

ON THE OPTIMAL RANK-1 APPROXIMATION OF MATRICES IN THE CHEBYSHEV NORM*

STANISLAV MOROZOV[†], MATVEY SMIRNOV^{†‡}, AND NIKOLAI ZAMARASHKIN^{†‡}

Abstract. The problem of low rank approximation is ubiquitous in science. Traditionally this problem is solved in unitary invariant norms such as Frobenius or spectral norm due to existence of efficient methods for building approximations. However, recent results reveal the potential of low rank approximations in Chebyshev norm, which naturally arises in many applications. In this paper we tackle the problem of building optimal rank-1 approximations in the Chebyshev norm. We investigate the properties of alternating minimization algorithm for building the low rank approximations and demonstrate how to use it to construct optimal rank-1 approximation. As a result we propose an algorithm that is capable of building optimal rank-1 approximations in Chebyshev norm for small matrices.

Key words. Chebyshev norm, low-rank matrix approximations, alternating minimization

MSC codes. 41A50, 65F30

1. Introduction. To date, the problem of low-rank approximation of matrices is a critical component in many areas of science, such as computational mathematics [1], computational fluid dynamics [5], recommender systems [3], machine learning [7], and others. This problem can be easily solved in unitary invariant norms for example via SVD or ALS algorithm. However, in many applications the elementwise approximations (i.e. in Chebyshev norm) are more appropriate.

Formally the problem of rank- r Chebyshev approximation is formulated as follows. Given matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and integer r , it is required to find $\widehat{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ and $\widehat{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ such that

$$\|A - \widehat{U}\widehat{V}^T\|_C = \inf_{U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}} \|A - UV^T\|_C,$$

where $\|X\|_C = \max_{i,j} |x_{ij}|$ is the Chebyshev norm.

In this paper we address the problem of rank-1 approximations in the Chebyshev norm. More precisely, we investigate into the *alternating minimization algorithm* and its structure. The algorithm can be briefly summarized as follows: fix arbitrary $v^{(0)}$ and generate sequences $v^{(n)}$ and $u^{(n)}$ such that

$$\|A - u^{(n)}(v^{(n-1)})^T\|_C = \min_u \|A - u(v^{(n-1)})^T\|_C,$$

$$\|A - u^{(n)}(v^{(n)})^T\|_C = \min_v \|A - u^{(n)}v^T\|_C$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We show that for almost all matrices A (in the sense of Lebesgue measure) it is possible to choose $u^{(n)}$ and $v^{(n)}$ in a canonical way, if all the components of $v^{(0)}$ are non-zero. Moreover, the limit of errors $\|A - u^{(1)}(v^{(0)})^T\|_C, \|A -$

*Submitted to the editors December 7, 2022.

Funding: This work was supported by the Moscow Center of Fundamental and Applied Mathematics at INM RAS (Agreement with the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation No.075-15-2022-286).

[†]Marchuk Institute of Numerical Mathematics of RAS, Moscow (stanis-morozov@yandex.ru, matsmir98@gmail.com, nikolai.zamarashkin@gmail.com).

[‡]Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow.

$u^{(1)}(v^{(1)})^T\|_C, \dots$ depends only on the signs of components of $v^{(0)}$. Finally, it is always possible to extract a converging subsequence from the sequences $u^{(n)}$ and $v^{(n)}$ and its limit gives one of the best rank-1 approximations for A from a relatively big set of pairs (u, v) . This observation allows to propose an algorithm that finds an *optimal* rank-1 approximation via finite number of alternating minimization algorithm runs for special starting points. By analyzing the signs of vectors $u^{(n)}$ and $v^{(n)}$ that are generated by alternating minimization algorithm, we propose an effectivization for an exhaustive search of optimal approximation.

We note, that in numerical experiments the sequences, generated by the alternating minimization algorithm, are always convergent. However, we are not able to prove (or disprove) this fact and, therefore, in this paper we often pass to convergent subsequences, instead of analyzing the initial sequences. Also it is noteworthy that similar structures can be observed in behaviour of the same algorithm for rank- r approximations. For now we are not able to provide a satisfactory analysis in the general case ($r > 1$).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review the results concerning Chebyshev approximations known in the literature. In Section 3, we present several facts concerning correctness of the alternating minimization method and properties of its limit points. In Section 4, we prove the main results concerning the properties of the alternating minimization method for the problem of constructing Chebyshev approximations. In Section 5, we describe a numerical method that makes it possible to find optimal Chebyshev approximations of rank 1 and present the results of numerical experiments. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Related work. As far as we know, the problem of constructing and analyzing low-rank approximations of matrices in the Chebyshev norm has been little studied.

One of the important properties of the Chebyshev norm is that, in a sense, in that norm any matrix can be approximated by a matrix of low rank. More precisely, the following theorem is proved in [6].

THEOREM 2.1. *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, where $m \geq n$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then, with*

$$r = \lceil 72 \log(2n + 1) / \varepsilon^2 \rceil$$

we have

$$\inf_{\text{rank } Y \leq r} \|X - Y\|_C \leq \varepsilon \|X\|_2.$$

The theorem states that with a fixed accuracy of the approximation ε and a bounded spectral norm of the matrix $\|X\|_2$, the rank required to obtain the accuracy ε in the Chebyshev norm increases logarithmically with the growth of the matrix size. The difference between the low-rank approximations in the Frobenius and Chebyshev norms can be seen on the example of the identity matrix. An identity matrix of size $n \times n$ can be approximated with rank $n - 1$ with accuracy not less than 1 in the Frobenius norm. At the same time, with the fixed accuracy ε , the rank required to obtain the Chebyshev ε -approximation grows logarithmically with the size of the matrix. So, for example, it is guaranteed that identity matrix of size 10^{100} can be approximated with an accuracy $\varepsilon = 0.01$ by a matrix of rank $r \approx 1.6 \times 10^8$.

