

# A Tighter Bound for Matrix Rank-Sparsity Decomposition using $l_{\infty,2}$ norm

Sakirudeen A. Abdulsalaam and Montaz Ali

## Abstract

In this paper, we apply the Rank-Sparsity Matrix Decomposition to the planted Maximum Quasi-Clique Problem (MQCP). This problem has the planted Maximum Clique Problem (MCP) as a special case. The maximum clique problem is NP-hard. A Quasi-clique or  $\gamma$ -clique is a dense graph with the edge density of at least  $\gamma$ , where  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ . The maximum quasi-clique problem seeks to find such a subgraph with the largest cardinality in a given graph. Our method of choice is the low-rank plus sparse matrix splitting technique that has been used successfully for similar problems in the literature. We present a theoretical basis for when our convex relaxation problem recovers the planted maximum quasi-clique. We derived a new bound on the norm of the dual matrix that certifies the recovery using  $l_{\infty,2}$  norm. We showed that when certain conditions are met, our convex formulation recovers the planted quasi-clique exactly. The numerical experiments we performed corroborated our theory.

## 1 Introduction

There are many real-life optimization problems involving constraints on rank of matrices. Low order controller design, minimal realization theory, and model reduction are some examples from control theory [42]. Furthermore, in some areas of artificial intelligence, the problems of manifold learning, multi-task learning and inference with partial information have been cast as rank minimization problems (RMP) [41]. Ames and Vavasis [6] recently applied rank minimization technique to solve the maximum clique problem. The maximum clique problem requires finding the largest complete subgraph in a given graph. The maximum clique problem is applicable in identifying connected components in a computer or telecommunications network [1], coding theory, fault diagnosis in multiprocessor systems, and pattern recognition [5]. However, the maximum clique problem is too confining for some applications like data mining/clustering, community detection, criminal network analysis, epidemic control [9]. Therefore, various clique relaxation models have emerged to bridge this gap. Prominent among them is the maximum also known as maximum  $\gamma$ -clique. Finding maximum  $\gamma$ -clique in a graph means finding the largest subgraph with required edge density with  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ . When  $\gamma = 1$ , the maximum quasi-clique problem is equivalent to the maximum clique problem. Various heuristic methods are available for maximum quasi-clique recovery but the theoretical basis is lacking. This

paper present the first theoretical framework for maximum quasi-clique recovery. We formulate a new convex problem for  $\gamma$ -clique recovery by generalising the idea in [6] for the maximum quasi-clique problem. More importantly, we derive a theoretical guarantee for when the formulated convex problem succeeds by using a new type of norm known as the  $l_{\infty,2}$  norm. The rest of this paper is organised as follows. We define symbols and notations in Section 2 while a brief survey of previous related work is contained in Section 3. We present our main results and the proof of our main theorem, Theorem 4.1, in Section 4 and 5 respectively. Section 6 contains the numerical experiment while we give concluding remarks in Section 7.

## 2 Notations and Definitions

Before we proceed, we summarize the notations used in this article. We use capital letter  $X$  to denote a matrix  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ .  $X^T$  is the transpose of  $X$ . The singular values of  $X$  is the square root of the eigenvalues of the matrix  $XX^T$ . If  $X$  is symmetric, then the singular values are equivalent to the eigenvalues of  $X$ .  $\sigma_i(X)$  denotes the  $i$ -th largest singular value of  $X$ . For a  $d$ -dimensional vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , its Euclidean norm is defined as  $\|v\| = \left(\sum_{i=1}^d v_i^2\right)^{1/2}$ . Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be matrices with the same dimension, the Euclidean inner product between  $X$  and  $Y$  is defined as  $\langle X, Y \rangle := \text{trace}(X^T Y) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} X_{ij} Y_{ij}$ . This inner product is associated with a norm known as the Frobenius norm or Hilbert-Schmidt norm and is defined as  $\|X\|_F := \langle X, X \rangle^{1/2} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} X_{ij}^2\right)^{1/2} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i^2\right)^{1/2}$ , where  $r$  is the rank of  $X$  (the number of linearly independent rows or columns of  $X$  or the number of its non-zero singular values). The sum of the singular values of a matrix is known as the nuclear norm of the matrix and is defined as  $\|X\|_* := \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(X)$ . The norm is also known by some other names which include the schattern 1-norm, the Ky Fan  $r$ -norm and the trace class norm [42]. The spectral norm, operator norm or induced 2-norm of a matrix is its largest singular value. It is defined as  $\|X\| := \sigma_1(X)$ . Suppose  $X$  has rank at most  $r$ , the three norms defined above are related by the following inequalities [42]:

$$\|X\| \leq \|X\|_F \leq \|X\|_* \leq \sqrt{r} \|X\|_F \leq r \|X\|. \quad (1)$$

From equation (1), we have that

$$\text{rank}(X) \geq \frac{\|X\|_*}{\|X\|}, \quad \forall X.$$

The last two matrix norms that we will define here are the  $l_1$  and the  $l_\infty$  norm. For a matrix  $X$ ,  $\|X\|_1 := \sum_{ij} |X_{ij}|$  while  $\|X\|_\infty = \max_{ij} |X_{ij}|$ .

## 3 Related works

We give summary of the existing related works in the section. Some comparisons are done at the preliminary section of the proof of our main theorem. The heuristic based on nuclear norm minimization was introduced in [42]. It was an extension of the well known trace heuristic (see for example [11, 34]), used in control theory, to Rank Minimization

Problems (RMP). Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$  be the decision variable,  $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$  be a linear map and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then the affine rank minimization problem can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } \text{rank}(X), \\ & \text{subject to } \mathcal{A}(X) = b. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The rank minimization problem is an NP-Hard, non-convex optimization problem in general. All the available finite time algorithms have exponential running time. Nevertheless, in some cases with special structure, RMP can be reduced to solution of a linear system or solved by singular value decomposition [42]. When the singular values are all equal to one, then  $\text{rank}(X)$  is equal to the nuclear norm, i.e,  $\text{rank}(X) = \|X\|_*$ . When the singular values are less than or equal to one, then the sum is less than the rank. So, we have  $\text{rank}(X) \geq \|X\|_*$ . Hence, the nuclear norm is the tightest convex function that underestimates the rank function on the unit ball in the spectral norm. Therefore, the nuclear norm heuristic provides bounds for solutions of affine rank minimization problem. That is, suppose  $X_0$  is the minimum rank solution of  $\mathcal{A}(X) = b$ , and  $X_0$  has the spectral norm  $\|X_0\| = k$ . The convex envelop of the rank on the set  $\mathcal{C} = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2} : \|X\| \leq k\}$  is  $\|X\|_*/k$ . If  $X_*$  is the minimum nuclear norm solution of  $\mathcal{A}(X) = b$ , then we have:

$$\|X_*\|_*/k \leq \text{rank}(X_0) \leq \text{rank}(X_*).$$

Thus, when the nuclear norm solution is known, it provides both the upper and lower bound for minimum rank solution of (2). The nuclear norm is a convex function, hence it can be easily optimized. In addition, it is the best known approximation of the rank function over the set of matrices with spectral norm less than one. Hence, the objective function in (2) can be replaced with nuclear norm and then we have the following formulation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } \|X\|_*, \\ & \text{subject to } \mathcal{A}(X) = b. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Indeed, when the matrix variable is a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix, (3) is equivalent to trace heuristic [11, 34]. The convex problem (3) can be solved using a wide range of existing algorithms. Over time, nuclear norm has been observed to produce very low rank solutions in practice but the theoretical basis for when it does produce the minimum rank solution recently emerged [40].

An instance of linearly constrained matrix rank minimization problem is the matrix completion problem. Let  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$  be a rectangular matrix. Suppose only  $m$  entries of  $M$  are available with  $m \ll n_1 n_2$ . Matrix completion problem answers the question: can we recover  $M$  from its  $m$  partially observed entries? Obviously, this is not possible in general. In fact, if  $M$  is an  $n \times n$  square matrix of unknown rank,  $r$ , then it can easily be observed that matrix completion is impossible unless  $m \geq (2n - r)r$ . This is because an  $n \times n$  matrix of rank  $r$  depends on  $2nr - r^2$  degree of freedom [16, 17]. The singular value decomposition (SVD) is helpful in revealing these degree of freedom. The singular value decomposition of  $M$  is given as:

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i u_i v_i^T = U \Sigma V^T,$$

where  $\sigma_i$ , for  $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , are the singular values and  $u_i, v_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  are orthonormal left and right singular vectors respectively. In many cases where the matrix we intend to recover is known to be low ranked, recovery is possible. One of such scenario is when the columns of the matrix are independent and identically distributed random samples with low covariance. Low rank matrix recovery from partial sampling of its entries is applicable in collaborative filtering and multi-class learning [40]. Furthermore, this problem can easily be ill-posed, even with prior knowledge that the unknown matrix has low rank. For example, suppose  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is an  $n$ -dimensional vector and  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a rank-one matrix where:

$$M = e_1 y^T$$

and  $e_1$  is the first element of the standard basis of the Euclidean vector space. In this case, we cannot recover  $M$  by sampling its entries. Even if we have up to 95% random sample of this matrix, we will probably miss the elements in the first row. Hence, we will not be able to recover  $y$ , and by implication,  $M$ . This is analogous in compressed sensing to the fact that one cannot recover a signal supposed to be sparsified in time domain by sub-sampling in time domain [15]. Therefore, it is not possible to recover all low-rank matrices from a sample of its entries. To avoid such scenario, it has become a customary approach to presume that  $M$  has additional properties known as the incoherence [16, 17, 18, 21, 28].  $M$  satisfies the incoherence conditions, with parameter  $\mu \in [1, \frac{\min(n_1, n_2)}{r}]$ , if

$$\max_i \|U^T e_i\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu r}{n_1}, \quad \max_i \|V^T e_i\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu r}{n_2} \quad (4)$$

