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Abstract

The plug-and-play priors (PnP) and regularization by denoising (RED) methods have become widely used for solving inverse problems by leveraging pre-trained deep denoisers as image priors. While the empirical imaging performance and the theoretical convergence properties of these algorithms have been widely investigated, their recovery properties have not previously been theoretically analyzed. We address this gap by showing how to establish theoretical recovery guarantees for PnP/RED by assuming that the solution of these methods lies near the fixed-points of a deep neural network. We also present numerical results comparing the recovery performance of PnP/RED in compressive sensing against that of recent compressive sensing algorithms based on generative models. Our numerical results suggest that PnP with a pre-trained artifact removal network provides significantly better results compared to the existing state-of-the-art methods.

1 Introduction

Many imaging problems—such as denoising, inpainting, and super-resolution—can be formulated as an inverse problem involving the recovery of an image $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ from noisy measurements

$$y = Ax^* + e,$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the measurement operator and $e \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the noise. Compressed sensing (CS) \cite{1,2} is a related class of inverse problems that seek to recover a sparse vector $x^*$ from $m < n$ measurements. The sparse recovery is possible under certain assumptions on the measurement matrix, such as the restricted isometry property (RIP) \cite{1} or the restricted eigenvalue condition (REC) \cite{3,4}. While traditional CS recovery relies on sparsity-promoting priors, recent work on compressed sensing using generative models (CSGM) \cite{5} has broadened this perspective to priors specified through pre-trained generative models. CSGM has prompted a large amount of follow-up work on the design and theoretical analysis of algorithms that can leverage generative models as priors for image recovery \cite{6–9}.

Plug-and-play priors (PnP) \cite{10,11} and regularization by denoising (RED) \cite{12} are two methods related to CSGM that can also leverage pre-trained deep models as priors for inverse problems. However, unlike CSGM, the regularization in PnP/RED is not based on restricting the solution to the range of a generative model, but rather on denoising the iterates with an existing additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) removal method. The effectiveness of PnP/RED has been shown in a number of inverse problems \cite{13–18}, which has prompted researchers to investigate the theoretical properties and interpretations of PnP/RED algorithms \cite{19–28}.

Preprint. Under review.
We show that if a measurement matrix satisfies a variant of REC from [5] over the range of a denoiser, then the distance of the PnP solutions to the true \( x^* \) can be explicitly characterized. We also present conditions under which the solutions of both PnP and RED coincide, providing sufficient conditions for the exact recovery of \( x^* \) using both methodologies. Our results highlight that the regularization in PnP/RED is achieved by giving preference to images near the fixed points of pre-trained deep neural networks. Besides new theory, this paper also presents numerical results directly comparing the recovery performance of PnP/RED against the recent algorithms in compressed sensing from random projections and subsampled Fourier measurements. These numerical results lead to new insights highlighting the excellent recovery performance of both PnP and RED, as well as the benefit of using priors specified as pre-trained artifact removal (AR) operators rather than AWGN denoisers.

All proofs and some technical details that have been omitted for space appear in the appendix, which also provides more background and simulations.

2 Background

**Inverse problems.** A common approach to estimate \( x^* \) in (1) is to solve an optimization problem:

\[
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \| y - Ax \|^2_2, \tag{2}
\]

where \( g \) is a data-fidelity term that quantifies consistency with the observed data \( y \) and \( h \) is a regularizer that encodes prior knowledge on \( x \). For example, a widely-used regularizer in inverse problems is the nonsmooth total variation (TV) function \( h(x) = \tau \| Dx \|_1 \), where \( D \) is the gradient operator and \( \tau > 0 \) is the regularization parameter [29–31].

**Compressed sensing using generative models.** Generative priors have recently become popular for solving inverse problems [5], which typically require solving the following optimization problem:

\[
\min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^k} \frac{1}{2} \| y - AW(z) \|^2_2, \tag{3}
\]

where \( W : \mathbb{R}^k \to \text{Im}(W) \) is a pre-trained generative model, such as StyleGAN-2 [32, 33]. The set \( \text{Im}(W) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) is the image set (or the range set) of the generator \( W \). In the past few years, several algorithms have been proposed for solving this optimization problem [6–9], including the recent algorithms PULSE [34] and intermediate layer optimization (TLO) [35] that can recover highly-realistic images. The recovery analysis of CSGM was performed under the assumption that \( A \) satisfies the set-restricted eigenvalue condition (S-REC) [5] over the range of the generative model:

\[
\| Ax - Az \|^2_2 \geq \mu \| x - z \|^2_2 - \eta \quad \forall x, z \in \text{Im}(W), \tag{4}
\]

where \( \mu > 0 \) and \( \eta \geq 0 \). S-REC implies that the pairwise distances between vectors in the range of the generative model must be well preserved in the measurement space. It thus broadens the traditional notions of REC and the restricted isometry property (RIP) in CS beyond sparse vectors [36].

**PnP and RED.** PnP [10, 11] refers to a family of iterative algorithms that are based on replacing the proximal operator \( \text{prox}_h \) of the regularizer \( h \) within a proximal algorithm [37] by a more general denoiser \( D : \mathbb{R}^n \to \text{Im}(D) \), such as BM3D [38] or DnCNN [39]. For example, the widely used proximal gradient method (PGM) [40–43] can be implemented as a PnP algorithm as

\[
x^k = T(x^{k-1}) \quad \text{with} \quad T := D(I - \gamma \nabla g), \tag{5}
\]

where \( g \) is the data-fidelity term in (2), \( I \) denotes the identity mapping, and \( \gamma > 0 \) is the step size. Remarkably, this heuristic of using denoisers not associated with any \( h \) within a proximal algorithm exhibited great empirical success [13–18] and spurred a great deal of theoretical work on PnP [19–27]. In particular, it has been recently shown in [23] that, when the residual of \( D \) is Lipschitz continuous, PnP-PGM converges to a point in the fixed-point set of the operator \( T \) that we denote \( \text{Fix}(T) \).
We present two sets of theoretical results for PnP-PGM (5) using the measurement model (1) and Assumption 2. The measurement operator which establishes a natural conceptual link between those two classes of methods. The main limitation while solving the inverse problem using the available measurements.

The residual is based on our interest in residual deep neural nets that take a noisy or an artifact-corrupted image at the input and produce the corresponding noise or artifacts at the output. The success of residual learning in the context of image restoration is well known [39]. Prior work has also shown that Lipschitz constrained residual networks yield excellent performance without sacrificing stable convergence [23, 24]. Related assumptions have been used in earlier convergence results for PnP [19, 23]. For example, one of the most-widely known PnP convergence results relies on the boundedness of D [19]. The Lipschitz continuity of the residual R has been used in the recent analysis of several PnP algorithms in [23]. Both of these assumptions are relatively easy to implement for deep priors. For example, the boundedness of R can be enforced by simply bounding each output pixel to be within [0, ν] for images in [0, ν] \ R^n for some ν > 0. The α-Lipschitz continuity of R can be enforced by using any of the recent techniques for training Lipschitz constrained deep neural nets [23, 62–64]. Fig. 1 presents an empirical evaluation of the Lipschitz continuity of R used in our simulations.

