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Abstract. We propose to reduce the original problem of compressive sensing to the weighted-MAX-SAT. Compressive sensing is a novel randomized data acquisition method that outperforms the traditional signal processing approaches (namely, the Nyquist–Shannon technique) in acquiring and reconstructing sparse or compressible signals. The original problem of compressive sensing in sparse recovery has a combinatorial nature so that one needs to apply severe constraints on the design matrix to handle it by its convex or nonconvex relaxations. In practice, such constraints are not only intractable to be verified but also invalid in broad applications. This paper bridges the gap between employing the modern SAT solvers and a vast variety of compressive sensing based real-world applications; ranging from imaging, video processing, remote sensing, communication systems, electronics and VLSI to machine learning, data fusion, manifold processing, natural language and speech processing, and processing the biological signals. We first divide the original problem of compressive sensing into relaxed sub-problems and represent them as separate SAT instances in conjunctive normal form (CNF). Afterward, we assign the weights to the clauses in such a way that the aggregated weighted-MAX-SAT problem can guarantee a successful recovery of the original signal. As proof of concept, we demonstrate the applicability of our approach in tackling the original problem of binary compressive sensing with Bernoulli design matrices.
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1 Introduction

In science and engineering disciplines, we generally turn the physical world into the data so we can perform necessary processes for analyzing the systems and returning the feedbacks. Digitizing measurements in sensors has revolutionized the data acquisition processes where we utilize the analog-to-digital converters (ADC) and the digital-to-analog converters (DAC) to bridge the gap between the continues-time and discrete-time signals. In the realm of digital computing, the Nyquist–Shannon theorem guarantees that if we sample the signals densely enough (namely, twice the highest frequency of the signal), then we can reconstruct it perfectly (Rabiner and Gold 1975).
From a sensing perspective, the traditional data acquisition techniques perform uniform sampling over the signals. Hence, we need to densify the measurements to obtain higher resolution representation of the physical systems, and in some applications (like multiband signals with wide spectral ranges), the required sampling rate can exceed the specifications of the best available ADCs (Rani, Duhok, and Deshmukh 2018). In addition to the sensing restrictions, storing and processing the acquired high-volume data are also challenging such that we employ specific application based encoding techniques to provide a compressed representation of the original signal. As an illustration, the majority of the modern digital cameras apply JPEG or JPEG2000 algorithms (embedded in the sensing modules of the cameras) to take high-quality but compressed digital pictures. Furthermore, we often change the basis of the digital signals to represent them in a transformed domain such as wavelet transform for natural images, discrete cosine transform for images and audio signals, Fourier transform for speech signals, and Radon transform for medical images. In a vast variety of the real-world applications, resulting coefficients follow the power law such that we discard the majority of them and retain only those with significant magnitudes for storage and transmission purposes (Eldar and Kutyniok 2012; Rani, Duhok, and Deshmukh 2018). Roughly speaking, point measurement approaches may result in too many samples compared to the actual information contained in the original signals (Foucart and Rauhut 2013).

Compressive sensing (also known as compressed sensing, compressive sampling or sparse sampling) is a randomized data acquisition method that outperforms traditional signal processing approaches (more precisely the Nyquist–Shannon technique) in acquiring and reconstructing sparse or compressible signals (Candès, Romberg, and Tao 2006; Donoho 2006; Candès and Tao 2006). From a data acquisition point of view, instead of sensing $N$ samples uniformly and then compressing them into a vector of size $s$, compressive sensing performs $m$ linear measurements such that $m$ is reasonably close to $s$. In other words, compressive sensing performs both sensing and size reduction tasks simultaneously. Since the majority of signals are either self-sparse in their original domain or have a sparse representation in some transform domain, compressive sensing samples the signal at a rate much below the Nyquist sampling rate — in many real-world applications $m = O(s \ln(N / s))$ (Rani, Duhok, and Deshmukh 2018; Eldar and Kutyniok 2012).

