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Abstract

In this work we apply the “deviation maximization”, a new column selection strategy, to the Lawson-Hanson algorithm for the solution of NonNegative Least Squares (NNLS), devising a new algorithm we call Lawson-Hanson with Deviation Maximization (LHDM). This algorithm allows to exploit BLAS-3 operations, leading to higher performances. We show the finite convergence of this algorithm and explore the sparse recovery ability of LHDM. The results are presented with an extensive campaign of experiments, where we compare its performance against several \(\ell_1\)-minimization solvers. An implementation of the proposed algorithm is available on a public repository.

1 Introduction

NonNegative Least Squares (NNLS) problems arise in many applications where data points can be represented as nonnegative linear combinations of some meaningful components. Such problems are frequently encountered in signal and image processing and they are core problems in more complex computations, such as nonnegative matrix and tensor decompositions. Moreover, when dealing with underdetermined systems of equations, the nonnegativity constraint is known to naturally enhance sparsity of the solution, that is the solution attained has few nonzeros, see e.g. [6, 18, 33, 34]. An important outcome of this body of work is that nonnegativity alone may attain a satisfactory sparse recovery. Over the last two decades, sparsity has become one of the most relevant topics in signal processing. In general, sparsity in signals describes the phenomenon where high dimensional data can be expressed with few measurements and it results in finding a sparse solution to underdetermined systems of equations. This problem is highly nonconvex and its solution is NP-hard in general, although it is well known that \(\ell_1\)-minimization leads the sparsest solution for a restricted class of matrices. This fact is known as \(\ell_0 - \ell_1\) equivalence and it has been found empirically [10] and theoretically [15, 17]. The \(\ell_1\)-minimization problem can be seen as a convex relaxation of the \(\ell_0\)-minimization problem. Notice that NNLS is a convex problem too.

The first algorithm devised for NNLS is the Lawson-Hanson algorithm [19]. Since this seminal work, many modifications have been proposed in order to improve the standard Lawson-Hanson algorithm: Bro and Jong [3] have proposed a variation specifically designed for use in nonnegative tensor decompositions; their algorithm, called “fast NNLS” (FNNLS), reduces the execution time by avoiding redundant computations in
nonnegative matrix factorization problems arising in tensor decompositions and performs well with multiple right-hand sides, which is not the case here discussed, thus we omit a comparison. Van Benthem and Keenan [32] presented a different NNLS solution algorithm, namely “fast combinatorial NNLS” (FCNNLS), also designed for the specific case of a large number of right-hand sides. The authors exploited a clever reorganization of computations in order to take advantage of the combinatorial nature of the problems treated (multivariate curve resolution) and introduced a nontrivial initialization of the algorithm by means of unconstrained least squares solution. Principal block pivoting method introduced by Portugal et al. [21] is an active set type algorithm which differs from the standard Lawson-Hanson algorithm, since the sequence of iterates produced does not necessarily fall into the feasible region. The convergence is ensured provided the objective function is strictly convex, while when we deal with underdetermined matrices it is simply convex, therefore this algorithm fails in sparse recovering. Surprisingly, the Lawson-Hanson algorithm [19] does not suffer from this drawback.

The Lawson-Hanson algorithm is an active set method which incrementally builds an optimal solution by solving at each iteration an unconstrained least squares subproblem, e.g. by computing a QR decomposition, on a subset of columns of the initial matrix in such a way that the objective value decreases while the iterates are kept within the feasible region. The algorithm performs a column pivoting by selecting one column at a time and therefore it relies only on BLAS-2 operations. Actually, the columns are not permuted, rather a vector of indices is used to represent the permutation. In general, column pivoting makes it more difficult to achieve high performances in QR computation, see [1, 2, 3, 22, 4].

In this work we apply the “deviation maximization” introduced in [11], as column selection strategy to the Lawson-Hanson algorithm for the solution of NNLS, devising a new algorithm we call Lawson-Hanson with Deviation Maximization (LHDM). This algorithm allows to exploit BLAS-3 operations, leading to higher performances. In [12], two of the authors observed that a preliminary version of this technique has led to a significant performance gain in the execution of the Lawson-Hanson algorithm for underdetermined systems, there applied to the particular case of computing nearly-optimal designs on high-dimensional spaces by means of Tchakaloff theorem. Here, we extend the theoretical discussion about the features of LHDM and we explore the sparsity recovery ability of LHDM, comparing its performance against several \( \ell_1 \)-minimization solvers.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formally introduce the NNLS problem and the Lawson-Hanson algorithm. We present the deviation maximization algorithm for column selection and we devise the Lawson-Hanson with Deviation Maximization algorithm. We provide a theoretical result about finite convergence of LHDM by generalizing the analogous result for the standard Lawson-Hanson. In Section 3 we introduce the \( \ell_0 \)-minimization problem as sparse recovery the convex \( \ell_1 \)-minimization problem. We recall results that ensure the so-called \( \ell_0 - \ell_1 \) equivalence and conditions under which the underdetermined NNLS problem has a unique solution. Last, we recall how arbitrary signed sparse recovery can be attained by NNLS solvers. In Section 4 we present a comparison of LHDM against several \( \ell_1 \)-minimization solvers in terms of performance and solution found. The results are shown with an extensive campaign of experiments. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 Solving nonnegative least squares problems

Consider the nonnegative least squares problem

\[
\min \|Ax - b\|_2^2, \quad \text{s.t. } x \geq 0, \tag{1}
\]
where \( A = (a_1 \ldots a_n) \) is an \( m \times n \) matrix, \( b \) is a vector of length \( m \). It is well known that

\[
\min \|Ax - b\|_2 = \min \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2.
\]

We have

\[
\frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} (Ax - b)^T (Ax - b) = \frac{1}{2} x^T A^T Ax - b^T Ax + \frac{1}{2} b^T b,
\]

and

\[
\min \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 = \min \frac{1}{2} x^T A^T Ax - b^T Ax := \phi(x).
\]

Note that the gradient (= - steepest descend direction) for \( \phi \) is

\[
\nabla \phi(x) = A^T Ax - A^T b = -A^T (b - Ax) = -A^T r(x),
\]

where \( r \) is the residual function \( r(x) = b - Ax \). The set of points satisfying the constraints is called feasible region, here \( \Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x \geq 0\} \), and a point \( x \) is said to be feasible if it belongs to the feasible region.

**Definition 1.** Let \( x \) be a feasible point, i.e. \( x \geq 0 \). A vector \( s \) is a feasible direction at \( x \) if there exists \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that \( x + \varepsilon s \geq 0 \).

Notice that if \( s \) is a feasible direction at \( x \) and \( s_i < 0 \), then we must have \( x_i > 0 \). The following theorem characterizes the solution of problem (1). For a proof see e.g. [19].

**Theorem 1.** (Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions for NNLS) A point \( x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is a solution of problem (1) if and only if there exists \( w^* \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and a partition \( Z^* \cup P^* = \{1, \ldots, n\} \) such that

\[
w^* = A^T (b - Ax^*),
\]

\[
x^*_i = 0, \quad i \in Z^*, \quad x^*_i > 0, \quad i \in P^*, \quad (3)
\]

\[
w^*_i \leq 0, \quad i \in Z^*, \quad w^*_i = 0, \quad i \in P^*. \quad (4)
\]

Notice that equations (3-4) imply

\[
x^*_i w^*_i = 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,
\]

which is also known as complementary condition.

Let us consider the \( i \)-th constraint, \( e_i^T x \geq 0 \), where \( e_i \) is the \( i \)-th element of the canonical basis. The vector \( e_i \) is normal to the half-space defined by the constraint and it points towards the interior of the feasible region \( \Omega \). The point \( x^* \) is in the interior of the half-spaces indexed in \( P^* \) and on the boundary of those indexed in \( Z^* \). The point \( -w^* \) is the gradient of the objective evaluated at \( x^* \). Since \( w^*_i = 0, \quad i \in P \), we have

\[
\sum_{i \in Z} (-w^*_i)(-e_i) = w^*,
\]

which states that the negative gradient at \( x^* \) is a nonnegative \((w^*_i \geq 0)\) linear combination of the outward normals \((e_i)\) to the constraint hyperplanes on which \( x^* \) lies \((i \in Z)\), that is \( w^* \) lies in the convex cone based at \( x^* \) and generated by \(-e_i, i \in Z\).
2.1 The Lawson-Hanson algorithm

The first algorithm to solve (1) is due to Lawson and Hanson [19], and it is presented in Algorithm 1 for completeness. It is an active set method and a particular case of the algorithm introduced in [28] for the least squares problem with linear inequality constraints. Recall that a constraint is said to be active if it holds with equality, here $x_i = 0$, it is said to be passive when it holds with strict inequality, here $x_i > 0$, otherwise it is violated, namely $x_i < 0$. Active set methods are in the family of descend algorithms, that is they look for the solution by decreasing the objective function value, in particular at each iteration the new solution is a feasible point in a feasible descend direction with respect to the current solution.

