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#### Abstract

In this work we introduce the concept of $s$-sparse observability for large systems of ordinary differential equations. Let $\dot{x}=f(t, x)$ be such a system. At time $T>0$, suppose we make a set of observations $b=A x(T)$ of the solution of the system with initial data $x(0)=x^{0}$, where $A$ is a matrix satisfying the restricted isometry property. The aim of this paper is to give answers to the following questions: Given the observation $b$, is $x^{0}$ uniquely determined knowing that $x^{0}$ is sufficiently sparse? Is there any way to reconstruct such a sparse initial data $x^{0}$ ?
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## 1. Introduction and Results

In recent years a number of papers on signal processing have developed a series of ideas and techniques on the reconstruction of a finite signal $x \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ from many fewer observations than traditionally believed necessary. It is now common knowledge that it is possible to exactly recover $x$ knowing that it is sparse or nearly sparse in the sense that it has only a limited number of nonzero components. A more formal definition of sparsity can be given through the $l_{0}$ norm $\|x\|_{0}:=\#\left\{i: x_{i} \neq 0\right\}$, that is, the cardinality of $x$ 's support. If $\|x\|_{0} \leq s$, for $s$ a nonnegative integer, then we say that $x$ is $s$-sparse.

Since sparsity is a very often encountered feature in signal processing and many other mathematical models of real-life phenomena, estimation under sparsity assumption has been a topic of increasing interest in the last decades. At this point, the work on this subject is so extended and growing so rapidly that it is extremely difficult to mention without injustice its achievements and results. It is beyond the scope of this paper to review, even partially, the contributions to this new and very dynamic area of research. For example, in the signal process-

[^0]ing case, the interested reader can find valuable insight in the very informative survey by Bruckstein, Donoho and Elad [1].

This work addresses the recovery of the initial state of a high-dimensional dynamic variable from a restricted set of measurements, knowing that the initial state is sparse. More precisely, let $x(\cdot)$ be the solution of the following initialvalue problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{x}(t)=f(t, x(t)), \text { for } t>0 ; \quad x(0)=x^{0} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose that we can observe

$$
\begin{equation*}
b=A x(T) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

at a certain time $T>0$, where the vector $b$ represents the observations, and $A$ is an $n \times m$ measurement matrix (dictionary). As in signal processing case, the more interesting situation is when $n \ll m$; one interprets $b$ as low-dimensional observations/measurements at time $T>0$ of the high-dimensional dynamic solution $x(\cdot)$. Here are two interesting questions that we address in this note:

Question 1: Given the observation $b$, is $x^{0}$ uniquely determined knowing that $x^{0}$ is sufficiently sparse?

Question 2: Is there any way to reconstruct such a sparse initial data $x^{0}$ ?
Hereafter, $f:[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m}$ is a Lipschitz function in the second variable, i.e., there is $L(\cdot) \in L^{\infty}\left(\mathbf{R}^{m}\right)$ such that $\|f(t, x)-f(t, y)\| \leq L(t)\|x-y\|$ in $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{m}$. By $L$ we denote the $L^{\infty}$-norm of $L(\cdot)$ over the interval $[0, T]$. For $x \in$ $\mathbf{R}^{m}$, the $l^{p}$-norm $(p \geq 1)$ of $x$ is defined as usually $\|x\|_{p}:=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left|x_{i}\right|^{p}\right)^{1 / p}$. In what follows, we also assume that the matrix $A$ satisfies the restricted isometry property. Let us recall the concept of restricted isometry constants (see [4]).

Definition 1. For each integer $s=1,2, \ldots$ define the isometry constant $\delta_{s}$ of a matrix $A$ as the smallest number such that $\left(1-\delta_{s}\right)\|x\|_{2}^{2} \leq\|A x\|_{2}^{2} \leq\left(1+\delta_{s}\right)\|x\|_{2}^{2}$ holds for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^{m}$ with $\|x\|_{0} \leq s$.

