

Block Discrete Empirical Interpolation Methods

Perfect Y. Gidisu

P.GIDISU@TUE.NL

Michiel E. Hochstenbach

M.E.HOCHSTENBACH@TUE.NL

*Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
TU Eindhoven
The Netherlands*

Editor:

Abstract

We present two block variants of the discrete empirical interpolation method (DEIM); as a particular application, we will consider a CUR factorization. The block DEIM algorithms are based on the rank-revealing QR factorization and the concept of the maximum volume of submatrices. We also present a version of the block DEIM procedures, which allows for adaptive choice of block size. Experiments demonstrate that the block DEIM algorithms may provide a better low-rank approximation, and may also be computationally more efficient than the standard DEIM procedure.

Keywords: Block DEIM, MaxVol, CUR decomposition, rank-revealing QR factorization, low-rank approximation

1. Introduction

A CUR decomposition approximates a data matrix using a subset of its rows and columns. Such factorization preserves in the reduced matrix, properties such as interpretability, sparsity, and nonnegativity of the original data matrix. In machine learning, one can use a CUR decomposition as an unsupervised feature or sample selection technique. Given an $m \times n$ matrix A and a target rank k , a CUR factorization takes the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \approx & C & M & R, \\ m \times n & & m \times k & k \times k & k \times n \end{array}$$

where C and R are small subsets of the columns and rows of A , respectively. The selected columns and rows tend to capture the important information of A . One standard way of constructing the factors C and R of a CUR factorization is to apply the discrete empirical interpolation index selection method (DEIM) to the k dominant right and left singular vectors of A , respectively (Sorensen and Embree, 2016). Given the factors C and R , following Sorensen and Embree (2016) and others (Mahoney and Drineas, 2009; Stewart, 1998), the middle matrix M can be computed as $(C^T C)^{-1} C^T A R^T (R R^T)^{-1}$.

In this work, we propose three different block DEIM procedures. There are three motivating factors for a block DEIM scheme:

- The DEIM algorithm has a *greedy* nature: it locally selects the index corresponding to the largest magnitude element of a vector. A block method shares the same principle,

but it may be less greedy since the optimization is done over more indices instead of just one.

- The block DEIM procedures that we propose will generally have higher flop counts than the standard DEIM algorithm. However, in practice, we expect that the block DEIM schemes will have higher flop performance than the classical DEIM algorithm as they mainly involve BLAS-3 operations.
- A block DEIM scheme may be a good solution where the DEIM procedure faces a difficult choice when the local maximizer is (nearly) nonunique. Indeed, in (Sorensen and Embree, 2016, Footnote 3) it is already hinted that a potentially problematic case is if multiple entries in the vector have nearly the same magnitude, e.g., $|(\mathbf{v}_1)_i| \approx |(\mathbf{v}_1)_j|$ for $i \neq j$, then the DEIM scheme will pick the smaller index. However, if the other large-magnitude entries in \mathbf{v}_1 are not significant in the subsequent \mathbf{v} vectors, the corresponding indices will never be selected although they are equally important (see Example 1.1).

Our selection criterion for the block- b case will consist of maximizing the modulus of the determinant or volume over many possible $b \times b$ submatrices. Although $b = 5$ is the default, we also discuss options for approximating the maximum volume using larger values of b and taking adaptive values of b .

To motivate the discussion, let us first consider a small illustrative example.

Example 1.1 Consider the matrix of left singular vectors (where, e.g., $\varepsilon = 10^{-15}$)

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{3} + \varepsilon & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{3} & \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon \\ \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{3} & -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{corresponding to singular values } \sigma_1, \sigma_2.$$

It may easily be checked that, independent of the σ_i , standard DEIM will pick the first index, followed by the second. However, it is clear that the second and third indices are a better choice, especially if σ_2 is close to σ_1 . For instance, if $A = U \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.99 \end{bmatrix}$, working with a determinant of 2×2 submatrices gives a better result. Since

$$\left| \det \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{3} & \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2} \\ \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{3} & \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon \end{bmatrix} \right| > \left| \det \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{3} + \varepsilon & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{3} & \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon \end{bmatrix} \right|,$$

a block DEIM variant with block size 2 picks the more appropriate indices 2 and 3.

The outline of the paper is as follows. Section 2 provides a brief literature review of some existing deterministic CUR approximation algorithms. Section 3 describes how the DEIM scheme can be blocked using either a column-pivoted QR factorization or the concept of the maximum determinant or volume of submatrices. We discuss the newly proposed block DEIM algorithms and their computational complexities, and state a well-known error bound for the approximation. Section 4 reports the results from numerical experiments evaluating the computational efficiency and approximation quality of the various block DEIM procedures. Section 5 summarizes the key points and results of this paper. Some main properties of the methods are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Overview of the various variants with their properties. All methods have the SVD as a basis. The quantity η appears in error upper bounds and is discussed in Section 3.4.

Method \ Properties	SVD	Block	Adapt.	Tunable	Greediness	η	Speed
Standard DEIM	+	–	–	–	High	Medium	Moderate
B-MaxVol (Section 3.1)	+	+	–	+	Low	Low	Fast
B-RRQR (Section 3.2)	+	+	–	+	Low	Low	Fast
B-Adaptive (Section 3.3)	+	+	+	+	Medium	Medium	Variable

2. Review of CUR factorization algorithms

In this section, we summarize some known index selection algorithms for computing a CUR factorization. We use MATLAB notations to index vectors and matrices, i.e., $A(:, \mathbf{p})$ denotes the k columns of A whose corresponding indices are in vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{N}_+^k$. We denote the 2-norm norm by $\|\cdot\|$ and the notation R^+ denotes the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse of R .

