \mathbf{Q}$. Plugging this into the other equations yields

$$(4.6) \quad ((\mathbf{U}_i^{(1)} \mathbf{V}_*^{(1)}) \odot \dots \odot (\mathbf{U}_i^{(d)} \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)})) \mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)}) \mathbf{Q}, \quad i = 1, \dots, s$$

For each i individually, this is a generalized rectangular eigenproblem [12] that can be solved as a regular eigenvalue problem by multiplying the left-hand side with the pseudo-inverse of the matrix on the right. Since the right matrix has orthogonal columns (with respect to the Hermitian inner product), its pseudo-inverse is the conjugate transpose. Hence, the system (4.6) is equivalent to the $p \times p$ eigenproblem

$$(4.7) \quad ((\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)H} \mathbf{U}_i^{(1)} \mathbf{V}_*^{(1)}) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathbf{V}_*^{(d)H} \mathbf{U}_i^{(d)} \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)})) \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}, \quad i = 1, \dots, s;$$

herein, we exploited the basic property of the Khatri–Rao product that $(\mathbf{A} \odot \mathbf{B})^H (\mathbf{C} \odot \mathbf{D}) = (\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{C}) \otimes (\mathbf{B}^H \mathbf{D})$, where \otimes is the Hadamard or elementwise product. This first reduction step from (4.5) to (4.7) is especially interesting computationally when p is much smaller than $n_1 \dots n_d$, as we will see below.

The matrices $(\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)H} \mathbf{U}_i^{(1)} \mathbf{V}_*^{(1)}) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathbf{V}_*^{(n)H} \mathbf{U}_i^{(n)} \mathbf{V}_*^{(n)})$ are usually not normal and therefore not unitarily diagonalizable. Repeating the subspace restriction step is therefore, unfortunately, not possible. However, solving the non-normal eigensystem (4.7) is simplified by the next result.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *Let $\mathbf{B}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$, $i = 1, \dots, s$, be normal matrices whose right-most eigenvalues are real and positive:*

$$(\lambda_i, \mathbf{w}_i) := \arg \max_{\substack{(\lambda, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{S}^n \\ \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{w} = \lambda \mathbf{w}}} \Re(\mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{S}^n;$$

herein, $\mathbb{S}^n = \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \|\mathbf{w}\| = 1\}$ and $\Re(a)$ denotes the real part of $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ be a matrix with orthonormal columns in the Hermitian inner product, and let $\mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$.

The vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{S}^n$ solves the joint eigenvector problem

$$\mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{v} = \lambda_1 \mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{v} = \lambda_2 \mathbf{v}, \quad \dots, \quad \mathbf{A}_s \mathbf{v} = \lambda_s \mathbf{v}$$

if and only if $(x_1 \mathbf{A}_1 + \dots + x_s \mathbf{A}_s) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}$ with $x_i = \frac{1}{s \lambda_i}$.

Proof. If \mathbf{v} is a solution of the joint eigenproblem, then taking a linear combination of the system with the coefficients $x_i = \frac{1}{s \lambda_i}$ yields

$$x_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{v} + \dots + x_s \mathbf{A}_s \mathbf{v} = x_1 \lambda_1 \mathbf{v} + \dots + x_s \lambda_s \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}.$$

Conversely, because $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$1 = \mathbf{v}^H (x_1 \mathbf{A}_1 + \dots + x_s \mathbf{A}_s) \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^s x_i \Re(\mathbf{v}^H \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^s x_i \Re((\mathbf{U} \mathbf{v})^H \mathbf{B}_i (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{v})).$$

Since \mathbf{B}_i is a normal matrix, its *numerical range* or *field of values* is the convex hull of its eigenvalues [11, Chapter 1]. Consequently,

$$\lambda_i = \max_{\substack{(\lambda, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{S}^n \\ \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{w} = \lambda \mathbf{w}}} \Re(\mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{w}) = \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}^n} \Re(\mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{w}).$$

Combining the two foregoing equations, we obtain

$$1 = \sum_{i=1}^s x_i \Re((\mathbf{U} \mathbf{v})^H \mathbf{B}_i (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{v})) \leq \sum_{i=1}^s x_i \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}^n} \Re(\mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{w}) = x_1 \lambda_1 + \dots + x_s \lambda_s = 1.$$

Hence, the inequality is an equality, and subtracting both sides yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^s x_i (\lambda_i - \Re((\mathbf{U} \mathbf{v})^H \mathbf{B}_i (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{v}))) = 0.$$

Since $x_i > 0$ this equation can hold only if $\lambda_i = \Re((\mathbf{U} \mathbf{v})^H \mathbf{B}_i (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{v}))$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$. Since $\|\mathbf{U} \mathbf{v}\| = \|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$, we conclude that $(\lambda_i, \mathbf{U} \mathbf{v})$ is a solution of the eigenproblem associated to \mathbf{B}_i , for all i . That is,

$$\mathbf{B}_i (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{v}) = \lambda_i (\mathbf{U} \mathbf{v}), \quad i = 1, \dots, s.$$

Multiplying both sides of the equality by \mathbf{U}^H concludes the proof. \square

We can apply this result to the normal matrices $\mathbf{B}_i = \mathbf{U}_i^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{U}_i^{(d)}$ and matrix $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V}_*^{(1)} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)}$ with orthonormal columns. It follows that the solutions of the system (4.7) are the solutions of the *single* standard eigenproblem

$$\frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s ((\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)H} \mathbf{U}_i^{(1)} \mathbf{V}_*^{(1)}) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathbf{V}_*^{(d)H} \mathbf{U}_i^{(d)} \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)})) \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}.$$

