

Improved RIP-Based Bounds for Guaranteed Performance of two Compressed Sensing Algorithms

Yun-Bin Zhao *Member, IEEE*, Zhi-Quan Luo *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—Iterative hard thresholding (IHT) and compressive sampling matching pursuit (CoSaMP) are two types of mainstream compressed sensing algorithms using hard thresholding operators for signal recovery and approximation. The guaranteed performance for signal recovery via these algorithms has mainly been analyzed under the condition that the restricted isometry constant of a sensing matrix, denoted by δ_K (where K is an integer number), is smaller than a certain threshold value in the interval $(0, 1)$. The condition $\delta_K < \delta^*$ for some constant $\delta^* \leq 1$ ensuring the success of signal recovery with a specific algorithm is called the restricted-isometry-property-based (RIP-based) bound for guaranteed performance of the algorithm. At the moment, the best known RIP-based bound for the guaranteed recovery of k -sparse signals via IHT is $\delta_{3k} < 1/\sqrt{3} \approx 0.5774$, and the bound for guaranteed recovery via CoSaMP is $\delta_{4k} < 0.4782$. A fundamental question in this area is whether such theoretical results can be further improved. The purpose of this paper is to affirmatively answer this question and rigorously show that the RIP-based bounds for guaranteed performance of IHT can be significantly improved to $\delta_{3k} < (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2 \approx 0.618$, and the bound for CoSaMP can be improved and pushed to $\delta_{4k} < 0.5102$. These improvements are achieved through a deep property of the hard thresholding operator.

Index Terms—Iterative hard thresholding (IHT), compressive sampling matching pursuit (CoSaMP), restricted isometry property (RIP), compressed sensing, signal recovery.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the important tasks in signal processing is to recover (reconstruct) an unknown signal from the linear and nonadaptive measurements acquired for the signal. The sparse or compressible signals arise in many scenarios especially when the signal is represented in certain transformed domains or over redundant bases [1]–[6]. The compressed sensing algorithms were developed for signal recovery when the signal is sparse or can be sparsely approximated [7]–[10]. The recovery of a sparse signal or the significant information of the signal usually amounts to solving a sparse optimization model, and the numerical methods for solving such a model are often called compressed sensing algorithms (see, e.g., [9], [4], [5], [11], [12]). Denote by $\|z\|_0$ the ‘ ℓ_0 -norm’ counting

the number of nonzero entries of the n -dimensional vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let A be an $m \times n$ sensing matrix with $m < n$. The typical model for sparse signal recovery can be formulated as the ℓ_0 -minimization problem

$$\min\{\|z\|_0 : \|Az - y\|_2 \leq \epsilon\},$$

where $\epsilon \geq 0$ is a given parameter and $y := Ax + \nu$ are the measurements of the target signal $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with measurement errors $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^m$ bounded as $\|\nu\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. The model above aims at finding the sparsest data z^* that can best fit the linear measurements of x and thus under a suitable assumption the recovery $z^* = x$ can be achieved. In many practical situations, however, one is interested in recovering only the significant information of a signal which usually is interpreted as a small number of the largest absolute coefficients over the redundant bases of the signal (such as the redundant wavelet bases of a natural image). Based on this consideration, the sparse recovery model can be formulated as the following minimization problem with a sparsity constraint:

$$\min_z \{\|Az - y\|_2^2 : \|z\|_0 \leq k\}, \quad (1)$$

where k is a given integer number, the estimation of the sparsity level of the signal. The purpose of the model (1) is to find the k -term approximation of the target signal such that the selected k terms can best fit the acquired measurements compared to other k terms. The model (1) is not only an essential model for sparse signal recovery to which several compressed sensing algorithms have been developed (see, e.g., [4], [5], [11]–[13]), but also an important model closely related to the low-rank matrix recovery [14]–[16], variable selections in statistics [17]–[19], and sparse optimization and its various applications [12], [20]–[22].

For the model (1), the basic algorithm using the hard thresholding operator is called the iterative hard thresholding (IHT) [23]–[25] which admits several modifications such as the hard thresholding pursuit (HTP) [26], the IHT with a fixed step-size [27], the normalized iterative hard thresholding (NIHT) [28], the graded IHT [29], [30], and the recent Newton-step-based hard thresholding algorithms [31], [32]. The more sophisticated methods using the hard thresholding operator include the well known compressive sampling matching pursuit (CoSaMP) [33] and subspace pursuit (SP) [34]. Recent study of SP can be found in such references as [35]–[38]. The study in this paper is focused on the analysis of the IHT and CoSaMP, two well known compressed sensing algorithms. The

The research was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under the grant 12071307, and partially supported with grants 61571384, 61731018 and 11771003.

Yun-Bin Zhao is with the Shenzhen Research Institute of Big Data, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China (Email: yunbinzhao@cuhk.edu.cn). On leave from the University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, United Kingdom (Email: y.zhao.2@bham.ac.uk).

Zhi-Quan Luo is with the Shenzhen Research Institute of Big Data, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China (Email: luozq@cuhk.edu.cn).

purpose is to achieve remarkable improvement on the existing theoretical results concerning the guaranteed success in signal recovery/approximation with these algorithms.

To describe the IHT and CoSaMP algorithms, let us first introduce a few notations. We use \mathbb{R}^n to denote the n -dimensional Euclidean space and all vectors are understood as column vectors unless otherwise specified. Given a vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the operator $\mathcal{H}_k(z) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ called the hard thresholding operator retains the k largest absolute entries of z and sets other entries to zeros. We use $L_k(z)$ to denote the index set of the k largest absolute entries of the vector z , and we use $\text{supp}(z) = \{i : z_i \neq 0\}$ to denote the support of the vector z , i.e., the index set of nonzero entries of z . For a given vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and matrix A , the symbol z^T and A^T denote the transpose of z and A . Throughout the paper, a vector x is said to be k -sparse if $\|x\|_0 \leq k$.

The IHT [23]–[25] is a simple iterative scheme for the model (1), and is stated as Algorithm 1 below.

Algorithm 1 Iterative Hard Thresholding (IHT)

Input the measurement matrix A , measurement vector y , and sparsity level k . Perform the following steps:

- S1 Choose an initial k -sparse vector x^0 , typically $x^0 = 0$;
 S2 Repeat

$$x^{p+1} = \mathcal{H}_k(x^p + A^T(y - Ax^p))$$

until a stopping criterion is met.

Output: the k -sparse vector \hat{x} .

More efficient algorithms than the IHT can be obtained by integrating an orthogonal projection into the algorithm (also called a pursuit step) (see, e.g., [11], [26]). Using both hard thresholding operator and orthogonal projection, the next algorithm (Algorithm 2) is referred to as compressive sampling matching pursuit (CoSaMP) which was introduced by Needell and Tropp [33]. The CoSaMP was closely related to an earlier greedy method called regularized orthogonal matching pursuit proposed by Needell and Vershynin [39], [40]. The step (CP2)

Algorithm 2 Compressive Sampling Matching Pursuit (CoSaMP)

Input the measurement matrix A , measurement vector y , and sparsity level k . Perform the steps below:

- S1 Choose an initial k -sparse vector x^0 , typically $x^0 = 0$;
 S2 Repeat

$$U^{p+1} = \text{supp}(x^p) \cup L_{2k}(A^T(y - Ax^p)), \quad (\text{CP1})$$

$$z^{p+1} = \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\|y - Az\|_2 : \text{supp}(z) \subseteq U^{p+1}\}, \quad (\text{CP2})$$

$$x^{p+1} = \mathcal{H}_k(z^{p+1}) \quad (\text{CP3})$$

until a stopping criterion is met.