2.1 MaxVol Algorithm

The MaxVol algorithm (Goreinov et al., 1997, 2010) is one of the most common greedy deterministic procedures for a CUR factorization. Goreinov et al. (1997) propose a rank- k CUR factorization then referred to as pseudoskeleton approximation based on performing the MaxVol procedure on the top k right and left singular vectors. Oseledets and Tyrtshnikov (2010) develop a cross-approximation scheme that alternates between searching over rows and columns using the MaxVol method.

Given a tall-thin matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$, the MaxVol algorithm searches for k row indices such that the $k \times k$ upper submatrix \widehat{U} is dominant in U (Goreinov et al., 2010). Although the dominant property does not imply that \widehat{U} has the maximum volume, it guarantees that \widehat{U} is locally optimal so that replacing any row in \widehat{U} with a row in U that is already not present in \widehat{U} , does not increase the volume (Goreinov et al., 2010). Algorithm 1 presents the procedure to find a dominant submatrix using the MaxVol algorithm. In practice, a good initialization step for the MaxVol algorithm is the k rows of the input matrix that are the pivoted rows from the LU decomposition of the input matrix (Goreinov et al., 2010).

Algorithm 1 MaxVol: Approximation to dominant submatrix (Goreinov et al., 2010)

Input: $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ with $m > k$, convergence tolerance δ (default 0.01)

Output: $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{N}_+^k$ indices

- 1: $\mathbf{s} \leftarrow k$ first indices of the pivoted rows from the LU decomposition of U
 - 2: **repeat**
 - 3: Set $\widehat{U} \leftarrow U(\mathbf{s}, :)$ and $B \leftarrow U\widehat{U}^{-1}$
 - 4: Find the element of maximum absolute value in B : $(i, j) \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax} |b_{ij}|$
 - 5: if $|b_{ij}| > 1$, swap rows i and j in B : $\mathbf{s}(j) = i$
 - 6: **until** $\forall (i, j): |b_{ij}| < 1 + \delta$
-

The parameter δ is the convergence tolerance to find pivot elements; this parameter serves as a stopping criterion and should be sufficiently small (a good choice can be 0.01) (Goreinov et al., 2010). Note that by swapping the rows as done in Line 5, the volume of the upper submatrix in B is increased, and also in U until convergence. The most expensive part of the iterations is Line 3; this needs a $k \times k$ matrix inversion and mk^2 operations for

the matrix multiplication. Goreinov et al. (2010) describe a speed optimization process that avoids the expensive matrix multiplications and inversions. We refer the reader to (Goreinov et al., 2010) for a more detailed explanation of the MaxVol algorithm.

2.2 DEIM

The DEIM point selection method is a deterministic greedy index selection algorithm originally presented in the context of model order reduction for nonlinear dynamical systems (Chaturantabut and Sorensen, 2010). Sorensen and Embree (2016) show that this procedure is a viable index selection algorithm for constructing a CUR factorization. To select the indices for a rank- k CUR factorization, first, compute a rank- k singular value decomposition (SVD) of the original matrix. Using as input, the top- k right and left singular vectors contained in V and U , respectively, the DEIM algorithm selects k column and row indices, \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{s} , respectively, as in Algorithm 2¹. The DEIM procedure selects the indices by processing the singular vectors one at a time. We describe this method using the left singular vectors, and the procedure on the right singular vectors follows similarly.

Starting from the leading right singular vector \mathbf{u}_1 , the first row index s_1 corresponds to the entry in \mathbf{u}_1 with the largest magnitude, i.e., $|\mathbf{u}_1(s_1)| = \|\mathbf{u}_1\|_\infty$ (where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ denotes the infinity norm). The remaining indices s_j for $j = 2, \dots, k$ are selected so that each index corresponds to the largest magnitude entry in the residual $\mathbf{r}_j = \mathbf{u}_j - \mathbb{S}_{j-1}\mathbf{u}_j$, where \mathbb{S}_{j-1} is an interpolatory projector computed as $U_{j-1}(S_{j-1}^T U_{j-1})^{-1} S_{j-1}^T$. (The linear independence of the columns of U guarantees that $S_{j-1}^T U_{j-1}$ is nonsingular.) As mentioned in our third motivating factor in Section 1, in the case where we have multiple index options, e.g., $|(\mathbf{r}_j)_1| = |(\mathbf{r}_j)_2|$, the smaller index is picked. For further details about the DEIM scheme, we refer the reader to (Chaturantabut and Sorensen, 2010; Sorensen and Embree, 2016).

Algorithm 2 DEIM Index Selection (Sorensen and Embree, 2016)

Input: $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, $k \leq \min(m, n)$
Output: Indices $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{N}_+^k$ with non-repeating entries

```

1: for  $j = 1, \dots, k$  do
2:    $\mathbf{s}(j) = \operatorname{argmax}_{1 \leq i \leq m} |(U(:, j))_i|$  (Iteratively pick indices)
3:    $\mathbf{p}(j) = \operatorname{argmax}_{1 \leq i \leq n} |(V(:, j))_i|$ 
4:   if  $j < k$  then (Update remaining columns)
5:      $U(:, j+1) = U(:, j+1) - U(:, 1:j) \cdot (U(\mathbf{s}, 1:j) \setminus U(\mathbf{s}, j+1))$ 
6:      $V(:, j+1) = V(:, j+1) - V(:, 1:j) \cdot (V(\mathbf{p}, 1:j) \setminus V(\mathbf{p}, j+1))$ 
7:   end if
8: end for
```