In [6] the authors propose a constructive method for proving Theorem 2.1, however, it requires the construction of singular value decomposition of the matrix, which prevents the method from being applied to large matrices. At the same time, the

large constant in Theorem 2.1 does not give reasonable estimates for small matrices. In [8], an algorithm is proposed that is capable of constructing more efficient approximations. The authors propose a generalization of the Remez algorithm, which allows to find the optimal solution to the problem

$$\|A - UV^T\|_C \rightarrow \min_{U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}}, \quad A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}.$$

Then the authors applied alternating minimization method, that is, alternately computed $\arg \min_{U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}} \|A - UV^T\|_C$ and $\arg \min_{V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}} \|A - UV^T\|_C$.

In [2], it is also proposed to use the alternating minimization method for solving the problem of Chebyshev approximations, but only for approximations of rank 1. At the same time, the structure of the alternating minimization method in application to this problem is deeply analyzed. Among the main results proved in [2], the following can be highlighted. A necessary and sufficient condition is proved for a pair of vectors (u, v) to be a local minimum

$$(2.1) \quad \|A - uv^T\|_C \rightarrow \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^m, v \in \mathbb{R}^n}.$$

In addition, it is always possible to select a convergent subsequence from the sequence of vectors generated by the alternating minimization method, and any convergent subsequence converges to a local minimum of the problem (2.1). In this paper, we essentially rely on the theoretical results obtained in [2], but unlike [2], we pose ourselves the problem of finding a *global* minimum of (2.1) and develop the corresponding theory.

3. Preliminaries. We are going to solve the problem (2.1) with the alternating minimization method. That is, we begin from a vector $v^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and alternately solve the minimization problems with respect to u and v separately. Thus, we construct a pair of sequences

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} u^{(i)} &= \arg \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^m} \|A - u(v^{(i)})^T\|_C, \\ v^{(i+1)} &= \arg \min_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|A - u^{(i)}v^T\|_C. \end{aligned}$$

These problems do not always have a unique solution, so the correctness of the procedure needs to be discussed. It can be easily seen that the problem (3.1) can be split into the set of independent problems of the form

$$(3.2) \quad \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \|a - uv\|_\infty.$$

It can be shown that the problem (3.2) has a unique solution provided all the components of vector v are nonzero [8]. Such vectors are also called Chebyshev vectors.

DEFINITION 3.1. *A vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called Chebyshev if all of its components are non-zero.*

In [8] the authors propose an algorithm that can build the solution of the problem (3.1) in a polynomial number of operations if v is the Chebyshev vector. Thus, for the optimization procedure to be correct, it is sufficient that all vectors have all components nonzero. Here and further we denote columns of matrices by subscripts and rows by superscripts. For example, j -th column of matrix A is denoted with a_j and i -th row is denoted with a^i . We prove the following

THEOREM 3.2. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and let $\theta : \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ satisfy the inequality $|a_{i\theta(i)}| \geq |a_{ij}|$ for all i and j . Denote

$$\phi_i = |a_{i\theta(i)}| - \max_{j \neq \theta(i)} |a_{ij}|$$

Consider the problem

$$(3.3) \quad \|A - uv^T\|_C \rightarrow \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^m},$$

where v is Chebyshev. Let u be the solution of (3.3), which is optimal for every row of A (note that (3.3) can be split to independent problems for each row). Then the following inequalities hold

$$\frac{\phi_i}{2\|v\|_\infty} \leq |u_i| \leq \frac{2\|A\|_C}{\|v\|_\infty}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m$$

Proof. Let us fix the row index i and consider the problem

$$(3.4) \quad \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \|a^i - uv\|_\infty.$$

It can be shown [8] that if $u_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is the optimal solution for the problem (3.4), then the residual $a^i - u_i v$ archives its maximum absolute values at least in two positions. Hence

$$\max_{j \neq \theta(i)} |a_{ij} - u_i v_j| \geq |a_{i\theta(i)} - u_i v_{\theta(i)}|.$$

Also we have

$$\max_{j \neq \theta(i)} |a_{ij} - u_i v_j| \leq \max_{j \neq \theta(i)} |a_{ij}| + |u_i| \max_j |v_j|$$

$$|a_{i\theta(i)} - u_i v_{\theta(i)}| \geq |a_{i\theta(i)}| - |u_i| |v_{\theta(i)}|,$$

whence

$$\max_{j \neq \theta(i)} |a_{ij}| + |u_i| \max_j |v_j| \geq |a_{i\theta(i)}| - |u_i| |v_{\theta(i)}|.$$

Then

$$|u_i| (\max_j |v_j| + |v_{\theta(i)}|) \geq |a_{i\theta(i)}| - \max_{j \neq \theta(i)} |a_{ij}| = \phi_i$$

$$|u_i| \geq \frac{\phi_i}{(\max_j |v_j| + |v_{\theta(i)}|)} \geq \frac{\phi_i}{2\|v\|_\infty}.$$