Algorithm 1 Lawson-Hanson $LH(A, b)$

1. $P_0 = \emptyset$, $Z_0 = \{1, \ldots, M\}$, $x^{(0)} = 0$, $w^{(0)} = A^T b$, $k = 0$
2. while $Z_k \neq \emptyset$ and $\max(w_Z^{(k)}) > 0$ do
3. \quad $k = k + 1$
4. \quad $j_k = \arg\max_i w_i^{(k)}$
5. \quad $P_k = P_{k-1} \cup \{j_k\}$
6. \quad $Z_k = Z_{k-1} \setminus \{j_k\}$
7. \quad $y_P^{(k)} = \arg\min \min \|A_P^{(k)} y - b\|$, $y_Z^{(k)} = 0$
8. \quad while $\min\left(y_P^{(k)}\right) \leq 0$ do
9. \quad \quad $Q = P_k \cap \left\{i : y_i^{(k)} \leq 0\right\}$
10. \quad \quad $\alpha = \min_{i \in Q} \frac{x_i^{(k)}}{y_i^{(k)}}$
11. \quad \quad $x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + \alpha \left(y^{(k)} - x^{(k)}\right)$
12. \quad \quad $P_{k+1} = P_k \setminus \left\{i : i \in P_k, x_i^{(k+1)} \leq 0\right\}$
13. \quad \quad $Z_{k+1} = Z_k \cup \left\{i : i \in P_k, x_i^{(k+1)} \leq 0\right\}$
14. \quad \quad $y_P^{(k+1)} = \arg\min \min \|A_P^{(k+1)} y - b\|$, $y_Z^{(k+1)} = 0$
15. \quad $k = k + 1$
16. \quad end while
17. \quad $x_P^{(k)} = y_P^{(k)}$, $x_Z^{(k)} = 0$
18. \quad $w^{(k)} = A^T b - A x^{(k)}$
19. end while
20. $P^*, Z^* = Z_k$, $x^* = x^{(k)}$

Let us now describe the main features of the Lawson-Hanson algorithm. Let $P_k$ denote the passive set and $Z_k$ denote the active set at $k$-th algorithmic step, with cardinality respectively $n_k$ and $n - n_k$. Let us define the following submatrices

$A_P^{(k)} = \left(\begin{array}{c} a_{i_1} \ldots a_{i_{n_k}} \end{array}\right)$, \quad $i_1, \ldots, i_{n_k} \in P_k$,

$A_Z^{(k)} = \left(\begin{array}{c} a_{j_1} \ldots a_{j_{n-n_k}} \end{array}\right)$, \quad $j_1, \ldots, j_{n-n_k} \in Z_k$. 
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We define the $k$-th iterate as $x^{(k)} = \left(x_1^{(k)}, \ldots, x_n^{(k)}\right)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$. With an analogous notation to the one introduced above for matrices, we have

$$
x_p^{(k)} = \left(x_{i_1}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{i_{n_k}}^{(k)}\right)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k}, \quad i_1, \ldots, i_{n_k} \in P_k,
$$

$$
x_z^{(k)} = \left(x_{j_1}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{j_{n-n_k}}^{(k)}\right)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n-n_k}, \quad j_1, \ldots, j_{n-n_k} \in Z_k.
$$

Since the iterates produced by Lawson-Hanson algorithm do not leave the feasible region, we always have $x_z^{(k)} = 0$. With the notation introduced, we have

$$
r^{(k)} = b - Ax^{(k)} = b - A_p^{(k)}x_p^{(k)},
$$

$$
w^{(k)} = A^T \left(b - Ax^{(k)}\right) = A^T \left(b - A_p^{(k)}x_p^{(k)}\right) = A^Tr^{(k)},
$$

$$
w_z^{(k)} = (A_z^{(k)})^T \left(b - A_p^{(k)}x_p^{(k)}\right) = (A_z^{(k)})^T r^{(k)},
$$

$$
w_{p'}^{(k)} = (A_{p'}^{(k)})^T \left(b - A_p^{(k)}x_p^{(k)}\right) = 0,
$$

where the last identity is a consequence of normal equations for $\min \|A_p^{(k)}y - b\|$. Clearly we have $(w^{(k)})^Tx^{(k)} = 0$ for every $k$. As shown in [11], Algorithm 1 terminates in a finite number of steps and $x^{(k)}, w^{(k)}, P_k, Z_k$ satisfy KKT conditions \cite{3, 4} on termination.

### 2.2 A straightforward application of deviation maximization

The deviation maximization is a column selection technique. In [12], an early version for solving NNLS has been introduced, resulting in an algorithm whose finite convergence has not been proved. Here, we make a substantial algorithmic improvement and we provide a theoretical convergence analysis. Let us first introduce the following definition.

**Definition 2.** Let $C = (c_1 \ldots c_k)$ be an $m \times k$ matrix whose columns $c_j$ are non-null. Let $D$ be the diagonal matrix with entries $D_{ii} = \|c_i\|$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, then the cosine matrix associated to $C$ is defined as

$$
\Theta = \Theta(C) = (CD^{-1})^T CD^{-1} = D^{-1}C^T CD^{-1},
$$

and its entries are

$$
\theta_{ij} = \frac{c_i^T c_j}{\|c_i\| \|c_j\|} = \cos(\alpha_{ij}), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq k.
$$

(7)

where $\alpha_{ij} = \alpha(c_i, c_j)$ is the angle between the pair $c_i, c_j$.

The deviation maximization aims at identifying a subset of sufficiently linearly independent columns by looking for those columns with large pairwise angles. As shown in [11], this can be done by taking into account the cosine matrix of the largest columns in norm. Here, we extend this procedure to the case in which we have some additional information to incorporate, in this case descend direction. In fact, any column $j$ such that $w_j > 0$ identifies a feasible descend direction, that is its insertion in the passive set causes a strict decrease in the objective function.
Consider an \( m \times n \) matrix \( C \) and \( \mathbf{w} \leq \) a vector on length \( n \). Let us now detail how the deviation maximization identifies a set of column indices \( J \) within \( C \). The set \( J \) is initialized with the index corresponding to the maximum element of \( \mathbf{w} \), namely \( J = \{ j_1 \} \), where \( j_1 \in \arg\max \mathbf{w} \). Notice that the same index \( j_1 \) would be chosen by the standard Lawson-Hanson algorithm. We incrementally construct the set \( J \) by adding indices within the candidate set \( I \), defined as

\[
I = \{ i : w_i \geq \tau_w \max_{Z} \mathbf{w}, \ i \neq j_1 \},
\]

namely the set of those columns whose dual variable is larger than a given parameter \( \tau_w \) times the maximum value in \( \mathbf{w} \). If the cardinality of \( I \) exceeds a value \( k_{\max} \), then \( I \) is eventually restricted in order to limit memory usage and computational cost, mainly due to the creation of the cosine matrix \( \Theta = \Theta(C) = (\theta_{i,j}) \), \( C_I \) denotes the submatrix of \( C \) with column indices in \( I \). With a loop over the indices of the candidate set \( I \), an index \( i \in I \) is inserted in \( J \) only if the \( i \)-th column has a large norm and it forms a large angle (i.e., the corresponding cosine is small) with the columns whose index is already in \( J \). In formulae, we ask

\[
\| \mathbf{c}_i \| \geq \tau_u \max_{i \in I} \| \mathbf{c}_i \|
\]

and

\[
|\theta_{i,j}| < \tau_c, \quad \text{for all} \ j \in J.
\]

where \( 1 \geq \tau_u > 0 \) and where \( 1 > \tau_c \geq 0 \) are two parameters. At the end of the iterations, we have \( J = \{ j_1, \ldots, j_l \} \), with \( 1 \leq l \leq k_{\max} \). Notice that the following choice of the parameter \( \tau_c \), namely

\[
\tau_c \leq \bar{\tau}_c := \frac{1 - \gamma}{k_{\max} - 1}, \quad (8)
\]

allows to control the gap of diagonal dominance

\[
\gamma = 1 - \max_i \sum_{i \neq j} |\theta_{i,j}|
\]

of the submatrix \( \Theta_J = \Theta(C_J) \). Indeed, for every \( j \in J \), the choice \([8]\) of \( \tau_c \) ensures

\[
\sum_{i \neq j} |\theta_{i,j}| < (k_{\max} - 1)\bar{\tau}_c = (k_{\max} - 1) \frac{1 - \gamma}{k_{\max} - 1} = 1 - \gamma.
\]

At the \( k \)-th algorithmic step of the Lawson-Hanson algorithm, the above procedure can identify a subset of indices \( J_k \) to be moved from the active set \( Z_k \) to the passive set \( P_k \). In particular, consider the matrix \( B_k = Q_k^T A \), where \( Q_k^T \) is the orthogonal transformation that reduces to triangular form the columns of \( A^{(k)} \). Then, we apply the procedure above to the matrix \( C_k = B_k(n_k + 1 : m, I) \), where \( B_k(n_k + 1 : m, I_k) \) denotes the submatrix of \( B_k \) of row indices ranging from \( n_k + 1 \) to \( m \) and column indices in \( I_k \). The resulting procedure of column selection is summarized in Algorithm \([2]\). Notice that the cosine matrix can be expressed as a matrix product and it can be evaluated by means of BLAS-3 kernels.

