

# Uniform Exact Reconstruction of Sparse Signals and Low-rank Matrices from Phase-Only Measurements

Junren Chen\*      Michael K. Ng†

## Abstract

The reconstruction of low-complexity, particularly sparse signal from phase of complex linear measurements is known as phase-only compressive sensing (PO-CS). While perfect recovery of signal direction in PO-CS was observed quite early, the exact reconstruction guarantee for a fixed, real signal was recently done by Jacques and Feuillen [IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, 67 (2021), pp. 4150–4161]. However, two questions remain open: the uniform recovery guarantee and exact recovery of complex signal. In this paper, we almost completely address these two open questions. We prove that, all complex sparse signals or low-rank matrices can be uniformly, exactly recovered from a near optimal number of complex Gaussian measurement phases. By recasting PO-CS as a linear compressive sensing problem, the exact recovery follows from restricted isometry property (RIP). Technically, we achieve uniform guarantee by covering arguments, which involve a delicate control of near vanishing measurements. To handle complex signal, a different sign-product embedding property and a careful rescaling of the sensing matrix are employed. In addition, we show an extension that the uniform recovery is stable under moderate noise, as well as propose a simple way to incorporate norm reconstruction into PO-CS, with the aid of Gaussian dither. Experimental results are reported to corroborate and demonstrate our theoretical results.

## 1 Introduction

Signal reconstruction from phase of Fourier measurement was intensively studied about 40 years ago, see several pioneering works [26, 27, 37, 38]. Theoretically, these works showed almost all signals can be exactly reconstructed from Fourier phase, up to the trivial ambiguity of a positive scaling factor, thus confirming the importance of phase in Fourier transform [38]. Algorithms developed in early works include closed form solution [27], iterative algorithm [27, 41] and the Projection Onto Convex Sets (POCS) algorithm [32, 47]. Such considerable interest from signal processing community was mainly due to some early motivations such as blind deconvolution [26, 43], signal coding [27, 38], Kinoforms [21], while subsequent applications extended to image restoration [5, 47] and inpainting [28], object shape retrieval [4] and speech reconstruction [33]. Besides, generalized phase-only reconstruction, where the linear measurement is not restricted to be specific transform like Fourier transform, was studied in our

---

\*Department of Mathematics, The University of Hong Kong. E-mail: chenjr58@connect.hku.hk

†Department of Mathematics, The University of Hong Kong. E-mail: mng@maths.hku.hk. This work is supported by Hong Kong Research Grant Council GRF 12300218, 12300519, 17201020, 17300021, C1013-21GF, C7004-21GF and Joint NSFC-RGC N-HKU76921.

recent work [14]. We established more practical uniqueness conditions that are necessary and sufficient, as well as proved some new results on minimal measurement number therein.

While all papers reviewed above consider the phase-only reconstruction of unstructured signal, there is a line of research concerning recovery of sparse (or more generally, low-complexity) signal from phase [6, 7, 22, 29], which is termed as a phase-only compressive sensing (PO-CS) problem. More precisely, given the complex sensing matrix  $\Phi$ , one aims to recover or estimate a sparse signal  $\mathbf{x}$  from the phase of  $\Phi\mathbf{x}$ . The motivations of PO-CS are at least twofold. From a theoretical side, since the (complex) phase of a real number is just its sign (1 or  $-1$ ), PO-CS is a natural generalization of 1-bit compressive sensing (1-bit CS), which is probably the most important variant of compressive sensing and can be formulated as the estimation of a sparse real signal  $\mathbf{x}$  from the sign of  $\Phi\mathbf{x}$  under a real sensing matrix  $\Phi$  [8, 30, 39, 40]. Practically, such phase-only sensing scenario can be more stable under large measurement variations or corruption [29]. Moreover, it also allows easier finite-bit data quantization due to the compactness of the measurement range  $\{a \in \mathbb{C} : |a| = 1\}$ . By contrast, a uniform quantization in classical compressed sensing still needs infinite bits in general (e.g., [45]).

To generalize 1-bit CS to complex sensing matrix, Boufounos first proposed and studied PO-CS [6, 7]. Motivated by restricted isometry property (RIP) in linear compressive sensing [11, 12] and the binary  $\epsilon$ -stable embedding (B $\epsilon$ SE) in 1-bit CS [30], he established a kind of angle-preserving property that indicate the possibility of approximately recovering the signal. By recasting PO-CS as a linear compressive sensing problem, however, perfect reconstruction of signal direction beyond the theory was observed [7]. Since then, the experimental exact reconstruction in PO-CS, which is not possible in 1-bit CS, has become a folklore that cannot be theoretically explained. In the past few years, Jacques and his collaborators revisited the PO-CS problem. In [22], Feuillen et al. proposed a non-iterative called approach Projected Back Projection (PBP) to estimate a sparse signal that may be complex-valued. Provably, the estimation error of PBP decays with rate  $O(\sqrt[4]{\frac{s}{m}})$  under larger sample size  $m$ . Nevertheless, such result by no means leads to exact reconstruction. Indeed, even the possibility of exact reconstruction, i.e., the identifiability question, can not be confirmed by [6, 7, 22].

The theoretical breakthrough was recently made by Jacques and Feuillen [29]. Specifically, they considered  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}$  for some low-complexity set  $\mathcal{K}$  and recast PO-CS as a linear compressive sensing problem (this idea goes back to [7]). If  $\Phi$  has i.i.d. complex Gaussian entries drawn from  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)\mathbf{i}$ , they showed the sensing matrix of the resulting linear compressive sensing problem respects RIP under a sample size proportional to the intrinsic dimension of  $\mathcal{K}$  (characterized by Gaussian width). Therefore, exact signal reconstruction can be achieved by any instance optimal algorithm developed in the compressive sensing literature.

At a higher level, the result in [29] demonstrates the importance of phase in (complex) compressive sensing — as the reconstruction procedure can be implemented without aid from any magnitude information. It was also reported as numerical result that PO-CS exhibits similar performance as classical compressive sensing at about twice the measurement number, which is, interestingly, aligned with the minimal measurement number for recovering almost all unstructured signals presented in [14] (See Theorem 5 therein).

However, unlike in classical compressive sensing where the RIP of sensing matrix delivers uniform recovery guarantee for all sparse signals (e.g., [11, 23]), [29] only establishes non-uniform guarantee for reconstruction of a fixed signal<sup>1</sup>. In short, this is because in the refor-

---

<sup>1</sup>In a uniform recovery guarantee, a single measurement matrix simultaneously ensures the recovery of all signals of interest. By contrast, in a non-uniform guarantee, the measurement matrix only works for a fixed

mulation, the sensing matrix varies with the signal  $\mathbf{x}$ , while [29] only showed the RIP of a specific/fixed sensing matrix. Consequently, the non-uniform guarantee makes the important role played by phase in complex compressive sensing less convincing, and it is of particular interest to study whether a uniform exact recovery guarantee is achievable. In addition, many key ingredients in [29] heavily rely on the assumption of real signal  $\mathbf{x}$  and do not extend to complex  $\mathbf{x}$ , so it remains unknown whether it is possible to perfectly recover a sparse complex signal from phase-only measurements<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, Jacques and Feuilleux left these two possible improvements as open questions for future research, see Section VII in [29].

In the major results of this paper, we show that under near optimal sample complexity (up to logarithmic factor), all complex sparse signals or low-rank matrices can be uniformly and perfectly reconstructed from phase-only measurements, up to the trivial ambiguity of a positive scaling<sup>3</sup>. For the most classical sparse and low-rank signal structure, we thus simultaneously address the two open questions with a positive answer. Our technical contributions for proving these major results are summarized as follows:

- (Uniform Exact Recovery). Since the sensing matrix in the reformulation varies with the underlying signal (3.7), to yield a uniform guarantee we need to prove the sensing matrices for all signals simultaneously respect RIP, which is in essence bounding an empirical process from above (3.12). Due to the additional supremum taken for underlying signals, the empirical process essentially relies on  $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$  (the function to extract complex phase), thus making the techniques in [29] and some other tools not applicable. Instead, we resort to the more elementary covering arguments, and the main difficulty encountered is the pathological behaviour of  $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$  in  $\{\eta \cdot a : a \in \mathbb{C}, |a| \leq 1\}$  ( $\eta > 0$  is a pre-specified threshold), e.g., discontinuity. Thus, retaining only the phase would be problematic for the measurements with small absolute value (smaller than  $\eta$ ), which are termed near vanishing measurements. As it turns out, a rather delicate and involved analysis is needed to control the effect of near vanishing measurements. For instance, controlling the number of near vanishing measurement (Lemma 9), estimating the norm of sub-matrices (Lemma 10).
- (Recovery of Complex Signals). Compared with real signal [7, 29], PO-CS of complex signal should be reformulated as a (real) linear compressive sensing problem with an extended sensing matrix. A signal is decomposed as a parallel part and an orthogonal part regarding the desired underlying signal. Compared with Lemma 5.4 in [29], a different sign-product embedding property that only involves the real part of inner product is established for analyzing the parallel part. This is essentially due to the removal of a redundant measurement (Note that, the linear compressive sensing problem in [29] involves  $d+2$  measurements, but only  $d+1$  measurements in this work). For orthogonal part, our calculations unveil the existence of a bias term (i.e.,  $|\Im\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^2$  in (3.51)). To deal with this issue, a rescaling of the sensing matrix is applied to achieve a restricted isometry constant (RIC) of  $\frac{1}{3} + \delta$ , where  $\delta$  can be made sufficiently small. This RIP circumstance is sufficient for sparse or low-rank recovery [9].

---

signal, and in general a new measurement matrix should be drawn for recovery of another signal.

<sup>2</sup>Among existing works, only the approximate recovery guarantee in [22] applies to complex signal.

<sup>3</sup>The signals in  $\mathbb{R}_+ \mathbf{x} = \{\lambda \mathbf{x} : \lambda > 0\}$  can never be distinguished, thus we can only hope to recover  $\mathbf{x}$  up to a positive scaling  $\lambda$ . Throughout this work, the exact reconstruction in PO-CS allows such scaling ambiguity, which may not be explicitly mentioned.

Besides the main results presented in Theorems 1 and 2, we show that the uniform recovery in PO-CS is stable under moderate bounded noise (Theorem 3). Considering a full reconstruction without scaling ambiguity is preferable in some applications, we propose a simple variant of PO-CS that can achieve uniform reconstruction with norm information, which adds random Gaussian dither before capturing the phase (Theorem 4). Beyond that, our discussions reveal that our proof for Theorem 1 actually applies to signal set with low covering dimension. We also present a non-uniform result for complex signal set with low Gaussian width (Theorem 5), which represents a full extension of the main result in [29]. Due to a finer tool, Theorem 5 slightly refines the sample complexity needed in [29].

The outline of this paper is given as follows. In Section 2 we provide the notations and preliminaries. We present the technical proof for the uniform recovery guarantee of complex sparse signals in Section 3, which is then extended to low-rank matrices without details in Section 4. In Section 5 we present a uniform stability guarantee and the uniform reconstruction with norm in PO-CS with Gaussian dither. Some discussions on extension and limitation of our main result are provided in Section 6, where we also show the non-uniform guarantee for complex signal recovery, with technical proof relegated to Appendix. We report the experimental results for PO-CS in Section 7 and give some remarks to conclude the paper in Section 8.

## 2 Notations and Preliminaries

### 2.1 Notations

We introduce the generic notations used throughout the paper, while additional ones may be defined in subsequent development when appropriate. Boldface letters are used to represent vectors and matrices. We write  $[m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$  for positive integer  $m$ . The cardinality of a finite set  $\mathcal{T}$  will be denoted by  $|\mathcal{T}|$ . Writing  $\mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}$  as the complex unit, for a complex number  $a$  we alternatively use  $\Re(a)$  or  $a^{\Re}$  to denote its real part,  $\Im(a)$  or  $a^{\Im}$  for its imaginary part,  $|a|$ ,  $\bar{a}$  for the absolute value and conjugate, respectively. We let  $\text{sgn}(a) = \frac{a}{|a|}$  be the phase for non-zero  $a$ . By convention we set  $\text{sgn}(0) = 0$ . All these operations entry-wisely operate on complex vectors and matrices.

For a vector  $\mathbf{a} = [a_i] \in \mathbb{C}^n$  we introduce the  $\ell_2$  norm  $\|\mathbf{a}\| = (\sum_i |a_i|^2)^{1/2}$ ,  $\ell_1$  norm  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_1 = \sum_i |a_i|$  and max norm  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty = \max_i |a_i|$ . Given vector  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{a})$  represents the diagonal matrix with main diagonal  $\mathbf{a}$ . We also denote the number of non-zero entries by  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_0$ , then  $\Sigma_{s,c}^n = \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n : \|\mathbf{a}\|_0 \leq s\}$  (resp.  $\Sigma_{s,r}^n = \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\mathbf{a}\|_0 \leq s\}$ ) is the set of all complex (resp. real)  $s$ -sparse signals. Let  $\mathbb{S}_c^{n-1}$  (resp.  $\mathbb{S}_r^{n-1}$ ) be the unit Euclidean sphere in  $\mathbb{C}^d$  (resp.  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ), we also frequently work with  $\Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*} = \Sigma_{s,c}^n \cap \mathbb{S}_c^{n-1}$  and  $\Sigma_{s,r}^{n,*} = \Sigma_{s,r}^n \cap \mathbb{S}_r^{n-1}$ .

Given a matrix  $\mathbf{A} = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_2}$  with singular values  $\{\sigma_k : k = 1, \dots, \min\{n_1, n_2\}\}$ , we let  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_F = (\sum_{ij} |a_{ij}|^2)^{1/2}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_* = \sum_k \sigma_k$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\| = \max_k \sigma_k$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty = \max_{ij} |a_{ij}|$  be its Frobenius norm, nuclear norm, operator norm, and max norm, respectively. We denote the set of  $d_1 \times d_2$  complex (resp. real) matrices with rank no more than  $r$  by  $\mathcal{M}_{r,c}^{n_1, n_2}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{M}_{r,r}^{n_1, n_2}$ ). The restriction to matrices with unit Frobenius norm is denoted by  $(\mathcal{M}_{r,c}^{n_1, n_2})^*$  or  $(\mathcal{M}_{r,r}^{n_1, n_2})^*$ . For vectors or matrices  $\cdot^\top$ ,  $\cdot^*$  stand for the transpose, conjugate transpose, and we use the standard inner product  $\langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \rangle = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{B})$ . In addition,  $\mathbf{I}_d$  is the  $d \times d$  identity matrix, and  $\mathbf{e}_k$  is the  $k$ -th column of the identity matrix with self-evident dimension.

For  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ ,  $\mathcal{S} \in [m]$ ,  $\mathcal{T} \in [n]$ , we use  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\mathcal{T}}$  to denote the submatrix of  $\mathbf{A}$  constituted

by rows in  $\mathcal{S}$  and columns in  $\mathcal{T}$ . We also write  $\mathbf{A}^{\mathcal{S}} := \mathbf{A}_{[n]}^{\mathcal{S}}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{T}} := \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{T}}^{[m]}$ . This also applies column vector  $\mathbf{x}$ , while we sometimes alternatively write  $\mathbf{x}^{[l+1:k]} = \mathbf{x}^{[k] \setminus [l]}$  for  $l < k$ .

In this work,  $C$ ,  $C_i$ ,  $c$ , or  $c_i$  represents absolute constant with value varying from line to line, and we make no attempt to refine these constants. If  $T_1 \leq CT_2$  for some  $C > 0$ , we write  $T_1 = O(T_2)$  or  $T_1 \lesssim T_2$ . The opposite  $T_1 \geq CT_2$  would be denoted by  $T_1 \gtrsim T_2$  or  $T_1 = \Omega(T_2)$ . As standard complexity notation,  $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}(\cdot)$  further hide logarithmic factors. The probability, expectation would be given by  $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$  respectively. Given an event  $E$ ,  $\mathbb{1}(E)$  is an indicator function that equals to 1 if  $E$  happens, and 0 otherwise.

## 2.2 Preliminaries

### 2.2.1 High-dimensional Statistics

We first provide some necessary knowledge on high-dimensional statistics, including concentration of sub-Gaussian or sub-exponential random variable and some covering number results.

For a real random variable  $X$ , we define its sub-Gaussian norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_2}$ , sub-exponential norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_1}$  as  $\|X\|_{\psi_2} = \inf\{t > 0 : \mathbb{E} \exp\left(\frac{X^2}{t^2}\right) < 2\}$ ,  $\|X\|_{\psi_1} = \inf\{t > 0 : \mathbb{E} \exp\left(\frac{|X|}{t}\right) < 2\}$ .  $X$  is said to be sub-Gaussian (resp. sub-exponential) if  $\|X\|_{\psi_2} < \infty$  (resp.  $\|X\|_{\psi_1} < \infty$ ). Note that we have the relation (e.g., Lemma 2.7.7 in [48])

$$\|XY\|_{\psi_1} \leq \|X\|_{\psi_2} \|Y\|_{\psi_2}. \quad (2.1)$$

For some absolute constant  $C$ , sub-Gaussian  $X$  enjoys a probability tail (e.g., Proposition 2.5.2 in [48])

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{Ct^2}{\|X\|_{\psi_2}^2}\right), \quad \forall t > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

For independent, zero-mean sub-Gaussian random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ , it holds for some  $C$  that (e.g., Proposition 2.6.1 in [48])

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^k X_k \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \leq C \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i\|_{\psi_2}^2 \quad (2.3)$$

Note that combining (2.2) and (2.3) immediately yields the concentration of the mean of independent sub-Gaussian random variables. For random vector  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , its sub-Gaussian norm is defined by  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\psi_2} = \sup_{\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{S}_r^{n-1}} \|\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{X}\|_{\psi_2}$ . If the components of  $\mathbf{X}$  are independent sub-Gaussian variables with  $O(1)$  sub-Gaussian norm, then a simple fact delivered by (2.3) is that  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\psi_2} = O(1)$ .

For sub-exponential random variables, we have the following Bernstein's inequality for concentration (e.g., Theorem 2.8.1 in [48]).

