

# Gaussian random projections for Euclidean membership problems

VU KHAC KY<sup>1</sup>, PIERRE-LOUIS POIRION, LEO LIBERTI

CNRS LIX, École Polytechnique, F-91128 Palaiseau, France  
Email:vu,poirion,liberti@lix.polytechnique.fr

December 13, 2021

## Abstract

We discuss the application of random projections to the fundamental problem of deciding whether a given point in a Euclidean space belongs to a given set. We show that, under a number of different assumptions, the feasibility and infeasibility of this problem are preserved with high probability when the problem data is projected to a lower dimensional space. Our results are applicable to any algorithmic setting which needs to solve Euclidean membership problems in a high-dimensional space.

## 1 Introduction

Random projections are very useful dimension reduction techniques which are widely used in computer science [7, 13]. We assume we have an algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  acting on a data set  $X$  consisting of  $n$  vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $m$  is large, and assume that the complexity of  $\mathcal{A}$  depends on  $m$  and  $n$  in a way that makes it impossible to run  $\mathcal{A}$  sufficiently fast. A random projection exploits the statistical properties of some random distribution to construct a mapping which embeds  $X$  into a lower dimensional space  $\mathbb{R}^k$  (for some appropriately chosen  $k$ ) while preserving distances, angles, or other quantities used by  $\mathcal{A}$ .

One striking example of random projections is the famous Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma [9]:

### 1.1 Theorem (Johnson-Lindenstrauss Lemma)

Let  $X$  be a set of  $m$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then there is a map  $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  where  $k$  is  $O(\frac{\log m}{\varepsilon^2})$ , such that for any  $x, y \in X$ , we have

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\|x - y\|_2^2 \leq \|F(x) - F(y)\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|x - y\|_2^2. \quad (1)$$

Intuitively, this lemma claims that  $X$  can be projected in a much lower dimensional space whilst keeping Euclidean distances approximately the same. The main idea to prove Thm. 1.1 is to construct a random linear mapping  $T$  (called *JL random mapping* onwards), sampled from certain distribution families, so that for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , the event that

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\|x\|_2^2 \leq \|T(x)\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|x\|_2^2 \quad (2)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Supported by a Microsoft Research Ph.D. fellowship.

occurs with high probability. By Eq. (2) and the union bound, it is possible to show the existence of a map  $F$  with the stated properties (see [2, 4]).

In this paper we employ random projections to study the following general problem:

**EUCLIDEAN SET MEMBERSHIP PROBLEM (ESMP).** Given  $p \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ , decide whether  $p \in X$ .

This is a fundamental class consisting of many problems, both in **P** (e.g. the **LINEAR FEASIBILITY PROBLEM (LFP)**) and **NP**-hard (e.g. the **INTEGER FEASIBILITY PROBLEM (IFP)**), which can naturally model SAT, and also see [15]).

In this paper, we use a random linear projection operator  $T$  to embed both  $p$  and  $X$  to a lower dimensional space, and study the relationship between the original membership problem and its projected version:

**PROJECTED ESMP (PESMP).** Given  $p, X, T$  as above, decide whether  $T(p) \in T(X)$ .

Note that, when  $p \in X$ , the fact that  $T(p) \in T(X)$  follows by linearity of  $T$ . We are therefore only interested in the case when  $p \notin X$ , i.e. we want to estimate  $\text{Prob}(T(p) \notin T(X))$ , given that  $p \notin X$ .

## 1.1 Previous results

Random projections applying to some special cases of membership problems have been studied in [11], where we exploited some polyhedral structures of the problem to derive several results for polytopes and polyhedral cones. In the case  $X$  is a polytope, we obtained the following result.

### 1.2 Proposition ([11])

Given  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , let  $C = \text{conv}\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $b \notin C$ ,  $d = \min_{x \in C} \|b - x\|$  and  $D = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|b - a_i\|$ . Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a JL random mapping. Then

$$\text{Prob}(T(b) \notin T(C)) \geq 1 - 2n^2 e^{-C(\varepsilon^2 - \varepsilon^3)k}$$

for some constant  $C$  (independent of  $m, n, k, d, D$ ) and  $\varepsilon < \frac{d^2}{D^2}$ .