The following definition introduces a new concept, that is, the notion of $s$-sparse observability.

Definition 2. The pair (11)-(2) is called s-sparse observable at time $T>0$ if the knowledge of $b$ allows us to compute the $s$-sparse initial data vector $x^{0}$.

In other words, (11)-(2) is $s$-sparse observable at time $T>0$ if for any solutions $x_{1}(\cdot)$ and $x_{2}(\cdot)$ corresponding to the $s$-sparse intial data $x_{1}^{0}$ and $x_{2}^{0}$, respectively, with $A x_{1}(T)=A x_{2}(T)$, we have $x_{1}^{0}=x_{2}^{0}$.

Our first result gives a positive answer to Question 1. In fact it provides a sufficient condition for $s$-sparse observability. Roughly speaking, it says that $s$-sparse observability holds for sufficiently short periods of time.

Theorem 1. Let $T<\frac{1}{L} \ln \left(1+\frac{\sqrt{1-\delta_{2 s}}}{\|A\|}\right)$. Then (11) -(2) is $s$-sparse observable at time $T$.

In the remainder of this section we indicate how the sparsest initial data $x^{0}$ can be found, or approximated. We consider the more applicable situation in
which the measurements at time $T$ are corrupted with noise. That is,

$$
\begin{equation*}
b=A x(T)+e \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $e$ is the noise term whose maximum magnitude is $\epsilon$ (i.e., $\|e\|_{2} \leq \epsilon$ ).
Suppose we seek the sparsest initial data $x^{0}$ that solves (11) and (3). In order to narrow down to one well-defined (sparse) solution, we consider the problem:

$$
\left(P_{0}\right) \quad \text { Find } \hat{x}:=\arg \min _{\|b-A x(T)\|_{2} \leq \epsilon}\|x\|_{0}
$$

Here $x(t)$ is the solution of (11) together with the initial condition $x(0)=x$. However, this is a very hard combinatorial-dynamic optimization problem and practically impossible to solve. We propose reconstructing $x^{0}$ by replacing the $l_{0}$ norm $\|\cdot\|_{0}$ with the weighted $l_{1}$ norm $\|\cdot\|_{1, w}\left(\|x\|_{1, w}:=\sum_{i=1}^{m} w_{i}\left|x_{i}\right|, w_{i}>0\right.$, $i=1,2, \ldots, m)$, which is, in a natural way, its best convex approximant. This strategy originates in the work of Santosa and Symes 7] in the mid-eighties (see also [5, 6] for early results). In this context, we seek $x^{0}$ as the solution to the dynamic optimization problem

$$
\left(P_{1, w}^{\epsilon}\right) \quad \text { Find } x^{*}:=\arg \min _{\|b-A x(T)\|_{2} \leq \epsilon}\|x\|_{1, w}
$$

Denote by $\tau$ the condition number of the matrix $W:=\operatorname{diag}\left\{w_{i}\right\}$, that is, $\tau:=$ $\max _{1 \leq i \leq m}\left\{w_{i}\right\} / \min _{1 \leq i \leq m}\left\{w_{i}\right\}$, and by $x_{s}$ the vector having only the $s$ largest entries of the vector $x$, the others being set to zero. The following result gives a positive answer to Question 2. In essence, it states that for sufficiently small times, the accurate recovery of the sparse initial data $x^{0}$ can be done. Its proof is largely influenced by the methods and techniques used in [2, 3].

Theorem 2. If $\delta_{2 s}<(1+\tau \sqrt{2})^{-1}$ and $T<\frac{1}{L} \ln \left(1+\frac{1-\delta_{2 s}(1+\tau \sqrt{2})}{(1+\tau)\|A\| \sqrt{1+\delta_{2 s}}}\right)$, then the solution $x^{*}$ to $\left(P_{1, w}^{\epsilon}\right)$ satisfies $\left\|x^{*}-x^{0}\right\|_{2} \leq C_{0} s^{-1 / 2}\left\|x^{0}-x_{s}^{0}\right\|_{1}+C_{1} \epsilon$, with $C_{0}$ and $C_{1}$ constants independent of $x^{0}$.

