

# BINARIZED JOHNSON-LINDENSTRAUSS EMBEDDINGS

SJOERD DIRKSEN AND ALEXANDER STOLLENWERK

**ABSTRACT.** We consider the problem of encoding a set of vectors into a minimal number of bits while preserving information on their Euclidean geometry. We show that this task can be accomplished by applying a Johnson-Lindenstrauss embedding and subsequently binarizing each vector by comparing each entry of the vector to a uniformly random threshold. Using this simple construction we produce two encodings of a dataset such that one can query Euclidean information for a pair of points using a small number of bit operations up to a desired additive error - Euclidean distances in the first case and inner products and squared Euclidean distances in the second. In the latter case, each point is encoded in near-linear time. The number of bits required for these encodings is quantified in terms of two natural complexity parameters of the dataset - its covering numbers and localized Gaussian complexity - and shown to be near-optimal.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In modern data analysis one is frequently confronted with datasets that not only contain a large number of data points, but in addition each point is represented by a very high-dimensional vector. High-dimensional data imposes challenges in terms of storage consumption, computational expense during data analysis, and transmission of data across computing clusters. To alleviate these burdens, dimensionality reduction techniques have been applied in various areas, including clustering [41], computational geometry [28], privacy [8], spectral graph theory [49], linear programming [12, 40], numerical linear algebra [51, 54], multitask learning [53], computational learning theory [6, 7], manifold learning [13, 26], motif-finding in computational biology [11], and astronomy [15]. Dimensionality reduction methods map a given dataset into a lower-dimensional space, while preserving essential structure for a target application. Although the structure to be preserved is application-specific, it is frequently desired to preserve the Euclidean geometry of the dataset, i.e., to preserve inter-point Euclidean distances, inner products, and angles. That is, for a given point set  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $n$  very large, one desires to find a map  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $m \ll n$ , such that for any two query points  $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$  one can accurately and quickly evaluate  $\|x - y\|_2$ ,  $\langle x, y \rangle$ , and  $\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle / (\|x\|_2 \|y\|_2))$  using their images  $f(x)$  and  $f(y)$ .

A classical tool is the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma [33], which states that Euclidean dimensionality reduction can be achieved using a random linear map. In its modern formulation, it states that if  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  has independent,  $K$ -subgaussian entries with mean zero and unit variance and  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is defined by  $f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}Ax$ , then for any finite set  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$(1.1) \quad (1 - \varepsilon)\|x - y\|_2^2 \leq \|f(x) - f(y)\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|x - y\|_2^2, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathcal{D}$$

with high probability, provided that  $m \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2} \log |\mathcal{D}|$ , where  $|\mathcal{D}|$  denotes the number of points in  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $a \lesssim b$  means that  $a \leq Cb$  for a constant  $C > 0$  that only depends on the subgaussian constant  $K$ .

The Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma is remarkable in at least two respects. First, the dimensionality reducing map  $f$  is *data-oblivious*, i.e., it is constructed without any prior knowledge of the dataset to be embedded. This property is crucial in certain applications, e.g., one-pass streaming applications [14] and data structural problems such as nearest neighbor search [25]. Second, the Johnson-Lindenstrauss embedding is in general *optimal*: Larsen and Nelson [39] showed under the condition  $\varepsilon > \min\{n, |\mathcal{D}|\}^{-0.49}$  that any map  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  satisfying (1.1) must satisfy  $m \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2} \log |\mathcal{D}|$ . Motivated by these remarkable properties and the ubiquity of Euclidean dimensionality reduction in applications, a steady stream of works has strived to improve the construction of the classical Johnson-Lindenstrauss embedding and to refine its theoretical guarantees.

In the first vein, several works have focused on improving the speed of the Johnson-Lindenstrauss embedding: if  $A$  has independent subgaussian entries, then it is densely populated and hence computing  $f(x)$  in general requires time  $O(mn)$ . The first work improving over this [2] introduced the Fast Johnson-Lindenstrauss Transform, which achieved an embedding time  $O(n \log n + m^3)$ . An improved construction reduced this to time  $O(n \log n + m^{2+\gamma})$  for any small constant  $\gamma > 0$  [3]. More recently several works introduced transformations with  $O(n \log n)$  embedding time at the expense of increasing the embedding dimension  $m$  by a  $(\log n)^c$  factor [4, 37, 44]. In all these works the dense matrix  $A$  is replaced by a number of very sparse random matrices and discrete Fourier matrices. The improved embedding time stems from the Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) [16]. A second line of work, initiated in [1] and strongly advanced in [17], improved the embedding time by making  $A$  sparse. By drawing  $A$  from a distribution over matrices having at most  $s$  non-zeroes per column,  $Ax$  can be computed in time  $O(sn)$ . The best known construction in this direction is the sparse Johnson-Lindenstrauss Transform of [34], which achieves (1.1) with high probability under the conditions  $m \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2} \log |\mathcal{D}|$  and  $s \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-1} \log |\mathcal{D}|$ . This bound on  $s$  is known to be optimal in general up to a factor  $O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$  for any linear map satisfying (1.1) [43].

In the second vein, a number of works have refined the estimates on the embedding dimension in the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma. Although the bound  $m \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2} \log |\mathcal{D}|$  is worst-case optimal, it is possible to prove refined, *instance-optimal* bounds in which the factor  $\log |\mathcal{D}|$  is replaced by quantities that measure the *complexity* or *intrinsic dimension* of the set. The first result in this direction, derived by Gordon [24], states that if  $A$  has i.i.d. Gaussian entries, then  $f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}Ax$  satisfies (1.1) with high probability if  $m \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2} \ell_*(\mathcal{D}_{\text{nc}})^2$ , where  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{nc}} = \{(x-y)/\|x-y\|_2 : x, y \in \mathcal{D}\}$  denotes the set of normalized cords associated with  $\mathcal{D}$  and

$$(1.2) \quad \ell_*(T) = \mathbb{E} \sup_{x \in T} |\langle g, x \rangle|,$$

where  $g$  is a standard Gaussian vector, denotes the *Gaussian complexity*. This result was later extended to matrices with independent subgaussian rows [19, 35, 42]. It is easy to see that  $\ell_*(\mathcal{D}_{\text{nc}})^2$  is bounded by  $\log |\mathcal{D}|$  for any finite set, but may be much smaller if the set has a low-complexity structure. For instance, if  $\mathcal{D}$  is a set of (even infinitely many)  $k$ -sparse vectors, then  $\ell_*(\mathcal{D}_{\text{nc}})^2 \lesssim Ck \log(en/k)$  (see [19] for many more examples of low-complexity sets). More recently, similar instance-optimal bounds have been found for a large class of fast Johnson-Lindenstrauss transforms [46] and the sparse Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform [10].

**1.1. Main results.** Our paper fits into a general line of work [5, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 45, 47] developing a further enhancement of the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma: whereas all aforementioned embeddings encode every datum into a vector

in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , this new research line seeks to encode each datum into a minimal number of *bits*. Specifically, one would like to find an embedding map  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^B$  and reconstruction map  $d : \{-1, 1\}^B \times \{-1, 1\}^B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that for any pair  $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $d(f(x), f(y))$  is an accurate proxy of  $\|x - y\|_2$ ,  $\langle x, y \rangle$ , or  $\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle / (\|x\|_2 \|y\|_2))$ . Ideally, the bit complexity  $B$  is minimal and both the embedding time (i.e., the time needed to compute  $f(x)$ ) and the query time (the time to compute  $d(u, v)$ ) are low. In this paper we show that surprisingly good results in this direction can be obtained by applying a traditional Johnson-Lindenstrauss embedding followed by a very simple binarization operation, in which each vector entry is compared to a random threshold. That is, we use maps of the form

$$(1.3) \quad f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m, \quad x \mapsto f(x) = \text{sign}(Ax + \tau),$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  is a random linear embedding,  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is a random vector and the sign-function is applied component-wise. We quantify the sufficient number of bits in terms of two complexity measures: the localized version  $\ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \varepsilon B_2^n)$  of the Gaussian complexity given in (1.2) and the covering number  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, \varepsilon)$ , i.e., the smallest number of Euclidean balls with radius  $\varepsilon$  needed to cover  $\mathcal{D}$ .

In our first result we aim to encode a dataset into a minimal number of bits, while preserving information on the Euclidean distances between points. Below,  $d_H$  denotes the Hamming distance.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Fix  $R > 0$  and  $\mathcal{D} \subset RB_2^n$ . Let  $\delta \in (0, \frac{R}{2}]$  and suppose that*

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda &\gtrsim R\sqrt{\log(R/\delta)}, \\ m &\gtrsim \lambda^2 \delta^{-2} \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, \varepsilon) + \lambda \delta^{-3} \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \varepsilon B_2^n)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\varepsilon \lesssim \delta / \sqrt{\log(e\lambda/\delta)}$ . Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  be standard Gaussian and let  $\tau \in [-\lambda, \lambda]^m$  be uniformly distributed and independent of  $A$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - 2\exp(-c\delta^2 m / \lambda^2)$ , the map  $f$  in (1.3) satisfies

$$(1.5) \quad \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\lambda}{m} d_H(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2 \right| \leq \delta.$$

This result has a geometric interpretation in terms of the hyperplanes  $H_{a_i, \tau_i} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle a_i, z \rangle + \tau_i = 0\}$  that are generated by the rows  $a_i$  of  $A$ : (1.5) means that  $\lambda\sqrt{2\pi}$  times the fraction of the hyperplanes that separate  $x$  and  $y$  approximates the Euclidean distance between  $x$  and  $y$  up to an additive error  $\delta$ . The embedding in Theorem 1.1 enjoys a very low query time (requiring only the comparison of two bit strings of length  $m$ ) and, as we will discuss below, a near-optimal bit complexity. On the downside, the embedding time is  $O(mn)$ .

In our second main result, we use a different construction featuring a fast Johnson-Lindenstrauss embedding to bring the embedding time down to  $O(n \log n)$ , while maintaining a low query time and bit complexity. In this result, however, our reconstruction map instead approximates *squared* Euclidean distances. We consider the random circulant matrix  $A = R_I \Gamma_\xi D_\theta$ . Here,  $I \subset [n]$  is a fixed subset with  $|I| = m$ ,  $\Gamma_\xi$  is the circulant matrix generated by a mean-zero random vector  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with independent, unit variance,  $K$ -subgaussian entries and  $D_\theta$  is a diagonal matrix containing independent Rademachers on its diagonal. To state our result, we use the following notation. For  $\lambda > 0$ , we consider the binary embedding map

$$(1.6) \quad F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^{2m}, \quad x \mapsto F(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \text{sign}(Ax + \tau) \\ \text{sign}(Ax + \tau') \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $\tau, \tau'$  are uniformly distributed in  $[-\lambda, \lambda]^m$  and  $A, \tau$ , and  $\tau'$  are independent. We let

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{S_m} : \mathbb{R}^{2m} \times \mathbb{R}^{2m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \langle a, b \rangle_{S_m} := \langle a, S_m b \rangle, \quad a, b \in \mathbb{R}^{2m},$$

denote the (indefinite) symmetric bilinear form on  $\mathbb{R}^{2m}$  induced by the  $2m \times 2m$  matrix

$$S_m = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \text{Id}_m \\ \text{Id}_m & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Theorem 1.2.** *There exists an absolute constant  $c > 0$  and a polylogarithmic factor  $\alpha$  satisfying  $\alpha \leq \log^4(n) + \log(\eta^{-1})$  such that the following holds. Let  $\mathcal{D} \subset RB_2^n$  for  $R \geq 1$  and fix  $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $\lambda \geq R$ , if*

$$\lambda \gtrsim \alpha R \sqrt{\log(e\lambda^2/\delta R^2)}, \quad R^2 \geq \delta \lambda^2,$$

and

$$(1.7) \quad m \gtrsim \alpha^2 \delta^{-2} \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, r)) + \alpha^2 \lambda^{-2} \delta^{-3} \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap rB_2^n)^2,$$

for a parameter  $r \leq c\delta R$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \eta$

$$\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{2m} \langle F(x), F(y) \rangle_{S_m} - \langle x, y \rangle \right| \leq \delta \lambda^2$$

and, as a consequence,

$$\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{2m} \langle F(x) - F(y), F(x) - F(y) \rangle_{S_m} - \|x - y\|_2^2 \right| \leq 4\delta \lambda^2.$$

**1.2. Near-optimality of the results.** Let us briefly discuss the near-optimality of the bit complexity in our two main results. Alon and Klartag [5] recently investigated the minimal number  $B(N, n, \delta)$  of bits required to encode a set of  $N$  points in  $B_2^n$  into a data structure so that one can recover pairwise squared Euclidean distances up to an additive error  $\delta$ . They determined  $B(N, n, \delta)$  for any  $N \geq n \geq 1$  and  $\delta^{-0.49} < N$ . In particular, they showed that  $B(N, n, \delta)$  is equivalent (up to universal constants) to  $\delta^{-2} N \log N$  if  $n \geq \delta^{-2} \log N$ . We adapt their argument to give a lower bound on the number of bits that is required by any oblivious, possibly random binary embedding that is allowed to fail with probability  $\eta$ . Assuming  $n \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(N/\eta)$  and  $N/\eta \gtrsim \delta^{-4} \log^2(N/\eta)$ , we show that for any random  $f : B_2^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m$  and  $d : \{-1, 1\}^m \times \{-1, 1\}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying

$$(1.8) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |d(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2| \leq \delta\right) \geq 1 - \eta$$

for any  $\mathcal{D} \subset B_2^n$  with  $|\mathcal{D}| = N$ , we must have  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(N/\eta)$ . The same result holds if the Euclidean distances in (1.8) are replaced by their squares. This shows that the bit complexity in Theorem 1.1 is near-optimal for general finite sets. Indeed, if  $\mathcal{D}$  is a finite set in the Euclidean unit ball (i.e.,  $R = 1$  so that we can take  $\lambda \sim \log^{1/2}(1/\delta)$ ), then it is easily seen that

$$\log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, r)) \leq \log|\mathcal{D}|, \quad \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap rB_2^n)^2 \lesssim r^2 \log|\mathcal{D}|$$

and hence Theorem 1.1 implies that (1.5) holds with probability at least  $1 - \eta$  for any  $\mathcal{D} \subset B_2^n$  with  $|\mathcal{D}| = N$  if  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(1/\delta) \log(N/\eta)$ . Similarly, Theorem 1.2 is optimal up to logarithmic factors.