To prove the second inequality note that

$$\|A - uv^T\|_C \leq \|A\|_C$$

$$\|A - uv^T\|_C \geq \|uv^T\|_C - \|A\|_C,$$

whence

$$\|uv^T\|_C - \|A\|_C \leq \|A\|_C$$

$$\|u\|_\infty \|v\|_\infty \leq 2\|A\|_C$$

$$\|u\|_\infty \leq \frac{2\|A\|_C}{\|v\|_\infty},$$

which completes the proof. \square

The proved theorem motivates the following

DEFINITION 3.3. *A vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called alternance-free if there is only one number $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $|u_i| = \|u\|_\infty$.*

Theorem 3.2 implies that, if in the matrix A all rows and columns are alternance-free and $v^{(0)}$ is Chebyshev, then the procedure of alternating minimization is defined correctly, that is all the components of vectors $u^{(i)}$ and $v^{(i)}$ are nonzero. In addition, it follows that, under some normalization of the vectors $u^{(i)}$ and $v^{(i)}$, the sequence generated by the alternating minimization method turns out to be bounded, and therefore we can extract a convergent subsequence from it.

In [2], it is proved that if the sequence $(u^{(\alpha_k)}, v^{(\alpha_k)})$ converges, then it converges to a local minimum of the functional (2.1), and the limit provides the best value of (2.1) in a quite large domain. In order to formulate the result, we need the following

DEFINITION 3.4. *Let $\mu = \|A - uv^T\|_C$ and $T = \{(i, j) : |a_{ij} - u_i v_j| = \mu\}$. We say that a point (u, v) , where $u_i, v_j \neq 0$ for the matrix A , has a two-dimensional alternance if there exists a set of $2k$ ($k \geq 2$) points*

$$(i_1, j_1), (i_1, j_2), (i_2, j_2), \dots, (i_k, j_k), (i_k, j_1) \in T$$

such that

$$\tau_{i_1 j_1} = -\tau_{i_1 j_2} = \tau_{i_2 j_2} = \dots = \tau_{i_k j_k} = -\tau_{i_k j_1},$$

where

$$\tau_{ij} = \text{sign}((a_{ij} - u_i v_j)u_i v_j).$$

In [2, Section 1] it is proved that if (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) (with all components nonzero) has a two-dimensional alternance for the matrix A , then (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) is a local minimum. Moreover, denote the positions of the alternance

$$(i_1, j_1), (i_1, j_2), (i_2, j_2), \dots, (i_k, j_k), (i_k, j_1),$$

then if $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is such that

$$\text{sign}(u_i) = \text{sign}(\hat{u}_i), \quad i \in \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\},$$

then $\|A - uv^T\|_C \geq \|A - \hat{u}\hat{v}^T\|_C$ for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Similarly, if $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is such that

$$\text{sign}(v_j) = \text{sign}(\hat{v}_j), \quad j \in \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}$$

then $\|A - uv^T\|_C \geq \|A - \widehat{u}\widehat{v}^T\|_C$ for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Also in [2, Section 3], as a part of the argument, it is proved that if in the sequence $(u^{(k)}, v^{(k)})$ all vectors are Chebyshev, and also $u^{(\alpha_k)}$ and $v^{(\alpha_k)}$ are convergent subsequences converging to \widehat{u} and \widehat{v} respectively (where $\widehat{u}_i, \widehat{v}_j \neq 0$ for any i and j), then $(\widehat{u}, \widehat{v})$ provides a two-dimensional alternance for A . Summarizing the results we obtain the following

THEOREM 3.5. (Daugavet). *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let in the sequence $(u^{(k)}, v^{(k)})$ all vectors are Chebyshev. Let also $u^{(\alpha_k)}$ and $v^{(\alpha_k)}$ be subsequences converging to Chebyshev vectors \widehat{u} and \widehat{v} respectively. Then $(\widehat{u}, \widehat{v})$ is a local minimum of the functional $\|A - uv^T\|_C$.*

Moreover, in this case the matrix $A - \widehat{u}\widehat{v}^T$ has a two-dimensional alternance. Denote the positions of the alternance

$$(i_1, j_1), (i_1, j_2), (i_2, j_2), \dots, (i_k, j_k), (i_k, j_1),$$

then if $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is such that

$$\text{sign}(u_i) = \text{sign}(\widehat{u}_i), \quad i \in \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\},$$

then $\|A - uv^T\|_C \geq \|A - \widehat{u}\widehat{v}^T\|_C$ for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Similarly, if $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is such that

$$\text{sign}(v_j) = \text{sign}(\widehat{v}_j), \quad j \in \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}$$

then $\|A - uv^T\|_C \geq \|A - \widehat{u}\widehat{v}^T\|_C$ for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

It is worth noting that the results presented are formulated for a convergent subsequence. As for the ALS [4], the alternating minimization algorithm converges in all our numerical experiments, but the proof remains an open question.