## 2. Proofs of Results

### 2.1. Proof of Theorem 1

Suppose that (11)-(2) is not $s$-sparse observable at time $T$. That is, there exist $s$-sparse vectors $x_{1}^{0}$ and $x_{2}^{0}$, with $x_{1}^{0} \neq x_{2}^{0}$, such that $A x_{1}(T)=A x_{2}(T)$, where $x_{1}(t)$ and $x_{2}(t)$ are solutions to (11) together with the initial data $x_{1}(0)=$ $x_{1}^{0}$ and $x_{2}(0)=x_{2}^{0}$, respectively. Since $x_{1}(t)=x_{1}^{0}+\int_{0}^{t} f\left(s, x_{1}(s)\right) d s$ and $x_{2}(t)=x_{2}^{0}+\int_{0}^{t} f\left(s, x_{2}(s)\right) d s$, it follows that $\left\|x_{2}(t)-x_{1}(t)\right\|_{2} \leq\left\|x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}\right\|_{2}+$ $\int_{0}^{t}\left\|f\left(s, x_{2}(s)\right)-f\left(s, x_{1}(s)\right)\right\|_{2} d s \leq\left\|x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}\right\|_{2}+\int_{0}^{t} L(s)\left\|x_{2}(s)-x_{1}(s)\right\|_{2} d s$. By Gronwall's inequality, one obtains $\left\|x_{2}(t)-x_{1}(t)\right\|_{2} \leq\left\|x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}\right\|_{2} e^{\int_{0}^{t} L(s) d s}$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
0=\left\|A x_{2}(T)-A x_{1}(T)\right\|_{2} & =\left\|A\left(x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}\right)+A \int_{0}^{T}\left[f\left(t, x_{2}(t)\right)-f\left(t, x_{1}(t)\right)\right] d t\right\|_{2} \\
& \geq\left\|A\left(x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}\right)\right\|_{2}-\|A\| \int_{0}^{T} L(t)\left\|x_{2}(t)-x_{1}(t)\right\|_{2} d t \\
& \geq\left\|A\left(x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}\right)\right\|_{2}-\|A\| \int_{0}^{T} L(t)\left\|x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}\right\|_{2} e^{\int_{0}^{t} L(s) d s} d t \\
& \geq\left\|A\left(x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}\right)\right\|_{2}-M\|A\| \cdot\left\|x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}\right\|_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $M:=e^{\int_{0}^{T} L(s) d s}-1$. Thus, $\left\|A\left(x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}\right)\right\|_{2} \leq M\|A\| \cdot\left\|x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}\right\|_{2}$. Then, because $x_{2}^{0}-x_{1}^{0}$ is $2 s$-sparse and from the restricted isometry property, we obtain that $\sqrt{1-\delta_{2 s}} \leq M\|A\|$, which cannot hold for $T<\frac{1}{L} \ln \left(1+\frac{\sqrt{1-\delta_{2 s}}}{\|A\|}\right)$.

### 2.2. Proof of Theorem 2

The following Lemma is a simple application of the parallelogram identity and is due to Candés [2, Lemma 2.1.]. We include it here, together with its proof, for reader's convenience.

Lemma 3. Let $x$ and $x^{\prime}$ be two vectors in $\mathbf{R}^{m}$. Suppose that $x$ and $x^{\prime}$ are supported on disjoint subsets and $\|x\|_{0} \leq s$ and $\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{0} \leq s^{\prime}$. Then $\left|\left\langle A x, A x^{\prime}\right\rangle\right| \leq$ $\delta_{s+s^{\prime}}\|x\|_{2}\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{2}$.

