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ABSTRACT

DISTRIBUTED SPARSE SIGNAL RECOVERY IN NETWORKED SYSTEMS

By Puxiao Han, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2016.

Advisor: Ruixin Niu, Ph.D.,
Assistant Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

In this dissertation, two classes of distributed algorithms are developed for sparse signal recovery in large sensor networks. All the proposed approaches consist of local computation (LC) and global computation (GC) steps carried out by a group of distributed local sensors, and do not require the local sensors to know the global sensing matrix. These algorithms are based on the original approximate message passing (AMP) and iterative hard thresholding (IHT) algorithms in the area of compressed sensing (CS), also known as sparse signal recovery. For distributed AMP (DiAMP), we develop a communication-efficient algorithm GCAMP. Numerical results demonstrate that it outperforms the modified thresholding algorithm (MTA), another popular GC algorithm for Top-K query from distributed large databases.

For distributed IHT (DIHT), there is a step size $\mu$ which depends on the $\ell_2$ norm of the global sensing matrix $\mathbf{A}$. The exact computation of $\|\mathbf{A}\|_2$ is non-separable. We propose a new method, based on the random matrix theory (RMT), to give a very tight statistical upper bound on $\|\mathbf{A}\|_2$, and the calculation of that upper bound is separable without any communication cost. In the GC step of DIHT, we develop an-
other algorithm named GC.K, which is also communication-efficient and outperforms MTA. Then, by adjusting the metric of communication cost, which enables transmission of quantized data, and taking advantage of the correlation of data in adjacent iterations, we develop quantized adaptive GCAMP (Q-A-GCAMP) and quantized adaptive GC.K (Q-A-GC.K) algorithms, leading to a significant improvement on communication savings.

Furthermore, we prove that state evolution (SE), a fundamental property of AMP that in high dimensionality limit, the output data are asymptotically Gaussian regardless of the distribution of input data, also holds for DiAMP. In addition, compared with the most recent theoretical results that SE holds for sensing matrices with independent subgaussian entries, we prove that the universality of SE can be extended to far more general sensing matrices. These two theoretical results provide strong guarantee of AMP’s performance, and greatly broaden its potential applications.
1.1 An Overview of Compressed Sensing

Compressed sensing (CS) [1, 2, 3, 4] has wide applications in various areas of signal processing, such as multimedia processing [5, 6, 7], power systems [8, 9, 10], signal detection [11, 12, 13], and manifold learning [14, 15], etc.

Given a sparse $N$-dimensional signal $s_0$ which has at most $K$ non-zero components (we say $s_0$ is $K$-sparse, or the sparsity level of $s_0$ is $K$), and a sensing matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, we can obtain $M$ measurements composing the vector

$$y = As_0 + e,$$

where $e$ is an additive noise. Recovery of $s_0$ from $y$ and $A$ turns out to be solving the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\|x\|_0 \leq K} \|y - Ax\|_2^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.2)

Typically, solving (1.2) is a NP-hard problem. However, if $A$ is a matrix with entries being independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables drawn from a sub-Gaussian distribution and $M = O\left(K \log \frac{N}{K}\right)$, then with a very high probability, restricted isometry property (RIP) [16] will be satisfied [17], and $s_0$ can be reconstructed with high accuracy by solving the least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) problem [18]:

$$\min_x \frac{1}{2}\|y - Ax\|_2^2 + \lambda\|x\|_1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.3)

where $\lambda > 0$ is called the regularization parameter and needs to be tuned if the
sparsity level $K$ is not known in advance. In the rest of this dissertation, we assume that all entries of $A$ are i.i.d. random variables following $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/M)$.

1.2 Applications of CS

1.2.1 Power Systems

In power systems, each entry of the state vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ depicts the voltage phase angle of the corresponding bus, and the control center monitors the system by taking measurement of $x$ using the so-called measurement Jacobian matrix $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$:

$$z = Hx + n$$

(1.4)

Unlike network traffic systems, the measurement model in (1.4) is over-complete, i.e., $m \geq n$. Anomaly in power systems is typically defined as a false vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ injected onto the measurement domain by some malicious users, which may cause the control center obtaining a wrong estimate of $x$.

According to [8] and [20], traditional statistical tests will fail to detect a malicious attack if there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$a = Hc$$

(1.5)

Due to limited resources and other constraints of the malicious users, it is reasonable to assume that $a$ is sparse. In [8], the authors proposed a targeted attack model, in which the attackers can only control a subset of entries in $c$, say $c_\mathcal{L} := \{c_i, i \in \mathcal{L}\}$. Given $c_\mathcal{L}$, the object of the attackers is to find a sparse $a$ such that (1.5) holds, which can be formulated as a $\ell_1$ or LASSO optimization problem.

In [9] a different model named strategic sparse attacks was proposed. Instead of an assumption on the controllability on the state domain $[n]$, this model divided
the measurement domain $[m]$ into two parts $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{S}$, where the attackers can only inject data in $a_{\mathcal{A}}$, i.e., $a_{\mathcal{S}} = 0$. The attackers then seek a vector $c$ minimizing $\|a_{\mathcal{A}}\|_0$ subject to $a_{\mathcal{S}} = 0$ and $\|c\|_{\infty} \geq \tau$, where $\tau > 0$ is some predefined constant.

In [10], these two models were summarized and their corresponding optimization problems were solved by using Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) algorithm [21]. Distributed optimization strategies for attackers and estimation algorithms for system protectors were also proposed in [10].