**Lemma 1.** (Bernstein's inequality) *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_N$  be independent, sub-exponential random variable. Then for any  $t > 0$ , for some constant  $C$  we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \mathbb{E}X_i)\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-C \min\left\{\frac{t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N \|X_i\|_{\psi_1}^2}, \frac{t}{\max_{i \in [N]} \|X_i\|_{\psi_1}}\right\}\right)$$

Given a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  or  $\mathbb{C}^N$ , denoted  $\mathcal{X}$ , and its finite subset  $\mathcal{T}$ , then  $\mathcal{T}$  is a  $\epsilon$ -net of  $\mathcal{X}$  if for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ , there exists  $\mathbf{a}_x \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_x\| \leq \epsilon$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{X} \subset \cup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mathbf{a})$  where  $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mathbf{a})$  is the (real or complex) closed Euclidean ball with center  $\mathbf{a}$  and radius  $\epsilon$ . The minimum cardinality of the  $\epsilon$ -net of  $\mathcal{X}$  is usually called its covering number, and the covering number for the set of sparse or low-rank signals will be recurring in our proof.

**Lemma 2.** (Lemma 3.3 in [40]) *Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\mathcal{G}$  that is  $\epsilon$ -net of  $\Sigma_{s,r}^{n,*}$  with cardinality bounded by  $|\mathcal{G}| \leq \left(\frac{9n}{\epsilon s}\right)^s$ .*

Evidently, Lemma 2 implies  $\epsilon$ -net for  $\Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$  with cardinality at most  $\left(\frac{9n}{\epsilon s}\right)^{2s}$ .

**Lemma 3.** (Lemma 3.1 in [10]) *Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\mathcal{G}$  that is  $\epsilon$ -net of  $(\mathcal{M}_{r,r}^{n_1,n_2})^*$  with cardinality bounded by  $|\mathcal{G}| \leq \left(\frac{9}{\epsilon}\right)^{(n_1+n_2+1)r}$ .*

## 2.2.2 Compressive Sensing

As our approach is to recast PO-CS as a classical linear compressive sensing problem, we will also use some well-established facts in this field. Arguably, the RIP introduced below is the central of compressive sensing theory.

**Definition 1.** (Vector RIP) *Given a sensing matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and  $1 \leq s \leq n$  is an integer. We say  $\mathbf{A}$  respects restricted isometry property over the set of  $s$ -sparse real signals  $\Sigma_{s,r}^n$  for some  $\delta > 0$  if*

$$(1 - \delta)\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\|\mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{s,r}^n. \quad (2.4)$$

The smallest  $\delta$  such that (2.4) holds is called the restricted isometry constant (RIC) of order  $s$ , and denoted by  $\delta_s^{\mathbf{A}}$ .

**Definition 2.** (Matrix RIP) *Given a linear map  $\mathcal{A}(\cdot)$  from  $\mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and  $1 \leq r \leq \min\{d_1, d_2\}$  is an integer. We say  $\mathcal{A}$  respects restricted isometry property over  $\mathcal{M}_{r,r}^{n_1,n_2}$  for some  $\delta > 0$  if*

$$(1 - \delta)\|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2 \leq \|\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})\|^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{M}_{r,r}^{n_1,n_2}. \quad (2.5)$$

The smallest  $\delta$  such that (2.5) holds is denoted by  $\delta_r^{\mathbf{A}}$ .

Under sufficiently small  $\delta_s^{\mathbf{A}}$  (resp.  $\delta_r^{\mathbf{A}}$ ), all signals  $\mathbf{x}$  in  $\Sigma_{s,r}^n$  (resp.  $\mathcal{M}_{r,r}^{n_1,n_2}$ ) can be reconstructed from the compressive measurements  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x})$ ), exactly when there is no noise or stably in the noisy setting, via some instance optimal algorithms. Specifically, we present the following result regarding basis pursuit (e.g., constrained  $\ell_1$ /nuclear norm minimization).

**Lemma 4.** (e.g., [9]) *If  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  satisfies  $\delta_s^{\mathbf{A}} < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ , then all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,r}^n$  can be exactly reconstructed from  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$  via basis pursuit*

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\mathbf{u}\|_1, \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{y}. \quad (2.6)$$

In parallel, if a linear map  $\mathcal{A}(\cdot)$  from  $\mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^m$  satisfies  $\delta_r^{\mathbf{A}} < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ , then all  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{M}_{r,r}^{n_1,n_2}$  can be exactly reconstructed from  $\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$  from constrained nuclear norm minimization

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}} \|\mathbf{U}\|_{nu}, \quad \text{s.t. } \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{U}) = \mathbf{y}. \quad (2.7)$$

We will also use the stable result in [9] in a noisy setting, where the equality constraints above should be modified according to the noise structure.

### 3 PO-CS of Sparse Signals

The most classical signal structure in (1-bit) compressed sensing is undoubtedly sparsity. In this Section we assume  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}$  where  $\mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s,r}^n$  (the real case) or  $\Sigma_{s,c}^n$  (the complex case). We assume the complex sensing matrix  $\Phi$  has entries i.i.d. drawn from  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)\mathbf{i}$ , denoted by  $\Phi \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1)\mathbf{i}$ . Now, the PO-CS model can be formulated as

$$\mathbf{z} = \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \quad (3.1)$$

and note that we would exclusively use  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\mathbf{z}$  to respectively represent the underlying signal and the phase-only observations. The  $k$ -th row of  $\Phi$  would be denoted by  $\Phi_k^*$ .

Before proceeding, it is worth pointing out that our result applies to any random sensing matrix  $\Phi'$  with independent *rotationally invariant* rows (with a minor condition that each row is non-zero almost surely). This is because the norm of each sensing vector (each row) is absorbed into  $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ , hence  $\mathbf{z} = \text{sgn}(\Phi' \mathbf{x})$  is indeed equivalent to (3.1). Note that a similar comment is available for 1-bit compressive sensing in Remark 1.5, [40].

We also pause to give a big picture of our technical derivation. Compared with sensing a real signal in [29], dealing with complex signal requires a different reformulation and more complicated calculations. More tricky technical changes include taking the real part in the sign-product embedding property (Remark 2) and rescaling the sensing matrix to render a sufficiently small RIC (Remark 4). On the other hand, our uniform guarantee follows from a series of covering arguments (e.g., [2]) that strengthen each piece in [29] to be uniform. Indeed, covering argument has now become an elementary technique in the field, and the standard procedure is to first show the desired property over a discrete  $\epsilon$ -net (via union bound), then extends it to the whole signal set of interest. Note that such extension usually relies on certain continuity of the desired property. Thus, in the phase-only scenario, the main difficulty here is the discontinuity of  $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ . In fact,  $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$  behaves extremely badly around 0. For instance, complex linear measurements close to 0 are also close to each other, but they can have significantly different phases. Thus, for extremely small  $\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}$ , taking only the phase fails to preserve information and can even be misleading. To facilitate the presentation, we specify a threshold  $\eta$  ( $\eta > 0$ ) and collectively call  $\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}$  with  $|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}| < \eta$  near vanishing measurement. The indices of near vanishing measurements are collected in the set

$$\mathcal{J}_x = \{k \in [m] : |\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}| < \eta\}. \quad (3.2)$$

While near vanishing measurements are problematic in the phase-only sensing scenario, fortunately, with high probability  $|\mathcal{J}_x|/m = O(\eta)$  holds uniformly over  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}$  (Lemma 9). Hence, under sufficiently small  $\eta$ , the influence of near vanishing measurements can be well controlled.

#### 3.1 Reformulation

We begin with the reformulation of PO-CS to a classical linear compressive sensing problem, which stems from the experiments in [7] and also serves as the starting point of the proof in [29]. Note that our task is to find a sparse  $\mathbf{u}$  that admits phase consistency  $\mathbf{z} = \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{u})$ . This leads to  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{z})^* \Phi \mathbf{u} \geq \mathbf{0}$  with element-wise “ $\geq$ ” and all-zeros vector  $\mathbf{0}$ , which equals to

$$\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z})^* \Phi \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \Re(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z})^* \Phi \mathbf{u}) \geq \mathbf{0}.$$

We simply retain the dominant information  $\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z})^* \Phi \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0}$ . For the real case  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s,r}^n$ , this gives  $m$  real linear measurements

$$\Im\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}(\mathbf{z})^* \Phi\right) \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (3.3)$$

For the complex case  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s,c}^n$ , it reads

$$\left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z})^* \Phi) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \Re(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z})^* \Phi) \right] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}^{\Re} \\ \mathbf{u}^{\Im} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (3.4)$$

Derived from the phase-only measurements  $\mathbf{z} = \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x})$ , (3.3) and (3.4) obviously do not contain any information about the signal norm  $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ . Hence, to be more aligned with the classical linear compressive sensing, we add virtual measurement to uniquely specify the norm of the desired signal. Specifically, due to the observation  $\mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{x} = \|\Phi \mathbf{x}\|_1 > 0$ , we define  $\kappa := \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)\mathbf{i}| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}$  and impose the constraint  $\frac{1}{\kappa m} \mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u} = 1^4$ , which further gives two real linear measurements [7, 29]

$$\Re\left(\frac{1}{\kappa m} \mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u}\right) = 1, \quad \Im\left(\frac{1}{\kappa m} \mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u}\right) = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

However, a closer look finds that  $\Im\left(\frac{1}{\kappa m} \mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u}\right) = 0$  can be implied by  $\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z})^* \Phi \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0}$  and is hence redundant. Thus, we only add one virtual measurement  $\Re\left(\frac{1}{\kappa m} \mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u}\right) = 1$ , which gives  $\frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi) \mathbf{u} = 1$  for the real case and  $\frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi) \mathbf{u}^{\Re} - \frac{1}{\kappa m} \Im(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi) \mathbf{u}^{\Im} = 1$  for the complex case. We further introduce a positive scaling  $\hat{t}$  to (3.3), (3.4), then for  $\mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s,r}^n$  we obtain the reformulation

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{find } \mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{s,r}^n, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},r} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{e}_1, \\ & \text{with } \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},r} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\kappa m} \cdot \Re(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi) \\ \frac{\hat{t}}{\sqrt{m}} \cdot \Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*) \Phi) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1) \times n}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

For the complex case  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^n$  we similarly arrive at a linear compressive sensing problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{find } \mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{2s,r}^{2n}, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z}} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{e}_1, \\ & \text{with } \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},c} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\kappa m} \cdot \Re(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi) & -\frac{1}{\kappa m} \cdot \Im(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi) \\ \frac{\hat{t}}{\sqrt{m}} \Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*) \Phi) & \frac{\hat{t}}{\sqrt{m}} \Re(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*) \Phi) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1) \times 2n}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

We shall see shortly that a proper choice of  $\hat{t}$  is crucial to render a small RIC of the new sensing matrix<sup>5</sup>  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},c}$ . Besides, we mention that  $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{2s,r}^{2n}$  in (3.7) does not precisely rephrase the prior knowledge  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_s^n$ . For instance,  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_s^n$  restricts at most  $s$  of the first  $n$  entries of  $\mathbf{u}$  are non-zero, which such information is lost in  $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{2s,r}^{2n}$ . But on the other hand,  $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{2s,r}^{2n}$  would be more than sufficient for analysis of sparse signal.

Based on Lemma 4, our strategy is to show the  $2s$  order RIC of  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},r}$ , and the  $4s$  order RIC of  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},c}$ , are less than  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ . Compared with the classical compressive sensing where the RIP of the sensing matrix delivers uniform recovery guarantee (Lemma 4), here different  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}$

<sup>4</sup>One can take any  $t_1 > 0$  and specify  $\frac{1}{m} \mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u} = t_1$ , but our choice here is intended for subsequent RIP analysis (see Lemma 6, Corollary 1).

<sup>5</sup>To distinguish with the original sensing matrix  $\Phi$ , we collectively call  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},r}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},c}$  the new sensing matrix.



corresponds to different  $\mathbf{A}_{z,r}$  or  $\mathbf{A}_{z,c}$ . Hence, the RIP of a specific new sensing matrix can only deliver the exact reconstruction of a single underlying  $\mathbf{x}$  (such that  $\mathbf{z} = \text{sgn}(\Phi\mathbf{x})$ ). While the main aim of this paper is to prove a uniform recovery guarantee, we need to show the new sensing matrices for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}$  simultaneously respect RIP. By Definition 1, this can be precisely formulated for the real case  $\mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s,r}^n$  as

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{2s,r}^n} \left| \|\mathbf{A}_{z,r}\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad (3.8)$$

or for the complex case  $\mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s,c}^n$  as

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,r}^{2n}} \left| \|\mathbf{A}_{z,c}\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2. \quad (3.9)$$

We add the superscript  $*$  to restrict a set to elements with unit  $\ell_2$  norm, e.g.,  $\mathcal{K}^* = \Sigma_{s,r}^{n,*}$  (the real case),  $\mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$  (the complex case). Then by the homogeneity of  $\mathbf{u}$  and the property of  $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ , (3.8) is equivalent to

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,r}^{n,*}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{2s,r}^{n,*}} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa^2 m^2} [\Re(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u})]^2 + \frac{\hat{t}^2}{m} \left| \Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*) \Phi \mathbf{u}) \right|^2 - 1 \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}. \quad (3.10)$$

Similarly, for (3.9) we identify  $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,r}^{2n}$  with  $\mathbf{u}^{[1:n]} + \mathbf{u}^{[n+1:2n]} \mathbf{i} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^n$ , the desired (3.9) can thus be implied by

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa^2 m^2} [\Re(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u})]^2 + \frac{\hat{t}^2}{m} \left| \Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*) \Phi \mathbf{u}) \right|^2 - 1 \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}. \quad (3.11)$$

Now it shall be clear that our goals in both cases are to prove

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x}} \sup_{\mathbf{u}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \quad (3.12)$$

where we introduce a shorthand

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) := \left| \frac{1}{\kappa^2 m^2} [\Re(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u})]^2 + \frac{\hat{t}^2}{m} \left| \Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*) \Phi \mathbf{u}) \right|^2 - 1 \right|, \quad (3.13)$$

and the only difference is that  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \in \Sigma_{s,r}^{n,*} \times \Sigma_{2s,r}^{n,*}$  for real case, while  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*} \times \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$  for the complex case. Thus, in the sequel we only deal with the complex case where all arguments directly apply to the real case. We will point out the difference between real case and complex case when appropriate.

Given a specific underlying signal  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$ , we decompose  $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$  into

$$\mathbf{u}_x^\parallel = \Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{u}_x^\perp = \mathbf{u} - \Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{x} \quad (3.14)$$

and respectively call  $\mathbf{u}_x^\parallel$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_x^\perp$  the parallel part, the orthogonal part (regarding  $\mathbf{x}$ ). They evidently satisfy  $\|\mathbf{u}_x^\parallel\|^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|^2 = 1$ . Note that RIP indeed requires that the sensing matrix to operate on  $\Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$  (the range of  $\mathbf{u}$ ) in a near isometry way. We shall see that,  $\frac{1}{\kappa^2 m^2} |\Re(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u})|^2$ ,

which stems from the first row of  $\mathbf{A}_{z,c}$  (3.7) that is added to specify signal norm, contributes to the parallel part  $\|\mathbf{u}_x^\parallel\|^2$ . On the other hand,  $\frac{\hat{t}^2}{m}\|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u})\|^2$ , which corresponds to the the second row of  $\mathbf{A}_{z,c}$  in (3.7) that comes from the phase-only measurements, will provide the orthogonal part  $\|\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|^2$ . Indeed, a simple observation to preview this is that  $\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u})$  fails to sense the parallel part:

$$\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u}_x^\parallel) = \Re\langle\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}\rangle \cdot \Im(\text{diag}(\text{sgn}(\Phi\mathbf{x}))^*\Phi\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (3.15)$$

Having observed this, we further divide  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  by triangle inequality as

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \leq \underbrace{\left| \frac{[\Re(\mathbf{z}^*\Phi\mathbf{u})]^2}{\kappa^2 m^2} - \|\mathbf{u}_x^\parallel\|^2 \right|}_{f^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} + \underbrace{\left| \frac{\hat{t}^2}{m} \|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u})\|^2 - \|\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|^2 \right|}_{f^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})}. \quad (3.16)$$

Focusing on the complex case of (3.12), we only need to show

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}} f^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}} f^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \quad (3.17)$$

Now we pause to present our main result in this Section first.

**Theorem 1.** (Uniform PO-CS of Complex Sparse Signals) *Assume the sensing matrix  $\Phi \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1)$ ,  $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s,r}^n$  or  $\Sigma_{s,c}^n$ , and one aims to reconstruct  $\mathbf{x}$  based on the phase-only measurements  $\mathbf{z} = \text{sgn}(\Phi\mathbf{x})$ . Such PO-CS problem can be reformulated as (3.6) with  $\hat{t} = 1$  if  $\mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s,r}^n$ , or (3.7) with  $\hat{t} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$  if  $\mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s,c}^n$ . Given any  $\delta > 0$ , if*

$$m \geq \frac{Cs}{\delta^4} \log\left(\frac{n^2 \log(mn)}{\delta^6 s}\right) \quad (3.18)$$

*for some sufficiently large  $C$ , then with probability at least  $1 - c_1 \exp(-c_2 \delta^4 m) - 2(mn)^{-9}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_{z,r}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,r}^n$  has  $2s$  order RIC smaller than  $\delta$ , or  $\mathbf{A}_{z,c}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^n$  has  $4s$  order RIC smaller than  $\frac{1}{3} + \delta$ . In particular, under a sample complexity  $m \geq C_1 s \log\left(\frac{n^2 \log(mn)}{s}\right)$  with sufficiently large  $C_1$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2(mn)^{-9} - c_1 \exp(-c_3 m)$ , all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^n$  can be exactly reconstructed (up to positive scaling factor) from  $\mathbf{z}$  via basis pursuit of (3.6) for real case, or (3.7) for complex case.*

**Remark 1.** (Near Optimality) *Compared with the optimal sample complexity  $O(s \log(\frac{n}{s}))$  for uniform  $s$ -sparse recovery in linear compressive sensing [23], the presented  $O(s \log(\frac{n^2 \log(mn)}{s}))$  for achieving the same goal via only the measurement phase is near optimal up to logarithmic degradation. This illustrates the importance the phase in complex compressive sensing.*

## 3.2 Auxiliary Estimates

The proof of our main result hinges on a bunch of auxiliary estimates, which are collectively presented in this part to improve the readability of this paper. We first give the RIP of the original sensing matrix  $\Phi$ .