2.3 Rank-revealing QR factorization

The classical truncated pivoted QR factorization is another approach for computing a CUR factorization (Voronin and Martinsson, 2017). The QR factorization of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $m \geq n$ is of the form

$$\begin{array}{cc} A & \Pi \\ m \times n & n \times n \end{array} = \begin{array}{cc} Q & T \\ m \times n & n \times n \end{array},$$

1. Note that the backslash operator used in the algorithms is a Matlab type notation for solving linear systems and least-squares problems.

where Π is a permutation matrix, Q is an orthonormal matrix, and T is an upper triangular matrix that satisfies the condition

$$|T_{kk}|^2 \geq \sum_{i=k}^j |T_{ij}|^2, \quad j = k+1, \dots, n, \quad k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Given \mathbf{p} , a vector of indices, we can express Π as $\Pi = I(:, \mathbf{p})$ where I is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. The matrix A can then be written as a sum of rank-1 matrices

$$A(:, \mathbf{p}) \approx \sum_{j=1}^n Q(:, j) T(:, j).$$

Let us partition Q and T so that

$$A(:, \mathbf{p}) = [Q_1 \quad Q_2] \begin{bmatrix} T_{11} & T_{12} \\ 0 & T_{22} \end{bmatrix} = Q_1 [T_{11} \quad T_{12}] + Q_2 [0 \quad T_{22}],$$

where $Q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$, $Q_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n-k)}$, $T_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$, $T_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times (n-k)}$, and $T_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-k) \times (n-k)}$. We have that $\|A\Pi - Q_1 [T_{11} \quad T_{12}]\| \leq \|T_{22}\|$, which implies that Q_1 is an approximation of the range of A and as long as $\|T_{22}\|$ is small, $A(:, \mathbf{p})$ can be approximated by $Q_1 [T_{11} \quad T_{12}]$. For an arbitrary k , the best rank- k approximation of A (A_k) from the SVD gives $\|A - A_k\| = \sigma_{k+1}(A)$ where σ_{k+1} is the $(k+1)$ st singular value of A . It is always the case that $\sigma_{k+1}(A) \leq \|T_{22}\|$ (Voronin and Martinsson, 2017). A factorization is said to be a rank-revealing QR (RRQR) factorization if the ratio $\|T_{22}\| / \sigma_{k+1}(A)$ is guaranteed to be bounded (Gu and Eisenstat, 1996). Note that a rank-revealing QR factorization is based on selecting certain well-conditioned submatrices (Chandrasekaran and Ipsen, 1994); which is the underlying objective of the maximum volume concept.

To compute a pivoted QR factorization, one may use a column-pivoted Gram–Schmidt algorithm (Golub and Van Loan, 2012). Although there are counter-examples, the classical Gram–Schmidt process usually results in an RRQR factorization (Gu and Eisenstat, 1996). Notice that from the matrix partition, $Q_1 T_{11}$ equals the first k columns of $A(:, \mathbf{p})$. To construct a CUR decomposition, one may apply a Gram–Schmidt-based pivoted QR algorithm to the matrices A and A^T to obtain the matrices C and R , respectively (Berry et al., 2005; Stewart, 1998). Alternatively, Voronin and Martinsson (2017) show how to compute a CUR factorization via a two-sided interpolative decomposition (ID), which in turn can be constructed from a pivoted QR factorization. Using the Q-DEIM approach (Drmac and Gugercin, 2016), one can apply a column-pivoted QR procedure on the transpose of the leading k right and left singular vectors to find the indices for constructing the factors C and R in CUR approximation.

We will now use the tools described in this section to design our block variants of the standard DEIM algorithm in the following section.

3. Block DEIM

This section introduces three new block variants of the DEIM procedure. To design our block DEIM algorithms, we combine the index selection algorithms discussed in Section 2.

The block DEIM algorithms select a b -size set of indices at each step using a block of singular vectors and then update the subsequent block of vectors using the oblique projection technique in the standard DEIM procedure. The main difference between the block DEIM and the traditional DEIM scheme resides in the b -size indices selection. In the standard DEIM, we select the indices by processing one singular vector at a time, each iteration step produces an index whilst the block version processes a block of singular vectors at a time, and each step provides an index set of size b . As a result, this may lead to a different selection of indices. For ease of presentation, we assume that the number of singular vectors k is a multiple of the block size b and $2 \leq b < k$.

3.1 Block DEIM based on Maximum Volume (B-DEIM-MaxVol)

We first introduce a block DEIM procedure based on the MaxVol scheme (Goreinov et al., 2010) described in Section 2 for finding a submatrix with the largest possible determinant in a thin-tall matrix. This algorithm takes as inputs the left and right singular vectors, a block size b , a rank parameter k , and a convergence tolerance δ . For a b -block of singular vectors, the procedure returns b row indices at each step such that the final $b \times b$ upper submatrix in the b -block of singular vectors is dominant. We then use the oblique projection technique as in the standard DEIM scheme to update the subsequent blocks of singular vectors. At the end of the iteration, the algorithm returns a column and row index set of size k .

