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First, we will finish the proof of the guarantee of the Iterative Hard Thresholding algorithm from Lecture 12.

## 1 Iterative Hard Thresholding: proof cont'd

Recall that the goal is to recover the $k$-sparse vector $x$ from an observed measurement $y=\Pi x+e$ where $e$ is the post-measurement noise and $\Pi$ satisfies $(\varepsilon, 3 k)$-RIP with $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4 \sqrt{2}}$.

In Lecture 12, we proved that the residual error $r^{(t)}=x-x^{(t)}$ satisfies the following inequality:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|r^{(t+1)}\right\|_{2} \leq 2\left\|\left(I_{B^{(t+1)}}-\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}^{\top} \Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}\right) r_{B^{(t+1)}}^{(t)}\right\|_{2}+2\left\|\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}^{\top} \Pi_{B^{(t)} \backslash B^{(t+1)}} r_{B^{(t)} \backslash B^{(t+1)}}^{(t)}\right\|_{2}+2\left\|\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}^{\top} e_{B^{(t+1)}}\right\|_{2} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We bound each one of the three terms.
Claim 1 (Claim 3, Lecture 12). $\left\|\left(I_{B^{(t+1)}}-\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}^{\top} \Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}\right) r_{B^{(t+1)}}^{(t)}\right\|_{2} \leq \varepsilon\left\|r_{B^{(t+1)}}^{(t)}\right\|_{2}$.
Claim 2. $\left\|\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}^{\top} \Pi_{B^{(t)} \backslash B^{(t+1)}} r_{B^{(t)} \backslash B^{(t+1)}}^{\left(\|_{2}\right.}\right\|_{2} \leq \varepsilon\left\|r_{B^{(t)} \backslash B^{(t+1)}}^{(t)}\right\|_{2}$.
Proof. Similarly to Lemma 2 from Lecture 11, since $\Pi$ satisfies the ( $\varepsilon, 3 k$ )-RIP, for any $2 k$-sparse vectors $u$ and $v$ with disjoint support:

$$
\left|u \Pi^{\top} \Pi v\right| \leq \varepsilon\|u\|_{2}\|v\|_{2}
$$

In particular, if we consider arbitrary $u$ with support $(u) \subseteq B^{(t+1)}$ and $v$ with support $(v) \subseteq B^{(t)} \backslash$ $B^{(t+1)}$ :

$$
\left\|\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}^{\top} \Pi_{B^{(t)} \backslash B^{(t+1)}}\right\|=\sup _{\|u\|_{2}=\|v\|_{2}=1}\left|u \Pi^{\top} \Pi v\right| \leq \varepsilon
$$

Therefore,

$$
\left\|\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}^{\top} \Pi_{B^{(t)} \backslash B^{(t+1)}} r_{B^{(t)} \backslash B^{(t+1)}}^{(t)}\right\|_{2} \leq \varepsilon\left\|r_{B^{(t)} \backslash B^{(t+1)}}^{(t)}\right\|_{2}
$$

Claim 3. $\left\|\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}^{\top} e_{B^{(t+1)}}\right\|_{2} \leq(1+\varepsilon)\|e\|_{2}$.
Proof. It holds that $\left\|\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}^{\top}\right\|=\left\|\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}\right\|$.
By the definition of the operator norm and for an arbitrary $2 k$-sparse vector $u$ with support $(u) \subseteq$ $B^{(t+1)},\left\|\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}\right\|=\sup _{\|u\|_{2}=1}\|\Pi u\|_{2} \leq(1+\varepsilon)$.