**Lemma 5.** Assume  $\Phi \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}$ ,  $l$  is a fixed positive integer. Given any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $c_1, c_2$  depending only on  $\delta$ , such that when  $m \geq c_1 s \log\left(\frac{n}{s}\right)$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_2 m)$ , we have  $(1 - \delta) \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2m} \|\Phi \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq (1 + \delta) \|\mathbf{u}\|^2$  holds uniformly for all  $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{ls,c}^n$ . In particular we take  $\delta = \frac{1}{4}$ , then for some absolute constants  $c_3, c_4$ , when  $m \geq c_3 s \log\left(\frac{n}{s}\right)$ , with probability exceeding  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_4 m)$ , we have

$$\frac{3}{2} \leq \frac{1}{m} \|\Phi \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \frac{5}{2}, \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{ls,c}^{n,*}. \quad (3.19)$$

*Proof.* We only need to prove the statement for general  $\delta > 0$ . For the real case  $\Phi \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}$  and  $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{ls,r}^n$ , such result (with  $\frac{1}{2m} \|\Phi \mathbf{u}\|^2$  changed to  $\frac{1}{m} \|\Phi \mathbf{u}\|^2$ ) is indeed the backbone of compressive sensing theory, see Theorem 5.2 in [2] for instance. To adjust it to the complex case here, we only need to calculate  $\|\Phi \mathbf{u}\|^2 = \|\Phi^{\Re} \mathbf{u}^{\Re} - \Phi^{\Im} \mathbf{u}^{\Im}\|^2 + \|\Phi^{\Re} \mathbf{u}^{\Im} + \Phi^{\Im} \mathbf{u}^{\Re}\|^2$  and note that  $[\Phi^{\Re}, \Phi^{\Im}] \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times 2n}(0, 1)$ ,  $[(\mathbf{u}^{\Re})^\top, -(\mathbf{u}^{\Im})^\top]^\top, [(\mathbf{u}^{\Im})^\top, (\mathbf{u}^{\Re})^\top]^\top \in \Sigma_{2ls,r}^{2n}$ . Then applying the result for the real case concludes the proof.  $\square$

Due to the rotational invariance of  $\Phi$ ,  $\mathbb{E} \frac{1}{m} \|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1 = \mathbb{E} |\Phi_k^* \mathbf{w}| = \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}| = \kappa$  holds for any  $\|\mathbf{w}\| = 1$ . As Lemma 5.2 in [29], the concentration of  $\frac{1}{\kappa m} \|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1$  around 1 will be needed later. However, unlike their Lemma 5.2 only established for a fixed  $\mathbf{w}$ , we need a uniform concentration property over all sparse  $\mathbf{w}$ . This can be achieved by straightforwardly applying a covering argument over  $\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$ .

**Lemma 6.** Assume  $\Phi \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}$  and fix any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ . When  $m \geq C \frac{s}{\delta^2} \log\left(\frac{n}{\delta s}\right)$  for some absolute constant  $C$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c \delta^2 m)$  we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}} \left| \frac{\|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1}{\kappa m} - 1 \right| \leq \delta. \quad (3.20)$$

*Proof.* (Step I) We first consider the concentration regarding a fixed  $\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$  and note that

$$\left| \frac{\|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1}{\kappa m} - 1 \right| = \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \left( \frac{|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{w}|}{\kappa} - \mathbb{E} \frac{|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{w}|}{\kappa} \right) \right|. \quad (3.21)$$

By rotational invariance of  $\Phi_k$ ,  $\{|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{w}| : k \in [m]\}$  are independent copies of  $|\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}|$ . Thus, we can estimate its sub-Gaussian norm by definition

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{w}\|_{\psi_2} &= \|\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{N}(0, 1)\|_{\psi_2} + \|\mathcal{N}(0, 1)\|_{\psi_2} = O(1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Then, by centering (Lemma 2.6.8 in [48]),  $\|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{w} - \mathbb{E} |\Phi_k^* \mathbf{w}|\|_{\psi_2} = O(1)$ . Moreover, recalling (3.21) and using (2.3) leads to  $\left\| \frac{\|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1}{\kappa m} - 1 \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)$ . Thus, we apply (2.2) and obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \frac{\|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1}{\kappa m} - 1 \right| \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp(-c m t^2) \quad (3.23)$$

holds for any  $t \geq 0$ , for some absolute constant  $c$ .

(Step II) We now invoke a covering argument to strengthen the concentration to  $\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$ . We construct  $\mathcal{G}_{\delta/4}$  as a  $\frac{\delta}{4}$ -net of  $\Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$ , and we can assume  $|\mathcal{G}_{\delta/4}| \leq \left(\frac{36n}{\delta s}\right)^{2s}$  by Lemma 2. Based on (3.23), a union bound gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{G}_{\delta/4}} \left| \frac{\|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1}{\kappa m} - 1 \right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-cmt^2 + 2s \log\left(\frac{36n}{\delta s}\right)\right), \quad \forall t > 0. \quad (3.24)$$

We set  $t = \frac{\delta}{2}$ , then as long as  $m = C \frac{s}{\delta^2} \log\left(\frac{n}{\delta s}\right)$  for sufficiently large  $C$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-\frac{c}{8} \delta^2 m)$  we have  $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{G}_{\delta/4}} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1 - 1 \right| \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ .

We proceed by assuming (3.19) in Lemma 5 holds (with a parameter  $l \geq 2$ ). Since  $\Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$  is compact, we can assume  $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1 - 1 \right| = \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \|\Phi \hat{\mathbf{w}}\|_1 - 1 \right|$  for some  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$ . Note that  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$  can be approximated by some  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\delta/4}$  such that  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}} - \hat{\mathbf{w}}\| \leq \frac{\delta}{4}$ , then we can estimate that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \|\Phi \hat{\mathbf{w}}\|_1 - 1 \right| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \|\Phi \tilde{\mathbf{w}}\|_1 - 1 \right| + \frac{1}{\kappa m} \left| \|\Phi \tilde{\mathbf{w}}\|_1 - \|\Phi \hat{\mathbf{w}}\|_1 \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{G}_{\delta/4}} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1 - 1 \right| + \frac{1}{\kappa m} \|\Phi(\tilde{\mathbf{w}} - \hat{\mathbf{w}})\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{1}{\kappa \sqrt{m}} \|\Phi \cdot \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{w}} - \hat{\mathbf{w}}}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}} - \hat{\mathbf{w}}\|}\|_2 \cdot \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}} - \hat{\mathbf{w}}\| < \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

The next Lemma gives an upper bound on  $\|\Phi\|_\infty$ , which is indeed a standard estimate for a finite sequence of sub-Gaussian random variables. We provide the proof for completeness.

**Lemma 7.** *Assume  $\Phi \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1)$   $\mathbf{i}$ . For some absolute constant  $C$ ,  $\|\Phi\|_\infty \leq C \sqrt{\log(mn)}$  holds with probability exceeding  $1 - 2(mn)^{-9}$ .*

*Proof.* As shown in (3.22), the  $(i, j)$ -entry of  $\Phi$ , denoted  $\phi_{ij}$ , has  $O(1)$  sub-Gaussian norm, hence by (2.2) for some  $c$  we have  $\mathbb{P}(|\phi_{ij}| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-ct^2)$  for all  $t > 0$ . A union bound gives  $\mathbb{P}(\|\Phi\|_\infty \geq t) \leq 2mn \cdot \exp(-ct^2)$ . The proof can be concluded by setting  $t = \sqrt{\frac{10}{c} \log(mn)}$ .  $\square$

Then we give a Lemma for estimating  $|\operatorname{sgn}(a) - \operatorname{sgn}(b)|$  by  $|a - b|$ , note that the bound itself reflects the issue when both  $a, b$  are close to 0.

**Lemma 8.** *Given  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ , we conventionally let  $\frac{x}{0} = \infty$  for any  $x \geq 0$ , then we have*

$$|\operatorname{sgn}(a) - \operatorname{sgn}(b)| \leq \min \left\{ \frac{2|a - b|}{\max\{|a|, |b|\}}, 2 \right\}. \quad (3.26)$$

*Proof.* When  $a = 0$  or  $b = 0$ , the result is obvious, so we assume  $a, b$  are non-zero. By boundedness,  $|\operatorname{sgn}(a) - \operatorname{sgn}(b)| \leq |\operatorname{sgn}(a)| + |\operatorname{sgn}(b)| = 2$ . Since  $a, b$  are symmetric, it remains to show the upper bound  $\frac{2|a-b|}{|a|}$ , which follows from some algebra as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{sgn}(a) - \operatorname{sgn}(b)| &= \left| \frac{a}{|a|} - \frac{b}{|b|} \right| \leq \left| \frac{a-b}{|a|} \right| + \left| \frac{b}{|a|} - \frac{b}{|b|} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{|a-b|}{|a|} + \left| \frac{|b|}{|a|} - 1 \right| = \frac{|a-b|}{|a|} + \frac{||b| - |a||}{|a|} \leq \frac{2|a-b|}{|a|}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

thus completing the proof.  $\square$

Under the pre-specified threshold  $\eta > 0$ , recall that the  $k$ -th measurement  $\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}$  is called near vanishing measurement if  $|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}| < \eta$ . The corresponding indices are collected in  $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{x}}$  (3.2). As analyzed at the beginning of Section 3, the phase of near vanishing measurement is not informative for recovery. To address such issue, we establish a bound for  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}} |\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{x}}|$  in the next Lemma.

**Lemma 9.** *Given any  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\beta m$  is an integer, and assume the pre-specified threshold  $\eta$  satisfies  $\eta < \frac{\beta}{4}$ . If for some sufficiently large  $C$*

$$m \geq \frac{Cs}{\beta^2} \log \left( \frac{n^2 \log(mn)}{\eta s} \right), \quad (3.28)$$

then with probability at least  $1 - \exp(-c\beta^2 m) - 2(mn)^{-9}$  we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}} |\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{x}}| < \beta m. \quad (3.29)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{E} = \{E \subset [m] : |E| = \beta m\}$ , we first show that (3.29) can be implied by

$$\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}} \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_{\infty} \geq \eta. \quad (3.30)$$

Indeed, if (3.29) does not hold, then there exists  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{K}^*$ , such that  $|\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{x}_0}| \geq \beta m$ . And hence one can find  $E_0 \subset \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{x}_0}$  such that  $|E_0| = \beta m$ . By definition of  $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{x}_0}$  (3.2), we know  $\|\Phi^{E_0} \mathbf{x}_0\|_{\infty} < \eta$ . This contradicts (3.30). Thus, we only need to show (3.30) holds with high probability. By Lemma 7 with probability at least  $1 - 2(mn)^{-9}$  we can assume  $\|\Phi\|_{\infty} \leq C\sqrt{\log(mn)}$ . We first deal with a fixed  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$  (Step I) and then invoke a covering argument (Step II).

(Step I) We fix  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$ . Due to  $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$  and rotational invariance,  $\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}$ , so a simple estimate follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}| \leq 2\eta) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|\Re(\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x})| \leq 2\eta) \\ &= \int_{-2\eta}^{2\eta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{w^2}{2}\right) dw \leq 2\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

By similar reasoning in the first paragraph of this proof,

$$\inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_{\infty} < 2\eta \iff \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{1}(|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}| < 2\eta) \geq \beta m. \quad (3.32)$$

Note that  $\mathbb{1}(|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}| < 2\eta)$  with  $k \in [m]$  are i.i.d. bounded random variable, and (3.31) gives  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}(|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}| < 2\eta)) \leq 2\eta$ . Thus, for given  $\beta > 0$  we can take to be sufficiently small so that  $\eta < \frac{\beta}{4}$ , hence applying Hoeffding's inequality (e.g., Theorem 1.9 in [42]) delivers

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_{\infty} < 2\eta\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{1}(|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}| < 2\eta) - \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}(|\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x}| < 2\eta)) \geq \frac{\beta}{2}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\beta^2 m\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

(Step II) We construct  $\mathcal{G}_\delta$  as a  $\hat{\delta}$  net of  $\mathcal{K}^*$ , by Lemma 2 we assume  $|\mathcal{G}_\delta| \leq \left(\frac{18n}{\hat{\delta}s}\right)^s$ . Taking a union bound over  $\mathcal{G}_\delta$ , (3.33) gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_\infty < 2\eta\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\beta^2 m + s \log\left(\frac{18n}{\hat{\delta}s}\right)\right). \quad (3.34)$$

By compactness, there exist  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{K}^*$ ,  $\hat{E} \in \mathcal{E}$  such that  $\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \|\Phi^{\hat{E}} \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty$ . Thus, we can pick  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta$  so that  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\| \leq \hat{\delta}$ , which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_\infty &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_\infty + \|\Phi^{\hat{E}} \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty - \|\Phi^{\hat{E}} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty \\ &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_\infty - \|\Phi(\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})\|_\infty \\ &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_\infty - \|\Phi\|_\infty \cdot \sqrt{2s} \cdot \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\| \\ &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_\infty - C\sqrt{2s \log(mn)} \cdot \hat{\delta} \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_\infty - \eta, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

where in the fourth line we use  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \Sigma_{2s}^n$ , and we set  $\hat{\delta} = \frac{\eta}{C\sqrt{2s \log(mn)}}$  so that the last line

holds. Also put our choice of  $\hat{\delta}$  into (3.34), recalling the sample complexity (3.28) for sufficiently large  $C_s$ , with probability at least  $1 - \exp(-\frac{1}{4}\beta^2 m)$  we have  $\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \|\Phi^E \mathbf{x}\|_\infty \geq 2\eta$ , and hence by (3.35) the desired (3.30) holds. Thus, The proof is concluded.  $\square$

Lemma 9 states that the number of near vanishing measurements does not exceed  $\beta m$  with high probability. With a sufficiently small  $\beta$ , due to the boundedness  $|\text{sgn}(\cdot)| \leq 1$ , the influence of the near vanishing measurements is expected to be controllable. But in an actual attempt, we still need the following estimate.

We point out that Lemma 10 is an implication of a more in-depth result called Chevet's inequality [16, 25], see also Section 8.7 in [48]. To be self-contained, here we provide an elementary proof for it that suffices for our need.

**Lemma 10.** *Given a sufficiently small  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\beta m$  is an integer. Let  $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{\mathcal{S} \subset [m] : |\mathcal{S}| = \beta m\}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_2 = \{\mathcal{T} \subset [n] : |\mathcal{T}| = s\}$ . Then with probability at least  $1 - \exp(-c\beta \log(\frac{72}{\beta})m)$ , for some absolute constant  $C$  it holds that*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{E}_1} \sup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{E}_2} \|\Phi_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}\| \leq C\sqrt{m\beta \log\left(\frac{72}{\beta}\right) + s \log\left(\frac{72n}{s}\right)}. \quad (3.36)$$

*Proof.* This is again an application of covering argument. First note that there exist  $\hat{\mathbf{a}} \in \Sigma_{\beta m, c}^{m, *}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{b}} \in \Sigma_{s, c}^{n, *}$  such that

$$\sup_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{E}_1} \sup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{E}_2} \|\Phi_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}\| = \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \Sigma_{\beta m}^{m, *}} \sup_{\mathbf{b} \in \Sigma_{s, c}^{n, *}} \Re(\mathbf{a}^* \Phi \mathbf{b}) = \Re(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^* \Phi \hat{\mathbf{b}}). \quad (3.37)$$

We construct  $\mathcal{G}_1$  as a  $\frac{1}{8}$ -net of  $\Sigma_{\beta m, c}^{m, *}$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_2$  as a  $\frac{1}{8}$ -net of  $\Sigma_{s, c}^{n, *}$ , then by Lemma 2 we can assume  $|\mathcal{G}_1| \leq \left(\frac{72}{\beta}\right)^{2\beta m}$ ,  $|\mathcal{G}_2| \leq \left(\frac{72n}{s}\right)^{2s}$ . By rotational invariance of  $\Phi$ , for fixed  $\mathbf{a} \in \Sigma_{2\beta m}^{m, *}$ ,  $\mathbf{b} \in \Sigma_{s, c}^{n, *}$ ,

$\Re(\mathbf{a}^* \Phi \mathbf{b}) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . Thus, for any  $t > 0$  (2.2) gives  $\mathbb{P}(|\Re(\mathbf{a}^* \Phi \mathbf{b})| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-c_1 t^2)$  for some absolute constant  $c_1$ , then a union bound gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{G}_1} \sup_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{G}_2} |\Re(\mathbf{a}^* \Phi \mathbf{b})| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-c_1 t^2 + 2\beta \log\left(\frac{72}{\beta}\right) \cdot m + 2s \log\left(\frac{72n}{s}\right)\right). \quad (3.38)$$

Thus, we take  $t = \frac{C}{2} \sqrt{\beta \log\left(\frac{72}{\beta}\right) m + s \log\left(\frac{72n}{s}\right)}$  for some sufficient large  $C$ , with probability at least  $1 - \exp\left(-c_2 \beta \log\left(\frac{72}{\beta}\right) m\right)$ , we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{G}_1} \sup_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{G}_2} |\Re(\mathbf{a}^* \Phi \mathbf{b})| \leq \frac{C}{2} \sqrt{\beta \log\left(\frac{72}{\beta}\right) m + s \log\left(\frac{72n}{s}\right)}.$$

Based on this, we pick  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathcal{G}_1$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathcal{G}_2$  such that  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{a}} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}\| \leq \frac{1}{8}$ ,  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{b}} - \hat{\mathbf{b}}\| \leq \frac{1}{8}$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{E}_1} \sup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{E}_2} \|\Phi_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}\| &= \Re(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^* \Phi \hat{\mathbf{b}}) = \Re(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}^* \Phi \tilde{\mathbf{b}}) + \Re([\hat{\mathbf{a}} - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}]^* \Phi \hat{\mathbf{b}}) + \Re(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}^* \Phi (\hat{\mathbf{b}} - \tilde{\mathbf{b}})) \\ &\leq \Re(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}^* \Phi \tilde{\mathbf{b}}) + \frac{1}{8} \cdot 4 \cdot \Re(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^* \Phi \hat{\mathbf{b}}) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{G}_1} \sup_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{G}_2} |\Re(\mathbf{a}^* \Phi \mathbf{b})| + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{E}_1} \sup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{E}_2} \|\Phi_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

where the first inequality follows from the decomposition  $\frac{\hat{\mathbf{a}} - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}}{\|\hat{\mathbf{a}} - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}\|} = \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2$  with  $s$ -sparse  $\mathbf{a}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{a}_2$  satisfying  $\|\mathbf{a}_1\|, \|\mathbf{a}_2\| \leq 1$ , and similar treatment for  $\frac{\hat{\mathbf{b}} - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}}{\|\hat{\mathbf{b}} - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}\|}$ . Hence,  $\sup_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{E}_1} \sup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{E}_2} \|\Phi_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}\| \leq 2 \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{G}_1} \sup_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{G}_2} |\Re(\mathbf{a}^* \Phi \mathbf{b})|$ , the result is immediate.  $\square$

### 3.3 The Parallel Part

With all above estimates in place, we are now at a position to present the proof for our main result. The goal of this part is to deal with the parallel part  $\mathbf{u}_x^{\parallel}$  and show  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^{\parallel}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  in (3.17) can be sufficiently small. To this end, we plug in  $\mathbf{z} = \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x})$ , and  $\|\mathbf{u}_x^{\parallel}\|^2 = (\Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle)^2$ , then an initial attempt gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^{\parallel}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re\langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u} \rangle - \Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \right| \cdot \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re\langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u} \rangle + \Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re\langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u} \rangle - \Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \right| \right\} \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{m} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \|\text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x})\| \cdot \|\Phi \mathbf{u}\| + 1 \right\} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re\langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u} \rangle - \Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

Note that the last “ $\lesssim$ ” is due to  $\frac{1}{m} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \|\text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x})\| \cdot \|\Phi \mathbf{u}\| \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \|\frac{\Phi \mathbf{u}}{\sqrt{m}}\| = O(1)$ , which holds with high probability as long as  $m \gtrsim s \log\left(\frac{n}{s}\right)$  (Lemma 5).