Under additional restrictions (in particular, that  $f$  induces convex quantization cells), a more refined lower bound can be derived which features the complexity parameters in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. Our main result in this direction, Theorem 4.7, shows in particular that  $m$  needs to scale at least as

$$m \sim \delta^{-2} \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, \delta) + \delta^{-2} \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \delta B_2^n)^2$$

for the conclusions of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 to hold for  $R = 1$ . Hence, our bounds on  $m$  in these two results are optimal up to logarithmic factors and possibly the scaling  $\delta^{-3}$  in front of the localized Gaussian complexity parameter in (1.4) and (1.7).

**1.3. Related work.** Several prior works have analyzed quantized Johnson-Lindenstrauss embeddings, i.e., compositions of Johnson-Lindenstrauss embeddings with quantization schemes stemming from signal processing, to encode data vectors into bit strings. Apart from the interest in these embeddings for the purpose of dimensionality reduction, quantized Johnson-Lindenstrauss embeddings are tightly connected with compressed sensing with quantized measurements, see [20] for further details. We divide our review of the literature according to the quantization scheme used. To facilitate the comparison of the various bit complexity estimates with (1.4) and (1.7), we recall that  $\log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, \varepsilon) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \ell_*(\mathcal{D})^2$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  by Sudakov's inequality and note that trivially  $\ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \varepsilon B_2^n) \leq \varepsilon \ell_*(\mathcal{D}_{\text{nc}})$ .

**Memoryless one-bit quantization.** The works [22, 23, 32, 45, 47] studied quantized Johnson-Lindenstrauss embeddings featuring the memoryless one-bit quantizer  $\text{sign}(\cdot + \tau)$  featured in our present paper. A beautiful embedding result for general subsets of the unit sphere was derived by Plan and Vershynin [47]. They showed that if  $\mathcal{D} \subset S^{n-1}$ ,  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-6} \ell_*(\mathcal{D})^2$ , and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  is a standard Gaussian matrix then, with probability at least  $1 - 2e^{-cm\delta^2}$ , for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$ ,

$$(1.9) \quad \left| \frac{1}{m} d_H(\text{sign}(Ax), \text{sign}(Ay)) - d_{S^{n-1}}(x, y) \right| \leq \delta,$$

where  $d_{S^{n-1}} = \frac{1}{\pi} \arccos(\langle x, y \rangle / (\|x\|_2 \|y\|_2))$  denotes the angular distance. It was later shown in [45] that (1.9) remains true if  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-4} \ell_*(\mathcal{D})^2$ . Moreover, for certain 'simple' sets (e.g., if  $\mathcal{D}$  is the set of unit norm sparse vectors) it is known that  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \ell_*(\mathcal{D})^2$  suffices for (1.9) (see [32, 45, 47] for examples).

In [22] it was shown that one can embed general sets in a Euclidean ball (instead of the unit sphere) and approximate Euclidean distances (rather than angular distances) by taking uniformly distributed thresholds in the quantizer. Concretely, suppose that  $A$  has i.i.d. symmetric, isotropic,  $K$ -subgaussian rows and that the entries of  $\tau$  are i.i.d. uniformly distributed on  $[-\lambda, \lambda]$ . If  $\mathcal{D} \subset RB_2^n$ ,  $\lambda = c_0 R$  and

$$(1.10) \quad m \geq c_1 \frac{R \log(eR/\delta)}{\delta^3} \ell_*(\mathcal{D})^2,$$

then with probability at least  $1 - 8 \exp(-c_2 m \delta / R)$ , for any  $x, y$  in the convex hull  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{D})$  of  $\mathcal{D}$  satisfying  $\|x - y\|_2 \geq \delta$ , one has

$$(1.11) \quad c_3 \frac{\|x - y\|_2}{R} \leq \frac{1}{m} d_H(\text{sign}(Ax + \tau), \text{sign}(Ay + \tau)) \leq c_4 \sqrt{\log(eR/\delta)} \cdot \frac{\|x - y\|_2}{R},$$

where  $c_0, \dots, c_4$  depend only on  $K$ . In contrast to (1.5) and (1.9), which are near-isometric bounds, (1.11) is an isomorphic bound: Euclidean distances are only approximated up to a constant/logarithmic factor. Although one cannot expect a near-isometric estimate to hold for general subgaussian matrices, Theorem 1.1 shows that this is possible if  $A$  is Gaussian, under a near-optimal bit complexity.

**Uniform scalar quantization.** The works [29, 30, 31] analyzed quantized Johnson-Lindenstrauss embeddings related to the uniform scalar quantizer  $Q_{\rho, \tau} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow (\rho\mathbb{Z})^m$  defined by

$$Q_{\rho, \tau}(z) = (\rho \lfloor (z_i + \tau_i) / \rho \rfloor)_{i=1}^m.$$

Geometrically,  $Q_{\rho, 0}$  divides  $\mathbb{R}^m$  into half-open cubes with side lengths equal to  $\rho$  and maps any vector  $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$  to the corner of the cube in which it is located. In [31] it is shown that if  $\tau$  is uniformly distributed in  $[-\rho, \rho]^m$ ,  $m \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2} \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, \rho \varepsilon^2)$  and

$$(1.12) \quad (1 - \nu) \|z\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{m} \|Az\|_1 \leq (1 + \nu) \|z\|_2, \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D},$$

then with probability at least  $1 - Ce^{-cm\epsilon^2}$ ,

$$(1.13) \quad \left| \frac{1}{m} \|Q_{\rho,\tau}(Ax) - Q_{\rho,\tau}(Ay)\|_1 - \|x - y\|_2 \right| \leq \nu \|x - y\|_2 + c\rho\epsilon$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$ . A special case of a result of Schechtman [48] shows that if  $B$  is standard Gaussian and  $A = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}B$ , then  $A$  satisfies (1.12) with probability at least  $1 - 2e^{-m\nu^2/2}$  if  $m \gtrsim \nu^{-2}\ell_*(\mathcal{D}_{\text{nc}})^2$  (see also [47, Lemma 2.1] for a short proof of this special case). Note that in these results  $m$  does not represent the bit complexity: it will depend on the  $\ell_\infty$ -diameter of  $A\mathcal{D}$  and the choice of  $\rho$ . If  $\mathcal{D} \subset B_2^n$ , then the bit complexity is with high probability  $O(m \log(m/\rho))$ .

**Noise shaping methods.** The recent work [27] considered the use of noise shaping methods, a family of adaptive quantization methods that include the popular sigma-delta quantization method. Let  $Q$  be a stable one-bit distributed noise-shaping quantizer and let  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$  be the normalized condensation matrix associated with this scheme (see [27] for precise definitions and further details). For the purpose of this discussion, it is sufficient to know that  $Q(z)$  and  $Vz$  can be computed in time  $O(m)$ . Let  $A = R_I \Gamma_\xi D_\theta$  be the subgaussian circulant matrix featured in Theorem 1.2, let  $D_\sigma$  be a diagonal matrix with independent Rademachers on its diagonal that is independent of  $A$  and let  $g(z) = Q(8D_\sigma Az/9)$ . The main result [27, Theorem 5.8] states the following: if  $\mathcal{D} \subset B_1^n$  and

$$m \geq p \gtrsim \nu^{-2} \log^2(1/\eta) \log^4(n) \max \left\{ 1, \frac{\ell_*(\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D})^2}{\text{rad}(\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D})^2} \right\}$$

then with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ ,

$$\| \|Vg(x) - Vg(y)\|_2 - \|x - y\|_2 \| \leq \max\{\sqrt{\nu}, \nu\} \text{rad}(\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) + c^{-m/p}$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$ . Assuming the nontrivial case where  $\text{rad}(\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \geq \delta$ , we can set  $\nu = \delta^2 / \text{rad}(\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D})^2 \leq 1$  and take  $m/p \sim \log(1/\delta)$  to find that

$$\| \|Vg(x) - Vg(y)\|_2 - \|x - y\|_2 \| \leq \delta$$

when

$$m \geq \delta^{-4} \log(1/\delta) \log^2(1/\eta) \log^4(n) \max \left\{ \text{rad}(\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D})^4, \text{rad}(\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D})^2 \ell_*(\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D})^2 \right\}.$$

**1.4. Organization.** Our paper is structured as follows: in Section 2 we prove Theorem 1.1, Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2, and in the final section we derive lower bounds on the best possible bit complexity.

**1.5. Notation.** For an integer  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we set  $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . For any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\lfloor t \rfloor$  is the largest integer that is smaller than  $t$ . For a given set  $A$  we denote its cardinality by  $|A|$ . For  $p \geq 1$ , the  $\ell_p$ -norm of a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $\|x\|_p$  and the associated unit ball is  $B_p^n$ . Given  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we define  $D_x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  to be the diagonal matrix obtained from  $x$ , i.e.,  $(D_x)_{i,j} = \delta_{i,j} x_i$ .  $\Gamma_x$  denotes the  $n \times n$  circulant matrix generated by  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , that is,  $(\Gamma_x)_{i,j} = x_{j-i \bmod n}$ . A random variable  $X$  is called  $K$ -subgaussian if  $\|X\|_{\psi_2} = \inf\{t > 0 : \mathbb{E} \exp(X^2/t^2) \leq 2\} \leq K$ . More generally, a random vector  $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $K$ -subgaussian if  $\|X\|_{\psi_2} = \sup_{x \in B_2^n} \|\langle X, x \rangle\|_{\psi_2} \leq K$ . A random variable is called Rademacher if it takes values 1 and  $-1$  with equal probability. A random vector is called Rademacher if it has independent Rademacher entries. For  $k \in [n]$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we denote the  $\ell_2$ -norm of the  $k$  in magnitude largest entries of  $x$  by

$$\|x\|_{[k]} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^k (x_i^*)^2 \right)^{1/2} = \sup_{|I| \leq k} \left( \sum_{i \in I} x_i^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$  denotes the nonincreasing rearrangement of  $(|x_i|)_{i \in [n]}$ . The Hamming distance between  $a, b \in \{-1, 1\}^m$  is given by  $d_H(a, b) = |\{i \in [m] : a_i \neq b_i\}|$ . We use  $C, c > 0$  to denote constants that may depend only on the subgaussian constants involved. Their value might change from line to line. We write  $a \lesssim b$  if  $a \leq Cb$  for a constant  $C > 0$  that only depends on subgaussian constants, and we use the abbreviation  $a \simeq b$  if both  $a \lesssim b$  and  $b \lesssim a$  hold (with possibly different implicit constants).