and

$$\|UV^T\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{n_1 n_2}}, \quad (5)$$

where  $e_i$ 's are the canonical basis vectors with suitable dimensions. The notion of incoherence was studied in connection with recovery of sparse representation of vectors from “*over complete dictionary*” in [25]. In addition, incoherence has been used in compressed sensing [21]. The incoherence conditions ensure that the singular vectors are well spread-out when the value of  $\mu$  is small [18]. The main objective in compressed sensing is recovery of “low-dimensional” objects, e.g sparse vectors [14, 26] or low-rank matrices [16, 42]; given incomplete observations. Moreover, matrix completion, using nuclear norm minimization, was first proposed in [16]. It was based on ideas and techniques from compressed sensing. Candés and Recht [16] showed that other structures, apart from sparse signals and images, can be recovered from a small set of observations. They introduced the incoherent model. More importantly, Candés and Recht proved that a random matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  of rank  $r$  with  $m < n^2$  observed entries can perfectly be recovered if

$$m \geq Crn^{6/5} \log n,$$

for some numerical constant  $C > 0$  with high probability. On the other hand, from information theory point of view,  $m = \mathcal{O}(nr)$  for recovery to be possible with any kind of method whatsoever. Since the emergence of this problem, several other works have followed [16], providing theoretical guarantee and efficient algorithms for successful recovery of low-rank matrices [15, 17, 30]. Although, other methods have been proposed, e.g [30],

the method of choice remains the use of convex optimization. [15, 16, 17, 40] all proved the validity and effectiveness of this approach. Ames and Vavasis [6] adapted the idea of low-rank matrix recovery to solve the planted clique problem but with a different proof technique. Chen [22] reduced the sample complexity for recovery of semidefinite matrix from  $\mathcal{O}(nr^2 \log^2 n)$  to  $\mathcal{O}(nr \log^2 n)$ . The major tool used to achieve this improvement is by deriving a new bound using the  $l_{\infty,2}$ -norm.

An extension of the matrix completion problem known as matrix decomposition problem was studied in [18, 21, 23]. In this setting, the low rank matrix is a submatrix of a larger matrix with other additional unwanted entries (sometimes called error or corruptions). Such a matrix is formed by adding a low-rank matrix to a sparse matrix. The goal is to recover the low-rank and sparse components of the given matrix. A more difficult version of this is the case when the low-rank matrix has some missing entries. Chen et al. [23] calls this case recovery in presence of errors and erasures. Generally, the matrix decomposition problem is stated as follows. We are given a matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ , which is a sum of a low rank matrix  $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$  and a sparse (errors) matrix  $C_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ . The cardinality and the values of the non-zero entries of  $C_0$  are not known; likewise the locations of the non-zero entries are also not known. The goal is to recover  $B_0$  and  $C_0$  from  $M$ . The convex formulation for this problem is:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \|B\|_* + \lambda \|C\|_1, \\ \text{subject to} \quad & B + C = M, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where  $\lambda$  is a regularisation parameter. We will discuss the choice of its value in the next section. A pertinent question will be; under what condition is decomposition possible? Chandrasekaran et al. [21] tried to answer this question using a geometric method of analysis, whereby the tangent spaces of the algebraic varieties of the low-rank and sparse matrices plays an important role. The convex formulation of the matrix completion problem is extended to matrix decomposition problem in [18]. The proof techniques follow the path in [16] but also rely very much on the powerful Golfing Scheme introduced in [28]. In this paper, we adapt matrix decomposition technique to recovery of planted quasi-clique. We are inspired by the work of Ames and Vavasis [6] but our problem formulation and proof technique differ greatly. We provide a novel theoretical guarantee for maximum quasi-clique recovery using convex relaxation. Our work can be seen as an extension of [22] to matrix decomposition problem.

## 4 Planted quasi-clique recovery using semidefinite programming

It is quite astonishing that under very little assumption, low-rank plus sparse matrix recovery is possible using problem (6). Of course for this to be feasible, the rank of the low-rank component must be small while the sparse component must have few entries.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Suppose  $B_0 \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$  obeys the incoherence conditions. Let  $\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$  and  $S \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$  be the random sign matrix. Suppose further that the entries of  $C_0$  is such that  $\text{Sgn}([C_0]_{ij}) = S_{ij}$ , where  $\text{Sgn}(\cdot)$  is a sign function. Denote the optimal pair of problem*

(6) as  $(B^*, C^*)$ . There exists universal positive constants  $c$  and  $c_0$ ; independent of  $n$ , such that if

$$c_0 \frac{\mu r \log n}{n} \leq p \leq 1,$$

where  $p$  denotes the sampling probability of entries of  $B_0$ , then  $(B^*, C^*)$  is the unique optimal solution of (6) with probability at least  $1 - c_0 n^{-10}$ .

## 4.2 Convex Relaxation for Planted Maximum Quasi-clique Problem

The maximum clique problem is a very old combinatorial optimization problem with applications in various fields [1, 7, 29]. Although the problem is  $NP$ -hard, it has attracted much attention from researchers over the years due to its wide applications. A number of mathematical formulations and algorithms have been developed to solve instances of the problem [4, 12, 20, 37].

An instance of the MCP is the planted (hidden) clique problem. The problem can be formulated in two different ways namely: the randomize approach and the adversarial approach. For the randomize approach, a graph of size  $n$  is constructed and a clique of size  $n_c$  is inserted. The remaining pair of nodes are then connected depending on a given probability  $p$ . For the adversarial approach, on the contrary, instead of joining the diversionary edges in a probabilistic manner, an adversary is allowed to join the edges instead. A restriction is placed on the maximum number of edges that can be inserted so that a clique bigger than the planted clique is not formed. According to Kučera [31], if  $n_c = \Omega(c\sqrt{n \log n})$ , where  $c$  is a constant that is large enough, then the nodes of the planted clique will probably be those with the largest degree with a very high probability. In this case, the planted clique can easily be recovered. Alon et al. [4] and Feige and Krauthgamer [27] improved this bound by developing an algorithm that can find a clique of size  $n_c = \Omega(c\sqrt{n})$  when  $c$  is large enough. The algorithm of Alon et al. relies on the spectral properties of the adjacency matrix of the input graph. Ames and Vavasis [6] proposed the following convex relaxation for the planted clique problem.

$$\min \|X\|_*, \tag{7a}$$

$$\text{subject to } \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} X_{ij} \geq n^2, \tag{7b}$$

$$X_{ij} = 0 \quad \forall ij \notin E \text{ and } i \neq j. \tag{7c}$$

As mentioned earlier, the inadequacies of the clique model for some application domain led to the emergence of various kinds of clique relaxations. The graph theoretic properties of a clique are *familiarity*, *reachability* and *robustness*. Each of the relaxation models loosen one or more of these properties. The  $k$ -clique [33],  $k$ -club [3, 35] and  $k$ -clan [35] are distance/diameter (reachability) based clique relaxations. Furthermore, the  $k$ -plex [43, 10, 9] is a degree (familiarity) based relaxation. The case  $k = 1$  in all the aforementioned relaxation models is equivalent to the classical clique model. In this paper, we focus on a relatively new clique relaxation model known as *quasi-clique* or  $\gamma$ -clique.  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$  is the relaxation parameter. When  $\gamma = 1$ , the quasi-clique model is equivalent to clique model. Therefore, the quasi-clique model generalizes the clique

model. Quasi-clique is an edge density based relaxation. For a subgraph  $C_\gamma = (V', E')$  of  $G = (V, E)$  to be a  $\gamma$ -clique, the inequality  $|E'| \geq \gamma \binom{n_c}{2}$ , where  $n_c = |V'|$ , must be satisfied. Furthermore, for the inequality to hold, the degree of every  $v \in V'$  must be at least  $\lceil \frac{\gamma(|V|-1)}{2} \rceil$ . Consequently,  $\gamma$ -clique provides a mix of relaxation in reachability, familiarity and robustness. As a result, the model fits more real life situations while preserving the ideal properties of a clique as much as possible.

The quasi-clique relaxation was proposed by Abello et al. [1, 2]. Majority of the previous studies on  $\gamma$ -clique focused on developing heuristic based algorithm for detection of large quasi-clique [38]. Abello et al. [1] was the first to publish on maximum quasi-clique problem (MQCP). They proposed a greedy randomized adaptive search procedure (GRASP) for finding large quasi-clique in graphs generated from communication data. [2] presents similar approach using semi-external memory algorithms that handles massive graph together with GRASP so as to be able to deal with graphs with millions of nodes. [13] presents a heuristic solution approach to quasi-clique problem by extending two stochastic local search algorithms for the classical MCP to  $\gamma$ -clique problem. The first study on quasi-clique from mathematical perspective was carried out in [38] where  $\gamma$ -clique problem was proved to be NP-complete. Also, an upper bound was derived for maximum  $\gamma$ -clique and mixed integer programming models were proposed for finding maximum  $\gamma$ -clique in a random graph. Recently, the model in [38] has been modified and improved in [45]. This model handles larger sized graph than the original version presented in [38]. In both cases, only numerical experiments were presented with no theoretical guaranteed for perfect quasi-clique recovery. We present a convex formulation for planted maximum quasi-clique recovery via nuclear norm minimization. Furthermore, we show that when certain conditions are met, perfect recovery is guaranteed by solving the following problem:

$$\min \|X\|_* + \lambda \|\hat{X}\|_1 \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \sum_i \sum_j X_{i,j} \geq \gamma \eta^2 \quad (8b)$$

$$X + \hat{X} = A \quad (8c)$$

$$X_{ij}, \hat{X}_{ij} \in [0, 1], \quad \eta \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (8d)$$

where  $A$  is the adjacency matrix of the given graph, the variable  $X$  is the adjacency matrix of the quasi-clique,  $\hat{X}$  is the adjacency matrix of the nodes not belonging to the quasi-clique. The constraint (8b) ensures that the recovered quasi-clique satisfies the edge density requirement while (8c) makes sure that the decomposition agrees with the input matrix.  $\eta$  is an integer value variable that determines the size of the recovered quasi-clique.