Output: the k -sparse vector \hat{x} .

in CoSaMP is an orthogonal projection which seeks a vector that best fits the measurements over the prescribed support. As pointed out in [41], [42], the orthogonal projection may generally stabilize or speed up the IHT framework.

The analyses for the guaranteed performance (including stability and convergence) of these algorithms were carried out widely in terms of the restricted isometry property (RIP) of the sensing matrix. The RIP and the associated restricted isometry constant (RIC) of order K , denoted by δ_K , were first introduced by Candès and Tao [9], [10]. The RIP tool is quite natural for the analysis of various compressed sensing algorithms. The IHT for compressive sensing was initiated by Blumensath and Davies in [23] and was shown convergent under the condition $\delta_{3k} < 1/\sqrt{32}$. Stability and guaranteed performance for this method were established in [24] under the condition $\delta_{3k} < 1/\sqrt{8}$, which is still rather restrictive. This result was improved to $\delta_{3k} < 1/\sqrt{3} \approx 0.5774$ by Foucaut in [26] (see also in [11]). This bound remains the best bound for the hard thresholding pursuit (HTP) algorithm which is a simple combination of IHT and orthogonal projection [26]. In this paper, we will show that the current RIP-based bound for IHT is definitely not tight, and it can be improved to $\delta_{3k} < (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2 \approx 0.618$. Certain evidences point to the conjecture that this new bound is optimal, i.e., the tightest one.

In [33], some theoretical results (stability and robustness) for CoSaMP were established under the condition $\delta_{4k} \leq 0.1$. (Their proof actually implies that their results are valid under the bound $\delta_{4k} < 0.17157$.) This initial result was significantly improved to $\delta_{4k} < 0.4782$ by Foucart and Rauhut in [11]. In this paper, we will further improve this result to $\delta_{4k} < 0.5102$. As seen later, such an improvement is far from being trivial and is achieved by establishing a deep property of the hard thresholding operator.

The main contribution of the paper is summarized in the table below:

Algorithms	Existing results	New results
IHT	$\delta_{3k} < 0.5774$	$\delta_{3k} < 0.618$
CoSaMP	$\delta_{4k} < 0.4782$	$\delta_{4k} < 0.5102$

It is worth mentioning that an open question for IHT and CoSaMP remains standing: What is the optimal (i.e., the tightest) RIP-based bound for the algorithm? Any improvement on RIP-based bounds for these algorithms moves closer to the unknown optimal bound which clearly exists in the interval (0,1) for every individual compressed sensing algorithm. While it remains unclear at the moment whether the new results established in this paper for IHT and CoSaMP are optimal or not, from the analysis in this paper it seems that the room for a further improvement of our results is somewhat limited.

The paper is organized as follows. In section II, we present a basic and deep property of the hard thresholding operator and use this property to show an improved RIP-bound for the guaranteed performance of signal recovery via IHT. In section III, we show an improved RIP bound for CoSaMP.

II. IMPROVED RIP BOUND FOR IHT

For a given set $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $|S|$ denotes the cardinality of S , and $\bar{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus S$ denotes the complement set of S . The set difference of S and U is denoted by $S \setminus U = \{i : i \in S, i \notin U\}$. Given $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ and a

vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the vector $x_S \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is obtained by retaining the entries of x indexed by S and zeroing out other components of x .

To establish improved convergence results for the algorithms IHT and CoSaMP, we need to characterize the deep property of the hard thresholding operator $\mathcal{H}_k(\cdot)$. Such a property will lead to the improved RIP-based bounds that guarantee the success of signal recovery with IHT and CoSaMP.

Lemma 2.1: For any vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any k -sparse vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, one has

$$\|(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2 \leq \|(x - z)_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2 + \|(x - z)_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2, \quad (2)$$

where $S = \text{supp}(x)$ and $S^* = \text{supp}(\mathcal{H}_k(z))$.

Proof. By the definition of $\mathcal{H}_k(\cdot)$, we immediately see that $\|z - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2 \leq \|z - d\|_2^2$ for any k -sparse vector d . In particular, setting $d = z_S$, where $S = \text{supp}(x)$, yields

$$\|z - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2 \leq \|z - z_S\|_2^2 = \|z_{\bar{S}}\|_2^2 = \|(z - x)_{\bar{S}}\|_2^2,$$

where the last equality follows from $x_{\bar{S}} = 0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|z - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2 &= \|(z - x) + (x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))\|_2^2 \\ &= \|z - x\|_2^2 + \|x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2 - 2(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))^T(x - z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2 \leq -\|(z - x)_S\|_2^2 + 2(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))^T(x - z). \quad (3)$$

Note that $\text{supp}(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)) \subseteq S \cup S^*$ which can be decomposed into three disjoint sets $S \setminus S^*$, $S^* \setminus S$ and $S^* \cap S$. We also note that $(\mathcal{H}_k(z))_i = z_i$ for every $i \in S^*$, and thus $(\mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S^* \setminus S} = z_{S^* \setminus S}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S \cap S^*} = z_{S \cap S^*}$. The left-hand side of (3) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2 &= \|[x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)]_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2^2 + \|[x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)]_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \|[x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)]_{S^* \cap S}\|_2^2 \\ &= \|[x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)]_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2^2 + \|(x - z)_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \|(x - z)_{S^* \cap S}\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side of (3) is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} &-\|(z - x)_S\|_2^2 + 2(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))^T(x - z) \\ &= -\|(z - x)_S\|_2^2 + 2[(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S \setminus S^*}]^T(x - z)_{S \setminus S^*} \\ &\quad + 2\|(x - z)_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2^2 + 2\|(x - z)_{S^* \cap S}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq -\|(z - x)_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2^2 + 2\|(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2\|(x - z)_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2 \\ &\quad + 2\|(x - z)_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2^2 + \|(x - z)_{S^* \cap S}\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by substituting the above two relations into (3) and cancelling and rearranging terms, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|[x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)]_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2^2 &\leq -\|(z - x)_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2^2 + \|(x - z)_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + 2\|(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2\|(x - z)_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2$ is smaller than or equal to the largest real root of the quadratic equation

$$\begin{aligned} Q(r) &:= r^2 - 2r\|(z - x)_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2 + \|(x - z)_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2^2 \\ &\quad - \|(x - z)_{S^* \cap S}\|_2^2 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

to which the largest real root is given by

$$r^* = \|(x - z)_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2 + \|(x - z)_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2.$$

Thus we immediately obtain the inequality (2). \square

The next useful result is key to our later analysis.

Lemma 2.2: For any vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for any k -sparse vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (i.e., $\|x\|_0 \leq k$), one has

$$\|x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{2} \|(x - z)_{S \cup S^*}\|_2, \quad (4)$$

where $S = \text{supp}(x)$ and $S^* = \text{supp}(\mathcal{H}_k(z))$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, $\|(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2 \leq \Delta_1 + \Delta_2$, where Δ_1 and Δ_2 are defined as

$$\Delta_1 = \|(x - z)_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2, \quad \Delta_2 = \|(x - z)_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2 &= \|(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S \cup S^*}\|_2^2 \\ &= \|(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S^*}\|_2^2 + \|(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S \setminus S^*}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S^*}\|_2^2 + (\Delta_1 + \Delta_2)^2 \\ &= \|(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2^2 + \|(x - \mathcal{H}_k(z))_{S^* \cap S}\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + (\Delta_1 + \Delta_2)^2 \\ &= \|(x - z)_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2^2 + \|(x - z)_{S^* \cap S}\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + (\Delta_1 + \Delta_2)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Let $C := \|(x - z)_{S^* \cup S}\|_2$. We see that $C^2 = \|(x - z)_{S^* \cap S}\|_2^2 + \Delta_1^2 + \Delta_2^2$, and thus

$$\|(x - z)_{S^* \setminus S}\|_2^2 + \|(x - z)_{S^* \cap S}\|_2^2 = C^2 - \Delta_2^2.$$