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Throughout this subsection, we consider an  $m \times n$  standard Gaussian matrix  $A$ , and for a parameter  $\lambda > 0$  we let  $\tau \in [-\lambda, \lambda]^m$  denote a uniformly distributed random vector which is independent of  $A$ . Further, we consider the map

$$(2.1) \quad f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m, \quad x \mapsto f(x) = \text{sign}(Ax + \tau),$$

where the sign-function is applied component-wise. Finally, we use shorthand-notation for a rescaled version of the Hamming distance on  $\{-1, 1\}^m$ , namely

$$d_\lambda(b, c) = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\lambda}{m} d_H(b, c).$$

To prepare for the proof of Theorem 1.1 we collect several useful observations.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Fix  $\lambda > 0$  and let  $\sigma$  be uniformly distributed in  $[-\lambda, \lambda]$ . Define the function*

$$\phi_\lambda(s) = (|s| - \lambda)1_{|s| \geq \lambda} \quad \text{for } s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then for  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$|2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) - |a - b|| \leq \phi_\lambda(a) + \phi_\lambda(b).$$

**Proof.** We may assume that  $a < b$ . If  $|a| \leq \lambda$  and  $|b| \leq \lambda$  then  $\phi_\lambda(a) + \phi_\lambda(b) = 0$ . Hence, in this case we have to show that

$$2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) = |a - b|.$$

To see this, note that

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) = \mathbb{P}(a < -\sigma \leq b) = (b - a)/2\lambda,$$

as  $-\sigma$  is uniformly distributed in  $[-\lambda, \lambda]$ . Now assume that  $|a| > \lambda$  or  $|b| > \lambda$ . We distinguish three cases according to the value of  $a$ :

1)  $a < -\lambda$ . We distinguish three sub-cases according to the value of  $b$ :

If  $b < -\lambda$  then  $2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) = 0$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} |2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) - |a - b|| &= |a - b| \leq |a + \lambda| + |b + \lambda| \\ &= -(a + \lambda) - (b + \lambda) \\ &= \phi_\lambda(a) + \phi_\lambda(b). \end{aligned}$$

If  $|b| \leq \lambda$  then  $\text{sign}(a + \sigma) = -1$  implies

$$2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) = 2\lambda\mathbb{P}(b \geq -\sigma) = (b - (-\lambda)) = b + \lambda$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} |2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) - |a - b|| &= |b + \lambda - |a - b|| \\ &= |b + \lambda - (b - a)| \\ &= \phi_\lambda(a) \leq \phi_\lambda(a) + \phi_\lambda(b). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\lambda < b$  then  $2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) = 2\lambda$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} |2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) - |a - b|| &= |2\lambda - (b - a)| \\ &= (b - a) - 2\lambda \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -a - \lambda + b - \lambda \\
&= \phi_\lambda(a) + \phi_\lambda(b).
\end{aligned}$$

2)  $|a| \leq \lambda$ . Then  $\lambda < b$  and

$$2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) = 2\lambda\mathbb{P}(a < -\sigma) = \lambda - a.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
|2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) - |a - b|| &= |\lambda - a - (b - a)| \\
&= |\lambda - b| = b - \lambda \\
&= |b| - \lambda = \phi_\lambda(b) \leq \phi_\lambda(a) + \phi_\lambda(b).
\end{aligned}$$

3)  $\lambda < a$ . Then  $\lambda < b$  and  $2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) = 0$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
|2\lambda\mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \neq \text{sign}(b + \sigma)) - |a - b|| &= |a - b| \leq |a - \lambda| + |b - \lambda| \\
&= (|a| - \lambda) + (|b| - \lambda) \\
&= \phi_\lambda(a) + \phi_\lambda(b).
\end{aligned}$$

■

Our next lemma shows that  $d_\lambda(f(x), f(y))$  is in expectation a good proxy for the distance between  $x$  and  $y$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m$  be the map defined in (2.1). Then, for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,*

$$|\mathbb{E}d_\lambda(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2| \leq 2r_{x,y} \exp(-\lambda^2/2r_{x,y}^2),$$

where  $r_{x,y} = \max\{\|x\|_2, \|y\|_2\}$ .

**Proof.** Since every row  $a_i$  of  $A$  is standard Gaussian,

$$\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \mathbb{E}|\langle a_i, x - y \rangle| = \|x - y\|_2$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and hence

$$\mathbb{E} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{1}{m} \|A(x - y)\|_1 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \mathbb{E}|\langle a_i, x - y \rangle| = \|x - y\|_2.$$

Set  $\phi_\lambda(s) = (|s| - \lambda)1_{|s| \geq \lambda}$ . Using the independence of  $A$  and  $\tau$ , Jensen's inequality and the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{E}d_\lambda(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2| \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \mathbb{E}_A \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |2\lambda\mathbb{P}_\tau(\text{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i) \neq \text{sign}(\langle a_i, y \rangle + \tau_i)) - |\langle a_i, x - y \rangle|| \right) \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \mathbb{E}_A \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m [\phi_\lambda(\langle a_i, x \rangle) + \phi_\lambda(\langle a_i, y \rangle)] \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 2.1. Again using that every vector  $a_i$  is distributed as a standard Gaussian random vector  $g$ , we obtain

$$(2.2) \quad |\mathbb{E}d_\lambda(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \mathbb{E}(\phi_\lambda(\langle g, x \rangle) + \phi_\lambda(\langle g, y \rangle)).$$

If  $z = 0$ , then  $\mathbb{E}(\phi_\lambda(\langle g, z \rangle)) = \phi_\lambda(0) = 0$ . Otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.3) \quad \mathbb{E}\phi_\lambda(\langle g, z \rangle) &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\langle g, z \rangle| 1_{|\langle g, z \rangle| \geq \lambda}] = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \|z\|_2 \int_{\lambda/\|z\|_2}^{\infty} t \exp(-t^2/2) dt \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \|z\|_2 \exp(-\lambda^2/2 \|z\|_2^2),
\end{aligned}$$



Using this with  $z = x$  and  $z = y$  in (2.2) yields the result.  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 2.3.** *There exist constants  $c, C > 0$  that only depend on  $K$  such that the following holds. Let  $A$  be an  $m \times n$  matrix whose rows  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  are independent copies of an isotropic  $K$ -subgaussian random vector  $a$ . Let  $T \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $k \in [m]$ . For any  $u \geq 1$  with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-cu^2 k \log(em/k))$ ,*

$$\sup_{z \in T} \|Az\|_{[k]} \leq C \left( \ell_*(T) + u \operatorname{rad}(T) \sqrt{k \log(em/k)} \right).$$

We omit the proof of Theorem 2.3, which is standard. It is based on generic chaining (see e.g. [18, Theorem 3.2]) combined with Talagrand's majorizing measures theorem [50].

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section.

**Proof.** [Proof of Theorem 1.1] Let  $N_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{D}$  be a minimal  $\varepsilon$ -net of  $\mathcal{D}$  with respect to the Euclidean metric. For any  $x \in \mathcal{D}$  let  $\pi(x) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in N_\varepsilon} \|x - z\|_2$ . By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |d_\lambda(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2| &\leq |d_\lambda(f(x), f(y)) - d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y)))| \\ &\quad + |d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y))) - \mathbb{E}d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y)))| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y))) - \|\pi(x) - \pi(y)\|_2| \\ (2.4) \quad &\quad + \|\|\pi(x) - \pi(y)\|_2 - \|x - y\|_2|. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the last summand is bounded by  $2\varepsilon$ . Since  $\|\pi(x)\|_2 \leq R$  for every  $x \in \mathcal{D}$ , Lemma 2.2 implies

$$\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |\mathbb{E}d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y))) - \|\pi(x) - \pi(y)\|_2| \leq 2R \exp(-\lambda^2/2R^2) \leq \delta,$$

where the last inequality follows from  $\lambda \gtrsim R\sqrt{\log(R/\delta)}$ . In order to bound the second summand on the right hand side of (2.4), we invoke Hoeffding's inequality which implies that for every  $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y))) - \mathbb{E}d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y)))| \geq \delta) \leq 2 \exp(-c\delta^2 m/\lambda^2),$$

where  $c > 0$  denotes an absolute constant. If  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \lambda^2 \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, \varepsilon)$  then the union bound yields

$$\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y))) - \mathbb{E}d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y)))| \leq \delta$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c\delta^2 m/\lambda^2)$ . To bound the first summand on the right hand side of (2.4) we first apply the triangle inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} &|d_\lambda(f(x), f(y)) - d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y)))| \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\lambda}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |1_{\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, y \rangle + \tau_i)} - 1_{\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(y) \rangle + \tau_i)}|. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that if  $\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i) = \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i)$  and  $\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, y \rangle + \tau_i) = \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(y) \rangle + \tau_i)$ , then

$$1_{\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, y \rangle + \tau_i)} - 1_{\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(y) \rangle + \tau_i)} = 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} (2.5) \quad &\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |d_\lambda(f(x), f(y)) - d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y)))| \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\lambda}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m 1_{\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition,

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbf{1}_{\text{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i) \neq \text{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i)} = 0$$

on

$$A_\delta = \{|\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i| > \delta \geq |\langle a_i, x - \pi(x) \rangle|\}.$$

As a consequence,

$$(2.7) \quad \mathbf{1}_{\text{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i) \neq \text{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i)} \leq \mathbf{1}_{A_\delta^c} \leq \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i| \leq \delta} + \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, x - \pi(x) \rangle| > \delta}.$$

We conclude that

$$(2.8) \quad \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |d_\lambda(f(x), f(y)) - d_\lambda(f(\pi(x)), f(\pi(y)))| \\ \leq 2 \sup_{y \in N_\varepsilon} \frac{\sqrt{2\pi\lambda}}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, y \rangle + \tau_i| \leq \delta} + 2 \sup_{z \in (\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \varepsilon B_2^n} \frac{\sqrt{2\pi\lambda}}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, z \rangle| > \delta}.$$

Since

$$\mathbb{P}_\tau(|\langle a_i, y \rangle + \tau_i| \leq \delta) \leq \frac{\delta}{\lambda},$$

the Chernoff bound implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, y \rangle + \tau_i| \leq \delta} \leq \frac{2\delta m}{\lambda}$$

with probability at least  $1 - \exp(-cm\delta/\lambda)$ . Therefore, if  $m \gtrsim \lambda\delta^{-1} \log |N_\varepsilon|$  then the union bound implies that

$$\sup_{y \in N_\varepsilon} \frac{\sqrt{2\pi\lambda}}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, y \rangle + \tau_i| \leq \delta} \lesssim \delta$$

with probability at least  $1 - \exp(-c'm\delta/\lambda)$ . To estimate the second term on the right hand side of (2.8), first observe that

$$(2.9) \quad \sup_{z \in (\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \varepsilon B_2^n} |\{i \in [m] : |\langle a_i, z \rangle| > \delta\}| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\delta m}{\lambda} \right\rfloor$$

if and only if  $(Az)_{\lfloor \delta m/\lambda \rfloor}^* \leq \delta$  for all  $z \in (\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \varepsilon B_2^n$ . Clearly,

$$(2.10) \quad (Az)_{\lfloor \delta m/\lambda \rfloor}^* \leq \left( \frac{\lambda}{\delta m} \|Az\|_{[\lfloor \delta m/\lambda \rfloor]}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Theorem 2.3 with  $T = (\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \varepsilon B_2^n$  and  $k = \lfloor \delta m/\lambda \rfloor$  yields that with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_1 m \delta \log(e\lambda/\delta)/\lambda)$ ,

$$\sup_{z \in (\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \varepsilon B_2^n} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\delta m} \|Az\|_{[\lfloor \delta m/\lambda \rfloor]}^2 \right)^{1/2} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\delta m}} \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \varepsilon B_2^n) + \varepsilon \sqrt{\log(e\lambda/\delta)},$$

which is bounded by  $\delta$  if  $\varepsilon \lesssim \delta/\sqrt{\log(e\lambda/\delta)}$  and  $m \gtrsim \lambda\delta^{-3} \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \varepsilon B_2^n)^2$ . Combining our estimates we find that if

$$(2.11) \quad \lambda \gtrsim R\sqrt{\log(R/\delta)}, \quad m \gtrsim \lambda^2 \delta^{-2} \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, \varepsilon) + \lambda\delta^{-3} \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \varepsilon B_2^n)^2$$

for  $\varepsilon \lesssim \delta/\sqrt{\log(e\lambda/\delta)}$ , then with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c\delta^2 m/\lambda^2)$ ,

$$\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |d_\lambda(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2| \lesssim \delta.$$

By rescaling  $\delta > 0$  with a universal constant we obtain the result.  $\blacksquare$

## 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Theorem 1.2 immediately follows from the following result.

**Theorem 3.1.** *There exists an absolute constant  $c > 0$  and a polylogarithmic factor  $\alpha$  satisfying  $\alpha \leq \log^4(n) + \log(\eta^{-1})$  such that the following holds. Let  $\mathcal{D} \subset RB_2^n$  for  $R \geq 1$ ,  $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\lambda \geq R$ . Let  $I \subset [n]$  satisfy  $|I| = m$ ,  $\Gamma_\xi$  be the circulant matrix generated by a mean-zero random vector  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with independent, variance one and  $K$ -subgaussian entries, and  $D_\theta$  is a diagonal matrix containing independent Rademachers on its diagonal. Let  $A = R_I \Gamma_\xi D_\theta$ ,  $\tau, \tau'$  be uniformly distributed in  $[-\lambda, \lambda]^m$  and  $A$ ,  $\tau$ , and  $\tau'$  be independent. Consider the mappings*

$$f(x) = \text{sign}(Ax + \tau), \quad f'(x) = \text{sign}(Ax + \tau').$$

If

$$\lambda \gtrsim \alpha R \sqrt{\log(e\lambda^2/\delta R^2)}, \quad R^2 \geq \delta \lambda^2,$$

and

$$m \gtrsim \alpha^2 \delta^{-2} \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, r)) + \alpha^2 \lambda^{-2} \delta^{-3} \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap rB_2^n)^2,$$

for a parameter  $r \leq c\delta R$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ ,

$$\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(x), f'(y) \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle \right| \leq \delta \lambda^2.$$