Algorithm 4.1 Construct a basis of G -invariant tensors

Input: Normal representation matrices $\mathbf{U}_i^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{U}_i^{(d)}$ of the generator g_i , for $i = 0, 1, \dots, s$

- 1: For $j = 1, \dots, d$, compute the eigendecomposition $\mathbf{U}_0^{(j)} = \mathbf{V}^{(j)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(j)} \mathbf{V}^{(j)H}$.
- 2: Find all indices (i_{1q}, \dots, i_{dq}) , $q = 1, \dots, p$, so that $\Lambda_{i_{1q}, i_{1q}}^{(1)} \cdots \Lambda_{i_{dq}, i_{dq}}^{(d)} = 1$ and let $\mathbf{V}_*^{(j)} = [\mathbf{v}_{i_{j1}} \cdots \mathbf{v}_{i_{jp}}]$.
- 3: Calculate $\mathbf{A} = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s (\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)H} \mathbf{U}_i^{(1)} \mathbf{V}_*^{(1)}) \circledast \cdots \circledast (\mathbf{V}_*^{(d)H} \mathbf{U}_i^{(d)} \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)})$.
- 4: Compute a Schur decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}^H$ and extract an orthonormal basis $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times r}$ (in the Hermitian inner product) for the eigenspace corresponding to eigenvalue 1.

Output: The orthonormal basis $(\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)} \odot \cdots \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)}) \mathbf{Q}$

We summarize the above discussion as an algorithm for finding a basis of the G -invariant tensors as [Algorithm 4.1](#).

[Algorithm 4.1](#) leaves some space for heuristic optimizations. For example, the choice of which generator g_i should be processed first (we assumed g_0 above) has a serious impact on the computational cost. Indeed, the number of indices p in step 2 of [Algorithm 4.1](#) determines the size of the reduced eigenproblem that is solved in step 4; it is $p \times p$. Hence, it is interesting to choose the first generator as the one that minimizes p . Another observation is that often, as in our numerical experiments in [section 6](#), the representations are the same for different tensor modes. This ensures that some calculations can be recycled. We did not implement these optimizations.

There are also some numerical issues relevant to [Algorithm 4.1](#). In particular deciding when an eigenvalue is numerically equal to one or not. In our implementation, any eigenvalue λ for which $|\lambda - 1| < 10^{-6}$ is treated as an eigenvalue 1 for the purpose of [Algorithm 4.1](#).

The resulting algorithm has an asymptotic time complexity of order

$$\underbrace{(n_1^3 + \cdots + n_d^3)}_{\text{step 1}} + \underbrace{N}_{\text{step 2}} + \underbrace{2(n_1^2 + \cdots + n_d^2)ps + dp^2s}_{\text{step 3}} + \underbrace{p^3}_{\text{step 4}}.$$

Herein, s is the number of generators, n_i is the dimension of the i th mode, $N = n_1 \dots n_d$ is the tensor dimension, d is the tensor order, and p is the number of combinations for which the eigenvalue is 1. For a cyclic group, the complexity reduces to $O((n_1^3 + \cdots + n_d^3) + N)$, this is a strict improvement over the method from [\[7\]](#). For groups with multiple generators a theoretical comparison is more difficult. In theory, if every eigenvalue of all generators is 1, then $p = N$, so the asymptotic time complexity of [Algorithm 4.1](#) is worse than the state-of-the-art method from [\[7\]](#). However, in practice, p will never be as large as N , and our numerical experiments in [section 6](#) indicate orders of magnitude improvements over [\[7\]](#) in practical settings. We discuss the value of p in more depth in [section 5](#).

4.3. Training invariant tensor networks. The previous subsection showed how an orthonormal basis $(\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)} \odot \cdots \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)}) \mathbf{Q}$, a matrix whose columns live in $\mathbb{V}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{V}_d$, can be constructed with [Algorithm 4.1](#). Hence, a general G -invariant tensor \mathcal{T} is a linear combination of these columns:

$$\mathcal{T} = (\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)} \odot \cdots \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)}) \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{v}$$

for some $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^r$. Consequently, optimization over the subspace of G -invariant tensors, reduces to optimization over the vector space \mathbb{R}^r to find the coefficients \mathbf{v} relative to the orthonormal basis $(\mathbf{V}_*^{(1)} \odot \cdots \odot \mathbf{V}_*^{(d)})\mathbf{Q}$. Since $r \leq p \leq N = n_1 \cdots n_d$, and p can be much less than N (see [section 5](#) below), the dimension of the search space is reduced, which can reduce memory consumption and computation time.

After picking an appropriate TTN architecture and having constructed a basis of the subspace of G -invariant tensors for each core vector space in the network, we can use the G -invariant TTN as model for supervised learning. The variational parameters of the model are the sets of coefficients in these G -invariant tensor bases. Several gradient-based methods exist to optimize the variational parameters, such as stochastic gradient descent, AdaGrad, Adam, and RMSProp, among others [\[33\]](#).

This is the approach we used in our experiments. Alternatively, a method introduced by Stoudenmire and Schwab [\[25\]](#) for TTNs optimizes a few cores locally at a time, thereby sweeping back and forth over the network several times. This seems to have rapid convergence in terms of number of sweeps.

