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Abstract—In the present paper, we propose a novel sparse signal recovery algorithm called the Trainable Iterative Soft Thresholding Algorithm (TISTA). The proposed algorithm consists of two estimation units: a linear estimation unit and a minimum mean squared error (MMSE) estimator-based shrinkage unit. The estimated error variance required in the MMSE shrinkage unit is precisely estimated from a tentative estimate of the original signal. The remarkable feature of the proposed scheme is that TISTA includes adjustable variables that control step size and the error variance for the MMSE shrinkage. The variables are adjusted by standard deep learning techniques. The number of trainable variables of TISTA is equal to the number of iteration rounds and is much smaller than that of known learnable sparse signal recovery algorithms. This feature leads to highly stable and fast training processes of TISTA. Computer experiments show that TISTA is applicable to various classes of sensing matrices, including Gaussian matrices, binary matrices, and matrices with large condition numbers. Numerical results also demonstrate that, in many cases, TISTA provides significantly faster convergence than AMP and the Learned ISTA.

I. INTRODUCTION

The basic problem setup for compressed sensing [1], [2] is as follows. A real vector \( x \in \mathbb{R}^N \) represents a sparse source signal. It is assumed that we cannot directly observe \( x \), but we observe \( y = Ax + w \), where \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} (N \gg M) \) is a sensing matrix and \( w \in \mathbb{R}^M \) is a Gaussian noise vector. The goal is to estimate \( x \) from \( y \) as correctly as possible.

For a number of sparse reconstruction problems [3], the Lasso formulation [4] is fairly common for solving sparse signal recovery problems. In the Lasso formulation, the original problem is recast as a convex optimization problem for minimizing \( \frac{1}{2} || y - Ax ||_2^2 + \lambda || x ||_1 \). The regularization term \( \lambda || x ||_1 \) promotes the sparseness of a reconstruction vector, where \( \lambda \) is the regularization constant. A number of algorithms have been developed in order to solve Lasso problems efficiently [5]. The Iterative Shrinkage Thresholding Algorithm (ISTA) [6], [7] is one of the best-known algorithms for solving the Lasso problem. ISTA is an iterative algorithm comprising two processes: a linear estimation process and a shrinkage process based on a soft thresholding function. ISTA can be seen as a proximal gradient descent algorithm [8] and can be directly derived from the Lasso formulation.

Approximate Message Passing (AMP) [11], [12], which is a variant of approximate belief propagation, generally exhibits much faster convergence than the ISTA. The remarkable feature of AMP is that its asymptotic behavior is completely described by the state evolution equations [13]. AMP is derived based on the assumption that the sensing matrices consist of i.i.d. Gaussian distributed components. Recently, Ma and Ping proposed Orthogonal AMP (OAMP) [17], which can handle various classes of sensing matrices, including unitary invariant matrices. Rangan et al. proposed VAMP [18] for right-rotationally invariant matrices and provided a theoretical justification for its state evolution. Independently, Takeuchi [19] also gave a rigorous analysis for a sparse recovery algorithm for unitary invariant measurements based on the expectation propagation framework.

The recent advent of powerful neural networks (NNs) triggered the remarkable spread of research activities and applications on deep neural networks (DNNs) [20]. DNN have found a number of practical applications such as image recognition [22], [23], speech recognition [24], and robotics because of their outstanding performance compared with traditional methods. The advancement of DNNs has also had an impact on the design of algorithms for communications and signal processing [27], [28]. By unfolding an iterative process of a sparse signal recovery algorithm, we can obtain a signal-flow graph. The signal-flow graph includes trainable variables that can be tuned with a supervised learning method, i.e., standard deep learning techniques such as stochastic gradient descent algorithms based on back propagation and minibatches can be used to adjust the trainable variables. Gregor and LeCun presented the Learned ISTA (LISTA) [22], which uses learnable threshold variables for a shrinkage function. LISTA provides a recovery performance that is superior to that of the original ISTA. Borgerding et al. also presented variants of AMP and VAMP with learnable capability [33] [34].

The goal of the present study is to propose a simple sparse recovery algorithm based on deep learning techniques. The proposed algorithm, called the Trainable ISTA (TISTA), borrows the basic structure of ISTA, and adopts the estimator of the squared error between true signals and tentative estimations, i.e., the error variance estimator, from OAMP. Thus, TISTA consists of the three parts: a linear estimator, a minimum mean squared error (MMSE) estimator-based shrinkage function, and the above-mentioned error variance estimator. The linear estimator of TISTA includes trainable variables that can be adjusted via deep learning techniques. Zhang and Ghanem [35] proposed ISTA-Net, which is also an ISTA-based algorithm with learnable capability. The notable difference between ISTA-Net and TISTA is that TISTA uses an error variance estimator, which improves the speed of convergence.