Substituting this relation into (5) yields

$$\|x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2 \leq C^2 + \Delta_1^2 + 2\Delta_1\Delta_2.$$

When $\Delta_1 = 0$, then the above inequality immediately implies the bound (4). Thus, without loss of generality, we assume that $\Delta_1 \neq 0$. Denote by $r = \Delta_2/\Delta_1$. By substituting $\Delta_2 = r\Delta_1$ into the above inequality, we have

$$\|x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2 \leq (1 + 2r)\Delta_1^2 + C^2. \quad (6)$$

We also note that $\Delta_1^2 + \Delta_2^2 \leq C^2$ which together with $\Delta_2 = r\Delta_1$ implies that $\Delta_1^2 \leq C^2/(1 + r^2)$. Thus it follows from (6) that

$$\|x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{1 + 2r}{1 + r^2}\right) C^2 = g(r)C^2, \quad (7)$$

where

$$g(r) := 1 + \frac{1 + 2r}{1 + r^2} = \frac{2(1 + r) + r^2}{1 + r^2}.$$

Consider the maximum of $g(r)$ over the interval $[0, \infty)$. If $r = 0$, then $g(0) = 2$. When $r \rightarrow \infty$, we see that $g(r) \rightarrow 1$. Note that $g(r)$ has a unique stationary point in $[0, \infty)$, i.e., the equation $0 = g'(r) = \frac{2(1 - r - r^2)}{(1 + r^2)^2}$ has a unique solution given by $r^* = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2} \approx 0.618$ at which

$$g(r^*) = 1 + \frac{1 + 2r^*}{1 + (r^*)^2} = \frac{5 + \sqrt{5}}{5 - \sqrt{5}} = \left(\frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{2}\right)^2.$$

Thus the maximum value of $g(r)$ over the interval $[0, \infty)$ is given by

$$\max\{g(0), g(r^*), g(\infty)\} = g(r^*) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}\right)^2.$$

Therefore it follows from (7) that

$$\|x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{g(r^*)}C = \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}C,$$

which is the desired relation (4). \square

Note: After the first version of the manuscript appeared in arXiv, J. Shen communicated to us to point out that Lemma 2.2 above can actually follow from Shen and Li's Theorem 1 in [45] which claims that for any vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and k -sparse vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for any $q \geq k$, one has

$$\|\mathcal{H}_q(b) - x\|_2 \geq \sqrt{\mu}\|b - x\|_2, \quad \mu = 1 + \frac{\rho + \sqrt{(4+\rho)\rho}}{2},$$

$$\rho = \frac{\min\{k, n-q\}}{q-k+\min\{k, n-q\}}.$$

From such a result, it is not difficult to show that the bound in Lemma 2.2 can be also obtained from Theorem 1 in [45].

Example 2.3: [Tightness of (4)]. Let $0 < \tau < k$ be two given integer numbers. Consider two vectors in \mathbb{R}^n ($n > k + \tau$) of the following form:

$$z = (\overbrace{1, \dots, 1}^k, \overbrace{\varepsilon, \dots, \varepsilon}^\tau, 1/2, \dots, 1/2)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$x = (\overbrace{0, \dots, 0}^\tau, \overbrace{1, \dots, 1}^{k-\tau}, \overbrace{\alpha + \varepsilon, \dots, \alpha + \varepsilon}^\tau, 0, \dots, 0)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\alpha \geq 0$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ are two parameters.

For the vectors x and z given above, we see that x is k -sparse and we may take

$$\mathcal{H}_k(z) = (\overbrace{1, \dots, 1}^k, \overbrace{0, \dots, 0}^{n-k})^T \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Clearly, $S^* = \text{supp}(\mathcal{H}_k(z)) = \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $S = \text{supp}(x) = \{\tau + 1, \dots, \tau + k\}$. Thus

$$S^* \cup S = \{1, 2, \dots, k + \tau\}, \quad S^* \cap S = \{\tau + 1, \dots, k\},$$

and hence

$$\|(x - z)_{S^* \cup S}\|_2^2 = \tau(1 + \alpha^2),$$

$$\|x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2 = \tau[1 + (\alpha + \varepsilon)^2].$$

Consider the ratio

$$\frac{\|x - \mathcal{H}_k(z)\|_2^2}{\|(x - z)_{S^* \cup S}\|_2^2} = \frac{1 + (\alpha + \varepsilon)^2}{1 + \alpha^2} =: g(\alpha, \varepsilon).$$

We now find the maximum value of the function $g(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ with respect to $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$. It is easy to check that there exists a unique stationary point of $g(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ with respect to $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$. In fact, let $\frac{\partial g(\alpha, \varepsilon)}{\partial \alpha} = 0$ which leads to $\alpha^2 + \alpha\varepsilon - 1 = 0$.

Thus the unique stationary point of $g(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ in $[0, \infty)$ is $\alpha^* = \frac{\sqrt{4+\varepsilon^2}-\varepsilon}{2}$, at which

$$g(\alpha^*, \varepsilon) = \frac{1 + (\alpha^* + \varepsilon)^2}{1 + (\alpha^*)^2} = \frac{1 + \left(\frac{\sqrt{4+\varepsilon^2}+\varepsilon}{2}\right)^2}{1 + \left(\frac{\sqrt{4+\varepsilon^2}-\varepsilon}{2}\right)^2} = \frac{1 + \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon^2}{4+\varepsilon^2}}}{1 - \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon^2}{4+\varepsilon^2}}} = g_1(g_2(\varepsilon)),$$

where the functions g_1 and g_2 are defined as follows:

$$g_2(\varepsilon) = \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon^2}{4+\varepsilon^2}}, \quad g_1(t) = \frac{1+t}{1-t},$$

where $0 \leq t < 1$. Clearly, g_1 and g_2 are increasing functions and $g_2(\varepsilon) < 1$. Thus $g(\alpha^*, \varepsilon)$ is an increasing function of ε over $(0, 1]$. Therefore, as ε takes a value close to 1, the maximum of the function is achieved at $\varepsilon = 1$. Note that $g(\alpha^*, \varepsilon) = \frac{\sqrt{4+\varepsilon^2}+\varepsilon}{\sqrt{4+\varepsilon^2}-\varepsilon}$. Thus

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 1} g(\alpha^*, \varepsilon) = \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{\sqrt{5}-1} = \left(\frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}\right)^2 \geq 1 + \varepsilon^2$$

for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. As $g(0, \varepsilon) = 1 + \varepsilon^2$ and $g(\infty, \varepsilon) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} g(\alpha, \varepsilon) = 1$, the maximum of $g(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ in $[0, \infty)$ is determined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\alpha \in [0, \infty)} g(\alpha, \varepsilon) &= \max\{g(0, \varepsilon), g(\infty, \varepsilon), g(\alpha^*, \varepsilon)\} \\ &= \max\{1 + \varepsilon^2, 1, g(\alpha^*, \varepsilon)\} \\ &= g(\alpha^*, \varepsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

which tends to $\left(\frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}\right)^2$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 1$. This means the bound (4) is tight since the ratio $g(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ can approach to $\left(\frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}\right)^2$ for any level of accuracy provided that α and ε are suitably chosen. In particular, this ratio can achieve the exact value $\left(\frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}\right)^2$ by taking $\varepsilon = 1$ and $\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2}$. In other words, the equality in (4) can be achieved at the vectors

$$z = (\overbrace{1, \dots, 1}^{k+\tau}, 1/2, \dots, 1/2)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$x = (\overbrace{0, \dots, 0}^\tau, \overbrace{1, \dots, 1}^{k-\tau}, \overbrace{\eta, \dots, \eta}^\tau, 0, \dots, 0)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\eta = (\sqrt{5}+1)/2$. \square

In the rest of the paper, we will use the following concept of restricted isometry constant (RIC) and its several useful properties listed in Lemma 2.5 below.