1.2.2 Video Anomaly Detection

In trajectory-based video monitoring systems, there are $K$ pre-built dictionaries $D_1, D_2, \cdots, D_K \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$, where each column of $D_k$ is a training sample labeled as the $k$-th type of trajectories [6, 7, 22]. For example, in a road traffic scenario, we can redefine $K$ types of driving behaviors: legal/illegal straight, legal/illegal right turn, legal/illegal left turn, and legal/illegal U-turn, etc., and collect $n$ sample trajectories for each category to build $D_k$’s. A testing trajectory $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is then approximated as a linear combination of columns in $D := [D_1, D_2, \cdots, D_K]$, that is,

$$y \approx Dx,$$

(1.6)

where $x$ is called a representation of $y$ on $D$. Moreover, if we design $D$ properly, we can have a sparse vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^{Kn}$, which means that the dictionary is very comprehensive so that any normal $y$ can be well “indexed” by very few items in it. Finding a sparse
\( \mathbf{x} \) satisfying (1.6) is a typical CS recovery problem. In [6], upon finding

\[
\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{x}_1 \\
\hat{x}_2 \\
\vdots \\
\hat{x}_K
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(1.7)

where \( \hat{x}_k = [\hat{x}_{k,1}, \cdots, \hat{x}_{k,n}]^T \) is the vector of coefficients corresponding to the \( k \)-th category, a residual \( r_k \) is calculated for each \( k \):

\[
r_k = \| \mathbf{y} - D_k \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k \|_2,
\]

and \( \mathbf{y} \) is classified as the category corresponding to the minimal residual. If it falls into a category that is labeled abnormal, then we have a detection.

In [7], multiobject trajectory anomaly detection was proposed that exploits the interaction among multiple objects. For example, in a scenario where two moving vehicles are present, if both drivers drive carefully and follow the rules, then the trajectories of the two cars are all smooth and normal; however, if one car drives on a wrong way, then it may force an oncoming vehicle make a sudden change in direction, which leads both cars in an anomalous pattern. Mathematically, this can be formulated as a joint-sparsity structure, that is, for multiple trajectories \( \mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{y}_P \) in one scenario, their sparse representations \( \mathbf{x}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{x}_P \) under \( D \) shares a common support. Denote \( \mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{y}_P] \) and \( \mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{x}_P] \), the following \( \ell_2 - \ell_0 \) optimization problem was formulated to recover \( \mathbf{X} \):

\[
\min \| \mathbf{X} \|_{2,0} \\
\text{s.t.} \| \mathbf{Y} - D \mathbf{X} \|_F \leq \epsilon,
\]

(1.9)

which is a common structured CS problem and has many existing solvers.
1.2.3 Manifold Learning

In the context of manifold-based compressed sensing (CS), a sparse signal means that it is in a low-dimensional manifold of a high-dimensional domain. In [3] and [14], the properties of manifold-based CS were analyzed theoretically. In [15], a mixture of factor analyzers (MFA) [23, 24] was applied to model manifolds with low intrinsic dimension. The authors modeled a manifold as a finite mixture of Gaussians with low-rank covariance matrices. The intuition of this model is straightforward geometrically, in the sense that the contour of distribution of a manifold can be well approximated a collection of flat ellipsoids — in statistics, a ellipsoids corresponds to a multivariate Gaussian distribution, and the flatness indicates that the covariance matrix is low-rank. In their paper, they drew $n$ samples $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ from a manifold $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ as the training data, and built a mixture low-rank Gaussian prior $p(x)$, where the number of mixtures and the rank of the Gaussian covariance matrices are inferred by non-parametric Bayesian approaches in [25] and [26]. Then, given a CS measurement of a vector $x \in \Omega$, which is $y = \Phi x + \nu$, where $\Phi$ is the sensing matrix and $\nu$ is a zero-mean Gaussian noise, the likelihood $p(y|x)$ can be easily obtained in a closed form. With $p(x)$ and $p(y|x)$ available, the posterior distribution $p(x|y)$ can be inferred by the Bayes’ rule.

1.3 Motivation of Distributed CS

In spite of its strength in dimensionality reduction, it is still demanding to perform CS on a single processor with limited memory and computational power when $N$ and $M$ are large. This urges the emergence of distributed CS (DCS), due to its nature of dividing and allocating large memory burden into a network of sensors, and its potential of speeding up the CS recovery process [27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32].
In the literature, the term DCS may refer to two kinds of systems: one is linked to joint sparsity \([33, 34, 35, 36]\), where \(P\) nodes take measurements of \(P\) correlated signals \(\{s^p_0\}_{p=1}^P\); in the other system, all the nodes in the network take measurements of a common \(s_0\) \([37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42]\), and the goal is to develop a distributed approach with the same accuracy as the centralized setting, that is, single-processor setting.

For the former, each node has a sensing matrix \(A^p\) with enough rows such that the restricted isometry property (RIP) \([16]\) is satisfied, and can perform signal recovery individually, although collaboration will further improve the recovery performance.

On the other hand, the latter can be viewed as a distributed version of a centralized system, where the row-combination of all the \(P\) sensing matrices \(A^p\), is equivalent to a global sensing matrix \(A\) in centralized CS satisfying RIP. It is a typical assumption that each individual sensor has limited memory so that it cannot store the entire global sensing matrix.

In our work, we focus on the second DCS system, which contains two parts: (1) the local computation (LC) performed at each sensor, and (2) the global computation (GC) to obtain the estimate of the original sparse signal after sensors exchange the results of local computation. Among many efforts on the distributed computation, optimization, and network topology \([37, 38]\) in DCS, only a few have been spent on addressing the communication issue in the GC step \([40, 43, 41]\).

