

Greedy Pruning with Group Lasso Provably Generalizes for Matrix Sensing and Neural Networks with Quadratic Activations

Nived Rajaraman* Devvrit† Aryan Mokhtari‡ Kannan Ramchandran§

March 22, 2023

Abstract

Pruning schemes have been widely used in practice to reduce the complexity of trained models with a massive number of parameters. Several practical studies have shown that pruning an overparameterized model and fine-tuning generalizes well to new samples. Although the above pipeline, which we refer to as pruning + fine-tuning, has been extremely successful in lowering the complexity of trained models, there is very little known about the theory behind this success. In this paper we address this issue by investigating the pruning + fine-tuning framework on the overparameterized matrix sensing problem, with the ground truth denoted $U_* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and the overparameterized model $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ with $k \gg r$. We study the approximate local minima of the empirical mean square error, augmented with a smooth version of a group Lasso regularizer, $\sum_{i=1}^k \|Ue_i\|_2$ and show that pruning the low ℓ_2 -norm columns results in a solution U_{prune} which has the minimum number of columns r , yet is close to the ground truth in training loss. Initializing the subsequent fine-tuning phase from U_{prune} , the resulting solution converges linearly to a generalization error of $O(\sqrt{rd/n})$ ignoring lower order terms, which is statistically optimal. While our analysis provides insights into the role of regularization in pruning, we also show that running gradient descent in the absence of regularization results in models which are not suitable for greedy pruning, i.e., many columns could have their ℓ_2 norm comparable to that of the maximum. Lastly, we extend our results for the training and pruning of two-layer neural networks with quadratic activation functions. Our results provide the first rigorous insights on why greedy pruning + fine-tuning leads to smaller models which also generalize well.

*Dept. of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, UC Berkeley, nived.rajaraman@eecs.berkeley.edu

†Dept. of Computer Science, UT Austin, devvrit.03@gmail.com

‡Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering, UT Austin, mokhtari@austin.utexas.edu

§Dept. of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, UC Berkeley, kannanr@eecs.berkeley.edu

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Outline	4
2	Problem definition	4
2.1	Related work	6
3	Implicit regularization does not lead to greedy pruning-friendly models	6
4	Explicit regularization for pruning-friendly models: population analysis	8
5	Finite sample analysis	11
5.1	Fine-tuning phase: The benefit of pruning	12
6	Implementing Algorithm 1: Smoothness and optimization oracles	14
7	2-layer neural networks with quadratic activation functions	15
8	Conclusion	15
A	Failure of implicit regularization in pruning: Proof of Theorem 1	22
A.1	Proof outline of Lemma 1	23
A.2	Understanding the gradient flow: Proof of Lemma 1	23
A.3	Behavior at initialization: many columns are “active”	33
A.4	Putting it all together: Proof of Theorem 1	34
B	Population analysis of the regularized loss: Proof of Theorem 2	34
B.1	Proof outline of Theorem 2	35
B.2	Proof of Theorem 2	45
B.3	Missing proofs in Appendix B	45
B.3.1	Proof of Lemma 15	45
B.3.2	Proof of Lemma 17	47
B.3.3	Proof of Lemma 20	47
C	Finite sample guarantees: Proof of Theorem 3	49
D	Efficiently finding approximate second order stationary points	54
D.1	Proof of Theorem 5	55
D.2	Proof of Theorem 6	57
E	Gradient and Hessian computations	58
E.1	Population mean square error	58
E.2	Empirical mean square error	59
E.3	Regularization \mathcal{R}_β	59

1 Introduction

Training overparameterized models with a massive number of parameters has become the norm in almost all machine learning applications. While these large models are successful in achieving low training error and often good generalization performance, due to their massive sizes, they are hard to store, communicate or infer on. Moreover, inference with such large models is computationally prohibitive which limits their application.

To address these issues, a large effort has gone into compressing these overparameterized models via different approaches, such as quantization schemes [Kri18, Guo18], unstructured [HPTD15] and structured [HKD+18, LGGT19, KRS+20] pruning mechanisms, and distillation techniques using student-teacher models [HVD15, PPA18]. Among these approaches, *greedy pruning*, in which we greedily eliminate the parameters of the trained model based on some measure of their size (e.g., the norms of the weight vectors associated with individual neurons) has received widespread attention [HMD15, HPTD15, LKD+17, LL16, WWW+16a, YGN+20]. In addition to learning compressed models, in practice, pruning and fine-tuning overparameterized models can also result in better generalization performance compared to models trained without any pruning [BMBE20].

Greedy pruning pipeline. The greedy pruning framework follows a 3 step approach for training models:

- (a) Train an overparameterized model on the empirical loss (usually with some added regularization to promote sparsity).
- (b) Greedily prune the “small” weights/neurons based on some measure of their size/importance.
- (c) Fine-tune the resulting pruned model for a few iterations using gradient descent on the empirical loss.

While the greedy pruning framework has shown impressive results, there is little to no theory backing why this pipeline works so well in practice. At a finer level, a phenomenon that has been observed in several practical studies, is that different forms of regularization while training the overparameterized model, such as ℓ_0 or ℓ_1 regularization [LWK17, LLS+17, YLLW18] or ℓ_2 regularization (group Lasso) [SCHU17] lead to models that are better suited for pruning, and lead to better generalization post fine-tuning. The role of regularization in helping generate models which are suitable for greedy pruning is also poorly understood. In this work, the main questions we ask are the following:

Does the greedy pruning pipeline provably lead to a simple model with good generalization guarantees? What is the role of regularization in pruning?

In this paper, we study the greedy pruning framework through the lens of the symmetric matrix sensing problem [LMZ18a]. In addition to being an interesting model on its own, when the underlying measurement matrices are rank 1, it is known that symmetric matrix sensing with a factored model captures 1-hidden layer neural networks with quadratic activation functions [DL18, LMZ18a].

With i.i.d. Gaussian measurements, in the population setting, the expected square loss of the model is $\mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U) = \|UU^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F^2$, where $U_* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ is an unknown ground-truth rank- r matrix, with r also being unknown, and $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ is the overparameterized learning model with $k \gg r$. In drawing the connection to 1-hidden layer neural networks with quadratic activation functions, under rank 1 measurements, the columns of U correspond to the weight vectors associated with

individual neurons. Thus, the data generating model has r neurons, while the learner trains an overparameterized model with k neurons. More discussion is provided in Section 7.

While the statistical and computational complexity of the overparameterized matrix sensing problem has been studied extensively, we use it to study the performance of greedy pruning. In particular, we aim to answer the following questions: Does there exist a simple pruning criteria for which we can *provably* show that the pruned model generalizes well after fine-tuning *while having the minimal necessary number of parameters*? Furthermore, what is the role of regularization during training in promoting models which are compatible with greedy pruning?

Our main contribution is to show that an appropriately instantiated greedy pruning pipeline not only recovers the correct ground-truth $U_\star U_\star^T$ approximately, but also learns solutions with the minimum number of columns, r , and automatically adapt to the sparsity of the ground truth model. In particular, we show that training an overparameterized model U on the empirical mean squared error with an added regularizer to promote column sparsity, followed by a simple norm-based pruning strategy learns a model U_{prune} which has exactly the minimum number of columns, r . In addition, the pruned solution satisfies the property that $\|U_{\text{prune}} U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2$ is small, but non-zero. The pruned model is subsequently fine-tuned using a small number of gradient steps, and in this regime, $\|U_t U_t^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2$ shows linear convergence to a statistical error floor. The generalization bounds achieved by the terminal fine-tuned solution are also shown to be statistically minimax optimal, scaling as $O(\sqrt{rd/n})$ when n is sufficiently large.

The regularizer we use in the initial training phase is based on the L_2 group Lasso [YL06] and is a special case of the popular Structured Sparsity Learning (SSL) regularizer [WWW⁺16b]. A priori, however, it is unclear whether an explicit regularizer to promote column sparsity is even necessary in order to learn models suitable for greedy pruning. In particular, it is known that gradient descent starting from a small initialization, also known as implicit regularization, suffices to learn models which generalize well for matrix sensing [LMZ18a, YD21a]. We show a negative result that this approach in fact learns a solution with a large number of columns having ℓ_2 -norms comparable to that of the maximum, even if $r = 1$. It is therefore unclear how to prune such models based on the norms of their columns. Moreover, in the absence of any pruning at all, the best known generalization bound for vanilla gradient descent is known to scale as $O(\sqrt{kd/n})$, which degrades with the degree of overparameterization, which is also observed empirically Figure 2.

1.1 Outline

In Section 2, we first introduce the problem formulation and discuss related work. Subsequently, in Section 3, we show a negative result - the model obtained by minimizing the *unregularized* mean square error using gradient descent updates could fail to learn a solution which is suitable for greedy pruning. In Section 4, we study the second-order stationary points of the mean square error with an added group Lasso based regularizer (eq. (3)) in the population setting. In Section 5, we extend this analysis to the finite sample setting under the presence of RIP measurements. In Section 6 we discuss implementing algorithms for finding second-order stationary points of the regularized loss, required in the initial training phase of the learner. Finally in Section 7 we provide a discussion on extensions to neural networks with quadratic activation functions. In Section 8 we conclude the paper and discuss some open questions.

2 Problem definition

In the matrix sensing framework, given n observation matrices $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$, the learner is provided measurements $y_i = \langle A_i, U_\star U_\star^T \rangle + \varepsilon_i$ where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ indicates the trace inner product and ε_i is mea-

surement noise assumed to be distributed i.i.d. $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ ¹. Here $U_\star \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ is the unknown parameter, and the rank $r \leq d$ is unknown. To normalize the scale, we assume that $\|U_\star\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$. Furthermore, let $\{\sigma_i^\star\}_{i \in [r]}$ be the non-zero singular values of U_\star and $\kappa = \sigma_1^\star / \sigma_r^\star$ be its condition number. Informally, the goal of the matrix sensing problem is to learn a candidate matrix X such that $X \approx U_\star U_\star^T$. In this paper, we study the setting where X is explicitly factored as UU^T for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ in the presence of overparameterization, where $k \gg r$. The empirical mean square error is,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{emp}}(U) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\langle A_i, UU^T \rangle - y_i)^2 \quad (1)$$

For the case that A_i 's are sampled entry-wise i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and as $n \rightarrow \infty$, up to additive constants which we ignore, the population mean square error can be written down as,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U) = \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2. \quad (2)$$

The objective of the learner is to recover a solution U which generalizes well, in that $\mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U)$ is minimized, and at the same time, U has approximately the minimum number of non-zero columns to be able to achieve this, r .

There is an extensive literature on how to efficiently learn the right product $U_\star U_\star^T$ in both finite sample and population settings [KO09, PKCS17]. In particular, there are several works on the efficiency of gradient-based methods with or without regularization for minimizing the population loss [LMZ18a, ZKHC21]. While these approaches are guaranteed to approximately learn the correct product, $UU^T \approx U_\star U_\star^T$, in the overparameterized setting, the obtained solutions are not column sparse, i.e. having the number of non-zero columns being $\approx r$, up to constant or polylogarithmic factors. As a result, to recover a solution with the correct column sparsity from the obtained solution denoted $U_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$, one has to do a principle component analysis (PCA), an operation which is costly and impractical in high-dimensional settings.

Algorithmic framework. In this paper, we instantiate the greedy pruning framework in the following manner. In the initial phase, the training loss we consider is the empirical risk augmented with a group Lasso based regularizer [YL06, SCHU17],

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{emp}}(U) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(U), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{R}(U) = \sum_{i=1}^k \|Ue_i\|_2, \quad (3)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a regularization parameter. The particular choice of the regularizer \mathcal{R} is a special case of a widely used approach commonly known as *Structured Sparsity Learning* (SSL) [WWW⁺16a] used while pruning neural networks. This regularizer promotes sparsity across ‘‘groups’’ as discussed by [YL06]. Here, the groups correspond to the columns of U . Formally, we study a smooth variant of the loss in eq. (3).

After training the overparameterized model, the columns below a certain ℓ_2 -norm threshold are removed, resulting in a model with fewer columns, denoted U_{prune} . We show that when the hyperparameters are chosen appropriately, the pruned model U_{prune} is not only reasonably close to the ground-truth model U_\star in terms of population loss, but also has exactly r columns. Subsequently, fine-tuning this model by running a few gradient updates on the mean square error, it can be ensured that the iterates $U_t U_t^T$ converges to $U_\star U_\star^T$ at a linear rate. Algorithm 1 summarizes the framework that we study.

¹All proofs in the paper go through as long as the noise is i.i.d. sub-Gaussian with variance proxy σ^2 . We study the Gaussian case for simplicity of exposition.

2.1 Related work

Matrix sensing. A number of algorithms have been proposed in the literature for solving matrix sensing and related problems such as matrix factorization and matrix completion. For unfactored models, the most popular algorithms are variants of nuclear norm regularization [RFP10, HZY+12]. For factored models, the non-convex loss is often minimized by alternating minimization (ADMM) [JNS13, HW14, SL16], or gradient based methods [CW15, LMZ18b, MLC21, YD21b, JLL+23]. The use of regularization for matrix sensing and related problems has been well-studied in the literature. Regularization may serve many purposes - to encourage low rankness in the solution [CCS10, JMD10, KMO10, MGC11, Rec11, RFP10, TY10], to control the norm of the model and improve the landscape of the loss by eliminating spurious local minima [GLM16, BNS16, GJZ17, PKCS17]. While these approaches implicitly or explicitly regularize for the rank of the learned matrix, the solution learned as a result is often not column sparse. Indeed, note that a matrix can be low rank and dense at the same time, if many columns are linear combinations of the others.


Greedy Pruning. In the literature, various criteria have been proposed for greedy pruning. Magnitude-based approaches prune away the small weights/neurons based on some measure of their size, such as the ℓ_1/ℓ_2 norm of the associated vectors [LLS+17, LKD+17], average gradient norms [YLC+18, LAT18], or (approximations to) the change in the training loss after removing the weight/neuron [LDS89, HSW93]. Across a variety of domains, it has been shown that pruning and fine-tuning overparameterized models generalize far better than small but dense models with the same memory footprint [ZG17]. These approaches have been used across diverse architectures as well, including Convolutional Neural Networks [LKD+17, HZS17] and Transformer models [WWL20, VTM+19].

3 Implicit regularization does not lead to greedy pruning-friendly models

In various overparameterized learning problems, it has been shown that first-order methods, starting from a small initialization, implicitly biases the model toward “simple” solutions, resulting in models that generalize well [NTS14, SHN+18], a phenomenon known as implicit regularization. In particular, for the matrix sensing problem, [GWB+17, LMZ18b, YD21a] show that in the absence of any regularization, running gradient descent on the population loss *starting from a small initialization* biases UU^T to low rank solutions, and learns the correct outer product $UU^T \approx U_*U_*^T$. However, as discussed earlier, low-rank solutions are not necessarily column sparse, nor is it clear how to sparsify them without computing a PCA. It is a-priori unclear whether implicit regularization suffices to learn models that are also amenable for greedy pruning.

In this section, we address this question and show that minimizing the unregularized population loss \mathcal{L}_{pop} leads to models which are not suitable for greedy pruning, i.e., have many columns with large ℓ_2 norm. Specifically, we show that by running gradient flow from a small random initialization, even if the ground truth U_* is just a single column and $r = 1$, the learnt solution U has a large number of columns that are “active”, i.e. having ℓ_2 -norm comparable to that of the column with maximum norm. Thus, in the absence of the knowledge of r , it is unclear how to determine it from just observing the columns ℓ_2 norm. We thus claim that such trained models are not compatible with greedy pruning. The formal result is stated below.

Theorem 1. *Consider the population loss in eq. (2), for $r = 1$ and $k \gg 1$. Moreover, assume that the entries of the initial model U_0 are i.i.d. samples from $\mathcal{N}(0, \alpha^2)$, where $\alpha \leq c_1/k^3 d \log(kd)$ for*



(a) For $x \in [0, 1]$ along the horizontal axis, the vertical axis represents the fraction of columns having ℓ_2 norm at least x times the largest ℓ_2 norm across columns.

(b) A histogram of the ℓ_2 norms of columns.

Figure 1: Comparison of the sparsity of models trained with and without regularization. We run gradient updates to minimize the unregularized loss in eq. (1) (blue) and group Lasso regularized loss in eq. (3) (orange) until convergence in the population setting. In this figure, $d = k = 500$ and $r = 4$, resulting in a highly overparameterized learner. Using regularization leads to solutions with most of the columns having small ℓ_2 norm, and only a few significant columns. Without regularization, a large number of columns have their ℓ_2 norm comparable to the largest column norm.

some absolute constant $c_1 > 0$. For another absolute constant $c'_1 > 0$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the iterates of gradient flow converge to a model U_{gd} where $\tilde{\Omega}(k^{c'_1})$ active columns which satisfy,

$$\frac{\|U_{gd}e_i\|_2}{\max_{j \in [k]} \|U_{gd}e_j\|_2} \geq 0.99, \quad (4)$$

with probability $\geq 1 - O(1/k^{c'_1})$.

Note that the constant 0.99 in the result of Theorem 1 is arbitrary and can be extended to any constant on the RHS bounded away from 1 for appropriately small choices of c_1 and c'_1 , and a similar guarantee can be established when in the LHS of eq. (4), the ℓ_2 norm is replaced by the ℓ_p norm for any $p \geq 1$. We provide the general guarantee in Theorem 7 (Appendix A). It is worth noting that from [LMZ18a] that the learned model $U_{gd} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ is guaranteed to achieve a small generalization error, i.e., $U_{gd}U_{gd}^T \approx U_*U_*^T$. Hence, the algorithm does learn the correct ground-truth product; what we show is that the learnt model cannot be sparsified to the correct level by pruning away all the columns below any constant threshold on their ℓ_2 norm. Indeed, this is also observed in Figure 1: the model trained with implicit regularization has many significant columns and it is unclear how many to prune. Training on the empirical loss augmented by the group Lasso regularizer (eq. (3)) results in a much sparser solution.

Proof sketch of Theorem 1. Without loss of generality we assume in the proof that $\|U_*\|_2 = 1$. Defining $U(t)$ as the iterate at time t , gradient flow on \mathcal{L}_{pop} follows the below dynamic,

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = -\nabla \mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U) = -(UU^T - U_*U_*^T)U, \quad (5)$$

where for ease of notation we drop the explicit dependence on t in $U(t)$. In the proof of this result, we exactly characterize the limiting point of gradient flow as a function of the initialization in a

certain sense, which may be of independent interest. In particular, up to a small multiplicative error dependent on the size of the initialization,

$$\forall i \in [k], \|U_{\text{gd}}e_i\|_2 \approx \frac{|\langle U_\star, U(0)e_i \rangle|}{\|U_\star^T U(0)\|_2}. \quad (6)$$

Up to a normalization factor, the RHS is the correlation of U_\star with the i^{th} column of the gradient descent iterate at initialization. By the Gaussian initialization, $\langle U_\star, U(0)e_i \rangle$ is independent and identically distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, \alpha^2)$ across different values of $i \in [k]$. Since the random variables are i.i.d. across i , we expect no single $\langle U_\star, U(0)e_i \rangle$ to be larger than the others. In particular, we show that for some absolute constant $c'_1 > 0$, $m = \tilde{\Omega}(k^{c'_1})$ columns $i \in [k]$ will have correlations comparable to the maximum, with $|\langle U_\star, U(0)e_i \rangle| \geq 0.99 \cdot \max_{j \in [k]} |\langle U_\star, U(0)e_j \rangle|$. For any of these columns, $i \in [k]$,

$$\|U_{\text{gd}}e_i\|_2 \approx \frac{|\langle U_\star, U(0)e_i \rangle|}{\|U_\star^T U(0)\|_2} \geq 0.99 \max_{j \in [k]} \frac{|\langle U_\star, U(0)e_j \rangle|}{\|U_\star^T U(0)\|_2} \approx 0.99 \max_{j \in [k]} \|U_{\text{gd}}e_j\|_2. \quad (7)$$

This shows that $m \gg 1$ columns of U_{gd} have ℓ_2 norms comparable with the maximum, resulting in the statement of Theorem 1.

To understand why eq. (6) is true, it is informative to look at the gradient flow equation in more detail. Define $r(t) = (U(t))^T U_\star$, which captures the ‘‘signal component’’, the alignment of the columns of $U(t)$ with the correct subspace U_\star , and $E(t) = (I - U_\star U_\star^T)U(t)$ as the orthogonal (error) component. From eq. (5), $r(t)$ and $E(t)$, abbreviated to r and E can be shown to evolve per the following differential equations,

$$\frac{dr}{dt} = r(1 - \|r\|_2^2) - E^T E r. \quad (8) \quad \frac{d\|E\|_F^2}{dt} \leq 0 \quad (9)$$

With a small initialization, by eq. (9), the error term $\|E(t)\| \leq \|E(0)\|_F \approx 0$ remains small throughout training. This means that $\|U(t)e_i\|_2 \approx |\langle r(t), e_i \rangle|$ and therefore it suffices to study the trajectory of $|\langle r(t), e_i \rangle|$ as a function of t . Since $\|E\|_F$ is small, by eq. (8), $\frac{dr}{dt} \approx r(1 - \|r\|_2^2)$, which shows linear convergence of r until the point when $\|r\|_2$ approaches very close to 1. Therefore,

$$\langle r(t), e_i \rangle \approx \langle r(0), e_i \rangle e^t \quad (10)$$

until some time T_0 when $\|r(t)\|_2$ gets sufficiently close to 1. This time T_0 can be shown to be approximately $-\log \|r(0)\|_2$. Plugging into eq. (10) results in the bound,

$$\|U(T_0)e_i\|_2 \approx \langle r(T_0), e_i \rangle \approx \langle r(0), e_i \rangle e^{T_0} \approx \frac{\langle r(0), e_i \rangle}{\|r(0)\|_2}. \quad (11)$$

After this time T_0 , it can be shown that gradient flow does not change $\|U(t)e_i\|_2$ significantly. ■

The conclusion of this section is that greedy pruning is not compatible with models trained with implicit regularization. In the next section, we discuss positive results, showing that greedy pruning can be shown to work with the right regularization strategy in the training phase.

4 Explicit regularization for pruning-friendly models: population analysis

In this section, we study the properties of the square error augmented with group Lasso regularization in the population (infinite sample) setting. We show that SOSPs of the regularized loss are

suitable for greedy pruning, while at the same time achieving a small but non-zero generalization error.