4. Main results. It immediately follows from Theorem 3.5 that if we have two starting points $v_0^{(1)}$ and $v_0^{(2)}$ such that the alternating minimization initialized from them converges to the pairs $(\widehat{u}^{(1)}, \widehat{v}^{(1)})$ and $(\widehat{u}^{(2)}, \widehat{v}^{(2)})$ respectively, and the signs of the components of $\widehat{v}^{(1)}$ and $\widehat{v}^{(2)}$ coincide, then

$$\|A - \widehat{u}^{(1)}(\widehat{v}^{(1)})^T\|_C = \|A - \widehat{u}^{(2)}(\widehat{v}^{(2)})^T\|_C.$$

Our next goal is to prove that this is also true if the signs of $v_0^{(1)}$ and $v_0^{(2)}$ coincide.

Let us denote the set of all Chebyshev vectors of the size m by $\text{Ch}_m \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ and introduce the mapping

$$\mathcal{M} : \text{Ch}_m \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m$$

as follows

$$\mathcal{M} : [u_1 \quad u_2 \quad \dots \quad u_m] \mapsto [\text{sign}(u_1) \quad \text{sign}(u_2) \quad \dots \quad \text{sign}(u_m)].$$

Similarly, we introduce a similar mapping for vectors of size n :

$$\mathcal{N} : [v_1 \quad v_2 \quad \dots \quad v_n] \mapsto [\text{sign}(v_1) \quad \text{sign}(v_2) \quad \dots \quad \text{sign}(v_n)].$$

Let $a, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Denote by $\phi(a, v)$ the function

$$(4.1) \quad \phi(a, v) = \arg \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \|a - uv\|_\infty.$$

Note that if the vector v is Chebyshev, then the solution of the problem (4.1) is unique and the function $\phi(a, v)$ is defined uniquely. Then we denote by $\phi(A, v)$ a vector function such that

$$\phi(A, v)_i = \phi(a^i, v).$$

Note that $\phi(A, v)$ is one of the solutions to the problem

$$\|A - uv^T\|_C \rightarrow \min_u,$$

although the solution of the last problem is not unique, and the function $\phi(A, v)$ is uniquely defined for the Chebyshev vectors v . Similarly, we define the function $\psi(A, u)$, which constructs the optimal vector v from the matrix A and the Chebyshev vector u .

DEFINITION 4.1. *We say that the matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ preserves Chebyshev systems if for any Chebyshev vectors $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ vectors $\phi(A, v)$ and $\psi(A, u)$ are also Chebyshev vectors.*

LEMMA 4.2. *A matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ preserves Chebyshev systems if and only if all rows and columns of A are alternance-free.*

Proof. Indeed, the if part is contained in Theorem 3.2. Now assume that A preserves Chebyshev systems. It is clear, that all rows and columns of A are non-zero. Assume that there are i and $j \neq k$ such that $\|a^i\|_\infty = |a_{ij}| = |a_{ik}|$. Then for a Chebyshev vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\|v\|_\infty = 1$, $|v_j| = |v_k| = 1$, $a_{ij}v_j < 0$ and $a_{ik}v_k > 0$ we observe that $\phi(a^i, v) = 0$. This contradiction shows that in all rows of A the maximum absolute value cannot be reached twice. The same, obviously, holds for the columns of A . \square

COROLLARY 4.3. *The set of all matrices that preserve Chebyshev systems is open and dense in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. The complement of this set is Lebesgue-null.*

Let us prove the following

THEOREM 4.4. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ preserve Chebyshev systems and the Chebyshev vectors $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are such that $\mathcal{M}(u_1) = \mathcal{M}(u_2)$. Then*

$$\mathcal{N}(\psi(A, u_1)) = \mathcal{N}(\psi(A, u_2))$$

Similarly, if the Chebyshev vectors $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are such that $\mathcal{N}(v_1) = \mathcal{N}(v_2)$. Then

$$\mathcal{M}(\phi(A, v_1)) = \mathcal{M}(\phi(A, v_2))$$

Proof. Let $O = \{u \in \text{Ch}_m : \mathcal{M}(u) = \mathcal{M}(u_1)\}$. It is clear that O is convex and, therefore, connected. The function $s(u) = \mathcal{N}(\psi(A, u))$ is continuous on Ch_m , for $\psi(A, u)$ is continuous with respect to u and \mathcal{N} is locally constant (and, hence, continuous). Since the range of s is discrete, it follows that s is constant on O . Thus, $s(u_1) = s(u_2)$, as $u_1, u_2 \in O$. \square

From now on we assume that A preserves Chebyshev systems. Thus, the signs of the vector components at each next step of the alternating minimization method depend only on the signs of the vector at the previous step. Then, if we have two

starting points $v_0^{(1)}$ and $v_0^{(2)}$ such that the alternating minimization initialized from them converges to the pairs $(\widehat{u}^{(1)}, \widehat{v}^{(1)})$ and $(\widehat{u}^{(2)}, \widehat{v}^{(2)})$ respectively, and the signs of the components of $v_0^{(1)}$ and $v_0^{(2)}$ coincide, then

$$\|A - \widehat{u}^{(1)}(\widehat{v}^{(1)})^T\|_C = \|A - \widehat{u}^{(2)}(\widehat{v}^{(2)})^T\|_C.$$

It worth noting that in our numerical experiments the similar structures arise also for ranks larger than 1, however, for now we do not understand them fully and leave the detailed analysis for further work.

This implies a method for constructing an optimal approximation of rank 1. It suffices to enumerate 2^{n-1} initial points with values ± 1 (the first component can always be chosen equal to 1).

However, in fact, we can do better than exhaustive search. To do this, we study how the signs of the vector behave when applying the method of alternating minimization.