Since we are only interested in  $X$ , we can eliminate constraint (8c) and write  $\hat{X} = A - X$ . Therefore, (8) can be reformulated as

$$\min \|X\|_* + \lambda \|A - X\|_1 \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \sum_i \sum_j X_{ij} \geq \gamma \eta^2 \quad (9b)$$

$$X_{ij} \in [0, 1], \quad \eta \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (9c)$$

### 4.3 Main Results

With the formulation above, Theorem 4.1 specializes to the following:

**Theorem 4.4.** *Suppose  $Q_\gamma = (V', E')$  is an  $n_c$ -vertex  $\gamma$ -clique contained in a graph  $G = (V, E)$  of  $n$ -vertices ( $n_c < n$ ) with the adjacency matrix  $A$ . Let  $X^* \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$ . If the conditions of Theorem 4.1 holds with  $p = \gamma$ , where  $\gamma$  is the edge probability within the quasi-clique, then  $X^*$  is the unique optimal solution of (8) and  $Q_\gamma$  is the unique maximum  $\gamma$ -clique in  $G$ .*

## 5 Proof of Theorem 4.1 and 4.4

In this section, we present the proof of our main result, Theorem 4.1. The main steps follow the general idea in the low-rank matrix recovery literature [15, 16, 18, 23, 32]. The steps involved include constructing a dual matrix  $Q$ , which certifies the optimality of  $(B^*, C^*)$  for the convex problem (6). This dual certificate must obey some subgradient-type conditions. One of these conditions is that the spectral norm of  $Q$ , i.e  $\|Q\|$ , must be small. In many of the previous approaches,  $\|Q\|$  is bounded by the matrix  $l_\infty$  norm. Since  $Q$  has singular value decomposition,  $Q = U\Sigma V$ , by virtue of equation (5), there is a relationship between the bound on the dual certificate and the incoherence condition. We bound the norm of the dual certificate by the  $l_\infty$  and  $l_{\infty,2}$  norm. The  $l_{\infty,2}$  was first used in [22] to derive a tighter bound for matrix completion problem. Ours is an extension of this concept to the matrix decomposition setting. The  $l_{\infty,2}$  norm is defined on a matrix  $M$  as:

$$\|M\|_{\infty,2} := \max \left\{ \max_i \sqrt{\sum_b M_{ib}^2}, \max_j \sqrt{\sum_a M_{aj}^2} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

It is noteworthy that for any matrix  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ ,  $\|Z\|_{\infty,2} \leq \sqrt{\max\{n_1, n_2\}} \|Z\|_\infty$  [22]. Therefore, from the incoherence property, we have

$$\|UV^T\|_{\infty,2} \leq \sqrt{\max\{n_1, n_2\}} \|UV^T\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{\min\{n_1, n_2\}}},$$

or

$$\|UV^T\|_{\infty,2} \leq \sqrt{n} \|UV^T\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{n}}, \quad (11)$$

for a square matrix.

There is a norm similar to the  $l_{\infty,2}$  norm which is the  $l_{2,\infty}$  norm defined as  $\|M\|_{2,\infty} := \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Mx\|_\infty}{\|x\|_2}$ . The  $l_{2,\infty}$  is the maximum Euclidean norm of the rows of  $M$  while the  $l_{\infty,2}$  is the maximum of both the rows and column norm of  $M$  [22, 39]. These norms yield a tighter bound on the entries of a matrix than the commonly used ones [19, 22]. We show that the  $l_{\infty,2}$  norm yields a tighter bound on the norm of the dual matrix. This is achieved by expressing the bound as a sum of the  $l_\infty$  and  $l_{\infty,2}$  norm instead of the previously derived bounds in matrix decomposition literature which use the  $l_\infty$  norm only. This is one of the main contributions of this paper. In addition, we adopt some novel simplifying ideas different from the existing works.

Since every graph has a square adjacency matrix, we proof only for square matrices. The arguments follow easily for rectangular case by taking  $n = \min\{n_1, n_2\}$ . We denote universal constants that do not depend on the parameters of the problem (i.e  $n, r, \mu$ , etc) with  $c, c', c_1, c_2$ , etc. By with high probability, we mean with probability at least  $1 - c_1 n^{-c_2}$ ,  $c_1, c_2 > 0$ .

Furthermore, we will make use of linear operators which act on the space of matrices. We denote these operators by calligraphic letters, e.g  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(X)$ . In addition, we let  $\Gamma$  represent the linear space of matrices with their support contained in  $\Gamma$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp}$  is the projection onto the space of matrices with support on  $\Gamma^C$ . By implication,  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma + \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp} = \mathcal{I}$ , the identity operator. Suppose  $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is of rank  $r$  and has the singular value decomposition  $U\Sigma V^T$ , with  $U, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ . The subgradient of the nuclear norm at  $B_0$  is of the form:

$$UV^T + Q,$$

where  $U^T Q = 0, QV = 0$  and  $\|Q\| \leq 1$ .

In addition, we define  $T$ , the linear space of matrices that share the same row space or column space as  $B_0$ , as

$$T := \{UX^T + YV^T : X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}\}, \quad (12)$$

and  $T^\perp$  is its orthogonal compliment. Clearly,  $B_0 \in T$  holds always. Recall that the orthogonal projection of  $Q$  onto  $T$  is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_T Q &= \mathcal{P}_U Q + Q\mathcal{P}_V - \mathcal{P}_U Q\mathcal{P}_V \\ &= UU^T Q + QVV^T - UU^T QVV^T \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Q = Q$ , since  $\mathcal{P}_T Q + \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Q = Q$ . Basically, for any matrix  $Z$ ,

$$\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Z = (I - UU^T)Z(I - VV^T), \quad (13)$$

where  $I - UU^T$  and  $I - VV^T$  are the orthogonal projections onto the orthogonal compliment of the linear space spanned by the columns of  $U$  and  $V$  respectively. As a result of this, for any matrix  $Z$ ,  $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Z\| \leq \|Z\|$ . We will make use of this fact several times later.

The subgradient of  $l_1$ -norm at  $C_0$ , where  $\Gamma = \text{supp}(C_0)$ , is of the form:

$$\text{Sgn}(C_0) + D$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma D = 0$  and  $\|D\|_\infty \leq 1$ .

## 5.1 The Bernoulli Model and Derandomization

### 5.1.1 Bernoulli Model

Rather than showing that Theorem (4.1) holds with  $\Gamma$  sampled uniformly, where  $\Gamma$  is a random subset such that  $\Gamma = \{(i, j) : C_{ij} \neq 0\}$  of cardinality  $k$ , it is easier to prove (4.1) for  $\Gamma$  sampled according to the Bernoulli model, with  $\Gamma = \{(i, j) : \Delta_{ij} = 1\}$ , where  $\Delta_{ij}$ 's are independent and identically distributed Bernoulli random variables.  $\Delta_{ij} = 1$  with probability  $\varrho$  and 0 with probability  $1 - \varrho$ . Hence,  $\varrho n^2$  is the expected cardinality

of  $\Gamma$ . By doing this, we exploit the statistical independence of measurements. Based on the arguments presented in [15, 16, 18], any theoretical guarantee proved for Bernoulli model is also valid for the uniform model and the converse holds as well. Henceforth, we will write  $\Gamma \sim \text{Bern}(\varrho)$ , for short, to mean that  $\Gamma$  follows Bernoulli distribution with parameter  $\varrho$ .

### 5.1.2 Derandomization

Note that the sign of the entries of  $C^*$  in theorem (4.1) is fixed. Surprisingly, it is more convenient to prove the theorem under a tougher condition. We assume that the sign of  $C_{ij}^*$ , for  $C_{ij}^* \neq 0$ , are independent symmetric Bernoulli random variables which assume the value 1 or  $-1$  with probability  $1/2$ . The probability of recovering  $C^*$  with random sign on the support set of  $\Gamma$  is at least the same with  $C^*$  with fixed sign. This randomization technique was invented in [18] and has been previously used in [36] and [32]. The supporting theorem is stated formally here.

**Lemma 5.1.3** (Theorem 2.3 of [18]). *Suppose  $B_0^*$  obeys the conditions of Theorem (4.1) and that the positions of the non-zero entries of  $C_0$  follow the Bernoulli model with parameter  $2\varrho$ , with the signs of  $C_0$  independent and identically distributed  $\pm 1$  with probability  $1/2$ . Then if the solution to problem (6) is exact with high probability, it is also exact for the model with fixed signs and location sampled from the Bernoulli model with parameter  $\varrho$  with at least the same probability.*

## 5.2 Subgradient Condition for Optimality

Now, we state a sufficient condition for the pair  $(B^*, C^*)$  to be the unique optimal solution to problem (6). The conditions are stated in terms of the dual matrix, whose existence certifies optimality. These conditions are given in the following lemma which is similar to Proposition 2 of [21] and Lemma 2.4 of [18].

**Lemma 5.2.1** (Proposition 2 of [21], Lemma 2.4 of [18]). *Let  $M = B + C$ . Suppose  $\Gamma \cap T = \{0\}$  (i.e.,  $\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\| < 1$ ). Then  $(B^*, C^*)$  is the unique optimal solution to (6) if there exists a pair of dual matrix  $(D, Q)$  such that*

$$UV^T + Q = \lambda(\text{Sgn}(C_0) + D),$$

with  $\mathcal{P}_T Q = 0, \|Q\| < 1, \mathcal{P}_\Gamma D = 0$  and  $\|D\|_\infty < 1$ .