**Assumption 2.** The measurement operator A ∈ R^{m×n} satisfies the set-restricted eigenvalue condition (S-REC) over Im(D) ⊆ R^n with μ > 0, which can be written as

\[ \|Ax - Az\|_2^2 \geq \mu \|x - z\|_2^2, \quad \forall x, z \in \text{Im}(D). \]  

S-REC in Assumption 2 was adopted from the corresponding assumption for CSGM stated in (4), which establishes a natural conceptual link between those two classes of methods. The main limitation of Assumption 2, which is also present in the traditional RIP/REC assumptions for compressive sensing, lies in the difficulty of verifying it for a given measurement operator A. There has been significant activity in investigating the validity of related conditions for randomized matrices for different classes of signals [4, 65–67], including for those synthesized by generative models [5, 6, 9, 35].
We now present a more general result that relaxes the assumptions in Theorem 1. We first state the PnP recovery in the setting where there is no noise and which implies that PnP-PGM recovers $\mathbf{x}^*$.

Theorem 1.

Run PnP-PGM for $t \geq 1$ iterations under Assumptions 1-2 for the problem (1) with no noise and $\mathbf{x}^* \in \text{Zer}(\mathbf{R})$. Then, the sequence $\mathbf{x}^t$ generated by PnP-PGM satisfies

$$||\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{x}^*||_2 \leq c||\mathbf{x}^{t-1} - \mathbf{x}^*||_2 \leq c^t||\mathbf{x}^0 - \mathbf{x}^*||_2,$$

where $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \text{Im}(\mathbf{D})$ and $c := (1 + \alpha) \max\{1 - \gamma \mu, |1 - \gamma \lambda\}$ with $\lambda := \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A})$.

The proof of the theorem is available in the supplement. Theorem 1 extends the theoretical analysis of the S-REC for some $\mathbf{A}$. In the supplement, we present an empirical evaluation of $\mu$ for the measurement operators used in our experiments by sampling from $\text{Im}(\mathbf{D})$.

Consider the set $\text{Fix}(\mathbf{D}) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x})\}$ of the fixed points of $\mathbf{D}$. Note that $\text{Fix}(\mathbf{D})$ is equivalent to the set $\text{Zer}(\mathbf{R}) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}$ of the zeros of the residual $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}$. Intuitively, $\text{Zer}(\mathbf{R})$ consists of all images that produce no residuals, and therefore can be interpreted as the set of all noise-free images according to the network. Similarly, when $\mathbf{R}$ is trained to predict artifacts in an image, $\text{Zer}(\mathbf{R})$ is the set of images that are artifact-free according to $\mathbf{R}$. In the subsequent analysis, we use the notation $\text{Zer}(\mathbf{R})$, but these results can be equivalently stated using $\text{Fix}(\mathbf{D})$.

We first state the PnP recovery in the setting where there is no noise and $\mathbf{x}^* \in \text{Zer}(\mathbf{R})$.

Theorem 1. Run PnP-PGM for $t \geq 1$ iterations under Assumptions 1-2 for the problem (1) with no noise and $\mathbf{x}^* \in \text{Zer}(\mathbf{R})$. Then, the sequence $\mathbf{x}^t$ generated by PnP-PGM satisfies

$$||\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{x}^*||_2 \leq c||\mathbf{x}^{t-1} - \mathbf{x}^*||_2 \leq c^t||\mathbf{x}^0 - \mathbf{x}^*||_2,$$

where $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \text{Im}(\mathbf{D})$ and $c := (1 + \alpha) \max\{1 - \gamma \mu, |1 - \gamma \lambda\}$ with $\lambda := \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A})$.

The proof of the theorem is available in the supplement. Theorem 1 extends the theoretical analysis of PnP in [23] by showing convergence to the true solution $\mathbf{x}^*$ of (1) instead of the fixed points $\text{Fix}(\mathbf{T})$ of $\mathbf{T}$ in (5). Note that the condition $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \text{Im}(\mathbf{D})$ can be easily enforced by simply passing any initial image through the operator $\mathbf{D}$. As shown in [23], the coefficient $c$ in Theorem 1 is less that one if

$$1 \mu(1 + 1/\alpha) < \gamma < 2 \lambda - 1 \lambda(1 + 1/\alpha),$$

which implies that PnP-PGM recovers $\mathbf{x}^*$ that is the true solution for the inverse problem. Additionally, since all PnP algorithms have the same fixed points [20], our result implies that PnP can exactly recover $\mathbf{x}^*$, which extends the existing theory in the literature that only shows convergence to $\text{Fix}(\mathbf{T})$.

We now present a more general result that relaxes the assumptions in Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. Run PnP-PGM for $t \geq 1$ iterations under Assumptions 1-2 for the problem (1) with $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then, the sequence $\mathbf{x}^t$ generated by PnP-PGM satisfies

$$||\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{x}^*||_2 \leq c ||\mathbf{x}^{t-1} - \mathbf{x}^*||_2 + \varepsilon \leq c^t ||\mathbf{x}^0 - \mathbf{x}^*||_2 + \frac{\varepsilon(1 - c^t)}{(1 - c)},$$

where $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \text{Im}(\mathbf{D})$ and

$$\varepsilon := (1 + c) \left[ (1 + 2\sqrt{\lambda/\mu}) ||\mathbf{x}^* - \text{proj}_{\text{Zer}(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{x}^*)||_2 + 2/\sqrt{\mu} ||\mathbf{e}||_2 + \delta(1 + 1/\alpha) \right]$$

and $c := (1 + \alpha) \max\{1 - \gamma \mu, |1 - \gamma \lambda\}$ with $\lambda := \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A})$. 

We consider two priors for PnP/RED: (i) an AWGN denoiser and (ii) an artifact-removal (AR) denoiser.

We consider two scenarios: (a) CS using random projections and (b) CS for magnetic resonance imaging (CS-MRI). In order to gain a deeper insights into performance under subsampling, we use an idealized noise-free setting; however, we expect similar relative performances under noise. For each scenario, we include comparisons with several well-established methods based on deep learning.

Our final result explicitly relates the solutions of PnP and RED. In order to obtain the result, we need an additional assumption that the denoiser \( D = I - R \) is nonexpansive.

**Assumption 3.** The denoiser \( D \) is nonexpansive

\[
\|D(x) - D(z)\|_2 \leq \|x - z\|_2 \quad \forall x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

This is related but different from Assumption 1 that assumes the residual \( R \) is \( \alpha \)-Lipschitz continuous.

The convergence of SD-RED in (6) to \( \text{Zer}(G) \) can be established for a nonexpansive operator \( D \) [24].

As a reminder, the nonexpansiveness of \( D \) can be enforced during the training of the priors in the same manner as that of the more general Lipschitz continuity. However, the prior in our numerical evaluations is trained to have a contractive residual \( R \) without any explicit constraints on \( D \).

As a reminder, the nonexpansiveness of \( R \) is only a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for the nonexpansiveness of \( D \) [68]. Despite this fact, our empirical evaluation of the Lipschitz constant of \( D \) in Fig. 1 indicates that \( D \) used in our experiments is nonexpansive.