Part of this research will be presented at the IEEE International Conference of Communications 2018 (ICC2018) workshop.
II. BRIEF REVIEW OF KNOWN RECOVERY ALGORITHMS

As preparation for describing the details of the proposed algorithm, several known sparse recovery algorithms are briefly reviewed in this section. In the following, the observation vector is assumed to be \( y = Ax + w \), where \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} (N > M) \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^N \). Each entry of the additive noise vector \( w \in \mathbb{R}^M \) follows a zero-mean Gaussian distribution with variance \( \sigma_w^2 \).

A. ISTA

The ISTA is a well-known sparse recovery algorithm defined by the following simple recursion:

\[
\begin{align*}
    r_t &= s_t + \beta A^T (y - As_t), \\
    s_{t+1} &= \eta (r_t; \tau), \\
    \eta (r; \tau) &= \text{sign}(r) \max \{|r| - \tau, 0\}.
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \beta \) represents the step size, and \( \eta \) is the soft thresholding function defined by \( \eta (r; \tau) = \eta_1 (r; \tau), \ldots, \eta_N (r; \tau) \),

\[
\eta_i (r; \tau) = \text{sign}(r) \max \{|r| - \tau, 0\}.
\]

The parameter \( \tau (\tau > 0) \) indicates the threshold value. After \( T \) iterations, the estimate \( \hat{x} = s_T \) of the original sparse signal \( x \) is obtained. The initial value is assumed to be \( s_0 = 0 \).

In order to have convergence, the step size \( \beta \) is obtained. The initial value is assumed to be \( \hat{x} \).

The parameter \( \tau \) follows a zero-mean Gaussian distribution with variance \( \sigma^2 \). Each entry of the additive noise vector \( \tilde{w} \) is assumed to be generated according to the Gaussian distribution \( \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \), and provides the final estimate \( \hat{x} = s_T \).

The \( \eta \) in (1) is a well-known sparse recovery algorithm \[ \eta \text{ ISTA} \] defined by the following recursive formula:

\[
\begin{align*}
    r_t &= s_t + \beta A^T (y - As_t), \\
    s_{t+1} &= \eta (r_t; \tau), \\
    \eta (r; \tau) &= \text{sign}(r) \max \{|r| - \tau, 0\}.
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \beta \) represents the step size, and \( \eta \) is the soft thresholding function defined by \( \eta (r; \tau) = \eta_1 (r; \tau), \ldots, \eta_N (r; \tau) \),

\[
\eta_i (r; \tau) = \text{sign}(r) \max \{|r| - \tau, 0\}.
\]

B. AMP

AMP is defined by the following recursion:

\[
\begin{align*}
    r_t &= y - As_t + b_t r_{t-1}, \\
    s_{t+1} &= \eta (s_t + A^T r_t; \tau), \\
    b_t &= \frac{1}{M} ||s_t||_0, \quad \tau_t = \frac{\theta}{\sqrt{M}} ||r_t||_2
\end{align*}
\]

and provides the final estimate \( \hat{x} = s_T \). Each entry of the sensing matrix \( A \) is assumed to be generated according to the Gaussian distribution \( \mathcal{N}(0, 1/M) \), i.e., a Gaussian distribution with mean zero and variance \( 1/M \). At a glance, the recursive formula of AMP appears similar to that of ISTA, but there are several critical differences. Due to the Onsager correction term \( b_t r_{t-1} \) in (5), the output of the linear estimator becomes statistically decoupled, and an error between each output signal from the linear estimator and the true signal behaves as a white Gaussian random variable in the large system limit. This enables us to use a scalar recursion called the state evolution to track the evolution of the error variances.

Another difference between ISTA and AMP is the estimator of \( \tau_t \) in (6), which is used as the threshold value for the shrinkage function \( \eta \). In (6), it was reported that AMP exhibits much faster convergence than ISTA if the sensing matrix satisfies the above condition. On the other hand, AMP cannot provide excellent recovery performance for sensing matrices violating the above condition such as non-Gaussian sensing matrices, Gaussian matrices with large variance, Gaussian matrices with nonzero means, and matrices with large condition numbers [15].