If the deviation maximization is applied to the Lawson-Hanson algorithm without any further modification, we obtain Algorithm \([3]\). Steps \([12]\) and \([21]\) require the solution of a unconstrained least squares problem each, e.g., by QR decomposition. This can be done efficiently by exploiting QR updates/downdates. The deviation maximization selects the subset of indices \( J_k \), and the Householder reflectors of the corresponding
Algorithm 2 Deviation Maximization $J = DM(A, P, w, \tau_w, \tau_u, \tau_c, k_{\text{max}})$

1. $J = \{j_1 : j_1 = \max w\}$
2. $I = \{i : w_i \geq \tau_w \max w, \ i \neq j\}$
3. if $|I| > k_{\text{max}}$ then
4. $I = \{i_k \in I : k = 1, \ldots, k_{\text{max}}\}$
5. end if
6. let $Q$ triangularize $AP$
7. compute $B = Q^T A$, and let $C = B(|P| + 1 : m, I)$
8. compute the cosine matrix $\Theta_I = \Theta(C)$
9. compute $u_i = \|c_i\|_2$, $u = (u_i)_{i \in I}$
10. for $i \in I$ do
11. if $u_i > \tau_u \max u$ and $|\theta_{i,j}| < \tau_c, \forall j \in J$ then
12. $J = J \cup \{i\}$
13. end if
14. end for

columns can be applied by means of the so-called WY representation, see [25], which requires BLAS-3 operations as well. Just like the classic Lawson-Hanson algorithm, this strategy ensures that the new iterate will stay feasible, provided that first an intermediate solution $y$ is computed and then, eventually, an analogous inner loop will keep the iterate $x$ into the feasible region.
Proof.
In this case Neumann series converges, and we have
\[ \mathbb{M} = M^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (I - M)^k = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} S^k = I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k, \]  
(10)
hence
\[ \max_i \sum_j |M|_{ij} = \|M\|_{\infty} = \left\| I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k \right\|_{\infty} \leq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k \| \leq 2, \]

since \[ \|\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k\|_{\infty} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|S^k\|_{\infty} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|S\|_{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} = 1. \] Moreover, we also have that
\[ 1 > \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k \right\|_{\infty} = \max_i \sum_j \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S_{ij}^k \geq \sum_j \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S_{ij}^k \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S_{ij}^k, \]

Algorithm 3 Restricted Lawson-Hanson with Deviation Maximization

\[ \text{restrLHDM}(A, b, \tau_u, \tau_c, \kappa_{\text{max}}) \]

1: \( P_0 = \emptyset, Z_0 = \{1, \ldots, M\}, x^{(0)} = 0, w^{(0)} = ATb, k = 0 \)
2: \( \text{while } Z_k \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \max(w^{(k)}) > 0 \text{ do} \)
3: \( k = k + 1 \)
4: \( J_k = DM(A, P_{k-1}, w^{(k-1)}, \tau_u, \tau_c, \kappa_{\text{max}}) \)
5: \( P_k = P_{k-1} \cup J_k \)
6: \( Z_k = Z_{k-1} \setminus J_k \)
7: \( y_P^{(k)} = \arg\min \|A_P y - b\|, y_Z^{(k)} = 0 \)
8: \( \text{while } \min(y_P^{(k)}) \leq 0 \text{ do} \)
9: \( Q = P_k \cap \{i : y_i^{(k)} \leq 0\} \)
10: \( \alpha = \min_{i \in Q} \frac{x_i^{(k)}}{y_i^{(k)}} \)
11: \( x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + \alpha(y^{(k)} - x^{(k)}) \)
12: \( P_{k+1} = P_k \setminus \{i : i \in P_k, x_i^{(k+1)} \leq 0\} \)
13: \( Z_{k+1} = Z_k \cup \{i : i \in P_k, x_i^{(k+1)} \leq 0\} \)
14: \( y_P^{(k+1)} = \arg\min \|A_P^{(k+1)} y - b\|, y_Z^{(k+1)} = 0 \)
15: \( k = k + 1 \)
16: \( \text{end while} \)
17: \( x_P^{(k)} = y_P^{(k)}, x_Z^{(k)} = 0 \)
18: \( w^{(k)} = AT(b - Ax^{(k)}) \)
19: \( \text{end while} \)
20: \( P^* = P_k, Z^* = Z_k, x^* = x^{(k)} \)

Let us spend the rest of this section to prove the finite termination of Algorithm 3 as it was shown for Algorithm 1 in [19]. Before doing that, let us provide some technical results. The following Lemma 1 is taken from [23], and we prove it here for sake of completeness.

Lemma 1. Let \( M = I - S \), with \( ||S||_{\infty} < \frac{1}{2} \). Then \( M^{-1} \) exists, it has a positive diagonal and it is strictly diagonally dominant.

Proof. In this case Neumann series converges, and we have
\[ \mathbb{M} = M^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (I - M)^k = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} S^k = I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k, \]  
(10)

hence
\[ \max_i \sum_j |M|_{ij} = \|M\|_{\infty} = \left\| I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k \right\|_{\infty} \leq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k \| \leq 2, \]

since \[ \|\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k\|_{\infty} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|S^k\|_{\infty} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|S\|_{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} = 1. \] Moreover, we also have that
\[ 1 > \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k \right\|_{\infty} = \max_i \sum_j \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S_{ij}^k \geq \sum_j \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S_{ij}^k \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S_{ij}^k, \]
for all choices of \( i, j \). Considering eq. (10) entrywise, we get

\[
\bar{M}_{ij} = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} S^k \right)_{ij} = I_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k_{ij},
\]

implying that \( \bar{M}_{ii} > 0 \). Moreover, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{M}_{ii} - \sum_{j \neq i} |\bar{M}_{ij}| &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k_{ii} - \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k_{ij} \\
&> \sum_{j \neq i} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k_{ij} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k_{ii} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k_{ii} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k_{ii} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S^k_{ii} \geq 0,
\end{align*}
\]

therefore \( \bar{M} \) is a strictly diagonally dominant matrix with a positive diagonal.

**Corollary 1.** Let \( A = \alpha (I - S) \), with \( \alpha > 0 \) and \( \|S\|_\infty < \frac{1}{2} \). Then \( A^{-1} \) exists, it has a positive diagonal and it is strictly diagonally dominant.

**Proof.** Apply Lemma 1 to \( M = I - S \), then \( (I - S)^{-1} \) is strictly diagonally dominant with a positive diagonal, and so is \( \alpha^{-1}(I - S)^{-1} = A^{-1} \).

Let us state and prove the following Lemma 2, which is a generalization of Lemma 23.3 of [19] in the case of multiple columns.

**Lemma 2.** Let \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n-k)} \) and \( A' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k} \) two matrices such that their concatenation \( (A A') \) is a full column rank matrix of size \( m \times n \). Let \( Q \) be the orthogonal \( m \times m \) factor of the QR decomposition of \( A \), and let

\[
Q^T (A A') = \begin{pmatrix} R & B \\ \Theta & C \end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( R \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-k) \times (n-k)} \) is upper triangular, \( B \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-k) \times k} \) and \( C \in \mathbb{R}^{m-(n-k) \times k} \). Finally, suppose there exists \( r \) such that

\[
(A A')^T r = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ w \end{pmatrix},
\]

with \( w = (\omega, \ldots, \omega)^T \in \mathbb{R}^k, \omega > 0 \), and consider the solution \( \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix} \) of the least squares problem

\[
\min \left\| (A A') \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix} - r \right\|^2.
\]
If the cosine matrix $\Theta$ associated to $C$ is a strictly diagonally dominant matrix with 

$$\gamma = \min_i \left( 1 - \sum_{j \neq i} |\theta_{ij}| \right) > 1/2,$$  

and for every $i$ we have

$$\frac{\|c_i\|}{\max_j \|c_j\|} > \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} - \gamma,$$  

then $z' > 0$.

