Tensor Completion via Leverage Sampling and
Tensor QR Decomposition for Network

Latency Estimation

Jun Lei\*, Ji-Qian Zhao\*, Jing-Qi Wang\*, An-Bao Xu †#

\*College of Computer Science and Aritificial Intelligence, Wenzhou University, Zhejiang 325035, China. †College of Mathematics and Physics, Wenzhou University, Zhejiang 325035, China.

#### Abstract

In this paper, we consider the network latency estimation, which has been an important metric for network performance. However, a large scale of network latency estimation requires a lot of computing time. Therefore, we propose a new method that is much faster and maintains high accuracy. The data structure of network nodes can form a matrix, and the tensor model can be formed by introducing the time dimension. Thus, the entire problem can be be summarized as a tensor completion problem. The main idea of our method is improving the tensor leverage sampling strategy and introduce tensor QR decomposition into tensor completion. To achieve faster tensor leverage sampling, we replace tensor singular decomposition (t-SVD) with tensor CSVD-QR to appoximate t-SVD. To achieve faster completion for incomplete tensor, we use the tensor  $L_{2,1}$ -norm rather than traditional tensor nuclear norm. Furthermore, we introduce tensor QR decomposition into alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) framework. Numerical experiments witness that our method is faster than state-of-art algorithms with satisfactory accuracy.

### **Index Terms**

Network latency estimation, tensor completion, tensor QR decomposition, leverage sampling, tensor  $L_{2,1}$ -norm

### I. Introduction

Network latency estimation has played an important role in network performance evaluation and has been widely concerned in recent years. It is known to all that many applications are sensitive to latency [6]. For instance, to ensure the quality of service (QoS), the low transmission latency is extrmely required by mobile video calls. Thus, it is crucial to acquire the latencies of the whole network within a short time duration [21]. However, It is not

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 11801418.

E-mail address: leik5102@gmail.com (Jun Lei), xuanbao@wzu.edu.cn (An-Bao Xu).

<sup>#</sup> Corresponding author

practical to measure the whole large-scale network latency comprehensively due to the extremely high cost, as a result of which, we need a fast and precise method of network latency estimation.

Matrix completion (MC) [34], [5], [22], [25], [28] and tensor completion (TC) [9], [23], [4], [24], [29] are the main shunt of network latency estimation in previous work. MC was first proposed by Candè and Recht [2], and was applied to network latency estimation [26], [33] because of the low-rank structure of network traffic data [19]. TC is an extension of MC with higher precision and higher complexity [11]. The purpose of TC is to complete the missing entries from partially observed subset. Hence, TC introduces the dimension of time, but the time will not be too long in latency estimation. In the field of signal processing and data analysis, TC has been an advanced technology widely used. For example, TC has been applied to network traffic estimation [27], [30], [20].

In the past few years, many scholars have tried to optimize network latency estimation. In terms of MC, Zhu [34] proposed a latency recovery scheme by using a subset of source-destination pairs. Xie [26] proposed an adaptive sampling scheme to improve the accuracy of it. Mao and Saul [19] predicted the latencies of large-scale networks by matrix factorization. Liao [10] put forward a new algorithm called decentralized matrix factorization by stochastic gradient descent (DMFSGD). In terms of TC, Zhou [33] proposed explicit the advantage of tensor CP decomposition for network traffic estimation. Liu [13] put forward a TC strategy through "flattening" the tensor. Deng [11] artfully used the tensor completion model based on t-SVD [7] and an effective sampling strategy that greatly improve the precision of network latency. Lin [12] proposed a new robust spatial-temporal graph-tensor recovery model with high stability. There are also works with respect to approximating the underlying low-tubal-rank tensor by adaptive tubal sampling strategies [31], [16] and uniform element-wise sampling strategies [17] that make great sense. These approaches including other excellent related methods have made an important contributions to this field.

Most of the researchers in this field pay more attention to the accuracy of network delay estimation but do not pay much attention to the speed of the algorithm to some extent. It is meaningful to enhance the precision but network latency estimation also needs a strong real-time performance. Different from the above schemes, the purpose of our method is to greatly improve the speed while maintaining high accuracy. Inspired by [11], we improve the tensor leverage sampling strategy and tensor comopletion method, and we exploit tensor QR decomposition as a core subroutine to approximate tensor singular value decomposition (t-SVD), which is the core subroutine in ADMM framework [18]. Furthermore, we use tensor  $L_{2,1}$ -norm [32] to solve the tensor completion optimization problem with a fast speed and high accuracy.

The main contributions of this paper are:

- We propose a new method named QRLS, which is an improvement of tensor leverage sampling with faster speed. It replace the t-SVD in tensor leverage sampling with iterative QR decomposition to approximate t-SVD.
- We introduce tensor  $L_{2,1}$ -norm into network tensor completion model. Tensor factorization is an frequent process to compute the nuclear norm with a huge time cost while tensor  $L_{2,1}$ -norm can improve the speed of this process. In addition, the accuracy of tensor  $L_{2,1}$ -norm is also satisfactory because of its low computational

complexity and high robustness to noise compared to nuclear norm.

• We propose a new model called LNLS-TQR that is a combination of tensor completion based on  $L_{2,1}$ -norm and a fast leverage sampling method. The QR decomposition is the core subroutine of the above methods. Our method can rapidly and precisely obtain informative node pairs and can accurately estimate numerous unobserved node pairs. Numerical experiments witness that our method is not only faster than some of excellent algorithms proposed recent years, but it also has satisfactory accuracy.

