

A Nonconvex Nonsmooth Regularization Method for Compressed Sensing and Low-Rank Matrix Completion

Zhuo-Xu Cui, Qibin Fan*

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China

Abstract

In this paper, nonconvex and nonsmooth models for compressed sensing (CS) and low-rank matrix completion (MC) is studied. The problem is formulated as a nonconvex regularized least square optimization problems, in which the ℓ_0 -norm and the rank function are replaced by ℓ_1 -norm and nuclear norm, and adding a nonconvex penalty function respectively. An alternating minimization scheme is developed, and the existence of a subsequence, which generate by the alternating algorithm that converges to a critical point, is proved. The NSP, RIP, and RIP condition for stable recovery guarantees also be analysed for the nonconvex regularized CS and MC problems respectively. Finally, the performance of the proposed method is demonstrated through experimental results.

Keywords: Compressed sensing, low-rank matrix completion, nonconvex nonsmooth regularization, alternating minimization methods.

1. Introduction

The compressed sensing (CS) problem is to recover an unknown vector from a small amount of observations. It's possible to exactly reconstruct it with high probability if the vector is sparse. The mathematical formula reads:

$$\min_x \{\|x\|_0 : Ax = y\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $n \ll p$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is a measurement ensembles [8, 6, 7, 9, 11]. The matrix completion (MC) problem is to recover a low-rank matrix from a small

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: zhuoxucui@whu.edu.cn (Zhuo-Xu Cui), qbfan@whu.edu.cn (Qibin Fan)

Preprint submitted to Journal of

February 2, 2022

amount of observations:

$$\min_X \{rank(X) : X_{ij} = Y_{ij}, (i, j) \in \Omega\}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$, Ω is a given set of index pairs (i, j) [5, 10].

Due to the minimization of ℓ_0 -norm and $rank$ function, these problems (1.1), (1.2) are NP-hard problem in general, In some sense, ℓ_1 -norm and nuclear norm are the tightest convex relaxation of these nonconvex functions, respectively. The nuclear norm of X define as $\|X\|_* = \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i(X)$, where σ_i is the i largest singular value of X and m is the number of singular value. Therefore, the problem (1.1) and (1.2) can be relaxed into:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \{\|x\|_1 : Ax = y\}, \quad (1.3)$$

$$\min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} \{\|X\|_* : X_{ij} = Y_{ij}, (i, j) \in \Omega\}, \quad (1.4)$$

and the problem (1.3) and (1.4) is equivalent to (1.1) and (1.2) respectively under certain incoherence conditions [17]. However, the solution of (1.3) and (1.4) is usually suboptimal to the original problem (1.1) and (1.2), the ℓ_1 -norm minimization problem may yield the vector with lower sparse rate than the real one, and can't recover a sparse target with minimum measurements. Another limitation of the ℓ_1 -norm minimization is its bias caused by shrinking all the element toward zero simultaneously [22], the nuclear norm of a matrix is the ℓ_1 -norm of it's singular value vector, so it also have these limitations.

Since the ℓ_1 -norm may not be approximated ℓ_0 -norm well, in CS recovery problems, many known nonconvex surrogates of ℓ_0 -norm have been proposed, include ℓ_p -norm ($0 < p < 1$) [18], Smoothly Clipped Absolute Deviation (SCAD) [14], Minimax Concave Penalty (MCP) [34], Exponential Type Penalty (ETP) [19], etc. Recently, some of these method have been extended to low-rank matrix restoration and have well performance.

Because of the limitation of (1.3) and (1.4), we augment them by adding a nonconvex and nonsmooth term $\beta\Phi(x)$ and $\beta\hat{\Phi}(X)$, respectively, where β is a positive scalar,

$$\Phi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^p \varphi(x_i), \quad \hat{\Phi}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(\sigma_i(X)), \quad (1.5)$$

where $\varphi(t) = \frac{\alpha|t|}{1+\alpha|t|}$ [29, 12], σ_i is the i largest singular value of X and m is the number

of singular value. The augmented model for (1.3) and (1.4) are

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \{\|x\|_1 + \beta \Phi(x) : Ax = y\}, \quad (1.6)$$

$$\min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} \{\|X\|_* + \beta \hat{\Phi}(X) : \mathcal{A}X = b\}, \quad (1.7)$$

which can be solved by introducing a auxiliary variable and using alternating minimization scheme [33]. In (1.7), \mathcal{A} is a linear operator, if we choose \mathcal{A} as a componentwise projection, it become the matrix completion problem. The solution to (1.6) and (1.7) is also a solution to (1.3) and (1.4) as long as β is sufficiently small, and β controls the tradeoff between ℓ_1 -norm term and nonconvex term. For recovering a sparse vector and a low-rank matrix, the choose of the suitable β should obey follow formula

$$\beta \leq \frac{1}{20\alpha}. \quad (1.8)$$

In general, we choose $\alpha = 0.5$, so $\beta \leq 0.1$.

One can observe that $\Phi(x)$ convergence to $\|x\|_0$ and $C\|x\|_1$, as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ and $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ respectively, where C is a large scaler. It has been show in [28] that φ satisfies: (1) φ is continuous (Lipschitz function), symmetric on $(-\infty, \infty)$, C^2 on $(0, \infty)$ and $\varphi(0) = 0$ is a strict minimum; (2) $\varphi'(0^+) > 0$ and $\varphi'(t) \geq 0$ for all $t > 0$; (3) φ'' is increasing on $(0, \infty)$ with $\varphi''(t) < 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi''(t) = 0$, which implies that our augment regularizers to be a good promoted penalty function, and the augment term have some properties as follows:

- 24 (1) $\alpha > 0$, $\hat{\Phi}(X) \geq 0(\Phi(x) \geq 0)$, with equality hold if only if $X = 0(x = 0)$;
- (2) $\hat{\Phi}(X)(\Phi(x))$ is a decreasing function of α , and $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\Phi}(X) = \text{rank}(X)(\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(x) = \|x\|_0)$;
- (3) $\hat{\Phi}(X)$ is unitarily invariant, that is $\hat{\Phi}(UXV^*) = \hat{\Phi}(X)$ whenever $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$ are orthogonal matrix.