C. OAMP

OAMP is defined by the following recursive formula:

\[
\begin{align*}
    r_t &= s_t + W (y - As_t), \quad (7) \\
    s_{t+1} &= \eta \theta (r_t; \tau_t), \quad (8) \\
    v_t^2 &= \max \{ |y - As_t|^2 - M \sigma^2, \epsilon | \} \quad (9) \\
    \tau_t^2 &= \frac{1}{N^2} \text{trace} (BB^T) v_t^2 + \frac{1}{N^2} \text{trace} (WW^T) \sigma^2, \quad (10)
\end{align*}
\]

for \( t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, T - 1 \). The matrix \( B \) is given by \( B = I - W A \). To be precise, the estimator equations on \( v_t^2 \) and \( \tau_t^2 \) are not part of OAMP (for example, we can use the state evolution to provide \( v_t^2 \) and \( \tau_t^2 \), but these estimators are used for numerical evaluation in [12]. The matrix \( W \) in linear estimator (7) can be chosen from the transpose of \( A \), the pseudo inverse of \( A \), and the LMMSE matrix. The nonlinear estimation unit consists of a divergence-free function \( \eta \) that replaces the Onsager correction term. It is proved in [12] that the estimation errors of linear estimator (7) and non-linear estimator (8) are statistically orthogonal if a sensing matrix is i.i.d. Gaussian or unitary invariant. This provides a justification for the state evolution of OAMP.

III. DETAILS OF TISTA

This section describes the details of TISTA and its training process.

A. MMSE estimator for an additive Gaussian noise channel

Let \( X \) be a real-valued random variable with probability density function (PDF) \( P_X (\cdot) \). We assume an additive Gaussian noise channel defined by \( Y = X + N \), where \( Y \) represents a real-valued random variable as well. The random variable \( N \) is a Gaussian random variable with mean zero and variance \( \sigma^2 \). Consider the situation in which a receiver can observe \( Y \) and wish to estimate the value of \( X \).

The MMSE estimator \( \eta_{\text{MMSE}} (y) \) is defined by

\[
\eta_{\text{MMSE}} (y) = \mathbb{E} [X | y],
\]

where \( \mathbb{E} [X | y] \) is the conditional expectation given by

\[
\mathbb{E} [X | y] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x P_X (x | y) dx.
\]

The posterior PDF \( P_X (x | y) \) is given by Bayes’ Theorem:

\[
P_X (x | y) \propto P_X (x) P_Y (y | x),
\]

where the conditional PDF is Gaussian:

\[
P_Y (y | x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \sigma_y^2}} \exp \left( -\frac{(y - x)^2}{2 \sigma_y^2} \right).
\]

In the case of the Bernoulli-Gaussian prior, \( P_X (x) \) is given by

\[
P_X (x) = (1 - p) \delta (x) + \frac{p}{\sqrt{2 \pi \sigma_x^2}} \exp \left( -\frac{x^2}{2 \sigma_x^2} \right),
\]

where \( \mathbb{E} [X | y] \) is the conditional expectation given by

\[
\mathbb{E} [X | y] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x P_X (x | y) dx.
\]
where \( p \) represents the probability such that a nonzero element occurs. The function \( \delta(\cdot) \) is Dirac's delta function. In this case, a nonzero element follows the Gaussian PDF with mean zero and variance \( \alpha^2 \). The MMSE estimator for the Bernoulli-Gaussian prior can be easily derived [43] using Stein’s formula:

\[
\eta_{\text{MMSE}}(y; \sigma^2) = y + \sigma^2 \frac{d}{dy} \ln P_Y(y)
\]

and we have

\[
\eta_{\text{MMSE}}(y; \sigma^2) = \left( \frac{\alpha^2}{\xi} \right) \frac{pF(y; \xi)}{(1-p)F(y; \sigma^2) + pF(y; \xi)}.
\]  

B. Recursive formula for TISTA

We assume that the sensing matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} \) is a full-rank matrix. The recursive formula of TISTA is summarized as follows:

\[
r_t = s_t + \gamma_t W(y - As_t),
\]

\[
s_{t+1} = \eta_{\text{MMSE}}(r_t; \tau^2_t),
\]

\[
\bar{v}_t^2 = \max \left\{ \frac{||y - As_t||^2 - M\sigma^2}{\text{trace}(A^T A)}, \epsilon \right\}, \tag{22}
\]

\[
\tau^2_t = \frac{\bar{v}_t^2}{N} (N + (\gamma_t^2 - 2\gamma_t)M)
\]

\[+ \frac{\gamma_t^2 \sigma^2}{N} \text{trace}(WW^T), \tag{24}
\]

where the matrix \( W = A^T (AA^T)^{-1} \) is the pseudo inverse matrix of the sensing matrix \( A \). The initial condition is \( s_0 = 0 \), and the final estimate is given by \( \hat{x} = s_T \). The scalar variables \( \gamma_t \in \mathbb{R}(t = 0, 1, \ldots, T - 1) \) are learnable variables that are tuned in a training process. The number of learnable variables is thus \( T \), which is much smaller than those of LISTA [32] and LAMP [33].