If  $X$  is a polyhedral cone, we obtained the following result.

### 1.3 Proposition ([11])

Given  $b, a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$  of norms 1 such that  $b \notin C = \text{cone}\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ , let  $d = \min_{x \in C} \|b - x\|$  and  $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a JL random mapping. Then:

$$\text{Prob}(T(b) \notin T(C)) \geq 1 - 2n(n+1)e^{-C(\varepsilon^2 - \varepsilon^3)k}$$

for some constant  $C$  (independent of  $m, n, k, d$ ), where  $\varepsilon = \frac{d^2}{\mu_A^2 + 2\sqrt{1-d^2}\mu_A + 1}$ ,

$$\mu_A = \max\{\|x\|_A \mid x \in \text{cone}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \wedge \|x\| \leq 1\},$$

and  $\|x\|_A = \min\{\sum_i \theta_i \mid \theta \geq 0 \wedge x = \sum_i \theta_i a_i\}$  is the norm induced by  $A = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ .

We also recall the following Lemma, useful for the integer case.

**1.4 Lemma ([11])**

Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a JL random mapping, let  $b, a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and let  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  be a finite set. Then if  $b \neq \sum_{i=1}^m y_i a_i$  for all  $y \in X$ , we have

$$\text{Prob}(\forall y \in X \mid T(b) \neq \sum_{i=1}^m y_i T(a_i)) \geq 1 - 2|X|e^{-Ck};$$

for some constant  $C > 0$  (independent of  $m, k$ ).

## 1.2 New results

In this paper, we consider the general case where the data set  $X$  has no specific structure, and use Gaussian random projections in our arguments to obtain some results about the relationship between ESMP and PESMP.

In the case when  $X$  is at most countable (i.e. finite or countable), using a straightforward argument, we prove that these two problems are equivalent almost surely. However, this result is only of theoretical interest due to round-off errors in floating point operations, which make its practical application difficult. We address this issue by introducing a threshold  $\delta > 0$  with a corresponding THRESHOLD ESMP (TESMP): if  $\Delta$  is the distance between  $T(p)$  and the closest point of  $T(X)$ , decide whether  $\Delta \geq \delta$ .

In the case when  $X$  may also be uncountable, we employ the *doubling constant* of  $X$ , i.e. the smallest number  $\lambda_X$  such that any closed ball in  $X$  can be covered by at most  $\lambda_X$  closed balls of half the radius. Its logarithm  $\log_2 \lambda_X$  is called *doubling dimension* of  $X$ . Recently, the doubling dimension has become a powerful tool for several classes of problems such as nearest neighbor [10, 8], low-distortion embeddings [3], clustering [12].

We show that we can project  $X$  into  $\mathbb{R}^k$ , where  $k = O(\log_2 \lambda_X)$ , whilst still ensure the equivalence between ESMP and PESMP with high probability. We also extend this result to the threshold case, and obtain a more useful bound for  $k$ .

## 2 Finite and countable sets

In this section, we assume that  $X$  is either finite or countable. Let  $T$  be a JL random mapping from a Gaussian distribution, i.e. each entry of  $T$  is independently sampled from  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . It is well known that, for an arbitrary unit vector  $a \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ , the random variable  $\|Ta\|^2$  has a Chi-squared distribution  $\chi_k^2$  with  $k$  degrees of freedom ([14]). Its corresponding density function is  $\frac{2^{-k/2}}{\Gamma(k/2)} x^{k/2-1} e^{-x/2}$ , where  $\Gamma(\cdot)$  is the gamma function. By [4], for any  $0 < \delta < 1$ , taking  $z = \frac{\delta}{k}$  yields a cumulative distribution function

$$F_{\chi_k^2}(\delta) \leq (ze^{1-z})^{k/2} < (ze)^{k/2} = \left(\frac{e\delta}{k}\right)^{k/2}. \quad (3)$$

Thus, we have

$$\text{Prob}(\|Ta\| \leq \delta) = F_{\chi_k^2}(\delta^2) < (3\delta^2)^{k/2} \quad (4)$$

or, more simply,  $\text{Prob}(\|Ta\| \leq \delta) < \delta^k$  when  $k \geq 3$ .

