

A Quadratic Lens on Muon’s Polar Update: Benefits, Pitfalls, and the Role of Newton–Schulz[†]

Egor Shulgin^{1,2,*,‡}, Sam Laing^{3,4,*}, Antonio Orvieto³, and Peter Richtárik¹

¹King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Saudi Arabia

²Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence (MBZUAI), United Arab Emirates

³ELLIS Institute Tübingen and MPI for Intelligent Systems, Tübingen AI Center, Germany

⁴OpenEuroLLM

Abstract

Muon updates matrix-valued parameters along approximately orthogonalized directions and often trains large language models faster than AdamW, yet it remains unclear when and why orthogonalization helps. We study PolarGD, the orthogonalized update at the core of Muon, on matrix quadratics, where optimizers can be analyzed in closed form, and compare update directions under line search to remove the effect of learning-rate tuning. Orthogonalization pays off when the gradient is far from low rank and its largest singular directions see high curvature. PolarGD reaches the minimizer in one step whenever the rows of the error are orthogonal with equal norms, for any Hessian, whereas gradient descent needs all Hessian eigenvalues to be equal; and unlike sign descent, PolarGD is unaffected by rotations of the problem. Over many steps, PolarGD acts as gradient descent preconditioned by the current iterate, so its speed is governed by the conditioning of the iterate rather than of the Hessian. This explains fast regimes as well as a slow one, caused by tiny singular values of the iterate, in which PolarGD is much slower than gradient descent. Finally, the few Newton–Schulz iterations used in Muon treat these tiny singular values as gradient descent does, so fewer iterations can converge faster than exact orthogonalization; in a transformer trained with Muon, about a quarter of the singular values of the attention matrices fall in this regime.

1 Introduction

Muon (Jordan et al., 2024b) has emerged as a strong optimizer for training large neural networks. It has matched or outperformed AdamW in language-model pretraining, from speedrun benchmarks (Jordan et al., 2024a) to large-scale training (Liu et al., 2025; Shah et al., 2025), and standard optimizers more broadly in vision (Jordan et al., 2024b; Pethick et al., 2025), diffusion (Schaipp, 2025), and tabular models (Gorishniy et al., 2026). For two-dimensional parameter blocks, Muon approximately orthogonalizes the momentum matrix with a few Newton–Schulz iterations, that is, it steps along an approximation of the polar factor $\text{polar}(G) = UV^\top$ of $G = U\Sigma_G V^\top$. The same direction is shared by a broader family of matrix optimizers. It is the steepest-descent direction for the spectral norm, used in stochastic spectral descent (Carlson et al., 2015a, 2016, 2015b) and revisited by Bernstein and Newhouse (2024). It is also the linear-minimization-oracle (LMO) direction of norm-constrained methods (Pethick et al., 2025), and Shampoo (Gupta et al., 2018) reduces to it when preconditioner accumulation is switched off (Bernstein and Newhouse, 2024). Controlled benchmarks

*Equal contribution. Correspondence to Egor Shulgin, shulgin.yegor@gmail.com.

[†]A shorter version of this work was presented at the ICML 2026 Workshop on High-dimensional Learning Dynamics.

[‡]The initial versions of this work were completed while Egor Shulgin was at KAUST.

place such matrix-based optimizers among the strongest available (Wen et al., 2026), so understanding when a step along $\text{polar}(G)$ helps matters well beyond Muon.

Existing analyses view these methods as non-Euclidean trust-region (Kovalev, 2025) or LMO-based steepest descent (Pethick et al., 2025) and provide convergence guarantees for Muon (Li and Hong, 2025). These are worst-case bounds over broad function classes, governed by smoothness constants in the chosen norm and by norm-equivalence factors; where they suggest an advantage over (stochastic) gradient descent (GD), it comes from comparing such constants across norms (Kim and Oh, 2026; Davis and Drusvyatskiy, 2025). They do not separate the effect of the orthogonalized direction from that of the step-size scale set by these constants, so when this direction improves on the gradient step remains open. Analyses of Muon with finite Newton-Schulz treat it as an approximation of the polar factor whose error worsens the guarantees (Shulgin et al., 2026; Kim and Oh, 2026; Takezawa et al., 2026), related work attributes this error to ill-conditioning and replaces the solver (Refael et al., 2025; He et al., 2025), and improved solvers aim to reduce it (Cesista et al., 2025; Grishina et al., 2025; Amsel et al., 2026).

We study this question on matrix quadratics. Quadratic models are the classical setting for understanding optimizers, and they have repeatedly explained optimizer behavior in deep learning, from critical batch sizes and the value of preconditioning (Zhang et al., 2019) to the advantage of Adam on transformers (Zhang et al., 2024) and of sign descent under Zipf-distributed data (Kunstner and Bach, 2025). Their matrix-valued form already contains the features that matter for orthogonalized updates: singular structure, anisotropic curvature, dependence on initialization, and the choice of coordinate system. We focus on the core update of Muon and of the methods above, $X_{k+1} = X_k - \gamma_k \text{polar}(\nabla f(X_k))$, and compare it with GD and SignGD. We call this update PolarGD by analogy with SignGD: it replaces the gradient by its polar factor, as SignGD replaces it by its entrywise sign (it has also been called spectral descent (Carlson et al., 2016)). Momentum and stochasticity are left out on purpose, so that the effect of the update direction can be isolated.

To compare the three directions on equal footing, we let each take its best scalar step, computed by exact line search. This removes learning-rate tuning from the comparison, so that methods are compared through their directions rather than through step-size choices. On matrix quadratics, the resulting one-step decreases are available in closed form and show a tradeoff between how much a direction D decreases the loss to first order, its gain $\langle G, D \rangle$, and the curvature $\text{tr}(D^\top H D)$ along it.

Contributions. Our main contributions are as follows.

- **One-step geometry (Section 3).** We give closed-form line-search decreases for GD, SignGD, and PolarGD. Each method reaches the minimizer in one step under its own condition (Theorem 1): GD from every starting point only when the Hessian is a multiple of the identity, SignGD when the error has entries of equal magnitude and the Hessian preserves their signs (e.g., a diagonal Hessian), and PolarGD, for any positive-definite Hessian, when the rows of the error are orthogonal with equal norms. This explains why orthogonal initialization is special for PolarGD and diagonal structure for SignGD. In the worst case over iterates, however, the one-step comparison is pessimistic for PolarGD: its guaranteed decrease is smaller than GD’s (Theorem 3), although PolarGD is often faster over whole trajectories (Figure 1).
- **Rotation equivariance (Section 3.3).** PolarGD is equivariant under orthogonal changes of basis, while SignGD is not (Theorem 2): rotating the problem rotates the PolarGD iterates but changes the SignGD trajectory. Accordingly, PolarGD keeps its performance when an ill-conditioned diagonal problem, such as a Zipf-type regression model of language data, is rotated, whereas SignGD degrades.
- **Implicit preconditioning (Section 4).** PolarGD is a gradient step with a preconditioner set by the current iterate, whose condition number is that of the iterate rather than of the Hessian. When the iterate has full row rank, this gives an exact formula for the progress per step, for line search and fixed steps. With line search, GD satisfies $f(X_{k+1}) \leq (1 - 1/\kappa(H)) f(X_k)$; PolarGD satisfies the same bound with the condition number $\kappa(H)$ of the Hessian replaced by the condition number $\kappa(X_k)$ of the iterate (taking $X^* = 0$). PolarGD is therefore fastest when the rows of X_k are orthogonal with equal norms and slowest when X_k has tiny singular values; this slow regime is tight, and in it GD can be nearly one-step exact

while **PolarGD** stays slow along the trajectory. We also show that a direction that is better for one step need not give a faster trajectory.

- **Rank deficiency and finite Newton-Schulz (Section 4.2).** We extend these identities to rank-deficient iterates and show that a few **Newton-Schulz** steps, as used in **Muon**, give a softened polar update: they behave like damped polar, treating large singular values like exact polar and tiny ones like a **GD** step. Near rank deficiency this converges faster than exact polar, so finite **Newton-Schulz** is not merely an approximation of the polar factor.

Related and concurrent work. Gonon et al. (2026) also study **Muon** on quadratics. On the isotropic quadratic, exact polar steps with a constant step size can fail to reach the minimizer, and random perturbations of the polar step restore reachability in a one-dimensional model; on general Hessians, they show numerically that the comparison with **GD** depends on the shape of the spectrum, that **Newton-Schulz** can help or hurt, and that a direction that wins at every step need not win along the trajectory. Our one-step and trajectory results are exact for any positive-definite Hessian. We relate our one-step condition to Davis and Drusvyatskiy (2025) in Section 2 and discuss other work in the sections where it is relevant.

2 Notation and Setup

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable, $G := \nabla f(X)$, and $\langle A, B \rangle := \text{tr}(A^\top B)$. We write $\|\cdot\|_F$, $\|\cdot\|_2$, and $\|\cdot\|_*$ for the Frobenius, spectral, and nuclear norms, and $\|\cdot\|_1$ for the entrywise ℓ_1 norm. We also write $\sigma_i(\cdot)$ for singular values, $\kappa(A) := \sigma_{\max}(A)/\sigma_{\min}(A)$, $A^\dagger$ for the pseudoinverse with $A^{\dagger/2} := (A^\dagger)^{1/2}$ for $A \succeq 0$, and $\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}$ for the orthogonal projector onto a subspace $\mathcal{V}$.

We consider iterations

$$X_{k+1} = X_k - \gamma_k D_k, \quad \gamma_k \geq 0, \quad (1)$$

where D_k is computed from $G_k := \nabla f(X_k)$ as one of the **GD**, **PolarGD**, and **SignGD** directions (dropping the index k) $D_{\text{GD}} := G$, $D_{\text{Pol}} := Q := \text{polar}(G)$, and $D_{\text{Sign}} := S := \text{sign}(G)$. Here $\text{polar}(G) := UV^\top$ for a thin SVD $G = U\Sigma_G V^\top$, and S is the entrywise sign matrix with $\text{sign}(0) = 0$. Both Q and S are LMO directions, $\text{LMO}(G) := \arg \max_{\|D\| \leq 1} \langle G, D \rangle$: Q for the spectral norm and S for the entrywise ℓ_∞ norm, and $\langle G, \text{LMO}(G) \rangle$ is the corresponding dual norm, namely $\|G\|_*$ and $\|G\|_1$, respectively.

Comparing directions by line search. We compare directions under exact line search, with step $\gamma^*(D) \in \arg \min_{\gamma \geq 0} f(X - \gamma D)$ and decrease $\Delta(D) := f(X) - f(X - \gamma^*(D)D)$. With fixed steps, the polar and sign directions are used in two forms: *LMO-normalized*, $D_k = Q_k$ or S_k , which ignores the size of the gradient and is the form used in most prior analyses (Kovalev, 2025; Pethick et al., 2025), and *dual-adapted*, $D_k = \|G_k\|_* Q_k$ or $\|G_k\|_1 S_k$, which multiplies the direction by the matching norm of the gradient, as in stochastic spectral descent (Carlson et al., 2016) and **PolarGrad** (Lau et al., 2025). Since rescaling D does not change the line-search update $X - \gamma^*(D)D$, line search treats both forms identically. The following bounds hold beyond quadratics and become equalities for the quadratic model of Section 3.

Assumption (matrix curvature bounds). There exist symmetric positive semidefinite $M \preceq L \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that for all $X, D \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ the Bregman divergence $B_f(X + D, X) := f(X + D) - f(X) - \langle \nabla f(X), D \rangle$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle MD, D \rangle \leq B_f(X + D, X) \leq \frac{1}{2} \langle LD, D \rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $\langle LD, D \rangle = \text{tr}(D^\top LD)$ (and similarly for M). For $L = \ell I_d$ and $M = \mu I_d$, these are the usual quadratic bounds implied by ℓ -smoothness and μ -strong convexity in the Frobenius norm; a general L captures anisotropic (e.g., row-wise) curvature. For $f(X) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(X^\top H X)$, both bounds hold with equality for $L = M = H$.




Figure 1: **Convergence across initialization–Hessian regimes.** Performance of dual-adapted **GD**, **SignGD** and **PolarGD** (the core **Muon** update) on matrix quadratic objectives $f(X) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(X^\top H X)$ with tuned fixed step sizes, not line search (see App. A.1). To isolate structural dependencies, we test three initializations: *Gaussian* ($X_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$), *Orthogonal* and *Vertex* ($X_0 \sim \{-1, 1\}$). We evaluate these against three Hessian profiles: *Isotropic* ($H = I_d$), *Dense* Marchenko–Pastur ($\kappa = 386$) and *Diagonal* (matching the spectrum in the dense case). Consistent with our analysis, each optimizer favors a distinct structural regime: **GD** is robust to initialization but degrades under ill-conditioning, **SignGD** benefits from coordinate-aligned curvature, and **PolarGD** is rotation-equivariant and benefits from row-isotropic initialization. No single optimizer dominates across all regimes.

For a direction D with gain $\langle G, D \rangle > 0$, write $\|D\|_L^2 := \langle LD, D \rangle$ for its curvature under the upper bound. Minimizing the upper bound in (2) along $X - \gamma D$ over $\gamma \geq 0$ gives the step

$$\gamma_L(D) := \frac{\langle G, D \rangle}{\|D\|_L^2}. \quad (3)$$

Proposition 1 (One-step decrease along a direction). *Assume (2). Fix X and a direction D with $\langle G, D \rangle > 0$ and $\|D\|_L > 0$. Let $X^+ = X - \gamma_L(D)D$, where $\gamma_L(D)$ is given by (3). Then*

$$f(X^+) \leq f(X) - \frac{\langle G, D \rangle^2}{2\|D\|_L^2}. \quad (4)$$

If $L = M$, equality holds and $\gamma_L(D)$ is the exact line-search step.

Proposition 1 judges a direction by its squared gain over its curvature, $\langle G, D \rangle^2 / \|D\|_L^2$, independently of its scale. Exact line search decreases f at least as much, and exactly as much when $L = M$ (Appendix B brackets the exact decrease when $L \neq M$). Since $\langle G, G \rangle = \|G\|_F^2$ and $\langle G, Q \rangle = \|G\|_*$, the polar direction guarantees a larger decrease than **GD** if and only if

$$\frac{\|G\|_L}{\|Q\|_L} > \frac{\|G\|_F^2}{\|G\|_*}. \quad (5)$$

This is why we allow matrix-valued curvature bounds in (2). A scalar bound $L = \ell I_d$ charges every direction the same curvature per unit Frobenius norm, $\|D\|_L^2 = \ell \|D\|_F^2$. The left side of (5) is then

$\|G\|_F / \|Q\|_F = \|G\|_F / \sqrt{r}$, with $r = \text{rank}(G)$, while the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality $\|G\|_* \leq \sqrt{r} \|G\|_F$ shows that the right side is at least $\|G\|_F / \sqrt{r}$. So (5) never holds: under a scalar bound, the polar direction never guarantees more decrease than GD, and guarantees as much only when all nonzero singular values of G are equal. A matrix L changes this. Writing $G = \sum_i \sigma_i u_i v_i^\top$, the GD curvature $\|G\|_L^2 = \sum_i \sigma_i^2 u_i^\top L u_i$ weights the curvature along each left singular vector u_i by σ_i^2 , whereas the polar curvature $\|Q\|_L^2 = \sum_i u_i^\top L u_i$ weights all of them equally. When the large singular directions of G see high curvature, GD pays for it most, and the polar direction can win. The right side depends only on the singular values of G : for fixed $\|G\|_F$, it is largest when G is close to rank one (at rank one, Q is proportional to G and the two directions coincide; Remark 1) and smallest when all nonzero singular values of G are equal. On quadratics, $L = M = H$ and (5) compares the exact line-search decreases (Section 3). Squaring (5) gives $\|G\|_*^2 / \|G\|_F^2 > \|G\|_F^2 \|Q\|_L^2 / \|G\|_L^2$. Bounding the two curvatures by their worst cases, $\|G\|_L^2 \leq \lambda_{\max}(L) \|G\|_F^2$ and $\|Q\|_L^2 \leq \text{tr}(L)$, which are the Frobenius- and spectral-norm smoothness constants implied by (2), replaces the right side by $\text{tr}(L) / \lambda_{\max}(L)$. For curvature $L \propto AA^\top$ generated by incoming activations A (up to transposition), this is their stable rank, and the result is the criterion of Davis and Drusvyatskiy (2025). Keeping the matrix curvature makes (5) exact for line search on quadratics, and the two criteria can disagree in either direction. With $\langle G, S \rangle = \|G\|_1$ in place of $\|G\|_*$, the same comparison for sign descent is that of Balles et al. (2020), who find that it beats GD when the Hessian is concentrated on its diagonal and its largest eigenvalue is much larger than the average, again with scalar (ℓ_∞ and Euclidean) smoothness constants. Shen et al. (2026) and Kovalev and Borodich (2025) assume the same one-sided curvature bound for Muon-type methods. Shen et al. (2026) check along training trajectories the condition $\|G\|_*^2 / \|Q\|_L^2 \geq \|G\|_F^2 / \lambda_{\max}(L)$, which bounds only GD’s curvature by its worst case and is therefore implied by (5), but not equivalent to it. Kovalev and Borodich (2025) analyze non-Euclidean SGD with momentum, using extrapolation or variance reduction for their faster stochastic rates, and obtain rates in $\text{tr}(L)$ rather than a dimension factor times $\lambda_{\max}(L)$, which amounts to bounding both curvatures by their worst cases.

This one-step comparison is pessimistic for PolarGD (its worst case is also worse than GD’s; Theorem 3), yet in Figure 1 PolarGD beats GD by orders of magnitude for every initialization on the dense and diagonal Hessians, and the gap widens with $\kappa(H)$ (Figure 10(c)); Section 4 studies this gap.

3 One-Step Geometry

On matrix quadratics, matrix geometry, curvature, and initialization already interact nontrivially, while the exact line-search quantities of Section 2 remain available in closed form. We consider

$$f(X) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((X - X^*)^\top H (X - X^*)), \quad (6)$$

with $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, $H = H^\top \succeq 0$, and gradient $G = H(X - X^*)$; we set $X^* = 0$ when convenient. Here (2) holds with equality for $L = M = H$, so by Proposition 1 the exact line-search step and decrease along any D with $\langle G, D \rangle > 0$ and $\text{tr}(D^\top H D) > 0$ are

$$\gamma^*(D) = \frac{\langle G, D \rangle}{\text{tr}(D^\top H D)}, \quad \Delta(D) = \frac{\langle G, D \rangle^2}{2 \text{tr}(D^\top H D)}. \quad (7)$$

Exact one-step decreases for GD, PolarGD, SignGD. With $D_{\text{GD}} = G$, $D_{\text{Pol}} = Q$, and $D_{\text{Sign}} = S$,

$$\Delta_{\text{GD}} = \frac{\|G\|_F^4}{2 \text{tr}(G^\top H G)}, \quad \Delta_{\text{Pol}} = \frac{\|G\|_*^2}{2 \text{tr}(Q^\top H Q)}, \quad \Delta_{\text{Sign}} = \frac{\|G\|_1^2}{2 \text{tr}(S^\top H S)}. \quad (8)$$

As in Section 2, GD weights the curvature along the left singular vectors of G by σ_i^2 , whereas PolarGD uses the unweighted curvature; SignGD instead pays the coordinate-wise curvature $\text{tr}(S^\top H S)$, which can be favorable when H is coordinate-aligned (Theorem 1).

Remark 1 (Vector and rank-one gradients). *If $m = 1$ (vector case), then $\|G\|_* = \|G\|_F$ and $Q = G/\|G\|_F$, so GD and PolarGD are collinear and therefore identical under exact line search. More generally, if $\text{rank}(G) = 1$, then Q is proportional to G and GD/PolarGD coincide under exact line search.*

On our matrix quadratic model, the one-step progress and optimal step-size of GD, PolarGD and SignGD can be written in closed form. How the algorithms rank depends on (1) *Initialization*: the evaluation point X , (2) *Curvature*: the eigenvalues of H , (3) *Geometry*: the eigenvectors of H .

We first isolate the role of the iterate with an isotropic Hessian (Section 3.1).

3.1 Isotropic Quadratic Setting

Consider $H = \lambda I_d$ with $\lambda > 0$ and $X^* = 0$, so that $G = \lambda X$. Let $X = U \Sigma_X V^\top$ be a thin SVD of rank r , and let s be the number of nonzero entries of X . By (7), GD uses $\gamma^*(G) = 1/\lambda$ and reaches X^* in one step from every X . PolarGD uses $\gamma^*(Q) = \|X\|_*/r$, so that

$$X_{\text{Pol}}^+ = U \left(\Sigma_X - \frac{\|X\|_*}{r} I_r \right) V^\top :$$

it subtracts the *same scalar from every nonzero singular value*. SignGD analogously subtracts the same scalar from every nonzero entry, $X_{\text{Sign}}^+ = X - \frac{\|X\|_1}{s} \text{sign}(X)$. The resulting loss ratios are (App. B.1)

$$\frac{f(X_{\text{Pol}}^+)}{f(X)} = 1 - \frac{\|X\|_*^2}{r \|X\|_F^2}, \quad \frac{f(X_{\text{Sign}}^+)}{f(X)} = 1 - \frac{\|X\|_1^2}{s \|X\|_F^2}. \quad (9)$$

Writing $\bar{\sigma}$ and $\overline{\sigma^2}$ for the means of the nonzero singular values of X and of their squares, the PolarGD ratio equals $1 - \bar{\sigma}^2/\overline{\sigma^2}$, the relative spread of the singular values; the SignGD ratio is the same quantity for the magnitudes of the nonzero entries. Hence PolarGD is one-step exact if and only if all nonzero singular values of X are equal (X is a scaled partial isometry), and SignGD if and only if all nonzero entries have equal magnitude. Thus, even for the best-conditioned Hessian, where GD needs a single step from anywhere, the efficiency of PolarGD and SignGD depends on the geometry of the initialization (Figure 1, first column: GD converges in one step from every initialization, PolarGD only from the orthogonal one, and SignGD only from the vertex one). Section 3.2 characterizes one-step exactness for general H .