**Proof.** [Proof of Theorem 1.2] By the definition (1.6) of  $F$ ,

$$\langle F(x), F(y) \rangle_{S_m} = \langle f(x), f'(y) \rangle + \langle f(y), f'(x) \rangle$$

and

$$\langle F(x) - F(y), F(x) - F(y) \rangle_{S_m} = 2\langle f(x) - f(y), f'(x) - f'(y) \rangle.$$

Hence, by the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{2m} \langle F(x), F(y) \rangle_{S_m} - \langle x, y \rangle \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(x), f'(y) \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle \right| + \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(y), f'(x) \rangle - \langle y, x \rangle \right| \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{2m} \langle F(x) - F(y), F(x) - F(y) \rangle_{S_m} - \|x - y\|_2^2 \right| \\ & \leq \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(x), f'(x) \rangle - \|x\|_2^2 \right| + \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(y), f'(y) \rangle - \|y\|_2^2 \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(x), f'(y) \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle \right| + \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(y), f'(x) \rangle - \langle y, x \rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The result now follows from Theorem 3.1. ■

The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.1. It follows the general ideas of the proof of Theorem 1.1. However, as Theorem 3.1 features a highly structured random embedding matrix with strong stochastic dependencies across the rows, we need to overcome several additional technical hurdles. Our first objective is to prove a version of Theorem 2.3 for this matrix, which is stated in Corollary 3.8 below. To prove it, we will make use of three ingredients. To state the first one, we use the following terminology from [46]. We say that  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  satisfies RIP( $s, \delta$ ) if

$$\left| \|Ax\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2 \right| \leq \max\{\delta, \delta^2\} \|x\|_2^2$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\|x\|_0 \leq s$ . Let  $L = \lceil \log_2(n) \rceil$ . Given  $\delta > 0$  and  $s \geq 1$ , we say that  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  satisfies MRIP( $s, \delta$ ) if  $A$  satisfies the RIP( $s_\ell, \delta_\ell$ ) simultaneously for  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ , where  $s_\ell = 2^\ell s$  and  $\delta_\ell = 2^{\ell/2} \delta$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** [46] *There exist absolute constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $T \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and set  $\text{rad}(T) = \sup_{x \in T} \|x\|_2$ . Let  $D_\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be a diagonal matrix containing i.i.d. Rademacher random variables on its diagonal. If  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  satisfies MRIP( $s, \tilde{\delta}$ ) for*

$$s = C_1(1 + \eta), \quad \tilde{\delta} = C_2 \delta \frac{\text{rad}(T)}{\max\{\text{rad}(T), \ell_*(T)\}}$$

then with probability at least  $1 - e^{-\eta}$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in T} \left| \|AD_\theta x\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2 \right| \leq \max\{\delta, \delta^2\} \text{rad}^2(T).$$

Our second ingredient can be viewed as a special case of Corollary 3.8 for the set  $T = \Sigma_{s,n} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_0 \leq s, \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}$  of all  $s$ -sparse vectors in the Euclidean unit ball.

**Theorem 3.3.** [21, Lemma 2.1] *Let  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a centered, isotropic,  $K$ -subgaussian random vector. There exist constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  that only depend on  $K$  such that the following holds. Let  $s \in [n]$ . For any  $u \geq 1$ , with probability at least  $1 - e^{-c_1 u^2}$ ,*

$$\sup_{x \in \Sigma_{s,n}} \|\Gamma_\xi x\|_{[s]} \leq c_2(\sqrt{s} \log(en) \log(s) + u\sqrt{s}).$$

The final ingredient is a well-known result on the restricted isometry property of a subsampled random circulant matrix.

**Theorem 3.4.** [36] *Let  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a centered random vector with independent, variance one,  $K$ -subgaussian entries. There exist constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  that only depend on  $K$  such that the following holds. Let  $I \subset [n]$  with  $|I| = m$ . For any  $\delta > 0$ , if*

$$m \geq c_1 \delta^{-2} s \log^2(s) \log^2(n),$$

then the matrix  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} R_I \Gamma_\xi$  satisfies RIP( $s, \delta$ ) with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_2 \delta^2 m/s)$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and  $s \geq 1$ . For  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  set  $s_l = 2^l s$ ,  $\delta_l = 2^{l/2} \delta$ . Suppose that  $A$  satisfies MRIP( $s, \delta$ ) and*

$$\sup_{x \in \Sigma_{s_l, n}} \|Ax\|_{[s_l]} \leq \max\{\delta_l, \delta_l^2\}, \quad \text{for all } l = 1, \dots, \lceil \log_2(n) \rceil.$$

Then  $[A \quad \text{Id}_m]$  satisfies MRIP( $s, 3\delta$ ).

**Proof.** Let  $l \in \{1, \dots, \lceil \log_2(n+m) \rceil\}$ . We need to show that  $[A \quad \text{Id}_m]$  satisfies RIP( $s_l, (3\delta)_l$ ). We will derive the stronger estimate

$$(3.1) \quad \sup_{z \in \Sigma_{s_l, n+m}} \left| \left\| [A \quad \text{Id}_m] z \right\|_2^2 - \|z\|_2^2 \right| \leq \max\{(3\delta)_l, (3\delta)_l^2\}.$$

To show (3.1), it suffices to prove that

$$\sup_{x \in \Sigma_{s_l, n}, y \in \Sigma_{s_l, m}} \left| \left\| [A \quad \text{Id}_m] \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 - \left\| \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \right| \leq \max\{(3\delta)_l, (3\delta)_l^2\}.$$

By assumption we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x \in \Sigma_{s_l, n}, y \in \Sigma_{s_l, m}} \left| \left\| [A \quad \text{Id}_m] \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 - \left\| \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{x \in \Sigma_{s_l, n}} \left| \|Ax\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2 \right| + 2 \sup_{x \in \Sigma_{s_l, n}, y \in \Sigma_{s_l, m}} |\langle Ax, y \rangle| \\ & \leq \sup_{x \in \Sigma_{s_l, n}} \left| \|Ax\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2 \right| + 2 \sup_{x \in \Sigma_{s_l, n}} \|Ax\|_{[s_l]} \\ & \leq 3 \max\{\delta_l, \delta_l^2\} \leq \max\{(3\delta)_l, (3\delta)_l^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

■

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ,  $T \subset \varepsilon B_2^n$ ,  $\delta, \eta > 0$  and  $k \in [m]$ . There exist absolute constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  such that the following holds. Set*

$$s = C_1(1 + \eta), \quad \tilde{\delta} = C_2 \delta \frac{\text{rad}(\tilde{T})}{\max\{\text{rad}(\tilde{T}), \ell_*(\tilde{T})\}}$$

where  $\tilde{T} = (\frac{1}{\varepsilon}T) \times \Sigma_{k,m}$ . Suppose that  $A$  satisfies  $\text{MRIP}(s, \tilde{\delta})$  and

$$\sup_{x \in \Sigma_{s_l, n}} \|Ax\|_{[s_l]} \leq \max\{\tilde{\delta}_l, \tilde{\delta}_l^2\}, \quad \text{for all } l = 1, \dots, \lceil \log_2(n) \rceil,$$

where  $s_l = 2^l s$  and  $\tilde{\delta}_l = 2^{l/2} \tilde{\delta}$ . Let  $\theta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  be a Rademacher random vector. Then, with probability at least  $1 - e^{-\eta}$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in T} \|AD_\theta x\|_{[k]} \leq \max\{\delta, \delta^2\} \varepsilon.$$

**Proof.** Let  $\zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^m$  be a Rademacher random vector that is independent of  $\theta$ . Set  $T' = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}T$ . We have

$$(3.2) \quad \sup_{x \in T} \|AD_\theta x\|_{[k]} = \varepsilon \cdot \sup_{x \in T'} \|AD_\theta x\|_{[k]}$$

and

$$\sup_{x \in T'} \|AD_\theta x\|_{[k]} = \sup_{x \in T'} \|D_\zeta AD_\theta x\|_{[k]} = \sup_{x \in T'} \sup_{y \in \Sigma_{k,m}} \left| \langle D_\zeta AD_\theta x, y \rangle \right|.$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle AD_\theta x, D_\zeta y \rangle \right| &= \frac{1}{4} \left| \left\| AD_\theta x + D_\zeta y \right\|_2^2 - \left\| AD_\theta x - D_\zeta y \right\|_2^2 \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left| \left\| \begin{bmatrix} AD_\theta & D_\zeta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 - \left\| \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left( \left\| \begin{bmatrix} AD_\theta & D_\zeta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ -y \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 - \left\| \begin{bmatrix} x \\ -y \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,

$$\begin{bmatrix} AD_\theta & D_\zeta \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & \text{Id}_m \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D_\theta & 0 \\ 0 & D_\zeta \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\text{Id}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  is the identity matrix. Combining the calculations above,

$$(3.3) \quad \sup_{x \in T'} \|AD_\theta x\|_{[k]} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{(x,y)^T \in \tilde{T}} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} A & \text{Id}_m \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D_\theta & 0 \\ 0 & D_\zeta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 - \left\| \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2,$$

where  $\tilde{T} = T' \times \Sigma_{k,m}$ . Since Lemma 3.5 shows that  $\begin{bmatrix} A & \text{Id}_m \end{bmatrix}$  satisfies  $\text{MRIP}(s, 3\tilde{\delta})$ , Theorem 3.2 in combination with (3.3) and (3.2) implies that with probability at least  $1 - e^{-\eta}$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in T} \|AD_\theta x\|_{[k]} \leq \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon \max\{3\delta, (3\delta)^2\} \text{rad}^2(\tilde{T}).$$

Using  $\text{rad}(\tilde{T}) \leq \sqrt{2}$  and rescaling  $C_2$  by an absolute constant factor yields the result. ■

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a centered random vector with independent, variance one,  $K$ -subgaussian entries. Let  $\theta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  be an independent Rademacher random vector. There exist absolute constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  that only depend on  $K$  such that the following holds. Let  $T \subset \varepsilon B_2^n$  and  $I \subset [n]$  with  $|I| = m$ . For every  $k \leq m$  and  $u > 0$ , if*

$$(3.4) \quad m \geq c_1 \max\{u^{-1}, u^{-2}\}(\varepsilon^{-2} \ell_*(T)^2 + k \log(em/k)) \log^8(n),$$

then

$$\sup_{x \in T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} R_I \Gamma_\xi D_\theta x \right\|_{[k]} \leq u \varepsilon$$

with probability at least

$$1 - 2 \exp(-c_2 \min\{\sqrt{u}, u\} \sqrt{m}/(\varepsilon^{-1} \ell_*(T) + \sqrt{k \log(em/k)})).$$

**Proof.** Let  $s \geq 1$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and set  $A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} R_I \Gamma_\xi$ . From Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 3.3 it follows that if

$$(3.5) \quad m \geq c_1 \delta^{-2} s \log^2(s) \log^2(n),$$

then with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_2 \delta^2 m/s)$  the following holds:  $A$  satisfies  $\text{RIP}(s, \delta)$  and

$$(3.6) \quad \sup_{x \in \Sigma_{s,n}} \|Ax\|_{[s]} \leq \delta.$$

A union bound shows that if

$$(3.7) \quad m \geq c_1 \delta^{-2} s \log^4(n),$$

then, with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_2 \delta^2 m/s)$ , the matrix  $A$  satisfies  $\text{MRIP}(s, \delta)$  and (3.6) holds for  $s = s_l = 2^l s$  and  $\delta = \delta_l = 2^{l/2} \delta$  simultaneously for all  $l = 1, \dots, \lceil \log_2(n) \rceil$ . Next, fix

$$s = C_1(1 + \eta), \quad \tilde{\delta} = C_2 \delta \frac{\text{rad}(\tilde{T})}{\max\{\text{rad}(\tilde{T}), \ell_*(\tilde{T})\}}$$

where  $\tilde{T} = T' \times \Sigma_{k,m}$ ,  $T' = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} T$  and  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  are absolute constants from Theorem 3.6. Clearly,

$$\ell_*(\tilde{T}) \simeq \ell_*(T') + \ell_*(\Sigma_{k,m}) \simeq \ell_*(T') + \sqrt{k \log(em/k)}$$

and

$$\text{rad}(\tilde{T}) \simeq \text{rad}(T') + 1 \simeq 1,$$

which implies

$$\tilde{\delta} \simeq \frac{\delta}{\ell_*(T') + \sqrt{k \log(em/k)}}.$$

Consequently, if

$$(3.8) \quad m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} (\ell_*(T')^2 + k \log(em/k)) (1 + \eta) \log^4(n),$$

then the assumptions of Theorem 3.6 are satisfied for  $A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} R_I \Gamma_\xi$  with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_2 \tilde{\delta}^2 m/s)$ . Hence, if (3.8) holds then

$$\sup_{x \in T} \left\| AD_\theta x \right\|_{[k]} \leq \max\{\delta, \delta^2\} \varepsilon$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_2 \tilde{\delta}^2 m/\eta) - \exp(-\eta)$ . Choosing  $\eta = \tilde{\delta} \sqrt{m}$  we conclude that if

$$m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} (\ell_*(T')^2 + k \log(em/k)) \log^8(n)$$

then

$$\sup_{x \in T} \left\| AD_\theta x \right\|_{[k]} \leq \max\{\delta, \delta^2\} \varepsilon$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_7 \delta \sqrt{m} / (\ell_*(T') + \sqrt{k \log(em/k)}))$ . Since

$$\max\{\min\{\sqrt{u}, u\}, \min\{u, u^2\}\} = u,$$

the result now follows by substituting  $\delta$  by  $\min\{\sqrt{u}, u\}$ .  $\blacksquare$