Note that the ℓ_2 norm is a non-smooth function at the origin, and therefore, the overall regularized loss is non-smooth and non-convex. While there are several notions of approximate stationary points for non-differentiable and non-convex functions, for technical convenience, we replace \mathcal{R} by a smooth proxy. In particular, for a smoothing parameter $\beta > 0$, define a smooth version of the ℓ_2 norm, and the corresponding smooth regularizer \mathcal{R}_β as,

$$\mathcal{R}_\beta(U) = \sum_{i=1}^k L_2^\beta(Ue_i), \quad \text{where} \quad L_2^\beta(v) = \frac{\|v\|_2^2}{\sqrt{\|v\|_2^2 + \beta}}. \quad (12)$$

Note that the smaller the value of β is, the closer is $L_2^\beta(v)$ to $\|v\|_2$. Considering this definition, the overall regularized loss we study in the population setting is

$$f_{\text{pop}}(U) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U) + \lambda \mathcal{R}_\beta(U), \quad (13)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}} = \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2$ as defined in eq. (2).

The above optimization problem is nonconvex due to the structure of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U)$, and finding its global minimizer is computationally prohibitive. Fortunately, for our theoretical results, we do not require achieving global optimality and we only require an approximate second-order stationary point of the loss in eq. (13), which is defined below.

Definition 1. U is an (ϵ, γ) -approximate second-order stationary point (SOSP) of f if,

1. The gradient norm is bounded above by ϵ , i.e., $\|\nabla f(U)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$.
2. The eigenvalues of the Hessian are larger than $-\gamma$, i.e., $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(U)) \geq -\gamma$.

The full algorithmic procedure that we analyze in this section is summarized in Algorithm 1. Once we find a (ϵ, γ) -approximate second-order stationary point U of f_{pop} (eq. (13)) with appropriately chosen ϵ and γ , we apply greedy pruning on the obtained model U by eliminating all of its columns with norm less than a specific threshold as mentioned in Step 3 of Algorithm 1. As a result, the pruned model U_{prune} has fewer than k columns. In fact, in our following theoretical results, we show that if the parameters are properly selected U_{prune} can be shown to have exactly r columns, which is the same as U_\star . Finally, we fine-tune the pruned solution by running gradient descent on the loss function without any added regularization. Note that Algorithm 1 requires a subroutine which finds an SOSP U of f_{pop} which is also bounded. We discuss this point in more detail later in Section 6, but in summary, a number of perturbed first-order methods can be used to instantiate this subroutine.

Next, we state the properties of the pruned model generated by Algorithm 1, in the population case.

Theorem 2. Consider the population loss with regularization in eq. (13), where U_\star has rank r and its smallest singular value is denoted by σ_r^\star . Let U_{prune} be the output of the pruning phase in Algorithm 1 with parameters $\beta, \lambda, \epsilon, \gamma$ satisfying $\beta \leq c_\beta (\sigma_r^\star)^2 / k$, $\lambda \leq c (\sigma_r^\star)^2 \sqrt{\beta/k}$, $\gamma \leq c_\gamma \lambda / r^2$ and $\epsilon \leq c \min\{(\sigma_r^\star)^3 / k^{1/4}, \sigma_r^\star / k^{3/2}, \sqrt{\beta^{1/2} \lambda / k r^2}, \lambda / r^2\}$ for absolute constants $c_\beta, c_\lambda, c_\epsilon, c_\gamma$. Then,

1. U_{prune} has exactly r columns.
2. $\|U_{\text{prune}} U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \leq \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_r^\star)^2$.

Algorithm 1 Greedy pruning based on group-Lasso regularization

Inputs: Measurements $\{(A_i, y_i) \text{ where } y_i = \langle A_i, U_\star U_\star^T \rangle + \varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$ (in the population setting $n = \infty$)

Initialization: Set parameters $\lambda, \beta, \epsilon, \gamma$

Greedy pruning phase:

- 1: Find an (ϵ, γ) -approximate SOSP of f_{emp} (resp. f_{pop}) satisfying $\|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3$.
- 2: Let $S = \{i \in [k] : \|\widehat{U}e_i\|_2 \leq \max\{2\sqrt{\beta}, \epsilon k\}\}$ denote the set of columns with small ℓ_2 norm.
- 3: Delete column i of U for $i \notin S$. Let the resulting solution be denoted U_{prune} .

Fine-tuning phase:

- 1: Run a few iterations of gradient descent on \mathcal{L}_{emp} (resp. \mathcal{L}_{pop}) initialized at U_{prune} to get U_{out} (gradient descent parameters provided in Theorem 4)

Return U_{out} .

This result implies that all bounded SOSPs of the regularized loss in eq. (13) are suitable for greedy pruning: removing the columns of U below a certain ℓ_2 -norm threshold results in a solution U_{prune} having exactly r columns, while at the same time having a reasonably small (but non-zero) generalization error. Hence, it serves as a warm-start for the fine-tuning phase.

Proof sketch of Theorem 2. The key idea in the proof relies on the following fact: consider a matrix \widehat{U} such that $\widehat{U}\widehat{U}^T = U_\star U_\star^T$, and the columns of \widehat{U} are orthogonal to one another. Then \widehat{U} has exactly r non-zero columns. This statement can be shown to hold even when $\widehat{U}\widehat{U}^T \approx U_\star U_\star^T$ and the columns of \widehat{U} are only approximately orthogonal.

The main observation we prove is that a bounded (ϵ, γ) -approximate SOSP of eq. (13) denoted U , satisfies the following condition:

$$\forall i, j : \|Ue_i\|_2, \|Ue_j\|_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}, \quad \frac{\langle Ue_i, Ue_j \rangle}{\|Ue_i\|_2 \|Ue_j\|_2} \approx 0. \quad (14)$$

In other words, all the large columns of U have their pairwise angle approximately 90° . This is an even stronger condition than orthogonality when the columns of U are bounded in norm, which is guaranteed by the boundedness condition $\|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3$ on U . Thus, by pruning away the columns of U that have an ℓ_2 norm less than $2\sqrt{\beta}$, the remaining columns of U , i.e., the columns of U_{prune} , are now approximately at 90° angles to one another. If β is chosen sufficiently small, even after deleting the low-norm columns, the approximation $U_{\text{prune}} U_{\text{prune}}^T \approx UU^T$. Moreover, noting that U itself was an approximate SOSP to begin with, if λ is sufficiently small, we can establish that $UU^T \approx U_\star U_\star^T$. Together, these facts imply that $U_{\text{prune}} U_{\text{prune}}^T \approx U_\star U_\star^T$ and at the same time, the columns of U_{prune} are approximately orthogonal to one another. Together, these facts imply that U_{prune} has exactly r columns.

In order to establish a bound on the generalization error, we simply use the triangle inequality that $\|U_{\text{prune}} U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \leq \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F + \|UU^T - U_{\text{prune}} U_{\text{prune}}^T\|_F$. The first term on the RHS is small by virtue of the fact that U is an approximate SOSP and since λ is small; the second term on the LHS is small by the fact that only the small norm columns of U were pruned away.

Now the only missing part that remains to justify is why eq. (14) holds and why the \mathcal{R}_β regularizer promotes orthogonality in the columns of approximate SOSPs. This is best understood by looking at the regularized loss for the case $\beta = 0$, which is equivalent to $\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2 + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^k \|Ue_i\|_2$. Consider any candidate first-order stationary point U and any variable \tilde{U} satisfying the constraint $\tilde{U}\tilde{U}^T = UU^T$. Note that $\tilde{U} = U$ must also be a first-order stationary point of the

constrained optimization problem,

$$\text{Minimize: } \|\tilde{U}\tilde{U}^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F^2 + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^k \|\tilde{U}e_i\|_2, \quad \text{Subject to: } \tilde{U}\tilde{U}^T = UU^T. \quad (15)$$

The first term in the objective is a constant under the constraint and we remove it altogether. When U is a full-rank stationary point, constraint qualification holds, and it is possible to write down the necessary KKT first-order optimality conditions, which reduce to,

$$\forall i \in [k], \quad -\lambda \frac{\tilde{U}e_i}{\|\tilde{U}e_i\|_2} + (\Lambda + \Lambda^T)\tilde{U}e_i = 0 \quad (16)$$

where $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the set of optimal dual variables. Since $\tilde{U} = U$ is a first-order stationary point of the problem in eq. (15) and it satisfies eq. (16), the above condition means that the columns Ue_i are the eigenvectors of the symmetric matrix $\Lambda + \Lambda^T$. If all the eigenvalues of $\Lambda + \Lambda^T$ were distinct, then this implies that the eigenvectors are orthogonal and $Ue_i \perp Ue_j$ for all $i \neq j$. ■

While this analysis conveys an intuitive picture, there are several challenges in implementing it formally. First and foremost, it is unclear how to establish that the eigenvalues of $\Lambda + \Lambda^T$ are distinct. Secondly, this analysis only applies for full-rank stationary points and does not say anything about rank deficient stationary points, where constraint qualification does not hold. It is even more unclear how to extend this analysis to approximate stationary points.

Our proof will circumvent each of these challenges by (a) showing that at approximate SOSPs, even if the eigenvalues of $\Lambda + \Lambda^T$ are not distinct, the columns of U are orthogonal, and (b) directly bounding the gradients and Hessians of the regularized loss, rather than studying the KKT conditions to establish guarantees which hold even for approximate stationary points which may be rank deficient. Having established guarantees for the pruning phase of Algorithm 1 in the population setting, we next prove a result in the finite sample setting.

5 Finite sample analysis

Next, we extend the results of the previous section to the finite sample setting. Here, we also focus on the smooth version of the regularizer and study the following problem

$$f_{\text{emp}}(U) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{emp}}(U) + \lambda \mathcal{R}_{\beta}(U), \quad (17)$$

where the empirical loss \mathcal{L}_{emp} is defined in eq. (1) and the smooth version of the group Lasso regularizer $\mathcal{R}_{\beta}(U)$ is defined in eq. (12). Prior to introducing the main result, we impose that the measurement matrices satisfy the restricted isometry property (RIP).

Assumption 1. *Assume that the measurement matrices $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ are $(\max\{2k, 4r\}, \delta)$ -RIP for any $\delta \leq 1/12$. In other words, for any $d \times d$ matrix with rank $\leq \max\{2k, 4r\}$,*

$$\frac{11}{12} \|X\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle A_i, X \rangle^2 \leq \frac{13}{12} \|X\|_F^2. \quad (18)$$

With Gaussian measurements ($A_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ entry-wise), Assumption 1 is satisfied with probability $\geq 1 - e^{-\Omega(d)}$ as long as $n \gtrsim kd \log(d)$. [RFP10].

Below, we state the result in the case when σ_r^* is approximately known to make the dependency on σ_r^* explicit. In Definition 3 (Appendix C), we explain the parameter selection when σ_r^* is unknown.

Theorem 3. Consider the empirical loss with smooth regularization in eq. (17), where U_\star has rank r and its smallest singular value is denoted by σ_r^\star , and the noise variance is denoted by σ^2 . Let U_{prune} denote the output of the pruning phase in Algorithm 1 with parameters $\beta, \lambda, \epsilon, \gamma$, satisfying the conditions $\lambda = c_\lambda(\sigma_r^\star)^3/r^2k^{7/2}$ and $\beta = c_\beta(\sigma_r^\star)^2/k$, and choose any $\epsilon \leq c_\epsilon(\sigma_r^\star)^3/r^4k^4$ and $\gamma \leq c_\gamma(\sigma_r^\star)^3/r^4k^{7/2}$ for some absolute constants $c_\beta, c_\lambda, c_\epsilon, c_\gamma > 0$. If Assumption 1 holds and the number of samples is at least $n \geq C_3 \frac{\sigma^2 d \log(d/\eta) \cdot k^6 r^3}{(\sigma_r^\star)^4}$, where $C_3 > 0$ is a sufficiently large constant, then with probability at least $1 - \eta$,

1. U_{prune} has exactly r columns.
2. U_{prune} satisfies the spectral initialization condition: $\|U_{\text{prune}}U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \leq \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_r^\star)^2$.

Given Gaussian measurements, the sample requirement in the RIP condition Assumption 1 of $n = \tilde{\Omega}(kd)$ and Theorem 3 of $n = \tilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{\sigma^2 d \text{poly}(k,r)}{(\sigma_r^\star)^4}\right)$ grow linearly in the input dimension d . Improving the dependency on k, r and σ_r^\star in Theorem 3 is left for future work. The high level analysis of this result largely follows that of Theorem 2 in the population setting – we approximate the finite-sample gradient and Hessian by their population counterparts and show that the approximation error decays with the number of samples as $O(1/\sqrt{n})$.

5.1 Fine-tuning phase: The benefit of pruning

We next give the guarantee for the fine-tuning phase of the algorithm. Since the pruned model is exactly specified (i.e. has r columns) and is no longer overparameterized, there are several works analyzing the generalization performance and iteration complexity of gradient descent. The only condition we need to verify is that the pruned model U_{prune} satisfies the local condition needed for linear convergence of gradient descent when applied to the (non-regularized) empirical loss \mathcal{L}_{emp} . Here we borrow the result of [CW15] which requires the initial condition that $\|U_0 U_0^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \leq c(\sigma_r^\star)^2$, where c is any constant less than 1. As shown in part 2 of Theorem 3, this initial condition is satisfied by U_{prune} .

Theorem 4. [CW15, Corollary 2] Let the output of the greedy pruning stage in Algorithm 1, $U_{\text{prune}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ be the initial iterate for the fine-tuning phase, and assume that U_{prune} satisfies the properties in Theorem 3.

Running gradient descent (with iterates $\{U_t\}_{t \geq 0}$) on the unregularized loss \mathcal{L}_{emp} (eq. (1) with $k = r$) initialized at $U_0 = U_{\text{prune}}$, with step-size $\alpha = \frac{C_4}{\kappa^{10}(\sigma_r^\star)^2}$ for an appropriate constant $C_4 > 0$. Under Assumption 1, for any $t \geq C_4' \kappa^{10} \log\left(\frac{\kappa n}{d}\right)$,

$$\|U_t U_t^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \lesssim \kappa \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_r^\star} \sqrt{\frac{rd}{n}}, \quad (19)$$

where $C_4' > 0$ is a sufficiently large absolute constant and κ is the condition number $\sigma_1^\star/\sigma_r^\star$.

Combining Theorems 3 and 4 results in a generalization bound for greedy pruning + fine-tuning.

Corollary 1. In the finite sample setting, consider greedy pruning + fine-tuning (Algorithm 1) with appropriately initialized values of $\lambda, \beta, \gamma, \epsilon$ (see Theorem 3). With probability $1 - \eta$, the resulting solution U_{out} satisfies,

$$\|U_{\text{out}} U_{\text{out}}^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \lesssim \kappa \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_r^\star} \sqrt{\frac{rd}{n}}, \quad (20)$$




Figure 2: **Comparison of generalization of vanilla gradient descent vs. greedy pruning + fine-tuning.** Vanilla gradient descent is carried out to minimize the unregularized loss in eq. (1) (red). The group Lasso regularized loss, eq. (3), is used in the initial training phase of greedy pruning + fine-tuning (blue). This is subsequently pruned based on column norms and fine-tuned using gradient descent on the unregularized loss. In this figure, $d = k = 20$ and $r = 3$ and the learner has access to $n = 100$ Gaussian measurements with no added label noise. The figures plot the generalization error, $\|U_t U_t^T - U_* U_*^T\|_F^2$ as a function of the iteration number, t . The regularization parameter in eq. (3) was tuned minimally for greedy pruning + fine-tuning objective. A sharp improvement in the generalization error is observed after pruning is carried out and the error floor is observed to be an order of magnitude better for the pruned + fine-tuned solution.

as long as Assumption 1 holds and the number of samples is at least $n \geq C_3 \frac{\sigma^2 d \log(d/\eta) \cdot k^6 r^3}{(\sigma_r^*)^4}$, for a sufficiently large absolute constant $C_3 > 0$. Here κ is the condition number σ_1^*/σ_r^* .

Theorem 4 shows that in the exactly setting, the iterates of gradient descent converges at a linear rate to the generalization error floor of $O(\sqrt{rd/n})$, which is also known to be statistically minimax optimal [NW12, KLT11]. This is enabled by the fact that in the pruning phase, the learner is able to correctly identify the rank of the model and operate in the exactly specified setting in the fine-tuning phase. In contrast, one may ask how this guarantee compares with running vanilla factored gradient descent in the overparameterized setting. This corresponds to the case where no pruning is carried out to reduce the size of the model. [ZKHC21] presented a guarantee for the convergence of factored gradient descent from a warm start in the overparameterized setting. In comparison with the exactly specified case, the generalization error floor $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|U_t U_t^T - U_* U_*^T\|_F$ is shown to scale as $O(\sqrt{kd/n})$ which now depends on k and deteriorates as the model becomes more overparameterized. Furthermore, linear convergence can no longer be established because of the ill-conditioning of the objective. This is not just an artifact of the proof - experimentally too, the convergence slowdown was first noticed in [ZKHC21, Figure 1]. We also validate these findings in Figure 2.

This discussion shows that greedy pruning the model *first*, prior to running gradient descent, in fact generates solutions which generalize better and also converge much faster.

6 Implementing Algorithm 1: Smoothness and optimization oracles

Recall that Algorithm 1 requires access to a subroutine which outputs an approximate SOSP with bounded operator norm. In this section we show that a number of perturbed gradient first-order methods with a small initialization satisfy the conditions required by this optimization oracle. First, we establish that the loss f_{emp} is well behaved on the domain $\{U : \|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3\}$, in that its gradient and Hessian are Lipschitz continuous. These conditions are required by many generic optimization algorithms which return approximate SOSPs [JGN⁺17, MOJ18]. We establish these properties for the population loss for simplicity and leave extensions to the empirical loss for future work.

Theorem 5. *Consider the population loss f_{pop} in eq. (13) and assume that $\lambda \leq \min\{\beta, \sqrt{\beta}\}$. The objective $f_{\text{pop}}(\cdot)$ defined in eq. (13) satisfies for any $U, V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ such that $\|U\|_{\text{op}}, \|V\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3$,*

$$(a) \text{ Lipschitz gradients: } \|\nabla f_{\text{pop}}(U) - \nabla f_{\text{pop}}(V)\|_F \lesssim \|U - V\|_F,$$

$$(b) \text{ Lipschitz Hessians: } \|\nabla^2 f_{\text{pop}}(U) - \nabla^2 f_{\text{pop}}(V)\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \|U - V\|_F.$$

Under the Lipschitz gradients and Lipschitz Hessian condition, a large number of algorithms in the literature show convergence to an approximate SOSP. A common approach for finding such a point is using the noisy gradient descent algorithm [JGN⁺17]. However, note that we establish these Lipschitzness properties on the bounded domain $\{U : \|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3\}$, and it remains to verify whether these algorithms indeed approach such points. A similar concern is present with Algorithm 1, which requires access to an optimization oracle which finds an (ϵ, δ) -approximate SOSP, U , of f_{emp} which is also bounded, in that $\|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3$. In the sequel we introduce a class of perturbed first-order methods and identify conditions under which these algorithms indeed output stationary points which are bounded, satisfying $\|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3$.

Perturbed first-order method: We consider a perturbed version of gradient descent with the following update rule: starting from the initialization U_0 , for all $t \geq 0$,

$$U_{t+1} \leftarrow U_t - \alpha(\nabla(\mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U_t) + P_t) \tag{21}$$

where P_t is a perturbation term, which for example, could be the explicit noise ($P_t \sim \text{Unif}(\mathbb{B}(r))$ for appropriate r) added to escape strict saddle points in [JGN⁺17]. Over the course of running the update rule eq. (21), we show that $\|U_t\|_{\text{op}}$ remains bounded under mild conditions if the algorithm is initialized within this ball. In combination with Theorem 5, this shows that the noisy gradient descent approach of [JGN⁺17] can be used to find the SOSPs required for Algorithm 1.

Theorem 6. *Consider the population setting. Suppose $\alpha \leq 1/8$, $\lambda \leq \sqrt{\beta}$ and $\|P_t\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$ almost surely for each $t \geq 0$. For the update rule eq. (21), assuming that $\|U_0\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3$ at initialization, for every $t \geq 1$, $\|U_t\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3$.*

The implication of this result is that when perturbed gradient descent is run starting from a small initialization, the iterates always remain within the ball $\{\|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3\}$ at each time t , as long as the learning rate and perturbations are not too large. By the smoothness of the gradient and Hessian within this ball, the algorithm of [JGN⁺17] which is an instance of the perturbed gradient descent framework in eq. (21) can be used to find a bounded SOSP efficiently.

In the next section we provide an algorithm for the training and pruning of 2-layer neural networks with quadratic activation functions.

7 2-layer neural networks with quadratic activation functions

The connection of matrix sensing to shallow neural networks having quadratic activation functions was first observed in [SJJL18]. Indeed, when the measurement matrices are of the form $A_i = x_i x_i^T$ for some vector $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the functional representation of the output can be written as $\langle A_i, UU^T \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma(\langle x_i, Ue_i \rangle)$, where $\sigma(\cdot) = (\cdot)^2$ takes the form of a 1-hidden layer shallow network with quadratic activations, with the weights of the output neuron clamped to 1. The columns of U correspond to the weight vectors associated with individual neurons of the network. Likewise, sparsity in the column domain corresponds to learning networks with only a few non-zero neurons. We focus on the population setting here, and mention that the same techniques can be extended to the finite-sample setting. By [GKZ19, Theorem 3.1 (b)], when $x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ are distributed i.i.d. Gaussian, in the population setting,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NN}}(U) = \mathbb{E}[\langle xx^T, UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T \rangle^2] = (\|U\|_F^2 - \|U_\star\|_F^2)^2 + 2\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2 \quad (22)$$

A similar expansion can be written in the finite sample setting as well. Here, $\|U_\star\|_F^2$ can be estimated to a small error using $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$ and therefore the first term on the RHS can be estimated even with finite samples. Assuming that $\|U_\star\|_F^2$ was known exactly, we consider updates of the form,

$$U_{t+1} \leftarrow U_t - \alpha (\nabla \mathcal{L}_{\text{NN}}(U) + \lambda \nabla \mathcal{R}_\beta(U) - \nabla (\|U\|_F^2 - \|U_\star\|_F^2)^2) + P_t, \quad (23)$$

where P_t are again perturbations similar to in eq. (21). By definition of eq. (22) it is easily verified that the update eq. (23) matches that in eq. (21). Thus running the updates in eq. (23) serve to minimize the loss $\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2$. In particular, for the update rule in eq. (23), the results in Theorems 2 and 4 can be used to establish guarantees for greedy pruning + fine-tuning even for 2-layer neural networks with quadratic activations, which we avoid restating in the interest of space. While we assumed that $\|U_\star\|_F^2$ is known in order to be able to compute the updates eq. (23), in the finite sample setting, the algorithm is likely to be robust to this error by absorbing it into P_t .