Proof. Applying the matrix $Q^T$ by the left, we get

$$Q^T (A A'|r) = \begin{pmatrix} R & B \\ \bigodot & C \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ t \end{pmatrix},$$

where $s \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^{m-(n-k)}$. Then equation (11) rewrites

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ w \end{pmatrix} = (A A')^T r = (A A')^T QQ^T r = \begin{pmatrix} R^T & B^T \\ \bigodot & C^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ t \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} R^T s \\ B^T s + C^T t \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $R$ is full rank, we have $s = 0$ and $C^T t = w > 0$. On the other hand, we have

$$\| (A A') \left( \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix} - r \right) \| = \left\| \begin{pmatrix} R & B \\ \bigodot & C \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} s \\ t \end{pmatrix} \right\|$$

therefore the last $k$ entries $z'$ of the solution of (2) satisfy $z' = \arg\min_x \| Cx - t \|^2$, i.e.

$$z' = C^T \omega w = (C^T C)^{-1} C^T \omega = (C^T C)^{-1} \omega.$$

Now, we would like to apply Corollary to $C^T C$, in order to prove that its inverse $(C^T C)^{-1}$ is strictly diagonally dominant with positive diagonal values. This is enough to conclude that $z' > 0$, since

$$z_i' = \omega \left( (C^T C)_{ii}^{-1} + \sum_{j \neq i} (C^T C)_{ij}^{-1} \right) > \omega \left( \sum_{j \neq i} (C^T C)_{ij}^{-1} \right) \geq 0.$$  

Without loss of generality, suppose $\|c_1\| = \max_i \|c_i\|$. Then we have $C^T C = \|c_1\|^2 (I - S)$, where the matrix $S = (s_{ij})$ is given by

$$s_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\|c_i\|^2}{\|c_1\|^2}, & i = j, \\ \frac{c_i^T c_j}{\|c_1\|^2}, & i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\|S\|_\infty = \max_i \left\{ 1 - \frac{\|c_i\|^2}{\|c_1\|^2} + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{|c_i^T c_j|}{\|c_1\|^2} \right\}.$$
Let us show that $\|S\|_\infty < 1/2$, which concludes the proof by Corollary 1. Take $\tau_u = \min_i \|c_i\|/\|c_1\|$ and, by assumption, $\tau_u > \sqrt{(3 - 2\gamma)/2}$. For every $i$, we have

$$\frac{\|c_i\|^2}{\|c_1\|^2} \geq \tau_u^2 \frac{\|c_1\|^2}{\|c_1\|^2} = \tau_u^2,$$

$$\frac{|c_i^T c_j|}{\|c_1\|^2} \leq \frac{|c_i^T c_j|}{\|c_i\| \|c_j\|} = |\theta_{ij}|,$$

and thus, since $1 - \tau_u^2 \geq 0$, we have

$$\|S\|_\infty \leq 1 - \tau_u^2 + \max_i \sum_{i \neq j} |\theta_{ij}|$$

$$= 2 - \tau_u^2 - \min_i \left(1 - \sum_{i \neq j} |\theta_{ij}|\right)$$

$$= 2 - \tau_u^2 - \gamma$$

$$< 2 - \left(\frac{3}{2} - \gamma\right) - \gamma = \frac{1}{2},$$

concluding the proof. 

In order to ensure that the inverse of the matrix $C^T C$ is strictly diagonally dominant with a positive diagonal, Lemma 2 introduces quite demanding thresholds in Algorithm 3, namely $\tau_u$ and $\tau_c$, whose values should be picked near 1, while it has not been possible to set the parameter $\tau_w$ on a value strictly smaller than one, in fact the values $w_i$ are supposed all equal to $\omega > 0$. Indeed, it would have been possible if any bound on the gap of diagonal dominance of the matrix $(C^T C)^{-1}$ were known, as shown in equation (14). Unfortunately, no result in this direction is known to the authors. However, as we detail in the next section and we experimentally show in Section 4, we can relax these requirements without losing the convergence of the method in practice, i.e. these theoretical bounds describe a worst-case scenario.

Let us restate the following theorem, proved in [24] in the single column case and here adapted to the multiple column case.

**Theorem 2.** Let $(A')$ and $r$ satisfy hypotheses of Lemma 3 that is $(A')$ has full rank, $A'Tr = 0$ and $(A')'Tr = w > 0$. Consider the solution $\left(\begin{array}{c} z \\ z' \end{array}\right)$ of the least squares problem

$$\min \left\| (A') \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix} - r \right\|^2.$$

and the solution $\left(\begin{array}{c} y \\ y' \end{array}\right)$ of the least squares problem

$$\min \left\| (A') \begin{pmatrix} y \\ y' \end{pmatrix} - b \right\|^2.$$

If we have $r = P_{N(A)} b = (I - AA^\dagger)b$, then $z' = y'$. 
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Proof. Consider the matrix \((A A')^T (A A')\) and apply block Gauss elimination so that 
\[
(L (A A')^T (A A')) = U,
\]
because \((A A)^T = (A A)^T\). Premultiplying by \(L\) normal equations for (15) we get 
\[
(A')^T (I - A A^+) A' z' = w,
\]
and for (16) we get 
\[
(A')^T (I - A A^+) A' y' = (A')^T (I - A A^+) b = (A')^T P_N(A) b = (A')^T r = w.
\]
Thus the equality \(z' = y'\) holds provided that the matrix \((A A')^T (I - A A^+) A'\) is nonsingular. This follows from eq. (17), and from the fact that \(A^T A\) is nonsingular.

We can now prove the following result.

**Theorem 3.** Consider the NNLS problem
\[
\min \|Ax - b\|_2^2, \quad \text{s.t. } x \geq 0.
\]
Given \(1 > \gamma > \frac{1}{2}\) and \(k_{\text{max}} \geq 1\), Algorithm 3 terminates in a finite number of steps, provided that
\[
\tau_w = 1, \\
\tau_c \leq \bar{\tau}_c, \\
\tau_u > \sqrt{\frac{3}{2} - \gamma}.
\]
On termination, \(x\) will be a solution vector and \(w\) will be the dual vector.

**Proof.** Consider the least squares solution \(y\) computed at step 12 of Algorithm 3 that is \(y\) solves
\[
y_p = \arg\min_y \|A_p(k) y - b\|_2 \quad y_Z = 0.
\]
where \(Z = Z_k\) and \(P = P_k\). Lemma 2 and Theorem 2 imply that \(y_i(k) > 0\) for \(i \in J\). This, together with \(x(k-1) \geq 0\), means that \(s(k) := y(k) - x(k-1)\) is a feasible direction. Said \(r(k-1) = b - A x(k-1)\), let us define \(\hat{z}\) as follows
\[
\hat{z} = \arg\min_{z_Z = 0} \|Az - r(k-1)\| = \arg\min_{z_Z = 0} \|A(x(k-1) + z) - b\|,
\]
where \(Z = Z_k\) and \(P = P_k\). Notice that \(\hat{z}\) can be obtained as
\[
\hat{z}_p = \arg\min_z \|A_p(k) z - r(k-1)\|, \quad \hat{z}_Z = 0.
\]
Then we have
\[
\|A\hat{z} - r(k-1)\| = \|A\hat{z} - (b - A x(k-1))\| = \|A(\hat{z} + x(k-1)) - b\| \geq \|Ay(k) - b\|,
\]
Consider the function

\[ \phi(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \| A(x^{(k-1)} + \varepsilon s^{(k)}) - b \|^2. \]

We have

\[ \phi'(0) = (s^{(k)})^T A^T (Ax^{(k-1)} - b) = -(s^{(k)})^T w^{(k-1)} = -(y^{(k)})^T w^{(k-1)} \]

\[ = \sum_{i \in J} y_i^{(k)} (-w_i^{(k-1)}) < 0, \quad (25) \]

since \( w_i^{(k-1)} > 0 \) for all \( i \in J \) and \( y_i^{(k)} > 0 \) for all \( i \in J \) (or at least one if we choose more generous thresholds). Therefore there exists \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that

\[ \| A(x^{(k-1)} + \varepsilon s^{(k)}) - b \|^2 < \| Ax^{(k-1)} - b \|^2 = \phi(x^{(k-1)}). \]

By definition \([22]\) and relation \([24]\), we have

\[ \| A(x^{(k-1)} + s^{(k)}) - b \|^2 \leq \| A(x^{(k-1)} + \varepsilon s^{(k)}) - b \|^2 < \| Ax^{(k-1)} - b \|^2. \quad (26) \]

Thus, we take \( \varepsilon = 1 \) (i.e. \( x^{(k)} = y^{(k)} \)), if \( y^{(k)} \) is feasible, otherwise the algorithm enters the inner loop and we choose a smaller step length \( \varepsilon = \alpha_k \), more precisely the largest possible to keep the new iterate within the feasible region. It’s easy to check that (use KKT):

\[ \| A(x^{(k-1)} + \alpha s^{(k)}) - b \|^2 = \min_{\varepsilon} \{ \| A(x^{(k-1)} + \varepsilon s^{(k)}) - b \|^2 : x^{(k-1)} + \varepsilon s^{(k)} \geq 0 \} \]

\[ \leq \| Ax^{(k-1)} - b \|^2. \]

We deduce that the objective function is always non increasing. Equation \([26]\) also implies that every time step \([17]\) is reached, we have a strictly smaller value of the objective function. Hence at every iteration of the outer loop, the current objective value is strictly smaller than the preceding one. Since the solution solves a least squares subproblem like those of steps \([7]\) and \([4]\) the corresponding passive set must be different from the preceding one. As the number of possible combinations of active and passive sets is finite, namely it is equal to \( 2^n \), the algorithm must terminate in at most \( 2^n \) outer loop repetitions.