We need to show the last line of (3.40) is sufficiently small. Compared with the local sign-product embedding property established in Lemma 5.4 of [29], what we are going to show is indeed a global sign-product embedding property that holds uniformly for all sparse  $\mathbf{x}$ . Besides, a crucial technical change is to only take the real part of the inner product, which stems from the removal the second constraint in (3.5). Otherwise, additional bias would arise and  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^{\parallel}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  cannot be bounded close to 0 (see Remark 2 for details).

For clarity we divide it into

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u} \rangle - \Re \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \right| \\ & \leq \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} |\Re \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle| \left| \frac{\|\Phi \mathbf{x}\|_1}{\kappa m} - 1 \right|}_{f_1^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} + \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \frac{1}{\kappa m} \left| \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u}_x^\perp \rangle \right|}_{f_2^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

By previous development, the bound for  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f_1^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  is immediate.

**Corollary 1.** *Given any  $\delta > 0$ , when  $m \geq \frac{Cs}{\delta^2} \log\left(\frac{n}{\delta s}\right)$  for some absolute constant  $C$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2\exp(-c\delta^2 m)$  we have  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f_1^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \leq \delta$ .*

*Proof.* Recall the range of the supremum is  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*} \times \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$  we have  $|\Re \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle| \leq 1$ . It remains to invoke Lemma 6.  $\square$

To deal with  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f_2^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ , an approach similar to Lemma 6, 9, 10 is in order. That is, we first study a fixed  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  in Lemma 11, and then apply a covering argument in Lemma 12.

**Lemma 11.** *Fix  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$ ,  $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$ , for some absolute constant  $c > 0$  we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u}_x^\perp \rangle\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp(-cmt^2), \quad \forall t > 0. \quad (3.42)$$

*Proof.* For a fixed  $\mathbf{x}$ , there exists a unitary matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^* = \mathbf{I}_n$ ) such that  $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{e}_1$ . Furthermore, we let  $\tilde{\Phi} = \Phi\mathbf{P}^*$ , then by the rotational invariance of Gaussian variable,  $\tilde{\Phi}$  and  $\Phi\mathbf{P}^*$  have the same distribution. We divide it into two blocks  $\tilde{\Phi} = [\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{G}]$  with  $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times 1}$  and  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times (n-1)}$ . We set  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} = \frac{\text{sgn}(\mathbf{g}^*)}{\sqrt{m}} \mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times (n-1)}$ . Since with full probability  $\|\frac{\text{sgn}(\mathbf{g}^*)}{\sqrt{m}}\| = 1$ , and  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  is independent of  $\mathbf{G}$ , almost surely  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  has entries i.i.d. distributed as  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)\mathbf{i}$ . In addition, we define  $\mathbf{v} := \mathbf{P}\mathbf{u}_x^\perp$  and denote its  $i$ -th entry by  $v_i$ . Since  $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{u}_x^\perp = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{u} - \Re \langle \mathbf{P}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{P}\mathbf{x} \rangle \mathbf{P}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{u} - \Re \langle \mathbf{P}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle \mathbf{e}_1$ , we have  $\Re(v_1) = 0$ . Now it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u}_x^\perp \rangle &= \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{P}\mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{P}\mathbf{u}_x^\perp \rangle \\ &= \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\tilde{\Phi} \mathbf{e}_1), \tilde{\Phi} \mathbf{v} \rangle = \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\mathbf{g}), \mathbf{g}v_1 + \mathbf{G}\mathbf{v}^{[2:n]} \rangle \\ &= \Re(\|\mathbf{g}\|_1 v_1 + \text{sgn}(\mathbf{g}^*) \mathbf{G}\mathbf{v}^{[2:n]}) = \sqrt{m} \cdot \Re(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\mathbf{v}^{[2:n]}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

Note that  $\Re(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\mathbf{w}) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  if  $\|\mathbf{w}\| = 1$ , and evidently we have  $\|\mathbf{v}^{[2:n]}\| \leq 1$ , and hence  $\frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u}_x^\perp \rangle = \frac{1}{\kappa \sqrt{m}} \Re(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\mathbf{v}^{[2:n]})$  has sub-Gaussian norm bounded by  $\frac{C}{\sqrt{m}}$  for some  $C$ . Then the result follows immediately from (2.2).  $\square$

**Remark 2.** (Taking the real part only) *We emphasize that using  $\Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u} \rangle$  (rather than  $\langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u} \rangle$  as [29]) is crucial for the complex case. Otherwise,  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f_2^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  in (3.41) may not be close to 0. This issue arises even for fixed  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ . Indeed, without taking the real part of the inner product, the calculation in (3.43) delivers  $\frac{1}{\kappa m} \mathbb{E} \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u}_x^\perp \rangle = v_1$ , which is in general non-zero, and hence  $\langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u}_x^\perp \rangle$  by no means approximates 0. Of course, in the real case where  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $v_1$  is also real and hence  $\Re(v_1) = 0$  leads to  $v_1 = 0$ . This is why Lemma 5.4 in [29] can hold for a full inner product  $\langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u} \rangle$ , but does not generalize to the complex case.*



**Lemma 12.** *Given any sufficiently small constant  $\delta > 0$  and threshold  $\eta$  (for defining near vanishing measurement), if*

$$m \geq C_s s \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\eta^2} \log \left( \frac{n^2 \log(mn)}{s} \right), \frac{1}{\delta^2} \log \left( \frac{n}{\delta \eta s} \right) \right\} \quad (3.44)$$

for some sufficiently large  $C_s$ , then with probability at least  $1 - 2(mn)^{-9} - 4 \exp(-c_1 \delta^2 m) - \exp(-c_2 \eta^2 m)$ , there exists some absolute constant  $C_e$  such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}} f_2^{\parallel}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \leq C_e (\delta + \sqrt{\eta}). \quad (3.45)$$

*Proof.* By the boundedness of  $\Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*} \times \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$  we can find  $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*} \times \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$  such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f_2^{\parallel}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) < f_2^{\parallel}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) + \delta.$$

For a given  $\delta$  we construct  $\mathcal{G}_\delta \subset \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$  as a  $\delta$ -net,  $\mathcal{G}_{\eta\delta} \subset \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$  as a  $(\eta\delta)$ -net, then Lemma 2 allows us to suppose  $|\mathcal{G}_\delta| \leq \left(\frac{9n}{4\delta s}\right)^{4s}$  and  $|\mathcal{G}_{\eta\delta}| \leq \left(\frac{9n}{\eta\delta s}\right)^s$ . We first extend (3.42) to  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{G}_{\eta\delta} \times \mathcal{G}_\delta$ , which by a union bound gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_{\eta\delta}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u}_x^\perp \rangle \right| \geq t \right) \\ & \leq 2 \exp \left( -cmt^2 + 4s \log \left( \frac{9n}{4\delta s} \right) + s \log \left( \frac{9n}{\eta\delta s} \right) \right), \quad \forall t > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

Setting  $t = \delta$ , then when (3.44) holds for sufficiently large  $C_s$ , it holds with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_1 \delta^2 m)$  that  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_{\eta\delta}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} |(\kappa m)^{-1} \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u}_x^\perp \rangle| \leq \delta$ .

It remains to prove  $f_2^{\parallel}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) = O(\delta + \sqrt{\eta})$ . For approximation, we can pick  $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) \in \mathcal{G}_{\eta\delta} \times \mathcal{G}_\delta$  such that  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\| \leq \eta\delta$ ,  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}\| \leq \delta$ . For a given sufficiently small  $\eta$ , we can find  $\eta < \beta = O(\eta)$  such that  $\beta m$  is an integer, then Lemma 9 states that under the sample size (3.44), with probability at least  $1 - \exp(-c_2 \eta^2 m) - 2(mn)^{-9}$ , we have  $|\mathcal{J}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}| < \beta m$ . Recall that, for all  $k \in \mathcal{J}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^c := [m] \setminus \mathcal{J}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$  we have  $|\Phi_k^* \hat{\mathbf{x}}| \geq \eta$ . Now we can estimate as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\kappa m} \left| \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \hat{\mathbf{x}}), \Phi \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp \rangle \right| \leq \frac{1}{\kappa m} \left| \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \tilde{\mathbf{x}}), \Phi \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp \rangle \right| \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\kappa m} \left| \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \hat{\mathbf{x}}), \Phi \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp \rangle - \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \tilde{\mathbf{x}}), \Phi \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp \rangle \right| \\ & \leq \delta + \frac{1}{\kappa m} \left| \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \text{sgn}(\Phi \tilde{\mathbf{x}}), \Phi \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp \rangle \right| \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\kappa m} \left| \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \tilde{\mathbf{x}}), \Phi (\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp) \rangle \right| \\ & \lesssim \delta + \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \left\| \text{sgn}(\Phi \hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \text{sgn}(\Phi \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \right\| + \left\| \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

Note that in the last “ $\lesssim$ ” we use  $\Re \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \leq \|\mathbf{a}\| \|\mathbf{b}\|$  and  $\frac{1}{m} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{10s,c}^{n,*}} \|\Phi \mathbf{u}\|^2 = O(1)$ . The latter is from Lemma 5 that holds with probability exceeding  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_3 m)$ , and we note

that  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp \in \Sigma_{5s,c}^n$ . Divide it according to whether a measurement is near vanishing, then apply the estimate in Lemma 8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|\operatorname{sgn}(\Phi \hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \operatorname{sgn}(\Phi \tilde{\mathbf{x}})\| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|\operatorname{sgn}(\Phi^{\mathcal{J}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^c} \hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \operatorname{sgn}(\Phi^{\mathcal{J}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^c} \tilde{\mathbf{x}})\| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|\operatorname{sgn}(\Phi^{\mathcal{J}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^c} \hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \operatorname{sgn}(\Phi^{\mathcal{J}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^c} \tilde{\mathbf{x}})\| \quad (3.48) \\
& \leq \frac{2\sqrt{|\mathcal{J}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}|}}{\sqrt{m}} + \frac{2\|\Phi^{\mathcal{J}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^c}(\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})\|}{\sqrt{m}\eta} \lesssim \sqrt{\beta} + \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|}{\eta} \leq \sqrt{\beta} + \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that in the last line, we apply the bound 2 in Lemma 8 to the measurements in  $\mathcal{J}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$ , while the bound  $\frac{2|a-b|}{\max\{|a|,|b|\}}$  to the measurements in  $\mathcal{J}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^c$ , then, the “ $\lesssim$ ” is again due to Lemma 5. It remains to do a more standard estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp\| &= \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \Re\langle \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}} + \Re\langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\| \\
&\leq \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\| + |\Re\langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \rangle| \cdot \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\| \\
&\quad + \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}\| \cdot (|\Re\langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \rangle| + |\Re\langle \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle|) \\
&\leq 2 \cdot (\|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\| + \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|) \leq 4\delta.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.49)$$

Since  $\beta = O(\eta)$ , putting (3.48), (3.49) into (3.47) concludes the proof.  $\square$

While the left-hand side of (3.41) is divided into  $f_1^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ ,  $f_2^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  for clarity, we further put them together and present a global sign-product embedding property as the following Corollary, which may be interesting on its own right (Remark 3).

**Corollary 2.** (Global Sign-Product Embedding Property) *Assume  $\Phi \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}$ , given any  $\delta > 0$ , if  $m \geq \frac{Cs}{\delta^4} \log\left(\frac{n^2 \log(mn)}{\delta^3 s}\right)$  holds for sufficiently large  $C$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2(mn)^{-9} - 7 \exp(-c\delta^4 m)$  we have*

$$\left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re\langle \operatorname{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{u}), \Phi \mathbf{v} \rangle - \Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \right| \leq \delta \|\mathbf{v}\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}, \mathbf{v} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^n. \quad (3.50)$$

**Remark 3.** *From a geometry perspective, the sign-product embedding property states that the projection length of a sparse  $\mathbf{v}$  onto a unit sparse  $\mathbf{u}$ , can be uniformly (over both  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$ ) encoded into the projection length of  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \Phi \mathbf{v}$  onto the unit phase-only measurements  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \operatorname{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{u})$ , up to a rescaling of  $\frac{1}{\kappa}$ . This property is reminiscent of the binary embedding studied in 1-bit compressive sensing, for instance, the BeSE in [30], Hamming cube encoding in [39] (see Remark 1.5 therein). Corollary 2 presents a twofold extension of Lemma 5.4 in [29], that is, to complex  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$  and to universality of  $\mathbf{u}$ .*

### 3.4 The Orthogonal Part

This part is devoted to estimating  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ . We first calculate its expectation and show the concentration property for fixed  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{K}^* \times \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$ . The main technique is similar to the proof of Lemma 11, which is to take advantage of the rotational invariance of  $\Phi$ .

**Lemma 13.** *Fix  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$ ,  $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$ , it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{1}{m} \|\Im(\operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*) \Phi \mathbf{u})\|^2 = \|\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{x}}^\perp\|^2 + |\Im\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^2. \quad (3.51)$$

Moreover, there exists  $c > 0$  such that for all  $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{m}\|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u})\|^2 - (\|\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|^2 + |\Im\langle\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}\rangle|^2)\right| \geq t\right) \\ \leq 2 \exp(-cm \min\{t, t^2\}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.52)$$

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Lemma 11, we can find a unitary matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  such that  $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{e}_1$ , then  $\mathbf{v} = [v_i] = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{u}_x^\perp$  satisfies  $\Re v_1 = 0$ . We further define  $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = [\gamma_i] := \mathbf{P}\Phi_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$  (Recall that  $\Phi_1^*$  is the first row of  $\Phi$ ), whose entries are i.i.d. distributed as  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)\mathbf{i}$ . Then some algebra gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\frac{1}{m}\|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u})\|^2 &= \mathbb{E}\frac{1}{m}\|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u}_x^\perp)\|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\Im(\overline{\Phi_1^*\mathbf{x}}) \cdot \Phi_1^*\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\right]^2 = \mathbb{E}\left[\Im(\text{sgn}(\gamma_1) \cdot (\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*\mathbf{v}))\right]^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[|\gamma_1|v_1^\Im + \sum_{j=2}^n \Re(\text{sgn}(\gamma_1)\overline{\gamma_j}) \cdot v_j^\Im + \sum_{j=2}^n \Im(\text{sgn}(\gamma_1)\overline{\gamma_j}) \cdot v_j^\Re\right]^2 \\ &= (\mathbb{E}|\gamma_1|^2) \cdot (v_1^\Im)^2 + \sum_{j=2}^n \left\{ (\mathbb{E}[\Re(\text{sgn}(\gamma_1)\overline{\gamma_j})]^2) \cdot (v_j^\Im)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\mathbb{E}[\Im(\text{sgn}(\gamma_1)\overline{\gamma_j})]^2) \cdot (v_j^\Re)^2 \right\} \\ &= 2|v_1|^2 + \sum_{j=2}^n |v_j|^2 = \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 + |v_1|^2 = \|\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|^2 + |\Im\langle\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}\rangle|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

This displays (3.51). Note that we use (3.15) in the first line, and the fourth line is because the expectation of cross term vanishes.

It remains to show the concentration result. Note that

$$\frac{1}{m}\|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u})\|^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \left[\Im(\overline{\text{sgn}(\Phi_k^*\mathbf{x})} \cdot \Phi_k^*\mathbf{u}_x^\perp)\right]^2$$

is the mean of  $m$  independent copies of  $[\Im(\overline{\text{sgn}(\Phi_1^*\mathbf{x})} \cdot \Phi_1^*\mathbf{u}_x^\perp)]^2$ . Then we use (2.1) and the definition of sub-Gaussian norm to estimate

$$\|[\Im(\overline{\text{sgn}(\Phi_1^*\mathbf{x})} \cdot \Phi_1^*\mathbf{u}_x^\perp)]^2\|_{\psi_1} \leq \|\Im(\overline{\text{sgn}(\Phi_1^*\mathbf{x})} \cdot \Phi_1^*\mathbf{u}_x^\perp)\|_{\psi_2}^2 \leq \|\Phi_1^*\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|_{\psi_2}^2 = O(1). \quad (3.54)$$

Therefore, we can invoke Bernstein's inequality (Lemma 2.4) to display (3.52).  $\square$

**Remark 4.** Lemma 13 exhibits an essential difference between the real case and the complex case. That is, while for the real case in [29]  $\Im\langle\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}\rangle = 0$  and hence  $\frac{1}{m}\|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u})\|^2$  exactly provides the orthogonal part  $\|\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|^2$ , in the complex case there appears a bias term  $|\Im\langle\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}\rangle|^2$  that may rise up to 1, e.g., when  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{u}$ . Thus, if letting the scaling factor  $\hat{t} = 1$  in (3.16) (as [29]),  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  can never be bounded below 1, which even does not guarantee the identifiability of  $\mathbf{x}$ , not to mention (3.17). We shall see shortly in the proof of Theorem 1 that, a careful choice of  $\hat{t}$  can yield  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \leq \frac{1}{3} + \delta$  for any pre-specified  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , thus fulfilling (3.17).

