

For-all Sparse Recovery in Near-Optimal Time

Anna C. Gilbert*

Department of Mathematics
University of Michigan
annacg@umich.edu

Yi Li†

Max-Planck Institute for Informatics
yli@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Ely Porat

Department of Computer Science
Bar-Ilan University
porately@cs.biu.ac.il

Martin J. Strauss‡

Department of Mathematics and Department of EECS
University of Michigan
martinjs@umich.edu

Abstract

An *approximate sparse recovery system* in ℓ_1 norm consists of parameters k, ϵ, N , an m -by- N measurement Φ , and a recovery algorithm, \mathcal{R} . Given a vector, \mathbf{x} , the system approximates x by $\widehat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{R}(\Phi\mathbf{x})$, which must satisfy $\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq (1 + \epsilon)\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_k\|_1$. We consider the “for all” model, in which a single matrix Φ , possibly “constructed” non-explicitly using the probabilistic method, is used for all signals \mathbf{x} . The best existing sublinear algorithm by Porat and Strauss (SODA’12) uses $O(\epsilon^{-3}k \log(N/k))$ measurements and runs in time $O(k^{1-\alpha}N^\alpha)$ for any constant $\alpha > 0$.

In this paper, we improve the number of measurements to $O(\epsilon^{-2}k \log(N/k))$, matching the best existing upper bound (attained by super-linear algorithms), and the runtime to $O(k^{1+\beta} \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$, with a modest restriction that $\epsilon \leq (\log k / \log N)^\gamma$, for any constants $\beta, \gamma > 0$. When $k \leq \log^c N$ for some $c > 0$, the runtime is reduced to $O(k \text{poly}(N, 1/\epsilon))$. With no restrictions on ϵ , we have an approximation recovery system with $m = O(k/\epsilon \log(N/k)((\log N / \log k)^\gamma + 1/\epsilon))$ measurements.

The overall architecture of this algorithm is similar to that of Porat and Strauss (SODA’12) in that we repeatedly use a weak recovery system (with varying parameters) to obtain a top level recovery algorithm. The weak recovery system consists of a two-layer hashing procedure (or with two unbalanced expanders, for a deterministic algorithm). The algorithmic innovation is a novel encoding procedure that is reminiscent of network coding and that reflects the structure of the hashing stages. The idea is to encode the signal position index i by associating it with a unique message \mathbf{m}_i , which will be encoded to a longer message \mathbf{m}'_i (in contrast to (Porat-Strauss, SODA’12) in which the encoding is simply the identity). Portions of the message \mathbf{m}'_i correspond to repetitions of the hashing and we use a regular expander graph to encode the linkages among these portions.

The decoding or recovery algorithm consists of recovering the portions of the longer messages \mathbf{m}'_i and then decoding to the original messages \mathbf{m}_i , all the while ensuring that corruptions can be detected and/or corrected. The recovery algorithm is similar to list recovery introduced in (Indyk et al., SODA’10) and used in (Gilbert et al., ICALP’13). In our algorithm, the messages $\{\mathbf{m}_i\}$ are independent from the hashing, which enables us to obtain a better result.

*Supported in part by DARPA/ONR N66001-08-1-2065.

†Work completed when the author was at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. The author was supported in part by NSF CCF 0743372.

‡Supported in part by NSF CCF 0743372 and DARPA/ONR N66001-08-1-2065.

1 Introduction

Sparse signal recovery is a critical data-acquisition and processing problem that arises in many modern scientific and computational applications, including signal and image processing, machine learning, data networking, and medicine [7, 16]. It is a method for acquiring linear measurements or observations of a signal with a measurement matrix Φ , and an algorithm, \mathcal{D} , for recovering the significant components of the original signal. We model this problem mathematically by assuming that we *measure* a vector \mathbf{x} and collect observation $\mathbf{y} = \Phi\mathbf{x}$, then we run a *recovery algorithm* and produce an approximation $\widehat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{D}(\Phi, \mathbf{y})$ to \mathbf{x} with the guarantee that the approximation error $\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|$ is bounded above.

More quantitatively, let us denote the length of the vector \mathbf{x} by N , the sparsity (or compression) parameter k , and distortion parameter ϵ . Let $\mathbf{x}_{[k]}$ denote the best k -term approximation to \mathbf{x} , the “heavy hitters” of \mathbf{x} , *i.e.*, \mathbf{x} with all but the k largest-magnitude terms zeroed out. There are many different ways to assess the error of the recovery algorithm and the quality of the measurement matrix, depending on the particular application. (See Table 1 for an overview of all of problem variations.) In this paper, we address the ℓ_1/ℓ_1 -for-all problem¹ which is to give a measurement matrix Φ and a recovery algorithm \mathcal{D} , such that, for any input vector \mathbf{x} , we have

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq (1 + \epsilon)\|\mathbf{x}_{[k]} - \mathbf{x}\|_1.$$

The goal is to use the minimum number of measurements (rows of Φ), namely, $O(k \log(N/k)/\epsilon^2)$ and to keep the runtime of \mathcal{D} to polynomial in $k \log(N)/\epsilon$.

What makes this problem challenging is that we must simultaneously keep the number of measurements small, ensure the recovery algorithm is highly efficient, and achieve a good approximation for all input vectors. If we increase the number of measurements by factors of $\log N$, it is easy to optimize the run-time. Similarly, if we severely restrict the distortion parameter ϵ , we may also increase the number of measurements by factors of ϵ . In many applications, all three quantities are important; *i.e.*, in medical imaging applications, the measurements reflect the time a patient is observed, the recovery time drives the effectiveness of real-time imaging systems, and the recovery accuracy determines the diagnostic effectiveness of the imaging system.

Related work. There has been considerable work on this problem in a variety of parameter settings and we summarize the results in Table 1. A number of parameter values are incommensurate: we can achieve better approximation guarantees (using the ℓ_2/ℓ_2 norm) but only in the for-each model and in the for-all signal model, we can achieve ℓ_2/ℓ_1 error guarantees. A somewhat harder problem than the one we address in this paper is the mixed-norm (or ℓ_2/ℓ_1) for-all result. In this setting, the goal is to give Φ and \mathcal{D} , such that, for any \mathbf{x} , we have

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{k}}\|\mathbf{x}_{[k]} - \mathbf{x}\|_1. \tag{1.1}$$

It is known that if (Φ, \mathcal{D}) solves the ℓ_2/ℓ_1 problem it also solves the ℓ_1/ℓ_1 problem [4].

In another direction, the ℓ_2/ℓ_2 for-each problem is to give *distribution* \mathcal{F} on Φ and \mathcal{D} , such that, for any \mathbf{x} , if $\Phi \sim \mathcal{F}$, we have

$$\Pr_{\Phi \sim \mathcal{F}} \{ \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)\|\mathbf{x}_{[k]} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \} \geq 1 - O(1).$$

The ℓ_2/ℓ_2 for-each problem with constant failure probability was solved in [11], where the authors gave an algorithm with constant-factor-optimal runtime and number of measurements. The failure probability was recently improved to exponentially small in [12], but the technique is not likely to give an ℓ_1/ℓ_1 for-all result without additional logarithmic factors in the number of measurements.

The first sublinear-time algorithm in the for-all setting (for the ℓ_1/ℓ_1 norm) was given in [19], though that algorithm had a number of limitations.

¹More generally, the expression ℓ_p/ℓ_q means that we measure the approximation error $\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_p$ with the ℓ_p norm and we compare it to the ℓ_q error of the best k -term approximation, $\|\mathbf{x}_{[k]} - \mathbf{x}\|_q$.




Figure 1: Algorithm to generate the measurements. Darker spots indicate a bigger value of the bucket/measurement. Strikethroughs are used to show where our approach or our object sizes differ from [19].

- The runtime, while sublinear, was \sqrt{kN} or, more generally, of the form $k^{1-\alpha}N^\alpha$ for any constant $\alpha > 0$. That algorithm did not achieve runtime polynomial in $k \log(N)/\epsilon$.
- The algorithm required a precomputed table of size $Nk^{0.2}$.
- The result was far from optimal in its dependence of the number of measurements on ϵ .

Our results. In this work, we rectify the above limitations, assuming the (modest) restriction that $\epsilon < \log k / \log N$. We also make the measurement dependence on ϵ optimal. The best lower bound for the ℓ_1/ℓ_1 for-all problem is $\Omega(k/\epsilon^2 + (k/\epsilon) \log(\epsilon N/k))$ [17], which is also the best lower bound for the ℓ_2/ℓ_1 for-all problem. Our algorithm uses $O(k/\epsilon^2 \log(N/k))$ measurements when $\epsilon < (\log k / \log N)^\gamma$, which is suboptimal only by a logarithmic factor. When $k \leq \log^c N$ for some $c > 0$, the runtime is reduced to $O(k \text{ poly}(N, 1/\epsilon))$.

Theorem 1 (Main Theorem). *Let $\beta, \gamma > 0$. There is an approximate sparse recovery system consisting of an $m \times N$ measurement matrix Φ and a decoding algorithm \mathcal{D} that satisfy the following property: for any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, given $\Phi \mathbf{x}$, the system approximates \mathbf{x} by $\widehat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{D}(\Phi \mathbf{x})$, which satisfies*

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq (1 + \epsilon) \|\mathbf{x}_{[k]} - \mathbf{x}\|_1.$$

Provided that $N = \Omega(\max\{k^2, k/\epsilon^2\})$, the matrix Φ has $m = O(k/\epsilon \log(N/k)(\log N / \log k)^\gamma + 1/\epsilon)$ rows and the decoding algorithm \mathcal{D} runs in time $O(k^{1+\beta} \text{ poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$. When $\epsilon = O((\frac{\log k}{\log N})^\gamma)$, the number of rows $m = O(k/\epsilon^2 \log(N/k))$. If, in addition, $k \leq \log^{O(1)} N$, the runtime can be reduced to $O(k \text{ poly}(N, 1/\epsilon))$.

Overview of Techniques. Our overall approach builds on [19] and [12] with several critical innovations. In Figure 1 is a framework which captures both the algorithm in [19] and the algorithm in this paper.

First, we describe the encoding procedure at a high level. Initially each $i \in [N]$ is associated with a unique message \mathbf{m}_i , which is encoded to a longer message \mathbf{m}'_i . In [19] this encoding is trivial, namely, $\mathbf{m}'_i = \mathbf{m}_i$; while in our work it is a more complicated procedure (see Figure 3). The first hash assigns one of B buckets to each $i \in [N]$, while maintaining the original index i ; the *aggregation* step sums each bucket. There are $\frac{\log(N/k)}{\epsilon \log(B/k)}$ repetitions. The index i in each repetition is now associated with a chunk of \mathbf{m}'_i . In [19], the aggregated buckets are hashed into (k/ϵ) buckets and there are $\log(B/k)/\epsilon$ repetitions. Thus, altogether, there are $O(\epsilon^{-3} k \log(N/k))$ measurements. In our work, there are only $\log(B/k)$ repetitions, saving a factor of $1/\epsilon$, so the total number of measurements is $O(\epsilon^{-2} k \log(N/k))$.