Compressive sensing has also demonstrated remarkable numerical stabilities in terms of not only noisy measurements but also quantization errors (Saab, Wang, and Yilmaz 2018). Moreover, some compressive sensing techniques are universal regarding the sparsifying basis. Hence, when we are taking the random linear measurements, it is not required to know the sparsifying basis; for example, in blind compressive sensing (Gleichman and Eldar 2010). This universality allows us to reconstruct higher quality signals from the currently available measurements if a novel transform is available, albeit we need this basis in the recovery step (Eldar and Kutyniok 2012). Remark that because the measurements in the compressive sensing are a random linear combination of the elements of the original signal, they approximately carry a close amount of information. This property makes compressive sensing reasonably robust
for packages lost in data streaming applications (Pudlewski, Prasanna, and Melodia 2012; Ciaramella and Giunta 2016; Malioutov, Sanghavi, and Willsky 2010). Unlike uniform sampling techniques, the recovering process in the compressive sensing requires prior knowledge about the original signals which adds reasonable levels of security and privacy to the compressive sensing based data acquisition frameworks (Zhang et al. 2018; Wu et al. 2018).

From an application attitude, compressive sensing has revolutionized the trends in digital imaging. As an illustration, instead of using millions of CMOS or CCD based photo sensors to take a megapixel image, a single-pixel camera utilizes only one but advanced light sensor for measuring the entire image. Therefore: (a) single-pixel cameras require much less information to reconstruct an image; (b) the technology can make simpler, smaller, and less expensive cameras; and (c) single-pixel cameras can operate across a broader spectral range compared to silicon-based cameras like infrared or ultraviolet cameras (Duarte et al. 2008; Rani, Dhok, and Deshmukh 2018).

In radar imaging, not only compressive sensing results in significantly higher-resolution images through much fewer measurements but it also offers advantages like robustness in inverse synthetic aperture radar (ISAR) imaging, and resistance to countermeasures and interception in synthetic aperture radar (SAR) imaging (Rani, Dhok, and Deshmukh 2018). Traditional magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) techniques perform time-consuming processes to construct high-enough-resolution images for diagnosis purposes (several minutes for one patient), although compressive sensing has revealed that high-quality MRI is feasible in much less time (Lustig, Donoho, and Pauly 2007; Lustig et al. 2008).

In compressive machine learning, we try to exploit the sparsity of observations (instances in the datasets or some transform domains) for enhancing the performance of machine learning models. For instance, compressive sensing-based face recognition techniques are invariant to rotations, re-scaling, and translations of the data. In the same way, compressive sensing has demonstrated more robust results in speaker recognition applications (Rani, Dhok, and Deshmukh 2018). In compressive NLP (natural language processing), compressive sensing has performed remarkable functionalities in information-preserving and low-dimensional embedding of n-grams for supervised and unsupervised text mining applications (Arora et al. 2018). Similarly, compressive NLP has shown outstanding functionalities in text classification applications like topic modeling and document categorization (Sainath et al. 2012). Compressive sensing has also demonstrated outstanding improvements in many biomedical applications —ranging from processing biological signals like an electrocardiogram (ECG), electroencephalographic (EEG) and neural signals, to genomic sensing, DNA microarrays, the study of proteins and bacterial composition reconstruction (Rani, Dhok, and Deshmukh 2018).

Compressive sensing linearly samples sparse or compressible signals at a rate much below of the Nyquist-Shannon sampling theorem and outperforms traditional data acquisition approaches where (Rani, Dhok, and Deshmukh 2018): (a) traditional sensing techniques are very time-consuming —i.e., MRI and functional MRI; (b) energy efficiency is vital —e.g., wireless sensor networks (WSN) and wireless body sensor nodes (WBSN); (c) sensing is too expensive (namely high-speed ADCs); (d) we have
to utilize few sensors like non-visible wavelengths. In traditional signal processing approaches, the data acquisition process is much more complicated than the recovery of the original signals. In compressive sensing, however, the encoding process is simple, and the signal recovery process is challenging. The original problem of compressive sensing in the recovery of a sparse or compressible signal is NP-hard (Muthukrishnan 2005). Hence, in practice, we apply severe constraints to convexify the problem and take advantage of efficient linear programming tools (Foucart and Rauhut 2013). Recent studies have demonstrated that compressive sensing is doable via employing quantum computers (Ayanzadeh et al. 2019), albeit large-scale quantum computers are not available yet.