Using this estimation, we immediately obtain the following result.

### 2.1 Proposition

Given  $p \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ , at most countable, such that  $p \notin X$ . Then, for a Gaussian random projection  $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  with any  $k \geq 1$ , we have  $T(p) \notin T(X)$  almost surely, i.e.  $\text{Prob}(T(p) \notin T(X)) = 1$ .

*Proof.* First, note that for any  $u \neq 0$ ,  $Tu \neq 0$  holds almost certainly. Indeed, without loss of generality we can assume that  $\|u\| = 1$ . Then for any  $0 < \delta < 1$ :

$$\text{Prob}(T(z) = 0) \leq \text{Prob}(\|Tz\| \leq \delta) = (3\delta^2)^{k/2} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

Since the event  $T(p) \notin T(X)$  can be written as the intersection of at most countably many almost sure events  $T(p) \neq T(x)$  (for  $x \in X$ ), it follows that  $\text{Prob}(T(p) \notin T(X)) = 1$ , as claimed.  $\square$

Proposition 2.1 is simple, but it looks interesting because it suggests that we only need to project the data points to a line (i.e.  $k = 1$ ) and study an equivalent membership problem on a line. Furthermore, it turns out that this result remains true for a large class of random projections.

### 2.2 Proposition

Let  $\nu$  be a probability distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  with bounded Lebesgue density  $f$ . Let  $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  be an at most countable set such that  $0 \notin Y$ . Then, for a random projection  $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$  sampled from  $\nu$ , we have  $0 \notin T(Y)$  almost surely, i.e.  $\text{Prob}(0 \notin T(Y)) = 1$ .

*Proof.* For any  $0 \neq y \in Y$ , consider the set  $\mathcal{E}_y = \{T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1 \mid T(y) = 0\}$ . If we regard each  $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$  as a vector  $t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , then  $\mathcal{E}_y$  is a hyperplane  $\{t \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid y \cdot t = 0\}$  and we have

$$\text{Prob}(T(y) = 0) = \nu(\mathcal{E}_y) = \int_{\mathcal{E}_y} f d\mu \leq \|f\|_\infty \int_{\mathcal{E}_y} d\mu = 0$$

where  $\mu$  denotes the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . The proof then follows by the countability of  $Y$ , similarly to Proposition 2.1.  $\square$

Proposition 2.2 is based on the observation that the degree  $[\mathbb{R} : \mathbb{Q}]$  of the field extension  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Q}$  is  $2^{\aleph_0}$ , whereas  $Y$  is countable; so the probability that any row vector  $T_i$  of the random projection matrix  $T$  will yield a linear dependence relation  $\sum_{j \leq m} T_{ij} y_j = 0$  for some  $0 \neq y \in Y$  is zero. In practice, however,  $Y$  is part of the rational input of a decision problem, and the components of  $T$  are rational: hence any subsequence of them is trivially linearly dependent over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Moreover, floating point numbers have a bounded binary representation: hence, even if  $Y$  is finite, there is a nonzero probability that any subsequence of components of  $T$  will be linearly dependent by means of a nonzero multiplier vector in  $Y$ .

This idea, however, does not work in practice: we tested it by considering the ESMP given by the IPF defined on the set  $\{x \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \cap [L, U] \mid Ax = b\}$ . Numerical experiments indicate that the corresponding PESMP  $\{x \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \cap [L, U] \mid T(A)x = T(b)\}$ , with  $T$  consisting of a one-row Gaussian projection matrix, is always feasible despite the infeasibility of the original IPF. Since Prop. 2.1

assumes that the components of  $T$  are real numbers, we think that the reason behind this failure is the round-off error associated to the floating point representation used in computers. Specifically, when  $T(A)x$  is too close to  $T(b)$ , floating point operations will consider them as a single point. In order to address this issue, we force the projected problems to obey stricter requirements. In particular, instead of only requiring that  $T(p) \notin T(X)$ , we ensure that

$$\text{dist}(T(p), T(X)) = \min_{x \in X} \|T(p) - T(x)\| > \tau,$$

where  $\text{dist}$  denotes the Euclidean distance, and  $\tau > 0$  is a (small) given constant. With this restriction, we obtain the following result.