3.2 One-Step Convergence Analysis

For general H , whether a method reaches X^* in one step depends jointly on H and the error $E = X - X^*$.

Theorem 1 (One-step convergence regimes under exact line search on quadratics). *Consider (6) with $H \succ 0$, let $E := X - X^*$, and call a direction $D \in \{G, Q, S\}$ one-step exact at $X \neq X^*$ if $X - \gamma^*(D)D = X^*$.*

- (i) *GD is one-step exact from every X if and only if $H = \lambda I_d$ for some $\lambda > 0$. (For a fixed $X \neq X^*$, GD is one-step exact if and only if $HE = \lambda E$ for some $\lambda > 0$.)*
- (ii) *SignGD is one-step exact at X if and only if all nonzero entries of E have a common magnitude and $\text{sign}(HE) = \text{sign}(E)$ entrywise, including zero entries. In particular, if H is strictly diagonally dominant with positive diagonal, i.e. $H_{ii} > \sum_{j \neq i} |H_{ij}|$ for all i , then $\text{sign}(HS) = S$ for every $S \in \{\pm 1\}^{d \times m}$; hence any vertex initialization $E = cS$ with $c > 0$ yields one-step convergence.*
- (iii) *Assume $\text{rank}(G) = d \leq m$. PolarGD is one-step exact at X if and only if $EE^\top = cI_d$ for some $c > 0$, that is, $E = \sqrt{c}UV^\top$ with $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ orthogonal and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ having orthonormal columns (a scaled orthogonal matrix if $m = d$).*

One-step analysis on quadratics reveals a “preference” for each method: **GD** converges in one step from every initialization if and only if the Hessian has equal eigenvalues. **SignGD** relaxes this condition on the Hessian (diagonal dominance suffices), at the price of a vertex initialization. **PolarGD** requires no condition on the Hessian, provided the rows of the initial error $X_0 - X^*$ are orthogonal with equal norms (e.g., a scaled orthogonal matrix). This is why orthogonal initialization is special for **PolarGD** in Figure 1, and vertex initialization for **SignGD** on diagonal Hessians.

3.3 Rotation Equivariance and Curvature Adaptation

While most trends in Figure 1 correlate with our one-step characterization, another pattern stands out: for every initialization, **PolarGD** performs the same on the dense and on the diagonal Hessian, in stark contrast to **SignGD**. The following result, proven in App. B.4, explains this *beyond the line-search setup*: the dense Hessian is a rotation of the diagonal one, so for initializations with rotation-invariant distributions (Gaussian, orthogonal) the two problems are equivalent in distribution for **GD** and **PolarGD**; the vertex case matches empirically.

Theorem 2 (Orthogonal equivariance). *Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ be orthogonal and $\tilde{H} := P^\top H P$. Run **GD** or **PolarGD**, with exact line search or the same fixed (LMO-normalized or dual-adapted) step sizes, on (6) with Hessian H from the error $E_0 := X_0 - X^*$, and with Hessian $\tilde{H}$ from $\tilde{E}_0 := P^\top E_0 R$. Then the errors satisfy $E_k = P \tilde{E}_k R^\top$ and the losses coincide for all k . **SignGD** does not have this property (App. B.4).*

The same holds for **Muon**’s update with momentum and finite **Newton-Schulz** (deterministic gradients), since momentum commutes with the rotation and $\text{NS}_q(P^\top M R) = P^\top \text{NS}_q(M) R$.

Zipf Laws experiment. **Kunstner and Bach (2025)** model next-token prediction as linear regression over one-hot inputs, with squared loss $L(X) = \frac{1}{2n} \|ZX - Y\|_F^2$. Since one-hot inputs are orthogonal, $Z^\top Z$ is diagonal with entries given by token counts; under Zipf frequencies $\pi_k \propto k^{-\zeta}$, this gives (6) with $H = \text{diag}(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_d)$ and a target X^* of next-token probabilities. On such ill-conditioned diagonal problems, **SignGD** scales much more favorably than **GD** (**Kunstner and Bach, 2025**); heavy-tailed frequencies of this kind slow **GD** on rare classes but not sign-based methods, which **Kunstner et al. (2024)** identify as a reason for **Adam**’s advantage on language models. Figure 2 shows that **PolarGD** behaves similarly in the diagonal case (if H and $X - X^*$ are diagonal and $d = m$, then $Q = \text{sign}(G)$; App. B.2) and that, unlike **SignGD**, it keeps its performance when H is randomly rotated; the advantage of sign descent requires curvature concentrated on the diagonal (**Balles**




Figure 2: Zipf quadratic with $\lambda_k(H) \propto k^{-\zeta}$, $\zeta \in \{0.25, 0.5, 1\}$, for diagonal and randomly rotated H with the target X^* kept fixed; best-tuned dual-adapted fixed steps, median and range over 5 seeds. **PolarGD** is unaffected by the rotation, while **SignGD** degrades significantly. Details in App. A.3.

et al., 2020), which a rotation removes. Theorem 2 guarantees this when H and X^* are rotated together; Figure 2 keeps X^* fixed and confirms it empirically, and App. A.3 shows both cases. This is consistent with, though not by itself an explanation of, the strong performance of **Muon** in language modeling.

From one step to trajectories. Theorem 1 explains why row-isotropic iterates are special, and Theorem 2 why **PolarGD** behaves the same on diagonal and rotated Hessians. Neither explains the stronger phenomenon in Figures 1 and 2: **PolarGD** stays fast along the whole trajectory when H is dense and ill-conditioned. Section 4 shows that the polar direction is a gradient step preconditioned by the iterate covariance $XX^\top$ rather than by H , which explains why row-isotropic iterates can be fast for any $\kappa(H)$ and why near-rank-deficient iterates are slow.

On our quadratic loss, **PolarGD** is empirically as robust to ill-conditioning as **SignGD** (explained in Section 4). Unlike **SignGD**, it is orthogonally equivariant, so its performance carries over to every rotation of a problem, not only to coordinate-aligned ones.

4 Beyond One Step: Implicit Preconditioning

The polar direction can be rewritten as a gradient step with a preconditioner set by the row covariance $XX^\top$ of the current iterate rather than by H alone. This yields an optimistic regime, where row-isotropic iterates cancel the curvature, and a pessimistic one, where tiny singular values make the preconditioner ill-conditioned. We first note that one-step preferences can change along a trajectory (see also Appendix C).

Local preferences need not be consistent along a trajectory. Even on convex quadratics, the sign of $\Delta_{\text{Pol}}(X) - \Delta_{\text{GD}}(X)$ can change with X , so pointwise one-step comparisons do not induce a global ordering between methods. Appendix C gives a closed-form 2×2 diagonal example in which, along the exact-line-search **GD** trajectory $\{X_k^{\text{GD}}\}_{k \geq 0}$, the local winner between **GD** and **PolarGD** alternates deterministically at every iterate. Gonon et al. (2026) give a numerical example of a related failure: a greedy rule that picks the better of the two directions chooses the polar direction at every step and is still much slower than **GD** with line search. Both examples call for the trajectory-level analysis below.

4.1 PolarGD as an Implicit Preconditioned Method

We return to the quadratic setting of Section 3, with $H \succ 0$. For the thin SVD $G = U\Sigma_G V^\top$ of Section 2, of rank r ,

$$Q = \text{polar}(G) = (GG^\top)^{\dagger/2}G, \quad QQ^\top = \Pi_{\text{range}(G)}, \quad (10)$$

so polar normalization sets all singular values of G to one. Writing $\Sigma := XX^\top$ and using $G = HX$,

$$Q = \text{polar}(HX) = (H\Sigma H)^{\dagger/2}HX =: A(X)X, \quad A(X) := (H\Sigma H)^{\dagger/2}H. \quad (11)$$

So **PolarGD** applies a left preconditioner determined by the current iterate.

The cleanest identities occur in the full-row-rank regime $d \leq m$, $\text{rank}(X) = d$. We state the main results in this regime and give the active-subspace extension below.

Proposition 2 (Conditioning of the implicit preconditioner). *Assume $H \succ 0$ and $\text{rank}(X) = d$.*

$$A(X)\Sigma A(X)^\top = I_d, \quad A(X)^\top A(X) = \Sigma^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

Consequently, the singular values of $A(X)$ are $\{1/\sigma_i(X)\}_{i=1}^d$, and

$$\kappa(A(X)) = \kappa(X) = \sqrt{\kappa(\Sigma)}. \quad (13)$$

This is the first qualitative difference from **GD**. For **GD** on a quadratic, the linear rate is governed by $\kappa(H)$. For **PolarGD**, the conditioning of the implicit preconditioner is governed by the current iterate covariance. Thus the Hessian condition number alone is not predictive: a badly conditioned H can be harmless near row-isotropic iterates, while a well-conditioned H can be paired with an ill-conditioned preconditioner if X has tiny singular values.

In full row rank, $QQ^\top = I_d$, hence $\text{tr}(Q^\top H Q) = \text{tr}(H)$. Combining this with the line-search identity from Section 3 yields the following exact contraction.

Theorem 3 (Exact progress coefficient for **PolarGD**). *Assume $H \succ 0$ and $\text{rank}(X) = d$. Let $Q = \text{polar}(HX)$, and let $X^+ = X - \gamma^*(Q)Q$ be the exact line-search update. Then*

$$\gamma^*(Q) = \frac{\|HX\|_*}{\text{tr}(H)}, \quad f(X^+) = f(X) - \frac{\|HX\|_*^2}{2\text{tr}(H)}. \quad (14)$$

Equivalently,

$$\frac{f(X^+)}{f(X)} = 1 - p(X), \quad p(X) := \frac{\|HX\|_*^2}{\text{tr}(H)\text{tr}(HXX^\top)}. \quad (15)$$

Moreover,

$$\max \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{\min}(H)}{\text{tr}(H)}, \frac{4\kappa(X)}{(1 + \kappa(X))^2} \right\} \leq p(X) \leq 1, \quad (16)$$

where both lower bounds are tight, and the upper bound is attained if and only if $XX^\top = cI_d$, in which case **PolarGD** reaches the minimizer in one step. Finally, for a fixed dual-adapted step $X^+ = X - \gamma \|HX\|_* Q$,

$$\frac{f(X^+)}{f(X)} = 1 - \alpha(2 - \alpha)p(X), \quad \alpha := \gamma \text{tr}(H). \quad (17)$$

The full-rank assumption holds approximately in all nine regimes of Figure 1: the numerical rank of the gradients stays close to d along the trajectories (Figure 7). The coefficient $p(X)$ is scale-invariant, so it measures the shape of the iterate rather than its magnitude. Row-isotropic iterates give $p(X) = 1$, recovering Theorem 1(iii). The second lower bound in (16) behaves like $4/\kappa(X)$ for ill-conditioned iterates. It is the Kantorovich factor $4\kappa(H)/(1 + \kappa(H))^2 \approx 4/\kappa(H)$ of **GD** with exact line search, with $\kappa(H)$ replaced by $\kappa(X)$: in the worst case, **GD** is limited by the conditioning of the curvature and **PolarGD** by that of the iterate




Figure 3: **Alternating local winner.** A 2×2 diagonal quadratic with $\kappa(H) = 10$ (details in App. C). Along the **GD** trajectory, the one-step advantage $\Delta_{\text{GD}} - \Delta_{\text{Pol}}$ alternates sign every iteration. Loss curves are shown in Figure 8.




Figure 4: **Spectral recovery near rank deficiency.** (Left) Loss $f(X_k)$, (Right) exact progress coefficient $p(X_k)$. We initialize at $X_0 = O^\top \text{diag}(1, \delta, \dots, \delta) O$ for $\delta = 10^{-4}$, O random orthogonal, $H = I_d$ and $d = 10$; with $H = I_d$, GD is one-step exact, so this setting isolates the effect of the iterate’s spectrum on PolarGD. All methods use exact line search. Exact PolarGD contracts at the fixed rate $(1 - 2/d)^2$ per step after the first (Corollary 5), while Newton-Schulz damps the tiny singular values and recovers quickly, the more so with fewer steps. GD is shown for reference. Further details in Appendix A.

(Remark 4 gives a coefficient-of-variation form of $p(X)$). On dense quadratics, GD’s iteration count grows roughly linearly with $\kappa(H)$, while tuned PolarGD’s grows only slowly (Figure 10(c)). The first lower bound, however, can be as small as $1/(1 + (d - 1)\kappa) \approx 1/(\kappa d)$, roughly $d/4$ times smaller than $4\kappa/(\kappa + 1)^2 \approx 4/\kappa$. It is tight: Appendix E.2 constructs a near-rank-deficient full-rank family with $p(X) \rightarrow \lambda_{\min}(H)/\text{tr}(H)$, on which GD is nearly one-step exact, while PolarGD contracts at exactly $\left(\frac{(d-1)\kappa-1}{(d-1)\kappa+1}\right)^2$ per step from the second step on, GD’s worst-case rate with κ replaced by $(d - 1)\kappa$ (Corollary 5). Figure 4 shows such an instance with $H = I_d$: GD converges in one step, whereas exact PolarGD contracts by a fixed factor per step. Thus exact line search alone does not make PolarGD uniformly better than GD; its advantage depends on how the iterate covariance evolves along the trajectory. By (17), the same coefficient governs the tuned fixed steps of Figure 1; line search is the rate $\alpha = 1$, which maximizes the one-step factor but, as Section 4 illustrates, need not give the best trajectory. The adverse example also motivates the softened polar variants below: the bad regime is caused by exact polar normalization of tiny singular modes.

Relation to prior preconditioning views. Writing $\text{polar}(G) = (GG^\top)^{-1/2}G$ as a gradient-built preconditioner is common (Lau et al., 2025; Ma et al., 2026); on quadratics, substituting $G = HX$ shows that this preconditioner is set by the iterate, with conditioning $\kappa(X)$ whatever H is (Proposition 2). Under smoothness and the Polyak–Łojasiewicz condition, Lau et al. (2025) prove linear rates for the dual-adapted step that depend on $\kappa(H)$, such as $1 - 1/(r\kappa(H))$ for gradients of rank r ; on quadratics, the first lower bound in (16) has this form and is tight, so this dependence cannot be removed in the worst case, while the second bound depends on $\kappa(X)$ alone. When H and $XX^\top$ commute, $Q = \text{polar}(X)$ and H drops out of the direction (Corollary 4). Ma et al. (2026) exploit decoupling of this kind, along trajectories aligned with the eigenbasis of the problem and with geometrically decaying steps, to prove rates independent of the condition number for matrix factorization and for an in-context-learning quadratic, and leave matrix linear regression, the setting studied here, open.

Greedy steps are not the best fixed steps. For GD, exact line search typically does at least as well as a tuned fixed step; for PolarGD and SignGD it does not (Figure 10; Appendix D gives further settings). In the dual-adapted parameterization, line search is the fixed rate $\alpha = 1$ in (17), which maximizes the one-step factor, yet the tuned rate $\alpha \approx 1.7$ converges much faster: it keeps $p(X_k)$ near 0.6, whereas under line search

$p(X_k)$ decays to 0.01 within 150 iterations. Line search itself creates the tiny singular values that make $p(X)$ small. When H and $XX^\top$ commute, a fixed step maps the singular values of X to $s_i^+ = |s_i - \alpha \bar{s}_H|$, where $\bar{s}_H$ is their λ -weighted mean (Corollary 4). Line search subtracts the mean, which lies in the bulk of the spectrum, so singular values near it are sent close to zero and a growing tail of tiny ones forms; a longer step instead reflects small singular values to large ones. As in Figure 3, the locally optimal choice is not optimal along the trajectory, and the gap grows with $\kappa(H)$ (Figure 10(c)).

On our quadratic loss, **PolarGD** acts like a self-preconditioned **GD** step: the polar map sets all singular values of the gradient to one, so the effective preconditioner is controlled by the iterate covariance $XX^\top$, not by $\kappa(H)$ alone. This helps near row-isotropic iterates, but can be pessimistic near rank deficiency, where exact polar normalization gives tiny singular modes the same weight as large ones.

Active-subspace extension. When $\text{rank}(G) < d$, $QQ^\top$ is no longer I_d but the projector $\Pi_G := \Pi_{\text{range}(G)}$. The exact line-search formula remains valid with active curvature $\text{tr}(H\Pi_G)$:

$$\gamma^*(Q) = \frac{\|G\|_*}{\text{tr}(H\Pi_G)}, \quad f(X^+) = f(X) - \frac{\|G\|_*^2}{2\text{tr}(H\Pi_G)}. \quad (18)$$

Moreover, like **GD** on this model, exact **PolarGD** acts on X from the left and cannot increase rank: for any step size, $\text{rank}(X_{k+1}) \leq \text{rank}(X_k)$ (Proposition 9). Thus rank deficiency is an active-subspace regime rather than a failure of the theory. Appendix E.6 gives the full projector-based extension.

4.2 Near-Rank-Deficiency and Softened Polar Updates

The representation $Q = (GG^\top)^{\dagger/2}G$ also exposes a failure mode of exact polar normalization: tiny nonzero singular values are inverted. Two simple variants reduce this sensitivity: rank-truncated polar, $Q^{(s)} := U_{:,1:s}V_{:,1:s}^\top$, which drops small modes, and damped polar,

$$Q_\varepsilon := (GG^\top + \varepsilon I_d)^{-1/2}G,$$

which maps each singular value to $\sigma_i / \sqrt{\sigma_i^2 + \varepsilon}$. Up to the factor $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$, damped polar is the soft spectral clipping $(I_d + GG^\top/c^2)^{-1/2}G$ with $c = \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, a smooth version of $\sigma_i \mapsto \min(\sigma_i, c)$, which Jiang et al. (2026) apply to the updates of **AdamW**-type optimizers; there c is large and only the largest singular values are capped, whereas **Muon** operates in the opposite regime. We define these variants and give basic properties in Appendix F.

Finite Newton-Schulz as damped polar. Practical **Muon** replaces the SVD by q **Newton-Schulz** steps on $G/\|G\|_F$, which keep the singular vectors of G and map each normalized singular value s to $\phi_q(s)$ (Appendix G). Small singular values are multiplied by a fixed factor ℓ_q , which grows geometrically with q ($\ell_5 \approx 485$ for **Muon**'s coefficients), while those above about $1/\ell_q$ are mapped close to 1. This is the behavior of damped polar with $\varepsilon_q = \ell_q^{-2}$, i.e., a rescaled soft spectral clipping at $c = 1/\ell_q$: finite **Newton-Schulz** acts like **GD** on singular values below the damping scale $1/\ell_q$ and like exact polar above it, and its damping decreases geometrically with the number of steps. Near rank deficiency it therefore avoids the slow regime of exact polar, and fewer steps converge faster (Figure 4). This contrasts with convergence bounds that treat the **Newton-Schulz** error only as a degradation factor (Shulgin et al., 2026; Kim and Oh, 2026): here a less accurate polar factor converges faster. Gonon et al. (2026) observe numerically that five **Newton-Schulz** steps can beat exact polar on some quadratics; damping of tiny singular values gives a deterministic mechanism for such gains.

Newton-Schulz in practice. To check whether this regime occurs in practice, we examined a 90M-parameter transformer trained with **Muon** on 1.8B tokens (App. H). Figure 5(a) shows the singular values of the momentum matrices M that **Muon** orthogonalizes, normalized by $\|M\|_F$ as in training. About a




Figure 5: **Muon departs from exact polar on a sizable part of the attention spectrum.** Momentum matrices M that Muon orthogonalizes in a 90M-parameter transformer (final checkpoint), with singular values normalized by $\|M\|_F$ as in training. (a) Top: output vs. input singular value for exact polar, normalized GD, Muon’s five **Newton-Schulz** (NS) steps, and damped polar with $\varepsilon = \ell_5^{-2}$; below the damping scale $1/\ell_5$ (shaded, GD-like), Muon’s output is proportional to its input, as for GD, and above it Muon behaves like exact polar. Bottom: distribution of the singular values. (b) Percentage of singular values below $1/\ell_5$, by layer and matrix; the embedding and the LM head have none.

quarter of the singular values of the attention matrices lie below the damping scale $1/\ell_5 \approx 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$, where five **Newton-Schulz** steps act like GD rather than like exact polar; the MLP matrices, the embedding, and the LM head have none. Over all 50 matrices, exact polar would place about 16% of the update’s squared Frobenius norm on these directions and five **Newton-Schulz** steps about 5%. The effect is strongly heterogeneous (Figure 5(b)): it is largest in the first layer and decreases with depth. As in NanoGPT (Shulgin et al., 2026, Figure 5), attention matrices are thus much harder to orthogonalize than MLP matrices, and their smallest singular values explain why: **Newton-Schulz** becomes polar-like on all directions only once ℓ_q times the smallest normalized singular value exceeds 1, which takes 9–18 steps for the attention matrices and 4–5 for the MLP matrices.

5 Conclusion

We isolated the geometry of the orthogonalized update shared by Muon and related matrix optimizers by analyzing PolarGD on matrix quadratics. PolarGD benefits from orthogonal equivariance and implicit preconditioning by the iterate, but it is not uniformly better than GD or SignGD: it is fast near row-isotropic iterates and slow near rank deficiency, where exact polar normalization overweights tiny singular values. Finite **Newton-Schulz** softens the update exactly there and can then converge faster than exact polar, so it is not merely an approximation of the polar factor. The trajectory results rely on the quadratic structure, but Proposition 1 only needs the curvature bounds (2), and equivariance and the softening by **Newton-Schulz** hold for any objective, including the momentum matrix that Muon orthogonalizes. Our transformer measurements show that the regime where exact polar and **Newton-Schulz** differ occurs in practice. This suggests treating

the number of **Newton-Schulz** steps, or the damping level, as a design choice of the optimizer rather than only as an accuracy setting.