The Boolean satisfiability (SAT) is the problem of determining whether a given Boolean formula can be interpreted as “True” with a constant replacement of the values (“True” or “False”) for all Boolean variables (Cormen et al. 2009). This problem is NP-complete (Cook 1971) so, in the worst case, the SAT solvers need to explore an exponentially large search space to satisfy the given expression. During the last decade, nevertheless, various real-world applications of SAT have revealed that worst cases are very less likely to happen in practice. Hence, the modern SAT solvers can tackle the SAT instances with thousands of variables and millions of clauses (in CNF representation).

From the complexity point of view, we can reduce all problems in the NP class to SAT in polynomial time (Cormen et al. 2009). This paper proposes to reduce (convert) the original problem of compressive sensing in recovery of sparse or compressible signals to the weighted-MAX-SAT instances. As proof of concept, we apply our method to represent the original problem of binary compressive sensing with Bernoulli design matrices as weighted-MAX-SAT instances.

## 2 Problem Definition

For a given measurement vector \( y \in \mathbb{R}^m \) and a design matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times N} \) with \( m \ll N \), the original problem of compressive sensing seeks for the sparsest \( x \in \mathbb{R}^N \) with \( y = Ax \). To avoid a combinatorial search for finding the desired vector, compressive sensing imposes some constraints on the design matrix like the restricted isometry property (RIP) so that, for example, the convex relaxation problem obtains the same solution (Foucart and Rauhut 2013). Denote sparsity level of \( x \) with \( \| x \|_0 \), i.e., the number of nonzero entries of \( x \), then the original problem of compressive sensing in sparse recovery formulates as:

\[
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \| x \|_0 \quad \text{subject to} \quad Ax = y. \quad (I)
\]

In problem (I), we exploit the sparsity of signals through \( \ell_0 \)-minimization to reconstruct the original signal \( x \) from far fewer samples than required by the sampling theorem (Foucart and Rauhut 2013). From a complexity perspective, finding the min-
imal support set of $x$ in problem (1) is NP-hard (Muthukrishnan 2005); meaning that a well-posed compressive sensing is plausible only in the realm of quantum computing (Ayanzadeh et al. 2019). In the realm of classical computing, greedy algorithms like orthogonal matching pursuit (OMP) can tackle the $\ell_0$-minimization under some restrictive constraints (Foucart and Rauhut 2013). In many real-world applications, however, greedy algorithms suffer in recovering signals with high-enough accuracy (Eldar and Kutyniok 2012). From an application viewpoint, compressive sensing started to revolutionize the real-world applications through convexifying the problem (1). Since $\ell_p$-norm approaches $\ell_0$-norm when $p \downarrow 0$, we can approximate the problem (1) as follows:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|x\|_p \quad \text{subject to} \quad Ax = y.$$  

(2)

Here, we need to provide necessary and sufficient conditions to guarantee that both problems (1) and (2) appoint an identical solution. On this basis, we generally apply additional severe constraints on the design matrix to certify this possibility using tools such as restricted isometry constants or null and range space properties (Baraniuk et al. 2008).