### 2.3 Proposition

Given  $\tau, \delta > 0$  and  $p \notin X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $X$  is a finite set, let

$$d = \min_{x \in X} \|p - x\| > 0.$$

Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a Gaussian random projection with  $k \geq \frac{\log(\frac{|X|}{\delta})}{\log(\frac{d}{\tau})}$ . Then:

$$\text{Prob}\left(\min_{x \in X} \|T(p) - T(x)\| > \tau\right) > 1 - \delta.$$

*Proof.* We assume that  $k \geq 3$ . For any  $x \in X$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(\|T(p-x)\| \leq \tau) &= \text{Prob}\left(\left\|T\left(\frac{p-x}{\|p-x\|}\right)\right\| \leq \frac{\tau}{\|p-x\|}\right) \\ &\leq \text{Prob}\left(\left\|T\left(\frac{p-x}{\|p-x\|}\right)\right\| \leq \frac{\tau}{d}\right) < \frac{\tau^k}{d^k}, \end{aligned}$$

due to (3). Therefore, by the union bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}\left(\min_{x \in X} \|T(p) - T(x)\| > \tau\right) &= 1 - \text{Prob}\left(\min_{x \in X} \|T(p) - T(x)\| \leq \tau\right) \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_{x \in X} \text{Prob}(\|T(p) - T(x)\| \leq \tau) > 1 - |X| \left(\frac{\tau}{d}\right)^k. \end{aligned}$$

The RHS is greater than or equal to  $1 - \delta$  if and only if  $\left(\frac{d}{\tau}\right)^k \geq \frac{|X|}{\delta}$ , which is equivalent to  $k \geq \frac{\log(\frac{|X|}{\delta})}{\log(\frac{d}{\tau})}$ , as claimed.  $\square$

Note that  $d$  is often unknown and can be arbitrarily small. However, if both  $p, X$  are integral, then  $d \geq 1$  and we can select  $k > \frac{\log \frac{|X|}{\delta}}{\log \frac{1}{\tau}}$  in the above proposition.

In many cases, the set  $X$  is infinite. We show that when this is the case, we can still overcome this difficulty under some assumptions. In particular, we prove that if  $X = \{Ax \mid x \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n\}$  where  $A$  is an  $m \times n$  matrix with integer coefficients which are all positive in at least one row, then for any bounded vector  $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  the problem  $b \in X$  is equivalent, with high probability, to its projection to a  $O(\log n)$ -dimensional space. The idea is to separate one positive row and apply random projection to the others.

Formally, let us denote by  $a^i$  the  $i$ -th row and by  $a_j$  the  $j$ -th column of  $A$ . Assume that all entries in the row  $a^i$  is positive and all entries of  $b$  are bounded by a constant  $B > 0$ . Remove the row  $i$  from  $A$  and  $b$  to obtain  $\tilde{A} = (a'_1, \dots, a'_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{(m-1) \times n}$  and  $\tilde{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^{m-1}$ . Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^{m-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a JL random mapping and denote by  $Z = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \mid a^i \cdot x = b_i\}$ . Then we have:

### 2.4 Proposition

Assume that  $b \notin X$ , and let  $0 < \delta < 1$ . Using the terminology and given the assumptions above, if  $k \geq \frac{1}{C} \ln(\frac{2}{\delta}) + \frac{B}{C} \log(n + B - 1)$  we have

$$\text{Prob}\left(T(b) \neq \sum_{j=1}^n x_j T(a'_j) \text{ for all } x \in Z\right) \geq 1 - \delta$$

for some constant  $C > 0$ .