Applying Theorem 3.7 with  $u = \frac{C(\varepsilon^{-1} \ell_*(T) + \sqrt{k \log(em/k)}) u' \log^4(n)}{\sqrt{m}}$  where  $C > 0$  denotes an absolute constant and  $u' \geq 1$  yields the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.8.** *Let  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a centered random vector with independent, variance one,  $K$ -subgaussian entries. Let  $\theta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  be an independent Rademacher random vector. There exist absolute constants  $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$  that only depend on  $K$  such that the following holds. Let  $T \subset \varepsilon B_2^n$  and  $I \subset [n]$  with  $|I| = m$ . For every  $k \leq m$  and  $u' \geq 1$ , if*

$$m \geq c_1(\varepsilon^{-2} \ell_*(T)^2 + k \log(em/k))(u')^2 \log^8(n),$$

then

$$\sup_{x \in T} \left\| R_I \Gamma_\xi D_\theta x \right\|_{[k]} \leq c_2(\ell_*(T) + \varepsilon \sqrt{k \log(em/k)}) u' \log^4(n)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_3 u' \log^4(n))$ .

The second ingredient for the proof of Theorem 3.1 is a consequence of Theorem 3.7.

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a centered random vector with independent, variance one,  $K$ -subgaussian entries. Let  $\theta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  be an independent Rademacher random vector. Set  $A = R_I \Gamma_\xi D_\theta$  for  $I \subset [n]$  with  $|I| = m$ . There exist absolute constants  $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$  that only depend on  $K$  such that the following holds. For any  $T \subset RB_2^n$ ,  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , if*

$$m \geq c_1 \delta^{-1} R^{-2} \ell_*(T)^2 \log^8(n), \quad \lambda \geq c_2 R \sqrt{\log(e\lambda^2 / \delta R^2)} \log^4(n),$$

then

$$\sup_{x, y \in T} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |\langle a_i, x \rangle| |\langle a_i, y \rangle| 1_{|\langle a_i, x \rangle| > \lambda} \leq \delta R^2$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_3 R \sqrt{\delta m} / \ell_*(T)) - 2 \exp(-c_3 \lambda / R \sqrt{\log(e\lambda^2 / \delta R^2)})$ .

**Proof.** For  $k \in [m]$ , define the event

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \left\{ \sup_{x \in T} \sum_{i=1}^m 1_{|\langle a_i, x \rangle| > \lambda} \leq k \right\}.$$

On the event  $\mathcal{A}_k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x, y \in T} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |\langle a_i, x \rangle| |\langle a_i, y \rangle| 1_{|\langle a_i, x \rangle| > \lambda} \\ & \leq \sup_{x, y \in T} \max_{S \subset [m], |S| \leq k} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in S} |\langle a_i, x \rangle| |\langle a_i, y \rangle| \\ & \leq \sup_{x, y \in T} \max_{S \subset [m], |S| \leq k} \frac{1}{m} \left( \sum_{i \in S} |\langle a_i, x \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{i \in S} |\langle a_i, y \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \left( \sup_{x \in T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} Ax \right\|_{[k]} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously to (2.9) and (2.10), we see that

$$\left\{ \sup_{x \in T} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|Ax\|_{[k]} \leq \lambda \sqrt{\frac{k}{m}} \right\} \subset \mathcal{A}_k.$$

Consequently, for every  $\delta > 0$  and every  $k \in [m]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x,y \in T} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |\langle a_i, x \rangle| |\langle a_i, y \rangle| \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, x \rangle| > \lambda} > \delta R^2\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} Ax \right\|_{[k]} > \lambda \sqrt{\frac{k}{m}}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} Ax \right\|_{[k]} > \sqrt{\delta} R\right). \end{aligned}$$

For  $k = m\delta R^2/\lambda^2 \in [m]$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x,y \in T} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |\langle a_i, x \rangle| |\langle a_i, y \rangle| \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, x \rangle| > \lambda} > \delta R^2\right) \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} Ax \right\|_{[m\delta R^2/\lambda^2]} > \sqrt{\delta} R\right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Theorem 3.7 with  $k = m\delta R^2/\lambda^2$ ,  $\varepsilon = R$  and  $u = \sqrt{\delta}$  yields the result.  $\blacksquare$

The final ingredient for the proof of Theorem 3.1 is the following observation, which is analogous to Lemma 2.1.

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $\lambda > 0$  and let  $\sigma, \sigma'$  be independent and uniformly distributed in  $[-\lambda, \lambda]$ . Define the function*

$$\phi_\lambda(s) = (|s| - \lambda) \mathbf{1}_{|s| > \lambda} \quad \text{for } s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then for  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$|\lambda^2 \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \text{sign}(b + \sigma')] - ab| \leq \phi_\lambda(a) |b| + |a| \phi_\lambda(b).$$

**Proof.** By independence of  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ ,

$$(3.9) \quad \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \text{sign}(b + \sigma')] = \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(a + \sigma)] \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(b + \sigma')].$$

If  $|a| \leq \lambda$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} (3.10) \quad \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(a + \sigma)] &= \mathbb{P}(a + \sigma \geq 0) - \mathbb{P}(a + \sigma < 0) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\sigma \geq -a) - \mathbb{P}(\sigma < -a) \\ &= \frac{\lambda + a}{2\lambda} - \frac{\lambda - a}{2\lambda} \\ &= \frac{a}{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if  $|a| > \lambda$ , then  $\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(a + \sigma)] = \text{sign}(a)$ . We distinguish three cases:

- 1)  $|a| \leq \lambda$  and  $|b| \leq \lambda$ ,
- 2)  $|a| \leq \lambda$  and  $|b| > \lambda$  or  $|a| > \lambda$  and  $|b| \leq \lambda$ ,
- 3)  $|a| > \lambda$  and  $|b| > \lambda$ .

In the first case, we have  $\phi_\lambda(a) = \phi_\lambda(b) = 0$ . Hence, we need to show that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \text{sign}(b + \sigma')] = \frac{ab}{\lambda^2}.$$

This follows from (3.9) and (3.10). In the second case, if  $|a| \leq \lambda$  and  $|b| > \lambda$ , then  $\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \text{sign}(b + \sigma')] = \frac{a}{\lambda} \text{sign}(b)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda^2 \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \text{sign}(b + \sigma')] - ab| &= |a\lambda \text{sign}(b) - ab| = |a| |\lambda \text{sign}(b) - |b| \text{sign}(b)| \\ &= |a| (|b| - \lambda) \\ &= |a| \phi_\lambda(b). \end{aligned}$$

Analogously we obtain  $|\lambda^2 \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \text{sign}(b + \sigma')] - ab| \leq |b| \phi_\lambda(a)$  if  $|a| > \lambda$  and  $|b| \leq \lambda$ . In the third case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda^2 \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(a + \sigma) \text{sign}(b + \sigma')] - ab| &= |\lambda \text{sign}(a) \lambda \text{sign}(b) - |a| \text{sign}(a) |b| \text{sign}(b)| \\ &\leq |\lambda \text{sign}(a) \lambda \text{sign}(b) - \lambda \text{sign}(a) |b| \text{sign}(b)| \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& + |\lambda \operatorname{sign}(a)|b| \operatorname{sign}(b) - |a| \operatorname{sign}(a)|b| \operatorname{sign}(b)| \\
& = \lambda(|b| - \lambda) + (|a| - \lambda)|b| \\
& \leq |a|(|b| - \lambda) + (|a| - \lambda)|b|.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows the result.  $\blacksquare$

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section.

**Proof.** [Proof of Theorem 3.1] For  $r \leq \delta R$  let  $N_r \subset \mathcal{D}$  be a minimal  $r$ -net of  $\mathcal{D}$  with respect to the Euclidean metric. For every  $x \in \mathcal{D}$  we fix a  $\pi(x)$  in  $\operatorname{argmin}_{z \in N_r} \|x - z\|_2$ . By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(x), f'(y) \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle \right| & \leq \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(x), f'(y) \rangle - \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle \right| \\
& + \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle - \mathbb{E}_{\tau, \tau'} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle \right| \\
& + \left| \mathbb{E}_{\tau, \tau'} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle - \langle \pi(x), \pi(y) \rangle \right| \\
& + \left| \langle \pi(x), \pi(y) \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle \right| =: (1) + (2) + (3) + (4).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound each of the four summands above uniformly for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$ . Clearly, (4)  $\leq 2Rr \leq 2\delta R^2$ .

**Estimate of (2).** Hoeffding's inequality and the union bound imply that if  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, r)/\eta)$  then with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ ,

$$\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle - \mathbb{E}_{\tau, \tau'} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle \right| \leq \delta \lambda^2.$$

**Estimate of (1).** For all  $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$ , it follows analogously to (2.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(x), f'(y) \rangle - \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle \right| \\
& \leq \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i) \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, y \rangle + \tau'_i) \\
& \quad - \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i) \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(y) \rangle + \tau'_i)| \\
& \leq \frac{2\lambda^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i)} + \mathbf{1}_{\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, y \rangle + \tau'_i) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(y) \rangle + \tau'_i)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(x), f'(y) \rangle - \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle \right| \\
& \leq 2 \sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i)} \\
& \quad + 2 \sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau'_i) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau'_i)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (2.7)

$$\mathbf{1}_{\operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i) \neq \operatorname{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i)} \leq \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i| \leq \delta \lambda} + \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, \pi(x) - x \rangle| > \delta \lambda}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(x), f'(y) \rangle - \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle \right| \\
& \leq 2 \sup_{x \in N_r} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i| \leq \delta \lambda} + 2 \sup_{x \in N_r} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{|\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau'_i| \leq \delta \lambda}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ 4 \sup_{z \in (\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap rB_2^n} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m 1_{|\langle a_i, z \rangle| > \delta \lambda}.$$

For every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_\tau(|\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i| \leq \delta \lambda) \leq \delta.$$

Therefore, the Chernoff bound implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m 1_{|\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i| \leq \delta \lambda} \leq 2\delta m$$

with probability at least  $1 - \exp(-cm\delta)$ . By the union bound, if  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-1} \log |N_r|$  then with probability at least  $1 - \exp(-c'm\delta)$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in N_r} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m 1_{|\langle a_i, x \rangle + \tau_i| \leq \delta \lambda} \lesssim \delta \lambda^2.$$

Observe that

$$\sup_{z \in (\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap rB_2^n} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m 1_{|\langle a_i, z \rangle| > \delta \lambda} \leq \delta$$

if

$$(3.11) \quad \sup_{z \in (\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap rB_2^n} \|Az\|_{[\delta m]} \leq \delta \lambda \sqrt{\delta m}.$$

Since  $T = (\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap rB_2^n \subset \delta R B_2^n$  and  $\sqrt{\delta} \lambda / R \leq 1$ , applying Theorem 3.7 with  $k = \delta m$ ,  $T = (\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap rB_2^n$ ,  $\varepsilon = \delta R$ ,  $u = \sqrt{\delta} \lambda / R$  shows that (3.11) holds with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ , if

$$\lambda \gtrsim R \sqrt{\log(e/\delta)} (\log^4(n) + \log(\eta^{-1}))$$

and

$$m \gtrsim \lambda^{-2} \delta^{-3} \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap rB_2^n)^2 (\log^8(n) + \log^2(\eta^{-1})).$$

