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Abstract

L0-regularization-based compressed sensing (L0-RBCS) is capable of outperforming L1-RBCS, but it is difficult to solve an optimization problem for L0-RBCS that cannot be formulated as a convex optimization. To achieve the optimization for L0-RBCS, we propose a quantum-classical hybrid system consisting of a quantum machine and a classical digital processor. Because forming a densely-connected network on a quantum machine is required for solving this problem, the coherent Ising machine (CIM) is one of suitable quantum machines for composing this hybrid system. To evaluate theoretically the performance of the CIM-classical hybrid system, a truncated Wigner stochastic differential equation (W-SDE) is obtained from the master equation for the density operator of the network of degenerate optical parametric oscillators, and macroscopic equations are derived from the W-SDE using statistical mechanics. We show that the system performance in principle approaches the theoretical limit of compressed sensing and in practical situations this hybrid system can exceed L1-RBCS’s estimation accuracy.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum machines have attracted significant interest because of their potential to overcome the difficulty of solving the large-scale combinatorial optimization problem. Many quantum machines such as quantum annealing (QA) on D-Wave systems, quantum approximate optimization algorithm (QAOA), quantum adiabatic bifurcations and coherent Ising machine (CIM) have been proposed in the past decade. There are other examples including classical annealers, implemented in electromechanical resonators, nanomagnet arrays, electronic oscillators, silicon photonic weight banks, complementary metal–oxide–semiconductor static random access memory circuits and field-programmable gate arrays (FPGAs). Much of this interest has been centered upon implementing quantum machines and understanding the behavior of those, whereas there have been few practical applications of quantum machines. To open the door to practical use of quantum machines, we show that quantum machines can be used for implementing the compressed sensing (CS), and furthermore we demonstrate using non-equilibrium statistical mechanics methods that its system performance in principle approaches the theoretical limit of CS.

L1 regularization-based CS (L1-RBCS) including the least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) is a very efficient approach to solving various sparse signal reconstruction problems in exploration geophysics, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), black hole observation and material informatics, which is formulated as:

\[ x = \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( \frac{1}{2} \| y - Ax \|_2^2 + \lambda \| x \|_1 \right), \]  

(1)

where \( x \) is an \( N \)-dimensional source signal, \( y \) is an \( M \)-dimensional observation signal, \( A \) is an \( M \times N \) observation matrix, and \( \lambda \) is a regularization parameter. L1-RBCS can be formulated as a convex optimization problem, for which many efficient heuristic algorithms are available.

On the other hand, L0 regularization-based CS (L0-RBCS) can be formulated with the following L0 norm instead of L1 norm:

\[ x = \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( \frac{1}{2} \| y - Ax \|_2^2 + \lambda \| x \|_0 \right). \]  

(2)
L0-RBCS defined in Eq. (2) can be equivalently reformulated as a two-fold optimization problem [43, 44]:

\[
(r, \sigma) = \arg \min_{\sigma \in \{0, 1\}^N} \min_{r \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( \frac{1}{2} \| y - A (\sigma \circ r) \|_2^2 + \lambda \| \sigma \|_0 \right),
\]

(3)

where the element \( r_i \) in \( r \) represents the real number value of the \( i \)-th element in the \( N \)-dimensional source signal. The vector \( \sigma \) is called a support vector, which represents the places of non-zero elements in the \( N \)-dimensional source signal. The element \( \sigma_i \) in \( \sigma \) takes either 0 or 1 to indicate whether the \( i \)-th element in the source signal is zero or non-zero. The symbol \( \circ \) denotes the Hadamard product. From the elementwise representation of Eq. (3), the Hamiltonian (or cost function) of L0-RBCS is given as

\[
H = \sum_{i>j}^{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A^\mu_i A^\mu_j r_i r_j \sigma_i \sigma_j - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} y^\mu_i A^\mu_i r_i \sigma_i + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma_i,
\]

(4)

where \( A^\mu_i \) is an element in a \( M \)-by-\( N \) observation matrix \( A \), and \( y^\mu \) is an element in a \( M \)-dimensional observation signal. Minimization of \( H \) with respect to \( r \) is identical to solving simultaneous linear equations giving the minimum of the parabola with respect to \( r \) if \( \sigma \) is given. On the other hand, minimization of \( H \) with respect to \( \sigma \) is identical to minimizing an Ising Hamiltonian if \( r \) is given. \( J_{i,j} = -\sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A^\mu_i A^\mu_j r_i r_j \) in the first term of Eq. (4) corresponds to a connection from the \( j \)-th spin \( \sigma_j \) to the \( i \)-th spin \( \sigma_i \) if \( r \) is given.

It has been suggested that L0-RBCS is capable of outperforming L1-RBCS, because L1 regularization imposes a shrinkage on variables over a threshold (soft-thresholding) but L0 regularization does not impose such a shrinkage (hard-thresholding) [43]. However, the optimization of the support vector is a combinatorial optimization problem. Furthermore, the mutual interaction \( J_{ij} = -\sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A^\mu_i A^\mu_j r_i r_j \) induces frustration among the spins, the Hamiltonian might have numerous metastable states, and thus L0-RBCS cannot be formulated as a convex optimization problem. Because of these difficulties, only few approximation algorithms were proposed under special conditions [45–47].

To overcome these difficulties for optimizing the support vector \( \sigma \), we focus on quantum machines. In this paper, we propose a quantum-classical hybrid system composed of some quantum machine and a classical digital processor (CDP) (Fig. 1). This system solves the two-fold optimization problem by alternately performing two minimization processes; (i) the quantum machine optimizes \( \sigma \) to minimize \( H \) with given \( r \), and (ii) the CDP optimizes \( r \).
to minimize \( H \) with given \( \sigma \). If the quantum machine can find the ground state of \( H \) with given \( r \), the quantum-classical hybrid system is expected to provide better performance than L1-RBCS.

There are several candidate quantum machines for optimizing \( \sigma \) such as QA [1], QAOA [2, 3], CIM [7–12] and so on. As defined in Eq. (4), the number of non-zero connections \( J_{ij} = -\sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A_i^\mu A_j^\mu r_i r_j \) from one spin to others is \( O(N) \), and thus forming a densely-connected network on a quantum machine is required for optimizing \( \sigma \). On comparison of these candidates, a measurement-feedback (MFB) CIM is one of most suitable quantum machines for this purpose. This is because MFB-CIM can construct any densely-connected network of degenerate optical parametric oscillators (OPOs) due to a time-division multiplexing scheme and MFB [9, 10]. QA and almost all other machines can only support local graphs including chimera graphs, and thus a densely-connected network for optimizing \( \sigma \) has to be embedded in a fixed hardware local graph by using the Lechner-Hauke-Zoller scheme, which requires additional physical spins [48, 49]. Furthermore, it has been reported [50] that MFB-CIM experimentally outperformed QA on two problem sets: one is the full-connected Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model [51] and the other is dense graph MAX-CUT. In contrast to the exponential computation time proportional to \( \exp\left(O\left(N^2\right)\right) \) for the QA, the CIM has an exponential computational time proportional to \( \exp\left(O\left(\sqrt{N}\right)\right) \), where \( N \) is a problem size [50].

We evaluate the performance of a quantum-classical hybrid system composed of MFB-CIM and CDP (Fig. 2). We derive a truncated Wigner stochastic differential equation (W-SDE) from the master equation for a density operator of network consisting of OPOs. Then we develop a statistical mechanics method based on self-consistent signal-to-noise analysis (SCSNA) [24, 52, 53] and derive a macroscopic equation (ME) for the whole system [54–56]. We show that the performance of the proposed system approaches the theoretical limit of L0-minimization-based CS [44] and possibly exceeds that of LASSO.
II. RESULTS

A. Roles of CIM and CDP

The CIM-CDP hybrid system (Fig. 2) executes L0-RBCS described in Eqs. (3) and (4). This system achieves the optimization by alternately performing the following two minimization processes. The CIM optimizes $\sigma$ to minimize $H$ with given $r$, and then forwards $\sigma$ to the CDP. The CDP optimizes $r$ to minimize $H$ with given $\sigma$, and then forwards $r$ to the CIM. Algorithm 1 is an outline of the two alternating minimization processes. In this algorithm, to make the basin of attraction wider, we heuristically introduce a linear threshold reduction whereby the threshold $\eta$ is linearly lowered from $\eta_{\text{init}}$ to $\eta_{\text{end}}$ as the alternating minimization proceeds.

The CIM estimates the support vector $\sigma$, i.e. the places of the non-zero elements in the source signal. To optimize $\sigma$ to minimize $H$ with given $r$, we use a measurement feedback circuit to control the intensity modulator (IM) and phase modulator (PM), which produce the optical injection field to the target ($i$-th) OPO pulse:

$$f_{\text{sig}}^i = K \left( F_\chi(h_i) - \eta \right), \quad i = 1, \ldots, N,$$

where

$$F_\chi(h) = \begin{cases} h & (\chi = +) \\ |h| & (\chi = \pm) \end{cases}.$$ 

Here, $K$ is the gain of the feedback circuit and $\eta$ is the threshold. $\eta$ is related to the regularization parameter $\lambda$ in Eqs. (3) and (4) by $\eta = \sqrt[3]{\lambda}$. $h_i$ is the local field explained below.

We use two different functions $F_+(h)$ and $F_\pm(h)$ for the local field in accordance with the source signal. $F_+(h)$ is the identity function: it is used for a non-negative source signal. $F_\pm(h)$ is the absolute value function: it is used for a signed source signal.

