University of Wisconsin-Madison

Lecturer: Benjamin Recht

#### CS838 Topics In Optimization: Convex Geometry in High-Dimensional Data Analysis

February 9, 2010

Scribe: Jesse Holzer

## Lecture 7

#### 1 Norms on $\mathbb{R}^n$

We will make use of all of the following norms

$$|x|| = ||x||_2 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2\right)^{1/2}$$
$$||x||_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|$$
$$||x||_{\infty} = \max_{i=1\dots n} |x_i|$$

Fact 1. If x is s-sparse then

$$\|x\|_{\infty} \le \|x\|_{2} \le \|x\|_{1} \le \sqrt{s} \|x\|_{2} \le s \|x\|_{\infty}.$$

These inequalities can all be verified immediately from the definitions of the norms.

### 2 Compressed sensing

Given  $p, n, A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}, b \in \mathbb{R}^m, \epsilon \ge 0$  the archetypal problem of compressed sensing is the following:

$$\begin{array}{l} \min \quad \operatorname{card}(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \|Ax - b\|_2 \le \epsilon. \end{array}$$
 (1)

As a relaxation, or, really, surrogate, of (1), we consider the following problem:

$$\min_{\substack{\|x\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \|Ax - b\|_2 \le \epsilon. } }$$

$$(2)$$

Now, why is (2) a sensible surrogate for (1)? In a sense, the  $l^1$  norm is the best convex relaxation of the card function, which is not convex:

**Fact 2.** If  $f: [-1,1]^n \to \mathbb{R}$  is convex and  $f(x) \leq \operatorname{card}(x)$ , then  $f(x) \leq ||x||_1$ .

Proof (Sid Barman, next lecture). The main idea is to express |x| as a convex combination of the vertices of  $[0,1]^n$ .

Also, the  $l^1$  unit ball is the convex hull of the length-one cardinality-one vectors:

Fact 3.  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : ||x||_1 \le 1\} = \operatorname{conv}\{e_1, -e_1, \dots, e_n, -e_n\}$ 

*Proof.* Any nonzero x in the  $l^1$  unit ball satisfies

$$x = \sum_{i} \frac{|x_i|}{\|x\|_1} \operatorname{sgn}(x_i) e_i,$$

and, conversely, if

$$x = \sum_{i} (c_i - d_i)e_i$$

with  $c, d \ge 0$  and  $1^T(c+d) = 1$ , then  $||x||_1 = 1^T |c-d| \le 1$ .

And, we can draw pictures that suggest that a minimum-cardinality solution to a random linear system is likely also to be a minimum  $l^1$ -norm solution. We now try to formalize this observation.

### **3** Restricted isometry property

**Definition 1.** Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ ,  $s \ge 0$ . The s-restricted isometry constant  $\delta_s$  of A is the smallest nonnegative number  $\delta$  such that

$$(1-\delta)\|x\|_2 \le \|Ax\|_2 \le (1+\delta)\|x\|_2$$

for all x with  $\operatorname{card}(x) \leq s$ . If  $\delta_s < 1$ , then A is said to be an s-restricted isometry and to have the s-restricted isometry property (RIP).

**Fact 4.** If  $s \leq s'$  then  $\delta_s \leq \delta_{s'}$ .

How might we check s-RIP? For  $I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$  let  $A_I$  be the submatrix of A consisting of those columns of A with indices in I. Check the extreme singular values of all  $A_I$ , |I| = s. Then  $\delta_s$  is the smallest number  $\delta$  such that all these values lie in  $[1 - \delta, 1 + \delta]$ .

The point of RIP is that it sometimes ensures that the solution set to (1) is well-behaved. For example:

**Proposition 1.** Suppose A has 2s-RIP constant  $\delta_{2s} < 1$ . If Ax = b has a solution  $x_0$  with  $\operatorname{card}(x_0) \leq s$ , then  $x_0$  is the only such solution.

*Proof.* Suppose there exists z with  $\operatorname{card}(z) \leq s$  and Az = b. Then  $\operatorname{card}(z - x_0) \leq 2s$  so by RIP,

$$0 = ||Az - Ax_0||_2 = ||A(z - x_0)||_2 \ge (1 - \delta_{2s})||z - x_0||_2$$

so  $z = x_0$ .

