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Abstract

We tackle the problem of recovering a complex signal \( \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n \) from quadratic measurements of the form \( y_i = \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x} \), where \( \{ \mathbf{A}_i \}_{i=1}^m \) is a set of full-rank, complex random matrices with rotation-invariant entries. We formulate it as the minimization of a nonconvex loss. This problem is related to the well understood phase retrieval where \( \mathbf{A}_i \) is a rank-1 positive semidefinite matrix. Here we study the general full-rank case which models a number of key applications such as molecular geometry recovery from distance distributions and compound measurements in phaseless diffractive imaging. Most prior work either addresses the rank-1 case or focuses on real measurements. The several papers that address the full-rank complex case adopt the computationally-demanding semidefinite relaxation approach. In this paper we prove that the general class of problems with rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement models can be efficiently solved with high probability via the standard framework comprising a spectral initialization followed by iterative gradient descent updates on a nonconvex loss. Numerical experiments on simulated data corroborate our theoretical analysis.

1 Introduction

Systems of quadratic equations model many problems in applied science, including phase retrieval [1–3], the unlabeled distance geometry problem (uDGP) [4, 5], and blind channel estimation [6, 7]. Phase retrieval, in particular, has motivated considerable recent research on quadratic equations. The phaseless measurements are given as \( y_i = |\mathbf{a}_i^* \mathbf{x}|^2 = \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^* \mathbf{x} \), with the measurement matrices \( \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^* \) being rank-1 positive semidefinite matrices. In this paper, we study a different measurement model with full-rank measurement matrices. Such measurements arise in a number of applications including combinatorial optimization problems such as the uDGP [7], the turnpike problem [8], and in phaseless diffractive imaging where, either because of experimental or algorithmic design, we work with linear combinations of pixel values on the detector: \( y_i = \sum_r w_r |\mathbf{a}_r^* \mathbf{x}|^2 \). These problems can be modeled as systems of quadratic equations where the measurement matrices are not necessarily rank-1 or real.

Recovery of the signal \( \mathbf{x} \) from its complex quadratic measurements is naturally formulated as a nonconvex optimization problem, where solving for the the globally optimal solution is in general intractable. Recent work on nonconvex quadratic problems such as phase retrieval [9, 10], phase synchronization [11, 12], and low-rank matrix recovery [13] have shown that a globally optimal solution can be recovered from sufficient measurements with high probability when iid Gaussian measurement vectors or matrices are used. This motivates the question of what other types of measurement matrices also enjoy such favorable properties. In this paper we show that the class of measurement matrices with rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian entries is one such type, and propose to recover a globally optimal solution via the standard framework comprising a...
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spectral initialization and iterative gradient descent updates. We prove that when the number of measurements exceeds the signal length by some sufficiently large \( C \), the complex signal can be recovered up to a global phase with high probability.

### 1.1 Rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model

We address the problem of recovering a complex signal \( x \in \mathbb{C}^n \) from its complex quadratic measurements \( y_i \in \mathbb{C} \) of the following form:

\[
y_i = x^* A_i x, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m,
\]

where \( A_i \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \) is the \( i \)-th complex measurement matrix. For convenience, let \( r_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2n^2} \) denote the real and imaginary coefficients of the entries of \( A_i \). The \( m \) coefficients vectors \( r_i \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq m \) are independent and identically distributed following a multivariate rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian distribution \([14,15]\), that is, the distribution of \( r_i \) does not change under unitary transforms \([14]\). It follows that the probability density function of \( r_i \), \( p(r_i) \), depends only on the norm \( \|r_i\|_2 \). Without loss of generality, we also assume \( \mathbb{E}[r_{ik}^2] = 1, \forall k = 1, \ldots, 2n^2 \).

The coefficient vector \( r_i \) is a sub-Gaussian random vector \([15, \text{ Definition 5.22}]\) such that the one-dimensional marginals \( g^T r_i \) are sub-Gaussian random variables for all \( g \in \mathbb{R}^{2n^2} \). In particular, the entries \( r_{ik} \) are sub-Gaussian. We shall refer to the model given by (1) as the rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model. Some examples of matrices in this model are given in Section 4.1.

### 1.2 Problem formulation

Instead of addressing (1) directly, we formulate it as a minimization problem. Namely, we minimize the following loss function \( f(z) \) to obtain the recovered signal \( z \):

\[
f(z) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} |z^* A_i z - y_i|^2. \tag{2}
\]

Clearly, for any solution \( z_0 \) to (1) we have \( f(z_0) = 0 \); conversely, the \( z \)-s that make the loss in (2) vanish are solutions to (1).

Suppose we are given a “good” initialization point \( z^{(0)} \) (finding such a point is discussed in Section 2). The solution is then updated iteratively via gradient descent:

\[
z^{(t+1)} = z^{(t)} - \eta \nabla f(z), \tag{3}
\]

where \( \eta > 0 \) is some suitable step size. The gradient \( \nabla f(z) \) can be computed as

\[
\nabla f(z) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} (z^* A_i^* z - x^* A_i^* x) A_i z + (z^* A_i z - x^* A_i x) A_i^* z. \tag{4}
\]

If \( x \) is a global minimum of \( f(z) \), then \( x e^{j \phi} \) is also a global minimum for some \( \phi \in (0, 2\pi] \). Consequently, it is standard to define the squared distance between the recovered solution \( z \) and the true solution \( x \) as

\[
dist^2(z, x) = \min_{\phi \in (0, 2\pi]} \|z - x e^{j \phi}\|_2^2
\]

\[
= \min_{\phi \in (0, 2\pi]} \|z\|_2^2 + \|x\|_2^2 - 2 |z^* x| (e^{j \phi} e^{*} + e^{-j \phi} e^{*} e^{j \phi})
\]

\[
= \|z\|_2^2 + \|x\|_2^2 - 2 |z^* x|,
\]

where \( z^* x = |z^* x| e^{j \phi} e^{*} \) and the minimum is achieved when \( \phi_{\text{min}} = -\phi_x^* x \).
1.3 Prior art

Similar quadratic equation problems have been studied in other contexts. Candès et al. [10] cast the phase retrieval problem as a system of structured quadratic equations and solve it via vanilla gradient descent with a linear convergence rate. As this is a non-convex problem, they use a suitably constructed spectral initializer \( z^{(0)} \) for the Gaussian measurement model. Spectral initialization for phase retrieval was originally proposed in [9]. It results in \( z^{(0)} \) which is close to a globally optimal solution with high probability when sufficient measurements are available. The works of [16,17] subsequently show that adapting the loss and truncating the measurements adaptively in the initialization and gradient stages can give improved performance.

Lu and Li [18] study generalizations of spectral initialization in the real case and focus on the asymptotic behavior of the initializer with respect to the sampling ratio \( m/n \) in the high-dimensional limit. Moving beyond the Gaussian measurement model, Ghods et al. [19] propose a linear spectral estimator for the general nonlinear measurement systems. The works of Wang and Xu [20,21] address a generalized phase retrieval problem where \( A_i \) is a Hermitian matrix. They use algebraic methods [22] to find the number of measurements needed for a successful recovery. Here we complement these results by showing that both the initialization and convergence proofs can be derived using the Bernstein-type inequalities for the full-rank rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model in [1].

Solving systems of quadratic equations is closely related to low-rank matrix recovery—it is equivalent to recovering a rank-1 positive semidefinite matrix \( X = x x^* \) with \( y_i = \langle A_i, X \rangle \) [23,24]. Early work [25–28] on low-rank matrix recovery focused on relaxing the non-convex low rank constraint to the convex minimum nuclear norm constraint and establishing sufficient conditions that warrant such a semidefinite convex relaxation. However, recovering the relaxed \( X \) is computationally demanding even for moderate-size problems. To address this issue, [29] modifies the conditional gradient method by handling a small random sketch of \( X \) that can be used to recover \( X \) later. On the other hand, [13,30–32] approach the problem directly by factoring the unknown matrix as \( \hat{X} = UV^T \), where \( U, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) and \( \hat{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) are all real matrices, and search for \( U \) and \( V \) instead. In [33–35], the authors focus on the special case of recovering a real, positive-semidefinite \( X \) from its rank-1 measurements where \( A_i = a_i a_i^T \). In this work we aim to directly recover a complex signal \( x \) from full-rank measurements up to a global phase factor.