**Theorem 3.** Suppose that Assumptions 1-3 are satisfied and that \( \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \cap \text{Zer}(R) \neq \emptyset \), then PnP and RED have the same set of solutions: \( \text{Fix}(T) = \text{Zer}(G) \).

In summary, our theoretical analysis reveals that the fixed-point convergence of PnP/RED algorithms can be strengthened to provide recovery guarantees when S-REC from CSGM is satisfied. Since PnP/RED algorithms do not require nonconvex projections onto the range of a generative model, they enjoy computational benefits over methods that use generative models as priors. However, the literature on generative models is rich with theoretical bounds and recovery guarantees compared to that of PnP/RED. By showing that a similar analysis can be carried out for PnP/RED, we believe that our work suggests an exciting new direction of research for PnP/RED.

4 Numerical Evaluation

Before presenting our numerical results, it is important to note that PnP and RED are well-known methods and it is not our aim to claim any algorithmic novelty on them. However, comparing PnP/RED to state-of-the-art compressed sensing (CS) algorithms is of interest in the context of our theory. Our goal in this section is thus to both (a) empirically evaluate the recovery performance of PnP/RED and (b) compare their performances relative to widely-used CS algorithms.

We consider two scenarios: (a) CS using random projections and (b) CS for magnetic resonance imaging (CS-MRI). In order to gain a deeper insights into performance under subsampling, we use an idealized noise-free setting; however, we expect similar relative performances under noise. For each scenario, we include comparisons with several well-established methods based on deep learning.

We consider two priors for PnP/RED: (i) an AWGN denoiser and (ii) an artifact-removal (AR) denoiser trained to remove artifacts specific to the PnP iterations. We implement both priors using the...
4.1 Reconstruction of Natural Images from Random Projections

We adopt a simulation setup widely-used in the CS literature, in which non-overlapping 33 × 33 patches of an image are measured using the same \( m \times n \) random Gaussian matrix \( \mathbf{A} \), whose rows have been orthogonalized [58, 72]. The patches are vectorized to \( n = 1089 \)-length vectors \( \mathbf{x}^* \). The training data for the denoiser is generated by adding AWGN to the images from the BSD500 [73] and DIV2K datasets [74]. We pre-train several deep models as denoisers for \( \sigma \in [1, 15] \), using \( \sigma \) intervals of 0.5, and use the denoiser achieving the best PSNR value in each experiment. We use the same set of 91 images as in [72] to train the AR operators that are implemented on individual image patches at a time for the CS ratios \( (m/n) \) of \{10\%, 30\%, 40\%, 50\%\}. In order to overcome the block-artifacts in the recovered images, we implement PnP and RED regularizers over the entire image while still using the per-patch measurement model for \( \nabla g \).

Our first numerical study in Fig. 1 evaluates the Lipschitz continuity of our pre-trained denoisers and the AR operators by following the procedure in [23]. We use the residual \( \mathbf{R} \) and its corresponding operator \( \mathbf{D} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{R} \) and plot the histograms of \( \alpha_1 = \|\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{z})\|_2/\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}\|_2 \) and \( \alpha_2 = \|\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z})\|_2/\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}\|_2 \) over 1160 AWGN corrupted image pairs extracted from BSD68. The

### Table 1: Numerical evaluation of the CS recovery in terms of PSNR (dB) on BSD68 and Set11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>BSD68</th>
<th>Set11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>28.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA [71]</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>26.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReconNet [72]</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>27.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTA-Net [58]</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>28.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTA-Net+ [58]</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>29.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED (denoising)</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>30.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PnP (denoising)</td>
<td>25.06</td>
<td>30.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PnP (AR)</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>31.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maximum value of each histogram is indicated by a vertical bar, providing an empirical bound on the Lipschitz constants. Fig. 1 confirms empirically that both R and D are contractive operators.

Theorem 2 establishes that the sequence of iterates $x^t$ generated by PnP-PGM converges to the true solutions $x^*$ up to an error term. Fig. 2 illustrates the convergence behavior of PnP/RED in terms of $\|x^t - x^*\|_2^2/\|x^*\|_2^2$ and peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR) for CS with subsampling ratio of 30% on Set11. The shaded areas represent the range of values attained across all test images. The results in Fig. 2 are consistent with our general observation that the PnP/RED algorithms converge in all our experiments for both types of priors and achieve excellent recovery performance.

We also report the average PSNR values obtained by five baseline CS algorithms, namely TV [31], SDA [71], ReconNet [72], ISTA-Net [58] and ISTA-Net+ [58]. TV is an iterative methods that does not require training, while the other four are all deep learning-based methods that have publicly available implementations. The numerical results on Set11 and BSD68 with respect to four measurement rates are summarized in Table 1. We observe that the performances of PnP and RED are nearly identical to one another. The result also highlights that PnP using the AR prior provides the best performance1 compared to all the other methods, outperforming PnP using the AWGN denoiser by at least 0.57 dB on BSD68. Fig. 3 (top) shows visual examples for an image from Set11. Note that both PnP and RED yield similar visual recovery performance. The enlarged regions in the image suggest that PnP (AR) better recovers the fine details and sharper edges compared to other methods.

---

1We did not use RED with the AR prior in our experiments since it is expected to closely match PnP.

---

Table 2: Average PSNR values for various CS-MRI methods on test images from [58].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>CS Ratio</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>38.41</td>
<td>40.43</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMM-Net [57]</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>39.84</td>
<td>41.56</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTA-Net+ [58]</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>38.70</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>42.65</td>
<td>44.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED (denoising)</td>
<td>34.37</td>
<td>38.63</td>
<td>40.94</td>
<td>42.62</td>
<td>44.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PnP (denoising)</td>
<td>35.46</td>
<td>38.74</td>
<td>41.06</td>
<td>42.73</td>
<td>44.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PnP (AR)</td>
<td>35.21</td>
<td>39.05</td>
<td>41.28</td>
<td>42.96</td>
<td>44.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 3: Visual evaluation of various compressive sensing algorithms at 10% sampling on two imaging problems: (top) reconstruction of Butterfly from Set11; (bottom) reconstruction of a brain MR image from its radial Fourier measurements. The pink box in the bottom image provides the error residual that was amplified by $10\times$ for better visualization. Note the similar performance of PnP and RED, as well as the competitiveness of both relative to other methods. Additionally, note the improvement due to the usage of an AR prior instead of an AWGN denoiser within PnP.
Figure 4: Visual evaluation of PnP/RED and two methods using generative models as priors on the CelebA HQ [77] dataset at 10% CS sampling. Note the visual and quantitative similarity of PnP and RED when both are using AWGN denoisers. PnP using an artifact-removal (AR) prior visually matches the performance of ILO based on StyleGAN2, which highlights the benefit of using pre-trained AR operators within PnP. Best viewed by zooming in the display.