Acknowledgements

The research reported in this publication was supported by funding from King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST): i) KAUST Baseline Research Scheme, ii) Center of Excellence for Generative AI, under award number 5940, iii) CRG Grant ORFS-CRG12-2024-6460. This research was partially funded by the European Commission under the grant No. 101195233 (OpenEuroLLM). Antonio Orvieto acknowledges the financial support of the Hector Foundation.

References

- Noah Amsel, David Persson, Christopher Musco, and Robert M Gower. [The Polar Express: Optimal matrix sign methods and their application to the Muon algorithm](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. (Cited on pages 2 and 39)
- Lukas Balles, Fabian Pedregosa, and Nicolas Le Roux. [The geometry of sign gradient descent](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08056*, 2020. (Cited on pages 5 and 7)
- Jeremy Bernstein and Laker Newhouse. [Old optimizer, new norm: An anthology](#). In *OPT 2024: Optimization for Machine Learning (NeurIPS Workshop)*, 2024. (Cited on page 1)
- David Carlson, Volkan Cevher, and Lawrence Carin. [Stochastic spectral descent for restricted Boltzmann machines](#). In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2015a. (Cited on page 1)
- David Carlson, Ya-Ping Hsieh, Edo Collins, Lawrence Carin, and Volkan Cevher. [Stochastic spectral descent for discrete graphical models](#). *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 10(2):296–311, 2016. (Cited on pages 1, 2, and 3)
- David E Carlson, Edo Collins, Ya-Ping Hsieh, Lawrence Carin, and Volkan Cevher. [Preconditioned spectral descent for deep learning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2015b. (Cited on page 1)
- Franz Louis Cesista, Jiacheng You, and Keller Jordan. [Squeezing 1-2% efficiency gains out of Muon by optimizing the Newton-Schulz coefficients](#), 2025. Blog post. (Cited on page 2)
- Jeremy M. Cohen, Simran Kaur, Yuanzhi Li, J. Zico Kolter, and Ameet Talwalkar. [Gradient descent on neural networks typically occurs at the edge of stability](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. (Cited on page 29)
- Damek Davis and Dmitriy Drusvyatskiy. [When do spectral gradient updates help in deep learning?](#) *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.04299*, 2025. (Cited on pages 2, 3, and 5)
- Antoine Gonon, Andreea-Alexandra Muşat, and Nicolas Boumal. [Insights on Muon from simple quadratics](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.11948*, 2026. (Cited on pages 3, 8, and 11)
- Yury Gorishniy, Ivan Rubachev, Dmitrii Feoktistov, and Artem Babenko. [Benchmarking optimizers for MLPs in tabular deep learning](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.15297*, 2026. (Cited on page 1)
- Ekaterina Grishina, Matvey Smirnov, and Maxim Rakhuba. [Accelerating Newton-Schulz iteration for orthogonalization via Chebyshev-type polynomials](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.10935*, 2025. (Cited on page 2)
- Vineet Gupta, Tomer Koren, and Yoram Singer. [Shampoo: Preconditioned stochastic tensor optimization](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018. (Cited on page 1)

- Chuan He, Zhanwang Deng, and Zhaosong Lu. [Low-rank orthogonalization for large-scale matrix optimization with applications to foundation model training](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.11983*, 2025. (Cited on page 2)
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. [Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on ImageNet classification](#). In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2015. (Cited on page 30)
- Xiaowen Jiang, Andrei Semenov, and Sebastian U Stich. [Enhancing LLM training via spectral clipping](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2026. (Cited on page 11)
- Keller Jordan, Jeremy Bernstein, Brendan Rappazzo, @fernbear.bsky.social, Vlado Boža, Jiacheng You, Franz Cesista, Braden Koszarsky, and @Grad62304977. [Modded-nanoGPT: Speedrunning the nanoGPT baseline](#), 2024a. GitHub repository. (Cited on page 1)
- Keller Jordan, Yuchen Jin, Vlado Boža, Jiacheng You, Franz Cesista, Laker Newhouse, and Jeremy Bernstein. [Muon: An optimizer for hidden layers in neural networks](#), 2024b. Blog post. (Cited on pages 1 and 39)
- Gyu Yeol Kim and Min-hwan Oh. [Convergence of Muon with Newton–Schulz](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. (Cited on pages 2 and 11)
- Dmitry Kovalev. [Understanding gradient orthogonalization for deep learning via non-Euclidean trust-region optimization](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.12645*, 2025. (Cited on pages 2 and 3)
- Dmitry Kovalev and Ekaterina Borodich. [Non-Euclidean SGD for structured optimization: Unified analysis and improved rates](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.11466*, 2025. (Cited on page 5)
- Alex Krizhevsky, Vinod Nair, and Geoffrey Hinton. [CIFAR-10 \(Canadian Institute for Advanced Research\)](#), 2009. Dataset. (Cited on page 29)
- Frederik Kunstner and Francis Bach. [Scaling laws for gradient descent and sign descent for linear bigram models under Zipf’s law](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025. (Cited on pages 2, 7, and 18)
- Frederik Kunstner, Robin Yadav, Alan Milligan, Mark Schmidt, and Alberto Bietti. [Heavy-tailed class imbalance and why Adam outperforms gradient descent on language models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. (Cited on page 7)
- Tim Tsz-Kit Lau, Qi Long, and Weijie Su. [PolarGrad: A class of matrix-gradient optimizers from a unifying preconditioning perspective](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.21799*, 2025. (Cited on pages 3, 10, and 28)
- Jiaxiang Li and Mingyi Hong. [A note on the convergence of Muon](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.02900*, 2025. (Cited on page 2)
- Jingyuan Liu, Jianlin Su, Xingcheng Yao, Zhejun Jiang, Guokun Lai, Yulun Du, Yidao Qin, Weixin Xu, Enzhe Lu, Junjie Yan, Yanru Chen, Huabin Zheng, Yibo Liu, Shaowei Liu, Bohong Yin, Weiran He, Han Zhu, Yuzhi Wang, Jianzhou Wang, Mengnan Dong, Zheng Zhang, Yongsheng Kang, Hao Zhang, Xinran Xu, Yutao Zhang, Yuxin Wu, Xinyu Zhou, and Zhilin Yang. [Muon is scalable for LLM training](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.16982*, 2025. (Cited on page 1)
- Jianhao Ma, Yu Huang, Yuejie Chi, and Yuxin Chen. [Preconditioning benefits of spectral orthogonalization in Muon](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.13474*, 2026. (Cited on page 10)
- Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J. Wright. [Numerical Optimization](#). Springer, 2 edition, 2006. (Cited on page 34)
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Yang, Zach DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. [PyTorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019. (Cited on page 18)

- Thomas Pethick, Wanyun Xie, Kimon Antonakopoulos, Zhenyu Zhu, Antonio Silveti-Falls, and Volkan Cevher. [Training deep learning models with norm-constrained LMOs](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. (Cited on pages 1, 2, and 3)
- Yehonathan Refael, Guy Smorodinsky, Tom Tirer, and Ofir Lindenbaum. [SUMO: Subspace-aware moment-orthogonalization for accelerating memory-efficient LLM training](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025. (Cited on page 2)
- Fabian Schaipp. [Optimization benchmark for diffusion models on dynamical systems](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.19376*, 2025. (Cited on page 1)
- Ishaan Shah, Anthony M. Polloreno, Karl Stratos, Philip Monk, Adarsh Chaluvaraju, Andrew Hojel, Andrew Ma, Anil Thomas, Ashish Tanwer, Darsh J. Shah, Khoi Nguyen, Kurt Smith, Michael Callahan, Michael Pust, Mohit Parmar, Peter Rushton, Platon Mazarakis, Ritvik Kapila, Saurabh Srivastava, Somanshu Singla, Tim Romanski, Yash Vanjani, and Ashish Vaswani. [Practical efficiency of Muon for pretraining](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.02222*, 2025. (Cited on page 1)
- Wei Shen, Ruichuan Huang, Minhui Huang, Cong Shen, and Jiawei Zhang. [On the convergence analysis of Muon](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2026. (Cited on page 5)
- Egor Shulgin, Sultan AlRashed, Peter Richtárik, and Francesco Orabona. [Beyond the ideal: Analyzing the inexact Muon update](#). In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2026. (Cited on pages 2, 11, and 12)
- Dan Su, Kezhi Kong, Ying Lin, Joseph Jennings, Brandon Norick, Markus Kliegl, Mostofa Patwary, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. [Nemotron-CC: Transforming Common Crawl into a refined long-horizon pretraining dataset](#). In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2025. (Cited on page 41)
- Yuki Takezawa, Anastasia Koloskova, Xiaowen Jiang, and Sebastian U. Stich. [FedMuon: Federated learning with bias-corrected LMO-based optimization](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. (Cited on page 2)
- Kaiyue Wen, David Leo Wright Hall, Tengyu Ma, and Percy Liang. [Fantastic pretraining optimizers and where to find them](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. (Cited on page 2)
- Guodong Zhang, Lala Li, Zachary Nado, James Martens, Sushant Sachdeva, George Dahl, Chris Shallue, and Roger B. Grosse. [Which algorithmic choices matter at which batch sizes? Insights from a noisy quadratic model](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019. (Cited on page 2)
- Tianyue H. Zhang, Lucas Maes, Alan Milligan, Alexia Jolicoeur-Martineau, Ioannis Mitliagkas, Damien Scieur, Simon Lacoste-Julien, and Charles Guille-Escuret. [Understanding Adam requires better rotation dependent assumptions](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025. (Cited on page 19)
- Yushun Zhang, Congliang Chen, Tian Ding, Ziniu Li, Ruoyu Sun, and Zhi-Quan Luo. [Why transformers need Adam: A Hessian perspective](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. (Cited on page 2)

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Notation and Setup	3
3	One-Step Geometry	5
3.1	Isotropic Quadratic Setting	6
3.2	One-Step Convergence Analysis	6
3.3	Rotation Equivariance and Curvature Adaptation	7
4	Beyond One Step: Implicit Preconditioning	8
4.1	PolarGD as an Implicit Preconditioned Method	8
4.2	Near-Rank-Deficiency and Softened Polar Updates	11
5	Conclusion	12
A	Experimental Details	17
A.1	Learning Rate Selection	17
A.2	Initialization-Hessian Regimes (Figure 1)	18
A.3	Zipfian Language-Modeling Proxy (Figure 2)	18
A.4	Spectral Recovery Near Rank Deficiency (Figure 4)	19
A.5	Line Search versus Tuned Dual-Adapted Steps (Figure 10)	20
B	Proofs for Sections 2 and 3	21
B.1	Isotropic Quadratics	21
B.2	Exact Line-Search Quantities for Diagonal H	22
B.2.1	Local Comparison in the Diagonal Case (Explicit but Initialization-Dependent)	23
B.3	Proof of Theorem 1	24
B.4	Orthogonal Equivariance and Coordinate Dependence	25
C	An Analytic 2×2 Example Where the Local Winner Alternates	26
D	Line Search versus Tuned Fixed Steps	28
D.1	Proof of Proposition 4	28
D.2	Line Search on a CIFAR-5K MLP	29
E	Proofs and Details for Section 4	30
E.1	Proofs for the Implicit-Preconditioning Identities	30
E.2	A Near-Rank-Deficient Instance Approaching the Pessimistic PolarGD Bound	32
E.3	Generic Multiplicative Recursion Under Exact Line Search	33
E.4	GD with Exact Line Search: Classical Rate	34
E.5	PolarGD with Exact Line Search: Trajectory Dependence Through Σ_k	34
E.6	Rank-Deficient and Active-Subspace Extensions	35
E.6.1	Active-Subspace Preconditioning	35
E.6.2	Exact Line Search and Progress in the Rank-Deficient Case	36
E.6.3	Rank Monotonicity and Rank Drops	36
E.6.4	A Rank- r One-Step Exactness Regime	37
E.6.5	Active-Subspace Root Dynamics	37
E.6.6	Local Comparison with Active Curvature	37

F Rank-Truncated and Damped Polar Directions	38
F.1 Rank-Truncated Polar Direction	38
F.2 Damped Polar Direction	38
G Finite Newton–Schulz as Damped Polar	39
G.1 A General Polynomial Newton–Schulz Filter	39
G.2 Comparison with Exact Polar, Damped Polar, and Truncation	39
G.3 Near-Zero Behavior and Damping Equivalence	39
G.4 Bounded Amplification	40
H Transformer Diagnostic	40
I Exact Dynamics through the Square-Rooted Gradient Covariance	42
I.1 Specialization to the 2×2 Case	45
I.2 Optimizer Trajectories in Singular Value Space	46

Where the Main-Text Results Are Proved

Main-text result	Appendix
Proposition 1 (one-step decrease along a direction)	B
Isotropic case (Section 3.1)	B.1
Theorem 1 (one-step exactness regimes)	B.3
Theorem 2 (orthogonal equivariance)	B.4
$Q = \text{sign}(G)$ for diagonal H and $X - X^*$ with $d = m$ (Section 3.3)	B.2
Alternating local winner (Figure 3)	C
Proposition 2 and Theorem 3 (preconditioner, progress coefficient)	E.1
Adverse family and its trajectory-level rate (Section 4.1)	E.2, I
Corollary 4 and the fixed-step update $s_i^+ = s_i - \alpha \bar{s}_H $ (Section 4.1)	I
Active-subspace formula and rank monotonicity (Section 4.1)	E.6
Rank-truncated and damped polar directions (Section 4.2)	F
Finite Newton–Schulz as damped polar (Section 4.2)	G
Transformer diagnostic (Section 4.2)	H

A Experimental Details

Below we provide implementation details of the experiments behind the main-text figures. Figure 3 is detailed in App. C, Figure 5 in App. H, and Figure 10 in App. A.5.

A.1 Learning Rate Selection

Unless stated otherwise, whenever we report results for a “best-tuned” learning rate, the following two-stage grid search is applied. In the first stage, we evaluate 50 learning rates drawn from an evenly-spaced logarithmic grid over $[10^{-8}, 10^2]$. We select the candidate γ_c that minimizes the loss at the final iterate among runs that did not diverge. In the second stage, we evaluate a further 50 points on a finer logarithmic interval $[\frac{\gamma_c}{10}, 10\gamma_c]$. The final reported learning rate is the one whose run first crosses a threshold of ε (in the least number of iterates). If no run reaches this threshold, we select the run which minimizes the loss at the final iterate. The tuned rates are dual-adapted (Section 2), $X_{k+1} = X_k - \gamma \|G_k\|_* Q_k$ for **PolarGD** and $X_{k+1} = X_k - \gamma \|G_k\|_1 S_k$ for **SignGD**, except in Figure 9, which uses LMO-normalized steps $X_{k+1} = X_k - \gamma \text{LMO}(G_k)$.

A.2 Initialization-Hessian Regimes (Figure 1)

Hessian Structures. We test three specific curvature profiles to isolate the effects of condition number and coordinate alignment. To model Hessians arising in ill-conditioned, multi-output regression problems, we draw random matrices from the Marchenko–Pastur (MP) ensemble:

$$H = \frac{1}{N} Z^\top Z, \quad Z \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}, \quad Z_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

Here the aspect ratio $d/N \in (0, 1]$ (the ratio of input features to samples) dictates the conditioning. Using this framework, we construct the following Hessian regimes

- **Isotropic Hessian:** $H = I_d$. This regime has condition number $\kappa = 1$.
- **Dense:** $H = \frac{1}{N} Z^\top Z$ with $d/N = 0.8$.
- **Diagonal:** $H = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$, where λ_i are the exact eigenvalues of the dense MP matrix.

Initialization Strategies.

- **Gaussian:** $X_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ element-wise. This is the standard baseline, as in neural-network initialization.
- **Orthogonal:** X_0 is a random orthogonal matrix.
- **Vertex:** $X_0 \in \{-1, 1\}$ element-wise. Each entry is drawn randomly.

Within each Hessian-Initialization setting, the best learning rate for each optimizer is selected using the two-stage learning-rate grid of App. A.1 with threshold $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$. We choose $d = 100$ and 150 iterations for each setting.

To empirically validate the full-rank assumption of Theorem 3, we track $\text{rank}(HX_k)$ at each iterate, computed in float32 precision via PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019).

A.3 Zipfian Language-Modeling Proxy (Figure 2)

To evaluate how these optimizers perform under the heavy-tailed geometries typical of language modeling, we construct a multi-output linear regression proxy inspired by Kunstner and Bach (2025).

Linear Bigram Model. Consider fitting a linear next-token prediction model $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ on n token pairs $z_i, y_i \in \{0, 1\}^d$ representing one-hot encodings. The squared loss is given by

$$L(X) = \frac{1}{2n} \|ZX - Y\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2,$$

where X_{ij} is an estimate of $p(\text{token}_j \mid \text{token}_i)$ for each $i, j \in [d]$. To simulate the heavy-tailed nature of language modeling, token frequencies follow a Zipfian distribution $\pi_k \propto k^{-\zeta}$ where $\zeta > 0$ controls the heaviness of the tail. Following their framework, we consider the equivalent quadratic problem

$$f(X) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((X - X^*)^\top H(X - X^*)),$$

initialized at $X_0 = 0$, with Hessian $H = \text{diag}(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_d)$ and target $X_{ij}^* = p(\text{token}_j \mid \text{token}_i)$. We draw each row of X^* independently from a Dirichlet distribution with parameter 100π , so that the next-token distributions fluctuate around the Zipf frequencies; X^* then has full rank almost surely. A full-rank target matters: for a rank-one target such as $\mathbf{1}\pi^\top$ (every row equal to π), every gradient $H(X_k - X^*)$ from $X_0 = 0$ is rank one, so dual-adapted PolarGD coincides with GD.

Rotated Hessians. To test the rotation dependence of the optimizers, we additionally evaluate a rotated setting: $H = R^\top \text{diag}(\pi)R$, where $R \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a random orthogonal matrix. This rotation preserves the spectrum while removing axis alignment. This approach follows recent work by Zhang et al. (2025), which demonstrates that Adam is highly sensitive to random rotations. We rotate the Hessian in two ways (Figure 6). (i) As in Figure 2, the target X^* is kept fixed in the standard basis. For GD and PolarGD, this is equivalent to keeping H diagonal and replacing the target by RX^* , so it changes the problem and is not covered by Theorem 2. (ii) H and X^* rotated together, $X^* \mapsto R^\top X^*$: the same regression written in rotated feature coordinates, as with input embeddings ZR in place of one-hot vectors. By Theorem 2, the GD and PolarGD trajectories are then exactly those of the diagonal case; in our runs, PolarGD needs the same number of iterations to reach 10^{-15} as without rotation for every seed. SignGD degrades in both cases: after 1000 iterations, its relative loss is between 10^{-8} and 10^{-2} , whereas without rotation it reaches 10^{-15} in about 200 iterations.




Figure 6: The Zipf quadratic of Figure 2 with diagonal H , with H rotated and X^* fixed (as in Figure 2), and with H and X^* rotated together ($X^* \mapsto R^\top X^*$). Same tuning; median and range over 5 seeds. In the third panel, the PolarGD curves coincide with those of the first by Theorem 2.

We set $d = 100$ and for each $\zeta \in \{0.25, 0.5, 1.0\}$ and each of the three regimes, we tune the best dual-adapted learning rate with the procedure of App. A.1 with threshold $\varepsilon = 10^{-15}$ on the relative loss $f(X_k)/f(X_0)$, separately for each of 5 seeds (each seed draws X^* and R), and run 1000 iterations. The polar factor is computed by an SVD; along the reported trajectories, $\sigma_{\min}(G_k)/\sigma_{\max}(G_k) \geq 10^{-8}$ until the relative loss reaches 10^{-15} .

A.4 Spectral Recovery Near Rank Deficiency (Figure 4)

To illustrate that finite Newton-Schulz behaves like damped polar, we compare it with exact polar normalization near rank deficiency.

Near-singular initialization. We isolate the spectral recovery dynamics by setting the Hessian to the identity matrix $H = I$ in dimension $d = 10$. We initialize the weights at a near rank-deficient state:

$$X_0 = O^\top \text{diag}(1, \delta, \dots, \delta) O, \quad O \in \mathbb{R}^{10 \times 10} \text{ random orthogonal}, \quad \delta = 10^{-4}$$

Methods. We compare the *exact* PolarGD update against the practical Muon update with $q \in \{3, 4, 5\}$ Newton-Schulz steps to observe how tiny singular modes are handled. Newton-Schulz uses Muon’s coefficients




Figure 7: **Tracking the rank for PolarGD.** For the experiments of App. A.2 (Figure 1), we track the rank of the gradient $G = HX_k$ for the best performing PolarGD learning rate γ_{best} along with $0.1\gamma_{\text{best}}$ and $10\gamma_{\text{best}}$. The rank remains near full across the nine regimes, validating the full-rank assumption used in Theorem 3.

$(a, b, c) = (3.4445, -4.7750, 2.0315)$ and the Frobenius normalization of the reference implementation, all methods use exact line search, and we run 10 iterations. We further track the progress coefficient $p(X_k) = \frac{\|HX_k\|_*^2}{\text{tr}(H)\text{tr}(HX_kX_k^\top)}$ introduced in Section 4.1.