The inner loops terminates each time in at most \( n_k - l_k \) steps, where \( n_k = |P_k| \) and \( l_k = |J_k| \). In fact, we have

\[ A^T r^{(k)} = A^T (b - Ax^{(k)}) = A^T (b - A(x^{(k-1)} + \alpha s^{(k)})) = \]

\[ A^T (b - (1 - \alpha)Ax^{(k-1)} - \alpha Ay^{(k)}) = \]

\[ (1 - \alpha)A^T (b - Ax^{(k-1)}) + \alpha A^T (b - Ay^{(k)}) = \]

\[ (1 - \alpha)A^T r^{(k-1)} + \alpha A^T (b - Ay^{(k)}) \]
and therefore, for \( i \in J_k \) we have
\[
\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{r}^{(k)} = (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{r}^{(k-1)} + \alpha \mathbf{a}_i^T (\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{y}^{(k)}) = (1 - \alpha)w_i^{(k-1)} > 0,
\]
where the second term of the summation is zero because of normal equations (\( \mathbf{y}^{(k)} \) is least squares solution).

On the other hand, for all other indices \( j \not\in J_k \) that already were in the passive set we have
\[
\mathbf{a}_j^T \mathbf{r}^{(k)} = (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{a}_j^T \mathbf{r}^{(k-1)} + \alpha \mathbf{a}_j^T (\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{y}^{(k)}) = 0,
\]
where both terms vanishes because of normal equations. Hence \( \mathbf{r}^{(k)} \) satisfies hypotheses of Lemma 2 and we have \( s_i^{(k+1)} > 0 \), for \( i \in J \), where \( s^{(k+1)} \) is the solution of
\[
\min_{\mathbf{s}_x = 0} \| A\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{r}^{(k)} \|.
\]

Since \( s^{(k+1)} = \mathbf{y}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \) (eq. (24)), we can conclude that
\[
y_i^{(k+1)} > x_i^{(k)} \geq 0, \quad i \in J_k
\]
meaning that at least the indices \( i \in J_k \) are kept in the passive set at the end of the inner loop. This is enough to conclude that Algorithm 3 terminates in a finite number of steps and \( \mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \mathbf{w}^{(k)}, P_k, Z_k \) satisfy KKT conditions (31) on termination. \( \square \)

At a first glance, the requirement \( \tau_w = 1 \) may suggest that only one column index at a time can be inserted to the passive set, but it turns out that, especially in the first iterations, \( \arg\max \mathbf{w}^{(Z)} \) is not a singleton. As all active set methods, the upper bound on the number of iteration needed for convergence is exponential on the problem size, as the outer loop. However, this is a worst case analysis and polynomial rate of convergence is observed in practice.

2.3 The Lawson-Hanson algorithm with Deviation Maximization

In the previous section, we showed that a straightforward application of the deviation maximization of column selection strategy into the Lawson-Hanson algorithm introduces quite demanding values of thresholds \( \tau_w, \tau_c, \tau_u \) in order to ensure finite convergence. Here, we show that these requirements can be relaxed without losing finite convergence, provided a further inner loop is added in order to ensure (28) is satisfied. The resulting procedure, namely the Lawson-Hanson algorithm with Deviation Maximization (LHDM), is presented in Algorithm 4 and it terminates in a finite number of steps as shown in Theorem 4 below.

Let us recall the following results whose proof can be found in [11].

**Lemma 3.** Let \( \mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{c}_1 \ldots \mathbf{c}_k) \) be an \( m \times k \) matrix such that \( \| \mathbf{c}_1 \| = \max_j \| \mathbf{c}_j \| \), and let \( \Theta \) be the associated cosine matrix. Suppose there exists \( 1 \geq \tau_u > 0 \) such that \( \| \mathbf{c}_j \| \geq \tau_u \| \mathbf{c}_1 \| \), for all \( 1 \leq j \leq k \). Moreover, suppose that \( \Theta \) is a strictly diagonally dominant matrix with \( \gamma = \min_i (1 - \sum_{j \not= i} |\theta_{ij}|) > 1 - \tau_u^2 > 0 \). Then \( \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{C}) \geq \sqrt{\gamma + \tau_u^2 - 1} \| \mathbf{c}_1 \| \).

**Theorem 4.** Let \( \mathbf{R}_k \) be the upper triangular factor of the QR decomposition of \( \mathbf{A}^{(k)}_P = (\mathbf{A}^{(k)}_P A_{J_k}) \) where \( J_k \) is chosen by the deviation maximization with \( 1 > \gamma > 0 \), \( k_{\max} \geq 1 \) and
\[
\begin{align*}
\tau_w &> 0, \\
\tau_c &\leq \bar{\tau}_c, \\
\tau_u &> \sqrt{1 - \gamma}.
\end{align*}
\]
Let $\sigma_{\text{min}}^{(k)}$ be the smallest singular value of $R_k$, then

$$\sigma_{\text{min}}^{(k)} \geq \sigma_{\text{min}}(A)\frac{\sigma_{\text{min}}^{(k-1)}}{\sigma_1(A)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(n-n_k)n_k}} \sqrt{\gamma + \tau_u^2 - 1} \frac{k^2_{\text{max}}n_{k-1}}{\sqrt{2(n-n_k)n_k}} \sqrt{\gamma + \tau_c^2 - 1}.$$ 

It is known, as two of the authors showed in [11], that even if the matrix $A_P^{(k)}$ is well conditioned, there could be a potentially dramatic increase in the condition number of $A_P^{(k+1)}$ when using the deviation maximization strategy, as well as for the other column selection strategy like the standard column pivoting. A famous example is the Kahan matrix, however it is a very unlikely occurrence in practice.

Let us now prove the main result of this work.

**Theorem 5.** Consider the NNLS problem

$$\min \|Ax - b\|_2^2, \quad \text{s.t. } x \geq 0.$$ 

Given $1 > \gamma > 0$ and $k_{\text{max}} \geq 1$, Algorithm 4 terminates in a finite number of steps, provided that

1. $\tau_w > 0$, 
2. $\tau_c \leq \tau_c$, 
3. $\tau_u > \sqrt{1 - \gamma}.$

On termination, $x$ will be a solution vector and $w$ will be the dual vector.

**Proof.** In order to ensure finite convergence of Algorithm 4, we have to ensure

1. termination of the outer loop, by choosing a feasible direction $s^{(k)}$ such that the strict inequality (25) still holds;
2. termination of the inner loop with a nonempty passive set.