5. Orthogonal representations and a good first generator. The crux of [Algorithm 4.1](#) is that oftentimes the amount of initial combinations of eigenvalues equal to 1, i.e., p in [Algorithm 4.1](#), can be kept relatively small. In this section, we investigate p and introduce some heuristics to keep it small.

The key observation is that [Algorithm 4.1](#) applies for any set of generators of G . In particular, there is no assumption of minimality. Hence, if $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_s \rangle$, then we are free to add any additional group element g_0 , so that $G = \langle g_0, g_1, \dots, g_s \rangle$. We can thus assume without loss of generality that $g_0 \in G$ in [subsection 4.2](#) is any desirable group element, albeit at the cost of a minor impact on the computational performance as the number of generators increases by 1. The trick is then to choose g_0 in a way that minimizes p .

Representation theory studies representations of groups in different dimensions. Here, we focus on a few basic, well-known groups of order n that have natural n -dimensional orthogonal representations:² the *cyclic group* C_n , the *dihedral group* of symmetries of a regular n -gon D_n , the *symmetric group* of permutations on n symbols S_n , and the *dicyclic group* Q_n (which includes as a special case the group of quaternions). The dicyclic group only for n divisible by 4. We recall these well-known representations next.

Consider the permutation matrices

$$(5.1) \quad \mathbf{U}_c = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{U}_r = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

be the matrices that, when applied to a vector \mathbf{v} , circularly shift the elements of \mathbf{v} upwards, and invert the order of the elements of \mathbf{v} , respectively. Also consider the orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{U}_s^{ij} = \mathbb{1} - (\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j)(\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j)^\top$ that, when applied to \mathbf{v} swaps the elements at positions i and j of \mathbf{v} . Then,

²It is important to note that groups of order n can also have representations in different dimensions than n . For example, the cyclic group $C_n = \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ has a natural 1-dimensional representation for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$: $\mathbf{U}_j = e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{n}}$.

- ▶ $C_n = \langle g_c \rangle$ is generated by a single generator g_c whose n -dimensional representation is the cyclic shift matrix $\rho(g_c) = \mathbf{U}_c$.
- ▶ $D_n = \langle g_c, g_r \rangle$ is generated by g_c and the additional generator g_r whose representation is the reverser matrix $\rho(g_r) = \mathbf{U}_r$.
- ▶ $S_n = \langle g_c, g_s^{12} \rangle$ is generated by g_c and the additional generator g_s^{12} whose representation is the swapping matrix $\rho(g_s^{12}) = \mathbf{U}_s^{12}$.
- ▶ $Q_n = \langle g_c, g_x \rangle$ is generated by g_c and an additional generator g_x that satisfies the relations $g_x^2 = g_c^{\frac{n}{2}}$ and $g_c g_x = g_x g_c^{-1}$.

All four of these groups have g_c , a cyclic shift, as generator. We observe that \mathbf{U}_c , the representation of g_c in dimension n , is a *circulant matrix*. The eigenvalues of such matrices are known; see, for example, [6].

LEMMA 5.1 ([6]). *The eigenvalues of \mathbf{U}_c are $\lambda_j = e^{-2\pi i \frac{1}{n} j}$.*

COROLLARY 5.2. *Assume that we choose g_c as first generator of C_n , D_n , S_n , or Q_n . When g_c is represented in dimension n by \mathbf{U}_c , then (4.4) has a solution space of dimension $p = n^{d-1}$.*

Proof. Let $1 \leq i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{d-1} \leq n$ be arbitrary. Then,

$$\lambda_{i_1} \lambda_{i_2} \cdots \lambda_{i_{d-1}} = e^{-2\pi i \frac{1}{n} (i_1 + i_2 + \cdots + i_{d-1})} = e^{-2\pi i \frac{1}{n} (i_1 + i_2 + \cdots + i_{d-1} \pmod n)},$$

where the second equality is due to the fact that the group of n th roots of unity is cyclic of order n . It follows there is precisely one $1 \leq i_d \leq n$ such that $i_1 + i_2 + \cdots + i_{d-1} + i_d = 0 \pmod n$. For this choice of i_d , $\lambda_{i_1} \cdots \lambda_{i_d} = 1$, while any other choice leads to a different n th root of unity. Hence, there are exactly $p = n^{d-1}$ products of eigenvalues equal to 1 in $\Lambda^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \Lambda^{(d)}$ in (4.4), concluding the proof. \square

Since the maximum value of p is $n^d = N$, the previous result causes a significant reduction of a factor of $\frac{1}{n}$ in the size of the system (4.6) relative to (4.5). Choosing a different generator than g_c can result in a much poorer reduction. For example, because $\mathbf{U}_s^{12} = \text{diag}(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{1})$, we see that it has $n - 2$ eigenvalues equal to 1. In this case, (4.4) will have at least $(n - 2)^d \approx n^d = N$ solutions, causing no appreciable reduction in size.

A natural way to construct new discrete groups is from the product of smaller discrete groups. For the product group $G \times H$ of $G = \langle g_0, g_1, \dots, g_{s_1} \rangle$ and $H = \langle h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{s_2} \rangle$, two representations can easily be found from the representations of G and H . Let ρ_G be a d_1 -dimensional representation of G and ρ_H a d_2 -dimensional representation of H . Then, we can either take the *direct sum*, $\rho_{G \times H}(g, h) = \rho_G(g) \oplus \rho_H(h) = \text{diag}(\rho_G(g), \rho_H(h))$ as a $(d_1 + d_2)$ -dimensional representation, or take the *tensor product*, $\rho_{G \times H}(g, h) = \rho_G(g) \otimes \rho_H(h)$, as a $d_1 d_2$ -dimensional representation.