The computational cost of this algorithm is dominated by two calls of the MaxVol procedure and the block updates. The initialization step of Algorithm 1 requires a permutation of the input matrix, which is done via the LU factorization. Given an $n \times b$ matrix, the LU decomposition requires $\mathcal{O}(nb^2)$ operations. Furthermore, the dominant cost of each iteration in the MaxVol algorithm is the multiplication of an $n \times b$ matrix and a $b \times b$ matrix, for a cost of $\mathcal{O}(nb^2)$ operations. Let $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}_+$ denote the number of iterations performed. The computational complexity of the MaxVol procedure is $\mathcal{O}(\kappa nb^2)$. The cost of the two calls of MaxVol is $\mathcal{O}(\kappa(m+n)b^2)$ and the block updates cost $\mathcal{O}((m+n)kb)$. Given that we have k/b iterations in Algorithm 3, the total cost of the B-DEIM-MaxVol algorithm is $\mathcal{O}((m+n)(\kappa bk + k^2))$. A crude bound on the number of iterations in Algorithm 1 is $\kappa \leq (\log |\det(\widehat{U}_{\text{dom}})| - \log |\det(\widehat{U}_{\text{ini}})|) / \log(1+\delta)$, where \widehat{U}_{ini} is the submatrix at the initialization step and \widehat{U}_{dom} is the dominant submatrix in Algorithm 1, respectively (Goreinov et al., 2010). The procedure of block DEIM using MaxVol is summarized in Algorithm 3. In Lines 2 and 3 of the algorithm, we apply Algorithm 1 as implemented by Kramer and Gorodetsky (2018) to the block of singular vectors.

Algorithm 3 Block DEIM index selection based on MaxVol (B-DEIM-MaxVol)

Input: $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, $k \leq \min(m, n)$, block size b (with $b | k$), convergence tolerance δ (default 0.01)

Output: Indices $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{N}_+^k$ with non-repeating entries

```

1: for  $j = 1, \dots, k/b$  do
2:    $\mathbf{s}((j-1)b+1 : bj) = \text{MaxVol}(U(:, (j-1)b+1 : bj), \delta)$ 
3:    $\mathbf{p}((j-1)b+1 : bj) = \text{MaxVol}(V(:, (j-1)b+1 : bj), \delta)$ 
4:    $U(:, bj+1 : bj+b) = U(:, bj+1 : bj+b) - U(:, 1 : bj) \cdot (U(\mathbf{s}, 1 : bj) \setminus U(\mathbf{s}, bj+1 : bj+b))$ 
5:    $V(:, bj+1 : bj+b) = V(:, bj+1 : bj+b) - V(:, 1 : bj) \cdot (V(\mathbf{p}, 1 : bj) \setminus V(\mathbf{p}, bj+1 : bj+b))$ 
6: end for

```

3.2 Block DEIM based on RRQR (B-DEIM-RRQR)

The MaxVol algorithm seeks to find a good approximation of a submatrix with the maximum volume in a given input matrix. It is noted in (Drmac and Gugercin, 2016, Remark 2.3) that the pivoting in the RRQR factorization can be interpreted as a greedy volume maximizing scheme. Practical experience shows that the index selection via a column-pivoted QR factorization may be more computationally efficient than the MaxVol method.

Additionally, Khabou et al. (2013) propose a block LU factorization with panel rank-revealing pivoting (LU-PRRP) procedure by employing the strong rank-revealing QR (RRQR) panel factorization. The algorithm computes the block LU-PRRP as follows: at each step of the block factorization, a block of columns is factored by performing strong RRQR factorization (Gu and Eisenstat, 1996) on its transpose. Pivoting is done by applying the permutation matrix returned on the entire original matrix followed by an update of the trailing matrix. As noted in (Sorensen and Embree, 2016), the DEIM index selection procedure is equivalent to the index selection of partially pivoted LU decomposition.

With this knowledge, we propose an alternative block DEIM variant (B-DEIM-RRQR) that merges the components of an RRQR factorization and the standard DEIM scheme. At each step of the index selection process, given a block size b and a block of singular vectors, we perform a QR decomposition with column pivoting on the transpose of a block of singular vectors; the first b columns give the selected indices. We then update the next block of singular vectors comparatively to how the standard DEIM algorithm updates subsequent singular vectors by using interpolatory projection.

The cost of the B-DEIM-RRQR scheme is dominated by two QR factorizations and block updates. Given an $n \times b$ matrix, a QR factorization requires $\mathcal{O}(nb^2)$ operations hence the cost of the two QR decompositions here is $\mathcal{O}((m+n)b^2)$ and the block updates cost $\mathcal{O}((m+n)kb)$. Since there are k/b iterations in Algorithm 4, the total cost of the B-DEIM-RRQR scheme is therefore $\mathcal{O}((m+n)(bk+k^2))$. The B-DEIM-RRQR may be viewed as a hybrid standard DEIM and Q-DEIM scheme. The Q-DEIM selects k indices by performing one column-pivoted QR while our B-DEIM-RRQR algorithm selects the k indices by performing k/b rounds of column-pivoted QR. Note that when the block size $b = k$, this B-DEIM-RRQR algorithm is just the Q-DEIM scheme. Algorithm 4 summarizes the procedure. The permutation matrices Π_s and Π_p in Lines 3 and 4 are from the column-pivoted QR of U^T and V^T , respectively.