We introduce the shorthand  $\hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  that contains the bias term  $|\Im\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^2$

$$\hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) := \left| \frac{1}{m} \|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u})\|^2 - (\|\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|^2 + |\Im\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^2) \right|. \quad (3.55)$$

Applying a covering argument to strengthen Lemma 13 to  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*} \times \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$ , the next Lemma plays a similar role as Lemma 12 for the parallel part. The technical difference is that, a finer net for approximation of  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$  is needed to overcome the difficulty of lack of good estimation on  $\|\Phi\mathbf{x}\|_\infty$  (3.59), which is analogous to Lemma 9.

**Lemma 14.** *Given any sufficiently small constant  $\delta > 0$  and the threshold  $\eta$  (for defining near vanishing measurement), if*

$$m \geq C_s s \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\eta^2} \log \left( \frac{n^2 \log(mn)}{s} \right), \frac{1}{\delta^2} \log \left( \frac{n^2 \log(mn)}{\eta^2 \delta^2 s} \right) \right\} \quad (3.56)$$

for some sufficiently large  $C_s$ , then with probability at least  $1 - 2(mn)^{-9} - c_1 \exp(-c_2 \min\{\delta^2, \eta^2\}m)$ , for some  $C$  we have  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \leq C(\delta + \sqrt{\eta})$ .

*Proof.* We construct  $\mathcal{G}_\delta$  as  $\delta$ -net of  $\Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{\delta}}$  as  $\tilde{\delta}$ -net of  $\Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$  (where  $\tilde{\delta}$  will be specified later), then Lemma 2 allows us to suppose  $|\mathcal{G}_\delta| \leq \left(\frac{9n}{4\delta s}\right)^{8s}$ ,  $|\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{\delta}}| \leq \left(\frac{9n}{\tilde{\delta}s}\right)^{2s}$ . A union bound extends (3.52) to  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{\delta}} \times \mathcal{G}_\delta$ , i.e., for any  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{\delta}}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} \hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -cm \min\{t, t^2\} + 8s \log \left( \frac{9n}{4\delta s} \right) + 2s \log \left( \frac{9n}{\tilde{\delta}s} \right) \right). \quad (3.57)$$

We can assume  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) < \hat{f}^\perp(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) + \delta$  for some  $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*} \times \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}$ . Then there exist  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{\delta}}$  such that  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}\| \leq \delta$ ,  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\| \leq \tilde{\delta}$ . We further use the shorthand  $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \text{sgn}(\Phi\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \text{sgn}(\Phi\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ , then some algebra gives

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}^\perp(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) &\leq \hat{f}^\perp(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) + \hat{f}^\perp(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) - \hat{f}^\perp(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{\delta}}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{G}_\delta} \hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + \frac{1}{m} \left| \|\Im(\text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}^*)\Phi\hat{\mathbf{u}})\|^2 - \|\Im(\text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*)\Phi\tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|^2 \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_x^\perp\|^2 - \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_x^\perp\|^2 \right| + \left| |\Im\langle \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}} \rangle|^2 - |\Im\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \rangle|^2 \right| := I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4. \end{aligned} \quad (3.58)$$

(Bounds for  $I_1, I_2$ .) We will handle  $I_1$  by (3.57). For  $I_2$ , with high probability we first assume  $\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|\Phi\mathbf{u}\| = O(1)$  (Lemma 5) and  $\|\Phi\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{\log(mn)}$  (Lemma 7). For any  $\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{2s,c}^{n,*}$ , this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi\mathbf{w}\|_\infty &= \max_{k \in [m]} |\Phi_k^* \mathbf{w}| \leq \max_{k \in [m]} \|\Phi_k\|_\infty \|\mathbf{w}\|_1 \\ &\leq \|\Phi\|_\infty \cdot \sqrt{2s} \|\mathbf{w}\| \lesssim \sqrt{s \log(mn)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.59)$$

Before proceeding, we invoke Lemma 9 and obtain that for some  $\beta = O(\eta)$  (but  $\beta \geq \eta$ ),  $\hat{E} := \mathcal{J}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} \cup \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}$  satisfies  $|\hat{E}| < 2\beta m$  with high probability. We also write  $\hat{E}^c = [m] \setminus \hat{E}$ . Moreover, Lemma 10 delivers that with high probability,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}} \|\Phi^{\hat{E}} \mathbf{u}\| \leq \sup_{|\mathcal{S}| \leq 2\beta m} \sup_{|\mathcal{T}| \leq 4s} \|\Phi_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}\| = O \left( \sqrt{\eta m \log \left( \frac{72}{\eta} \right) + s \log \left( \frac{72n}{s} \right)} \right). \quad (3.60)$$

Now we can go into the estimate of  $I_2$ . First divide it according to  $\hat{E}$ , we have (Recall that we use  $\mathbf{A}^S$  to extract the rows in  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathbf{A}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq \frac{1}{m} \left| \|\Im([\text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}^*)\Phi]^{\hat{E}^c} \hat{\mathbf{u}})\|^2 - \|\Im([\text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*)\Phi]^{\hat{E}^c} \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|^2 \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{m} \left| \|\Im([\text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}^*)\Phi]^{\hat{E}} \hat{\mathbf{u}})\|^2 - \|\Im([\text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*)\Phi]^{\hat{E}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|^2 \right| := I_{21} + I_{22}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.61)$$

For  $I_{21}$  we can proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} I_{21} &\leq \frac{1}{m} \left| \|\Im([\text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}^*)]^{\hat{E}^c} \Phi \hat{\mathbf{u}})\| - \|\Im([\text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*)]^{\hat{E}^c} \Phi \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\| \right| \\ &\quad \cdot \left| \|\Im([\text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}^*)]^{\hat{E}^c} \Phi \hat{\mathbf{u}})\| + \|\Im([\text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*)]^{\hat{E}^c} \Phi \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\| \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \left\| [\text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}^*)]^{\hat{E}^c} \Phi \hat{\mathbf{u}} - [\text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*)]^{\hat{E}^c} \Phi \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \right\| \cdot \left( \|\Phi \hat{\mathbf{u}}\| + \|\Phi \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\| \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \left( \left\| [\text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}^*) - \text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*)]^{\hat{E}^c} \Phi \hat{\mathbf{u}} \right\| + \left\| [\text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*)]^{\hat{E}^c} \Phi (\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) \right\| \right) \\ &\leq \|\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{\hat{E}^c} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{\hat{E}^c}\|_\infty \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|\Phi \hat{\mathbf{u}}\| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|\Phi (\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\| \lesssim \|\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{\hat{E}^c} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{\hat{E}^c}\|_\infty + \delta \end{aligned} \quad (3.62)$$

Note that we use Lemma 5 several times. Furthermore, by Lemma 8 we can bound  $\|\hat{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_\infty$  from above

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{\hat{E}^c} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{\hat{E}^c}\|_\infty &= \max_{k \in \hat{E}^c} |\text{sgn}(\Phi_k^* \hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \text{sgn}(\Phi_k^* \tilde{\mathbf{x}})| \leq 2 \max_{k \in \hat{E}^c} \frac{|\Phi_k^* (\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})|}{|\Phi_k^* \hat{\mathbf{x}}|} \\ &\leq 2 \frac{\max_{k \in \hat{E}^c} |\Phi_k^* (\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})|}{\min_{k \in \hat{E}^c} |\Phi_k^* \hat{\mathbf{x}}|} \leq \frac{2 \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|}{\eta} \cdot \left( \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{2s,c}^{n,*}} \|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_\infty \right) \lesssim \frac{\tilde{\delta} \sqrt{s \log(mn)}}{\eta}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.63)$$

where we use (3.59) in the last inequality. Thus, we take  $\tilde{\delta} = \frac{\eta \delta}{\sqrt{s \log(mn)}}$ , then (3.62) gives  $I_{21} \lesssim \delta$ , and under the sample complexity of (3.56), (3.57) gives  $I_1 \leq \delta$  with probability at least  $1 - 2(-c_1 \delta^2 m)$ . We still need to deal with the near vanishing part of  $I_2$ , i.e.,  $I_{22}$ . Previous developments can yield

$$\begin{aligned} I_{22} &\leq \frac{1}{m} \left( \|\Im([\text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}^*)\Phi]^{\hat{E}} \hat{\mathbf{u}})\|^2 + \|\Im([\text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*)\Phi]^{\hat{E}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \left( \|\Phi^{\hat{E}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|^2 + \|\Phi^{\hat{E}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|^2 \right) \leq \frac{2}{m} \sup_{|\mathcal{S}| \leq 2\beta m} \sup_{|\mathcal{T}| \leq 4s} \|\Phi_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}\|^2 \\ &\lesssim \eta \log\left(\frac{72}{\eta}\right) + \frac{s}{m} \log\left(\frac{72n}{s}\right) \lesssim \sqrt{\eta} + \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (3.64)$$

where we invoke (3.60) in the last line, and then further use  $\eta$  is sufficiently small and the sample complexity (3.56). Thus, we arrive at  $I_1 + I_2 \lesssim \delta + \sqrt{\eta}$ .

(*Bounds for  $I_3, I_4$ .*) It remains to deal with  $I_3$  and  $I_4$ , which are more standard estimates. Specifically, by (3.49) we have  $I_3 \leq \left\| \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp\| + \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp\| \right\| \cdot \left\| \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^\perp\| \right\| \leq 8\delta$ , and likewise for  $I_4$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &= \left| \|\Im\langle \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}} \rangle\|^2 - \|\Im\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \rangle\|^2 \right| \\ &\leq \left| \|\Im\langle \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}} \rangle\| + \|\Im\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \rangle\| \right| \cdot \left| \|\Im\langle \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}} \rangle - \Im\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \rangle\| \right| \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \left( \|\Im\langle \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}} \rangle\| + \|\Im\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \rangle\| \right) \leq 4\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (3.65)$$

Putting pieces into (3.58), and also counting all the involved probability terms, the proof is complete.  $\square$

### 3.5 The Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof of Theorem 1.* A simple inspection of (3.8)–(3.17) finds that  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  is an upper bound for the  $2s$  order RIC of  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z}, r}$ , or  $4s$  order RIC of  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z}, c}$ . Such upper bound is uniform over all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}$ , and for the real case where  $\mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s, r}^n$ ,  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}}$  stands for  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s, r}^{n, *}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{2s, r}^{n, *}}$ , for the complex case where  $\mathcal{K} = \Sigma_{s, c}^n$ ,  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}}$  refers to  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s, c}^{n, *}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s, c}^{n, *}}$ .

Recall that  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  has further been decomposed as  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f_1^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f_2^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  in (3.41). Applying Corollary 1 to  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f_1^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ , and applying Lemma 12 with  $\eta = \delta^2$  to  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f_2^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ , (under simple rescaling of  $\delta$ ) we obtain  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^\parallel(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$  for both real and complex cases. We divide the discussion of  $f^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  into real case and complex case.

(*Real case*) As stated in the Theorem, we take  $\hat{t} = 1$  in  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z}, r}$ . In this case, we have  $f^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = \hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  (Compare (3.16) and (3.55)). Then Lemma 14 with  $\eta = \delta$  (up to rescaling of  $\eta$ ) yields  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ . The result follows.

(*Complex case*) As stated in the Theorem, we take  $\hat{t} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$  in  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z}, c}$ . Similar to the real case, by Lemma 14 we can also obtain  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ . Moreover, we apply triangle inequality and then plug in  $\|\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|^2 = 1 - [\Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle]^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) &\leq \frac{2}{3} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \frac{1}{3} \cdot \left| 2|\Im\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^2 - \|\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|^2 \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \left| |\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^2 + |\Im\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^2 - 1 \right| \leq \frac{1}{3} + \frac{\delta}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.66)$$

The result is immediate.

For the uniform exact reconstruction guarantee (the statement after “in particular” in the Theorem), we only need to take sufficiently small  $\delta$  (e.g.,  $\delta = \frac{1}{3}$ ) and then apply Lemma 4.  $\square$

We point out that with a rescaling factor  $\hat{t}$ , our choice  $\hat{t} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$  for the complex case has already been optimized.

## 4 PO-CS of Low-rank Matrices

We shall present here the parallel result of uniform low-rank recovery from phase-only measurements. The main differences between real signal and complex signal are in the global sign product embedding property (Remark 2) and a crucial rescaling of new sensing matrix (Remark 4), hence we only focus on the complex case.

In this section  $\mathbf{X}$  denotes the underlying low-rank signal, and  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{M}_{r, c}^{n_1, n_2}$ . We still use  $\Phi$  to denote the (original) linear sensing matrix,  $\mathbf{z}$  for phase-only measurements of  $\mathbf{X}$ , but keep in mind that in this section  $\Phi(\cdot)$  is a random map from  $\mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_2}$  to  $\mathbb{C}^m$  defined for any  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_2}$  by  $\Phi(\mathbf{U}) = (\langle \Phi_1, \mathbf{U} \rangle, \langle \Phi_2, \mathbf{U} \rangle, \dots, \langle \Phi_m, \mathbf{U} \rangle)^\top \in \mathbb{C}^m$ , where  $\{\Phi_k : k \in [m]\}$  are i.i.d. copies of  $\mathcal{N}^{n_1 \times n_2}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}^{n_1 \times n_2}(0, 1)\mathbf{i}$ ,  $\langle \Phi_k, \mathbf{U} \rangle = \text{Tr}(\Phi_k^* \mathbf{U})$ . In PO-CS, our task is to reconstruct  $\mathbf{X}$  (up to a positive scaling factor) from  $\mathbf{z} := \text{sgn}(\Phi(\mathbf{X}))$ . Analogous to (3.7),

this can be reformulated as a linear compressive sensing problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{find } \mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{M}_{2r,r}^{2n_1, n_2}, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{A}_z(\mathbf{U}) = \mathbf{e}_1, \\ \mathbf{A}_z(\mathbf{U}) = & \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\kappa m} \langle \Re(\sum_{k=1}^m z_k \Phi_k), \mathbf{U}^{[n_1]} \rangle + \frac{1}{\kappa m} \langle \Im(\sum_{k=1}^m z_k \Phi_k), \mathbf{U}^{[2n_1] \setminus [n_1]} \rangle \\ -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3m}} \langle \Im(z_1 \Phi_1), \mathbf{U}^{[n_1]} \rangle + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3m}} \langle \Re(z_1 \Phi_1), \mathbf{U}^{[2n_1] \setminus [n_1]} \rangle \\ \vdots \\ -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3m}} \langle \Im(z_m \Phi_m), \mathbf{U}^{[n_1]} \rangle + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3m}} \langle \Re(z_m \Phi_m), \mathbf{U}^{[2n_1] \setminus [n_1]} \rangle \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

From Lemma 4 our goal is to show  $\mathbf{A}_z$  for all  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{M}_{r,c}^{n_1, n_2}$  simultaneously respect RIP  $\delta_{4r}^{\mathbf{A}_z} < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ , and simple algebra verifies that proving

$$\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in (\mathcal{M}_{r,c}^{n_1, n_2})^*} \sup_{\mathbf{U} \in (\mathcal{M}_{4r,c}^{n_1, n_2})^*} f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{U}) < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \quad (4.2)$$

is sufficient, where we define

$$f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{U}) := \left| \frac{1}{\kappa^2 m^2} [\Re(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi(\mathbf{U}))]^2 + \frac{2}{3m} \|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*) \Phi(\mathbf{U}))\|^2 - 1 \right|. \quad (4.3)$$

Our result states that the uniform low-rank recovery guarantee can be achieved from  $O(r(n_1 + n_2) \log(r(n_1 + n_2)))$  phase-only measurements.

**Theorem 2.** *Consider the setting of PO-CS of  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{M}_{r,c}^{n_1, n_2}$  described above. Under the sample complexity of  $m = O(r(n_1 + n_2) \log(r(n_1 + n_2)))$ , with probability at least  $1 - c_1 \exp(-c_2 m) - 2m \exp(-c(n_1 + n_2))$ , all  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{M}_{r,c}^{n_1, n_2}$  can be exactly reconstructed (up to positive scaling factor) from  $\mathbf{z} = \text{sgn}(\Phi(\mathbf{X}))$  via finding  $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \hat{\mathbf{U}}^{[n_1]} + \hat{\mathbf{U}}^{[2n_1] \setminus [n_1]} \mathbf{i}$  where  $\hat{\mathbf{U}}$  is obtained from*

$$\hat{\mathbf{U}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n_1 \times n_2}} \|\mathbf{U}\|_{nu}, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{A}_z(\mathbf{U}) = \mathbf{e}_1. \quad (4.4)$$

The proof of Theorem 2 is parallel to Theorem 1, hence we omit the details but only point out several essential changes. Specifically, Lemma 7 should be substituted with the following Lemma, which gives rise to the probability term  $2m \exp(-c(n_1 + n_2))$  in Theorem 2.

**Lemma 15.** *For the linear random map  $\Phi$  in this Section, there exists some absolute constant  $c, C$ , such that  $\max_{k \in [m]} \|\Phi_k\| \leq C\sqrt{n_1 + n_2}$  holds with probability at least  $1 - 2m \exp(-c(n_1 + n_2))$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.4.5 in [48]  $\mathbb{P}(\|\Phi_k\| \geq C_0(\sqrt{n_1} + \sqrt{n_2} + t)) \leq 2 \exp(-t^2)$  for some constant  $C_0$ , thus a union bound gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{k \in [m]} \|\Phi_k\| \geq C(\sqrt{n_1} + \sqrt{n_2} + t)\right) \leq 2m \exp(-t^2).$$

Setting  $t = \sqrt{c(n_1 + n_2)}$  concludes the proof.  $\square$

Based on Lemma 15, the estimate  $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{2s,c}^{n_1, *}} \|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{s \log(mn)}$  used in (3.35) and (3.63) should be replaced with  $\sup_{\mathbf{W} \in (\mathcal{M}_{2r,c}^{n_1, n_2})^*} \|\Phi(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{r(n_1 + n_2)}$ , which is due to  $|\langle \Phi_k, \mathbf{W} \rangle| \leq \|\Phi_k\| \cdot \sqrt{\text{rank}(\mathbf{W})} \cdot \|\mathbf{W}\|_F$ . In addition, the RIP of  $\Phi$  over low-rank matrices needed in Lemma 5 can be positioned in Theorem 2.3, [10]. For slightly more details, we refer readers to Section 6.1 where we will show that the techniques developed in Section 3 works for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}$ , as long as  $\mathcal{K}$  has low covering dimension.

## 5 Stability and Reconstruction with Norm

Having presented the uniform exact recovery guarantee over  $\Sigma_{s,c}^n$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{r,c}^{n_1,n_2}$  in PO-CS, we further investigate the uniform stable recovery in a noisy setting. After that, while exact reconstruction of the signal direction  $\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}$  has been established in [29] and the present paper, we show uniform full reconstruction with norm with be achieved by adding Gaussian dither before capturing the phases. For succinctness we would only present the result for sparse recovery.