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we studied the efficacy of the greedy pruning + fine-tuning pipeline in learning low-complexity solutions for the matrix sensing problem, as well as for learning shallow neural networks with quadratic activation functions. We showed that training on the mean square error augmented by a natural group Lasso regularizer results in models which are suitable for greedy pruning. Moreover, we proved that after pruning the remaining columns by removing the columns which are below a certain ℓ_2 -norm threshold, we arrive at a solution with correct column sparsity of r . Running a few iterations of gradient descent to fine-tune the resulting model, the population loss was shown to converge at a linear rate to an error floor of $O(\sqrt{rd/n})$, which is also statistically optimal, improving over the best-known generalization error bound of $O(\sqrt{kd/n})$ for training overparameterized models using gradient descent. We also presented a negative result showing the importance of regularization while training the model. To the best of our knowledge, our results provide the first theoretical guarantee on the generalization error of the model obtained via the greedy pruning + fine-tuning framework.

Acknowledgements

The research of A. Mokhtari is supported in part by NSF Grants 2007668 and 2127697, ARO Grant W911NF2110226, the National AI Institute for Foundations of Machine Learning (IFML), and the

Machine Learning Lab (MLL) at UT Austin. Kannan Ramchandran would like to acknowledge support from NSF CIF-2002821 and ARO fund 051242-00.

References

- [BMBE20] Brian Bartoldson, Ari Morcos, Adrian Barbu, and Gordon Erlebacher. The generalization-stability tradeoff in neural network pruning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:20852–20864, 2020.
- [BNS16] Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Behnam Neyshabur, and Nati Srebro. Global optimality of local search for low rank matrix recovery. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29, 2016.
- [CCS10] Jian-Feng Cai, Emmanuel J. Candès, and Zuowei Shen. A singular value thresholding algorithm for matrix completion. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(4):1956–1982, 2010.
- [CW15] Yudong Chen and Martin J. Wainwright. Fast low-rank estimation by projected gradient descent: General statistical and algorithmic guarantees, 2015.
- [DL18] Simon Du and Jason Lee. On the power of over-parametrization in neural networks with quadratic activation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1329–1338. PMLR, 2018.
- [GJZ17] Rong Ge, Chi Jin, and Yi Zheng. No spurious local minima in nonconvex low rank problems: A unified geometric analysis. *CoRR*, abs/1704.00708, 2017.
- [GKZ19] David Gamarnik, Eren C. Kızıldağ, and Ilias Zadik. Stationary points of shallow neural networks with quadratic activation function, 2019.
- [GLM16] Rong Ge, Jason D Lee, and Tengyu Ma. Matrix completion has no spurious local minimum. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [GLWW19] Rong Ge, Zhize Li, Weiyao Wang, and Xiang Wang. Stabilized svrg: Simple variance reduction for nonconvex optimization. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 1394–1448. PMLR, 2019.
- [Guo18] Yunhui Guo. A survey on methods and theories of quantized neural networks, 2018.
- [GWB⁺17] Suriya Gunasekar, Blake E Woodworth, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Behnam Neyshabur, and Nati Srebro. Implicit regularization in matrix factorization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- [HKD⁺18] Yang He, Guoliang Kang, Xuanyi Dong, Yanwei Fu, and Yi Yang. Soft filter pruning for accelerating deep convolutional neural networks, 2018.
- [HMD15] Song Han, Huizi Mao, and William J Dally. Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and huffman coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.00149*, 2015.

- [HPTD15] Song Han, Jeff Pool, John Tran, and William Dally. Learning both weights and connections for efficient neural network. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- [HSW93] Babak Hassibi, David G Stork, and Gregory J Wolff. Optimal brain surgeon and general network pruning. In *IEEE international conference on neural networks*, pages 293–299. IEEE, 1993.
- [HVD15] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network, 2015.
- [HW14] Moritz Hardt and Mary Wootters. Fast matrix completion without the condition number. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 638–678. PMLR, 2014.
- [HZS17] Yihui He, Xiangyu Zhang, and Jian Sun. Channel pruning for accelerating very deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1389–1397, 2017.
- [HZY⁺12] Yao Hu, Debing Zhang, Jieping Ye, Xuelong Li, and Xiaofei He. Fast and accurate matrix completion via truncated nuclear norm regularization. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(9):2117–2130, 2012.
- [JGN⁺17] Chi Jin, Rong Ge, Praneeth Netrapalli, Sham M Kakade, and Michael I Jordan. How to escape saddle points efficiently. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1724–1732. PMLR, 2017.
- [JLL⁺23] Jikai Jin, Zhiyuan Li, Kaifeng Lyu, Simon S Du, and Jason D Lee. Understanding incremental learning of gradient descent: A fine-grained analysis of matrix sensing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11500*, 2023.
- [JMD10] Prateek Jain, Raghu Meka, and Inderjit Dhillon. Guaranteed rank minimization via singular value projection. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 23, 2010.
- [JNS13] Prateek Jain, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Sujay Sanghavi. Low-rank matrix completion using alternating minimization. In *Proceedings of the forty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 665–674, 2013.
- [KLT11] Vladimir Koltchinskii, Karim Lounici, and Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Nuclear-norm penalization and optimal rates for noisy low-rank matrix completion. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(5):2302 – 2329, 2011.
- [KMO10] Raghunandan H Keshavan, Andrea Montanari, and Sewoong Oh. Matrix completion from a few entries. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 56(6):2980–2998, 2010.
- [KO09] Raghunandan H Keshavan and Sewoong Oh. A gradient descent algorithm on the grassman manifold for matrix completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0910.5260*, 2009.
- [Kri18] Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi. Quantizing deep convolutional networks for efficient inference: A whitepaper. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.08342*, 2018.

- [KRS⁺20] Aditya Kusupati, Vivek Ramanujan, Raghav Somani, Mitchell Wortsman, Prateek Jain, Sham Kakade, and Ali Farhadi. Soft threshold weight reparameterization for learnable sparsity. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5544–5555. PMLR, 2020.
- [LAT18] Namhoon Lee, Thalaiyasingam Ajanthan, and Philip HS Torr. Snip: Single-shot network pruning based on connection sensitivity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.02340*, 2018.
- [LDS89] Yann LeCun, John Denker, and Sara Solla. Optimal brain damage. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2, 1989.
- [LGGT19] Yawei Li, Shuhang Gu, Luc Van Gool, and Radu Timofte. Learning filter basis for convolutional neural network compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5623–5632, 2019.
- [LKD⁺17] Hao Li, Asim Kadav, Igor Durdanovic, Hanan Samet, and Hans Peter Graf. Pruning filters for efficient convnets. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [LL16] Vadim Lebedev and Victor Lempitsky. Fast convnets using group-wise brain damage. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2554–2564, 2016.
- [LLS⁺17] Zhuang Liu, Jianguo Li, Zhiqiang Shen, Gao Huang, Shoumeng Yan, and Changshui Zhang. Learning efficient convolutional networks through network slimming. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2736–2744, 2017.
- [LM00] B. Laurent and P. Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *The Annals of Statistics*, 28(5):1302 – 1338, 2000.
- [LMZ18a] Yuanzhi Li, Tengyu Ma, and Hongyang Zhang. Algorithmic regularization in over-parameterized matrix sensing and neural networks with quadratic activations. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 2–47. PMLR, 2018.
- [LMZ18b] Yuanzhi Li, Tengyu Ma, and Hongyang Zhang. Algorithmic regularization in over-parameterized matrix sensing and neural networks with quadratic activations. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 2–47. PMLR, 2018.
- [LWK17] Christos Louizos, Max Welling, and Diederik P. Kingma. Learning sparse neural networks through l_0 regularization, 2017.
- [MGC11] Shiqian Ma, Donald Goldfarb, and Lifeng Chen. Fixed point and bregman iterative methods for matrix rank minimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 128(1-2):321–353, 2011.
- [MLC21] Cong Ma, Yuanxin Li, and Yuejie Chi. Beyond procrustes: Balancing-free gradient descent for asymmetric low-rank matrix sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 69:867–877, 2021.

- [MOJ18] Aryan Mokhtari, Asuman Ozdaglar, and Ali Jadbabaie. Escaping saddle points in constrained optimization. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- [MWCC18] Cong Ma, Kaizheng Wang, Yuejie Chi, and Yuxin Chen. Implicit regularization in nonconvex statistical estimation: Gradient descent converges linearly for phase retrieval and matrix completion. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3345–3354. PMLR, 2018.
- [NTS14] Behnam Neyshabur, Ryota Tomioka, and Nathan Srebro. In search of the real inductive bias: On the role of implicit regularization in deep learning, 2014.
- [NW12] Sahand Negahban and Martin J Wainwright. Restricted strong convexity and weighted matrix completion: Optimal bounds with noise. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):1665–1697, 2012.
- [Pet01] Michel Petrovitch. Sur une manière d’étendre le théorème de la moyenne aux équations différentielles du premier ordre. (mit 2 figuren im text). *Mathematische Annalen*, 54:417–436, 1901.
- [PKCS17] Dohyung Park, Anastasios Kyrillidis, Constantine Carmanis, and Sujay Sanghavi. Non-square matrix sensing without spurious local minima via the burer-monteiro approach. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 65–74. PMLR, 2017.
- [PPA18] Antonio Polino, Razvan Pascanu, and Dan Alistarh. Model compression via distillation and quantization, 2018.
- [Rec11] Benjamin Recht. A simpler approach to matrix completion. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(12), 2011.
- [RFP10] Benjamin Recht, Maryam Fazel, and Pablo A. Parrilo. Guaranteed minimum-rank solutions of linear matrix equations via nuclear norm minimization. *SIAM Review*, 52(3):471–501, jan 2010.
- [SCHU17] Simone Scardapane, Danilo Comminiello, Amir Hussain, and Aurelio Uncini. Group sparse regularization for deep neural networks. *Neurocomputing*, 241:81–89, 2017.
- [SHN⁺18] Daniel Soudry, Elad Hoffer, Mor Shpigel Nacson, Suriya Gunasekar, and Nathan Srebro. The implicit bias of gradient descent on separable data. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(1):2822–2878, 2018.
- [SJJ18] Mahdi Soltanolkotabi, Adel Javanmard, and Jason D Lee. Theoretical insights into the optimization landscape of over-parameterized shallow neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(2):742–769, 2018.
- [SL16] Ruoyu Sun and Zhi-Quan Luo. Guaranteed matrix completion via non-convex factorization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(11):6535–6579, 2016.
- [Tro11] Joel A. Tropp. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 12(4):389–434, aug 2011.

- [TY10] Kim-Chuan Toh and Sangwoon Yun. An accelerated proximal gradient algorithm for nuclear norm regularized least squares problems. *Pacific Journal of Optimization*, 6, 09 2010.
- [Ver18] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [VTM⁺19] Elena Voita, David Talbot, Fedor Moiseev, Rico Sennrich, and Ivan Titov. Analyzing multi-head self-attention: Specialized heads do the heavy lifting, the rest can be pruned. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5797–5808, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Wai19] Martin J. Wainwright. *High-Dimensional Statistics: A Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [WWL20] Ziheng Wang, Jeremy Wohlwend, and Tao Lei. Structured pruning of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6151–6162, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [WWW⁺16a] Wei Wen, Chunpeng Wu, Yandan Wang, Yiran Chen, and Hai Li. Learning structured sparsity in deep neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [WWW⁺16b] Wei Wen, Chunpeng Wu, Yandan Wang, Yiran Chen, and Hai Li. Learning structured sparsity in deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’16*, page 2082–2090, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2016. Curran Associates Inc.
- [YD21a] Tian Ye and Simon S Du. Global convergence of gradient descent for asymmetric low-rank matrix factorization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:1429–1439, 2021.
- [YD21b] Tian Ye and Simon S Du. Global convergence of gradient descent for asymmetric low-rank matrix factorization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:1429–1439, 2021.
- [YGN⁺20] Mao Ye, Chengyue Gong, Lizhen Nie, Denny Zhou, Adam Klivans, and Qiang Liu. Good subnetworks provably exist: Pruning via greedy forward selection. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10820–10830. PMLR, 2020.
- [YL06] Ming Yuan and Yi Lin. Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 68:49–67, 02 2006.
- [YLC⁺18] Ruichi Yu, Ang Li, Chun-Fu Chen, Jui-Hsin Lai, Vlad I Morariu, Xintong Han, Mingfei Gao, Ching-Yung Lin, and Larry S Davis. Nisp: Pruning networks using neuron importance score propagation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9194–9203, 2018.
- [YLLW18] Jianbo Ye, Xin Lu, Zhe Lin, and James Z. Wang. Rethinking the smaller-norm-less-informative assumption in channel pruning of convolution layers, 2018.

- [ZG17] Michael Zhu and Suyog Gupta. To prune, or not to prune: exploring the efficacy of pruning for model compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.01878*, 2017.
- [ZKHC21] Jiacheng Zhuo, Jeongyeol Kwon, Nhat Ho, and Constantine Caramanis. On the computational and statistical complexity of over-parameterized matrix sensing. *CoRR*, abs/2102.02756, 2021.

A Failure of implicit regularization in pruning: Proof of Theorem 1

In this section, we prove the negative result showing that running gradient descent trained with implicit regularization results in dense networks that are not compatible with greedy pruning. For scale reasons, and to simplify the exposition, we will assume that $\|U_\star\|_2 = 1$ through the remainder of this proof. The gradient flow update rule can be written as,

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = -\nabla\mathcal{L}(U) = -(UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T)U \quad (24)$$

where $U = U(t)$ is the weight matrix at time t . Define the column vector $r(t) = U^T U_\star \in \mathbb{R}^k$ capturing the correlation/alignment between the weights on the neurons of U_t with the ground truth U_\star , the signal component. Wherever convenient, we will drop the time argument in $r(t)$ and simply refer to it as r .

We will show that given that gradient flow is run starting from a small initialization, at convergence, the column norms $\|Ue_i\|_2$'s approximately distribute themselves proportional to the inner product of the corresponding column of U with U_\star initially at $t = 0$. Namely,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|U(t)e_i\|_2 \propto |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \quad (25)$$

Given a random initialization where the entries of $U(0)$ are i.i.d., $|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|$ for each i are independent. Moreover, when $U(0)$ follows a Gaussian distribution, we expect no single coordinate $|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| = |\langle (U(0))^T U_\star, e_i \rangle|$ to be much larger than the others, a statement which we formally prove in Lemma 12. Combining this with eq. (25) results in a proof of Theorem 1.

The rest of this section is devoted to proving a formal version of eq. (25), which we state below.

Lemma 1. *Suppose the initialization scale parameter $\alpha \leq c\eta^2/k^3 d \log(kd)$ for a sufficiently small absolute constant $c > 0$. With probability $\geq 1 - O(\frac{1}{k})$ over the initialization, for each column $i \in [k]$,*

$$(1 - 5\eta) \frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\|r(0)\|_2} \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|U(t)e_i\|_2 \leq \frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\|r(0)\|_2} (1 + 4\sqrt{\eta}) \quad (26)$$

As a counterpart to the signal component $r(t)$, the noise component is $E(t) = (I - U_\star U_\star^T)U$. At a high level, the proof of Lemma 1 will be to establish that with a small initialization, the noise component satisfies $E \approx 0$ approximately, while the signal component $\|r(t)\|_2$ grows exponentially fast to 1 with t , and $\frac{d\langle r(t), e_i \rangle}{dt} \approx \langle r(t), e_i \rangle$ until $\|r(t)\|_2$ gets sufficiently close to 1. This will imply that $\langle r(t), e_i \rangle \approx \langle r(0), e_i \rangle e^t$ until then, and by extension,

$$\frac{\langle r(t), e_i \rangle}{\langle r(t), e_j \rangle} \approx \frac{\langle r(0), e_i \rangle}{\langle r(0), e_j \rangle}. \quad (27)$$

Since the noise component $E \approx 0$, $\|Ue_i\|_2 \approx |\langle r(t), e_i \rangle|$, plugging which into eq. (27) results in the ratio form of Lemma 1. By the gradient flow equation eq. (24), it is a short calculation to see that r and E evolve per the following differential equations,

$$\frac{dr}{dt} = r(1 - \|r\|_2^2) - E^T E r. \quad (28) \qquad \frac{dE}{dt} = -E U^T U. \quad (29)$$

In the sequel, we will show that as a function of t , $E^T E r$ decays linearly. The resulting differential equation $\frac{dr}{dt} \approx r(1 - \|r\|_2^2)$ shows linear convergence of r until the point when $\|r\|_2$ approaches 1. We place these intuitions formally by discussing a formal proof of Lemma 1.

A.1 Proof outline of Lemma 1

Firstly, as a function of the scale parameter α , we bound the energy of the signal and noise components at initialization in Lemma 2. In Lemma 3 we first establish that $\|E(t)\|_2$ does not increase with time. In Lemma 5, we establish an upper bound on the signal norm $\|r(t)\|_2$ as a function of time. This shows that the signal energy cannot grow to be 1 too rapidly, which is necessary to show that the error term $E^T E r$ has sufficient time to decay to 0. In Lemma 6 we show that the signal norm $\|r(t)\|_2^2$ does not fall below a threshold of $3/4$ after t grows to be sufficiently large. This is essential in proving Lemma 7 which shows that the norm of the error term $\|E^T E r\|_2$ in eq. (28) begins decaying after $\|r(t)\|_2^2$ becomes larger than $1/2$. Finally, in Lemmas 8 and 9 we use these results to prove a refined bound on the rate at which $\|r(t)\|_2 \rightarrow 1$. These results are collectively used in Lemmas 10 and 11 to prove the upper and lower bounds on $|\langle r(t), e_i \rangle| \approx \|U e_i\|_2$.

A.2 Understanding the gradient flow: Proof of Lemma 1

In this section we prove Lemma 1 formally. First we establish bounds on the scale of parameters at initialization.

Lemma 2. *With probability $\geq 1 - O(\frac{1}{k})$, at initialization,*

$$\|E(0)\|_F^2, \|r(0)\|_2^2 \leq 2\alpha^2 kd \quad (30)$$

$$\|r(0)\|_2^2 \geq \cdot \left[\frac{k\alpha^2}{10}, 10k\alpha^2 \right] \quad (31)$$

$$\forall i \in [k], |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \geq \frac{\alpha}{k^2} \quad (32)$$

Proof. Recall that $\langle r, e_i \rangle$ for each $i \in [k]$ is distributed $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \alpha^2)$. By Gaussian anti-concentration [Ver18] and union bounding, $\mathbb{P}(\min_{i \in [k]} |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \geq \frac{\alpha}{k^2}) \gtrsim \frac{1}{k}$ simultaneously for all $i \in [k]$. On the other hand, since every entry of $U(0)$ is iid distributed $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \alpha^2)$, by tail bounds for χ^2 -distributed random variables [LM00, Lemma 1], $\|E(0)\|_F^2 \leq \|U(0)\|_F^2 \leq 2\alpha^2 kd$ with probability $\geq 1 - \exp(-kd) \geq 1 - O(\frac{1}{k})$. The same bound applies for $\|r(0)\|_2^2$ since it is also upper bounded by $\|U(0)\|_F^2$. Finally, the upper and lower bounds on $\|r(0)\|_2$ follows by noting that $\|r(0)\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k \langle U_\star, U e_i \rangle^2$, which concentrates around $k\alpha^2$. The result directly follows by concentration of χ^2 -random variables. \square

As a corollary of Lemma 2 when the initialization parameter satisfies the upper bound in Lemma 1, $\|E(0)\|_F$ and $\|r(0)\|_2$ are upper bounded by small constants. We will use this fact several times in proving Lemma 1. Next we establish that the error $\|E\|_F$ does not grow with time.

Lemma 3. *At any time $t \geq 0$, $\|E(t)\|_F \leq \|E(0)\|_F$.*

Proof. The proof follows by showing that the time derivative of $\|E(t)\|_F^2$ is non-positive. Indeed,

$$\frac{d\|E\|_F^2}{dt} = 2 \left\langle E, \frac{dE}{dt} \right\rangle = -2\text{Tr}(E^T E U^T U) = -2\|U E^T\|_F^2 \leq 0. \quad (33)$$

\square

Starting from a small initialization, this means that the error matrix E remains small over the course of gradient flow. In for any coordinate $i \in [k]$, by eq. (28), the differential equation governing $\langle r, e_i \rangle = \langle r(t), e_i \rangle$ is,

$$\frac{d\langle r, e_i \rangle}{dt} = \langle r, e_i \rangle(1 - \|r\|_2^2) - e_i^T E^T E r. \quad (34)$$

By Lemma 3 we expect the error term $E^T E r$ to be small (not necessarily decaying) in comparison with the first term as long as $\|r(t)\|_2$ is smaller than an absolute constant. In this regime, the differential form is easy to control since we expect $\langle r, e_i \rangle$ to grow linearly and across the different coordinates $i \in [k]$, we expect its value to be proportional to that at initialization, $\langle r(0), e_i \rangle$.

However, when $\|r\|_2$ eventually approaches 1, the relative contribution of the signal term $\langle r, e_i \rangle(1 - \|r\|_2^2)$ and the error term $E^T E r$ become important. This is the main technical challenge in proving Lemma 1. We will show that even as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the error term cannot change $\langle r, e_i \rangle$ by more than a constant factor. For a sufficiently large constant $C > 0$, define,

$$T_0 \triangleq -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\log(\|r(0)\|_2^2) - 1}{1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2}. \quad (35)$$

As we will later show, T_0 controls the amount of time it takes the signal norm $\|r(t)\|_2$ to grow to an absolute constant. Firstly, we show that when the initialization scale α is sufficiently small, T_0 is approximately $-\log \|r(0)\|_2$.

Lemma 4. *When the initialization scale $\alpha \leq c/k^3 d \log(kd)$ for a sufficiently small absolute constant $c > 0$,*

$$-\log(\|r(0)\|_2) + \frac{1}{2} \leq T_0 \leq -\log(\|r(0)\|_2) + \frac{3}{2}. \quad (36)$$

Proof. This follows from the fact that,

$$T_0 = -\log(\|r(0)\|_2) - \frac{\|E(0)\|_F^2}{1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2} \log(\|r(0)\|_2) + \frac{1}{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)} \quad (37)$$

The lower bound on T_0 follows readily, noting that $\|r(0)\|_2, \|E(0)\|_F < 1$ from the initialization bounds in Lemma 2 when $\alpha \leq c/k^3 d \log(kd)$. For the upper bound on the other hand, note that the last term of eq. (37) is upper bounded by,

$$\frac{1}{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)} \leq 1 \quad (38)$$

And the middle term of eq. (37) is upper bounded by,

$$-\frac{\|E(0)\|_F^2}{1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2} \log(\|r(0)\|_2) \leq \frac{\|E(0)\|_F^2}{1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2} \frac{1}{\|r(0)\|_2} \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{2\alpha^2 kd}{(1 - 2\alpha^2 kd)} \frac{10}{\sqrt{k}\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (39)$$

where the last inequality assumes that $\alpha \leq c_{39}/\sqrt{kd}$ for a small constant $c_{39} > 0$, and inequality (i) uses the bounds on $\|E(0)\|_F$ and $\|r(0)\|_2$ proved in Lemma 2. Combining eqs. (38) and (39) with eq. (37) results in the proof of Lemma 4. \square

The next result we establish is an upper bound on the signal norm $\|r(t)\|_2$. The proof follows by upper bounding the rate of change of $\|r(t)\|_2$ and integrating the resulting bound.