*Proof.* We first show that  $|Z| \leq (n + B - 1)^B$ . Since all the entries of  $A$  are positive integers, we have

$$|Z| \leq |\{x \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \mid \sum_{j=1}^n x_j = b_i\}| \leq |\{x \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \mid \sum_{j=1}^n x_j = B\}|.$$

The number of elements in the RHS corresponds to the number of combinations with repetitions of  $B$  items sampled from  $n$ , which is equal to  $\binom{n+B-1}{n-1} = \binom{n+B-1}{B} \leq (n + B - 1)^B$ .

Next, by Lemma 1.4, we have:

$$\text{Prob}\left(T(b) \neq \sum_{j=1}^n x_j T(a'_j) \text{ for all } x \in Z\right) \geq 1 - 2(n + B - 1)^B e^{-Ck}, \quad (5)$$

which is greater than  $1 - \delta$  when taking any  $k$  such that  $k \geq \frac{1}{C} \ln(\frac{2}{\delta}) + \frac{B}{C} \log(n + B - 1)$ . The proposition is proved.  $\square$

Note that in Prop. 2.4 we can choose the JL random mapping  $T$  as a matrix with  $\{-1, +1\}$  entries (Rademacher variables). In this case, there is no need to worry about floating point errors.

## 3 Sets with low doubling dimension

In this section, we denote by  $B(x, r)$  the closed ball centered at  $x$  with radius  $r > 0$ , and  $B_X(x, r) = B(x, r) \cap X$ . We will also assume that  $X$  is a doubling space, i.e. a set with bounded doubling dimension. One example of doubling spaces is a Euclidean space.  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , we can show that the doubling dimension  $\log_2(\lambda_X)$  of  $X$  can be shown to be a constant factor of  $m$  ([16, 6]). However, many sets of low doubling dimensions are contained in high dimensional spaces ([1]). Note that computing the doubling dimension of a metric space is generally **NP**-hard ([5]). We shall make use of the following simple lemma.

### 3.1 Lemma

For any  $p \in X$  and  $\varepsilon, r > 0$ , there is a set  $S \subseteq X$  of size at most  $\lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}) \rceil}$  such that

$$B_X(p, r) \subseteq \bigcup_{s \in S} B(s, \varepsilon).$$

*Proof.* By definition of the doubling dimension,  $B_X(p, r)$  is covered by at most  $\lambda_X$  closed balls of radius  $\frac{r}{2}$ . Each of these balls in turn is covered by  $\lambda_X$  balls of radius  $\frac{r}{4}$ , and so on: iteratively, for each  $k \geq 1$ ,  $B_X(p, r)$  is covered by  $\lambda_X^k$  balls of radius  $\frac{r}{2^k}$ . If we select  $k = \lceil \log_2(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}) \rceil$  then  $k \geq \log_2(\frac{r}{\varepsilon})$ , i.e.  $\frac{r}{2^k} \leq \varepsilon$ . This means  $B_X(p, r)$  is covered by  $\lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}) \rceil}$  balls of radius  $\varepsilon$ .  $\square$

We will also use the following lemma, which is proved in [8] using a concentration estimation for sum of squared gaussian variables (Chi-squared distribution).

### 3.2 Lemma

Let  $X \subseteq B(0, 1)$  be a subset of the  $m$ -dimensional Euclidean unit ball. Then there exist universal constants  $c, C > 0$  such that for  $k \geq C \log \lambda_X + 1$  and  $\delta > 1$ , the following holds:

$$\text{Prob}(\exists x \in X \text{ s.t. } \|Tx\| > \delta) < e^{-c\delta^2}.$$

In the proof of the next result (one of the main results in this section), we use the same idea as that in [8] for the nearest neighbor problem.