The local field for estimating the support vector on the CIM is set as

$$h_i = - \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{\mu=1}^N A_i^\mu A_j^\mu r_j H(X_j) + \sum_{\mu=1}^M A_i^\mu y^\mu,$$

where $X_j$ is the in-phase amplitude (generalized coordinate) of the $j$-th OPO pulse measured by a homodyne detector. In the local field, $H(X)$ is the Heaviside step function taking 0 for $X \leq 0$ or $+1$ for $X > 0$. $r_j$ is a solution given by the CDP. During the support estimation on the CIM, all $r_j$ are fixed. Thus, the first term is the mutual interaction term, and the second term corresponds to the Zeeman term.
The CDP obtains a solution of the linear simultaneous equations from the minimization condition of \( H \) with respect to \( r \). Without loss of generality, the elementwise representation of the simultaneous equations with respect to the unknown values of \( r_i \) can be rewritten as

\[
 r_i \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} (A_i^\mu)^2 = H(X_i)h_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{7}
\]

\[
 h_i = - \sum_{j=1(\not=j)}^{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A_i^\mu A_j^\mu H(X_j)r_j + \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A_i^\mu y^\mu. \tag{8}
\]

To eliminate indefiniteness, \( r_i \) is set to zero when \( H(X_i) \) is zero. Here, \( h_i \) in Eq. (8) is the same as the local field (Eq. (6)) for the support estimation on the CIM. \( X_j \) is the solution given by the CIM. During the signal estimation on the CDP, all \( H(X_j) \) are fixed. The solution of the simultaneous equations (Eq. (7)) is

\[
 r = \left( \text{diag}[A^T A] + SA^T AS - \text{diag}[SA^T AS] \right)^{-1} SA^T y, \\
 S = \text{diag} (H(X_1), H(X_2), \ldots, H(X_N)).
\]

**B. ME for quantum-classical hybrid system**

We summarize the derivation of MEs. A detailed derivation of the W-SDE and MEs is provided in Methods.

To solve the W-SDE (18) and the simultaneous equations (7) using statistical mechanics methods, we introduce the following observation model in which all variables are randomly chosen,

\[
 \begin{bmatrix}
 y^1 \\
 y^2 \\
 \vdots \\
 y^M
\end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \begin{bmatrix}
 A_1^1 & A_1^2 & \cdots & A_1^N \\
 A_2^1 & A_2^2 & \cdots & A_2^N \\
 \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
 A_M^1 & A_M^2 & \cdots & A_M^N
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
 \xi_1 x_1 \\
 \xi_2 x_2 \\
 \vdots \\
 \xi_N x_N
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
 n^1 \\
 n^2 \\
 \vdots \\
 n^M
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{9}
\]

\( A_i^\mu \) is scaled by \( 1/\sqrt{M} \) and its value is randomly generated satisfying \( \langle A_i^\mu \rangle = 0 \) and \( \langle A_i^\mu A_j^\nu \rangle = \delta_{ij}\delta_{\mu\nu} \). \( [n^1, \ldots, n^M]^T \) is an \( M \)-dimensional observation noise satisfying \( \langle n^\mu \rangle = 0 \) and \( \langle n^\mu n^\nu \rangle = \beta^2 \delta_{\mu\nu} \). Each element of \( [\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_N]^T \) randomly and independently takes 1 or 0 with probability \( a \) and \( 1 - a \), respectively. \( [x_1, \cdots, x_N]^T \) is also assumed to be generated from some iid probability distribution. Here we introduce a measurement compression rate
α defined as \( \alpha = M/N \) and a sparseness \( a \) defined as the probability of non-zero elements in the source signal. \( \beta^2 \) is a variance of the observation noise.

As described above, the CIM and CDP share the same local field (Eqs. (6) and (8)), which can be rewritten by substituting the observation model (9) as

\[
h_i = -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\mu=1}^{N} A_i^\mu A_j^\mu r_j H(c_j) + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\mu=1}^{N} A_i^\mu A_j^\mu \xi_j x_j + \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A_i^\mu n^\mu. \tag{10}
\]

where \( X_j \) is replaced to \( c_j \) that is the real part of the normalized complex Wigner amplitude \( c_j + ik_j \).

Thus, the CIM and CDP can be unified into a single mean field system in the steady state. Since the W-SDE for the \( i \)-th OPO only depends on the self-state and the local field \( h_i \), we can introduce a formal transfer function \( X \) from \( h_i \) to \( H(c_i) \) \[24, 53\],

\[
H(c_i) = X(h_i).
\]

Substituting \( X \) into Eq. (7) and because \( \langle (A_i^\mu)^2 \rangle = 1 \), a formal transfer function \( G \) from \( h_i \) to \( r_i \) is given by

\[
r_i = X(h_i) h_i = G(h_i).
\]

Therefore, the local field can be defined in a self-consistent manner through \( G \) as follows,

\[
h_i = -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\mu=1}^{N} A_i^\mu A_j^\mu G(h_j) + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\mu=1}^{N} A_i^\mu A_j^\mu \xi_j x_j + \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A_i^\mu n^\mu, \tag{11}
\]

Following a recipe of the SCSNA \[24, 52, 53\], the local field \( h_i \) is separated into a pure local field \( \tilde{h}_i \) independent of the self-state \( H(c_i) r_i \) and an effective self-coupling term \( \Gamma H(c_i) r_i \) (called the Onsager reaction term (ORT)) in the thermodynamic limit \[24, 53\]:

\[
h_i = \tilde{h}_i + \Gamma H(c_i) r_i. \tag{12}
\]

\( \tilde{h}_i \) and \( \Gamma \) are determined in a self-consistent manner. \( X \) redefined on \( \tilde{h}_i \) can be safely replaced with its average value \( \langle H(c_i) \rangle \) by using the self-averaging property of such a mean field system. Finally, the following ME are obtained using the self-consistent local field:

\[
R = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Dz \left\{ x \xi_h \int_{0}^{+\infty} dc \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds f(c, s|h_p) \right\}_{x, \xi},
\]

\[
Q = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Dz \left\{ h_p^2 \int_{0}^{+\infty} dc \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds f(c, s|h_p) \right\}_{x, \xi},
\]

\[
U \sqrt{\beta^2 + \frac{a}{\alpha} \langle Q + \langle x^2 \rangle_x \rangle - 2R} = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Dz \left\{ h_p \int_{0}^{+\infty} dc \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds f(c, s|h_p) \right\}_{x, \xi}. \tag{13}
\]
Here, \( R, Q \) and \( U \) are macroscopic parameters called the overlap, the mean square magnetization and the susceptibility, respectively. \( \langle \cdot \rangle_{x,\xi} \) denotes the average with respect to \( x \) and \( \xi \), and

\[
f(c, s|h_y) \propto \exp \left( \frac{2A_s^2 \left( c\bar{K} (F_{\chi}(h_y) - \eta) - V(c, s) \right)}{G_c(z, x\xi) + G_s(z, x\xi) + 0.5} \right), \quad (y = m, p),
\]

\[
h_p = x\xi + \sqrt{\beta^2 + \frac{a}{\alpha}(Q + \langle x^2 \rangle_x - 2R)z}, \quad (c > 0)
\]

\[
h_m = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{a}{\alpha}U} h_p, \quad (c \leq 0)
\]

\[
V(c, s) = \frac{1}{2} (1 - p)c^2 + \frac{1}{2} (1 + p)s^2 + \frac{1}{2} c^2 s^2 + \frac{1}{4} c^4 + \frac{1}{4} s^4.
\]

\( G_c(z, x\xi) \) and \( G_s(z, x\xi) \) can be determined self-consistently from the following equations,

\[
G_c(z, x\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{0} dc \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds^2 f(c, s|h_m) + \int_{0}^{+\infty} dc \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds^2 f(c, s|h_p),
\]

\[
G_s(z, x\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{0} dc \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds^2 f(c, s|h_m) + \int_{0}^{+\infty} dc \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds^2 f(c, s|h_p).
\]

\( A_s \) is a saturation parameter, which diverges in the infinite limit of the amplitude of injected pump field \( \epsilon \rightarrow +\infty \). In the limit \( A_s \rightarrow +\infty \), we obtain the following simplified ME,

\[
R = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Dz \left\langle x\xi h_p \bar{X}(h_p, h_m) \right\rangle_{x,\xi},
\]

\[
Q = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Dz \left\langle h_p^2 \bar{X}(h_p, h_m) \right\rangle_{x,\xi},
\]

\[
U \sqrt{\beta^2 + \frac{a}{\alpha}(Q + \langle x^2 \rangle_x - 2R)} = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Dz \left\langle h_p X(h_p, h_m) \right\rangle_{x,\xi}. \tag{14}
\]

Here, \( \bar{X}(h_p, h_m) \) is an effective output function obtained from the Maxwell rule \[57\], which is given by

\[
\bar{X}(h_p, h_m) = H(F_{\chi}(h_p) - F_{\chi}(h_m) - 2\eta).
\]

To verify the system performance, the following probability density functions are used for generating the source signal: Gaussian \( g(x) = e^{-x^2/2\sigma^2}/\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2} \), half-Gaussian \( g(x) = 2H(x)e^{-x^2/2\sigma^2}/\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2} \), Gamma \( g(x) = x^{k-1}e^{-x/\theta}/(\Gamma(k)\theta^k) \) and bilateral Gamma \( g(x) = |x|^{k-1}e^{-x/\theta}/(2\Gamma(k)\theta^k) \) (see Fig. \[3\]).
C. Accuracy of MEs and comparison with LASSO when $\beta = 0$