Algorithm 4 Block DEIM index selection based on RRQR (B-DEIM-RRQR)

Input: $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, $k \leq \min(m, n)$, block size b (with $b | k$)

Output: Indices $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{N}_+^k$ with non-repeating entries

```

1: for  $j = 1, \dots, k/b$  do
2:   Perform a column-pivoted QR on  $U(:, (j-1)b+1 : bj)^T$  and  $V(:, (j-1)b+1 : bj)^T$ 
3:    $\mathbf{s}((j-1)b+1 : bj) = \Pi_s(1 : b)$ 
4:    $\mathbf{p}((j-1)b+1 : bj) = \Pi_p(1 : b)$ 
5:    $U(:, bj+1 : bj+b) = U(:, bj+1 : bj+b) - U(:, 1 : bj) \cdot (U(\mathbf{s}, 1 : bj) \setminus U(\mathbf{s}, bj+1 : bj+b))$ 
6:    $V(:, bj+1 : bj+b) = V(:, bj+1 : bj+b) - V(:, 1 : bj) \cdot (V(\mathbf{p}, 1 : bj) \setminus V(\mathbf{p}, bj+1 : bj+b))$ 
7: end for

```

3.3 Adaptive choice of block size (AdapBlock)

To combine the strength of standard DEIM with a block version, we also consider adaptive choices for the block size b . In particular, we propose the following variant: perform block DEIM if for the singular vector \mathbf{v}_j being considered the two largest elements are nearly equal, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} \text{block DEIM} & \text{if } |(\mathbf{v}_j)_i| \approx |(\mathbf{v}_j)_\ell| \quad \text{for } i \neq \ell, \\ \text{standard DEIM} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In Algorithm 5, we show an implementation of the adaptive block DEIM using the block DEIM variants discussed in Section 3. The parameter ρ is the desired lower bound on the ratio $|(\mathbf{v}_j)_i|/|(\mathbf{v}_j)_\ell|$ for $i \neq \ell$. We note that although our criterion for switching from a standard DEIM scheme to a block DEIM method is based on how close the two largest entries (magnitude) in the vector being considered are, other criteria can be used.

Algorithm 5 Adaptive Block DEIM index selection (AdapBlock)

Input: $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, $k \leq \min(m, n)$, block size b , ρ (default 0.95), tolerance δ (default 0.01), method (MaxVol or QR)

Output: Indices $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{N}_+^k$ with non-repeating entries

```

1:  $j = 1$ 
2: while  $j \leq k$  do
3:    $U(:, j) = U(:, j) - U(:, 1 : j - 1) \cdot (U(\mathbf{s}(1 : j - 1), 1 : j - 1) \setminus U(\mathbf{s}(1 : j - 1), j))$            ( $U_0 = 0$ )
4:    $[\mathbf{u}, \text{ind}] = \text{sort}(|U(:, j)|)$                                (in descending order)
5:   if  $(j = k)$  or  $(u_2 < \rho u_1)$  then  $\mathbf{s}(j) = \text{ind}(1)$ ;  $j = j + 1$ 
6:   else
7:      $\text{cols} = j + b - 1$ 
8:      $U(:, j + 1 : \text{cols}) = U(:, j + 1 : \text{cols}) - U(:, 1 : j - 1) \cdot (U(\mathbf{s}(1 : j - 1), 1 : j - 1) \setminus U(\mathbf{s}(1 : j - 1), j + 1 : \text{cols}))$ 
9:     if  $\text{method} = \text{MaxVol}$ 
10:       $\mathbf{s}(j : \text{cols}) = \text{MaxVol}(U(:, j : \text{cols}), \delta)$ 
11:     else
12:      Perform a column-pivoted QR on  $U(:, j : \text{cols})^T$ 
13:       $\mathbf{s}(j : \text{cols}) = \Pi_{\mathbf{s}}(1 : b)$ 
14:     end if
15:      $j = j + b$ 
16:   end if
17: end while
18: Repeat the procedure on  $V$  to get indices  $\mathbf{p}$ 

```

3.4 Error Bounds

The following proposition restates a known theoretical error bound for a CUR approximation, which holds for the block DEIM algorithms proposed in this paper. A detailed constructive proof is in (Sorensen and Embree, 2016), but we provide the necessary details here for the reader's convenience. Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and $S \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ be matrices with some columns of the identity indexed by the indices selected by employing any of the three block DEIM algorithms.

Proposition 3.1 (Sorensen and Embree, 2016, Thm. 4.1) *Given $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a target rank k , let $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ be the leading k right and left singular vectors of A . Suppose $C = AP$ and $R = S^T A$ are of full rank, and $V^T P$ and $S^T U$ are nonsingular, then, with $M = C^+ A R^+$, a rank- k CUR decomposition constructed by either of the block DEIM*

schemes presented in this paper satisfies

$$\|A - CMR\| \leq (\eta_{\mathbf{s}} + \eta_{\mathbf{p}}) \sigma_{k+1} \quad \text{with} \quad \eta_{\mathbf{s}} < \sqrt{\frac{nk}{3}} 2^k, \quad \eta_{\mathbf{p}} < \sqrt{\frac{mk}{3}} 2^k,$$

where $\eta_{\mathbf{p}} = \|(V^T P)^{-1}\|$, $\eta_{\mathbf{s}} = \|(S^T U)^{-1}\|$.

Proof Let $\mathbb{P} = P(V^T P)^{-1}V^T$ and $\mathbb{S} = U(S^T U)^{-1}S^T$ be oblique projectors. Note that $V^T \mathbb{P} = V^T$ and $\mathbb{S}U = U$, implying that $V^T(I - \mathbb{P}) = 0$ and $(I - \mathbb{S})U = 0$. Using $M = C^+AR^+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|A - CMR\| &= \|A - CC^+AR^+R\| = \|(I - CC^+)A + CC^+A(I - R^+R)\| \\ &\leq \|(I - CC^+)A\| + \|CC^+\| \|A(I - R^+R)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Leveraging the fact that CC^+ is an orthogonal projector, $\|CC^+\| = 1$ and (Sorensen and Embree, 2016, Lemma 4.1 and 4.2)