Table 3: Average PSNR (dB) values for several algorithms on test images from CelebA HQ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>CS Ratio</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>35.24</td>
<td>37.41</td>
<td>39.35</td>
<td>41.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PULSE [34]</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>29.98</td>
<td>33.06</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>34.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO [35]</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td>40.98</td>
<td>43.46</td>
<td>47.89</td>
<td>48.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED (denoising)</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.46</td>
<td>41.59</td>
<td>45.65</td>
<td>48.13</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PnP (denoising)</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.61</td>
<td>41.51</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>48.05</td>
<td>52.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PnP (AR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.19</td>
<td>44.20</td>
<td>48.66</td>
<td>51.32</td>
<td>53.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Image reconstruction in Compressed Sensing MRI

MRI is a widely-used medical imaging technology that has known limitations due to the slow speed of data acquisition. CS-MRI [75, 76] seeks to recover an image $x^*$ from its sparsely-sampled Fourier measurements. We simulate a single-coil CS-MRI using radial Fourier sampling. The measurement operator $A$ is thus $A = PF$, where $P$ is the diagonal sampling matrix and $F$ is the Fourier transform.

The priors for PnP/RED were trained using the brain dataset from [58], where the test set contains 50 slices of $256 \times 256$ images (i.e., $n = 65536$). We train seven variants of DnCNN, each using a separate noise level from $\sigma \in \{1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 4, 5\}$. Similarly, we separately train the AR operators for different CS ratios ($m/n$), initializing the weights of the models from the pre-trained denoiser with $\sigma = 2$. For these sets of experiments, we also equipped PnP/RED with Nesterov acceleration [79] for faster convergence. We compare PnP/RED against publicly available implementations of several well-known methods, including TV [31], ADMM-Net [57], and ISTA-Net+ [58]. The last two are deep unrolling methods that train both image transforms and shrinkage functions within the algorithm.

Table 2 reports the results for five CS ratios. The visual comparison can be found in Fig. 3 (bottom). It can been seen that PnP/RED with an AWGN denoiser matches the performance of ISTA-Net+ and outperforms ADMM-Net at higher sampling ratios, while PnP with an AR prior improves over PnP/RED with an AWGN denoiser [78]. Note also the similarity of PnP and RED performances.

4.3 Comparison with generative models on human faces

We numerically evaluated the recovery performance of PnP/RED in CS against two recent algorithms using generative models: PULSE [34] and ILO [35]. Similar to the measurement matrix used for grayscale images, we use orthogonalized random Gaussian matrices for sampling image blocks of size $33 \times 33 \times 3$. The test images correspond to 15 images randomly selected from CelebA HQ [77].
dataset, each of size $1024 \times 1024$ pixels. We use the DIV2K [74] and 200 high quality face images from FFHQ dataset [32] to train the PnP/RED denoisers for color image denoising at six noise levels corresponding to $\sigma \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10\}$. We use the same training set to train the AR operators for CS ratios of $[10\%, 50\%]$, using the ratio intervals of 10%. Similar to CS-MRI, we equipped PnP/RED with Nesterov acceleration. The PSNR comparison between different methods is presented in Table 3. It can be seen that ILO outperforms PULSE in terms of PSNR, which is consistent with the results in [35]. Note also how PnP/RED match or sometimes quantitatively outperform ILO at high CS ratios, with PnP (AR) leading to significantly better results compared to PnP (denoising). Fig. 4 provides visual reconstruction examples. Note the ILO images are sharper compared to PnP/RED with denoisers because ILO uses a state-of-the-art generative model specifically trained on face images. However, PnP (AR) achieves better PSNR and a similar visual quality as ILO.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

The main goal of this work is to address the theoretical gap between two-widely used classes of methods for solving inverse problems, namely PnP/RED and CSGM [5]. Motivated by the theoretical analysis of CSGM, we used S-REC to establish recovery guarantees for PnP/RED. Our theoretical results provide a new type of convergence for PnP-PGM that goes beyond a simple fixed-point convergence by showing convergence relative to the true solution. Additionally, we show the full equivalence of PnP and RED under some explicit conditions on the inverse problem. While the focus of this work is mainly theoretical, we presented several numerical evaluations that can provide additional insights into PnP/RED and their performance relative to standard methods used in compressed sensing. Empirically, we observed the similarity of PnP/RED in image reconstruction from subsampled random projections and Fourier transform. We also provided additional evidence on the suboptimality of AWGN denoisers compared to artifact-removal operators that take into account the actual artifacts within PnP iterates.

The work presented in this paper has a certain number of limitations and possible directions for improvement. The main limitation of our theoretical analysis is in the difficulty of theoretically verifying S-REC for a given measurement operator. This limitation goes beyond our work and is at the core of compressive sensing research. One can also consider the Lipschitz assumptions on $R/D$ as a limitation, since those can have a negative impact on the recovery. However, our results suggest that even with Lipschitz constrained priors, PnP/RED are competitive with widely-known CS algorithms. While PnP/RED can be implemented using non-Lipschitz-constrained priors, we expect that this will reduce their stability and ultimately hurt their recovery performances. A relatively minor limitation of our simulations is that they were performed without AWGN. One can easily re-run the algorithms by including AWGN and we expect that the relative performances will be preserved for a reasonable amount of noise. We hope that this work will inspire further theoretical and algorithmic research on PnP/RED that will lead to extensions and improvements to our results.

6 Broader impact

This work is expected to impact the area of imaging inverse problems with potential applications to computational microscopy, computerized tomography, medical imaging, and image restoration. There is a growing need in imaging to deal with noisy and incomplete measurements by integrating multiple information sources, including physical information describing the imaging instrument and learned information characterizing the statistical distribution of the desired image. The ability to accurately solve inverse problems has the potential to enable new technological advances for imaging. These advances might lead to new imaging tools for diagnosing health conditions, understanding biological processes, or inferring properties of complex materials. Traditionally, imaging relied on linear models and fixed transforms (filtered back projection, wavelet transform) that are relatively straightforward to understand. Learning based methods, including PnP and RED, have the potential to enable new technological capabilities; yet, they also come with a downside of being much more complex. Their usage might thus lead to unexpected outcomes and surprising results when used by non-experts. While we aim to use our method to enable positive contributions to humanity, one can also imagine nonethical usage of imaging technology. This work focuses on understanding theoretical properties of imaging algorithms using learned priors, but it might be adopted within broader data science, which might lead to broader impacts that we have not anticipated.
Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

Research presented in this article was supported by NSF awards CCF-1813910, CCF-2043134, and CCF-2046293 and by the Laboratory Directed Research and Development program of Los Alamos National Laboratory under project number 20200061DR.

References


Supplementary Material

The mathematical analysis presented in this supplementary document builds on two distinct lines of work: (a) monotone operator theory [68, 80] and (b) compressive sensing using generative models (CSGM) [5]. In Section A, we build on past work to prove the convergence of PnP-PGM to the true solution of the inverse problem in the absence of noise. In Section B, we extend the result in Section A to \( x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( e \in \mathbb{R}^m \) (i.e., when the signal can be arbitrary and measurements can have noise). In Section C, we show that PnP/RED can have the same set of solutions under some specific conditions. In Section D, we provide background material useful for our theoretical analysis. Finally, in Section E, we provide additional technical details on our implementations and simulations omitted from the main paper due to space.