The proof of Lemma 5.2.1 can be found in Appendix A. Consequently, to proof exact recovery, it suffices to derive a dual certificate  $Q$  which satisfies:

- (a)  $Q \in T^\perp$ ,
- (b)  $\|Q\| < 1$ ,
- (c)  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T + Q) = \lambda \text{Sgn}(C_0)$ ,
- (d)  $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp}(UV^T + Q)\|_\infty < \lambda$ .

Our approach, however, yields a somewhat different certificate with high probability. This is due to a relaxation on the constraint  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T + Q) = \lambda \text{Sgn}(C_0)$ . This relaxation was introduced in [28] and was previously used in [18].

**Lemma 5.2.2** (Lemma 2.5 of [18]). *Suppose  $\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\| \leq 1/2$  and  $\lambda < 1$ . Then  $(B^*, C^*)$  is the unique optimal solution of (6) if there exists a pair of dual matrix  $(Q, D)$ , such that*

$$UV^T + Q = \lambda(\text{Sgn}(C_0) + F + \mathcal{P}_\Gamma D)$$

with  $\mathcal{P}_T Q = 0$ ,  $\|Q\| \leq 1/2$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma D = 0$ ,  $\|F\|_\infty \leq 1/2$ , and  $\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma F\| \leq 1/4$ .

Interested reader can check the proof of this Lemma in [18]. As a result of Lemma 5.2.2, it is sufficient to derive a dual matrix  $Q$ , which obeys

$$\begin{aligned} Q &\in T^\perp \\ \|Q\| &< 1/2 \\ \|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T - \lambda \text{Sgn}(C_0) + Q)\|_F &\leq \lambda/4 \\ \|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp}(UV^T + Q)\|_\infty &< \lambda/2 \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

### 5.3 Construction of Dual Certificate

We need to construct a dual matrix  $Q$  satisfying the conditions in (14).  $Q$  will be constructed using a modified version of the *Golfing Scheme* [18, 22, 23, 28]. Set  $k_0 = 20\lceil \log n \rceil$ . We decompose the observed entries of  $\Gamma$  into independent entries, so that we sample with respect to a different batch at every step. Recall that by the initial setup,  $\Gamma \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ , which implies that  $\Gamma^C \sim \text{Bern}(1-p)$ . Now, we think of  $\Gamma^C$  as a union of  $k_0$  independent samples, so that  $\Gamma^C = \bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq k_0} \Gamma_k$ , with each  $\Gamma_k$  following the Bernoulli model with parameter  $q$  (probability of sampling for each batch). This gives the following Binomial model:

$$\mathbb{P}((i, j) \in \Gamma) = \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(k_0, q) = 0) = (1-q)^{k_0}, \tag{15}$$

and the two models are equivalent if  $p = (1-q)^{k_0}$ . Hence, this  $\Gamma$  has the same distribution with the initial model. The *Bin* in equation (15) means binomial. Because of the intersections between the  $\Gamma_k$ 's  $q \geq \frac{(1-p)}{k_0}$  [18].

We now proceed to construct a dual certificate  $Q = Q_B + Q_C$ . Details about the two components of  $Q$  are as follow.

#### 5.3.1 Constructing $Q_B$ using Golfing Scheme

Let  $k_0$  and  $\Gamma_k, k \in [1, k_0]$ , be as defined above. Also, recall that  $\Gamma^C = \bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq k_0} \Gamma_k$ . Starting with  $Y_0 = 0$  and proceeding inductively, define

$$Y_k = Y_{k-1} + p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_k} \mathcal{P}_T(UV^T - Y_{k-1}), \tag{16}$$

and set

$$Q_B = \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Y_{k_0}. \tag{17}$$

### 5.3.2 Constructing $Q_C$ using Least Square Method

Suppose  $\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\| < 1/2$ , then  $\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma\| < 1/4$ . Thus, the operator  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma$  is invertible. We write  $(\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1}$  for the inverse and set

$$Q_C = \lambda \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1} \text{Sgn}(C_0). \quad (18)$$

There is an alternative definition of (18) using the convergent Neumann series [17, 18]. The definition is as follows:

$$Q_C = \lambda \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} \sum_{k \geq 0} (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^k \text{Sgn}(C_0). \quad (19)$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\Gamma Q_C &= \lambda \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1} \text{Sgn}(C_0) \\ &= \lambda \mathcal{P}_\Gamma (\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{P}_T) (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1} \text{Sgn}(C_0) \\ &= \lambda (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma) (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1} \text{Sgn}(C_0) \\ &= \lambda \text{Sgn}(C_0). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

(20) follows from properties of the projection operators, i.e for any two projection operators  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_1 = \mathcal{P}_1^2$  while  $\mathcal{P}_1 \mathcal{P}_2 = \mathcal{P}_2 \mathcal{P}_1$  must hold for the product  $\mathcal{P}_1 \mathcal{P}_2$  to be a projector [8]. Consequently, one can verify that among all the matrices  $Q \in T^\perp$  which satisfies  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma Q = \lambda \text{Sgn}(C_0)$ ,  $Q_C$  is the one with minimum Frobenius norm [18]. Since, by construction,  $Q_B, Q_C \in T^\perp$  and  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma Q_C = \lambda \text{Sgn}(C_0)$ , it remains to show that  $Q = Q_B + Q_C$  obeys:

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_B + Q_C\| &< 1/2 \\ \|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T + Q_B)\|_F &\leq \lambda/4 \\ \|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp}(UV^T + Q_B + Q_C)\|_\infty &< \lambda/2 \end{aligned}$$

to establish (14). Indeed, our approach yields a better bound on  $Q$ . Our new results is proposed in the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.3.3.** *Suppose  $\Gamma \sim \text{Bern}(p)$  such that  $0 < p \leq 1$ . Let  $k_0 = 20 \lceil \log n \rceil$ , then under the assumption of Theorem 4.1, the matrix  $Q_B$  satisfies:*

- i.  $\|Q_B\| < 1/8$ ,
- ii.  $\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T + Q_B)\| < \lambda/8$ ,
- iii.  $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp}(UV^T + Q_B)\|_\infty < \lambda/4$ .

Furthermore, if  $\text{supp}(C_0) = \Gamma$  ( $\Gamma$  is as sampled earlier at the beginning of Section 5.3), and the signs of  $C_0$  are symmetric iid, then when the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 holds, the matrix  $Q_C$  satisfies:

- iv.  $\|Q_C\| < 1/8$ ,
- v.  $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp} Q_C\|_\infty < 1/4$ .

## 5.4 Key Lemmas

We now state some important Lemmas which are used to establish our results, Theorem 4.1. Our proof differs here, substantially, from the existing works. We derive bound on  $Q$  in terms of  $l_{\infty,2}$  norm. This is done with the aid of the following two Lemmas. The first lemma is used to bound the operator norm of  $(p^{-1}\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{I})Z$ , for a matrix  $Z$ , in terms of the  $l_{\infty,2}$  and  $l_\infty$  norms of  $Z$ . The bound produced this way is tighter [22] than the previous ones [18, 23].

**Lemma 5.4.1** (Lemma 2 of [22]). *Let  $Z$  be a square matrix of dimension  $n$ . For a universal constant  $c > 1$ , we have*

$$\|(p^{-1}\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{I})Z\| \leq c \left( \frac{\log n}{p} \|Z\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{p}} \|Z\|_{\infty,2} \right),$$

with high probability.

The next Lemma provides for further controls on the  $l_{\infty,2}$  norm.

**Lemma 5.4.2** (Lemma 3 of [22]). *Suppose  $Z \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$  is a fixed matrix. If  $p \geq c_0 \frac{\mu r \log n}{n}$ , for some  $c_0 > 0$  which is large enough, then*

$$\|(\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - p^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\mathcal{P}_\Gamma)Z\|_{\infty,2} \leq 1/2 \sqrt{\frac{n}{\mu r}} \|Z\|_\infty + 1/2 \|Z\|_{\infty,2},$$

with high probability.

The proof of these two lemmas can be found in [22]. We also need the following standard results which enable us to manipulate the  $l_\infty$  norm.

**Lemma 5.4.3** (Lemma 4 of [22], Lemma 3.1 of [18], Lemma 13 of [23]). *Suppose  $Z \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$  is a fixed matrix and that  $\Gamma_0 \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ . If  $p \geq c_0 \frac{\mu r \log n}{n}$ , for some  $c_0 > 0$  large enough, then*

$$\|(\mathcal{P}_T - p^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\mathcal{P}_\Gamma\mathcal{P}_T)Z\|_\infty \leq 1/2 \|Z\|_\infty,$$

with high probability.

**Lemma 5.4.4** (Theorem 6.3 of [16], Lemma 3.2 of [18]). *Suppose  $Z \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$  is a fixed matrix and that  $\Gamma_0 \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ . If  $p \geq c_0 \frac{\mu r \log n}{n}$ , for some  $c_0 > 0$  sufficiently large, then with high probability,*

$$\|(p^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_0} - \mathcal{I})Z\| \leq c'_0 \sqrt{\frac{n \log n}{p}} \|Z\|_\infty,$$

for some small numerical constant  $c'_0 > 0$ .

**Lemma 5.4.5** (Theorem 4.1 of [16], Theorem 2.6 of [18], Lemma 1 of [22]). *Suppose  $p \geq c_0 \frac{\mu r \log n}{n}$  for some sufficiently large  $c_0$ , then (with high probability);*

$$\|\mathcal{P}_T - p^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\mathcal{P}_\Gamma\mathcal{P}_T\| \leq 1/2.$$

We will also need the following results on bounds of the operator norm of random matrices.