This paper also shows the recovery guarantees for augment model of compressed sensing and low-rank matrix completion respectively, the results are given based on varieties of properties of matrix A and linear operator \mathcal{A} including the null-space property (NSP), the restricted isometry property (RIP), at last, the RIP condition for stable recovery are given.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2, we firstly give the augmented model, and introduce the nonconvex and nonsmooth penalty function for low-rank matrix

36 completion and sparse vector recovery. Then, we use the alternating minimization scheme for solving the proposed problem and give the convergence result of the proposed method. In Sect. 3, we shows the recovery guarantees for augmented model of compressed sensing and low-rank matrix completion respectively, include NSP, RIP, and so on. In Sect. 4, some numerical experiment results of our augment model have been showed on simulated and real data. Finally, some conclusions are summarized in Sect. 5.

2. Algorithm and Convergence Analysis

In this section, we propose an alternating minimization scheme for solving (1.6) and (1.7). We begin with introducing an auxiliary variable, and obtain a new cost function, then we decompose the cost function into two subproblems, soft-thresholding operator has been used to solve subproblem one and Quasi-Newton's method has been used to solve subproblem two. Finally, we give the algorithm for solving (2.5) and show its
48 convergence.

Firstly, we consider the variant of (1.6) and (1.7) are

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \{ \|x\|_1 + \beta \Phi(x) : \|Ax - y\|_2 \leq \epsilon \}, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} \{ \|X\|_* + \beta \hat{\Phi}(X) : \|\mathcal{A}X - b\|_2 \leq \epsilon \}, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\epsilon \geq 0$ admits the possible noise in the measurement. The equivalent Lagrangian form:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} : \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - y\|_2^2 + \lambda (\|x\|_1 + \beta \Phi(x)), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} : \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{A}X - b\|_2^2 + \lambda (\|X\|_* + \beta \hat{\Phi}(X)), \quad (2.4)$$

where λ is the regularization parameter which controls the tradeoff between data fitting term and the regularization term. Next, we mainly introduce the low-rank matrix completion problems, and it is fairly easy to extended the result to sparse vector recovery.

Firstly, by introducing an auxiliary variable $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$, cost function (2.4) can be approximately transformed into

$$\varepsilon(X, W) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{A}X - b\|_2^2 + \lambda (1 + \alpha \cdot \beta) \|W\|_* + \lambda \cdot \beta \hat{\Psi}(X) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|X - W\|_F^2, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\hat{\Psi}(X) = \hat{\Phi}(X) - \alpha \cdot \|X\|_*$, and there exists Gateaux derivatives of $\hat{\Psi}(X)$ at X , however, the Gateaux derivatives of $\hat{\Phi}(X)$ is not always exist.

Given $(W^{(s-1)}, X^{(s-1)})$, the iteration scheme of problem (2.5) can be described as follows:

$$W^{(s)} \in \arg \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} \varepsilon(W, X^{(s-1)}); \quad (2.6)$$

$$X^{(s)} \in \arg \min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} \varepsilon(W^{(s)}, X), \quad (2.7)$$

where $\arg \min$ denotes the minimal set to an optimization problem. It's easy to know that the W-subproblem (2.6) can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(s)} &\in \arg \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} \frac{\rho}{2} \|X - W\|_F^2 + \lambda(1 + \alpha \cdot \beta) \|W\|_* \\ &= \arg \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} \frac{1}{2} \|X - W\|_F^2 + \tau \|W\|_*, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where $\tau = \frac{\lambda(1+\alpha \cdot \beta)}{\rho}$, according to [3], it's easy to show the solution of (2.8) as

$$W^{(s)} = \mathcal{D}_\tau(X^{(s-1)}), \quad (2.9)$$

where \mathcal{D}_τ is the soft-thresholding operator, $\mathcal{D}_\tau = U\mathcal{D}_\tau(\Sigma)V^*$, $\mathcal{D}_\tau(\Sigma) = \text{diag}(\{\sigma_i - \tau\}_+)$, t_+ is the positive part of t , namely, $t_+ = \max(0, t)$ and $X = U\Sigma V^*$ is the singular value decomposition (SVD) of matrix X .

The X-subproblem (2.7) can be formulated as follows

$$X^{(s)} = \arg \min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{A}X - b\|_2^2 + \lambda \cdot \beta \hat{\Psi}(X) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|X - W^{(s)}\|_F^2, \quad (2.10)$$

we could use Quasi-Newton's method to solve this optimization problem

$$(\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} + \rho \mathcal{I}) \Delta X = \mathcal{A}^*(b - \mathcal{A}X^{(s-1)}) - \lambda \cdot \beta D_X \hat{\Psi}(X^{(s-1)}) + \rho(W^{(s)} - X^{(s-1)}), \quad (2.11)$$

$$X^{(s)} = X^{(s-1)} + \Delta X, \quad (2.12)$$

where \mathcal{I} is an identity operator, and \mathcal{A}^* is the adjoint of \mathcal{A} . In order to get ΔX , we could use conjugate gradient method for solving this linear system (2.11).

Proposition 2.1. *The Gateaux derivatives of $\hat{\Psi}(X)$ is*

$$D_X \hat{\Psi}(X) = U^* \Lambda V, \quad (2.13)$$

60 where $\Lambda = \text{Diag}(\frac{\partial\psi(\sigma_1)}{\partial\sigma_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial\psi(\sigma_m)}{\partial\sigma_m})_{n_1 \times n_2}$, $\psi(t) = \varphi(t) - \alpha|t|$ and U, V are unitary matrices which consist of left-singular vectors and right-singular vectors.