The algorithmic details of PnP-PGM and SD-RED are summarized in Fig. 5. It is important to note that it is not our intent to claim any algorithmic novelty in PnP/RED, which are well-known methods. However, there is a strong interest in understanding the theoretical properties of PnP/RED in terms of both recovery and convergence. The main contribution of this work is the development of new theoretical insights into the recovery and convergence of PnP/RED. Finally, our code, including pre-trained denoisers and AR operators, is also included in the supplementary material.

We follow the same notation in the supplement as in the main manuscript. The measurement model corresponds to \( y = Ax^* + e \), where \( x^* \) is the true solution and \( e \) is the noise. The function \( g(x) = \frac{1}{2} \| y - Ax \|_2^2 \) denotes the data-fidelity term. The operator \( D \) denotes the PnP/RED prior, which is implemented via its residual \( R := I - D \). The operator \( T := D(1 - \gamma \nabla g) \) denotes the PnP update and \( G := \nabla g + \tau R \) denotes the term used to compute RED updates.

A Proof of Theorem 1

In this section, we prove the first of the main theoretical result in this work, namely the convergence of PnP-PGM to the true solution of the problem \( y = Ax^* \) when \( x^* \in \text{Zer}(R) \). Our analysis extends the existing convergence analysis of PnP-PGM from [23], which proved a linear convergence of the algorithm to \( \text{Fix}(T) \). Here we extend [23] by using the fact that \( x^* \in \text{Zer}(R) \cap \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \) and relaxing the assumption of strong convexity in [23] to S-REC over \( \text{Im}(D) \).

Suppose all the assumptions for Theorem 1 are true and the step size \( \gamma > 0 \) is selected in a way that satisfies eq. (10) in the main paper. First note that we have assumed that \( x^0 \in \text{Im}(D) \) and we have

\[
x^t = T(x^{t-1}) = D(x^{t-1} - \gamma \nabla g(x^{t-1})) \in \text{Im}(D),
\]

which implies that all the PnP-PGM iterates \( \{x^t\} \) are in \( \text{Im}(D) \).

Note also the following equivalences

\[
\text{Zer}(\nabla g) = \text{Fix}(1 - \gamma \nabla g) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \nabla g(x) = 0 \} = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax = y \} \tag{13a}
\]
\[
\text{Zer}(R) = \text{Fix}(D) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : R(x) = 0 \}, \tag{13b}
\]

where the first equality in (13a) is due to the following equivalence true for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( \gamma > 0 \)

\[
\nabla g(x) = 0 \quad \iff \quad x - \gamma \nabla g(x) = x.
\]

From the assumption \( y = Ax^* \) with \( x^* \in \text{Zer}(R) \) and from (13), we have the following inclusions:

\[
x^* \in \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \cap \text{Zer}(R) \subseteq \text{Fix}(T) \subseteq \text{Im}(D) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

From Lemma 3 and Lemma 6, we conclude that for any \( x, z \in \text{Im}(D) \), we have

\[
\| T(x) - T(z) \|_2 \leq c \| x - z \|_2 \quad \text{with} \quad c = (1 + \alpha) \max \{ 1 - \gamma \mu, 1 - \gamma \lambda \}.
\]

From \( T \) being a contraction over \( \text{Im}(D) \) and with Lemma 4, we can conclude that \( x^* \in \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \cap \text{Zer}(R) \) is the unique fixed point of PnP-PGM for any \( x^0 \in \text{Im}(D) \). Thus, we have that

\[
\| x^t - x^* \|_2 = \| T(x^{t-1}) - T(x^*) \|_2 \leq c \| x^{t-1} - x^* \|_2 \leq \cdots \leq c^t \| x^0 - x^* \|_2,
\]

which establishes the desired result.
Figure 5: Algorithmic details of two optimization methods used in this work: (a) PnP-PGM and (b) SD-RED. Both algorithms are initialized with $x^0$ and perform $t \geq 1$ iterations.

**B Proof of Theorem 2**

In this section, we extend the analysis in Section A to the noisy measurement model $y = Ax^* + e$ where $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $e \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The following analysis builds on that of CSGM in [5] by showing that the proof techniques used for CSGM can be also used for analyzing PnP. Note also that one can improve the error term in the recovery under an additional assumption discussed in Section B.1.

Suppose all the assumptions for Theorem 2 are true and the step size $\gamma > 0$ is selected in a way that satisfies eq. (10) of the main manuscript. First note that Lemma 3 and Lemma 6 imply that for $\bar{x} \in \text{Fix}(T)$, we have that

$$
\|x^t - \bar{x}\|_2 \leq c \|x^{t-1} - \bar{x}\|_2 \quad \text{with} \quad c = (1 + \alpha) \max\{|1 - \gamma \mu|, |1 - \gamma \lambda|\} \in (0, 1).
$$

(14)

Let $\hat{x} = \text{proj}_{\text{Zer}(R)}(x^*)$, then we have that

$$
\|\bar{x} - \hat{x}\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \left[ \|y - Ax\|_2 + \|y - A\hat{x}\|_2 \right]
\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \left[ \min_{x \in \text{Zer}(R)} \|y - Ax\|_2 + \sqrt{\mu} \delta(1 + 1/\alpha) + \|y - A\hat{x}\|_2 \right]
\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\mu}} \|y - A\hat{x}\|_2 + \delta(1 + 1/\alpha)
\leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\mu}} \|x^* - \hat{x}\|_2 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{\mu}} \|e\|_2 + \delta(1 + 1/\alpha),
$$

where the first inequality uses S-REC, the second one uses Lemma 1 in Section B.1, the third one combines two terms by picking the larger one, and the final one uses the measurement model and the triangular inequality. By using the inequality above, we can obtain the bound

$$
\|\bar{x} - x^*\|_2 \leq \left[ 1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\mu}} \right] \|x^* - \text{prox}_{\text{Zer}(R)}(x^*)\|_2 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{\mu}} \|e\|_2 + \delta(1 + 1/\alpha) := \varepsilon/(1 + c).
$$

Note that the first two terms of $\varepsilon/(1 + c)$ above are the distance of $x^*$ to $\text{Zer}(R)$ and the magnitude of the error $e$, and have direct analogs in standard compressed sensing. The third term is the consequence of the possibility for the solution of PnP not being in $\text{Zer}(R)$ and as discussed in Section B.1 when $\text{Zer}(R) \cap \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \neq \emptyset$, then the third term disappears.

Then, from (14), we obtain

$$
\|x^t - x^*\|_2 \leq \|x^t - \bar{x}\|_2 + \|\bar{x} - x^*\|_2 = \|x^t - \bar{x}\|_2 + \epsilon/(c + 1)
\leq c\|x^{t-1} - \bar{x}\|_2 + \epsilon/(c + 1) = c\|x^{t-1} - x^*\|_2 + \epsilon/c + \epsilon/(c + 1) + \epsilon/(c + 1)
\leq c\|x^{t-1} - x^*\|_2 + \epsilon \leq c^t\|x^0 - x^*\|_2 + \epsilon \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} c^k
\leq c\|x^0 - x^*\|_2 + \epsilon(1 - c^t)/(1 - c),
$$

which establishes the desired result.
B.1 A Technical Lemma for the Proof of Theorem 2

The following lemma provides a bound used for Theorem 2. As discussed within the proof, if $\text{Zer}(R) \cap \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \neq \emptyset$, the error term on the right of Lemma 1 can be removed by using Lemma 4. While this would lead to a tighter overall bound for Theorem 2, it would also reduce its generality. Fig. 7 empirically shows that the sequence $\|R(x^t)\|_2$ obtained by PnP-PGM in our simulations converges to a small value, suggesting that the solution obtained by the algorithm is near $\text{Zer}(R)$.