**Estimate of (3).** By the triangle inequality,

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}_{\tau, \tau'} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle - \langle \pi(x), \pi(y) \rangle| \\ & \leq |\mathbb{E}_{\tau, \tau'} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle - \frac{1}{m} \langle A\pi(x), A\pi(y) \rangle| \\ & \quad + |\frac{1}{m} \langle A\pi(x), A\pi(y) \rangle - \langle \pi(x), \pi(y) \rangle|. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the first summand, we apply Lemma 3.10 which yields

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}_{\tau, \tau'} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle - \frac{1}{m} \langle A\pi(x), A\pi(y) \rangle| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{\tau, \tau'} |\lambda^2 \text{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle + \tau_i) \text{sign}(\langle a_i, \pi(y) \rangle + \tau'_i) - \langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle \langle a_i, \pi(y) \rangle| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \phi_\lambda(\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle) |\langle a_i, \pi(y) \rangle| + \phi_\lambda(\langle a_i, \pi(y) \rangle) |\langle a_i, \pi(x) \rangle|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |\mathbb{E}_{\tau, \tau'} \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(\pi(x)), f'(\pi(y)) \rangle - \frac{1}{m} \langle A\pi(x), A\pi(y) \rangle| \\ & \leq 2 \sup_{x, y \in N_r} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |\langle a_i, x \rangle| |\langle a_i, y \rangle| 1_{|\langle a_i, x \rangle| > \lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.9 and  $\ell_*(N_r) \lesssim R\sqrt{\log(|N_r|)}$  it follows that if

$$\begin{aligned} m &\gtrsim \delta^{-1} \log(|N_r|)(\log^8(n) + \log^2(\eta^{-1})), \\ \lambda &\gtrsim R\sqrt{\log(e\lambda^2/\delta R^2)}(\log^4(n) + \log(\eta^{-1})), \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\sup_{x,y \in N_r} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |\langle a_i, x \rangle| |\langle a_i, y \rangle| 1_{|\langle a_i, x \rangle| > \lambda} \leq \delta R^2$$

with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ . Combining the polarization identity with the triangle inequality we estimate the second summand on the right hand side of (3.12) by

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{m} \langle A\pi(x), A\pi(y) \rangle - \langle \pi(x), \pi(y) \rangle \right| &\leq \frac{1}{4} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} A(\pi(x) + \pi(y)) \right\|_2^2 - \|\pi(x) + \pi(y)\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} A(\pi(x) - \pi(y)) \right\|_2^2 - \|\pi(x) - \pi(y)\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.4 in combination with [38, Theorem 3.1] yields the following: there exist absolute constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that if

$$m \geq c_1 \delta^{-2} \log(|N_r|/\eta) (\log^4(n) + \log(\eta^{-1})),$$

then with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ ,

$$\left| \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} A(\pi(x) + \pi(y)) \right\|_2^2 - \|\pi(x) + \pi(y)\|_2^2 \right| \leq \delta \|\pi(x) + \pi(y)\|_2^2 \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathcal{D}$$

and

$$\left| \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} A(\pi(x) - \pi(y)) \right\|_2^2 - \|\pi(x) - \pi(y)\|_2^2 \right| \leq \delta \|\pi(x) - \pi(y)\|_2^2 \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Combining our estimates, we find that there exist absolute constants  $C, C' \geq 1$  such that if

$$\lambda \gtrsim R\sqrt{\log(e\lambda^2/\delta R^2)}(\log^4(n) + \log(\eta^{-1})), \quad R^2 \geq \delta \lambda^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m &\gtrsim \lambda^{-2} \delta^{-3} \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap rB_2^n)^2 (\log^8(n) + \log^2(\eta^{-1})), \\ m &\gtrsim \delta^{-1} \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, r)) (\log^8(n) + \log^2(\eta^{-1})), \\ m &\gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, r)/\eta) (\log^4(n) + \log(\eta^{-1})), \end{aligned}$$

for  $r \leq \delta R$ , then, with probability at least  $1 - C\eta$ ,

$$\sup_{x,y \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \frac{\lambda^2}{m} \langle f(x), f'(y) \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle \right| \leq C' \delta \lambda^2.$$

By rescaling  $\delta$  and  $\eta$  we obtain the result.  $\blacksquare$

#### 4. LOWER BOUNDS

In this section we derive bounds on the necessary number of bits required by an oblivious random embedding that preserves Euclidean or squared Euclidean distances.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $R > 0$ ,  $\delta \in (0, \frac{R}{2})$  and assume that*

$$(4.1) \quad n \gtrsim \delta^{-2} R^2 \log(N/\eta), \quad \sqrt{N/\eta} \gtrsim \delta^{-2} R^2 \log(N/\eta).$$

*Let  $f : RB_2^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m$  be a random binary embedding map and  $d : \{-1, 1\}^m \times \{-1, 1\}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a (random) reconstruction map such that given any finite data set  $\mathcal{D} \subset RB_2^n$  with  $|\mathcal{D}| = N$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x,y \in \mathcal{D}} |d(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2| \leq \delta \right) \geq 1 - \eta.$$

*Then  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} R^2 \log(N/\eta)$ .*

By considering  $R^{-1}\mathcal{D} \subset B_2^n$  it suffices to prove the result for  $R = 1$ . Further, if  $|d(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2| \leq 1$  and  $x, y \in B_2^n$  then

$$\begin{aligned} |d(f(x), f(y))^2 - \|x - y\|_2^2| &\leq |d(f(x), f(y)) + \|x - y\|_2| \cdot |d(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2| \\ &\leq 5 \cdot |d(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Theorem 4.1 with  $R = 1$  follows from the following result:

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}, \eta, \delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  and assume that (4.1) holds for  $R = 1$ . Let  $f : B_2^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m$  be a random binary embedding map and  $d : \{-1, 1\}^m \times \{-1, 1\}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a (random) reconstruction map such that given any finite data set  $\mathcal{D} \subset B_2^n$  with  $|\mathcal{D}| = N$ ,*

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |d(f(x), f(y)) - \|x - y\|_2^2| \leq \delta\right) \geq 1 - \eta.$$

Then  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(N/\eta)$ .

Clearly this result is equivalent to the following statement.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}, \eta, \delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  and assume that (4.1) holds for  $R = 1$ . Let  $f : B_2^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m$  be a random binary embedding map and  $d : \{-1, 1\}^m \times \{-1, 1\}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a (random) reconstruction map such that given any finite data set  $\mathcal{D} \subset B_2^n$  with  $|\mathcal{D}| = N$ ,*

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |d(f(x), f(y)) - \langle x, y \rangle| \leq \delta\right) \geq 1 - \eta.$$

Then  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(N/\eta)$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $V$  be uniformly distributed on the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{k-1}$ . Let  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  and  $k \geq 2\delta^{-2}$ . Then for any  $x \in \mathbb{S}^{k-1}$ ,*

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{1}{6\delta\sqrt{k}}(1 - \delta^2)^{\frac{k-1}{2}} \leq \mathbb{P}(\langle V, x \rangle \geq \delta) \leq \frac{1}{2\delta\sqrt{k}}(1 - \delta^2)^{\frac{k-1}{2}}.$$

If additionally  $\delta \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ , then

$$(4.5) \quad \mathbb{P}(|\langle V, x \rangle| \geq \delta) \geq \exp(-2\delta^2 k).$$

Moreover, for  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$  and  $k \geq 8$ ,

$$(4.6) \quad \mathbb{P}(\|V - x\|_2 \leq \alpha) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\alpha^{k-1}.$$

**Proof.** Inequality (4.4) is standard (e.g. see [9, Section 7.2]). The second inequality immediately follows from the lower bound in (4.4) and using  $1 - u \geq \exp(-2u)$  for  $u \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . Inequality (4.6) follows from the upper bound in (4.4) for  $\delta = 1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}$  by observing that  $\|V - x\|_2 \leq \alpha$  if and only if  $\langle V, x \rangle \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}$ . ■

**Lemma 4.5.** *For  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  let  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{S}^{k-1}$  be a maximal  $\delta$ -packing of  $\mathbb{S}^{k-1}$  (a maximal subset of  $\mathbb{S}^{k-1}$  such that  $\|x - x'\|_2 > \delta$  for all distinct  $x, x' \in \mathcal{N}$ ). Then*

$$(4.7) \quad \sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{k-1} \leq |\mathcal{N}| \leq \left(\frac{4}{\delta} + 1\right)^k.$$

**Proof.** The upper bound follows from [52, Lemma 4.2.8 and Corollary 4.2.13]. Define  $\mathcal{B}_\delta(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{S}^{k-1} : \|x - y\|_2 \leq \delta\}$ . Since  $\mathbb{S}^{k-1}$  is covered by the union of balls  $\mathcal{B}_\delta(x)$  with centers  $x \in \mathcal{N}$ , it follows

$$1 \leq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{P}(\|V - x\|_2 \leq \delta),$$

where  $V$  is uniformly distributed on  $\mathbb{S}^{k-1}$ . The claim now follows from inequality (4.6). ■

Theorem 4.3 is clearly implied by the following result:

**Theorem 4.6.** *There exists an absolute constant  $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  such that the following holds. Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\delta, \eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  and assume that*

$$(4.8) \quad n \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(N/\eta), \quad \sqrt{N/\eta} \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(N/\eta).$$

Let  $f : B_2^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m$  be a random binary embedding map and  $d : \{-1, 1\}^m \times \{-1, 1\}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a random reconstruction map such that given any finite data set  $\mathcal{D} \subset B_2^n$  with  $|\mathcal{D}| = N$  and  $(\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \alpha B_2^n = \{0\}$ ,

$$(4.9) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |d(f(x), f(y)) - \langle x, y \rangle| \leq \delta\right) \geq 1 - \eta.$$

Then  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(N/\eta)$ .

To prove this result, we will make use of ideas developed by Alon and Klartag in [5]. In that work they were concerned with the task of designing so-called  $\delta$ -distance sketches, that is, data structures which allow reconstruction of all Euclidean scalar products between points of a given  $N$ -point set  $\mathcal{D} \subset B_2^n$  up to additive error  $\delta$ . Using a probabilistic argument, they showed in [5, Lemma 5.1] that if  $n \sim \delta^{-2} \log(N)$ , then at least  $c\delta^{-2}N \log N$  bits are needed for any such data structure. Let us briefly sketch their argument, as it will form a key ingredient of our proof of Theorem 4.6. First, they fix a maximal subset  $\mathcal{N} \subset B_2^n$  consisting of  $\frac{1}{2}$ -separated points. It is well-known that  $|\mathcal{N}| \sim 2^n$ . In a second step, they choose independent random vectors  $V_1, \dots, V_{N/2} \in B_2^n$ , which are uniformly distributed in  $B_2^n$ , and prove that with positive probability for any distinct points  $x, x' \in \mathcal{N}$  there exists an  $i \in [\frac{N}{2}]$  such that  $|\langle V_i, x \rangle - \langle V_i, x' \rangle| > \delta$ . In particular, there exist at least  $|\mathcal{N}|^{N/2} \sim 2^{nN/2}$  ordered  $N$ -point sets (each consisting of the vectors  $V_1, \dots, V_{N/2}$  and  $\frac{N}{2}$ -points from  $\mathcal{N}$ ) whose Gram matrices differ pairwise in at least one entry by  $\delta$ . This immediately yields the lower bound on the number of bits needed for  $\frac{\delta}{2}$ -distance sketches of  $N$ -point sets by using  $n \sim \delta^{-2} \log(N)$ .

In contrast to Alon and Klartag's setup, in Theorem 4.6 we are concerned with random encodings  $f$  (which can be seen to induce specific data structures) and aim to show a lower bound for the number of bits needed for the encoding of each individual vector, which additionally quantifies the dependence on the probability  $\eta$  that the embedding fails. In order to do so, we will quantify and extend the argument by Alon and Klartag by showing the following:

- (1) For  $k \leq n$ , let  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{S}^{k-1}$  be a maximal  $\frac{1}{2}$ -packing ( $|\mathcal{N}| \sim 2^k$ ) and for  $M \sim \frac{N}{\eta}$  consider independent vectors  $V_1, \dots, V_M \in \mathbb{S}^{k-1}$  which are uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{S}^{k-1}$ .
- (2) If  $k \sim \delta^{-2} \log(N/\eta)$  and the assumptions of Theorem 4.6 are satisfied then

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\forall x \neq x' \in \mathcal{N} \exists i \in [M] : |\langle x, V_i \rangle - \langle x', V_i \rangle| > 2\delta\}$$

occurs with probability at least  $1 - \exp(-32k)$ .

- (3) If  $X$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathcal{N}$  and (4.9) holds, then there exist deterministic  $\tilde{f}, \tilde{d}$  such that

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ \sup_{i \in [M]} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(X), \tilde{f}(V_i)) - \langle X, V_i \rangle| \leq \delta \right\}$$

occurs with probability at least  $c$ , where  $c$  is a suitable absolute constant.