An appropriate MMSE shrinkage [22] is chosen according to the prior distribution of the original signal \( x \). Note that the MMSE shrinkage is also used in [33]. The real constant \( \epsilon \) is a sufficiently small value, e.g., \( \epsilon = 10^{-9} \). The max operator in (23) is used to prevent the estimate of the variance from being non-positive. The learnable variables \( \gamma_t \) in (21) provide appropriate step sizes and control for the variance of the MMSE shrinkage.

The true error variances \( \bar{v}_t^2 \) and \( \bar{v}_t^2 \) are defined by

\[
\bar{v}_t^2 = \frac{E[||r_t - x||^2]}{N}, \quad \bar{v}_t^2 = \frac{E[||s_t - x||^2]}{N}. \tag{25}
\]

These error variances should be estimated as correctly as possible in a sparse recovery process because the MMSE shrinkage (22) requires knowing \( \bar{v}_t^2 \). As in the case of OAMP [17], we make the following assumptions on the residual errors in order to derive an error variance estimator.

The first assumption is that \( r_t - x \) consists of i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian entries. Based on this assumption, each entry of the output from the linear estimator (21) can be seen as an observation obtained from a virtual additive Gaussian noise channel with the noise variance \( \sigma^2 \). This justifies the use of the shrinkage function based on the MMSE estimator (22) with \( \bar{v}_t^2 \). Another assumption is that \( s_t - x \) consists of zero-mean i.i.d. entries and satisfies \( E[(s_t - x)^T A^T w] = E[(s_t - x)^T W w] = 0 \) for any \( t \).

The error variance estimator for \( \bar{v}_t^2 \) (23) is the same as that of OAMP [17], and its justification comes from the following proposition.

**Proposition 1:** If each entry of \( s_t - x \) is i.i.d. with mean zero and \( E[(s_t - x)^T A^T w] = 0 \) is satisfied, then

\[
\bar{v}_t^2 = \frac{E[||y - As_t||^2] - M\sigma^2}{\text{trace}(A^T A)}) \tag{26}
\]

holds.
From the right-hand side of (26), we have

\[
E[\|2 - As_t\|_2^2] - M\sigma^2
\]

\[
\frac{\text{trace}(AT^2)}{\text{trace}(AT)} = E[\|Ax + w - As_t\|_2^2] - M\sigma^2
\]

\[
\frac{\text{trace}(AT^2)}{\text{trace}(AT)} = E[\|(Ax - s_t) + w\|_2^2] - E[w^T w]
\]

\[
\frac{\text{trace}(AT^2)}{\text{trace}(AT)} = \frac{E[(Ax - s_t)^T A(x - s_t) + w^T w + (Ax - s_t)^T w] - E[w^T w]}{\text{trace}(AT^2)}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{N}\text{trace}(AT^2)E[\|s_t - x\|_2^2] - \frac{1}{\text{trace}(AT^2)}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{N} E[\|s_t - x\|_2^2] = v_t^2.
\]

The justification of the error variance estimator (24) for \(\tau^2_t\) is also provided by the following proposition.

**Proposition 2:** If each entry of \(s_t - x\) is i.i.d. with mean zero and \(E[(s_t - x)^T W w] = 0\) is satisfied, then

\[
\tau^2_t = \frac{v_t^2}{N} (N - 2\gamma_t \text{trace}(Z) + \gamma_t^2 \text{trace}(Z^T Z)) + \frac{\gamma_t^2 \sigma^2}{N} \text{trace}(W W^T)
\]

holds, where \(Z = WA\).