Take an arbitrary vector $p \in \{-1, 1\}^m$. Consider an arbitrary Chebyshev vector u such that $\mathcal{M}(u) = p$ and introduce the mapping \mathcal{S} as

$$\mathcal{S}(p) = \mathcal{N}(\psi(A, u)).$$

The just proved theorem guarantees the correctness of the mapping.

Similarly, take an arbitrary $p \in \{-1, 1\}^n$. Consider an arbitrary Chebyshev vector v such that $\mathcal{N}(v) = p$ and introduce the mapping \mathcal{T} as

$$\mathcal{T}(p) = \mathcal{M}(\phi(A, v)).$$

In addition, we introduce the mappings \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} given by

$$\mathcal{U}(p) = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}(p)),$$

$$\mathcal{V}(p) = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}(p)).$$

The mapping \mathcal{V} specifies how the signs change at the step $\psi(A, \phi(A, v))$ of the alternating minimization method. That is, the mapping $\mathcal{V} : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^n$ determines the signs of the vector $v^{(k+1)}$ from the signs of the vector $v^{(k)}$.

The mapping \mathcal{V} can be thought of as the sign transition graph $G_{\mathcal{V}}$. The vertices of this graph are all elements of $\{-1, 1\}^n$, and there is an edge from t_1 to t_2 if and only if $\mathcal{V}(t_1) = t_2$. Let us show that the graph $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ is a set of isomorphic trees, and the roots of the trees are the vertices t for which $\mathcal{V}(t) = t$.

Denote by $j(k)$ the position of the maximum absolute value element in the k -th row of the matrix A , so

$$j(k) = \arg \max_j |a_{kj}|.$$

Recall that in the matrix A the maximum absolute value element in any row and in any column is not reached twice. Similarly, we denote by $i(l)$ the position of the maximum absolute value element in the l -th column of the matrix A :

$$i(l) = \arg \max_i |a_{il}|.$$

Note that, due to the assumption on the matrix A , we have $|a_{k,j(k)}| > 0$. Since the vector $u^{(t+1)}$ equals to $\phi(A, v^{(t)})$, it follows that $\|a^i - u_i^{(t+1)}v^{(t)}\|_\infty < \|a^i\|_\infty$, so

$$|a_{k,j(k)} - u_k^{(t+1)}v_{j(k)}^{(t)}| \leq |a_{k,j(k)}|.$$

But this is only possible if

$$\text{sign } a_{k,j(k)} = \text{sign } u_k^{(t+1)}v_{j(k)}^{(t)},$$

whence

$$\text{sign } u_k^{(t+1)} = \text{sign } a_{k,j(k)} \text{sign } v_{j(k)}^{(t)}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\text{sign } v_l^{(t+1)} = \text{sign } a_{i(l),l} \text{sign } u_{i(l)}^{(t+1)}.$$

Then from the last two equalities we get

$$(4.2) \quad \text{sign } v_l^{(t+1)} = \text{sign } a_{i(l),l} \cdot \text{sign } a_{i(l),j(i(l))} \cdot \text{sign } v_{j(i(l))}^{(t)}.$$

The equality (4.2) defines the signs of the vector $v^{(t+1)}$ by the signs of the vector $v^{(t)}$, that is, it determines the mapping \mathcal{V} . Let us introduce the sign dependency graph G^{st} . The vertices of the graph are numbers from 1 to n , and there are edges $j(i(l)) \rightarrow l$.

We consider $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ and G^{st} as *directed* graphs. Also the word *acyclic* below means that a graph does not contain directed cycles apart from loops. A vertex t of a graph G such that there is a loop $t \rightarrow t$ we shall call *loop vertex*. Finally, by the *depth* of a graph G we denote the maximal possible number p such that there exists a sequence of distinct vertices t_1, \dots, t_p such that there is an edge from t_k to t_{k+1} for all $k = 1, \dots, p-1$.

LEMMA 4.5. *The graph G^{st} fulfills the following properties:*

- (i) *For each vertex there is exactly one edge that is pointing to it.*
- (ii) *There is always at least one loop in the graph. The components of the vector v corresponding to loop vertices do not change during iterations of the alternating minimization method.*
- (iii) *The graph G^{st} is acyclic.*
- (iv) *All vertices of the graph G^{st} are reachable from loop vertices (that is, for arbitrary vertex l of G^{st} there is a sequence l_1, \dots, l_k such that $l_k = l$, l_1 is a loop vertex, and there is an edge from l_s to l_{s+1} for all $s = 1, \dots, k-1$).*
- (v) *Consider the following process for the matrix A . Take a column, find the maximum element in it, find the maximum element in the corresponding row, then again the maximum element in the corresponding column, and so on. The maximal possible number of distinct columns in a foregoing process is equal to the depth of the graph G^{st} .*

Proof. Statement (i) trivially follows from the definition of G^{st} . To prove (ii) note, that a vertex l is a loop vertex iff $j(i(l)) = l$. Thus, loop vertices are exactly the numbers of columns of the matrix A for which the maximum absolute value element is also the maximum absolute value element in its row. It is easy to see such an element in the matrix always exists, so the graph G^{st} contains at least one loop. In addition,

the components of the vector v corresponding to such columns do not change during iterations of the alternating minimization method, since in this case the equality (4.2) becomes

$$\text{sign } v_l^{(t+1)} = \text{sign } v_l^{(t)}.$$

Now we prove (iii). It is clear that $\|a_l\|_\infty \leq \|a^{i(l)}\|_\infty$ and $\|a^k\|_\infty \leq \|a_{j(k)}\|_\infty$, whence $\|a_l\|_\infty \leq \|a_{j(i(l))}\|_\infty$. Moreover, due to the assumptions on the matrix A , if $j(i(l)) \neq l$, then

$$\|a_l\|_\infty < \|a_{j(i(l))}\|_\infty.$$

Thus, a directed cycle in G^{st} has to be a loop.