1.4 Paper outline

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we extend the derivations from [9] to the general rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model. We show that the spectral initialization concentrates around a global optimum with high probability and compute the associated concentration bounds. In Section 3, we analyze the regularity condition and derive new results for the rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model. The two results are then combined to give the main theorem of this paper. Section 4 shows computational experiments. The proofs of the formal results are given in the Appendix.

2 Spectral initialization

Spectral initialization is widely used in problems with quadratic measurements to obtain an initialization that is close to a global optimum. Similar to [9,10], we show that the spectral initializer \( z^{(0)} \) obtained with the rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model concentrates around \( x \) with high probability and can be used to initialize the gradient descent update in [3].

2.1 Initialization for signals with known norms

We first consider the case where the norm of \( x \) is known and fixed. Without loss of generality, we shall assume \( \|x\|_2 = 1 \). The rationale behind the spectral initialization strategy is that we can get a good estimate \( S' \) of \( x x^* \) using the measurements. The spectral initializer \( z^{(0)} \) can then be obtained by performing a singular value decomposition of \( S' \) and choosing a leading singular vector so that \( z^{(0)} \) is highly correlated with \( x \).
Unlike in the phase retrieval problem, which uses the leading eigenvector of the Hermitian matrix \( \hat{S} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i a_i a_i^* \) as the initializer, we have two possible choices here: either the leading left or right singular vector \( v_0 \) of

\[
S = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i A_i,
\]

can be chosen as the spectral initializer \( z^{(0)} = v_0 \), where \( y_i \) is the complex conjugate of \( y_i \). To understand this intuitively, note that the expectation of \( S \) is

\[
\mathbb{E}[S] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_r x_c A_{i,rc} \cdot A_i \right] = \sum_{rc} x_r x_c \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i,rc} \cdot A_i \right].
\]

Let \( A_{i,rc}^{(R)} \) and \( A_{i,rc}^{(I)} \) denote the real and imaginary coefficients of the \((r,c)\)-th entry \( A_{i,rc} \). They are rotation-invariant, pairwise uncorrelated and by assumption have unit variance. Using (10), it is easy to check that

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ A_{i,rc} \cdot A_{i,rc} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ A_{i,rc}^{(R)^2} + A_{i,rc}^{(I)^2} \right] = 2 \tag{8}
\]

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ A_{i,rc} \cdot A_{i,kl} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ (A_{i,rc}^{(R)} A_{i,kl}^{(R)} + A_{i,rc}^{(I)} A_{i,kl}^{(I)}) + (A_{i,rc}^{(R)} A_{i,kl}^{(I)} - A_{i,rc}^{(I)} A_{i,kl}^{(R)}) \cdot j \right] = 0, \tag{9}
\]

where \( r \neq k \) or \( c \neq l \). Hence \( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i,rc} A_i \) is a matrix with the \((r,c)\)-th entry equaling to 2 and the rest of entries being zeros. Thus

\[
\mathbb{E}[S] = 2xx^*, \tag{10}
\]

so that both the left and the right singular vectors of \( \mathbb{E}(S) \) equal \( x \) (up to a global entrywise phase).

The following lemma implies that the matrix \( S \) concentrates around \( \mathbb{E}[S] \) in the spectral norm with high probability when \( m \) is sufficiently large.

**Lemma 1.** Under the rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model given by (1), for every \( \nu > 0 \), when the number of measurements \( m \) satisfies \( m > Cn \) for some sufficiently large constant \( C := C(\nu) \), we have for some fixed \( p, q \in \mathbb{C}^n \) satisfying \( \|p\|_2 = 1, \|q\|_2 = 1 \) that

\[
\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p^* A_i^* q \cdot A_i - 2qq^* \right\| < \nu, \tag{11}
\]

with probability at least \( 1 - 20 \exp \left( -m \cdot C_1(C, \nu) \right) \), where \( C_1(C, \nu) > 0 \) is some constant depending on \( C \) and \( \nu \).

Note that the statement of Lemma \( 1 \) is slightly more general than what we need right now, since it allows \( p \neq q \) (here we set both to \( \frac{x}{\|x\|_2} \)). This will be useful in the later sections. As a consequence of Lemma \( 1 \), the leading singular vectors of \( S \) are both highly correlated with a global optimizer \( x \), as proved below in Lemma \( 2 \). The concentration proof hinges on the rotation invariance of the measurement matrices \( A_i \) [14]: If we define \( B = RA \) with \( R \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \) being a complex unitary matrix, the real and imaginary parts of the entries in \( B \) have the same joint distribution as those of \( A \).

### 2.2 Initialization for signals with unknown norms

When the norm of the signal is unknown, we can estimate it from the quadratic measurements. Using (10), we compute as follows:

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i y_i \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{2} x^* S x \right] = \frac{1}{2} x^* \mathbb{E}[S] x = \|x\|^4. \tag{12}
\]
When \( m \) is sufficiently large, we prove that \( \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i y_i^* \) is close to its expectation \( \| \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \|_2^2 \) with high probability (see the proof of Lemma 2 in the Appendix). Based on this result, we can scale one of the leading singular vectors \( \mathbf{v}_0 \) of \( S \) to get our spectral initializer,

\[
z^{(0)} = \left( \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i y_i^* \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_0.
\]  

(13)

The following lemma states that the distance between the spectral initializer \( z^{(0)} \) and a global optimizer \( x \) is small with high probability when \( m \) is sufficiently large.

**Lemma 2.** Under the rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model given by (1), when the number of complex quadratic measurements satisfies \( m > Cn \) for some sufficiently large constant \( C \), for every \( \delta \in (0, 24) \), there exist a global optimizer \( x \) of the loss in (2) such that the distance between the spectral initializer \( z^{(0)} \) and \( x \) obeys

\[
\text{dist}^2 \left( z^{(0)}, x \right) \leq \frac{51}{24} \| \mathbf{x} \|_2^2,
\]

(14)

with probability at least \( 1 - 20 \exp \left( - m \cdot C_1(C, \delta) \right) \), where \( C_1(C, \delta) > 0 \) is some constant depending on \( C \) and \( \delta \).

### 3 Convergence analysis

Let \( x \) denote a global optimizer, and \( \mathcal{P} \) the set of all vectors that differ from \( x \) by some phase shift \( \phi \):

\[
\mathcal{P} = \{ x e^{j\phi} : \phi \in (0, 2\pi) \}.
\]

We study the convergence behavior of the gradient descent iterates in the neighborhood \( E(\rho) \) of \( \mathcal{P} \), defined as

\[
E(\rho) = \{ z \mid \text{dist}(z, x) \leq \rho \| x \|_2 \},
\]

where \( \text{dist}(z, x) = \| z - x e^{j\phi_{\min}} \|_2 \) is computed as in (5). The objective function \( f(z) \) is said to satisfy the regularity condition \( RC(\alpha, \beta, \rho) \) if the following holds for all \( z \in E(\rho) \):

\[
\text{Re} \left( \langle \nabla f(z), z - x e^{j\phi_{\min}} \rangle \right) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \text{dist}^2(z, x) + \frac{1}{\beta} \| \nabla f(z) \|_2^2,
\]

(15)

for the choice of constants \( \alpha > 0, \beta > 0, \rho > 0 \). The regularity condition \( RC(\alpha, \beta, \rho) \) ensures that the gradient descent iterates (3) with a step size \( \eta \in \left( 0, \frac{2}{\alpha} \right) \) converge linearly to a global optimizer \( x \) when the descent is initialized within the neighborhood \( E(\rho) \) [10, Lemma 7.10]:

\[
\text{dist}^2 \left( z^{(t)}, x \right) \leq \left( 1 - \frac{2\eta}{\alpha} \right)^t \text{dist}^2 \left( z^{(0)}, x \right).
\]

(16)

We show that there exist choices of parameters \( \alpha, \beta, \rho \) such that the objective function \( f(z) \) introduced in (2) satisfies the regularity condition \( RC(\alpha, \beta, \rho) \) in (15) with high probability depending on \( \nu \), and exhibit a set of parameter values such that spectral initialization followed by gradient descent succeeds with high probability. The existence of good parameters is shown in three steps, following from (15) and (16):

1. Finding a positive lower bound on \( \text{Re} \left( \langle \nabla f(z), z - x e^{j\phi_{\min}} \rangle \right) \);
2. Finding an upper bound on \( \| \nabla f(z) \|_2^2 \);
3. Choosing a suitable set of $(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$-values to obtain the regularity condition $RC(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$ in (15).

