

The Difference of Convex Algorithm on Riemannian Manifolds

Ronny Bergmann

joint work with

O. P. Ferreira, E. M. Santos, and J. C. O. Souza.

6th European Conference on Computational Optimization,
Heidelberg,

September 26, 2023

Difference of Convex

We aim to solve

$$\arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} f(p)$$

where

- ▶ \mathcal{M} is a Riemannian manifold
- ▶ $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a difference of convex function, i. e. of the form

$$f(p) = g(p) - h(p)$$

- ▶ $g, h: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ are convex, lower semicontinuous, and proper

A Riemannian Manifold \mathcal{M}


A d -dimensional Riemannian manifold can be informally defined as a set \mathcal{M} covered with a “suitable” collection of charts, that identify subsets of \mathcal{M} with open subsets of \mathbb{R}^d and a continuously varying inner product on the tangent spaces.

[Absil, Mahony, and Sepulchre 2008]

A Riemannian Manifold \mathcal{M}

Notation.

- ▶ Logarithmic map $\log_p q = \dot{\gamma}(0; p, q)$
- ▶ Exponential map $\exp_p X = \gamma_{p,X}(1)$
- ▶ Geodesic $\gamma(\cdot; p, q)$
- ▶ Tangent space $\mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$
- ▶ inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_p$



(Geodesic) Convexity

[Sakai 1996; Udriște 1994]

A set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{M}$ is called (strongly geodesically) **convex** if for all $p, q \in \mathcal{C}$ the geodesic $\gamma(\cdot; p, q)$ is unique and lies in \mathcal{C} .

A function $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is called (geodesically) **convex** if for all $p, q \in \mathcal{C}$ the composition $F(\gamma(t; p, q)), t \in [0, 1]$, is convex.

The Riemannian Subdifferential

The **subdifferential** of f at $p \in \mathcal{C}$ is given by

[Lee 2003; Udriște 1994]

$$\partial_{\mathcal{M}} f(p) := \{ \xi \in \mathcal{T}_p^* \mathcal{M} \mid f(q) \geq f(p) + \langle \xi, \log_p q \rangle_p \text{ for } q \in \mathcal{C} \},$$

where

- ▶ $\mathcal{T}_p^* \mathcal{M}$ is the dual space of $\mathcal{T}_p \mathcal{M}$,
- ▶ $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p$ denotes the duality pairing on $\mathcal{T}_p^* \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{T}_p \mathcal{M}$

The Euclidean DCA

Idea 1. At x_k , approximate $h(x)$ by its affine minorization $h_k(x) := h(x^{(k)}) + \langle x - x^{(k)}, y^{(k)} \rangle$ for some $y^{(k)} \in \partial h(x^{(k)})$.

\Rightarrow minimize $g(x) - h_k(x) = g(x) + h(x^{(k)}) - \langle x - x^{(k)}, y^{(k)} \rangle$ instead.

Idea 2. Using duality theory finding a new $y^{(k)} \in \partial h(x^{(k)})$ is equivalent to

$$y^{(k)} \in \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ h^*(y) - g^*(y^{(k-1)}) - \langle y - y^{(k-1)}, x^{(k)} \rangle \right\}$$

Idea 3. Reformulate 2 using a proximal map \Rightarrow DCP

On manifolds:

[Almeida, Neto, Oliveira, and Souza 2020; Souza and Oliveira 2015]

In the Euclidean case, all three models are equivalent.

A Fenchel Duality on a Hadamard Manifold

[Silva Louzeiro, RB, and Herzog 2022]

Definition

Let $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. The **Fenchel conjugate** of f is the function $f^*: \mathcal{T}^*\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ defined by

$$f^*(p, \xi) := \sup_{q \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \langle \xi, \log_p q \rangle - f(q) \right\}, \quad (p, \xi) \in \mathcal{T}^*\mathcal{M}.$$

The Dual Difference of Convex Problem

Given the Difference of Convex problem

$$\arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} g(p) - h(p)$$

and the Fenchel duals g^* and h^* we can state the dual difference of convex problem as

[RB, Ferreira, Santos, and Souza 2023]

$$\arg \min_{(p, \xi) \in T^* \mathcal{M}} h^*(p, \xi) - g^*(p, \xi).$$

On $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^n$ this indeed simplifies to the classical dual problem.