We are particularly interested in one category of CS recovery algorithms, where in every iteration \(t\) we have a sparse estimate \(x_t\) of \(s_0\), a residual or innovation \(z_t \in \mathbb{R}^M\) in the measurement domain, and a predetermined step size \(\mu_t\), based on which we can obtain a new estimate \(x_{t+1}\) of \(s_0\) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
 f_t &= x_t + \mu_t A^T z_t, \\
 x_{t+1} &= \eta_t(f_t),
\end{align*}
\]
where $[,]^T$ denotes transposition, and $\eta_t$ is some predefined thresher, for example, the hard thresher in $[44, 45]$, and the soft thresher applied in $[46, 47]$. The reason we find these algorithms appealing is that we can develop DCS approaches based on them with a small communication cost and exactly the same recovery result as the centralized CS algorithms. As will be shown later, $f_t$ in (1.10) can be expressed as the summation of $P$ vectors $w^p_t$, where each $w^p_t$ can be calculated by the $p$-th sensor without communication. Due to the thresholding process in (1.11), it is not necessary to compute all the elements in $f_t$ to obtain $x_{t+1}$, which indicates that each sensor does not need to send the whole vector $w^p_t$ to the fusion center in the GC step, hence yielding an amount of communication saving.

More specifically, in a DCS framework, the hard thresholding applied in $[44, 45]$ can be modeled as an extension of Top-$K$ problems $[48, 49]$ in the field of distributed database querying, where there are $P$ distributed agents indexed by $p \in \{1, \cdots, P\}$ and $N$ objects indexed by $n \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$, with each object $n$ having $P$ partial scores $S^p(n)$'s distributed on the $P$ sensors, and the object is to find the top $K$ total scores $S(n) = \sum_{p=1}^{P} S^p(n)$ as well as the corresponding object indices with a minimum communication cost. On the other hand, the soft thresholding applied in $[46, 47]$ can be modeled as a similar problem, which we name Top-$\beta$ problem and is to find all the total scores with magnitudes greater than a threshold $\beta$ as well as the corresponding object indices in pursuit of the highest communication savings.

Throughout the dissertation, we use bold capital letters to denote matrices and bold lower-case letters to denote vectors. $[,]^T$ denotes matrix or vector transposition. $v(k)$ denotes the $k$-th component of the vector $v$, $\mathcal{T}_K(v)$ returns its $K$-th largest absolute element, $S(v) = \{k : v(k) \neq 0\}$ denotes its support set, and $\|v\|_0$ denotes $|S(v)|$, where $|\cdot|$ on a set means its cardinality. $A \setminus B$ denotes the set difference between sets $A$ and $B$. $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, \cdots, n\}$. For $\Omega = \{n_1, \cdots, n_d\} \subset $
\( [n], \mathbf{v}(\Omega) \) denotes \([\mathbf{v}(n_1), \cdots, \mathbf{v}(n_d)]^T\); \( \mathbf{W}(\Omega, :) \) and \( \mathbf{W}( :, \Omega) \) denote the rows and columns of the matrix \( \mathbf{W} \), specified by \( \Omega \) respectively. The sign function is defined as \( \text{sgn}(x) \triangleq x/|x| \) if \( x \neq 0 \) and 0 otherwise; indicator function \( \mathbb{I}(\text{STATEMENT}) = 1 \) if the boolean \( \text{STATEMENT} \) is true and 0 otherwise, and \( \mathbb{I}_S(x) \) means \( \mathbb{I}(x \in S) \). \( \mathbb{E} \) denotes the expectation of a random variable, \( \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2) \) denotes the normal (Gaussian) distribution with mean \( \mu \) and variance \( \sigma^2 \). For \( Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \), \( \Phi(z) \triangleq \Pr\{Z \leq z\} \) and \( \phi(z) \triangleq d\Phi(z)/dz \) denote its cumulative distribution function (CDF) and probability density function (PDF) respectively, \( Q(z) \triangleq 1 - \Phi(z) \) denotes the right tail probability \( \Pr\{Z > z\} \) and \( z_\alpha \triangleq Q^{-1}(\alpha) \).
CHAPTER 2

DCS BASED ON APPROXIMATE MESSAGE PASSING

2.1 Introduction

Different from traditional CS recovery algorithms such as convex relaxation [50, 51], greedy pursuit [52, 53, 54], and iterative thresholding [46, 55, 44, 45], etc., approximate message passing (AMP) [47] is a statistical algorithm derived from the theory of probabilistic graphical models (PGM) [56]. The reason we choose AMP as a basic algorithm for developing DCS is that it is analytically convenient due to its state evolution (SE) formalism, as will be shown later in this chapter.

Instead of focusing on network topologies varying from applications, we are trying to propose some “universal” efficient data querying algorithms in the GC step of DiAMP. To this end, we assume a network of \( P \) sensors where Sensors 2 to \( P \) are connected to the fusion center Sensor 1, for better illustration of the proposed algorithms. We also assume that each individual sensor has limited memory, so that it cannot store the entire global sensing matrix, which has been assumed in [40, 43, 41]. In the LC step, each sensor only performs simple matrix operations, and in the GC step where communication cost is induced, we propose a algorithm named GC of DiAMP (GCAMP), to reduce the amount of data transmitted in the sensor network. Based on GCAMP, we take into consideration the correlation of data between adjacent iterations and incorporate quantization and propose a more sophisticated approach named quantized adaptive GCAMP (Q-A-GCAMP), which comes close to requiring the minimum bit rates.

In the rest of the chapter, we will give a brief review on AMP in Section 2.2, and
then present the framework of DiAMP and GCAMP algorithm in Section 2.3. An improved version of GCAMP, A-GCAMP is presented in Section 2.4, which is further improved by Q-A-GCAMP in Section 2.5. The proposed algorithms are evaluated in Section 2.6 and the dissertation is concluded in Section 2.7.