Lemma 1. Under the assumptions of Theorem 2 in the main manuscript, we have

$$\|y - Ax\|_2 \leq \min_{x \in \text{Zer}(R)} \|y - Ax\|_2 + \sqrt{\mu} \delta (1 + 1/\alpha).$$

If in addition, we know that $\text{Zer}(R) \cap \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \neq \emptyset$, then

$$\|y - Ax\|_2 \leq \min_{x \in \text{Zer}(R)} \|y - Ax\|_2.$$

Proof. First note that by re-expressing the fixed point equation of PnP-PGM, we obtain

$$x = D(x - \nabla g(x))$$

$$\Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
x = x - \gamma \nabla g(x) \\
x = x - (x - D(x)) = x - R(x)
\end{array} \right. \Rightarrow \nabla g(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma} R(x) = 0,$$

where the final result is obtained by adding the two equalities on the left. Since $g$ satisfies S-REC over $\text{Im}(D)$, Lemma 5 in Section D.2 implies that for any $x \in \text{Im}(D)$ and $\bar{x} \in \text{Fix}(T)$

$$g(x) \geq g(\bar{x}) + \nabla g(\bar{x})^T (x - \bar{x}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2_2$$

$$= g(\bar{x}) - (1/\gamma) R(\nabla g(x))^T (x - \bar{x}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2_2$$

$$\geq \min_{x \in \text{Im}(D)} \left\{ g(\bar{x}) - (1/\gamma) R(\nabla g(x))^T (x - \bar{x}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2_2 \right\}$$

$$\geq \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ g(x) - (1/\gamma) R(\nabla g(x))^T (x - \bar{x}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2_2 \right\}$$

$$\geq g(\bar{x}) - \frac{1}{2 \mu \gamma^2} \|R(x)\|^2_2,$$

where $\bar{x} = x - \gamma \nabla g(x)$. By rearranging the terms and minimizing over $x \in \text{Im}(D)$, we obtain

$$g(\bar{x}) \leq \min_{x \in \text{Zer}(R)} g(x) + \frac{1}{2 \mu \gamma^2} \|R(\nabla g(x))\|^2_2 \leq \min_{x \in \text{Zer}(R)} g(x) + \frac{\delta^2}{2 \mu \gamma^2}; \tag{15}$$

where in the last inequality we used the boundedness of $R$.

By using the actual expression of $g$ and the lower-bound on $\gamma$ in eq. (10) in the main paper, we obtain

$$1/\gamma < \mu (1 + 1/\alpha)$$

$$\Rightarrow \|y - Ax\|_2 \leq \min_{x \in \text{Zer}(R)} \|y - Ax\|_2 + \delta/(\sqrt{\mu} \gamma) \leq \min_{x \in \text{Zer}(R)} \|y - Ax\|_2 + \delta \sqrt{\mu} (1 + 1/\alpha).$$

If we assume that $\text{Zer}(R) \cap \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \neq \emptyset$, then from Lemma 4, we have $\bar{x} \in \text{Zer}(R) \cap \text{Zer}(\nabla g)$, which implies that $\bar{x} = x$ and $R(\nabla g) = R(\bar{x}) = 0$. In this case, we can eliminate the error term in (15)

$$g(\bar{x}) \leq \min_{x \in \text{Zer}(R)} g(x).$$

\[\square\]

C Proof of Theorem 3

The SD-RED algorithm in eq. (6) of the main manuscript seeks zeroes of the operator

$$G = \nabla g + \tau R.$$
It is clear that
\[ \nabla g(z) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad R(z) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad G(z) = 0 , \]
which corresponds to the inclusion \( \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \cap \text{Zer}(R) \subseteq \text{Zer}(G) \).

We now prove the reverse inclusion under the assumptions of Theorem 3. Let \( x \in \text{Zer}(G) \) and \( z \in \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \cap \text{Zer}(R) \). Since \( \nabla g \) is \( \lambda \)-Lipschitz continuous with \( \lambda = \lambda_{\max}(A^T A) \), Lemma 7 in Section D.2 implies that \( \nabla g \) is also \((1/\lambda)\)-cocoercive. Therefore, we have that
\[ \nabla g(x)^T (x - z) = (\nabla g(x) - \nabla g(z))^T (x - z) \geq (1/\lambda)\|\nabla g(x) - \nabla g(z)\|^2 = (1/\lambda)\|\nabla g(x)\|^2 . \]
On the other hand, since \( D \) is nonexpansive, \( R = I - D \) is \((1/2)\)-cocoercive, which implies that
\[ R(x)^T (x - z) = (R(x) - R(z))^T (x - z) \geq (1/2)\|R(x) - R(z)\|^2 = (1/2)\|R(x)\|^2 . \]
By using the fact that \( G(x) = 0 \) and the two inequalities above, we obtain
\[ 0 = G(x)^T (x - z) = \nabla g(x)^T (x - z) + \tau R(x)^T (x - z) \geq (1/\lambda)\|\nabla g(x)\|^2 + (1/2)\|R(x)\|^2 , \]
which directly leads to the conclusion
\[ G(x) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \nabla g(x) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad R(x) = 0 . \]
Therefore, we have that \( \text{Zer}(G) = \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \cap \text{Zer}(R) \).

Note also that from Lemma 3, we know that when \( \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \cap \text{Zer}(R) \neq \emptyset \), we have \( \text{Fix}(T) = \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \cap \text{Zer}(R) \), which directly leads to our result
\[ \text{Zer}(G) = \text{Zer}(\nabla g) \cap \text{Zer}(R) = \text{Fix}(T) . \]

### D Background Material

The results in these sections are well-known and can be found in different forms in standard textbooks [68, 79, 81, 82]. For completeness, we summarize the key results used in our analysis.

#### D.1 Properties of Monotone Operators

**Definition 1.** An operator \( T \) is Lipschitz continuous with constant \( \lambda > 0 \) if
\[ \|T(x) - T(z)\|_2 \leq \lambda \|x - z\|_2 \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n . \]
When \( \lambda = 1 \), we say that \( T \) is nonexpansive. When \( \lambda < 1 \), we say that \( T \) is a contraction.

**Definition 2.** \( T \) is monotone if
\[ (T(x) - T(z))^T (x - z) \geq 0 \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n . \]
We say that \( T \) is strongly monotone with parameter \( \theta > 0 \) if
\[ (T(x) - T(z))^T (x - z) \geq \theta \|x - z\|^2 \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n . \]

**Definition 3.** \( T \) is cocoercive with constant \( \beta > 0 \) if
\[ (T(x) - T(z))^T (x - z) \geq \beta \|T(x) - T(z)\|^2 \quad \forall x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n . \]
When \( \beta = 1 \), we say that \( T \) is firmly nonexpansive.