**Lemma 5.4.6** (Corollary 2.3.5 of [44]). *Let  $Z \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$  be a random matrix with  $Z_{ij}$  being independent and identically distributed random variables. Suppose  $Z_{ij}$  is uniformly bounded in magnitude by one and has mean zero. Then there exist constants  $c, c^* > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Z\| > \varpi\sqrt{n}) \leq c^* \exp(-c\varpi n)$$

for all  $\varpi \in$  greater than or equal to  $c^*$ .

As a consequence, we have  $\|Z\| \leq \varpi\sqrt{n}$  with high probability.

**Definition 5.4.7** (Definition 5.1 of [46], Nets). *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and  $\delta > 0$ . A subset  $\mathcal{N}_\delta$  of  $X$  is called a  $\delta$ -net of  $X$  if every point  $x \in X$  can be approximated to within  $\delta$  by some point  $y \in \mathcal{N}_\delta$ , such that  $d(x, y) \leq \delta$ .*

**Lemma 5.4.8** (Lemma 5.2 of [46]). *The unit Euclidean sphere<sup>1</sup>  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  equipped with the Euclidean metric satisfies, for every  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}, \delta) \leq (1 + \frac{2}{\delta})^n$ .*

**Lemma 5.4.9** (Lemma 5.3 of [46]). *Let  $Z \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$  be a matrix, and suppose that  $\mathcal{N}_\delta$  is a  $\delta$ -net of  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  for some  $\delta \in [0, 1)$ . Then*

$$\|Z\| \leq (1 - \delta)^{-2} \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{N}_\delta} \langle y, Zx \rangle.$$

Equipped with these Lemmas, we are now ready to prove Lemma 5.3.3.

## 5.5 Proof of Lemma 5.3.3

Proof of (i.)

*Proof.* Note that from the construction of the dual certificate,  $Q = Q_B + Q_C$ . Also, from Equation (16),  $Y_k = Y_{k-1} + p^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_k}\mathcal{P}_T(UV^T - Y_{k-1})$  and  $Y_0 = 0$ . We set  $Z_k = UV^T - \mathcal{P}_T Y_k$  for  $k = 0, \dots, k_0$ ; so that  $Z_0 = UV^T$  and

$$Z_k = (\mathcal{P}_T - p^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_k}\mathcal{P}_T)Z_{k-1}. \quad (21)$$

Hence,

$$Y_{k_0} = \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} p^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_k}Z_{k-1}. \quad (22)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The unit Euclidean  $(n - 1)$ -sphere is defined as  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n : \|x\| = 1\}$

Observe that  $Z_k \in T$ , therefore  $\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Z_k = 0$ . Since  $Q_B = \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Y_{k_0}$  (see Equation 17), then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Q_B\| &= \|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Y_{k_0}\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \|p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_k} Z_{k-1}\| \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} (p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_k} Z_{k-1} - Z_{k-1})\|^\diamond \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \|p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_k} Z_{k-1} - Z_{k-1}\| \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \|(p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_k} - \mathcal{I}) Z_{k-1}\| \\
&\leq c \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \left( \frac{\log n}{p} \|Z_{k-1}\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{p}} \|Z_{k-1}\|_{\infty,2} \right)^\spadesuit \\
&\leq c \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \left( \frac{n}{c_0 \mu r} \|Z_{k-1}\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{n}{c_0 \mu r}} \|Z_{k-1}\|_{\infty,2} \right)^\clubsuit \\
&\leq c \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \left( \frac{n}{\sqrt{c_0 \mu r}} \|Z_{k-1}\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{n}{c_0 \mu r}} \|Z_{k-1}\|_{\infty,2} \right)^\dagger \\
&\leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{c_0}} \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \left( \frac{n}{\sqrt{\mu r}} \|Z_{k-1}\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{n}{\mu r}} \|Z_{k-1}\|_{\infty,2} \right). \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

The expression in the first line is as a result of Equation 22.  $\diamond$  follows from the fact that  $\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Z_k = 0$ .  $\spadesuit$  is application of Lemma 5.4.1.  $\clubsuit$  holds for  $p \geq \frac{c_0 \mu r \log n}{n}$  while  $\dagger$  is valid since we can choose  $c_0$  such that  $c_0 \mu r > 1$  so that  $\frac{n}{c_0 \mu r} \leq \frac{n}{\sqrt{c_0 \mu r}}$  holds. We will now bound  $\|Z_{k-1}\|_\infty$  and  $\|Z_{k-1}\|_{\infty,2}$  by applying Lemma 5.4.3. Using (21), applying Lemma 5.4.3 repeatedly (replacing  $\Gamma$  with  $\Gamma_k$ ), we have (with high probability);

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Z_{k-1}\|_\infty &= \|(\mathcal{P}_T - p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_{k-1}} \mathcal{P}_T) \dots (\mathcal{P}_T - p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_1} \mathcal{P}_T) Z_0\|_\infty \\
&= \left\| \prod_{k=1}^{k-1} (\mathcal{P}_T - p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_k} \mathcal{P}_T) Z_0 \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq (1/2)^{k-1} \|UV^T\|_\infty, \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

since  $Z_0 = UV^T$ . In like manner, we apply Lemma 5.4.2 to  $\|Z_{k-1}\|_{\infty,2}$ , using Equation (21) again and replacing  $\Gamma$  with  $\Gamma_k$  to get, with high probability,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Z_{k-1}\|_{\infty,2} &= \|(\mathcal{P}_T - p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_{k-1}} \mathcal{P}_T) Z_{k-2}\|_{\infty,2} \\
&\leq 1/2 \sqrt{\frac{n}{\mu r}} \|Z_{k-2}\|_\infty + 1/2 \|Z_{k-2}\|_{\infty,2} \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (24) and (25) and using (21) repeatedly, then

$$\|Z_{k-1}\|_{\infty,2} \leq k(1/2)^{k-1} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\mu r}} \|UV^T\|_\infty + (1/2)^{k-1} \|UV^T\|_{\infty,2}. \tag{26}$$

Substituting (24) and (26) back into (23), we get;

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Q_B\| &\leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{c_0}} \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \left( \frac{n}{\sqrt{\mu r}} (1/2)^{k-1} \|UV^T\|_\infty + \right. \\
&\quad \left. \sqrt{\frac{n}{\mu r}} \left( k(1/2)^{k-1} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\mu r}} \|UV^T\|_\infty + (1/2)^{k-1} \|UV^T\|_{\infty,2} \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{c}{\sqrt{c_0}} \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \left( \frac{n}{\sqrt{\mu r}} (k+1)(1/2)^{k-1} \|UV^T\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{n}{\mu r}} (1/2)^{k-1} \|UV^T\|_{\infty,2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{c_0}} \frac{n}{\sqrt{\mu r}} \|UV^T\|_\infty \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} (k+1)(1/2)^{k-1} + \frac{c}{\sqrt{c_0}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\mu r}} \|UV^T\|_{\infty,2} \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} (1/2)^{k-1} \\
&\leq \frac{6c}{\sqrt{c_0}} \frac{n}{\sqrt{\mu r}} \|UV^T\|_\infty + \frac{2c}{\sqrt{c_0}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\mu r}} \|UV^T\|_{\infty,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

From (5) and (11),  $\|UV^T\|_\infty \leq \frac{\sqrt{\mu r}}{n}$  and

$$\|UV^T\|_{\infty,2} = \max \left\{ \max_i \|U^T e_i\|^2, \max_j \|V^T e_j\|^2 \right\} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{n}}.$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Q_B\| = \|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Y_{k_0}\| &\leq \frac{6c}{\sqrt{c_0}} + \frac{2c}{\sqrt{c_0}} \\
&= \frac{8c}{\sqrt{c_0}} \leq 1/8,
\end{aligned}$$

provided  $c_0 \geq (64c)^2$ . □

Proof of (ii.)

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T + Q_B) &= \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T + \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Y_{k_0}) \\
&= \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T + Y_{k_0} - \mathcal{P}_T Y_{k_0}) \\
&= \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T - \mathcal{P}_T Y_{k_0}) \\
&= \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T - \mathcal{P}_T(Y_{k_0-1} + p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_{k_0}} \mathcal{P}_T(UV^T - \mathcal{P}_T Y_{k_0-1}))) \\
&= \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T - \mathcal{P}_T Y_{k_0-1} - p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_{k_0}} \mathcal{P}_T(UV^T - \mathcal{P}_T Y_{k_0-1})) \\
&= \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(Z_{k_0-1} - p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_{k_0}} \mathcal{P}_T Z_{k_0-1}) \\
&= \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(\mathcal{P}_T - p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_{k_0}} \mathcal{P}_T) Z_{k_0-1} = \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(Z_{k_0}).
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

$\mathcal{P}_\Gamma Y_{k_0} = 0$  (since  $\Gamma \cap T = \{0\}$  from the conditions of Lemma 5.2.1), therefore 27 holds. The last equality in the last line above follows from Equation (21). Hence,

$$\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T + Q_B)\|_F \leq \|Z_{k_0}\|_F = \|\mathcal{P}_T - p^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_{k_0}} \mathcal{P}_T\| \cdot \|Z_{k_0-1}\|_F. \tag{28}$$

Notice that by the conditions of Theorem 4.1,  $p \geq \frac{c_0 \mu r \log n}{n}$  and  $\Gamma_k$  is independent of  $Z_{k-1}$ . Using the recurrence relation (21) again and applying Lemma 5.4.5 repeatedly (replacing  $\Gamma$  with  $\Gamma_k$ ), we get with high probability;

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(UV^T + Q_B)\|_F &\leq (1/2)^{k_0} \|UV^T\|_\infty \\ &= (1/2)^{k_0} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{n^2}} \\ &< \frac{1}{8\sqrt{n}} = \frac{\lambda}{8}, \quad (\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}) \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

The second line holds from Equation (5) while the last inequality is valid since  $(1/2)^{k_0}$  tends to zero as  $k_0$  increases.  $\square$

Proof of (iii.)