Definition 2.4: [9] Let A be a given $m \times n$ matrix with $m < n$. The restricted isometry constant (RIC), denoted $\delta_q := \delta_q(A)$, is the smallest number $\delta \geq 0$ such that

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

holds for all q -sparse vectors $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If $\delta_q < 1$, then A is said to satisfy the restricted isometry property (RIP) of order q .

From the definition, we see that $\delta_{q_1} \leq \delta_{q_2}$ for $q_1 \leq q_2$. Implied directly from the above definition are the following properties which are widely utilized in the compressed sensing literature and in this paper.

Lemma 2.5: [9], [26], [33] (i) Let $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be s -sparse and t -sparse vectors, respectively. If $\text{supp}(u) \cap \text{supp}(v) = \emptyset$, then

$$|u^T A^T A v| \leq \delta_{s+t} \|u\|_2 \|v\|_2.$$

(ii) Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector and $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ be an index set. If $|S \cup \text{supp}(v)| \leq t$, then

$$\|(I - A^T A)v_S\|_2 \leq \delta_t \|v\|_2.$$

(iii) Let $\Lambda \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ be an index set satisfying that $\Lambda \cap \text{supp}(u) = \emptyset$ and $|\Lambda \cup \text{supp}(u)| \leq t$. Then

$$\|(A^T A u)_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \delta_t \|u\|_2.$$

Item (iii) follows from (ii). In fact, when $\Lambda \cap \text{supp}(u) = \emptyset$ which means $u_\Lambda = 0$, one has $\|(A^T A u)_\Lambda\|_2 = \|(I - A^T A)u_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \delta_t \|u\|_2$.

We now start to establish an improved result for the guaranteed performance of signal recovery via IHT. The result for CoSaMP will be given separately in section III. Such improvements in terms of RIP are vital for both compressed sensing theory and algorithms. The RIP-based bound directly clarifies the scenarios in which the algorithms are guaranteed to be successful in signal recovery. A more relaxed RIP condition is imposed, the broader the class of signal recovery problems that can be solved successfully by the algorithms are identified. Moreover, the relaxed RIP-based bound can also dramatically impact on the number of measurements required for signal recovery. As shown in [10], [43], [44], for Gaussian random sensing matrix A of size $m \times n$ ($m \ll n$), there is a universal constant $C^* > 0$ such that the RIC of A/\sqrt{m} satisfies $\delta_{2k} \leq \delta^* < 1$ with probability at least $1 - \xi$ provided that

$$m \geq C^* (\delta^*)^{-2} (k(1 + \ln(n/k)) + \ln(2\xi - 1)).$$

From this result, it can be seen that the higher the bound δ^* , the less number of measurements is required.

It is worth mentioning that the practical signal x may not necessarily be k -sparse. Let S be the index set for the largest k absolute entries of the signal x , i.e., $S = L_k(x)$. Then the k -sparse vector x_S is the best k -term approximation of x . In terms of x_S , $y = Ax + \nu = Ax_S + \nu'$ with $\nu' = Ax_{\bar{S}} + \nu$. This means the measurements y of the original signal x can be seen as the measurements of the k -sparse signal x_S with measurement error ν' . Thus when the signal is not k -sparse, the recovery can be made for a smaller number of significant components of the target signal, i.e., only the k terms of the signal are recovered.

We are ready to show the main result for IHT.

Theorem 2.6: Suppose that the sensing matrix A satisfies

$$\delta_{3k} < \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2} \approx 0.618.$$

Let $y = Ax + \nu$ be the measurements of x with error ν and $S = L_k(x)$. Then the iterates x^p , generated by the IHT, approximate x with error

$$\|x^p - x_S\|_2 \leq \rho^p \|x^0 - x_S\|_2 + \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{2(1 - \rho)} \|A^T \nu'\|_2, \quad (9)$$

where $\nu' = Ax_{\bar{S}} + \nu$, and the constants ρ is given as

$$\rho = \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{2} \delta_{3k} < 1. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Denote by $u^p := x^p + A^T(y - Ax^p)$. By the structure of the IHT, $S^{p+1} := \text{supp}(x^{p+1}) = \text{supp}(\mathcal{H}_k(u^p))$. By Lemma 2.2, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_S - x^{p+1}\|_2 &= \|x_S - \mathcal{H}_k(u^p)\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{2} \|(x_S - u^p)_{S^{p+1} \cup S}\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We now estimate the term $\|(x_S - u^p)_{S^{p+1} \cup S}\|_2$ which can be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(x_S - u^p)_{S^{p+1} \cup S}\|_2 &= \|(x_S - x^p - A^T(y - Ax^p))_{S^{p+1} \cup S}\|_2 \\ &= \|(x_S - x^p - A^T(Ax_S + \nu' - Ax^p))_{S^{p+1} \cup S}\|_2 \\ &= \|[(I - A^T A)(x_S - x^p) - A^T \nu']_{S^{p+1} \cup S}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|[(I - A^T A)(x_S - x^p)]_{S^{p+1} \cup S}\|_2 + \|A^T \nu'\|_2 \\ &\leq \delta_{3k} \|x_S - x^p\|_2 + \|A^T \nu'\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 2.5 (ii) with $|\text{supp}(x_S - x^p) \cup (S^{p+1} \cup S)| \leq 3k$. Substituting this into (11) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_S - x^{p+1}\|_2 &\leq \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{2} (\delta_{3k} \|x_S - x^p\|_2 + \|A^T \nu'\|_2) \\ &= \rho \|x_S - x^p\|_2 + \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{2} \|A^T \nu'\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the constant

$$\rho = \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{2} \delta_{3k} < 1,$$

provided that

$$\delta_{3k} < \frac{2}{\sqrt{5} + 1} = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2} \approx 0.618.$$

The error bound (9) immediately follows from (12). \square

Remark 2.7: The above result improves the current best known bound $\delta_{3k} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \approx 0.5774$ for IHT established by Foucart and Rauhut [11], [26]. The tightness of the relation (4) (as indicated by Example 2.3) is essential to the improvement of the RIP-based bound for IHT. The tightness of (4) and the simple argument in the proof of Theorem 2.6 point to the conjecture that the new bound $\delta_{3k} < (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2$ for IHT is optimal. This, however, is an interesting conjecture requiring a further investigation. It is also worth mentioning that some researchers developed the RIP-based bounds for the performance of compressed sensing algorithms according to the geometric rate $\rho \leq 0.5$ instead of $\rho < 1$. From the analysis above, if we require the geometric rate ρ given in (10) be less than 0.5, namely, $\rho = \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{2} \delta_{3k} \leq 0.5$, which is guaranteed by $\delta_{3k} \leq (\sqrt{5} - 1)/4 \approx 0.309$, then we immediately obtain from (12) the following recovery error:

$$\|x^p - x_S\|_2 \leq 0.5^p \|x^0 - x_S\|_2 + (\sqrt{5} + 1) \|A^T \nu'\|_2.$$

We clearly see that our result for IHT also remarkably improves the existing result $\delta_{3k} \leq 0.22$ established by Shen and Li [45] for IHT in terms of geometric rate 0.5. From the proof of Theorem 6.18 in [11], it is easy to verify that the RIP-based bound obtained by Foucart and Rauhut is $\delta_{3k} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \approx 0.2886$ in terms of geometric rate 0.5.