For the product group, $G \times H = \langle (g_0, e_h), \dots, (g_{s_1}, e_h), (e_g, h_0), \dots, (e_g, h_{s_2}) \rangle$ is a natural generating set, where e_g is the neutral element of G and likewise for $e_h \in H$. However, for our purpose, it can be useful to add the element (g_0, h_0) to the generating set and use this as the first generator. This is because, for the direct sum case, in $\rho_G(g_0) \oplus \rho_H(e_H)$, the $\rho_H(e_H)$ part is the identity matrix, hence adding the maximum number of eigenvalues equal to 1 in the direct sum. By contrast, the number of eigenvalues 1 in $\rho_G(g_0) \oplus \rho_H(h_0)$ is the sum of those in $\rho_G(g_0)$ and $\rho_H(h_0)$. In the tensor product case, (g_0, h_0) , whose representation is $\rho_G(g_0) \otimes \rho_H(h_0)$, is an evident choice as first generator. The number of eigenvalues equal to 1 will be at least equal to the product of the number of eigenvalues 1 of $\rho_G(g_0)$ and $\rho_H(h_0)$.

The representation theory of semidirect products of groups is less straightforward and will not be discussed here.

Table 1: The number of eigenvalues equal to 1 in $\mathbf{U}^{\otimes d} = \mathbf{U} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{U}$ for increasing d and different representations \mathbf{U} of the octahedral group in dimensions 3, 5, and 8. This corresponds to the value p in [Algorithm 4.1](#).

d	\mathbf{U}								
	$\rho(a)$	$\rho(b)$	$\rho(c)$	$\rho_{\oplus}(a)$	$\rho_{\oplus}(b)$	$\rho_{\oplus}(c)$	$\rho_{\otimes}(a)$	$\rho_{\otimes}(b)$	$\rho_{\otimes}(c)$
2	9	3	5	17	5	17	40	24	32
3	0	9	13	76	47	76	288	176	256
4	81	27	41	353	219	353	2176	1376	2048

Finally, the different representations of groups and their corresponding differences in the number of eigenvalues equal to 1 is illustrated next.

Example 5.3. The octahedral group O_h is the symmetry group of the octahedron and has three generators, commonly denoted by a, b and c . A representation in 3 dimensions is:

$$\rho(a) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(b) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(c) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Other representations can be found from the fact that $O_h \cong S_4 \times C_2$. For example, a direct sum representation in 5 dimensions is

$$\rho_{\oplus}(a) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_{\oplus}(b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_{\oplus}(c) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and a tensor product representation in 8 dimensions is

$$\rho_{\otimes}(a) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \mathbb{1}_2, \quad \rho_{\otimes}(b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \mathbb{1}_2, \quad \rho_{\otimes}(c) = \mathbb{1}_4 \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

[Table 1](#) lists the number of products of eigenvalues equal to 1, i.e., p in [Algorithm 4.1](#), with the different representations and different choices of first generator. As can be seen, the choice of representation and choice of first generator have a major impact on the value of p .

6. Experimental results. In the next subsection, we compare the performance of [Algorithm 4.1](#) against the methods introduced in [7], whose key steps were already recalled in [section 3](#). Thereafter, in [subsection 6.3](#), we compare the performance of group-invariant tensor networks for supervised learning tasks against their non-invariant counterparts.

We implemented all employed methods in Python 3.8 using Tensorflow 2.6 and SciPy and executed them on 10 cores of one Xeon Gold 6140 CPU (18 cores, clockspeed of each core 2.3GHz, 24.75MB L3 cache) with 180GB RAM from the tier-2 Genius cluster of the Vlaams Supercomputer Centrum. Our implementation is available at <https://gitlab.kuleuven.be/u0134300/group-invariant-tensor-trains>.

6.1. Group-invariant tensor basis construction. We compare the proposed [Algorithm 4.1](#) against the state-of-the-art “baseline method” [7, Algorithm 1] for group-invariant tensor basis construction for three groups over a range of orders and dimensions. For this baseline method, we used a compressed sparse row sparse matrix data structure for the representation matrices $\mathbf{U}_i^{(j)}$, while our method operates on dense matrices. We also implemented a “naive method” that computes the nullspace of the constraint matrix \mathbf{C} in (3.2) using a dense singular value decomposition. Herein, \mathbf{C} is first constructed explicitly with tensor (Kronecker) products of dense matrices.


We compare the timings of the proposed [Algorithm 4.1](#) against the naive and baseline methods for cyclic groups $C_n = \langle g_c \rangle$, dihedral groups $D_n = \langle g_c, g_r \rangle$, and symmetric groups $S_n = \langle g_c, g_s^{12} \rangle$; the generators and representations were explained in [section 5](#). In these cases, $g_0 = g_c$ is selected as first generator in [Algorithm 4.1](#). In addition, we also investigate the alternative set of generators $S_n = \langle g_s^{12}, g_s^{13}, \dots, g_s^{1n} \rangle$ of the symmetric group S_n . Here we use $g_0 = g_s^{12}$ as first generator. In all experiments, the dimensions and representations are the same for every mode of the order- d tensor: $\mathbf{U}_i^{(j)} = \rho(g_0)$ for all i and j . We run each of the three methods (naive, Finzi et al., and [Algorithm 4.1](#)) for each group $G = C_n, D_n, S_n$, for tensors of order $d = 2, 3, 4$ and $n = 10, 20, 30, 40, 50$. In each configuration, a time limit of 1 hour is enforced, and a main memory limit of 180GB. The results are shown in [Figure 2](#). All methods, when they were not prematurely terminated, successfully extracted an orthonormal basis of the correct dimension, as determined by the naive method.