A.5 Line Search versus Tuned Dual-Adapted Steps (Figure 10)

PolarGD uses the dual-adapted step $X_{k+1} = X_k - (\alpha/\text{tr}(H)) \|G_k\|_* Q_k$, for which $\alpha = 1$ is exact line search in full row rank (Theorem 3), and GD uses either exact line search or the fixed step $X_{k+1} = X_k - (\eta/\lambda_{\max}(H))G_k$. The step sizes are tuned on the grids below instead of with the procedure of App. A.1.

Panels (a) and (b). We set $d = m = 100$ and $H = Z^\top Z/N$ with $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ standard Gaussian and $N = d/0.8$ (random seed 6); X_0 has i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ entries, and all methods run 150 iterations. The PolarGD rate is tuned over $\alpha \in \{0.2, 0.3, \dots, 1.0\} \cup \{1.05, 1.10, \dots, 1.95\}$ and the GD step over η on a 150-point uniform grid in $[0.5, 1.99]$, in both cases by the loss after 150 iterations.

Panel (c). We set $d = m = 50$ and $H = O \text{diag}(\lambda) O^\top$, where O is the orthogonal factor of the QR decomposition of a Gaussian matrix and λ is log-spaced from 1 to κ , for $\kappa \in \{10, 30, 100, 300, 10^3, 3 \cdot 10^3, 10^4\}$; X_0 has i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ entries, and we use 3 seeds per κ . We report the number of iterations to reach $f(X_k)/f(X_0) \leq 10^{-6}$. The PolarGD rate is tuned over $\alpha \in \{1.3, 1.35, \dots, 1.95\}$, with each run capped at $3 \cdot 10^4$ iterations, and the GD fixed step $\eta/\lambda_{\max}(H)$ is scanned over 7 evenly spaced values in $[0.85, 1] \cdot 2/(\lambda_{\min}(H) + \lambda_{\max}(H))$.

B Proofs for Sections 2 and 3

Proposition 1 (One-step decrease along a direction). *Assume (2). Fix X and a direction D with $\langle G, D \rangle > 0$ and $\|D\|_L > 0$. Let $X^+ = X - \gamma_L(D)D$, where $\gamma_L(D)$ is given by (3). Then*

$$f(X^+) \leq f(X) - \frac{\langle G, D \rangle^2}{2\|D\|_L^2}. \quad (4)$$

If $L = M$, equality holds and $\gamma_L(D)$ is the exact line-search step.

We prove a slightly stronger statement: if, in addition, $\|D\|_M^2 := \langle MD, D \rangle > 0$, the exact step and decrease satisfy

$$\frac{\langle G, D \rangle}{\|D\|_L^2} \leq \gamma^*(D) \leq \frac{\langle G, D \rangle}{\|D\|_M^2}, \quad \frac{\langle G, D \rangle^2}{2\|D\|_L^2} \leq \Delta(D) \leq \frac{\langle G, D \rangle^2}{2\|D\|_M^2}. \quad (19)$$

For $L = M$, the bounds coincide, which gives the equality case of Proposition 1.

Proof. Write $g := \langle G, D \rangle$, $c_L := \|D\|_L^2$, $c_M := \|D\|_M^2$, and $\phi(\gamma) := f(X - \gamma D)$ for $\gamma \geq 0$. Applying (2) at X with direction $- \gamma D$ gives

$$f(X) - \gamma g + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} c_M \leq \phi(\gamma) \leq f(X) - \gamma g + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} c_L, \quad \gamma \geq 0. \quad (20)$$

Step 1: the decrease (4). Evaluating the upper bound in (20) at $\gamma_L(D) = g/c_L$ gives $f(X^+) \leq f(X) - g^2/c_L + g^2/(2c_L) = f(X) - g^2/(2c_L)$.

Step 2: derivative bounds. We show that $-g + \gamma c_M \leq \phi'(\gamma) \leq -g + \gamma c_L$ for all $\gamma \geq 0$; at $\gamma = 0$ both hold with equality. For $\gamma > 0$, let $Y := X - \gamma D$, so that $\phi'(\gamma) = -\langle \nabla f(Y), D \rangle$. The lower bound in (2), applied at X with direction $- \gamma D$ and at Y with direction $+ \gamma D$, gives

$$f(Y) \geq f(X) - \gamma g + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} c_M, \quad f(X) \geq f(Y) + \gamma \langle \nabla f(Y), D \rangle + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} c_M,$$

and adding the two yields $\phi'(\gamma) \geq -g + \gamma c_M$. The same argument with the upper bounds yields $\phi'(\gamma) \leq -g + \gamma c_L$.

Step 3: the bracket (19). Let $c_M > 0$. By Step 2, $\phi'(\gamma) < 0$ for $\gamma < g/c_L$ and $\phi'(\gamma) > 0$ for $\gamma > g/c_M$, so every minimizer satisfies $g/c_L \leq \gamma^*(D) \leq g/c_M$. Exact line search does at least as well as the step $\gamma_L(D)$, so $\Delta(D) \geq g^2/(2c_L)$ by Step 1; and minimizing the lower bound in (20) over γ gives $\phi(\gamma) \geq f(X) - g^2/(2c_M)$ for all $\gamma \geq 0$, hence $\Delta(D) \leq g^2/(2c_M)$. $\square$

B.1 Isotropic Quadratics

Consider the isotropic setting $H = \lambda I_d$ with $\lambda > 0$, so $f(X) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \|X\|_F^2$ and $G = \lambda X$.

- **GD (one-step exact).** From (7), $\gamma^*(G) = 1/\lambda$ and $X^+ = X - (1/\lambda)G = 0$.
- **PolarGD (additive shrinkage of singular values).** Let $r = \text{rank}(X) = \text{rank}(G)$ and write the thin SVD $X = U\Sigma_X V^\top$. Then $Q = \text{polar}(X) = UV^\top$ and $\|Q\|_F^2 = r$. Exact line search yields

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^*(Q) &= \frac{\langle \lambda X, Q \rangle}{\lambda \langle Q, Q \rangle} = \frac{\|X\|_*}{r}, \\ X^+ &= X - \frac{\|X\|_*}{r} \text{polar}(X) \\ &= U \left(\Sigma_X - \frac{\|X\|_*}{r} I_r \right) V^\top, \end{aligned}$$

so **PolarGD** subtracts the *same scalar from every nonzero singular value*. The objective ratio is

$$\frac{f(X^+)}{f(X)} = 1 - \frac{\|X\|_*^2}{r\|X\|_F^2}, \quad (21)$$

which equals 0 iff all nonzero singular values of X are equal (i.e., X is a scaled partial isometry).

- **SignGD (additive shrinkage of entries).** Let $S = \text{sign}(X)$ and $s := \|S\|_F^2$ (the number of nonzero entries, since $\text{sign}(0) = 0$). Since $\langle X, \text{sign}(X) \rangle = \|X\|_1$, line search yields

$$\gamma^*(S) = \frac{\|X\|_1}{s}, \quad X^+ = X - \frac{\|X\|_1}{s} \text{sign}(X),$$

so **SignGD** subtracts the *same scalar from every nonzero entry*. The objective ratio is

$$\frac{f(X^+)}{f(X)} = 1 - \frac{\|X\|_1^2}{s \|X\|_F^2}, \quad (22)$$

which equals 0 iff all nonzero entries of X have equal magnitude.

Table 1 summarizes the gain, curvature, and one-step exactness condition of each direction.

Table 1: Line search reveals distinct “isotropy targets” for different methods on isotropic quadratics.

Direction D	gain $\langle G, D \rangle$	curvature $\text{tr}(D^\top H D)$	one-step exactness for $H = \lambda I$
GD ($D = G$)	$\ G\ _F^2$	$\lambda \ G\ _F^2$	always (any X)
PolarGD ($D = Q$)	$\ G\ _*$	$\lambda \ Q\ _F^2 = \lambda \text{rank}(G)$	iff nonzero singular values of X are equal
SignGD ($D = S$)	$\ G\ _1$	$\lambda \ S\ _F^2$	iff nonzero entries of X have equal magnitude

B.2 Exact Line-Search Quantities for Diagonal H

We specialize the exact line-search identities to diagonal curvature $H = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$ with $\lambda_i \geq 0$, the natural regime for coordinate methods such as **SignGD**. Work with the error $E := X - X^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and write its rows as $E = [e_1^\top; \dots; e_d^\top]$ with $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then

$$f(E) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \|e_i\|_2^2, \quad G = HE, \quad g_i = \lambda_i e_i.$$

All formulas below hold for any shape $d \times m$; shape or rank assumptions are stated where needed.

GD (direction $D = G$). Using $\langle G, G \rangle = \|G\|_F^2$ and $\text{tr}(G^\top H G)$, the diagonal structure yields

$$\|G\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \|g_i\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 \|e_i\|_2^2, \quad \text{tr}(G^\top H G) = \text{tr}(E^\top H^3 E) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^3 \|e_i\|_2^2.$$

Therefore the exact line-search step size and one-step decrease are

$$\gamma_{\text{GD}}^* = \frac{\|G\|_F^2}{\text{tr}(G^\top H G)} = \frac{\sum_i \lambda_i^2 \|e_i\|_2^2}{\sum_i \lambda_i^3 \|e_i\|_2^2}, \quad \Delta_{\text{GD}} = \frac{\|G\|_F^4}{2 \text{tr}(G^\top H G)} = \frac{\left(\sum_i \lambda_i^2 \|e_i\|_2^2\right)^2}{2 \sum_i \lambda_i^3 \|e_i\|_2^2}. \quad (23)$$

Moreover, the **GD** update remains rowwise-scaling (coupled only through the shared γ_{GD}^*):

$$e_i^+ = (1 - \gamma_{\text{GD}}^* \lambda_i) e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

SignGD (direction $D = S = \text{sign}(G)$). Let $S = \text{sign}(G)$ be the entrywise sign matrix with $\text{sign}(0) = 0$, and let $s_i^\top$ denote its i th row. For diagonal H with nonnegative diagonal, S is coordinate-aligned with E on the active rows: if $\lambda_i > 0$ then $\text{sign}(g_i) = \text{sign}(e_i)$ entrywise. The gain term is

$$\langle G, S \rangle = \|G\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \|e_i\|_1,$$

and the curvature term reduces to a weighted count of nonzeros:

$$\text{tr}(S^\top HS) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \|s_i\|_2^2, \quad \|s_i\|_2^2 = \#\{j : e_{ij} \neq 0\} \quad (\lambda_i > 0).$$

Hence

$$\gamma_{\text{Sign}}^* = \frac{\|G\|_1}{\text{tr}(S^\top HS)} = \frac{\sum_i \lambda_i \|e_i\|_1}{\sum_i \lambda_i \|s_i\|_2^2}, \quad \Delta_{\text{Sign}} = \frac{\|G\|_1^2}{2 \text{tr}(S^\top HS)} = \frac{\left(\sum_i \lambda_i \|e_i\|_1\right)^2}{2 \sum_i \lambda_i \|s_i\|_2^2}. \quad (24)$$

Vertex regime (one-step exactness, diagonal H). If $E = cS$ for some $c > 0$ and a sign pattern $S \in \{\pm 1, 0\}^{d \times m}$, and $\lambda_i > 0$ for every row i in the support of S , then $G = HE = c(HS)$ and $\text{sign}(HS) = S$ entrywise. Consequently $\gamma_{\text{Sign}}^* = c$ and $E^+ = 0$ in one step, consistent with Theorem 1(ii).

Exact line-search quantities for PolarGD (diagonal H). Let $G = U\Sigma_G V^\top$ be the thin SVD of G with rank $r = \text{rank}(G)$ and define $Q = \text{polar}(G) = UV^\top$. The gain remains $\langle G, Q \rangle = \|G\|_*$, while the diagonal structure makes the curvature term particularly interpretable:

$$\text{tr}(Q^\top HQ) = \text{tr}(U^\top HU) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i w_i, \quad w_i := \|u_{i,:}\|_2^2, \quad \sum_{i=1}^d w_i = r, \quad 0 \leq w_i \leq 1. \quad (25)$$

Thus **PolarGD** “samples” the diagonal spectrum $\{\lambda_i\}$ through the *row-energy weights* of the left singular vectors of $G = HE$, which depend on the iterate (and therefore on initialization). The exact line-search step and one-step decrease are

$$\gamma_{\text{Pol}}^* = \frac{\|G\|_*}{\text{tr}(Q^\top HQ)}, \quad \Delta_{\text{Pol}} = \frac{\|G\|_*^2}{2 \text{tr}(Q^\top HQ)} = \frac{\|G\|_*^2}{2 \sum_i \lambda_i w_i}. \quad (26)$$

Full row rank simplification (shape condition). If $\text{rank}(G) = d$ (full row rank), then necessarily $d \leq m$ and $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is orthogonal, so $QQ^\top = I_d$. In this case for *any* H (in particular for diagonal H),

$$\text{tr}(Q^\top HQ) = \text{tr}(HQQ^\top) = \text{tr}(H) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i,$$

so the **PolarGD** curvature is constant (iterate-independent) and

$$\gamma_{\text{Pol}}^* = \frac{\|G\|_*}{\text{tr}(H)}, \quad \Delta_{\text{Pol}} = \frac{\|G\|_*^2}{2 \text{tr}(H)}. \quad (27)$$

B.2.1 Local Comparison in the Diagonal Case (Explicit but Initialization-Dependent)

In the diagonal setting, the exact local comparison $\Delta_{\text{Pol}} > \Delta_{\text{GD}}$ is equivalent to

$$\frac{\|G\|_*^2}{\text{tr}(Q^\top HQ)} > \frac{\|G\|_{\text{F}}^4}{\text{tr}(G^\top HG)} \iff \|G\|_*^2 \text{tr}(G^\top HG) > \|G\|_{\text{F}}^4 \text{tr}(Q^\top HQ).$$

Using (23) and (25), this becomes

$$\|G\|_*^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^3 \|e_i\|_2^2 \right) > \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 \|e_i\|_2^2 \right)^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i w_i \right), \quad (28)$$

which makes explicit the two sources of iterate-dependence: (i) the singular spectrum of $G = HE$ through $\|G\|_*$, and (ii) the alignment of the left singular subspace of G with the coordinate axes through $(w_i)_i$.

Diagonal iterates (PolarGD coincides with SignGD). If $d = m$ and E is diagonal, then $G = HE$ is also diagonal, and $Q = \text{polar}(G) = \text{sign}(G)$ (diagonal $\pm 1/0$). Thus PolarGD and SignGD coincide on this invariant subspace of diagonal matrices, and both act as an *additive shrinkage* of the active diagonal entries with a shared step. This regime underlies the explicit 2×2 example of App. C.

B.3 Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1 (One-step convergence regimes under exact line search on quadratics). *Consider (6) with $H \succ 0$, let $E := X - X^*$, and call a direction $D \in \{G, Q, S\}$ one-step exact at $X \neq X^*$ if $X - \gamma^*(D)D = X^*$.*

- (i) **GD** is one-step exact from every X if and only if $H = \lambda I_d$ for some $\lambda > 0$. (For a fixed $X \neq X^*$, GD is one-step exact if and only if $HE = \lambda E$ for some $\lambda > 0$.)
- (ii) **SignGD** is one-step exact at X if and only if all nonzero entries of E have a common magnitude and $\text{sign}(HE) = \text{sign}(E)$ entrywise, including zero entries. In particular, if H is strictly diagonally dominant with positive diagonal, i.e. $H_{ii} > \sum_{j \neq i} |H_{ij}|$ for all i , then $\text{sign}(HS) = S$ for every $S \in \{\pm 1\}^{d \times m}$; hence any vertex initialization $E = cS$ with $c > 0$ yields one-step convergence.
- (iii) Assume $\text{rank}(G) = d \leq m$. **PolarGD** is one-step exact at X if and only if $EE^\top = cI_d$ for some $c > 0$, that is, $E = \sqrt{c}UV^\top$ with $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ orthogonal and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ having orthonormal columns (a scaled orthogonal matrix if $m = d$).

Proof. Let $G = HE$. Since $H \succ 0$, $E = 0$ is the unique minimizer, so D is one-step exact at $X \neq X^*$ if and only if $E = \gamma D$ for some $\gamma > 0$; such a γ is then the exact line-search step, since it attains the minimum value 0 along the ray.

(i) **GD.** $E = \gamma HE$ with $\gamma > 0$ if and only if $HE = \lambda E$ with $\lambda = 1/\gamma > 0$, which is the fixed- X statement. If $H = \lambda I_d$, this holds for every E . Conversely, if it holds for every E , then every nonzero $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an eigenvector of H (take E with a single nonzero column v). For linearly independent eigenvectors u, v with eigenvalues λ_u, λ_v , the vector $u + v$ is also an eigenvector, say with eigenvalue μ , so $(\lambda_u - \mu)u + (\lambda_v - \mu)v = 0$ and $\lambda_u = \mu = \lambda_v$. Hence $H = \lambda I_d$, and $\lambda > 0$ since $H \succ 0$.

(ii) **SignGD.** $E = \gamma \text{sign}(G)$ with $\gamma > 0$ holds if and only if all nonzero entries of E have the common magnitude γ and $\text{sign}(E) = \text{sign}(G) = \text{sign}(HE)$ entrywise, including zero entries: on the support of E the signs must match, and off the support HE must vanish. If H is strictly diagonally dominant with positive diagonal and $s \in \{\pm 1\}^d$, then for every i ,

$$s_i(Hs)_i = H_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} H_{ij} s_i s_j \geq H_{ii} - \sum_{j \neq i} |H_{ij}| > 0,$$

so $\text{sign}(Hs) = s$. Applying this to each column of $S \in \{\pm 1\}^{d \times m}$ gives $\text{sign}(HS) = S$, so $E = cS$ satisfies the condition.

(iii) **PolarGD.** Since $\text{rank}(G) = d$, we have $QQ^\top = I_d$. If $E = \gamma Q$, then $EE^\top = \gamma^2 QQ^\top = \gamma^2 I_d$. Conversely, suppose $EE^\top = cI_d$. Then $GG^\top = HEE^\top H = cH^2$, and the representation $Q = (GG^\top)^{-1/2}G$ in (10) gives, since $H \succ 0$,

$$Q = (GG^\top)^{-1/2}G = (cH^2)^{-1/2}HE = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c}}H^{-1}HE = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c}}E.$$

Hence $E = \sqrt{c}Q$, and the step $\gamma = \sqrt{c}$ reaches X^* . Finally, $EE^\top = cI_d$ means that all d singular values of E equal $\sqrt{c}$, i.e., $E = \sqrt{c}UV^\top$ for a thin SVD $E = U\Sigma_E V^\top$. $\square$

B.4 Orthogonal Equivariance and Coordinate Dependence

This subsection formalizes which of the three canonical direction rules (**GD**, **PolarGD**, **SignGD**) are equivariant under orthogonal changes of coordinates. These equivariances justify working in a diagonal eigenbasis for H when analyzing **GD** and **PolarGD**, and clarify why the same reduction is *not* lossless for **SignGD**.

Orthogonal actions on matrices. For $P \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ orthogonal, define the left-right orthogonal action

$$\mathcal{T}_{P,R}(X) := PXR^\top.$$

The Frobenius inner product and the Schatten norms are invariant under $\mathcal{T}_{P,R}$: for any $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$,

$$\langle \mathcal{T}_{P,R}(A), \mathcal{T}_{P,R}(B) \rangle = \langle A, B \rangle, \quad \|\mathcal{T}_{P,R}(A)\|_F = \|A\|_F, \quad \|\mathcal{T}_{P,R}(A)\|_* = \|A\|_*, \quad \|\mathcal{T}_{P,R}(A)\|_2 = \|A\|_2.$$

Lemma 1 (Bi-orthogonal equivariance of the polar factor). *Let $G \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ have thin SVD $G = U\Sigma_G V^\top$ and define its thin polar factor $\text{polar}(G) := UV^\top$. Then for any orthogonal $P \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$,*

$$\text{polar}(PGR^\top) = P \text{polar}(G) R^\top.$$

Proof. Write $G = U\Sigma_G V^\top$. Then $PGR^\top = (PU)\Sigma_G(RV)^\top$ is a thin SVD because PU and RV have orthonormal columns. Hence $\text{polar}(PGR^\top) = (PU)(RV)^\top = P(UV^\top)R^\top = P \text{polar}(G) R^\top$. $\square$

Quadratic objectives and change of basis. Consider the (shifted) quadratic model

$$f_H(E) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(E^\top H E), \quad H = H^\top \succeq 0, \quad E \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}.$$

Under the change of variables $E = \mathcal{T}_{P,R}(Y) = PYR^\top$, the objective becomes

$$f_H(PYR^\top) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(Y^\top (P^\top H P) Y) =: f_{\tilde{H}}(Y), \quad \tilde{H} := P^\top H P.$$

Moreover, the gradients transform equivariantly:

$$\nabla_E f_H(PYR^\top) = H(PYR^\top) = P(\tilde{H}Y)R^\top = P \nabla_Y f_{\tilde{H}}(Y) R^\top.$$

Proposition 3 (Rotation equivariance of **GD** and **PolarGD** on quadratics). *Fix $H = H^\top \succeq 0$. Let $\tilde{H} = P^\top H P$ for some orthogonal $P \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, and let $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ be orthogonal. Consider corresponding iterates related by $E_k = PY_k R^\top$.*

(i) (**GD** direction) *If $D_{\text{GD}}(E) := \nabla f_H(E) = HE$, then*

$$D_{\text{GD}}(E_k) = P D_{\text{GD}}^{(\tilde{H})}(Y_k) R^\top, \quad D_{\text{GD}}^{(\tilde{H})}(Y) := \nabla f_{\tilde{H}}(Y) = \tilde{H}Y.$$

(ii) (**PolarGD** direction) *If $D_{\text{Pol}}(E) := \text{polar}(\nabla f_H(E))$, then*

$$D_{\text{Pol}}(E_k) = P D_{\text{Pol}}^{(\tilde{H})}(Y_k) R^\top, \quad D_{\text{Pol}}^{(\tilde{H})}(Y) := \text{polar}(\nabla f_{\tilde{H}}(Y)),$$

by Lemma 1.