2.2 Overview of AMP

2.2.1 Centralized AMP

AMP starts from an initial estimate \( x_0 = 0 \) and residual \( z_0 = y \), and proceeds as follows:

\[
f_t = x_t + A^T z_t,
\]

\[
x_{t+1} = \eta(f_t; \tau \sigma_t),
\]

\[
z_{t+1} = y - A x_{t+1} + \frac{||x_{t+1}||_0}{M} z_t,
\]

where the square of \( \sigma_t \), namely \( \sigma_t^2 = \mathbb{E}\{||f_t - s_0||^2/N\} \) is the component-wise mean square error (MSE) of \( f_t \), and is often replaced by its estimate \( \hat{\sigma}_t^2 = ||z_t||^2/M \) since \( s_0 \) is unknown \cite{57, 58}, \( \tau \) is a tunable parameter, and \( \eta(x; \beta) \) is a component-wise soft thresholding function and returns \( u \in \mathbb{R}^N \) with the \( i \)-th component computed by

\[
u(i) = \text{sgn}(x(i))I(|x(i)| > \beta)|x(i)| - \beta).
\]

Define \( \kappa = M/N \) and \( \rho = K/M \), and assume that each component of \( s_0 \) comes from an i.i.d. source \( S_0 \) with unknown distribution. In the large system limit, that is, with \( N \to \infty \) and \( \kappa, \rho \) keeping constant, each component in \( f_t - s_0 \) is i.i.d. Gaussian with mean 0 and variance \( \sigma_t^2 \), where \( \sigma_t^2 \) follows the State Evolution (SE) equation \cite{47, 57, 58}:

\[10\]
\[ \sigma_{t+1}^2 = \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{s}_0 \right\|^2 \right] \frac{1}{N} \]

\[ = \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathbb{E} \left[ \eta(S_0 + \sigma_t Z; \tau \sigma_t) - S_0 \right]^2, \quad (2.5) \]

where \( \sigma^2 \) is the variance of the noise \( \mathbf{e} \) in (1.1) and \( Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1) \).

Compared with RIP-based deterministic approaches, AMP has the following advantages:

1) The SE equation in AMP enables us to predict the recovery performance analytically in each iteration.

2) The soft thresholding denoiser in (2.4) is optimal in the minimax sense, i.e., it minimizes the recovery error in the worst-case scenario when the distribution of \( \mathbf{s}_0 \) is unknown. In the Bayesian framework, when the prior distribution of \( \mathbf{s}_0 \) is given, the denoiser can be replaced by the Minimum-Mean-Square-Error (MMSE) estimator, which is the conditional mean

\[ \mathbf{x}_{t+1}(n) = \eta(f_t(n); \sigma_t) \]

\[ = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{s}_0(n)|\mathbf{s}_0(n) + \sigma_t Z = f_t(n)\}, \quad (2.6) \]

and the SE still holds [58, 59, 60, 61].

2.2.2 Tuning of \( \tau \) in Centralized AMP

We adopt the tuning framework in [62] to determine \( \tau \), which inherits the idea of continuation from the area of optimization [63]. First, a candidate list of candidate values of \( \tau \), \( \{\tau_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L \) is generated. Then, for each candidate \( \tau_\ell \), we run iterations in (2.2) and (2.3) until \( \mathbf{x}_t \) and \( \sigma_t \) converge to \( \mathbf{x}_\ell^* \) and \( \hat{\sigma}_\ell^* \), and use them as the initial estimates for the iterations using the next candidate \( \tau_{\ell+1} \). Among all the \( L \) estimates \( \mathbf{x}_\ell^* \), we choose the one that corresponds to the minimal \( \hat{\sigma}_\ell^* \).

Since \( \tau \) is directly related to the sparsity level of the estimate \( \mathbf{x}_t \) — the larger \( \tau \) is, the more sparse \( \mathbf{x}_t \) becomes, and vice versa — we can determine the upper and
lower bounds on $\tau$, namely $\tau_{\text{max}}$ and $\tau_{\text{min}}$, due to this property. Note that at the beginning, $x_0 = 0$, $z_0 = y$, and $f_0 = A^T y$, if $\tau \geq \|f_0\|_\infty = \|A^T y\|_\infty/\hat{\sigma}_0$, then we will come to the zero solution. Therefore $\tau_{\text{max}} = \|f_0\|_\infty/\hat{\sigma}_0$. If we set the first candidate value $\tau_1 = \tau_{\text{max}}$, then we will still stay at the zero solution after the first iteration. To prevent it from happening, we set $\tau_1 = T_2(f_0)/\hat{\sigma}_0$, which is guaranteed to yield a non-zero solution $x_1$.

To determine $\tau_{\text{min}}$, notice that for a given $\kappa = M/N$, the most dense $s_0$ AMP can guarantee to recover is with the sparsity level $N\kappa \rho(\kappa)$, where $\rho(\kappa)$ is given by the phase-transition formalism [47, 57]:

$$
\rho(\kappa) = \max_{z \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{1 - 2/\kappa [(1 + z^2)\Phi(-z) - z\phi(z)]}{1 + z^2 - 2[(1 + z^2)\Phi(-z) - z\phi(z)]} \right\},
$$

(2.7)

and the value of $\tau$ in this case is given by

$$
\tau(\kappa) = \arg \max_{z \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{1 - 2/\kappa [(1 + z^2)\Phi(-z) - z\phi(z)]}{1 + z^2 - 2[(1 + z^2)\Phi(-z) - z\phi(z)]} \right\}.
$$

(2.8)

Therefore, we can set $\tau_{\text{min}} = \tau(\kappa)$, and set the last candidate value $\tau_L = \tau_{\text{min}}$. Let $\Delta \tau = (\tau_1 - \tau_L)/(L - 1)$, we can then set $\tau_\ell = \tau_1 - (\ell - 1)\Delta \tau$, $\forall \ell \in \{2, \cdots, L - 1\}$.

