

# Signal reconstruction from the magnitude of subspace components

Christine Bachoc

Joint work with Martin Ehler (Helmholtz Zentrum München).

Université Bordeaux I, IMB

IMS, National University of Singapore  
Large Scale Conic Optimization, 19-23 Novembre 2012

# Outline

- ▶ Problem formulation
- ▶ Configurations allowing for closed formulas
- ▶ Constructions
- ▶ SDP reconstruction for random configurations

# Problem formulation

- ▶ Given a set of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ :

$$\{V_j\}_{j=1}^n \quad V_j \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \dim(V_j) = k$$

- ▶ Given  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|x\| = 1$ , can we recover  $x$  (up to sign) from

$$\|P_{V_1}(x)\|, \dots, \|P_{V_n}(x)\| ?$$

- ▶ Aims: exact recovery versus probabilistic recovery.

# Goals

- ▶ **Exact recovery from a closed formula.** Requires special properties of  $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$  that nicely relate to cubature formulas, Grassmann designs, group representation.

Requires  $n \geq cd^2$ .

Extends and strengthens Balan, Bodmann, Casazza, Edidin (2009) for  $k = 1$

- ▶ **Recovery with high probability,** using semidefinite programming, under a random choice of  $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ .

Requires only  $n \geq cd \log(d)$ .

Follows the lines of Candès, Strohmer, Voroninski (2011) for  $k = 1$ .

Candes, Li (2012):  $n \geq c \log(d)$  is enough.

# Grassmann space

- ▶  $\mathcal{G}_{k,d}$  the space of subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of dimension  $k$ .
- ▶ The orthogonal group  $O(\mathbb{R}^d)$  acts transitively on  $\mathcal{G}_{k,d}$  and induces an **invariant probability measure**  $\sigma_k$ .
- ▶ **Polynomial functions**  $\text{Pol}_{\leq 2p}(\mathcal{G}_{k,d})$ .

**Definition:** A **cubature formula of strength  $2p$**  is a set  $\{(V_j, \omega_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  such that  $\omega_j > 0$ ,  $\sum_j \omega_j = 1$ , and

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}_{k,d}} f(V) d\sigma_k(V) = \sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j f(V_j) \quad \text{for all } f \in \text{Pol}_{\leq 2p}(\mathcal{G}_{k,d}).$$

$\omega_j = 1/n$ : **Grassmannian designs** (of strength  $2p$ ) (B., Coulangeon, Nebe 2002)

# Exact recovery

**Theorem:** (B., Ehler) Let  $\{(V_j, \omega_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  be a cubature formula of strength 4. Then,

$$P_x = \frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i \|P_{V_i}(x)\|^2 P_{V_i} - \frac{\beta}{\alpha} I_d$$

where  $\alpha = \frac{2k(d-k)}{d(d+2)(d-1)}$  and  $\beta = \frac{k(kd+k-2)}{d(d+2)(d-1)}$ .

**Sketch of proof:**

$V \rightarrow \langle P_x, P_V \rangle \langle P_y, P_V \rangle \in \text{Pol}_{\leq 4}(\mathcal{G}_{k,d})$  so:

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}_{k,d}} \langle P_x, P_V \rangle \langle P_y, P_V \rangle d\sigma_k(V) = \sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j \langle P_x, P_{V_j} \rangle \langle P_y, P_{V_j} \rangle.$$

$$\text{Let } K(x, y) := \int_{\mathcal{G}_{k,d}} \langle P_x, P_V \rangle \langle P_y, P_V \rangle d\sigma_k(V).$$

By  $O(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -invariance of  $\sigma_k$ , also  $K(x, y)$  is  $O(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -invariant. It shows that, for some constants  $\alpha, \beta$ ,

$$K(x, y) = \alpha(x^*y)^2 + \beta.$$

Leads to:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \underbrace{\omega_j \langle P_x, P_{V_j} \rangle \langle P_y, P_{V_j} \rangle}_{\langle \omega_j \|P_{V_j}(x)\|^2 P_{V_j}, P_y \rangle} = \underbrace{\alpha(x^*y)^2 + \beta}_{\langle \alpha P_x + \beta I, P_y \rangle}$$

It remains to compute  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  (easy).

# Exact recovery in presence of erasures

It is sometimes possible to recover  $\{\|P_{V_j}(x)\|\}_{j=1}^n$  **even if  $p$  of these values are missing**. It is the case when  $\{(V_j, \omega_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  is a **tight  $p$ -fusion frame**.