Let us address the first task. Lemma 3 and Theorem 4 ensures that $A_P^{(k)} = (A_P^{(k-1)} A_{j_k})$ has numerically linearly independent columns. Consider $s^{(k)}$ that solves the triangular linear system

$$R_k s^{(k)} = Q_k^T r^{(k-1)},$$

where $Q_k R_k$ is the QR decomposition of $(A_p^{(k-1)} a_{j_1} \ldots a_{j_{k-1}})$. If not a feasible direction or (25) does not hold, we drop the last column of $A_{j_k}$ and the corresponding index $j_{k}$ is moved back to the active set $Z_k$. We then look for the solution $s^{(k)}$ of the triangular linear system

$$R_k^{(1)} s^{(k)} = (Q_k^{(1)})^T r^{(k-1)},$$

where $Q_k^{(1)} R_k^{(1)}$ is the QR decomposition of $(A_p^{(k-1)} a_{j_1} \ldots a_{j_{k-1}})$. Notice that $R_k^{(1)}$ can be obtained by dropping the last row and column of $R_k$, while $Q_k^{(1)}$ can be obtained as $Q_k G_1$, where $G_1^T$ is an orthogonal transformation that zeros out the last diagonal element of $R_k$, e.g. a Givens transformation. We continue dropping a column at a time from $A_{j_k}$ until $s^{(k)}$ turns out to be a feasible solution and (25) is satisfied. It should be noticed that this procedure terminates at most when only the first column of $A_{j}$ is left, which
Algorithm 4 Lawson-Hanson Deviation Maximization

\[ \text{LHDM}(A, b, \tau_w, \tau_u, \tau_c, k_{\text{max}}) \]

1: \( P_0 = \emptyset, Z_0 = \{1, \ldots, M\}, x^{(0)} = 0, w^{(0)} = A^T b, y^{(0)} = 0, k = 0 \)
2: while \( Z_k \neq \emptyset \) and \( \max(w^{(k)}) > 0 \) do
3: \( k = k + 1 \)
4: \( J_k = \text{DM}(A, P_{k-1}, w^{(k-1)}, \tau_w, \tau_u, \tau_c, k_{\text{max}}) \)
5: \( P_k = P_{k-1} \cup J_k \)
6: \( Z_k = Z_{k-1} \setminus J_k \)
7: \( y^{(k)}_P = \text{argmin} \left\| A^{(k)}_P y - b \right\|, y^{(k)}_Z = 0 \)
8: while \( \min \left( y^{(k)}_J \right) \leq 0 \) do
9: delete the last element from \( J_k \)
10: \( P_k = P_{k-1} \cup J_k \)
11: \( Z_k = Z_{k-1} \setminus J_k \)
12: \( y^{(k)}_P = \text{argmin} \left\| A^{(k)}_P y - b \right\|, y^{(k)}_Z = 0 \)
13: \( y^{(k)}_P = \frac{x^{(k)}}{y^{(k)}_P} \)
14: \( x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + \alpha(y^{(k)} - x^{(k)}) \)
15: \( P_{k+1} = P_k \setminus \{ i : i \in P_k, x^{(k+1)}_i \leq 0 \} \)
16: \( Z_{k+1} = Z_k \cup \{ i : i \in P_k, x^{(k+1)}_i \leq 0 \} \)
17: \( y^{(k+1)}_P = \text{argmin} \left\| A^{(k+1)}_P y - b \right\|, y^{(k+1)}_Z = 0 \)
18: \( k = k + 1 \)
19: \( x^{(k)}_P = y^{(k)}_P, x^{(k)}_Z = 0 \)
20: \( w^{(k)} = A^T (b - Ax^{(k)}) \)
21: end while
22: \( P^* = P_k, Z^* = Z_k, x^* = x^{(k)} \)

is the same that would be selected by the standard Lawson-Hanson algorithm, ensuring that \( s^{(k)} \) will be a feasible direction. In practice, we compute \( y^{(k)} \) as the solution of

\[
R^{(i)}_k s^{(k)} = \left( Q^{(i)}_k \right)^T b, \quad i = 0, 1, \ldots,
\]

until the last \( l_k - i \) entries of \( y^{(k)} \) are positive.

For what concerns the second task, once \( y^{(k)} \) is found, with the same arguments used in the previous section we guarantee that (28) holds for the indices left in \( J_k \), thus ensuring the finite convergence of the inner loop with a nonempty passive set.
In Section 4, we give experimental evidence of the significant performance gain that this strategy can lead.

3 Sparse recovery

In this section we present the problem of sparse recovery and its connections with nonnegative least squares and with the deviation maximization technique. Sparse recovery is a fundamental problem in compressed sensing, signal denoising, statistical model selection and related fields, and it consists in finding the sparsest solution to an underdetermined system of equations, see e.g. [16] [14]. There is a wide literature in the field of signal processing, in which a matrix is usually referred as a dictionary and its columns are called atoms. Here, we abandon this terminology in favour of the classical linear algebra one.

Given a vector \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), we define its support \( S(x) = \{ i : x_i \neq 0 \} \). We aim at identifying the solution \( x^* \) of the linear system \( Ax = b \) with the sparsest support \( S^* \). Formally, we consider the optimization problem

\[
\min \| x \|_0, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad Ax = b. \tag{35}
\]

Recall the "\( \ell_0 \)-norm" of a vector \( x \) is defined as

\[
\| x \|_0 = |S(x)| = |\{ i : x_i \neq 0 \}|,
\]

and it is not an actual norm because it does not hold that for any scalar \( s \) we have \( \| sx \| = |s| \| x \| \). Actually, problem (35) is NP-hard, and in general we seek an approximate solution. It is well known that we can solve instead the so-called Basis Pursuit (BP) [9] problem

\[
\min \| x \|_1, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad Ax = b, \tag{36}
\]

which is a convex optimization problem, since \( \| x \|_1 \) is a convex function of \( x \). Indeed, the two problems yield the same solution provided it is sparse enough. This result is known as \( \ell_0 - \ell_1 \) equivalence, and it has been found empirically [10] and theoretically [15] [17].

3.1 Exact recovery

There are different conditions under which we have \( \ell_0 - \ell_1 \) equivalence, i.e. an exact recovery. In the literature, these conditions are usually found by showing the uniqueness of solution to problems (35) and (36) and their coincidence. As a consequence of these results, efficient algorithms to solve (36) can be used to find the sparsest solution to an underdetermined system of equations.

3.1.1 Uniqueness based on RIP

Let us recall the following definition.

**Definition 3.** Consider a matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \), and suppose there exists \( \delta_s \in (0, 1) \) such that for every \( m \times s \) submatrix \( A_s \) of \( A \) and for every \( y \in \mathbb{R}^s \) we have

\[
(1 - \delta_s) \| y \|_2^2 \leq \| A_s y \|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta_s) \| y \|_2^2. \tag{37}
\]

We say that \( A \) has the \( s \)-order Restricted Isometry Property (RIP) with constant \( \delta_s \).
For a given $s$, one is usually interested in the smallest constant $\delta_s$ for which (37) holds, which is referred as the $s$-order restricted isometry constant.

A popular result [8] states that if $\delta_{2s} < 1$, then problem (35) has a unique solution $x$ with support size obeying $\|x\|_0 \leq s$. Moreover, if $\delta_{2s} < \sqrt{2} - 1$, then the solution to problem (36) also solves problem (35). However, the problem of establishing whether a given matrix $A$ fulfills the $s$-order RIP is NP-hard in general [30].

3.1.2 Uniqueness based on ERC

Let us state the following result from [31].

**Theorem 6.** Consider a linear system $Ax = b$. If there exists a solution $\overline{x}$ with support $\overline{S} = S(\overline{x})$ such that

$$\max_{i \in \overline{S}} \left\| A_{S}^{\dagger} a_i \right\|_1 < 1,$$

(38)

then $\overline{x}$ is the unique solution to the minimum $\ell_0$ problem (35), which can be recovered by solving the minimum $\ell_1$ problem (36).

We refer to (38) as Exact Recovery Condition (ERC). This provides an easy sufficient optimality check for a given support $S$, but finding a support $S$ satisfying (38) is a combinatorial problem.

3.1.3 Uniqueness based on mutual coherence

Let us briefly introduce some definitions in order to help the reader to close the gap between numerical linear algebra and compressed sensing. Let $\Theta = (\theta_{ij})$ be the cosine matrix associated to the matrix $A$, as introduced in (7). Please note that $\theta_{ij}$ is called the cross-correlation between the columns $a_i, a_j$ in signal processing.

**Definition 4.** The coherence or mutual coherence or two-sided coherence of a matrix $A$ is defined as

$$\mu(A) = \max_{i<j} |\theta_{ij}| \left( = \max_{i>j} |\theta_{ij}| \right).$$

(39)

In [7], it is shown that if a solution $x$ with $\|x\|_0 \leq s$ exists and

$$\mu(A) < \frac{1}{2s - 1},$$

(40)

then the solution $x$ of problem (35) is unique. The condition above is easy to verify for a given matrix $A$, however it is quite demanding.

3.2 Sparse recovery by NNLS

The nonnegativity constraint is known to naturally produce sparse solutions, see e.g. [6, 18, 33, 34]. An important outcome of this body of work is that nonnegativity alone may attain a satisfactory sparse recovery. Notice that arbitrary signed sparse recovery is easily achievable. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, decompose it as $x = x^+ - x^-$, where $x^+ \geq 0$ and $x^- \geq 0$. Then the solutions of the linear system $Ax = b$ can be attained as the solutions of the nonnegative least squares problem

$$\min_{\tilde{x}} \| A\tilde{x} - b \|_2^2, \quad \tilde{x} \leq 0,$$

(41)
where $\bar{x} = \left( \begin{array}{c} x^+ \\ x^- \end{array} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and $\bar{A} = (A - A)$. This has been shown e.g. in [18] and it is sometimes referred as “positivity trick”.