PROOF. φ is a nonconvex and nonsmooth function, and $\varphi(t) = \alpha|t| + \psi(t)$, $\psi \in C^2$. $D_\sigma \hat{\Psi}(\sigma) = \text{Diag}(\frac{\partial\psi(\sigma_1)}{\partial\sigma_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial\psi(\sigma_s)}{\partial\sigma_s})_{n_1 \times n_2}$, $\Sigma(X) = U^* X V$, U and V are unitary matrices which consist of left-singular vectors and right-singular vectors, and $\Sigma(X) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, we have $D_X \Sigma(X) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2} \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}, \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2})$, $\langle D_X \Sigma(X), H \rangle = U^* H V$, where $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$ is an arbitrary matrix. By chain rule of Gateaux derivatives, we have $D_X \hat{\Psi}(X) = U^* \text{Diag}(\frac{\partial\psi(\sigma_1)}{\partial\sigma_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial\psi(\sigma_s)}{\partial\sigma_s})_{n_1 \times n_2} V$.

Based on the analysis above, we give a basic framework of the alternating minimization scheme for solving our nonconvex augmented model of low-rank completion problem as follows:

Algorithm to Solve The Minimum Value of (2.5)

Step 1: Initialize $X^{(0)}$ and $s = 1$;

Step 2: Update X and W until the convergence

W-step:

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(s)} &= \arg \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} \varepsilon(W, X^{(s-1)}), \\ W^{(s)} &= \mathcal{D}_\tau(X^{(s-1)}) \text{ and } \tau = \frac{\lambda(1+\alpha)}{\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

X-step:

$$\begin{aligned} X^{(s)} &= X^{(s-1)} + \Delta X, \text{ where} \\ (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} + \rho \mathcal{I}) \Delta X &= -D_X \varepsilon(X, W^{(s)}), \end{aligned}$$

where, $D_X \varepsilon(X, W^{(s)})$ is the Gateaux derivatives at X .

(Here the iteration index is the superscript s .)

72

Proposition 2.1. (1) For all $s \geq 1$, there exist a γ such that

$$\varepsilon(W^{(s)}, X^{(s)}) + \gamma(\|W^{(s)} - W^{(s-1)}\|_F^2 + \|X^{(s)} - X^{(s-1)}\|_F^2) \leq \varepsilon(W^{(s-1)}, X^{(s-1)}), \quad (2.14)$$

hence, $\varepsilon(W^{(s)}, X^{(s)})$ dose not increase.

(2)

$$\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} (\|W^{(s)} - W^{(s-1)}\|_F^2 + \|X^{(s)} - X^{(s-1)}\|_F^2) < +\infty. \quad (2.15)$$

[1, 2].

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\{(W^{(s)}, X^{(s)})\}$ be a sequence generated by our algorithm, then there exists a subsequence of $\{(W^{(s)}, X^{(s)})\}$ such that it converges to a critical point.*

PROOF. According to (2.8), we first obtain

$$0 \in \partial_W \varepsilon(W^{(s)}, X^{(s-1)}) = \lambda(1 + \alpha \cdot \beta) \partial \|W\|_* + \rho(W^{(s)} - X^{(s-1)}), \quad (2.16)$$

and we have

$$\partial_W \varepsilon(W^{(s)}, X^{(s)}) = \lambda(1 + \alpha \cdot \beta) \partial \|W\|_* + \rho(W^{(s)} - X^{(s)}). \quad (2.17)$$

According to (2.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -(\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} + \rho \mathcal{L})(X^{(s)} - X^{(s-1)}) &= D_X \varepsilon(X^{(s-1)}, W^{(s)}) \\ &= \mathcal{A}^*(Y - \mathcal{A}X^{(s-1)}) - \lambda \cdot \beta D_X \hat{\Psi}(X^{(s-1)}) + \rho(W^{(s)} - X^{(s-1)}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

and we have

$$D_X \varepsilon(X^{(s)}, W^{(s)}) = \mathcal{A}^*(\mathcal{A}X^{(s)} - Y) + \lambda \cdot \beta D_X \hat{\Psi}(X^{(s)}) + \rho(X^{(s)} - W^{(s)}). \quad (2.19)$$

With (2.16), (2.17) and (2.18), (2.19), we obtain

$$\partial_W \varepsilon(W^{(s)}, X^{(s)}) = \rho(X^{(s-1)} - X^{(s)}), \quad (2.20)$$

and

$$D_X \varepsilon(X^{(s)}, W^{(s)}) = \lambda \cdot \beta (D_X \hat{\Psi}(X^{(s)}) - D_X \hat{\Psi}(X^{(s-1)})). \quad (2.21)$$

Suppose there exist a bounded subsequence $\{(W^{(s')}, X^{(s')})\}$, by using (2.15) we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \{(W^{(s')}, X^{(s')})\} - \{(W^{(s'-1)}, X^{(s'-1)})\} = 0, \quad (2.22)$$

and $D_X \hat{\Psi}(X)$ is a continuous function on bounded subsets, then,

$$\{(W^*, X^*)\} = \lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \{(W^{(s')}, X^{(s')})\}, \quad (2.23)$$

is a critical point.

3. Recovery Guarantees

In this section, we established recovery guarantees for our augmented models (1.6) and extends these result to matrix recovery models (1.7). The result for (1.6) and (1.7) are given based on varieties of properties of A and \mathcal{A} including the null-space property (NSP) and the restricted isometry property (RIP). It ensures the success of the low-rank matrix completion algorithms presented in Sect. 2, restricted isometry constants are introduced in Definition 3.2 and Definition 3.3 , the success of sparse vectors recovery and of low-rank matrices completion are then established under some conditions on these constants for our models in (1.6), (1.7).

