



CTG Reading Group  
Electrical and Computer Engineering

A discussion on “Near-Optimal Signal Recovery From Random Projections: Universal Encoding Strategies?” by Candes and Tao (IEEE Trans. IT, Dec 2006).

Anand Oka (Ph.D. Candidate)  
29 February 2008

# Outline

- Motivation

Questions that this paper answers:

- What is Compressed Sensing?
- How does it work? (answer is easy)
- Why does it work? (answer is subtle)
- Some revolutionary applications

# Motivation

- Consider example of a digital camera ...
- Tens of mega-pixels of *raw data* is sampled. Then *transform coded* to say 10 kilo-pixels. Thus most of the raw data is “thrown out” ...
- The optimal transform *depends on type of scene*.
- What if we directly measure relevant linear functionals, perhaps via *analog processing*?  
Bonus: make the transform universal!
- Result: extremely sensitive SINGLE-PIXEL camera!

# What is CS?

- An efficient way to encode and reconstruct *sparse* signals.
- *Universal Encoder!* Only the decoder needs to know the *sparsity basis*.
- Reconstruction algorithm is *tractable*.
- *Robust* to erasures or errors in encoded data.

# How does it work?

$\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  is said to be a sparse family with sparsity  $|T|$  in the basis formed by the columns of an  $N \times N$  orthonormal matrix  $\Phi$  if

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \|\Phi^T f\|_0 = |T|.$$

Let  $F_\Omega$  be a  $K \times N$  random measurement matrix with i.i.d entries with bounded variance, say  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/N)$ .

Let  $K$  measurements be obtained for a generic  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  as  $y = F_\Omega f$ .

Let the reconstruction be made by the *basis pursuit* linear program:

$$\hat{f} = \arg \min_{g: F_\Omega g = y} \|\Phi^T g\|_1$$

# Guarantees

If

$$|T| \leq \alpha \frac{K}{\log N}$$

where  $\alpha$  is a positive constant independent of  $f$ , then

$$\hat{f} = f$$

with probability  $1 - O(N^{-\rho/\alpha})$ , where  $\rho > 0$  is a universal constant.

**Paraphrase: With a small oversampling factor we can achieve exact reconstruction with high probability.**

# What if strict sparsity is not satisfied by signals?

Suppose signals satisfy a power law decay

$$|(\Phi^T f)_n| \leq R n^{-1/p}$$

where  $R, p$  are some positive parameters.

Then with probability  $1 - O(N^{-\rho/\alpha})$  the reconstruction MSE satisfies

$$\|f - \hat{f}\|_2 \leq C_{p,\alpha} R \left( \frac{K}{\log N} \right)^{-r}$$

where  $r = 1/p - 1/2$ .

**Paraphrase: With a small oversampling factor the MSE decays just as in transform coding.**

# How does it work?

## Heuristics ...

- Close analogy to the technique of *holography*.
- Main requirement: sparsity basis should be *incoherent* w.r.t. the measurement ensemble. (That's weird!)
- The energy of each sparsity basis element should be more or less evenly distributed in all linear measurement functionals.
- CS works because a random measurement ensemble is *universally decoherent w.r.t. any sparsity basis*.



# How does it work?

## The math (theorem 1.2) ...

Recall *uncertainty principle* from signal processing: A signal with a small support in time must necessarily have a wide frequency support.

While this holds *automatically* for time-frequency, we can *axiomatize* this property:

$F_\Omega$  is said to satisfy the **Uniform Uncertainty Principle** if, with probability  $1 - O(N^{-\rho/\alpha})$ ,

$$|T| \leq \alpha \frac{K}{\lambda} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \frac{K}{N} \leq \lambda_{\min}(F_\Omega F_\Omega^T) \leq \lambda_{\max}(F_\Omega F_\Omega^T) \leq \frac{3}{2} \frac{K}{N}$$

# How it works? (contd.)

Another related axiom is the Exact Reconstruction Property (ERP). In some cases, but not always, ERP is implied by UUP.

Paraphrase of Theorem 1.2:  
CS “works” (in the sense described earlier) for signal families with power law decay provided the measurement ensemble satisfies the UUP and ERP properties.

So remaining job is to prove that a random ensemble does satisfy UUP and ERP.

# How it works? (contd.)

The good news (Lemma 4.1- 4.3): Random ensembles (Gaussian, binary and others) *do satisfy* UUP for *any sparsity basis*.

Reason: Marchenko-Pastur law

The limiting density (as  $K \rightarrow \infty, K/N \rightarrow \beta$ ) of eigen values of a  $K \times K$  S.P.D. matrix  $F_\Omega F_\Omega^T$ , where entries of the  $K \times N$  random matrix  $F_\Omega$  are i.i.d. with variance  $1/N$ , is given by

$$f_\beta(x) = \frac{\sqrt{(x-a)(b-x)}}{2\pi x}$$

on support  $[a, b]$  and is identically zero elsewhere, where  $a = (1 - \sqrt{\beta})^2$  and  $b = (1 + \sqrt{\beta})^2$ .

# Some interesting open questions ...

- Will UUP and ERP hold for carefully selected non-random (deterministic) measurement ensembles?
- Will dependencies in ensemble be catastrophic?
- How much can the oversampling factor be reduced if we have knowledge of the *locations* of sparse entries?
- Most important: What is the relation of CS to information theoretic source compression? What about fountain encoders?
- Most important: Can we *prove* uniform robustness to errors/erasures of measurements?

# Some revolutionary applications

- Extremely Sensitive but universal imaging and detection, e.g. in medicine, astronomy etc (By hugely reducing number of sensors, we can make each sensor ultra sensitive.)
- Data extraction from Wireless Sensor Networks
- Universal and Encrypted compression
- Reliable Micro Array Analysis of gene expression

# Prominent researchers ...

- Candes, Tao, Romberg (Caltech, UCLA)
- Donoho (Stanford)
- Baranuik (Rice)
- Also many from EE and IT field, e.g. Tarokh (Harvard)

*Thank You ...!*