### 3.2.1 Uniqueness for NNLS problem

This topic has been treated in [6, 27, 18].

**Definition 5.** Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, we say that the columns of $A$ are in General Linear Position (GPL) if

$$A_J y = 0 \Rightarrow y = 0,$$

for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^{|J|}$, with $J \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $|J| \leq \min\{m, n\}$.

When $A$ is underdetermined, GPL means that $A$ does not contain more linear dependencies than it must have.

A nonnegative solution to the linear system $Ax = b$ exists provided that $b$ is an element of the convex cone $C_A$ generated by $A$, namely

$$C_A = \{ b \in \mathbb{R}^m : b = Ax, \ x \geq 0 \}. \quad (42)$$

Suppose that $C_A$ has a nonempty interior $\hat{C}_A$. If $b \in \hat{C}_A$, then $b$ does not have a unique representation in terms of nonnegative linear combination of the columns of $A$. therefore, in order to have a unique solution then $b$ must lie on the boundary of $C_A$, $\partial C_A$. A necessary condition for $\partial C_A \neq \emptyset$ is that $C_A$ is pointed, i.e. $C_A \cap C^{-A} = \{0\}$. A sufficient condition (also necessary under GLP) for $C_A$ to be pointed is that $A \in \mathcal{M}^+$, defined as

$$\mathcal{M}^+ = \{ A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : \exists h \in \mathbb{R}^m \text{ s.t. } A^T h = w > 0 \}. \quad (43)$$

A necessary condition in order to have a unique solution to the NNLS problem (1) is that $A$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}^+$ [33, 26]. Moreover, in [26] it is shown that

$$A \in \mathcal{M}^+ \iff 0 \notin \mathcal{P}_A,$$

where $\mathcal{P}_A$ is the convex hull generated by the columns of $A$, namely

$$\mathcal{P}_A = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^m : x = A\lambda, \ \lambda \geq 0, \ 1^T \lambda = 1 \}. \quad (44)$$

For a given $A$, we can verify if $A \in \mathcal{M}^+$ by solving the following least squares problem with linear constraints

$$\min ||A\lambda||^2_2, \quad \text{s.t. } \lambda \geq 0, \ 1^T \lambda = 1. \quad (44)$$

To see this, let $\lambda^*$ be a solution of the solution above. If the optimal value attained is zero, namely $||A\lambda^*||^2_2 = 0$, then clearly $0 \in \mathcal{P}_A$ and $A \in \mathcal{M}^+$; on the other hand, if $||A\lambda^*||^2_2 > 0$ then $0$ cannot belong to $\mathcal{P}_A$ and we have $A \notin \mathcal{M}^+$. The uniqueness provided by (40) cannot be extended as it is to NNLS when the solution vector is nonnegative. Clearly, if a nonnegative solution $x$ of $Ax = b$ with $||x||_0 \leq s$ exists and

$$\mu(A) < \frac{1}{2s - 1}, \quad (45)$$

then it is the unique solution of minimum $\ell_1$-norm and it is also nonnegative, however it may not be the unique nonnegative solution to this linear system of equations. Thus, any NNLS solver has no guarantees to find the minimum $\ell_1$-norm solution in general, while any $\ell_1$ solver does.

We can extend this result by adding the necessary condition [13].
Theorem 7. Consider a linear system $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ such that $A \in \mathcal{M}^+$. If there exists a nonnegative solution $\bar{x}$ with $\|\bar{x}\|_0 \leq s$ and
\[
\mu(A) < \frac{1}{2s - 1},
\]
then $\bar{x}$ is the unique nonnegative solution and the minimum $\ell_1$-norm solution to $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$.

Let us now consider the matrix $\Gamma = (AD^{-2})^TA = (A^TAD^{-2})^T$ whose entries are given by
\[
\gamma_{ij} = \frac{a_i^Ta_j}{\|a_i\|^2}.
\]

Definition 6. The one-sided coherence of a matrix $A$ is defined as
\[
\nu(A) = \max_{i \neq j} |\gamma_{ij}|.
\]

The following results are from [6].

Lemma 4. For any matrix $A$, we have
\[
\nu(A) \geq \mu(A).
\]

Theorem 8. Consider a linear system $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ such that $A \in \mathcal{M}^+$. If there exists a nonnegative solution $\bar{x}$ with $\|\bar{x}\|_0 \leq s$ and
\[
\nu(A) \leq \frac{1}{2s - 1},
\]
or equivalently $s \leq \frac{\nu(A) + 1}{2\nu(A)}$, then $\bar{x}$ is the unique nonnegative solution to $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$.

Notice that even if we have uniqueness of the solution, we cannot ensure it when we apply the positivity trick (41). To see it, suppose take a matrix $A$ that belong to $\mathcal{M}^+$, that is there exists $h$ such that $A^Th = w > 0$. We look for $h'$ such that $(A - A)^Th' = w' > 0$, that is we look for $w'$ that solves
\[
\begin{cases}
A^Th' = w' > 0, \\
-A^Th' = -w' > 0.
\end{cases}
\]
Clearly, the linear system of inequalities above has no solution.

3.3 Sparsity enhancing methods and approximate measurements

Let us now consider the more general situation in which the linear system does not have to be exactly solved, i.e. we rather look for an approximate solution satisfying $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b} + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon$ is the vector containing the error in the measurements. A famous method addressing this problem is the so-called LASSO [29]. Following Foucart and Koslicki [18], we address to the solution of the following closely related problem
\[
\min \|\mathbf{x}\|_1^2 + \lambda \|A\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}\|_2^2.
\]
As we already pointed out that no theoretical result states that NNLS solvers ensure sparse recovery, problem (50) can be interpreted as a sparsity enhancing or squared $\ell_1$-regularization method consisting in adding a penalization term to the objective function. This problem can be thought as a weighted-sum form of a multiobjective problem where the parameter $\lambda$ controls the tradeoff between the two objectives. This
technique suffers from an evident drawback that is the choice of \( \lambda \), which is not explicitly related norm to the sparsity, nor to the linear system.

In [18], problem (50) is recast as a nonnegative least squares problem. By introducing \( \bar{x} = \begin{pmatrix} x^+ \\ x^- \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \) and \( \bar{A} = (A - A) \), problem (50) becomes

\[
\min \left\| \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \ldots & 1 \\ \lambda \bar{A} \end{pmatrix} \bar{x} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \lambda b \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2^2, \quad \text{s.t. } \bar{x} \geq 0
\] (51)

which will be referred as \( \ell_1 \text{-NNLS} \). A nice feature of this form is that the matrix involved clearly belongs to \( \mathcal{M}^+ \) and uniqueness of the solution is possible for any \( \lambda \). The equivalence between problem (50) and problem (51) above can be established for \( \lambda \to \infty \), meaning that the squared residual is much more important than the \( \ell_1 \)-norm, which becomes more and more vacuous as \( \lambda \) gets larger. This suggests it could be sufficient to solve a simple NNLS problem in order to get a sparse solution.

4 Numerical experiments

In this section, we present a few results obtained by applying LHDM and other methods for sparse recovery, to a quite large set of linear systems. We provide a C implementation of LHDM, here used for numerical tests, freely available at [https://github.com/mdessole/lhdm](https://github.com/mdessole/lhdm).

We compared LHDM with LH, a C implementation of the standard Lawson-Hanson algorithm available at [https://software.sandia.gov/appspack/version3/nnls_8c-source.html](https://software.sandia.gov/appspack/version3/nnls_8c-source.html), and with the other methods tested in [20], whose implementation is publicly available online. As done in [20], we used the default setting for optional parameters of these solvers. Our purpose is not to provide an exhaustive experimental comparison between the methods, which has been done in the cited article, but instead to assess the substantial performance gain attained by the deviation maximization to the Lawson-Hanson algorithm, i.e. by the LHDM algorithm, and its competitiveness with the other methods publicly available for sparse recovery. Actually, numerical experiments reveal that LHDM is a good choice for sparse recovery, for a wide class of instances.

Numerical tests have been carried out on two different datasets. The first dataset is freely available online and it has been created by Lorenz et al. [20]. It contains many instances satisfying the ERC (38), thus representing a favorable situation for compressed sensing in terms of recoverability of sparse solutions via \( \ell_1 \) minimization. We also include instances not satisfying the ERC in order to assess solvers’ performance outside the so-called \( \ell_0 - \ell_1 \) equivalence. In our test we have used 444 instances over 548, since we restrict our investigation to dense matrices from this dataset. In fact, dealing with sparse matrices would require a dedicated implementation of LHDM which can be addressed in the future. In order to simplify the comparison with the results here presented with the ones in [20], we keep the same indexing from 1 to 548 to show the results. Results concerning sparse instances are left blank.