- (4) On the event  $\mathcal{B}$ ,

$$\left| \left\{ x \in \mathcal{N} : \sup_{i \in [M]} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x), \tilde{f}(V_i)) - \langle x, V_i \rangle| \leq \delta \right\} \right| \leq |\{\tilde{f}(x) : x \in \mathcal{N}\}| \leq 2^m,$$

which implies  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}) \leq \frac{2^m}{|\mathcal{N}|}$ . Part (2) and (3) imply that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$  (for  $k \gtrsim 1$ ), which shows the claim using  $|\mathcal{N}| \sim 2^k \sim 2^{\delta^{-2} \log(N/\eta)}$ .

**Proof.** [Proof of Theorem 4.6] Set  $s = \lceil 1/\eta \rceil \geq 2$ . For  $k \in [n]$ ,  $k \gtrsim \log(N)$ , let  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{S}^{k-1}$  be a maximal  $\frac{1}{2}$ -packing of  $\mathbb{S}^{k-1}$ . Note that  $\sqrt{k} \cdot 2^{k-1} \leq |\mathcal{N}| \leq 9^k$  by Lemma 4.5. Set  $N' = N - 1$ , let  $V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}$  denote independent random vectors which are uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{S}^{k-1}$  and set  $S_j = \{V_{(j-1)N'+1}, \dots, V_{jN'}\}$  for  $j \in [s]$ . Further, define the independent events

$$\mathcal{E}_{S_j} := \left\{ \inf_{x \neq y \in S_j \cup \mathcal{N}} \|x - y\|_2 > \alpha \right\}.$$

Since  $k \gtrsim \log(N)$  and  $|\mathcal{N}| \geq 2^{k-1}$  it follows  $|\mathcal{N}| \geq N' = |S_j|$ . Using inequality (4.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{S_j}^c) &\leq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{y \in S_j} \mathbb{P}(\|x - y\|_2 \leq \alpha) + \sum_{x \neq y \in S_j} \mathbb{P}(\|x - y\|_2 \leq \alpha) \\ &\leq 2|\mathcal{N}|^2 \alpha^{k-1} \leq 2^{-k}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by choosing  $\alpha > 0$  small enough. Define the event

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ \forall x \neq x' \in \mathcal{N} \exists i \in [sN'] : |\langle x, V_i \rangle - \langle x', V_i \rangle| > 2\delta \right\}.$$

Let us show that if

$$(4.10) \quad \frac{1}{8}\delta^{-2} \leq k \leq \frac{1}{64}\delta^{-2} \log(sN'), \quad \delta^{-2} \log(sN') \leq \sqrt{sN'},$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) \geq 1 - \exp(-32k).$$

Using the independence of the vectors  $V_i$  and the union bound we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c) &= \mathbb{P}(\exists x \neq x' \in \mathcal{N} : \forall i \in [sN'] : |\langle x, V_i \rangle - \langle x', V_i \rangle| \leq 2\delta) \\ &\leq \sum_{x \neq x' \in \mathcal{N}} (\mathbb{P}(|\langle x, V \rangle - \langle x', V \rangle| \leq 2\delta))^{sN'} \end{aligned}$$

where  $V$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{S}^{k-1}$ . Since  $\|x - x'\|_2 > \frac{1}{2}$  for any  $x \neq x' \in \mathcal{N}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\langle x, V \rangle - \langle x', V \rangle| > 2\delta) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\left\langle \frac{x - x'}{\|x - x'\|_2}, V \right\rangle\right| > 4\delta\right) \geq \exp(-32\delta^2 k)$$

where in the last step we applied Lemma 4.4. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c) &\leq |\mathcal{N}|^2 (1 - \exp(-32\delta^2 k))^{sN'} \\ &\leq \exp(\log(81)k) \cdot (\exp(-\exp(-32\delta^2 k)))^{sN'} \\ &= \exp(\log(81)k - sN' \exp(-32\delta^2 k)). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using (4.10) we obtain

$$\log(81)k - sN' \exp(-32\delta^2 k) \leq -32k.$$

In the following, we consider  $k = \frac{1}{64}\delta^{-2} \log(sN')$  and assume  $\delta^{-2} \log(sN') \leq (sN')^{1/2}$ . Let  $X$  be uniformly distributed in  $\mathcal{N}$ . Let  $S = \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}$  be a set of independent random vectors  $V_i$  which are uniformly distributed on  $\mathbb{S}^{k-1}$ . By independence of the random vectors  $V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}$  and Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j \in [s]} \mathcal{E}_{S_j}, \sup_{y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}} |d(f(X), f(y)) - \langle X, y \rangle| \leq \delta\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{f, d, X} \mathbb{P}_V \left( \bigcap_{j \in [s]} \left\{ \sup_{y \in S_j} |d(f(X), f(y)) - \langle X, y \rangle| \leq \delta, \mathcal{E}_{S_j} \right\} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{f, d, X} \left[ \mathbb{P}_S \left( \sup_{y \in S} |d(f(X), f(y)) - \langle X, y \rangle| \leq \delta, \mathcal{E}_S \right) \right]^s \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \left[ \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{y \in S} |d(f(X), f(y)) - \langle X, y \rangle| \leq \delta, \mathcal{E}_S \right) \right]^s.$$

Observe that  $S \cup \{X\} \subset B_2^n$  satisfies  $|S \cup \{X\}| \leq N$ . Therefore, (4.9) implies

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{y \in S} |d(f(X), f(y)) - \langle X, y \rangle| \leq \delta, \mathcal{E}_S \right) \geq (1 - \eta) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_S) \geq (1 - \eta)(1 - 2^{-k}).$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigcap_{j \in [s]} \mathcal{E}_j, \sup_{y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}} |d(f(x), f(y)) - \langle x, y \rangle| \leq \delta \right) \geq (1 - \eta)^s (1 - 2^{-k})^s.$$

Observe that  $1 - \eta \geq \exp(-2\eta)$  for  $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . Hence, if  $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ , then  $(1 - \eta)^s \geq \exp(-2\eta s) \geq \exp(-4)$ . Further, if  $k \geq \log(\eta^{-1})$ , then  $(1 - 2^{-k})^s \geq \frac{1}{2}$ . Hence,

$$e^{-4} \cdot 2^{-1} \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}} |d(f(X), f(y)) - \langle X, y \rangle| \leq \delta \right).$$

This implies that there exist (deterministic)  $\tilde{f} : B_2^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m$  and  $\tilde{d} : \{-1, 1\}^m \times \{-1, 1\}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$e^{-4} \cdot 2^{-1} \leq \mathbb{P}_{X, V} \left( \sup_{y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(X), \tilde{f}(y)) - \langle X, y \rangle| \leq \delta \right).$$

Since  $X$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathcal{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-4} \cdot 2^{-1} - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}_{X, V} \left( \sup_{y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(X), \tilde{f}(y)) - \langle X, y \rangle| \leq \delta, \mathcal{B} \right) \\ & = \mathbb{E}_V \left[ 1_{\mathcal{B}} \cdot \mathbb{P}_X \left( \sup_{y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(X), \tilde{f}(y)) - \langle X, y \rangle| \leq \delta \right) \right] \\ & = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \mathbb{E}_V \left[ 1_{\mathcal{B}} \cdot \left| \left\{ x \in \mathcal{N} : \sup_{y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x), \tilde{f}(y)) - \langle x, y \rangle| \leq \delta \right\} \right| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now show that on the event  $\mathcal{B}$

$$\left| \left\{ x \in \mathcal{N} : \sup_{y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x), \tilde{f}(y)) - \langle x, y \rangle| \leq \delta \right\} \right| \leq |\{\tilde{f}(x) : x \in \mathcal{N}\}|.$$

It suffices to show that for any  $b \in \{\tilde{f}(x) : x \in \mathcal{N}\}$ ,

$$(4.11) \quad \sum_{x \in \tilde{f}^{-1}(\{b\}) \cap \mathcal{N}} 1_{\left\{ \sup_{y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x), \tilde{f}(y)) - \langle x, y \rangle| \leq \delta \right\}} \leq 1.$$

To prove (4.11) assume that  $\sup_{y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}} |\tilde{d}(b, \tilde{f}(y)) - \langle x, y \rangle| \leq \delta$  for some  $x \in \tilde{f}^{-1}(\{b\}) \cap \mathcal{N}$ . By definition of the event  $\mathcal{B}$ , for any  $x' \in \tilde{f}^{-1}(\{b\}) \cap \mathcal{N}$  with  $x' \neq x$  there exists a  $y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}$  such that  $|\langle x, y \rangle - \langle x', y \rangle| > 2\delta$ . This implies

$$\begin{aligned} 2\delta & < |\langle x, y \rangle - \langle x', y \rangle| \leq |\langle x, y \rangle - \tilde{d}(b, \tilde{f}(y))| + |\tilde{d}(b, \tilde{f}(y)) - \langle x', y \rangle| \\ & \leq \delta + |\tilde{d}(b, \tilde{f}(y)) - \langle x', y \rangle| \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\delta < |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x'), \tilde{f}(y)) - \langle x', y \rangle|.$$

Hence,

$$1_{\left\{ \sup_{y \in \{V_1, \dots, V_{sN'}\}} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x'), \tilde{f}(y)) - \langle x', y \rangle| \leq \delta \right\}} = 0,$$

which proves (4.11). In summary, we have shown that if  $k = \frac{1}{64} \delta^{-2} \log(sN')$  and  $\delta^{-2} \log(sN') \leq \sqrt{sN'}$ , then

$$\frac{|\mathcal{N}|}{4e^4} \leq (e^{-4} \cdot 2^{-1} - e^{-32k}) |\mathcal{N}| \leq (e^{-4} \cdot 2^{-1} - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c)) |\mathcal{N}| \leq |\{\tilde{f}(x) : x \in \mathcal{N}\}| \leq 2^m.$$

Since  $|\mathcal{N}| \geq 2^k$ , this yields the result.  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 4.7.** *There exists an absolute constant  $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  such that the following holds. Let  $\delta \in (0, \alpha)$ ,  $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $N_\delta \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $w_\delta > 0$  and assume that*

$$(4.12) \quad n \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(N_\delta/\eta) + \delta^{-2} w_\delta^2, \quad \sqrt{N_\delta/\eta} \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(N_\delta/\eta), \quad \delta^{-2} w_\delta^2 \gtrsim 1.$$

*Let  $f : B_2^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m$  be a random binary embedding map and  $d : \{-1, 1\}^m \times \{-1, 1\}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a random reconstruction map such that given any  $\mathcal{D} \subset B_2^n$  with*

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, 8\delta) \leq N_\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap 8\delta B_2^n) \leq w_\delta$$

*we have*

$$(4.13) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |d(f(x), f(y)) - \langle x, y \rangle| \leq \delta\right) \geq 1 - \eta.$$

*Further, assume that the quantization cells of  $f$  are convex. Then  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(N_\delta/\eta) + \delta^{-2} w_\delta^2$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  denote the absolute constant from Theorem 4.6. If  $8\delta \leq \alpha$  then every  $\mathcal{D} \subset B_2^n$  with  $|\mathcal{D}| = N_\delta$  and  $(\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap \alpha B_2^n = \{0\}$  satisfies

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, 8\delta) \leq N_\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap 8\delta B_2^n) = 0 \leq w_\delta,$$

so by assumption

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |d(f(x), f(y)) - \langle x, y \rangle| \leq \delta\right) \geq 1 - \eta.$$

By Theorem 4.6 this implies  $m \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \log(N_\delta/\eta)$ . Next, let us show that if  $n \geq \delta^{-2} w_\delta^2$  and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} |d(f(x), f(y)) - \langle x, y \rangle| \leq \delta\right) \geq 1 - \eta$$

for every  $\mathcal{D} \subset B_2^n$  with  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, 8\delta) = 1$  and  $\ell_*((\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}) \cap 8\delta B_2^n) \leq w_\delta$ , then

$$m \geq \delta^{-2} w_\delta^2 - 1.$$

Set  $k = c\delta^{-2} w_\delta^2$  for a constant  $c > 0$  and let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  denote a  $k$ -dimensional subspace. Let  $\mathcal{N} \subset E \cap B_2^n$  be a maximal  $\frac{1}{2}$ -packing of  $E \cap B_2^n$ , then  $2^k \leq |\mathcal{N}| \leq 9^k$  (e.g. see [52, Lemma 4.2.8 and Corollary 4.2.13]). For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  define  $\mathcal{D}_x = x + (E \cap 8\delta B_2^n)$ . Then  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}_x, 8\delta) = 1$  and  $\ell_*((\mathcal{D}_x - \mathcal{D}_x) \cap 8\delta B_2^n) \leq 2\ell_*(E \cap 8\delta B_2^n) \lesssim \delta\sqrt{k}$ . Hence, if  $c > 0$  is chosen small enough, then  $\ell_*((\mathcal{D}_x - \mathcal{D}_x) \cap 8\delta B_2^n) \leq w_\delta$ . Let  $X$  be uniformly distributed in  $\mathcal{N}$ . By assumption,

$$1 - \eta \leq \mathbb{P}_X \mathbb{P}_{f, d} \left( \sup_{z, z' \in \mathcal{D}_X} |d(f(z), f(z')) - \langle z, z' \rangle| \leq \delta \right).$$