Regarding when to terminate the algorithm, we use the convergence criterion $|\hat{\sigma}_{t+1} - \hat{\sigma}_t| \leq \zeta \hat{\sigma}_t$. Besides, we set a “budget” $T_1$ for the total number of iterations of DiAMP; for each candidate $\tau_\ell$, we set its maximum number of iterations as $\min\{T_2, (T_1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} t_i)/(L - \ell + 1)\}$, where $t_i$ is the number of iterations of running DiAMP with parameter $\tau_i$. In this way, the total number of iterations would not exceed $T_1$ and the number of iterations corresponding to each $\tau_\ell$ would not exceed $T_2$.

The pseudo code of AMP algorithm is shown in Table 1.

### 2.3 Distributed AMP Framework

Let us consider a sensor network with $P$ distributed sensors. Each sensor $p$ ($p = 1, \cdots, P$) takes $M_p$ rows of $A$, namely $A^p$, and obtains $y^p = A^p s_0 + e^p$. Then
### Table 1. Centralized AMP algorithm

**Input** $y, A, \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_L, T_1, T_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initialization</th>
<th>$x_0 = 0, z_0 = y$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for $\ell = 1:L$</td>
<td>initialize $t_\ell = 0$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while $t_\ell &lt; \max{T_2, (T_1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} t_i)/ (\ell - 1)}$</td>
<td>obtain an estimator $\hat{\sigma}^2_{t_\ell}$ of $\sigma^2_{t_\ell}$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{t_\ell+1} = \eta(x_{t_\ell} + A^Tz_{t_\ell}; \tau_\ell\hat{\sigma}<em>{t</em>\ell})$</td>
<td>$z_{t_\ell+1} = y - Ax_{t_\ell+1} + \frac{</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if some convergence criterion is met</td>
<td>$\hat{\sigma}(\tau_\ell) = \hat{\sigma}<em>{t</em>\ell}, x(\tau_\ell) = x_{t_\ell+1}, z(\tau_\ell) = z_{t_\ell+1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>else</td>
<td>update $t_\ell \leftarrow t_\ell + 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continue</td>
<td>endif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endwhile</td>
<td>update $x_0 = x_{t_\ell+1}, z_0 = z_{t_\ell+1}$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endfor</td>
<td>endfor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Output** $\hat{\sigma}(\tau_\ell), x(\tau_\ell), \ell = 1, \ldots, L.$

\[ (1.1) \text{ can be rewritten as:} \]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
y^1 \\
\vdots \\
y^p
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
A^1 \\
\vdots \\
A^p
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
e^1 \\
\vdots \\
e^p
\end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix}
s_0 \\
\vdots \\
s_0
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

\[ (2.9) \]

Let us introduce an intermediate matrix $W_t = [w^1_t, \ldots, w^p_t]$ with each column computed by the corresponding sensor as \[41\]:

\[
 w^p_t = \begin{cases} 
 x_t + (A^p)^Tz^p_t, & \text{if } p = 1, \\
 (A^p)^Tz^p_t, & \text{otherwise}. 
\end{cases}
\]

\[ (2.10) \]
It is easy to show that AMP can be run in a distributed manner:

\[
f_t = x_t + (A^1)^T z^p_t + \sum_{p=2}^{P} [(A^p)^T z^p_t] = \sum_{p=1}^{P} w^p_t,
\]

(2.11)

\[
x_{t+1} = \eta (f_t; \tau \hat{\sigma}_t),
\]

(2.12)

\[
z^p_{t+1} = y^p - A^p x_{t+1} + \frac{\|x_{t+1}\|_0}{M} z^p_t, \quad \forall p \in [P].
\]

(2.13)

In (2.10), if we modify the definition of \( w^p_t \) as

\[
w^p_t = \omega^p x_t + (A^p)^T z^p_t,
\]

(2.14)

where \( \omega^p = M^p / M \) with \( M^p \) being the number of rows of \( A^p \), then it is easy to verify that (2.11) still holds. The new definition is adopted not only because it generates more balanced data, but also due to our recent proof on distributed AMP (DiAMP) that \( w^p_t - \omega^p s_0 \) is asymptotically \( \mathcal{N}(0, \omega^p \sigma^2_t I_N) \) as \( N \to \infty \), where \( I_N \) is the \( N \times N \) identity matrix. The proof will be shown later in Chapter 3. Due to this property, we can obtain a new estimator \( \hat{\sigma}^2_t \) of \( \sigma^2_t \) as follows.

On Sensor \( p \), we further partition \( A^p \) equally by rows and obtain \( A^{p,1}, A^{p,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{M^p/2 \times N} \), and the corresponding \( y^{p,1}, y^{p,2}, z^{p,1}_t, z^{p,2}_t \), etc. Denoting \( w^{p,i}_t = (\omega^p/2) x_t + (A^{p,i})^T z^{p,i}_t \) \( (i = 1, 2) \), then the \( 2P \) random vectors \( r^{p,i}_t = w^{p,i}_t - (\omega^p/2) s_0 \) is asymptotically \( \mathcal{N}(0, \omega^p \sigma^2_t I_N) \). Defining \( d^{p}_t = (w^{p,1}_t - w^{p,2}_t) / \sqrt{\omega^p} \), it is easy to show that

\[
d^{p}_t = \frac{w^{p,1}_t - w^{p,2}_t}{\sqrt{\omega^p}} = \frac{r^{p,1}_t - r^{p,2}_t}{\sqrt{\omega^p}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_t I_N).
\]

(2.15)

We can obtain an estimator for \( \sigma^2_t \):

\[
\hat{\sigma}^2_t = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{P} \|d^p_t\|^2_2}{NP}.
\]

(2.16)

Note that \( d^p_t \) can be computed locally without communication. In order to obtain \( \hat{\sigma}^2_t \), each sensor \( p \geq 2 \) only needs to send a positive number \( \|d^p_t\|^2_2 \) to Sensor 1; Sensor
1 then computes $\hat{\sigma}_t^2$ and broadcasts it back to other sensors. This communication cost is negligible compared with that of obtaining $x_{t+1}$, as will be shown later.