The *identification* portion of the recovery algorithm is shown in Figure 2. To recover the identity of




Figure 2: Algorithm to recover from the measurements




Figure 3: Encoding scheme. The Parvaresh-Vardy code automatically has a chunk structure. Suppose that there are D chunks. Choose a d -regular expander on D vertices as desired. For the i -th chunk of the PV code, append to it the information of the neighbours of the i -th vertex in the expander. Then apply Reed-Solomon to each appended message chunk. Recall that $k = O(\sqrt{N})$ so $\log(N/k) = \Theta(\log N)$.




Figure 4: Decoding scheme. The asterisks in the bottom layer indicates corrupted measurements (owing to collision or noise). The Reed-Solomon decoding either recovers the message chunk (with linking information) or produces a useless one (crossed out). Then the clustering procedure finds a set of chunks, of which a small fraction is good. This is sufficient for the Parvaresh-Vardy decoding to succeed.

heavy hitters, the algorithm reads off the measurements and recovers the message chunk associated with each bucket. This message chunk is supposed to be associated with the heavy hitter in the bucket. Then, all B buckets are examined exhaustively. The pre-image of each heavy bucket under the first hash is determined, in [19], from a look-up table and searched exhaustively. In our work, this is done by the decoding procedure illustrated in Figure 4. We encode the “linking information” into the message chunks so that we can collect across the repetitions enough heavy buckets which contain the same heavy hitter i (whose actual value is unknown at this stage of the algorithm). Thus, we obtain a (small) fraction of \mathbf{m}'_i , which is sufficient for the Parvaresh-Vardy decoding algorithm to produce the exact \mathbf{m}_i , from which we recover the value of i immediately.

The *estimation* portion of the recovery algorithm estimates the coefficient at each of those candidate positions by reading the aggregated bucket value of the corresponding heavy buckets at the first hash level.

Putting these pieces together, we have a *weak recovery system*, which identifies all but $k/2$ of the heavy hitters. We then repeat with smaller (easier) sparsity parameter $k/2 < k$ and smaller (harder) distortion parameter $(3/4)\epsilon < \epsilon$, resulting in a number of measurements whose leading term is $(k/2)(4/3\epsilon)^2 = (8/9)k/\epsilon^2 < k/\epsilon^2$. Summing the geometric progression gives the result we need. Finally, we note that our algorithm works (deterministically) with any unbalanced expander having the appropriate properties.

Encoding and Decoding details. See Figure 3 and Figure 4 for a detailed illustration of these steps. For each message \mathbf{m} , the Parvaresh-Vardy code encodes it into a longer message \mathbf{m}' , which automatically exhibits a chunk structure, so that if a few number of the chunks are correct, the original \mathbf{m} will be recovered. Suppose there are D chunks. Now, choose a d -regular expander graph G (d is a constant) on D nodes such that after removing $O(D)$ nodes from G , the remaining graph still contains an expander of size $\Omega(D)$. For the i -th chunk of \mathbf{m}' , append to it the information of the neighbours of the i -th vertex in G . Then we apply Reed-Solomon to protect the appended chunks.

To decode, we first recover the appended message chunks. The two-layer hash guarantees that for the same heavy hitter, at most $O(D)$ of them will be wrong and the remaining ones are all correct. Now, consider a breadth-first search from a correct message chunk (whose “linking information” is therefore correct). By the special property of the expander graph G , we shall be able to visit all nodes (i.e., all corresponding message chunks) of a smaller expander graph of size $\Omega(D)$ in $\log D$ steps. This small fraction of good message chunks of \mathbf{m}' will enable the P-V code to recover the original message \mathbf{m} successfully. Recall that d is a constant, the total number of vertices visited is $O(d^{\log D}) = O(\text{poly}(D)) = O(\text{poly}(\log N))$ for appropriate D . This enables a sublinear recovery time.

Our contributions.

- We give an algorithm for sparse recovery in the for-all setting, under a modest restriction on the distortion factor ϵ , having the number of measurements that matches the best upper bound, attained by super-linear algorithms; e.g., [15], and optimal in runtime up to a power.
- We conjecture that our algorithm can be extended from the 1-norm to the mixed norm guarantee and that the restriction on ϵ can be weakened or eliminated. Thus our algorithm may be a stepping stone to the final algorithm.
- Our work is not the first to consider list recovery. Indyk et al. introduces the idea in the context of combinatorial group testing [14]. The idea of list recovery is also used in [12], where the list decoding, however, would affect the hashing and the hashing was thus required to be sufficiently random. In our algorithm, the messages $\{\mathbf{m}_i\}$ are independent of the hashing, which enables us to obtain a better result.
- Finally, our encoding/decoding techniques are reminiscent of network coding and may have other contexts for soft-decoding or network coding.

Paper Organization. In Section 2 we review some properties of expanders. In Section 3, we show that provided with good identification results, unbalanced expanders with appropriate properties will give a weak system. Our construction of weak system culminates in Section 4, where we shall show how to achieve good identification via message encoding and decoding. Then we build the overall algorithm on the weak system in Section 5. Finally we close with a short discussion and open problems in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

Our main algorithm will be built on regular graph expanders and unbalanced bipartite expanders. In this section we review some properties of expanders. Let n, m, d, ℓ be positive integers and ϵ, κ be positive reals. The following two definitions are adapted from [13].

Definition 2 (expander). An (n, ℓ, κ) -expander is a graph $G(V, E)$, where $|V| = n$, such that for any set $S \subseteq V$ with $|S| \leq \ell$ it holds that $|\Gamma(S)| \geq \kappa|S|$.

When n is clear from the context, we abbreviate the expander as (ℓ, κ) -expander.

Definition 3 (bipartite expander). An $(n, m, d, \ell, \epsilon)$ -bipartite expander is a d -left-regular bipartite graph $G(L \cup R, E)$ where $|L| = n$ and $|R| = m$ such that for any $S \subseteq L$ with $|S| \leq \ell$ it holds that $|\Gamma(S)| \geq (1 - \epsilon)d|S|$, where $\Gamma(S)$ is the neighbour of S (in R).

When n and m are clear from the context, we abbreviate the expander as (ℓ, d, ϵ) -bipartite expander.

Paper	A/E	Number of Measurements	Column sparsity/ Update time	Decode time	Approx. error	Noise
[2]	E	$k \log^c N$	$\log^c N$	$N \log^c N$	$\ell_2 \leq C \ell_2$	
[5]	E	$k \log^c N$	$\log^c N$	$k \log^c N$	$\ell_2 \leq C \ell_2$	
[11]	E	$\epsilon^{-1} k \log(N/k)$	$\log^c N$	$\epsilon^{-1} k \log^c N$	$\ell_2 \leq (1 + \epsilon) \ell_2$	Y
[6, 1]	A	$k \log(N/k)$	$k \log(N/k)$	LP	$\ell_2 \leq (C/\sqrt{k}) \ell_1$	Y
[10]	A	$\epsilon^{-2} k \log^c N$	$\epsilon^{-2} k \log^c N$	$\epsilon^{-4} k^2 \log^c N$	$\ell_2 \leq (\epsilon/\sqrt{k}) \ell_1$	Y
[9]	A	$k \log^c N$	$\log^c N$	$k \log^c N$	$\ell_1 \leq (C \log N) \ell_1$	Y
[15]	A	$\epsilon^{-2} k \log(N/k)$	$\epsilon^{-1} \log(N/k)$	$N \log(N/k)$	$\ell_1 \leq (1 + \epsilon) \ell_1$	Y
[19] (any integer ℓ)	A	$\ell^c \epsilon^{-3} k \log(N/k)$	$\ell^c \epsilon^{-3} \log(N/k) \log k$	$\ell^c \epsilon^{-3} k(N/k)^{1/\ell}$	$\ell_1 \leq (1 + \epsilon) \ell_1$	Y
This paper (any $\beta > 0$) (restrictions on ϵ apply)	A	$\epsilon^{-2} k \log(N/k)$	$\epsilon^{-1} \log(N/k)$	$k^{1+\beta} (\epsilon^{-1} \log N)^c$	$\ell_1 \leq (1 + \epsilon) \ell_1$	Y
Lower bound ‘A’	A	$\epsilon^{-2} k \log(N/k)$	$\epsilon^{-1} \log(N/k)$	$\epsilon^{-2} k \log(N/k)$	$\ell_2 \leq (\epsilon/\sqrt{k}) \ell_1$	Y

Table 1: Summary of the best previous results and the result obtained in this paper. Some constant factors are omitted for clarity. “LP” denotes (at least) the time to do a linear program of size at least N . The column “A/E” indicates whether the algorithm works in the forall (A) model or the foreach (E) model. The column “noise” indicates whether the algorithm tolerates noisy measurements. Measurement and decode time dependence on ϵ , where applicable, is polynomial. The constants c could be different in different occurrences. The lower bound on number of measurements in table above is, in fact, the best upper bound attained by super-linear algorithms.

When d is also clear from the context, we simply write (ℓ, ϵ) -bipartite expander.

Consider the adjacency matrix A_G of an d -regular expander G . It always holds that the biggest eigenvalue of A_G is d . Let $\lambda(G)$ denote the largest absolute value of any other eigenvalue. The following theorem is now well-known.

Theorem 4 ([8]). *For all sufficiently large n and even d , there exists a d -regular expander G such that $|V(G)| = n$ and $\lambda(G) \leq C \sqrt{d}$ for some absolute constant $C > 0$.*

Next we present a result due to Upfal [20], implicitly used in the proof of Lemma 1 and 2 therein. It states that there exists a expander graph of n nodes and constant degree, such that after removing a constant fraction of nodes the remaining subgraph contains an expander of size $\Omega(n)$.

Theorem 5 ([20]). *Let G be a δ -regular expander of n nodes such that $\lambda(G) \leq C \sqrt{\delta}$, where δ is a (sufficiently large) constant. There exist absolute constants $\alpha, \zeta > 0$ and $\kappa > 1$ such that after removing an arbitrary set T of nodes with $|T| \leq \zeta n$ from G , the remaining graph contains a subgraph G' such that $|V(G')| \geq \alpha n$ and G' is a $(|V(G')|, n/2, \kappa)$ graph expander.*

The following definitions concern hashing, in which the parameters N, B_1, B_2, d_1, d_2 are positive integers. We adopt the conventional notation that $[m] = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$.

Definition 6 (one-layer hashing scheme). The (N, B, d) (one layer) hashing scheme is the uniform distribution on the set of all functions $f : [N] \rightarrow [B]^d$.

Each instance of such a hashing scheme induces a d -left-regular bipartite graph with Bd right nodes. When N is clear from the context, we simply write (B, d) hashing scheme.