A subtler example of this principle is the following:

**Theorem 2** (Candes, Romberg, Tao [?]). Suppose A has 4s-RIP constant  $\delta_{4s} \leq \frac{1}{4}$ . Suppose

$$x_0 \in \operatorname{argmin}_x \{\operatorname{card}(x) : Ax = b\}$$

and

$$x_1 \in \operatorname{argmin}_x\{\|x\|_1 : Ax = b\}$$

If  $\operatorname{card}(x_0) \leq s$  then  $x_1 = x_0$ .

*Proof.* In the proof of the previous proposition, we used RIP on  $z - x_0$ . We would like to do so here on

$$r = x_1 - x_0,$$

but we can't since r is not sparse. Instead the strategy will be to use RIP on sparse pieces of r, absorbing the smaller such pieces into the largest. So, for any vector  $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and any index set  $I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ , define  $p_I \in \mathbb{R}^n$  by

$$(p_I)_j = \begin{cases} p_j & j \in I \\ 0 & j \notin I \end{cases}$$

Let  $I = \text{supp}(x_0)$ . Then, since  $x_0$  and  $r_{I^c}$  have disjoint supports,

$$|x_0||_1 \ge ||x_1||_1 = ||x_0 + r||_1 \ge ||x_0 + r_{I^c}||_1 - ||r_I||_1 = ||x_0||_1 + ||r_{I^c}||_1 - ||r_I||_1,$$

 $\mathbf{SO}$ 

$$||r_{I^c}||_1 \le ||r_I||_1.$$

Now partition  $I^c$  into sets  $I_k, k = 1, 2, ...,$  of size 3s (except for the last one, which may be smaller), so that

$$|r_j| \ge |r_{j'}|$$
 if  $j \in I_k$  and  $j' \in I_{k'}$  with  $k \le k'$ .

Then for all  $j' \in I_{k+1}$ ,

$$|r_{j'}| \le \frac{1}{3s} \sum_{j \in I_k} |r_j|,$$

i.e.

$$||r_{I_{k+1}}||_{\infty} \le \frac{1}{3s} ||r_{I_k}||_1,$$

 $\mathbf{SO}$ 

$$||r_{I_{k+1}}||_2 \le \sqrt{3s} ||r_{I_{k+1}}||_\infty \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{3s}} ||r_{I_k}||_1.$$

Then, using our earlier estimate of  $r_{I^c}$  in terms of  $r_I$ , we are able to absorb the small pieces of r into the main one, with, crucially, a factor less than 1:

$$\sum_{k \ge 2} \|r_{I_k}\|_2 \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{3s}} \sum_{k \ge 1} \|r_{I_k}\|_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3s}} \|r_{I^c}\|_1 \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{3s}} \|r_I\|_1 \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{3s}} \|r_I\|_2.$$

Finally,

$$0 = \|Ax_1 - Ax_0\|_2 = \|A(r_I + r_{I_1}) + \sum_{k \ge 2} Ar_{I_k}\|_2$$
  

$$\geq \|A(r_I + r_{I_1})\|_2 - \sum_{k \ge 2} \|Ar_{I_k}\|_2$$
  

$$\geq (1 - \delta_{4s})\|r_I + r_{I_1}\|_2 - (1 + \delta_{3s})\sum_{k \ge 2} \|r_{I_k}\|_2$$
  

$$\geq (1 - \delta_{4s})\|r_I\|_2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(1 + \delta_{4s})\|r_I\|_2$$
  

$$\geq c(\delta_{4s})\|r_I\|_2,$$

where  $c(\delta) > 0$  as long as  $\delta < (1 - 1/\sqrt{3})/(1 + 1/\sqrt{3}) = 0.26795...$  Hence  $r_I = 0$ , so  $r_{I^c} = 0$ , so r = 0.

# References

 E. J. Candès, J. Romberg, and T. Tao. Robust uncertainty principles: exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 52(2):489–509, 2006.