The estimation (9) implies the finite termination and stability of IHT through a standard lemma such as Lemma 6.23 in [11]. We don't state the stability results and the ones concerning the number of iterations required to achieve the desired recovery accuracy (the interested reader can see the statement of such results in [11], [30] for details). In this paper, we only focus on the establishment of the estimation like (9) which ensures the convergence of an algorithm and the success of signal recovery/approximation with the algorithm.

III. IMPROVED RIP BOUND FOR CoSAMP

As pointed out in [41], [42], the hard thresholding operator may cause numerical oscillation, and thus the IHT may fail to consistently reduce the objective value of the model (1) during the course of iterations. The orthogonal projection is one of the techniques which may alleviate the oscillation problem. Thus it is widely used in hard-thresholding-based algorithms including CoSaMP, SP, the latest Newton-step-based thresholding [31], and optimal k -thresholding algorithms [41], [42]. In this section, we show the main result for CoSaMP. Before doing so, we first state a few technical results.

Lemma 3.1: Given three constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \geq 0$ where $\alpha_1 < 1$, if t satisfies the condition $0 \leq t - \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_1 \sqrt{t^2 + \alpha_2^2}$, then

$$t \leq \frac{\alpha_1}{\sqrt{1 - \alpha_1^2}} \alpha_2 + \frac{1}{1 - \alpha_1} \alpha_3.$$

Proof. Under the conditions of the Lemma, t satisfies the condition $(t - \alpha_3)^2 \leq \alpha_1^2(t^2 + \alpha_2^2)$, i.e.,

$$\phi(t) := (1 - \alpha_1^2)t^2 - 2t\alpha_3 + \alpha_3^2 - \alpha_1^2\alpha_2^2 \leq 0.$$

Thus t is less than or equal to the largest real root of the quadratic equation $\phi(t) = 0$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} t &\leq \frac{2\alpha_3 + \sqrt{4\alpha_3^2 - 4(1 - \alpha_1^2)(\alpha_3^2 - \alpha_1^2\alpha_2^2)}}{2(1 - \alpha_1^2)} \\ &= \frac{\alpha_3 + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2\alpha_3^2 + (1 - \alpha_1^2)\alpha_1^2\alpha_2^2}}{1 - \alpha_1^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha_3 + \alpha_1\alpha_3 + \alpha_1\alpha_2\sqrt{1 - \alpha_1^2}}{1 - \alpha_1^2} \\ &= \frac{\alpha_1}{\sqrt{1 - \alpha_1^2}} \alpha_2 + \frac{\alpha_3}{1 - \alpha_1}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

A fundamental property of the orthogonal projection is given as follows. A similar property can be found in the literature, however, the following one is more general than the existing ones.

Lemma 3.2: Let $y = Ax + \nu$ be the measurements of the signal x where ν is a noisy vector. Let $S, \Lambda \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ be

two nonempty index sets and $|S| \leq \tau$ where τ is an integer number. Let x^* be the solution to the orthogonal projection problem

$$x^* = \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\|y - Az\|_2 : \text{supp}(z) \subseteq \Lambda\}. \quad (13)$$

Let Γ be any given index set satisfying $\Lambda \subseteq \Gamma \subseteq \{i : [A^T(y - Ax^*)]_i = 0\}$. If $\delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau} < 1$, then

$$\|(x_S - x^*)_\Gamma\|_2 \leq \frac{\delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau} \|(x_S - x^*)_\Gamma\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}^2}} + \frac{\|A^T \nu'\|_2}{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}}, \quad (14)$$

and hence

$$\|x_S - x^*\|_2 \leq \frac{\|(x_S - x^*)_\Gamma\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}^2}} + \frac{\|A^T \nu'\|_2}{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}}, \quad (15)$$

where $\nu' = Ax_{\overline{S}} + \nu$.

Proof. Since x^* is the optimal solution to the problem (13), by optimality, we immediately see that $[A^T(y - Ax^*)]_\Lambda = 0$ and thus the set $\{i : [A^T(y - Ax^*)]_i = 0\}$ is nonempty since it contains Λ as a subset. By the definition of Γ , we have $[A^T(y - Ax^*)]_\Gamma = 0$ which, together with $y = Ax_S + \nu'$ where $\nu' = Ax_{\overline{S}} + \nu$, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= [A^T A(x_S - x^*) + A^T \nu']_\Gamma \\ &= [(A^T A - I)(x_S - x^*)]_\Gamma + (x_S - x^*)_\Gamma \\ &\quad + [A^T \nu']_\Gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

As $\text{supp}(x_S - x^*) \subseteq S \cup \Lambda$ and $\Lambda \subseteq \Gamma$, we see that

$$|\text{supp}(x_S - x^*) \cup \Gamma| \leq |(S \cup \Lambda) \cup \Gamma| = |S \cup \Gamma| \leq |\Gamma| + \tau.$$

Thus it follows from (16) and Lemma 2.5 (ii) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(x_S - x^*)_\Gamma\|_2 &\leq \|(A^T A - I)(x_S - x^*)_\Gamma\|_2 + \|A^T \nu'\|_2 \\ &\leq \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau} \|x_S - x^*\|_2 + \|A^T \nu'\|_2 \\ &= \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau} \sqrt{\|(x_S - x^*)_\Gamma\|_2^2 + \|(x_S - x^*)_{\overline{\Gamma}}\|_2^2} \\ &\quad + \|A^T \nu'\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

If $\|(x_S - x^*)_\Gamma\|_2 \leq \|A^T \nu'\|_2$, the desired relations (14) and (15) hold trivially. Otherwise if $\|(x_S - x^*)_\Gamma\|_2 > \|A^T \nu'\|_2$, then by setting $\alpha_1 = \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau} < 1$, $\alpha_2 = \|(x_S - x^*)_{\overline{\Gamma}}\|_2$, $\alpha_3 = \|A^T \nu'\|_2$, and $t = \|(x_S - x^*)_\Gamma\|_2$, it follows from (17) and Lemma 3.1 that

$$\|(x_S - x^*)_\Gamma\|_2 \leq \frac{\delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau} \|(x_S - x^*)_{\overline{\Gamma}}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}^2}} + \frac{\|A^T \nu'\|_2}{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}}. \quad (18)$$

Note that

$$\sqrt{(a+b)^2 + c^2} \leq \sqrt{a^2 + c^2} + b \quad (19)$$

for any $a, b, c \geq 0$. It follows from (18) and (19) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|x_S - x^*\|_2^2 \\
&= \|(x_S - x^*)_{\Gamma}\|_2^2 + \|(x_S - x^*)_{\bar{\Gamma}}\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau} \|(x_S - x^*)_{\bar{\Gamma}}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}^2}} + \frac{\|A^T \nu'\|_2}{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}} \right)^2 + \|(x_S - x^*)_{\bar{\Gamma}}\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{\delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}^2 \|(x_S - x^*)_{\bar{\Gamma}}\|_2^2}{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}^2}} + \|(x_S - x^*)_{\bar{\Gamma}}\|_2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\|A^T \nu'\|_2}{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}} \right)^2 \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}^2}} \|(x_S - x^*)_{\bar{\Gamma}}\|_2 + \frac{\|A^T \nu'\|_2}{1 - \delta_{|\Gamma|+\tau}} \right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

The next helpful technical result which together with Lemma 3.2 eventually yields an improved RIP-based bound for the guaranteed success of CoSaMP.

Lemma 3.3: Let $y = Ax + \nu$ be the measurements of x with measurement error ν . Let $S = L_k(x)$. Given a k -sparse vector x^p with $S^p = \text{supp}(x^p)$ and the index set

$$T = L_{\beta}(A^T(y - Ax^p)),$$

where $\beta \geq 2k$ is an integer number, if $\delta_{2k+\beta} < 1$ then one has

$$\|(x^p - x_S)_{\bar{T}}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2}(\delta_{2k+\beta} \|x^p - x_S\|_2 + \|A^T \nu'\|_2), \quad (20)$$

where $\nu' = Ax_{\bar{S}} + \nu$.