**Definition:** A **tight  $p$ -fusion frame** is a set  $\{(V_j, \omega_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  such that  $\omega_j > 0$ ,  $\sum_j \omega_j = 1$ , and

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}_{k,d}} f(V) d\sigma_k(V) = \sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j f(V_j) \quad \text{for all } f \in \text{Pol}_{\leq 2p}^1(\mathcal{G}_{k,d}).$$

where  $\text{Pol}_{\leq 2p}^1(\mathcal{G}_{k,d}) \subset \text{Pol}_{\leq 2p}(\mathcal{G}_{k,d})$  is the subspace 'generated' by  $\text{Pol}_{\leq 2p}(\mathcal{G}_{1,d})$ .

B., Ehler, *Tight  $p$ -fusion frames* (2011), arXiv:1201.1798



# Tight $p$ -fusion frames

Equivalent characterizations:

1.  $\{(V_j, \omega_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  is a **tight  $p$ -fusion frame**
2. There exists a constant  $A_p$  such that, for all  $x \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j \|P_{V_j}(x)\|^{2p} = A_p.$$

3. For all  $k = 1, \dots, p$ ,

$$\sum_{i,j} \omega_i \omega_j P_{(2k)}(\underline{y}(V_i, V_j)) = 0,$$

where  $P_{(2k)}(y_1, \dots, y_k)$  are certain multivariate Jacobi polynomials attached to  $\text{Pol}_{\leq 2p}^1(\mathcal{G}_{k,d})$  and  $\underline{y}(V_i, V_j) \in [0, 1]^k$  are the squared cosine of the **principal angles** between  $V_i$  and  $V_j$ .

# Tight $p$ -fusion frames

- ▶ The constant in 2. can take only the value:

$$A_p = \frac{\binom{k/2}{p}}{\binom{d/2}{p}} \quad (a)_p := a(a+1)\dots(a+p-1)$$

- ▶ From 3. we see that a tight  $p$ -fusion frame is also a tight  $\ell$ -fusion frame for  $\ell < p$ . So, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j \|P_{V_j}(x)\|^{2\ell} = A_\ell \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq p$$

- ▶ Extends the notion of **tight frames** ( $k = 1, p = 1$ ) and **tight fusion frames** ( $k \geq 2, p = 1$ ).

## Tight $p$ -fusion frames correct $p$ erasures

If the values  $\|P_{V_1}(x)\|, \dots, \|P_{V_p}(x)\|$  are missing, they can be recomputed by solving the following system of algebraic equations:

$$\begin{cases} \omega_1 T_1 + \dots + \omega_p T_p = A_1 - \sum_{j=p+1}^n \omega_j \|P_{V_j}(x)\|^2 \\ \omega_1 T_1^2 + \dots + \omega_p T_p^2 = A_2 - \sum_{j=p+1}^n \omega_j \|P_{V_j}(x)\|^4 \\ \dots\dots\dots \\ \omega_1 T_1^p + \dots + \omega_p T_p^p = A_p - \sum_{j=p+1}^n \omega_j \|P_{V_j}(x)\|^{2p} \end{cases}$$

There are only finitely many solutions (at most  $p!$ . Think of  $\omega_j = ct$ ).  
Moreover in the reconstruction process using

$$P_x = \frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i \|P_{V_i}(x)\|^2 P_{V_i} - \frac{\beta}{\alpha} I_d$$

it is likely that most solution will not give rise to a matrix of rank one.  
However it outputs **a list of candidate signals  $x$** .

# Existence and constructions

We want to adress the following questions:

- ▶ When do cubature formulas and tight  $p$ -fusion frames exist ?
- ▶ How can they be constructed ?

# Existence

## Theorem:

1. If  $\{(V_j, \omega_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  is a cubature formula of strength  $2p$ , then

$$n \geq \dim(\text{Pol}_{\leq p}(\mathcal{G}_{k,d})) \approx c_p d^p.$$

2. Such a configuration does exist, with number of elements

$$n \leq \dim(\text{Pol}_{\leq 2p}(\mathcal{G}_{k,d})) \approx c'_p d^{2p}.$$

$p = 2$ :  $n \geq p(p+1)/2$  and  $n \leq p^4/8$ .

Standard results. See [de la Harpe, Pache 2005] for a general framework where Grassmann spaces fit.