(iii) (Line search invariance) *For either direction choice $D \in \{D_{\text{GD}}, D_{\text{Pol}}\}$, the exact line-search step sizes*

$$\gamma_H^*(D; E) := \arg \min_{\gamma \geq 0} f_H(E - \gamma D(E)), \quad \gamma_{\tilde{H}}^*(D; Y) := \arg \min_{\gamma \geq 0} f_{\tilde{H}}(Y - \gamma D^{(\tilde{H})}(Y)),$$

where $D^{(\tilde{H})}$ is the corresponding direction for $f_{\tilde{H}}$ from (i)–(ii), satisfy

$$\gamma_H^*(D; E_k) = \gamma_{\tilde{H}}^*(D; Y_k),$$

and the one-step decrease in objective is preserved:

$$f_H(E_k) - f_H(E_{k+1}) = f_{\tilde{H}}(Y_k) - f_{\tilde{H}}(Y_{k+1}).$$

Consequently, the **GD** and **PolarGD** trajectories are identical up to orthogonal change of basis.

Proof. Parts (i) and (ii) follow from the gradient transformation and Lemma 1. For (iii), the exact line-search formulas on a quadratic depend only on $\langle G, D \rangle$ and $\text{tr}(D^\top H D)$. Under $E = P Y R^\top$ and $D = P \tilde{D} R^\top$, invariance of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and cyclicity of trace give $\langle G, D \rangle = \langle \tilde{G}, \tilde{D} \rangle$ and $\text{tr}(D^\top H D) = \text{tr}(\tilde{D}^\top \tilde{H} \tilde{D})$, hence the minimizing γ and the decrease coincide. $\square$

Corollary 1 (Diagonalization is lossless for **GD** and **PolarGD**). *Let $H = O \Lambda O^\top$ be an eigendecomposition with O orthogonal and Λ diagonal. For **GD** and **PolarGD** (with fixed, LMO-normalized, dual-adapted, or exact line-search steps), analyzing $f_H(E)$ is equivalent to analyzing $f_\Lambda(Y)$ under the change of variables $Y = O^\top E$ (up to the same objective values and the same one-step decreases).*

Remark 2 (Why **SignGD** is not rotation-equivariant). **SignGD** uses the entrywise direction $D_{\text{Sign}}(E) := \text{sign}(\nabla f_H(E))$. In general, for a dense orthogonal P ,

$$\text{sign}(PG) \neq P \text{sign}(G),$$

so **SignGD** is not equivariant under arbitrary orthogonal changes of basis and therefore diagonalizing H changes the algorithm. A minimal example: take $d = 2$, $m = 1$, $H = I_2$ (so $\tilde{H} = H$ for every P) and $E_0 = (2, 1)^\top$. Then $S_0 = (1, 1)^\top$, exact line search gives $\gamma^* = 3/2$, and $E_1 = (1/2, -1/2)^\top \neq 0$. For the rotation P mapping $(\sqrt{5}, 0)^\top$ to E_0 , the rotated initialization $\tilde{E}_0 = P^\top E_0 = (\sqrt{5}, 0)^\top$ is solved in one step, so the trajectories are not related by P , whereas **GD** and **PolarGD** reach the minimizer in one step from both points. **SignGD** is equivariant under signed permutations (coordinate relabelings and sign flips), i.e., orthogonal matrices with exactly one nonzero entry ± 1 per row and per column. Consequently, diagonal (or nearly diagonal) H should be interpreted as a coordinate-aligned regime for **SignGD** rather than a lossless reduction.

Proof of Theorem 2.

Theorem 2 (Orthogonal equivariance). *Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ be orthogonal and $\tilde{H} := P^\top H P$. Run **GD** or **PolarGD**, with exact line search or the same fixed (LMO-normalized or dual-adapted) step sizes, on (6) with Hessian H from the error $E_0 := X_0 - X^*$, and with Hessian $\tilde{H}$ from $\tilde{E}_0 := P^\top E_0 R$. Then the errors satisfy $E_k = P \tilde{E}_k R^\top$ and the losses coincide for all k . **SignGD** does not have this property (App. B.4).*

Proof. Suppose $E_k = P \tilde{E}_k R^\top$, which holds for $k = 0$ by definition. Then $H E_k = P(\tilde{H} \tilde{E}_k) R^\top$, and Lemma 1 gives $\text{polar}(H E_k) = P \text{polar}(\tilde{H} \tilde{E}_k) R^\top$. The inner product and the norms $\|\cdot\|_F$ and $\|\cdot\|_*$ are invariant under $Z \mapsto P Z R^\top$, so the exact line-search steps (Proposition 3(iii)), and the scalings $\|G\|_F$ and $\|G\|_*$ of the LMO-normalized and dual-adapted steps, coincide for the two problems. Hence $E_{k+1} = P \tilde{E}_{k+1} R^\top$, and the claim follows by induction; the losses coincide because $f_H(P Y R^\top) = f_{\tilde{H}}(Y)$. Remark 2 shows that **SignGD** does not have this property. $\square$

Experimental implication. Because of Proposition 3, “rotating” a diagonal Hessian by an orthogonal change of basis should not change **GD** or **PolarGD** behavior (up to the corresponding rotation of the initialization), while it can substantially change **SignGD** behavior. This separation helps design experiments that isolate truly spectral effects (**PolarGD**) from coordinate effects (**SignGD**).

C An Analytic 2×2 Example Where the Local Winner Alternates

This section gives a closed-form example showing that the local one-step preference between **GD** and **PolarGD** can swap repeatedly along a trajectory, even on a convex quadratic.

Consider $d = m = 2$, $X^* = 0$, and a diagonal Hessian

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \kappa > 1.$$




Figure 8: **Local advantage oscillates along the GD path.** 2×2 diagonal quadratic with $H = \text{diag}(\kappa, 1)$, $\kappa = 10$, initialized at $X_0 = \text{diag}(1, \sqrt{\kappa})$. (Left) Loss trajectories for **GD (exact line search)** and a **Greedy** comparison. At each iterate X_k , Greedy selects the direction $D_k \in \{G_k, Q_k\}$ with the larger one-step decrease. Despite always choosing the locally better step, Greedy underperforms **GD** globally. (Right) The one-step advantage $\Delta_{\text{GD}} - \Delta_{\text{Pol}}$ along the **GD** trajectory.

Restrict attention to diagonal iterates $X = \text{diag}(x_1, x_2)$ with $x_1 x_2 \neq 0$. Then $G = HX = \text{diag}(\kappa x_1, x_2)$ and the exact one-step decreases under line search are

$$\Delta_{\text{GD}}(X) = \frac{(\kappa^2 x_1^2 + x_2^2)^2}{2(\kappa^3 x_1^2 + x_2^2)}, \quad \Delta_{\text{Pol}}(X) = \frac{(\kappa|x_1| + |x_2|)^2}{2(\kappa + 1)}, \quad (29)$$

where we used that for full-rank 2×2 gradients the polar factor $Q = \text{polar}(G)$ is orthogonal and $\text{tr}(Q^T H Q) = \text{tr}(H) = \kappa + 1$.

Define the (scale-invariant) anisotropy parameter

$$\theta(X) := \frac{\kappa|x_1|}{|x_2|}.$$

Substituting $|x_1| = \theta|x_2|/\kappa$ into (29) and simplifying gives

$$\Delta_{\text{Pol}}(X) - \Delta_{\text{GD}}(X) = \frac{x_2^2 g_\kappa(\theta)}{2(\kappa + 1)(\kappa\theta^2 + 1)}, \quad g_\kappa(\theta) := (\theta + 1)^2(\kappa\theta^2 + 1) - (\kappa + 1)(\theta^2 + 1)^2, \quad (30)$$

with $\theta = \theta(X)$. Hence $\Delta_{\text{Pol}}(X) > \Delta_{\text{GD}}(X)$ if and only if $g_\kappa(\theta(X)) > 0$.

A two-cycle under GD with exact line search. Now run **GD with exact line search** from $X_0 = \text{diag}(1, \sqrt{\kappa})$, the initialization used in Figures 3 and 8. Since H and X_0 are diagonal, **GD** preserves diagonality: $X_k = \text{diag}(x_{1,k}, x_{2,k})$ for all k . With the exact step $\gamma_k^* = \|G_k\|_F^2 / \text{tr}(G_k^T H G_k) = (\kappa^2 x_{1,k}^2 + x_{2,k}^2) / (\kappa^3 x_{1,k}^2 + x_{2,k}^2)$, a direct computation gives $x_{1,k+1} = (1 - \kappa\gamma_k^*)x_{1,k}$, $x_{2,k+1} = (1 - \gamma_k^*)x_{2,k}$ and

$$\theta(X_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{\theta(X_k)}. \quad (31)$$

Since $\theta(X_0) = \sqrt{\kappa}$, we get $\theta(X_{2t}) = \sqrt{\kappa}$ and $\theta(X_{2t+1}) = 1/\sqrt{\kappa}$ for all $t \geq 0$. Evaluating g_κ at these two values,

$$g_\kappa(\sqrt{\kappa}) = 2\sqrt{\kappa}(\sqrt{\kappa} - 1)(\kappa^{3/2} - 1) > 0, \quad g_\kappa(1/\sqrt{\kappa}) = -\frac{\kappa^3 + \kappa^2 + \kappa + 1 - 4\kappa^{3/2}}{\kappa^2} < 0$$




Figure 9: **Diminishing returns of line search.** Comparing three fixed LMO-normalized learning rates, $X_{k+1} = X_k - \gamma \text{LMO}(G_k)$ (best from the grid of App. A.1), to line search for GD, PolarGD, and SignGD on a quadratic with dense MP Hessian ($d = 20$, aspect ratio $d/N = 0.8$), and Gaussian initialization ($X_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$). We see that while line search typically outperforms a tuned learning rate for GD, this is not true for PolarGD and SignGD, where a fixed learning rate can significantly outperform line search. The rightmost panel displays the step sizes selected by each line search method. For PolarGD and SignGD this step size, measured in units of the normalized direction, is positively homogeneous of degree one in X_k (Proposition 4). This reflects only the unit scale of $\text{polar}(G)$ and $\text{sign}(G)$: in dual-adapted units the PolarGD line-search step is constant when G_k has full row rank (Theorem 3), and the gap to the tuned rate comes from the trajectory.

for every $\kappa > 1$, where the second inequality is the AM–GM inequality $\kappa^3 + \kappa^2 + \kappa + 1 \geq 4\kappa^{3/2}$, with equality only at $\kappa = 1$. Therefore, along the GD trajectory,

$$\Delta_{\text{Pol}}(X_{2t}) > \Delta_{\text{GD}}(X_{2t}), \quad \Delta_{\text{GD}}(X_{2t+1}) > \Delta_{\text{Pol}}(X_{2t+1}), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

The same argument applies to any diagonal initialization with $g_\kappa(\theta_0) > 0 > g_\kappa(1/\theta_0)$, where $\theta_0 := \theta(X_0)$; for example, $X_0 = I_2$ gives $\theta_0 = \kappa$, $g_\kappa(\kappa) = \kappa(\kappa+1)(\kappa-1)^2 > 0$ and $g_\kappa(1/\kappa) = -(\kappa+1)(\kappa-1)^2(\kappa^2+\kappa+1)/\kappa^4 < 0$. Thus, even on a convex quadratic, the local one-step preference between GD and PolarGD swaps *every iteration* along a natural trajectory, so local comparisons should be read as diagnostics at a point, not as a global ranking.

D Line Search versus Tuned Fixed Steps

Figure 9 uses LMO-normalized fixed steps and Figure 10 dual-adapted ones. The gap is not caused by a vanishing step: the LMO-normalized line-search step shrinks proportionally to $\|X\|$ only because Q has unit singular values (Proposition 4 below), while in the dual-adapted parameterization the line-search step of PolarGD is the constant $1/\text{tr}(H)$ when G_k has full row rank (Lau et al. (2025) observe that Armijo backtracking on the LMO-normalized step recovers this nuclear-norm scaling approximately). The mechanism of Section 4 is visible in the singular values: along the run of Figure 10(a), the share of singular values of X_k below $10^{-2}\sigma_{\max}(X_k)$ grows to about 90% under line search but stays mostly between 10% and 20% for the tuned step. The same comparison for dual-adapted steps on a full-batch one-hidden-layer MLP is in App. D.2. We first record how the LMO-normalized line-search step scales with the iterate (Proposition 4).

D.1 Proof of Proposition 4

Proposition 4. For $f(X) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(X^\top H X)$ with $H \succ 0$ and $c > 0$, the exact line-search step sizes satisfy

$$\gamma_{\text{GD}}^*(cX) = \gamma_{\text{GD}}^*(X), \quad \gamma_{\text{Pol}}^*(cX) = c\gamma_{\text{Pol}}^*(X).$$




Figure 10: **Line search vs. tuned dual-adapted steps.** Dense Marchenko–Pastur Hessian (aspect ratio $d/N = 0.8$, $d = m = 100$, $\kappa(H) \approx 192$; a separate draw from Figure 1), Gaussian initialization, 150 iterations; details in App. A.5. (a) Relative loss. (b) Progress coefficient $p(X_k)$ along the two PolarGD runs. Exact line search is the dual-adapted rate $\alpha = 1$ in (17); the tuned rate $\alpha \approx 1.7$ keeps $p(X_k)$ near 0.6, whereas line search drives the iterate toward shapes with small $p(X_k)$. For GD, line search and the tuned fixed step perform similarly. (c) Iterations to reach $f(X_k)/f(X_0) \leq 10^{-6}$ versus $\kappa(H)$ for a dense Hessian with log-spaced spectrum ($d = m = 50$, Gaussian initialization, median over 3 seeds). GD’s iteration count grows roughly linearly with $\kappa(H)$ and tuned PolarGD’s only slowly, so the gap exceeds two orders of magnitude at $\kappa(H) = 10^4$; PolarGD with line search is slower than its tuned fixed step throughout.

Proof. Consider the quadratic objective $f(X) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(X^\top H X)$ with $H \succ 0$. For any search direction D , the exact step size γ^* minimizes $f(X - \gamma D)$.

Gradient Descent. For GD, the direction is the gradient $G = \nabla f(X) = HX$. The step size is:

$$\gamma_{\text{GD}}^*(X) = \frac{\text{tr}((HX)^\top HX)}{\text{tr}((HX)^\top H(HX))} = \frac{\|HX\|_F^2}{\text{tr}(X^\top H^3 X)}.$$

Replacing X by cX multiplies both numerator and denominator by c^2 , leaving the ratio unchanged.

PolarGD. For PolarGD, the direction is $Q = \text{polar}(HX)$. By positive homogeneity of the polar factor, $\text{polar}(cHX) = \text{polar}(HX) = Q$ for any $c > 0$. The step size is:

$$\gamma_{\text{Pol}}^*(X) = \frac{\text{tr}((HX)^\top Q)}{\text{tr}(Q^\top H Q)}.$$

Since $\|H(cX)\|_* = c\|HX\|_*$ while $\text{tr}(Q^\top H Q)$ does not depend on c , we obtain $\gamma_{\text{Pol}}^*(cX) = c\gamma_{\text{Pol}}^*(X)$. $\square$

Remark 3 (SignGD). The same logic applies to SignGD, where the direction is $D = \text{sign}(HX)$. Since $\text{sign}(c \cdot HX) = \text{sign}(HX)$ for $c > 0$, the direction remains unchanged under scaling. Consequently, $\gamma_{\text{Sign}}^*(cX) = c\gamma_{\text{Sign}}^*(X)$, and the exact line search step size vanishes as $X \rightarrow 0$.

D.2 Line Search on a CIFAR-5K MLP

We evaluate on a two-layer fully-connected network with ReLU activations, following the CIFAR-5K testbed of Cohen et al. (2021), a subsampled collection of the CIFAR-10 dataset (Krizhevsky et al., 2009) consisting of 5 classes, each with 1,000 samples. The architecture has input dimension $d_{\text{in}} = 3,072$ (flattened $32 \times 32 \times 3$




Figure 11: **Line search on an MLP.** Training loss on CIFAR-5K under fixed dual-adapted learning rates and line search (dashed). The three fixed rates shown are the best-performing from a grid search. For GD, line search matches or slightly beats the best fixed rate; for PolarGD, a fixed learning rate outperforms it. This is consistent with the local-global gap observed in the quadratic case (Section 4). The rightmost panel plots the line-search step size: for GD it oscillates, whereas for PolarGD it decays by about an order of magnitude over 100 iterations.

images), hidden dimension $h = 4,608$ ($= 1.5 d_{\text{in}}$), output dimension 5, and no bias terms; weights are initialized via Kaiming normal initialization (He et al., 2015). We train with cross-entropy loss.

We compare standard gradient descent (GD) and PolarGD (the core Muon update without momentum); PolarGD applies the polar direction to both weight matrices. Since we are in the full batch setting with no momentum, the only hyperparameter is the step size. For each optimizer we evaluate (i) a grid of fixed learning rates and (ii) an exact line search implemented via Brent’s method, which searches for the step size in the wide interval $[0, 4]$ with tolerance 10^{-5} ; each line-search step requires approximately 10–15 forward passes. All runs share a fixed random seed and are trained for 100 iterations.

E Proofs and Details for Section 4

E.1 Proofs for the Implicit-Preconditioning Identities

Proposition 2 (Conditioning of the implicit preconditioner). *Assume $H \succ 0$ and $\text{rank}(X) = d$.*

$$A(X)\Sigma A(X)^\top = I_d, \quad A(X)^\top A(X) = \Sigma^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

Consequently, the singular values of $A(X)$ are $\{1/\sigma_i(X)\}_{i=1}^d$, and

$$\kappa(A(X)) = \kappa(X) = \sqrt{\kappa(\Sigma)}. \quad (13)$$

Proof. Since $H \succ 0$ and $\text{rank}(X) = d$, we have $\Sigma \succ 0$ and $H\Sigma H \succ 0$, so all inverse square roots are ordinary ones and $A = (H\Sigma H)^{-1/2}H$. First,

$$A\Sigma A^\top = (H\Sigma H)^{-1/2}(H\Sigma H)(H\Sigma H)^{-1/2} = I_d.$$

Second, using $(H\Sigma H)^{-1} = H^{-1}\Sigma^{-1}H^{-1}$,

$$A^\top A = H(H\Sigma H)^{-1}H = H H^{-1}\Sigma^{-1}H^{-1}H = \Sigma^{-1}.$$

The squared singular values of A are therefore the eigenvalues of Σ^{-1} , namely $\sigma_i(X)^{-2}$, so the singular values of A are $1/\sigma_i(X)$ and

$$\kappa(A) = \frac{\sigma_{\max}(X)}{\sigma_{\min}(X)} = \kappa(X) = \sqrt{\kappa(\Sigma)}.$$

□

Theorem 3 (Exact progress coefficient for **PolarGD**). *Assume $H \succ 0$ and $\text{rank}(X) = d$. Let $Q = \text{polar}(HX)$, and let $X^+ = X - \gamma^*(Q)Q$ be the exact line-search update. Then*

$$\gamma^*(Q) = \frac{\|HX\|_*}{\text{tr}(H)}, \quad f(X^+) = f(X) - \frac{\|HX\|_*^2}{2\text{tr}(H)}. \quad (14)$$

Equivalently,

$$\frac{f(X^+)}{f(X)} = 1 - p(X), \quad p(X) := \frac{\|HX\|_*^2}{\text{tr}(H)\text{tr}(HXX^\top)}. \quad (15)$$

Moreover,

$$\max \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{\min}(H)}{\text{tr}(H)}, \frac{4\kappa(X)}{(1 + \kappa(X))^2} \right\} \leq p(X) \leq 1, \quad (16)$$

where both lower bounds are tight, and the upper bound is attained if and only if $XX^\top = cI_d$, in which case **PolarGD** reaches the minimizer in one step. Finally, for a fixed dual-adapted step $X^+ = X - \gamma \|HX\|_* Q$,

$$\frac{f(X^+)}{f(X)} = 1 - \alpha(2 - \alpha)p(X), \quad \alpha := \gamma \text{tr}(H). \quad (17)$$

Proof. Let $G = HX$, $Q = \text{polar}(G)$, and $\Sigma = XX^\top$. Since $H \succ 0$ and $\text{rank}(X) = d$, also $\text{rank}(G) = d$, so $QQ^\top = I_d$ and $\text{tr}(Q^\top H Q) = \text{tr}(H)$; moreover $\langle G, Q \rangle = \|G\|_*$ and $f(X) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(H\Sigma)$.

Step 1: line search and fixed steps. For every $\beta \geq 0$,

$$f(X - \beta Q) = f(X) - \beta \|G\|_* + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \text{tr}(H).$$

Minimizing over β gives $\gamma^*(Q) = \|G\|_*/\text{tr}(H)$ and $f(X^+) = f(X) - \|G\|_*^2/(2\text{tr}(H))$, i.e., $f(X^+)/f(X) = 1 - p(X)$. The dual-adapted step $\beta = \gamma \|G\|_*$ with $\alpha = \gamma \text{tr}(H)$ gives $f(X^+) = f(X) - \alpha(2 - \alpha) \|G\|_*^2/(2\text{tr}(H))$, which is (17).