**Definition 4.** For a constant \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \), we say that \( T \) is \( \alpha \)-averaged, if there exists a nonexpansive operator \( N \) such that \( T = (1 - \alpha)I + \alpha N \).

The following lemma is derived from the definitions above.

**Lemma 2.** Consider \( R = I - D \) where \( D : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \). Then,
\[ D \text{ is nonexpansive} \quad \iff \quad R \text{ is (1/2)-cocoercive} . \]
We also have that

\begin{equation}
\frac{1}{2} \| R(x) - R(z) \|_2^2 \leq (R(x) - R(z))^T h = \| h \|_2^2 - (D(x) - D(z))^T h.
\end{equation}

We also have that

\begin{equation}
\frac{1}{2} \| R(x) - R(z) \|_2^2 = \frac{1}{2} \| h \|_2^2 - (D(x) - D(z))^T h + \frac{1}{2} \| D(x) - D(z) \|_2^2.
\end{equation}

By combining these two and simplifying the expression

\[ \| D(x) - D(z) \|_2 \leq \| h \|_2. \]

The converse can be proved by following this logic in reverse. \(\square\)

The following lemma relates the Lipschitz continuity of the residual \( S = I - T \) to that of \( T \).

**Lemma 3.** The operator \( R = I - D \) is \( \alpha \)-Lipschitz continuous if and only if the operator \((1/(1 + \alpha))D\) is nonexpansive and \( \alpha/(1 + \alpha) \)-averaged.

**Proof.** See Lemma 9 in [23]. \(\square\)

The following lemma considers fixed points of a composite operator.

**Lemma 4.** Let \( T = D \cdot S \) with \( \text{Fix}(D) \cap \text{Fix}(S) \neq \emptyset \) be a contraction with constant \( \lambda \in (0, 1) \) over the set \( \text{Im}(D) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \). Then, we have that \( \text{Fix}(T) = \text{Fix}(D) \cap \text{Fix}(S) \).

**Proof.** We modify the proof of Proposition 4.49 from [68] to be consistent with our assumptions.

It is clear that \( \text{Fix}(D) \cap \text{Fix}(S) \subseteq \text{Fix}(T) \) and our goal is to show the reverse inclusion. Let \( x \in \text{Fix}(T) \) and consider three cases.

- **Case** \( S(x) \in \text{Fix}(D) \): We have that
  \[ S(x) = D(S(x)) = T(x) = x \in \text{Fix}(D) \cap \text{Fix}(S). \]

- **Case** \( x \in \text{Fix}(S) \): We have that
  \[ D(x) = D(S(x)) = T(x) = x \in \text{Fix}(D) \cap \text{Fix}(S). \]

- **Case** \( S(x) \notin \text{Fix}(D) \) and \( x \notin \text{Fix}(S) \): Since \( T = D \cdot S \) is a contraction over \( \text{Im}(D) \)
  \[ \| x - z \|_2 = \| T(x) - T(z) \|_2 \leq \lambda \| x - z \|_2 \quad \forall z \in \text{Fix}(D) \cap \text{Fix}(S), \]
  which is impossible. \(\square\)
D.2 Convexity, restricted strong convexity, and set-restricted eigenvalue condition

S-REC in the main manuscript can be generalized to the restricted strong convexity (RSC) assumption, which is widely-used in the nonconvex analysis of the gradient methods (see Section 3.2 in [83]).

**Definition 5.** A continuously differentiable function $g$ is said to satisfy restricted strong convexity (RSC) over $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mu > 0$ if

$$
    g(z) \geq g(x) + \nabla g(x)^T (z - x) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|z - x\|^2_2 \quad \forall x, z \in \mathcal{X}.
$$

In fact, for $g(x) = \frac{1}{2} \|y - Ax\|^2_2$, S-REC is equivalent to RSC in Definition 5.

**Lemma 5.** Let $g(x) = \frac{1}{2} \|y - Ax\|^2_2$ and consider $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Then,$
    g$ satisfies S-REC with $\mu$ over $\mathcal{X} \iff g$ satisfies $\mu$-RSC over $\mathcal{X}$.

*Proof.* Suppose $g$ is the least-squares function that satisfies S-REC with $\mu$, then for any $x, z \in \mathcal{X}$

$$
    g(z) \geq g(x) + \nabla g(x)^T (z - x) + \frac{1}{2} \|z - x\|^2_2 = g(x) + \nabla g(x)^T (z - x) + \frac{1}{2} \|A(z - x)\|^2_2 \geq g(x) + \nabla g(x)^T (z - x) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|z - x\|^2_2,
$$

which implies that $g$ satisfies $\mu$-RSC. To show S-REC using $\mu$-RSC, follow the logic in reverse. □

One can use the previous and the following lemma to show that the gradient step of PnP-PGM can be a contraction for any vector in $\text{Im}(D)$ for a properly chosen step size.

**Lemma 6.** Assume $g$ satisfies $\mu$-RSC over $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\nabla g$ is $\lambda$-Lipschitz continuous. Then,

$$
    \|(1 - \gamma \nabla g)(x) - (1 - \gamma \nabla g)(z)\|_2 \leq \max\{|1 - \gamma \mu|, |1 - \gamma \lambda|\} \|x - z\|_2 \quad \forall x, z \in \mathcal{X}.
$$

*Proof.* Since for any $x, z \in \mathcal{X}$, the function $g$ is strongly convex with constant $\mu$, this lemma is a simple modification of Lemma 7 in [23]. □

**Lemma 7.** For a convex and continuously differentiable function $g$, we have

$$
    \nabla g \text{ is } \lambda\text{-Lipschitz continuous} \iff \nabla g \text{ is } (1/\lambda)-\text{cocoercive}.
$$

*Proof.* See Theorem 2.1.5 in Section 2.1 of [79]. □

---

Figure 7: Illustration of the convergence of PnP under nonexpensive denoisers and AR operators. Average normalized distance to $\|R(x)\|_2^2 = \|x - D(x)\|_2^2$ and PSNR (dB) are plotted as dashed and solid lines, respectively, against the iteration number. This plot illustrates that PnP in our experiments converges to vectors close to $\text{Zer}(R)$, which is consistent with the view that it regularizes inverse problems by obtaining solutions near the fixed-points of a denoiser/AR operator.
We now present the implementation details of training the AR operators used in this work. Inspired by an AR operator trained to remove artifacts specific to the PnP iterations using the MSE loss operator. In our implementation, we opted to share the weights of the AR operator across different architecture, fixing the total number of unrolling iterations to the input image. We train several denoisers to optimize the mean squared error (MSE) by using the 64 filters of size $3 \times 3$ layer and a rectified linear units (ReLU) layer. It convolves the components. The first part is a composite convolutional layer, consisting of a normal convolutional normalization and weight sharing on DnCNN across different iterations. Note that once DnCNN is training loss. In order to make the AR operator satisfy the Assumption A, we impose the spectral $N$ the output is the reconstructed image from the $N$th iteration, which is subsequently used within the training loss. In order to make the AR operator satisfy the Assumption A, we impose the spectral normalization and weight sharing on DnCNN across different iterations. Note that once DnCNN is pre-trained following this scheme, it is used as an AR operator within PnP.