It can be seen that DiAMP can be divided into two parts: local computation (LC) of $w_p^t$ and $z_{t+1}^p (p = 1, \cdots, P)$, where there is no communication; and global computation (GC) of $x_{t+1}$, where communication is needed. For the latter, a natural approach is to send all the components in $w_p^t$ for $p \geq 2$ to sensor 1, which will induce a high communication cost when $N$ is large. Therefore, how to reduce the communication cost, meanwhile without incurring any loss of accuracy compared with the original AMP, is the main goal of the distributed approach.

In DiAMP, by (2.10), $x_{t+1}(n) = 0$ if $|f_t(n)| \leq \beta_t = \tau \hat{\sigma}_t$. Therefore, we only need to know all $(n, f_t(n))$ such that $|f_t(n)| = |\sum_{p=1}^P w_p^t(n)| > \beta_t$ in the GC. As introduced in Chapter 1, this is a Top-$\beta$ problem. The $n$-th row of the intermediate matrix $W_t$ can be viewed as an object with index $n$ and partial scores $w_1^t(n), \cdots, w_P^t(n)$ stored on agents (sensors) 1, $\cdots$, $P$ respectively, and the total score of object $n$ is $f_t(n) = \sum_{p=1}^P w_p^t(n)$. Our objective is to find all the total scores with magnitudes greater than the threshold $\beta_t$ as well as the objects they correspond to, meanwhile trying to reduce the communication cost induced. The Top-$\beta$ problem has a very similar structure to the Top-$K$ problem.

For the Top-$K$ problems, one of the most popular algorithms is known as thresholding algorithm (TA) [48], which requires a known $K$ and all the entries in $W_t$ to be non-negative, and cannot be directly applied in DCS. In [40], a modified TA (MTA) was proposed to deal with the positivity issue. Notice that for DiAMP, TA can also be modified in a similar way to solve the induced Top-$\beta$ algorithm, namely, MTA, which is shown in Table 2.

**Theorem 1** In each iteration, MTA gives exactly the same $x_{t+1}$ as that of original
Table 2. MTA Algorithm for DiAMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initialization</th>
<th><strong>Input</strong> $w^1_t, \cdots, w^P_t, \beta_t = \tau \hat{\sigma}_t$;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $x_{t+1}$ = 0, count = 0; | for sensor $p = 1:P$

- sort components of $w^p_t$ in descending order of magnitudes;
- define the sorted vector as $s_p^p_t$ and $I_p^p_t(n) := \ell$ s.t. $w^p_t(\ell) = s_p^p_t(n)$;
- mark all $(I_p^p_t(n), s_p^p_t(n))$ pairs as “unsent”;

endfor

while TRUE

for $p = 1:P$

- find the first $(I_p^p_t(n), s_p^p_t(n))$ pair marked “unsent” from top;
- set $u_p = s_p^p_t(n)$, broadcast $(I_p^p_t(n), u_p)$ to other sensors;
- mark $(I_p^p_t(n), s_p^p_t(n))$ as “sent”;
- for sensor $q \neq p$

- store $u_p$ and send $(I_q^p_t(n), w^q_t(I_q^p_t(n)))$ to sensor $p$;
- mark $(I_p^p_t(n), w^q_t(I_p^p_t(n)))$ as “sent”;

endfor

update $x_{t+1}(I_p^p_t(n)) = \eta_t(\sum_{p=1}^P w^p_t(I_p^p_t(n)); \beta_t)$;

count = count + 1;

if count $\geq P$ and $\sum_{p=1}^P |u_p| \leq \beta_t$, or if $\text{count} \geq N$

set $N_s = \text{count}$, the algorithm terminates;

endif

endfor

endwhile

Output $x_{t+1}$

**AMP algorithm computed by** [2.2].

**Proof of Theorem 1**: As we can see, MTA is composed of a series of global summation, where a global summation means computing a total score $f_t(n)$ for some $n$. $N_s$ is a counter recording the number of global summations. At the very end of one global summation, for each $n$, either the $(n, w^p_t(n))$ pairs for all $p$ are marked as “sent”; or all are marked as “unsent”. So we can just say $n$ is marked as “sent” or “unsent”. It is easy to show that, $\sum_{p=1}^P |u_p|$ is an upper bound on $|f_t(n)|$ for all the $n$'s that have not been marked as “sent”; if $\sum_{p=1}^P |u_p| \leq \beta_t$, then we have $|f_t(n)| \leq \beta_t$ for these $n$'s. Therefore, as the algorithm terminates, we do not lose any non-zero components of
2.3.1 Proposed GC Algorithm in DiAMP: GCAMP

As discussed in the introduction of this chapter, the GC step of DiAMP can be modeled as a Top-\(\beta\) problem, which has a structure similar to the Top-\(K\) problem. There are many mature algorithms, e.g., TA \cite{48}, and the three-phase uniform threshold (TPUT) algorithm \cite{49}. Similar to TA, the original TPUT cannot be applied in DiAMP, not only because it solves a Top-\(K\) problem instead of a Top-\(\beta\) problem, but also due to the fact that it requires all partial scores to be non-negative, which does not hold in our problem settings. The point is that some essence of TPUT, which is to get an upper bound on the total score, really helps us derive our own Top-\(\beta\) algorithm. Before we proceed, we first introduce the following Lemma:

**Lemma 1** Given arbitrary \(T > 0\), define

\[
S_n = \{ p \in [P] \setminus \{1\} : |w_p^t(n)| > T \} \tag{2.17}
\]

for \(n \in [N]\), then

\[
U(n) = |w_1^t(n)| + \sum_{p \in S_n} w_p^t(n) + (P - 1 - |S_n|)T \tag{2.18}
\]

is an upper bound on \(|f_t(n)|\).