Proof. Denote by $y=x /\|x\|_{2}$ and $y^{\prime}=x^{\prime} /\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{2}$ the unit vectors in the $x$ and $x^{\prime}$ directions, respectively. By the restricted isometry property, it is easy to see that $2\left(1-\delta_{s+s^{\prime}}\right) \leq\left\|A y \pm A y^{\prime}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq 2\left(1+\delta_{s+s^{\prime}}\right)$. These inequalities, together with the parallelogram identity, give $\left|\left\langle A y, A y^{\prime}\right\rangle\right|=\frac{1}{4}\left|\left\|A y+A y^{\prime}\right\|_{2}^{2}-\left\|A y-A y^{\prime}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right| \leq \delta_{s+s^{\prime}}$, and so $\left|\left\langle A x, A x^{\prime}\right\rangle\right| \leq \delta_{s+s^{\prime}}\|x\|_{2}\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{2}$, which concludes the proof.

Let $y(t)$ be the solution to the initial value problem $\dot{y}(t)=f(t, y)$ in $(0, T)$, $y(0)=x^{*}$, where $x^{*}$ is the solution to $\left(P_{1, w}^{\epsilon}\right)$. Then,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|A y(T)-A x(T)\|_{2} \leq\|b-A y(T)\|_{2}+\|b-A x(T)\|_{2} \leq 2 \epsilon \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Decompose $x^{*}$ as $x^{*}=x^{0}+h$. Then, as in [2], decompose $h$ into a sum of vectors $h_{T_{0}}, h_{T_{1}}, \ldots$, each of $s$-sparsity. Here, $T_{0}$ corresponds to the locations of the first $s$ largest coefficients of $h, T_{1}$ to the locations of the next $s$ largest coefficients, and so on. Since $x(t)=x^{0}+\int_{0}^{t} f(s, x(s)) d s$ and $y(t)=x^{*}+\int_{0}^{t} f(s, y(s)) d s$, it follows that $\|y(t)-x(t)\|_{2} \leq\|h\|_{2}+\int_{0}^{t} L(s)\|y(s)-x(s)\| d s$. By Gronwall's
inequality, we get $\|y(t)-x(t)\|_{2} \leq\|h\|_{2} e^{\int_{0}^{t} L(s) d s}$, for all $t \in[0, T]$. Then,

$$
\begin{align*}
\|A y(T)-A x(T)\|_{2} & =\left\|A h+A \int_{0}^{T}[f(t, y(t))-f(t, x(t))] d t\right\|_{2} \\
& \geq\|A h\|_{2}-\|A\| \int_{0}^{T} L(t)\|y(t)-x(t)\|_{2} d t \\
& \geq\|A h\|_{2}-\|A\| \int_{0}^{T} L(t)\|h\|_{2} e^{\int_{0}^{t} L(s) d s} d t \\
& \geq\|A h\|_{2}-M\|A\|\|h\|_{2} \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