(Proof) The residual error \(r_t - x\) can be rewritten as

\[
r_t - x = s_t + \gamma_t W(y - As_t) - x
\]

\[
= s_t + \gamma_t W(Ax + w) - \gamma_t WAs_t - x
\]

\[
= (I - \gamma_t Z)(s_t - x) + \gamma_t W w.
\]

From the definition \(v_t^2\), we have

\[
v_t^2 = \frac{1}{N} E[\|s_t - x\|_2^2] - \frac{2\gamma_t \text{trace}(Z)}{N} \text{trace}(W W^T) + \frac{\gamma_t^2 \sigma^2}{N} \text{trace}(W W^T) \gamma_t^2 + \frac{2\gamma_t^2}{N} \text{trace}(W W^T) \gamma_t^2
\]

\[
= \sum_{i,j \neq j} (\gamma_t Z_{i,j})^2 + \sum_i (1 - \gamma_t Z_{i,i})^2
\]

\[
= \sum_{i,j \neq j} Z_{i,j}^2 + \sum_i (1 - 2\gamma_t Z_{i,i} + \gamma_t^2 Z_{i,i}^2)
\]

\[
= N - 2\gamma_t \text{trace}(Z) + \gamma_t^2 \text{trace}(Z^T Z).
\]

The proposition is thus proved. \(\Box\)

The identity \(\text{trace}(Z) = \text{trace}(Z^T Z) = M\) holds because \(A\) and \(Z\) have full rank. Combining this identity, we have the estimation formula (25) for \(\tau^2_t\).

These error variance estimators (23) and (24) play a crucial role in providing appropriate variance estimates required for the MMSE shrinkage. Since the validity of these assumptions on the residual errors cannot be proved, it will be experimentally confirmed in the next section. Moreover, note that the TISTA recursive formula does not include either an Onsager correction term or a divergence-free function. Thus, we cannot expect stochastic orthogonality guaranteed in OAMP in a process of TISTA. This means that the state evolution cannot be used to analyze the asymptotic performance of TISTA.

### C. Time complexity and number of trainable variables

For treating a large-scale problem, a sparse recovery algorithm should require low computational complexity for each iteration. The time complexity required for evaluating the recursive formula of TISTA per iteration is \(O(N^2)\), which is the same time complexity as those of ISTA and AMP, which means that the TISTA has sufficient scalability for large problems. The evaluation of the matrix-vector products \(As_t\) and \(W(y - As_t)\) requires \(O(N^2)\) time, which is dominant in an iteration. The evaluation of the scalar constants \(\text{trace}(AT^2)\) and \(\text{trace}(W W^T)\) requires \(O(N^2)\) time. Although computation of the pseudo inverse of \(A\) requires \(O(N^3)\) time, it can be pre-computed only once in advance.

Since the \(t\)-th round of TISTA contains only a trainable variable \(\gamma_t\), the total number of trainable variables is equal to \(T\). On the other hand, LISTA and LAMP require \(N^2 + MN + 1\) and \(N + 2\) trainable variables for each round, respectively. Table I summarizes the required numbers of trainable variables in \(T\) rounds. TISTA requires the least trainable variables among them, and the number of trainable variables of TISTA is independent of the system size, i.e., \(N\) and \(M\). This is an advantageous feature for large-scale problems. The number of trainable variables also affects the stability and speed of convergence in training processes.

### D. Incremental training for TISTA

In order to achieve reasonable recovery performance, the trainable variables \(\gamma_t (t = 0, 1, \ldots, T - 1)\) should be appropriately adjusted. By unfolding the recursive formula of TISTA, we immediately have a signal-flow graph which is similar to a multi-layer feedforward neural network. Figure 2 depicts a unit of the signal-flow graph corresponding to the \(t\)-th iteration of TISTA, and we can stack the units to compose a whole signal-flow graph. Here, we follow a standard recipe of deep learning techniques; namely, we apply mini-batch training with a stochastic gradient descent algorithm to the signal-flow graph of TISTA. Based on several experiments, we found that the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TISTA</th>
<th>LISTA</th>
<th>LAMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of params</td>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>(T(N^2 + MN + 1))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
following incremental training is considerably effective for learning appropriate values that provide superior performance.

The training data consists of a number of randomly generated pairs \((x, y)\), where \(y = Ax + w\). The sample \(x\) follows the prior distribution \(P_X(x)\) and the observation noise \(w\) is an i.i.d. Gaussian random vector. The entire set of training data is divided into mini-batches to be used in a stochastic gradient descent algorithm such as SGD, RMSprop, or Adam.

In the \(t\)-th round of the incremental training (referred to as a generation), an optimizer attempts to minimize \(E[|s_t - x|^2]\) by tuning \(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{t-1}\). The number of mini-batches used in the \(t\)-th generation is denoted by \(D\). After processing \(D\) mini-batches, the objective function of the optimizer is changed to \(E[|s_t - x|^2]\). Namely, after training the first \(t\) to \(t\)-th layers, a new \(t + 1\) layer is appended to the network, and the entire network is trained again for \(D\) mini-batches. Although the objective function is changed, the values of the variables \(\gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_{t-1}\) of the previous generation are taken as the initial values in the optimization process for the new generation. In summary, the incremental training updates the variables \(\gamma_t\) in a sequential manner from the first layer to the last layer.