In all tested configurations, our method outperforms the baseline method and the naive method, often with multiple orders of magnitude, provided that the “good” set of generators $\{g_c, g_s^{12}\}$ is chosen for S_n . The naive method outperforms the baseline in some small-scale cases as well because of the higher throughput realized by dense linear algebra kernels; Finzi, Welling, and Wilson’s algorithm [7], on the other hand, was specifically developed for large-scale cases where the naive method is not feasible anymore due to excessive memory consumption.

The bottom row of [Figure 2](#) highlights the importance of selecting the right set of generators. While the naive method is competitive with [7, Algorithm 1] when viewing $S_n = \langle g_c, g_s^{12} \rangle$ ([Figure 2](#), bottom left), the naive method clearly has the worst asymptotic scaling behaviour when using the alternative set of generators $\{g_s^{12}, g_s^{13}, \dots, g_s^{1n}\}$ instead ([Figure 2](#), bottom right). Similarly, the proposed method [Algorithm 4.1](#) is also orders of magnitude slower with the latter “bad” selection of generators. Indeed, in this case, the initial filtering step can only reduce to a joint eigendecomposition problem of dimension $p = (n - 2)^d \approx n^d$, whereas using the generators $\{g_c, g_s^{12}\}$ reduces the eigenproblem to $p = n^{d-1}$. This means that with the two generators the cost of solving the eigenproblem, which dominates the time complexity, is $O(n^{3d-3})$, versus $O(n^{3d})$ when using the n generators. This performance gap is consistent with the bottom row of [Figure 2](#).

6.2. An invariant TTN for parity classification. As a first toy example, we consider the problem of classifying bit-strings according to their parity. Depending on whether the length of the bit-strings is even or odd, the problem is respectively invariant or invariant. The group action on a bit-string consists of replacing a 0 by a 1 and vice versa. For strings of odd length, if the parity is 1, this means there is an odd amount of ones and an even amount of zeros, and after the group action there is an even amount of ones. Thus, this problem is G -invariant for the parity group $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2, +_2)$. For strings of even length, if the parity is 1, there is an odd amount of ones and an odd amount of zeros. Hence, after the group action, the parity remains

Fig. 2: Construction times for group-invariant tensor bases.




the same, so that the problem is G -invariant.

As local feature map ϕ that preserves this invariance we use the one-hot encoding of the two group elements. That is $\phi(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\phi(1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. For the representation on the input vector spaces $\mathbb{V}_i = \mathbb{R}^2$ and the output vector space $\mathbb{W} = \mathbb{R}^2$ we use the representation defined in [Example 2.3](#), while the obvious extensions thereof are used as representations on the bond vector spaces $\mathbb{B}_i = \mathbb{B}_i^* = \mathbb{R}^b$, where b is the bond dimension. For even-length strings, a network that is G -invariant can be achieved by using the *trivial representation* on the output mode; that is, $\rho(g) = \mathbb{1}_2$ for every $g \in G$ [[14](#), Chapter XVIII, section 1].

To train a model for classifying bitstrings of length $d = 2\ell + 1$, we construct a tensor train with d cores as in [subsection 4.1](#). The first and the last cores are order-2 tensors in $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^b$ and $\mathbb{R}^b \otimes \mathbb{R}^2$ respectively, where b denotes the bond dimension. The output mode is positioned at the ℓ th core, which lives in $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^b \otimes \mathbb{R}^b \otimes \mathbb{R}^2$, the other tensors are order-3 tensors in $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^b \otimes \mathbb{R}^b$. As baseline model we use aforementioned TTN without imposing invariance, while G -invariance is imposed on the model referred to below as the \mathbb{Z}_2 -invariant model. For both models, a softmax activation function is applied to normalize the output.

Above two TTNs were trained with Tensorflow for fixed bit-string length over 100 epochs with Adam optimization using automatic differentiation to compute the

Fig. 3: Parity classification results (both on training and validation set) on 100 runs after training for 100 epochs.



gradient. The core tensors in the baseline model are initialized such that the order-2 tensors are $\mathbb{1}_{2 \times b} := [\mathbb{1}_{2 \times 2} \ 0_{2 \times (b-2)}]$, the elements in the output core are all 1 and the other cores are initialized such that the matrices (“slices”) obtained by fixing the incoming bond dimension are $\mathbb{1}$; that is, for a tensor \mathcal{T} , for all $1 \leq i \leq \dim b$, $\mathcal{T}::i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \mathbb{1}_{2 \times b}$ or $\mathcal{T}::i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \mathbb{1}_{2 \times b}$, depending on whether the core is respectively to the left or right of the output core. To all cores identically and independently distributed Gaussian noise with average 0 and standard deviation 10^{-3} is added. As training data, a random subset consisting of 5% of all possible bitstrings were taken. No validation set was employed. Instead we simply minimize the binary cross-entropy loss on the training data, facilitating overfitting on the data. The goal is to illustrate that imposing the \mathbb{Z}_2 -invariance is a useful inductive bias and can prevent some of the overfitting. The model performance was evaluated on the bitstrings that were not used for training, comprising our test set. No hyperparameter tuning was performed. We trained the models 100 times with a different training set and different initialization of the network parameters.