The main tool in proving these steps is a matrix concentration bound (a high-probability spectral norm bound) similar to the one in Lemma 1. However, it is stated for a particular, fixed choice of the unit vectors $p, q$. Since we want the above bounds which imply the regularity condition to hold for all vectors in $E(\rho)$, it will be useful to strengthen Lemma 1 so that it holds for all choices of $p$ and $q$.

**Lemma 3.** Under the rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model given by (1), for every $\nu > 0$, when the number of measurements $m$ satisfies $m > Cn$ for some sufficiently large constant $C := C(\nu)$, we have for all $p, q \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfying $\|p\|_2 = 1, \|q\|_2 = 1$ that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p^* A_i q \langle A_i - 2qp^* \rangle \right\| < \nu,$$

with probability at least $1 - 20 \exp \left( - m \cdot C_2(C, \nu) \right)$, where $C_2(C, \nu)$ is some constant depending on $C$ and $\nu$.

With Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 in hand, we can now state our main result.

**Theorem 1.** Under the rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model given by (1), when the number of complex quadratic measurements $m > Cn$ for some sufficiently large constant $C$,

1. There exists a choice of $1 > \nu > 0, 1 > \rho > 0, \alpha > 0$, and $\beta > 0$, such that $RC(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$ holds on $E(\rho)$ with probability at least $1 - \kappa' \cdot \exp \left( - m \cdot C_2(C, \nu) \right)$, where $C_2(C, \nu)$ is some constant depending on $C$ and $\nu$, and $\kappa' > 0$ is an absolute constant.

2. Under this choice of parameters, if the step size $\eta$ is chosen so that $0 < \eta \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}$, the gradient descent iterates initialized at the spectral initializer $z^{(0)}$ converge linearly to a global optimizer $x$,

$$\text{dist}^2 \left( z^{(t)}, x \right) \leq \left( 1 - \frac{2\eta}{\alpha} \right)^t \cdot \rho^2 \|x\|^2,$$

with probability at least $1 - \kappa \cdot \exp \left( - m \cdot C_3(C, \nu, \rho) \right)$, where $\kappa > 0$ is some absolute constant and $C_3(C, \nu, \rho)$ depends on $C, \nu$ and $\rho$, but not on $m$.

Generally, one begins by choosing $1 > \nu > 0$ and $1 > \rho > 0$ to obtain a positive lower bound on $\text{Re} \left( \langle \nabla f(z), z - x e^{j\phi_{\text{min}}} \rangle \right)$. The values of $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$ should be large enough to ensure the regularity condition holds for all $z \in E(\rho)$, and satisfy $\frac{1}{\alpha \rho} \leq 1$ so that the iterates $z^{(t)}$ come closer to $x$ with each iteration. For concreteness, we end this section by exhibiting a particular choice of “good” parameter values.

### 3.1 Choosing the $\{\alpha, \beta, \rho\}$-values for the regularity condition

The proof of Theorem 1 makes it clear that there are many choices for the values of $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\rho$ such that the initializer $z^{(0)}$ stay in the neighborhood of $x$ and the objective function $f(z)$ satisfies the regularity condition (15) in this neighborhood with high probability.

As derived in the proof of Theorem 1 if we can choose $\nu = 0.01$ and $\rho = 0.2$, it is easy to verify that

$$\text{Re} \left( \langle h, \nabla f(z) \rangle \right) > 3 \|h\|_2^2 \|x\|^2$$

$$\|\nabla f(z)\|_2^2 < 120 \|h\|_2^2 \|x\|^2,$$

where $h = ze^{-j\phi_{\text{min}}} - x$. We can then choose $\alpha = \frac{3}{10} \cdot \frac{1}{\|x\|^2}$ and $\beta = \frac{3}{10} \cdot 120 \|x\|^2_2$ to obtain

$$\text{Re} \left( \langle h, \nabla f(z) \rangle \right) > \frac{3}{2} \|h\|_2^2 \|x\|^2 + \frac{3}{2} \|h\|_2^2 \|x\|^2_2$$

$$> \frac{1}{\alpha} \|h\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|\nabla f(z)\|^2_2.$$
When $m$ is sufficiently large, the regularity condition holds for all $h$ satisfying $\rho = \|h\|_2 / \|x\|_2 \leq 0.2$ with high probability. We can show that the following update converges linearly to a global optimizer:

$$ z^{(t+1)} = z^{(t)} - \eta \nabla f(z), $$

where $0 < \eta \leq \frac{2}{\beta}$.

### 4 Experimental results

We perform numerical experiments to corroborate the theoretical results. Theorem 1 states that the step size is upper-bounded by $\frac{2}{\beta}$ where $\beta$ is one of the regularity condition parameters in (15). In Section 3.1 $\beta$ is proportional to the squared norm of the signal to recover. Hence, in all experiments the step size is chosen as $\frac{0.1}{\|x\|_2^2}$ where the signal norm, $\|x\|_2^2$, is estimated using (12). 0.1 was experimentally found to give a suitable balance between convergence speed and reliable convergence.

#### 4.1 Rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian distributions

We next give examples of rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian distributions which we use in our experiments. Let

$$ u = \|s\|_2^q \cdot s, $$

where $q \in [-1,0]$, and $s \sim \mathcal{N}(0,\mathbf{I}_{d\times d})$, $s \neq 0$. If $q = -1$, the variable $u$ is uniformly distributed on the sphere $\|u\|_2 = 1$. If $q \in (-1,0)$, the pdf of $u$ is

$$ p(u) = \frac{1}{q+1} \|u\|_2^{-\frac{q+1}{2}} (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \|u\|_2^{\frac{q+1}{2}} \right). $$

(see Appendix A.5). If $q = 0$, then $u = s$ follows the standard multivariate Gaussian distribution. In the experiments, we further scale $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with the scaling parameter $\psi > 0$: $r = \psi \cdot u$ so that the coefficient vector $r$ satisfies $\mu^2 = \text{Var}(r_i) = E[r_i^2] = 1$.

#### 4.2 Closeness of spectral initializer

In this experiment we monitor how the distance between the initialization and the true solution varies with the number of measurements. We fix $n = 100$ and try different values of $m$ with $\frac{m}{n}$ uniformly sampled between 1 and 10. We run 100 random trials for each $\frac{m}{n}$ value and calculate the average relative distance between the initialization and a global optimizer. In each trial we generate a random signal $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $m$ complex random rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian matrices from the same distribution to produce $m$ complex quadratic measurements. We repeat this experiment with multiple distributions by varying the $q$ parameter in Section 4.1.

Distance between complex signals is defined in (5). We define relative distance as $\frac{\text{dist}(x,\hat{x})}{\|x\|}$ where $\hat{x}$ is the initialization and $x$ is the original signal. In Figure 1 we can see, as expected, that the spectral initializer comes closer to a global optimizer as $\frac{m}{n}$ increases. The behavior does not seem to be affected by varying $q$.

#### 4.3 Phase transition behavior

In this experiment we evaluate how the proposed approach transits from a failure phase to a success phase as we increase the number of measurements. We fix $n = 100$ and try different values of $m$ with $\frac{m}{n}$ sampled uniformly sampled between 1.5 and 5.5. We again run 100 random trials for each $\frac{m}{n}$ value and calculate the success rate. Success is declared if the relative distance between the recovered and true signal is less than

---

Figure 1: Closeness of spectral initialization with varying number of measurements where the complex random measurement matrices are from the rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model in Section 4.1.