First, to confirm the accuracy of the MEs, we compared solutions to the ME with solutions given by Algorithm 1. Figures 4a and 4b show the root-mean-square errors (RMSEs) (see Methods) of the solutions to the ME with $A_s^2 = 250$ (Eq. (13)) and those in the limit $A_s^2 \to \infty$ (Eq. (14)) for various values of the threshold $\eta$ and compression rate $\alpha$ (red and green solid lines). The figures also indicate the RMSEs of solutions obtained using Algorithm 1 with $A_s^2 = 250$ and $A_s^2 = 10^7$ (circles with error bars). Note that $A_s^2 = 10^7$ is on the same order as $A_s^2$ in experimental real CIMs. The results in Fig. 4 are for the case when there is no observation noise (i.e. $\beta = 0$) and the source signals are from a half-Gaussian (+) or Gaussian (±). To confirm if Algorithm 1 has solutions corresponding to the near-zero RMSE states obtained by the MEs, $r$ was initialized as the true signal value, i.e. $x \circ \xi$, in the alternating minimization process described above. However, even in this situation, the c-amplitude was always initialized as $c = 0$ in the initial stage of the support estimation in the alternating minimization process.

In the case of the half-Gaussian (+), two macroscopic states with non-zero RMSE (red solid lines) and near-zero RMSE (green solid lines) coexist as in a CIM-implemented CDMA multiuser detector [56, 58]. On the other hand, in the case of the Gaussian (±), we only found a single macroscopic state with near-zero RMSE (red solid lines). Compared with the simulation results in Fig. 4b, the theoretical results obtained with the ME (14) were in good agreement with the results of Algorithm 1 with $A_s^2 = 10^7$. In both the half-Gaussian case (+) and Gaussian case (±), the near-zero-RMSE states of the ME (14) (red solid lines in Fig. 4b) matched those of Algorithm 1 with $A_s^2 = 10^7$ (circles with error bars in Fig. 4b), and the phase transition points given by the ME (14) coincided with those of Algorithm 1. Under these conditions, as $\eta$ was lowered to 0.01, RMSE decreased monotonically and the phase transition point $a_c$ from the near-zero-RMSE state grew monotonically. On the other hand, the theoretical results obtained from the ME (13) with $A_s^2 = 250$ (red solid lines on the left of Fig. 4a) were in good agreement with results of Algorithm 1 with $A_s^2 = 250$ (circles with error bars on the left of Fig. 4a) in the half-Gaussian case (+), whereas the phase transition points given by the ME (13) became lower than those of Algorithm 1 when $\eta = 0.01$ in the Gaussian case (±), as shown on the right of Fig. 4a.

Furthermore, to compare the abilities of CIM L0-RBCS and LASSO, we computed the
RMSE profiles of LASSO using the ME (37) with the same threshold value as CIM L0-RBCS; these profiles are superimposed upon Fig. 4 (blue solid lines). The RMSEs of CIM L0-RBCS in the limit $A_s^2 \to \infty$ (red solid lines in Fig. 4b) were lower than those of LASSO (blue solid lines) at the same compression rate $\alpha$ and sparseness $a$, and the first-order phase transition points of CIM L0-RBCS were higher than those of LASSO. On the other hand, the RMSEs of CIM L0-RBCS with $A_s^2 = 250$ (red solid lines and circles with error bars in Fig. 4a) were lower than those of LASSO (blue solid lines) when $\eta = 0.1$ and 0.05, but the theoretical RMSEs of CIM L0-RBCS became higher than those of LASSO when $\eta = 0.01$.

We numerically checked that qualitatively the same results were obtained even in the case of source signals from the Gamma (+) and the bilateral Gamma (±) (See Supplementary Fig. 1).

D. Phase diagrams of CIM L0-RBCS and LASSO when $\beta = 0$

We drew phase diagrams of CIM L0-RBCS for various values of the threshold $\eta$ when there was no observation noise (i.e. $\beta = 0$). Figure 5a and Supplementary Fig. 2 show first-order phase transition lines from the near-zero-RMSE state (red lines) in the half-Gaussian case (+) and Gaussian case (±). The phase transition lines in Fig. 5a are for the limit $A_s^2 \to \infty$, while the ones in Supplementary Fig. 2 are for $A_s^2 = 250$.

As demonstrated in Fig. 5a, in the limit $A_s^2 \to \infty$, the phase transition lines from the near-zero-RMSE state in CIM L0-RBCS become asymptotic to the black solid line $a = \alpha$ as $\eta$ decreases, while the RMSEs of the near-zero-RMSE state in CIM L0-RBCS decrease to zero (the red lines in Fig. 4b). Nakanishi et al. showed using statistical mechanics that L0-minimization-based CS (minimize $\|x\|_0$ s.t. $y = Ax$) has a stable solution corresponding to reconstructing $x$ with zero error as long as $a$ is below a critical value $a_c = \alpha$ [44]. The black solid line $a = \alpha$ in Fig. 5a is a critical line indicating a boundary whether or not L0-minimization-based CS can perfectly reconstruct a source signal with no error for both the non-negative case and signed case [44]. Thus, the near-zero-RMSE solutions of CIM L0-RBCS are asymptotic to the perfect reconstruction solution of L0-minimization-based CS as $\eta$ decreases.

To compare the properties of CIM L0-RBCS with those of LASSO, Fig. 5b shows the phase diagrams of LASSO; the blue lines are the first-order phase transition lines from
the near-zero-RMSE state for various $\eta$. As $\eta$ decreases, the phase transition lines from the near-zero-RMSE state in LASSO for the half-Gaussian (+) and Gaussian (±) become asymptotic to the two black dotted lines, while the RMSEs of the near-zero-RMSE state in LASSO decrease to zero (the blue lines in Fig. 4). Donoho et al. showed that L1-minimization-based CS (minimize $\|x\|_1$ s.t. $y = Ax$) can reconstruct a sparse source signal $x$ with zero error as long as $a$ is below a critical value $a_c < \alpha$ [59]. The black dotted lines in Fig. 5 are critical lines indicating a boundary whether or not L1-minimization-based CS can perfectly reconstruct a source signal with no error for the non-negative case and signed case, respectively [59]. Thus, the near-zero-RMSE solutions of LASSO are asymptotic to the perfect reconstruction solution of L1-minimization-based CS as $\eta$ decreases.

CIM L0-RBCS and LASSO have these asymptotic properties even in the case of source signals from the Gamma (+) and bilateral Gamma (±) (see Supplementary Fig. 3b). Note that we have theoretically proved that this asymptotic property of CIM L0-RBCS is invariant to differences in the probability distributions of the source signal by applying a perturbation expansion to the ME (14) in the limit $\eta \to +0$ (see Methods). Thus, we have confirmed this theoretical result numerically.

On the other hand, when $A^2_s = 250$, the first-order phase transition lines of CIM L0-RBCS are not asymptotic to the black solid line $a = \alpha$, as shown in Supplementary Figs. 2 and 3a. Around $\eta = 0.1$, the phase transition line is closest to $a = \alpha$.

The black dotted dashed lines in Fig. 5a shows the lower bounds of the first-order phase transition lines of CIM L0-RBCS in the limit $A^2_s \to \infty$. The lower bound lines are above the critical line (black dotted line) of L1-minimization-based CS when the compression rate $\alpha$ is lower than around than around 0.5/0.7. The lower boundary property in Fig. 5a is satisfied even in the case of source signals from the Gamma (+) and bilateral Gamma (±) (see Supplementary Fig. 3b). On the other hand, there are no such lower bounds when $A^2_s = 250$ (Supplementary Figs. 2 and 3a).

E. Basin of attraction when $\beta = 0$

To check the practicality of CIM L0-RBCS, we verified the basin of attraction of Algorithm 1. To make the basin wider, we heuristically introduced a linear threshold attenuation wherein the threshold $\eta$ was linearly lowered from $\eta_{\text{init}}$ to $\eta_{\text{end}}$ as the minimization process...
was alternated (see Algorithm 1). First, we carried out numerical experiments to verify the size of the basin of attraction for various values of the initial threshold \( \eta_{\text{init}} \) for fixed \( \eta_{\text{end}} = 0.01 \) in the case of no observation noise (i.e. \( \beta = 0 \)). As shown in Fig. 6a, the basin of attraction tended to be widened by selecting a higher initial threshold \( \eta_{\text{init}} \) than \( \eta_{\text{end}} \). As the compression rate \( \alpha \) decreased, this tendency became more marked, especially in the Gaussian case (±).

Next, we sought to confirm how well Algorithm 1 converged on the near-zero RMSE state given by the ME (14) when starting from an initial state \( r = 0 \) for various \( \eta_{\text{init}} \) (Fig. 6b). As demonstrated in Fig. 6b, when the sparseness \( s \) was lower than the lower bound of the first-order phase transition points (the black dotted dashed line in Fig. 5a), Algorithm 1 with \( \eta_{\text{init}} = 0.6 \) converged to the solutions (red lines) of the ME (14), whereas it failed to converge to the solutions for other values of \( \eta_{\text{init}} \). Compared with the RMSE profiles of LASSO in Fig. 6b, Algorithm 1 exceeded LASSO’s estimation accuracy under almost all of the conditions in which LASSO has a small error.