## II. Notations and preliminaries

## A. Notations

In this papper, handwritten uppercase letters represent third-order tensors, printed uppercase letters represent matrices, and printed lowercase letters represent vectors. For example,  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  represents a third order tensor,  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$  is a matrix and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$  is a vector. The definition method of matlab is adopted for the lower corner label. For instance,  $\mathcal{X}(k,:,:)$ ,  $\mathcal{X}(:,k,:)$ ,  $\mathcal{X}(:,:,k)$  means horizontal, lateral and frontal slice of a third-order tensor respectively.  $\mathcal{X}(i,j,:)$  denotes the tube of  $i^{th}$  row,  $j^{th}$  column when faced with frontal slices of  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{X}_{ijk}$  denotes the  $(i,j,k)^{th}$  entry of a tensor. If the whole entries of a tensor is zero, the tensor will be denoted by  $\mathcal{O}$ . A tensor with its first slice being an identity matrix and others being zero matrices is defined as an identity tensor  $\mathcal{I}$ . Specially,  $\mathcal{X}^{(k)}$  denotes the  $k^{th}$  frontal silice of  $\mathcal{X}$ . The Frobenius norm of a tensor  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\|\mathcal{X}\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j,k} |\mathcal{X}_{ijk}|^2}$ .

## B. Background knowledge

T-product is the product of tensors. If a tensor  $\mathcal{X}$  is the t-product of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , it will be denoted as  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}$ . Before we understand the t-product, we need some background knowledge.

**Definition 1.** (Discrete Fourier Transformation (DFT)) Discrete Fourier transformation is a linear transformation on a vector that satisfies the mapping

$$\mathbf{fft}: \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$$
$$v \to \hat{v}$$

where  $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$  and the matrix for the transformation is:

$$F_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 & \cdots & \omega^{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \omega^{n-1} & \omega^{2(n-1)} & \cdots & \omega^{(n-1)(n-1)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n},$$

where  $\omega$  is a complex number that is equal to  $e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{n}}$  and  $F_n$  will operate on a n-dimensional column vectors.

From Definition 1, we can infer that  $\frac{F_n}{\sqrt{n}}$  is unitary, i.e.,

$$F_n^* F_n = F_n F_n^* = n I_n, \tag{1}$$

where  $F_n^*$  is the conjugate transpose of  $F_n$ . We can apply discrete Fourier transformation to a vector in the third dimension (tube) of the tensor  $\mathcal{X}$  and express it as  $\hat{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{fft}(\mathcal{X},3)$  where 3 in the bracket means the third dimension. Of course, we have  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbf{ifft}(\hat{\mathcal{X}},3)$  where ifft is the inverse of ifft.

Assuming that there's a matrix  $\tilde{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 n_3 \times n_2 n_3}$  satisfying the following form:

where **bdiag** is an operator that can transform a tensor into a block diagonal matrix like above. Furthermore, the block circulant matrix is defined by

$$\mathbf{bcirc}\left(\mathcal{X}\right) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}^{(1)} & \mathcal{X}^{(n_3)} & \cdots & \mathcal{X}^{(2)} \\ \mathcal{X}^{(2)} & \mathcal{X}^{(1)} & \cdots & \mathcal{X}^{(3)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{X}^{(n_3)} & \mathcal{X}^{(n_3-1)} & \cdots & \mathcal{X}^{(1)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We can exploit DFT to block diagonalize the block circulant matrix and then we have

$$(F_{n_3} \otimes I_{n_1}) \cdot \mathbf{bcirc}(\mathcal{X}) \cdot (F_{n_3}^{-1} \otimes I_{n_2}) = \tilde{X},$$
(2)

where  $\otimes$  is the Kronecker product.

**Definition 2.** [7] (*T-product* ) Assuming that  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_2 \times l \times n_3}$ , we can operate t-product  $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$  and get a new tensor with the size of  $n_1 \times l \times n_3$ :

$$\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y} = \mathbf{fold} \left( \mathbf{bcirc} \left( \mathcal{X} \right) \cdot \mathbf{unfold} \left( \mathcal{Y} \right) \right), \tag{3}$$

where  $\mathbf{unfold}(\cdot)$  is the operator that arranges the tensor in frontal slices into a long matrix and  $\mathbf{fold}(\cdot)$  is to restore the long matrix to its original tensor, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{unfold}\left(\mathcal{X}\right) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}^{(1)} \\ \mathcal{X}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{X}^{(n_3)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 n_3 \times n_2}, \quad \mathbf{fold}\left(\mathbf{unfold}\left(\mathcal{X}\right)\right) = \mathcal{X}.$$

We can see that t-product is similar to the matrix product, except that multiplying the elements of the matrix operation is extended to a circular convolution between tubes in a tensor. According to the details in [7], we can infer that t-product can be thought of as a matrix product in the Fourier domain.

**Definition 3.** [7] (Tensor conjugate transpose) Assuming that there's a tensor  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ , the conjugate transpose of  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  is given by conjugate transposing every frontal slice of  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  and reversing the order of these slices from the second slice through  $n_3$ . The conjugate transpose of  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{X}^* \in \mathbb{C}^{n_2 \times n_1 \times n_3}$ , i.e.,

$$(\mathcal{X}(:,:,k))^* = \mathcal{X}^*(:,:,n_3-k+2), \quad k = 2, 3, \dots, n_3$$
 (4)

Besides, there are lots of other tensor's operations that is similar to matrix operations [7]. For instance, an orthogonal tensor  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  satisfies  $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{X}^* = \mathcal{X}^* * \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{I}$ , where  $\mathcal{I}$  is the identity tensor. In addition, a tensor with every frontal slice being a diagonal matrix is called a f-diagonal tensor.

**Theorem 1.** [7] (*T-SVD* and tensor tubal-rank) Assuming that there is a tensor  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  and then we can decompose  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{U} * \mathcal{S} * \mathcal{V}^*, \tag{5}$$

where both  $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1 \times n_3}$  and  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  are orthogonal tensors, and  $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  is a f-diagonal tensor, as shown in Figure 1. The complexity of t-SVD is  $O\left(20n_1n_2^2n_3\right)$ . The tubal-rank of  $\mathcal{X}$  is the number of nonzero tubes of  $\mathcal{S}$ .




Figure 1: The illustration of t-SVD of a  $n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3$  tensor.

**Theorem 2.** [8] (*T-QR* ) Assuming that there is a tensor  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ , and then  $\mathcal{X}$  can be decomposed, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Q} * \mathcal{R} \tag{6}$$

where  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1 \times n_3}$  is an orthogonal tensor, and  $\mathcal{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  is similar to the upper triangular matrix, as shown in Figure 2. The complexity of t-QR is  $O(2n_1n_2^2n_3)$ .