Again, in each trial a random signal \( x \in \mathbb{C}^n \) is reconstructed and multiple distributions from Section 4.1 are used to generate the measurement matrices.

The iterative gradient descent reconstruction is terminated if the relative distance between successive iterations is less than \( 10^{-6} \) or if 2500 iterations are completed. Here we define relative distance between successive iterates as \( \frac{\text{dist}(\hat{x}_{t-1}, \hat{x}_t)}{\|x\|} \) where \( \hat{x}_{t-1} \) and \( \hat{x}_t \) are two signals recovered from successive gradient descent updates. \( \|x\| \) is used to estimate \( \|x\| \). Figure 2 shows that approximately 4\( n \) measurements are needed to successfully recover the signal for all tested values of \( q \).

4.4 Reconstruction of an image

In this experiment we reconstruct an image via its complex quadratic measurements given by (1). For images the iterative gradient descent reconstruction is terminated if the distance between successive iterations is less than \( 10^{-6} \) or if 2500 iterations are completed. The measurement matrices are for \( q = 0 \) from Section 4.1 which corresponds to a complex random Gaussian measurement model. We reconstruct the three color channels of an image separately. We choose \( \frac{m}{n} = 4 \). Figure 3 shows the absolute value of the spectral initialization and the corresponding reconstruction.

We define the relative error as \( \frac{\|\hat{x} - x\|}{\|x\|} \), where \( \|\hat{x}\| \) is the absolute value of the recovered image and \( x \) is the original image. The spectral initialization relative error is 0.34. The relative distances between the three channels of the original and their spectral initializations are 0.53, 0.49 and 0.51. The reconstruction relative error is \( 4.78 \times 10^{-7} \). The relative distances between the three channels of the original and their reconstructions are \( 5.45 \times 10^{-7} \), \( 7.73 \times 10^{-7} \) and \( 8.66 \times 10^{-7} \). Additionally, we also reconstruct the same image with varying number of measurements. Figure 4 shows the relative distances of the recovered images for each channel.

\[ ^2 \text{We note that changing the numerical tolerance in the algorithm stopping criterion can shift the curve.} \]
Figure 2: Success transition plot showing the empirical probability of success based on 100 trials with varying number of measurements where the complex random measurement matrices are from the rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian model in Section 4.1.

Figure 3: Spectral initialization and reconstruction of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign logo from its complex random quadratic Gaussian measurements.
5 Conclusion and future work

We addressed the problem of recovering a signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ from a system of complex random quadratic equations $y_i = \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}$, for rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement matrices $\{\mathbf{A}_i\}_{i=1}^m$. Our analysis complements the existing results on quadratic equations with real measurements and rank-1 positive semidefinite measurement matrices, and extends them to full-rank complex matrices. Since our measurements matrices have uncorrelated entries, the proofs can be made simpler than those for phase retrieval, where the entries of measurement matrices are correlated. Our main result has a standard form: we show that when the number of complex measurements exceeds the length of $\mathbf{x}$ multiplied by some sufficiently large $C$, then with high probability: 1) the spectral initializer $\mathbf{z}^{(0)}$ is close to a global optimizer; 2) the gradient descent iterates initialized with $\mathbf{z}^{(0)}$ converge linearly to a global optimizer. Numerical experiments corroborate the theoretical analysis and show that a global optimum can be successfully recovered when $m$ is sufficiently large.

Recent phase retrieval works show that a regularized spectral initialization and gradient descent update can improve the robustness and performance of the recovery algorithm [16, 17, 36]. Chen, et al., [37] further proved that vanilla gradient descent with random initialization enjoys favorable convergence guarantees in solving the phase retrieval problem. Our ongoing work involves analyzing similar algorithmic enhancements for the random complex sub-Gaussian measurement model. Perhaps more importantly, we are working on extending our approach to structured high-rank complex matrices that arise in key applications.
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A Proofs for rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian measurement model

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Using [14 Proposition 4.1.1], we have:

\[ p\left(A^{(R)}_{i,rc}\right) = p\left(-A^{(R)}_{i,rc}\right) \]
\[ p\left(A^{(R)}_{i,rc} A^{(R)}_{i,kl}\right) = p\left(-A^{(R)}_{i,rc} A^{(R)}_{i,kl}\right) , \]

where \((r,c) \neq (k,l)\). It is easy to verify that \( \mathbb{E}\left[A^{(R)}_{i,rc}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[A^{(R)}_{i,kl}\right] = 0 \) and \( \mathbb{E}\left[A^{(R)}_{i,rc} A^{(R)}_{i,kl}\right] = 0 \) so that

\[ \mathbb{E}\left[A^{(R)}_{i,rc} A^{(R)}_{i,kl}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[A^{(R)}_{i,rc}\right] \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[A^{(R)}_{i,kl}\right] = 0 , \]

meaning that the entries of \( A^{(R)}_{i,rc} \) and \( A^{(R)}_{i,kl} \) are pairwise uncorrelated. We can similarly get that

\[ \mathbb{E}\left[A^{(R)}_{i,rc} A^{(I)}_{i,kl}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[A^{(I)}_{i,rc} A^{(R)}_{i,kl}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[A^{(I)}_{i,rc} A^{(I)}_{i,kl}\right] = 0 . \]

Without loss of generality we assume that the real and imaginary parts of the entries have unit variance,

\[ \mathbb{E}\left[A^{(R)}_{i,rc}\right]^2 = \mathbb{E}\left[A^{(I)}_{i,rc}\right]^2 = 1 . \]

For fixed \( p, q \), by rotation invariance, we can choose

\[ p = e_1 \]
\[ q = r_1 e^{j\phi_1} e_1 + r_2 e^{j\phi_2} e_2 , \]

where \( r_1, r_2 \) are non-negative real numbers satisfying \( r_1^2 + r_2^2 = 1 \). Let \( b_i = r_1 e^{j\phi_1} \bar{A}_{i,11} + r_2 e^{j\phi_2} \bar{A}_{i,21} \), and \( \bar{A}_i \) denote the matrix \( A_i \) with the \((1,1)\)-th and \((2,1)\)-th entries replaced by \( 0s \). Then

\[
\left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p^* A_i^* q \cdot A_i - 2qp^* \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i A_{i,11} - 2r_1 e^{j\phi_1} \right| + \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i A_{i,21} - 2r_2 e^{j\phi_2} \right| + \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \bar{A}_i \right| \]

\[
\leq \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i A_{i,11} - 2r_1 e^{j\phi_1} \right) + \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i A_{i,21} - 2r_2 e^{j\phi_2} \right) \]
\[ + \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i A_{i,11} - 2r_1 e^{j\phi_1} \right) + \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i A_{i,21} - 2r_2 e^{j\phi_2} \right) + \| H \| , \]

where \( H = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \bar{A}_i \).