Step 2: upper bound and its equality case. Write $G = H^{1/2}(H^{1/2}X)$. The Hölder inequality $\|AB\|_* \leq \|A\|_F \|B\|_F$ gives

$$\|G\|_*^2 \leq \left\| H^{1/2} \right\|_F^2 \left\| H^{1/2}X \right\|_F^2 = \text{tr}(H) \text{tr}(H\Sigma),$$

i.e., $p(X) \leq 1$. If $\Sigma = cI_d$, then $H\Sigma H = cH^2$, so

$$\|G\|_* = \text{tr}((H\Sigma H)^{1/2}) = \sqrt{c} \text{tr}(H), \quad \text{tr}(H\Sigma) = c \text{tr}(H),$$

and $p(X) = 1$. Conversely, $p(X) = 1$ means $f(X^+) = 0$, i.e., $X^+ = 0$ since $H \succ 0$; **PolarGD** is then one-step exact, and Theorem 1(iii) gives $\Sigma = cI_d$.

Step 3: first lower bound. Using $\|G\|_* \geq \|G\|_F$,

$$\|G\|_*^2 \geq \|G\|_F^2 = \text{tr}(X^\top H^2 X) = \text{tr}(H^2 \Sigma) \geq \lambda_{\min}(H) \text{tr}(H\Sigma),$$

and dividing by $\text{tr}(H)\text{tr}(H\Sigma)$ gives $p(X) \geq \lambda_{\min}(H)/\text{tr}(H)$.

Step 4: second lower bound. Let $a := \sigma_{\min}(X)$, $b := \sigma_{\max}(X)$, $R := (H\Sigma H)^{1/2}$, $T := H^{-1/2}RH^{-1/2}$, and $\rho := H/\text{tr}(H)$. From $a^2 H^2 \preceq H\Sigma H \preceq b^2 H^2$ and operator monotonicity of the matrix square root, $aH \preceq R \preceq bH$, i.e., $aI_d \preceq T \preceq bI_d$. Since $\|G\|_* = \text{tr}(R) = \text{tr}(HT)$ and $\text{tr}(H\Sigma) = \text{tr}(RH^{-1}R) = \text{tr}(HT^2)$,

$$p(X) = \frac{\text{tr}(HT)^2}{\text{tr}(H)\text{tr}(HT^2)} = \frac{\text{tr}(\rho T)^2}{\text{tr}(\rho T^2)}. \quad (32)$$

Since the spectrum of T lies in $[a, b]$, the matrix $(T - aI_d)(bI_d - T)$ is positive semidefinite; as $\rho \succeq 0$ and $\text{tr}(\rho) = 1$, with $t := \text{tr}(\rho T)$,

$$0 \leq \text{tr}(\rho(T - aI_d)(bI_d - T)) = (a + b)t - ab - \text{tr}(\rho T^2).$$

Thus $0 < \text{tr}(\rho T^2) \leq (a+b)t - ab$, and in particular $t > ab/(a+b)$. Hence

$$p(X) \geq \frac{t^2}{(a+b)t - ab} \geq \min_{\tau > ab/(a+b)} \frac{\tau^2}{(a+b)\tau - ab} = \frac{4ab}{(a+b)^2} = \frac{4\kappa(X)}{(1+\kappa(X))^2},$$

where the minimum is attained at $\tau = 2ab/(a+b)$.

Step 5: tightness. The first lower bound is approached by the family of Appendix E.2. The second is attained by $d = m = 2$, $H = \text{diag}(b, a)$, and $X = \text{diag}(a, b)$ with $0 < a < b$: then $G = ab I_2$, $\|G\|_* = 2ab$, $\text{tr}(H) = a + b$, and $\text{tr}(H\Sigma) = ab(a+b)$, so $p(X) = 4ab/(a+b)^2$ with $\kappa(X) = b/a$. $\square$

Remark 4 (Progress coefficients as coefficients of variation). By (32), $p(X) = 1/(1 + \text{CV}^2)$, where $\text{CV}^2 := (\text{tr}(\rho T^2) - \text{tr}(\rho T)^2)/\text{tr}(\rho T)^2$ is the squared coefficient of variation of T in the state $\rho = H/\text{tr}(H)$. If $H\Sigma = \Sigma H$, then $T = \Sigma^{1/2}$ and, in a common eigenbasis with $H = U \text{diag}(\lambda_i) U^\top$ and $\Sigma = U \text{diag}(s_i^2) U^\top$,

$$p(X) = \frac{(\sum_i \pi_i s_i)^2}{\sum_i \pi_i s_i^2}, \quad \pi_i := \frac{\lambda_i}{\text{tr}(H)},$$

so $p(X)$ is determined by the spread of the singular values of X , weighted by curvature. GD with exact line search has the dual form: writing $e_i := \|u_i^\top X\|_2^2$ for the energy of X along the i th eigenvector of H and $w_i := \lambda_i e_i / \sum_j \lambda_j e_j$, its progress coefficient is

$$p_{\text{GD}}(X) := \frac{\Delta_{\text{GD}}(X)}{f(X)} = \frac{\|G\|_F^4}{\text{tr}(G^\top H G) \text{tr}(H\Sigma)} = \frac{(\sum_i w_i \lambda_i)^2}{\sum_i w_i \lambda_i^2},$$

determined by the spread of the eigenvalues of H , weighted by the iterate. The same argument as above gives the classical bound $p_{\text{GD}}(X) \geq 4\kappa(H)/(1 + \kappa(H))^2$; for PolarGD the role of $\kappa(H)$ is played by $\kappa(X)$.

E.2 A Near-Rank-Deficient Instance Approaching the Pessimistic PolarGD Bound

Theorem 3 gives the lower bound

$$p(X) \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(H)}{\text{tr}(H)}.$$

We now show that this bound is essentially tight. The example also illustrates why exact polar normalization can behave poorly near rank deficiency.

Consider the square case $m = d$. Let

$$H = \text{diag}(\mu, L, \dots, L), \quad 0 < \mu \ll L, \quad \kappa := \frac{L}{\mu},$$

and take the full-rank diagonal iterate

$$X_\varepsilon = \text{diag}(1, \varepsilon, \dots, \varepsilon), \quad \varepsilon > 0.$$

Then

$$\Sigma_\varepsilon = X_\varepsilon X_\varepsilon^\top = \text{diag}(1, \varepsilon^2, \dots, \varepsilon^2), \quad G_\varepsilon = H X_\varepsilon = \text{diag}(\mu, L\varepsilon, \dots, L\varepsilon).$$

Since G_ε is diagonal with nonnegative entries, its nuclear norm is $\|G_\varepsilon\|_* = \mu + (d-1)L\varepsilon$. Moreover,

$$\text{tr}(H) = \mu + (d-1)L, \quad \text{tr}(H\Sigma_\varepsilon) = \mu + (d-1)L\varepsilon^2.$$

Therefore the exact PolarGD progress coefficient is

$$p(X_\varepsilon) = \frac{(\mu + (d-1)L\varepsilon)^2}{(\mu + (d-1)L)(\mu + (d-1)L\varepsilon^2)}.$$

Taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ gives

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} p(X_\varepsilon) = \frac{\mu}{\mu + (d-1)L} = \frac{1}{1 + (d-1)\kappa} \approx \frac{1}{\kappa d}.$$

Thus the lower bound $\lambda_{\min}(H)/\text{tr}(H)$ is attained in the near-rank-deficient limit.

Comparison with GD. On the same family, **GD** with exact line search is nearly one-step exact. Its progress coefficient (Remark 4) is

$$p_{\text{GD}}(X) = \frac{\Delta_{\text{GD}}(X)}{f(X)} = \frac{\|G\|_{\text{F}}^4}{\text{tr}(G^\top HG)\text{tr}(H\Sigma)}.$$

For $X = X_\varepsilon$, we have

$$\|G_\varepsilon\|_{\text{F}}^2 = \mu^2 + (d-1)L^2\varepsilon^2, \quad \text{tr}(G_\varepsilon^\top HG_\varepsilon) = \mu^3 + (d-1)L^3\varepsilon^2.$$

Hence

$$p_{\text{GD}}(X_\varepsilon) = \frac{(\mu^2 + (d-1)L^2\varepsilon^2)^2}{(\mu^3 + (d-1)L^3\varepsilon^2)(\mu + (d-1)L\varepsilon^2)} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0.$$

Thus this family separates the two methods: **GD** is nearly one-step exact, while exact **PolarGD** decreases only a $1/(1 + (d-1)\kappa)$ -fraction of the loss in its first step.

The slowdown persists along the trajectory. Since H and X_ε are diagonal, $H\Sigma_\varepsilon = \Sigma_\varepsilon H$, and X_ε has two distinct singular values, 1 on the first coordinate and ε on the others. Corollary 5 applies with curvature mass $w = \mu/(\mu + (d-1)L) = 1/(1 + (d-1)\kappa)$ on the first coordinate: for every $k \geq 1$,

$$p(X_k) = 4w(1-w), \quad f(X_{k+1}) = (1-2w)^2 f(X_k) = \left(\frac{(d-1)\kappa - 1}{(d-1)\kappa + 1} \right)^2 f(X_k),$$

for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. This is the worst-case rate of **GD** with exact line search with κ replaced by $(d-1)\kappa$. By Theorem 2, the same holds for every rotation of this instance.

Interpretation. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, the iterate is full rank, so full-row-rank **PolarGD** pays curvature $\text{tr}(H) = \mu + (d-1)L$. However, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, almost all gradient gain is concentrated in the first, low-curvature direction. Exact polar normalization still maps the tiny singular modes $L\varepsilon$ to unit-size directions, so the line-search denominator pays for all directions even though most of the gain comes from only one.

At the limiting point $\varepsilon = 0$, the gradient is rank one. Then **PolarGD** and **GD** are collinear, and the active-subspace formula from Appendix E.6 uses the active curvature $\text{tr}(H\Pi_G) = \mu$ instead of $\text{tr}(H)$. In that rank-one limit, **PolarGD** again reaches the minimizer in one step. Hence the pathology is a near-rank-deficient full-rank effect: exact polar is discontinuous at rank drops because it hard-normalizes every nonzero singular mode. This is the failure mode targeted by rank truncation, damping, and finite **Newton-Schulz** filters.

E.3 Generic Multiplicative Recursion Under Exact Line Search

Consider a quadratic objective $f(X) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(X^\top HX)$ with $H \succeq 0$. Let a generic method produce updates

$$X_{k+1} = X_k - \gamma_k D_k,$$

where γ_k is chosen by exact line search along D_k . For any $D_k \neq 0$ with $\text{tr}(D_k^\top H D_k) > 0$, exact line search yields

$$\gamma_k = \frac{\langle G_k, D_k \rangle}{\text{tr}(D_k^\top H D_k)}, \quad G_k = \nabla f(X_k) = H X_k,$$

and the one-step decrease equals

$$\Delta_k := f(X_k) - f(X_{k+1}) = \frac{\langle G_k, D_k \rangle^2}{2\text{tr}(D_k^\top H D_k)}.$$

Whenever $f(X_k) > 0$, define the progress coefficient

$$p_k := \frac{\Delta_k}{f(X_k)} \in [0, 1],$$

so that

$$f(X_{k+1}) = (1 - p_k) f(X_k), \quad f(X_T) = f(X_0) \prod_{k=0}^{T-1} (1 - p_k) \leq f(X_0) \exp \left(- \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} p_k \right). \quad (33)$$

Thus any *trajectory-wise* lower bound on p_k implies a global linear (geometric) rate.

E.4 GD with Exact Line Search: Classical Rate

For GD, $D_k = G_k$, hence

$$\Delta_k^{\text{GD}} = \frac{\|G_k\|_{\text{F}}^4}{2 \text{tr}(G_k^{\text{T}} H G_k)}.$$

For $H \succ 0$, it is classical (Nocedal and Wright, 2006, Theorem 3.3) that exact line search yields the sharp contraction

$$f(X_{k+1}) \leq \left(\frac{\kappa(H) - 1}{\kappa(H) + 1} \right)^2 f(X_k), \quad \kappa(H) = \frac{\lambda_{\max}(H)}{\lambda_{\min}(H)}. \quad (34)$$

Equivalently, the progress coefficient satisfies $p_k^{\text{GD}} \geq 1 - \left(\frac{\kappa(H) - 1}{\kappa(H) + 1} \right)^2 = \frac{4\kappa(H)}{(\kappa(H) + 1)^2}$.

E.5 PolarGD with Exact Line Search: Trajectory Dependence Through Σ_k

In the full-row-rank regime ($d \leq m$ and $\text{rank}(X_k) = d$), Theorem 3 gives an explicit $p(X_k)$:

$$p(X_k) = \frac{\|H X_k\|_*^2}{\text{tr}(H) \text{tr}(H X_k X_k^{\text{T}})}.$$

Combining this with (33) shows that global behavior depends on how $p(X_k)$ evolves along the trajectory. In particular, the bound $p(X_k) \geq 4\kappa(X_k)/(1 + \kappa(X_k))^2$ implies that if $\kappa(X_k) \leq K$ uniformly along the path, then

$$f(X_k) \leq \left(\frac{K - 1}{K + 1} \right)^{2k} f(X_0),$$

which is the classical rate of GD with exact line search (34), with $\kappa(H)$ replaced by K . This makes precise the intuition from Section 4: PolarGD can be fast if the iterate geometry stays close to row-isotropic, but can slow down if $\Sigma_k = X_k X_k^{\text{T}}$ becomes highly anisotropic.

E.6 Rank-Deficient and Active-Subspace Extensions

The main text focuses on the full-row-rank regime, where $QQ^\top = I_d$ and $\text{tr}(Q^\top HQ) = \text{tr}(H)$. Outside it, the same identities hold with I_d replaced by the active projector $\Pi_G := QQ^\top$. Throughout this subsection, $f(X) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(X^\top HX)$ with $H \succ 0$, $G = HX$, $\Sigma = XX^\top$, and $G = U\Sigma_G V^\top$ is a thin SVD with $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$, $\Sigma_G = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) \succ 0$, and $r = \text{rank}(G) = \text{rank}(X)$; we write $R := (GG^\top)^{1/2} = U\Sigma_G U^\top$, so that $G = RQ$.

Lemma 2 (Active projector identities). $Q = \text{polar}(G) = UV^\top = (GG^\top)^{\dagger/2}G$, $QQ^\top = UU^\top = \Pi_G = \Pi_{\text{range}(G)}$, $Q^\top Q = VV^\top = \Pi_{\text{range}(G^\top)}$, and $\text{tr}(Q^\top HQ) = \text{tr}(H\Pi_G)$.

Proof. Since $GG^\top = U\Sigma_G^2 U^\top$, we have $(GG^\top)^{\dagger/2} = U\Sigma_G^{-1} U^\top$, and therefore

$$(GG^\top)^{\dagger/2}G = U\Sigma_G^{-1} U^\top U\Sigma_G V^\top = UV^\top = Q.$$

Moreover, $U^\top U = V^\top V = I_r$ gives

$$QQ^\top = UV^\top VU^\top = UU^\top, \quad Q^\top Q = VU^\top UV^\top = VV^\top,$$

and the trace identity follows from cyclicity: $\text{tr}(Q^\top HQ) = \text{tr}(HQQ^\top) = \text{tr}(H\Pi_G)$. $\square$

E.6.1 Active-Subspace Preconditioning

Proposition 5 (Active-subspace preconditioner identities). *With $A(X) := (H\Sigma H)^{\dagger/2}H$,*

$$Q = A(X)X, \quad A(X)\Sigma A(X)^\top = \Pi_G, \quad A(X)^\top A(X) = H(H\Sigma H)^{\dagger/2}H.$$

Proof. Since $H\Sigma H = HXX^\top H = GG^\top$, Lemma 2 gives

$$A(X)X = (H\Sigma H)^{\dagger/2}HX = (GG^\top)^{\dagger/2}G = Q.$$

Next,

$$A\Sigma A^\top = (GG^\top)^{\dagger/2}(GG^\top)(GG^\top)^{\dagger/2}$$

is the orthogonal projector onto $\text{range}(GG^\top) = \text{range}(G)$, i.e., Π_G . Finally, $A^\top A = H(H\Sigma H)^{\dagger/2}(H\Sigma H)^{\dagger/2}H = H(H\Sigma H)^{\dagger}H$. $\square$

In the full-row-rank case, $(H\Sigma H)^{-1} = H^{-1}\Sigma^{-1}H^{-1}$ gives $A^\top A = \Sigma^{-1}$ and hence $\kappa(A) = \kappa(X)$ (Proposition 2). For singular Σ this factorization fails in general, and the conditioning of A also depends on how the active subspace is aligned with H . We write $\sigma_{\min}^+(\cdot)$ and $\kappa_+(\cdot)$ for the smallest positive singular value and the condition number restricted to the positive singular values.

Proposition 6 (Conditioning of the active preconditioner). $\sigma_{\max}(A) \leq \lambda_{\max}(H)/\sigma_{\min}^+(G)$ and $\sigma_{\min}^+(A) \geq \lambda_{\min}(H)/\sigma_{\max}(G)$. Consequently, $\kappa_+(A) \leq \kappa(H)\kappa_+(G) \leq \kappa(H)^2\kappa_+(X)$.

Proof. Let $B := GG^\top = H\Sigma H$, so that $A = B^{\dagger/2}H$. The positive singular values of A are the square roots of the positive eigenvalues of $AA^\top = B^{\dagger/2}H^2B^{\dagger/2}$, whose range is $\text{range}(B)$. Since $\lambda_{\min}(H)^2 I_d \preceq H^2 \preceq \lambda_{\max}(H)^2 I_d$, congruence by $B^{\dagger/2}$ gives

$$\lambda_{\min}(H)^2 B^\dagger \preceq AA^\top \preceq \lambda_{\max}(H)^2 B^\dagger.$$

The positive eigenvalues of $B^\dagger$ are $\sigma_i(G)^{-2}$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, which gives

$$\sigma_{\max}(A) \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(H)}{\sigma_{\min}^+(G)}, \quad \sigma_{\min}^+(A) \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(H)}{\sigma_{\max}(G)},$$

and hence $\kappa_+(A) \leq \kappa(H)\kappa_+(G)$. Finally, $\sigma_{\max}(G) \leq \lambda_{\max}(H)\sigma_{\max}(X)$, and for every unit vector $v \in \text{range}(G^\top) = \text{range}(X^\top)$,

$$\|Gv\|_2 = \|HXv\|_2 \geq \lambda_{\min}(H)\|Xv\|_2 \geq \lambda_{\min}(H)\sigma_{\min}^+(X),$$

so $\sigma_{\min}^+(G) \geq \lambda_{\min}(H)\sigma_{\min}^+(X)$ and $\kappa_+(G) \leq \kappa(H)\kappa_+(X)$. $\square$

Proposition 7 (Invariant active subspaces). *If $\mathcal{S} := \text{range}(X)$ is H -invariant, then $\text{range}(G) = \mathcal{S}$, $\Pi_G = \Pi_{\mathcal{S}}$, $A\Sigma A^\top = \Pi_G$, $A^\top A = \Sigma^\dagger$, and hence $\kappa_+(A) = \kappa_+(X)$.*

Proof. Since H is invertible and maps $\mathcal{S}$ into itself, $\text{range}(G) = H\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}$, so $\Pi_G = \Pi_{\mathcal{S}}$. Choose an orthonormal basis adapted to $\mathbb{R}^d = \mathcal{S} \oplus \mathcal{S}^\perp$. Because H is symmetric and $\mathcal{S}$ is H -invariant, both H and Σ are block diagonal in this basis:

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} H_{\mathcal{S}} & 0 \\ 0 & H_{\mathcal{S}^\perp} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} \succ 0.$$

Hence

$$A^\top A = H(H\Sigma H)^\dagger H = \begin{pmatrix} H_{\mathcal{S}}(H_{\mathcal{S}}\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}H_{\mathcal{S}})^{-1}H_{\mathcal{S}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \Sigma^\dagger.$$

The identity $A\Sigma A^\top = \Pi_G$ is Proposition 5. $\square$

E.6.2 Exact Line Search and Progress in the Rank-Deficient Case

Proposition 8 (Active-subspace line search). *If $G \neq 0$, then $f(X - \gamma Q) = f(X) - \gamma \|G\|_* + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \text{tr}(H\Pi_G)$ for every $\gamma \geq 0$. Hence $\gamma^*(Q) = \|G\|_* / \text{tr}(H\Pi_G)$, $f(X - \gamma^*(Q)Q) = f(X) - \|G\|_*^2 / (2\text{tr}(H\Pi_G))$, and, whenever $f(X) > 0$,*

$$\frac{f(X - \gamma^*(Q)Q)}{f(X)} = 1 - \tilde{p}(X), \quad \tilde{p}(X) := \frac{\|G\|_*^2}{\text{tr}(H\Pi_G)\text{tr}(H\Sigma)}.$$

Proof. The quadratic expansion along Q , together with $\langle G, Q \rangle = \|G\|_*$ and $\text{tr}(Q^\top H Q) = \text{tr}(H\Pi_G)$ (Lemma 2), gives

$$f(X - \gamma Q) = f(X) - \gamma \langle G, Q \rangle + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \text{tr}(Q^\top H Q) = f(X) - \gamma \|G\|_* + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \text{tr}(H\Pi_G).$$

Minimizing over $\gamma \geq 0$ gives the step and the decrease, and dividing by $f(X) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(H\Sigma)$ gives the ratio. $\square$

Corollary 2 (Rank-dependent pessimistic bound). $\tilde{p}(X) \geq \lambda_{\min}(H) / \text{tr}(H\Pi_G) \geq 1/(r\kappa(H))$.

Proof. As in Step 3 of the proof of Theorem 3,

$$\|G\|_*^2 \geq \|G\|_{\text{F}}^2 = \text{tr}(H^2\Sigma) \geq \lambda_{\min}(H) \text{tr}(H\Sigma),$$

which gives the first inequality. The second follows from $\text{tr}(H\Pi_G) \leq r\lambda_{\max}(H)$, since Π_G is a rank- r orthogonal projector. $\square$

Compared with the full-row-rank bound $\lambda_{\min}(H) / \text{tr}(H) \geq 1/(d\kappa(H))$, the dimension factor becomes the rank r : rank deficiency is not automatically pessimistic, since the curvature paid drops from $\text{tr}(H)$ to the active curvature $\text{tr}(H\Pi_G)$ (see also the comparison at the end of this subsection).