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In this section, the sparse recovery performance of TISTA is evaluated based on computer experiments.

A. Details of experiments

The basic conditions for the computer experiments are summarized as follows. Each component of the sparse signal \(x\) is assumed to be a realization of an i.i.d. random vector following the Bernoulli-Gaussian PDF \((15)\) with \(p = 0.1, \alpha^2 = 1\). The Bernoulli-Gaussian PDF is often assumed as a benchmark setting in related researches [33], [34]. We thus use the MMSE estimator \((22)\) for the Bernoulli-Gaussian prior. Each component of the noise vector \(w\) follows the zero-mean Gaussian PDF with variance \(\sigma^2\). The signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the system is defined as

\[
SNR = \frac{E[|Ax|^2]}{E[|w|^2]}.
\]

The size of the mini-batch is set to 1000, and \(D = 200\) mini-batches are allocated for each generation. We used the Adam optimizer [39] with the initial value of \(4.0 \times 10^{-2}\) in the training phase. The experimental system was implemented in TensorFlow [41]. For comparison purposes, we will include the NMSE performances of AMP and LISTA in the following subsections. The hyperparameter \(\theta\) used in AMP is set to \(\theta = 1.14\). We used an implementation of LISTA by Borgerding [46].

B. IID Gaussian matrix

1) Comparison with AMP and LISTA: This subsection describes the case in which \(A \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/M)\), i.e., each component of the sensing matrix \(A\) obeys a zero-mean Gaussian distribution with variance \(1/M\). Note that AMP is designed for this matrix ensemble. The dimensions of the sensing matrices are set to be \(N = 500, M = 250\).

Figure 4 shows the estimate \(\tau^2\) by \((24)\) and the empirically estimated values of the true error variance \(\hat{\sigma}^2\). The estimator \(\hat{\tau}^2\) provides accurate estimations and justifies the use of \((23)\) and \((24)\) and our assumptions on the residual errors.

Figure 3 presents the average normalized MSE (NMSE) of TISTA, LISTA, and AMP as functions of iteration when SNR = 40 dB. The NMSE is defined by

\[
NMSE = 10 \log_{10} \frac{|s_{t+1} - x|^2}{|x|^2}.
\]

From Fig. 4 we can observe that TISTA provides a steeper NMSE curve than AMP or LISTA in the first 16 rounds. For example, AMP and LISTA require 16 and 10 rounds, respectively, in order to achieve NMSE = \(-30\) dB, whereas TISTA requires only 6 rounds. The NMSE curve of TISTA saturates at around \(-43\) dB, at which TISTA converges. This means that TISTA shows significantly faster convergence than AMP and LISTA in this setting. Compared with the experimental results under the condition shown in [34], the NMSE values of TISTA are approximately comparable to those of LAMP [33].

In order to study the behavior of the learned trainable variables \(\gamma_t\), we conducted the following experiments. For a fixed sensing matrix \((A_{i,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/M))\), we trained TISTA three times with distinct random number seeds. The learned variables \(\gamma_t\) (denoted by TISTA1–3) are shown in Fig. 5. The three sequences of learned parameters approximately coincide with each other. Furthermore, the sequences have a zigzag shape, and the values of \(\gamma_t\) lies in the range from 1 to 6.

2) Large-scale problem: As discussed in the previous section, the number of trainable variables of TISTA is small. This feature enables us to handle large-scale problems. Figure 6
shows the NMSEs for the cases of \((N, M) = (500, 250)\) and 
\((5000, 2500)\). The CPU time required for training TISTA with 
7 layers was approximately 6 minutes when using a PC with 
GPU NVIDIA GeForce GTX 1080. A large Gaussian matrix of 
size \((N, M) = (5000, 2500)\) required approximately 7 hours 
for training. As shown in Fig. 6 fast convergence of the NMSE 
\((N = 5000)\) to \(-54\) dB is observed, which is 10 dB lower than the saturated NMSE \(-43\) dB of the small system \((N = 500)\). This example indicates that TISTA indeed has high scalability to large-scale problems.