For the first term of (30), we have:

\[
\left| \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i A_{i,11} - 2r_1 e^{j\phi_1} \right) \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_1 \cos \phi_1 \left( |A_{i,11}|^2 - 2 \right) \right| \]
\[ + \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_2 \cos \phi_2 \left( A_{i,21}^{(R)} A_{i,11}^{(R)} + A_{i,21}^{(I)} A_{i,11}^{(I)} \right) - 2r_2 \sin \phi_2 \left( A_{i,21}^{(R)} A_{i,11}^{(I)} - A_{i,21}^{(I)} A_{i,11}^{(R)} \right) \right| . \]

One can verify that \( r_1 \cos \phi_1 \left( |A_{i,11}|^2 - 2 \right) \) is a centered subexponential random variable (cf. [15 Lemma 5.14]). Let \( F_1(1) = r_2 \cos \phi_2 \left( A_{i,21}^{(R)} A_{i,11}^{(R)} + A_{i,21}^{(I)} A_{i,11}^{(I)} \right) - 2r_2 \sin \phi_2 \left( A_{i,21}^{(R)} A_{i,11}^{(I)} - A_{i,21}^{(I)} A_{i,11}^{(R)} \right) \) so that \( F_1(1) \) is
also a centered subexponential random variable. Using the Bernstein-type inequality \[15\] Proposition 5.16, we have:

\[
\Pr \left( \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_i \cos \phi_i \left( |A_{i,11}|^2 - 2 \right) \right| \geq \frac{\nu}{12} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -m \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{c\nu^2}{144K_1^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_1} \right\} \right) \tag{32}
\]

\[
\Pr \left( \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} F_i(1) \right| \geq \frac{\nu}{12} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -m \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{c\nu^2}{144K_2^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_2} \right\} \right), \tag{33}
\]

where \( c > 0 \) is some absolute constant and \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) are the respective subexponential norms. Combining (31), (32) and (33), we then have

\[
\Pr \left( \left| \Re \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i A_{i,11} - 2r_1 e^{i\phi_i} \right) \right| < \frac{\nu}{6} \right) \geq 1 - 2 \exp \left( -m \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{c\nu^2}{144K_1^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_1} \right\} \right) \\
- 2 \exp \left( -m \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{c\nu^2}{144K_2^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_2} \right\} \right) \\
\geq 1 - 4 \exp \left( -m \cdot \hat{C}_1(\nu) \right), \tag{34}
\]

where \( \hat{C}_1(\nu) \) is a constant depending on \( \nu \),

\[
\hat{C}_1(\nu) = \min \left\{ \frac{c\nu^2}{144K_1^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_1}, \frac{c\nu^2}{144K_2^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_2} \right\}. \tag{35}
\]

For the second, third and fourth term of (30), we obtain similarly:

\[
\Pr \left( \left| \Re \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i A_{i,21} - 2r_2 e^{i\phi_2} \right) \right| < \frac{\nu}{6} \right) \geq 1 - 4 \exp \left( -m \cdot \hat{C}_2(\nu) \right) \tag{36}
\]

\[
\Pr \left( \left| \Im \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i A_{i,11} - 2r_1 e^{i\phi_i} \right) \right| < \frac{\nu}{6} \right) \geq 1 - 4 \exp \left( -m \cdot \hat{C}_3(\nu) \right) \tag{37}
\]

\[
\Pr \left( \left| \Im \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i A_{i,21} - 2r_2 e^{i\phi_2} \right) \right| < \frac{\nu}{6} \right) \geq 1 - 4 \exp \left( -m \cdot \hat{C}_4(\nu) \right), \tag{38}
\]

where \( \hat{C}_2(\nu), \hat{C}_3(\nu), \hat{C}_4(\nu) \) are some constants depending on \( \nu \).

To compute an upper bound on the spectral norm \( \|H\| \) in (30), we adapt an approach from \[15\] Theorem 5.39. The idea is to bound \( \|u^*Hv\| \), uniformly for all \( u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n \) on the unit sphere \( S^{n-1} \). In order to take the union bound over \( u \) and \( v \), we first discretize using an \( \epsilon \)-net \( \mathcal{N} \) \[15\] Definition 5.1, for \( \epsilon \in [0, 1) \). For every fixed pair \( (u, v) \), we establish a high-probability upper bound on \( \|u^*Hv\| \), and then take the union bound over \( (u, v) \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N} \), taking care of the adjustments so that the result holds over \( S^{n-1} \times S^{n-1} \).

**Step 1: Approximation.** We first bound the error of approximating \( \|H\| \) using a \( (u, v) \) from \( \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N} \).

Suppose \( u_1, v_1 \in S^{n-1} \) is chosen such that \( \|H\| = \langle Hv_1, u_1 \rangle \), and choose \( u_2, v_2 \in \mathcal{N} \) that approximate \( u_1, v_1 \) as \( \|u_1 - u_2\| \leq \epsilon, \|v_1 - v_2\| \leq \epsilon \). We get

\[
\|Hv_1, u_1\rangle - \langle Hv_2, u_2 \rangle \rangle = |u_1^*H(v_1 - v_2) + (u_1^* - u_2^*)Hv_2| \\
\leq \|H\| \|u_1 - u_2\| \|v_1 - v_2\| + \|H\| \|u_1 - u_2\| \|v_2\| \\
\leq 2\epsilon \|H\|. \tag{39}
\]
It follows that
\[
\langle \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{u}_2 \rangle \geq \langle \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{u}_1 \rangle - 2\varepsilon \|\mathbf{H}\| = (1 - 2\varepsilon) \cdot \|\mathbf{H}\|.
\] (40)

Taking the maximum over all \( \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2 \) in the above inequality, we obtain the bound
\[
\|\mathbf{H}\| \leq (1 - 2\varepsilon)^{-1} \cdot \max_{(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}} |\langle \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{u}_2 \rangle|.
\] (41)

We now choose \( \varepsilon = \frac{1}{4} \). According to \cite[Lemma 5.2]{15}, there exists a \( \frac{1}{4} \)-net with cardinality \( |\mathcal{S}| \leq 9^n \). Since we are maximizing over \((\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}\), the total cardinality is bounded as \( |\mathcal{S}|^2 \leq 81^n \) so that
\[
\|\mathbf{H}\| \leq \max_{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}} 2|\mathbf{u}^\ast \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v}|.
\] (42)

**Step 2: Concentration.** For a fixed \( (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \), we have:
\[
\left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \mathbf{u}^\ast \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_i \mathbf{v} \right| = \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \cdot G_i \right| \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left( |b_i^{(R)} G_i^{(R)} - b_i^{(I)} G_i^{(I)}| + |b_i^{(R)} G_i^{(I)} + b_i^{(I)} G_i^{(R)}| \right),
\] (43)

where \( G_i = \sum_{k,l} \pi_{k,l} \tilde{a}_{i,k,l} \). The first term of \( (43) \), \( b_i^{(R)} \) and \( b_i^{(I)} \) are linear combinations of the real and imaginary coefficients of \( \tilde{a}_{i,11} \) and \( \tilde{a}_{i,21} \). On the other hand, \( G_i^{(R)} \) and \( G_i^{(I)} \) are linear combinations of the coefficients of the entries in \( \tilde{a}_i \) that do not contain \( \tilde{a}_{i,11} \) and \( \tilde{a}_{i,21} \). We can check that \( b_i^{(R)} G_i^{(R)} - b_i^{(I)} G_i^{(I)} \) is a centered subexponential random variable as before. Using the Bernstein-type inequality \cite[Proposition 5.16]{15}, we have:
\[
\Pr\left( \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m b_i^{(R)} G_i^{(R)} - b_i^{(I)} G_i^{(I)} \right| \geq \frac{\nu}{12} \right) \leq 2 \exp\left( -m \cdot \min\left\{ \frac{c^2}{44K_3^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_3} \right\} \right),
\] (44)

where \( c > 0 \) is some absolute constant and \( K_3 \) is the subexponential norm of \( b_i^{(R)} G_i^{(R)} - b_i^{(I)} G_i^{(I)} \). We get a similar result for the second term of \( (43) \),
\[
\Pr\left( \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m b_i^{(R)} G_i^{(I)} + b_i^{(I)} G_i^{(R)} \right| \geq \frac{\nu}{12} \right) \leq 2 \exp\left( -m \cdot \min\left\{ \frac{c^2}{44K_4^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_4} \right\} \right),
\] (45)

where \( c > 0 \) is some absolute constant and \( K_4 \) is the subexponential norm of \( b_i^{(R)} G_i^{(I)} + b_i^{(I)} G_i^{(R)} \). Combining \( (43), (44), (45) \), we have:
\[
\Pr\left( 2 \cdot \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \cdot G_i \right| < \frac{\nu}{3} \right) \geq 1 - 4 \exp\left( -m \cdot \min\left\{ \frac{c^2}{144K_3^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_3} \right\} \right) - 2 \exp\left( -m \cdot \min\left\{ \frac{c^2}{144K_4^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_4} \right\} \right)
\] (46)

\[
\geq 1 - 4 \exp\left( -m \cdot \hat{C}_5(\nu) \right),
\]

where \( \hat{C}_5(\nu) \) is a constant depending on \( \nu \) and the measurement model,
\[
\hat{C}_5(\nu) = \min\left\{ \frac{c^2}{144K_3^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_3}, \frac{c^2}{144K_4^2}, \frac{c\nu}{12K_4} \right\}.
\] (47)
Using Lemma 1, the following holds with probability at least 1
Hence, on this event,

\[
\Pr \left( \max_{u, v \in \mathcal{M}_{1/4} \times \mathcal{M}_{1/4}} 2 \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i u^* \tilde{A}_i v \right| \geq \frac{\nu}{3} \right) \leq 81^n \cdot 4 \exp \left( -m \cdot \tilde{C}_5(\nu) \right) \\
= 4 \exp \left( -m \cdot \tilde{C}_5(\nu) + n \ln 81 \right) \\
\leq 4 \exp \left( -m \cdot \left( \tilde{C}_5(\nu) - C^{-1} \ln 81 \right) \right). 
\]