Proof. Let S, S^p , and T be defined as in the lemma. If $S \cup S^p \subseteq T$, then $\bar{T} \subseteq \overline{S \cup S^p}$ which implies that $\|(x^p - x_S)_{\bar{T}}\|_2 \leq \|(x^p - x_S)_{\overline{S \cup S^p}}\|_2 = 0$. Thus the relation (20) holds trivially. We only need to show (20) for the case $S \cup S^p \not\subseteq T$. Thus in the remaining proof, we assume that $S \cup S^p \not\subseteq T$. It is convenient to define

$$\Omega := \|[A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2. \quad (21)$$

As the cardinality $|T| = \beta \geq 2k \geq |S \cup S^p|$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
|(S \cup S^p) \setminus T| &= |S \cup S^p| - |(S \cup S^p) \cap T| \\
&\leq |T| - |(S \cup S^p) \cap T| \\
&= |T \setminus (S \cup S^p)|.
\end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

This means the number of the indices in $(S \cup S^p) \setminus T$ is less than or equal to the number of elements in $T \setminus (S \cup S^p)$. By the definition of T , the entries of the vector $A^T(y - Ax^p)$ supported on $(S \cup S^p) \setminus T$ are not among the β largest absolute entries of the vector. This together with (22) implies that

$$\|[A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2 \leq \|[A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{T \setminus (S \cup S^p)}\|_2. \quad (23)$$

Denote by

$$\Omega^* = \|[(x_S - x^p) - A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{(S \cup S^p) \Delta T}\|_2,$$

where Δ denotes the symmetric difference of two sets, i.e.,

$$(S \cup S^p) \Delta T = ((S \cup S^p) \setminus T) \cup (T \setminus (S \cup S^p)).$$

Note that

$$|(S \cup S^p) \cup ((S \cup S^p) \Delta T)| \leq |(S \cup S^p) \cup T| \leq 2k + \beta.$$

As $y = Ax_S + \nu'$, by Lemma 2.5 (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega^* &= \|[(I - A^T A)(x_S - x^p) + A^T \nu']_{(S \cup S^p) \Delta T}\|_2 \\
&= \|[(I - A^T A)(x_S - x^p)]_{(S \cup S^p) \Delta T}\|_2 \\
&\quad + \|(A^T \nu')_{(S \cup S^p) \Delta T}\|_2 \\
&\leq \delta_{2k+\beta} \|x_S - x^p\|_2 + \|A^T \nu'\|_2.
\end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Let $\hat{\Omega} = \|[A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{T \setminus (S \cup S^p)}\|_2$ and

$$W = (x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T} - [A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}.$$

Then by the definition of Ω^* , we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Omega^*)^2 &= \|[(x_S - x^p) - A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + \|[(x_S - x^p) - A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{T \setminus (S \cup S^p)}\|_2^2 \\
&= \|[(x_S - x^p) - A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + \|[A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{T \setminus (S \cup S^p)}\|_2^2 \\
&= \|W\|_2^2 + \hat{\Omega}^2
\end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the second equality follows from the fact $(x_S - x^p)_{T \setminus (S \cup S^p)} = 0$. There are only two cases.

Case 1: $\hat{\Omega} = 0$. Then by (23), we must have $[A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T} = 0$. From the definition of W and the relation (24) and noting that $\|(x_S - x^p)_{\bar{T}}\|_2 = \|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2$, we immediately have that

$$\|(x_S - x^p)_{\bar{T}}\|_2 = \|W\|_2 \leq \Omega^* \leq \delta_{2k+\beta} \|x_S - x^p\|_2 + \|A^T \nu'\|_2.$$

Thus the bound (20) holds trivially for this case.

Case 2: $\hat{\Omega} \neq 0$. Then let β be the ratio of $\|W\|_2$ and $\hat{\Omega}$, i.e. $\|W\|_2 = \beta \hat{\Omega}$. Substituting this into (25), we immediately obtain

$$\hat{\Omega} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \beta^2}} \Omega^*, \quad \|W\|_2 = \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{1 + \beta^2}} \Omega^*. \quad (26)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega^2 &= \|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T} - [(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T} - [A^T(y - Ax^p)]_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}]\|_2^2 \\
&= \|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T} - W\|_2^2 \\
&= \|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2^2 - 2[(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}]^T W \\
&\quad + \|W\|_2^2 \\
&\geq \|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2^2 - 2\|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2 \|W\|_2 \\
&\quad + \|W\|_2^2
\end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

By (23) and (26), the left-hand side of the above inequality can be bounded as

$$\Omega^2 \leq \hat{\Omega}^2 = \frac{(\Omega^*)^2}{1 + \beta^2}.$$

Thus substituting $\|W\|_2$ in (26) into (27) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{(\Omega^*)^2}{1 + \beta^2} &\geq \|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{1 + \beta^2} (\Omega^*)^2 \\
&\quad - 2\|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2 \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{1 + \beta^2}} \Omega^*.
\end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Simplifying yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2^2 - \frac{2\beta\Omega^*}{\sqrt{1+\beta^2}} \|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2 \\ & + \frac{(\beta^2 - 1)(\Omega^*)^2}{1 + \beta^2} \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is a quadratic inequality of $\|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(x_S - x^p)_{(S \cup S^p) \setminus T}\|_2 \\ & \leq \frac{\frac{2\beta\Omega^*}{\sqrt{1+\beta^2}} + \sqrt{\frac{4\beta^2(\Omega^*)^2}{1+\beta^2} - \frac{4(\beta^2-1)(\Omega^*)^2}{1+\beta^2}}}{2} = \frac{1+\beta}{\sqrt{1+\beta^2}}\Omega^* \\ & \leq \left(\max_{0 < \beta < \infty} \frac{1+\beta}{\sqrt{1+\beta^2}} \right) \Omega^* \\ & = \sqrt{2}\Omega^*, \end{aligned}$$

where the maximum of the univariate function of β achieves at $\beta = 1$. Combined with (24), we immediately obtain the desired inequality in the lemma. \square

The main result for CoSaMP is summarized as follows.

Theorem 3.4: If the restricted isometry constant of the sensing matrix A satisfies that

$$\delta_{4k} < \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{13+4\sqrt{5}}+3}} \approx 0.5102, \quad (29)$$

then the iterates $\{x^p\}$, generated by the CoSaMP, satisfy that

$$\|x_S - x^p\|_2 \leq \rho^p \|x_S - x^0\|_2 + \frac{C}{1-\rho} \|A^T \nu'\|_2,$$

where the constants ρ and C are given as

$$\rho = \delta_{4k} \sqrt{\frac{2 + (\sqrt{5}+1)\delta_{4k}^2}{1 - \delta_{4k}^2}} < 1$$

and

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{2 + (\sqrt{5}+1)\delta_{4k}^2}{1 - \delta_{4k}^2}} + \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2(1-\delta_{4k})}.$$