The properties shown in Fig. 6 are satisfied even when the source signals are from the Gamma (+) and bilateral Gamma (±) (see Supplementary Fig. 4).

**F. Performance of CIM L0-RBCS and LASSO when \( \beta \neq 0 \)**

Moreover, to check the practicality of the CIM L0-RBCS, we verified the accuracy and convergence of the CIM L0-RBCS in the presence of observation noise (i.e. \( \beta \neq 0 \)). We searched for the optimal threshold values that would give the minimum RMSEs of CIM L0-RBCS and those of LASSO (Figs. 7a and 8a) and computed the difference between their minimum RMSEs (Figs. 7b and 8b) under the optimal threshold for each method when \( \beta = 0.01, 0.05, \) and \( 0.1 \). The minimum RMSE was obtained by conducting a grid search on the set of solutions to the MEs (14) and (37) in the range \( 0.002 \leq \eta \leq 0.5 \) at each point \((a, \alpha)\). These figures show cases of the half-Gaussian (+) and Gaussian (±) source signals. As indicated in Figs. 7a and 8a, as \( \beta \) decreases, the phase transition lines from the near-zero RMSE state in CIM L0-RBCS under the optimal threshold approaches the critical line (black solid line) of L0-minimization-based CS, and the RMSEs of CIM L0-RBCS under the optimal threshold decreases. As shown in Figs. 7b and 8b, the RMSEs of LASSO are higher than those of CIM L0-RBCS under almost all of the conditions in which LASSO has
an error less than 0.2, and thus, CIM L0-RBCS exceeds LASSO’s estimation accuracy under the optimal threshold for each method.

Next, for the case of observation noise, we determined whether the output of Algorithm 1 with $A^2 = 10^7$ converged on solutions to the ME (14) when starting from the initial state $r = 0$ and $\eta_{init} = 0.6$. As shown in Figs. 7c and 8c, near or at the phase transition points, Algorithm 1 converged to the solutions of the ME (14).

The properties shown in Fig. 7 and 8 were similar for source signals from the Gamma (+) and bilateral Gamma (±) (see Supplementary Figs. 5 and 6).

G. Performance of CIM L0-RBCS on realistic data

Finally, we evaluated the performance of CIM L0-RBCS and other methods on realistic data. We used MRI data obtained from the fastMRI datasets [60]. A Haar-wavelet transform (HWT) was applied to the data, and 79% of the HWT coefficients were set to zero to create a signal spanned by Haar basis functions with a sparseness of 0.21 (left panel of Fig. 9a). A k-space data shown in the middle panel of Fig. 9a was obtained by calculating the discrete Fourier transform (DFT) from the signal of the left panel of Fig. 9a, and 40% of k-space data were undersampled at random red points in the middle panel of Fig. 9a to create an observation signal with a compression rate of 0.4. The right panel of Fig. 9a shows an image with incoherent artifacts obtained by zero-filling Fourier reconstruction from the randomly undersampled k-space data.

To achieve higher reconstruction accuracy from the undersampled signal, we formulated the following implementable optimization problem on CIM with L0 and L2 norms [61]:

$$ x = \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( \frac{1}{2} \| y - SFx \|^2_2 + \frac{1}{2} \| \Delta x \|^2_2 + \lambda \| \Psi x \|_0 \right), $$

(15)

where $x$ is a source signal, $y$ is a k-space undersampling signal, $F$ is a DFT matrix, $S$ is an undersampling matrix, $\Psi$ is a HWT matrix, $\Delta$ is a second derivative matrix, and $\gamma$ and $\lambda$ are regularization parameters. Under the variable transformation $r = \Psi x$, the local field vector and the mutual interaction matrix for CIM L0-RBCS can be set as

$$ h = -Jr \circ H(X) + SF \Psi y, $$

$$ J = \Psi F^T S^T SF \Psi^T + \gamma \Psi \Delta^T \Delta \Psi^T. $$
Furthermore, we evaluated the performance of LASSO minimizing \( \frac{1}{2} \| y - SFx \|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \gamma \| \Delta x \|_2^2 + \lambda \| \Psi x \|_1 \) and that of L1 minimization-based CS minimizing \( \| \Psi x \|_1 + \gamma \| \Delta x \|_2^2 \) s.t. \( y = SFx \).

Figure 9b shows images (and RMSEs) reconstructed from CIM L0-RBCS (left panel of Fig. 9b), LASSO \[41\] (middle panel of Fig. 9b) and L1-minimization-based CS implemented in CVX \[62, 63\] (right panel of Fig. 9b). As indicated in images surrounded by red circles in these panels, CIM L0-RBCS gave the most accurate reconstruction.

We evaluated the RMSEs of the three methods as a function of the threshold \( \eta \). As shown in Fig. 9c, the blue line with error bars is the RMSE of CIM L0-RBCS obtained from ten trials, the red line is the RMSE of LASSO, and the circle is the RMSE of L1 minimization-based CS, which is identical to LASSO in the limit \( \eta \to 0 \), as demonstrated in Fig. 5b. There is an optimal value of \( \eta \) to minimize the RMSEs of both CIM L0-RBCS and LASSO because of a trade-off between detecting small non-zero elements and eliminating incoherent artifacts by thresholding. The RMSE of CIM L0-RBCS was lower than those of the other methods in a wide range of \( \eta \).

III. DISCUSSION

A. Summary and Conclusion

We proposed the quantum-classical hybrid system which uses CIM and CDP alternately to minimize \( r \) and \( \sigma \). To evaluate the performance of CIM L0-RBCS, we derived the W-SDE from the master equation for the density operator of a system consisting of \( N \) OPOs and the measurement-feedback circuit. After that, we obtained the MEs for CIM L0-RBCS from the W-SDE \(18\) and the simultaneous equations \(7\).

As shown in Figs. 4, 7c and 8c and Supplementary Figs. 1, 5c and 6c, we confirmed that the MEs derived here describe steady solutions of Algorithm \(11\) very well regardless of whether observation noise exists in the observed signal \( y \). In particular, the theoretical results in the limit \( A_s^2 \to \infty \) are in good agreement with the results of Algorithm \(11\) with \( A_s^2 = 10^7 \). Because \( A_s^2 = 10^7 \) is on the same order as \( A_s^2 \) in the experimental CIMs \[9, 10\], we expect that the ME \(14\) can be used to evaluate real experimental CIMs.

In the case of no observation noise, we theoretically showed that the performance of
the quantum-classical hybrid system in principle approaches the theoretical limit of L0-minimization-based CS \cite{44} at high pump rates (see Fig. 5a and Supplementary Fig. 3b). From a mathematical perspective, the theoretical limit line $a = \alpha$ means the condition when the rank of a matrix composed of column vectors of an observation matrix corresponding to non-zero elements of the source signal is full. Thus, it is impossible for any system to go beyond this line mathematically. As described above, because the theoretical results in the limit $A^2_s \rightarrow \infty$ are in good agreement with those of Algorithm 1 with $A^2_s = 10^7$, we expect that the theoretical performance limit of real experimental CIMs is close to this ideal limit.

In the case of observation noise, we theoretically showed that the RMSEs of CIM L0-RBCS are lower than those of LASSO for almost all conditions in which LASSO has an error less than 0.2, and thus CIM-L0-RBCS exceeds LASSO’s estimation accuracy under the optimal threshold for each method (see Figs. 7a, 7b, 8a and 8b and Supplementary Figs. 5a, 5b, 6a and 6b).

However, there exists a problem regarding the basin of attraction. As numerically demonstrated in Fig. 6 and Supplementary Figs. 4, when there is no observation noise, Algorithm 1 cannot reach the theoretical performance limit if it starts from the practical initial condition $r = 0$. However, even in such a situation, Algorithm 1 exceeds LASSO’s estimation accuracy until the lower bound of the first phase transition points of CIM L0-RBC (Fig. 6 and Supplementary Fig. 4). On the other hand, when there is observation noise, under the practical initial condition $r = 0$, Algorithm 1 gets very close to or achieves the theoretical performance limits given by the ME (see Figs. 7c and 8c and Supplementary Figs. 5c and 6c).

Finally, we confirmed using realistic data that CIM L0-RBCS gave the most accurate reconstruction compared with LASSO and L1-minimization-based CS (Fig. 9).

Therefore, we can conclude that the performance of the quantum-classical hybrid system in principle approaches the theoretical limit of L0-minimization-based CS at high pump rates, exceeds that of LASSO, and moreover in practical situations exceeds LASSO’s estimation accuracy.

A detailed interpretation and discussion of these results is given below.
B. Effectiveness of CIM in support estimation

In Algorithm 1, the c-amplitude is always initialized as $c = 0$ in the initial stage of the support estimation even when $r$ is initialized to the true signal value, i.e. $x \circ \xi$. In this situation, the solutions of Algorithm 1 match the near-zero-RMSE states of the MEs very well, as demonstrated in Fig. 4 and Supplementary Fig. 1, and hence, the simulated CIM can reconstruct the support vector up to the theoretical limit. Note that the ME in the limit $A_s^2 \to \infty$ (Eq. (14)) is equivalent to a ME obtained from an Ising spin system with zero temperature \[55, 56\]. Therefore, the simulated CIM can reach the ground state to minimize $H$ with respect to $\sigma$ when $r$ is fixed.