Using (41), we have

\[
\Pr \left( \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \tilde{A}_i \right\| < \frac{\nu}{3} \right) \geq \Pr \left( \max_{u, v \in \mathcal{M}_{1/4} \times \mathcal{M}_{1/4}} 2 \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i u^* \tilde{A}_i v \right| < \frac{\nu}{3} \right) \\
\geq 1 - 4 \exp \left( -m \cdot \left( \tilde{C}_5(\nu) - C^{-1} \ln 81 \right) \right). 
\]

If \( m \geq Cn \), using (30) and combining all the bounds so far (34), (36), (37), (38), (40), we get

\[
\Pr \left( \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p^* A_i^* q \cdot A_i - 2qp^* \right\| < \nu \right) \geq 1 - 20 \exp \left( -m \cdot C_1(C, \nu) \right), 
\]

where \( C_1(C, \nu) \) depends on \( C \) and \( \nu \), but not on \( m \).

\[
C_1(C, \nu) = \min \left\{ \tilde{C}_1(\nu), \tilde{C}_2(\nu), \tilde{C}_3(\nu), \tilde{C}_4(\nu), \tilde{C}_5(\nu) - C^{-1} \ln 81 \right\}. 
\]

When \( C \) is sufficiently large, we have that \( C_1(C, \nu) > 0 \) so that both sides of (50) go to 1 as \( m \to \infty \).

\[ \square \]

**A.2 Proof of Lemma 2**

**Proof.** Let \( \{u_0, v_0\} \) be the leading left and right singular vectors of \( S \) and \( \tau_0 \) be its largest singular value. Using Lemma 1, the following holds with probability at least \( 1 - 20 \exp \left( -m \cdot C_1(C, \delta) \right) \):

\[
|\tau_0 - u_0^* (2xx^*) v_0| = |u_0^* (S - 2xx^*) v_0| \\
\leq \|S - 2xx^*\| \\
\leq \delta \|x\|^2. 
\]

Hence, on this event, \( u_0^* (2xx^*) v_0 \geq \tau_0 - \delta \|x\|^2 \) and we have with at least the same probability that

\[
\tau_0 \geq \frac{1}{\|x\|^2} x^* Sx \\
= \frac{1}{\|x\|^2} x^* (S - 2xx^*) x + 2|x|^2 \\
\geq (2 - \delta) \|x\|^2. 
\]

1) Since \( |u_0^* x| \leq \|x\| \), when the signal norm \( \|x\| \) is known and we choose \( \|x\| v_0 \) as the spectral initializer, we have

\[
2|\tau_0 v_0 \cdot x| \geq 2|u_0^* x| \cdot |x^* v_0| \\
\geq u_0^* (2xx^*) v_0 \\
\geq \tau_0 - \delta \|x\|^2 \\
\geq (2 - 2\delta) \|x\|^2. 
\]
Using (5), the squared distance between the spectral initializer \( z^{(0)} = \|x\|_2 v_0 \) and \( x \) is then bounded as

\[
\text{dist}^2 (\|x\|_2 v_0, x) = \min_{\phi \in (0, 2\pi]} \|x\|_2 v_0 - x e^{i\phi}\|^2_2 \\
= \|x\|_2^2 v_0^2 + \|x\|_2^2 - 2|x^* v_0 \cdot \|x\|_2| \\
\leq 2\|x\|_2^2 - (2 - 2\delta)\|x\|_2^2 \\
= 2\delta \|x\|_2^2 ,
\]

with probability at least \( 1 - 20 \exp (-m \cdot C_1(C, \delta)) \).

2) When the signal norm \( \|x\|_2 \) is unknown, we estimate it from \( R = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i=1}^m y_i y_i^* \). By rotation invariance of the sub-Gaussian matrix \( A_i \), we can simply assume \( x = \|x\|_2 e_1 \) so that

\[
R = \frac{\|x\|_2^4}{2m} \sum_{i=1}^m |A_{i,11}|^2 .
\]

Using (52) in the proof of Lemma [1] (\( \phi_1 = 0 \) in this case), we know that on the same event on which (52) holds (of probability \( \geq 1 - 20 \exp (-m \cdot C_1(C, \delta)) \)), it also holds that

\[
\left( 2 - \frac{\delta}{12} \right) m \leq \sum_{i=1}^m |A_{i,11}|^2 \leq \left( 2 + \frac{\delta}{12} \right) m .
\]

We thus have

\[
\left( 1 - \frac{\delta}{24} \right) \|x\|_2^4 \leq R \leq \left( 1 + \frac{\delta}{24} \right) \|x\|_2^4 ,
\]

and choose the spectral initializer as \( z^{(0)} = \sqrt{R} v_0 \). Assuming \( \delta \in (0, 24) \), using (54) we have that

\[
\text{dist}^2 \left( \sqrt{R} v_0, x \right) = \|\sqrt{R} v_0 - x\|_2^2 \\
\leq \sqrt{R} + \|x\|_2^2 - (2 - 2\delta) \sqrt{R} \|x\|_2 \\
\leq \sqrt{1 + \frac{\delta}{24}} \|x\|_2^2 + \|x\|_2^2 - 2(1 - \delta) \sqrt{1 - \frac{\delta}{24}} \|x\|_2^2 \\
\leq \left( 1 + \frac{\delta}{24} \right) \|x\|_2^2 + \|x\|_2^2 - 2(1 - \delta) \left( 1 - \frac{\delta}{24} \right) \|x\|_2^2 \\
\leq \frac{51}{24} \delta \|x\|_2^2 ,
\]

with probability at least \( 1 - 20 \exp (-m \cdot C_1(C, \delta)) \).

\[ \square \]

A.3 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. Let \( G(p, q) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m p^* A_i^* q \cdot A_i - 2q q^* \). We prove that the bound on the spectral norm \( \|G(p, q)\| \) in (17) holds with high probability for all unit vectors \( p, q \) by combining Lemma 1 with yet another union bound. Let \( p_1, q_1 \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \) such that

\[
\|G(p_1, q_1)\| = \max_{(p, q) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \|G(p, q)\| .
\]
Let further $p_2, q_2 \in \mathcal{N}$ obey $p_1, q_1$ as $\|p_1 - p_2\|_2 \leq \epsilon$, $\|q_1 - q_2\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ (they exist by the definition of an $\epsilon$-net). We can write
\[
\|G(p_1, q_1) - G(p_2, q_2)\| = \|G(p_1, q_1 - q_2) + G(p_1 - p_2, q_2)\| \\
\leq \|G(p_1, q_1 - q_2)\| + \|G(p_1 - p_2, q_2)\| \\
= \|q_1 - q_2\|_2 \cdot \|G\left(\frac{p_1 - q_1 - q_2}{\|q_1 - q_2\|_2}\right)\| + \|p_1 - p_2\|_2 \cdot \|G\left(\frac{p_1 - p_2}{\|p_1 - p_2\|_2}, q_2\right)\| 
\]
(61)
so that
\[
\|G(p_1, q_1)\| \leq (1 - 2\epsilon)^{-1}\|G(p_2, q_2)\|. 
\]
(62)
Taking the maximum over all $p_2, q_2$ in the above inequality, we get
\[
\|G(p_1, q_1)\| \leq (1 - 2\epsilon)^{-1} \max_{p_2, q_2 \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}} \|G(p_2, q_2)\| 
\]
(63)
We again choose $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}$ so that as in Lemma 1, $|\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}| = |\mathcal{N}|^2 \leq 81^n$ and
\[
\|G(p_1, q_1)\| \leq \max_{p_2, q_2 \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}} 2\|G(p_2, q_2)\|.
\]
(64)