Proof. Let U^{p+1} , z^{p+1} and x^{p+1} are given, respectively, by the steps (CP1)–(CP3) of CoSaMP (Algorithm 2 in section I). From the structure of CoSaMP, we see that $S^p = \text{supp}(x^p) \subseteq U^{p+1}$ and $S^{p+1} = \text{supp}(x^{p+1}) = \text{supp}(\mathcal{H}_k(z^{p+1})) \subseteq U^{p+1}$ (so $(x^{p+1})_{U^{p+1}} = x^{p+1}$). By Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(x_S - x^{p+1})_{U^{p+1}}\|_2 = \|x_{S \cap U^{p+1}} - x^{p+1}\|_2 \\ & = \|x_{S \cap U^{p+1}} - \mathcal{H}_k(z^{p+1})\|_2 \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2} \|(x_{S \cap U^{p+1}} - z^{p+1})_{(S \cap U^{p+1}) \cup S^{p+1}}\|_2 \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2} \|(x_{S \cap U^{p+1}} - z^{p+1})_{U^{p+1}}\|_2 \\ & \quad (\text{since } (S \cap U^{p+1}) \cup S^{p+1} \subseteq U^{p+1}) \\ & = \eta \|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{U^{p+1}}\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta = (\sqrt{5}+1)/2$. Also, since $\text{supp}(x^{p+1}) \subseteq U^{p+1}$, we have that $(x^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}} = 0 = (z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}$. This together with the above relation implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|x_S - x^{p+1}\|_2^2 \\ & = \|(x_S - x^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2^2 + \|(x_S - x^{p+1})_{U^{p+1}}\|_2^2 \\ & = \|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2^2 + \|(x_S - x^{p+1})_{U^{p+1}}\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2^2 + [\eta \|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{U^{p+1}}\|_2]^2. \quad (30) \end{aligned}$$

Consider the step (CP2) of the CoSaMP. Applying Lemma 3.2 with $\Gamma = \Lambda = U^{p+1}$, $S = L_k(x)$, $x^* = z^{p+1}$, $\tau = k$ and $|\Gamma| = |U^{p+1}| \leq 3k$, we conclude that if $\delta_{4k} < 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{U^{p+1}}\|_2 \\ & \leq \frac{\delta_{4k} \|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{4k}^2}} + \frac{\|A^T \nu'\|_2}{1 - \delta_{4k}}. \quad (31) \end{aligned}$$

By combining the two relations (30) and (31) and using the inequality (19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|x_S - x^{p+1}\|_2^2 \leq \|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2^2 \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{\eta \delta_{4k} \|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{4k}^2}} + \frac{\eta \|A^T \nu'\|_2}{1 - \delta_{4k}} \right)^2 \\ & \leq \left(\sqrt{(1 + \frac{\eta^2 \delta_{4k}^2}{1 - \delta_{4k}^2})} \|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2 + \frac{\eta \|A^T \nu'\|_2}{1 - \delta_{4k}} \right)^2 \\ & = \left(\sqrt{\frac{1 + \eta \delta_{4k}^2}{1 - \delta_{4k}^2}} \|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2 + \frac{\eta \|A^T \nu'\|_2}{1 - \delta_{4k}} \right)^2, \quad (32) \end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows from the fact $\eta^2 - 1 = \eta$. In the remainder of this proof, it is sufficient to bound the term $\|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2$ in terms of $\|x_S - x^p\|_2$. Note that $(z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}} = 0$ and $S^p = \text{supp}(x^p) \subseteq U^{p+1}$ which implies that $(x^p)_{\overline{U^{p+1}}} = 0$. Thus

$$\|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2 = \|(x_S)_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2 = \|(x_S - x^p)_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2. \quad (33)$$

Setting $\beta = 2k$ and $T = \text{supp}[\mathcal{H}_\beta(A^T(y - Ax^p))]$, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that the CoSaMP satisfies the relation

$$\|(x_S - x^p)_{\overline{T}}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2}(\delta_{4k} \|x^p - x_S\|_2 + \|A^T \nu'\|_2). \quad (34)$$

Note that $T \subseteq U^{p+1}$ which implies that $\overline{U^{p+1}} \subseteq \overline{T}$. Thus

$$\|(x_S - x^p)_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2 \leq \|(x_S - x^p)_{\overline{T}}\|_2. \quad (35)$$

Merging the above three relations (33)–(35) leads to

$$\|(x_S - z^{p+1})_{\overline{U^{p+1}}}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2}(\delta_{4k} \|x^p - x_S\|_2 + \|A^T \nu'\|_2).$$

Therefore, it follows from (32) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_S - x^{p+1}\|_2 & \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(1 + \eta \delta_{4k}^2)}{1 - \delta_{4k}^2}} (\delta_{4k} \|x_S - x^p\|_2 \\ & \quad + \|A^T \nu'\|_2) + \frac{\eta}{1 - \delta_{4k}} \|A^T \nu'\|_2 \\ & = \rho \|x_S - x^p\|_2 + C \|A^T \nu'\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where the constants ρ and C are given by

$$\rho = \delta_{4k} \sqrt{\frac{2 + (\sqrt{5}+1)\delta_{4k}^2}{1 - \delta_{4k}^2}}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
C &= \sqrt{\frac{2(1 + \eta\delta_{4k}^2)}{1 - \delta_{4k}^2}} + \frac{\eta}{1 - \delta_{4k}} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{2 + (\sqrt{5} + 1)\delta_{4k}^2}{1 - \delta_{4k}^2}} + \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{2(1 - \delta_{4k})}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now prove that if δ_{4k} satisfies (29), then the constant $\rho < 1$. In fact, to ensure $\rho < 1$, it is sufficient to ensure that

$$\delta_{4k} \sqrt{\frac{2(1 + \eta\delta_{4k}^2)}{1 - \delta_{4k}^2}} < 1,$$

which, by squaring both sides, can be written as

$$2\eta\delta_{4k}^4 + 3\delta_{4k}^2 - 1 < 0.$$

Thus

$$\delta_{4k}^2 < \frac{\sqrt{9 + 4(\sqrt{5} + 1)} - 3}{2(\sqrt{5} + 1)} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{9 + 4(\sqrt{5} + 1)} + 3},$$

and hence

$$\delta_{4k} < \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{13 + 4\sqrt{5}} + 3}} \approx 0.5102.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Remark 3.5: The existing bound $\delta_{4k} < 0.4782$ for CoSaMP was shown by Foucart and Rauhut (see, e.g., Theorem 6.18 in [11]). Our result improves their result to $\delta_{4k} < 0.5102$. In terms of geometric rate 0.5, Foucart and Rauhut's result is equivalent to $\delta_{4k} < 0.299$, and their bound was slightly improved to $\delta_{4k} < 0.301$ by Shen and Li [45]. Let us find out our RIP-based bound if the geometric rate $\rho \leq 0.5$ is required. To see this, let

$$\rho = \delta_{4k} \sqrt{\frac{2(1 + \eta\delta_{4k}^2)}{1 - \delta_{4k}^2}} \leq 0.5. \quad (36)$$

It is not difficult to verify that (36) is satisfied if

$$\delta_{4k} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{81 + 16(\sqrt{5} + 1)} + 9}} \approx 0.3122,$$