Figure 2: The illustration of t-QR of a  $n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3$  tensor.

In recent years, t-SVD is one of the most popular strategies of tensor factorization widely applied in the tensor completion problem because of its high accuracy with pretty fast speed. Compared with Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, it's easy to find that t-QR is ten times faster than t-SVD. If we can insert t-QR into the tensor completion problem, the algorithm will be more cost-efficient.

**Theorem 3.** [11] (Tensor leverage scores ) Let  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  with tubal-rank r. The leverage scores  $u_i(\mathcal{X})$  for

the  $i^{th}$  horizontal slice  $\mathcal{X}(i,:,:)$  for the  $j^{th}$  lateral slice  $\mathcal{X}(:,j,:)$  can be expressed as:

$$u_{i}(\mathcal{X}) = \frac{n_{1}}{r} \|\mathcal{U}^{*} * \vec{e}_{i}\|_{F}^{2}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, n_{1}$$

$$v_{j}(\mathcal{X}) = \frac{n_{2}}{r} \|\mathcal{V}^{*} * \vec{e}_{j}\|_{F}^{2}, j = 1, 2, \cdots, n_{2}$$
(7)

where  $\vec{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times 1 \times n_3}$  satisfies the entry  $\vec{e}_{i11} = 1$  and other entries are zeros. Namely,  $u_i(\mathcal{X})$  is Frobenius norm of  $i^{th}$  lateral slices of  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $v_j(\mathcal{X})$  is Frobenius norm of  $j^{th}$  lateral slices of  $\mathcal{V}$  where  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  comes from t-SVD in Theorem 1.

The purpose of leverage sampling strategy is to collect informative sample points under the circumstance of limited sampling cost and the leverage score is an indication of the amount of information. In the matrix leverage sampling, it is thought that the singular vector contains a lot of information in the original matrix and quantize it by Frobenius norm of singular vector. Hence, we can generalize this property to tensors [11], as a result of which, tensor leverage sampling strategy becomes an excellent algorithm with high precision in a high dimension.

## C. Problem description

The device-to-device network latency information can be stored in a matrix and this matrix is not necessarily symmetric. In addition, to obtain the nodes with more information, we need to introduce the time dimension into the model [11], and thus the network latency estimation problem can be reduced to the third-order tensor completion problem. For example, the entry  $\mathcal{X}(i,j,k)$  denotes the network latency from the  $i^{th}$  device to the  $j^{th}$  one in the  $k^{th}$  time slot, but we cannot measure all the latency information in a large scale. The remaining unmeasured information that needs to be estimated is the tensor element that needs to be completed.

The tensor completion problem can be described as follow:

$$\min_{\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}} \operatorname{rank}_{\mathsf{t}}(\mathcal{X}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathcal{X}_{i,j,k} = \mathcal{M}_{i,j,k}, \quad (i,j,k) \in \Omega$$
(8)

where  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  is a low-tubal-rank tensor,  $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathsf{t}}(\mathcal{X})$  is the tubal-rank of  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  the tensor that we need to complete, and the set  $\Omega$  stores the tensor index we have known. In addition, we define a tensor  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  as follow:

$$\mathcal{A}_{ijk} = \begin{cases} 1, & (i, j, k) \in \Omega \\ 0, & else. \end{cases}$$
(9)

From (8) and (9), it is easy to realize that

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{X} \circ \mathcal{A},\tag{10}$$

where  $\circ$  denotes Hadamard product.

Since Problem 8 is NP hard and the objective function  $f(\mathcal{X}) = \operatorname{rank}_{t}(\mathcal{X})$  is not convex, we usually choose a surrogate convex function [8] becoming the objective function, and then Problem (8) can be transformed as follow:

$$\min_{\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}} \|\mathcal{X}\|_* \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathcal{X}_{i,j,k} = \mathcal{M}_{i,j,k}, \quad (i,j,k) \in \Omega$$
 (11)

where  $\|\mathcal{X}\|_*$  is the tensor nuclear norm (TNN) [18]. The t-SVD decomposition and ADMM [18] is one of the most popular ways to solve this problem in recent years due to thier high accuracy.

## III. Our method of network latency estimation

To reconstruct the whole network latencies, the entire process can be divided into two parts. Firstly, we adopts a fast and reasonable sampling strategy in Subsection A. Secondly, we estimate the rest latencies in Subsection B. Furthermore, we analyze the complexity of our algorithms in Subsection C.

### A. Sampling strategy

We need to measure a few nodes before we estimate other ones in the real world. Therfore, we start with an empty tensor. By sampling, we get an incomplete tensor. Finally, we complete the incomplete tensor. Firstly, we need a reasonable and efficient sampling strategy.

Tensor leverage sampling strategy [11] is an excellent approach with high accuracy because the core subroutine of this method is t-SVD that can extract the most of the information of a tensor. However, despite of high accuracy, t-SVD is not cost-efficient enough for timely feedback. Thus, we propose a new method called QRLS that is much faster than conventional leverage sampling to improve the tensor leverage sampling with faster speed.

Here are the stages of our method.

Stage 1: For the first t time slots, namely considering a part of our tensor  $\mathcal{X}(:,:,1:t)$ . a random sampling strategy is adopted [11], which is the information basis for subsequent leverage sampling.  $t = \lceil \beta n_3 \rceil$  where  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$  is the ceiling brackets that rounds  $\beta n_3$  up to upper integer and  $\beta \in (0,1)$ . Assuming that the total number of nodes that we will measure is N, we will impose  $\left\lceil \frac{N}{n_3} \right\rceil$  measurement for each time slot in the first t time slots.