### 5.1 Uniform Stable Reconstruction

Our approach is to recast PO-CS as a linear compressive sensing problem, and note that the stability for linear compressive sensing has been well developed under the framework of RIP, see for instance, Theorem 2.1 in [9] for sparse recovery. Our analysis would be based on this well-known result. More precisely, we consider bounded complex additive noise  $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{C}^m$  satisfying  $\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_\infty \leq \tau_0$ , and the resulting noisy PO-CS model

$$\check{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{z} + \boldsymbol{\tau} = \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}) + \boldsymbol{\tau}. \quad (5.1)$$

This problem set-up accommodates many noise pattern of interest, specifically a moderate phase disturbance  $\mathbf{z}_\Lambda = \Lambda \mathbf{z}$  where  $\Lambda$  is a diagonal matrix with unit entries close to 1. This also embraces the noise brought by uniform quantization over  $\{|z| = 1\}$ . Moreover, the bounded noise has been noted to be quite necessary for success of PO-CS, see Remark 4.4 in [29]. Indeed, compared with [29] we follow a similar strategy to establish the following stability result. The difference is that we can now provide a stable recovery guarantee uniformly for all complex sparse signals, (while their result only handles a fixed real signal).

**Theorem 3.** *Assume  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^n$ , then in noiseless PO-CS with reformulation (3.7) one can exactly reconstruct  $\mathbf{x}^* = \frac{\kappa m}{\|\Phi \mathbf{x}\|_1} \mathbf{x}$  (since the measurement added to specify signal norm stems from the choice  $\|\Phi \mathbf{x}\|_1 = \kappa m$ ). Consider (5.1) with  $\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_\infty \leq \tau_0$ , we use  $\check{\mathbf{z}}$  to construct the new sensing matrix  $\mathbf{A}_{\check{\mathbf{z}},c}$  and solve*

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_1, \quad \text{s.t. } \|\mathbf{A}_{\check{\mathbf{z}},c} \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{e}_1\| \leq \tilde{\tau}. \quad (5.2)$$

Let  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{[1:n]} + \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{[n+1:2n]} \mathbf{i}$ . Then if  $\tau_0$  is sufficiently small,  $m \geq Cs \log\left(\frac{n^2 \log(mn)}{s}\right)$  for some sufficiently large  $c$ , one can pick  $\tilde{\tau} = \sqrt{2}\tau_0$ , and for some absolute constant  $c$ , for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^n$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2(mn)^{-9} - c_1 \exp(-c_2 m)$  we have the stability guarantee  $\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*\| \leq c\tau_0$ .

*Proof.* For  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  we let  $[\mathbf{u}]_{\mathbb{R}} = [(\mathbf{u}^{\Re})^\top, (\mathbf{u}^{\Im})^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  be its real counterpart. By (3.7)  $\mathbf{A}_{\check{\mathbf{z}},c}$  linearly depends on  $\mathbf{z}$ , thus we can write  $\mathbf{A}_{\check{\mathbf{z}},c} = \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},c} + \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\tau},c}$ , which gives  $\|\mathbf{A}_{\check{\mathbf{z}},c}[\mathbf{x}^*]_{\mathbb{R}} - \mathbf{e}_1\| = \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},c}[\mathbf{x}^*]_{\mathbb{R}} - \mathbf{e}_1\| + \|\mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\tau},c}[\mathbf{x}^*]_{\mathbb{R}}\|$ , and some algebra can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\tau},c}[\mathbf{x}^*]_{\mathbb{R}}\|^2 &= \frac{1}{\kappa^2 m^2} [\Re(\boldsymbol{\tau}^* \Phi \mathbf{x}^*)]^2 + \frac{2}{3m} \|\Im(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\tau}^*) \Phi \mathbf{x}^*)\|^2 \\ &\leq \tau_0^2 \frac{\|\Phi \mathbf{x}^*\|_1^2}{\kappa^2 m^2} + \frac{2\tau_0^2}{3m} \|\Phi \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 = \tau_0^2 + \frac{2\tau_0^2}{3} \|\mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \cdot \left( \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}} \frac{1}{m} \|\Phi \mathbf{u}\|^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$



By Lemma 6,  $\|\mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \leq \frac{\kappa^2 m^2}{\inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}} \|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1^2} \leq \frac{1}{(1-\delta)^2}$  with probability at least  $1 - 2\exp(-\Omega(\delta^2 m))$  for any  $\delta > 0$ . By Lemma 5,  $\frac{1}{m} \|\Phi \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq 1 + \delta$  for any  $\delta > 0$  with probability at least  $1 - 2\exp(-c(\delta)m)$ . Thus, taking  $\delta$  as sufficiently small constant, with probability at least  $1 - 4\exp(-\Omega(m))$  we have  $\|\mathbf{A}_{\tau,c}[\mathbf{x}^*]_{\mathbb{R}}\| \leq \sqrt{2}\tau_0$ . This provides the  $\ell_2$  fidelity and justifies a constraint  $\|\mathbf{A}_{z,c}\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{e}_1\| \leq \sqrt{2}\tau_0$ .

We still need to show  $\mathbf{A}_{z,c}$  respects RIP (note that previous analysis is only for  $\mathbf{A}_{z,c}$ ). Based on Theorem 1, we already know for any fixed  $\delta_0 > 0$ , with high probability  $\mathbf{A}_{z,c}$  possesses  $4s$  order RIP smaller than  $\frac{1}{3} + \delta_0$ . Moreover, for any  $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,r}^{2n,*}$  we write  $[\mathbf{u}]_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbf{u}^{[1:n]} + \mathbf{u}^{[n+1:2n]}\mathbf{i}$  and then estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}_{\tau,c}\mathbf{u}\|^2 &= \frac{1}{\kappa^2 m^2} [\Re(\boldsymbol{\tau}^* \Phi[\mathbf{u}]_{\mathbb{C}})]^2 + \frac{2}{3m} \|\Im(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\tau}^*) \Phi[\mathbf{u}]_{\mathbb{C}})\|^2 \\ &\leq \tau_0^2 \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}} \frac{\|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1^2}{\kappa^2 m^2} + \frac{2\tau_0^2}{3m} \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{4s,c}^{n,*}} \|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|^2 < 2\tau_0^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where  $\sup_{\mathbf{w}} \frac{\|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_1^2}{\kappa^2 m^2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{m} \sup_{\mathbf{w}} \|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|^2$  can be made sufficiently close to 1 by Lemma 5, Lemma 6 (up to a simple modification of proof to accommodate  $4s$ -sparse signals). Evidently, (5.4) holds uniformly for all  $\boldsymbol{\tau}, \mathbf{u}$ . We now estimate the  $4s$  order RIC of  $\mathbf{A}_{z,c}$ . Pick any  $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_{4s,r}^{2n,*}$ , we assume  $\delta_0, \tau_0$  are sufficiently small, then estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}_{z,c}\mathbf{u}\|^2 &\leq (\|\mathbf{A}_{z,c}\mathbf{u}\| + \|\mathbf{A}_{\tau,c}\mathbf{u}\|)^2 \leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{4}{3}} + \delta_0 + \sqrt{2}\tau_0\right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{4}{3} + \delta_0 + 2\tau_0^2 + 3\tau_0 \leq \frac{4}{3} + \delta_0 + 4\tau_0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

For the other direction, similarly

$$\|\mathbf{A}_{z,c}\mathbf{u}\|^2 \geq (\|\mathbf{A}_{z,c}\mathbf{u}\| - \|\mathbf{A}_{\tau,c}\mathbf{u}\|)^2 \geq \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} - \delta_0 - \sqrt{2}\tau_0\right)^2 \geq \frac{2}{3} - 2\sqrt{2}\tau_0. \quad (5.6)$$

Thus,  $\mathbf{A}_{z,c}$  has  $4s$  order RIC essentially smaller than  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ , which is uniformly true for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^n$  and arbitrary noise  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  satisfying  $\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{\infty} \leq \tau_0$ . Now, a direct application of Theorem 2.1 in [9] concludes the proof.  $\square$

We point out that, letting  $\tau_0 = 0$  in Theorem 3 precisely recovers Theorem 1.

## 5.2 Full Reconstruction with Gaussian Dither

Although reconstruction of  $\|\mathbf{x}\|$  is hopeless from  $\mathbf{z} = \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x})$ , a question of both theoretical and practical interest asks how one can incorporate norm reconstruction into PO-CS. We propose here a simple way for this purpose, which is to add dither before capturing the phase, and hence the reconstruction would be based on the phases of affine measurements. Specifically, we adopt  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_d \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times 1}(0, \rho^2) + \mathcal{N}^{m \times 1}(0, \rho^2)\mathbf{i}$  as random Gaussian dither with dithering scale  $\rho$  ( $\rho > 0$ ), and then change the classical PO-CS (3.1) to dithered PO-CS

$$\mathbf{z}_d = \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\tau}_d). \quad (5.7)$$

We shall see shortly that the dithered phases  $\mathbf{z}_d$  manage to encode the norm information of  $\mathbf{x}$ . Our analysis will be built upon Theorem 1, and specifically we show uniform exact reconstruction with norm information can be achieved under a near optimal sample complexity.

**Theorem 4.** Consider dithered PO-CS (5.7) with  $\Phi \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}$ ,  $\tau_d \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times 1}(0, \rho^2) + \mathcal{N}^{m \times 1}(0, \rho^2) \mathbf{i}$ ,  $\rho$  is known, and  $\Phi$  and  $\tau_d$  are independent. Our reconstruction procedure is to let  $\tilde{\Phi} = [\Phi, \frac{\tau_d}{\rho}] \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times (d+1)}$  and construct  $\mathbf{A}_{z_d, c} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1) \times (2n+2)}$  by (3.7) using  $z_d$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}$ , then we obtain  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$  by

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n+2}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_1, \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{A}_{z_d, c} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{e}_1 \quad (5.8)$$

Finally we define  $\mathbf{x}^\sharp := \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{[1:n+1]} + \mathbf{u}^{[n+2:2n+1]} \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ . Denote the  $(n+1)$ -th entry of  $\mathbf{x}^\sharp$  by  $t^\sharp$  and then take  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = [\frac{\rho}{t^\sharp} \mathbf{x}^\sharp]^{[1:n]}$ . If  $m \geq Cs \log(\frac{n^2 \log(mn)}{s})$  for some sufficiently large  $C$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2(mn)^{-9} - c_1 \exp(-c_2 m)$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}$  uniformly holds for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s, c}^n$ .

*Proof.* The main idea is to view (5.7) as a classical PO-CS problem and then invoke Theorem 1. Specifically, (5.7) is equivalent to

$$z_d = \text{sgn} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \Phi & \frac{\tau_d}{\rho} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \rho \end{bmatrix} \right) := \text{sgn}(\tilde{\Phi} \mathbf{x}^\sharp). \quad (5.9)$$

Evidently,  $\tilde{\Phi}$  has entries i.i.d. distributed as  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}^\sharp \in \Sigma_{s+1, c}^{n+1}$ . Then by Theorem 1, under the conditions and reconstruction procedure described in Theorem 4, for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_s^n$ ,  $\mathbf{x}^\sharp$  exactly reconstruct  $\mathbf{x}^\sharp$  up to positive scaling, i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}^\sharp = \lambda \mathbf{x}^\sharp$  for some  $\lambda > 0$ . Note that by construction, the last entry of  $\mathbf{x}^\sharp$  equals to  $\rho$ , thus  $\lambda = \frac{t^\sharp}{\rho}$ . This shows  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = [\frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbf{x}^\sharp]^{[1:n]} = [\mathbf{x}^\sharp]^{[1:n]} = \mathbf{x}$ . The proof is concluded.  $\square$

**Remark 5.** (Related Work) A parallel result for 1-bit compressive sensing can be found in Theorem 4 of [31], which is built upon [40]. In particular, their result delivers approximate recovery and requires a known upper bound on  $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ , while our Theorem 4 achieves exact reconstruction and is free of the prior estimate on  $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ . While for the phase-only scenario, it has been shown in Section 7 of our previous work [14] that, all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  can be exactly reconstructed from  $O(n)$  phase-only measurements. Theorem 4 can be viewed as its counterpart for sparse signal recovery.

Analogous to the analysis in Theorem 3, it is straightforward to establish uniform stable recovery guarantee for dithered PO-CS. We do not pursue this in this work.

## 6 Discussions

### 6.1 Signal Sets with Low Covering Dimension

We previously study sparse signals ( $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s, c}^n$ ) and low-rank matrices ( $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}_{r, c}^{n_1, n_2}$ ) as two canonical examples that lie in the central of compressive sensing theory. However, a more modern way to study compressive sensing is to assume  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}$  where  $\mathcal{K}$  is a general low-complexity set beyond sparsity and low-rankness.

In this part, we further discuss other signal structures for which the developed techniques can yield a uniform reconstruction guarantee under near optimal sample complexity. We will finally justify the claim that our methodology works for any signal set  $\mathcal{K}$  with *low covering dimension*, by pointing out how one can adjust each technical ingredient for proving Theorem 1 to such  $\mathcal{K}$ . Similar to Definition 5.1 in [17], covering dimension is defined as follows.

**Definition 3.** Assume  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{C}^n$  has diameter  $\Delta_d(\mathcal{K}) := \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{K}} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|$ . We say  $\mathcal{K}$  has covering dimension  $K > 0$  with parameter  $c_0 \geq 1$  and base covering  $N_0 > 0$  if for all  $0 < \epsilon \leq \Delta_d(\mathcal{K})$ , there exists  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon$  as  $\epsilon$ -net of  $\mathcal{K}$  satisfying  $|\mathcal{G}_\epsilon| \leq N_0 \left(\frac{c_0 \Delta_d(\mathcal{K})}{\epsilon}\right)^K$ .

We assume  $N_0$  is some absolute constant but allow  $c_0$  to depend on  $K$  or even  $n$  (which is the case for  $\Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$ ).

The Gaussian width for  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  defined by

$$\omega(\mathcal{K}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)} \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{K}} \langle \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{t} \rangle \quad (6.1)$$

captures the intrinsic dimension of  $\mathcal{K}$  in a stable way (e.g., [13, 39]). Gaussian width is often defined for  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , and in this work we would use a direct generalization to  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  given by  $\omega(\mathcal{K}) = \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{K}} \Re \langle \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{t} \rangle$  with  $\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n) + \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{i}$ , which is in essence to identify  $\mathcal{K}$  as a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ . For bounded  $\mathcal{K}$  having covering dimension  $K$  for some  $c_0$  and  $N_0$ , one can show  $\omega(\mathcal{K}) = O(\sqrt{K \log(ec_0)}) = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{K})$ , see [17] for instance.

We now carefully inspect the proof of Theorem 1. First of all, it shall be clear that the initial reformulation applies to any signal structure. For Lemma 5 concerning RIP of the original sensing matrix, one can generalize it to  $m$  depending on  $\omega^2(\mathcal{K}) = \tilde{O}(K)$ , (and hence the covering dimension  $K$ ), by the main result in [34]<sup>6</sup>. Our proofs for Lemma 6, Lemma 10 directly work for  $\mathcal{K}$  with low covering dimension, and we simply note that Lemma 10 should be changed to an estimate for

$$\sup_{|S|=\beta m} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}} \|\Phi^S \mathbf{u}\| = \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \Sigma_{\beta m, c}^{m, *}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}} \Re(\mathbf{v}^* \Phi \mathbf{u}),$$

which will be used to control the near vanishing measurements for the orthogonal part (3.64). While most arguments directly transfer, careful readers may notice that Lemma 9 (3.35), Lemma 14 (3.63) involve an estimate

$$\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_{2s, c}^{n, *}} \|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{s \log(mn)}) \quad (6.2)$$

that is essentially depending on sparse structure. However, for general  $\mathcal{K}$ , instead we can use the universally applicable estimate  $\|\Phi \mathbf{w}\|_\infty \leq \max_k \|\Phi_k\| = O(\sqrt{n})$  for all  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}_c^{n-1}$ , and then take finer net for approximation. For instance, in Lemma 9 we shall take  $\hat{\delta} = O(\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{n}})$  so that the last line of (3.35) remains valid. Obviously, for  $\mathcal{K}$  with low covering dimension, taking a finer net only induces logarithmic degradation to the overall sample complexity. Thus, for any  $\mathcal{K}$  with covering dimension  $K$ , our analysis is sufficient to establish a uniform reconstruction guarantee from the near optimal  $\tilde{O}(K)$  phase-only measurements.

Consequently, many signal structures of particular interest can be accommodated by the uniform guarantee in this work, to name a few, group sparse signals [1, 19], finite union of subspace [20], cospase signals [24, 36]. Of course, in a complex case we only show an RIC of  $\frac{1}{3} + \delta$  (Theorem 1), hence one need to search for feasible reconstruction algorithm that works under this RIP condition. For instance, the  $\ell_1 - \ell_2$  norm (e.g., group norm) can serve as the regularizer for recovery of group sparse signals, since its success has been guaranteed under RIC smaller than  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$  [46].

<sup>6</sup>Also see Theorem 2.2 in [29], Theorem 2.1 in [35].