C. Correctness of assumptions

To derive the ME (13), we derived an approximate value for $\langle H(c_i) \rangle$ of each OPO pulse by replacing the state variables in the second-order coefficient of the power of the quantum noise with average values of the state variables (see Eq. (19)). As shown in Figs. 4b, 7c and 8c, the ME derived under this approximation has good accuracy at the values of $A_s^2$ used in the actual equipment of the CIM. However, as shown in Fig. 4a, some solutions of the ME did not match the numerical solutions of Algorithm 1 for smaller values of $A_s^2$. Thus, this approximation is possible if the mutual injection field is much larger than the noise in the steady state where the c-amplitude has grown.

D. Basin of attraction and its dependency on threshold

To make the basin of attraction of Algorithm 1 wider, we heuristically introduced a linear threshold attenuation in which the threshold $\eta$ linearly decreases as the alternating minimization proceeds. We confirmed that the basin of attraction widens as a result of lowering $\eta$ from a higher initial threshold $\eta_{init}$ to a lower terminal threshold $\eta_{end}$ (see Fig. 6 and Supplementary Fig. 4).

According to the definition of the injection field for each OPO pulse in Eq. (5), the threshold $\eta$ acts as an external field to give a negative bias for the OPO pulses to take the down state. By initially giving a large negative external field, almost all of the OPO pulses take the $\pi$-phase state, and thus, almost all of the $\{H(X_j)\}_{j=1,\ldots,N}$ take zero in the initial
stage of the alternating minimization process. In the initial stage, the system can easily reach the ground state under a strong negative bias because the phase space, which consists of a small number of up-state OPO pulses, is simple. Then, through the alternating minimization process, the system tracks gradual changes in the ground state due to incremental increases in the number of up-state OPO pulses by gradually sweeping out a negative external field. Finally, the system achieves the ground state at the terminal threshold $\eta_{\text{end}}$. This is the qualitative interpretation of the mechanism of widening the basin of attraction of Algorithm 1 by linearly lowering the threshold.

However, as demonstrated in Fig. 6b, when there is no observation noise, the system failed to converge to the near-zero-RMSE solutions beyond the lower bound line of the first-order phase transition points. We suspect that there might be many quasi steady states at the condition beyond the lower bound line as in the spin-glass phase [64], and thus, the system might become trapped in one of the quasi steady states.

On the other hand, when there is observation noise, as demonstrated in Figs. 7c and 8c, the system converged to the near-zero-RMSE solutions even nearby the phase transition line when it started from the practical initial condition $r = 0$. It was suggested that the symmetries of the system allow for the creation of quasi steady states [65]. We expect that observation noise could break the symmetries for quasi steady states.

### E. Plan to improve CIM L0-RBCS

To achieve the theoretical performance limit when there is no observation noise, we need to construct a full quantum system in which both the support estimation and the signal estimation are implemented on the CIM. We expect that due to the minimum gain principle [7, 50], the full quantum system could overcome the quasi-steady-state problem discussed above.

### IV. METHODS

#### A. Derivation of W-SDE for CIM

As shown in Fig. 2, the pump pulses are injected into the main ring cavity through a second harmonic generation (SHG) crystal. A periodically poled lithium niobate (PPLN)
waveguide is a highly efficient nonlinear medium for optical parametric oscillation. Suppose that the amplitude of the injected pump field into the main cavity is \( \epsilon \) and the parametric coupling constant of the PPLN waveguide between the signal field and the pump field is \( \kappa \). Then, the pumping Hamiltonian is \( \hat{H}_1 = i\hbar \epsilon (\hat{a}_p^\dagger - \hat{a}_p) \) and the parametric interaction Hamiltonian is \( \hat{H}_2 = i\hbar \kappa / 2 (\hat{a}_s^2 \hat{a}_p - \hat{a}_p^2 \hat{a}_s^2) \). Here \( \hat{a}_p \) and \( \hat{a}_s \) are the annihilation operators for the intra-cavity pump and signal fields. If the round-trip time of the ring cavity is correctly adjusted to \( N \) times the pump pulse interval, \( N \) independent and identical OPO pulses can be simultaneously generated inside the cavity. The photon annihilation and creation operators for the \( j \)-th OPO signal pulse are denoted by \( \hat{a}_j \) and \( \hat{a}_j^\dagger \). The intra-cavity pump field and signal field have loss rates \( \gamma_p \) and \( \gamma_s \), respectively. If \( \gamma_p \gg \gamma_s \), the pump field can be eliminated by the slaving principle: the following master equation of the density operator for a solitary \( j \)-th OPO signal pulse is obtained by adiabatic elimination of the pump mode \[66,67\],

\[
\frac{\partial \hat{\rho}_{DOPO}}{\partial t} = -i\hbar \frac{S}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} [\hat{a}_j^\dagger - \hat{a}_j^2, \hat{\rho}_{DOPO}] + \gamma_s \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( 2\hat{a}_j \hat{\rho}_{DOPO} \hat{a}_j^\dagger - \hat{a}_j^\dagger \hat{a}_j \hat{\rho}_{DOPO} - \hat{\rho}_{DOPO} \hat{a}_j^\dagger \hat{a}_j \right) \\
+ \frac{B}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( 2\hat{a}_j^2 \hat{\rho}_{DOPO} \hat{a}_j^\dagger - \hat{a}_j^\dagger \hat{a}_j^2 \hat{\rho}_{DOPO} - \hat{\rho}_{DOPO} \hat{a}_j^\dagger a_j^2 \right),
\]

where \( S = \epsilon \kappa / \gamma_p \) and \( B = \kappa^2 / (2\gamma_p) \) are linear parametric gain coefficient and two photon absorption (or back conversion) rate, respectively. \([\hat{x}, \hat{y}]\) denotes the bosonic commutator.

Next, let us examine the measurement-feedback circuit shown in Fig. 2. The circuit is connected to the main cavity by extraction and injection couplers with reflection coefficients \( R_{ex} = j_{ex} \Delta t \) and \( R_{in} = j_{in} \Delta t \), where \( j_{ex} \) and \( j_{in} \) are coarse-grained out-coupling and in-coupling constants and \( \Delta t \) is the cavity round trip time. Under a condition in which \( B / \gamma_s << 1 \) and the vacuum fluctuations are incident on the open ports of the extraction and injection couplers, the measurement-feedback circuit can be described with the Gaussian quantum model \[68,69\]. The master equation consists of the linear loss term, measurement-induced state reduction term and coherent feedback signal injection term (see Eqs. (12)(13)(14) in ref. \[69\]).

The Fokker-Planck equation is derived by using the Wigner \( W(\alpha) \) representation of the density operator \( \hat{\rho} \) in master equations, and we arrive at the following truncated Wigner
stochastic differential equation (W-SDE) by applying Ito’s rule \[69, 70\],

\[
\frac{d\alpha_i}{dt} = -(\gamma_s + j)\alpha_i + S\alpha_i^* - B|\alpha_i|^2\alpha_i + j_imf_i^{\text{sig}} + \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_s}{2} + \frac{j}{2} + B|\alpha_i|^2}v_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \tag{17}
\]

where \( j = j_{ex} + j_{in} \), \( \alpha_i \) is the complex Wigner amplitude, and \( v_i \) is a c-number noise amplitude satisfying \( \langle v_i(t) \rangle = 0 \), \( \langle v_i^*(t)v_j(t') \rangle = 2\delta_{ij}\delta(t - t') \).

Then, by introducing a saturation parameter \( A_s \) by \( A_s = \sqrt{2\gamma_p(\gamma_s + j)/\kappa^2} \) and applying the following scale transformation: \( \alpha_i / A_s = c_i + is_i \), \( t(\gamma_s + j) = t' \), \( p = S/(\gamma_s + j) \) and \( K_{jm}/A_s(\gamma_s + j) = \tilde{K} \), we obtain

\[
\frac{dc_i}{dt'} = (-1 + p - c_i^2 - s_i^2)c_i + \tilde{K}(F_\chi(h_i) - \eta) + \frac{1}{A_s}\sqrt{c_i^2 + s_i^2 + 1}/2W_{i,1},
\]

\[
\frac{ds_i}{dt'} = (-1 - p - c_i^2 - s_i^2)s_i + \frac{1}{A_s}\sqrt{c_i^2 + s_i^2 + 1}/2W_{i,2}, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \tag{18}
\]

where \( c_i \) and \( s_i \) are the in-phase and quadrature-phase normalized amplitudes of the i-th OPO pulse. The second term of the R.H.S. in the upper equation of Eq. (18) is the optical injection field, which has only in-phase component. \( p \) is the normalized pump rate. \( p = 1 \) corresponds to the oscillation threshold of a solitary OPO without mutual coupling. If \( p \) is above the oscillation threshold (\( p > 1 \)), each of the OPO pulses is either in the 0-phase state or \( \pi \)-phase state. The 0-phase of an OPO pulse is assigned to an Ising spin up-state, while the \( \pi \)-phase is assigned to the down-state. The last terms of both upper and lower equations of Eq. (18) express the vacuum fluctuations injected from external reservoirs and the pump fluctuations coupled into the OPO system via gain saturation. \( W_{i,1} \) and \( W_{i,2} \) are independent real Gaussian noise processes satisfying \( \langle W_{i,k}(t) \rangle = 0 \), \( \langle W_{i,k}(t)W_{j,l}(t') \rangle = \delta_{ij}\delta_{kl}\delta(t - t') \). The saturation parameter \( A_s \) determines the nonlinear increase (abrupt jump) of the photon number at the OPO threshold.