Stage 2: For the rest  $k^{th}$  time slot ( $k \in [t+1, n_3]$ ), we adopt a new sampling method (QRLS) that we propose. After Stage 1, we have got the sampling tensor, and then we exploit CTSVD-QR [32] that is besed on tensor QR decomposition as an extension of CSVD-QR [15], rather than t-SVD. The CTSVD-QR decomposition of a tensor  $\mathcal{X}$  is as follow:

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{L} * \mathcal{D} * \mathcal{R} \tag{12}$$

where  $\mathcal{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times r \times n_3}$ ,  $\mathcal{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n_2 \times n_3}$  are orthogonal, and  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r \times n_3}$  is analogous to the  $\mathcal{R}^*$  of Theorem 2. Let  $\mathcal{D}_k$  denotes the  $k^{th}$  iteration of CTSVD-QR. Under constant iterations,  $\mathcal{D}_k$  will converge to a f-diagonal

tensor that is equivalent to S in t-SVD as Theorem 1. CTSVD-QR is an extension for the matrix decomposition CSVD-QR. In CSVD-QR, there are three basic steps as follows.

First, initialize  $L_1 = eye(m, r)$ ,  $D_1 = eye(r, r)$ ,  $R_1 = eye(r, n)$ , where eye(m, n) is an  $m \times n$  matrix with the main diagonal element being 1 and the other positional elements being 0 in matlab function.

Second, Perform QR decomposition on  $X_k R_k^*$ , i.e.,

$$L_{k+1}R' = X_k R_k^* (13)$$

 $R_{k+1}$  is also given by QR decomposition, i.e.,

$$R_{k+1}T = A_k^* L_{k+1} (14)$$

Eventually, we update  $D_{k+1}$ 

$$D_{k+1} = T^* \tag{15}$$

CTSVD-QR can be regarded as the combination of t-SVD and CSVD. The concrete process is shown on the Algorithm 1. Note that  $conj(\cdot)$  means the conjugate transpose operator.

# Algorithm 1: Computing an Approximate T-SVD via QR Decomposition (CTSVD-QR) [32]

Input:  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ .

**Output:** CTSVD-QR components  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

- 1: Compute  $\hat{\mathcal{X}} = \text{fft}(\mathcal{X}, [], 3)$ .
- 2: Compute each frontal slice of  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ ,  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$  from  $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$  by
- 3: **for**  $i = 1, ..., \lceil \frac{n_3+1}{2} \rceil$  **do**

4: 
$$\left[\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(i)},\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{(i)},\hat{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}\right] = \text{CSVD-QR}\left(\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{(i)}\right);$$

5: end for

6: **for** 
$$i = \left[\frac{n_3+1}{2}\right] + 1, ..., n_3$$
 **do**

7: 
$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(i)} = \operatorname{conj}\left(\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(n_3-i+2)}\right);$$

8: 
$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{(i)} = \hat{\mathcal{D}}^{(n_3-i+2)};$$

9: 
$$\hat{\mathcal{V}}^{(i)} = \operatorname{conj}\left(\hat{\mathcal{V}}^{(n_3-i+2)}\right);$$

10: end for

11: Compute 
$$\mathcal{L}=ifft\left(\hat{\mathcal{L}},\left[\right],3\right),~\mathcal{D}=ifft\left(\hat{\mathcal{D}},\left[\right],3\right),$$
 and  $\mathcal{R}=ifft\left(\hat{\mathcal{R}},\left[\right],3\right).$ 

Theoretically, if we introduce CTSVD-QR into our sampling strategy, the speed will increase and the accuracy can still be maintained. According to the leverage sampling theory [11], we propose that the tensor sampling probability of measuring the (i, j) node for the  $k^{th}$  time slot can be improved by

$$p_{i,j,k} = \min \left\{ c_0 \left( \frac{u_i^k r}{n_1} + \frac{v_j^k r}{n_1} - \frac{u_i^k r}{n_2} \cdot \frac{v_j^k r}{n_2} \right) \log(n_1 n_3) \log(n_2 n_3), 1 \right\}$$
(16)

where  $u_i^k = \frac{n_1}{r} \parallel \mathcal{L}^k(i,1:r,:) \parallel_F^2$ ,  $v_j^k = \frac{n_2}{r} \parallel \mathcal{R}^k(1:r,j,:) \parallel_F^2$  with the estimated rank r and  $c_0$  is a constant number for normalization. The Frobenius norm of  $i^{th}$  horizontal slice of  $\mathcal{L}$  and the  $j^{th}$  lateral slice of  $\mathcal{R}$  are respectively  $u_i^k$  and  $v_i^k$ .

Until k is iterated to  $n_3$ , we can summarize the whole sampling strategy in Algorithm 2. Note that A in (9) will be constructed in Algorithm 2. We use  $\Omega_k$  to represent the set of locations measured in the  $k^{th}$  time slot, and  $\Omega$  in (9) is exactly the union of sampled measurements, i.e.,  $\Omega = \bigcup_{k=1}^{n_3} \Omega_k$ .

# Algorithm 2: Embedding QR Decomposition into Leverage Sampling (QRLS)

Input:  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ .

**Output:** An incomplete tensor  $\mathcal{X}$  and an updated  $\mathcal{A}$ .

1: Stage 1: Ramdom Sampling.

2: **for** 
$$k = 1, ..., t$$
 **do**

Randomly probe  $\left\lceil \frac{N}{n_3} \right\rceil$  nodes' latencies in the  $k^{th}$  time slot  $\mathcal{X}(:,:,k)$ .

4: Update 
$$\mathcal{A}(:,:,k):\mathcal{A}_{ijk}=\left\{ egin{array}{ll} 1, & (i,j,k)\in\Omega_k \\ \\ 0, & else. \end{array} \right.$$

6: Stage 2: Leverage Sampling based on QR Decomposition.

7: **for** 
$$k = t + 1, ..., n_3$$
 **do**

8: 
$$[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{R}] = \text{CTSVD-QR}(\mathcal{X}(:,:,1:k-1))$$

9: 
$$u_i^k = \frac{n_1}{r} \parallel \mathcal{L}^k(i, 1:r, :) \parallel_F^2$$

10: 
$$v_i^k = \frac{n_2}{r} \parallel \mathcal{R}^k(1:r,j,:) \parallel_F^2$$

11: 
$$p_{i,j,k} = \min \left\{ c_0 \left( \frac{u_i^k r}{n_1} + \frac{v_j^k r}{n_1} - \frac{u_i^k r}{n_2} \cdot \frac{v_j^k r}{n_2} \right) \log(n_1 n_3) \log(n_2 n_3), 1 \right\}$$
12: Sample  $\left\lceil \frac{N}{n_3} \right\rceil$  nodes with the order of measurement propability  $p_{i,j,k}$  and we get  $\mathcal{X}(:,:,k)$ .