Lemma 5. *At any time $t \geq 0$, the signal norm is upper bounded by,*

$$\|r(t)\|_2^2 \leq \frac{e^{2(t-T_0)+1+\eta}}{1 + e^{2(t-T_0)+1+\eta}} \leq 1. \quad (40)$$

Proof. From the differential equation governing r we can infer that,

$$\frac{d\|r\|_2^2}{dt} = 2\|r\|_2^2(1 - \|r\|_2^2) - 2\|Er\|_2^2 \leq 2\|r\|_2^2(1 - \|r\|_2^2) \quad (41)$$

By a theorem of [Pet01] on differential inequalities, the trajectory of $\|r(t)\|_2^2$ as a function of t starting from some reference point $\|r(0)\|_2^2$ is pointwise lower bounded by the trajectory of $\|r(t)\|_2^2$ obtained when the inequality is set to be an equality. In particular, by integrating the differential equation this results in the lower bound,

$$\log \frac{\|r(t)\|_2^2}{1 - \|r(t)\|_2^2} - \log \frac{\|r(0)\|_2^2}{1 - \|r(0)\|_2^2} \leq 2t \quad (42)$$

Observe that $-\log \frac{\|r(0)\|_2^2}{1 - \|r(0)\|_2^2} \geq -\log \|r(0)\|_2^2 - \eta \geq 2T_0 - 1 - \eta$ where the first inequality uses the upper bound on $\|r(0)\|_2^2 \leq \eta$ when $\alpha \leq c/k^3 d \log(kd)$ and the second by Lemma 4. Therefore by rearranging the terms we have,

$$\|r(t)\|_2^2 \leq \frac{e^{2t-2T_0+1+\eta}}{1 + e^{2t-2T_0+1+\eta}}. \quad (43)$$

□

As it turns out, the error term $E^T Er(t)$ in eq. (28) can be shown to decrease linearly once $\|r(t)\|_2^2$ hits the critical threshold of $1/2$. In the next lemma we show that the signal norm $\|r(t)\|_2^2$ never drops below the threshold of $3/4$ for all $t \geq T_0 + 2$. Thus, after a sufficiently large amount of time, we expect the differential equation for r to behave as $\frac{dr}{dt} \approx r(1 - \|r\|_2^2)$.

Lemma 6. *For $t \geq T_0$,*

$$\|r(t)\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2}{1 + e^{-2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t-T_0)+1}} \quad (44)$$

As an implication, for any $t \geq T_0 + 2$, under the small initialization $\alpha \leq c/k^3 d \log(kd)$, $\|r(t)\|_2^2 \geq 3/4$.

Proof. From the differential equation governing r , we may infer that,

$$\frac{d\|r\|_2^2}{dt} = 2 \left\langle r, \frac{dr}{dt} \right\rangle = 2\|r\|_2^2(1 - \|r\|_2^2) - 2\|Er\|_2^2. \quad (45)$$

Note that $\|Er\|_2 \leq \|E\|_F \|r\|_2 \leq \|E(0)\|_F \|r\|_2$ and therefore,

$$2\|r\|_2^2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2 - \|r\|_2^2) \leq \frac{d\|r\|_2^2}{dt} \quad (46)$$

Rearranging and integrating both sides,

$$2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)t \leq \log \left(\frac{\|r(t)\|_2^2}{1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2 - \|r(t)\|_2^2} \right) - \log \left(\frac{\|r(0)\|_2^2}{1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2 - \|r(0)\|_2^2} \right) \quad (47)$$

$$\leq \log \left(\frac{\|r(t)\|_2^2}{1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2 - \|r(t)\|_2^2} \right) + 2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)T_0 + 1 \quad (48)$$

where the last inequality uses the choice of the initialization scale $\alpha \leq c\eta^2/k^3 d \log(kd)$, and the bounds on $\|E(0)\|_F^2, \|r(0)\|_2^2$ in Lemma 2. Therefore,

$$(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2 - \|r(t)\|_2^2)e^{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) - 1} \leq \|r(t)\|_2^2 \quad (49)$$

$$\implies \frac{1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2}{1 + e^{-2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) + 1}} \leq \|r(t)\|_2^2 \quad (50)$$

□

Having established that $\|r(t)\|_2^2$ does not decay below the threshold of 3/4 beyond time $T_0 + 2$, we establish that this condition is sufficient for the error term $E^T Er$ to begin decaying to 0. Below we instead bound $\|Er\|_F$, and a bound on $\|E^T Er\|_F$ is obtained by upper bounding it as $\|E(t)\|_F \|Er(t)\|_F \leq \|E(0)\|_F \|Er\|_F$ by Lemma 3.

Lemma 7. *At any time $t \geq 0$, the error term,*

$$\|Er(t)\|_2 \leq \frac{\|Er(0)\|_2 e^t}{1 + e^{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) - 1}} \quad (51)$$

Proof. By explicit computation,

$$\frac{dEr}{dt} = -EU^T Ur + Er(1 - \|r\|_2^2) - EE^T Er \quad (52)$$

$$= -E(E^T E + rr^T)r + Er(1 - \|r\|_2^2) - EE^T Er \quad (53)$$

$$= -2E(E^T E)r + Er(1 - 2\|r\|_2^2) \quad (54)$$

By taking an inner product with Er , we get that,

$$\frac{d\|Er\|_2^2}{dt} = -4\|(E^T E)r\|_2^2 + 2\|Er\|_2^2(1 - 2\|r\|_2^2). \quad (55)$$

Using the lower bound on $\|r\|_2^2$ in Lemma 6,

$$\frac{d\|Er\|_2^2}{dt} \leq 2\|Er\|_2^2 \left(1 - \frac{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)}{1 + e^{-2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) + 1}} \right) \quad (56)$$

Rearranging and integrating both sides from time 0 to t using the fact that $\int \frac{dx}{1 + e^{-x}} = \log(1 + e^x)$,

$$\log \|Er(t)\|_2^2 - \log \|Er(0)\|_2^2 \leq 2 \left(t - \log \left(1 + e^{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) - 1} \right) \right) \quad (57)$$

$$\implies \|Er(t)\|_2 \leq \frac{\|Er(0)\|_2 e^t}{1 + e^{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) - 1}}, \quad (58)$$

where the last inequality follows by exponentiating both sides and rearranging. □

Using the fact that $\|Er\|_F$ rapidly decays to 0 after time T_0 , we can in fact establish a more refined lower bound on the rate at which $\|r(t)\|_2$ approaches 1. The decay of the error term is not captured in the prior lower bound on $\|r(t)\|_2$ in Lemma 6. The error decay established in Lemma 7 is essential to proving such a result, especially as $\|r(t)\|_2$ approaches 1. In this regime, the error term $\|Er\|_2^2$ in eq. (45) becomes comparable with the leading order term $\|r\|_2^2(1 - \|r\|_2^2)$.

Lemma 8. *At any time $t \leq 3T_0/2$, for some absolute constant $C_{59} > 0$,*

$$\|r(t)\|_2^2 \geq \frac{e^{2t}}{\|r(0)\|_2^2 + e^{2t} - 1} - C_{59} \frac{\|E(0)\|_F^2 T_0}{\|r(0)\|_2}. \quad (59)$$

Proof. From Lemma 7, note that,

$$\|Er(t)\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\|E(0)\|_F^2 \|r(0)\|_2^2 e^{2t}}{\left(1 + e^{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) - 1}\right)^2} \quad (60)$$

$$\lesssim \frac{\|Er(0)\|_F^2 e^{2t}}{\left(1 + e^{2(t - T_0)}\right)^2}, \quad (61)$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that when $t \leq 4T_0$, $(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) \geq t - T_0 - 4$ (see the analysis in eqs. (37) and (39)). This inequality also uses Lemma 4 to bound $\|r(0)\|_2^2$. From Lemma 7, therefore, denoting $x = \|r\|_2^2$, for some absolute constant $C_{61} > 0$,

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = 2x(1 - x) - C_{61} \frac{e^{2t} \|Er(0)\|_F^2}{\left(1 + e^{2(t - T_0)}\right)^2} \quad (62)$$

$$\implies e^{-2t} \frac{dx}{dt} = 2e^{-2t} x - 2e^{-2t} x^2 - C_{61} \frac{\|Er(0)\|_F^2}{\left(1 + e^{2(t - T_0)}\right)^2} \quad (63)$$

$$\implies \frac{d}{dt} \{e^{-2t} x\} = -2e^{-2t} x^2 - C_{61} \frac{\|Er(0)\|_F^2}{\left(1 + e^{2(t - T_0)}\right)^2} \quad (64)$$

$$\implies \frac{dy}{dt} = -2y^2 e^{2t} - C_{61} \frac{\|Er(0)\|_F^2}{\left(1 + e^{2(t - T_0)}\right)^2}, \quad (65)$$

where $y = e^{-2t} x$. Define a new variable $\tilde{y}(t)$ with $\tilde{y}(0) = y(0)$ and satisfying the following differential equation corresponding to just the first term on the RHS of eq. (65),

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{y}^2} \frac{d\tilde{y}}{dt} = -2e^{2t} \iff \tilde{y}(t) = \frac{1}{1/y(0) + e^{2t} - 1} \quad (66)$$

On the other hand, since $\frac{dy}{dt} \leq -2y^2 e^{2t}$, rearranging and integrating both sides, we get $y(t) \leq 1/(y(0) + e^{2t} - 1) = \tilde{y}(t)$. Plugging this back into eq. (65),

$$\frac{dy}{dt} \geq -2(\tilde{y})^2 e^{2t} - C_{61} \frac{\|Er(0)\|_F^2}{\left(1 + e^{2(t - T_0)}\right)^2}. \quad (67)$$

However, by definition, $\frac{d\tilde{y}}{dt} = -2(\tilde{y})^2 e^{2t}$ and therefore, integrating both sides, for some absolute constant $C'_{61} > 0$, we get,

$$y(t) - y(0) \geq \tilde{y}(t) - \tilde{y}(0) - C'_{61} \|Er(0)\|_F^2 T_0 \quad (68)$$

Plugging in $\tilde{y}(t)$ and subsequently $y(t)$ and $x(t)$ results in the equations,

$$\|r(t)\|_2^2 \geq \frac{e^{2t}}{\|r(0)\|_2^{-2} + e^{2t} - 1} - C'_{61} \|Er(0)\|_F^2 T_0 e^{2t} \quad (69)$$

When $t \leq 3T_0/2$, by using the upper bound on T_0 from Lemma 4, the second term on the RHS itself is upper bounded by $C''_{61} \|E(0)\|_F^2 T_0 / \|r(0)\|_2$ for another absolute constant $C''_{61} > 0$. This completes the proof. \square

While the refined convergence lemma in Lemma 8 applies for the case when $t \leq 3T_0/2$, we also prove a lemma for the case when $t \geq 3T_0/2$.

Lemma 9. *At any $t \geq 3T_0/2$,*

$$e^{3t/4}(1 - \|r(t)\|_2^2) \lesssim 1 + e^{11T_0/4} \|Er(0)\|_2^2 + e^{3T_0/4}. \quad (70)$$

Proof. Consider any time $t \geq 3T_0/2$ which is greater than $T_0 + 2$ by the small initialization and Lemma 2. By Lemma 6, $\|r\|_2^2 \geq 3/4$. From eq. (45) and Lemma 7,

$$\forall t \geq T_0, \quad \frac{d\|r\|_2^2}{dt} \geq \frac{3}{4}(1 - \|r\|_2^2) - 2 \frac{\|Er(0)\|_2^2 e^{2t}}{\left(1 + e^{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) - 1}\right)^2} \quad (71)$$

Multiplying both sides by $e^{3t/4}$ and rearranging,

$$e^{3t/4} \frac{d(1 - \|r\|_2^2)}{dt} + \frac{3}{4} e^{3t/4} (1 - \|r\|_2^2) \leq 2 \frac{\|Er(0)\|_2^2 e^{2t} e^{3t/4}}{\left(1 + e^{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) - 1}\right)^2} \quad (72)$$

$$\implies \frac{d}{dt} \left(e^{3t/4} (1 - \|r\|_2^2) \right) \leq 2 \int \frac{\|Er(0)\|_2^2 e^{2t} e^{3t/4}}{\left(1 + e^{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) - 1}\right)^2} dt. \quad (73)$$

Integrating from T_0 to t , we can upper bound eq. (73) as,

$$e^{3t/4}(1 - \|r(t)\|_2^2) - e^{3T_0/4}(1 - \|r(T_0)\|_2^2) \lesssim \int_{T_0}^t \frac{\|Er(0)\|_2^2 e^{2t} e^{3t/4}}{e^{4(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0)}} dt, \quad (74)$$

By the small initialization, $\|E(0)\|_F^2 \leq 1/8$ and the denominator in the integral is lower bounded by $e^{7/2(t - T_0)}$. Therefore,

$$e^{3t/4}(1 - \|r(t)\|_2^2) - e^{3T_0/4}(1 - \|r(T_0)\|_2^2) \lesssim e^{7T_0/2} \int_{T_0}^t \|Er(0)\|_2^2 e^{-3t/4} dt \quad (75)$$

$$\lesssim e^{7T_0/2} \|Er(0)\|_2^2 e^{-3T_0/4} \quad (76)$$

$$= 2e^{11T_0/4} \|Er(0)\|_2^2 \quad (77)$$

Therefore,

$$e^{3t/4}(1 - \|r(t)\|_2^2) \lesssim 1 + e^{11T_0/4} \|Er(0)\|_2^2 + e^{3T_0/4}. \quad (78)$$

\square

Finally we are ready to prove the lower and upper bounds on the limiting value of column norms of U_t as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Lemma 10 establishes the lower bound, while Lemma 11 establishes the upper bound.

Lemma 10. *When the initialization parameter $\alpha \leq c/k^3 d \log(kd)$, then with probability $\geq 1 - O(1/k)$ over the initialization, for any $t \geq 4T_0$,*

$$\|U(t)e_i\|_2 \geq (1 - \eta) \frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\|r(0)\|_2}. \quad (79)$$

Proof. From the differential equation governing r , eq. (28), for any coordinate $i \in [k]$,

$$\frac{d\langle r, e_i \rangle^2}{dt} = 2\langle r, e_i \rangle^2(1 - \|r\|_2^2) - 2\langle r, e_i \rangle e_i E^T E r \quad (80)$$

$$\geq 2\langle r, e_i \rangle^2(1 - \|r\|_2^2) - 2|\langle r, e_i \rangle| \|E\|_F \|E r\|_2 \quad (81)$$

From Lemma 5 and Lemma 7, and since $\|E(t)\|_F \leq \|E(0)\|_F$, at any time $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\langle r, e_i \rangle^2}{dt} &\geq \frac{2\langle r, e_i \rangle^2}{e^{2(t-T_0)+1+\eta} + 1} - \frac{2|\langle r, e_i \rangle| \|E(0)\|_F \|E r(0)\|_F e^t}{1 + e^{2(1-\|E(0)\|_F^2)(t-T_0)-1}} \\ \implies \frac{d|\langle r, e_i \rangle|}{dt} - \frac{|\langle r, e_i \rangle|}{e^{2(t-T_0)+1+\eta} + 1} &\geq -\frac{\|E(0)\|_F^2 e^t}{1 + e^{2(1-\|E(0)\|_F^2)(t-T_0)-1}} \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

Define $q(t) = e^{-2(t-T_0)+1+\eta}$ (which we abbreviate simply as q) and multiply both sides by $\sqrt{1+q}$,

$$\sqrt{1+q} \frac{d|\langle r, e_i \rangle|}{dt} - |\langle r, e_i \rangle| \frac{q}{\sqrt{1+q}} \geq -\frac{2\|E(0)\|_F^2 e^t \sqrt{1+q}}{1 + e^{2(1-\|E(0)\|_F^2)(t-T_0)-1}} \quad (83)$$

Noting that $\frac{d}{dt} \sqrt{1+q} = -\frac{q}{\sqrt{1+q}}$, we get that,

$$\implies \frac{d}{dt} \left(|\langle r, e_i \rangle| \sqrt{1+q} \right) \geq -2\|E(0)\|_F^2 e^{-(t-T_0)+T_0-2} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{1+e^{2(t-T_0+1)}}}{1 + e^{2(1-\|E(0)\|_F^2)(t-T_0)-1}}. \quad (84)$$

We further lower bound the RHS for the case when $t \leq 4T_0$. Later we will give a different proof to show that when $t \geq 4T_0$, $|\langle r, e_i \rangle|$ does not change significantly then onward.

For $t \leq 4T_0$, $(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) \geq t - T_0 - 4$. This follows from the same analysis as eqs. (37) and (39). In this regime, we therefore have that,

$$\frac{\sqrt{1+e^{2(t-T_0)+1+\eta}}}{1 + e^{2(1-\|E(0)\|_F^2)(t-T_0)-1}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+e^{2(t-T_0)+1+\eta}}} \quad (85)$$

On the other hand,

$$e^{-(t-T_0)+T_0-2} \lesssim e^{T_0} \sqrt{1+e^{-2(t-T_0)+1+\eta}} \quad (86)$$

Multiplying eqs. (85) and (86) results in the lower bound,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(|\langle r, e_i \rangle| \sqrt{1+q} \right) \gtrsim -\|E(0)\|_F^2 e^{T_0} \quad (87)$$

Integrating both sides from $t = 0$ to $4T_0$, and since $T_0 \geq 1$ by the small initialization bound,

$$|\langle r(4T_0), e_i \rangle| \geq |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \sqrt{\frac{1 + e^{2T_0 - 1 - \eta}}{1 + e^{-4T_0}}} - \frac{c_{88} \|E(0)\|_F^2 T_0 e^{T_0}}{\sqrt{1 + e^{-4T_0}}} \quad (88)$$

where $c_{88} > 0$ is an absolute constant. Since $e^{T_0} \geq -\log(\|r(0)\|_2) + 1/2$ from Lemma 4, and since $\|r(0)\|_2^2 \leq \eta$ by the small initialization, the term multiplying $|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|$ on the RHS is upper bounded by $\sqrt{\frac{1 + e^{2T_0 - 1 - \eta}}{1 + e^{-4T_0}}} \geq (1 - 2\eta)e^{T_0 - 1/2 - \eta/2} \geq (1 - 3\eta)e^{T_0 - 1/2}$. On the other hand, noting again by Lemma 4 that $T_0 \leq -\log(\|r(0)\|_2) + 3/2$, and since $\|r(0)\|_2^2 \gtrsim k\alpha^2$ and $\|E(0)\|_F^2 \lesssim \alpha^2 kd$ and furthermore $|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \geq \alpha/k^2$ from Lemma 2, as long as $\alpha \leq c\eta/k^3 d \log(kd)$ for a sufficiently small constant $c > 0$,

$$|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \geq \frac{c_{88} \|E(0)\|_F^2 T_0}{\eta \sqrt{1 + e^{-4T_0}}}. \quad (89)$$

And by implication, eq. (88) gives,

$$|\langle r(4T_0), e_i \rangle| \geq (1 - 4\eta) |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| e^{T_0 - 1/2}, \quad (90)$$

where the last inequality follows from the lower bound on T_0 in Lemma 4.

Finally we show that, from time $4T_0$ onward, $\langle r(t), e_i \rangle$ does not change much. From eq. (82),

$$\frac{d|\langle r, e_i \rangle|}{dt} \geq -\frac{\|E(0)\|_F^2 e^t}{1 + e^{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) - 1}} \gtrsim -\frac{\|E(0)\|_F^2 e^t}{e^{(9/5)(t - T_0)}}. \quad (91)$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $\|E(0)\|_F^2 \leq 1/10$ by Lemma 2 and the upper bound on the initialization scale $\alpha \leq c\eta^2/k^3 d \log(kd)$. Integrating both sides from $4T_0$ to t ,

$$|\langle r(t), e_i \rangle| - |\langle r(4T_0), e_i \rangle| \gtrsim -\|E(0)\|_F^2 e^{9T_0/5} \int_{4T_0}^{\infty} e^{-4t/5} dt \quad (92)$$

$$\gtrsim -\|E(0)\|_F^2 e^{-7T_0/5} \quad (93)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\gtrsim} -|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| e^{-7T_0/5} \quad (94)$$

where (i) follows from eq. (89). Finally, combining with eq. (90),

$$|\langle r(t), e_i \rangle| \geq (1 - 4\eta) |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \left(e^{T_0 - 1/2} - c_{95} e^{-7T_0/5} \right) \quad (95)$$

for some absolute constant $c_{95} > 0$. By noting that $T_0 \geq -\log\|r(0)\|_2 + 1/2$ from Lemma 4 and the fact that $\|r(0)\|_2 \lesssim \alpha^2 k$, by choosing $\alpha \leq c'_{95}/\eta\sqrt{k}$ for some absolute constant $c'_{95} > 0$ results in the inequality,

$$\forall t \geq T_0, |\langle r(t), e_i \rangle| \geq (1 - 5\eta) |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| e^{T_0 - 1/2} \geq (1 - 5\eta) \frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\|r(0)\|_2}. \quad (96)$$

Since $\|Ue_i\|_2 \geq |\langle r(t), e_i \rangle|$, this completes the proof. \square

Lemma 11. *Suppose $\alpha \leq c\eta^2/\eta k^3 d \log(kd)$ for a sufficiently small absolute constant $c > 0$. Then with probability $\geq 1 - O(1/k)$ over the initialization, for any $t \geq 3T_0/2$,*

$$\|U(t)e_i\|_2 \leq (1 + 4\sqrt{\eta}) \frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\|r(0)\|_2}. \quad (97)$$

Proof. Following the proof of the lower bound in Lemma 10, from the differential equation governing r , for any coordinate $i \in [k]$,

$$\frac{d\langle r, e_i \rangle^2}{dt} = 2\langle r, e_i \rangle^2(1 - \|r\|_2^2) - 2\langle r, e_i \rangle e_i E^T E r \quad (98)$$

$$\leq 2\langle r, e_i \rangle^2(1 - \|r\|_2^2) + 2|\langle r, e_i \rangle| \|E\|_F \|E r\|_2 \quad (99)$$

$$\implies \frac{d|\langle r, e_i \rangle|}{dt} \leq |\langle r, e_i \rangle|(1 - \|r\|_2^2) + \frac{\|E(0)\|_F \|E r(0)\|_2 e^t}{1 + e^{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) - 1}} \quad (100)$$

where in the last inequality, we bound $\|E\|_F \leq \|E(0)\|_F$ and apply Lemma 7 to upper bound the error term $\|E r(t)\|_2$. Akin to Lemma 10, we carry out the analysis of $|\langle r(t), e_i \rangle|$ in two parts, we first analyze its growth from time 0 to $3T_0/2$. From time $3T_0/2$ to t we show that $|\langle r(t), e_i \rangle|$ does not change significantly.