3.1. Recovery Guarantees for Compressed Sensing

Definition 3.1. A matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is said to satisfies the null-space property relative to a set $\mathcal{S} \subset [p]$ if

$$\|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 \leq \|h_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}\|_1, \quad (3.1)$$

for all $h \in \text{NULL}(A) \setminus \{0\}$ [21, 13].

It is said to satisfy the null-space property of order k if it satisfies the null-space property relative to any set $\mathcal{S} \subset [p]$ with $\text{card}(\mathcal{S}) \leq k$. Given every vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ supported on a set \mathcal{S} is the unique solution of (1.3) if and only if A satisfies the null-space property relative to \mathcal{S} . Then, we extend the necessary and sufficient NSP condition to our augment model (1.6).

Theorem 3.1. (NSP condition).

We choose the augmented regularization term Φ introduced in (1.5). Problem (1.6) uniquely recovers k -sparse vector x_0 from measurement $Ax_0 = y$ if

$$(1 + \beta \cdot \alpha) \|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 \leq \|h_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}\|_1 \quad (3.2)$$

hold for all vectors $h \in \text{NULL}(A)$ and coordinate sets \mathcal{S} of cardinality $|\mathcal{S}| \leq k$.

PROOF. $\|x_0 + h\|_1 + \beta\Phi(x_0 + h)$
 $= \|x_0 + h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 + \beta\Phi(x_0 + h_{\mathcal{S}}) + \|h_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}\|_1 + \beta\Phi(h_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}})$
 $\geq \|x_0\|_1 - \|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 + \beta\Phi(x_0) + \beta\Phi(x_0 + h_{\mathcal{S}}) - \beta\Phi(x_0) + \|h_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}\|_1 + \beta\Phi(h_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}})$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq [\|x_0\|_1 + \beta\Phi(x_0)] - \|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 + \beta \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\alpha(|x_i + h_i| - |x_i|)}{(1 + \alpha|x_i + h_i|) \cdot (1 + \alpha|x_i|)} + \alpha \|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 + \Psi(h_{\mathcal{S}}) \\
&\geq [\|x_0\|_1 + \beta\Phi(x_0)] + [\|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 - (1 + \beta \cdot \alpha) \|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1] + \beta\Phi(h_{\mathcal{S}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality from the triangle inequality and the second follows from $\frac{\alpha(|x_i + h_i| - |x_i|)}{(1 + \alpha|x_i + h_i|) \cdot (1 + \alpha|x_i|)} \geq -\alpha|h_i|$. Since $\Phi(h_{\mathcal{S}}) > 0$, and $\|x_0 + h\|_1 + \beta\Phi(x_0 + h)$ is strictly larger than $\|x_0\|_1 + \beta\Phi(x_0)$, so we can derive inequality (3.2).

Definition 3.2. *The k th restricted isometry constant $\delta_k = \delta_k(A)$ of matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is the smallest $\delta \geq 0$ such that*

$$(1 - \delta)\|x\|_2^2 \leq \|Ax\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\|x\|_2^2, \quad (3.3)$$

for all k -sparse vectors $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ [8].

We say that A satisfies the restricted isometry property if δ_k is small for reasonably large k , then we establish the success of sparse recovery via augment model (1.6) for measurement matrices with small restricted isometry constants.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is k -sparse. If A satisfies RIP with $\delta_{2k} \leq 0.4663$ and $\beta \leq \frac{1}{20\alpha}$, then x_0 is the unique minimizer of (1.6) given by measurement $Ax_0 = y$.*

PROOF. [27] shows that any vectors $h \in \text{NULL}(A)$ satisfies

$$\|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 \leq \theta_{2k} \|h_{\mathcal{S}^c}\|_1, \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\theta_{2k} := \sqrt{\frac{4(1 + 5\delta_{2k} - 4\delta_{2k}^2)}{(1 - \delta_{2k})(32 - 25\delta_{2k})}}, \quad (3.5)$$

From (3.3), we have

$$\beta \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{\theta_{2k}} - 1 \right), \quad (3.6)$$

for $\delta_{2k} = 0.4663$, we obtain $\frac{1}{\theta_{2k}} - 1 \approx 0.05 \geq \alpha \cdot \beta$.

Remark1: For (1.3) to recover any k -sparse vector uniformly, [4] shows the sufficiency of $\delta_{2k} < 0.4142$ and improved to $\delta_{2k} < 0.4404$ [24], $\delta_{2k} < 0.4531$ [16], $\delta_{2k} < 0.4652$ [15], $\delta_{2k} < 0.4931$ [27] and the bound is still being improved.

Remark2: In general, we choose $\alpha = 0.5$ in PF(1.5), so we have $\beta \leq 0.1$.

Next, it shows that the condition $\delta_{2k} \leq 0.4378$ is actually sufficient to guarantee stable recovery of x via augmented model (2.1).

Theorem 3.3. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a arbitrary vector, \mathcal{S} be the coordinate set of its k largest components in magnitude. Let x^* be the solution of and error vector $h = x^* - x_0$ satisfy

$$\|h_{\mathcal{S}}\| \leq C_1 \|h_{\mathcal{S}}\| + C_2 \|(x_0)_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1, \quad (3.7)$$

where

$$C_1 = \frac{1 + \alpha \cdot \beta}{1 - \alpha \cdot \beta}, \quad C_2 = \frac{2}{1 - \alpha \cdot \beta}. \quad (3.8)$$