Results for odd-length bit-strings for different string lengths and bond dimensions are shown in Figure 3. The plots show the average accuracy over the 100 runs on both test and training set. We compared \mathbb{Z}_2 -invariant TTN-models, regular TTN-models, and the regular TTN-model trained with complete *data-augmentation*; that is, after creating a training set, the $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +_2)$ -transformed training set is added to the initial training set, thereby doubling the amount of training data.

Apart from the general conclusion regarding TTNs that increasing the bond dimension also increases the model performance, it is clear that the \mathbb{Z}_2 -invariant model outperforms the baseline model in every case. Eventually, the invariant model outperforms the data-augmented model as well. For the cases where this is not the case, the bond dimension is too small, which limits the model’s expressiveness. The performance of the invariant models appears to increase as the problem size increases but this is because we use an amount of $0.05 \cdot 2^d$ datapoints for training, which increases with the problem size. This is the reason why for $d=15$ the baseline model also performs well.

Apart from an increased performance, the invariant TTNs also have less free parameters (as determined by Tensorflow’s `count_params` function), this is shown in Table 2. On average, in this example, the number of free parameters was reduced by

Table 2: Number of variational parameters and total storage requirements in number of floating-point values of the two models. The ratios between those quantities of the baseline and invariant model are also shown.

	b	$d = 11$			$d = 13$			$d = 15$		
		4	6	10	4	6	10	4	6	10
Parameters (floats)	Baseline	338	746	2042	402	890	2442	466	1034	2842
	Invariant	168	372	1020	200	444	1220	232	516	1420
	Ratio	2.01	2.01	2.00	2.01	2.00	2.00	2.01	2.00	2.00
Storage (floats)	Baseline	338	746	2042	402	890	2442	466	1034	2842
	Invariant	280	612	1660	312	684	1860	344	756	2060
	Ratio	1.21	1.22	1.23	1.29	1.30	1.31	1.35	1.37	1.38

about a factor 2 by using \mathbb{Z}_2 -invariant networks. Naturally, this depends entirely on the group, the tensor order, and dimensions. Memory consumption decreases as well, because there are less parameters and the basis tensors need only be stored a single time, and thus the reduction increases as the model grows.

6.3. Invariant TTNs for transcription factor binding. We illustrate the power of the introduced invariant networks by applying them to a binary classification task on DNA sequences. The task is to predict whether a *transcription factor* (a protein) will bind to a DNA sequence. The data set of Zhou, Shrikumar and Kundaje [34] contains three transcription factors (MAX, CTCF and SPI1) along with 10 000 DNA strands per transcription factor. Each DNA strand in this dataset is composed of a sequence of 1 000 canonical base pairs, i.e., adenine (A), cytosine (C), guanine (G), and thymine (T). The authors of [34] randomly partitioned the data, allocating 40% to the training set, 30% to the test set, and 30% to the validation set.

When used for predicting genome-wide regulatory signals such as transcription factor binding, DNA strands exhibit an interesting invariance called *reverse complement (RC) invariance* [34]. The complement invariance arises from the nucleobase pairings in the double helix (A pairs up with T, and G pairs up with C) and the way the strands are read. The reverse invariance is geometric in nature: if a transcription factor binds to a DNA strand, then it also binds on the same strand rotated by π radians by rotating the protein likewise. For example, AGTGC is equivalent to GCACT and if a transcription factor binds to one of them it will bind to the other as well.

RC invariance has both a local (the complement invariance) and a global part (the reverse invariance). This paper was concerned with local invariance. However, this particular global invariance can also be handled with our invariant TTNs.

The architecture of our network is as follows. As nucleobase feature maps ϕ , binary vectors of length 4 that represent a one-hot encoding of the molecules A, C, G, and T in this respective order are chosen. A TTN with $d = 1001$ cores is constructed as a classification model. The output is located on core in the middle, which does not have an input mode and thus lives in $\mathbb{R}^b \otimes \mathbb{R}^b \otimes \mathbb{R}^2$. The local part is described by the cyclic group $(\langle f \rangle, \circ)$, where the bijective map f is such that $f(A) = C$, $f(C) = A$, $f(G) = T$ and $f(T) = G$; note that it is isomorphic to the parity group $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2, +_2)$. This naturally induces a 4-dimensional representation $\mathbf{U}_f = \mathbf{U}_r$ that can be used on the input vector spaces $\mathbb{V}_i = \mathbb{R}^4$, where \mathbf{U}_r is as in (5.1). For the bond vector spaces \mathbb{B}_i , we take as representation of G the reverser matrix \mathbf{U}_r in dimension $\dim \mathbb{B}_i$. To

Table 3: Optimal training parameters used for evaluating model.