**Proof of Lemma 1** For any \(n = 1, \cdots, N\), we have

\[
f_t(n) = w_1^t(n) + \sum_{p \in S_n} w_p^t(n) + \sum_{p \geq 2, p \notin S_n} w_p^t(n) \tag{2.19}
\]
Then, applying the triangular inequality, we have
\[
|f_t(n)| \leq \left|w_t^1(n) + \sum_{p \in S_n} w_t^p(n)\right| + \left|\sum_{p \geq 2, p \notin S_n} w_t^p(n)\right| \leq |w_t^1(n) + \sum_{p \in S_n} w_t^p(n)| + (P - |S_n|) T = U(n)
\] (2.20)

According to Lemma 1, we develop the following GCAMP algorithm.

First, sensors 2 to \(P\) only send the partial scores with magnitudes greater than a predefined threshold \(T\), as well as the corresponding indices of objects to sensor 1. Then sensors 1 computes an upper bound \(U(n)\) for each \(n\) according to (2.18) and obtains the set of \(n\)'s with \(U(n) > \beta_t\). Finally, sensor 1 requests all the partial scores for all objects \(n \in F\) from other sensors, computes total scores \(f_t(n)\) for all objects \(n \in F\), and obtains the new estimate \(x_{t+1}\), where \(x_{t+1}(F) = \eta(f_t(F); \beta_t)\) and \(x_{t+1}([N] \setminus F) = 0\).

**Theorem 2** In each iteration, GCAMP gives exactly the same \(x_{t+1}\) as that of the centralized AMP algorithm computed by (2.2).

**Proof of Theorem 2** Let \(x_{t+1}^G\) and \(x_{t+1}^A\) denote the result obtained by the GCAMP and the Centralized AMP respectively. For any \(n \in F\), we have \(x_{t+1}^G(n) = \eta(f_t(n); \beta_t) = x_{t+1}^A(n)\); for any \(n \notin F\), we have \(x_{t+1}^G(n) = 0\) and \(U(n) \leq \beta_t\), while according to Lemma 1 we know \(|f_t(n)| \leq U(n) \leq \beta_t\), so \(x_{t+1}^A(n) = 0\). Therefore, \(x_{t+1}^G = x_{t+1}^A\).

A remaining problem is how to choose a proper \(T\). Theoretically, we can use arbitrary \(T > 0\). However, if \(T\) is too large, then we may get a very loose upper bound \(U(n)\) for \(n\). Moreover, considering the case that all entries in \(W_t\) have the same sign but we are not aware of it in advance, and we use \(T \geq \frac{\beta_t}{P-1}\), then it is easy to show that we will have \(U(n) > \beta_t\) for all \(n \in [N]\), that is, we need to send all partial scores from other sensors to sensor 1 and cannot save any communication. To
prevent such case from happening, we need to constrain $T < \frac{\beta_t}{P - 1}$. Therefore, we can choose some $\theta \in (0, 1)$, and set $T = \theta \frac{\beta_t}{P - 1}$.

The pseudo code of GCAMP algorithm is shown in Table 3. It can be shown that the total numbers of messages is $\sum_{p=1}^{P} |\Omega_p \cup F| + |F|$, where the first part is the number of data other sensors send to Sensor 1, and the second part is the number of broadcasting messages Sensor 1 sends to others. For MTA, in each global summation, there are 1 broadcasting message from some sensor to others and $P - 1$ incoming messages, so the total number of messages is $PN_s$.

In every inner loop of DiAMP, after GCAMP and MTA return $x_{t+1}$, it takes $\|x_{t+1}\|_0$ messages for all the sensors to know the non-zero components in $x_{t+1}$. Once knowing $x_{t+1}$, each local sensor can obtain $z_{t+1}^p$ using (2.13) and $\sigma_{t+1}^p = ||z_{t+1}^p||_2$ $(p = 1, \ldots, P)$. Next, each sensor $p \geq 2$ just sends a scalar $\sigma_{t+1}^p$ to Sensor 1, which needs $P - 1$ messages. Then, sensor 1 computes $\hat{\sigma}_{t+1} = \sqrt{\sum_{p=1}^{P} (\sigma_{t+1}^p)^2 / M}$, updates $\beta_t$ and $T$, and broadcasts the scalar $T$ to other sensors, so the total number of messages in DiAMP is that of GCAMP (MTA) plus $\|x_{t+1}\|_0 + P$.

In Fig. 1, an example is provided to illustrate how GCAMP works, in which each sensor $p$ already sorts $w_t^p(n)$ in descending order of magnitudes, and stores the data in the form of $(n, w_t^p(n))$ pairs $(p = 1, \ldots, 3, n = 1, \ldots, 10)$. Suppose $\beta_t = 20$ and $\theta = 0.8$, since we have $P = 3$ sensors, we get $T = \beta_t \theta / (P - 1) = 8$. In Step I, Sensors 2 to $P$ send all the $(n, w_t^p(n))$ pairs with $|w_t^p(n)| > T$ (red boxes in the figure) to Sensor 1 (red arrows). In Step II, Sensor 1 receives the data and computes upper bounds $U(n)$ for $n = 1, \ldots, 10$. As we can see, only $U(4), U(6)$ and $U(7) > \beta_t$, which means that we are sure that $x_{t+1}(n) = 0$ for all $n \notin F = \{4, 6, 7\}$. So Sensor 1 only needs to broadcast requests of partial scores of objects $n \in V$. In Step III, Sensor 2 sends $w_t^2(4)$ and $w_t^2(7)$, and Sensor 3 sends $w_t^3(4)$ and $w_t^3(6)$ to Sensor 1. Finally, in Step IV, Sensor 1 computes $x_{t+1}(n)$ for $n \in F$ by (2.11), and outputs the non-zero
Table 3. GCAMP algorithm