*Proof.* We are required to show that  $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(UV^T + Q_B)\|_\infty < \lambda/4$ . Observe that  $Z_k = UV^T - \mathcal{P}_T Y_k$  implies that  $UV^T = Z_k + \mathcal{P}_T Y_k$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} UV^T + Q_B &= Z_{k_0} + \mathcal{P}_T Y_{k_0} + \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Y_{k_0} \\ &= Z_{k_0} + Y_{k_0}. \end{aligned}$$

We know that the support of  $Y_{k_0}$  is  $\Gamma^C$  and, by virtue of (28) and (29), we have shown that  $\|Z_{k_0}\|_F = \|\mathcal{P}_T - p^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_{k_0}}\mathcal{P}_T\| Z_{k_0-1}\|_F < \lambda/8$ . Therefore, to show that  $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(UV^T + Q_B)\|_\infty = \|Z_{k_0} + Y_{k_0}\|_\infty < \lambda/4$ , it is sufficient to show that  $\|Y_{k_0}\|_\infty < \lambda/8$ . Recall from (22) that  $Y_{k_0} = \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} p^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_k} Z_{k-1}$ . It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y_{k_0}\|_\infty &\leq p^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma_k} Z_{k-1}\|_\infty \\ &\leq p^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \|Z_{k-1}\|_\infty \\ &\leq p^{-1} (1/2)^{k_0} \|UV^T\|_\infty \\ &\leq p^{-1} (1/2)^{k_0} \frac{\sqrt{\mu r}}{n} \\ &\leq \frac{n}{c_0 \mu r \log n} (1/2)^{k_0} \frac{\sqrt{\mu r}}{n} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c_0 \sqrt{\mu r} \log n} (1/2)^{k_0} < \frac{1}{8\sqrt{n}} = \frac{\lambda}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

The same argument for the last line of (29) is applicable for the last inequality here as well.  $\square$

Proof of (iv.)

*Proof.* From equation (19),

$$\begin{aligned} Q_C &= \lambda \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} \sum_{k \geq 0} (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^k \text{Sgn}(C_0) \\ &= \lambda \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} \text{Sgn}(C_0) + \lambda \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} \sum_{k \geq 1} (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^k \text{Sgn}(C_0). \end{aligned}$$

We define  $\Phi = \text{Sgn}(C_0)$  with the following probability distribution:

$$\Phi_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } p/2, \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - p, \\ -1 & \text{with probability } p/2. \end{cases}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_C &= \lambda \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} \Phi + \lambda \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} \sum_{k \geq 1} (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^k \Phi \\ &:= \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Q_C^0 + \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Q_C^1. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Therefore, to derive a bound for  $Q_C$ , we only need to derive a bound for  $\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Q_C^0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Q_C^1$ . Applying Lemma 5.4.6 to the first term of (30), the following holds with high probability;

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} Q_C^0\| &\leq |\lambda| \|\Phi\| \\ &\leq \lambda c^* \sqrt{pn} = c^* \sqrt{p}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ , hence the last part of the equation above follows. For the second term of (30), let  $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} \sum_{k \geq 1} (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^k$ , so that  $\|Q_C^1\| = |\lambda| \|\mathcal{R}(\Phi)\|$ . We are required to find a bound on the operator norm of  $\mathcal{R}(\Phi)$ . We make use of Lemmas 5.4.8 and 5.4.9 to achieve this. Let  $\mathcal{N}_\delta$  be a  $\delta$ -net for a sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  of size at most  $(3/\delta)^n$ . Then by Lemma 5.4.9,

$$\|\mathcal{R}(\Phi)\| \leq (1 - \delta)^{-2} \max_{x, y \in \mathcal{N}_\delta} \langle y, \mathcal{R}(\Phi)x \rangle$$

We define a random variable  $Y(x, y)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} Y(x, y) &:= \langle y, \mathcal{R}(\Phi)x \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{R}(yx^*), \Phi \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

for a fixed pair  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{N}_\delta \times \mathcal{N}_\delta$  with unit norm. (31) holds because  $\mathcal{R}$  is a self-adjoint operator [18]. Note that the support of  $\Phi$  is  $\Gamma$  and  $\Phi$  is a symmetric matrix with independent and identically distributed random signs. Using Hoeffding's Inequality, conditioning on  $\Gamma$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|Y(x, y)| > \tau | \Gamma) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-2\tau^2}{\|\mathcal{R}(yx^*)\|_F^2}\right),$$

for  $\tau \geq 0$ . Since  $(yx^*)$  is a unit-normed vector,  $\|yx^*\|_F = 1$ . Therefore,  $\|\mathcal{R}(yx^*)\|_F \leq \|\mathcal{R}\|$  holds. So, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{x, y \in \mathcal{N}_\delta} |Y(x, y)| > \tau | \Gamma\right) \leq 2|\mathcal{N}_\delta|^2 \exp\left(\frac{-2\tau^2}{\|\mathcal{R}\|^2}\right).$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}\| &= \|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} \sum_{k \geq 1} (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^k\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \|(\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^k\| = \sum_{k \geq 1} \|(\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T)\|^{2k} \\ &= \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\|^2}{1 - \|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The equality in the immediate equation before the last line above holds with the assumption that the product of  $\mathcal{P}_T$  and  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma$  commute and for the fact that  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma^2 = \mathcal{P}_\Gamma$ . Considering the event  $\psi := \{\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\| \leq \beta\}$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{R}\| \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\|^2}{1 - \|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\|^2} = \frac{\beta^2}{1 - \beta^2}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{R}(\Phi)\| > \tau | \Gamma) &\leq 2(3/\delta)^{2n} \exp\left(\frac{-2\tau^2}{((1-\delta)^{-2}(\frac{\beta^2}{1-\beta^2}))^2}\right) \\ &= 2(3/\delta)^{2n} \exp\left(\frac{-2\tau^2(1-\beta^2)^2(1-\delta)^4}{\beta^4}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and marginally,

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{R}(\Phi)\| > \tau) \leq 2(3/\delta)^{2n} \exp\left(\frac{-2\tau^2(1-\beta^2)^2(1-\delta)^4}{\beta^4}\right) + \mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\| \geq \beta).$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda \|\mathcal{R}(\Phi)\| > \tau) \leq 2(3/\delta)^{2n} \exp\left(\frac{-2\tau^2(1-\beta^2)^2(1-\delta)^4}{\lambda^2 \beta^4}\right) + \mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\| \geq \beta),$$

with  $\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ . Conclusively,

$$\|Q_C\| \leq c^* \sqrt{p} + |\lambda| \|\mathcal{R}(\Phi)\| \leq 1/8,$$

with high probability, provided that  $\beta$  is small enough and for an appropriate choice of  $c^*$  and  $\delta$ .  $\square$

Proof of (v.)

*Proof.* Recall that  $Q_C = \lambda \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1} \text{Sgn}(C_0)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp} Q_C &= \lambda \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp} \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1} \text{Sgn}(C_0) \\ &= \lambda \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp} (\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{P}_T) (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1} \text{Sgn}(C_0) \\ &= \lambda [\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp} (\mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1} - \mathcal{P}_T (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1}] \text{Sgn}(C_0). \end{aligned}$$

Since the operator  $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma$  maps  $\Gamma$  onto itself,  $(\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1}$  is in  $\Gamma$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp} (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1} = 0$ . So, we have

$$\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp} Q_C = -\lambda \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\perp} \mathcal{P}_T (\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1} \Phi, \quad (32)$$

where  $\Phi = \text{Sgn}(C_0)$ . Now, for  $(i, j) \in \Gamma^C$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{Cij} &= \langle e_i, Q_C e_j \rangle \\ &= \langle e_i e_j^T, Q_C \rangle \\ &= \lambda \langle W(i, j), \Phi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where  $W(i, j)$  is the matrix  $-(\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1} \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T (e_i e_j^T)$ . Since  $\Gamma = \text{supp}(\Phi)$ , the signs of  $\Phi$  are independent, symmetric and identically distributed. Applying Hoeffding's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|Q_{C_{ij}}| > \tau \lambda |\Gamma|) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-2\tau^2}{\|W(i, j)\|_F^2}\right),$$

therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\sup_{i,j} |Q_{C_{ij}}| > \tau \lambda |\Gamma|) \leq 2n^2 \exp\left(\frac{-2\tau^2}{\sup_{i,j} \|W(i, j)\|_F^2}\right).$$

For a matrix of the form  $e_i e_j^T$ , from (13), we have

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} e_i e_j^T\|_F^2 = \|(\mathcal{I} - UU^T)e_i\|^2 \|(\mathcal{I} - VV^T)e_j\|^2 \geq \left(1 - \frac{\mu r}{n}\right)^2. \quad (33)$$

The last inequality is based on (4) with the assumption that  $\frac{\mu r}{n} \leq 1$ . From the fact that  $\|\mathcal{P}_T e_i e_j^T\|_F^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp} e_i e_j^T\|_F^2 = 1$ , we deduce

$$\|\mathcal{P}_T e_i e_j^T\|_F \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mu r}{n}}, \quad (34)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T (e_i e_j^T)\|_F &\leq \|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\| \|\mathcal{P}_T (e_i e_j^T)\|_F \\ &\leq \beta \sqrt{\frac{2\mu r}{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

on the event  $\{\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\| \leq \beta\}$ . Similarly, on the same event,

$$\|(\mathcal{P}_\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{P}_\Gamma)^{-1}\|_F \leq \frac{1}{1 - \beta^2}. \quad (35)$$

Therefore,

$$\|W(i, j)\|_F^2 \leq \frac{2\beta^2}{(1 - \beta^2)^2} \frac{\mu r}{n}. \quad (36)$$

Hence, unconditionally, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{i,j} |Q_{C_{ij}}| > \tau \lambda\right) \leq 2n^2 \exp\left(\frac{-n(1 - \beta^2)^2 \tau^2}{2\beta^2 \mu r}\right) + \mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_T\| \geq \beta). \quad (37)$$

□

Similar proof to this part can be found in [18]. This concludes the proof of the Theorems. We performed series of numerical experiments to corroborate our claim. The report of these experiments is presented in the next section.