Finally, more general quantum model of MFB-CIM without Gaussian approximation was derived for both discrete time model [71] and continuous time model [72].

**B. Mean-field behavior of OPO pulses**

Here, we derive an approximate value of \( \langle H(c_i) \rangle \) for each OPO pulse [54].

It is difficult to solve Eq. (18) analytically. To obtain a mathematically tractable form, we will replace the state variables in the second-order coefficient of the Kramers-Moyal
expansion (representing the power of the quantum noise) with the average values of these state variables:

\[
\frac{dc_i}{dt'} = (-1 + p - c_i^2 - s_i^2)c_i + \tilde{K}(F_{\chi}(h_i) - \eta) + \frac{1}{A_s} \sqrt{\langle c_i^2 \rangle + \langle s_i^2 \rangle + 1/2W_i1},
\]

\[
\frac{ds_i}{dt'} = (-1 - p - c_i^2 - s_i^2)s_i + \frac{1}{A_s} \sqrt{\langle c_i^2 \rangle + \langle s_i^2 \rangle + 1/2W_i2}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N. \tag{19}
\]

As described in Eq. (12), the local field \(h_i\) can be separated into a pure local field \(\tilde{h}_i\) independent of the self-state \(H(c_i)r_i\) and the ORT \(\Gamma H(c_i)r_i\) \([24, 53]\). From Eq. (7) and \(\langle (A_i^\mu)^2 \rangle = 1\), \(r_i\) is given by

\[
r_i = \begin{cases} 
0 & c_i \leq 0 \\
\frac{\tilde{h}_i}{1 - \Gamma} & c_i > 0 
\end{cases} \tag{20}
\]

In the next subsection, these terms are determined in a self-consistent manner.

Under these conditions, we can derive the following equations to determine the approximate value of \(\langle H(c_i) \rangle\) for each OPO pulse \([54]\).

\[
\langle H(c_i) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dc \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds H(c, s | \tilde{h}_i),
\]

\[
f(c, s | \tilde{h}_i) \propto \exp \left( \frac{2A_s^2}{G_{ci} + G_{si} + 0.5} \left[ (\tilde{h}_i + H(c)\tilde{h}_i\Gamma/(1 - \Gamma)) - \eta \right] - V(c, s) \right),
\]

\[
V(c, s) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - p)c^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1 + p)s^2 + \frac{1}{2}c^2s^2 + \frac{1}{4}c^4 + \frac{1}{4}s^4,
\]

where \(V(c, s)\) is the potential appearing in the CIM-ferromagnetic and the CIM-finite loading Hopfield models \([54]\). \(G_{ci}\) and \(G_{si}\) are parameters for calculating \(\langle H(c_i) \rangle\), which satisfy

\[
G_{ci} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dc \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dsc^2 f(c, s | \tilde{h}_i), \quad G_{si} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dc \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dss^2 f(c, s | \tilde{h}_i). \tag{22}
\]

\(G_{ci}\) and \(G_{si}\) are equal to \(\langle c_i^2 \rangle\) and \(\langle s_i^2 \rangle\), and by giving \(\tilde{h}_i\) and \(\Gamma\), they can be self-consistently determined from the above equation.

C. Derivation of ME for quantum-classical hybrid system

By separating the local field \(h_i\) into the pure local field \(\tilde{h}_i\) and the ORT \(\Gamma H(c_i)r_i\) (Eq. (12)) with SCSNA \([24, 52, 53, 55, 56]\), we can reduce the \(N\)-body system composed of \(N\)
mutually coupled OPO pulses to an effective one-body system. After that, we can derive the ME for the quantum-classical hybrid system for L0-RBCS.

Let us start by introducing the following parameters.

\[ g_{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{j}^{\mu} (G(h_{j}) - \xi_{j} x_{j}) - \sqrt{\alpha/N} n_{\mu}, \]  

(23)

Under the given conditions, the correlation between the elements of the observation matrix \( A_{j}^{\mu} \) and \( G(h_{j}) - \xi_{j} x_{j} \) becomes \( O(1/\sqrt{N}) \) for any \( \mu \) if the system succeeds in reconstructing. Thus, we assume that \( g_{\mu} = O(1/\sqrt{N})(\mu = 1, \cdots, M) \) is satisfied.

Substituting Eq. (23) into Eq. (11) gives

\[ h_{i} = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A_{i}^{\mu} g_{\mu} + r_{i} H(c_{i}), \]  

(24)

where the first term is the cross-talk noise part and the second term is the self-coupling part.

The next step of SCSNA is to evaluate the cross-talk noise part. We derive the dominant term of the correlation between the self-state \( r_{i} H(c_{i}) \) and \( A_{i}^{\mu} \) and split the crosstalk noise part into a Gaussian-noise part independent of the self-state \( r_{i} H(c_{i}) \) and the self-coupling term.

Now let us imagine a variation in \( G(h) \) due to a small perturbation \( dh \) in the local field \( h \):

\[ dG = \frac{\partial G(h)}{\partial h} dh, \]

Then, \( g_{\mu} = O(1/\sqrt{N}) \) of Eq. (23) can be expanded as

\[ g_{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{j}^{\mu} (G^{(\mu)}_{j} - \xi_{j} x_{j}) - \sqrt{\alpha/N} n_{\mu} - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \frac{g_{\mu} U^{(\mu)}}{\alpha}, \]  

(25)

where

\[ G^{(\mu)}_{i} = G(h^{(\mu)}_{i}), \quad U^{(\mu)} = \frac{1}{\alpha N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\partial G(h^{(\mu)}_{j})}{\partial h^{(\mu)}_{j}}, \quad h^{(\mu)}_{i} = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{\nu=1}^{M} A_{i}^{\nu} g_{\nu} + r_{i} H(c_{i}), \]  

(26)

\( U^{(\mu)} \) is a macroscopic parameter called the susceptibility. \( G^{(\mu)}_{i} \) is independent of \( A_{i}^{\mu} \), because \( h^{(\mu)}_{i} \) does not contain \( A_{i}^{\mu} \).

From Eq. (25), we obtain

\[ g_{\mu} = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + aU^{(\mu)}} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{N} n_{\mu} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{j}^{\mu} (G^{(\mu)}_{j} - \xi_{j} x_{j})} \right), \]  

(27)
Substituting Eq. (27) into the crosstalk noise of Eq. (24), we can derive the dominant term of the correlation between the self-state $r_i H(c_i)$ and $A^\mu_i$, and rearrange $h_i$ as follows.

$$h_i = \frac{\alpha x_i \xi_i}{\alpha + aU} + \frac{1}{\alpha + aU} z_i + \Gamma r_i H(c_i),$$

(28)

$$z_i = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A^\mu_i A^\mu_j (\tilde{G}_j - \xi_j x_j) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A^\mu_i n^\mu, \quad \Gamma = \frac{aU}{\alpha + aU}.$$  

(29)

The first term of Eq. (28) is the signal part, the second term is the Gaussian noise independent of the self-state $r_i H(c_i)$, and the third term is the self-coupling part. A comparison of Eq. (12) with Eq. (28) indicates that the ORT is the third term and the pure local field $\tilde{h}_i$ consists of the first and second terms:

$$\tilde{h}_i = \frac{\alpha x_i \xi_i}{\alpha + aU} + \frac{1}{\alpha + aU} z_i.$$  

(30)

$\tilde{G}_i$ and $U$ in Eq. (29) satisfy

$$\tilde{G}_i = \tilde{G}(\tilde{h}_i), \quad U = \frac{1}{aN} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\partial \tilde{G}(\tilde{h}_j)}{\partial \tilde{h}_j} \frac{\partial \tilde{h}_j}{\partial h_j}.$$  

(31)

$\tilde{G}$ is a function of the pure local field $\tilde{h}_i$, into which the ORT is renormalized. $U$ is the susceptibility, expressed as the average sensitivity of $\tilde{G}_i$ to the local field $h_i$ instead of to the pure local field $\tilde{h}_i$ because of the definition of $U^{(\mu)}$. In the thermodynamic limit ($N \to +\infty$), the fluctuations in $G^{(\mu)}_i$ and $U^{(\mu)}$ depending on $\mu$ become negligible, and thus, $G^{(\mu)}_i$ and $U^{(\mu)}$ can be safely replaced with $\tilde{G}_i$ and $U$.

From Eq. (20), $r_i$ is given by

$$r_i = \begin{cases} 
0 & c_i \leq 0 \\
(1 + \frac{a}{\alpha} U) \tilde{h}_i & c_i > 0 \end{cases}.$$  

(32)

Substituting Eq. (32) into Eq. (28), $h_i$ can be rewritten as

$$h_i = \begin{cases} 
\tilde{h}_i & c_i \leq 0 \\
\tilde{h}_i + \frac{a}{\alpha} U \tilde{h}_i = x_i \xi_i + \frac{1}{\alpha} z_i & c_i > 0 \end{cases}.$$  

(33)

Thus, from Eq. (33), $\partial \tilde{h}_j / \partial h_j$ can be obtained as

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{h}_j}{\partial h_j} = \begin{cases} 
1 & c_i \leq 0 \\
\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + aU} & c_i > 0 \end{cases}.$$
The above manipulations reduce the $N$-body system to an effective one-body system depending only on the pure local field $\tilde{h}$.