By Lemma 1 if $m > Cn$ for some sufficiently large $C$, 
\[
\Pr\left(\|G(p_2, q_2)\| \geq \frac{\nu}{2}\right) \leq 20 \exp\left(-m \cdot C_1\left(C, \frac{\nu}{2}\right)\right),
\]
(65)
for fixed unit vectors $p_2, q_2$. To get a result which holds for all $p$ and $q$, we take the union bound over $\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$. For $m \geq Cn$,
\[
\Pr\left(\max_{p_2, q_2 \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}} 2\|G(p_2, q_2)\| \geq \nu\right) \leq 81^n \cdot 20 \exp\left(-m \cdot C_1\left(C, \frac{\nu}{2}\right)\right)
\]
(66)
\[
= 20 \exp\left(-m \cdot C_1\left(C, \frac{\nu}{2}\right) + n \ln 81\right)
\]
\[
\leq 20 \exp\left(-m \cdot \left[C_1\left(C, \frac{\nu}{2}\right) - C^{-1} \ln 81\right]\right)
\]
Using (64), we have
\[
\Pr\left(\forall p, q \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}, \|G(p, q)\| < \nu\right) = \Pr(\|G(p_1, q_1)\| < \nu)
\]
\[
\geq \Pr\left(\max_{(p_2, q_2) \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}} 2\|G(p_2, q_2)\| < \nu\right)
\]
(67)
\[
\geq 1 - 20 \exp\left(-m \cdot C_2(C, \nu)\right),
\]
where $C_2(C, \nu) := C_1\left(C, \frac{\nu}{2}\right) - C^{-1} \ln 81 > 0$ for $C$ sufficiently large.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. The main task in proving the theorem is to prove Part 1. Once we establish that there exists a choice of parameters such that the regularity condition holds in the neighborhood of a minimizer, Part 2 (linear convergence to a minimizer) follows simply by noting that $RC(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$ implies
\[
\text{dist}^2(z^{(t+1)}, x) \leq \left(1 - \frac{2n}{\alpha}\right)\text{dist}^2(z^{(t)}, x),
\]
whenever $z^{(t)} \in E(\rho)$. We work as follows:
Part 1: Establishing the regularity condition.

1. Finding a positive lower bound on \( \text{Re}(\langle \nabla f(z), z - xe^{j\phi_{\text{min}}}/2 \rangle) \) in the neighborhood of \( x \).

We let \( h = ze^{-j\phi_{\text{min}}} - x \) so that
\[
\text{Re}(\langle h, \nabla f(z) \rangle) = \text{Re}(\langle \nabla f(z), z - xe^{j\phi_{\text{min}}} \rangle),
\]
and equivalently look for a lower bound on \( \text{Re}(\langle h, \nabla f(z) \rangle) \) for all \( h, x \in \mathbb{C}^n \) satisfying \( \frac{|h|_2}{|x|_2} \leq \rho \). We proceed by showing that \( \mathbb{E}[\text{Re}(\langle h, \nabla f(z) \rangle)] > 0 \), and that \( \text{Re}(\langle h, \nabla f(z) \rangle) \) is close to \( \mathbb{E}[\text{Re}(\langle h, \nabla f(z) \rangle)] \) with high probability, so that a strictly positive lower bound can be established with high probability when \( m \) is sufficiently large. The expression (68) can be expanded as
\[
\text{Re}(\langle h, \nabla f(z) \rangle) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ 2 \cdot \text{Re}(h^* A_i^* h \cdot h^* A_i x) + 3 \cdot \text{Re}(h^* A_i^* h \cdot h^* A_i x) \right. \\
+ 3 \cdot \text{Re}(h^* A_i^* x \cdot h^* A_i h) + 2 \cdot \text{Re}(h^* A_i^* x \cdot h^* A_i x) + \text{Re}(x^* A_i^* h \cdot h^* A_i x) \right].
\]

We rely on the spectral norm bound in Lemma 3 to lower bound (69), by bounding each of the six terms in turn. Since the exact same logic applies to all terms, we give details only for the second one, \( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \text{Re}(h^* A_i^* x \cdot h^* A_i x) \). Let \( h = \|h\|_2 \cdot \hat{h} \), and \( x = \|x\|_2 \cdot \hat{x} \), where \( \|\hat{h}\|_2 = 1 \) and \( \|\hat{x}\|_2 = 1 \). By Lemma 3, we have
\[
\left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \text{Re}(h^* A_i^* x \cdot h^* A_i x) - 2 \cdot \text{Re}(h^* x h^* x) \right| \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} h^* A_i^* x \cdot h^* A_i x - 2h^* x h^* x \leq \|h\|_2^2 \|x\|_2^2 \cdot \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{h} A_i^* \hat{x} \cdot A_i - 2 \hat{x} h^* \right| \leq \nu \|h\|_2^2 \|x\|_2^2,
\]
for all \( h \) and \( x \) with probability at least \( 1 - 20 \exp \left( -m \cdot C_2(C, \nu) \right) \). From (3) we see that \( h^* x = x^* x e^{j\phi_{\text{min}}} - |x|_2^2 = |z^* x| - |x|_2^2 \) is a real number. We then have with the same probability that
\[
\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \text{Re}(h^* A_i^* x \cdot h^* A_i x) \geq 2(h^* x)^2 - \nu \|h\|_2^2 |x|_2^2.
\]
Repeating for every term in (69), for all \( h, x \in \mathbb{C}^n \) satisfying \( \frac{|h|_2}{|x|_2} \leq \rho \), we find that
\[
\text{Re}(\langle h, \nabla f(z) \rangle) \geq 4 \left( \|h\|_2^2 + |x|_2^2 \right) ^2 + \|h\|_2^2 \left( \|x\|_2^2 + |x^* h| \right) - 2\|h\|_2^2 \nu \left( \|h\|_2^2 + 3 \|h\|_2 \|x\|_2 + 2 |x|_2^2 \right) \geq 4 \left( \left| \frac{h}{2} \right|_2 \left( \|x\|_2^2 + |x^* h| \right) - 2\left| \frac{h}{2} \right|_2 \left( \|h\|_2^2 + 3 \|h\|_2 \|x\|_2 + 2 |x|_2^2 \right) \right) \geq 4 \left( 1 - \rho - \frac{\nu}{2} \left( 2 + 3 \rho + \rho^2 \right) \right) \cdot \|h\|_2^2 |x|_2^2 = c_1(\nu, \rho) \cdot \|h\|_2^2 |x|_2^2,
\]
holds with probability at least \( 1 - \kappa_1 \exp \left( -m \cdot C_2(C, \nu) \right) \) where \( \kappa_1 > 0 \) is some absolute constant.