3) Gaussian sensing matrices with large variance: In the 
next experiment, we changed the variance of the sensing 
matrices to a larger value, i.e., each element in \(A\) follows 
\(N(0, 1)\) instead of \(N(0, 1/M)\). Figure 7 shows the NMSE 
curves of TISTA and LISTA. Note that, under this condition, 
AMP does not perform well, i.e., AMP actually cannot 
converge at all, because the setting does not fit the required 
condition \(A_{i,j} \sim N(0, 1/M)\) for achieving the guaranteed 
performance and the convergence of AMP. As shown in Fig. 
7 TISTA behaves soundly and shows faster convergence than 
that of LISTA. This result suggests that TISTA is appreciably 
robust against the change of the variance.

C. Binary matrix

In this subsection, we will discuss the case in which the 
sensing matrices are binary, i.e., \(A \in \{\pm 1\}^{M \times N}\). Each entry 
of \(A\) is selected uniformly at random on \(\{\pm 1\}\). This situation 
is closely related to multiuser detection in Coded Division 
Multiple Access (CDMA) [11]. Figure 8 shows the NMSE 
curves of TISTA and LISTA as a function of iteration. The 
NMSE curves of TISTA approximately coincide with those of 
the Gaussian sensing matrices. This result can be regarded 
as an evidence for the robustness of TISTA for non-Gaussian 
sensing matrices.

D. Sensing matrices with a large condition number

Regression problems regarding a matrix with a large condi-
tion number are difficult to solve in an accurate manner. The 
condition number \(\kappa\) of a matrix is defined as the ratio of the
largest and smallest singular values, i.e., $\kappa = s_1/s_M$, where $s_1 \geq s_2 \geq \cdots \geq s_M$ are the singular values of the matrix. In this subsection, we assess the performance of TISTA for sensing matrices with a large condition number.

The setting for the experiments is as follows. For a given condition number $\kappa$, we assume that the ratio $s_i/s_{i-1}$ is constant for each $i$ in order to fulfill $s_1/s_M = \kappa$ and $\text{trace}(A^T A) = N$. We first sample a matrix $G \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, where each entry of $G$ follows an i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian distribution with variance 1. The matrix $G$ is then decomposed by singular value decomposition and we obtain $G = U \Sigma V^T$, where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$. From the set of singular values $s_1, \ldots, s_M$ satisfying the above conditions, $\Sigma^*$ is defined by $\Sigma^* = (\Delta O)$, where the matrix $\Delta = \text{diag}(s_1, \ldots, s_M)$ and $O$ is the zero matrix. A sensing matrix $A$ with the condition number $\kappa$ is obtained by calculating $A = U \Sigma^* V^T$.

Figure 9 shows the NMSE of TISTA and AMP without observation noise (i.e., $\sigma^2 = 0$). As shown in Fig. 9, there is almost no performance degradation in the NMSE even for a large condition number such as $\kappa = 5000$. On the other hand, AMP converges up to $\kappa = 4$, but the output diverges when $\kappa \geq 5$. These results indicate the robustness of TISTA with respect to sensing matrices with a large condition number in the noiseless case.

V. EXTENSIONS

In this section, we propose a few extensions of TISTA to treat a sensing matrix with nonzero-mean components or with a large condition number. The numerical results show that the proposed extensions outperform the original TISTA in each situation without additional computational costs in the learning process.

A. Sensing matrices with nonzero-mean components

In this subsection, we propose an extension of TISTA for a sensing matrix with nonzero-mean components. It is known that, e.g., generalized AMP [45] (GAMP), which is constructed for zero-mean Gaussian random matrices, fails to converge to a fixed point when a sensing matrix consists of nonzero-mean components [15]. To overcome this difficulty, Vila et al. proposed a variant of GAMP with damping of messages and mean removal from a sensing matrix and signals [16]. Following these advances in AMP, we apply a mean removal technique to TISTA to improve its performance for large nonzero-mean sensing matrices.