PROOF. Since $x^* = x_0 + h$ is the minimizer of (1.6), we have

$$\|x_0 + h\|_1 + \beta\Phi(x_0 + h) \leq \|x_0\|_1 + \beta\Phi(x_0). \quad (3.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{We have } \|x_0 + h\|_1 + \beta\Phi(x_0 + h) \\ &= \|(x_0)_{\mathcal{S}} + h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 + \beta\Phi((x_0)_{\mathcal{S}} + h_{\mathcal{S}}) + \|(x_0)_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} + h_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}\|_1 + \beta\Phi((x_0)_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} + h_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}) \\ &\geq \|(x_0)_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 - \|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 + \beta\Phi((x_0)_{\mathcal{S}}) - \|(x_0)_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}\|_1 + \|h_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}\|_1 + \beta\Phi((x_0)_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}) \\ &\quad + \beta(\Phi((x_0)_{\mathcal{S}} + h_{\mathcal{S}}) - \Phi((x_0)_{\mathcal{S}})) + \beta(\Phi((x_0)_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} + h_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}) - \Phi((x_0)_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}})) \\ &\geq [\|x_0\|_1 + \beta\Phi(x_0)] - 2\|(x_0)_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}\|_1 - (1 + \alpha \cdot \beta)\|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 + (1 - \alpha \cdot \beta)\|h_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.9), we have

$$\|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 \leq \frac{1 + \alpha \cdot \beta}{1 - \alpha \cdot \beta} \|h_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 + \frac{2}{1 - \alpha \cdot \beta} \|(x_0)_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1. \quad (3.10)$$

Theorem 3.4. (see [24]) Let $y = Ax + n$, where n is a arbitrary noise vector with $\|n\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. If A satisfied RIP with $\delta_{2k} \leq 0.4378$, then the solution x^* of (2.1) satisfies

$$\|x^* - x_0\|_1 \leq C_3 \cdot \sqrt{k} \|n\|_2 + C_4 \cdot \|(x_0)_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}\|_1, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\|x^* - x_0\|_2 \leq C_5 \cdot \|n\|_2 + C_6 \cdot \|(x_0)_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}\|_1 / \sqrt{k}, \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$C_3 = \frac{2\sqrt{2}(1 + C_1)}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2k}}(1 - C_1\theta_{2k})}, \quad C_4 = \frac{(1 + \theta_{2k})C_2}{1 - C_1\theta_{2k}}, \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$C_5 = \frac{2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2k}}} \left\{ \frac{4C_1}{1 - C_1\theta_{2k}} \sqrt{\frac{2 - \delta_{2k}}{(1 - \delta_{2k})(32 - 25\delta_{2k})}} + 1 \right\}, \quad (3.14)$$

$$C_6 = \frac{2C_2}{1 - C_1\theta_{2k}} \sqrt{\frac{2(2 - \delta_{2k})}{(1 - \delta_{2k})(32 - 25\delta_{2k})}}. \quad (3.15)$$

3.2. Recovery Guarantees for Matrix Recovery

It's easy to extended the NSP and RIP condition to low-rank matrix recovery, first, let us introduce some definitions and properties. $\|X\|_* = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(X)$, $\|X\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i^2(X)}$ denote the nuclear and Frobenius norm of X respectively, where σ_i is the i largest singular value of X and r is the number of singular value.

Let X and W be two matrices of the same size, we have $\sum_{i=r}^p \varphi(\sigma_i(X) - \sigma_i(W)) \leq \hat{\Phi}(X - W)$, because $|\sigma_i(X) - \sigma_i(W)| \leq |\sigma_i(X - W)|$, for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and φ is a increasing function.

Theorem 3.5. *Problem (1.7) uniquely recovers all matrices X of rank r or less from measurement $\mathcal{A}X = b$ if*

$$(1 + \beta \cdot \alpha) \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(H) \leq \sum_{i=r+1}^m \sigma_i(H), \quad (3.16)$$

holds for all matrices $H \in \text{NULL}(\mathcal{A})$.

PROOF. $\|X + H\|_* + \beta \hat{\Phi}(X + H) \geq \beta \sum_{i=1}^m (\sigma_i(X) + \sigma_i(H)) + \beta \sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(\sigma_i(X) + \sigma_i(H))$
 $\geq \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(X) - \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(H) + \sum_{i=r+1}^m \sigma_i(H) + \beta \sum_{i=1}^r \varphi(\sigma_i(X) + \sigma_i(H)) + \beta \sum_{i=1+r}^m \varphi(\sigma_i(H))$
 $\geq [\|X\|_* + \beta \hat{\Phi}(X)] + [\sum_{i=r+1}^m \sigma_i(H) - (1 + \beta \cdot \alpha) \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(H)] + \beta \sum_{i=1+r}^m \varphi(\sigma_i(H)).$

Definition 3.3. *for a linear map $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_3}$ and for $r \leq m = \min\{n_1, n_2\}$, the rank restricted isometry constant $\delta_r = \delta_r(\mathcal{A})$ is the defined as the smallest $\delta \geq 0$ such that*

$$(1 - \delta) \|X\|_F^2 \leq \|\mathcal{A}(X)\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta) \|X\|_F^2, \quad (3.17)$$

for all matrices $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ of rank at most r [30].

Theorem 3.6. *(RIP condition for exact recovery). Let X be a matrix with rank r or less, the augment model (1.7) exactly recovers X from measurement $b = \mathcal{A}(X)$ if \mathcal{A} satisfies the RIP condition with $\delta_{2r} \leq 0.4663$.*

PROOF. In [24], establishes that any $H \in \text{NULL}(\mathcal{A})$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(H) \leq \theta_{2r} \sum_{i=r+1}^m \sigma_i(H)$, hence (3.16) holds if $(1 + \alpha \cdot \beta)^{-1} \geq \theta_{2r}$.