In particular, at any time $t \leq 3T_0/2$, since $(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) \geq t - T_0 - 4$ (see the analysis in eqs. (37) and (39)), for some absolute constant C_{101} ,

$$\frac{d|\langle r, e_i \rangle|}{dt} \leq |\langle r, e_i \rangle|(1 - \|r\|_2^2) + C_{101} \frac{\|E(0)\|_F \|E r(0)\|_2 e^t}{1 + e^{2(t - T_0)}} \quad (101)$$

$$\leq |\langle r, e_i \rangle|(1 - \|r\|_2^2) + C_{101} \|E(0)\|_F^2 \|r(0)\|_2 e^{T_0}, \quad (102)$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $e^t/(1 + e^{2(t - T_0)})$ is maximized at $t = T_0$. Plugging in the lower bound on $\|r\|_2^2$ in Lemma 8,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d|\langle r, e_i \rangle|}{dt} &\leq |\langle r, e_i \rangle| \left(\frac{\|r(0)\|_2^{-2} - 1}{\|r(0)\|_2^{-2} + e^{2t} - 1} + C_{59} \frac{\|E(0)\|_F^2 T_0}{\|r(0)\|_2} \right) + C_{101} \|E(0)\|_F^2 \|r(0)\|_2 e^{T_0} \\ &\leq |\langle r, e_i \rangle| \left(\frac{p}{p + e^{2t}} \right) + C_{103} \|E(0)\|_F^2 T_0. \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where $C_{103} > 0$ is a sufficiently large absolute constant, and $p = \|r(0)\|_2^{-2} - 1$. Multiplying both sides by $y = \sqrt{pe^{-2t} + 1}$ and noting that $\frac{dy}{dt} = -\left(\frac{p}{p + e^{2t}}\right)y$, we get,

$$\frac{d}{dt} (y|\langle r, e_i \rangle|) = C_{103} \|E(0)\|_F^2 T_0. \quad (104)$$

Integrating both sides from 0 to $3T_0/2$,

$$|\langle r(3T_0/2), e_i \rangle| \sqrt{pe^{-3T_0} + 1} - |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \sqrt{1 + p} = C'_{103} \|E(0)\|_F^2 T_0^2 \quad (105)$$

$$\implies |\langle r(3T_0/2), e_i \rangle| \leq C'_{103} \|E(0)\|_F^2 T_0^2 + \frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\|r(0)\|_2} \quad (106)$$

By Lemma 2, at initialization, $\|r(0)\|_2^2 \lesssim \alpha\sqrt{k}$ and $|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \geq \alpha/k^2$. Therefore, by the small initialization condition, $C'_{103} \|E(0)\|_F^2 T_0^2 \leq \eta |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| / \|r(0)\|_2$ and,

$$|\langle r(3T_0/2), e_i \rangle| \leq (1 + \eta) \frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\|r(0)\|_2}. \quad (107)$$

Next we show that from $3T_0/2$ to t , $|\langle r(t), e_i \rangle|$ does not change significantly. By the same analysis as eq. (100),

$$\frac{d|\langle r, e_i \rangle|}{dt} \leq |\langle r, e_i \rangle|(1 - \|r\|_2^2) + \frac{2\|E(0)\|_F^2 e^t}{1 + e^{2(1 - \|E(0)\|_F^2)(t - T_0) - 1}} \quad (108)$$

Plugging in the upper bound on $1 - \|r(t)\|_2^2$ from Lemma 9 and simplifying,

$$\frac{d|\langle r, e_i \rangle|}{dt} \lesssim |\langle r, e_i \rangle| e^{-3t/4} \left(e^{3T_0/4} + e^{11T_0/4} \|Er(0)\|_2^2 \right) + \frac{2\|E(0)\|_F^2 e^t}{e^{2(1-\|E(0)\|_F^2 \|r(0)\|_2)(t-T_0)}}, \quad (109)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} |\langle r, e_i \rangle| e^{-3t/4} \left(e^{3T_0/4} + e^{11T_0/4} \|Er(0)\|_2^2 \right) + \frac{2\|E(0)\|_F^2 \|r(0)\|_2 e^t}{e^{7/4(t-T_0)}} \quad (110)$$

$$= |\langle r, e_i \rangle| e^{-3t/4} \left(e^{3T_0/4} + e^{11T_0/4} \|Er(0)\|_2^2 \right) + 2\|E(0)\|_F^2 \|r(0)\|_2 e^{-3t/4} e^{7T_0/4}, \quad (111)$$

$$= (|\langle r, e_i \rangle| (1 + e^{2T_0} \|Er(0)\|_2^2) + 2\|E(0)\|_F^2 \|r(0)\|_2 e^{T_0}) e^{-3(t-T_0)/4}, \quad (112)$$

where (i) invokes the fact that $\|E(0)\|_F^2 \leq 1/8$ from Lemma 2, by the bound on the initialization scale $\alpha \leq c\eta/k^3 d \log(kd)$. Simplifying the terms in eq. (112),

$$e^{2T_0} \|Er(0)\|_2^2 \leq e^{2T_0} \|E(0)\|_2^2 \|r(0)\|_2^2 \stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \|E(0)\|_2^2 \leq 1, \quad (113)$$

where (i) is by Lemma 4 and the last equation follows from the scaling of α and Lemma 2. Likewise, $\|E(0)\|_F^2 \|r(0)\|_2 e^{T_0} \lesssim \|E(0)\|_F^2$, and plugging this and eq. (113) into eq. (112),

$$\frac{d|\langle r, e_i \rangle|}{dt} \lesssim (|\langle r, e_i \rangle| + 2\|E(0)\|_F^2) e^{-3(t-T_0)/4} \quad (114)$$

Integrating both sides,

$$\log \frac{|\langle r(t), e_i \rangle| + 2\|E(0)\|_F^2}{|\langle r(3T_0/2), e_i \rangle| + 2\|E(0)\|_F^2} \lesssim \int_{3T_0/2}^{\infty} e^{-3(t-T_0)/4} dt \lesssim e^{-3T_0/8}. \quad (115)$$

Therefore, for some absolute constant $C_{116} > 0$,

$$|\langle r(t), e_i \rangle| \leq (|\langle r(3T_0/2), e_i \rangle| + 2\|E(0)\|_F^2) (1 + C_{116} e^{-3T_0/8}) \quad (116)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} (|\langle r(3T_0/2), e_i \rangle| + 2\|E(0)\|_F^2) (1 + \sqrt{\eta}) \quad (117)$$

$$\implies \|U(t)e_i\|_2 \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \|E(0)\|_F + (|\langle r(3T_0/2), e_i \rangle| + 2\|E(0)\|_F^2) (1 + \sqrt{\eta}), \quad (118)$$

where (i) lower bounds T_0 using Lemma 4 and uses the fact that at initialization $\|r(0)\|_2 \gtrsim \alpha\sqrt{k}$ and therefore when $\alpha \leq c\eta^{4/3}$ for a sufficiently small constant $c > 0$, $C_{116} e^{-3T_0/8} \leq \sqrt{\eta}$. On the other hand, (ii) uses triangle inequality to bound $\|U(t)e_i\|_2 \leq |\langle r(t), e_i \rangle| + \|E(t)e_i\|_2 \leq |\langle r(t), e_i \rangle| + \|E(t)\|_F \leq |\langle r(t), e_i \rangle| + \|E(0)\|_F$ by Lemma 3. Using the bound on $|\langle r(3T_0/2), e_i \rangle|$ in eq. (107),

$$\|U(t)e_i\|_2 \leq \|E(0)\|_F + \left(\frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\|r(0)\|_2} + 2\|E(0)\|_F^2 \right) (1 + \sqrt{\eta}) \quad (119)$$

$$\leq \frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\|r(0)\|_2} (1 + 4\sqrt{\eta}). \quad (120)$$

The last inequality uses the fact that at initialization, $|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \geq \alpha/k^2$ and $\|r(0)\|_2 \lesssim \alpha\sqrt{k}$. Therefore, $|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|/\|r(0)\|_2 \geq 1/k^{5/2}$ and $\|E(0)\|_F \leq \alpha\sqrt{kd}$. Therefore, by the small initialization condition on α , $\|E(0)\|_F, \|E(0)\|_F^2 \leq \eta |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|/\|r(0)\|_2$. \square

Combining the statements of Lemma 10 and Lemma 11 shows that, with probability $\geq 1 - O(1/k)$ over the initialization, at any time $t \geq 4T_0$,

$$\frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\|r(0)\|_2} (1 - 5\eta) \leq \|U(t)e_i\|_2 \leq \frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\|r(0)\|_2} (1 + 4\sqrt{\eta}). \quad (121)$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 1.

A.3 Behavior at initialization: many columns are “active”

Lemma 1 establishes the limiting behavior of gradient flow as a function of the initialization, specifically that the norm of a column grows to a value proportional to the inner product of the column with U_\star at initialization, $|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|$. In this section, we show that at initialization, $\langle r(0), e_i \rangle$ is significant for many $i \in [d]$ compared to the maximum among them.

At time $t = 0$, each coordinate of $r(0)$ is distributed as the inner product of a Gaussian vector $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \alpha^2 I)$ with a fixed vector U_\star . By Gaussian concentration, we therefore expect each coordinate of $r(0)$ to concentrate around α , and no one coordinate of $r(0)$ to be significantly larger than the others. The next lemma makes this claim precise.

Lemma 12. *Many columns are “active” at initialization* For any $\eta > 0$, let $S_{\max}(\eta)$ denote the

set $\left\{ i \in [k] : \frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\max_{j \in [k]} |\langle r(0), e_j \rangle|} \geq 1 - \sqrt{\eta} \right\}$. For any $\eta \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\log(k)}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|S_{\max}(\eta)| \leq \frac{k^\eta}{2\sqrt{2(1-\eta)\log(k)}} \right) \leq \frac{c_{122}\sqrt{\log(k)}}{k^\eta}. \quad (122)$$

for a sufficiently small absolute constant $c_{122} > 0$. In other words, with high probability, $\tilde{\Omega}(k^\eta)$ of the column indices $i \in [k]$ are significantly correlated with U_\star compared to the maximum among all columns.

Proof. By rotation invariance of Gaussians and since $\|U_\star\|_2 = 1$, for each i , $\langle r(0), e_i \rangle \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \alpha^2)$. By Gaussian anti-concentration, for each $i \in [k]$, from [Ver18, Proposition 2.1.2], for $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} (|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \geq t\alpha) \geq \left(\frac{1}{t} - \frac{1}{t^3} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-t^2/2} \triangleq p(t). \quad (123)$$

Therefore roughly we expect $kp(t)$ of the columns $i \in [k]$ to satisfy the condition $\{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \geq t\alpha\}$. In particular, by the independence across i , the number of successes follows a binomial distribution with number of trials k and probability of success $p(t)$. Denote $S(t) = \{i \in [k] : |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \geq t\alpha\}$. By binomial concentration [Ver18],

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|S(t)| \leq \frac{kp(t)}{2} \right) \leq e^{-\frac{kp(t)}{4}}. \quad (124)$$

On the other hand, for i.i.d standard normal random variables, $X_1, \dots, X_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, the supremum satisfies the following concentration inequality

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} X_i \geq \sqrt{2 \log(k)} + \eta \right) \leq e^{-\eta^2/2} \quad (125)$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{i \in [k]} |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle| \leq \alpha \sqrt{2 \log(k)} + \alpha \sqrt{2\eta \log(k)} \right) \geq 1 - k^{-\eta}. \quad (126)$$

For each $t > 0$, define,

$$S_{\max}(t) = \left\{ i \in [k] : \frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\max_{i \in [k]} |\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|} \geq \frac{t}{\sqrt{2 \log(k)}(1 + \sqrt{\eta})} \right\}, \quad (127)$$

and combining eqs. (123), (124) and (126) results in the inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|S_{\max}(t)| \leq \frac{kp(t)}{2}\right) \leq e^{-\frac{kp(t)}{4}} + k^{-1/8} \leq \frac{4}{kp(t)} + k^{-\eta}. \quad (128)$$

With the choice of $t = \sqrt{2(1-\eta)\log(k)}$ and for any $\eta \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\log(k)}$, we obtain that $p(t) \geq k^{-(1-\eta)}/4\sqrt{(1-\eta)\log(k)}$. Plugging into eq. (128) and using the results in the bound,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|S_{\max}(\sqrt{2(1-\eta)\log(k)})| \leq \frac{k^\eta}{4\sqrt{(1-\eta)\log(k)}}\right) \leq \frac{1 + 16\sqrt{2(1-\eta)\log(k)}}{k^\eta} \quad (129)$$

Using the definition of $S_{\max}(\sqrt{2(1-\eta)\log(k)})$ and the fact that $\frac{\sqrt{1-\eta}}{1+\sqrt{\eta}} \geq 1 - \sqrt{\eta}$ completes the proof. \square

A.4 Putting it all together: Proof of Theorem 1

Below we state and prove a stronger version of Theorem 1 which follows by combining Lemmas 1 and 12. The strengthening is in the sense of holding for any constant lower bound on the ratio of the norm of a column to that of the maximum (and not just 0.99 as in Theorem 1).

Theorem 7. *Consider the population loss defined in eq. (2), for the case that $r = 1$ and $k \gg 1$. Moreover, assume that the entries of the initial model U_0 are i.i.d. samples from $\mathcal{N}(0, \alpha^2)$, where $\alpha \leq \eta^2/k^3 d \log(kd)$. Then, for any constant $\eta \in (0, 1)$, the iterates generated by gradient descent converge to a model U_{gd} where $\tilde{\Omega}(k^\eta)$ columns of which are active and satisfy,*

$$\frac{\|U_{gd}e_i\|_2}{\max_{j \in [k]} \|U_{gd}e_j\|_2} \geq 1 - C_4\sqrt{\eta}, \quad (130)$$

with probability $\geq 1 - \text{poly}(1/d, 1/k^\eta)$, where $C_4 > 0$ is a sufficiently large constant.

Proof. Consider any $i \in [k]$, such that,

$$\frac{|\langle r(0), e_i \rangle|}{\max_{j \in [k]} |\langle r(0), e_j \rangle|} \geq 1 - \sqrt{\eta} \quad (131)$$

Then, by Lemma 1,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|U(t)e_i\|_2}{\max_{j \in [k]} \|U(t)e_j\|_2} \geq 1 - C_{132}\sqrt{\eta}. \quad (132)$$

where $C_{132} > 0$ is a sufficiently large constant. By Lemma 12, eq. (131) is satisfied for $\Omega(k^\eta)$ choices of i with high probability. Together with eq. (132), this completes the proof of Theorem 7. \square

B Population analysis of the regularized loss: Proof of Theorem 2

In this section, we study the second-order stationary points of loss $f_{\text{pop}}(U) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U) + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta(U)$ (eq. (13)) which is the regularized loss in the population (infinite sample) setting. The main result we prove in this section is about approximate second-order stationary points of the regularized loss $f_{\text{pop}}(U)$. When λ and β are chosen appropriately, we show that such points (i) are ‘‘pruning friendly’’ in that greedily pruning the columns of U based on their L_2 norm results in a solution

U_{prune} having exactly r columns, and (ii) the resulting solution U_{prune} satisfies $\|U_{\text{prune}}U_{\text{prune}}^T\|_F \leq c(\sigma_r^*)^2$ where $c > 0$ is a small constant, and serves essentially as a “spectral initialization” in the sense of [ZKHC21] for the subsequent fine-tuning phase.

The proof of Theorem 2 relies on two main observations: (i) showing that at approximate second-order stationary points $UU^T \approx U_*U_*^T$, where the error is small when λ is small, (ii) the regularizer ensures that the columns of U that are not too small in ℓ_2 -norm are all approximately orthogonal to one another, in that the angle between pairs of vectors is $\approx 90^\circ$. Since the columns are orthogonal, the rank of U equals the number of non-zero columns. However, U is close to a rank r matrix since $UU^T \approx U_*U_*^T$. This will imply that U also has approximately r non-zero columns. Moreover, pruning away the columns of U at the correct threshold will result in a model having exactly r columns remaining, while at the same time not affecting the population loss significantly.

The intuition behind $UU^T \approx U_*U_*^T$ at second order stationary points is straightforward - prior work [GJZ17] characterizes the behavior of such points for matrix sensing in the absence of any regularization, showing that $UU^T = U_*U_*^T$ at second-order stationary points, and establishing a strict saddle condition for the population loss \mathcal{L}_{pop} . In the presence of regularization, as long as λ is small, we do not expect the behavior to change significantly. As we will discuss in more detail in Appendix D, the regularizer \mathcal{R}_β satisfies gradient and Hessian-Lipschitzness as long as β is not too small. This will suffice in showing that the locations of first and second order stationary points do not change significantly when λ is small.

As introduced earlier in eq. (14), the main result we prove in this section is that the “bounded” (in operator norm) (ϵ, γ) -approximate second-order stationary points of f_{pop} satisfies the following condition,

$$\forall i, j : \|Ue_i\|_2, \|Ue_j\|_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}, \quad \frac{\langle Ue_i, Ue_j \rangle}{\|Ue_i\|_2 \|Ue_j\|_2} \approx 0.$$

In other words, all the large columns of U have their pairwise angle approximately 90° . By pruning away the columns of U that have an ℓ_2 norm less than $2\sqrt{\beta}$, the remaining columns of U , i.e., which are a superset of the columns of U_{prune} , are now approximately at 90° angles to one another. But since $UU^T \approx U_*U_*^T$, we know that there can be at most r significant columns of U . Therefore, after pruning the resulting model has at most r columns.

Note that the above discussion does not absolve the risk of over-pruning the model. If the pruning threshold is not chosen carefully, it might be possible to end up with a model having fewer than r columns. Such a model cannot generalize to a vanishing error even in the population setting. As we will show, it is possible to establish that error of the pruned model, $\|U_{\text{prune}}U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F$ is also small, which comes to the rescue. We can show that it is at most $\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_r^*)^2$. If U_{prune} indeed had fewer than r columns, the approximation error must be at least $(\sigma_r^*)^2$, which leads to a contradiction. This shows that the greedy pruning strategy we employ is not too aggressive.

B.1 Proof outline of Theorem 2

In Lemma 13 we begin with a lower bound on the gradient norm of the regularized loss which we use to show that at approximate second order stationary points of the regularized loss, every pair of columns which are not too small in ℓ_2 norm are approximately orthogonal to each other. Next, in Lemma 16 we show that at approximate second order stationary points of the loss, we also expect $\|UU^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F$ to be small when λ is small. In Lemmas 18 and 19 we show that first-order stationary points of U are aligned with the correct subspace induced by the columns of U_* . Finally, we combine these results in Theorem 8 to show bounds on the generalization loss of the pruned solution as a function of the problem parameters. By instantiating the problem parameters properly, we prove Theorem 2 in Appendix B.2.

Lemma 13 (A lower bound on the gradient norm). *Consider any loss function \mathcal{L} of the form $f(UU^T)$ where $f : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a differentiable function. For any candidate matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$,*

$$\|\nabla(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)\|_F^2 \geq \lambda^2 \max_{i \neq j \in [k]} (D(U)_{ii} - D(U)_{jj})^2 \frac{\langle Ue_i, Ue_j \rangle^2}{\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \|Ue_j\|_2^2} \quad (133)$$

Proof. Note that $\|\nabla(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)\|_F^2 \geq \langle Z, \nabla(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U) \rangle^2$ for any candidate $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k} : \|Z\|_F \leq 1$. The rest of this proof will be dedicated to finding such a Z .

Note from Lemma 26 that $\langle \mathcal{L}(U), Z \rangle = \langle (\nabla f)(UU^T), UZ^T + ZU^T \rangle$. Suppose the perturbation Z is chosen as UW where W is a skew-symmetric matrix. Then, $UZ^T + ZU^T = U(W + W^T)U^T = 0$. Therefore,

$$\langle \nabla \mathcal{L}(U), Z \rangle = 0 \quad (134)$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 28,

$$\langle \nabla \mathcal{R}_\beta(U), Z \rangle = \text{Tr}(D(U)U^T Z) = \text{Tr}(D(U)U^T U W). \quad (135)$$

where $D(U)$ is defined in eq. (337). Define (i, j) as an arbitrary pair of distinct indices in $[k]$. Suppose $W = e_i e_j^T - e_j e_i^T$. Then,

$$\langle \nabla \mathcal{R}_\beta(U), Z \rangle^2 = (e_i^T (D(U)U^T U - U^T U D(U)) e_j)^2 \quad (136)$$

$$= (D(U)_{ii} - D(U)_{jj})^2 \langle Ue_i, Ue_j \rangle^2. \quad (137)$$

Dividing throughout by $\|Z\|_F^2 = \|UW\|_F^2 = \|Ue_i\|_F^2 + \|Ue_j\|_F^2$ and noting that $i \neq j$ are arbitrary completes the proof. \square

Remark 1. *The interpretation of the lower bound on the gradient norm in Lemma 13 is best understood by looking at its behavior at first-order stationary points, where the gradient is 0. At a first-order stationary point, for any $i, j \in [k]$ such that $i \neq j$, either $D(U)_{ii} = D(U)_{jj}$ or $Ue_i \perp Ue_j$. The former condition is true iff $\|Ue_i\|_2 = \|Ue_j\|_2$.*

Next we prove a result which establishes near-orthogonality of the columns of U at approximate second-order stationary points.

Lemma 14. *Consider any loss $\mathcal{L}(U)$ of the form $f(UU^T)$ where $f : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is doubly differentiable. Consider any ϵ -approximate first-order stationary point of $\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta$, denoted U . Consider any $i \neq j \in [k]$ and define $C_{ij} = \frac{\langle Ue_i, Ue_j \rangle}{\sqrt{\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \|Ue_j\|_2^2}}$. Then, if*

1. $\min\{\|Ue_i\|_2, \|Ue_j\|_2\} \leq 2\sqrt{\beta}$, then, $|C_{ij}| \leq 2\sqrt{\beta}$.

2. In the complement case, defining $\|Z\|_F = \sqrt{\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \|Ue_j\|_2^2}$, if,

$$|C_{ij}| \geq 5\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon + \gamma \min\{\|Ue_i\|_2, \|Ue_j\|_2\}}{\lambda}} \cdot \min\{\|Ue_i\|_2, \|Ue_j\|_2\}. \quad (138)$$

then the Hessian of the regularized loss at U has a large negative eigenvalue,

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)) < -\gamma. \quad (139)$$

In summary, at second order stationary points the columns are approximately orthogonal in the sense that $|C_{ij}|$ is small.

Regardless of whether U is approximately stationary or not, for any $i \neq j \in [k]$, if $\min\{\|Ue_i\|_2, \|Ue_j\|_2\} \leq 2\sqrt{\beta}$, then,

$$\frac{|\langle Ue_i, Ue_j \rangle|}{\sqrt{\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \|Ue_j\|_2^2}} \leq \frac{\|Ue_i\|_2 \|Ue_j\|_2}{\max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2^2} = \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{\beta}. \quad (140)$$

This proves the first part of the theorem statement. Henceforth, we will assume that $\min\{\|Ue_i\|_2, \|Ue_j\|_2\} \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$. This condition will turn out to lower bound the Frobenius norm of a matrix Z which we will require later for the proof of the second part.