12:

13: Update the rest slices 
$$\mathcal{A}(:,:,k):\mathcal{A}_{ijk}=\left\{ egin{array}{ll} 1, & (i,j,k)\in\Omega_k \\ 0, & else. \end{array} \right.$$

## 14: **end for**

## B. Completion for incomplete tensor

After sampling some informative nodes, we need to estimate the latency of the rest nodes with some time slots, and the math model is tensor completion.

The general approach to Problem (11) is using t-SVD to decompose  $\mathcal{X}$ . Due to a full rank decomposition, t-SVD need numerous iterations to solve the tensor completion problem. Iterative tensor QR decomposition is a great way to reduce the computational time in spite of a little precision loss.

To bypass complex tensor factorization, we use tensor  $L_{2,1}$ -norm instead of traditional nuclear norm. Here is the definition of  $L_{2,1}$ -norm of a tensor  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ :

$$\|\mathcal{X}\|_{2,1} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{k=1}^{n_3} \mathcal{X}_{ijk}^2} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \|\mathcal{X}(:,j,:)\|_F$$
 (17)

**Theorem 4.** [32] Assuming that there is a tensor  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ , imposing CTSVD-QR on  $\mathcal{X}$ , namely  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{L} * \mathcal{D} * \mathcal{R}$ , we have  $\|\mathcal{D}\|_* \leq \|\mathcal{D}\|_{2,1}$ .

Theorem 4 demonstrates that for tensor  $\mathcal{D}$ , the nuclear norm is the lower bound of the  $L_{2,1}$ -norm. Thus, Problem (11) can be transformed as follows:

$$\min_{\mathcal{D}} \|\mathcal{D}\|_{2,1} \quad \text{s.t.} \begin{cases} \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{L} * \mathcal{D} * \mathcal{R} \\ \mathcal{X}_{i,j,k} = \mathcal{M}_{i,j,k} \end{cases}$$
(18)

The objective function in Problem (18) is convex [32], so we can use ADMM to solve the problem. The augmented Lagrange function of Problem (18) is

$$\operatorname{Lag}\left(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Y}, \mu\right) = \left\|\mathcal{D}\right\|_{2,1} + \left\langle\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{L} * \mathcal{D} * \mathcal{R}\right\rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \left\|\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{L} * \mathcal{D} * \mathcal{R}\right\|_{F}^{2},\tag{19}$$

where  $\mu > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ , and  $\langle \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \rangle$  is the inner product of  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ , i.e.,

$$\langle \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n_3} \langle \mathcal{X}^{(i)}, \mathcal{Y}^{(i)} \rangle$$
 (20)

Let  $\mathcal{X}_k$  denotes the  $k^{th}$  iteration result in ADMM. We optimize the Lagrange function in the following three steps.

In the first step, we update  $\mathcal{L}_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}$  by solving the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}} \left\| \left( \mathcal{X}_k + \frac{\mathcal{Y}_k}{\mu_k} \right) - \mathcal{L} * \mathcal{D}_k * \mathcal{R} \right\|_F^2$$
 (21)

The optimization Problem in (21) is convex to each variable, so we can update the variables one by one. We use ADMM to initial  $\mathcal{L}_k$  and  $\mathcal{R}_k$  as the first iteration in CTSVD-QR. Due to converging within a few iterations,  $\mathcal{L}_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}$  can be given by tensor QR decomposition. We perform tensor QR decomposition on  $\mathcal{L}_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_{k+1}\mathcal{R}' = \text{t-QR}\left(\left(\mathcal{X}_k + \frac{\mathcal{Y}_k}{\mu_k}\right) * \mathcal{R}_k^*\right)$$
(22)

$$\mathcal{R}_{k+1}\mathcal{R}'' = \text{t-QR}\left(\left(\mathcal{X}_k + \frac{\mathcal{Y}_k}{\mu_k}\right)^* * \mathcal{L}_{k+1}\right)$$
(23)

where t-QR denotes the tensor QR decomposition operator.

In the second step,  $\mathcal{D}_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{X}_{k+1}$  are updated with  $\mathcal{X}_k$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}_k$ ,  $L_{k+1}$  and  $R_{k+1}$  being fixed. We attempt to decompose  $(\mathcal{X}_k + \frac{\mathcal{Y}_k}{\mu_k})$  in one iteration of CTSVD-QR, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{X}_k + \frac{\mathcal{Y}_k}{\mu_k} = \mathcal{L}_{k+1} * \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}} * \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$$
 (24)

where  $\mathcal{D}_T \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r \times n_3}$ . Then, we consider a  $L_{2,1}$ -norm minimization problem to update  $D_{k+1}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}_{k+1} = \arg\min_{\mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{\mu_k} \|\mathcal{D}\|_{2,1} + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{L}_{k+1}^* * \mathcal{X}_c * \mathcal{R}_{k+1}^* \|_F^2.$$
 (25)

According to (24), we can get  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}$ :

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{L}_{k+1}^* * (\mathcal{X}_k + \frac{\mathcal{Y}_k}{\mu_k}) * \mathcal{R}_{k+1}^*$$
(26)

From (23) and (26), we can know that  $R'' = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}$ .