Definition 7 (two-layer hashing scheme). An (N, B_1, d_1, B_2, d_2) (two-layer) hashing scheme is a distribution μ on the set of all functions $f : [N] \rightarrow [B_2]^{d_1 d_2}$ defined as follows. Let g be a random function subject to the (N, B_1, d_1) hashing scheme and $\{h_{i,j}\}_{i \in [d_1], j \in [d_2]}$ be a family of independent functions subject to the (B_1, B_2, d_2) hashing scheme which are also independent of g . Then μ is defined to be the distribution induced by the mapping $x \mapsto (h_{1,1}(g_1(x)), \dots, h_{1,d_2}(g_1(x)), h_{2,1}(g_2(x)), \dots, h_{2,d_2}(g_2(x)), \dots, h_{d_1,1}(g_{d_1}(x)), \dots, h_{d_1,d_2}(g_{d_1}(x)))$.

Each instance of such a hashing scheme gives a $d_1 d_2$ -left-regular bipartite graph of $B_2 d_1 d_2$ right nodes. When N is clear from the context, we simply write (B_1, d_1, B_2, d_2) hashing scheme. Conceptually we hash N elements into B_1 buckets and repeat d_1 times, those buckets will be referred to as first-layer buckets; in

each of the d_1 repetitions, we hash B_1 elements into B_2 buckets and repeat d_2 times, those buckets will be referred to as second-layer buckets.

We note that bipartite expander graphs can be used as hashing schemes because of their unique neighbours property (and hence isolation property).

Definition 8 (unique neighbours). Let $G = (L \cup R, E)$ be a bipartite graph and $S, T \subseteq L$. Define

$$U_S(T) = \{y \in R : (x, y) \in E \text{ for some } x \in T \text{ while } (z, y) \notin E \text{ for all } z \in S \setminus \{x\}\}.$$

Definition 9 (isolation property). An $(n, m, d, \ell, \epsilon)$ -bipartite expander G is said to satisfy the (L, η, ζ) -isolation property if for any set $S \subset L(G)$ with $|S| \leq L$, there exists $S' \subset S$ with $|S'| \geq (1 - \eta)|S|$ such that for all $x \in S'$ it holds that $|U_S(\{x\})| \geq (1 - \zeta)d$.

3 Weak System

To simplify our analysis, we decompose a signal \mathbf{x} into two parts of disjoint support, $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}$, where \mathbf{y} has small support and \mathbf{z} has small norm. We call \mathbf{y} the *head* and \mathbf{z} the *tail*. To simplify the language we may also use head to refer to $\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$. We aim to recover the elements in \mathbf{y} . Introduced in [19], a *weak system* takes an additional input, some set I of indices (called the candidate set), and tries to estimate \mathbf{x}_i for $i \in I$, hoping to recover some head items with estimate error dependent on $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1$. It is shown in [19] that when I contains the entire head, we can always recover a good fraction of the head. In this paper we make a slight modification on the definition of weak system as below. We only need I to contain a good fraction of the head instead of the entire head.

Definition 10 (Weak system). A *Weak system* consists of parameters N, s, η, ζ , an m -by- N measurement matrix Φ , and a decoding algorithm \mathcal{D} , that satisfy the following property:

For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ that can be written as $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}$, where $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})| \leq s$ and $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 \leq 3/2$, given the measurements $\Phi\mathbf{x}$ and a subset $I \subseteq [N]$ such that $|I \cap \text{supp}(\mathbf{y})| \geq (1 - \zeta/2)|\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})|$, the decoding algorithm \mathcal{D} returns $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$, such that \mathbf{x} admits the following decomposition:

$$\mathbf{x} = \widehat{\mathbf{x}} + \widehat{\mathbf{y}} + \widehat{\mathbf{z}},$$

where $|\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})| = O(s)$, $|\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{y}})| \leq \zeta s$, and $\|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{z}\|_1 + \eta$. Intuitively, $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$ will be the head and the tail of the residual $\mathbf{x} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}$, respectively.

Theorem 11 (Weak). Suppose that Φ is the adjacency matrix of an $(N, Bd, d, 4s, \eta)$ -bipartite expander such that (a) $d = O(\frac{1}{\eta\zeta^2} \log \frac{N}{s})$ and $B = O(\frac{d}{\zeta\eta})$ and (b) it is an instance of a (B, d) -hashing scheme. With appropriate instantiations of constants, Algorithm 2 (see Appendix) yields a correct Weak system that runs in time $O(|I|\eta^{-1}\zeta^{-2} \log(N/s))$.

The proof is essentially the same as [19, Lemma 4] and is therefore postponed to Appendix A.

To complete the construction of a Weak system, it remains to show that a bipartite expander as required by Theorem 11 exists. By probabilistic methods, we show that it can be attained by both one-layer and two-layer hashing schemes, with appropriate parameters. We state the results for two-layer hashing schemes only because our identification procedure uses it. All proofs use standard techniques and are postponed to the Appendix.

Lemma 12 (expanding property). Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1/4)$, $k \geq 1$ and $N = \Omega(\max\{k/\epsilon^2, k^2\})$. A random two-layer (B_1, d_1, B_2, d_2) hashing scheme gives an $(N, B_2d_1d_2, d_1d_2, 4k, \epsilon)$ bipartite expander with probability $\geq 1 - 1/N^c$, where $B_1 = \Omega(\frac{k}{\epsilon^2})$, $d_1 = \Omega(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \log(N/k))$, $B_2 = \Omega(\frac{k}{\epsilon})$ and $d_2 = \Omega(\log \frac{B_1}{k})$ with appropriate choices of constants.

Remark 13. The constraint that $k = O(\sqrt{N})$ could be weakened to $k = O(N^{1-\xi})$ for any $\xi > 0$. The constants hidden in various $\Omega(\cdot)$ notations above will depend on ξ .

Lemma 14 (isolation property). Let $\epsilon > 0$, $\alpha > 1$ be arbitrary constants and (B_1, d_1, B_2, d_2) be a two-layer hashing scheme with $B_1 = \Omega(\frac{k}{\zeta^\alpha \epsilon^{2\alpha}})$, $d_1 = \Omega(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \cdot \frac{1}{\zeta \epsilon} \log(N/k))$, $B_2 = \Omega(\frac{k}{\zeta \epsilon})$ and $d_2 = \Omega(\frac{1}{\zeta} \log \frac{B_1}{k})$. Then with




Figure 5: Sparse recovery channel. The encoder and decoder agree on some matrix Φ . The encoder takes messages \mathbf{m} and produces a measurement matrix Φ' based on \mathbf{m} and Φ . The channel is fed with Φ' and \mathbf{x} and produces $\Phi'\mathbf{x}$, from which the decoder tries to recover $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}$ in the sense of weak list recovery.

probability $\geq 1 - 1/N^c$, the two-layer hashing scheme with parameters prescribed above gives a bipartite graph with the (L, ϵ, ζ) -isolation property, where $L = O(k/\epsilon)$.

4 Identification of Heavy Hitters

In the previous section, we showed how to estimate all candidates in a candidate set I quickly. The main bottleneck in a highly efficient algorithm is finding a non-trivial set $I \subset [N]$ of candidates which we address in this section.

The overall strategy is as follows. Using the two-layer hashing scheme (B_1, d_1, B_2, d_2) , we expect that a heavy hitter dominates the first-layer buckets where it lands in $\Omega(d_1)$ repetitions. In each of these repetitions, it is a heavy hitter in a signal of length B_1 , and we expect to recover it using the Weak algorithm applied to the signal of length B_1 with $I = [B_1]$. After finding the heavy buckets in each repetition, the remaining problem is to extract the position of a heavy hitter i from the $\Omega(d_1)$ repetitions that contain i . To do this, we shall encode the index i in such a way that if we recover the buckets containing i in enough repetitions we shall be able to reconstruct i . To that end, we introduce the following model of weak list recovery in the *sparse recovery channel*.

Definition 15. The (m, N, s) *Sparse Recovery Channel* takes an m -by- N matrix Φ as input, chooses a signal \mathbf{x} with decomposition $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}$ with $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})| \leq s$ and $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 \leq O(1)$, and outputs $\Phi\mathbf{x}$.

Note that \mathbf{x} may depend on Φ . Also note that *any* signal may be chosen by the channel and normalized so that $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 \leq 3/2$. It will be convenient to assign the normalization at this point to match the Weak system (Definition 10). Next, we define the *Weak Recovery Criterion* appropriate for this channel. See Figure 5.

Definition 16 (Weak list Recovery Criterion). Fix parameters m, N, s, ϵ . Let \mathbf{m} be a vector of β -bit messages, for $i \in [N]$, and suppose $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}$ is a list of possible index-message pairs. We say that $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}$ is *correct in the List Weak sense* if, for at least $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})| - s/8$ indices i in $\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$, we have $(i, \mathbf{m}_i) \in \widehat{\mathbf{m}}$.

The encoding/decoding scheme is given in Algorithm 1. We break each message \mathbf{m}_i associated with position i into d_1 chunks, $\mathbf{m}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{i,d_1}$. Note that \mathbf{m}_i could be much longer than $\log N$ bits in order to guarantee a successful list recovery. Now in the j -th repetition of the d_1 repetitions, we obtain a signal $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}$ of length B . Each $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_\ell$ is associated with a message that can be viewed as a weighted sum of $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$ for positions i hashed into bucket ℓ . If a heavy hitter i is isolated in bucket ℓ and the noise is mild in this bucket, this weighted sum would be approximately $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$, and we expect to recover $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$ from the second-layer hashing, with inner encoding and decoding. Now we assume that we have recovered $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$ for heavy hitter i in sufficiently many repetitions j . The central difficulty is to match $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$ with $\mathbf{m}_{i,j'}$ with $j \neq j'$ in order to find enough fraction of \mathbf{m}_i in the end. In order to solve this we shall encode some linking information in the node that will enable us to match $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$ with $\mathbf{m}_{i,j'}$. This will be the topic of the next subsection, in which we shall use the Parvaresh-Vardy code to overcome this difficulty.

Lemma 17 is a simple case to illustrate our idea of encoding, in which we show how to code $\beta = \log(B/k)$ bits in the length- B Sparse Recovery Channel and how to recover the messages associated with $\Omega(k)$ heavy hitters in the length B signal in time approximately B . The proof is postponed to Appendix E.

Algorithm 1 Encding/Decoding paradigm.

```

// Encoding with  $(B_1, d_1, B_2, d_2)$  hashing scheme
for  $i = 1$  to  $N$  do
  Break: Break the information of  $i$  into  $d_1$  chunks
  Outer encoding: Encode the chunks with cluster info (from a regular expander graph) and against errors, getting
   $\{\mathbf{m}_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^{d_1}$ 
end for
for  $j = 1$  to  $d_1$  do
  Inner encoding: Encode  $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$ , for  $i \in [N]$ 
end for
// Decoding with  $(B_1, d_1, B_2, d_2)$  hashing scheme
for  $j = 1$  to  $d_1$  do
  // ... length  $B_1$ ,  $(B_2 d_2)$ -measurement Sparse Recovery Channel ...
  Inner decoding: Recover  $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_j$  in the Weak List sense
  Record Side Info: Tag each element of  $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_j$  with  $j$ 
end for
Outer decoding: From  $\widehat{\mathbf{m}} = \bigcup_j \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_j$ 's, find chunk clusters and correct errors; produce  $I$ 

```




Figure 6: Underlying graph G_N . Suppose that \mathbf{x}_1 is in the tail and that $\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3$ and \mathbf{x}_N are heavy hitters.