Finally, (iv) easily follows from (i) and (iii), and (v) is clear in view of the proof of the statement (iii). \square

LEMMA 4.6. *The graph $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ satisfies the following properties.*

- (i) *For each vertex in $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ there is exactly one edge that is pointing out of it.*
- (ii) *Each sequence of vertices t_1, t_2, \dots , such that there is an edge $t_n \rightarrow t_{n+1}$ for all n , stabilizes.*
- (iii) *$G_{\mathcal{V}}$ is acyclic and its depth does not exceed the depth of G^{st} .*

Proof. Statement (i) is an immediate consequence of the definition of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$. To prove (ii) consider $v \in \text{Ch}_n$ such that $\mathcal{N}(v) = t_1$. Let $v^{(k)}$ be the sequence generated by the alternating minimization algorithm with a starting point v . i.e. $v^{(1)} = v$ and $v^{(k+1)} = \psi(A, \phi(A, v^{(k)}))$. Observe that $\mathcal{N}(v^{(k)}) = t_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The equation (4.2) implies that $\mathcal{N}(v^{(k+1)})$ depends only on the components of the vector $\mathcal{N}(v^{(k)})$ on the set $\{j(i(l)) : l = 1, \dots, n\}$. Thus, it easily follows that $t_p = t_{p+1} = \dots$, where p denotes the depth of G^{st} . Indeed, vector $\mathcal{N}(v^{(k+p-1)})$ depends only on the components of $\mathcal{N}(v^{(k)})$ on the set $F = \{(j \circ i)^{p-1}(l) : l = 1, \dots, n\}$, which contains exactly loop vertices of G^{st} by Lemma 4.5 (v). Observe that Lemma 4.5 (ii) implies that the components of vectors $\mathcal{N}(v^{(k)})$ on F do not depend on k , implying that $t_k = t_p$ for all $k \geq p$. Hence, the proof of (ii) is complete, and it is also evident that the depth of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ does not exceed p . The acyclicity of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ easily follows from (i) and (ii). \square

Lemma 4.6 implies that for each vertex $t \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ there is a unique sequence t_1, t_2, \dots such that $t = t_1$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an edge $t_k \rightarrow t_{k+1}$. Since this sequence stabilizes, it is possible to define $f(t)$ as the vector which is equal to t_k for arbitrary big k . By definition, for all t there is a path in $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ from t to $f(t)$, and $f(t)$ is a loop vertex.

LEMMA 4.7. *The following statements hold.*

- (i) *A pair of vertices t_1 and t_2 in $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ belong to the same connected component if and only if $f(t_1) = f(t_2)$.*
- (ii) *If t_1 and t_2 are loop vertices in $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $(t_1)_l = (t_2)_l$ for all loop vertices l in G^{st} , then $t_1 = t_2$.*

Proof. To prove (i) assume that $f(t_1) = f(t_2)$. Then t_1 and t_2 belong to the same connected component, since both t_1 and t_2 can be connected with $f(t_1) = f(t_2)$ with a path. The converse easily follows from the following observation: if there is an edge $t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ or $t_2 \rightarrow t_1$, then $f(t_1) = f(t_2)$.

Now let t_1 and t_2 satisfy the assumptions of (ii). Let $F_k \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ denote the set of vertices l of G^{st} such that there is a directed path from a loop vertex

to l which length does not exceed k . So, F_0 contains exactly all loop vertices of G^{st} . Lemma 4.5 (iv) implies that $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} F_k = \{1, \dots, n\}$. By the assumption we have $(t_1)_l = (t_2)_l$ for all $l \in F_0$. We finish the proof by showing that the equality $(t_1)_l = (t_2)_l$ for all $l \in F_k$ implies $(t_1)_l = (t_2)_l$ for all $l \in F_{k+1}$. Indeed, if $l \in F_{k+1}$, then by definition there exists $s \in F_k$ such that $j(i(l)) = s$. Since t_1 is a loop vertex, (4.2) implies that $(t_1)_l = q(t_1)_s$, where $q = \text{sign } a_{i(l),l} \cdot \text{sign } a_{i(l),s}$. By the same reason, $(t_2)_l = q(t_2)_s$. Finally, since $s \in F_k$, we have $(t_1)_s = (t_2)_s$ and, consequently, $(t_1)_l = (t_2)_l$. \square

Before proceeding to the concluding theorem on the structure of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ we define one auxiliary function $d : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^n$ by the equality $d(t)_i = t_i / f(t)_i$. That is, $d(t)_i$ is equal to 1 if t_i coincides with $f(t)_i$ and -1 otherwise. Note that we do not interpret the value $d(t)$ as a vertex of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$.