Suppose that the tensor  $\mathcal{D}$  can be decomposed as follows:

$$\mathcal{D} = \sum_{k=1}^{r} \mathcal{D}^k,\tag{27}$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{ijk} = \delta_{j,k} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{ijk} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_{ijk}, & j = k \\ 0, & j \neq k. \end{cases}$$
 (28)

From (17), (27) and (28), we can simplify the Problem(25) as a Frobenius norm minimization problem:

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{k+1}^{j} = \arg\min_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{j}} \frac{1}{\mu_{k}} \left\| \hat{\mathcal{D}}^{j} \right\|_{F} + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \hat{\mathcal{D}}^{j} - \hat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{T}}^{j} \right\|_{F}^{2}, \hat{\mathcal{D}} = \mathbf{fft}(\mathcal{D}, 3)$$

$$(29)$$

The  $l^{th}$  frontal slice of  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{k+1}^{j}$  can be represented as follow [32]:

$$\mathcal{D}_{k+1}^{j}^{(l)} = \mathbf{ifft} \left( \max \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}^{j}^{(l)} \right\|_{F} - \frac{1}{\mu}, 0 \right\} \cdot \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}^{j}^{(l)}}{\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}^{j}^{(l)} \right\|_{F}}, 3 \right), l = 1, \cdots, n_{3}$$

$$(30)$$

The iteration speed of (30) will be much faster than traditional tensor decomposition. And then we update  $\mathcal{X}_{k+1}$  as follow:

$$\mathcal{X}_{k+1} = \mathcal{L}_{k+1} * \mathcal{D}_{k+1} * \mathcal{R}_{k+1} - (\mathcal{L}_{k+1} * \mathcal{D}_{k+1} * \mathcal{R}_{k+1}) \circ \mathcal{A} + M \circ \mathcal{A}$$

$$\tag{31}$$

where A is mentioned in (9).

In the final step, we update  $\mathcal{Y}_{k+1}$  and  $\mu_{k+1}$  with ADMM method:

$$\mathcal{Y}_{k+1} = \mathcal{Y}_k + \mu_k \left( \mathcal{X}_{k+1} - \mathcal{L}_{k+1} * \mathcal{D}_{k+1} * \mathcal{R}_{k+1} \right)$$
 (32)

$$\mu_{k+1} = \rho \mu_k, \quad \rho \ge 1 \tag{33}$$

The whole tensor completion process above can be regarded as a modified ADMM method. Combining the QRLS sampling mathod that we propose, we can get the global algorithm for network latency estimation problem called LNLS-TQR in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3: Tensor  $L_{2,1}$ -Norm minimization and Leverage Sampling based on Tensor QR Decomposition (LNLS-TQR)

```
Input: \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}.
```

**Output:** The recovered tensor  $\mathcal{X}$ .

```
1: Initialize: The tubal rank r > 0. k = 0, c_0 > 0, l > 0, \mu > 0, \rho > 0. The positive tolerance \epsilon > 0, \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}, \mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times r \times n_3}, \mathcal{D}_1 = \mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r \times n_3}, \mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n_2 \times n_3}, \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}.

2: [\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{A}] = \text{QRLS}(\mathcal{X}).

3: while \|\mathcal{L}_k * \mathcal{D}_k * \mathcal{R}_k - \mathcal{X}_k\|_F^2 \ge \epsilon and k > l do

4: [L_{k+1}, \sim] = \text{t-QR}\left(\left(\mathcal{X}_k + \frac{\mathcal{Y}_k}{\mu_k}\right) * \mathcal{R}_k^*\right)

5: [\mathcal{R}_{k+1}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^*] = \text{t-QR}\left(\left(\mathcal{X}_k + \frac{\mathcal{Y}_k}{\mu_k}\right)^* * \mathcal{L}_{k+1}\right)

6: for t = 1, ..., r do
```

7: 
$$\mathbf{for} \ j=1,...,r \ \mathbf{do}$$
8: 
$$\mathcal{D}_{k+1}^{j}{}^{(l)} = \mathbf{ifft} \left( \max \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}^{j}{}^{(l)} \right\|_{F} - \frac{1}{\mu}, 0 \right\} \cdot \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}^{j}{}^{(l)}}{\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}^{j}{}^{(l)} \right\|_{F}}, 3 \right), \quad l=1,\cdots,n_{3}$$
9: 
$$\mathbf{end} \ \mathbf{for}$$

10: end for

11: 
$$\mathcal{X}_{k+1} = \mathcal{L}_{k+1} * \mathcal{D}_{k+1} * \mathcal{R}_{k+1} - (\mathcal{L}_{k+1} * \mathcal{D}_{k+1} * \mathcal{R}_{k+1}) \circ \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{X}_1;$$

12: 
$$\mathcal{Y}_{k+1} = \mathcal{Y}_k + \mu_k \left( \mathcal{X}_{k+1} - \mathcal{L}_{k+1} * \mathcal{D}_{k+1} * \mathcal{R}_{k+1} \right);$$

- 13:  $\mu_{k+1} = \rho \mu_k$ ;
- 14: end while
- 15: **return**  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_k$ .

## C. Analysis of computational complexity

In Algorithm 2, the main complexity of QRLS mainly concentrate on Step 8 rather than computing the leverage scores, which costs  $O\left((n_1+n_2)r^2n_3\right)$  [32]. In the application of network estimation, the complexity will be  $O\left(2nr^2n_3\right)$  because  $n=n_1=n_2$ . The complexity of tensor leverage sampling is  $O\left((n_3-1)(2nr-r^2)\log^2(nn_3)\right)\approx O\left(2rnn_3\log(nn_3)\right)$  [11], which is not the main cost of QRLS. Thus, the per-iteration complexity of QRLS in network latency estimation is  $O\left(2nr^2n_3+(n_3-1)(2nr-r^2)\log^2(nn_3)\right)$ .

In Algorithm 3, the main cost is in step 4, step 5, step 11 and step 12. Step 4 costs  $O\left(n_1n_2rn_3 + 2n_2r^2n_3\right)$  and step 5 costs  $O\left(n_1n_2rn_3 + 2n_1r^2n_3\right)$ , namely  $O\left(n^2rn_3 + 2nr^2n_3\right)$  in our application. Step 11 and step 12 costs  $O\left(n_1n_2rn_3 + n_1r^2n_3\right)$ , namely  $O\left(n^2rn_3 + n_1r^2n_3\right)$  in our application.

#### IV. EXPERIMENTS

To demonstrate the feasibility of our approach, several comparative experiments including synthetic and real datasets, were performed. The results were compared with the running time and the relative square error (RSE), i.e.,  $RSE = \sqrt{\frac{\|\mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{X}\|_F^2}{\|\mathcal{X}\|_F^2}}$ , where  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  are the completed tensor and the real tensor respectively.