Theorem 3.7. *(RIP condition for stable recovery) Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ be an arbitrary matrix, and let $b = \mathcal{A}X + n$, where \mathcal{A} is a linear operator and n is an arbitrary noise. If*

A satisfies the RIP with $\delta_{2r} \leq 0.4378$, then, the solution X^* of (2.2) satisfies the error bounds

$$\|X^* - X\|_* \leq \bar{C}_3 \cdot \sqrt{r} \|n\|_2 + \bar{C}_4 \cdot \sum_{i=r+1}^m \sigma_i(X), \quad (3.18)$$

$$\|X^* - X\|_F \leq \bar{C}_5 \cdot \|n\|_2 + \bar{C}_6 \cdot \sum_{i=r+1}^m \sigma_i(X)/\sqrt{r}, \quad (3.19)$$

$\bar{C}_3, \bar{C}_4, \bar{C}_5$ and \bar{C}_6 are given formulas (3.13)-(3.15) in which θ_{2k} shall be replaced by θ_{2r} .

4. Numerical Experiments

4.1. Test on Compressed Sensing

In this subsection, we perform experiments on synthetic data to illustrate the behavior of the augmented nonconvex method and Lasso. The support S of x is equal to $\{1, \dots, k\}$, where k is the size of the support. For i in the support of x , x_i is independently drawn from a Gaussian distribution with zero mean and standard deviation $\sigma = 1$. The A_i are drawn from a multivariate Gaussian with mean zero and covariance matrix Σ , where A_i is the i column of ensemble A . For the first setting, Σ is set to the identity, for the second setting, Σ is block diagonal with blocks equal to $0.2I + 0.8\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^*$ [20]. We perform the experiments ($p = 512, n = 128$) for which we report the estimation relative error, which defines as

$$RelErr = \frac{\|x^{opt} - x\|_2}{\|x\|_2}.$$

The recovery is performed via the augment nonconvex method algorithm, and we use

$$\|x^{(s)} - x^{(s-1)}\|_2 / \|x^{(s-1)}\|_2 < 10^{-4},$$

and the maximum iteration step $maxit = 500$ as stopping criterion. In Fig 1. we observe that the Lasso performs as well as the augmented nonconvex method with parameter $\alpha = 0.5, \beta = 0.1$ and $\alpha = 0.1, \beta = 0.5$ on very sparse case. But, when the support of x is large, the augmented nonconvex method perform well than Lasso on both two setting [31].




Figure 1: (a) Setting 1, the column of ensemble A_i with covariance matrix $\Sigma = I$; (b) Setting 2, the column of ensemble A_i with covariance matrix $\Sigma = 0.2I + 0.811^*$.

4.2. Reconstruction from Sparse Fourier Measurement

In this subsection, we consider the problem of image reconstruction from a limited number of Fourier measurements. In this setting, the operator of (1.1) corresponds to $A = MF$, where F denotes the Fourier transform and M is a masking operator that retains only a subset of the available Fourier coefficients [25], and we use the augmented nonconvex method to solve the following problem

$$\min_{f \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} \frac{1}{2} \|Af - g\|_2^2 + \lambda \cdot (\|f\|_{TV} + \beta \sum_{t_1, t_2} \varphi(\sqrt{|D_1 f(t_1, t_2)|^2 + |D_2 f(t_1, t_2)|^2})),$$

where $\|f\|_{TV}$ is the total variation norm, for discrete $f(t_1, t_2)$, $0 \leq t_1 \leq n_1, 0 \leq t_2 \leq n_2$ and D_1 is the finite difference $D_1 f(t_1, t_2) = f(t_1, t_2) - f(t_1 - 1, t_2)$ and D_2 is the finite difference $D_2 f(t_1, t_2) = f(t_1, t_2) - f(t_1, t_2 - 1)$. The reported experiments are conducted




Figure 2: (a)-(c) Images with size 256×256 and downsample factor=1.5; (d) Radial sampling mask with 64 lines; (e) low-frequency sampling with 40% portion.

on images shown in Fig. 2. To create the measured data we use two different Fourier

Table 1: PSNR comparisons on Fourier image reconstruction for several sampling patterned and noise conditions (N-TV represent our proposed nonconvex regularization method).

Sampling	PSNR	Radial-48 lines				Radial-64 lines				Radial-80 lines				Low-frequency portion 30				Low-frequency portion 40				Low-frequency portion 50			
		15dB	20dB	30dB	∞ dB	15dB	20dB	30dB	∞ dB	15dB	20dB	30dB	∞ dB	15dB	20dB	30dB	∞ dB	15dB	20dB	30dB	∞ dB	15dB	20dB	30dB	∞ dB
Lenna	N-TV	38.324	38.659	38.776	38.797	38.961	39.496	39.714	39.741	39.373	40.121	40.441	40.487	38.425	38.549	38.615	38.610	39.024	39.298	39.381	39.406	39.502	39.930	40.112	40.141
	TV	38.166	38.367	38.475	38.497	38.885	39.156	39.344	39.371	39.331	39.776	40.054	40.092	38.230	38.362	38.429	38.448	38.855	39.106	39.222	39.246	39.340	39.732	39.944	39.978
Cameraman	N-TV	37.799	37.905	37.973	37.983	38.276	38.512	38.598	38.591	38.758	38.997	39.107	39.122	37.070	37.129	37.142	37.144	37.629	37.777	37.838	37.839	38.108	38.383	38.469	38.481
	TV	37.441	37.571	37.668	37.637	37.927	38.206	38.328	38.350	38.544	38.798	38.993	39.018	36.899	36.973	37.025	37.005	37.523	37.642	37.712	37.782	38.037	38.238	38.362	38.369
Airplane	N-TV	39.555	40.426	40.782	40.819	40.065	40.780	41.103	41.148	39.751	41.496	42.380	42.482	38.426	38.583	38.645	38.639	38.847	39.174	39.257	39.268	39.078	39.687	39.839	39.853
	TV	39.236	39.893	40.401	40.509	39.718	40.571	41.486	41.679	40.039	40.934	42.164	42.418	38.257	38.384	38.490	38.456	38.696	38.975	39.116	39.112	38.960	39.476	39.472	39.765

sampling patterns, namely, a radial mask with 48, 64 and 80 radial lines and a low-frequency sampling with 30%, 40% and 50% portion. As an additional degradation factor we consider the presence of complex Gaussian noise in Fourier domain of four different levels. These correspond to a signal-to-noise-ratio (SNR) of $\{15, 20, 30, \infty\}$ dB, and the last SNR value indicates the absence of noise in the measurements. Peak-signal-to-noise ratio(PSNRs) is used to measure the quality of the restored images, which are defined as

$$PSNR = 10 \cdot \log \frac{255^2}{MSE} [dB]$$

where MSE is the Mean-Squared-Error per pixel. In Table. 1 and Fig. 3 shows that the augmented nonconvex method perform well than TV.