Let us consider a modified TISTA with a mean removal process. We assume that the sensing matrix $A$ is generated according to the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu A, \sigma^2)$ with a nonzero mean $\mu A$. In fact, without any modifications, TISTA shows
poor performance as $\mu_A$ increases. The simplest extension involves the use of a modified sensing matrix $A' = (A'_{i,j})$, where $A'_{i,j} = A_{i,j} - \mu_A$ instead of an original sensing matrix $A = (A_{i,j})$. The modified recursion formula of TISTA is then written as follows:

$$u_t = y - A's_t,$$

$$r_t = s_t + \gamma_t W' \left( u_t - \frac{1}{M} I_M u_t 1_M \right)$$

$s_{t+1} = \eta \text{MMSE}(r_t; \gamma_t^2)$

$$v_t^2 = \max \left\{ \frac{|u_t - \frac{1}{M} I_M u_t 1_M|^2}{\text{trace}(A'^T A')} - M \sigma^2 \right\},$$

$$\tau_t^2 = \frac{v_t^2}{N} (N + (\gamma_t^2 - 2\gamma_t^2)M) + \frac{\gamma_t^2 \sigma^2}{N} \text{trace}(W'W'^T),$$

where $1_M = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)^T$ is an $M$-dimensional vector, the elements of which are $1$s, and matrix $W'$ is the pseudo inverse matrix of $A'$. In the formula, $r_t$ is calculated via $u_t - M^{-1} I_M u_t 1_M$ to remove the mean of $u_t$. These modifications enable the performance of TISTA to be improved because TISTA attempts to recover a sparse signal with a modified sensing matrix, the components of which have sufficiently small means. Note that further performance improvement may be achieved when we use a modified sensing matrix for which the means of rows and columns are expected to be zero, as in [16].

Figure 11 shows the NMSE of TISTA and the modified TISTA when each element of a sensing matrix is generated from $\mathcal{N}(1, 1/M)$, where the original AMP has difficulty in convergence. The modified TISTA outperforms the original TISTA for which the NMSE saturates around $-10$ dB. Performance improvement by mean removal is found even for the case of a noisy observation, as shown in Fig. 12. In this case, the modified TISTA scores $-38$ dB in the NMSE when $T = 10$, whereas the NMSE of the original TISTA saturates at approximately $-10$ dB. These numerical results indicate that the modified TISTA based on mean removal gives drastically improved signal recovery performance without increasing the time complexity.

B. Sensing matrices with a large condition number

As discussed in the previous section, TISTA exhibits a non-negligible performance degradation (except for the noiseless case) when the condition number of the sensing matrix is large. In this subsection, we present a method for improving the sparse recovery performance of TISTA in such a case by using an LMMSE matrix as a linear estimator. A naive approach to suppress the noise enhancement in linear estimation is to use the LMMSE matrix

$$W_t = v_t^2 A'^T (v_t^2 A'^T + \sigma^2 I)^{-1}$$

as a linear estimator in TISTA recursions. Note that the error variance $v_t^2$ is calculated in a recursive calculation process of TISTA. Ma and Ping [17] took this approach in their OAMP experiments. A drawback of this approach is that it is necessary to calculate an $M \times M$ matrix inversion in (36) for each iteration, which requires $O(M^3)$ time for an iteration. In order to avoid the matrix inversion for each iteration, we use a simple ad-hoc solution, and define the matrix $W$ as

$$W = A'^T (A A'^T + \beta I)^{-1},$$

where $\beta$ is a real constant. This is the only difference from the original TISTA using the pseudo inverse matrix of $A$ as $W$. The term $\beta I$ can decrease the condition number of $W$ and prevents noise enhancement. Matrix inversion is needed in order to perform calculation only once at the beginning of a recovery process. Thus, the required time complexity of the improved TISTA is the same as that of the original TISTA. The parameter $\beta$ is determined to minimize the value of the NMSE after training.

Figure 13 shows the NMSE curves for the case of $\kappa = 1000$, which includes the NMSE curve of the improved TISTA with $\beta = 5.0 \times 10^{-4}$. From Fig. 13 we can confirm that the improved TISTA exhibits much better NMSE performance as compared with the original TISTA using the pseudo inverse matrix in the
Fig. 13. NMSE of LIST A and TISTA with (37) (improved TISTA) (linear estimator. This example shows that this simple ad-hoc approach is fairly effective without additional cost.

VI. CONCLUDING SUMMARY

The crucial feature of TISTA is that it includes adjustable variables which can be tuned by standard deep learning techniques. The number of trainable variables of TISTA is equal to the number of iterative rounds and is much smaller than those of the known learnable sparse signal recovery algorithms [3]-[5]. This feature leads to the highly stable and fast training processes of TISTA. Computer experiments indicate that TISTA is applicable to various classes of sensing matrices such as Gaussian matrices, binary matrices, and matrices with large condition numbers. Furthermore, numerical results demonstrate that TISTA shows significantly faster convergence than AMP or LISTA in many cases. By replacing the MMSE shrinkage, we can expect that TISTA is also applicable to non-sparse signal recovery problems such as detection of BPSK signals in overloaded MIMO systems.
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