## 6.2 Limitation of Current Approach

There are some situations where our method to produce a uniform guarantee leads to sub-optimal sample complexity essentially larger than  $\tilde{O}(\omega^2(\mathcal{K}))$ . Such essential degradation occurs when  $\omega(\mathcal{K})$  is small but  $\mathcal{K}$  does not admit covering dimension of the order  $\omega^2(\mathcal{K})$ . Specifically, the set of approximately sparse signals is conventionally captured by (quasi)  $\ell_q$  norm ( $0 < q \leq 1$ ) as (e.g., [35, 40])

$$\mathcal{K}_q = \{\mathbf{x} = [x_i] : \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^q \leq s^{1-\frac{q}{2}}, \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 1\}, \quad (6.3)$$

which is a natural relaxation for  $s$ -sparse signals. Although  $\omega(\mathcal{K}_q)$  is of the same order as  $\omega(\Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}) = O(s \log(\frac{n}{s}))^7$ , the covering number of  $\mathcal{K}_q$  is significantly larger than  $\Sigma_{s,c}^{n,*}$ . In particular, the cardinality of an  $\epsilon$ -net for  $\mathcal{K}_q$  is of order  $O(\left(\frac{C_q n}{\epsilon^{q_1} s}\right)^{s/\epsilon^{q_2}})$  where  $C_q$  is absolute constant depending on  $q$ ,  $q_1 = \frac{2-3q}{2-q}$ ,  $q_2 = \frac{2q}{2-q}$ , see Lemma 3.8 of [35] and Lemma 3.4 of [40]. In stark contrast to Lemma 2 or Definition 6.1, the covering number here depends on  $\epsilon$  in an exponential way. This is problematic in our covering-based arguments, mainly because a net with approximation error smaller than  $O(1)$  is needed. For example, when  $q \in (0, 1)$ , Holder's inequality proceeds (3.35) as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})\|_\infty &\leq \|\Phi\|_\infty \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_1 \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\log(mn)} \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_1^{\frac{2-2q}{2-q}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{x}_i - \tilde{x}_i|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{2-q}} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{s \log(mn)} \cdot \hat{\delta}^{\frac{2-2q}{2-q}}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

so now one need to take  $\hat{\delta}$  net for  $\mathcal{K}_q$  with  $\hat{\delta} = O\left(\left[\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{s \log(mn)}}\right]^{\frac{2-q}{2-2q}}\right)$  to justify the last line of (3.35). Consequently, a sample size essentially larger than  $\tilde{O}(s)$  is needed to offset the union bound over such net, (but note that the sample complexity is still free of the ambient dimension  $n$ ).

In a nutshell, for low-dimensional  $\mathcal{K}$  in the sense of Gaussian width but not covering dimension, particularly  $\mathcal{K}_q$  above, it remains an open question whether uniform robust recovery can be achieved with  $m = \tilde{O}(\omega^2(\mathcal{K}))$ . Since the technical proofs in our work is essentially to control an empirical process  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  (3.12), we conjecture that, resorting to the more advanced tool named generic chaining [44] may be fruitful for such investigation: On one hand, due to the complicated formulation of  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ , especially the essential dependence on  $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ , many user-friendly results presented for compressive sensing (e.g., those in [17, 34]) do not directly apply; On the other hand, while we have quite limited knowledge on generic chaining, experts in this field are still invited to check whether generic chaining can be applied to close the gap. In any case, the presented proof for Theorem 1, or more generally  $\mathcal{K}$  with low covering dimension, is of independent interest. That is, the proof is elementary and only involves fundamental techniques like covering argument, hence it can be easily grasped by compressive sensing researchers and readers with various backgrounds. Note that in classical compressive sensing, the role of an elementary proof is also played by [2, 34], which apply covering argument to show sub-Gaussian random matrix respects RIP over sparse signals.

---

<sup>7</sup>Based on the fact that taking convex hull cannot change Gaussian width, this can be shown by Lemma 3.7 in [35].

### 6.3 Non-uniform Guarantee for Complex Signal

The major result in this work delivers uniform exact recovery guarantee for  $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_{s,c}^n$  (resp.  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{M}_{r,c}^{n_1,n_2}$ ) from a near optimal  $\tilde{O}(s)$  (resp.  $\tilde{O}(r(n_1 + n_2))$ ) sample complexity, hence simultaneously addressing the first two open questions in [29] for sparse and low-rank structure. Nevertheless, our method leads to sub-optimal sample complexity for  $\mathcal{K}$  with covering dimension significantly larger than  $\omega^2(\mathcal{K})$  (Section 6.2).

We mention that our attempts to handle complex signals, and the techniques to yield uniform guarantee, are totally vertical. As it turns out, the limitation mentioned above mainly stems from the covering arguments for achieving a uniform guarantee. Therefore, without pursuing the universality, we can extract part of the technical ingredients to establish a non-uniform guarantee for a fixed, complex signal, with general low-complexity structure captured by Gaussian width. This serves as a complement for Theorem 1, and also a complete extension of [29] to complex signals.

Let  $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{x} = \{\lambda\mathbf{x} : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . For  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  we write  $[\mathbf{u}]_{\mathbb{R}} = [(\mathbf{u}^{\Re})^\top, (\mathbf{u}^{\Im})^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , and would also use  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{R}} = \{[\mathbf{u}]_{\mathbb{R}} : \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}\}$ . We present the following result, and note that (6.5) offers a refinement of the sample complexity in [29] that reads as  $O(\omega^2([\mathcal{K} - \mathbb{R}\mathbf{x}] \cap \mathbb{S}_r^{n-1}))$ .

**Theorem 5.** *Given a symmetric cone<sup>8</sup>  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $\delta > 0$ . Consider a fixed signal  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}$ , the observed measurement phases  $\mathbf{z} = \text{sgn}(\Phi\mathbf{x})$  where entries of  $\Phi$  are i.i.d. distributed as  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)\mathbf{i}$ , and the new sensing matrix  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},c}$  is constructed as (3.7) with  $\hat{t} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$ . If*

$$m \geq \frac{C}{\delta^2} \omega^2(\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{S}_c^{n-1}), \quad (6.5)$$

then with probability at least  $1 - c_1 \exp(-c_2 \delta^2 m)$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},c}$  respects  $\text{RIP}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{R}}, \frac{1}{3} + \delta)$ , i.e.,

$$\left(\frac{2}{3} - \delta\right) \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z},c}\mathbf{u}\| \leq \left(\frac{4}{3} + \delta\right) \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{R}}. \quad (6.6)$$

Compared with the proof of Theorem 1 where one aims to upper bound  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}} \sup_{\mathbf{u}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  (3.12), for Theorem 5 the goal simplifies to control  $\sup_{\mathbf{u}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  since  $\mathbf{x}$  is now a fixed signal. One shall see that, this allows a significantly simpler and cleaner analysis where all technicalities for near vanishing measurements are not needed — The dependence of  $f_2^{\parallel}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  (3.41) and  $\hat{f}^{\perp}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  (3.55) on  $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$  are inessential, and the rotational transform in Lemma 11, 13 reveals that they can be actually viewed as quite standard Gaussian processes. As a result, many well-established tools can be applied to replace the covering arguments in Theorem 1. For example, the concentration of Lipschitz function of Gaussian variables directly handles  $\sup_{\mathbf{u}} f_2^{\parallel}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  for the parallel part, as done in Lemma 5.4 of [29].

Since we position our primary contribution in the uniform reconstruction guarantee, the proof for Theorem 5 is relegated to Appendix for preserving the presentation flow. While doing this, we emphasize that this proof is not merely a combination of complex case in this work and the techniques in [29]. For example, the proof in [29] uses the RIP of a Gaussian matrix (see their Theorem 2.2) as the main tool to analyze orthogonal part. Unfortunately, this becomes insufficient in the complex case since the first component of  $\Psi_k$  in (A.13) is not Gaussian and not zero-mean. Instead, we invoke Theorem 3.2 in [17] to control the orthogonal part, which involves additional technicalities such as estimate of  $\gamma_2$ -functional [44]. A byproduct of using this finer tool is the refinement of sample complexity.

---

<sup>8</sup>That is,  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}$  implies  $\lambda\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}$  for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ .

## 7 Numerical Simulation

In this section, we conduct numerical experiments to validate our theoretical results. Note that exact recovery guarantee of complex signals in PO-CS is first proved in this work. To verify this, the underlying signals in all experiments are complex-valued. Specifically, we consider ( $s = 3$ )-sparse complex signal with ambient dimension  $n = 80$ . Parallel to [29], the support of  $\mathbf{x}$  is uniformly, randomly drawn from  $\binom{80}{3}$  possibilities, then non-zero entries are i.i.d. distributed as  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}$ . Eventually, we normalize  $\mathbf{x}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$ . As assumed throughout the present paper, entries of  $\Phi$  are independent copies of  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}$ . The success rate for each sample size is based on 100 independent trials. In a single trial, signals in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  are identified as the real ones in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , and particularly we find  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  via basis pursuit of (3.7)

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_1, \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{A}_{z,c}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{e}_1, \quad (7.1)$$

and then reconstruct  $\mathbf{x}$  as  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = [\hat{\mathbf{u}}]^{[1:n]} + [\hat{\mathbf{u}}]^{[n+1:2n]} \mathbf{i}$ . We use the ADMM solver that is available online<sup>9</sup>.

The main aim of our first experiment is to confirm the uniform guarantee in Theorem 1, which states that one randomly drawn matrix  $\Phi$  can simultaneously guarantee the recovery of all sparse signals. Note that it is not possible to recover  $\|\mathbf{x}\|$  from  $\mathbf{z} = \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x})$ , so we adopt an error measure given by  $\|\frac{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}{\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}\|} - \mathbf{x}\|$  (recall that  $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$ ). A trial is claimed to be successful if  $\|\frac{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}{\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}\|} - \mathbf{x}\| < 10^{-3}$ . Similar to [29], in our first experimental setting, both  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\Phi$  are randomly regenerated in each trial, which is evidently a experimental design for validating a non-uniform guarantee. By contrast, in our second setting, the 100 independent trials share a fixed  $\Phi$  that is drawn beforehand, while only the underlying signal is regenerated for each trial. The empirical success rates for these two settings under different sample sizes are plotted in Figure 1(left), labeled ‘‘PO-CS(non-uniform)’’ and ‘‘PO-CS(uniform)’’, respectively. In addition, we are also interested in comparing PO-CS with the classical compressive sensing setting where the full measurements  $\mathbf{z}_f = \Phi \mathbf{x}$  are observed. To be fair, we also formulate it as a real problem and solve  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_1, \quad \text{s.t. } \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^{\Re} & -\Phi^{\Im} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{z}_f^{\Re}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^{\Im} & \Phi^{\Re} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{z}_f^{\Im}, \quad (7.2)$$

which then recovers  $\mathbf{x}$  as  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = [\tilde{\mathbf{u}}]^{[1:n]} + [\tilde{\mathbf{u}}]^{[n+1:2n]} \mathbf{i}$ . For this setting we use new  $\Phi$  and  $\mathbf{x}$  for each trial, and report the experimental success rate in the curve with label ‘‘CS(non-uniform)’’.

It is natural that success rate increases under larger sample size in the above three settings. Clearly, the two curves for PO-CS, differentiated by whether the measurement matrix  $\Phi$  is new in each trial, are extremely close and almost coincident. This indicates that there is no need to regenerate the sensing matrix for the recovery of a new sparse signal, and hence is consistent with our main Theorem (uniform guarantee). In addition, we find that a high success rate ( $\geq 0.99$ ) for PO-CS is achieved at about twice the measurement number needed for linear compressed sensing. Particularly, the success rate remains higher than 0.99 when  $\frac{m}{s} \geq 7$  for classical linear compressive sensing, or when  $\frac{m}{s} \geq 12$  for PO-CS. In fact, this phenomenon has already been experimentally concluded in [29], and now it is also observed in the complex case.

---

<sup>9</sup>[https://web.stanford.edu/~boyd/papers/admm/basis\\_pursuit/basis\\_pursuit.html#4](https://web.stanford.edu/~boyd/papers/admm/basis_pursuit/basis_pursuit.html#4)

In our second experiment, we implement PO-CS under the additional Gaussian dither to achieve norm reconstruction. Recall that the model now reads as  $\mathbf{z}_d = \text{sgn}(\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\tau}_d)$ , and we use the dither  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_d \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \frac{1}{9}\mathbf{I}_n) + \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \frac{1}{9}\mathbf{I}_n)\mathbf{i}$ . The reconstruction procedure is given in Theorem 4. Let  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  be the reconstructed signal, and we claim a trial to be successful if  $\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\| < 10^{-3}$ . Note that Theorem 4 delivers uniform guarantee. In other words, drawing one sensing matrix  $\mathbf{\Phi}$  and dither  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  suffices to govern the recovery of all sparse signals. To verify this point, we similarly compare the settings with or without new sensing matrix for each trial. The experimental results are shown in Figure 1(right). Evidently, the success rate in both curves are comparable, thus validating the theoretical uniform recovery.




Figure 1: (left): PO-CS of direction recovery; (right): dithered PO-CS with norm recovery.

## 8 Conclusion and Future Direction

Phase-only compressive sensing (PO-CS) generalizes 1-bit CS to complex sensing matrix, and also provides a practically appealing sensing scenario that merits advantages like stability and easier finite-bit quantization. A recent breakthrough for PO-CS due to Jacques and Feuillen establishes exact recovery guarantee for the direction of a fixed real signal [29], thus theoretically supporting previous experimental observations [7]. Nevertheless, it remains unknown whether uniform exact recovery for all signals of interest can be achieved, and whether a complex signal can be exactly recovered from phase-only compressive measurements. These are among several open questions raised in [29].

We almost completely address the above two open questions in this work. It was proved that all sparse signals in  $\Sigma_{s,c}^n$  (resp. low-rank matrices in  $\mathcal{M}_{r,c}^{n_1,n_2}$ ) can be uniformly, exactly reconstructed up to a positive scaling, from the near optimal  $\tilde{O}(s)$  (resp.  $\tilde{O}(r(d_1 + d_2))$ ) phase-only measurements produced by a single random Gaussian matrix  $\mathbf{\Phi}$ . *This simultaneously provides a complete positive answer for the two open questions, under the most classical sparse and low-rank structures.* From a technical perspective, we achieve uniform recovery by covering arguments. While the main difficulty lies in pathological behaviour of  $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$  for variable close to 0, a delicate analysis is carried out to control near vanishing measurements. In addition, we establish new technical ingredient like a different sign-product embedding property, and for complex signal a careful rescaling of the new sensing matrix is also needed to render a

small RIC. While Theorem 1 directly extends to signal set with low covering dimension, the current approach is insufficient for some low-complexity signal sets with low Gaussian width. Therefore, a non-uniform result for PO-CS of complex signal is presented to complement the uniform guarantee. *This provides a complete positive answer for the open question of complex signal recovery in PO-CS.*

We point out several future directions in PO-CS to close this paper. Firstly, for  $\mathcal{K}$  with covering dimension essentially higher than  $\omega^2(\mathcal{K})$ , it is still unknown whether uniform recovery for all signals in  $\mathcal{K}$  is possible under the sample complexity  $m = \tilde{O}(\omega^2(\mathcal{K}))$ . An example of particular interest is the set of approximately sparse signals  $\mathcal{K}_q$  (6.3). Secondly, except for the universality for all sparse signals, our stability result is similar to [29] (e.g., a same noise assumption is adopted). Thus, we believe stability of PO-CS would be worth a more extensive study. For instance, one may explore the possibility of tighter error bound for some specific noise pattern. Our last direction for future research is motivated by developments of dithered 1-bit CS. Indeed, with aid of a random dither, one can go a long way in overcoming the limitations of 1-bit CS — not only the full reconstruction with norm [31], but also many others including an exponentially decaying error rate [3], extension from Gaussian measurements to sub-Gaussian or even heavy-tailed ones [15, 18, 45]. In addition to full reconstruction shown for PO-CS in the present paper, it would thus be interesting to investigate other possible privileges brought by the random dither, particularly whether the current Gaussian assumption on  $\Phi$  can be essentially relaxed. Of course, without introducing the dither, such relaxation of measurement ensemble is of independent interest in the original PO-CS problem.

## References

- [1] Ulaş Ayaz, Sjoerd Dirksen, and Holger Rauhut. Uniform recovery of fusion frame structured sparse signals. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 41(2):341–361, 2016.
- [2] Richard Baraniuk, Mark Davenport, Ronald DeVore, and Michael Wakin. A simple proof of the restricted isometry property for random matrices. *Constructive Approximation*, 28(3):253–263, 2008.
- [3] Richard G Baraniuk, Simon Foucart, Deanna Needell, Yaniv Plan, and Mary Wootters. Exponential decay of reconstruction error from binary measurements of sparse signals. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 63(6):3368–3385, 2017.
- [4] Ilaria Bartolini, Paolo Ciaccia, and Marco Patella. Warp: Accurate retrieval of shapes using phase of fourier descriptors and time warping distance. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 27(1):142–147, 2005.
- [5] Jacques Behar, Moshe Porat, and Yehoshua Y Zeevi. Image reconstruction from localized phase. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 40(4):736–743, 1992.
- [6] Petros T Boufounos. Angle-preserving quantized phase embeddings. In *Wavelets and Sparsity XV*, volume 8858, pages 375–383. SPIE, 2013.
- [7] Petros T Boufounos. Sparse signal reconstruction from phase-only measurements. In *Proc. Int. Conf. Sampling Theory and Applications (SampTA)*, (July 1-5 2013). Citeseer, 2013.



- [8] Petros T Boufounos and Richard G Baraniuk. 1-bit compressive sensing. In *2008 42nd Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems*, pages 16–21. IEEE, 2008.
- [9] T Tony Cai and Anru Zhang. Sparse representation of a polytope and recovery of sparse signals and low-rank matrices. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 60(1):122–132, 2013.
- [10] Emmanuel J Candes and Yaniv Plan. Tight oracle inequalities for low-rank matrix recovery from a minimal number of noisy random measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(4):2342–2359, 2011.
- [11] Emmanuel J Candes and Terence Tao. Decoding by linear programming. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 51(12):4203–4215, 2005.
- [12] Emmanuel J Candes and Terence Tao. Near-optimal signal recovery from random projections: Universal encoding strategies? *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 52(12):5406–5425, 2006.
- [13] Venkat Chandrasekaran, Benjamin Recht, Pablo A Parrilo, and Alan S Willsky. The convex geometry of linear inverse problems. *Foundations of Computational mathematics*, 12(6):805–849, 2012.
- [14] Junren Chen and Michael K Ng. Signal reconstruction from phase-only measurements: Uniqueness condition, minimal measurement number and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.04365v2*, 2022.
- [15] Junren Chen, Cheng-Long Wang, Michael K Ng, and Di Wang. High dimensional statistical estimation under one-bit quantization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.13157*, 2022.
- [16] S Chevet. Séries de variables aléatoires gaussiennes à valeurs dans  $e$ ,  $f$ . *Séminaire sur la géométrie des espaces de Banach 1977-78, Exposé No. XIX, 1<sup>er</sup> cycle Polytechnique, Palaiseau*, 1977.
- [17] Sjoerd Dirksen. Dimensionality reduction with subgaussian matrices: a unified theory. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 16(5):1367–1396, 2016.
- [18] Sjoerd Dirksen and Shahar Mendelson. Non-gaussian hyperplane tessellations and robust one-bit compressed sensing. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 23(9):2913–2947, 2021.
- [19] Yonina C Eldar, Patrick Kuppinger, and Helmut Bölcskei. Block-sparse signals: Uncertainty relations and efficient recovery. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 58(6):3042–3054, 2010.
- [20] Yonina C Eldar and Moshe Mishali. Robust recovery of signals from a structured union of subspaces. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(11):5302–5316, 2009.
- [21] C Espy and Jae Lim. Effects of additive noise on signal reconstruction from fourier transform phase. *IEEE transactions on acoustics, speech, and signal processing*, 31(4):894–898, 1983.