The approximate first-order stationarity of U implies that

$$\|\nabla(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)\|_F \leq \epsilon. \quad (141)$$

As in the proof of Lemma 13, the proof strategy is to construct explicit directions (matrices) capturing the directions of negative curvature of the regularized loss. From Lemma 13, the approximate first-order stationarity of U implies,

$$\frac{|\langle Ue_i, Ue_j \rangle|}{\sqrt{\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \|Ue_j\|_2^2}} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{1}{|\Delta|}. \quad (142)$$

where $\Delta = D(U)_{ii} - D(U)_{jj}$. Consider any tuple $i \neq j \in [k]$. Without loss of generality we will work with $i = 1, j = 2$.

Consider a perturbation $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ which takes the form $Z = UW$ where W is a skew-symmetric matrix which satisfies the ‘‘support condition’’,

$$\forall i' \geq 3, We_{i'} = 0, e_{i'}^T W = 0 \quad (143)$$

In general, when Δ is small in absolute value, by the support condition eq. (143) of W , one would expect $WD(U) \approx D(U)W$ in case Δ is small. In particular, defining the diagonal matrix $L = \text{diag}(\frac{\Delta}{2}, -\frac{\Delta}{2}, 0, \dots)$, we have that,

$$WD(U) - D(U)W = WL - LW. \quad (144)$$

From the gradient and Hessian computations in Lemma 28,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2 \mathcal{R}_\beta(U)] \text{vec}(Z) \\ &= \text{Tr}(D(U) \cdot Z^T Z) - \sum_{i=1}^k G(U)_{ii} \langle Ze_i, Ue_i \rangle^2 \end{aligned} \quad (145)$$

$$= \text{Tr}(WD(U)Z^T U) - \sum_{i=1}^k G(U)_{ii} \langle Ze_i, Ue_i \rangle^2 \quad (146)$$

$$= \langle \nabla \mathcal{R}_\beta(U), WZ^T \rangle + \text{Tr}((WL - LW) \cdot Z^T U) - \sum_{i=1}^k G(U)_{ii} \langle Ze_i, Ue_i \rangle^2 \quad (147)$$

where the last equation uses the gradient computation in Lemma 28 and the fact that W and $D(U)$ approximately commute per eq. (144). Likewise, analyzing the second order behavior of \mathcal{L} using

the Hessian computations in Lemma 26 results in the following set of equations,

$$\text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2\mathcal{L}(U)]\text{vec}(Z) \quad (148)$$

$$= \text{vec}(UZ^T + ZU^T)[(\nabla^2 f)(UU^T)]\text{vec}(UZ^T + ZU^T) + 2\langle(\nabla f)(UU^T), ZZ^T\rangle \quad (149)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{=} 2\langle(\nabla f)(UU^T), ZZ^T\rangle \quad (150)$$

$$= \langle(\nabla f)(UU^T), UWZ^T + ZW^TU^T\rangle \quad (151)$$

$$= \langle\nabla\mathcal{L}(U), WZ^T\rangle, \quad (152)$$

where (i) uses the fact that $UZ^T + ZU^T = U(W^T + W)U^T = 0$ and the last equation uses the gradient computations in Lemma 26.

Summing up eqs. (147) and (152), we get,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)]\text{vec}(Z) \\ & \stackrel{(i)}{=} \langle\nabla(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U), WZ^T\rangle + \lambda\text{Tr}((WL - LW) \cdot Z^TU) - \lambda\sum_{i=1}^k G(U)_{ii}\langle Ze_i, Ue_i\rangle^2 \end{aligned} \quad (153)$$

Noting that U is an ϵ -approximate stationary point of $\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta$, by Cauchy–Bunyakovsky–Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)]\text{vec}(Z) \\ & \leq \epsilon\|WZ^T\|_F + \lambda\text{Tr}((WL - LW) \cdot Z^TU) - \lambda\sum_{i=1}^k G(U)_{ii}\langle Ze_i, Ue_i\rangle^2 \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

Now we are ready to choose W . Suppose W is chosen as $(e_1e_2^T - e_2e_1^T)$. With this choice of W , we have that,

$$\|Z\|_F = \|UW\|_F = \sqrt{\|Ue_1\|_2^2 + \|Ue_2\|_2^2} \quad (155)$$

Likewise,

$$\|WZ^T\|_F = \|WW^TU^T\|_F \quad (156)$$

$$= \|U(e_1e_1^T + e_2e_2^T)\|_F \quad (157)$$

$$= \sqrt{\|Ue_1\|_2^2 + \|Ue_2\|_2^2} = \|Z\|_F. \quad (158)$$

Simplifying eq. (154), the last term can be evaluated to,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k G(U)_{ii}\langle Ze_i, Ue_i\rangle^2 = (G(U)_{11} + G(U)_{22})\langle Ue_1, Ue_2\rangle^2. \quad (159)$$

With this choice of parameters, eq. (154) simplifies to,

$$\text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)]\text{vec}(Z) \quad (160)$$

$$\leq \epsilon\|Z\|_F + \lambda\text{Tr}((WL - LW) \cdot Z^TU) - \lambda(G(U)_{11} + G(U)_{22})\langle Ze_i, Ue_i\rangle^2 \quad (161)$$

Next we prove a lemma upper bounding the middle term in eq. (154).

Lemma 15. *The error term $\lambda \text{Tr}((WL - LW) \cdot Z^T U)$ can be upper bounded by,*

$$\text{Tr}((WL - LW) \cdot Z^T U) \leq 40\Delta^2 \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2^2 \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2. \quad (162)$$

The proof is deferred to Appendix B.2. Combining eq. (161) with Lemma 15,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)] \text{vec}(Z) &\leq \epsilon \|Z\|_F + 40\lambda\Delta^2 \|Z\|_F^2 \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2 \\ &\quad - \lambda(G(U)_{11} + G(U)_{22}) \langle Ue_1, Ue_2 \rangle^2 \end{aligned} \quad (163)$$

Therefore, considering any approximate stationary point U that satisfies,

$$\lambda(G(U)_{11} + G(U)_{22}) \frac{\langle Ue_1, Ue_2 \rangle^2}{\|Z\|_F^2} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{\|Z\|_F} + 40\lambda\Delta^2 \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2 + \gamma \quad (C1)$$

the Hessian $\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)$ has an eigenvalue which is at most $-\gamma$. Note by a similar analysis as eq. (225),

$$G(U)_{11} + G(U)_{22} \geq \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} G(U)_{ii} \geq \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 4\beta}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{5/2}} \quad (164)$$

$$\geq \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{1}{3\|Ue_i\|_2^3 + 12\beta^{3/2}} \quad (165)$$

$$\geq \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{1}{5\|Ue_i\|_2^3}. \quad (166)$$

where the second-to-last inequality uses the fact that $\min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$. Therefore, a sufficient condition to guarantee eq. (C1) is,

$$\max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{\lambda}{5\|Ue_i\|_2^3} \cdot \frac{\langle Ue_1, Ue_2 \rangle^2}{\|Z\|_F^2} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{\|Z\|_F} + 40\lambda\Delta^2 \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2 + \gamma. \quad (167)$$

From eq. (142), we have that,

$$\frac{\langle Ue_1, Ue_2 \rangle^2}{\|Z\|_F^2} \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{\lambda^2 \Delta^2} \quad (168)$$

When Δ is large, the columns are nearly orthogonal by eq. (168). When Δ is small, the barrier to setting up a negative eigenvalue of the Hessian of $\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta$ is small by eq. (167). In particular, under the ‘‘small- Δ ’’ condition,

$$\Delta \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4\lambda^{1/2} \cdot \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2} \quad (169)$$

$\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)$ has a negative eigenvalue taking value at most $-\gamma$ under the sufficient condition,

$$\max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{\lambda}{5\|Ue_i\|_2^3} \cdot \frac{\langle Ue_1, Ue_2 \rangle^2}{\|Z\|_F^2} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{\|Z\|_F} + 40\lambda\Delta^2 \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2 + \gamma \quad (170)$$

$$\iff \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{\lambda}{5\|Ue_i\|_2^3} \cdot \frac{\langle Ue_1, Ue_2 \rangle^2}{\|Z\|_F^2} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{\|Z\|_F} + \frac{40\epsilon \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2}{16 \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2^2} + \gamma \quad (171)$$

$$\iff \frac{\langle Ue_1, Ue_2 \rangle^2}{\|Z\|_F^2} \geq \frac{18\epsilon \cdot \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2^2}{\lambda} + \frac{5\gamma}{\lambda} \cdot \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2^3, \quad (172)$$

which is precisely the bound in eq. (138). On the other hand, under the large- Δ condition, from eq. (142), we have that,

$$\frac{\langle Ue_1, Ue_2 \rangle^2}{\|Z\|_F^2} \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{\lambda^2} \frac{16\lambda}{\epsilon} \cdot \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2^2 \leq \frac{16\epsilon}{\lambda} \cdot \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2^2. \quad (173)$$

This completes the proof.

Lemma 16. Consider an ϵ -approximate first-order stationary point U . If the generalization loss is large, i.e. $\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \geq 8 \max\left\{\epsilon^{2/3}d^{1/6}, \lambda\sqrt{\frac{2k}{\beta}}\right\}$, then the Hessian of $\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta$ at U has a large negative eigenvalue,

$$\lambda_{\min}[\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)]\text{vec}(Z) \leq -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}}\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F. \quad (174)$$

In other words, at an (ϵ, γ) -approximate second order stationary point,

$$\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \lesssim \max\left\{\epsilon^{2/3}d^{1/6}, \lambda\sqrt{\frac{2k}{\beta}}, \sqrt{k}\gamma\right\} \quad (175)$$

Proof. In the rest of this proof we expand U_\star to a $\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ matrix by appending with 0 columns. This allows us to define $R_\star \in \arg \min_{R: RR^T = R^T R = I} \|U - U_\star R\|_F^2$, breaking ties arbitrarily. Define $Z = U - U_\star R_\star$. With this choice of Z , we invoke 3 results from [GJZ17] (Lemmas 7, 40 and 41),

$$\|ZZ^T\|_F^2 \leq 2\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2. \quad (176)$$

And,

$$\|ZU^T\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}-1}\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2. \quad (177)$$

And finally a bound on the Hessian,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)]\text{vec}(Z) &\leq 2\|ZZ^T\|_F^2 - 6\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2 + 4\langle\nabla(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U), Z\rangle \\ &\quad + \lambda[\text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2\mathcal{R}_\beta(U)]\text{vec}(Z) - 4\langle\nabla\mathcal{R}_\beta(U), Z\rangle]. \end{aligned} \quad (178)$$

Plugging eq. (176) into eq. (178), and using the fact that U is an ϵ -approximate first order stationary point,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)]\text{vec}(Z) &\leq -2\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2 + 4\epsilon\|Z\|_F \\ &\quad + \lambda[\text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2\mathcal{R}_\beta(U)]\text{vec}(Z) - 4\langle\nabla\mathcal{R}_\beta(U), Z\rangle]. \end{aligned} \quad (179)$$

In the next lemma we upper bound the last term.

Lemma 17. The contribution from the regularizer in the last term of eq. (179) can be bounded by,

$$\text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2\mathcal{R}_\beta(U)]\text{vec}(Z) - 4\langle\mathcal{R}_\beta(U), \text{vec}(Z)\rangle \leq 8\sqrt{\frac{2k}{\beta}}\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F. \quad (180)$$

The proof of this result is deferred to Appendix B.2.

Finally, combining Lemma 17 with Equation (179),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)]\text{vec}(Z) &\leq -2\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2 + 4\epsilon\|Z\|_F \\ &\quad + 8\lambda\sqrt{\frac{2k}{\beta}}\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \end{aligned} \quad (181)$$

Yet again using the inequality $\|Z\|_F^4 \leq k\|ZZ^T\|_F^2 \leq 2k\|UU^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F^2$, this results in the bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)]\text{vec}(Z) &\leq -2\|UU^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F^2 + 8\epsilon k^{1/4}\|UU^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F^{1/2} \\ &\quad + 8\lambda\sqrt{\frac{2k}{\beta}}\|UU^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F \end{aligned} \quad (182)$$

If $\|UU^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F \geq 8\max\left\{\epsilon^{2/3}k^{1/6}, \lambda\sqrt{\frac{2k}{\beta}}\right\}$, the RHS is upper bounded by $-\|UU^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F^2$. Finally, noting that $\|Z\|_F^4 \leq k\|ZZ^T\|_F^2 \leq 2k\|UU^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F^2$, we have that,

$$\lambda_{\min}[\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)] \leq \frac{\text{vec}(Z)^T[\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)]\text{vec}(Z)}{\|Z\|_F^2} \quad (183)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}}\|UU^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F \quad (184)$$

□

Next we show that each column of U is almost entirely contained in the span of V_r in that the angle between Ue_i and its projection onto V_r^\perp is almost 90° .

Lemma 18. *Consider an ϵ -approximate first order stationary point U . Let V_r denote the matrix with columns as the non-zero eigenvectors of $U_*U_*^T$. Then,*

$$\|V_r^\perp(V_r^\perp)^T U\|_F \leq \epsilon k. \quad (185)$$

Proof. By eq. (194) for $Z = V_r^\perp(V_r^\perp)^T U$,

$$2\langle UU^T - U_*U_*^T, UZ^T + ZU^T \rangle + \lambda\text{Tr}(UD(U)Z^T) \leq \epsilon\|Z\|_F \quad (186)$$

The LHS is lower bounded by,

$$4\text{Tr}(UU^T V_r^\perp(V_r^\perp)^T UU^T) + \lambda\text{Tr}(UD(U)U^T V_r^\perp(V_r^\perp)^T) \quad (187)$$

$$\geq 4\|V_r^\perp(V_r^\perp)^T UU^T\|_F^2 \quad (188)$$

$$\geq 4\|V_r^\perp(V_r^\perp)^T U \cdot (V_r^\perp(V_r^\perp)^T U)^T\|_F^2 \quad (189)$$

$$= 4\|ZZ^T\|_F^2 \quad (190)$$

$$\geq \frac{4}{\text{rank}(Z)}\|Z\|_F^4 \quad (191)$$

$$= \frac{4}{k}\|Z\|_F^2. \quad (192)$$

Combining with eq. (186) completes the proof (we drop the constant 4 for succinctness). □

Lemma 19. *Consider an ϵ -approximate first order stationary point U . Let V_r be as defined in Lemma 18. Then, for any column $i \in [k]$ such that $\|Ue_i\|_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$,*

$$\frac{\|V_r^\perp(V_r^\perp)^T Ue_i\|_2}{\|Ue_i\|_2} \leq \epsilon\sqrt{\frac{k}{\beta^{1/2}\lambda}}. \quad (193)$$

Note that the LHS is also the cosine of the angle between Ue_i and its projection onto V_r^\perp , or the sine of the angle between Ue_i and its projection onto V_r .

Proof. At an ϵ -approximate first order stationary point the gradient is upper bounded in L_2 -norm by ϵ . From the gradient and Hessian computations in Lemma 25 and Lemma 28, with $Z = V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T U$, this implies that,

$$2\langle UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T, UZ^T + ZU^T \rangle + \lambda \text{Tr}(D(U)Z^T U) \leq \epsilon \|Z\|_F \quad (194)$$

Noting that U_\star has rank r and is orthogonal to V_r^\perp , the LHS simplifies as,

$$4\text{Tr}(UU^T V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T UU^T) + \lambda \text{Tr}(UD(U)U^T V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T) \quad (195)$$

$$\geq \lambda \sum_{j=1}^k D(U)_{jj} \|V_r (V_r^\perp)^T U e_j\|_2^2 \quad (196)$$

$$\geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{\|V_r (V_r^\perp)^T U e_i\|_2^2}{\|U e_i\|_2}, \quad (197)$$

where the last inequality is for any column i such that $\|U e_i\|_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$, since we have that $D(U)_{ii} = \frac{2\beta + \|U e_i\|_2^2}{(\|U e_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} \geq \frac{1}{2\|U e_i\|_2}$. Putting everything together, we get that

$$\frac{\lambda}{2} \|U e_i\|_2 \cdot \frac{\|V_r (V_r^\perp)^T U e_i\|_2^2}{\|U e_i\|_2^2} \leq \epsilon \|Z\|_F \quad (198)$$

Since $\|U e_i\|_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$, rearranging the terms around and finally upper bounding $\|Z\|_F$ using Lemma 18 completes the proof. \square

Theorem 8. Consider any (ϵ, γ) -approximate second-order stationary point of $\mathcal{L} + \lambda \mathcal{R}_\beta$ denoted U . Suppose $\|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3$. Construct U_{prune} by following the pruning condition:

$$\|U e_i\|_2 \leq \max\{2\sqrt{\beta}, \epsilon k\} \implies U_{\text{prune}} e_i \leftarrow 0 \quad (199)$$

Suppose $\epsilon^2 < c\beta^{1/2}\lambda/kr^2$ and $\epsilon + \gamma \leq c\lambda/r^2$. Then,

1. U_{prune} has at most r non-zero columns.
2. Furthermore,

$$\|U_{\text{prune}} U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \lesssim \max \left\{ \sqrt{k}\gamma, \epsilon^{2/3} k^{1/6}, \lambda \sqrt{\frac{k}{\beta}}, k\beta, \epsilon^2 k^3 \right\}. \quad (200)$$

Proof. Recall that the columns of U having L_2 norm at most $2\sqrt{\beta}$ are set to 0 in U_{prune} . Since U is an (ϵ, γ) -approximate second-order stationary point, the eigenvalues of the Hessian of $\mathcal{L} + \lambda \mathcal{R}_\beta$ at the point U are all at least $-\gamma$.

In Lemma 14, this means that the condition eq. (138) is therefore violated, and for every pair of column indices $i \neq j \in S$ where $S = \{i \in [k] : \|U e_i\|_2 > 0\}$,

$$|C_{ij}| = \frac{|\langle U e_i, U e_j \rangle|}{\|Z_{ij}\|_2} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon + 3\gamma}{\lambda}} \min\{\|U e_i\|_2, \|U e_j\|_2\}. \quad (201)$$

where we use the assumption that the spectral norm $\|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3$, and therefore $\|U e_i\|_2 \leq 3$ for all $i \in [k]$. Note that $\|Z_{ij}\|_2 = \sqrt{\|U e_i\|_2^2 + \|U e_j\|_2^2} \leq \sqrt{2} \max\{\|U e_i\|_2, \|U e_j\|_2\}$, and therefore,

$$|\langle U e_i, U e_j \rangle| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon + \gamma}{\lambda}} \|U e_i\|_2 \|U e_j\|_2 \quad (202)$$

In other words, for each $i \neq j \in S$,

$$|\cos \theta_{ij}| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon + \gamma}{\lambda}} \implies \left| \theta_{ij} - \frac{\pi}{2} \right| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon + \gamma}{\lambda}} \quad (203)$$

Where θ_{ij} is the angle between Ue_i and Ue_j and the implication follows by assuming that $\epsilon, \gamma \leq c\lambda$ for a sufficiently small $c > 0$.

At any ϵ -approximate first order stationary point U , by Lemma 19, for any i such that $\|Ue_i\|_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$ the angle between Ue_i and its projection onto V_r is intuitively small. By eq. (203), we expect Ue_i and Ue_j to have an angle close to 90° between them. Therefore, we expect the projections of Ue_i and Ue_j onto V_r to also have an angle close to 90° between them. Given vectors v_1, v_2, v_3 and v_4 such that $|\angle v_1, v_2| \leq \epsilon_1$, $|\angle v_2, v_3 - 90^\circ| \leq \epsilon_2$ and $|\angle v_3, v_4| \leq \epsilon_3$, then $|\angle v_1, v_4 - 90^\circ| \leq \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3$. This means that for any columns Ue_i and Ue_j such that $\|Ue_i\|_2$ and $\|Ue_j\|_2 \geq \sqrt{\beta}$,

$$\left| \theta_{ij}^{\text{proj}} - \frac{\pi}{2} \right| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon + \gamma}{\lambda}} + \epsilon \sqrt{\frac{k}{\beta^{1/2}\lambda}} < \frac{c_1}{r} \quad (204)$$

for some small absolute constant $0 \leq c_1 \leq 1/3$ and $\theta_{ij}^{\text{proj}}$ is the angle between $V_r V_r^T Ue_i$ and $V_r V_r^T Ue_j$. This assumes that $\epsilon^2 < c\beta^{1/2}\lambda/kr^2$ and $\epsilon + \gamma \leq c\lambda/r^2$ for a sufficiently small constant $c > 0$. This can be written differently as,

$$\forall i \neq j \in S, \frac{|\langle V_r V_r^T Ue_i, V_r V_r^T Ue_j \rangle|}{\|V_r V_r^T Ue_i\|_2 \|V_r V_r^T Ue_j\|_2} < \frac{c_1}{r}. \quad (205)$$

eq. (205) implies that the projections of the columns of U_{prune} onto V_r are approximately at 90° to each other. However, intuitively, since V_r is an r dimensional space, this means that at most r of these projections can be large in norm.

Lemma 20. *Let $S_{\max} \subseteq [k]$ denote the subset of column indices of U such that the corresponding column has a non-zero projection onto V_r . Then, $|S_{\max}| \leq r$.*

The proof of this result is deferred to Appendix B.2.

What is the implication of Lemma 20? At most r columns of U and therefore U_{prune} have non-zero projections onto V_r . Moreover by implication of Lemma 18, for any column $i \in [k]$, its projection onto V_r^\perp , $\|V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T Ue_i\|_F$, is small at an approximate stationary point. By decomposing the ℓ_2 norm of Ue_i onto its component on V_r and its component on V_r^\perp , this implies that at most r columns of U can be large in norm. Formally, consider any of the $\geq k - r$ columns of U having 0 projections onto V_r , i.e. $i \in [k] \setminus S_{\max}$. Then,

$$\|Ue_i\|_2 = \|V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T Ue_i\|_2 \quad (206)$$

$$\leq \|V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T U\|_F \quad (207)$$

$$\leq \epsilon k, \quad (208)$$

which follows from Lemma 18. Note however, by the pruning condition in Equation (199), all columns of U with norm smaller than ϵk are pruned out. Therefore for all $i \in [k] \setminus S_{\max}$, this means that,

$$\|U_{\text{prune}} e_i\|_2 = 0. \quad (209)$$

And by extension, U_{prune} has at most r non-zero columns.