THEOREM 4.8. *Let the matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ preserve Chebyshev systems. Denote by F the set of all numbers $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that the maximum absolute value element in the column a_l is also the maximum absolute value element in its row. Let $|F| = k$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (i) *A pair of vertices $t_1, t_2 \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ belong to the same connected component if and only if $(t_1)_l = (t_2)_l$ for all $l \in F$.*
- (ii) *Each connected component of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ has 2^{n-k} elements (so there are exactly 2^k components in $G_{\mathcal{V}}$). Also each connected component is a tree and contains exactly one loop vertex.*
- (iii) *All components of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ are isomorphic. More precisely, let C_1 and C_2 be a pair of connected components. Then for arbitrary vertex t_1 of C_1 there is exactly one vertex t_2 of C_2 such that $d(t_2) = d(t_1)$. The mapping g , that maps vertices of C_1 into vertices of C_2 and satisfies $d(g(t)) = d(t)$ for all vertices t of C_1 , is well-defined and is an isomorphism from C_1 to C_2 .*
- (iv) *The depth of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ is equal to the depth of arbitrary connected component of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ and is also equal to the depth of G^{st} (which was computed in the statement (v) of Lemma 4.5).*

Proof. In view of Lemma 4.7, (i) is equivalent to the following statement: $f(t_1) = f(t_2)$ iff $(t_1)_l = (t_2)_l$ for all $l \in F$. Assume that $f(t_1) = f(t_2)$. Lemma 4.5 (ii) implies that $(t_1)_l = f(t_1)_l$ and $(t_2)_l = f(t_2)_l$ for all $l \in F$, since F is exactly the set of all loop vertices in G^{st} . Thus, $(t_1)_l = (t_2)_l$ for all $l \in F$. Now assume that $(t_1)_l = (t_2)_l$ for all $l \in F$. By the same argument as above, we have $f(t_1)_l = (t_1)_l = (t_2)_l = f(t_2)_l$ for all $l \in F$. Thus, Lemma 4.7 (ii) implies that $f(t_1) = f(t_2)$, as $f(t_1)$ and $f(t_2)$ are loop vertices.

The number of elements in a connected component is equal to the number of mappings from $\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus F$ to $\{-1, 1\}$, that is to the number 2^{n-k} . Also, Lemma 4.6 (i) and (iii) imply that all components of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ are trees. Finally, it is easy to see that each component indeed contains at least one loop vertex (take arbitrary vertex t and observe that $f(t)$ is a loop vertex that belongs to the same component). Thus, if t_1 and t_2 are loop vertices that belong to the same component, then $t_1 = f(t_1) = f(t_2) = t_2$. Hence, (ii) is proved.

Before proving (iii) note that the range of d is contained in the set $D = \{t \in \{-1, 1\}^n : t_l = 1 \ \forall l \in F\}$, which has exactly 2^{n-k} elements. By definition it is also clear that d is injective on each connected component of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$, which has the same number of elements. Thus, d maps each component bijectively onto D . Hence, if C_1 and C_2 are connected components of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$, then there exists a unique mapping g that maps vertices of C_1 into vertices of C_2 and satisfies $d(g(t)) = d(t)$ for all vertices

Fig. 1: Examples of graphs $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ for random matrices.

t of C_1 . It is also clear that g is bijective. Thus, it remains to show that g is a graph isomorphism, i.e. if there is an edge from t_1 to t_2 , then there is an edge from $g(t_1)$ to $g(t_2)$ (note that the converse is not necessary to prove, since C_1 and C_2 are interchangeable). Observe, that (4.2) implies that $d(\mathcal{V}(t_1)) = d(\mathcal{V}(t_2))$ when $d(t_1) = d(t_2)$. Indeed, $f(\mathcal{V}(t_1)) = f(t_1)$ and, by (4.2), we have $d(\mathcal{V}(t_1))_l = q_l d(t_1)_{j(i(l))}$, where $q_l = \text{sign } a_{i(l),l} \cdot \text{sign } a_{i(l),j(i(l))}$. The equality $d(\mathcal{V}(t_1)) = d(\mathcal{V}(t_2))$ for t_1 and t_2 such that $d(t_1) = d(t_2)$ is now evident, since q_l depends only on the matrix A . Finally, assume that there is an edge from t_1 to t_2 , where t_1 and t_2 are vertices in C_1 . Then $\mathcal{V}(t_1) = t_2$ and, therefore, $d(\mathcal{V}(g(t_1))) = d(\mathcal{V}(t_1)) = d(t_2) = d(g(t_2))$. Thus, $\mathcal{V}(g(t_1)) = g(t_2)$, so $g(t_1)$ and $g(t_2)$ are connected with an edge.

Since all components of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ have the same depth, it remains to prove that the depth of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ is equal to the depth of G^{st} . Let p denote the depth of G^{st} . In the statement (iii) of Lemma 4.6 it is already proved that the depth of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ does not exceed p . Let l_1, \dots, l_p be distinct elements of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $j(i(l_k)) = l_{k-1}$ for all $k = 2, \dots, p$. That is, l_1, \dots, l_p is one of the longest possible paths in G^{st} (in this case l_1 is a loop vertex). Let $q_k = \text{sign } a_{i(l_k),l_k} \cdot \text{sign } a_{i(l_k),l_{k-1}}$ for $k = 2, \dots, p$. And consider arbitrary $t \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ such that

$$t_{l_k} = - \prod_{s=k+1}^p q_s, \quad k = 2, \dots, p.$$

Then, since for arbitrary $t' \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ and $k = 2, \dots, p$ we have $d(\mathcal{V}(t'))_{l_k} = q_k d(t')_{l_{k-1}}$, it follows that $d(\mathcal{V}^k(t))_{l_p} = -1$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, p-2$. Therefore, $\mathcal{V}^k(t)$ is not a loop vertex for $k = 0, 1, \dots, p-2$ (because the function d maps loop vertices to a vector with all components equal to 1) and acyclicity of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ implies that $t, \mathcal{V}(t), \dots, \mathcal{V}^{p-1}(t)$ are distinct. Thus, the depth of $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ is greater or equal then p . \square

Examples of graphs $G_{\mathcal{V}}$ are shown in Figure 1.