[RB, Ferreira, Santos, and Souza 2023]

Theorem.

$$\inf_{(q, X) \in T^* \mathcal{M}} \left\{ h^*(q, X) - g^*(q, X) \right\} = \inf_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \{ g(p) - h(p) \}.$$

The Dual Difference of Convex Problem

The primal and dual Difference of Convex problem

$$\arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} g(p) - h(p) \quad \text{and} \quad \arg \min_{(p, \xi) \in T^* \mathcal{M}} h^*(p, \xi) - g^*(p, \xi)$$

are equivalent in the following sense.

Theorem.

[RB, Ferreira, Santos, and Souza 2023]

If p^* is a solution of the primal problem, then $(p^*, \xi^*) \in T^* \mathcal{M}$ is a solution for the dual problem for all $\xi^* \in \partial_{\mathcal{M}} h(p^*) \cap \partial_{\mathcal{M}} g(p^*)$.

If $(p^*, \xi^*) \in T^* \mathcal{M}$ is a solution of the dual problem for some $\xi^* \in \partial_{\mathcal{M}} h(p^*) \cap \partial_{\mathcal{M}} g(p^*)$, then p^* is a solution of the primal problem.

Derivation of the Riemannian DCA

We consider the linearization of h at some point $p^{(k)}$:

With $\xi \in \partial h(p^{(k)})$ we get

$$h_k(p) = h(p^{(k)}) + \langle \xi, \log_{p^{(k)}} p \rangle_{p^{(k)}}$$

Using **musical isomorphisms** we identify $X = \xi^\# \in T_p \mathcal{M}$, where we call X a subgradient. **Locally** h_k **minorizes** h , i. e.

$$h_k(q) \leq h(q) \text{ locally around } p^{(k)}$$

\Rightarrow Use $-h_k(p)$ as **upper bound** for $-h(p)$ in f .

Note. On \mathbb{R}^n the function h_k is linear.

On a manifold h_k is not necessarily **convex**, even on a Hadamard manifold.

The Riemannian DC Algorithm

[RB, Ferreira, Santos, and Souza 2023]

Input: An initial point $p^0 \in \text{dom}(g)$, g and $\partial_{\mathcal{M}}h$

- 1: Set $k = 0$.
- 2: **while** not converged **do**
- 3: Take $X^{(k)} \in \partial_{\mathcal{M}}h(p^{(k)})$
- 4: Compute the next iterate p^{k+1} as

$$p^{(k+1)} \in \arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} g(p) - (X_k, \log_{p^{(k)}} p)_{p^{(k)}}. \quad (*)$$

- 5: Set $k \leftarrow k + 1$
- 6: **end while**

Note. In general the subproblem (*) can not be solved in closed form. But an approximate solution yields a good candidate.

Convergence of the Riemannian DCA

[RB, Ferreira, Santos, and Souza 2023]

Let $\{p^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{X^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the iterates and subgradients of the RDCA.

Theorem.

If \bar{p} is a cluster point of $\{p^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, then $\bar{p} \in \text{dom}(g)$ and there exists a cluster point \bar{X} of $\{X^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ s. t. $\bar{X} \in \partial g(\bar{p}) \cap \partial h(\bar{p})$.

\Rightarrow Every cluster point of $\{p^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, if any, is a critical point of f .

Proposition. Let g be σ -strongly (geodesically) convex. Then

$$f(p_{k+1}) \leq f(p^{(k)}) - \frac{\sigma}{2} d^2(p^{(k)}, p_{k+1}).$$

and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} d^2(p^{(k)}, p_{k+1}) < \infty$, so in particular $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(p^{(k)}, p_{k+1}) = 0$.



[Axen, Baran, RB, and Rzecki 2023]

Goal. Provide an interface to implement and use Riemannian manifolds.