Next, we self-consistently derive the ME. We evaluate the average and variance of the Gaussian noise $z_i$ in Eq. (29). Because $\tilde{G}_i$ and $U$ are not correlated with $A^\mu_i$, the average and variance are

$$\langle z_i \rangle = 0, \quad \langle z_i^2 \rangle = a\alpha(Q + \langle x^2 \rangle_x - 2R) + \alpha^2 \beta^2.$$  

Here, $R$ and $Q$ are macroscopic parameters called the overlap and the mean square magnetization, respectively.

$$R = \frac{1}{aN} \sum_{j=1}^{N} x_j \xi_j \tilde{G}_j, \quad (34)$$

$$Q = \frac{1}{aN} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \tilde{G}_j^2. \quad (35)$$

In the thermodynamic limit ($N \to +\infty$), the averaging operations over the site index $j$ in Eqs. (31)-(34) can be replaced with the average in Eq. (21) and the average over the Gaussian noise $z$ and over the source signal $\xi \circ x$. Thus, we obtain the MEs (13) and (14).

### D. Perturbation expansion for ME in the limit $A_s \to \infty$ and $\eta \to +0$

By introducing a new macroscopic parameter $W$ defined by $W = Q - 2R$, when there is no observation noise, i.e. $\beta = 0$, we can rewrite the ME in the limit $A_s \to \infty$ as

$$W = \frac{a}{\alpha} \left| S + \langle x^2 \rangle_x \right| \frac{1}{a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Dz z^2 \left\langle \tilde{X}(h_p, h_m) \right\rangle_{x, \xi} - \frac{1}{a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Dz \left\langle x^2 \xi \tilde{X}(h_p, h_m) \right\rangle_{x, \xi} \quad (36)$$

$$\tilde{X}(h_p, h_m) = H \left( F_\chi(h_p) - 2\eta / \left( 1 + 1/F_\chi \left( 1 + \frac{a}{\alpha} U \right) \right) \right).$$

Here, we put $2\eta / \left( 1 + 1/F_\chi \left( 1 + \frac{a}{\alpha} U \right) \right) = \zeta^2$. In the limit $\eta \to +0$, i.e. $\zeta \to 0$, the ME (36) has a solution $W = -\langle x^2 \rangle_x$ corresponding to perfect reconstruction.

We assume that the above ME has the following solution when $\zeta \ll 1$.

$$W = -\langle x^2 \rangle_x + \zeta^2 w.$$  

Substituting this into the ME (36) and expanding around $\zeta = 0$, we obtain the following relation independent of the probability distribution of $x$, $g(x)$, if $g(0)$ and $g'(0)$ are finite.

$$w = \frac{a}{\alpha} |w|.$$  
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This equation suggests that the solution \( w = 0 \), i.e. the perfect reconstruction solution, is stable when \( a < \alpha \), neutral when \( a = \alpha \), and unstable when \( a > \alpha \).

Thus, when there is no observation noise, in the infinite limit of the amplitude of the injected pump field (i.e. \( A_s^2 \to \infty \)) and in the infinitesimal limit of \( \eta \), the phase transition line of the perfect reconstruction solution becomes \( a = \alpha \) independent of \( g(x) \).

E. ME of LASSO

Under the observation model (9), the update rule of the LASSO is given by

\[
Y_i := T_{\chi, \eta}(h_i), \quad i = 1, \cdots, N
\]

\[
h_i = -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\mu=1}^{N} A_t^i A_j^\mu Y_j + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\mu=1}^{N} A_t^i A_j^\mu \xi_j x_j + \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} A_t^i n^\mu,
\]

where \( T_{\chi, \eta}(h_j) \) is a soft-thresholding function with threshold \( \eta \), defined as

\[
T_{+, \eta}(h) = \begin{cases} 
    h - \eta & (h \geq \eta) \\
    0 & (h < \eta)
\end{cases},
\]

\[
T_{\pm, \eta}(h) = \begin{cases} 
    h - \eta & (h \geq \eta) \\
    0 & (-\eta < h < \eta) \\
    h + \eta & (h \leq -\eta)
\end{cases}.
\]

We use two different functions \( T_{+, \eta}(h) \) and \( T_{\pm, \eta}(h) \) depending on the source signal. \( T_{+, \eta}(h) \) is for non-negative source signals, and \( T_{\pm, \eta}(h) \) is for signed source signals.

Following the same recipe of the SCSNA, we obtain the following ME,

\[
R = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Dz \left< x \xi \bar{T}_{\chi, \eta}(\hat{h}) \right>_{x, \xi},
\]

\[
Q = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Dz \left< \bar{T}_{\chi, \eta}(\hat{h})^2 \right>_{x, \xi},
\]

\[
U \sqrt{\beta^2 + \frac{a}{\alpha}(Q + \langle x^2 \rangle_x - 2R)} = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Dz z \left< \bar{T}_{\chi, \eta}(\hat{h}) \right>_{x, \xi},
\]

where the pure local field of the LASSO becomes

\[
\bar{h}_i = \frac{\alpha x \xi}{\alpha + aU} + \frac{1}{\alpha + aU} z.
\]
$\tilde{T}_{\chi, \eta}(\tilde{h})$ is an effective output function, given by

$$\tilde{T}_{+, \eta}(\tilde{h}) = \begin{cases} 
(1 + \frac{\alpha U}{\alpha})(\tilde{h} - \eta) & (\tilde{h} \geq \eta) \\
0 & (\tilde{h} < \eta)
\end{cases},$$

$$\tilde{T}_{\pm, \eta}(\tilde{h}) = \begin{cases} 
(1 + \frac{\alpha U}{\alpha})(\tilde{h} - \eta) & (\tilde{h} \geq \eta) \\
0 & (-\eta < \tilde{h} < \eta) \\
(1 + \frac{\alpha U}{\alpha})(\tilde{h} + \eta) & (\tilde{h} \leq -\eta)
\end{cases}.$$}

$\tilde{T}_{+, \eta}(\tilde{h})$ is for non-negative source signals, and $\tilde{T}_{\pm, \eta}(\tilde{h})$ is for signed source signals.

### F. Root-mean-square error

The numerical experiments used the root-mean-square error (RMSE) as the measure of estimation accuracy. The RMSE of CIM L0-RBCS and LASSO is

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (r_i H(c_i) - x_i \xi_i)^2} = \sqrt{aQ - 2aR + a \langle x^2 \rangle_x},$$

where $R$ and $Q$ are the overlap and mean square magnetization defined above, $a$ is sparseness, and $a \langle x^2 \rangle_x$ is the second moment of the source signal. The RMSE is zero if CIM L0-RBCS / LASSO perfectly reconstructs the source signal.

---


Frontiers in Physics 7 (2019), ISSN 2296-424X.


[57] H. Nishimori, Statistical physics of spin glasses and information processing : an introduction,
International series of monographs on physics (Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York,
2001).

[58] M. Yoshida, T. Uezu, T. Tanaka, and M. Okada, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan 76,
054003 (2007).


[60] J. Zbontar, F. Knoll, A. Sriram, M. J. Muckley, M. Bruno, A. Defazio, M. Parente,
http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.08839

[61] A. Dedieu, M. Lázaro-Gredilla, and D. George, Sample-efficient l0-l2 constrained structure

[62] M. Grant and S. Boyd, in Recent Advances in Learning and Control, edited by V. Blondel,
S. Boyd, and H. Kimura (Springer-Verlag Limited, 2008), Lecture Notes in Control and

[63] M. Grant and S. Boyd, CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version


[69] Y. Inui and Y. Yamamoto, Noise correlation and success probability in coherent ising machines

ISBN 9783642615443 0172-7389 ;, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-61544-3


Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the Japan Science and Technology Agency through its ImPACT program, NTT Research Inc. and the National Science Foundation of the United States of America.

Author contributions

The project was conceived by T.A., K.M., M.O. and Y.Y. The hybrid system was devised by T.A., K.M., M.O. and Y.Y. The manuscript was written by T.A., K.M. and Y.Y. For the analytical results, T.A. and Y.Y. derived the truncated Wigner stochastic differential equation, and T.A., K.M. and M.O. derived the MEs. For the numerical results, T.A. and K.M. performed the simulator implementations.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information

Supplementary information is available for this paper at https://doi.org/XXXXXX/YYYYYYYY.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to T.A.
Algorithm 1 Alternating minimization of CIM-L0-RBCS

Require: $M$-by-$N$ observation matrix: $A$, $M$-dimensional observation signal: $y$

Ensure: $N$-dimensional support vector: $\sigma$, $N$-dimensional signal vector: $r$

1: Initialize $r = r_{\text{init}}$ and $\eta = \eta_{\text{init}}$

2: for $t = 1$ to $50$ do

3: Minimize $H$ with respect to $\sigma$ by CIM:
   
   $\sigma = \text{CIM\_support\_estimation}(r, \eta)$

   # Initialize the c-amplitude as $c = 0$, and numerically integrate the W-SDE while increasing
   normalized pump rate from 0 to 1.5 for five times photon’s lifetime when $A_s^2 = 10^7$ or for two
   hundred times photon’s lifetime when $A_s^2 = 250$.