For $p > 1$, the unique solution of this strictly convex problem is generically full-support, i.e., each of its components is non-zero (Shen and Mousavi 2018). We can reduce the problem (2) to a linear program when $p = 1$, and necessary and sufficient conditions are available to guarantee the uniqueness of the optimal solution (Mousavi and Shen 2017). Convex optimization based methods like basis pursuit (BP), Dantzig selector, and gradient-based algorithms generally require significantly more computational resources but they can outperform other ill-posed techniques like greedy algorithms and hybrid approaches (i.e., compressive sampling matching pursuit and stage-wise OMP) in terms of recovery accuracy (Foucart and Rauhut 2013). The case of $p \in (0,1)$ leads to a nonconvex objective function, although it obtains not only much less restrictive conditions on the design matrix but also more robust and stable theoretical guarantees at the cost of higher complexity in the recovery phase (Chartrand 2009). As an illustration, a sufficient condition for successful recovery in noiseless environments through $\ell_{0\alpha}$-norm is significantly less restrictive than the analogous results for $\ell_1$-norm recovery (Saab, Chartrand, and Yilmaz 2008).

The standard compressive sensing linearly measures the signals at a rate much below the sampling rate and assumes that such measurements come from noiseless sources. However, we need to deal with noisy measurements in the majority of the real-world applications, so we employ an unconstrained optimization problem as follows:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|y - Ax\|^2_2 + \lambda \|x\|_0;$$  

(3)
where the penalty parameter $\lambda$ controls the trade-off between the feasibility and sparsity (Figueiredo, Nowak, and Wright 2007). Beside the noise in the measurement vector $\gamma$, in certain applications (i.e., cognitive radio sensing, deconvolution and calibration of the antenna, we also do not have complete information about the design matrix due to various reasons—including but not limited to imperfect signal acquisition hardware, imperfect calibration, model mismatching and parameter discretization (Meng and Zhu 2018). For example, we only can approximate the erroneous measurement matrices that appear in various applications such as telecommunication, source separation, parameter discretization and model mismatching (Fannjiang, Strohmer, and Yan 2010; Herman and Strohmer 2009). Extending the existing efficient methods in compressive sensing, namely compressive sampling matching pursuit and basis pursuit, has demonstrated desirable performance in dealing with such uncertainties where we only have partial prior information about the design matrix (Chi et al. 2011; Zhu, Leus, and Giannakis 2011; Herman and Strohmer 2010). Compressive sensing with matrix uncertainty, associated to the Bayesian setting with prior informative, is a more realistic approach that extends (3) to simultaneously model the noisy measurements and uncertainties of the design matrix as follows:

$$\min_{x,d} \| (A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{r} d_i A_i) x - y \|_2^2 + \frac{\|d\|_2^2}{\gamma} + \lambda \|x\|_0; \quad (4)$$

where $d \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and $e \sim N(0, I / \gamma)$ are uncertainty parameter and unknown noise vectors respectively (Meng and Zhu 2018; Parker, Cevher, and Schniter 2011).

### 3 Boolean Satisfiability (SAT)

The problem of Boolean satisfiability (also known as propositional satisfiability, satisfiability or SAT) aims to determine whether a given Boolean expression/formula can be interpreted as “True” with a constant replacement of the values (“True” or “False”) for all Boolean variables (Cormen et al. 2009). A Boolean formula is in conjunctive/clausal normal form (CNF) if it is a conjunction of clauses, where each clause is the disjunction of literals –Boolean variables or their negation (Gu 1994). When we restrict the clauses to contain at most $k$ literals, for $k \geq 3$, the resulting $k$-SAT instances are NP-complete (Calabro, Impagliazzo, and Paturi 2006; Impagliazzo and Paturi 2001). We can convert any propositional expression to CNF in polynomial-time, and the majority of the modern SAT solvers have adapted it for standardizing the representation of the SAT instances (Gu et al. 1999; Biere, Heule, and van Maaren 2009).

Satisfiability is the first NP-complete problem (Cook 1971) so, according to Cook-Levin theorem, we can reduce all problems in the NP class to the SAT instances in polynomial time (Cormen et al. 2009). Real-world problems, however, have complicated properties that make the use of the standard SAT solvers challenging. Therefore, we extend the search-oriented nature of the original SAT to cover other problem
types—including but not limited to optimization and model counting (Biere, Heule, and van Maaren 2009; Marques-Silva and Sakallah 2000). Major extensions of the SAT are as follows:

- **Maximum Satisfiability problem (MAX-SAT):** For a given Boolean formula in CNF, the MAX-SAT determines the maximum number of satisfiable clauses. From a problem formulation attitude, the MAX-SAT adds optimization perspective to the original SAT which has searching nature. Weighted-MAX-SAT is an extended version of the MAX-SAT in which, each clause has an associated weight that specifies the penalty of not satisfying the clauses.
- **#SAT:** The #SAT problem (also known as Sharp-SAT) is the problem of counting the number of satisfying assignments of a given Boolean formula. The Parity-SAT problem is a special extension of the #SAT in which, we are trying to determine whether a given Boolean expression has odd numbers of satisfying assignments.
- **NAE-SAT:** (not all equal SAT); The NAE-SAT requires the satisfying solution to include at least one “True” literal and one “False” literal in each clause.
- **Unique-SAT & Tautology:** The Unique-SAT problem determines whether a given Boolean formula has exactly (one) satisfying assignment. On the other side, the Tautology problem determines whether a given logic formula is satisfiable for all possible assignments.
- **SAT for Higher-Order Logic:** Similar to the propositional logic (zeroth-order logic), we can also extend the SAT to satisfy expressions in higher-order logic—including but not limited to the first-order logic (variables are quantified over the domain) and second-order logic (both variables and operators are quantified).
- **Constraint Satisfaction Problem (CSP):** CSP represents the problems as a set of constraints, and CSP solvers search the state space to find a feasible solution. Although SAT can represent all problems in the class NP, CSP provides straighter forward perspective for formulating the real-world problems.
- **0-1-Integer Programming:** Integer programming restricts the variables’ domain in CSP to integer numbers. In the same way, 0-1-integer programming restricts the variables to take their values from \{0, 1\}. From a problem formulation perspective, 0-1-integer programming generalizes the SAT to include complicated constraints, and problems in 0-1-integer programming are reducible to SAT in polynomial time—and vice versa.

Solving satisfiability instances can require exponentially large computational resources. Worst cases, however, are less likely to happen in practice and modern SAT solvers can handle the real-world applications with thousands of variables and millions of clauses. As an illustration, advances in developing efficient heuristics have resulted in commercialized tools for SAT-based planning applications (Kautz and Selman 2006). Since we can transfer first-order logic formulas into propositional logic formulas (Russell and Norvig 2016), SAT serves as the cornerstone for a vast range of AI applications—more precisely, reasoning and inference systems. For example, “Z3” is an efficient satisfiability modulo theory (SMT) solver that can satisfy higher order expressions (De Moura and Bjørner 2008).
Furthermore, SAT solvers have demonstrated remarkable functionalities in a vast variety of electronic design automation (EDA) applications—including but not limited to combinational equivalence checking, logic optimization, functional test vector generation, test pattern generation, circuit delay computation and bounded model checking (Marques-Silva and Sakallah 2000). Satisfiability has also started to address various problems in cryptography. In 2005, for instance, high-performance SAT solvers were able to break several standard cryptographic hash functions (Mironov and Zhang 2006). In the same way, parallel SAT solvers have shown to be applicable for integer factoring applications (Lundén and Forsblom 2015).

4 SAT-based Compressive Sensing

From a problem-solving perspective, the sparse recovery module in compressive sensing receives the measurement vector \( y \in \mathbb{R}^m \) and the design matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \) as input, and returns a sparse vector \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) that: (a) \( x \) satisfies \( y = Ax \); and (b) \( x \) has maximum number of zeros. In SAT-based compressive sensing, we first divide the problem (1) into two relaxed sub-problems as follows:

- \( f_i \) : For the given measurement vector \( y \) and a design matrix \( A \), the first sub-problem aims to only satisfy \( y = Ax \). Here, we neglect the sparsity constraint that minimizes \( \| x \|_0 \).
- \( f_2 \) : The second sub-problem tries to only minimize \( \| x \|_0 \) in which, the global optimum appears when the zero vector \( x = 0 \).