where $M:=e^{\int_{0}^{T} L(s) d s}-1$. From (4) and (15), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|A h\|_{2} \leq 2 \epsilon+M\|A\|\|h\|_{2} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, we estimate $\left\|h_{\left(T_{0} \cup T_{1}\right)^{c}}\right\|_{2}$, where $h_{\left(T_{0} \cup T_{1}\right)^{c}}:=h-h_{T_{0}}-h_{T_{1}}$. First off, observe that $\left\|h_{T_{j}}\right\|_{2} \leq s^{1 / 2}\left\|h_{T_{j}}\right\|_{\infty} \leq s^{-1 / 2}\left\|h_{T_{j-1}}\right\|_{1}, j \geq 2$, and so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j \geq 2}\left\|h_{T_{j}}\right\|_{2} \leq s^{-1 / 2} \sum_{j \geq 1}\left\|h_{T_{j}}\right\|_{1}=s^{-1 / 2}\left\|h_{T_{0}^{c}}\right\|_{1} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $h_{T_{0}^{c}}:=h-h_{T_{0}}$. Thus,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|h_{\left(T_{0} \cup T_{1}\right)^{c}}\right\|_{2}=\left\|\sum_{j \geq 2} h_{T_{j}}\right\|_{2} \leq \sum_{j \geq 2}\left\|h_{T_{j}}\right\|_{2} \leq s^{-1 / 2}\left\|h_{T_{0}^{c}}\right\|_{1} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Because $x^{0}$ is feasible, it satisfies $\left\|x^{*}\right\|_{1, w} \leq\left\|x^{0}\right\|_{1, w}$, which implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{m} w_{i}\left|x_{i}^{0}\right| \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m} w_{i} \mid x_{i}^{0} & +h_{i}\left|=\sum_{i \in T_{0}} w_{i}\right| x_{i}^{0}+h_{i}\left|+\sum_{i \in T_{0}^{c}} w_{i}\right| x_{i}^{0}+h_{i} \mid \\
& \geq \sum_{i \in T_{0}} w_{i}\left|x_{i}^{0}\right|-\sum_{i \in T_{0}} w_{i}\left|h_{i}\right|-\sum_{i \in T_{0}^{c}} w_{i}\left|x_{i}^{0}\right|+\sum_{i \in T_{0}^{c}} w_{i}\left|h_{i}\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

and so $\left\|h_{T_{0}^{c}}\right\|_{1, w} \leq\left\|h_{T_{0}}\right\|_{1, w}+2\left\|x^{0}-x_{s}^{0}\right\|_{1, w}$. This last inequality induces $\min _{1 \leq i \leq m}\left\{w_{i}\right\}\left\|h_{T_{0}^{c}}\right\|_{1} \leq \max _{1 \leq i \leq m}\left\{w_{i}\right\}\left(\left\|h_{T_{0}}\right\|_{1}+2\left\|x^{0}-x_{s}^{0}\right\|_{1}\right)$, and so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|h_{T_{0}^{c}}\right\|_{1} \leq \tau\left(\left\|h_{T_{0}}\right\|_{1}+2\left\|x^{0}-x_{s}^{0}\right\|_{1}\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (8), (9), and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|h_{\left(T_{0} \cup T_{1}\right)^{c}}\right\|_{2} \leq \tau s^{-1 / 2}\left(\left\|h_{T_{0}}\right\|_{1}+2\left\|x^{0}-x_{s}^{0}\right\|_{1} \leq \tau\left(\left\|h_{T_{0}}\right\|_{2}+2 e_{0}\right)\right. \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $e_{0}:=s^{-1 / 2}\left\|x^{0}-x_{s}^{0}\right\|_{1}$. Now, let us estimate $\left\|h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2}$. By the restricted
isometry property, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\delta_{2 s}}}\left\|A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2} \leq\left\|h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\delta_{2 s}}}\left\|A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}=A h-\sum_{j>2} A h_{T_{j}}$, we have that $\left\|A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2}^{2}=\left\langle A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}, A h\right\rangle-$ $\left.\sum_{j \geq 2}\left\langle A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}, A h_{T_{j}}\right\rangle \leq \mathbb{Z} A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}, A h\right\rangle\left|+\sum_{j \geq 2}\right|\left\langle A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}, A h_{T_{j}}\right\rangle \mid$. This and the restricted isometry property imply that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\left\langle A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}, A h\right\rangle\right| & \leq\left\|A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2}\|A h\|_{2} \leq\left\|A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2}\left(2 \epsilon+M\|A\|\|h\|_{2}\right) \quad(\text { by (6) }) \\
& \leq \sqrt{1+\delta_{2 s}}\left\|h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2}\left(2 \epsilon+M\|A\|\|h\|_{2}\right) \quad(\text { by (11) }) \tag{12}
\end{align*}
$$