2. Finding an upper bound on \( \|\nabla f(z)\|_2^2 \) in the neighborhood of \( x \).

We can rewrite \( \|\nabla f(z)\|_2^2 \) as follows,
\[
\|\nabla f(z)\|_2^2 = \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} (h^* A_i^* h + h^* A_i^* x + x^* A_i^* h) A_i(h + x) \right\|,
\]
(73)
To upper bound (73) we again rely on the spectral norm bound in Lemma 3. Let $\hat{h} = \|\hat{h}\| \hat{h}$, and $x = \|x\| \hat{x}$, where $\|\hat{h}\| = 1$ and $\|x\| = 1$. We bound the second term (say) in (73) as follows

$$
\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} h^* A_i^* x \cdot A_i (h + x) \right\|_2^2 \leq \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} h^* A_i^* x \cdot A_i - 2xh^* \right\| (h + x)_2^2
\leq \nu \|\hat{h}\|_2 \|x\|_2 \cdot (\|\hat{h}\|_2 + \|x\|_2),
$$

holds with probability at least $1 - 20 \exp \left( - m \cdot C_2(C, \nu) \right)$, implying that

$$
\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} h^* A_i^* x \cdot A_i (h + x) \right\|_2 \leq (\nu + 2) \|\hat{h}\|_2 \|x\|_2 \cdot (\|\hat{h}\|_2 + \|x\|_2),
$$

holds with at least the same probability. Repeating for all terms in (73), we get

$$
\|\nabla f(x)\|_2^2 \leq 4(2 + \nu)^2 (\rho^2 + 3\rho + 2)^2 \cdot \|\hat{h}\|_2 \|x\|_2^4
= c_2(\nu, \rho) \cdot \|\hat{h}\|_2 \|x\|_2^4,
$$

with probability at least $1 - \kappa_2 \exp \left( - m \cdot C_2(C, \nu) \right)$ for all $h, x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfying $\|h\|_2 \leq \rho$, where $\kappa_2 > 0$ is some absolute constant.

3. Choosing suitable $\alpha, \beta$, and $\rho$.

We then have that (72) and (76) hold simultaneously with probability at least $1 - \kappa' \cdot \exp \left( - m \cdot C_2(C, \nu) \right)$ where $\kappa' > 0$ is some absolute constant.

Given some $\nu \in (0, 1)$, there exists a matching $\rho \in (0, 1)$ to ensure $c_1(\nu, \rho) > 0$ in (72). Choosing $\nu, \rho$ fixes $c_2(\nu, \rho) > 0$ in (76). It remains to show that there exist $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$ so that

$$
\text{Re}(\langle h, \nabla f(x) \rangle) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \|h\|_2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|\nabla f(x)\|_2^2,
$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \kappa' \cdot \exp \left( - m \cdot C_2(C, \nu) \right)$ for all $h, x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfying $\|h\|_2 \leq \rho$. Note that (77) is equivalent to the regularity condition (15).

The parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ can be chosen as follows.

(a) From (16) we need $1 - \frac{2a}{\alpha} \geq 0$. Since $\eta \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$, according to (10) Lemma 7.10, $\alpha$ and $\beta$ should satisfy $\frac{1}{\alpha \beta} \leq 1$. Making the change of variable $\alpha = a/\|x\|_2^2$, $\beta = b \cdot c_2(\nu, \rho) \|x\|_2^2$, we require

$$
\frac{4}{ab} \leq c_2(\nu, \rho).
$$

(b) From (72) and (76), the regularity condition (15) will hold if

$$
c_1(\nu, \rho) \cdot \|h\|_2 \|x\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \|h\|_2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \cdot c_2(\nu, \rho) \|h\|_2 \|x\|_2^4 = \left( \frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} \right) \|h\|_2 \|x\|_2^2,
$$

or

$$
\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} \leq c_1(\nu, \rho).
$$
There exist many choices of $a$ and $b$ (and thus $\alpha$ and $\beta$) that simultaneously satisfy (78) and (79), and consequently the regularity condition (15). For example, to get the best convergence rate, we can choose $a, b$ that maximize $\frac{4}{\alpha \beta} = \frac{4}{c_2(\nu, \rho)} \frac{1}{ab}$ subject to (78) and (79):

- If $c_2(\nu, \rho) \geq c_1(\nu, \rho)^2$, we can choose
  $$a = \frac{2}{c_1(\nu, \rho)}, \quad b = \frac{2}{c_1(\nu, \rho)}.$$  
  (80)

- If $c_2(\nu, \rho) < c_1(\nu, \rho)^2$, we can choose $a, b$ that solve
  $$ab = \frac{4}{c_2(\nu, \rho)}, \quad a + b \leq \frac{4c_1(\nu, \rho)}{c_2(\nu, \rho)}.$$  
  (81)

**Part 2: Linear convergence to a global minimizer with spectral initialization.** After $\nu, \rho, \alpha$, and $\beta$ are chosen in Part 1, it remains to ensure that the spectral initializer $\mathbf{z}^{(0)}$ falls inside the neighbourhood $E(\rho)$ with high probability. Using Lemma 2, we have that

$$\text{dist}^2 \left( \mathbf{z}^{(0)}, \mathbf{x} \right) \leq \rho^2,$$  
(82)

holds with probability at least $1 - 20 \exp \left( -m \cdot C_1 \left( C, \frac{24}{\alpha^2} \rho^2 \right) \right)$. Note that $\rho \in (0, 1)$ is equivalent to $\delta = \frac{24}{\alpha^2} \rho^2 \in (0, 24)$. Combining (81) and (82), we have that the gradient descent update (3) linearly converges to a global minimizer with probability at least $1 - \kappa \cdot \exp \left( -m \cdot C_3(\nu, \rho) \right)$, where $\kappa > 0$ is some absolute constant and $C_3(\nu, \rho) = \min \{ C_2(\nu), C_1(\nu, \rho) \}$ depends on $C, \nu$, and $\rho$, but not on $m$.

A.5 Example of rotation-invariant distributions

For completeness, we exhibit here one family of rotation-invariant sub-Gaussian distributions. Consider the random variable $\mathbf{u} = \| \mathbf{s} \|^2 \cdot \mathbf{s}$, where $q \in (0, 1)$, and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^d \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$, $\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0}$. We have:

$$\mathbf{s} = \| \mathbf{u} \|^2 \frac{\mathbf{u}}{\| \mathbf{u} \|^2} \cdot \mathbf{u}.$$  
(83)

The entries of the Jacobian matrix $\mathbf{J} = d\mathbf{s}/d\mathbf{u}$ are given as

$$\frac{\partial s_i}{\partial u_i} = \| \mathbf{u} \|^2 \frac{1}{\| \mathbf{u} \|^2} \left( 1 - \frac{q}{q + 1} \| \mathbf{u} \|^2 \cdot u_i^2 \right),$$  
(84)

$$\frac{\partial s_i}{\partial u_j} = \| \mathbf{u} \|^2 \frac{1}{\| \mathbf{u} \|^2} \left( -\frac{q}{q + 1} \| \mathbf{u} \|^2 \cdot u_i u_j \right), \quad i \neq j.$$  
(85)

The Jacobian matrix $\mathbf{J}$ is thus

$$\mathbf{J} = \| \mathbf{u} \|^2 \frac{\mathbf{u}}{\| \mathbf{u} \|^2} \left( \mathbf{I} - \frac{q}{q + 1} \| \mathbf{u} \|^2 \cdot \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \right),$$  
(86)

with the determinant given by

$$\det(\mathbf{J}) = \| \mathbf{u} \|^\frac{2d}{\| \mathbf{u} \|^2} \det \left( \mathbf{I} - \frac{q}{q + 1} \| \mathbf{u} \|^2 \cdot \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \right) = \| \mathbf{u} \|^\frac{2d}{\| \mathbf{u} \|^2} \left( 1 - \frac{q}{q + 1} \| \mathbf{u} \|^2 \cdot \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \right) \mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{q + 1} \| \mathbf{u} \|^{\frac{2d}{\| \mathbf{u} \|^2}}.$$  
(87)
We obtain the expression for the pdf as

$$p(u) = \frac{1}{q+1} \|u\|_2^{-\frac{q+1}{q}} (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|u\|_2^2\right).$$

(88)

We can see that $p(u)$ only depends on the norm $\|u\|_2$, and is thus invariant under unitary transform. For $q = -1$ we obtain a uniform distribution on the sphere, while $q = 0$ gives the Gaussian distribution. In all cases, when $q \in [-1,0]$, it is easy to check that the moments of the the random variables generated as above are suitably bounded (the tails decay faster than the Gaussian) so that these random variables are sub-Gaussian.