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I - CC^+)A\| &\leq \|A(I - \mathbb{P})\| = \|A(I - VV^T)(I - \mathbb{P})\| \\ &\leq \|(V^T P)^{-1}\| \|A(I - VV^T)\|, \\ \|A(I - R^+R)\| &\leq \|(I - \mathbb{S})A\| = \|(I - \mathbb{S})(I - UU^T)A\| \\ &\leq \|(S^T U)^{-1}\| \|(I - UU^T)A\|, \end{aligned}$$

we have that

$$\|A - CMR\| \leq \|(V^T P)^{-1}\| \|A(I - VV^T)\| + \|(S^T U)^{-1}\| \|(I - UU^T)A\|.$$

Since U and V contain the leading k left and right singular vectors, respectively, $\|(I - UU^T)A\| = \|A(I - VV^T)\| = \sigma_{k+1}$. Hence

$$\|A - CMR\| \leq (\|(V^T P)^{-1}\| + \|(S^T U)^{-1}\|) \cdot \sigma_{k+1}. \quad \blacksquare$$

Proposition 3.1 suggests that the quality of an index selection method may be assessed using the error constants $\eta_{\mathbf{s}}$ and $\eta_{\mathbf{p}}$ Sorensen. Fig. 1 illustrates the difference in the values of $\eta_{\mathbf{s}} = \|(S^T U)^{-1}\|$ computed by DEIM, B-DEIM-RRQR, and B-DEIM-MaxVol using 50 randomly generated orthonormal matrices of size 10000×100 . In most cases, the block DEIM variants provide a smaller values of $\eta_{\mathbf{s}}$; this may be an indication that the indices picked by the block DEIM variants are better for approximating than those selected by the DEIM scheme. We also observe that the values of $\eta_{\mathbf{s}}$ become smaller as we increase the block sizes.

4. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we conduct several sets of illustrative experiments to show the effectiveness of the block DEIM variants, i.e., B-DEIM-MaxVol, B-DEIM-RRQR, and AdapBlock, proposed in this paper using synthetic and real data sets. We evaluate the algorithms by




Figure 1: Comparison of the value $\eta_s = \|(S^T U)^{-1}\|$ in DEIM, B-DEIM-RRQR, and B-DEIM-MaxVol with different block sizes using 50 random orthonormal matrices of size 10000×100 .

applying them to data analysis problems in several application domains: recommendation system analysis, text categorization and information retrieval analysis, stocks, and image compression. We use real-world sparse and dense data matrices with sizes ranging from mid to large scale, an overview is presented in Table 2 . We compare the performance of our algorithms for constructing a CUR approximation with three state-of-the-art deterministic algorithms: DEIM (Sorensen and Embree, 2016), Q-DEIM (Drmac and Gugercin, 2016), and MaxVol (Goreinov et al., 2010). All these algorithms require the leading k right and left singular vectors to construct a rank- k CUR factorization. We use these two evaluation criteria: the rank- k approximation relative error $\|A - CMR\| / \|A\|$; the computational efficiency, i.e., the runtime scaling for the rank parameter k . Here, the runtime measures the time it takes each algorithm to select the desired number of column and row indices. We do not consider the run time for computing the singular vectors since all the methods we consider require the SVD. Our experiments are not meant to be exhaustive; however, they provide clear evidence that the block DEIM schemes proposed in this paper may provide a better low-rank approximation and may be computationally more efficient.

In the implementation, we perform the column-pivoted QR factorization and the truncated SVD using the MATLAB built-in functions `qr` and `svds` (Baglama and Reichel, 2005), respectively (and `svd` for small cases). For the MaxVol algorithm, we use a MATLAB implementation by Kramer and Gorodetsky (2018) made available on GitHub². Unless otherwise stated, in all the experiments we use as default block size $b = 5$, the AdapBlock method parameter $\rho = 0.95$, and the MaxVol scheme convergence tolerance $\delta = 0.01$.

Table 2: Various examples and dimensions considered.

Exp.	Domain	Matrix	m	n
1	Recommendation system	Dense	14116	100
2	Text categorization	Sparse	8293	18933
3	Image compression	Sparse	10000	784
4	Stock prices	Dense	3165	440
5	Synthetic	Dense	2000	4000

Experiment 4.1 Our first data set is from the recommendation system analysis domain, where one is usually interested in making service or purchase recommendations to users. One of the most common techniques for recommendation systems is collaborative filtering, which involves recommending to users items that customers with similar preferences liked in the past.

The Jester data set is often used as a benchmark for recommendation system research (Goldberg et al., 2001). This data matrix consists of 73421 users and their ratings for 100 jokes. We only consider users who have ratings for all 100 jokes resulting in a 14116×100 matrix. We center the matrix by subtracting the mean of each column from all entries in that column.

From Fig. 2, we observe that the approximation qualities of the block DEIM methods are more accurate compared to the state-of-art methods. In comparison to the original DEIM scheme, both the B-DEIM-MaxVol and B-DEIM-RRQR algorithms enjoy considerable lower runtimes while their adaptive variants have similar runtimes to the DEIM procedure. In Fig. 2a, we notice that both the B-DEIM-MaxVol algorithm and its adaptive variant are more efficient than the standard MaxVol scheme. Here, by using the block DEIM variants, we gain in both accuracy and speed compared to the standard MaxVol procedure. From Fig. 2b, we see that the B-DEIM-RRQR method is just as efficient as the Q-DEIM procedure while providing a more accurate approximation.