## 6 Experiments

In this section, we report the results of the numerical experiments performed to test the efficiency and effectiveness of problem 6 in planted maximum quasi-clique recovery. Firstly, we investigated the performance of the problem for various  $\gamma$ -clique and graph sizes. Secondly, we fixed the size of the graph and the planted  $\gamma$ -clique and then varied the edge connectivity within the  $\gamma$ -clique and the amount of diversionary edges that can be added for which perfect recovery would still be realized. All of these experiments were performed using CVXPY developed by Diamond and Boyd [24]. The experiments were performed in Python on an HP personal computer equipped with Intel core i7 2.7 GHz processor and 16GB RAM. For both of the experiments, we chose  $\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ . There is nothing special about our choice of  $\lambda$ . Various other values of  $\lambda$  will also work [18, 22]. Each of the experiments was repeated ten times.

### 6.1 Exact recovery from varying $\gamma$ – clique size

For our model to recover  $\gamma$ -clique,  $n_c$  must be large enough. To check what size of  $\gamma$ -clique can be recovered from a given network, we planted  $\gamma$ -clique of various sizes in some graphs and tried to recover them. We randomly generated  $n \times n$  symmetric binary matrices with  $n = 25, 50, 75, \dots, 250$ . We inserted  $\gamma$ -clique of sizes equal to 10%, 20%,  $\dots$ , 100% of the size of the matrices using binomial distribution as described before. In each case, we fixed  $\gamma$  (the edge density parameter of the quasi-clique) to be 0.85 and  $\rho$  (the probability of adding a diversionary edge) was 0.25. We generated an  $n \times n$  zero matrices  $X \in^{n \times n}$  and  $\hat{X} \in^{n \times n}$ . Let  $\Omega$  be the set of indices corresponding to the nodes belonging to the quasi-clique. Consequently,  $\Omega^c$  is the set indices of the nodes of the diversionary edges. The entries of  $\Omega$  are equal to one with probability  $\gamma$  and zero with probability  $1 - \gamma$ . Hence,  $\Omega$  has expected cardinality  $|\Omega| = \gamma n_c^2$ .  $\Omega^c$  also follows a Bernoulli distribution with parameter  $\rho$  and expected cardinality of  $\rho(n^2 - n_c^2)$ .  $n_c$  is the size of planted quasi-clique. We formed  $A$  by adding  $X$  and  $\hat{X}$  and tried to recover  $X$  from  $A$ . We declare a recovery attempt to be successful if the relative error (in Frobenius norm) of the recovered matrix is less than or equal to  $10^{-6}$ , i.e.,  $\|X - X^*\|_F / \|X\|_F \leq 10^{-6}$ , where  $X^*$  is the recovered  $\gamma$ -clique. Figure 1 contains the plot of the probability of recovery from different graph sizes and quasi-clique sizes. White area denotes perfect recovery while the black area means the recovery attempt failed for every trial. We discovered that when the  $\gamma$ -clique is less than 10% of the graph size, recovery is impossible and when the quasi-clique size is bigger than 60% of the graph size, perfect recovery is guaranteed for all the graph sizes in our experiment.




Figure 1: Exact recovery of varying quasi-clique size from graphs of different sizes

## 6.2 Recovery from varying edge density and random noise

Theorem 4.4 shows that convex programming can recover an incoherent, low-rank noisy matrix with a reasonable level of missing entries. In the next experiment, we determined, experimentally, the maximum tolerable level of diversionary edges (noise) that can be added along with the minimum observing probability (edge density) required for perfect recovery. The set-up follows the previous experiment with  $n = 100$  and  $200$ . In both cases, the  $\gamma$ -clique size,  $n_c$ , was  $85$  and  $170$  respectively. The results of this experiment is presented in Figures 2 and 3. In both cases, we observed a phase transition, whereby the probability of recovery jumps from zero to one as  $\gamma$  reached a particular threshold. This is in agreement with our theoretical claim that when  $\gamma \geq \frac{c_0 \mu r \log n}{n}$ , for some constant  $c_0 > 0$ , exact recovery is guaranteed. In addition, we recorded complete failure when the probability of adding a random noise,  $\rho$ , is greater than or equal to  $0.6$ , i.e, when  $\rho \geq 0.6$ . This implies that when the random noise becomes too much, recovery becomes impossible. As a conclusion, no  $\gamma$ -clique of any size can be recovered by our method when  $\gamma$  is less than the recovery threshold (i.e, the edge density of the planted  $\gamma$ -clique to be recovered is too low), the size of the planted  $\gamma$ -clique is too small or  $\rho \geq 0.6$  meaning the random noise is too much.




Figure 2:  $\gamma$  - *clique* recovery from varying edge density and random noise with  $n = 100$  and  $n_c = 85$




Figure 3:  $\gamma$ -*clique* recovery from varying edge density and random noise with  $n = 200$  and  $n_c = 170$

## 7 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have considered the mathematical modelling, theoretical framework, and computational aspects of recovering a density-based clique relaxation, known as quasi-clique, in networks. The planted quasi-clique problem is an extension of the planted clique problem. We have shown that the planted quasi-clique can be solved by relaxing it to a convex programming. This was achieved by borrowing techniques from low rank matrix decomposition and adapting it to the problem under consideration. We have used this formulation to solve the planted maximum quasi-clique problem in the randomized case. In the case where the input graph contains the desired single large dense subgraph and a moderate number of diversionary vertices and edges, then the relaxation is exact. Therefore, in planted case, these difficult combinatorial optimization problem can be efficiently solved using the tractable relaxation. One of our methodological contributions is the sharp theoretical bounds obtained for the dual matrix. Our proof follows the state of the art in the matrix decomposition literature. However, our innovations lie in the tools we used for our analysis to achieve better results. We improved the results on low rank matrix decomposition by deriving the bound on our dual matrix, using the matrix  $l_{\infty,2}$  norm. This norm has previously been used for matrix completion problem. We established conditions under which recovery is achievable by deriving a dual matrix, certifying the optimality of our solution.

The results in Section 6.2 is consistent with our theoretical findings that when  $\gamma \geq \frac{c_0 \mu r \log n}{n}$ , our convex formulation is guaranteed to recover the planted quasi-clique. However, this is constrained by the level of random noise present. No matter what the value of  $\gamma$  is, when  $\rho \geq 0.6$  for the cases we considered, recovery is impossible. Further study could consider establishing, theoretically, the upper bound for the amount of random noise that could be added for which recovery is still possible.

## Appendix

### A Proof of Lemma 5.2.1

*Proof.* To prove this lemma, we first show that  $(B_0, C_0)$  is an optimal pair to the problem (6) and then show that it is unique. From the optimality condition base on the subgradient condition at  $(B_0, C_0)$ , there must exist a dual matrix,  $\mathcal{F}$ , which simultaneously belong to the subdifferential of  $B_0$  ( $\partial \|B_0\|_*$ ) and  $C_0$  ( $\partial \|C_0\|_1$ ). The second condition of the proposition shows that such matrix exists. Hence  $(B_0, C_0)$  is an optimal pair. To show uniqueness, we consider a perturbation of  $(B_0, C_0)$ , i.e,  $(B_0 + \nu_B, C_0 + \nu_C)$ , which is also a minimizer. Since  $B_0 + C_0 = B_0 + \nu_B + C_0 + \nu_C$ ,  $\nu_B + \nu_C$  must be equal to zero. Now, applying the subgradient condition, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_0 + \nu_B\|_* + \lambda \|C_0 + \nu_C\|_1 &\geq \|B_0\|_* + \lambda \|C_0\|_1 + \langle UV^T + Q_0, \nu_B \rangle \\ &\quad + \lambda \langle \text{Sgn}(C_0) + D_0, \nu_C \rangle \\ &= \|B_0\|_* + \lambda \|C_0\|_1 + \Delta + \delta \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Recall that  $\mathcal{F} \in \partial\|B_0\|_*$  and  $\mathcal{F} \in \partial\|C_0\|_1 \implies \mathcal{F} = UV^T + Q = \lambda(\text{Sgn}(C) + D)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta &= \langle UV^T + Q_0, \nu_B \rangle = \langle UV^T + \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q_0), \nu_B \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q) + \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q_0), \nu_B \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q_0) - \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q), \nu_B \rangle + \langle \mathcal{F}, \nu_B \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta &= \lambda\langle \text{Sgn}(C_0) + D_0, \nu_C \rangle = \langle \lambda\text{Sgn}(C_0) + \lambda\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0), \nu_C \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{F} - \lambda\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D) + \lambda\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0), \nu_C \rangle \\ &= \langle \lambda\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0) - \lambda\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D), \nu_C \rangle + \langle \mathcal{F}, \nu_C \rangle \\ &= \lambda\langle \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0) - \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D), \nu_C \rangle + \langle \mathcal{F}, \nu_C \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta + \delta &= \langle \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q_0) - \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q), \nu_B \rangle + \langle \mathcal{F}, \nu_B \rangle + \lambda\langle \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0) - \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D), \nu_C \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \mathcal{F}, \nu_C \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q_0) - \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q), \nu_B \rangle + \lambda\langle \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0) - \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D), \nu_C \rangle + \langle \mathcal{F}, \nu_B + \nu_C \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q_0) - \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q), \nu_B \rangle + \lambda\langle \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0) - \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D), \nu_C \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, equation (38) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}\|B_0 + \nu_B\|_* + \lambda\|C_0 + \nu_C\|_1 &\geq \|B_0\|_* + \lambda\|C_0\|_1 + \langle \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q_0) - \mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q), \nu_B \rangle + \\ &\quad \lambda\langle \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0) - \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D), \nu_C \rangle \\ &= \|B_0\|_* + \lambda\|C_0\|_1 + (\|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q_0)\| - \|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q)\|)(\|\nu_B\|_*) + \\ &\quad \lambda(\|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0)\|_\infty - \|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D)\|_\infty)(\|\nu_C\|_1)\end{aligned}$$