It follows that $\left\|\Pi_{B^{(t+1)}}^{\top} e_{B^{(t+1)}}\right\|_{2} \leq(1+\varepsilon)\left\|e_{B^{(t+1)}}\right\|_{2} \leq(1+\varepsilon)\|e\|_{2}$.
By Claims ??, ??, ??, and inequality (??), it follows that:

$$
\begin{array}{rlr}
\left\|r^{(t+1)}\right\|_{2} & \leq 2 \varepsilon\left(\left\|r_{B^{(t)}}^{(t+1)}\right\|_{2}+\left\|r_{B^{(t)} \backslash B^{(t+1)}}^{(t)}\right\|_{2}\right)+2(1+\varepsilon)\|e\|_{2} & \\
& \leq 2 \sqrt{2} \varepsilon\left\|r^{(t)}\right\|_{2}+2(1+\varepsilon)\|e\|_{2} & \text { (by the Pythagorean Theorem) } \\
& \leq \frac{\left\|r^{(t)}\right\|_{2}}{2}+3\|e\|_{2} & \text { (since } \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4 \sqrt{2}} \text { ) }
\end{array}
$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|r^{(t+1)}\right\|_{2} \leq 2^{-1}\left\|r^{(t)}\right\|_{2}+3\|e\|_{2} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

By induction, we will show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|r^{(t+1)}\right\|_{2} \leq 2^{-t}\left\|r^{(1)}\right\|_{2}+6\|e\|_{2} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

- Base Step: By (??), for $t=1,\left\|r^{(2)}\right\|_{2} \leq 2^{-1}\left\|r^{(1)}\right\|_{2}+3\|e\|_{2} \leq 2^{-1}\left\|r^{(1)}\right\|_{2}+6\|e\|_{2}$.
- Inductive Step: By (??), it holds that, $\left\|r^{(t+1)}\right\|_{2} \leq 2^{-1}\left\|r^{(t)}\right\|_{2}+3\|e\|_{2}$. By inductive hypothesis, $\left\|r^{(t)}\right\|_{2} \leq 2^{-t+1}\left\|r^{(1)}\right\|_{2}+6\|e\|_{2}$. Therefore, $\left\|r^{(t+1)}\right\|_{2} \leq 2^{-1}\left(2^{-t+1}\left\|r^{(1)}\right\|_{2}+6\|e\|_{2}\right)+3\|e\|_{2}=$ $2^{-t}\left\|r^{(1)}\right\|_{2}+6\|e\|_{2}$.

Hence, since $r^{(1)}=x-x^{(1)}=x$, we get that $\left\|r^{(t+1)}\right\|_{2} \leq 2^{-t}\|x\|_{2}+6\|e\|_{2}$ and this concludes the proof of Theorem 2 from Lecture 12.

## 2 Model Based Compressive Sensing

So far, the model we have assumed for our signal $x$ is the set of all vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ that are $k$-sparse. Would having more information about the structure of the signal help in its recovery? In the more general Model Based Compressive Sensing we assume some model $\mathcal{M}$. The number of rows of the matrix $\Pi$ grows as the logarithm of the size of an $\varepsilon$-net of $\mathcal{M}$. If the model $\mathcal{M}$ is the set of all $k$-sparse vectors, as before, then this quantity would be $\sim \log \left(\binom{n}{k}\right)$.
In the general case, the Model Based Iterative Hard Thresholding algorithm is:

```
Algorithm 1 Model Based Iterative Hard Thresholding
    \(x^{(1)} \leftarrow 0\)
    for \(t=1\) to \(T\) do
        \(a^{(t+1)} \leftarrow x^{(t)}+\Pi^{\top}\left(y-\Pi x^{(t)}\right)\)
        \(x^{(t+1)} \leftarrow P_{\mathcal{M}}\left(a^{(t+1)}\right)\)
    end for
```

Here, instead of the operator $H_{k}$, we have $P_{\mathcal{M}}$, which projects $a^{(t+1)}$ to $\mathcal{M}$.

One example of such a model is the "block sparsity" model, where we assume there exist $k$ nonzeros in the signal and each is in one of $\frac{k}{B}$ blocks of size $B$. Then, in order to recover the signal, one would have to guess the start of each of those blocks, so the number of measurements needed would be $\sim \frac{k}{B} \log \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)$. Another example is "tree sparsity". In the Tree Sparsity problem we are given a node-weighted tree of size $n$ and aim to output a tree of size $k$ with maximum weight ([?]). In this case, the number of measurements needed is $\sim k+\log (n)$.