Task	Bond dimension	Regularization	Epochs	Learning rate
MAX	3	0.005	100	0.001
CTCF	8	0.005	100	0.01
SPI1	8	0.003	100	0.01

impose RC-invariance on the network we do not require the building blocks to be G -invariant as before, but we require the cores on the right of the middle core to be related to their corresponding cores on the left side; that is, for strands of length d the core at position m is related to the core at position $d - m + 1$ in the TTN in a way such that transposing the bond indices of the core has the same result as applying the invariance action for the $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +_2)$ -part on that core. Only the output core (at position $\ell = \frac{d+1}{2} = 501$) is $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +_2)$ -invariant, with an extra transposition for the reverse part of the invariance. This is summarized by the following conditions, using the TTN notation from [subsection 4.1](#):

$$(6.1) \quad \mathbf{A}_{ijl}^{(\ell)} = \left((\mathbf{U}_g^\top, \mathbf{U}_g^\top, \mathbb{1}) \cdot \mathbf{A}^{(\ell)} \right)_{jil},$$

$$(6.2) \quad \mathbf{A}_{ijk}^{(m)} = \left((\mathbf{U}_g^\top, \mathbf{U}_g, \mathbf{U}_g^\top) \cdot \mathbf{A}^{(d-m+1)} \right)_{ikj}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1,$$

$$(6.3) \quad \mathbf{A}_{ij}^{(d)} = \left((\mathbf{U}_g^\top, \mathbf{U}_g) \cdot \mathbf{A}^{(1)} \right)_{ji}.$$

An RC-action on this TTN then swaps all cores at locations m with the core at at position $d - m + 1$ while simultaneously applying the $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +_2)$ action on all input modes and transposing the bond modes. For odd-length strands we can make the middle core have an input vector space \mathbb{V}^* as well, making the core live in $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^b \otimes \mathbb{R}^b \otimes \mathbb{R}^2$. An example of an RC-invariant tensor network together with the conditions on the building blocks is given in [Figure 4](#); it can be verified that under the given conditions the network is indeed invariant.

Training was done for 100 epochs and a batch size of 100 examples, with binary cross-entropy loss and ℓ_2 -regularization on the variational parameters. The network output is again normalized with a softmax activation function. After every epoch, the *area under the ROC-curve* (AUROC) on the validation set is evaluated and the weights of the best performing model are saved and used for evaluating the model performance on the test set. Optimal hyperparameters vary depending on the prediction task and the parameters we used are given in [Table 3](#), these were found by manually trying out a few values. The model is trained with stochastic gradient descent with Nesterov momentum with a fraction of 0.2, with different learning rates.

Average results over 5 runs of our model together with the results from the state-of-the-art model introduced by Mallet and Vert [\[18\]](#) are given in [Table 4](#). Their model takes translation-invariance into account as well. The performance of our model is competitive with the state of the art for the CTCF and SPI1 dataset, while outperforming it for the MAX dataset. However, we note that for about one in five runs, the tensor network model starts in a local minimum and does not get to a loss value that is much better than the initial value. These cases are left out of the averages and variances, but may be avoided by using optimization algorithms that are better suited for training TTNs such as the one introduced by Stoudenmire and Schwab in [\[25\]](#) or better learning-hyperparameter finetuning.

Fig. 4: RC-invariant tensor network architecture and building block constraints in Penrose graphical notation [2]. The constraints are invariance constraints as introduced earlier with an extra transposition of the bond indices to account for the reverse operation of the symmetry. To arrive at a model that is RC-invariant, the trivial representation is taken on the output mode.




Table 4: Test set results RC-invariant networks and best benchmark results from Mallet and Vert [18].

Dataset	Model	AUROC	Standard deviation
CTCF	Ours	94.10%	0.21%
	Benchmark	98.84%	0.056%
SPI1	Ours	96.53%	0.030%
	Bechmark	99.26%	0.034%
MAX	Ours	97.06%	0.011%
	Benchmark	92.80%	0.26%

7. Conclusions. Equivariant and invariant tensors were introduced in [section 2](#) and the two concepts were shown to be equivalent ([Lemma 2.6](#)). We presented a new method to construct G -invariant TTNs for arbitrary discrete groups G with normal representations for supervised learning applications in [section 4](#). The main ingredient is [Algorithm 4.1](#), a basis construction method that scales better in practice than the state-of-the-art [[7](#), [Algorithm 1](#)] for several common groups. It exploits an observation, [Proposition 4.2](#), about real rightmost eigenvalues of a joint eigenproblem, allowing a reduction to a single standard eigenproblem. Crucial to the performance of [Algorithm 4.1](#) is the selection of the first generator of the group G . [Section 5](#) suggests a good first generator for any mixed product of cyclic, dihedral, symmetric, and dicyclic groups. Our G -invariant TTNs were applied to the prediction of transcription factor binding on DNA sequences in [section 6](#). The group structure inherent in this problem (reverse complement invariance) is completely captured by the proposed invariant TTN, hereby introducing a powerful and application-supported inductive bias. The experiments show that tensor network models can be competitive with state-of-the-art neural network models on a real world problem in terms of accuracy.