Figure 7: Recovered graph \tilde{G} in ideal situation, with expander copies clairvoyantly aligned in a column. Since the first column corresponds to a tail item, it is almost absent in the recovered graph. There are arcs from non- G_{i_j} nodes to G_{i_j} nodes.

Lemma 17. Fix k, B, β , with $B = \Omega(k)$ and $\beta = O(\log(B/k))$. There is a coding scheme for the length- B m -measurement Sparse Recovery Channel for $m = O(\frac{k}{\epsilon} \log \frac{B}{k})$ in the weak list recovery sense in which decoding runs in time $O(B \log^3 \frac{B}{k})$. This scheme also uses a look up table of size β .

4.1 Expander Encoding

Parameters. We assume that the constants $\beta, \gamma > 0$ are fixed; the parameters B_1, d_1, B_2, d_2 are as in Lemma 14 such that $B_1 = \Omega((\frac{k}{\epsilon})^{1+\beta} \log \frac{N}{k})$; $c \leq m$ are constant integers; h is an integer; and $\epsilon = O((\frac{\alpha}{m})^{\frac{m}{m-c}} (\frac{\log(B_1/k)}{\log(N/k)})^\gamma)$.

Let G be a graph of d_1 nodes with constant degree δ that satisfies Theorem 4, and α, ζ, κ be constants provided by Theorem 5 when applied to G . Without loss generality we can assume that $\alpha \leq 1/2$. Adjust the hidden constants together with c, m and h appropriately (depending on β and γ) such that

- (a) $B_1 > d_1$;
- (b) $(h-1)m \log_{B_1} N < \alpha d_1$;
- (c) $(\alpha d_1 - (h-1)m \log_{B_1} N) \cdot h^m > d_1^c$;
- (d) $c \geq \log \delta / \log \kappa$.




Figure 8: Recovered graph \tilde{G} , with ‘supposed’ expander copies clairvoyantly aligned in columns. The first column corresponds to a tail item so it is almost absent. The top node in the second column is corrupted so it points to wrong columns but nevertheless the correct rows because the row information is hard-wired. The top node in the third column is correctly recovered but the second node in the column is corrupted. The top node in the last column has a small bucket value in the first repetition so it is absent \tilde{G} . If we perform BFS at the top node in the third column, we may include a lot of nodes in the second column.

We note that an instance of m, h is to choose $m \geq c(1 + 1/\gamma)$ and $h = \Theta(d_1^{c/m})$.

Encoding. We shall use Reed-Solomon for inner encoding. Next, we define our outer coding, which uses the Parvaresh-Vardy code [18]. Take N disconnected copies of G and call the union G_N , where each node is indexed by a pair $(i, r) \in [N] \times [d_1]$. See Figure 6. Also, let \mathbb{F} be a field such that $|\mathbb{F}| = \Theta(B_1)$ is a power of 2 and $E(x)$ be an irreducible monic polynomial over \mathbb{F} such that $\deg E(x) = \log_{B_1} N$. View each $i \in [N]$ as a polynomial f over \mathbb{F} with degree $\log_{B_1} N - 1$. For each $(i, r) \in G_N$, associate with it an element $p(i, r) \in \mathbb{F}^{m+1}$ as

$$p(i, r) = (x_{i,r}, f(x_{i,r}), (f^h \bmod E)(x_{i,r}), \dots, (f^{h^{m-1}} \bmod E)(x_{i,r})),$$

where f is a polynomial associated with $i \in [N]$ and $x_{i,r} \in \mathbb{F}$ so that $x_{i,r}$ are distinct for different r . This is possible because of Property (a).

Attach to a node (i, r) a message $\mathbf{m}_{i,r}$ containing the information of $p(i, r)$ as well as $H(i, v_1(r)), \dots, H(i, v_\delta(r))$, where $v_1(r), \dots, v_\delta(r)$ are the neighbours of r in G and $H(i, j) \in [B_1]$ gives the bucket index where i lands in the j -th outer hashing repetition. It is clear that $\mathbf{m}_{i,r}$ has $\Theta(\log B_1) = O(d_2)$ bits and therefore we can encode it in d_2 hash repetitions, see Lemma 17.

Decoding. In each of the d_1 repetitions, we shall recover $O(k/\epsilon)$ heavy buckets and thus obtain $O(k/\epsilon)$ nodes with their messages. Even when the messages are recovered correctly, we only know that a message corresponds to $\mathbf{m}_{i,r}$ for some $i \in [N]$ and we do not know which i it is. However, if we can determine that enough messages are associated with the same i , we would have obtained enough $p(i, r)$ for different values of r then we should be able to find f and thus recover the position i .

To determine enough $p(i, r)$ for the same i , we do clustering as follows. Suppose that there are k heavy hitters at position i_1, \dots, i_k . Let \tilde{G} be a graph of $d_1 \times O(k/\epsilon)$ nodes, arranged in a $d_1 \times O(k/\epsilon)$ grid. For now we assume that the messages are recovered correctly for each heavy hitter i in all d_1 repetitions. (This means that there are no collisions and the noise in the buckets are all small.) Each message has the form $p(i, r), h_1, \dots, h_\delta$, where $h_j = H(i, v_j(r))$ for $1 \leq j \leq \delta$. Add an arc $(i, r) \rightarrow (h_j, v_j(r))$ for each $1 \leq j \leq \delta$.

Since the messages are recovered correctly, the graph \tilde{G} will contain several disjoint copies of the expander graph G , say G_{i_1}, \dots, G_{i_k} , though each G_{i_j} is not necessarily aligned within the same column in \tilde{G} . There will be arcs incoming to G_{i_j} from nodes not in any G_{i_j} , but there are no outgoing arcs from G_{i_j} . In this case, we can recover each G_{i_j} perfectly, and collect the full set $\{\mathbf{m}_{i_j,r}\}_{r=1}^{d_1}$ and thus recover i_j . Let us rearrange the nodes within each row and align each copy of G in the same column for clarity. In this case, the columns i_1, \dots, i_k are exact copies of the expander graph G . See Figure 7 for an illustration.

The heavy hitters may not, however, be recovered in some repetitions and the messages could be seriously corrupted. When we are adding the arcs, we introduce two kinds of errors, respectively:

- (i) We lose a node in G_{i_j} , i.e., the node is not present in \tilde{G} because the heavy hitter i_j is not recovered in that repetition;
- (ii) We connect a node in G_{i_j} to a node in some other $G_{i_{j'}}$ ($j \neq j'$), owing to erroneous message.

As before, we align each ‘‘ideal copy’’ of G in the same column. See Figure 8 for an example. We know that for a heavy hitter i , only a few messages $\{\mathbf{m}_{i,r}\}_r$ are ruined and the i -th column of G_N will contain a large connected subgraph G' of G , by Theorem 5. Hence, if we start a breadth-first search from an appropriate node with depth $c \log_\delta d_1$, the whole G' will be visited. In other words, we shall obtain a large set of $\{p(i, r)\}$, only a small number of which will be associated with the same i , but we expect to obtain enough $\{p(i, r)\}$ of the same i , which turns out to be sufficient to extract f associated with i using a good error-correcting code such as the Parvaresh-Vardy code that allows us to recover the codeword from a large fraction of errors. Without attempting to identify the ‘‘appropriate node’’ described above, we shall perform this breadth-first search on every node in \widetilde{G} .

Guarantee. Thus we have shown that the system described above meets the aforementioned guarantee. The proof is postponed to Appendix F.

Lemma 18. *Let $\beta, \gamma > 0$. The encoding and decoding strategy of Section 4.1 are correct in the sense of the guarantee of that section, against the channel described in that section. It uses $O(\epsilon^{-2} s \log(N/s))$ measurements and runs in time $O(s^{1+\beta} \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$, provided that $N = \Omega(\max\{s^2, s/\epsilon^2\})$ and $\epsilon = O((\frac{\log s}{\log N})^\gamma)$.*

5 Toplevel System

Now we define a Toplevel system, similarly to [11, 19], that is an algorithm that solves our overall problem.

Definition 19. An *approximate sparse recovery system* (briefly, a *Toplevel system*), consists of parameters N, k, ϵ , an m -by- N measurement matrix Φ , and a decoding algorithm \mathcal{D} that satisfy the following property: for any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, given $\Phi \mathbf{x}$, the system approximates \mathbf{x} by $\widehat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{D}(\Phi \mathbf{x})$, which satisfies

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq (1 + \epsilon) \|\mathbf{x}_{[k]} - \mathbf{x}\|_1.$$

Using this definition, we restate our main result from Theorem 1 in a slightly different form.

Theorem 20. *Let $\beta, \gamma > 0$. There is a Toplevel system that uses $O(\epsilon^{-2} k \log(N/k))$ measurements and runtime $O(k^{1+\beta} \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$, provided that $N = \Omega(\max\{k^2, k/\epsilon^2\})$ and $\epsilon = O((\frac{\log k}{\log N})^\gamma)$.*

The proof follows easily using the results on the weak system. We need Lemma 18 for identification and Theorem 11 for estimation. The proof of this theorem is postponed to Appendix G.

Remark 21. We note that

- (a) the constants in big O -notations and the power in $\text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon)$ depend on β and γ ; and,
- (b) as in Remark 13, The constraint that $k = O(\sqrt{N})$ could be weakened to $k = O(N^{1-\xi})$ for any $\xi > 0$;
- (c) the factor $k^{1+\beta}$ in the runtime is due to our choice of $B_1 = \Omega((k/\epsilon^2)^{1+\beta} \log(N/k))$ such that $\log B_1 = O(\log(B_1/k)) = O(d_2)$. When $k \leq (\log N)^c$ for some $c > 0$, since $B_1 = \Omega(k/\epsilon^{2(1+\beta)})$, choosing $B_1 = \Theta(k \log(N/k)/\epsilon^{2(1+\beta)})$ would suffice. It leads to runtime $O(k \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$.
- (d) For large ϵ we can take $d_1 = (\log(N/k)/\log(B_1/k))^{1+\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 0$, which gives an algorithm which uses more measurements $O(k \log^{1+\alpha}(N/k)/\epsilon^2)$ but suboptimal by only a logarithmic factor from the best known lower bound.