Interface `AbstractManifold` to model manifolds

Functions like `exp(M, p, X)`, `log(M, p, X)` or `retract(M, p, X, method)`.

Decorators for implicit or explicit specification of an embedding, a metric, or a group,

Efficiency by providing in-place variants like `exp!(M, q, p, X)`

Manifolds.jl



Goal. Provide a library of Riemannian manifolds, that is efficiently implemented and well-documented


[Axen, Baran, RB, and Rzecki 2023]

Meta. generic implementations for $\mathcal{M}^{n \times m}$, $\mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$, vector- and tangent-bundles, esp. $T_p\mathcal{M}$, or Lie groups

Library. Implemented functions for

- ▶ Circle, Sphere, Torus, Hyperbolic, Projective Spaces
- ▶ (generalized, symplectic) Stiefel, (generalized) Grassmann, Rotations
- ▶ Symmetric Positive Definite matrices
- ▶ Multinomial, Symmetric, Symplectic matrices
- ▶ Tucker & Oblique manifold, Kendall's Shape space
- ▶ ...

Manopt.jl




Goal. Provide optimization algorithms on Riemannian manifolds.


Features. Given a `Problem p` and a `SolverState s`, implement `initialize_solver!(p, s)` and `step_solver!(p, s, i)` \Rightarrow an algorithm in the `Manopt.jl` interface

Highlevel interface like `gradient_descent(M, f, grad_f)` on any manifold `M` from `Manifolds.jl`.

Provide `debug` output, `recording`, `cache` & `counting` capabilities, as well as a library of `step sizes` and `stopping criteria`.

Manopt family.





Algorithms.

Cost-based Nelder-Mead, Particle Swarm

Subgradient-based Subgradient Method

Gradient-based Gradient Descent, Conjugate Gradient, Stochastic, Momentum, Nesterov, Averaged, ...
Quasi-Newton: (L-)BFGS, DFP, Broyden, SR1,...

Hessian-based Trust Regions, Adaptive Regularized Cubics (soon)

nonsmooth Chambolle-Pock, Douglas-Rachford, Cyclic Proximal Point

constrained Augmented Lagrangian, Exact Penalty, Frank-Wolfe

nonconvex Difference of Convex Algorithm, DCPA

Implementation of the DCA

The algorithm is implemented and released in Julia using `Manopt.jl`¹. It can be used with any manifold from `Manifolds.jl`

A solver call looks like

```
q = difference_of_convex_algorithm(M, f, g, ∂h, p0)
```

where one has to implement $f(M, p)$, $g(M, p)$, and $\partial h(M, p)$.

- ▶ a sub problem is automatically generated
- ▶ an efficient version of its cost and gradient is provided
- ▶ you can specify the sub-solver to using `sub_state=` to also set up the specific parameters of your favourite algorithm

¹see https://manoptjl.org/stable/solvers/difference_of_convex/

Rosenbrock and First Order Methods

Problem. We consider the classical Rosenbrock example²

$$\arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} a(x_1^2 - x_2)^2 + (x_1 - b)^2,$$

where $a, b > 0$, usually $b = 1$ and $a \gg b$, here: $a = 2 \cdot 10^5$.

Known Minimizer $x^* = \begin{pmatrix} b \\ b^2 \end{pmatrix}$ with cost $f(x^*) = 0$.

Goal. Compare first-order methods, e. g. using the (Euclidean) gradient

$$\nabla f(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 4a(x_1^2 - x_2) \\ -2a(x_1^2 - x_2) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 2(x_1 - b) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

A “Rosenbrock-Metric” on \mathbb{R}^2

In our Riemannian framework, we can introduce a new metric on \mathbb{R}^2 as

$$G_p := \begin{pmatrix} 1 + 4p_1^2 & -2p_1 \\ -2p_1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with inverse } G_p^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2p_1 \\ 2p_1 & 1 + 4p_1^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We obtain $(X, Y)_p = X^T G_p Y$

The exponential and logarithmic map are given as

$$\exp_p(X) = \begin{pmatrix} p_1 + X_1 \\ p_2 + X_2 + X_1^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \log_p(q) = \begin{pmatrix} q_1 - p_1 \\ q_2 - p_2 - (q_1 - p_1)^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

[Manifolds.jl](#):

Implement these functions on `MetricManifold(\mathbb{R}^2 , RosenbrockMetric())`.