Since  $(Q_0, D_0)$  is any subgradient of  $\|B\|_* + \lambda\|C\|_1$  at  $(B_0, C_0)$ , we can choose  $\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q_0)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0)$  freely inasmuch as they satisfy the following conditions:

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q_0)\| \leq 1, \text{ and } \|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0)\|_\infty \leq 1.$$

Letting  $\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0) = \text{Sgn}(\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(\nu_C))$  implies that  $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D_0)\|_\infty = 1$ . Also, since the dual of nuclear norm is the operator norm, there exists a matrix  $Q_0$  with  $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q_0)\| = 1$  such that  $\langle Q_0, \nu_B \rangle = \|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(\nu_B)\|_*$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|B_0 + \nu_B\|_* + \lambda\|C_0 + \nu_C\|_1 &\geq \|B_0\|_* + \lambda\|C_0\|_1 + (1 - \|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q)\|)(\|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(\nu_B)\|_*) \\ &\quad + \lambda(1 - \|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D)\|_\infty)(\|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(\nu_C)\|_1).\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(Q)\| < 1$  and  $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(D)\| < 1$ , the last two terms in the equation above are strictly positive except if  $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(\nu_B)\|_* = 0$  and  $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(\nu_C)\|_1 = 0$ . Hence,  $\|B_0 + \nu_B\|_* + \lambda\|C_0 + \nu_C\|_1 = \|B_0\|_* + \lambda\|C_0\|_1$  if and only if  $\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(\nu_B) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(\nu_C) = 0$ . Note that  $\mathcal{P}_{T^\perp}(\nu_B) = \mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^C}(\nu_C) = 0$  implies that  $\mathcal{P}_T(\nu_B) + \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(\nu_C) = 0$ , since  $\nu_B + \nu_C = 0$ . So that  $\mathcal{P}_T(\nu_B) = -\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(\nu_C) = 0$  (since  $\Gamma \cap T = \{0\}$ ). This implies that  $\nu_B = \nu_C = 0$ . Therefore,  $\|B_0 + \nu_B\|_* + \lambda\|C_0 + \nu_C\|_1 > \|B_0\|_* + \lambda\|C_0\|_1$  except if  $\nu_B = \nu_C = 0$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] James Abello, PM Pardalos, and MGC Resende. On maximum clique problems in very large graphs. *DIMACS series*, 50:119–130, 1999.
- [2] James Abello, Mauricio GC Resende, and Sandra Sudarsky. Massive quasi-clique detection. In *Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics*, pages 598–612. Springer, 2002.
- [3] Richard D Alba. A graph-theoretic definition of a sociometric clique. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 3(1):113–126, 1973.
- [4] Noga Alon, Michael Krivelevich, and Benny Sudakov. Finding a large hidden clique in a random graph. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 13(3-4):457–466, 1998.
- [5] Brendan Ames. Convex relaxation for the planted clique, biclique, and clustering problems. 2011.
- [6] Brendan PW Ames and Stephen A Vavasis. Nuclear norm minimization for the planted clique and biclique problems. *Mathematical programming*, 129(1):69–89, 2011.
- [7] Brendan PW Ames and Stephen A Vavasis. Convex optimization for the planted  $k$ -disjoint-clique problem. *Mathematical Programming*, 143(1-2):299–337, 2014.
- [8] Oskar Maria Baksalary and Paulina Kik. On commutativity of projectors. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 417(1):31–41, 2006.
- [9] Balasundaram Balabhaskar. *Graph theoretic generalization of clique: Optimization and extensions*. PhD thesis, PhD thesis, Texas A & M University, 2007.
- [10] Balabhaskar Balasundaram, Sergiy Butenko, and Illya V Hicks. Clique relaxations in social network analysis: The maximum  $k$ -plex problem. *Operations Research*, 59(1):133–142, 2011.
- [11] Carolyn Beck and Raffaello D’Andrea. Computational study and comparisons of lft reducibility methods. In *Proceedings of the 1998 American Control Conference. ACC (IEEE Cat. No. 98CH36207)*, volume 2, pages 1013–1017. IEEE, 1998.
- [12] Immanuel M Bomze, Marco Budinich, Panos M Pardalos, and Marcello Pelillo. The maximum clique problem. In *Handbook of combinatorial optimization*, pages 1–74. Springer, 1999.
- [13] Mauro Brunato, Holger H Hoos, and Roberto Battiti. On effectively finding maximal quasi-cliques in graphs. In *International Conference on Learning and Intelligent Optimization*, pages 41–55. Springer, 2007.
- [14] Emmanuel Candes, Justin Romberg, and Terence Tao. Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information. *arXiv preprint math/0409186*, 2004.

- [15] Emmanuel J Candes and Yaniv Plan. Matrix completion with noise. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 98(6):925–936, 2010.
- [16] Emmanuel J Candès and Benjamin Recht. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Foundations of Computational mathematics*, 9(6):717–772, 2009.
- [17] Emmanuel J Candès and Terence Tao. The power of convex relaxation: Near-optimal matrix completion. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(5):2053–2080, 2010.
- [18] Emmanuel J Candès, Xiaodong Li, Yi Ma, and John Wright. Robust principal component analysis? *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 58(3):11:1 – 11:37, 2011.
- [19] Joshua Cape, Minh Tang, and Carey E Priebe. The two-to-infinity norm and singular subspace geometry with applications to high-dimensional statistics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.10735*, 2017.
- [20] Randy Carraghan and Panos M Pardalos. An exact algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *Operations Research Letters*, 9(6):375–382, 1990.
- [21] Venkat Chandrasekaran, Sujay Sanghavi, Pablo A Parrilo, and Alan S Willsky. Rank-sparsity incoherence for matrix decomposition. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21(2):572–596, 2011.
- [22] Yudong Chen. Incoherence-optimal matrix completion. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 61(5):2909–2923, 2015.
- [23] Yudong Chen, Ali Jalali, Sujay Sanghavi, and Constantine Caramanis. Low-rank matrix recovery from errors and erasures. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 59(7):4324–4337, 2013.
- [24] Steven Diamond and Stephen Boyd. CVXPY: A Python-embedded modeling language for convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(83):1–5, 2016.
- [25] David L Donoho and Michael Elad. Optimally sparse representation in general (nonorthogonal) dictionaries via  $\ell_1$  minimization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100(5):2197–2202, 2003.
- [26] David L Donoho et al. Compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 52(4):1289–1306, 2006.
- [27] Uriel Feige and Robert Krauthgamer. Finding and certifying a large hidden clique in a semirandom graph. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 16(2):195–208, 2000.
- [28] David Gross. Recovering low-rank matrices from few coefficients in any basis. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(3):1548–1566, 2011.
- [29] J Jeffrey Howbert and Jacki Roberts. The maximum clique problem. *Final Project of the course “CSEP*, 521, 2007.

- [30] Raghunandan H Keshavan, Andrea Montanari, and Sewoong Oh. Matrix completion from a few entries. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 56(6):2980–2998, 2010.
- [31] Luděk Kučera. Expected complexity of graph partitioning problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 57(2):193–212, 1995.
- [32] Xiaodong Li. Compressed sensing and matrix completion with constant proportion of corruptions. *Constructive Approximation*, 37(1):73–99, 2013.
- [33] Robert D Luce. Connectivity and generalized cliques in sociometric group structure. *Psychometrika*, 15(2):169–190, 1950.
- [34] Mehran Mesbahi and George P Papavassilopoulos. On the rank minimization problem over a positive semidefinite linear matrix inequality. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 42(2):239–243, 1997.
- [35] Robert J Mokken. Cliques, clubs and clans. *Quality and quantity*, 13(2):161–173, 1979.
- [36] Nam H Nguyen and Trac D Tran. Exact recoverability from dense corrupted observations via  $\ell_1$ -minimization. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 59(4):2017–2035, 2013.
- [37] Patric RJ Östergård. A fast algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 120(1):197–207, 2002.
- [38] Jeffrey Pattillo, Alexander Veremyev, Sergiy Butenko, and Vladimir Boginski. On the maximum quasi-clique problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 161(1):244–257, 2013.
- [39] Elizaveta Rebrova and Roman Vershynin. Norms of random matrices: local and global problems. *Advances in Mathematics*, 324:40–83, 2018.
- [40] Benjamin Recht. A simpler approach to matrix completion. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(Dec):3413–3430, 2011.
- [41] Benjamin Recht, Weiyu Xu, and Babak Hassibi. Necessary and sufficient conditions for success of the nuclear norm heuristic for rank minimization. In *Decision and Control, 2008. CDC 2008. 47th IEEE Conference on*, pages 3065–3070. IEEE, 2008.
- [42] Benjamin Recht, Maryam Fazel, and Pablo A Parrilo. Guaranteed minimum-rank solutions of linear matrix equations via nuclear norm minimization. *SIAM review*, 52(3):471–501, 2010.
- [43] Stephen B Seidman and Brian L Foster. A graph-theoretic generalization of the clique concept\*. *Journal of Mathematical sociology*, 6(1):139–154, 1978.
- [44] Terence Tao. Topics in random matrix theory.
- [45] Alexander Veremyev, Oleg A Prokopyev, Sergiy Butenko, and Eduardo L Pasiliao. Exact mip-based approaches for finding maximum quasi-cliques and dense subgraphs. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 64(1):177–214, 2016.

- [46] Roman Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027*, 2010.