For the analysis of $\|U_{\text{prune}}U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_{\star}U_{\star}^T\|_F$, note that, the columns of U with L_2 norm smaller than $\omega \triangleq \max\{2\sqrt{\beta}, \epsilon k\}$ are set to 0 in U_{prune} . This implies that,

$$\|U_{\text{prune}}U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_{\star}U_{\star}^T\|_F - \|UU^T - U_{\star}U_{\star}^T\|_F \leq \|U_{\text{prune}}U_{\text{prune}}^T - UU^T\|_F \quad (210)$$

$$\leq \left\| \sum_{i \in [k]} Ue_i(Ue_i)^T \mathbb{1}(\|Ue_i\|_2 \leq \omega) \right\|_F \quad (211)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i \in [k]} \|Ue_i(Ue_i)^T \mathbb{1}(\|Ue_i\|_2 \leq \omega)\|_F \quad (212)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i \in [k]} \|Ue_i\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}(\|Ue_i\|_2 \leq \omega) \quad (213)$$

$$\leq k\omega^2 \quad (214)$$

Plugging in the value of ω and combining with the guarantee on $\|UU^T - U_{\star}U_{\star}^T\|_F$ from Lemma 16 completes the proof. \square

B.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. From Theorem 8, we have that,

$$\|U_{\text{prune}}U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_{\star}U_{\star}^T\|_F \lesssim \max \left\{ \sqrt{k}\gamma, \epsilon^{2/3}k^{1/6}, \lambda\sqrt{\frac{k}{\beta}}, k\beta, \epsilon^2k^3 \right\}. \quad (215)$$

For the sufficiently small choice of regularization and smoothing parameters, and the bounds on ϵ and γ , the bound in eq. (215) results in,

$$\|U_{\text{prune}}U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_{\star}U_{\star}^T\|_F \leq \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_r^*)^2. \quad (216)$$

Note also that U_{prune} has at most r non-zero columns. However, by eq. (216), this means that U_{prune} has exactly r columns, since if it had $r - 1$ non-zero columns or fewer, the error of the best solution must be at least $(\sigma_r^*)^2$. \square

B.3 Missing proofs in Appendix B

B.3.1 Proof of Lemma 15

Proof. By definition of W and L , $w\text{Tr}((WL - LW) \cdot Z^T U)$, can be simplified to

$$\text{Tr}((WL - LW) \cdot Z^T U) = \Delta \text{Tr}((e_2 e_2^T - e_1 e_1^T) U^T U) \quad (217)$$

$$= \Delta (\|Ue_2\|_2^2 - \|Ue_1\|_2^2) \quad (218)$$

Note that $D(U)_{11} - D(U)_{22} = \Delta$ and $|\Delta| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda}$, so one can expect $\|Ue_1\|_2$ and $\|Ue_2\|_2$ to be close to each other. We bound $|\|Ue_1\|_2^2 - \|Ue_2\|_2^2|$ in two ways depending on the relative values of $\|Ue_1\|_2$ and $\|Ue_2\|_2$.

Case 1: Column norms are similar. $\max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2 \leq 2 \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2$.
By definition of Δ ,

$$|\Delta| = \left| \frac{\|Ue_1\|_2^2 + 2\beta}{(\|Ue_1\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} - \frac{\|Ue_2\|_2^2 + 2\beta}{(\|Ue_2\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} \right| \quad (219)$$

$$= \left| \int_{\|Ue_2\|_2^2}^{\|Ue_1\|_2^2} \frac{3/2 \cdot x + 4\beta}{(x + \beta)^{5/2}} dx \right| \quad (220)$$

$$\geq \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{3/2 \|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 4\beta}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{5/2}} \left| \|Ue_1\|_2^2 - \|Ue_2\|_2^2 \right|. \quad (221)$$

Furthermore, note that for any $i \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\frac{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{5/2}}{\frac{3}{2}\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 4\beta} \leq \left(\frac{3}{2}\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 4\beta \right)^{3/2} \quad (222)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sqrt{2} \left(\frac{3}{2}\|Ue_i\|_2^2 \right)^{3/2} + \sqrt{2} (4\beta)^{3/2} \quad (223)$$

$$\leq 3\|Ue_i\|_2^3 + 12\beta^{3/2} \quad (224)$$

$$\leq 5\|Ue_i\|_2^3 \quad (225)$$

where (i) uses the convexity of $(\cdot)^{3/2}$ for positive arguments and applies Jensen's inequality, and the last inequality uses the fact that $\|Ue_1\|_2, \|Ue_2\|_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$. Overall, combining eq. (218) with eq. (221) and eq. (225) results in the bound,

$$\text{Tr}((WL - LW) \cdot Z^T U) \leq 5\Delta^2 \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2^3 \quad (226)$$

$$\leq 40\Delta^2 \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2^3 \quad (227)$$

where the last inequality uses the assumption that $\max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2 \leq 2 \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2$.

Case 2: Column norms are separated. $\max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2 \geq 2 \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2$.

WLOG suppose $\|Ue_1\|_2 \geq \|Ue_2\|_2$ which implies that $D(U)_{22} \geq D(U)_{11}$. The above assumption implies that $\|Ue_1\|_2 \geq 2\|Ue_2\|_2$. Then,

$$D(U)_{11} = \frac{\|Ue_1\|_2^2 + 2\beta}{(\|Ue_1\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} \quad (228)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{4\|Ue_2\|_2^2 + 2\beta}{(4\|Ue_2\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} \quad (229)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{4}{3^{3/2}} \frac{\|Ue_2\|_2^2 + 2\beta}{(\|Ue_2\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} \quad (230)$$

$$\leq \frac{4}{5} D(U)_{22} \quad (231)$$

where (i) uses the fact that $\frac{x+2\beta}{(x+\beta)^{3/2}}$ is a decreasing function in x and (ii) uses the fact that

$\min\{\|Ue_1\|_2, \|Ue_2\|_2\} \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$, and therefore, $4\|Ue_2\|_2^2 + \beta \geq 3(\|Ue_2\|_2^2 + \beta)$. Therefore,

$$|D(U)_{11} - D(U)_{22}| \geq \frac{1}{5}D(U)_{22} = \frac{1}{5} \frac{\|Ue_2\|_2^2 + 2\beta}{(\|Ue_2\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} \quad (232)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \frac{1}{5} \frac{\|Ue_2\|_2^2}{\sqrt{2}\|Ue_2\|_2^3 + \sqrt{2}\beta^{3/2}} \quad (233)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\geq} \frac{1}{10} \frac{1}{\|Ue_2\|_2} \quad (234)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{10} \frac{1}{\|Ue_2\|_2 \|Ue_1\|_2^2} \|\|Ue_1\|_2^2 - \|Ue_2\|_2^2\| \quad (235)$$

where (i) uses the convexity of $(\cdot)^{3/2}$ for positive arguments and an application of Jensen's inequality, while (ii) uses the fact that $\min\{\|Ue_1\|_2, \|Ue_2\|_2\} \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$. Since $|D(U)_{11} - D(U)_{22}| \leq |\Delta|$, this results in an upper bound on $\|\|Ue_1\|_2^2 - \|Ue_2\|_2^2\|$. Combining this with eq. (218) results in,

$$\text{Tr}((WL - LW) \cdot Z^T U) \leq 10\Delta^2 \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2 \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \|Ue_i\|_2^2. \quad (236)$$

Combining eqs. (227) and (236) completes the proof of the lemma. \square

B.3.2 Proof of Lemma 17

Proof. By definition,

$$\text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2 \mathcal{R}_\beta(U)] \text{vec}(Z) - 4\langle \mathcal{R}_\beta(U), \text{vec}(Z) \rangle \quad (237)$$

$$\leq \text{Tr}(D(U)Z^T Z) - 4\text{Tr}(D(U)U^T Z) \quad (238)$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\beta}} \|Z\|_F^2 + 4\|D(U)\|_F \|ZU^T\|_F \quad (239)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{2}{\sqrt{\beta}} \|Z\|_F^2 + 8\sqrt{\frac{k}{\beta}} \|ZU^T\|_F \quad (240)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{2}{\sqrt{\beta}} \|Z\|_F^2 + 5\sqrt{\frac{k}{\beta}} \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \quad (241)$$

$$\leq 8\sqrt{\frac{2k}{\beta}} \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \quad (242)$$

where (i) follows from the fact that for any $i \in [k]$, $|D(U)_{ii}| \leq \max_{x \geq 0} \frac{x+2\beta}{(x+\beta)^{3/2}} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\beta}}$, (ii) uses eq. (177) and the last inequality uses the fact that $\|Z\|_F^4 = \|Z^T\|_F^4 \leq \text{rank}(Z^T) \|ZZ^T\|_F^2 \leq 2k \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2$ by eq. (176). \square

B.3.3 Proof of Lemma 20

Proof. Let S_{\max} denote the set of r column indices $i \in [k]$ such that $\|V_r V_r^T Ue_i\|_2$ are maximum and non-zero. If fewer than r columns of U have non-zero projections onto V_r (i.e. fewer than r candidates for S_{\max} exist), then all the remaining columns of U must have zero projections onto V_r and we are done. Therefore, henceforth, we will assume that $|S_{\max}| = r$. Let $V_{\max} = \text{span}(\{V_r V_r^T Ue_i : i \in S_{\max}\})$, a subspace contained in V_r .

Define M as the matrix $M = \left[\frac{V_r V_r^T U e_i}{\|V_r V_r^T U e_i\|_2} : i \in S_{\max} \right]$. Let V be the set of non-zero eigenvectors of MM^T . Note that the matrix $M^T M \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_{\max}| \times |S_{\max}|}$ has 1's on the diagonals, and has its off-diagonal entries upper bounded in absolute value by c_1/r by eq. (205). Therefore, by the Gersgorin circle theorem, all eigenvalues of $M^T M$ and consequently all non-zero eigenvalues of MM^T lie in the range $[1 - c_1, 1 + c_1]$. This means that $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ is full rank, and its columns are linearly independent.

This implies that $\text{span}(V) = \text{span}(V_r)$ and by the orthogonality condition, $VV^T = V_r V_r^T$. Therefore,

$$\|V_r V_r^T U e_i\|_2 = \|VV^T U e_i\|_2 \quad (243)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(M)} \|M^T U e_i\|_2 \quad (244)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(M)} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in S_{\max}} \frac{\langle V_r V_r^T U e_j, V_r V_r^T U e_i \rangle^2}{\|V_r V_r^T U e_j\|_2^2}} \quad (245)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(M)} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in S_{\max}} \frac{c_1^2}{r^2} \|V_r V_r^T U e_i\|_2^2}, \quad (246)$$

where (i) follows from eq. (204). Consequently by eq. (246), we have,

$$\|V_r V_r^T U e_i\|_2 \leq \frac{c_1}{1 - c_1} \|V_r V_r^T U e_i\|_2. \quad (247)$$

For $c_1 \leq 1/3$ this means that $\|V_r V_r^T U e_i\|_2 = 0$ for every $i \in [k] \setminus S_{\max}$. This proves the claim. \square

C Finite sample guarantees: Proof of Theorem 3

In this section, we provide guarantees on the approximate second order stationary points of the regularized loss f_{emp} (eq. (17)) when the dataset is finite in size, and satisfies the RIP condition. We provide a formal proof of Theorem 3.

For completeness, in the finite sample setting, the empirical loss is defined as,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{emp}}(U) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\langle UU^T - U_{\star} U_{\star}^T, A_i \rangle + \varepsilon_i)^2 \quad (248)$$

where $\varepsilon_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ is the measurement noise. Without loss of generality we assume that the measurement matrices $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are symmetric, since the empirical loss \mathcal{L}_{emp} is unchanged by the symmetrization $A_i \rightarrow \frac{A_i + A_i^T}{2}$. Note that the loss can be expanded as,

$$\|UU^T - U_{\star} U_{\star}^T\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 2 \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i A_i, UU^T - U_{\star} U_{\star}^T \right\rangle + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i^2 \quad (249)$$

where $\langle X, Y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle X, A_i \rangle \langle Y, A_i \rangle$ and $\|X\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \langle X, X \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$.

We will assume that the measurement matrices $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ satisfy the RIP condition. At a high level this condition guarantees that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \approx \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ when the arguments are low rank matrices.

Definition 2 (RIP condition). *A set of linear measurement matrices A_1, \dots, A_m in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ satisfies the (k, δ) -restricted isometry property (RIP) if for any $d \times d$ matrix X with rank at most k ,*

$$(1 - \delta) \|X\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle A_i, X \rangle^2 \leq (1 + \delta) \|X\|_F^2 \quad (250)$$

The crucial property we use in this section is that the RIP condition on the measurements guarantees that $\langle X, Y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \approx \langle X, Y \rangle$ when X and Y are low rank matrices.

Lemma 21. *Let $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be a family of matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ that satisfy (k, δ) RIP. Then for any pair of matrices $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with rank at most k , we have:*

$$|\langle X, Y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} - \langle X, Y \rangle| \leq \delta \|X\|_F \|Y\|_F \quad (251)$$

Lemma 22. *Let $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a set of matrices which satisfy the $(2k, \delta)$ -RIP for some $\delta \leq 1/10$. Let $\varepsilon_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. Consider any $\eta \in (0, 1)$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \varepsilon_i \right\|_{\text{op}} \geq 4 \sqrt{\frac{d \log(d/\eta)}{n}} \right) \leq \eta. \quad (252)$$

Proof. Note that $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ satisfies the $(2k, \delta)$ -RIP for $\delta \leq 1/10$. That is, for any rank $\leq 2k$ matrix X ,

$$\frac{9}{10} \|X\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle A_i, X \rangle^2 \leq \frac{11}{10} \|X\|_F^2. \quad (253)$$

Choosing $X = vu^T$ for any pair of vectors u, v , we get,

$$\forall u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (u^T A_i v)^2 \leq \frac{11}{10} \|u\|_2^2 \|v\|_2^2. \quad (254)$$

This implies that for each $i \in [k]$, $\|A_i\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sqrt{2n}$. Furthermore, plugging in $v = e_1, \dots, e_d$ and summing,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|A_i^T u\|_2^2 \leq \frac{11}{10} d \|u\|_2^2 \quad (255)$$

This implies that $\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i A_i^T \right\|_{\text{op}} = \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i A_i^T \right) \leq 2d$. Hence, we obtain,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left((\epsilon_i A_i) (\epsilon_i A_i)^T \right) \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sigma^2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n A_i A_i^T \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\sigma^2 dn. \quad (256)$$

By applying the matrix Bernstein inequality [Tro11, Wai19], for any $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \epsilon_i \right\|_2 \geq t \right) \leq d \cdot \exp \left(\frac{-3t^2 n^2}{12dn\sigma^2 + 2\sigma\sqrt{2nnt}} \right) = d \cdot \exp \left(\frac{-3t^2 n}{12d\sigma^2 + 4\sigma\sqrt{nt}} \right).$$

Choosing $t = 3\sigma\sqrt{\frac{d \log(d/\eta)}{n}}$, the RHS is upper bounded by η . This completes the proof. \square

By virtue of this result, we expect that for all U , with probability $\geq 1 - \eta$, the loss \mathcal{L} in eq. (249) is $\approx \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2$ when n is large. Indeed, by an application of Holder's inequality, $\text{Tr}(AB) \leq \|A\|_{\text{op}} \|B\|_* \leq \|A\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\text{rank}(B)} \|B\|_F$ and,

$$\left| \mathcal{L}_{\text{emp}}(U) - \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i^2 \right| \lesssim \sigma \sqrt{\frac{kd \log(d/\eta)}{n}} \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F. \quad (257)$$

Likewise,

$$|\langle \nabla \mathcal{L}_{\text{emp}}(U), Z \rangle - \langle \nabla \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, Z \rangle| \lesssim \sigma \sqrt{\frac{kd \log(d/\eta)}{n}} \|UZ^T + ZU^T\|_F \quad (258)$$

And finally,

$$|\text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}_{\text{emp}}(U)] \text{vec}(Z) - \text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2 \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] \text{vec}(Z)| \lesssim \sigma \sqrt{\frac{kd \log(d/\eta)}{n}} \|ZZ^T\|_F \quad (259)$$

where the hidden constants in each of these inequalities are at most 16.

Prior to proving our results, we define the choice of parameters of the algorithm which we will use throughout.

Definition 3 (Choice of parameters). *Suppose,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda\beta^{1/2} &\leq c \min \left\{ kr(\sigma_r^*)^4, \frac{r(\sigma_r^*)^2}{k^2} \right\}, \\
n &\geq \frac{\sigma^2 \cdot k^2 r^2 d \log(d/\eta)}{c_3 \lambda \beta^{1/2}}, \\
\epsilon &\leq c_3 \min \left\{ \frac{\lambda^{3/4} \beta^{3/8}}{(\delta r)^{3/2} k}, \frac{\lambda}{r^2} \right\}, \\
\lambda &\leq c_3 \frac{\beta^{3/2}}{k^2 (\delta r)^2}, \text{ and,} \\
\gamma &\leq c_3 \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{\beta^{1/2} \lambda}}{\delta r k}, \frac{\lambda}{r^2} \right\}, \\
\beta &\leq c_3 \frac{(\sigma_r^*)^2}{k}, \\
\delta &\leq \frac{1}{10},
\end{aligned} \tag{260}$$

for some sufficiently small universal constant $c_3 > 0$.

Note that in order for the measurements to satisfy (k, δ) -RIP for $\delta = \frac{1}{10}$, it suffices to have $n \gtrsim kd \log(d)$ Gaussian measurements which is satisfied by the lower bound on n in eq. (260).

Remark 2. *In case σ_r^* is known, the parameter choices in Definition 3 are satisfied by choosing,*

$$\delta = \frac{1}{10}, \tag{262}$$

$$\beta \asymp \frac{(\sigma_r^*)^2}{k}, \tag{263}$$

$$\lambda \asymp \frac{(\sigma_r^*)^3}{r^2 k^{7/2}}, \tag{264}$$

$$n \asymp \frac{\sigma^2 k^6 r^3 d \log(d/\eta)}{(\sigma_r^*)^4}, \tag{265}$$

$$\epsilon \lesssim \frac{(\sigma_r^*)^3}{r^4 k^4}, \tag{266}$$

$$\gamma \lesssim \frac{(\sigma_r^*)^3}{r^4 k^{7/2}}. \tag{267}$$

Note that these choices are all polynomial in the problem parameters.

Lemmas 13 and 14: The conclusion of these lemmas can still be applied since the finite sample loss function eq. (248) is still of the form $f(UU^T)$ for a doubly differentiable f .

Lemma 16: This lemma is slightly modified in the finite sample setting. The new result is provided below

Lemma 23 (Modified Lemma 16). *At an (ϵ, γ) -approximate second order stationary point of $\mathcal{L} + \lambda \mathcal{R}_\beta$,*

$$\|UU^T - U_* U_*^T\|_F \lesssim \max \left\{ \epsilon^{2/3} k^{1/6}, \lambda \sqrt{\frac{k}{\beta}} + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{kd \log(d/\eta)}{n}}, \sqrt{k} \gamma \right\}. \tag{268}$$

Proof. From [GJZ17, Lemma 7] and eq. (259) we have the following bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)] \text{vec}(Z) &\leq 2\|ZZ^T\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - 6\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 4\langle \nabla(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U), Z \rangle \\ &\quad + \lambda [\text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2\mathcal{R}_\beta(U)] \text{vec}(Z) - 4\lambda\langle \nabla\mathcal{R}_\beta(U), Z \rangle] \\ &\quad + 4\sigma\sqrt{\frac{d\log(kd/\eta)}{n}} \|ZZ^T\|_F \end{aligned} \quad (269)$$

Plugging eq. (176) into eq. (269) and using Lemma 17 and the fact that $\|\nabla(\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)\|_F \leq \epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)] \text{vec}(Z) &\leq 2\|ZZ^T\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - 6\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 4\epsilon\|Z\|_F \\ &\quad + \left(8\lambda\sqrt{\frac{2k}{\beta}} + 8\sigma\sqrt{\frac{kd\log(d/\eta)}{n}} \right) \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F. \end{aligned} \quad (270)$$

By the RIP condition on the measurements, $\|ZZ^T\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \geq (1 - \delta)\|ZZ^T\|_F^2$ and likewise, $\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2$. Therefore, assuming $\delta \leq 1/10$ and simplifying as done in eqs. (181) and (182), we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U)] \text{vec}(Z) &\leq -\|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^2 + 8\epsilon k^{1/4} \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left(8\lambda\sqrt{\frac{2k}{\beta}} + 8\sigma\sqrt{\frac{kd\log(d/\eta)}{n}} \right) \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the analysis resembles the calculations from eq. (182) to eq. (184). \square

Lemmas 18 and 19: These lemmas are slightly changed in the finite sample setting. The new result is presented below.