Experiment 4.2 The second data set is from text categorization and information retrieval applications. In these data analysis problems, a “bag of words” is commonly used to represent the documents. We use the data set from the Reuters-21578 text categorization collection, which is a collection of documents that appeared on Reuters newswire in 1987. This data set has been heavily used as a benchmark in the text classification community. The corpus contains 21578 documents in 135 categories. We perform our experiment using the preprocessed data set containing 18933 unique terms and 8293 documents (Cai et al., 2005). We scale the rows of this 8293×18933 sparse matrix to have a unit length. This matrix is much larger than the one from the previous section, and is also less well-approximated

². github.com/bokramer/CURERA/blob/master/maxvol.m




Figure 2: Relative approximation errors (left) and runtimes (right) as a function of k for the block DEIM CUR approximation algorithms compared with some standard CUR approximation algorithms using the Jester data set.

by a low-rank matrix; the first 50 principal components explain less than 50% of the overall variance in the data set and less than 80% is captured by the top 500 principal components. (However, spectral methods are often applied to this data.) The matrix is very sparse, with approximately 0.25% nonzero elements.

For this data set, just as in the previous experiment we observe that the columns and rows sampled by the block DEIM variants lead to considerably smaller reconstruction errors than the existing methods. From Fig. 3a, it is evident that the standard MaxVol method yields better approximation accuracy than the block DEIM schemes when k is small but as k increases, the approximation quality becomes worse than the those of the block DEIM schemes. We also see that the error of the MaxVol and Q-DEIM approximations do not necessarily decrease monotonically as the rank k increases. The efficiency of the algorithms is similar to previous experiments; the adaptive variants have similar runtimes as the DEIM whilst the B-DEIM-MaxVol and B-DEIM-RRQR schemes are more speed efficient. Once

more, the MaxVol algorithm is the least efficient method. Fig. 3b illustrates better runtimes for the AdapBlock-RRQR algorithm as k gets larger.




Figure 3: Relative approximation errors (left) and runtimes (right) as a function of k for the block DEIM CUR approximation algorithms compared with some standard CUR approximation algorithms using the Reuters-21578 data set.

Experiment 4.3 For this experiment, we use the popular MNIST test set, which consists of 10000 images of handwritten digits from 0 to 9, each image of size 28×28 . The matrix is flattened and normalized, resulting in a 10000×784 sparse nonnegative matrix with entries in the interval $[0, 1]$.

From Fig. 4, we observe that the block DEIM algorithms produce slightly better approximation accuracy than the standard DEIM and MaxVol, and enjoy considerably lower approximation error than the Q-DEIM scheme. In terms of efficiency, compared with the classical DEIM and MaxVol, the block DEIM procedures have appreciable lower runtimes. The Q-DEIM demonstrates the lowest runtimes among all the algorithms but produces the worst approximation accuracy. The improved efficiency gained by using the block DEIM algorithms instead of the standard DEIM scheme is apparent as k increases.

Experiment 4.4 Our final data set is the historical stock prices for the S&P 500 index, one of world’s most famous financial benchmarks. This stock market index tracks the




Figure 4: Relative approximation errors (left) and runtimes (right) as a function of k for the block DEIM CUR approximation algorithms compared with some standard CUR approximation algorithms using the MNIST data set.

performance of 500 large companies listed on the stock exchanges in the United States. We collect historical adjusted closing prices for the 500 stocks of the index from Jan 4, 2010, to Jul 29, 2022, a total of 3165 days. The index includes multiple classes of stock of some constituent companies; as a result, there are than 500 stocks in the gauge. We construct a 3165×503 date-by-stock matrix, where the (i, j) th entry of this matrix represents the price of the j th stock on the i th date. We remove stocks with missing values resulting in a 3165×440 dense matrix, which we center by subtracting the mean of each column from its the entries. Numerically, the resulting matrix is quite low-rank; less than ten principal components capture 99% of the total variance in the data set.

Fig. 5 reveals that the block DEIM variants provide smaller approximation errors compared to Q-DEIM and the original DEIM schemes; with the latter producing the worst approximation quality. We also observe that, for this dataset, the standard MaxVol algorithm and its block variants yield similar approximation quality. Table 3 shows the stocks that achieved the least approximation error among all 7 methods for a rank-10 CUR approxi-

mation. Both the B-DEIM-RRQR and AdapBlock-RRQR schemes achieved this result with the same stocks but have slightly different rankings for the stocks. Note that four stocks from the Consumer Cyclical sector are picked; this seems to correspond to the fact that this sector is quite diverse, and its behavior may be representative of the S&P 500 index as a whole.




Figure 5: Relative approximation errors as a function of k for the block DEIM CUR approximation algorithms compared with some standard CUR approximation algorithms using the S&P 500 index stocks data set.

Table 3: The ten stocks that yield the least relative approximation error for $k = 10$. The first two columns are the rankings of the various stocks by the B-DEIM-RRQR and the AdapBlock-RRQR methods.

B-DEIM	AdapBlock	Symbol	Company	Sector
1	1	NVR	NVR, Inc.	Consumer Cyclical
2	2	BKNG	Booking, Inc.	Consumer Cyclical
3	4	AZO	AutoZone, Inc.	Consumer Cyclical
4	3	CMG	Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.	Consumer Cyclical
5	8	MKTX	MarketAxess, Inc.	Financial Services
6	5	REGN	Regeneron Pharma., Inc.	Healthcare
7	6	MTD	Mettler-Toledo Int. Inc.	Healthcare
8	7	NFLX	Netflix, Inc.	Communication Services
9	10	BIIB	Biogen Inc.	Healthcare
10	9	GE	General Electric Company	Industrials

Experiment 4.5 Following the experiments in (Voronin and Martinsson, 2017), our test matrix in this experiment is a full-rank data set $A \in \mathbb{R}^{2000 \times 4000}$ that has the structure of the SVD, i.e., $A = U\Sigma V^T$. The matrices U and V have random orthonormal columns obtained via a QR factorization of a random Gaussian matrix, and the diagonal matrix Σ has entries that are logspace ranging from 1 to 10^{-3} .