### 3.3 Theorem

Given  $0 < \delta < 1$  and  $p \notin X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ . Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a Gaussian random projection. Then

$$\text{Prob}(T(p) \notin T(X)) = 1$$

if  $k \geq C \log_2(\lambda_X)$ , for some universal constant  $C$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $0 = r_0 < r_1 < r_2 < \dots$  be positive scalars (their values will be defined later). For each  $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  we define a set

$$X_j = X \cap B(p, r_j) \setminus B(p, r_{j-1}).$$

Since  $X_j \subseteq B_X(p, r_j)$ , by Lemma 3.1 we can find a point set  $S_j \subseteq X$  of size  $|S_j| \leq \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{r_j}{\varepsilon}) \rceil}$  such that

$$X_j \subseteq \bigcup_{s \in S_j} B(s, \varepsilon).$$

Hence, for any  $x \in X_j$ , there is  $s \in S_j$  such that  $\|x - s\| < \varepsilon$ . Moreover, by the triangle inequality, any such  $s$  satisfies  $r_{j-1} - \varepsilon < \|s - p\| < r_j + \varepsilon$ , so without loss of generality we can assume that

$$S_j \subseteq B(p, r_j + \varepsilon) \setminus B(p, r_{j-1} - \varepsilon).$$

We denote by  $\mathcal{E}_j$  the event that:

$$\exists s \in S_j, \exists x \in X_j \cap B(s, \varepsilon) \text{ s.t. } \|Ts - Tx\| > \varepsilon\sqrt{j}.$$

By the union bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(\mathcal{E}_j) &\leq \sum_{s \in S_j} \text{Prob}(\exists x \in X_j \cap B(s, \varepsilon) \text{ s.t. } \|Ts - Tx\| > \varepsilon\sqrt{j}) \\ &\leq \sum_{s \in S_j} e^{-c_1 k j} \quad (\text{for some universal constant } c_1 \text{ by Lemma 3.2}) \\ &\leq \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{r_j + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}) \rceil} e^{-c_1 k j}. \end{aligned}$$

Again by the union bound, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(\exists x \in X \text{ s.t } T(x) = T(p)) &= \text{Prob}(\exists x \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} X_j \text{ s.t } T(x) = T(p)) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \text{Prob}(\exists x \in X_j \text{ s.t } T(x) = T(p)). \end{aligned}$$

Now we will estimate the individual probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Prob}(\exists x \in X_j \text{ s.t } T(x) = T(p)) \\ &\leq \text{Prob}((\exists x \in X_j \text{ s.t } T(x) = T(p)) \wedge \mathcal{E}_j^c) + \text{Prob}(\mathcal{E}_j) \\ &\leq \text{Prob}(\exists x \in X_j, s \in S_j \cap B(x, \varepsilon) \text{ s.t } T(x) = T(p) \wedge \|T(s) - T(x)\| \leq \varepsilon\sqrt{j}) + \text{Prob}(\mathcal{E}_j) \\ &\leq \text{Prob}(\exists s \in S_j \text{ s.t } \|T(s) - T(p)\| < \varepsilon\sqrt{j}) + \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{r_j + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}) \rceil} e^{-c_1 k j}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we choose  $\varepsilon = \frac{d}{N}$  for some large  $N$ ; and for each  $j \geq 1$ , we choose  $r_j = (2+j)\varepsilon$ . For  $j < N-2$ , by definition it follows that  $X_j = \emptyset$ . Therefore

$$\text{Prob}(\exists x \in X_j \text{ s.t } T(s) = T(p)) = 0.$$

On the other hand, for  $j \geq N-2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Prob}(\exists s \in S_j \text{ s.t } \|T(s) - T(p)\| \leq \varepsilon\sqrt{j}) \\ &\leq \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{r_j + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}) \rceil} \text{Prob}(\|T(z)\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon\sqrt{j}}{r_{j-1} - \varepsilon}) \quad \text{for an arbitrary } z \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \\ &= \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(3+j) \rceil} \text{Prob}(\|T(z)\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}}) \quad \text{for an arbitrary } z \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \\ &< \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(3+j) \rceil} j^{-k/2} \quad \text{by the estimation (4)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(3+j) \rceil} \leq \lambda_X^{\log_2(6+2j)} = (6+2j)^{\log_2 \lambda_X} < j^{(2 \log_2 \lambda_X)}$  for large enough  $N$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(\exists x \in X_j \text{ s.t } T(x) = T(p)) &\leq \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(3+j) \rceil} (j^{-k/2} + e^{-c_1 k j}) \\ &\leq j^{-c_2 k} + e^{-c_3 k j} \end{aligned}$$

for some universal constants  $c_2, c_3$ , provided that  $k \geq \mathcal{C}_1 \log \lambda_X$  for some large enough constant  $\mathcal{C}_1$ . Finally, by the union bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(T(p) \notin T(X)) &= 1 - \text{Prob}(T(p) \in T(X)) \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_{i=N-2}^{\infty} (i^{-c_2 k} + e^{-c_3 k i}) \end{aligned}$$

which tends to 1 when  $N$  tends to infinity. □

Our final result in the section is an extension of Thm. 3.3 to the threshold case.