From Lemma 3, we have that $\left|\left\langle A h_{T_{i}}, A h_{T_{j}}\right\rangle\right| \leq \delta_{2 s}\left\|h_{T_{i}}\right\|_{2}\left\|h_{T_{j}}\right\|_{2}$, for $i \neq j$, and so $\left|\left\langle A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}, A h_{T_{j}}\right\rangle\right| \leq \delta_{2 s}\left(\left\|h_{T_{0}}\right\|_{2}+\left\|h_{T_{1}}\right\|_{2}\right)\left\|h_{T_{j}}\right\|_{2} \leq \sqrt{2} \delta_{2 s}\left\|h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2}\left\|h_{T_{j}}\right\|_{2}$. Therefore,
$\left\|A h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq \sqrt{1+\delta_{2 s}}\left\|h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2}\left(2 \epsilon+M\|A\|\|h\|_{2}\right)+\sqrt{2} \delta_{2 s}\left\|h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2} \sum_{j \geq 2}\left\|h_{T_{j}}\right\|_{2}$.
As in [2], let $\alpha=2 \sqrt{1+\delta_{2 s}}\left(1-\delta_{2 s}\right)^{-1}$ and $\rho=\sqrt{2} \delta_{2 s}\left(1-\delta_{2 s}\right)^{-1}$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2} & \leq \alpha\left(\epsilon+\frac{1}{2} M\|A\|\|h\|_{2}\right)+\rho \sum_{j \geq 2}\left\|h_{T_{j}}\right\|_{2} \quad(\text { by (11) and (13) }) \\
& \leq \alpha\left(\epsilon+\frac{1}{2} M\|A\|\|h\|_{2}\right)+\rho s^{-1 / 2}\left\|h_{T_{0}^{c}}\right\|_{1} \quad(\text { by (7) }) \\
& \leq \alpha\left(\epsilon+\frac{1}{2} M\|A\|\|h\|_{2}\right)+\rho s^{-1 / 2} \tau\left(\left\|h_{T_{0}}\right\|_{1}+2\left\|x^{0}-x_{s}^{0}\right\|_{1}\right) \quad(\text { by (9) }) \\
& \leq \alpha\left(\epsilon+\frac{1}{2} M\|A\|\|h\|_{2}\right)+\rho \tau\left\|h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2}+2 \rho \tau e_{0},
\end{aligned}
$$

and so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2} \leq(1-\rho \tau)^{-1}\left[\alpha\left(\epsilon+\frac{1}{2} M\|A\|\|h\|_{2}\right)+2 \rho \tau e_{0}\right] . \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

(Observe that $1-\rho \tau>0$ since $\delta_{2 s}<(1+\sqrt{2} \tau)^{-1}$.)
Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|h\|_{2} & \leq\left\|h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2}+\left\|h_{\left(T_{0} \cup T_{1}\right)^{c}}\right\|_{2} \leq(1+\tau)\left\|h_{T_{0} \cup T_{1}}\right\|_{2}+2 \tau e_{0} \quad(\text { by (10) }) \\
& \leq(1+\tau)(1-\rho \tau)^{-1}\left[\alpha\left(\epsilon+\frac{1}{2} M\|A\|\|h\|_{2}\right)+2 \rho \tau e_{0}\right]+2 \tau e_{0}, \quad(\text { by (14) })
\end{aligned}
$$

and so $\|h\|_{2} \leq C_{0} e_{0}+C_{1} \epsilon$, with $C_{0}:=2 \tau(\rho+1)[1-\rho \tau-0.5 \alpha(1+\tau) M\|A\|]^{-1}$ and $C_{1}:=\alpha(1+\tau)[1-\rho \tau-0.5 \alpha(1+\tau) M\|A\|]^{-1}$. As a consequence of $T<$ $\frac{1}{L} \ln \left(1+\frac{1-\delta_{2 s}(1+\tau \sqrt{2})}{(1+\tau)\|A\| \sqrt{1+\delta_{2 s}}}\right)$, observe that both $C_{0}$ and $C_{1}$ are strictly positive.
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