Existence result 2. is non constructive (uses Caratheodory theorem).

# Numerical constructions

Constructing a cubature formulas of strength say 4 amounts to solve an algebraic system of equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \{(V_j, \omega_j)\}_{j=1}^n \\ \text{cub. str. 4} \end{array} \right\} \iff \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j \varphi(V_j) = 0 \\ \text{for all } \varphi \in \text{Pol}_{\leq 4}^0(\mathcal{G}_{k,d}) \end{array} \right.$$
$$\iff \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j \varphi_\ell(V_j) = 0 \\ \text{for all } \ell = 1, \dots, \dim(\text{Pol}_{\leq 4}^0(\mathcal{G}_{k,d})) \end{array} \right.$$

where  $\text{Pol}_{\leq 4}^0(\mathcal{G}_{k,d}) := \{\varphi \in \text{Pol}_{\leq 4}(\mathcal{G}_{k,d}) : \int \varphi d\sigma_k(V) = 0\}$  and  $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_\ell, \dots\}$  is a basis of  $\text{Pol}_{\leq 4}^0(\mathcal{G}_{k,d})$ .

# Algebraic constructions

## Constructions using symmetries:

- ▶ Let  $G$  be a finite subgroup of  $O(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Can  $\{(V_j, \omega_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  afford  $G$  as a transitive group of symmetries, and be a cubature of strength  $2p$  (resp a tight  $p$ -fusion frames) ?
- ▶ If so, we can assume  $\omega_j = 1/n$ .
- ▶ Stronger condition: Can all the orbits of  $G$  on  $\mathcal{G}_{k,d}$  be cubatures of strength  $2p$  (resp tight  $p$ -fusion frames) ?

$$\text{Orbit of } V : G \cdot V := \{g(V) : g \in G\}$$

# Constructions using symmetries

**Theorem:** The following are equivalent:

1. For all  $2 \leq k \leq d/2$ , for all  $V \in \mathcal{G}_{k,d}$ ,  $G \cdot V$  is a **design of str. 4**.
2.  $(V_d^{(4)})^G = (V_d^{(2,2)})^G = (V_d^{(2)})^G = \{0\}$ .

And also:

1. For all  $k \leq d/2$ , for all  $V \in \mathcal{G}_{k,d}$ ,  $G \cdot V$  is a **tight  $p$ -fusion frame**.
2.  $(\mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_d]_{2p})^G = \mathbb{R}(X_1^2 + \dots + X_d^2)^p$ .

where, for a partition  $\mu$ ,  $V_d^\mu$  denotes a specific irreducible representation of  $O(\mathbb{R}^d)$  that occurs in  $\text{Pol}_{\leq 2p}(\mathcal{G}_{k,d})$  iff  $\ell(\mu) \leq k$ ,  $\deg(\mu) \leq 2p$  and  $\mu$  is even.



# Constructions using symmetries

## Examples:

1. Tiep 2006: complete classification of the groups that satisfy 1.
2. Designs of strength 4: Weyl groups of root systems  $A_2$ ,  $D_4$ ,  $E_6$ ,  $E_7$ ,  $E_8$  (str. 6),  $2.Co_1$  (str. 10).
3. An infinite family: the Clifford groups  $C_m$  acting on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d = 2^m$  give rise to 6-designs.  
Conway. Hardin, Rains, Shor, Sloane (1999) in view of Grassmannian packings have described non-generic orbits: e.g.  $k = 2^{m-1} = d/2$  and  $n = d^2 + d - 2$ .
4. With a modification of this construction using maximal spreads of isotropic subspaces in  $\mathcal{F}_2^{2m}$ , when  $m - s$  divided  $m$  (e.g,  $s = 0$ ), 4-designs in  $\mathcal{G}_{2^s, 2^m}$  with  $n \approx (d - 1)(d + 2)/2$  can be constructed (B. 2004).

# A construction using 'concatenation'

**Ingredients:**  $k < \ell < d$

$$\{(V_j, \omega_j)\}_{j=1}^n, V_j \in \mathcal{G}_{k,\ell} \quad \{(W_i, \tau_i)\}_{i=1}^m, W_i \in \mathcal{G}_{\ell,d}$$

**Goal:** cubature of str. 4 or tight  $p$ -ff in  $\mathcal{G}_{k,d}$ .

$$f_j : \mathbb{R}^\ell \rightarrow W_j \text{ fixed isometries.} \quad V_{ij} := f_j(V_j) \in \mathcal{G}_{k,d}$$

**Theorem:** (B., Ehler 2011) If  $\{(V_j, \omega_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  and  $\{(W_i, \tau_i)\}_{i=1}^m$  are cubature formulas of strength 4, respectively tight  $p$ -fusion frames, then

$$\{(V_{ij}, \tau_i \omega_j)\}_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq n}}$$

is also a cubature formula of strength 4, respectively a tight  $p$ -fusion frame.