**3.4 Theorem**

Let  $p \notin X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a Gaussian random projection, and  $d = \min_{x \in X} \|p - x\|$ . Then for all  $0 < \delta < 1$  and all  $0 < \tau < \kappa d$  for some constant  $\kappa < 1$ , we have

$$\text{Prob}(\text{dist}(T(p), T(X)) > \tau) > 1 - \delta$$

if  $k$  is  $O\left(\frac{\log(\frac{\lambda_X}{\delta})}{\log(\frac{d}{\tau})}\right)$ .

*Proof.* For  $j = 1, 2, \dots$  we construct the sets  $X_j, S_j$  similarly as those in the proof of Thm. 3.3 (where the values of  $r_j$  and  $\varepsilon$  will be defined later). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(\exists x \in X \text{ s.t. } \|T(x) - T(p)\| < \tau) &= \text{Prob}(\exists x \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} X_j \text{ s.t. } \|T(x) - T(p)\| < \tau) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \text{Prob}(\exists x \in X_j \text{ s.t. } \|T(x) - T(p)\| < \tau). \end{aligned}$$

For all  $j \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Prob}(\exists x \in X_j \text{ s.t. } \|T(x) - T(p)\| < \tau) \\ &\leq \text{Prob}((\exists x \in X_j \text{ s.t. } \|T(x) - T(p)\| < \tau) \wedge \mathcal{E}_j^c) + \text{Prob}(\mathcal{E}_j) \\ &\leq \text{Prob}(\exists x \in X_j, s \in S_j \cap B(x, \varepsilon) \text{ s.t. } \|T(x) - T(p)\| < \tau \wedge \|T(s) - T(x)\| \leq \varepsilon\sqrt{j}) + \text{Prob}(\mathcal{E}_j) \\ &\leq \text{Prob}(\exists s \in S_j \text{ s.t. } \|T(s) - T(p)\| < \tau + \varepsilon\sqrt{j}) + \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{r_j + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}) \rceil} e^{-c_1 k j}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we choose  $\varepsilon = \frac{\tau}{N}$  for some  $N > 0$  such that  $1 + \frac{1}{N} < \frac{1}{\kappa}$  and for each  $j \geq 1$ , we choose  $r_j = \tau\sqrt{j+1} + (2+j)\varepsilon$ . For  $j = 1$ , by the union bound we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Prob}(\exists s \in S_1 \text{ s.t. } \|T(s) - T(p)\| \leq \tau + \varepsilon\sqrt{1}) \\ &\leq \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{r_1 + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}) \rceil} \text{Prob}(\|T(z)\| \leq \frac{\tau + \varepsilon}{d}) \quad \text{for an arbitrary } z \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1} \\ &= \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(4 + N\sqrt{2}) \rceil} \text{Prob}\left(\|T(z)\| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{N}\right)\frac{\tau}{d}\right) \quad \text{for an arbitrary } z \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1} \\ &< \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(4 + N\sqrt{2}) \rceil} \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{N}\right)\frac{\tau}{d}\right)^{k/2} \quad \text{by estimation (4)} \\ &< \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{N}\right)\frac{\tau}{d}\right)^{c_2 k} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

for some universal constant  $c_2 > 0$ , as long as  $k > \mathcal{C} \log(\lambda_X)$  for some  $\mathcal{C}$  large enough.