- [1] B. W. BADER AND T. G. KOLDA, *Algorithm 862: Matlab tensor classes for fast algorithm prototyping*, ACM Trans. Math. Softw., 32 (2006), p. 635–653, <https://doi.org/10.1145/1186785.1186794>.
- [2] J. C. BRIDGEMAN AND C. T. CHUBB, *Hand-waving and interpretive dance: an introductory course on tensor networks*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor., 50 (2017), p. 223001, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/aa6dc3>.
- [3] M. M. BRONSTEIN, J. BRUNA, T. COHEN, AND P. VELIČKOVIĆ, *Geometric deep learning: Grids, groups, graphs, geodesics, and gauges*, 2021, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.13478>.
- [4] S. CHENG, L. WANG, T. XIANG, AND P. ZHANG, *Tree tensor networks for generative modeling*, Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter, 99 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.99.155131>.
- [5] T. S. COHEN AND M. WELLING, *Group equivariant convolutional networks*, 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.07576>.
- [6] P. DAVIS, *Circulant Matrices*, Monographs and textbooks in pure and applied mathematics, Wiley, 1979.
- [7] M. FINZI, M. WELLING, AND A. G. WILSON, *A practical method for constructing equivariant multilayer perceptrons for arbitrary matrix groups*, 2021, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.09459>.
- [8] L. GRASEDYCK, *Hierarchical singular value decomposition of tensors*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 31 (2010), pp. 2029–2054, <https://doi.org/10.1137/090764189>.
- [9] W. H. GREUB, *Multilinear Algebra*, Universitext, second ed., 1978.
- [10] W. HACKBUSCH AND S. KÜHN, *A new scheme for the tensor representation*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl., 15 (2009), pp. 706–722, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00041-009-9094-9>.
- [11] R. A. HORN AND C. R. JOHNSON, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1991.
- [12] L. S. JENNINGS AND M. R. OSBORNE, *Generalized eigenvalue problems for rectangular matrices*, IMA J. Appl. Math., 20 (1977), pp. 443–458, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imamat/20.4.443>.
- [13] J. M. LANDSBERG, *Tensors: Geometry and Applications*, vol. 128 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [14] S. LANG, *Algebra*, Springer, New York, NY, 3 ed., 2002.
- [15] J. LI, C. BATTAGLINO, I. PERROS, J. SUN, AND R. VUDUC, *An input-adaptive and in-place approach to dense tensor-times-matrix multiply*, in SC '15: Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis, 2015, pp. 1–12, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2807591.2807671>.
- [16] J. LI, J. BIEN, AND M. T. WELLS, *rtensor: An R package for multidimensional array (tensor) unfolding, multiplication, and decomposition*, J. Stat. Softw., 87 (2018), p. 1–31, <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v087.i10>.
- [17] L.-H. LIM, *Tensors in computations*, Acta Numer., 30 (2021), pp. 555–764, <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0962492921000076>.
- [18] V. MALLETT AND J.-P. VERT, *Reverse-complement equivariant networks for DNA sequences*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. W. Vaughan, eds., 2021.
- [19] I. OSELEDETS, *Tensor-train decomposition*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 33 (2011), pp. 2295–2317, <https://doi.org/10.1137/090752286>.
- [20] V. PESTUN, J. TERILLA, AND Y. VLASSOPOULOS, *Language as a matrix product state*, 2017, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.01416>.
- [21] U. SCHOLLWÖCK, *The density-matrix renormalization group in the age of matrix product states*, Ann. Phys., 326 (2011), p. 96–192, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2010.09.012>.
- [22] R. SELVAN, E. B. DAM, AND J. PETERSEN, *Segmenting two-dimensional structures with strided tensor networks*, 2021, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.06900>.
- [23] S. SINGH, R. N. PFEIFER, AND G. VIDAL, *Tensor network decompositions in the presence of a global symmetry*, Phys. Rev. A: At. Mol. Opt. Phys., 82 (2010), p. 050301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.82.050301>.
- [24] S. SINGH AND G. VIDAL, *Global symmetries in tensor network states: Symmetric tensors versus minimal bond dimension*, Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter, 88 (2013), <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.88.115147>.
- [25] E. M. SToudenMIRE AND D. J. SCHWAB, *Supervised learning with quantum-inspired tensor networks*, 2017, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.05775>.
- [26] J. TANGPANITANON, C. MANGKANG, P. BHADOLA, Y. MINATO, D. ANGELAKIS, AND T. CHOTIBUT, *Explainable natural language processing with matrix product states*, 2021, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.08628>.
- [27] N. VANNIEUWENHOVEN, R. VANDEBRIL, AND K. MEERBERGEN, *A randomized algorithm for testing nonsingularity of structured matrices with an application to asserting nondefectivity*

- of Segre varieties*, IMA J. Numer. Anal., 35 (2015), pp. 289–224, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drt069>.
- [28] F. VERSTRAETE, D. PORRAS, AND J. I. CIRAC, *Density matrix renormalization group and periodic boundary conditions: A quantum information perspective*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 93 (2004), <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.93.227205>.
- [29] N. VERVLIET, O. DEBALS, L. SORBER, M. VAN BAREL, AND L. DE LATHAUWER, *Tensorlab*, <http://www.tensorlab.net>.
- [30] G. VIDAL, *Entanglement renormalization*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 99 (2007), <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.99.220405>.
- [31] W3TECHS, *awesome-equivariant-network*, <https://github.com/Chen-Cai-OSU/awesome-equivariant-network>. Last accessed April 2022.
- [32] K. YE AND L.-H. LIM, *Tensor network ranks*, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1801.02662>.
- [33] A. ZHANG, Z. C. LIPTON, M. LI, AND A. J. SMOLA, *Dive into deep learning*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.11342, (2021).
- [34] H. ZHOU, A. SHRIKUMAR, AND A. KUNDAJE, *Benchmarking reverse-complement strategies for deep learning models in genomics*, bioRxiv, (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.04.368803>.