6 Discussions and Open Problems

At the core part of this paper lies the following list recovery problem: Suppose that there are $d_1 = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\log(N/k)}{\log(B/k)}$ lists L_1, \dots, L_{d_1} with $|L_i| = O(k/\epsilon)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d_1$, we want to recover all possible codewords $c = (c_1, \dots, c_{d_1})$ such that $c_i \in L_i$ for at least $\Omega(d_1)$ different i s. We used an expander structure to reduce the problem to kd_1/ϵ subproblems, each of which has a smaller number of nodes. It is natural to be tempted to apply Parvaresh-Vardy code directly without the expander structure. Indeed it works for some configurations of k and ϵ with a runtime of $O(k \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$, but only for small k and ϵ . A direct application already fails even for $k = \exp(\sqrt{\log n})$. The runtime resulting from a direct application is also better for very small k , however, obtaining the precise range is difficult and beyond the scope of our work, as it relies on the precise complexity of factorizing a polynomial, which is not explicit in the literature.

Next we list a few open problems.

Restriction on ϵ . The algorithm in this paper restricts ϵ to $(\frac{\log k}{\log N})^\gamma$ for any $\gamma > 0$ because of its way of applying the Parvaresh-Vardy code. In a sense our construction reduces the problem to a list recovery problem. We ask if it is possible to find an improvement by applying a better list recoverable code. The ultimate goal is to relax the restriction of ϵ to $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ for some constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$.

Sparse Recovery in ℓ_2/ℓ_1 norm. The ultimate problem is the ℓ_2/ℓ_1 problem with error guarantee as in (1.1). We hope that the algorithm in this paper offers new ideas for the mixed-norm problem. Again the difficulty is in identification, as an RIP_2 matrix would be sufficient for estimation.

Post-measurement Noise. In many algorithms on the sparse recovery problem, the input to the decoding algorithm is $\Phi\mathbf{x} + \nu$ instead of $\Phi\mathbf{x}$, where ν is an arbitrary noise vector. It can be seen that our algorithm does tolerate substantial noise in ℓ_1 norm. We leave to future work full analysis and possible improved algorithms.

References

- [1] E. Candès, J. Romberg, and T. Tao. Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information. *IEEE Inf. Theory*, 52(2):489–509, 2006.
- [2] Moses Charikar, Kevin Chen, and Martin Farach-Colton. Finding frequent items in data streams. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, pages 693–703, 2002.
- [3] Raphaël Clifford, Klim Efremenko, Ely Porat, and Amir Rothschild. From coding theory to efficient pattern matching. In *Proceedings of the twentieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '09*, pages 778–784, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2009. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [4] Albert Cohen, Wolfgang Dahmen, and Ronald Devore. Compressed sensing and best k-term approximation. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, pages 211–231, 2009.
- [5] G. Cormode and S. Muthukrishnan. Combinatorial algorithms for Compressed Sensing. In *Proc. 40th Ann. Conf. Information Sciences and Systems*, Princeton, Mar. 2006.
- [6] D. L. Donoho. Compressed Sensing. *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, 52(4):1289–1306, Apr. 2006.
- [7] M F Duarte, M A Davenport, D Takhar, J N Laska, K F Kelly, and R G Baraniuk. Single-pixel imaging via compressive sampling. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 25(2):83–91, 2008.
- [8] J. Friedman, J. Kahn, and E. Szemerédi. On the second eigenvalue of random regular graphs. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, STOC*, pages 587–598, 1989.
- [9] Anna Gilbert, Martin Strauss, Joel Tropp, and Roman Vershynin. Algorithmic linear dimension reduction in the ℓ_1 norm for sparse vectors. In *Allerton*, 2006.
- [10] Anna Gilbert, Martin Strauss, Joel Tropp, and Roman Vershynin. One sketch for all: fast algorithms for compressed sensing. In *ACM STOC*, pages 237–246, 2007.
- [11] Anna C. Gilbert, Yi Li, Ely Porat, and Martin J. Strauss. Approximate sparse recovery: Optimizing time and measurements. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 41(2):436–453, 2012.

- [12] Anna C. Gilbert, Hung Q. Ngo, Ely Porat, Atri Rudra, and Martin J. Strauss. ℓ_2/ℓ_2 -foreach sparse recovery with low risk. In *Automata, Languages, and Programming*, volume 7965 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 461–472. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.
- [13] Venkatesan Guruswami, Christopher Umans, and Salil Vadhan. Unbalanced expanders and randomness extractors from Parvaresh-Vardy codes. *J. ACM*, 56(4):20:1–20:34, July 2009.
- [14] Piotr Indyk, Hung Q. Ngo, and Atri Rudra. Efficiently decodable non-adaptive group testing. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '10, pages 1126–1142, 2010.
- [15] Piotr Indyk and Milan Ruzic. Near-optimal sparse recovery in the L_1 norm. *Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 199–207, 2008.
- [16] Michael Lustig, David Donoho, and John M. Pauly. Sparse MRI: The application of compressed sensing for rapid MR imaging. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*, 58(6):1182–1195, 2007.
- [17] Jelani Nelson, Huy L. Nguyen, and David P. Woodruff. On deterministic sketching and streaming for sparse recovery and norm estimation. In *APPROX-RANDOM*, pages 627–638, 2012.
- [18] Farzad Parvaresh and Alexander Vardy. Correcting errors beyond the guruswami-sudan radius in polynomial time. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, FOCS '05, pages 285–294, 2005.
- [19] Ely Porat and Martin J. Strauss. Sublinear time, measurement-optimal, sparse recovery for all. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '12, pages 1215–1227, 2012.
- [20] Eli Upfal. Tolerating linear number of faults in networks of bounded degree. In *Proceedings of the eleventh annual ACM symposium on Principles of distributed computing*, PODC '92, pages 83–89, 1992.

Algorithm 2 Weak system.

Input: N, s, Φ (adjacency matrix of a d -left-regular expander G), $\Phi \mathbf{x}$, and I

Output: $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$

for $j \leftarrow 1$ **to** d **do**

for each $i \in I$ **do**

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{(j)} \leftarrow \text{median}_{u \in \Gamma(\{i\})} \sum_{(u,v) \in E} \mathbf{x}_u$$

\triangleright each sum is an element of input $\Phi \mathbf{x}$

for each $i \in I$ **do**

$$\mathbf{x}'_i \leftarrow \text{median}_{1 \leq j \leq d} \mathbf{x}_i^{(j)}$$

$\widehat{\mathbf{x}} \leftarrow$ top $O(s)$ elements of \mathbf{x}'

return $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$

A Proof of Theorem 11

First, we need the following two lemmata.

Lemma 22 (Noise). *Let $\alpha > 1$ and $t > \alpha k$. Let Φ be the adjacency graph of an $(n, m, d, 2\alpha k, \epsilon)$ -expander with $\epsilon < 1/2$. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $|\mathbf{x}_1| \geq |\mathbf{x}_2| \geq \dots \geq |\mathbf{x}_n|$. Let $I = [\alpha k]$, then*

$$\|(\Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{[I]}))_{\Gamma(I)}\|_1 \leq 4\epsilon d(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{[I]}\|_1 + \alpha k|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}|).$$

Proof. Partition $\{1, \dots, N\}$ into blocks $I \cup H_1 \cup B_1 \cup B_2 \cup \dots$, where $H_1 = \{\alpha k + 1, \dots, t\}$ and $B_i = \{t + (i-1)\alpha k + 1, \dots, t + i\alpha k\}$ for $i \geq 1$. Consider \mathbf{x} restricted to a block B_i .

Case 1. \mathbf{x}_{B_i} is flat, i.e., $|\mathbf{x}_{t+i\alpha k}| \geq |\mathbf{x}_{t+(i-1)\alpha k+1}|/2$. Consider all $d|B_i|$ edges in the expander emanating from B_i . Suppose that Z edges of them are incident to $\Gamma(I)$, then

$$|\Gamma(I) \cup \Gamma(B_i)| \leq \epsilon d(|I| + |B_i|) - Z.$$

On the other hand, by the expansion property,

$$|\Gamma(I) \cup \Gamma(B_i)| \geq (1 - \epsilon)d(|I| + |B_i|),$$

which implies that

$$Z \leq \epsilon d(|I| + |B_i|) \leq 2\epsilon \alpha k d.$$

Each of the Z edges sends a noise of x_i to $\Gamma(I)$, therefore

$$\|(\Phi \mathbf{x}_{B_i})_{\Gamma(I)}\| \leq Z \cdot \max_{i \in B_i} |\mathbf{x}_i| \leq 2\epsilon \alpha k d \cdot |\mathbf{x}_{t+(i-1)\alpha k+1}| \leq 4\epsilon d \|\mathbf{x}_{B_i}\|_1,$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that \mathbf{x}_{B_i} is flat so that $\alpha k |\mathbf{x}_{t+(i-1)\alpha k+1}| \leq 2 \|\mathbf{x}_{B_i}\|_1$.

Case 2. \mathbf{x}_{B_i} is not flat, then $|\mathbf{x}_{t+i\alpha k}| < |\mathbf{x}_{t+(i-1)\alpha k+1}|/2$. Let

$$J = \{i \in B_i : |\mathbf{x}_i| < |\mathbf{x}_{t+(i-1)\alpha k+1}|/2\}.$$

Increase $|\mathbf{x}_i|$ for all $i \in J$ so that $|\mathbf{x}_i| = |\mathbf{x}_{t+(i-1)\alpha k+1}|/2$ and \mathbf{x}_{B_i} becomes flat, and this increases $\|\mathbf{x}_{B_i}\|_1$ by at most $\alpha k |\mathbf{x}_{t+(i-1)\alpha k+1}|/2$. Invoking Case 1, we obtain that

$$\|(\Phi \mathbf{x}_{B_i})_{\Gamma(I)}\|_1 \leq 4\epsilon d \left(\|\mathbf{x}_{B_i}\|_1 + \frac{\alpha k |\mathbf{x}_{t+(i-1)\alpha k+1}|}{2} \right).$$

Now we go back to the entire \mathbf{x} . Suppose that B_{i_1}, \dots, B_{i_q} are not flat, then by triangle inequality we shall have

$$\|(\Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t))_{\Gamma(I)}\|_1 \leq 4\epsilon d \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_1 + 4\epsilon d \cdot \frac{\alpha k}{2} \sum_{p=1}^q |\mathbf{x}_{t+(i_p-1)\alpha k+1}|.$$

Observe that $|\mathbf{x}_{t+(i_p-1)\alpha k+1}| \leq |\mathbf{x}_{t+(i_{p-1}-1)\alpha k+1}|$ for $p \geq 2$, we can show inductively that

$$|\mathbf{x}_{t+(i_p-1)\alpha k+1}| \leq \frac{|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}|}{2^{p-1}}, \quad p \geq 1,$$

whence it follows that

$$\|(\Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{[I]}))_{\Gamma(I)}\|_1 \leq 4\epsilon d(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{[I]}\|_1 + \alpha k|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}|). \quad \square$$

In the usual decomposition, the head contains the entries with large coordinate values, which will be referred to as *heavy hitters*. If a heavy hitter fails to be recovered, it must have been displaced by another entry, loosely called a decoy, in the recovered signal. The next lemma bounds the number of decoys.