- [22] Thomas Feuillen, Mike E Davies, Luc Vandendorpe, and Laurent Jacques.  $(\ell_1, \ell_2)$ -rip and projected back-projection reconstruction for phase-only measurements. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 27:396–400, 2020.
- [23] Simon Foucart and Holger Rauhut. *An Invitation to Compressive Sensing*, pages 1–39. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2013.
- [24] Raja Giryes, Sangnam Nam, Michael Elad, Rémi Gribonval, and Mike E Davies. Greedy-like algorithms for the cospase analysis model. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 441:22–60, 2014.
- [25] Yehoram Gordon. Some inequalities for gaussian processes and applications. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 50(4):265–289, 1985.
- [26] Monson Hayes. The reconstruction of a multidimensional sequence from the phase or magnitude of its fourier transform. *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, 30(2):140–154, 1982.
- [27] Monson Hayes, Jae Lim, and Alan Oppenheim. Signal reconstruction from phase or magnitude. *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, 28(6):672–680, 1980.
- [28] Gang Hua and Michael T Orchard. Image inpainting based on geometrical modeling of complex wavelet coefficients. In *2007 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, volume 1, pages I–553. IEEE, 2007.
- [29] Laurent Jacques and Thomas Feuillen. The importance of phase in complex compressive sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(6):4150–4161, 2021.
- [30] Laurent Jacques, Jason N Laska, Petros T Boufounos, and Richard G Baraniuk. Robust 1-bit compressive sensing via binary stable embeddings of sparse vectors. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 59(4):2082–2102, 2013.
- [31] Karin Knudson, Rayan Saab, and Rachel Ward. One-bit compressive sensing with norm estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(5):2748–2758, 2016.
- [32] Aharon Levi and Henry Stark. Signal restoration from phase by projections onto convex sets. *JOSA*, 73(6):810–822, 1983.
- [33] Erfan Loveimi and Seyed Mohammad Ahadi. Objective evaluation of magnitude and phase only spectrum-based reconstruction of the speech signal. In *2010 4th International Symposium on Communications, Control and Signal Processing (ISCCSP)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2010.
- [34] Shahar Mendelson, Alain Pajor, and Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann. Reconstruction and subgaussian operators in asymptotic geometric analysis. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 17(4):1248–1282, 2007.
- [35] Shahar Mendelson, Alain Pajor, and Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann. Uniform uncertainty principle for bernoulli and subgaussian ensembles. *Constructive Approximation*, 28(3):277–289, 2008.

- [36] Sangnam Nam, Mike E Davies, Michael Elad, and Rémi Gribonval. The cosparse analysis model and algorithms. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 34(1):30–56, 2013.
- [37] Alan V Oppenheim, Monson H Hayes, and Jae S Lim. Iterative procedures for signal reconstruction from phase. In *1980 Intl Optical Computing Conf I*, volume 231, pages 121–129. SPIE, 1980.
- [38] Alan V Oppenheim and Jae S Lim. The importance of phase in signals. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 69(5):529–541, 1981.
- [39] Yaniv Plan and Roman Vershynin. Robust 1-bit compressed sensing and sparse logistic regression: A convex programming approach. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 59(1):482–494, 2012.
- [40] Yaniv Plan and Roman Vershynin. One-bit compressed sensing by linear programming. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 66(8):1275–1297, 2013.
- [41] T Quatieri and Alan Oppenheim. Iterative techniques for minimum phase signal reconstruction from phase or magnitude. *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, 29(6):1187–1193, 1981.
- [42] Phillippe Rigollet and Jan-Christian Hütter. High dimensional statistics. *Lecture notes for course 18S997*, 813(814):46, 2015.
- [43] Thomas G Stockham, Thomas M Cannon, and Robert B Ingebretsen. Blind deconvolution through digital signal processing. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 63(4):678–692, 1975.
- [44] Michel Talagrand. *The generic chaining: upper and lower bounds of stochastic processes*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- [45] Christos Thrampoulidis and Ankit Singh Rawat. The generalized lasso for sub-gaussian measurements with dithered quantization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(4):2487–2500, 2020.
- [46] Yann Traonmilin and Rémi Gribonval. Stable recovery of low-dimensional cones in hilbert spaces: One rip to rule them all. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 45(1):170–205, 2018.
- [47] Sharon Urieli, Moshe Porat, and Nir Cohen. Optimal reconstruction of images from localized phase. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 7(6):838–853, 1998.
- [48] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.

## A The Proof of Theorem 5

With no loss of generality, we assume the fixed underlying signal  $\mathbf{x}$  satisfies  $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$ . For  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  we use the notation  $[\mathbf{u}]_{\mathbb{R}} = [(\mathbf{u}^{\Re})^{\top}, (\mathbf{u}^{\Im})^{\top}]^{\top} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , for  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  we reversely write

$[\mathbf{u}]_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbf{u}^{[n]} + \mathbf{u}^{[2n] \setminus [n]} \mathbf{i}$ . We let  $\mathcal{K}^* = \mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{S}_c^{n-1}$ , and some algebra translates (6.6) into

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa^2 m^2} [\Re(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u})]^2 + \frac{2}{3m} \|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*) \Phi \mathbf{u})\|^2 - 1 \right| < \frac{1}{3} + \delta, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

which can be implied by an upper bound for the parallel part

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} f^{\parallel}(\mathbf{u}) := \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa^2 m^2} [\Re(\mathbf{z}^* \Phi \mathbf{u})]^2 - [\Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle]^2 \right| = O(\delta), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and the bound for the orthogonal part

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} f^{\perp}(\mathbf{u}) := \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \left| \frac{2}{3m} \|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*) \Phi \mathbf{u})\|^2 - \|\mathbf{u}_x^{\perp}\|^2 \right| \leq \frac{1}{3} + O(\delta). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Note that we use  $O(\delta)$  that allows an multiplicative absolute constant, and up to rescaling (A.2), (A.3) jointly yield (A.1).

## A.1 The Parallel Part

By similar algebra used in (3.40), (3.41), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} f^{\parallel}(\mathbf{u}) &\lesssim \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re\langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u} \rangle - \Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} |\Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle|}_{f_1^{\parallel}(\mathbf{u})} \underbrace{\left| \frac{\|\Phi \mathbf{x}\|_1}{\kappa m} - 1 \right|}_{f_2^{\parallel}(\mathbf{u})} + \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \frac{1}{\kappa m} \left| \Re\langle \text{sgn}(\Phi \mathbf{x}), \Phi \mathbf{u}_x^{\perp} \rangle \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

By Lemma 5.2 in [29], we have  $\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} f_1^{\parallel}(\mathbf{u}) \leq \left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \|\Phi \mathbf{x}\|_1 - 1 \right| = O(\delta)^{10}$  with probability at least  $1 - c_1 \exp(-\Omega(\delta^2 m))$ . As analyzed in the proof of Lemma 11, especially (3.43), we can show  $\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} f_2^{\parallel}(\mathbf{u})$  (almost surely) has the same distribution as  $\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \frac{1}{\kappa \sqrt{m}} |\Re\langle \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{v}^{[2:n]} \rangle|$  where  $\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{n-1}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{n-1}) \mathbf{i}$ , and  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{u}_x^{\perp} = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{u} - \Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \mathbf{x})$  with a fixed unitary matrix  $\mathbf{P}$ . We let  $\hat{\mathbf{g}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n) + \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{i}$  and then use Lemma 5.3 in [29]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} f_1^{\parallel}(\mathbf{u}) &= \frac{1}{\kappa \sqrt{m}} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} |\Re\langle \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{v}^{[2:n]} \rangle| = \frac{1}{\kappa \sqrt{m}} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \Re\langle \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{v}^{[2:n]} \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa \sqrt{m}} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \Re\langle \hat{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\kappa \sqrt{m}} \omega(\mathcal{K}^*) < \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where the second “=” is because  $\mathcal{K}$  is a symmetric cone, the first two “ $\leq$ ” are both from Lemma 5.3 in [29], and  $\mathbf{P}$  does not change Gaussian width. The last “ $<$ ” is guaranteed by the sample complexity (6.5).

Moreover, we define  $F(\mathbf{g}) := \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \frac{1}{\kappa \sqrt{m}} |\Re\langle \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{v}^{[2:n]} \rangle|$  and view it as a function of the Gaussian variable  $\mathbf{g}$ . It is  $\frac{1}{\kappa \sqrt{m}}$ -Lipschitz since

$$|F(\mathbf{g}_1) - F(\mathbf{g}_2)| \leq \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \frac{1}{\kappa \sqrt{m}} |\Re\langle \mathbf{g}_1 - \mathbf{g}_2, \mathbf{v}^{[2:n]} \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{\kappa \sqrt{m}} \|\mathbf{g}_1 - \mathbf{g}_2\|. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

<sup>10</sup>Lemma 5.2 in [29] is stated for real  $\mathbf{x}$  but the proof obviously applies to  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ .

Hence, combine these pieces and apply Lemma 5.1 in [29], we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(F(\mathbf{g}) \geq 2\delta) \leq \mathbb{P}(F(\mathbf{g}) - \mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{g}) > \delta) \leq 2 \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\kappa^2\delta^2m), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

which states  $\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} f_2^\parallel(\mathbf{u}) \leq 2\delta$  with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-\Omega(\delta^2m))$ . Thus, we arrive at  $\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} f^\parallel(\mathbf{u}) = O(\delta)$  with high probability.

We have indeed shown the following local sign-product embedding property in (A.4), which is a the complex extension of Lemma 5.4 in [29] and may be of independent value. Note that even restricted to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , Corollary 3 is not fully coincident with Lemma 5.4 in [29] since  $\langle \text{sgn}(\Phi\mathbf{u}), \Phi\mathbf{v} \rangle$  is complex in general.

**Corollary 3.** (Local Sign-Product Embedding Property) *Assume  $\Phi \sim \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}^{m \times n}(0, 1) \mathbf{i}$ . Given a symmetric cone  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $\delta > 0$ , and a fixed  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{S}_c^{n-1}$ , if  $m \geq \frac{C}{\delta^2}\omega^2(\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{S}_c^{n-1})$ , then with probability at least  $1 - c_1 \exp(-c_2\delta^2m)$  we have*

$$\left| \frac{1}{\kappa m} \Re \langle \text{sgn}(\Phi\mathbf{u}), \Phi\mathbf{v} \rangle - \Re \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \right| \leq \delta \|\mathbf{v}\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

## A.2 The Orthogonal Part

It remains to show (A.3). Recall that  $\|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u})\|^2$  concentrates around  $\|\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|^2 + |\Im \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^2$  with a bias term  $|\Im \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^2$  (Lemma 13). Thus, we introduce

$$\hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{u}) := \left| \frac{1}{m} \|\Im(\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}^*)\Phi\mathbf{u})\|^2 - (\|\mathbf{u}_x^\perp\|^2 + |\Im \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^2) \right|. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Similar to (3.66), we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} f^\perp(\mathbf{u}) \leq \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{u}), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

thus it is sufficient to show  $\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{u}) = O(\delta)$ . By (3.15), (3.51), we can write

$$\hat{f}^\perp(\mathbf{u}) = \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m [\Im(\overline{\text{sgn}(\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x})} \Phi_k^* \mathbf{u}_x^\perp)]^2 - \mathbb{E} [\Im(\overline{\text{sgn}(\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x})} \Phi_k^* \mathbf{u}_x^\perp)]^2 \right| \quad (\text{A.11})$$

as the average of independent, zero-mean random variable. We then identify the distribution of  $\Im(\overline{\text{sgn}(\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x})} \Phi_k^* \mathbf{u}_x^\perp)$ . We find unitary matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  such that  $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{e}_1$ , then we have  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{u}_x^\perp = [v_i]$  satisfying  $\Re(v_1) = 0$ . We also let  $\tilde{\Phi}_k = \mathbf{P}\Phi_k = [\phi_{ki}]_{i \in [n]}$ , and by rotational invariance  $\{\tilde{\Phi}_k : k \in [m]\}$  are independent copies of  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n) + \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{i}$ , then some algebra delivers

$$\begin{aligned} \Im(\overline{\text{sgn}(\Phi_k^* \mathbf{x})} \Phi_k^* \mathbf{u}_x^\perp) &= \Im(\overline{\text{sgn}(\tilde{\Phi}_k^* \mathbf{e}_1^\top)} \tilde{\Phi}_k^* \mathbf{v}) = \Im(\text{sgn}(\phi_{k1}) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\phi_{ki}} v_i) \\ &= \frac{|\phi_{k1}|}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot (\sqrt{2}v_1^\Im) + \sum_{i=2}^n \Re(\text{sgn}(\phi_{k1}) \overline{\phi_{ki}}) \cdot v_i^\Im + \sum_{i=2}^n \Im(\text{sgn}(\phi_{k1}) \overline{\phi_{ki}}) \cdot v_i^\Re = \langle \Psi_k, \hat{\mathbf{v}} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{v}} = [\sqrt{2}v_1^\Im, v_2^\Im, \dots, v_n^\Im, v_2^\Re, \dots, v_n^\Re]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2n-1}$ ,  $\Psi_k$  will be given below. It is well known that  $|\phi_{k1}|$  and  $\text{sgn}(\phi_{k1})$  are statistically independent, and evidently,  $\{\text{sgn}(\phi_{k1}) \overline{\phi_{ki}} : 2 \leq i \leq n\}$

are (almost surely) i.i.d. copies of  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)\mathbf{i}$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_k = & \left[ \frac{|\phi_{k1}|}{\sqrt{2}}, \Re(\text{sgn}(\phi_{k1})\overline{\phi_{k2}}), \dots, \Re(\text{sgn}(\phi_{k1})\overline{\phi_{kn}}), \right. \\ & \left. \Im(\text{sgn}(\phi_{k1})\overline{\phi_{k2}}), \dots, \Im(\text{sgn}(\phi_{k1})\overline{\phi_{kn}}) \right]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2n-1} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

are isotropic random vector with  $O(1)$  sub-Gaussian norm.

Therefore, we only need to show

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_k, \hat{\mathbf{v}} \rangle^2 - \|\hat{\mathbf{v}}\|^2 \right| \leq C_1 \delta, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Note that  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{u} - \Re\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \mathbf{x})$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{L}[\mathbf{v}]_{\mathbb{R}}$ ,

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2n-1) \times 2n}, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

we have  $[\mathbf{v}]_{\mathbb{R}} = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}\mathbf{Q}_x[\mathbf{u}]_{\mathbb{R}}$  for some orthogonal matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$  (corresponding to  $\mathbf{P}$ ) and a linear projection  $\mathbf{Q}_x \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$  when  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*$  (corresponding to the projection  $(\cdot)_{\mathbf{x}}^\perp$  (3.14)) satisfying  $\|\mathbf{Q}_x\| \leq 1$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}^*$  leads to  $\hat{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathbf{L}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\mathbf{Q}_x[\mathcal{K}^*]_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Therefore, to show (A.14) we let  $\mathcal{K}_1 := \mathbf{L}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\mathbf{Q}_x[\mathcal{K}^*]_{\mathbb{R}}$  and it suffices to establish

$$\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}_1} \left| \frac{1}{m} (\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_k, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 - \mathbb{E} \langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_k, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2) \right| \leq C_1 \delta. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

We prove this by Theorem 3.2 in [17]. Following the notations in [17], for any  $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \in \mathcal{K}_1$  we first estimate

$$d_{\psi_2}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) = \max_{k \in [m]} \|\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_k, \mathbf{w}_1 \rangle - \langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_k, \mathbf{w}_2 \rangle\|_{\psi_2} \leq C_2 \|\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_2\|, \quad (\text{A.17})$$

which is due to  $\max_k \|\boldsymbol{\Psi}_k\|_{\psi_2} \leq C_2$ . Thus, assume  $\mathbf{g}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{2n-1})$  and let  $d_{\ell_2}$  be the  $\ell_2$  norm, we have

$$\gamma_2(\mathcal{K}_1, d_{\psi_2}) \leq C_2 \gamma_2(\mathcal{K}_1, d_{\ell_2}) \lesssim \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}_1} |\langle \mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{w} \rangle| = \omega(\mathcal{K}_1). \quad (\text{A.18})$$

The “ $\leq$ ” is due to definition of the  $\gamma_2$ -functional (e.g., Definition 3.1, [17]) and (A.17), “ $\lesssim$ ” is due to (5) in [17], the “ $=$ ” is because  $\mathcal{K}_1$  is symmetric. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Delta}_{\psi_2}(\mathcal{K}_1) &= \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}_1} \max_{k \in [m]} \|\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_k, \mathbf{w} \rangle\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq C_2 \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}_1} \|\mathbf{w}\| \leq C_2 \|\mathbf{L}\| \|\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\| \|\mathbf{Q}_x\| \leq C_2 \sqrt{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Therefore, we now invoke Theorem 3.2 in [17], it gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}_1} \left| \frac{1}{m} (\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_k, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 - \mathbb{E} \langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_k, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2) \right| \geq C_3 \left[ \frac{\omega^2(\mathcal{K}_1)}{m} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{\omega(\mathcal{K}_1)}{\sqrt{m}} + \frac{t}{m} + \frac{\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{m}} \right] \right) \leq \exp(-t), \quad \forall t > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Thus, we take  $t = \delta^2 m$  and assume a sample size  $m = \Omega(\delta^{-2} \omega^2(\mathcal{K}_1))$ , (A.16) follows with probability at least  $1 - \exp(-C_4 \delta^2 m)$ . Now it remains to confirm  $\omega^2(\mathcal{K}_1) \lesssim \omega^2(\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{S}_c^{n-1})$ . Since  $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathbf{L} \tilde{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{Q}_x [\mathcal{K}^*]_{\mathbb{R}}$  where  $\mathbf{L}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \mathbf{Q}_x$  are matrices with  $O(1)$  operator norm, by property of Gaussian width (e.g., Exercise 7.5.4 in [48]),  $\omega(\mathcal{K}_1) \lesssim \omega([\mathcal{K}^*]_{\mathbb{R}}) = \omega(\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{S}_c^{n-1})$ , the “=” follows from our definition of Gaussian width for  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ . The proof is concluded.  $\square$