# Probabilistic recovery from trace minimization

- ▶ We follow the lines of: Candès, Strohmer, Voroninski: *PhaseLift: exact and stable signal recovery from magnitude measurements via convex programming* (2011) who deal with  $k = 1$ .
- ▶ Let  $f_i := \langle P_x, P_{V_i} \rangle$ .  $P_x$  is an optimal solution of:

$$(P_{\text{rank}}) \quad \min \{ \text{rank}(X) : X \succeq 0, \langle X, P_{V_i} \rangle = f_i \quad 1 \leq i \leq n \}$$

- ▶ As is standard, we replace **rank minimization** with **trace minimization**:

$$(P_{\text{trace}}) \quad \min \{ \text{trace}(X) : X \succeq 0, \langle X, P_{V_i} \rangle = f_i \quad 1 \leq i \leq n \}$$

- ▶ Question : under which conditions is  $P_x$  the unique optimal solution of  $(P')$ ?

# Probabilistic recovery from trace minimization

**Theorem:** (B., Ehler 2012, arxiv:1209.5986v1)

Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|x\| = 1$ . There are constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that, if  $n \geq c_1 d$ , and  $\{V_j\}_{j=1}^n$  are chosen independently identically distributed according to  $\sigma_k$ , with probability at least  $1 - e^{-c_2 n/d}$ ,  $P_x$  is the unique optimal solution of  $(P_{\text{trace}})$ .

For  $k = 1$ , Candès and Li, *Solving quadratic equations via PhaseLift where there are about as many equations as unknowns*, arxiv:1208.6247v2 have proved a stronger result: proba  $1 - e^{-cd}$ . As a consequence, the same result holds uniformly for all  $x$ .

## An idea of the proof

Let

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{F} : \mathcal{S}^d & \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \\ X & \mapsto \frac{d}{k} \langle X, P_{V_i} \rangle_{i=1}^n \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{F}^* : \mathbb{R}^n & \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^d \\ y & \mapsto \frac{d}{k} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i P_{V_i} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (P_{\text{trace}}) \quad \min \{ \langle X, I_d \rangle : X \succeq 0, \mathcal{F}X = f \} \\ = \max \{ y^* f : I_d - \mathcal{F}^*(y) \succeq 0 \}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\langle X, I_d \rangle - y^* f = \langle X, I_d - \mathcal{F}^* y \rangle.$$

We assume  $x = e = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^*$ . A **dual certificate** for unique optimality of  $ee^*$  is given by a matrix  $Y \in \text{rg}(\mathcal{F}^*)$  such that

## An idea of the proof

$$Y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & & & \\ \vdots & & Y' & \\ 0 & & & \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad I_d - Y' \succ 0$$

Remember the reconstruction formula for a design of strength 4:

$$P_e = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \|P_{V_j}(e)\|^2 - \frac{d\beta}{k\alpha} \right) P_{V_j}$$

The RHS is a valid dual certificate  $Y$ ! Motivates to take **in general**

$$Y := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \|P_{V_j}(e)\|^2 - \frac{d\beta}{k\alpha} \right) P_{V_j}.$$

## An idea of the proof

With high probability, under the assumptions of the theorem, this matrix satisfies:

1.  $\|Y_T - P_e\| \leq \gamma$
2.  $\|Y_{T^\perp}\|_\infty \leq 1/2$

and  $\mathcal{F}$  satisfies and 'almost isometry' property:

1. For all  $X \succeq 0$ ,

$$(1 - r)\|X\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{n}\|\mathcal{F}(X)\|_{\ell_1} \leq (1 + r)\|X\|_1$$

2. For all  $X$  symmetric of rank at most 2,

$$\frac{1}{n}\|\mathcal{F}(X)\|_{\ell_1} \geq u_k(1 - r)\|X\|_\infty$$

where  $0 < r, u_k, \gamma < 1$  satisfy certain inequalities.