E.6.3 Rank Monotonicity and Rank Drops

Proposition 9 (Rank is non-increasing under exact PolarGD directions). *For every $\gamma \geq 0$, $X^+ := X - \gamma Q$ satisfies $\text{rank}(X^+) = \text{rank}(HX^+) \leq \text{rank}(G) = \text{rank}(X)$. In particular, exact PolarGD cannot create new active gradient directions.*

Proof. Since $G = RQ$,

$$HX^+ = H(X - \gamma Q) = G - \gamma HQ = (R - \gamma H)Q,$$

so $\text{rank}(HX^+) \leq \text{rank}(Q) = \text{rank}(G)$. As H is invertible, $\text{rank}(X^+) = \text{rank}(HX^+)$ and $\text{rank}(G) = \text{rank}(X)$. $\square$

Proposition 10 (Characterizing rank drops). *For $X^+ = X - \gamma Q$, $\text{rank}(X^+) = \text{rank}((R - \gamma H)U)$. Hence the rank drops if and only if $(R - \gamma H)u = 0$ for some nonzero $u \in \text{range}(G)$. In the full-row-rank case, this happens if and only if $\det(R - \gamma H) = 0$, i.e., $\gamma \in \text{spec}(H^{-1/2}RH^{-1/2})$.*

Proof. By the previous proof, $HX^+ = (R - \gamma H)Q = (R - \gamma H)UV^\top$. Since $V^\top$ has full row rank r ,

$$\text{rank}(X^+) = \text{rank}(HX^+) = \text{rank}((R - \gamma H)U).$$

The $d \times r$ matrix $(R - \gamma H)U$ loses column rank if and only if $(R - \gamma H)Ua = 0$ for some $a \neq 0$; setting $u = Ua \in \text{range}(U)$ gives the condition. If $r = d$, then U is orthogonal, so the rank drops if and only if $R - \gamma H$ is singular, and

$$R - \gamma H = H^{1/2}(H^{-1/2}RH^{-1/2} - \gamma I_d)H^{1/2}$$

shows that this happens exactly when $\gamma \in \text{spec}(H^{-1/2}RH^{-1/2})$. $\square$

E.6.4 A Rank- r One-Step Exactness Regime

Proposition 11 (One-step exactness on an invariant active subspace). *If $X = \sqrt{c}UV^\top$ with $c > 0$ and $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ having orthonormal columns, and $\text{range}(U)$ is H -invariant, then one exact-line-search PolarGD step reaches the minimizer. Conversely, if a nonzero rank- r point X is one-step exact under PolarGD, then $X = \sqrt{c}UV^\top$ for some $c > 0$ and such U, V , with $\text{range}(U)$ H -invariant.*

Proof. Suppose first that $\text{range}(U)$ is H -invariant. Then $HU = UB$ with $B := U^\top HU \succ 0$, and

$$G = HX = \sqrt{c}HUV^\top = \sqrt{c}UBV^\top.$$

Since $B \succ 0$, the polar factor of $UBV^\top$ is $UV^\top$, so $Q = UV^\top$ and

$$\gamma^*(Q) = \frac{\langle G, Q \rangle}{\text{tr}(Q^\top H Q)} = \frac{\sqrt{c} \text{tr}(B)}{\text{tr}(B)} = \sqrt{c}, \quad X^+ = \sqrt{c}UV^\top - \sqrt{c}UV^\top = 0.$$

Conversely, suppose $X - \gamma^*Q = 0$, where $Q = UV^\top$ comes from the thin SVD $G = U\Sigma_G V^\top$, and set $\sqrt{c} := \gamma^*$. Then $X = \sqrt{c}UV^\top$ and

$$\sqrt{c}HUV^\top = HX = G = U\Sigma_G V^\top.$$

Multiplying on the right by V gives $HU = U\Sigma_G/\sqrt{c}$, so $\text{range}(U)$ is H -invariant. $\square$

For $r = d$ the invariance condition is automatic, and Proposition 11 reduces to Theorem 1(iii): the general statement is *isotropy on an invariant active subspace*.

E.6.5 Active-Subspace Root Dynamics

Proposition 12 (Root dynamics with an active projector). *For $X(\gamma) := X - \gamma Q$ and $\Sigma(\gamma) := X(\gamma)X(\gamma)^\top$, $H\Sigma(\gamma)H = (R - \gamma H)\Pi_G(R - \gamma H)$. In the full-row-rank case $\Pi_G = I_d$, so $(H\Sigma(\gamma)H)^{1/2} = |R - \gamma H|$ (cf. Proposition 17).*

Proof. Since $G = RQ$, we have $HX(\gamma) = G - \gamma HQ = (R - \gamma H)Q$, and therefore

$$H\Sigma(\gamma)H = HX(\gamma)X(\gamma)^\top H = (R - \gamma H)QQ^\top(R - \gamma H) = (R - \gamma H)\Pi_G(R - \gamma H).$$

$\square$

E.6.6 Local Comparison with Active Curvature

The exact local comparison between PolarGD and GD remains valid in the rank-deficient case with the PolarGD curvature written as $\text{tr}(H\Pi_G)$:

$$\Delta_{\text{Pol}} > \Delta_{\text{GD}} \iff \frac{\text{tr}(G^\top H G)}{\text{tr}(H\Pi_G)} > \left(\frac{\|G\|_{\text{F}}^2}{\|G\|_*} \right)^2.$$

Rank deficiency affects this comparison in two competing ways: the active curvature $\text{tr}(H\Pi_G)$ can be much smaller than $\text{tr}(H)$, which helps PolarGD, while lower rank reduces the gap between $\|G\|_*$ and $\|G\|_{\text{F}}$. At rank one, Q is collinear with G , and PolarGD coincides with GD under exact line search.

F Rank-Truncated and Damped Polar Directions

This appendix formalizes simple modifications of the polar direction that address the “tiny singular values” sensitivity suggested by the representation $Q = (GG^\top)^{\dagger/2}G$.

F.1 Rank-Truncated Polar Direction

Let $G \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ with thin SVD $G = U\Sigma_G V^\top$, $\Sigma_G = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$, $\sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_r > 0$. For an integer $1 \leq s \leq r$, define the rank- s truncation

$$Q^{(s)} := U_{:,1:s} V_{:,1:s}^\top. \quad (35)$$

Then $\text{rank}(Q^{(s)}) = s$, $\|Q^{(s)}\|_2 = 1$, and

$$Q^{(s)}(Q^{(s)})^\top = U_{:,1:s} U_{:,1:s}^\top \quad (36)$$

is the projector onto the span of the top- s left singular vectors.

LMO interpretation. $Q^{(s)}$ is the maximizer of $\langle G, Q \rangle$ over spectral-norm-bounded matrices with rank at most s :

$$Q^{(s)} \in \arg \max \left\{ \langle G, Q \rangle : \|Q\|_2 \leq 1, \text{rank}(Q) \leq s \right\}. \quad (37)$$

Moreover, the attained gain is the Ky Fan s -norm

$$\langle G, Q^{(s)} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^s \sigma_i =: \|G\|_{*,s}. \quad (38)$$

Effect on exact line search for quadratics. For the quadratic $f(X) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(X^\top H X)$ with gradient $G = HX$, the exact line-search decrease along $Q^{(s)}$ is

$$\Delta_{\text{Pol}}^{(s)}(X) = \frac{\langle G, Q^{(s)} \rangle^2}{2 \text{tr}((Q^{(s)})^\top H Q^{(s)})} = \frac{\|G\|_{*,s}^2}{2 \text{tr}((Q^{(s)})^\top H Q^{(s)})}. \quad (39)$$

In the isotropic case $H = \lambda I_d$, we have $\text{tr}((Q^{(s)})^\top H Q^{(s)}) = \lambda \|Q^{(s)}\|_F^2 = \lambda s$, hence

$$f(X^+) = f(X) - \frac{\lambda \|X\|_{*,s}^2}{2s}, \quad \frac{f(X^+)}{f(X)} = 1 - \frac{\|X\|_{*,s}^2}{s \|X\|_F^2}. \quad (40)$$

When X has rapidly decaying singular values, choosing $s \ll d$ can significantly improve the fractional decrease by ignoring tiny singular modes that otherwise degrade the isotropic coefficient $p(X) = \|X\|_*^2 / (r \|X\|_F^2)$ of (21), with $r = \text{rank}(X)$.

F.2 Damped Polar Direction

A soft alternative is Tikhonov damping: for $\varepsilon > 0$, define

$$Q_\varepsilon := (GG^\top + \varepsilon I_d)^{-1/2} G. \quad (41)$$

If $G = U\Sigma_G V^\top$, then

$$Q_\varepsilon = U \text{diag} \left(\frac{\sigma_i}{\sqrt{\sigma_i^2 + \varepsilon}} \right) V^\top, \quad (42)$$

so each singular value is mapped to $\sigma_i / \sqrt{\sigma_i^2 + \varepsilon} \in (0, 1)$. The preconditioner $(GG^\top + \varepsilon I_d)^{-1/2}$ is uniformly bounded: $\|(GG^\top + \varepsilon I_d)^{-1/2}\|_2 \leq 1/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$, with equality when $\text{rank}(G) < d$.

Both truncation (35) and damping (41) keep the singular vectors of the polar direction and limit the weight given to tiny singular values.

G Finite Newton–Schulz as Damped Polar

This appendix relates finite **Newton–Schulz** orthogonalization to exact polar, damped polar, and rank-truncated polar directions. Finite **Newton–Schulz** is a polynomial map of the singular values rather than an exact damping or truncation, but it behaves like damped polar: unlike the exact polar map, it does not apply an unbounded multiplier $1/\sigma_i$ to tiny nonzero singular values.

G.1 A General Polynomial Newton–Schulz Filter

Consider iterations of the form

$$Z_{t+1} = a_t Z_t + b_t Z_t Z_t^\top Z_t + c_t (Z_t Z_t^\top)^2 Z_t, \quad t = 0, \dots, q-1. \quad (43)$$

This includes the quintic **Newton–Schulz** iteration of **Muon** (**Jordan et al., 2024b**), which uses the constant coefficients $(a_t, b_t, c_t) = (3.4445, -4.7750, 2.0315)$, and step-dependent variants such as Polar Express (**Amsel et al., 2026**).

Proposition 13 (Finite **Newton–Schulz** preserves singular vectors). *If $Z_0 = U \text{diag}(s_i) V^\top$ is a thin SVD, then $Z_t = U \text{diag}(\phi_t(s_i)) V^\top$ for all t , where $\phi_0(s) = s$ and $\phi_{t+1}(s) = a_t \phi_t(s) + b_t \phi_t(s)^3 + c_t \phi_t(s)^5$.*

Proof. We argue by induction on t ; the case $t = 0$ is the assumption. If $Z_t = U \text{diag}(\phi_t(s_i)) V^\top$, then $Z_t Z_t^\top = U \text{diag}(\phi_t(s_i)^2) U^\top$, so

$$Z_t Z_t^\top Z_t = U \text{diag}(\phi_t(s_i)^3) V^\top, \quad (Z_t Z_t^\top)^2 Z_t = U \text{diag}(\phi_t(s_i)^5) V^\top.$$

Substituting into (43) gives $Z_{t+1} = U \text{diag}(\phi_{t+1}(s_i)) V^\top$. $\square$

G.2 Comparison with Exact Polar, Damped Polar, and Truncation

For $G = U \text{diag}(\sigma_i) V^\top$, each direction considered here has the form $U \text{diag}(\phi(\sigma_i)) V^\top$, i.e., it applies a scalar filter ϕ to the singular values, or equivalently a multiplier $m(\sigma) = \phi(\sigma)/\sigma$ to each singular mode of G :

- exact polar, $Q = (GG^\top)^\dagger/2 G$: $\phi(\sigma) = 1$ and $m(\sigma) = 1/\sigma$, unbounded as $\sigma \downarrow 0$;
- damped polar, $Q_\varepsilon = (GG^\top + \varepsilon I_d)^{-1/2} G$: $\phi_\varepsilon(\sigma) = \sigma/\sqrt{\sigma^2 + \varepsilon}$, with $\sup_\sigma m_\varepsilon(\sigma) = \varepsilon^{-1/2}$ and $\phi_\varepsilon(\sigma) = \varepsilon^{-1/2} \sigma + O(\sigma^3)$;
- rank- s truncation $Q^{(s)}$: the hard filter $\phi(\sigma_i) = 1$ for $i \leq s$ and 0 otherwise;
- q **Newton–Schulz** steps: the polynomial filter ϕ_q of Proposition 13, applied to the normalized singular values.

G.3 Near-Zero Behavior and Damping Equivalence

Proposition 14 (Finite **Newton–Schulz** is damping-like near zero). *$\phi_q(\sigma) = \ell_q \sigma + O(\sigma^3)$ as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, with $\ell_q = \prod_{t=0}^{q-1} a_t$. Near zero, finite **Newton–Schulz** therefore matches a damped polar filter with $\varepsilon_q = \ell_q^{-2}$ in normalized singular-value units.*

Proof. We argue by induction on t , starting from $\phi_0(\sigma) = \sigma$. If $\phi_t(\sigma) = \ell_t \sigma + O(\sigma^3)$, then $\phi_t(\sigma)^3$ and $\phi_t(\sigma)^5$ are $O(\sigma^3)$, so

$$\phi_{t+1}(\sigma) = a_t \phi_t(\sigma) + b_t \phi_t(\sigma)^3 + c_t \phi_t(\sigma)^5 = a_t \ell_t \sigma + O(\sigma^3).$$

Hence $\ell_{t+1} = a_t \ell_t$ and $\ell_q = \prod_{t=0}^{q-1} a_t$. Since the damped polar filter satisfies $\phi_\varepsilon(\sigma) = \varepsilon^{-1/2} \sigma + O(\sigma^3)$, matching slopes gives $\varepsilon_q = \ell_q^{-2}$. $\square$

For **Muon**’s constant coefficients, $\ell_q = 3.4445^q$; e.g., $\ell_2 \approx 11.9$, $\ell_3 \approx 40.9$, and $\ell_5 \approx 485$. For these coefficients the slope at zero is also the largest amplification.

Proposition 15 (Muon’s Newton-Schulz filter). *Let $(a, b, c) = (3.4445, -4.7750, 2.0315)$ and ϕ_q as in Proposition 13 with constant coefficients. Then for every $q \geq 1$ and $s \in (0, 1]$,*

$$0 < \phi_q(s) \leq \bar{x} := 1.2024, \quad \frac{\phi_q(s)}{s} \leq a^q, \quad \lim_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi_q(s)}{s} = a^q.$$

Hence the constant L_q defined in Proposition 16 below equals $\ell_q = a^q$.

Proof. Write one step as $g(x) = xh(x^2)$ with $h(y) = a + by + cy^2$. Since $b^2 - 4ac < 0$, $h > 0$, so $g(x) > 0$ for $x > 0$. On $[0, \bar{x}]$, g' vanishes at $x^2 = (-3b \pm \sqrt{9b^2 - 20ac})/(10c)$, i.e. at $x \approx 0.5545$ (local maximum, $g \approx 1.20237$) and $x \approx 1.0501$ (local minimum, $g \approx 0.6818$), and $g(\bar{x}) \approx 0.9466$; hence $g([0, \bar{x}]) \subseteq [0, \bar{x}]$. For $x \in [0, \bar{x}]$ we have $x^2 \leq \bar{x}^2 < 1.446 < -b/c \approx 2.350$, so $h(x^2) - a = x^2(b + cx^2) \leq 0$. Starting from $\phi_0(s) = s \in (0, 1] \subset (0, \bar{x}]$, induction gives $\phi_t(s) \in (0, \bar{x}]$ and $\phi_{t+1}(s)/\phi_t(s) = h(\phi_t(s)^2) \in (0, a]$ for all t . Multiplying over $t = 0, \dots, q-1$ gives $\phi_q(s)/s \leq a^q$. The limit follows from Proposition 14. $\square$

The proposition also locates the transition between the two regimes. Since $\phi_q(s) \approx \ell_q s$ for small s and $\phi_q(s) \approx 1$ for larger s , the two regimes meet at the damping scale $\tau_q := 1/\ell_q$, where the linear part reaches 1; equivalently, $\tau_q = \sqrt{\varepsilon_q}$ is the scale at which damped polar with $\varepsilon_q = \ell_q^{-2}$ switches from $\sigma/\sqrt{\varepsilon_q}$ to 1. For Muon’s coefficients, $\tau_q \approx 0.29, 8.4 \cdot 10^{-2}, 2.4 \cdot 10^{-2}, 2.1 \cdot 10^{-3}, 4.3 \cdot 10^{-6}$ for $q = 1, 2, 3, 5, 10$. Above τ_q the map behaves like exact polar; below it, it is close to the linear map $s \mapsto \ell_q s$, i.e., to a GD step on those singular values. Other conventions give similar scales: the point where ϕ_5 first reaches $\frac{1}{2}$ is $1.1 \cdot 10^{-3}$, and the point where it first reaches 1 is $2.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$. Since τ_q decreases with q , more steps make the map closer to exact polar, which helps far from rank deficiency and can hurt near it (Figure 4).

G.4 Bounded Amplification

Proposition 16 (Finite Newton-Schulz has bounded singular-mode amplification). *Let $Z_0 = G/\nu$ with $\nu > 0$ chosen so that the singular values $s_i = \sigma_i(G)/\nu$ lie in $[0, 1]$, and let $L_q := \sup_{s \in (0, 1]} |\phi_q(s)/s|$. Then $Z_q = \psi_q(GG^\top)G$ for the polynomial $\psi_q(t) := \phi_q(\sqrt{t}/\nu)/\sqrt{t}$ (extended continuously at $t = 0$), and $\|\psi_q(GG^\top)\|_2 \leq L_q/\nu < \infty$. By contrast, exact polar applies the multiplier $1/\sigma_i(G)$ to the i th singular mode, which is unbounded as $\sigma_i(G) \downarrow 0$.*

Proof. Since ϕ_q is an odd polynomial, ψ_q is a polynomial in t . Write $G = U \text{diag}(\sigma_i) V^\top$. By Proposition 13,

$$Z_q = U \text{diag}(\phi_q(\sigma_i/\nu)) V^\top = U \text{diag}\left(\frac{\phi_q(\sigma_i/\nu)}{\sigma_i}\right) U^\top G = \psi_q(GG^\top) G.$$

The eigenvalues of $\psi_q(GG^\top)$ are $\phi_q(s_i)/(\nu s_i)$ on $\text{range}(G)$ and $\psi_q(0) = \ell_q/\nu$ on its orthogonal complement, all bounded in absolute value by L_q/ν . $\square$

Bounded amplification explains why finite Newton-Schulz can converge faster than exact polar near rank deficiency: tiny nonzero singular values are not mapped to unit size but multiplied by at most L_q (equal to ℓ_q for Muon’s coefficients), as by damped polar with $\varepsilon_q = \ell_q^{-2}$. Finite Newton-Schulz does not create new singular directions, however: exact zero singular values remain zero, so it softens near-rank-deficiency but does not undo exact low rank.

H Transformer Diagnostic

Setup. We trained a decoder-only transformer with Muon and saved, at 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100% of training, the weights, the momentum matrices M , and the raw minibatch gradients G of all 50 matrices trained by Muon. Table 2 lists the configuration.

Table 2: Configuration of the transformer run.

Data	Nemotron-CC (Su et al., 2025), 1.8B tokens; GPT-2 BPE tokenizer, vocabulary 50,304; sequence length 2048
Model	decoder-only, 89.8M parameters (31.9M non-embedding); 8 layers, width 576, 9 heads of dimension 64; RoPE ($\theta = 5 \cdot 10^5$), pre-RMSNorm, fused SwiGLU MLP with hidden width 1536; untied embedding and LM head
Training	3433 steps, batch 524,288 tokens (32 sequences $\times$ 8 accumulation micro-steps); one NVIDIA A100; bfloat16 mixed precision (fp32 master weights and gradients); gradient clipping at 1.0
Schedule (Muon)	linear warmup over 10% of the steps to $8 \cdot 10^{-3}$, then cosine decay to 10^{-6}
Muon	50 matrices: query, key, value, and output projections and both MLP matrices of each layer, embedding, LM head; momentum 0.9 without Nesterov; weight decay 0; per-matrix scaling $0.2\sqrt{\max(d_{\text{out}}, d_{\text{in}})}$
Newton-Schulz	5 steps, coefficients $(a, b, c) = (3.4445, -4.7750, 2.0315)$, applied to $M/(\ M\ _F + 10^{-7})$
Other parameters	normalization gains, Adam with $\beta = (0.95, 0.95)$

Definitions. Let $s_i := \sigma_i(M)/(\|M\|_F + 10^{-7})$ be the singular values of the matrix that **Newton-Schulz** receives. We call the singular values with $s_i < \tau_5 = 1/\ell_5 \approx 2.1 \cdot 10^{-3}$ the **GD-like range** (Appendix G). For an update $O = \sum_i o_i u_i v_i^T$ ($o_i = 1$ for exact polar, $o_i = \phi_5(s_i)$ for five **Newton-Schulz** steps), we report the share $\sum_{s_i < \tau_5} o_i^2 / \sum_i o_i^2$ of $\|O\|_F^2$ in the **GD-like range**; for exact polar it equals the fraction of singular values in that range.