Lemma 23 (Decoys). *Suppose that G is a $(4s, \frac{\epsilon}{512})$ -bipartite expander which satisfies the $(\frac{9s}{\epsilon}, \beta\epsilon, \zeta)$ -isolation property, where $\frac{1}{2} - \zeta > 576\beta$. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a signal satisfying the assumption in the Weak system, and let $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the estimates defined as*

$$\mathbf{x}'_i = \text{median}_{u \in \Gamma(\{i\})} \sum_{(u,v) \in E} \mathbf{x}_u, \quad i \in [N].$$

Define

$$D = \{i \in [N] : |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}'_i| \geq \epsilon/(4s)\},$$

then $|D| < s/8$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $|D| = s/8$, or we replace D with a subset of size exactly $s/8$. Also assume that $|\mathbf{x}_1| \geq |\mathbf{x}_2| \geq \dots \geq |\mathbf{x}_n|$. Suppose that $|\mathbf{x}_i| \geq \epsilon/(2s)$ for all $i \in H := \text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$, otherwise we can place the violated i 's into \mathbf{z} , causing $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1$ to increase by at most $s \cdot \epsilon/(2s) = \epsilon/2$, so we would have $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 \leq 2$. Let $T = H \cup D \cup \{i : |\mathbf{x}_i| \geq \epsilon/(4s)\}$, then $t := |T| \leq \|\mathbf{z}\|_1 / (\epsilon/(4s)) + |D| + |H| \leq 9s/\epsilon$.

Note that $|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}| \leq \epsilon/(4s)$. Taking $\alpha = 2$ in Lemma 22, we know that

$$\|(\Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{(t)}))_{\Gamma(H \cup D)}\|_1 \leq 4 \cdot \beta\epsilon d \left(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + 2s \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{4s} \right) \leq 8\beta\epsilon d.$$

By the isolation property, there are at most $\frac{9s}{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{144} = \frac{s}{16}$ elements in T which are not isolated in at least ζd nodes from other elements in T . This implies that at least $s/16$ elements in D are isolated in at least ζd nodes from other elements in T .

A decoy at position i receives at least $\epsilon/(4s)$ noise in at least $(1/2 - \zeta)d$ isolated nodes of $\Gamma(\{i\})$, hence in total, a decoy element receives at least $\epsilon(1/2 - \zeta)d/(4s)$ noise. Therefore the $s/16$ decoys overall should receive noise at least

$$\frac{\epsilon(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta)d}{4s} \cdot \frac{s}{16} > 8\beta\epsilon d \geq \|(\Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{(t)}))_{\Gamma(H \cup D)}\|_1,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $|D| < s/8$. \square

Remark 24. Despite the fact that we have specified various constants (such as $4, \frac{1}{512}, 9$, etc) in the lemma above, the constants can be flexibly adjusted such that the number of decoys is at most ζs for any given small $\zeta > 0$ with appropriate choices of other constants.

Now we are ready to show Theorem 11.

Proof of Theorem 11. The proof is essentially the same as [19, Lemma 4]. It follows from Lemma 23 that with appropriate choices of constants, that there are at most $\zeta s/4$ decoys and at least $(1 - \zeta/4)s$ elements i in $\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$ satisfy $|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}'_i| \leq \eta/(4s)$. Let $I' = I \cap \text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$. We describe below the construction of $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \widehat{\mathbf{y}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$.

- Elements $i \in \text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ with a good estimate (to within $\pm\eta/(4s)$) contribute $\mathbf{x}_i - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i$ to $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$. There are at most s of these, each contributing $\eta/(4s)$, for total contribution $\eta/4$ to $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$.
- Elements $i \in \text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ with a bad estimate (not to within $\pm\eta/(4s)$) contribute $\mathbf{x}_i - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i$ to $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}$. There are at most $\zeta s/4$ of these.
- Elements $i \in \text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}) \setminus \text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ contribute \mathbf{x}_i to $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$. The ℓ_1 norm of these is at most $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1$.
- Elements $i \in I' \setminus \text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ with a good estimate that are nevertheless displaced by another element $i' \in \text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) \setminus \text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$ with a good estimate contribute to $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$. There are at most s of these. While the value \mathbf{x}_i may be large and make a large contribution to $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$, this is offset by $\mathbf{x}_{i'}$ satisfying $|\mathbf{x}_{i'}| \geq |\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i'}| - \eta/(4s) \geq |\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i| - \eta/(4s) \geq |\mathbf{x}_i| - \eta/(2s)$, which contributes to \mathbf{z} but not to $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$. Thus the net contribution to $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$ is at most $\eta/(2s)$ for each of the s of these i , for a total $\eta/2$ contribution to $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$.

- Elements $i \in I' \setminus \text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ that themselves have bad estimates or are displaced by elements with bad estimates contribute \mathbf{x}_i to $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}$. There are at most $\zeta s/4$ bad estimates overall, so there are at most $\zeta s/4$ of these.
- Elements $i \in I \setminus I'$ contribute to $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}$. There are at most $\zeta s/2$ of these.

It is clear that $|\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{y}})| \leq \zeta s$ and $\|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{z}\|_1 + \eta$, as desired. The runtime is easy to verify. \square

B One-layer Hashing Construction

Lemma 25 (expanding property). *For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1/4)$, $k \geq 1$, $\alpha \geq 1$ and $N = \Omega(\alpha k)$, a random one-layer (B, d) hashing scheme gives an $(\alpha k, \epsilon)$ bipartite expander with probability $\geq 1 - 1/N^c$, where $B = \Omega(\frac{\alpha k}{\epsilon})$ and $d = \Omega(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \log \frac{N}{k})$.*

Lemma 26 (isolation property). *For any $\epsilon, \zeta \in (0, 1/4)$, $k \geq 1$, $\alpha \geq 1$ and $N = \Omega(k/\epsilon)$, a random one-layer (B, d) hashing scheme gives a bipartite graph with (L, ϵ, ζ) -isolation property with probability $\geq 1 - 1/N^c$, where $B = \Omega(\frac{k}{\zeta \epsilon})$, $d = \Omega(\frac{1}{\zeta \epsilon} \log \frac{N}{k})$, $L = O(k/\epsilon)$.*

If we combine Lemma 25, Lemma 26 and Theorem 11, we have a clean formulation, in the language of expanders, of the result on weak system in [19].

B.1 Proof of Lemma 25

Proof. Let p_s be the probability of a fixed set of s elements hashed into less than $(1 - \epsilon)ds$ elements. By symmetry this probability is independent of the s positions and thus is well-defined. Hence the probability

$$\Pr\{\text{hashing does not give an expander}\} = \sum_{s=2}^{4k} \binom{N}{s} p_s. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Our goal is to show that

$$p_s \leq \exp\left(-cs \ln \frac{eN}{s}\right) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

for some absolute constant $c > 2$, for which it suffices to show that

$$p_s \leq \exp\left(-cs \ln \frac{N}{k} \ln \frac{Ck}{s}\right) \quad (\text{B.3})$$

for some $c, C > 0$. Indeed, it follows from (B.3) that

$$p_s \leq \exp\left(-cs \ln \frac{N}{k} \ln \frac{Ck}{s}\right) \leq \exp\left\{-cs \left(\ln \frac{N}{k} + \ln \frac{Ck}{s}\right)\right\} = \exp\left(-cs \ln \frac{CN}{s}\right)$$

and (B.2) holds. Assume for the moment that (B.2) is proved, then we can bound (B.1) to be

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=2}^{\alpha k} \binom{N}{s} p_s &\leq \sum_{s=2}^{\alpha k} \exp\left\{s \ln \frac{eN}{s} - cs \ln \frac{CN}{s}\right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{s=2}^{\alpha k} \exp\left\{-(c-1)s \ln \frac{C'N}{s}\right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{s=2}^{\alpha k} \exp(-(c-1)s \log N) < \frac{1}{N^{c'}} \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Now we compute p_s . Fix a set S of s elements. Suppose that they are hashed into X_i ($i = 1, \dots, d$) buckets in d repetitions, respectively. We have that $1 \leq X_i \leq s$ and $\sum X_i \leq (1 - \epsilon)sd$. Define the event

$$E_i(X_i) = \{S \text{ is hashed into } X_i \text{ rows in } i\text{-th repetition}\},$$

and we shall compute $\Pr\{E_i(X_i)\}$.

When E_i happens, there are $s - X_i$ repetitions. Consider we hash the element one by one, choosing $b_1, \dots, b_d \in \{1, \dots, B\}$ sequentially. We have a collision when selecting b_i if $b_i \in \{b_1, \dots, b_{i-1}\}$. The

probability that a collision occurs at step i , even conditioned on b_1, \dots, b_{i-1} , is at most $i/B \leq s/B$. Therefore,

$$\Pr\{E_i(X_i)\} \leq \binom{s}{s-X_i} \left(\frac{s}{B}\right)^{s-X_i}.$$

Hence

$$p_s = \sum \Pr\{E_1(X_1), \dots, E_d(X_d)\} = \sum \prod_{i=1}^d \binom{s}{s-X_i} \left(\frac{s}{B}\right)^{s-X_i} = \sum \left(\frac{s}{B}\right)^{sd-\sum X_i} \prod_{i=1}^d \binom{s}{s-X_i}$$

where the summation is over all possible configurations of $\{X_i\}$. Invoking the combinatorial identity

$$\sum_{k_1+k_2+\dots+k_m=n} \binom{r_1}{k_1} \binom{r_2}{k_2} \dots \binom{r_m}{k_m} = \binom{r_1+r_2+\dots+r_m}{n} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

and writing $X = \sum X_i$, we see that

$$p_s \leq \sum_{X=d}^{(1-\epsilon)sd} \left(\frac{s}{B}\right)^{sd-\sum X_i} \binom{sd}{sd-\sum X_i} \leq \sum_{X=\epsilon sd}^d \binom{sd}{X} \left(\frac{s}{B}\right)^X$$

Now we invoke Chernoff bound

$$\sum_{k=\epsilon n}^n \binom{n}{k} \lambda^k \leq \left(\frac{e\lambda}{\epsilon}\right)^{\epsilon n}, \quad \lambda < \epsilon \quad (\text{B.5})$$

to obtain that

$$p_s \leq \left(\frac{es}{\epsilon B}\right)^{\epsilon sd} \leq \exp\left(-cs \log \frac{N}{k} \ln \frac{Ck}{s}\right)$$

as desired, where the constants $c, C > 0$ can be made arbitrarily big. \square

B.2 Proof of Lemma 26

Proof. Let S be a set of size $s \leq L$. We shall bound the probability p_s (which is defined by symmetry) that at least ϵs elements of S collide with each other in at least ζd repetitions. When this happens, there are at least $\epsilon \zeta ds$ colliding element-repetition pairs. As in Lemma 25 it suffices to have (B.3) for some $c, C > 0$ that can be made arbitrarily large.