The second dataset is made of a few instances of a problem we already addressed in [13], in which a sparse nonnegative solution of a Vandermonde-like linear system is sought. In our tests, we have used 6 instances consisting of large linear systems whose nonnegative solution is not unique and for which a solution satisfying the ERC (38) is not known, thus representing difficult instances of the sparse recovery problem. Note that the \( \ell_1 \) solvers here considered do not enforce nonnegativity of the solution.

Fig. [1] shows a general comparison between LHDM and each other method here considered concerning execution times and residual error, for the instances of the first dataset. We used the positivity trick presented
in \cite{41} in order to achieve an arbitrary signed solution by means of LHDM, which succeeded in exact recovery for all tests verifying the ERC, meaning that the solution with smallest support was found.
Figure 1: Residual of the solution (left) and execution times (right) of LHDM versus the five methods tested on the first dataset.
Table 1 shows the comparison between methods in terms of execution times and solution quality, for the instances of the second dataset. Notice that \( \ell_1 \) solvers look for the minimum \( \ell_1 \) solution of arbitrary sign, while LH and LHDM look for a nonnegative solution. As already pointed out, the nonnegative solutions to these linear systems is not unique and it is not known a solution satisfying any of the criteria presented in Section 3.1, thus these instances present further difficulties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chebyshev ( n = 6, d = 3 )</th>
<th>( |Ax - b|_2 )</th>
<th>time (s)</th>
<th>( |x|_0 )</th>
<th>Halton ( n = 5, d = 4 )</th>
<th>( |Ax - b|_2 )</th>
<th>time (s)</th>
<th>( |x|_0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-magic</td>
<td>2.047e-03</td>
<td>19.006</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>11-magic</td>
<td>3.548e-13</td>
<td>8.050</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-homotopy</td>
<td>4.015e-07</td>
<td>3.592</td>
<td>110592</td>
<td>11-homotopy</td>
<td>1.566e-07</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SolveBP</td>
<td>9.052e-05</td>
<td>5.869</td>
<td>100292</td>
<td>SPGL1</td>
<td>9.646e-05</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>9580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAL1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ISAL1</td>
<td>2.575e-07</td>
<td>39.387</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td>3.062e-05</td>
<td>59.331</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>1.405e-05</td>
<td>23.796</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHDM</td>
<td>2.909e-05</td>
<td>13.023</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>LHDM</td>
<td>8.745e-06</td>
<td>2.441</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chebyshev ( n = 3, d = 4 )</th>
<th>( |Ax - b|_2 )</th>
<th>time (s)</th>
<th>( |x|_0 )</th>
<th>Chebyshev ( n = 2, d = 5 )</th>
<th>( |Ax - b|_2 )</th>
<th>time (s)</th>
<th>( |x|_0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-magic</td>
<td>2.707e-03</td>
<td>10.520</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11-magic</td>
<td>2.466e-03</td>
<td>3.678</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-homotopy</td>
<td>3.742e-07</td>
<td>4.793</td>
<td>331776</td>
<td>11-homotopy</td>
<td>2.384e-07</td>
<td>9.457</td>
<td>1048576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SolveBP</td>
<td>9.993e-05</td>
<td>11.816</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>SPGL1</td>
<td>9.315e-05</td>
<td>12.184</td>
<td>32302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAL1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ISAL1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td>1.734e-05</td>
<td>52.704</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>2.11e-05</td>
<td>78.857</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHDM</td>
<td>1.534e-05</td>
<td>8.113</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>LHDM</td>
<td>1.653e-05</td>
<td>38.214</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multibubble ( n = 10, d = 3 )</th>
<th>( |Ax - b|_2 )</th>
<th>time (s)</th>
<th>( |x|_0 )</th>
<th>Halton ( n = 2, d = 10 )</th>
<th>( |Ax - b|_2 )</th>
<th>time (s)</th>
<th>( |x|_0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-magic</td>
<td>1.996e-13</td>
<td>19.188</td>
<td>18915</td>
<td>11-magic</td>
<td>8.782e-13</td>
<td>7.852</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-homotopy</td>
<td>2.057e-03</td>
<td>38.676</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>11-homotopy</td>
<td>1.420e-03</td>
<td>2.343</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SolveBP</td>
<td>2.095e-07</td>
<td>3.023</td>
<td>18915</td>
<td>SolveBP</td>
<td>1.833e-07</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGL1</td>
<td>1.170e-05</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>18915</td>
<td>SPGL1</td>
<td>5.598e-05</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAL1</td>
<td>5.322e-17</td>
<td>109.900</td>
<td>18915</td>
<td>ISAL1</td>
<td>4.008e-07</td>
<td>12.989</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td>8.536e-05</td>
<td>115.116</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>1.056e-05</td>
<td>21.375</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHDM</td>
<td>7.206e-05</td>
<td>9.526</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>LHDM</td>
<td>7.491e-06</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Results of LHDM versus the five methods tested on the second dataset. For each test and each method we list the residual of the solution found (\( \|Ax - b\|_2 \)), execution times (time (s)) and cardinality of the support (\( \|x\|_0 \)). Experiments in which an error occurred or whose execution times took more than 10 minutes are labeled by \( - \).

For both datasets, we used a fixed choice of the thresholds used in LHDM, that is \( \tau_w = 0.5, \tau_c = 0.3, \tau_u = 0.1 \) and \( k_{\max} = 32 \), hence giving evidence of the wide applicability of the method proposed without the need of choosing problem dependent parameters. The values we adopted gave the best overall execution times and were tuned on the first dataset only.

Figures 2 and 3 summarize the role of \( k_{\max} \) on the execution times. In Figure 2 it is shown the speedup of LHDM with respect to LH: the figure clearly highlights the performance gain produced by the deviation maximization, which turns out to be fundamental in order to make Lawson-Hanson algorithm competitive against to other methods for sparse recovery. For example, when a larger \( k_{\max} \) is chosen the time to solution generally decreases, but we observe that the deviation maximization may struggle to find a large set of indices to add to the passive set, as shown by the figure on the left in which we see the evolution of the cardinality of the passive set for \( k_{\max} = 8, 16, 32 \). The figures below show that the larger the value of \( k_{\max} \) is, the larger the average increase of the cardinality of the passive set is, as we might expect. In most cases, a larger \( k_{\max} \) leads to reach the solution in a smaller number of iteration (Fig. 3 on the right); however, it may cause the
algorithm to convergence in a larger number of iterations, hence with larger execution times, to a solution whose support is larger than the optimal one (Fig. 3 on the left). A preliminary investigation led $k_{\text{max}} = 32$ to be our default choice, although it could be interesting to devise an adaptive strategy for the choice of $k_{\text{max}}$. This is far from trivial and out of scope of the current work. We rather apply the strategy implemented in Algorithm 4 that allows to set a large $k_{\text{max}}$, which can be chosen by considering only memory usage and computational cost of deviation maximization.

Figure 2: Speedup of LHDM over LH for different values of $k_{\text{max}}$.

Figure 3: Evolution of the cardinality of the passive set during the execution of LHDM for different values of $k_{\text{max}}$. Test case 512 (right) and 500 (left) of the first dataset.

5 Conclusions

In this work we have presented a new NNLS solver, namely the Lawson-Hanson with Deviation Maximization algorithm, based on the “deviation maximization” columns selection strategy. Our method relies on cosine evaluation in order to select a subset of sufficiently linearly independent descent directions and we have used it as column pivoting strategy to devise a new active set method. We have provided a theoretical analysis proving the finite convergence of LHDM, which is shown to terminate in at most $2^n$ steps, just like the standard Lawson-Hanson. This is a worst case bound, and in practice a polynomial rate of convergence is observed.

This work comes together with a C implementation of LHDM, available online at https://github.com/mdessole/lhdm. Extensive numerical experiments have been carried out over a wide set of instances,
confirming that LHDM yields a significant performance gain over LH with an average speedup of 3× with peaks up to 10×. Moreover, we compared LHDM with several $\ell_1$ solvers whose implementation is publicly available online. Numerical testing has confirmed that LHDM is competitive with $\ell_1$ solvers for sparse recovery in terms of solution quality and execution times, revealing that LHDM is a good choice for sparse recovery for a wide class of instances.

We did not cope with sparse instances, since it would require a dedicated implementation based on sparse QR with column pivoting. Finally, it would be interesting to extend the deviation maximization as pivoting strategy to other problems which require column selection, e.g., more general constrained optimization problems such as least squares problems with linear inequality constraints.
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