It guarantees the following estimation:

$$\|x^p - x_S\|_2 \leq 0.5^p \|x^0 - x_S\|_2 + \gamma \|A^T \nu'\|_2 \quad (37)$$

where γ is a certain univariate constant. Clearly, our result $\delta_{4k} \leq 0.3122$ for CoSaMP in terms of geometric rate 0.5 also improves the existing result established by Shen and Li [45].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The RIP-based bounds that guarantee the success of signal recovery via the IHT and CoSaMP algorithms have been improved in this paper. A common feature of the two algorithms is using hard thresholding operator to produce a sparse approximation of the unknown signal. The property of hard thresholding operator given in Lemma 2.2 provides a useful basis to the improvement of the current performance theory for these algorithms. The new RIP-based bound $\delta_{2k} < (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2$

shown for IHT in this paper remarkably improves the current best known bound for this algorithm. While the improvement of the performance result for CoSaMP is much more challenging, the existing RIP-based bound for this algorithm was improved to $\delta_{4k} < 0.5102$ in this paper. However, the question concerning the optimal (or the tightest) RIP-based bounds for the guaranteed performance of these algorithms remains open at the moment.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Boche, G. Caire, R. Calderbank, G. Kutyniok, R. Mathar, and P. Petersen, *Compressed Sensing and Its Applications: Third International MATHEON Conference 2017*, Birkhauser, 2019.
- [2] D.L. Donoho and I. Johnstone, Idea spatial adaptation via wavelet shrinkage, *Biomatrika*, 81 (1994), no.3, pp. 425–455.
- [3] M. Elad, Why simple shrinkage is still relevant for redundant representation, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 52 (2006), no.12, pp. 5559–5569.
- [4] M. Elad, *Sparse and Redundant Representations: From Theory to Applications in Signal and Image Processing*, Springer, New York, 2010.
- [5] Y.C. Eldar and G. Kutyniok, *Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2012.
- [6] A. Majumdar, *Compressed Sensing for Magnetic Resonance Image Reconstruction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2015.
- [7] D.L. Donoho, Compressed sensing, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 52 (2006), no.4, pp. 1289–1306.
- [8] E.J. Candès, *Compressive Sampling*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Madrid, Spain, 2006.
- [9] E.J. Candès and T. Tao, Decoding by linear programming, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 51(2005), no.12, pp. 4203–4215.
- [10] E.J. Candès and T. Tao, Near optimal signal recovery from random projections: universal encoding strategies? *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 52 (2006), no.12, pp.5406–5425.
- [11] S. Foucart and H. Rauhut, *A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing*, Springer, NY, 2013.
- [12] Y.-B. Zhao, *Sparse Optimization Theory and Methods*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2018.
- [13] N. Nguyen, D. Needell and T. Woolf, Linear convergence of stochastic iterative greedy algorithms with sparse constraints, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 63 (2017), no. 11, pp. 6869–6895.
- [14] E.J. Candès and Y. Plan, Tight oracle inequalities for low-rank matrix recovery from a minimal number of noisy random measurements, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 57 (2011), no.4, pp. 2342–2359.
- [15] M.A. Davenport and J. Romberg, An overview of low-rank matrix recovery from incomplete observations, *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, 10 (2016), no.4, pp. 608–622.
- [16] S. Foucart and S. Subramanian, Iterative hard thresholding for low-rank recovery from rank-one projections, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 572 (2019), pp. 117–134.
- [17] A. Bertsimas, R. King and R. Mazumder, Best subset selection via a modern optimization lens, *Ann. Statist.*, 44 (2016), pp. 813–852.
- [18] A. Miller, *Subset Selection in Regression*, CRC Press, Washington, 2002.
- [19] M. Ndaoud and A.B. Tsybakov, Optimal variable selection and adaptive noisy compressed sensing, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* (to appear), 2020.
- [20] A. Beck and Y.C. Eldar, Sparsity constrained nonlinear optimization: Optimality conditions and algorithms, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 23 (2013), no.3, pp. 1480–1509.
- [21] H. Liu and R.F. Barber, Between hard and soft thresholding: Optimal iterative thresholding algorithms, arXiv, July 2019.
- [22] A. Wachsmuth, Iteration hard-thresholding applied to optimal control problems with $L^0(\Omega)$ control cost, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 57 (2019), no.2, pp. 854–879.
- [23] T. Blumensath and M. Davies, Iterative thresholding for sparse approximations, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* 14 (2008), no.5–6, pp. 629–654.
- [24] T. Blumensath and M. Davies, Iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 27 (2009), no.3, pp. 265–274.
- [25] M. Fornasier and R. Rauhut, Iterative thresholding algorithms, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 25 (2008), no.2, pp. 187–208.

- [26] S. Foucart, Hard thresholding pursuit: an algorithm for compressive sensing. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 49 (2011), no.6, pp. 2543-2563
- [27] R. Garg and R. Khandekar, Gradient descent with sparsification: An iterative algorithm for sparse recovery with restricted isometry property. In Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 09, pp. 337-344, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2009.
- [28] T. Blumensath and M. Davies, Normalized iterative hard thresholding: guaranteed stability and performance. *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Signal Process.* 4 (2010), no.2, pp. 298-309.
- [29] J.-U. Bouchot, A generalized class of hard thresholding algorithms for sparse signal recovery. In: Fasshauer G., Schumaker L. (eds) Approximation Theory XIV: San Antonio 2013. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, 83 (2014), pp. 45-63.
- [30] J.-U., Bouchot, S. Foucart and P. Hitzenki, Hard thresholding pursuit algorithms: Number of iterations, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 41 (2016), no.2, pp. 412-435.
- [31] N. Meng and Y.-B. Zhao, Newton-Step-Based Hard Thresholding Algorithms for Sparse Signal Recovery, arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.07181, January 2020.
- [32] S. Zhou, N. Xiu and H. Qi, Global and quadratic convergence of Newton hard-thresholding pursuit, arXiv:1901.02763v1, 9 Jan 2019.
- [33] D. Needell, J. Tropp, CoSaMP: Iterative signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate samples. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 26(2009), no.3, pp. 301-321.
- [34] W. Dai, and O. Milenkovic, Subspace pursuit for compressive sensing signal reconstruction, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 55 (2009), no.5, pp. 2230-2249.
- [35] R. Giryes and M. Elad, RIP-based near-oracle performance guarantees for SP, CoSaMP and IHT, *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 60 (2012), no. 3, pp. 1465-1568.
- [36] L.-H. Chang and J.-Y. Wu, An improved RIP-based performance guarantee for sparse signal reconstruction via subspace pursuit, IEEE 8th Sensor Array and Multichannel Signal Processing Workshop (SAM), 2014, pp. 405-408.
- [37] K. Lee, Y. Bresler and M. Junge, Oblique pursuits for compressed sensing, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 59 (2013), no.9, pp. 6111-6141.
- [38] C.-B. Song, S.-T. Xia and X.-J. Liu, Improved analysis for subspace pursuit algorithm in terms of restricted isometry constant, *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, 21 (2014), no. 11, pp. 1365-1369.
- [39] D. Needell, R. Vershynin, Uniform uncertainty principle and signal recovery via regularized orthogonal matching pursuit. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 9(2009), no.3, pp.317-334
- [40] D. Needell, R. Vershynin, Signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements via regularized orthogonal matching pursuit. *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Signal Process.*, 4 (2010), no.2, pp.310-316.
- [41] Y.-B. Zhao, Optimal k -thresholding algorithms for sparse optimization problems, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 30 (2020), no. 1, pp. 31-55.
- [42] Y.-B. Zhao and Z.-Q. Luo, Analysis of optimal thresholding algorithms for compressed sensing, *Signal Processing* (to appear).
- [43] S. Mendelson, A. Pajor and N. Tomczak-Jaegermann, Uniform uncertainty principle for Bernoulli and subgaussian ensembles. *Constr. Approx.*, 28 (2008), pp. 277-289.
- [44] R. Baraniuk, M. Davenport, R. DeVore and M. Wakin, A simple proof of the restricted isometry property for random matrices, *Constr. Approx.*, 28 (2008), pp. 253-263.
- [45] J. Shen and P. Li, A tight bound of hard thresholding, *J. Machine Learning Res.*, 18 (2018), pp. 1-42.
- [46] Y.-B. Zhao, RSP-Based analysis for sparsest and least ℓ_1 -norm solutions to underdetermined linear systems, *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 61 (2013), no.22, pp. 5777-5788.
- [47] Y.-B. Zhao, H. Jiang, Z.-Q. Luo, Weak stability of ℓ_1 -minimization methods in sparse data reconstruction, *Math. Oper. Res.*, 44 (2019), no.1, pp.173-195.