Hence, there exist (deterministic)  $\tilde{f} : B_2^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^m$  and  $\tilde{d} : \{-1, 1\}^m \times \{-1, 1\}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$1 - \eta \leq \mathbb{P}_X \left( \sup_{z, z' \in \mathcal{D}_X} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(z), \tilde{f}(z')) - \langle z, z' \rangle| \leq \delta \right).$$

Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_X \left( \sup_{z, z' \in \mathcal{D}_X} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(z), \tilde{f}(z')) - \langle z, z' \rangle| \leq \delta \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sup_{v, v' \in E \cap 8\delta B_2^n} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x+v), \tilde{f}(x+v')) - \langle x+v, x+v' \rangle| \leq \delta \right\}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sup_{v \in E \cap 8\delta B_2^n} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x), \tilde{f}(x+v)) - \langle x, x+v \rangle| \leq \delta \right\}}. \end{aligned}$$



Next, let us show

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \sup_{v \in E \cap 8\delta B_2^n} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x), \tilde{f}(x+v)) - \langle x, x+v \rangle| \leq \delta \right\}} \leq |\{\tilde{f}(x) : x \in \mathcal{N}\}|.$$

Clearly it suffices to prove that

$$(4.14) \quad \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \sup_{v \in E \cap 8\delta B_2^n} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x), \tilde{f}(x+v)) - \langle x, x+v \rangle| \leq \delta \right\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \sup_{v \in E \cap 8\delta B_2^n} |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x'), \tilde{f}(x'+v)) - \langle x', x'+v \rangle| \leq \delta \right\}} \leq 1$$

for all  $x \neq x' \in \mathcal{N}$  with  $\tilde{f}(x) = \tilde{f}(x')$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $\|x\|_2 \leq \|x'\|_2$  and set  $\tilde{v} = 8\delta \frac{x'-x}{\|x'-x\|_2} \in E \cap 8\delta B_2^n$ . If  $8\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , then  $\frac{8\delta}{\|x-x'\|_2} \leq 1$  which implies  $x + \tilde{v} \in \text{Span}(\{x, x'\})$ . Since the quantization cells of  $\tilde{f}$  are convex it follows  $\tilde{f}(x + \tilde{v}) = \tilde{f}(x) = \tilde{f}(x')$ . Further, using  $\|x\|_2 \leq \|x'\|_2$  we find

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x', x' \rangle - \langle x, x + \tilde{v} \rangle &= \langle x', x' \rangle - \langle x, x \rangle + \frac{8\delta}{\|x - x'\|_2} \langle x, x - x' \rangle \\ &= \frac{8\delta}{\|x - x'\|_2} (\langle x', x' \rangle - \langle x, x \rangle + \langle x, x - x' \rangle) \\ &\quad + \left[ 1 - \frac{8\delta}{\|x - x'\|_2} \right] (\langle x', x' \rangle - \langle x, x \rangle) \\ &\geq \frac{8\delta}{2\|x - x'\|_2} (2\langle x', x' \rangle - 2\langle x, x \rangle) \\ &\geq 4\delta \|x - x'\|_2 \\ &> 2\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\mathbf{1}_{\left\{ |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x), \tilde{f}(x+\tilde{v})) - \langle x, x+\tilde{v} \rangle| \leq \delta \right\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ |\tilde{d}(\tilde{f}(x'), \tilde{f}(x')) - \langle x', x' \rangle| \leq \delta \right\}} \leq 1$ , which implies (4.14). In summary, we showed  $(1 - \eta)|\mathcal{N}| \leq |\{\tilde{f}(x) : x \in \mathcal{N}\}| \leq 2^m$ . Since  $\eta < \frac{1}{2}$  and  $2^k \leq |\mathcal{N}|$ , this yields  $m \geq c\delta^{-2}w_\delta^2 - 1 \geq \frac{c}{2}\delta^{-2}w_\delta^2$ , provided that  $\frac{c}{2}\delta^{-2}w_\delta^2 \geq 1$ .  $\blacksquare$

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

S.D. was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under SPP 1798 (COSIP - Compressed Sensing in Information Processing) through project CoCoMiMo. A.S. acknowledges support by the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique - FNRS under Grant n° T.0136.20 (Learn2Sense).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] D. Achlioptas. Database-friendly random projections: Johnson-Lindenstrauss with binary coins. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 66(4):671–687, 2003.
- [2] N. Ailon and B. Chazelle. The Fast Johnson–Lindenstrauss Transform and approximate nearest neighbors. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(1):302–322, 2009.
- [3] N. Ailon and E. Liberty. Fast dimension reduction using Rademacher series on dual BCH codes. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 42(4):615–630, 2009.
- [4] N. Ailon and E. Liberty. An almost optimal unrestricted fast Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 9(3):21, 2013.
- [5] N. Alon and B. Klartag. Optimal compression of approximate inner products and dimension reduction. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 639–650, Oct 2017.
- [6] M. Balcan and A. Blum. A PAC-style model for learning from labeled and unlabeled data. In *Learning Theory, 18th Annual Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2005, Bertinoro, Italy, June 27-30, 2005, Proceedings*, pages 111–126, 2005.
- [7] M. Balcan, A. Blum, and S. Vempala. Kernels as features: On kernels, margins, and low-dimensional mappings. *Machine Learning*, 65(1):79–94, 2006.

- [8] J. Blocki, A. Blum, A. Datta, and O. Sheffet. The Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform itself preserves differential privacy. In *53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2012, New Brunswick, NJ, USA, October 20-23, 2012*, pages 410–419, 2012.
- [9] S. Boucheron, G. Lugosi, and P. Massart. *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [10] J. Bourgain, S. Dirksen, and J. Nelson. Toward a unified theory of sparse dimensionality reduction in Euclidean space. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 25(4):1009–1088, 2015.
- [11] J. Buhler and M. Tompa. Finding motifs using random projections. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 9(2):225–242, 2002.
- [12] A. Chowdhury, P. London, H. Avron, and P. Drineas. Speeding up linear programming using randomized linear algebra. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.08072*, 2020.
- [13] K. L. Clarkson. Tighter bounds for random projections of manifolds. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry, College Park, MD, USA, June 9-11, 2008*, pages 39–48, 2008.
- [14] K. L. Clarkson and D. P. Woodruff. Numerical linear algebra in the streaming model. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2009, Bethesda, MD, USA, May 31 - June 2, 2009*, pages 205–214, 2009.
- [15] P. Contreras and F. Murtagh. Fast, linear time hierarchical clustering using the Baire metric. *J. Classification*, 29(2):118–143, 2012.
- [16] J. W. Cooley and J. M. Tukey. An algorithm for the machine calculation of complex Fourier series. *Math. Comput.*, 19:297–301, 1965.
- [17] A. Dasgupta, R. Kumar, and T. Sarlós. A sparse Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 341–350, 2010.
- [18] S. Dirksen. Tail bounds via generic chaining. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 20:no. 53, 1–29, 2015.
- [19] S. Dirksen. Dimensionality reduction with subgaussian matrices: a unified theory. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 16(5):1367–1396, 2016.
- [20] S. Dirksen. Quantized compressed sensing: a survey. In *Compressed Sensing and Its Applications*, pages 67–95. Springer, 2019.
- [21] S. Dirksen and S. Mendelson. Robust one-bit compressed sensing with partial circulant matrices. *arXiv:1812.06719*.
- [22] S. Dirksen and S. Mendelson. Non-gaussian hyperplane tessellations and robust one-bit compressed sensing. *To appear in Journal of the European Mathematical Society, arXiv:1805.09409*, 2018.
- [23] S. Dirksen and A. Stollenwerk. Fast binary embeddings with gaussian circulant matrices: improved bounds. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 60(3):599–626, 2018.
- [24] Y. Gordon. On Milman’s inequality and random subspaces which escape through a mesh in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis*, pages 84–106, 1988.
- [25] S. Har-Peled, P. Indyk, and R. Motwani. Approximate nearest neighbor: Towards removing the curse of dimensionality. *Theory of Computing*, 8(1):321–350, 2012.
- [26] C. Hegde, M. Wakin, and R. Baraniuk. Random projections for manifold learning. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 641–648, 2007.
- [27] T. Huynh and R. Saab. Fast binary embeddings and quantized compressed sensing with structured matrices. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 73(1):110–149, 2020.
- [28] P. Indyk. Algorithmic applications of low-distortion geometric embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 10–33, 2001.
- [29] L. Jacques. A quantized Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma: The finding of Buffon’s needle. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(9):5012–5027, 2015.
- [30] L. Jacques. Small width, low distortions: quantized random embeddings of low-complexity sets. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 63(9):5477–5495, 2017.
- [31] L. Jacques and V. Cambareri. Time for dithering: fast and quantized random embeddings via the restricted isometry property. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 6(4):441–476, 2017.
- [32] L. Jacques, J. N. Laska, P. T. Boufounos, and R. G. Baraniuk. Robust 1-bit compressive sensing via binary stable embeddings of sparse vectors. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 59(4):2082–2102, 2013.
- [33] W. B. Johnson and J. Lindenstrauss. Extensions of Lipschitz mappings into a Hilbert space. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 26:189–206, 1984.
- [34] D. M. Kane and J. Nelson. Sparser Johnson-Lindenstrauss transforms. *Journal of the ACM*, 61(1):4, 2014.
- [35] B. Klartag and S. Mendelson. Empirical processes and random projections. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 225(1):229–245, 2005.

- [36] F. Krahmer, S. Mendelson, and H. Rauhut. Suprema of chaos processes and the restricted isometry property. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 67(11):1877–1904, 2014.
- [37] F. Krahmer and R. Ward. New and improved Johnson-Lindenstrauss embeddings via the Restricted Isometry Property. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(3):1269–1281, 2011.
- [38] F. Krahmer and R. Ward. New and improved Johnson-Lindenstrauss embeddings via the restricted isometry property. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(3):1269–1281, 2011.
- [39] K. G. Larsen and J. Nelson. Optimality of the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 633–638, Oct 2017.
- [40] Y. T. Lee and A. Sidford. Path finding methods for linear programming: Solving linear programs in  $o$ ( $v$ rank) iterations and faster algorithms for maximum flow. In *2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 424–433. IEEE, 2014.
- [41] K. Makarychev, Y. Makarychev, and I. Razenshteyn. Performance of Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform for  $k$ -means and  $k$ -medians clustering. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1027–1038, 2019.
- [42] S. Mendelson, A. Pajor, and N. Tomczak-Jaegermann. Reconstruction and subgaussian operators in asymptotic geometric analysis. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 17(4):1248–1282, 2007.
- [43] J. Nelson and H. L. Nguyễn. Sparsity lower bounds for dimensionality-reducing maps. In *Proceedings of the 45th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 101–110, 2013.
- [44] J. Nelson, E. Price, and M. Wootters. New constructions of RIP matrices with fast multiplication and fewer rows. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 2014.
- [45] S. Oymak and B. Recht. Near-optimal bounds for binary embeddings of arbitrary sets. *CoRR*, abs/1512.04433, 2015.
- [46] S. Oymak, B. Recht, and M. Soltanolkotabi. Isometric sketching of any set via the restricted isometry property. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 7(4):707–726, 03 2018.
- [47] Y. Plan and R. Vershynin. Dimension reduction by random hyperplane tessellations. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 51(2):438–461, 2014.
- [48] G. Schechtman. Two observations regarding embedding subsets of Euclidean spaces in normed spaces. *Advances in Mathematics*, 200(1):125–135, 2006.
- [49] D. A. Spielman and N. Srivastava. Graph sparsification by effective resistances. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(6):1913–1926, 2011.
- [50] M. Talagrand. *Upper and lower bounds for stochastic processes*, volume 60 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2014. Modern methods and classical problems.
- [51] J. A. Tropp, A. Yurtsever, M. Udell, and V. Cevher. Streaming low-rank matrix approximation with an application to scientific simulation. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 41(4):A2430–A2463, 2019.
- [52] R. Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*, volume 47 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [53] K. Q. Weinberger, A. Dasgupta, J. Langford, A. J. Smola, and J. Attenberg. Feature hashing for large scale multitask learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 1113–1120, 2009.
- [54] D. P. Woodruff. Sketching as a tool for numerical linear algebra. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 10(1–2):1–157, 2014.

UTRECHT UNIVERSITY, MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, THE NETHERLANDS  
 E-mail address: s.dirksen@uu.nl

UCLouvain, ICTEAM INSTITUTE, ISPGROUP, BELGIUM  
 E-mail address: alexander.stollenwerk@uclouvain.be