4: Minimize $H$ with respect to $r$ by CDP:

   $S = \text{diag}(\sigma)$

   $r = (\text{diag}[A^T A] + SA^T AS - \text{diag}[SA^T AS])^{-1} SA^T y$

5: Decrement $\eta$: $\eta = \max(\eta_{\text{init}}(1-t/50), \eta_{\text{end}})$

6: end for

7: return $\sigma$ and $r$

---

FIG. 1: A quantum-classical hybrid system for L0-RBCS. To estimate $N$-dimensional support
vector $\sigma$ and $N$-dimensional signal vector $r$, this system solves the two-fold optimization problem
by alternately performing two minimization processes; a the quantum machine optimizes $\sigma$ to
minimize $H$ with given $r$, and b the classical digital processor optimizes $r$ to minimize $H$ with
given $\sigma$.
Coherent Ising Machine for Support Estimation

FIG. 2: A quantum-classical hybrid system for L0-RBCS consisting of a coherent Ising machine (CIM) for support estimation and b classical digital processor (CDP) for signal estimation. This system is realizes the alternating minimization described in Algorithm 1. Pump pulses are injected into an optical parametric oscillator (OPO) formed in a fiber ring cavity through second harmonic generation (SHG) crystal. A periodically poled lithium niobate (PPLN) waveguide device induces a phase-sensitive degenerate optical parametric amplification of the signal pulses, and each of the OPO pulses take either the 0-phase state (corresponding to the up-spin) or the $\pi$-phase state (corresponding to the down-spin) above the oscillation threshold. Part of each pulse is picked off from the main cavity by the output coupler, and it is measured by optical homodyne detectors. A field programmable gate array (FPGA) calculates the feedback signal which is then provided to the intensity modulator (IM) and phase modulator (PM) to produce the injection field described in Eq. (5) to each of the OPO pulses through the input coupler. $H(X_i)$ is a binarized value, either 0 or 1, of the in-phase amplitude of the $i$-th OPO pulse, which is the support estimate to be transferred to the CDP. The CDP solves the linear simultaneous equation (Eq. (7)), and the solution $r_i$ is transferred to the CIM.
FIG. 3: Four kinds of probability density function used for generating the source signal in the numerical experiments. The half-Gaussian (+) and Gamma (+) are defined over a non-negative random variable. The Gaussian (±) and bilateral Gamma (±) are defined over a signed random variable. The second moments of the half-Gaussian (+) and Gaussian (±) are set to $\langle x^2 \rangle_x = 1$. The shape and scale parameters of Gamma (+) and bilateral Gamma (±) are set to $k = 2$ and $\theta = 0.4$, and the second moments are $\langle x^2 \rangle_x = 0.96$. The figures in the main text show results for source signals generated from half-Gaussian (+) and Gaussian (±), while the supplementary figures show results for source signals from Gamma (+) and bilateral Gamma (±).
FIG. 4: Comparison of solutions of MEs with solutions of Algorithm 1 in cases of no observation noise (i.e. $\beta = 0$) and half-Gaussian (+) and Gaussian (±) source signals. The RMSEs of the solutions are plotted as a function of sparseness $a$ for various thresholds $\eta$ and compression rates $\alpha$.

**a** Comparison of solutions of the ME (13) and those of Algorithm 1 with $A_s^2 = 250$. **b** Comparison of solutions of the ME (14) and those of Algorithm 1 with $A_s^2 = 10^7$. In a and b, the red lines and green lines respectively indicate RMSEs of the near-zero RMSE state and non-zero RMSE state in CIM L0-RBCS, which were obtained with the ME (13) with $A_s^2 = 250$ and the ME (14). The blue lines are RMSEs of the near-zero RMSE state in LASSO, which were obtained with the ME (13) with the same threshold value of $\eta$ indicated above the graphs. The circles and error bars represent mean values and standard deviations of ten trial solutions numerically obtained by Algorithm 1.

To confirm the existence of solutions of Algorithm 1 corresponding to the near-zero RMSE states indicated by the ME, $r$ was initialized to the true signal value, i.e. $x \circ \xi$, and $\eta$ was kept constant by setting $\eta_{\text{init}} = \eta_{\text{end}}$ to the value of $\eta$ indicated above the graphs. For all graphs, $\tilde{K} = 0.25$ and $N = 2000$. 

\[A_s^2 = 250\]
FIG. 5: Phase diagrams of CIM L0-RBCS in the limit $A_s^2 \to \infty$ and LASSO for various $\eta$: cases of no observation noise (i.e. $\beta = 0$) and half-Gaussian (+) and Gaussian ($\pm$) source signals. a Phase diagrams of CIM L0-RBCS. b Phase diagrams of LASSO. In a, the red lines show the first-order phase transition point $a_c$ from the near-zero-RMSE state as a function of $\alpha$. In a, the black dotted-dashed line in each plot indicates the lower bound of the first-order transition points from the near-zero-RMSE state in CIM L0-RBCS. In b, the blue lines show the first-order phase transition point $a_c$ of LASSO as a function of $\alpha$. The black solid line in each plot is a critical line indicating a boundary whether or not L0-minimization-based CS can perfectly reconstruct the source signal with no error for the non-negative case and signed case [44], while the black dotted line is a critical line indicating a boundary whether or not L1-minimization-based CS can perfectly reconstruct the source signal with no error for the non-negative case and signed case [59].
FIG. 6: Basin of attraction of CIM L0-RBCS depending on the initial threshold $\eta_{\text{init}}$: cases of no observation noise (i.e. $\beta = 0$) and half-Gaussian (+) and Gaussian ($\pm$) source signals.  

**a** Final states of Algorithm 1 when starting from various initial states for various $\eta_{\text{init}}$. The pairs of points connected by a line indicate initial and final states for each trial when $\eta_{\text{end}} = 0.01$ and $A_s^2 = 10^7$. 

**b** Final states of Algorithm 1 when starting from an initial state $r = 0$ for various $\eta_{\text{init}}$. The circles and error bars represent mean values and standard deviations of twenty trial solutions numerically obtained by Algorithm 1 with $\eta_{\text{end}} = 0.01$ and $A_s^2 = 10^7$. The red lines show the solutions of the ME (14) with near-zero RMSE when $\eta = 0.01$ and $A_s^2 \rightarrow \infty$, while the blue lines indicate RMSEs of LASSO when $\eta = 0.01$. The black lines present the lower bounds of first-order phase transition points of the CIM L0-RBCS. $\tilde{K} = 0.25$ and $N = 4000$. 
FIG. 7: RMSEs under the optimal threshold when there is observation noise: case of half-Gaussian (+) source signals. The standard deviation of the observation noise was set to $\beta = 0.01, 0.05$ and $0.1$. 

a Comparison of RMSEs of CIM L0-RBCS and those of LASSO under the optimal threshold for each method. The color-scale indicates the minimum RMSE under the optimal threshold at each point $(a, \alpha)$, which was obtained by a grid search for the set of solutions to the MEs (14) and (37) in the range $0.002 \leq \eta \leq 0.5$ at each point $(a, \alpha)$. 

b Difference in minimum RMSE between LASSO and the CIM L0-RBCS under the optimal threshold for each method. The color-scale indicates the minimum RMSE of CIM L0-RBCS subtracted from that of LASSO at each point $(a, \alpha)$. 

c Comparison of solutions of the ME (14) and those of Algorithm 1 with $A_s^2 = 10^7$. The red solid lines show the near-zero RMSE solutions to the ME (14). The circles and error bars represent mean values and standard deviations of ten trial solutions numerically obtained by Algorithm 1 when starting from the initial state $r = 0$. The value of $\eta$ indicated on the right side of the graphs in c is the optimal threshold at $\alpha = 0.5$, which was set as the value of $\eta_{end}$. For all the graphs in c, $\eta_{init} = 0.6$, $\tilde{K} = 0.25$ and $N = 4000$. 
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FIG. 8: RMSEs under the optimal threshold when there is observation noise: case of Gaussian (±) source signals. The standard deviation of the observation noise was set to $\beta = 0.01$, 0.05, and 0.1.

The methods and conditions for obtaining these graphs are the same as in Fig. 7 except for the probability distribution of the source signals. 

a Comparison of RMSEs of CIM L0-RBCS and those of LASSO under the optimal threshold for each method. The color-scale indicates the minimum RMSE under the optimal threshold at each point $(a, \alpha)$.

b Difference in minimum RMSE between LASSO and the CIM L0-RBCS under the optimal threshold for each method. The color-scale indicates the minimum RMSE of CIM L0-RBCS subtracted from that of LASSO at each point $(a, \alpha)$.

c Comparison of solutions of the ME with $A_s^2 = 10^7$ when starting from the initial state $r = 0$. 


FIG. 9: Performance of CIM L0-RBCS and other methods on realistic data.  

a Left: Original image consisting of 64 x 64 pixels, which is spanned by Haar basis functions. The sparseness of original image is 0.21. Middle: k-space data (64 x 64 pixels) obtained with discrete Fourier transform from original image. 40% of k-space data were undersampled at random red points. Thus, the compression rate of observation signal is 0.4. Right: Zero-filling Fourier reconstruction from undersampled k-space data.  

b Reconstructed images with lowest errors and their RMSEs. Left: CIM L0-RBCS. \( \eta_{\text{init}} = \eta_{\text{end}} = 0.009 \). The initial state was given by LASSO. Middle: LASSO. \( \eta = 0.0004 \). Right: L1 minimization-based CS.  

RMSEs as a function of the threshold \( \eta \). Blue line with error bars: CIM L0-RBCS. Ten trials. Red line: LASSO. Circle: L1 minimization-based CS. For all methods, \( \gamma = 0.0001 \).