In one repetition, one element of S collide with others with probability $\leq s/B$. By a coupling argument as in [19], among all sd element-repetition pairs with expected $\mu = s^2 d/B$ failed pairs, there are at least $\zeta \epsilon sd$ failed pairs with probability

$$\left(\frac{\epsilon \mu}{\zeta \epsilon ds}\right)^{\zeta \epsilon sd} = \left(\frac{es}{\zeta \epsilon B}\right)^{\zeta \epsilon sd} \leq \exp\left(-cs \log \frac{N}{k} \ln \frac{Ck}{s}\right)$$

as desired, where the absolute constants $C, c > 0$ can be made arbitrary large. \square

C Proof of Lemma 12

Proof. Let p_s be the probability of a fixed set of s elements hashed into less than $(1-\epsilon)ds$ elements. By symmetry this probability is independent of the s positions and thus is well-defined. Hence the probability

$$\Pr\{\text{hashing does not give an expander}\} = \sum_{s=2}^{4k} \binom{N}{s} p_s. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Similarly to Lemma 25, it suffices to show that

$$p_s \leq \exp\left(-cs \ln \frac{N}{k}\right) \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Assume for the moment that this is proved, then we can bound (C.1) to be

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s=2}^{4k} \binom{N}{s} p_s &\leq \sum_{s=2}^{4k} \exp \left\{ s \ln \frac{eN}{s} - cs \ln \frac{N}{k} \right\} \\
&\leq \sum_{s=2}^{4k} \exp \left\{ s \ln(eN) - \frac{c}{2} s \ln(eN) \right\} \quad (k \leq \sqrt{N/e}) \\
&\leq \sum_{s=2}^{4k} \exp \left(- \left(\frac{c}{2} - 1 \right) s \log(eN) \right) < \frac{1}{N^{c'}}
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Now we prove (C.2). Fix a set S of s elements. The outer layer of hashing has d_1 blocks of size B_1 , and let Y_i ($i = 1, \dots, d_1$) be the number of hashed row of the s elements in i -th block. The inner layer has $d_1 d_2$ blocks, indexed by $(i, j)_{1 \leq i \leq d_1, 1 \leq j \leq d_2}$ of size B_2 , and let X_{ij} be the number of hashed row of the s elements in the (i, j) -th block. Define the events

$$E_i(Y_i) = \{S \text{ is hashed into } Y_i \text{ rows in } i\text{-th outer block}\}$$

$$E_{ij}(X_{ij}) = \{S \text{ hashed into } X_{ij} \text{ rows in } (i, j)\text{-th inner block}\}$$

First we calculate $\Pr\{E_i\}(Y_i)$. Consider we pick a row at one time for an element in S in order. When $E_i(Y_i)$ happens there are at least $s - Y_i$ collisions, hence

$$\Pr\{E_i(Y_i)\} \leq \binom{s}{s - Y_i} \left(\frac{s}{B_1} \right)^{s - Y_i}$$

and similarly

$$\Pr\{E_{ij}(X_{ij})|E_i(Y_i)\} \leq \binom{Y_i}{Y_i - X_{ij}} \left(\frac{Y_i}{B_2} \right)^{Y_i - X_{ij}}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
p_s &= \sum \Pr\{E_{11}(X_{11}), \dots, E_{d_1 d_2}(X_{d_1 d_2})|E_1(Y_1), \dots, E_{d_1}(Y_{d_1})\} \Pr\{E_1(Y_1), \dots, E_{d_1}(Y_{d_1})\} \\
&\leq \sum \prod_i \Pr\{E_i\}(Y_i) \prod_{i,j} \Pr\{E_{ij}(X_{ij})|E_i(Y_i)\} \\
&\leq \sum \prod_i \binom{s}{Y_i} \left(\frac{s}{B_1} \right)^{s - Y_i} \cdot \prod_{i,j} \binom{Y_i}{X_{ij}} \left(\frac{Y_i}{B_2} \right)^{Y_i - X_{ij}} \\
&\leq \sum \left(\frac{s}{B_1} \right)^{sd_1 - \sum Y_i} \left(\frac{s}{B_2} \right)^{d_2 \sum Y_i - \sum X_{ij}} \prod_i \binom{s}{Y_i} \prod_{i,j} \binom{Y_i}{X_{ij}}
\end{aligned}$$

where the summation is taken over all possible configurations of $\{X_i\}$ and $\{Y_i\}$ so that $s \geq Y_i \geq \max_j X_{ij}$ and $\sum X_{ij} \leq (1 - \epsilon)sd_1 d_2$.

Invoking the combinatorial equality (B.4) and letting $X = \sum X_{ij}$ and $Y = \sum Y_i$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
p_s &\leq \sum_{Y=d_1}^{sd_1} \binom{sd_1}{Y} \left(\frac{s}{B_1} \right)^{sd_1 - Y} \sum_{X=d_1 d_2}^{\min\{d_2 Y, (1-\epsilon)sd_1 d_2\}} \binom{d_2 Y}{X} \left(\frac{s}{B_2} \right)^{d_2 Y - X} \\
&\leq \sum_{Y=d_1}^{(1-\epsilon/2)sd_1} \binom{sd_1}{Y} \left(\frac{s}{B_1} \right)^{sd_1 - Y} \sum_{X=d_1 d_2}^{d_2 Y} \binom{d_2 Y}{X} \left(\frac{s}{B_2} \right)^{d_2 Y - X} \\
&\quad + \sum_{Y=(1-\epsilon/2)sd_1}^{sd_1} \binom{sd_1}{Y} \left(\frac{s}{B_1} \right)^{sd_1 - Y} \sum_{X=d_1 d_2}^{(1-\epsilon)sd_1 d_2} \binom{d_2 Y}{X} \left(\frac{s}{B_2} \right)^{d_2 Y - X} \\
&=: S_1 + S_2
\end{aligned} \tag{C.3}$$

We bound S_1 and S_2 separately. First,

$$S_1 \leq \sum_{Y=d_1}^{(1-\epsilon/2)sd_1} \binom{sd_1}{Y} \left(\frac{s}{B_1}\right)^{sd_1-Y} \left(1 + \frac{s}{B_2}\right)^{d_2 Y} \leq \left(1 + \frac{s}{B_2}\right)^{sd_1 d_2} \sum_{Y=\frac{\epsilon}{2}sd_1}^{sd_1} \binom{sd_1}{Y} \left(\frac{s}{B_1}\right)^Y$$

It follows from Chernoff bound (B.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\leq \left(1 + \frac{s}{B_2}\right)^{sd_1 d_2} \left(\frac{es}{\frac{\epsilon}{2}B_1}\right)^{\epsilon sd_1/2} \\ &\leq \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon sd_1 \left(\ln \frac{\epsilon B_1}{2es}\right) + sd_1 d_2 \ln\left(1 + \frac{s}{B_2}\right)\right\} \\ &\leq \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{4}\epsilon sd_1 \ln \frac{B_1}{k} + c_2 \epsilon sd_1 d_2\right\} \quad (\text{since } B_1 \gtrsim k/\epsilon^2) \\ &\leq \exp\left\{-c_3 s \ln \frac{N}{k}\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{C.4}$$

where the absolute constant $c_2 > 0$ can be made arbitrarily close to 0 and the absolute constant c_3 can be made arbitrarily large.

Now we bound S_2 . When $Y \geq (1 - \epsilon/2)sd_1$ then

$$\frac{(1 - \epsilon)sd_1 d_2}{d_2 Y} \leq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Again invoking Chernoff bound,

$$\sum_{X=d_1 d_2}^{(1-\epsilon)sd_1 d_2} \binom{d_2 Y}{X} \left(\frac{s}{B_2}\right)^{d_2 Y - X} \leq \left(\frac{es}{\frac{\epsilon}{2}B_2}\right)^{d_2 Y - (1-\epsilon)sd_1 d_2} \leq \left(\frac{s}{C'k}\right)^{d_2 Y - (1-\epsilon)sd_1 d_2}$$

where $C' > 0$ is an absolute constant which can be made arbitrarily large. So

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &\leq \sum_{Y=(1-\epsilon/2)sd_1}^{sd_1} \binom{sd_1}{Y} \left(\frac{s}{B_1}\right)^{sd_1-Y} \left(\frac{s}{C'k}\right)^{\epsilon sd_1 d_2/2} \\ &\leq \sum_{Y=0}^{(\epsilon/2)sd_1} \binom{sd_1}{Y} \left(\frac{s}{B_1}\right)^Y \left(\frac{s}{C'k}\right)^{\epsilon sd_1 d_2/2} \\ &\leq 2 \left(\frac{s}{C'k}\right)^{\epsilon sd_1 d_2/2} \end{aligned}$$

It immediately follows, similarly to upper-bounding S_1 , that

$$S_2 \leq \exp\left\{-c_4 s \ln \frac{N}{k} \ln \frac{C'k}{s}\right\}, \tag{C.5}$$

where $c_4 > 0$ can be made arbitrarily large. Plugging (C.4) and (C.5) into (C.3) we see that (C.2) holds. This completes the proof. \square

D Proof of Lemma 14

Proof. Fix a set S of size s . Let event \mathcal{E} be that at least $(1 - \epsilon/2)s$ elements in S are isolated in at least $(1 - \zeta/2)d_1$ first-layer buckets. Similarly to Lemma 26 we know that

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{E}^c\} \leq \left(\frac{c's}{\zeta \epsilon B_1}\right)^{\zeta \epsilon s d_1} \leq e^{-cs \log \frac{N}{k}}$$

where c' is an absolute constant and $c > 0$ can be made arbitrarily large. In the above we used that fact that since $B_1 = \Omega(k/(\zeta^\alpha \epsilon^{2\alpha}))$ it holds that

$$\ln \frac{\zeta \epsilon^2 B_1}{c_1 k} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \ln \frac{B_1}{k}.$$

Conditioned on the event \mathcal{E} . Among the $(1 - \epsilon/2)s$ elements we shall show that at least $(1 - \epsilon)$ of them are

isolated in at least $(1 - \zeta)d_1d_2$ second-layer buckets. That means, there are a total of at least $\frac{\epsilon}{2} \frac{\eta}{2} sd_1d_2$ failed element-repetitions. But now, the probability of each collision is always bounded by s/B_2 even conditioned on previous outcomes, and we can proceed as in Lemma 26 to conclude that there are at least $\theta\zeta\epsilon sd_1d_2$ (for some absolute constant θ) with probability at most

$$\left(\frac{es}{\theta\zeta\epsilon B_2} \right)^{\theta\zeta\epsilon sd_1d_2} \leq e^{-c''s \log \frac{N}{k}},$$

as desired, where the constant $c'' > 0$ can be made arbitrarily large. \square

E Proof of Lemma 17

Proof. As an outer code, use Reed-Solomon over an alphabet of size $\beta/\log \beta$. This is concatenated with a random code of length $\log \beta$ as an inner code. The inner code can be decoded in constant time from a lookup table of size β and the outer code can be decoded by solving a linear system of size approximately β in time $O(\beta^2)$. To encode the β bits of the inner code, proceed as follows.