Afterward, we represent \( f_i \) and \( f_2 \) as two separate SAT instances in CNF. To this end, we can employ hardware description languages (i.e., Verilog and VHDL) and rely on electronic design automation (EDA) tools to represent \( f_i \) and \( f_2 \) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
 f_i &:= C_{i1} \land C_{i2} \land \cdots \land C_{in}, \\
 f_2 &:= C_{21} \land C_{22} \land \cdots \land C_{2p_2},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( C_{ii} \) for \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, p_i\} \) and \( C_{jj} \) for \( j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, p_2\} \) are clauses over the elements of the vector \( x \) in \( f_i \) and \( f_2 \) respectively. Since both problems (5) and (6) are in CNF, \( f := f_i \land f_2 \) leads to an aggregated SAT as follows:

\[
 f := f_1 \land f_2 = C_{i1} \land C_{i2} \land \cdots \land C_{in} \land C_{21} \land C_{22} \land \cdots \land C_{2p_2};
\]
which is also in CNF, and any \( x \) that satisfies (7) is guaranteed to satisfy (5) and (6) as well. Finally, we assign weights to the clauses in (7) to form a Weighted-MAX-SAT as follows:

\[
f_{C_3} := w_{11}^C C_1^1 \land w_{12}^C C_2^1 \land \ldots \land w_{p_1}^C C_{p_1}^1 \land w_{11}^C C_1^2 \land w_{12}^C C_2^2 \land \ldots \land w_{p_2}^C C_{p_2}^2. \tag{8}
\]

We only need to provide necessary and sufficient conditions to guarantee that both problems (1) and (8) appoint an identical solution. A possible scenario is to have the one-to-one relation between the clauses of the problem (6) and \( x = 0 \) in which, we only need to simply satisfy the following constraints:

\[
w_i^j > \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} w_j^j \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, p_1. \tag{9}
\]

More precisely, if \( f \) includes exactly “one” clause for representing each of the elements in \( x = 0 \), then satisfying (9) will guarantee a successful recovery via (8). It is worth highlighting that (8) is guaranteed to have a unique solution.

### 5 Proof of Concept

Restricting the vector \( x \) in the problem (1) to take its values from \( \{0, 1\} \) leads to a discrete optimization problem that we call binary compressive sensing which is also NP-hard. Owing to the nature of the discrete optimization problems, the majority of the approaches in standard compressive sensing are not applicable for binary compressive sensing. Hence, well-posed binary compressive sensing is doable only in the realm of quantum computing (Ayanzadeh et al. 2019). In this section, we demonstrate that we can employ the modern SAT solvers to propose a well-posed approach for tackling the original problem of binary compressive sensing.

While most of the studies in compressive sensing focus on random design matrices with Gaussian distribution, solid theoretical and experimental results are available to guarantee that we can also exactly recover sparse (or compressible) signals from random binary matrices with a very high probability (G. Zhang et al. 2010). Therefore, without losing the generality of the proposed SAT-based compressive sensing, we demonstrate the applicability of our method on design matrices with Bernoulli distribution. For a given measurement vector \( y \in \mathbb{N}^m \) and a coding matrix \( A \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times N} \) (where \( m \ll N \)), the objective in SAT-based binary compressive sensing is to construct a Weighted-MAX-SAT instance, shown in (8), over the binary vector \( x \in \{0, 1\}^N \) and guarantee that (8) and (1) appoint an identical solution.

We start with defining the relaxed sub-problem \( f^r \), shown in (5), which tries to only solve \( y = Ax \). Because both \( A \) and \( x \) take their values from \( \{0, 1\} \), calculating
\langle A, x \rangle$ is equivalent to finding the Hamming weight (or population count) of the set \{A_1x_1, A_2x_2, \ldots, A_Nx_N\} as follows:

$$z_i = \langle A_i, x \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_j x_j;$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

and represent the relaxed sub-problem $f_i$ as $y_i = z_i, \ \forall i \in [1, m]$. Since both $y$ and $z$ take their values from $[0, N]$, we can represent them in binary basis as $\hat{y} \in \{0,1\}^{2 \cdot \log_2 N \cdot (y \cdot z)}$, and $\hat{z} \in \{0,1\}^{2 \cdot \log_2 N \cdot (z \cdot z)}$ respectively. Afterward, we can use the “XNOR” Boolean operator for representing the $f_i$ in binary basis as follows:

$$f_i := -(\hat{y}_i \oplus \hat{z}_i), \ \forall i \in [1, m]\left(\left\lfloor \log_2 N \right\rfloor + 1\right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