Lemma 24. *Consider an ϵ -approximate first order stationary point U satisfying $\|U\|_{op} \leq 2$. Let V_r denote the top- r eigenspace of $U_\star U_\star^T$. Then,*

$$\|V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T U\|_F \lesssim \epsilon k + \delta k \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F + \sigma\sqrt{\frac{k^3 d \log(d/\eta)}{n}}. \quad (271)$$

Furthermore, for any column $i \in [k]$ such that $\|Ue_i\|_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$,

$$\frac{\|V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T Ue_i\|_2}{\|Ue_i\|_2} \leq \left(\epsilon + 2\delta \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F + \sigma\sqrt{\frac{kd\log(d/\eta)}{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{k}{\beta^{1/2}\lambda}}. \quad (272)$$

Proof. From the gradient computations in Lemma 27 and Lemma 28, with $Z = V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T U$, approximate first-order stationarity of U implies that,

$$\langle UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T, UZ^T + ZU^T \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \lambda \text{Tr}(D(U)Z^T U) - \sigma\sqrt{\frac{kd\log(d/\eta)}{n}} \|UZ^T + ZU^T\|_F \leq \epsilon\|Z\|_F \quad (273)$$

In the infinite sample analyses (Lemmas 18 and 19) the first term on the LHS is non-negative for this choice of Z . In the finite sample case, we instead lower bound as follows. Noting that $Z = V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T U$ is rank $k - r$, this means that $UZ^T + ZU^T$ is a symmetric matrix of rank

$\leq 2(k-r) \leq 2k$ by the subadditivity of the rank of matrices. Likewise, $UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T$ is of rank $\leq k+r \leq 2k$. Therefore, by Assumption 1,

$$\langle UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T, UZ^T + ZU^T \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \quad (274)$$

$$\geq \langle UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T, UZ^T + ZU^T \rangle - \delta \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \|UZ^T + ZU^T\|_F \quad (275)$$

$$\geq \langle UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T, UZ^T + ZU^T \rangle - 2\delta \|Z\|_F \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \quad (276)$$

where the last inequality uses the assumption that $\|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2$. On the other hand,

$$\|ZU^T + UZ^T\|_F \leq 2\|U\|_{\text{op}}\|Z\|_F \leq 4\|Z\|_F. \quad (277)$$

Therefore, in the finite sample case, instead of eq. (186) (and likewise, eq. (194)) we have,

$$\langle UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T, UZ^T + ZU^T \rangle + \lambda \text{Tr}(D(U)Z^T U) \quad (278)$$

$$\lesssim \left(\epsilon + \delta \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{kd \log(d/\eta)}{n}} \right) \|Z\|_F. \quad (279)$$

Following the analysis from eq. (187) to eq. (192) results in the upper bound,

$$\|Z\|_F \lesssim \epsilon k + \delta k \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{k^3 d \log(d/\eta)}{n}} \quad (280)$$

Likewise, using an analysis resembling eq. (195) to eq. (198) and plugging in the upper bound on $\|Z\|_F$ from eq. (280), we get that, for any column $i \in [k]$ such that $\|Ue_i\|_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$,

$$\frac{\|V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T Ue_i\|_2}{\|Ue_i\|_2} \leq \left(\epsilon + 2\delta \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{kd \log(d/\eta)}{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{k}{\lambda \sqrt{\beta}}}. \quad (281)$$

Since $\|Ue_i\|_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\beta}$, rearranging the terms around and finally upper bounding $\|Z\|_F$ using Lemma 18 completes the proof. \square

Theorem 9 (Modified Theorem 8). *Consider any (ϵ, γ) -approximate second-order stationary point of $\mathcal{L} + \lambda \mathcal{R}_\beta$ denoted U . Suppose $\|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2$. Construct U_{prune} by following the pruning condition:*

$$\|Ue_i\|_2 \leq \max \left\{ 2\sqrt{\beta}, \frac{\sqrt{\lambda \beta^{1/2} k}}{r} \right\} \implies U_{\text{prune}} e_i \leftarrow 0 \quad (282)$$

For a small absolute constant $c > 0$, suppose the parameter conditions in Definition 3 are satisfied. Then,

1. U_{prune} has at most r non-zero columns.

2. Furthermore,

$$\|U_{\text{prune}} U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\lambda \beta^{1/2}}}{kr} + k\beta + \frac{k^2 \lambda \beta^{1/2}}{r}. \quad (283)$$

Proof. Up until eq. (203), the proof is unchanged. Plugging in the new upper bound on the cosine of the angle between $V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T Ue_i$ and Ue_i in eq. (272) in Lemma 24, we get,

$$\left| \theta_{ij}^{\text{proj}} - \frac{\pi}{2} \right| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon + \gamma}{\lambda}} + \left(\epsilon + 2\delta \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{kd \log(d/\eta)}{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{k}{\beta^{1/2} \lambda}} \quad (284)$$

Assume for a sufficiently small constant $c_2 > 0$, $\epsilon + \gamma \leq \lambda/r^2$. Then the first term on the RHS is upper bounded by $\frac{c_1}{2r}$ for a sufficiently small $c_1 \leq 1/3$. On the other hand, by the assumptions on the parameters in eq. (261), it is easily verified that,

$$\epsilon + 2\delta \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{kd \log(d/\eta)}{n}} \leq \frac{c_1}{2r} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda\beta^{1/2}}{k}} \quad (285)$$

And overall, the RHS of eq. (284) is upper bounded by c_1/r for a sufficiently small absolute constant $0 \leq c_1 \leq 1/3$. The proof until eq. (247) carries over unchanged, and we have that at most k columns of U can have a non-zero projection onto V_r . For any remaining column $i \in [d_1]$ of U ,

$$\|Ue_i\|_2 = \|V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T Ue_i\|_2 \quad (286)$$

$$\leq \|V_r^\perp (V_r^\perp)^T U\|_F \quad (287)$$

$$\lesssim \epsilon k + \delta k \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{k^3 d \log(d/\eta)}{n}}, \quad (288)$$

$$\lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\lambda\beta^{1/2}k}}{r}, \quad (289)$$

where (i) is by Lemma 24 and (ii) is by eq. (285). Since these columns satisfy the pruning criterion in eq. (282), this in fact implies that U_{prune} has at most r non-zero columns. Finally, by following the analysis from eq. (210) to eq. (214), and with the pruning threshold $\omega = \max \left\{ 2\sqrt{\beta}, \frac{\sqrt{\lambda\beta^{1/2}k}}{r} \right\}$, we have that,

$$\|U_{\text{prune}} U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \leq \|UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F + k\omega^2 \quad (290)$$

$$\lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\lambda\beta^{1/2}}}{kr} + k\beta + \frac{k^2\lambda\beta^{1/2}}{r} \quad (291)$$

□

Note that in order for the measurements to satisfy (k, δ) -RIP for $\delta = \frac{1}{10}$, it suffices to have $n \gtrsim kd \log(d)$ Gaussian measurements [RFP10]. This is satisfied by the choice of n in our theorem.

Theorem 10 (Main result in the finite sample setting). *Suppose the conditions on the parameters $\epsilon, \gamma, \lambda$ and β in Definition 3 are satisfied. Construct U_{prune} using Algorithm 1. Then,*

1. U_{prune} has exactly r non-zero columns.

2. $\|U_{\text{prune}} U_{\text{prune}}^T - U_\star U_\star^T\|_F \leq \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_r^\star)^2$.

In other words, given $n \gtrsim \sigma^2 \frac{d \log(d/\eta) \cdot \text{poly}(r, k)}{(\sigma_r^\star)^4}$ samples, Algorithm 1 results in a solution having exactly r non-zero columns, and also serves as a spectral initialization.

D Efficiently finding approximate second order stationary points

In this section we discuss efficiently finding second order stationary points of the loss $\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta$. We establish smoothness conditions on \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R}_β and show that running gradient descent with sufficiently bounded perturbations satisfies the property that all iterates are bounded in that $\|U_t\|_2 \leq 3$, as long as the algorithm is initialized within this ball.

Perturbed gradient descent: We consider a first order method having the following update rule: for all $t \geq 0$,

$$U_{t+1} \leftarrow U_t - \alpha(\nabla(\mathcal{L} + \lambda\mathcal{R}_\beta)(U_t) + P_t) \quad (292)$$

where P_t is a perturbation term, which for example could be the stochastic noise present in SGD. Over the course of running the update rule eq. (21), we show that the iterates $\|U_t\|_2$ remains bounded under mild conditions.

D.1 Proof of Theorem 5

In this section we prove Theorem 5. We first prove the gradient Lipschitzness condition by showing that the Hessian of f_{pop} is bounded on the domain $\{U : \|U\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3\}$. Below we provide an analysis for the population setting, starting with showing gradient Lipschitzness. Observe that,

$$\|\nabla\mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U) - \nabla\mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(V)\|_F \quad (293)$$

$$= \|(UU^T - U_\star U_\star^T)U - (VV^T - U_\star U_\star^T)V\|_F \quad (294)$$

$$= \|UU^T(U - V) + (U(U - V)^T + (U - V)V^T)V - U_\star U_\star^T(U - V)\|_F \quad (295)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \|U\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|U - V\|_F + \|U\|_{\text{op}} \|U - V\|_F \|V\|_{\text{op}} + \|U - V\|_F \|V\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \|U_\star U_\star^T\|_{\text{op}} \|U - V\|_F \quad (296)$$

$$\lesssim \|U - V\|_F, \quad (297)$$

where (i) repeatedly uses the bound $\|AB\|_F \leq \|A\|_{\text{op}} \|B\|_F$ and the last inequality follows from the fact that $\|U\|_{\text{pop}} \leq 3$ and $\|U_\star\|_{\text{pop}} = 1$. On the other hand, by the gradient computations in Lemma 28,

$$\|\nabla^2\mathcal{R}_\beta(U)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sup_{Z:\|Z\|_F \leq 1} \text{vec}(Z)[\nabla^2\mathcal{R}_\beta(U)]\text{vec}(Z) \quad (298)$$

$$\leq \sup_{Z:\|Z\|_F \leq 1} \langle D(U), Z^T Z \rangle \quad (299)$$

$$= \sup_{Z:\sum_{i=1}^k \|Z e_i\|_2^2 \leq 1} \sum_{i=1}^k D(U)_{ii} \|Z e_i\|_2^2 \quad (300)$$

$$= \max_{i \in [k]} D(U)_{ii} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\beta}}. \quad (301)$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $\frac{x+2\beta}{(x+\beta)^{3/2}} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\beta}}$. This implies that,

$$\|\nabla\mathcal{R}_\beta(U) - \nabla\mathcal{R}_\beta(V)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\beta}} \|U - V\|_F. \quad (302)$$

Combining eqs. (297) and (301), by triangle inequality,

$$\|\nabla f_{\text{pop}}(U) - \nabla f_{\text{pop}}(V)\|_F \lesssim \|U - V\|_F \quad (303)$$

where the assumption $\lambda/\sqrt{\beta} \leq 1$ is invoked.

Next we prove Hessian Lipschitzness of f_{pop} . By [GLWW19, Theorem 23], the Hessian of \mathcal{L}_{pop} satisfies the condition,

$$\|\nabla^2\mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U) - \nabla^2\mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(V)\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \|U - V\|_F. \quad (304)$$

Although the analysis in [GLWW19] is provided for the exactly specified case ($k = r$), it carries over unchanged to the overparameterized case as well. On the other hand, for any $Z, Z_U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ such that $\|Z\|_F, \|Z_U\|_F \leq 1$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \text{vec}(Z)^T \left[\frac{\nabla^2 \mathcal{R}_\beta(U) - \nabla^2 \mathcal{R}_\beta(U + tZ_U)}{t} \right] \text{vec}(Z) \quad (305)$$

$$= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\langle D(U) - D(U + tZ_U), Z^T Z \rangle}{t} \quad (306)$$

$$+ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k G(U + tZ_U)_{ii} \langle Ze_i, (U + tZ_U)e_i \rangle^2 - G(U)_{ii} \langle Ze_i, Ue_i \rangle^2}{t}. \quad (307)$$

The first term of the RHS of eq. (307) can be bounded as,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\langle D(U) - D(U + tZ_U), Z^T Z \rangle}{t} = - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 4\beta}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{5/2}} \langle Ue_i, Z_U e_i \rangle \cdot \|Ze_i\|_2^2 \quad (308)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \max_{i \in [k]} \left| \frac{\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 4\beta}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{5/2}} \langle Ue_i, Z_U e_i \rangle \right| \sum_{i=1}^k \|Ze_i\|_2^2 \quad (309)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \max_{i \in [k]} \frac{\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 4\beta}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{5/2}} \|Ue_i\|_2 \quad (310)$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{\beta}, \quad (311)$$

where (i) follows by Holder inequality, and (ii) uses the fact that $\|Z\|_F, \|Z_U\|_F \leq 1$. The last inequality uses the fact that $\min_{x \geq 0} \frac{\sqrt{x(x+4\beta)}}{(x+\beta)^{5/2}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\beta}$.

On the other hand, by the chain rule, the second term on the RHS of eq. (307) can be computed in two parts, the first being,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{(G(U + tZ_U)_{ii} - G(U)_{ii}) \langle Ze_i, Ue_i \rangle^2}{t} &= - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{3(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 6\beta)}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{7/2}} \langle Ue_i, Z_U e_i \rangle \langle Ze_i, Ue_i \rangle^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k H(U)_{ii} \langle Ze_i, Ue_i \rangle^2 \end{aligned} \quad (312)$$

where $H(U)_{ii} = \frac{3(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 6\beta)\|Ue_i\|_2}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{7/2}}$. Note that for any $c \geq 0$, the optimization problem which takes the form $\max_{Ze_i: \|Ze_i\|_2^2 \leq c} \langle Ze_i, Ue_i \rangle^2$ is maximized when $Ze_i \propto Ue_i$. Therefore, one may replace Ze_i by $x_i \cdot Ue_i / \|Ue_i\|_2$ for some $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and bound eq. (312) as,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{(G(U + tZ_U)_{ii} - G(U)_{ii}) \langle Ze_i, Ue_i \rangle^2}{t} \leq \max_{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2 \leq 1} \sum_{i=1}^k H(U)_{ii} x_i^2 \|Ue_i\|_2^2 \quad (313)$$

$$= \max_{i \in [k]} H(U)_{ii} \|Ue_i\|_2^2 \quad (314)$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{\beta}, \quad (315)$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $\min_{x \geq 0} \frac{3\sqrt{x^3(x+6\beta)}}{(x+\beta)^{7/2}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\beta}$. The second term on the RHS

of eq. (307) is,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{G(U)_{ii} (\langle Ze_i, (U + tZ_U)e_i \rangle^2 - \langle Ze_i, Ue_i \rangle^2)}{t} \quad (316)$$

$$= 2 \sum_{i=1}^k G(U)_{ii} \langle Ze_i, Ue_i \rangle \langle Ze_i, Z_U e_i \rangle \quad (317)$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^k G(U)_{ii} \|Ue_i\|_F \langle Ze_i, Z_U e_i \rangle \quad (318)$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^k G(U)_{ii} \|Ue_i\|_F \|Ze_i\|_2 \|Z_U e_i\|_2 \quad (319)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k (G(U)_{ii})^2 \|Ue_i\|_F^2 \|Ze_i\|_2^2} \quad (320)$$

$$\leq \max_{i \in [k]} G(U)_{ii} \|Ue_i\|_F \quad (321)$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{\beta} \quad (322)$$

where in (i) we use the fact that $x_i = \langle Ze_i, Z_U e_i \rangle$ satisfies $|\sum_i x_i| = |\langle Z, Z_U \rangle| \leq \|Z\|_F \|Z_U\|_F \leq 1$. The last inequality uses the fact that $\max_{x \geq 0} \frac{\sqrt{x}(x+4\beta)}{(x+\beta)^{5/2}} \lesssim 1/\beta$. Combining eqs. (311), (315) and (322) in eq. (307) results in the bound,

$$\max_{Z, Z_U: \|Z\|_F, \|Z_U\|_F \leq 1} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2 \mathcal{R}_\beta(U) - \mathcal{R}_\beta(U + tZ_U)] \text{vec}(Z)}{t} \lesssim \frac{1}{\beta} \quad (323)$$

By choosing $Z_U = (U - V)/\|U - V\|_F$, this implies that,

$$\max_{Z: \|Z\|_F \leq 1} \text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2 \mathcal{R}_\beta(U) - \nabla^2 \mathcal{R}_\beta(V)] \text{vec}(Z) \lesssim \frac{1}{\beta} \|U - V\|_F. \quad (324)$$

This implies that,

$$\|\nabla^2 \mathcal{R}_\beta(U) - \nabla^2 \mathcal{R}_\beta(V)\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\beta} \|U - V\|_F. \quad (325)$$

Combining with eq. (304) by triangle inequality and noting the assumption that $\lambda \leq \beta$ results in the equation,

$$\|\nabla^2 f_{\text{pop}}(U) - f_{\text{pop}}(V)\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \|U - V\|_F. \quad (326)$$

This completes the proof.

D.2 Proof of Theorem 6

In this section we prove Theorem 6 formally. By the gradient computations in Lemmas 25 and 28 and triangle inequality,

$$\|U_{t+1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|(I - \alpha U_t U_t^T)U_t\|_{\text{op}} + \alpha \|U_\star U_\star^T U_t\|_{\text{op}} + \alpha \lambda \|D(U_t)\|_{\text{op}} \|U_t\|_{\text{op}} + \alpha \quad (327)$$

$$\leq \|(I - \alpha U_t U_t^T)U_t\|_{\text{op}} + \alpha \|U_\star U_\star^T U_t\|_{\text{op}} + \alpha \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{\beta}} \|U_t\|_{\text{op}} + \alpha \quad (328)$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $D(U_t)$ is a diagonal matrix with largest entry upper bounded by $2/\sqrt{\beta}$. Note that $\|(I - \alpha U_t U_t^T)U_t\|_{\text{op}} = \max_i \sigma_i(1 - \alpha \sigma_i^2)$ where $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^k$ denotes the singular values of U_t . For $x \in [0, 1/2\alpha]$, $x(1 - \alpha x^2)$ is an increasing function. Therefore, assuming $\|U_t\|_{\text{op}} \in [0, 1/2\alpha]$,

$$\|(I - \alpha U_t U_t^T)U_t\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|U_t\|_{\text{op}}(1 - \alpha \|U_t\|_{\text{op}}^2). \quad (329)$$

Combining everything together,

$$\|U_{t+1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|U_t\|_{\text{op}}(1 - \alpha \|U_t\|_{\text{op}}^2) + \alpha \|U_t\|_{\text{op}} + \alpha \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{\beta}} \|U_t\|_{\text{op}} + \alpha \quad (330)$$

$$\leq \|U_t\|_{\text{op}}(1 - \alpha \|U_t\|_{\text{op}}^2) + 2\alpha \|U_t\|_{\text{op}} + \alpha \quad (331)$$

where the last inequality assumes $\lambda/\sqrt{\beta} \leq 1$. Depending on whether $\|U_t\|_{\text{op}} \geq 2$ or $\|U_t\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2$, and recalling that $\alpha \leq 1/8$, we may derive two bounds from the above,

$$0 \leq \|U_t\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2 \implies \|U_{t+1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|U_t\|_{\text{op}}(1 + 2\alpha) + \alpha \quad (332)$$

$$2 \leq \|U_t\|_{\text{op}} \leq 4 \implies \|U_{t+1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|U_t\|_{\text{op}}(1 - \alpha) \quad (333)$$

Suppose the initial iterate satisfied $\|U_0\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2$, and let t_0 be any iteration where $\|U_{t_0}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2$, but $\|U_{t_0+1}\|_{\text{op}} \geq 2$. Then by eq. (332), $\|U_{t_0+1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3$. However, in the subsequent iterations, $\|U_t\|_{\text{op}}$ must decrease until it is no larger than 2, by virtue of eq. (333). This implies the statement of the theorem.

E Gradient and Hessian computations

E.1 Population mean square error

Lemma 25. Consider the function $\mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U) = \|UU^T - U_*U_*^T\|_F^2$. Then,

1. The gradient of \mathcal{L} satisfies $\langle \nabla \mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U), Z \rangle = 2\langle (UU^T - U_*U_*^T), UZ^T + ZU^T \rangle$.

2. For any $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$,

$$\text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}_{\text{pop}}(U)] \text{vec}(Z) = 4\langle Z, (UU^T - U_*U_*^T)Z \rangle + 2\|UZ^T + ZU^T\|_F^2. \quad (334)$$

Proof. The first part is proved in [MWCC18, eq. (59)]. The second part is proved shortly after in [MWCC18, eq. (61)]. \square

Lemma 26. Consider the function $\mathcal{L}(U) = f(UU^T) : \mathbb{R}^{d \times k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some doubly differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then,

1. For any $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$, $\langle \nabla \mathcal{L}(U), Z \rangle = \langle (\nabla f)(UU^T), UZ^T + ZU^T \rangle$.

2. For any $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(U)] \text{vec}(Z) \\ &= \text{vec}(UZ^T + ZU^T)^T [(\nabla^2 f)(UU^T)] \text{vec}(UZ^T + ZU^T) + 2\langle (\nabla f)(UU^T), ZZ^T \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (335)$$

Proof. This result is straightforward to prove by direct computation. \square

E.2 Empirical mean square error

Lemma 27. Consider $\mathcal{L}_{emp}(\cdot)$ as defined in eq. (248). Then,

1. The gradient of \mathcal{L}_{emp} satisfies, $\langle \nabla \mathcal{L}_{emp}(U), Z \rangle = 2\langle UU^T - U_*U_*^T, UZ^T + ZU^T \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$.
2. For any $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$,

$$\text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}_{emp}(U)] \text{vec}(Z) = 4\langle UU^T - U_*U_*^T, ZZ^T \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + 2\|UZ^T + ZU^T\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (336)$$

Proof. These results are proved in [GJZ17, eq. (18)]. \square

E.3 Regularization \mathcal{R}_β

Lemma 28. Consider the function $\mathcal{R}_\beta : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $\mathcal{R}_\beta(U) = \sum_{i=1}^m L_2^\beta(Ue_i)$. Define,

$$D(U) = \text{diag} \left(\left\{ \frac{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 2\beta)}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} : i \in [m] \right\} \right), \text{ and}, \quad (337)$$

$$G(U) = \text{diag} \left(\left\{ \frac{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 4\beta)}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{5/2}} : i \in [m] \right\} \right). \quad (338)$$

For any $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$,

1. The gradient of \mathcal{R}_β is, $\nabla \mathcal{R}_\beta(U) = UD(U)$.
2. The Hessian of \mathcal{R}_β satisfies,

$$\text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2 \mathcal{R}_\beta(U)] \text{vec}(Z) = \langle D(U), Z^T Z \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^m G(U)_{ii} \langle Ue_i, Ze_i \rangle^2 \quad (339)$$

Proof. Note that the gradient of $L_2^\beta(v)$ as a function of v is,

$$\nabla L_2^\beta(v) = \frac{2v}{\sqrt{\|v\|_2^2 + \beta}} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|v\|_2^2}{(\|v\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} \cdot (2v) = \frac{(\|v\|_2^2 + 2\beta)v}{(\|v\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}}. \quad (340)$$

Therefore,

$$\langle Z, \nabla \mathcal{R}_\beta(U) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 2\beta)}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} \langle Ue_i, Ze_i \rangle \quad (341)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 2\beta)}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} \text{Tr}(Ze_i e_i^T U^T) \quad (342)$$

$$= \text{Tr}(D(U) \cdot U^T Z), \quad (343)$$

where $D(U) = \text{diag} \left(\left\{ \frac{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 2\beta)}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} : i \in [m] \right\} \right)$ is as defined in eq. (337).

On the other hand, the Hessian of $L_2^\beta(v)$ as a function of v is,

$$\nabla^2 L_2^\beta(v) = \frac{(\|v\|_2^2 + 2\beta)}{(\|v\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} I - \frac{3(\|v\|_2^2 + 2\beta)}{(\|v\|_2^2 + \beta)^{5/2}} vv^T + \frac{2}{(\|v\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} vv^T \quad (344)$$

$$= \frac{(\|v\|_2^2 + 2\beta)}{(\|v\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} I - \frac{\|v\|_2^2 + 4\beta}{(\|v\|_2^2 + \beta)^{5/2}} vv^T. \quad (345)$$

The Hessian of \mathcal{R}_β is block diagonal with the i^{th} block equal to $\nabla^2 L_2^\beta(Ue_i)$. Therefore,

$$\text{vec}(Z)^T [\nabla^2 \mathcal{R}_\beta(U)] \text{vec}(Z) = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 2\beta)}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{3/2}} \|Ze_i\|_2^2 - \frac{\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + 4\beta}{(\|Ue_i\|_2^2 + \beta)^{5/2}} \langle Ue_i, Ze_i \rangle^2 \quad (346)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^m D(U)_{ii} \|Ze_i\|_2^2 - G(U)_{ii} \langle Ue_i, Ze_i \rangle^2 \quad (347)$$

$$= \text{Tr}(D(U) \cdot ZZ^T) - \sum_{i=1}^m G(U)_{ii} \langle Ue_i, Ze_i \rangle^2 \quad (348)$$

□