We perform our method on MATLAB 2021b platform equipped with an Intel (R) Core (TM) i7-11800H CPU and 32.0 GB of RAM.

## A. Experiments with a synthetic dataset

Since the tensor model of network latency estimation has been proved to have the property of approximately low rank [11], we can use tensor completion method to solve this problem. Besides, the key subroutine of our method CTSVD-QR has also been proved convergent [32].

For the original tensor  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ , we choose  $n_1 = n_2 = 50$ , and  $n_3 = 10$ . We normalized the data before complete the tensor. In our method, we choose  $\mu = 0.01$ ,  $\beta = 0.10$  and  $\rho = 1.50$ . In addition, we test whether the tensor completion results will be disturbed greatly under Gaussian noise  $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$  where  $\mathcal{N} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma)$  with  $\mu = 0$ , and  $\sigma = 0.01$ .

The speed of the algorithm is represented by the interval of one iteration of an algorithm, and the accuracy of the algorithm is represented by RSE with the changeable sampling rate with tubal-rank r = 5. Table I demonstrates the running time of one iteration of the dataset through recent four algorithms equipped with speed and precision. Figure 3 depicts the average accuracy of the four algorithms for numerous iterations.

TABLE I: Running time and RSE value for the synthetic dataset in average.

Algorithm	Running Time (seconds)	RSE value
LNLS-TQR	0.03334	0.2107
Random sampling+ADMM	0.2716	0.2409
Leverage sampling+ADMM	0.2923	0.1928
Random sampling+ALM	4.5411	0.3030

It is clear that our method is obviously much faster than others while the precision of it is also satisfactory. Our method performs great at high sampling rates and performs acceptable at low sampling rates. The results is in line with expectations because the speed of tensor QR decomposition(t-QR) is  $O(2n_1n_2^2n_3)$  while that of t-SVD is  $O(2n_1n_2^2n_3)$ , which means t-QR will fater than t-SVD for nearly 10 times. In addition, t-QR is used to approximate t-SVD. Thus, t-QR will not be more accurate than t-SVD but the effect of approximation is satisfactory. Figure 4 indicates that our method suffers very little from the noise.




Figure 3: Accuracy for the synthetic dataset without noise

# B. Experiments with a real dataset

Here, our method will be evaluated by the real Seattle dataset [11], [3]. The Seattle latency dataset includes the round-trip times (RTTs) between 99 personal devices over 3 hours in Seattle [3]. There are 688 latency matrices in this dataset that become a third order tensor  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{99 \times 99 \times 688}$  and the low-rank property has been fully proved [11]. We randomly choose 10 sequential frontal slices of the tensor in the Seattle dataset, namely 10 groups of sequential time frames.

Since getting the totally precise tubal-rank of a tensor is a NP-hard problem and the time slots will not be too much in the estimation of network latency, we estimate the tubal-rank by experiments from 1 to 10 in Figure 5. We can see that our algorithm performs well when the rank is 1 to 5 and we can judge that the approximate tubal-rank of this dataset is in this range. r = 3 is the best case, but in fact, we may not be able to find the optimal estimated rank in all cases, so in the following experiment, we choose r = 2 with medium performance as our estimated rank.

For the sake of the optimal effect of the algorithms, we still choose  $\mu$ =0.01,  $\beta$ =0.10 and  $\rho$ =1.50. The comparison result of recent algorithms in terms of speed is shown in Table II and the comparison conclusion of recent algorithms in terms of accuracy is shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7. We can judge that our algorithm is obviously faster than others with a satisfied precision. At the same time, our algorithm also has high accuracy, especially when the




Figure 4: Accuracy for the synthetic dataset with noise

sampling rate is greater than or equal to 0.4. The precision at low sampling rate is also satisfactory. Figure 7 also illustrate that our method has a strong resistance to noise.

TABLE II: Running time and RSE value for the real dataset in average.

Algorithm	Running Time (seconds)	RSE value
LNLS-TQR	0.1011	0.3647
Random sampling+ADMM	0.9798	0.4894
Leverage sampling+ADMM	1.041	0.3247
Random sampling+ALM	7.244	0.7980

# V. CONCLUSION

In this papper, we propose a new method for network latency estimation. This method includes the fast leverage sampling strategy and tensor QR decomposition. The network latency estimation can be abstracted into a tensor




Figure 5: The relationship between estimated rank and RSE

completion problem. The purpose of the fast leverage sampling is to collect more informative nodes efficiently, and tensor QR decomposition is to approximate t-SVD that is a critical subroutine of tensor decomposition with high precision, and then the tensor completion problem can be solved better. The advantage of our method is that it has several times the speed up and little accuracy loss compared to t-SVD and tensor ADMM. In addition, we use synthetic and real-world datasets to evaluate our method. The experiment witnesses the fast speed and high accuracy of our method.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Boyd, Stephen P., Neal Parikh, Eric King-Wah Chu, Borja Peleato and Jonathan Eckstein. "Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers." Found. Trends Mach. Learn. 3 (2011): 1-122.
- [2] Candès, Emmanuel J. and Benjamin Recht. "Exact matrix completion via convex optimization." Foundations of Computational Mathematics 9 (2008): 717-772.
- [3] Cappos, Justin, Ivan Beschastnikh, Arvind Krishnamurthy and Tom Anderson. "Seattle: a platform for educational cloud computing." Technical symposium on computer science education (2009).
- [4] Grasedyck, Lars, Melanie Kluge and Sebastian Krämer. "Variants of alternating least squares tensor completion in the tensor train format." SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 37 (2015): n. pag.
- [5] Gürsun, Gonca and Mark Crovella. "On traffic matrix completion in the internet." Proceedings of the 2012 Internet Measurement Conference (2012): n. pag.