For  $j \geq 2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Prob}(\exists s \in S_j \text{ s.t. } \|T(s) - T(p)\| \leq \tau + \varepsilon\sqrt{j}) \\ &\leq \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{r_j + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}) \rceil} \text{Prob}(\|T(z)\| \leq \frac{\tau + \varepsilon\sqrt{j}}{r_{j-1} - \varepsilon}) \quad \text{for an arbitrary } z \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1} \\ &= \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(3 + j + N\sqrt{j+1}) \rceil} \text{Prob}(\|T(z)\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}}) \quad \text{for an arbitrary } z \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1} \\ &< \lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(3 + j + N\sqrt{j+1}) \rceil} j^{-k/2} \quad \text{by estimation (4)} \\ &< j^{-c_3 k} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

for some universal constant  $c_3 > 0$ , as long as  $k > \mathcal{C} \log(\lambda_X)$  for some  $\mathcal{C}$  large enough.

Similarly, for all  $1 \leq j$ , we have

$$\lambda_X^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{r_j + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}) \rceil} e^{-c_1 k j} \leq e^{-c_4 k j}, \quad (8)$$

for some universal constant  $c_4 > 0$ , as long as  $k > \mathcal{C} \log(\lambda_X)$  for some  $\mathcal{C}$  large enough.

From estimations (6), (7), (8) and by the union bound we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(\text{dist}(T(p), T(X)) \geq \tau) &\geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \text{Prob}(\text{dist}(T(p), T(X_j)) < \tau) \\ &\geq 1 - \left( \left(1 + \frac{1}{N}\right) \frac{\tau}{d} \right)^{c_2 k} - \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} j^{-c_3 k} - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-c_4 k j} \\ &\geq 1 - \delta \quad \text{for } k = O\left(\frac{\log(\frac{\lambda_X}{\delta})}{\log(\frac{d}{\tau})}\right) \text{ large enough.} \end{aligned}$$

□

## References

- [1] I. Abraham, Y. Bartal, and O. Neiman. Embedding metric spaces in their intrinsic dimension. In *19th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, page 363372, 2008.
- [2] D. Achlioptas. Database-friendly random projections: Johnson-Lindenstrauss with binary coins. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 66:671–687, 2003.
- [3] P. Agarwal, S. Har-Peled, and H. Yu. Embeddings on surfaces, curves, and moving points in Euclidean space. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 381–389. ACM, 2007.
- [4] S. Dasgupta and A. Gupta. An elementary proof of a theorem by johnson and lindenstrauss. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 22:60–65, 2002.
- [5] L. Gottlieb and R. Krauthgamer. Proximity algorithms for nearly doubling spaces. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 27(4):1759–1769, 2013.
- [6] A. Gupta, R. Krauthgamer, and J.R. Lee. Bounded geometries, fractals, and low-distortion embeddings. In *IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, page 534543. IEEE, 2003.
- [7] P. Indyk. Algorithmic applications of low-distortion geometric embeddings. In *42nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 10–33. IEEE, 2001.
- [8] P. Indyk and A. Naor. Nearest neighbor preserving embeddings. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 3(3):Art. 31, 2007.

- [9] W. Johnson and J. Lindenstrauss. Extensions of Lipschitz mappings into a Hilbert space. In G. Hedlund, editor, *Conference in Modern Analysis and Probability*, volume 26 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 189–206, Providence, 1984. AMS.
- [10] R. Krauthgamer and J.R. Lee. Navigating nets: Simple algorithms for proximity search. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 791–801, 2004.
- [11] Vu Khac Ky, P.-L. Poirion, and L. Liberti. Using the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma in linear and integer programming. Technical Report 07/4985, Optimization Online, 2015.
- [12] A. Magen. Dimensionality reductions in  $\ell_2$  that preserve volumes and distance to affine spaces. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 30(1):139–153, 2007.
- [13] J. Matousek. *Lectures on Discrete Geometry*. Springer, New York, 2002.
- [14] A. Mood, F. Graybill, and D. Boes. *Introduction to the Theory of Statistics*. McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- [15] K. Murty and S. Kabadi. Some NP-complete problems in quadratic and nonlinear programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 39:117–129, 1987.
- [16] J.-L. Verger-Gaugry. Covering a ball with smaller equal balls in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . *Discrete Computational Geometry*, 33:143–155, 2005.