144




Figure 3: Reconstruct the image from Fourier data sampled with 64 radial lines and 20-dB SNR. (a) Original image; (b) Back-project image; (c) Our proposed nonconvex regularization method; (d) TV reconstruction.

4.3. Test on Matrix Completion

In our numerical experiments, n_1 and n_2 represent the matrix dimension, r is the rank of original matrix, and n_3 denotes the number of measurement. Given $r \leq \min(n_1, n_2)$,

we generate $X = X_L X_R^*$, where matrix $X_L \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times r}$ and $X_R \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times r}$ are generated with independent identically distributed Gaussian entries. The subset Ω of n_3 elements is selected uniformly at random entries from $\{(i, j) : i = 1, \dots, n_1, j = 1, \dots, n_2\}$ [23]. The linear measurement b are set to be $b = \mathcal{A}(X) + n$, where n is the additive Gaussian noise of zero mean and standard deviation σ , which will be specified in different test data sets. We use $sr = n_3/(n_1 n_2)$ to denote the sampling ratio, and $dr = r(n_1 + n_2 - r)$ to denote the number of degree of freedom for a real-valued rank r matrix. As mentioned in [26], when the ratio n_3/dr is greater than 3, the problem can be viewed as an easy problem. On the contrary, it is called as a hard problem.

In this subsection, we apply the proposed augmented nonconvex method for solving the matrix completion problem (2.4). In order to illustrate the performance of this method, we compare the augmented nonconvex method with the nuclear-norm model [5] and the augmented Nuclear-Norm model with $\alpha = 50$ [24].

The recovery is performed via the augment nonconvex method algorithm, and we use

$$\|X^{(s)} - X^{(s-1)}\|_F / \|X^{(s-1)}\|_F < 10^{-8},$$

and the maximum iteration step $maxit = 2000$ as stopping criterion. Our computational results are displayed in Table 2. We choose $n_1 = n_2$, noise level $\sigma = 1e - 3$, and the relative error of the reconstruction matrix X is

$$RelErr = \frac{\|X^{opt} - X\|_F}{\|X\|_F},$$

and it shows that the augment nonconvex method (the last column) can get higher accuracy than others.

Finally, we test the augmented nonconvex method for recovering two real corrupted gray scale image. at first, we use SVD to obtain the low-rank-50 images. Then we randomly select 40% samples from the low-rank image, which corrupted image with noise level $\sigma = 1e - 3$. Finally, these corrupted images are recovered by the proposed nonconvex regularization method and the nuclear-norm model. From Fig. 1, it showed that the quality of image (c) restored by augmented nonconvex method is better than the image (d) restored by nuclear-norm model.

Table 2: Numerical result of nuclear-norm model (Nuclear) [5], augmented nuclear-norm model (Aug-Nuclear) [24] and our proposed nonconvex regularization method (N-Nuclear) for matrix completion problems.

(n_1, r)	n_3/dr	Nuclear RelErr	Aug-Nuclear RelErr	N-Nuclear RelErr
(100,10)	2.632	8.01e-04	9.30e-04	9.48e-05
(200,20)	2.632	9.02e-04	9.71e-04	5.78e-05
(300,30)	2.632	7.88e-04	4.35e-04	4.50e-05
(400,40)	2.632	6.63e-04	4.90e-04	5.29e-05
(500,50)	2.632	6.57e-04	5.25e-04	5.23e-05

5. conclusions

In this paper, we given the augmented model, and introduced the nonconvex and nonsmooth penalty function for low-rank matrix completion and sparse vector recovery. Then, we developed the alternating minimization scheme for solving the proposed problem and give the convergence result of the proposed method. In addition, we showed the recovery guarantees for augmented model of compressed sensing and low-rank matrix completion respectively, including NSP and RIP. At last, some numerical experiment results of our augmented model have been showed on simulated and real data and performs well. However, the unclear norm measures the low-rank property of X without considering the interelement of singular value correlations. When the singular values have high correlations, the nuclear norm is known to have stability problems. In the future research work, We desire to measure the low-rank property of X at group level and have all singular value within a group become nonzero (or zero) simultaneously, and also show the recovery guarantees at group level.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the National Science Foundation of China under Grant 61179039 and the National Key Basic Research Development Program(973 Program) of China under Grant 2011CB707100.




Figure 4: (a) Corresponding low rank image with $n_1 = n_2 = 512$, $r = 50$ and $\text{downsamplefactor}=1.8$; (b) Randomly masked images from rank 50 with $sr = 40\%$, $\sigma = 1e - 3$; (c) Recovered images by our proposed nonconvex regularization method [ErrRel= $7.93e-03$ (first image), $1.01e-02$ (second image)]; (d) Recovered images by nuclear-norm model [ErrRel= $2.04e-02$ (first image), $2.36e-02$ (second image)].