Finally, we can convert the Boolean expressions $-(\hat{y}_i \oplus \hat{z}_i)$ to CNF individually, and aggregate the resulting sub-SAT instances via the “AND” operator to represent $f$ as an SAT in CNF. For the given measurement vector $y$, we simply can convert the basis and form the binary vector $\hat{y}$. To construct the binary vector $\hat{z}$, we can employ the gate model of “half-adder” and “full-adder” modules in a tree-based structure and build a digital circuit for the problem of Hamming weight.

In the following example, we intend on recovering a 2-sparse binary vector $x \in \{0,1\}^8$ from the given measurement vector $y = (1 \ 2 \ 1 \ 0)^T$, where:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}.$$

For $N = 8$, we need 4 bits to represent each of the elements of the measurement vector $y$ in a binary basis as:

$$\hat{y} = (0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1)^T.$$

For each row of the design matrix $A$ in this example, we need to use an 8-bit Hamming weight module (shown in Fig. 1) to generate the result of $\langle A, x \rangle$. Integrating the outputs of these four Hamming weight circuits with the corresponding elements from the binary vector $\hat{y}$ via “XNOR” operator followed by an “AND” gate (shown in Fig. 2) results in a prototype circuit for the relaxed sub-problem $f_i$. 
Now, we need to represent $f_1$ in CNF which can be computationally intensive. To subside the odds of the need for defining auxiliary variables in this conversion, we first convert $-(\hat{z}_i \oplus \hat{y}_i)$ to CNF, and then aggregate the resulting sub-SAT instances via the “AND” operator. Table 1 displays the resulting sub-SAT instances for the 4-bit output from the first Hamming weight module in the abovementioned example.
Table 1. Sub-SAT instances for the 4-bit output Hamming weight module

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$i$</th>
<th>$y_i^*$</th>
<th>$z_i^*$</th>
<th>$\neg((y_i^* \oplus z_i^*)$ in CNF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$x_1 \land x_2 \land x_3 \land x_6$</td>
<td>$x_1 \land x_2 \land x_3 \land x_6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$(x_1 \lor x_4 \lor x_5 \lor x_6) \land$</td>
<td>$(x_1 \lor x_4 \lor x_5 \lor x_6) \land$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(x_1 \lor x_4 \lor x_5 \lor \neg x_6) \land$</td>
<td>$(x_1 \lor x_4 \lor x_5 \lor \neg x_6) \land$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(x_1 \lor \neg x_4 \lor x_5 \lor x_6) \land$</td>
<td>$(x_1 \lor \neg x_4 \lor x_5 \lor x_6) \land$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(\neg x_1 \lor x_4 \lor x_5 \lor x_6) \land$</td>
<td>$(\neg x_1 \lor x_4 \lor x_5 \lor x_6) \land$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(\neg x_1 \lor \neg x_4 \lor \neg x_5 \lor \neg x_6) \land$</td>
<td>$(\neg x_1 \lor \neg x_4 \lor \neg x_5 \lor \neg x_6) \land$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$(x_1 \lor x_4 \lor x_5 \lor x_6) \land$</td>
<td>$(x_1 \lor x_4 \lor x_5 \lor x_6) \land$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(x_1 \lor \neg x_4 \lor \neg x_5 \lor \neg x_6) \land$</td>
<td>$(x_1 \lor \neg x_4 \lor \neg x_5 \lor \neg x_6) \land$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(\neg x_1 \lor x_4 \lor \neg x_5 \lor \neg x_6) \land$</td>
<td>$(\neg x_1 \lor x_4 \lor \neg x_5 \lor \neg x_6) \land$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(\neg x_1 \lor \neg x_4 \lor \neg x_5 \lor x_6) \land$</td>
<td>$(\neg x_1 \lor \neg x_4 \lor \neg x_5 \lor x_6) \land$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(\neg x_1 \lor x_4 \lor \neg x_5 \lor \neg x_6) \land$</td>
<td>$(\neg x_1 \lor x_4 \lor \neg x_5 \lor \neg x_6) \land$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We know that the global minimum of $\| x \|_8$ occurs at the zero vector $x = 0$. Therefore, we can represent the second sub-problem $f_2^{\ast}$ in CNF as follows:

$$f_2 := \neg x_1 \land \neg x_2 \land \ldots \land \neg x_N.$$  (12)

Remark that each element of $x$ in (12) has exactly one corresponding clause. Because $p_i = N = 8$, a possible scenario to guarantee that (8) and (1) in the abovementioned example will appoint an identical solution is:

$$w_i^{\ast} > 8, \quad \forall i \in [1, p_i];$$  (13)

$$w_j^{\ast} = 1, \quad \forall j \in [1, N].$$  (14)
6 Conclusion

Compressive sensing is a randomized data acquisition approach that outperforms the traditional signal processing techniques via linearly sampling the sparse or compressible signals at a rate much below the Nyquist–Shannon rate. The original problem of compressive sensing in sparse recovery is NP-hard, and ill-posed approaches apply severe restrictions on the coding matrix to convexify the problem and tackle it via the linear and non-linear optimization heuristics. Nevertheless, such restrictions are not only themselves NP-complete to be verified but also invalid in many practical arrangements.

We propose to reduce the original problem of compressive sensing in the recovery of sparse or compressible signals to the weighted-MAX-SAT. We first divide the original problem of compressive sensing into two relaxed sub-problems and represent them as separate SAT instances in CNF. In the first sub-problem, we relax the sparsity constraint and formulate the resulting sub-problem only to solve the given underdetermined system. The second sub-problem aims only to find the sparsest signal which we know where the global optimum appears in advance. Afterward, we aggregate the resulting CNF instances via the “AND” operator and form a larger SAT in CNF. Finally, we assign weights to the clauses of the aggregated CNF in such a way that the ultimate weighted-MAX-SAT and the original problem of interest are guaranteed to appoint an identical solution. Remark that the only required assumption here is to have a unique solution for the original problem of compressive sensing which is much looser than those of relaxations or greedy methods.

As proof of concept, we demonstrate the applicability of our method in tackling the original problem of binary compressive sensing with Bernoulli design matrices. To form the first relaxed sub-problem, we use the gate models of half-adder and full-adder modules in a tree-based structure and design a digital circuit for the problem of Hamming weight. To recover an \( N \)-bit signal, our prototype employs \( N - 1 \) modules of half-adder and full-adder. Since the probability of having “1” in each element of the design matrix with Bernoulli distribution is close to \( 1/2 \), we can simplify the Hamming weight circuit via neglecting the inputs with zero coefficient and reduce the number of required half/full-adder modules to about \( N/2 \) in practice. To form the second sub-problem, we aggregate the negation of the elements in \( x \) via the “AND” operator. In this case of study, assigning the weights \( N + 1 \) and 1 to the clauses of first and second sub-problems (respectively) provide necessary and sufficient conditions that guarantee a successful recovery of the binary signal \( x \).

This paper bridges the gap between the trends in advancing the SAT solvers and a broad range of compressive sensing based real-world applications. In standard compressive sensing, we assume that the measurements come from noiseless sources and we also have perfect knowledge about the coding matrix. In practice, however, such assumptions are not valid. As a future work, we are extending the proposed SAT-based compressive sensing to handle the noisy measurements. Besides, we are leveraging the proposed model for tackling the problem of compressive sensing with matrix uncertainty which is a more general problem that handles the case where we only can approximate the design matrices.
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