Randomized Algorithms for Canonical Polyadic Decomposition

Salman Ahmadi-Asl

December 4, 2019

Outline

Canonical polyadic decomposition (CPD)

Randomized algorithms for CPD - Randomized Randomize

Randomized CPD with prior reduction in Tucker format

Randomized block sampling algorithm

Randomized ALS algorithm

- Randomized Parafac2
- Simulations

Canonical Polyadic Decomposition (CPD)



Tucker decomposition



Orthogonal factor matrices and all-orthogonality of core tensor



Algorithms for CPD

- Alternating Least Squares (ALS) algorithm
- Gauss-Newton and Levenberg-Marquardt algorithms
- Tensor power iteration algorithm
- Fast damped Gauss-Newton (dGN)
- Simultaneous matrix diagonalization

Alternating least-squares algorithm (ALS)

Fixed all factor matrices and update one by solving the following least squats problem

$$\mathbf{W}^{(n)} = \mathbf{A}^{(1)T} \mathbf{A}^{(1)} * \dots * \mathbf{A}^{(n-1)T} \mathbf{A}^{(n-1)} * \mathbf{A}^{(n+1)T} \mathbf{A}^{(n+1)} * \dots * \mathbf{A}^{(N)T} \mathbf{A}^{(N)}$$

6





This approach is applicable when tensor is not of very high order and also the tensor rank is less than the original tensor sizes.

Compression step can be performed by randomized HOSVD algorithms



9



Sparse random matrices

$$\Phi = \begin{cases} -1 \text{ with probability } \frac{1}{6} \\ 0 \text{ with probability } \frac{2}{3} \\ +1 \text{ with probability } \frac{1}{6} \end{cases} \qquad \Phi = \begin{cases} -1 \text{ with probability } \frac{1}{2\sqrt{D}} \\ 0 \text{ with probability } 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{D}} \\ +1 \text{ with probability } \frac{1}{2\sqrt{D}} \end{cases}$$

where matrix components are i.i.d.

These random matrices are **reminiscent** the **quantization procedure** in learning DNNs.







Count sketch

Pictures from: S. Wang. A practical guide to randomized matrix computations with MATLAB implementations. arXiv:1505.07570, 2015.



(a) Hash each column with a value uniformly sampled from $[s] = \{1, 2, 3\}$.



(b) Flip the sign of each column with probability 50%, and then sum up columns with the same hash value.



Sampling columns - Uniform sampling (with or without replacement) Length-squared distribution

Leverage scores distribution

↓ j-th column leverage score



$$l_{j} = \|V_{R}(j,:)\|_{2}^{2}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, \prod_{m \neq n} I_{m}$$
 $\sum_{j=1}^{\prod I_{m}} l_{j} = R$

i-th row leverage score
$$\triangleleft l_i = \| \mathbf{U}_R(i,:) \|_2^2, \quad i = 1, 2, ..., I_n$$
 $\sum_{j=1}^{I_n} l_j = R$

Leverage score distribution for column selection

$$p_j = \frac{l_j}{R}, \qquad j = 1, 2, \dots, \prod_{m \neq n} I_m$$

Maximum of leverage score is called coherence of a matrix

Fast computation of leverage scores are proposed in the following papers.

Journal of Machine Learning Research 13 (2012) 3441-3472 Submitted 7/12; Published 12/12 Fast Approximation of Matrix Coherence and Statistical Leverage		On Fast Leverage Score Sampling and Optimal Learning		
Petros Drineas Malik Magdon-Ismail Department of Computer Science Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, NY 12180	DRINEP@CS.RPI.EDU MAGDON@CS.RPI.EDU	Alessandro Rudi* Daniele Calandriello* Luigi Carratino Lorenzo Rosasco INRIA – Sierra team, LCSL – IIT & MIT, University of Genoa, University of Genoa, ENS, Paris Genoa, Italy Genoa, Italy LCSL – IIT & MIT		
Michael W. Mahoney Department of Mathematics Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305	MMAHONEY@CS.STANFORD.EDU	Abstract Leverage score sampling provides an appealing way to perform approximate com- putations for large matrices. Indeed, it allows to derive faithful approximations with a complexity adapted to the problem at hand. Yet, performing leverage scores sampling is a challenge in its own right requiring further approximations. In this paper, we study the problem of leverage score sampling for positive definite ma- trices defined by a kernel. Our contribution is twofold. First we provide a novel algorithm for leverage score sampling and second, we exploit the proposed method in statistical learning by deriving a novel solver for kernel ridge regression. Our main technical contribution is showing that the proposed algorithms are currently the most efficient and accurate for these problems.		
David P. Woodruff IBM Almaden Research Center 650 Harry Road San Jose, CA 95120 Editor: Mehryar Mohri	DPWOODRU@US.IBM.COM			



Randomized rank revealing or equivalently randomized fixed-precision algorithms are applicable when an estimation of matrix rank is unknown and it is approximated adaptively by the underlying algorithms.

Randomized block sampling algorithm

Randomized block sampling uses the locality property to compute CPD of a given matrix.



Picture from: N. Vervliet, *Compressed sensing approaches to large-scale tensor decompositions*, PhD thesis, KU Leuven, May 2018.