## 3 Fast Algorithms for Linear Algebra Problems

### 3.1 Matrix Multiplication

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times p}$ be two matrices. Let $a_{i}$ denote row $i$ of $A$ and $b_{j}$ denote row $j$ of $B$. The goal is to compute (approximately) the product $A^{\top} B$.

We can compute the product exactly in $O(n d p)$ time. Furthermore, if the matrices are in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, then this computation takes $O\left(n^{\omega}\right)$ time, where $\omega=\log _{2}(7)$ for Strassen's algorithm. The state of the art algorithm for this problem achieves $\omega=2.3728639$.

We aim to compute a matrix $C$ such that with probability at least $1-\delta,\left\|C-A^{\top} B\right\|_{q} \leq \varepsilon\|A\|_{p}\|B\|_{p}$, for some norm $p$ and $q$.

### 3.1.1 Sampling Technique

We will compute a matrix $C$ as follows: we will sample the $i$-th term with probability $p_{i}$ (to be defined later) and whenever the $i$-th term is picked, we add $\frac{1}{p_{i}} a_{i} b_{i}^{\top}$ to the sum.
Then, we have the following claim.
Claim 4. $\mathbb{E}[C]=A^{\top} B$.

Proof. $\mathbb{E}[C]=\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}\left(\frac{1}{p_{i}} a_{i} b_{i}^{\top}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} b_{i}^{\top}=A^{\top} B$.
Claim 5. $\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|A^{\top} B-C\right\|_{F}^{2}\right]=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|a_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left\|b_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left(\frac{1}{p_{i}}-1\right)$.
Proof. Let $x_{i}$ be the indicator variable such that $x_{i}=1$ if the $i$-th term is picked, and $x_{i}=0$ otherwise.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|A^{\top} B-C\right\|_{F}^{2}\right] & =\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} b_{i}^{\top}\left(1-\frac{x_{i}}{p_{i}}\right)\right\|_{F}^{2}\right] \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{trace}\left(\left(a_{i} b_{i}^{\top}\left(1-\frac{x_{i}}{p_{i}}\right)\right)^{\top}\left(a_{j} b_{j}^{\top}\left(1-\frac{x_{j}}{p_{j}}\right)\right)\right)\right] \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1-\frac{x_{i}}{p_{i}}\right)^{2} \cdot \operatorname{trace}\left(b_{i} a_{i}^{\top}=\operatorname{trace}\left(M_{i} b_{i}^{\top}\right)\right]\right. \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1-\frac{x_{i}}{p_{i}}\right)^{2} \cdot\left\|a_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot \operatorname{trace}\left(M M^{\top}\right)\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1-\frac{x_{i}}{p_{i}}\right)^{2} \cdot\left\|a_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left\|b_{i}\right\|^{2}\right] \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|a_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left\|b_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1-\frac{x_{i}}{p_{i}}\right)^{2}\right] \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|a_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left\|b_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left(p_{i} \cdot\left(1-\frac{1}{p_{i}}\right)^{2}+\left(1-p_{i}\right) \cdot 1\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|a_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left\|b_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left(\left(p_{i}-1\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{p_{i}}\right)+\left(1-p_{i}\right)\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|a_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left\|b_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left(\left(p_{i}-1\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{p_{i}}-1\right)\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|a_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left\|b_{i}\right\|^{2} \cdot\left(\frac{1}{p_{i}}-1\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

To minimize the expression, we set $p_{i}=\frac{\left\|a_{i}\right\|\left\|b_{i}\right\|}{\sum_{i=1}^{\|}\left\|a_{i}\right\|\left\|b_{i}\right\|}$.
In the next lecture, we will present and prove the guarantee of the approximation matrix $C$.
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