Figure 6: Completion error for the Seattle dataset without noise

- [6] Hurtig, Per, Karl-Johan Grinnemo, Anna Brunstrom, Simone Ferlin, Özgü Alay and Nicolas Kuhn. "Low-latency scheduling in MPTCP." IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking 27 (2019): 302-315.
- [7] Kilmer, Misha Elena and Carla D. Moravitz Martin. "Factorization strategies for third-order tensors." Linear Algebra and its Applications 435 (2011): 641-658.
- [8] Kilmer, Misha Elena, Karen S. Braman, Ning Hao and Randy C. Hoover. "Third-order tensors as operators on matrices: A theoretical and computational framework with applications in tmaging." SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. 34 (2013): 148-172.
- [9] Leurgans, Sue E., Robert T. Ross and R. B. Abel. "A decomposition for three-way arrays." SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications 14 (1993): 1064-1083.
- [10] Liao, Yongjun, Wei Du, Pierre Geurts and Guy Leduc. "DMFSGD: a decentralized matrix factorization algorithm for network distance prediction." IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking 21 (2012): 1511-1524.
- [11] Lei, Deng, Zheng Haifeng, Xiao-Yang Liu, Feng Xinxin and Zhizhang David Chen. "Network latency estimation with leverage sampling for personal devices: an adaptive tensor completion approach." IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking 28 (2020): 2797-2808.
- [12] Lin, Huiyu, Lei Deng, Lingzhen Wang, Haifeng Zheng and Xinxin Feng. "Robust spatial-temporal graph-tensor recovery for network latency estimation." GLOBECOM 2022 2022 IEEE Global Communications Conference (2022): 4202-4207.
- [13] Liu, Bang, Di Niu, Zongpeng Li and H. Vicky Zhao. "Network latency prediction for personal devices: distance-feature decomposition from 3D sampling." 2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM) (2015): 307-315.
- [14] Liu, Guangcan, Zhouchen Lin and Yong Yu. "Robust subspace segmentation by low-rank representation." International Conference on Machine Learning (2010).
- [15] Liu, Qing, Franck Davoine, Jian Yang, Ying Cui, Zhong Jin and Fei Han. "A fast and accurate matrix completion method based on QR decomposition and  $L_{2,1}$  -norm minimization." IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems 30 (2019): 803-817.




Figure 7: Completion error for the Seattle dataset with noise

- [16] Liu, Xiao-Yang, S. Aeron, Vaneet Aggarwal, Xiaodong Wang and Minyou Wu. "Adaptive sampling of RF fingerprints for fine-grained indoor localization." IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing 15 (2015): 2411-2423.
- [17] Liu, Xiao-Yang, S. Aeron, Vaneet Aggarwal and Xiaodong Wang. "Low-tubal-rank tensor completion using alternating minimization." IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 66 (2016): 1714-1737.
- [18] Lu, Canyi, Jiashi Feng, Yudong Chen, W. Liu, Zhouchen Lin and Shuicheng Yan. "Tensor robust principal component analysis with a new tensor nuclear norm." IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence 42 (2018): 925-938.
- [19] Mao, Yun and Lawrence K. Saul. "Modeling distances in large-scale networks by matrix factorization." ACM/SIGCOMM Internet Measurement Conference (2004).
- [20] McPherson, Sean and Antonio Ortega. "Improved Internet traffic analysis via optimized sampling." 2010 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (2010): 3618-3621.
- [21] Shahzad, Muhammad and Alex X. Liu. "Noise can help: accurate and efficient per-flow latency measurement without packet probing and time stamping." Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems (2014).
- [22] Tripathi, Ruchi and Ketan Rajawat. "Dynamic network latency prediction with adaptive matrix completion." 2018 International Conference on Signal Processing and Communications (SPCOM) (2018): 407-411.
- [23] Tucker, Ledyard R.. "Some mathematical notes on three-mode factor analysis." Psychometrika 31 (1966): 279-311.
- [24] Wang, Wenqi, Vaneet Aggarwal and S. Aeron. "Efficient low rank tensor ring completion." 2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV) (2017): 5698-5706.
- [25] Xie, Dongxiu, Hugo J. Woerdeman and An-Bao Xu. "Parametrized quasi-soft thresholding operator for compressed sensing and matrix completion." Computational and Applied Mathematics 39 (2020): 1-24.

- [26] Xie, Kun, Lele Wang, Xin Wang, Gaogang Xie, Guangxin Zhang, Dongliang Xie and Jigang Wen. "Sequential and adaptive sampling for matrix completion in network monitoring systems." 2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM) (2015): 2443-2451.
- [27] Xie, Kun, Lele Wang, Xin Wang, Gaogang Xie, Jigang Wen, Guangxin Zhang, Jiannong Cao and Dafang Zhang. "Accurate recovery of Internet traffic data: a sequential tensor completion approach." IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking 26 (2018): 793-806.
- [28] Xu, An-Bao and Dongxiu Xie. "Low-rank approximation pursuit for matrix completion." Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing 95 (2017): 77-89.
- [29] Xu, An-Bao. "Tensor completion via a low-Rank approximation pursuit." ArXiv abs/2004.08872 (2020): n. pag.
- [30] Zhang, Yin, Matthew Roughan, Walter Willinger and Lili Qiu. "Spatio-temporal compressive sensing and internet traffic matrices." Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication (2009).
- [31] Zheng, Haifeng, Min Gao, Zhizhang David Chen, Xiao-Yang Liu and Xinxin Feng. "An adaptive sampling scheme via approximate volume sampling for fingerprint-based indoor localization." IEEE Internet of Things Journal 6 (2019): 2338-2353.
- [32] Zheng, Yongming and An-Bao Xu. "Tensor completion via tensor QR decomposition and L2, 1-norm minimization." Signal Process. 189 (2020): 108240.
- [33] Zhou, Huibin, Dafang Zhang, Kun Xie and Yuxiang Chen. "Spatio-temporal tensor completion for imputing missing internet traffic data." 2015 IEEE 34th International Performance Computing and Communications Conference (IPCCC) (2015): 1-7.
- [34] Zhu, Rui, Bang Liu, Di Niu, Zongpeng Li and Hong Vicky Zhao. "Network latency estimation for personal devices: a matrix completion approach." IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking 25 (2017): 724-737.