Using two of the block DEIM algorithms proposed: the B-DEIM-MaxVol and B-DEIM-RRQR, in Fig. 6, we investigate how varying block sizes, i.e., $b = (2, 5, 10, 20)$ may affect

their approximation quality and computational efficiency. For each fixed block size, maintaining the properties of A , we generate five different test cases and compute the averages of the evaluation criteria for the range of k values.

We observe that for increasing block sizes, both algorithms become considerably faster. On the other hand, the approximation quality of the varying block sizes may not degrade significantly. In this experiment, given the various values of k , the errors are almost similar irrespective of the block size.




Figure 6: Runtimes and average approximation errors for the B-DEIM-RRQR (up) and B-DEIM-MaxVol (down) CUR approximation algorithms as a function of k for varying block sizes using large matrices of size 2000×4000 .

5. Conclusions

This paper presents various block variants of the discrete empirical interpolation method for computing CUR decompositions. We exploit the advantages of the classical DEIM procedure, a column-pivoted QR decomposition, and the concept of maximum determinant or volume of submatrices to develop these block variants. We have then presented a version of the block DEIM, which allows for adaptive choice of block size.

We perform the following procedures in the block DEIM based on RRQR; at each iteration step, we compute a QR factorization with column pivoting on the transpose of a block of singular vectors to obtain the indices corresponding to the first b columns. Then,

we update the next block of vectors using the interpolatory projection technique in the DEIM algorithm (repeat these two steps until all indices are selected). A similar procedure is used in the block DEIM based on MaxVol; the difference here is, instead of using a column-pivoted QR decomposition, we use the MaxVol method.

Numerical experiments illustrate that the accuracy of a CUR factorization using the newly proposed block DEIM procedures may be better than the classical DEIM, MaxVol, and Q-DEIM schemes. The experiments also demonstrate that the block variants, regarding computational speed, may have an advantage over the standard DEIM and MaxVol algorithms. Relative to the Q-DEIM algorithm, the B-DEIM-RRQR scheme yields lesser approximation errors while maintaining comparable runtimes. Using the B-DEIM-RRQR and B-DEIM-MaxVol methods, we have also illustrated how increasing the block size improves the speed of the algorithms but may not necessarily degrade the approximation quality significantly. A schematic overview of some properties of the various methods is displayed in Table 1. A Matlab code of the proposed algorithms is available via github.com/perfectyayra.

References

- J. Baglama and L. Reichel. Augmented implicitly restarted Lanczos bidiagonalization methods. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 27(1):19–42, 2005.
- M. W. Berry, S. A. Pulatova, and G. W. Stewart. Algorithm 844: Computing sparse reduced-rank approximations to sparse matrices. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 31(2):252–269, 2005.
- D. Cai, X. He, and J. Han. Document clustering using locality preserving indexing. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 17(12):1624–1637, 2005.
- S. Chandrasekaran and I. C. F. Ipsen. On rank-revealing factorisations. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 15(2):592–622, 1994.
- S. Chaturantabut and D. C. Sorensen. Nonlinear model reduction via discrete empirical interpolation. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 32:2737–2764, 2010.
- Z. Drmac and S. Gugercin. A new selection operator for the discrete empirical interpolation method—Improved a priori error bound and extensions. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 38(2):A631–A648, 2016.
- K. Goldberg, T. Roeder, D. Gupta, and C. Perkins. Eigentaste: A constant time collaborative filtering algorithm. *Inform. Retrieval*, 4(2):133–151, 2001.
- G. Golub and C. F. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 4th edition, 2012.
- S. A. Goreinov, E. E. Tyrtyshnikov, and N. L. Zamarashkin. A theory of pseudoskeleton approximations. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 261(1-3):1–21, 1997.
- S. A. Goreinov, I. V. Oseledets, D. V. Savostyanov, E. E. Tyrtyshnikov, and N. L. Zamarashkin. How to find a good submatrix. In *Matrix Methods: Theory, Algorithms And Applications*, pages 247–256. World Scientific, Singapore, 2010.

- M. Gu and S. C. Eisenstat. Efficient algorithms for computing a strong rank-revealing QR factorization. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 17(4):848–869, 1996.
- A. Khabou, J. W. Demmel, L. Grigori, and M. Gu. LU factorization with panel rank revealing pivoting and its communication avoiding version. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 34(3):1401–1429, 2013.
- B. Kramer and A. A. Gorodetsky. System identification method via CUR factorization of Hankel matrix. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 40(2):A848–A866, 2018.
- M. W. Mahoney and P. Drineas. CUR matrix decompositions for improved data analysis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 106:697–702, 2009.
- I. Oseledets and E. Tyrtshnikov. TT-cross approximation for multidimensional arrays. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 432(1):70–88, 2010.
- D. C. Sorensen and M. Embree. A DEIM induced CUR factorization. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 33(3):A1454–A1482, 2016.
- G. W. Stewart. Four algorithms for the efficient computation of truncated pivoted QR approximations to a sparse matrix. *Numer. Math.*, 83:313–323, 1998.
- S. Voronin and P. G. Martinsson. Efficient algorithms for CUR and interpolative matrix decompositions. *Adv. Comput. Math*, 43:495–516, 2017.