5. Numerical results. The constructed theory makes it possible to propose an algorithm for finding optimal rank-1 approximations in the Chebyshev norm. Indeed, to do this, it suffices to run the method of alternating minimization from all root vertices of the graph $G_{\mathcal{V}}$. However, actually it is even redundant. Indeed, let the method of alternating minimization be started from a vector $v^{(0)}$ and for the constructed limit point the alternance is formed on the columns s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k . Then it does not make

sense to run the method of alternating minimization from vectors whose signs coincide with $v^{(0)}$ at positions s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k (see Theorem 3.5). Then the following algorithm can be proposed to construct the optimal Chebyshev approximation.

1. Find the set of positions in the matrix such that the element in this position is the maximum absolute value in its row and its column. Denote this set T . All components from the set T are independent and uniquely determine the signs of all root vertices of the graph $G_{\mathcal{V}}$.
2. Define a disjunctive normal form $B = 0$.
3. We sequentially recursively generate all possible signs of the components from the set B . Suppose we have generated signs for the first l components from the set T . We substitute the signs in the disjunctive normal form B (we associate the sign -1 with 0). If it is identical to 1, then this means that vectors with such components cannot give a better solution than has already been constructed. In this case, we terminate this search branch. If the DNF is not identical to 1, then we continue the generation by choosing the sign at the $l + 1$ -st position.
4. If signs were generated for all components from the set T , then we run the method of alternating minimization from the constructed point. Let the method be started from the vector v and the alternance is reached in positions s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k . Then we add a new conjunction to DNF B :

$$B = B \vee x_{s_1}^{v_{s_1}} x_{s_2}^{v_{s_2}} \dots x_{s_k}^{v_{s_k}},$$

where

$$x^t = \begin{cases} x, & t = 1 \\ \bar{x}, & t = -1 \end{cases}$$

5. The enumeration ends when all signs have been considered or $B = 1$.




Fig. 2: The average running time of the algorithm depending on the size of the matrix. The matrices are random from a normal distribution, all results are averaged over 200 runs.

It is worth noting that the problem of checking a DNF for equality 1 is an NP-complete problem, so we use only trivial simplifications for checking in our implementation. Thus, we are not always able to understand that the DNF is the identity 1, even if it is.




Fig. 3: The average number of runs of alternating minimization depending on the size of the matrix. The matrices are random from a normal distribution, all results are averaged over 200 runs.

We have implemented the described algorithm in C++. Matrices in all experiments are chosen randomly from the normal distribution. Fig. 1 shows the average running time for matrices of various sizes. Fig. 2 shows the number of runs of the alternating minimization method required to build the optimal approximation. It is worth noting that the number of runs grows linearly with the size of the problem, and the running time of the alternating minimization method is negligible compared to the total running time. Thus, a more efficient organization of the combinatorial optimization process could give significantly better results, but we leave this for further work.

6. Conclusion. In the paper we proved that the result of the alternating minimization method depends only on the signs of the components of the starting point, and studied how the signs of the approximation vectors change when the alternating minimization method applied. As a result, a method is constructed that is capable of constructing optimal Chebyshev approximations of rank 1 for small matrices.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. BEBENDORF, *A means to efficiently solve elliptic boundary value problems*, Hierarchical Matrices. LNCS, 63 (2008), pp. 49–98.
- [2] V. DAUGAVET, *Uniform approximation of a function of two variables, tabulated as the product of functions of a single variable*, USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, 11 (1971), pp. 1–16.
- [3] X. HE, H. ZHANG, M.-Y. KAN, AND T.-S. CHUA, *Fast matrix factorization for online recommendation with implicit feedback*, in Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, 2016, pp. 549–558.
- [4] M. J. MOHLENKAMP, *Musings on multilinear fitting*, Linear Algebra and its Applications, 438 (2013), pp. 834–852.
- [5] S. W. SON, Z. CHEN, W. HENDRIX, A. AGRAWAL, W.-K. LIAO, AND A. CHOUDHARY, *Data compression for the exascale computing era-survey*, Supercomputing frontiers and innovations, 1 (2014), pp. 76–88.
- [6] M. UDELL AND A. TOWNSEND, *Why are big data matrices approximately low rank?*, SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science, 1 (2019), pp. 144–160.
- [7] C. YANG, Y. AKIMOTO, D. KIM, AND M. UDELL, *Oboe: Collaborative filtering for auttml initialization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.03233, (2018).
- [8] N. ZAMARASHKIN, S. MOROZOV, AND E. TYRTYSHNIKOV, *On the best approximation algorithm*

by low-rank matrices in chebyshev's norm, Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, 62 (2022), pp. 701–718.