To encode a single bit $b \in \{0, 1\}$, replace each row ρ of Φ with a 2-by- N submatrix. In column i of ρ , replace each 1 with a height-two column $\begin{pmatrix} \rho_i \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ or $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \rho_i \end{pmatrix}$ depending on b . For decoding in the presence of noise, consider any $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$ to be a *relaxed* encoding equivalent to $\begin{pmatrix} \rho_i \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ if $|a| > |b|$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \rho_i \end{pmatrix}$ otherwise. Replace each 0 with a height-2 column of zeros.

Overall we use a Weak system (Theorem 11) with a $(\Theta(k), O(1))$ bipartite expander that exhibits a $(\Theta(k), d)$ hashing scheme, where $d = \Theta(\log(B/k))$. We know that there exist $\Omega(k)$ heavy hitters, each dominates the buckets where it lands in $\Omega(d)$ repetitions. In each such repetition, our bit encoding scheme ensures that the associated bit can be recovered successfully, hence for each of such heavy hitter, we shall collect $\Omega(d)$ bits, enough to recover the message of β bits.

The runtime is $O(B\beta^2 \log(B/k))$ for exhaustive recovery in the Weak system. \square

F Proof of Lemma 18

Proof. Combining Lemma 12 and Lemma 14, one can show that there exists an $(4s, \epsilon)$ -expander such that

- (a) the expander exhibits a (B_1, d_1, B_2, d_2) hashing structure, where the parameters are as in Lemma 14;
- (b) the expander satisfies the $(O(s/\epsilon), O(\epsilon), O(1))$ -isolation property;

As in the proof of Lemma 23, suppose that $|x_i| \geq \epsilon/s$ for all $i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$, otherwise we can place the violated i 's into \mathbf{z} , causing $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1$ to increase by at most $s \cdot \epsilon/s = \epsilon$, so we would have $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 \leq 2$. Call the elements in $\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$ heavy hitters. If $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})| \leq s/8$ our goal is automatically achieved, so we assume that $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})| > s/8$.

Step 1. Overall we know from Remark 24 that we have at most $s/8$ decoys, or, we can recover $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})| - s/8$ heavy hitters from the second-layer bucket values, where successful recovery means that each of them dominates in at least $\alpha_2 d_1 d_2$ second-layer buckets, i.e., the bucket noise is at most $\nu = \epsilon/(2s)$. For each of them, in at least $\beta_1 d_1$ of d_1 outer repetitions, it dominates in at least $\beta_2 d_2$ inner repetitions, where $(1 - \beta_1)(1 - \beta_2) > 1 - \alpha_2$. Because whenever an element dominates in the second-layer bucket, it must dominate the first-layer bucket incident to that second-layer bucket, we conclude that there exists a set $S \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$, $|S| \geq |\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})| - s/8$, such that each $i \in S$ dominates at least $\beta_1 d_1$ first-layer buckets among all d_1 repetitions, and in each of such repetitions, it dominates at least $\beta_2 d_2$ second-layer buckets.

We can choose the hidden constants in the expander parameters such that $\beta_1 \geq 1 - \zeta$ and β_2 matches the error tolerance of the coding scheme we described in Lemma 17, where ζ is the parameter we set in Section 4.1.

Step 2. It follows from above that each $i \in S$ will be recovered in at least $\beta_1 d_1$ outer repetitions, since its bucket value is $\geq \epsilon/s - \nu \geq \epsilon/(2s)$. Indeed, in every repetition of outer hashing, we collect top $O(s/\epsilon)$ (first-layer) buckets, so we will include every bucket with value $\geq \epsilon/(2s)$, and thus the heavy hitter i . In this case, the message associated with the heavy hitter will be recovered correctly, as the inner encoding can

tolerate $1 - \beta_2$ fraction of error. Therefore we know that for each $i \in S$, the associated messages will be correctly recovered in $\beta_1 d_1$ outer repetitions.

Step 3. As described in the previous section, we shall form a graph \tilde{G} . Note that for $i \in S$, $\beta_1 d_1$ nodes in the column are good nodes (i.e., with correct message). For each of them, perform a breadth-first search of $O(\log_\delta d_1)$ steps, collecting at most d_1^c nodes. Since the column contains at most $(1 - \beta)d_1 \leq \zeta d_1$ bad nodes, by Theorem 5 and Property (d) of our choices of parameters, there exists a good node in the i -th column such that if we perform a breadth-first search of $c \log_\delta d_1$ steps, we shall collect αd_1 good nodes which are all in the i -th column. The Parvaresh-Vardy code with our choice of parameters (Property (b) and (c)) enables us to include it in the list. We shall briefly describe the decoding below. Having collected at most d_1^c points $(x, r(x)) \in \mathbb{F}^{m+1}$, we consider all polynomials $Q(x, y_0, \dots, y_{m-1})$ of degree at most $d_X = \alpha d_1 - (h-1)m \log_{B_1} N$ in its first variable and at most $h-1$ in each such that $Q(x, r(x)) = 0$ for all i . Our choice of parameters (Property (c), i.e., $d_X h^m > d_1^c$) guarantees that such Q exists. Then, the existence of αd_1 good nodes (in the BFS visited nodes) indicates that the equation

$$Q(x, f_i(x), (f_i^h \bmod E)(x), \dots, (f_i^{h^{m-1}} \bmod E)(x)) = 0$$

has αd_1 roots in \mathbb{F} for f_i corresponding to the coordinate $i \in S$. By our choice of parameters (Property (b)), the univariate polynomial $Q(x)$ has degree less than αd_1 and must be identically zero. This means that $f_i(x)$ is a root of $Q^*(z) = Q(x, z, z^h, \dots, z^{h^{m-1}}) = 0$ over $\mathbb{F}[x]/E(x)$. We can find f_i by factoring Q^* and thus recover the position i of the heavy hitter.

In the end, our candidate list will contain all $i \in S$, that is, we shall have recovered $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})| - s/8$ heavy hitters.

Number of Measurements. The number of measurements is $O(B_2 d_1 d_2) = O(\epsilon^{-2} s \log(N/s))$.

Size of Look-up Table. The inner decoding uses a look-up table of size $O(\log B_1) = O(\frac{s}{\epsilon} + \log \log \frac{N}{s})$. The algorithm also stores the expander graph G , which takes space $O(d_1)$. Both are smaller than the space cost of the recovered graph $O(sd_1/\epsilon)$, so their contribution to the space complexity can be neglected.

Runtime. For each of d_1 repetitions, we shall recover every bucket with value $\geq \epsilon/(2s)$ in $O(B_1 \log^3(B_1/k)) = O(s^{1+\beta} \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$ time. There are $O(s/\epsilon)$ of them in each repetition. Then we form a graph of size $O(sd_1/\epsilon)$. Forming this graph takes time $O(s^{1+\beta} \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$ from the argument above. Then we do breadth-first search of $c \log_\delta d_1$ steps on every node. Each BFS takes $O(d_1^c)$ time. Each decoding of the BFS nodes takes $\text{poly}(d_1, \log |B_1|) = \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon)$ time, and can be done deterministically (see, e.g., [3, Theorem 4.3]), since $|\mathbb{F}|$ has a small characteristic. Hence extracting heavy hitters i from the recovered graph \tilde{G}_N takes time $O(s \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$ and therefore, the overall runtime is $O(s^{1+\beta} \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$. In the end, we shall obtain a candidate list of size $O(s \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$. \square

G Proof of Theorem 20

Proof. Suppose that in Lemma 18, the exponent of $1/\epsilon$ in runtime is $c = c(\beta, \gamma) > 2$. Choose $\alpha < 1$ such that $\alpha^c > 1/2$.

Using Lemma 18 for identification and Theorem 11 for estimation, with appropriate choice of constants, we claim that at the beginning of the j -th step, $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}$, where $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})| \leq k/2^j$ and

$$\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 \leq 1 + \epsilon(1 + \alpha + \alpha^2 + \dots + \alpha^{j-1}).$$

We shall prove this claim by induction. Letting $s = k/2^j$, $\eta = \epsilon(1 - \alpha)\alpha^j$ for identification, which introduces at most η into the tail and the tail remains at most $3/2$ by assuming that all head items, i.e., the non-zero elements in \mathbf{y} , are all larger than η/s .

The identification procedure returns a candidate I that contains $3/4$ fraction of $\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$ (note that when the head is flat, we can change $\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$ to be a superset that satisfies this condition without changing the norm of \mathbf{z}). Then the estimation procedure, with $s = O(k/2^j)$ and $\eta = \epsilon\alpha^{j+1}$ will give us

$$\mathbf{x} = \widehat{\mathbf{x}} + \widehat{\mathbf{y}} + \widehat{\mathbf{z}},$$

Algorithm 3 Toplevel System

Input: $\Phi, \Phi \mathbf{x}, N, k, \epsilon$ **Output:** $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$ $\widehat{\mathbf{x}} \leftarrow 0$ $\mu \leftarrow \Phi \mathbf{x}$ **for** $j \leftarrow 0$ to $\log k$ **do**Run Algorithm 1 on μ with length N , $s \leftarrow k/2^j$, $\eta \leftarrow \frac{\epsilon}{\gamma^j(1-\gamma)}$ and obtain a candidate list I Run Algorithm 2 on candidate set I with $s \leftarrow k/2^j$ and $\eta \leftarrow \epsilon \gamma^j$ Let \mathbf{x}' be the result $\widehat{\mathbf{x}} \leftarrow \widehat{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{x}'$ $\mu \leftarrow \mu - \Phi \mathbf{x}'$ **end for****return** $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$

where $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{x})| = O(s)$, $|\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{y}})| \leq s/2$ and

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{z}\|_1 + \epsilon(1-\alpha)\alpha^j + \alpha^{j+1} = \|\mathbf{z}\|_1 + \alpha^j.$$

It is easy to verify that $\|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}\|_1 \leq 1 + \epsilon/(1-\alpha) = O(1)$ and thus Lemma 18 for identification and Theorem 11 can be applied at the next round and the inductive hypothesis is satisfied. Therefore, in the end we shall obtain that

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{1-\alpha}\right) \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_k\|_1.$$

The number of measurements used for identification is

$$O\left(\sum_j \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 \alpha^{2j}} \cdot \frac{k}{2^j} \log \frac{N}{\frac{k}{2^j}}\right) = O\left(\frac{k}{\epsilon^2} \sum_j \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha^2}\right)^j \left(j + \log \frac{N}{k}\right)\right) = O\left(\frac{k}{\epsilon^2} \log \frac{N}{k}\right)$$

and the number of measurements used for estimation is

$$O\left(\sum_j \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 \alpha^j} \cdot \frac{k}{2^j} \log \frac{N}{\frac{k}{2^j}}\right) = O\left(\frac{k}{\epsilon^2} \sum_j \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha}\right)^j \left(j + \log \frac{N}{k}\right)\right) = O\left(\frac{k}{\epsilon^2} \log \frac{N}{k}\right)$$

hence the total number of measurements is $O(\epsilon^{-2} k \log(N/k))$ as claimed.It can be verified in a similar way that total runtime is $O(k^{1+\beta} \text{poly}(\log N, 1/\epsilon))$.Finally, replacing ϵ with $(1-\alpha)\epsilon$ completes the proof. □