Appendix: Algorithm for Sparse Vector Recovery

Algorithm To solve the Minimum Value of (2.1)

Step 1: Initialize $x^{(0)}$ and $s = 1$;

Step 2: Update x and w until the convergence

w-step:

$$w^{(s)} = \arg \min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^p} J(w, x^{(s-1)}),$$

$$w_i^{(s)} = x_i^{(s-1)} \max\{1 - \frac{\tau}{|x_i^{(s-1)}|}, 0\},$$

for $i = 1, \dots, p$ and $\tau = \frac{\lambda(1+\alpha)}{\rho}$.

x-step:

$$x^{(s)} = x^{(s-1)} + \Delta x, \text{ where}$$

$$(A^* A + \rho I) \Delta x = -\nabla J(x, w^{(s)}).$$

(Here the iteration index is the superscript s .)

References

References

- [1] H. Attouch, J. Bolte, P. Redont, A. Soubeyran, Proximal alternating minimization and projection methods for nonconvex problems: an approach based on the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz inequality, *Math. Oper. Res.*, 35(2010), 438-457.
- [2] H. Attouch, J. Bolte, B.F. Svaiter, Convergence of descent methods for semi-algebraic and tame problems: proximal algorithms, forward-backward splitting, and regularized Gauss-Seidel methods, *Mathematical Programming*, 137(2013), 91-129.
- [3] J.F. Cai, E.J. Candès, Z. Shen, A singular value thresholding algorithm for matrix completion, *SIAM J. Optimization*, 20(2010), 1956-1982.
- [4] E.J. Candès, The restricted isometry property and its implications for compressed sensing, *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 346(2008), 589-592.
- 204 [5] E.J. Candès, B. Recht, Exact matrix completion via convex optimization, *Found. Comput. math.*, 9(2009), 717-772.
- [6] E.J. Candès, J.K. Romberg, T. Tao, Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 52(2006), 489-509.
- [7] E.J. Candès, J.K. Romberg, T. Tao, Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements, *Commun. pure appl. math.*, 59(2006), 1207-1223.
- [8] E.J. Candès, T. Tao, Decoding by linear programming, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 51(2005), 4203-4215.
- [9] E.J. Candès, T. Tao, Near-optimal signal recovery from random projections: Universal encoding strategies?, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 52(2006), 5406-5425.
- [10] E.J. Candès, T. Tao, The power of convex relaxation: Near-optimal matrix completion, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 56(2010), 2053-2080.
- 216 [11] E.J. Candès, M.B. Wakin, An introduction to compressive sampling, *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 25(2008), 21-30.
- [12] X. Chen, W. Zhou, Smoothing nonlinear conjugate gradient method for image restoration using nonsmooth nonconvex minimization, *SIAM J. Imag. Sci.*, 3(2010), 765-790.
- [13] D. Donoho, X. Huo, Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decompositions, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 47(2001), 2845-2862.
- [14] J. Fan, R. Li, Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties, *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 96(2001), 1348-1360.
- [15] S. Foucart, A note on guaranteed sparse recovery via ℓ_1 -minimization, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 29(2010), 97-103.
- [16] S. Foucart, M.J. Lai, Sparsest solutions of underdetermined linear systems via ℓ_q -minimization for $0 < \ell_q \leq 1$, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 26(2009), 395-407.
- 228 [17] S. Foucart, H. Rauhut, *A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing*, Basel: Birkhäuser, 2013.

- [18] L.L.E. Frank, J.H. Friedman, A statistical view of some chemometrics regression tools, *Technometrics*, 35(1993), 109-135.
- [19] C. Gao, N. Wang, Q. Yu, Z. Zhang, A feasible nonconvex relaxation approach to feature selection, *AAAI*, 2011.
- [20] E. Grave, G.R. Obozinski, F.R. Bach, Trace lasso: a trace norm regularization for correlated designs, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2011, 2187-2195.
- [21] R. Gribonval, M. Nielsen, Sparse representations in unions of bases, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 49(2003), 3320-3325.
- [22] Y. Hu, D. Zhang, J. Ye, X. Li, X. He, Fast and accurate matrix completion via truncated nuclear norm regularization, *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 35(2013), 2117-2130.
- [23] Z.F. Jin, Z. Wan, Y. Jiao, X. Lu, An alternating direction method with continuation for nonconvex low rank minimization, *J. Sci. Comput.*, 2015, 1-21.
- [24] M.J. Lai, W. Yin, Augmented ℓ_1 and nuclear-norm models with a globally linearly convergent algorithm, *SIAM J. Imag. Sci.*, 6(2013), 1059-1091.
- [25] S. Lefkimiatis, A. Roussos, P. Maragos, M. Unser, Structure tensor total variation, *SIAM J. Imag. Sci.*, 8(2015), 1090-1122.
- [26] M. Malek-Mohammadi, M. Babaie-Zadeh, A. Amini, C. Jutten, Recovery of low-rank matrices under affine constraints via a smoothed rank function, *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 62(2014), 981-992.
- [27] Q. Mo, S. Li, New bounds on the restricted isometry constant δ_{2k} , *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 31(2011), 460-468.
- [28] M. Nikolova, M.K. Ng, C.P. Tam, Fast nonconvex nonsmooth minimization methods for image restoration and reconstruction, *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 19(2010), 3073-3088.
- [29] M. Nikolova, M.K. Ng, C.P. Tam, On ℓ_1 data fitting and concave regularization for image recovery, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 35(2013), A397-A430.
- [30] B. Recht, M. Fazel, P.A. Parrilo, Guaranteed minimum-rank solutions of linear matrix equations via nuclear norm minimization, *SIAM review*, 52(2010), 471-501.
- [31] R. Tibshirani, Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B (Methodological)*, 1996, 267-288.
- [32] G.A. Watson, Characterization of the subdifferential of some matrix norms, *Linear algebra and its applications*, 170(1992), 33-45.
- [33] J. Xiao, M.K.P. Ng, Y.F. Yang, On the convergence of nonconvex minimization methods for image recovery, *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 24(2015), 1587-1598.
- [34] C.H. Zhang, Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty, *The Annals of statistics*, 2010, 894-942.