Randomized block sampling algorithm



Picture from: N. Vervliet, *Compressed sensing approaches to large-scale tensor decompositions*, PhD thesis, KU Leuven, May 2018.

Randomized block sampling algorithm

Matlab codes are accessible in tensorlab toolbox

N. Vervliet, O. Debals, L. Sorber, M. V. Barel, L. D. Lathauwer, Tensorlab 3.0.



$$\underset{A}{\text{Min}} \| Z^{(n)} A^{(n)T} - X^{T}_{(n)} \|_{F}, n = 1, 2, \dots, N$$

$$Z^{(n)} = \mathbf{A}^{(N)} \square \cdots \square \mathbf{A}^{(n+1)} \square \mathbf{A}^{(n-1)} \cdots \square \mathbf{A}^{(1)}$$



$$\mathbf{A}^{(n)} = \mathbf{X}_{(n)} \mathbf{Z}^{(n)} \mathbf{W}^{(n)\dagger}$$





The column selection does not need to compute $Z^{(n)}$ explicitly.

$$Z^{(n)}(j,:) = A^{(1)}(i_{1},:) * \dots * A^{(n-1)}(i_{n-1},:) * A^{(n+1)}(i_{n+1},:) * \dots * A^{(N)}(i_{N},:)$$
$$j = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{N} (i_{k}-1)J_{k}, \quad J_{k} = \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} I_{k}$$

$$\sum_{k=1,k\neq n}^{N} (i_k - 1) J_k, \quad J_k = \prod_{m=1,m\neq n}^{N-1} I_m$$

25

Uniform sampling `

Coherence of matrix should be as small as possible

Sampling

Nonuniform sampling (Leverage scores)

SPALS: Fast Alternating Least Squares via Implicit Leverage Scores Sampling



Dehua Cheng University of Southern California dehua.cheng@usc.edu

Ioakeim Perros Georgia Institute of Technology perros@gatech.edu Richard Peng Georgia Institute of Technology rpeng@cc.gatech.edu

Yan Liu University of Southern California yanliu.cs@usc.edu





For both Khatri-Rao and Kroncker product of matrices



27

Matlab codes are included in tensor toolbox (Matlab)

B. W. Bader, T. G. Kolda, Matlab tensor toolbox version 2.6 (2015).

Matlab codes are included in Tensorly (Python)

J. Kossaifi, Y. Panagakis, A. Anandkumar, M. Pantic, Tensorly: *Tensor learning in python*, The Journal of Machine Learning Research 20 (1) (2019) 925–930.

Randomized algorithms for parafac2

Parafac2 model



Picture from: E.E. Papalexakis, C. Faloutsos, N.D. Sidiropoulos, *Tensors for data mining and data fusion: Models, applications, and scalable algorithms*, ACM Trans. on Intelligent Systems and Technology, vol. 8, no. 2, 16:1–16:44, 2016.

Randomized algorithms for parafac2



Picture from: E.E. Papalexakis, C. Faloutsos, N.D. Sidiropoulos, *Tensors for data mining and data fusion: Models, applications, and scalable algorithms*, ACM Trans. on Intelligent Systems and Technology, vol. 8, no. 2, 16:1–16:44, 2016.

Simulations

Collinearity [0.7, .8]

0.01

$$\mathbf{A}^{(1)} = \operatorname{randn}(500, R), \quad \mathbf{A}^{(2)} = \operatorname{randn}(500, R),$$

 $\mathbf{A}^{(3)} = \operatorname{randn}(500, R).$
 $\eta =$

$$\underline{\mathbf{X}} = \left[\left[\mathbf{A}^{(1)}, \mathbf{A}^{(2)}, \mathbf{A}^{(3)} \right] \right] \qquad \qquad \underline{\widehat{\mathbf{X}}} = \underline{\mathbf{X}} + \eta \left(\frac{\|\underline{\mathbf{X}}\|}{\|\underline{\mathbf{Y}}\|} \right) \underline{\mathbf{Y}},$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{Y}}$ is a 4-th order tensor with i.i.d Gaussian components.

$$f = 1 - \frac{\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{X}} \right\|}{\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}} \right\|}$$

Simulations



	Algorithm	R = 5	R = 10	R = 15
	CP-ALS	0.9900	0.9900	0.9900
	CPRAND-PREMIX	0.9897	0.9898	0.9898
	CPRAND	0.9893	0.9895	0.9896
	RBS	0.9881	0.9897	0.9898
1			1	



Coil-100 dataset

S. Nene, S. Nayar, and H. Murase, Columbia Object Image Library (COIL-100), Tech. Report CUCS-006-96, Columbia University, 1996.



100 different object classes

72 different angles

 $128 \times 128 \times 3 \times 7200$

Simulations

For CP-rank R = 20 the following results were achieved

	Cpu Time (Second)	Fit
CP-ALS	220	0.686
CPRAND-PREMIX	77.46	0.684

Simulations

Video compression



Video link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1qeWugmiGt4

Time duration : 1'': 29'''size: $360 \times 480 \times 3 \times 2200$

 $360 \times 480 \times 3 \times 300$





Here again CP-PREMIX was approximately 2 times faster than CP-ALS.

Thanks for your attention!