The Riemannian Gradient w.r.t. the new Metric

Let $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Given the Euclidean gradient $\nabla f(p)$, its Riemannian gradient $\text{grad } f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow T\mathcal{M}$ is given by

$$\text{grad } f(p) = G_p^{-1} \nabla f(p).$$

While we could implement this denoting $\nabla f(p) = (f'_1(p) \ f'_2(p))^T$ using

$$\left\langle \text{grad } f(q), \log_q p \right\rangle_q = (p_1 - q_1) f'_1(q) + (p_2 - q_2 - (p_1 - q_1)^2) f'_2(q),$$

but it is [automatically](#) done in `Manopt.jl`.

The Experiment Setup

Algorithms. We now compare

1. The Euclidean gradient descent algorithm on \mathbb{R}^2 ,
2. The Riemannian gradient descent algorithm on \mathcal{M} ,
3. The Difference of Convex Algorithm on \mathbb{R}^2 ,
4. The Difference of Convex Algorithm on \mathcal{M} .


For DCA third we split f into $f(x) = g(x) - h(x)$ with

$$g(x) = a(x_1^2 - x_2)^2 + 2(x_1 - b)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad h(x) = (x_1 - b)^2.$$

Initial point. $p_0 = \frac{1}{10} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ with cost $f(p_0) \approx 7220.81$.

Stopping Criterion. $d_{\mathcal{M}}(p^{(k)}, p^{(k-1)}) < 10^{-16}$ or $\|\text{grad } f(p^{(k)})\|_p < 10^{-16}$.

The Results



Algorithm	Runtime	# Iterations
Euclidean GD	305.567 sec.	53 073 227
Euclidean DCA	58.268 sec.	50 588
Riemannian GD	18.894 sec.	2 454 017
Riemannian DCA	7.704 sec.	2 459

Selected References



Almeida, Y. T., J. X. d. C. Neto, P. R. Oliveira, and J. C. d. O. Souza (2020). “A modified proximal point method for DC functions on Hadamard manifolds”. In: *Computational Optimization and Applications* 76.3, pp. 649–673. DOI: [10.1007/s10589-020-00173-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-020-00173-3).



Axen, S. D., M. Baran, RB, and K. Rzecki (2023). “Manifolds.jl: An Extensible Julia Framework for Data Analysis on Manifolds”. In: *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*. Accepted for publication. DOI: [10.1145/3618296](https://doi.org/10.1145/3618296). arXiv: 2106.08777.



RB (2022). “Manopt.jl: Optimization on Manifolds in Julia”. In: *Journal of Open Source Software* 7.70, p. 3866. DOI: [10.21105/joss.03866](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.03866).



RB, O. P. Ferreira, E. M. Santos, and J. C. d. O. Souza (2023). *The difference of convex algorithm on Hadamard manifolds*. arXiv: 2112.05250.



Silva Louzeiro, M., RB, and R. Herzog (2022). “Fenchel Duality and a Separation Theorem on Hadamard Manifolds”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 32.2, pp. 854–873. ISSN: 1052-6234, 1095-7189. DOI: [10.1137/21M1400699](https://doi.org/10.1137/21M1400699). arXiv: 2102.11155.



Souza, J. C. d. O. and P. R. Oliveira (2015). “A proximal point algorithm for DC functions on Hadamard manifolds”. In: *Journal of Global Optimization* 63.4, pp. 797–810. DOI: [10.1007/s10898-015-0282-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10898-015-0282-7).

Interested in Numerical Differential Geometry?

Join  [numdiffgeo.zulipchat.com!](https://numdiffgeo.zulipchat.com)



ronnybergmann.net/talks/2023-EUCCO-Difference-of-Convex.pdf