Where the GD-like range occurs. All singular values in the **GD-like range** belong to attention matrices, where they make up about a quarter of all singular values; the MLP matrices, the embedding, and the LM head have none. The fraction is largest in the first layer (89% for the query matrix and 60% for the output projection at the final checkpoint) and decreases with depth (Figure 5(b)). The momentum spectra are nearly stationary over training (Figure 12), whereas the raw gradients have many more singular values in the **GD-like range** early in training (about 40% for attention at 25–50% of training) and about as many as the momentum at the end: momentum averaging stabilizes the spectrum that **Newton-Schulz** receives. Other cutoffs than $1/\ell_5$ change the percentages (between 5% and 28% for attention at the final checkpoint) but not this pattern.

Relation to the weights. In the quadratic model, tiny singular values of the gradient come from tiny singular values of the iterate. Here the attention weights are themselves ill-conditioned, but the **GD-like** directions of M are not aligned with the bottom singular directions of the weights: for the span of the k left (right) singular vectors of M with $s_i < 1.1 \cdot 10^{-3}$ (where $\phi_5(s_i) < \frac{1}{2}$) and the span of the k bottom left (right) singular vectors of the weight matrix, the mean squared cosine of the principal angles is, in the median over the 32 matrices with such directions at the final checkpoint, 1.05 (1.02) times its value k/n for a random k -dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$. transfer literally.

Extreme directions. At the final checkpoint, five attention matrices have smallest normalized singular values $s_{\min} = \sigma_{\min}/\|M\|_F$ between $5.6 \cdot 10^{-9}$ and $2.7 \cdot 10^{-7}$. Exact polar multiplies these directions by $1/s_{\min}$, that is, by $1.8 \cdot 10^8$ to $3.7 \cdot 10^6$, whereas two, three, and five **Newton-Schulz** steps multiply them by $\ell_q = a^q \approx 11.9, 40.9$, and 485 (Proposition 15). **Newton-Schulz** becomes polar-like on all directions of a matrix once $\ell_q s_{\min} \geq 1$, i.e., for $q \geq \lceil \log(1/s_{\min})/\log a \rceil$; over the four checkpoints, this gives 9–18 steps for the attention matrices and 4–5 for the MLP matrices. The training implementation reproduces $\text{NS}_5(M) = U \text{diag}(\phi_5(s_i)) V^T$ on all momentum matrices except the embedding and the LM head, which we did not check, to within 10^{-4} (maximal absolute deviation of the diagonal entries $u_i^T \text{NS}_5(M) v_i$ from $\phi_5(s_i)$; the off-diagonal part of $U^T \text{NS}_5(M) V$ is below 10^{-5} in relative Frobenius norm).




Figure 12: (Left, middle) Distribution of the normalized singular values of the momentum matrices at four checkpoints, for the attention matrices (left) and for the MLP, embedding, and LM-head matrices (middle); the shaded band is the GD-like range. (Right) Percentage of singular values in the GD-like range over training for the momentum M and the raw gradient G , for the attention matrices and for all 50 matrices.

I Exact Dynamics through the Square-Rooted Gradient Covariance

In the full-row-rank regime, the exact PolarGD trajectory is most transparent in terms of the *square-rooted gradient covariance* $R := (H\Sigma H)^{1/2} = (GG^\top)^{1/2}$, where $\Sigma = XX^\top$ and $G = HX$.

Proposition 17 (Exact state recursion for PolarGD in the full-row-rank regime). *Assume $H \succ 0$ and $\text{rank}(X) = d$. For $\gamma \geq 0$, let $X(\gamma) := X - \gamma Q$ and $\Sigma(\gamma) := X(\gamma)X(\gamma)^\top$. Then*

$$\Sigma(\gamma) = \Sigma - \gamma(\Sigma H(H\Sigma H)^{-1/2} + (H\Sigma H)^{-1/2}H\Sigma) + \gamma^2 I_d, \quad (44)$$

$$H\Sigma(\gamma)H = (R - \gamma H)^2, \quad (45)$$

$$f(X(\gamma)) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(H^{-1}(R - \gamma H)^2) = \frac{1}{2}[\text{tr}(H^{-1}R^2) - 2\gamma\text{tr}(R) + \gamma^2\text{tr}(H)]. \quad (46)$$

Consequently, $\gamma^*(Q) = \text{tr}(R)/\text{tr}(H) = \|G\|_*/\text{tr}(H)$, and for $X^+ := X - \gamma^*(Q)Q$,

$$R^+ := (H\Sigma^+ H)^{1/2} = |R - \gamma^*(Q)H|, \quad \Sigma^+ = H^{-1}(R - \gamma^*(Q)H)^2 H^{-1}, \quad (47)$$

where $|M| := (M^2)^{1/2}$ for symmetric M .

Proof. Since $\text{rank}(G) = d$, we have $QQ^\top = I_d$ and

$$Q = (GG^\top)^{-1/2}G = R^{-1}G = (H\Sigma H)^{-1/2}HX.$$

The covariance recursion. Expanding,

$$\Sigma(\gamma) = (X - \gamma Q)(X - \gamma Q)^\top = \Sigma - \gamma(XQ^\top + QX^\top) + \gamma^2 QQ^\top,$$

and substituting Q and $QQ^\top = I_d$ gives (44).

The root recursion. Since $G = RQ$, we have $HX(\gamma) = G - \gamma HQ = (R - \gamma H)Q$, and therefore

$$H\Sigma(\gamma)H = (R - \gamma H)QQ^\top(R - \gamma H) = (R - \gamma H)^2.$$

The loss along Q . Since $X(\gamma) = H^{-1}(R - \gamma H)Q$,

$$f(X(\gamma)) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(X(\gamma)^\top HX(\gamma)) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(H^{-1}(R - \gamma H)^2),$$

and expanding the square with cyclicity of the trace gives (46). Minimizing this quadratic in γ gives $\gamma^*(Q) = \text{tr}(R)/\text{tr}(H)$, where $\text{tr}(R) = \|G\|_*$, and (47) follows from (45) at $\gamma = \gamma^*(Q)$. $\square$

Corollary 3 (A scalar decomposition of the one-step decrease). *Under the assumptions of Proposition 17, $2f(X) = \text{tr}(H^{-1}R^2)$ and $2f(X^+) = \text{tr}(H^{-1}R^2) - \text{tr}(R)^2/\text{tr}(H)$. Hence*

$$p(X) = \frac{\text{tr}(R)^2}{\text{tr}(H)\text{tr}(H^{-1}R^2)} = 1 - \frac{\min_{\gamma \geq 0} \text{tr}(H^{-1}(R - \gamma H)^2)}{\text{tr}(H^{-1}R^2)}. \quad (48)$$

Proof. $\text{tr}(H^{-1}R^2) = \text{tr}(\Sigma H) = 2f(X)$ because $R^2 = H\Sigma H$; evaluate (46) at $\gamma^*(Q)$. $\square$

Corollary 4 (Commuting case: additive shrinkage of the singular values). *Assume $H \succ 0$, $\text{rank}(X) = d$, and $H\Sigma = \Sigma H$. Let*

$$H = U \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) U^\top, \quad \Sigma = U \text{diag}(s_1^2, \dots, s_d^2) U^\top,$$

with $\lambda_i > 0$ and $s_i > 0$. Then

$$R = (H\Sigma H)^{1/2} = U \text{diag}(\lambda_1 s_1, \dots, \lambda_d s_d) U^\top, \quad \gamma^*(Q) = \bar{s}_H := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i s_i}{\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i}. \quad (49)$$

Moreover,

$$\Sigma^+ = (\Sigma^{1/2} - \bar{s}_H I_d)^2 = U \text{diag}((s_1 - \bar{s}_H)^2, \dots, (s_d - \bar{s}_H)^2) U^\top. \quad (50)$$

Equivalently, the singular values of X evolve according to

$$s_i^+ = |s_i - \bar{s}_H|, \quad i = 1, \dots, d. \quad (51)$$

Finally,

$$f(X) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i s_i^2, \quad f(X^+) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i (s_i - \bar{s}_H)^2, \quad (52)$$

and

$$p(X) = \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i s_i)^2}{(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i)(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i s_i^2)}. \quad (53)$$

Proof. Since $H\Sigma = \Sigma H$ and both matrices are symmetric, they are simultaneously diagonalizable, and therefore

$$R = (H\Sigma H)^{1/2} = H\Sigma^{1/2} = \Sigma^{1/2}H.$$

Define

$$W := \Sigma^{-1/2}X.$$

Then $WW^\top = I_d$ and $X = \Sigma^{1/2}W$. Using $G = HX = H\Sigma^{1/2}W = RW$, we get

$$Q = R^{-1}G = W = \Sigma^{-1/2}X.$$

Hence

$$X^+ = X - \gamma^*(Q)Q = (\Sigma^{1/2} - \gamma^*(Q)I_d)W,$$

which implies

$$\Sigma^+ = X^+ X^{+\top} = (\Sigma^{1/2} - \gamma^*(Q)I_d)^2.$$

This proves (50). The formula for $\gamma^*(Q)$ follows from Proposition 17 and

$$\text{tr}(R) = \text{tr}(H\Sigma^{1/2}) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i s_i.$$

The expressions for $f(X)$, $f(X^+)$, and $p(X)$ follow by simultaneous diagonalization. $\square$

Fixed steps. The same argument applies to the fixed dual-adapted step $X^+ = X - \gamma \|G\|_* Q$ of Theorem 3, with $\alpha = \gamma \text{tr}(H)$. Since $\|G\|_* = \text{tr}(R) = \sum_i \lambda_i s_i$, the step along Q is $\alpha \bar{s}_H$, so $\Sigma^+ = (\Sigma^{1/2} - \alpha \bar{s}_H I_d)^2$ and $s_i^+ = |s_i - \alpha \bar{s}_H|$. In both cases Σ^+ is a function of Σ , so it again commutes with H , and the commuting structure persists along the trajectory.

Corollary 5 (Two-cluster dynamics). *Under the assumptions of Corollary 4, suppose that the singular values $s_1, \dots, s_d$ of X take exactly two distinct values, a for $i \in I$ and b for $i \notin I$, and let $w := \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i / \text{tr}(H) \in (0, 1)$. Let $X_0 := X$ and let X_k be the PolarGD iterates with exact line search. Then, for every $k \geq 1$ with $X_k \neq 0$, the singular values of X_k equal $c_k(1 - w)$ for $i \in I$ and $c_k w$ for $i \notin I$, for some $c_k > 0$ (two distinct values if $w \neq \frac{1}{2}$), and*

$$p(X_k) = 4w(1 - w), \quad f(X_{k+1}) = (1 - 2w)^2 f(X_k).$$

If $w = \frac{1}{2}$, then $X_2 = 0$.

Proof. By Corollary 4, the iterates stay in the common eigenbasis of H and the singular values evolve as $s_i^+ = |s_i - \bar{s}_H|$ with $\bar{s}_H = \sum_i \pi_i s_i$, $\pi_i = \lambda_i / \text{tr}(H)$. Two values a (mass w) and b (mass $1 - w$) give $\bar{s}_H = wa + (1 - w)b$, hence $|a - \bar{s}_H| = (1 - w)c$ and $|b - \bar{s}_H| = wc$ with $c := |a - b| > 0$. For values $c(1 - w)$ on I and cw on its complement, $\bar{s}_H = 2cw(1 - w)$, and the next values are $c(1 - w)|1 - 2w|$ and $cw|1 - 2w|$: the same configuration scaled by $|1 - 2w|$. By induction, for $k \geq 1$ the singular values of X_k are $c_k(1 - w)$ on I and $c_k w$ on its complement with $c_{k+1} = |1 - 2w| c_k$. Since $f = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \lambda_i s_i^2$ is homogeneous of degree two in the singular values, $f(X_{k+1}) = (1 - 2w)^2 f(X_k)$, and $p(X_k) = 1 - (1 - 2w)^2 = 4w(1 - w)$. If $w = \frac{1}{2}$, then $c_2 = 0$. While $c_k > 0$ all singular values are positive, so the full-rank assumption holds along the trajectory. $\square$

Corollary 5 gives exact trajectory-level rates in both directions. (i) *Adverse*: the near-rank-deficient family of Appendix E.2 has $w = 1/(1 + (d - 1)\kappa)$ and contracts at $((d - 1)\kappa - 1)^2 / ((d - 1)\kappa + 1)^2$ per step. (ii) *Favorable*: if the curvature mass is balanced, $w = \frac{1}{2}$, PolarGD reaches the minimizer in two steps for any $\kappa(H)$. (iii) *Figure 4*: with $H = I_d$ and $X_0 = O^\top \text{diag}(1, \delta, \dots, \delta) O$, we have $w = 1/d$, so $p(X_k) = 4(d - 1)/d^2$ and the loss contracts by $(1 - 2/d)^2$ per step for every $k \geq 1$ and every $\delta \in (0, 1)$. (iv) For $d = 2$ every full-rank iterate is a two-cluster configuration after one step, and $w = \lambda_{\min}(H) / \text{tr}(H)$ recovers Corollary 6.

Remark 5 (PolarGD does not monotonically improve $\kappa(\Sigma_k)$). *Even in the commuting case with $H = I_d$, PolarGD does not monotonically improve the conditioning of Σ_k . For example, if $d = 3$ and the singular values of X are*

$$(s_1, s_2, s_3) = (4, 2, 1),$$

then $\bar{s} = (4 + 2 + 1)/3 = 7/3$, so

$$(s_1^+, s_2^+, s_3^+) = \left(\frac{5}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{4}{3}\right).$$

Hence

$$\kappa(\Sigma) = \left(\frac{4}{1}\right)^2 = 16, \quad \kappa(\Sigma^+) = \left(\frac{5/3}{1/3}\right)^2 = 25.$$

Thus the row-covariance can become more ill-conditioned after a PolarGD step.

Remark 6 (The progress coefficient $p(X_k)$ is not monotone). *The exact progress coefficient $p(X_k)$ from Theorem 3 need not be monotone along a PolarGD trajectory. In the commuting case with $H = I_3$,*

$$p(X) = \frac{(s_1 + s_2 + s_3)^2}{3(s_1^2 + s_2^2 + s_3^2)}.$$

If $(s_1, s_2, s_3) = (3, 3, 2)$, then

$$p(X) = \frac{32}{33}, \quad (s_1^+, s_2^+, s_3^+) = \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\right), \quad p(X^+) = \frac{8}{9} < \frac{32}{33}.$$

On the other hand, if $(s_1, s_2, s_3) = (4, 1, 1)$, then

$$p(X) = \frac{2}{3}, \quad (s_1^+, s_2^+, s_3^+) = (2, 1, 1), \quad p(X^+) = \frac{8}{9} > \frac{2}{3}.$$

So $p(X_k)$ may either decrease or increase from one step to the next.

Proposition 18 (One-step collapse to gradient isotropy in the 2×2 full-rank case). *Assume $d = 2$, $H \succ 0$, and $\text{rank}(X) = 2$, and let $X^+ = X - \gamma^*(Q)Q$. Then $R^+ = (H\Sigma^+H)^{1/2} = cI_2$ for some $c \geq 0$; equivalently, $G^+G^{+\top} = c^2I_2$ and $\Sigma^+ = c^2H^{-2}$. In particular, $H\Sigma^+ = \Sigma^+H$.*

Proof. By Proposition 17, $R^+ = |M|$ with $M := R - \gamma^*(Q)H$, and $\text{tr}(M) = \text{tr}(R) - \gamma^*(Q)\text{tr}(H) = 0$. A symmetric trace-zero 2×2 matrix has eigenvalues $\pm c$ for some $c \geq 0$, so $|M| = cI_2$. The equivalent forms follow from $G^+G^{+\top} = H\Sigma^+H = (R^+)^2$. $\square$

Corollary 6 (Exact post-collapse dynamics in 2×2). *Under the assumptions of Proposition 18, let $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ be the eigenvalues of H . For every $k \geq 1$, $(HX_kX_k^\top H)^{1/2} = c_kI_2$ with $c_{k+1} = \rho c_k$ and $\rho := (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)/(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) = (\kappa(H) - 1)/(\kappa(H) + 1)$, so that $f(X_{k+1}) = \rho^2 f(X_k)$. Moreover, whenever $c_k > 0$, the PolarGD and GD direction rays coincide.*

Proof. For $k = 1$ the claim is Proposition 18. Suppose $R_k := (HX_kX_k^\top H)^{1/2} = c_kI_2$. Then $\gamma_k^*(Q) = \text{tr}(R_k)/\text{tr}(H) = 2c_k/(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)$, and Proposition 17 gives, with $H = U\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)U^\top$,

$$R_{k+1} = \left| c_kI_2 - \frac{2c_k}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}H \right| = U\text{diag}\left(c_k\left|1 - \frac{2\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}\right|, c_k\left|1 - \frac{2\lambda_2}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}\right|\right)U^\top = \rho c_kI_2.$$

Since $R_k = c_kI_2$, we have $G_k = R_kQ_k = c_kQ_k$, so the PolarGD and GD directions are collinear whenever $c_k > 0$. Finally, $HX_kX_k^\top H = c_k^2I_2$ gives $X_kX_k^\top = c_k^2H^{-2}$ and $f(X_k) = \frac{c_k^2}{2}\text{tr}(H^{-1})$, so $f(X_{k+1})/f(X_k) = (c_{k+1}/c_k)^2 = \rho^2$. $\square$

Remark 7 (Why $d = 2$ is special). *The collapse uses that a symmetric trace-zero 2×2 matrix has eigenvalues $\pm c$. For $d > 2$, a trace-zero symmetric matrix need not have eigenvalues of equal magnitude, so R^+ is generally not isotropic and PolarGD need not reduce to GD after one step. In $d = 2$, by contrast, PolarGD contracts at exactly GD's worst-case rate after the first step unless it terminates.*

I.1 Specialization to the 2×2 Case

We specialize the line-search comparison between GD and PolarGD to $d = m = 2$ with $H = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$, which is without loss of generality by Corollary 1. Let $g_1^\top, g_2^\top$ be the rows of $G = HX$, and let $r_j := \|g_j\|_2^2$, $c := \langle g_1, g_2 \rangle$, and $a := r_1 + r_2 = \|G\|_F^2$. The eigenvalues of $GG^\top$ are σ_1^2, σ_2^2 with $\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 = a$ and $\sigma_1\sigma_2 = \sqrt{\det(GG^\top)} = \sqrt{r_1r_2 - c^2}$, so

$$\|G\|_*^2 = (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)^2 = a + 2\sqrt{r_1r_2 - c^2}. \quad (54)$$

With $K := \text{tr}(G^\top HG) = \lambda_1r_1 + \lambda_2r_2$, GD with exact line search has $\gamma^{\text{GD}} = a/K$ and

$$\Delta_{\text{GD}} = \frac{a^2}{2K}. \quad (55)$$

If $\text{rank}(G) = 2$, then Q is orthogonal, $\text{tr}(Q^\top HQ) = \text{tr}(H) = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$, and

$$\Delta_{\text{Pol}} = \frac{\|G\|_*^2}{2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)} = \frac{a + 2\sqrt{r_1r_2 - c^2}}{2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)}. \quad (56)$$

If $\text{rank}(G) = 1$, Q is collinear with G and $\Delta_{\text{Pol}} = \Delta_{\text{GD}}$. Thus, for full-rank G ($r_1r_2 > c^2$), combining (55) and (56),

$$\Delta_{\text{Pol}} > \Delta_{\text{GD}} \iff (a + 2\sqrt{r_1r_2 - c^2})(\lambda_1r_1 + \lambda_2r_2) > a^2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2). \quad (57)$$

With $\omega := r_1/a \in [0, 1]$, the share of gradient energy in the first eigendirection, and $\chi := c/\sqrt{r_1 r_2} \in [-1, 1]$, the correlation between the gradient rows, we have $\sqrt{r_1 r_2 - c^2} = a\sqrt{\omega(1-\omega)}\sqrt{1-\chi^2}$, and (57) becomes

$$[\lambda_1 \omega + \lambda_2 (1 - \omega)] [1 + 2\sqrt{\omega(1-\omega)}\sqrt{1-\chi^2}] > \lambda_1 + \lambda_2. \quad (58)$$

Three consequences follow. If G has rank one ($\chi = \pm 1$), **PolarGD** coincides with **GD**. If H is isotropic ($\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$), (58) cannot hold, since $2\sqrt{\omega(1-\omega)}\sqrt{1-\chi^2} \leq 1$, with equality only for $\omega = \frac{1}{2}$, $\chi = 0$, i.e., equal singular values of G ; so **GD** is always at least as good. If $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, taking $\chi = 0$ and ω slightly below $\frac{1}{2}$ satisfies (58), so there are configurations in which **PolarGD** achieves a strictly larger decrease than **GD**.

I.2 Optimizer Trajectories in Singular Value Space

By von Neumann's trace inequality,

$$f(X) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(H X X^\top) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{\min(d,m)} \sigma_i(X)^2 \lambda_i(H), \quad (59)$$

where $\lambda_i(H)$, $\sigma_i(X)$ are in decreasing order. Crucially, this upper bound depends only on the singular values of X and the eigenvalues of H . In the 2×2 case we can therefore overlay this upper bound on the trajectories of singular values. This visualization (Figure 13) makes the interplay between the spectrum of X and the structure of H immediately apparent in two dimensions.




Figure 13: **Singular value trajectories in $\mathbb{R}^2$.** Rows correspond to different initializations; the right column shows the loss curves. For each row, optimizer trajectories in singular value space, all start from the same initialization ($\star$), with the von Neumann bound (59) overlaid. Terminal iterates are marked with a square ($\square$). Here $H = O \text{diag}(1, 10^4) O^\top$ with O a random orthogonal matrix, and the rows use orthogonal, Gaussian, and low-rank initializations. PolarGD’s singular value trajectory maintains a 45° direction in singular value space. By contrast GD is seen to optimize the larger eigen-direction first. SignGD does not obviously exploit singular geometry here.