### Additional Technical Details and Numerical Results

We designed two types of deep priors for PnP/RED: (i) an AWGN denoiser and (ii) an artifact-removal (AR) operator trained to remove artifacts specific to the PnP iterations\(^2\). Both of these deep priors share the same neural network architecture, based on DnCNN [39]. The networks contain three components. The first part is a composite convolutional layer, consisting of a normal convolutional layer and a rectified linear units (ReLU) layer. It convolves the $n_1 \times n_2$ input to $n_1 \times n_2 \times 64$ features maps by using 64 filters of size $3 \times 3$. The second part is a sequence of 10 composite convolutional layers, each having 64 filters of size $3 \times 3 \times 64$. Those composite layers further process the feature maps generated by the first part. The third part of the network, a single convolutional layer, generates the final output image by convolving the feature maps with a $3 \times 3 \times 64$ filter. Every convolution is performed with a stride = 1, so that the intermediate feature maps share the same spatial size of the input image. We train several denoisers to optimize the mean squared error (MSE) by using the Adam optimizer. All the experiments in this work were performed on a machine equipped with an Intel Xeon Gold 6130 Processor and eight NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080 Ti GPUs.

We now present the implementation details of training the AR operators used in this work. Inspired by ISTA-Net\(^3\), we implement our own deep unfolding neural network for training the AR operator. Given an initial solution $x^0$, i.e. $x^0 = A^T y$, we iteratively refine it by infusing information from both the gradient of the data-fidelity term $\nabla g$ and the learned operator $D$ defined as

$$R(x) = (1 - D)(x) = x - D(x),$$

where $R$ is the residual of the deep neural network. We use Nesterov acceleration in the unrolled architecture, fixing the total number of unrolling iterations to $N \geq 1$

$$z^k = s^{k-1} - \gamma \nabla g(s^{k-1})$$

$$x^k = D(z^k)$$

$$c_k = (q_{k-1} - 1)/q_k$$

$$s^k = x^k + c_k(x^k - x^{k-1})$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is a step-size parameter and the value of $q_k = 1/2(1 + \sqrt{1 + 4q_{k-1}^2})$ is adapted during the training for better PSNR performance. Fig. 8 illustrates the algorithmic details for training the AR operator. In our implementation, we opted to share the weights of the AR operator across different iterations to satisfy our theoretical assumptions. We trained several AR operators for $N$ unfolded iterations using the MSE loss

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE}} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \|x_j^N - x_j^*\|_2^2,$$

\(^2\)The implementation of our pre-trained denoisers and AR operators are also available in the supplement.

\(^3\)ISTA-Net\(^+\) is publicly available at https://github.com/jianzhangcs/ISTA-Net-PyTorch.
where $x^*_j$ is the ground truth. We also included a smoothness-constraint loss across different iterations, defined as

$$L_{\text{Smooth}} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{k=N-q}^{N} \|x_j^k - D(z_j^k)\|_2^2. \quad (23)$$

We observe that the AR operators trained with this smoothness-constraint outperform those trained without it, especially, when the AR operator is integrated into the PnP algorithm. The total AR training loss is thus $L = L_{\text{MSE}} + \beta L_{\text{Smooth}}$, where $\beta > 0$ controls the amount of smoothing. For the experiments in this paper, we set $N = 90$, $\beta = 10$ for all gray and color AR operators’ training, while we set $N = 27$, $\beta = 10$ for CS-MRI.

We used a pre-training strategy to accelerate the training of the weights within the AR operator. Since the weights are shared across iterations of the deep unfolding network, we can then initialize them with those obtained from pre-trained AWGN denoisers. We observe that this pre-training strategy is considerably more efficient than initializing the entire unfolding network with the random weights. Since we initialize our learned components with deep denoisers, the initial setup for our method exactly corresponds to tuning a PnP approach with a deep denoiser. Such training adapts the operator $D$ to a particular inverse problem and data distribution.

In Fig. 6, we report the empirical evaluation of $\mu$ for the measurement operators used in our experiments by sampling images from $\text{Im}(D)$. Specifically, we test two types of measurement matrices for CS, namely random matrix and radially subsampled Fourier matrix, both at subsampling rates of 10% and 50%. For each type of matrix, we first use the operator $D$ to generate several denoised image pairs on BSD68 and medical brain images, respectively. This ensures the tested image pairs are all in the range of $D$. We plot the histograms of $\mu = \frac{\|Ax - Az\|_2^2}{\|x - z\|_2^2}$, and the minimum value of each histogram is indicated by a vertical bar, providing an empirical lower bound on the values of $\mu$. Fig. 6 illustrates that empirically the measurement operators $A$ used in this work satisfies S-REC over $\text{Im}(D)$ with $\mu > 0$.

In Fig. 7, we report the convergence of $\|R(x^t)\|_2^2 = \|x^t - D(x^t)\|_2^2$ for both the AWGN denoisers and the AR operators used in our experiments. As can be observed from the plots, in both cases, PnP converges to vectors close to $\text{Zer}(R)$, which is consistent with the view that it regularizes inverse problems by obtaining solutions near the fixed-points of a denoiser/AR operator. Note that this view is completely backward compatible with the traditional sparsity-promoting priors and ISTA-algorithms, where one achieves regularization by promoting sparse solutions in some transform domain.

We provide additional visualizations of the solutions produced by PnP/RED and various baseline methods considered in our work. Fig. 9 (top) reports the visual comparison of multiple methods on Set11 with CS ratios of 10%, while Fig. 9 (bottom) reports the comparison on medical brain images for CS-MRI with under-sampling ratios of 20%. Fig. 10 illustrates the numerical comparison on BSD68 for CS ratios of 30% (top) and 10% (bottom), respectively. Fig. 11 reports the visual comparison between PnP/RED and two CS methods based on StyleGAN2. Note that in all figures, PnP/RED achieves competitive results, with PnP (AR) achieving superior reconstruction results compared to PnP (denoising).
Figure 9: Additional visual comparisons between various methods for CS and CS-MRI. Top: reconstruction results on the “House” image in Set 11 at CS ratios of 10\%.
Bottom: results on MRI images with radially under-sampling at CS ratios of 20\% (The pink box provides the error residual that was amplified by 10\times for better visualization.). Best viewed by zooming in the display.
Figure 10: Supplementary visual comparisons between various methods on BSD68. Top: Results at 30% sampling ratio. Bottom: Results at 10% sampling ratio.
Figure 11: Supplementary visual comparison between PnP/RED and two methods using generative models, when applied to the CelebA HQ dataset at 10% sampling ratio. Note the similarity between the RED and PnP solutions. PnP (AR) leads to sharp images, comparable to those obtained by ILO with StyleGAN2. This highlights the benefit of using pre-trained AR operators.