**Input** $w_t^1, \cdots, w_t^P, \beta_t = \tau \sigma_t, \theta$

**Step I** Set $T = \beta_t \theta / (P - 1)$
for sensor $p = 2:P$
    denote $\Omega_p = \{ n : |w_t^p(n)| > T \}$;
    send all $(n, w_t^p(n))$ pairs for $n \in \Omega_p$ to sensor 1.
endfor

**Step II** for sensor 1,
for $n = 1:N$
    get $S_n$ as defined in (2.17);
    Compute the upper bound $U(n)$ for $|f_t(n)|$ according to (2.18)
    if $U(n) > \beta_t$
        broadcast the index $n$ to other sensors
    endif
endfor

**Step III** denote $F = \{ n : U(n) > \beta_t \}$
for sensor $p = 2:P$
    send all $(n, w_t^p(n))$ pairs for $n \in F \setminus R_p$ to sensor 1.
endfor

**Step IV** for sensor 1, denote $\Gamma = \{ n \in F : |f_t(n)| > \beta_t \}$
assign $x_{t+1}(\Gamma) = \eta(f_t(\Gamma); \beta_t)$ and $x_{t+1}([N] \setminus \Gamma) = 0$;

**Output** $x_{t+1}$

components of $x_{t+1}$, which is $x_{t+1}(6) = 3$ and $x_{t+1}(6) = -1$. It is easy to verify that the gap $\Delta_{t+1}$ obtained for this example is 1. Overall, in this example, only 9 data points are sent from the sensors to sensor 1, and the total number of messages is 12 (9 data points plus 3 broadcast requests). For the data set in Fig. 1, MTA needs 9 global summations to get the final results, which leads to 27 messages, much greater than that of GCAMP.

Recall that the centralized AMP starts with $x_0 = 0, z_0 = y$, and $\tau = \mathcal{T}_2(f_0)/\hat{\sigma}_0$, which requires the second largest magnitude in the vector $f_0$. This requires us to solve an extended Top-2 problem to obtain $\mathcal{T}_2(f_0)$ at the beginning of DiAMP.
2.3.2 The optimal value of $\theta$ in GCAMP

It can be shown in Table 3 that the number of communication messages needed in GCAMP is $N_G = \sum_{p=2}^{P} |F \cup \Omega_p| + |F| + \|x_{t+1}\|_0$. If we model the elements in $s_0$ and measurement noise $e$ as i.i.d. scalar random variables $S_0 \sim p_{S_0}$ and $E \sim p_E$
respectively, then $N_G$ is also a random variable, where its expectation

$$
\mathbb{E}[N_G] = \sum_{p=2}^{P} \mathbb{E}[(F \cup \Omega_p)] + \mathbb{E}[|F|] + \mathbb{E}[|\chi_{t+1}|_0] 
$$

(2.21)
is a function of the parameter $\theta$. More specifically, only the items $\mathbb{E}|F \cup \Omega_p|$ and $\mathbb{E}|F|$ depend on $\theta$. So we can model the following optimization problem to determine the value of $\theta$:

$$
\min_{\theta} \sum_{p=2}^{P} \mathbb{E}[(F \cup \Omega_p)] + \mathbb{E}[|F|].
$$

(2.22)

Recalling the Gaussianity in DiAMP as described in Section 2.3, we know that each element $w_p(n)$ follows i.i.d. $\omega_p S_0 + \sigma_t \sqrt{\omega_p} Z_p$ with $Z_1, \cdots, Z_P \sim$ i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. We can derive

$$
\mathbb{E}[|F|] = N \Pr\{U(n) > \beta_t\} = N \Pr\left\{ \omega_p S_0 + \sigma_t \sqrt{\omega_p} Z_1 + 
\sum_{p=2}^{P} (\omega_p S_0 + \sigma_t \sqrt{\omega_p} Z_p) \mathbb{I}\left( \omega_p S_0 + \sigma_t \sqrt{\omega_p} Z_p > \frac{\theta \beta_t}{P-1} \right) 
\right\} + T \sum_{p=2}^{P} \mathbb{I}\left( \omega_p S_0 + \sigma_t \sqrt{\omega_p} Z_p \leq \frac{\theta \beta_t}{P-1} \right) > \beta_t \right\},
$$

(2.23)

and

$$
\mathbb{E}[|F| \cup \Omega_p] = N \left[ \Pr\left\{ U(n) > \beta_t \right\} + \Pr\left\{ \omega_p S_0 + \sigma_t \sqrt{\omega_p} Z_p > \frac{\theta \beta_t}{P-1} \right\} \right] 
\frac{\theta \beta_t}{P-1} \right\} - \Pr\left\{ U(n) > \beta_t, \omega_p S_0 + \sigma_t \sqrt{\omega_p} Z_p > \frac{\theta \beta_t}{P-1} \right\} \right].
$$

(2.24)

For the most common cases where the prior distribution $p_{S_0}$ is unknown, we can perform worst-case analysis to obtain a mini-max solution:
\[
\min_{\theta} \sup_{p, s_0} \sum_{p=2}^{P} \mathbb{E} [|F \cup \Omega_p|] + \mathbb{E} [||F||]. \tag{2.25}
\]

Unfortunately, there is no closed-form solution for either (2.22) or (2.25). While it may be possible to get some approximated solutions given particular assumptions, we will tune \( \theta \) empirically in this dissertation.

### 2.4 Improvement on GCAMP: Adaptive Approach

In GCAMP, the intermediate \( W_t \) in each iteration \( t \) is considered as totally new data, i.e., correlation between \( W_t \) and \( W_{t-1} \) is not considered in the algorithm. However, due to the convergence of AMP, \( W_t \) and \( W_{t-1} \) will become closer and closer through iterations. If an adaptive approach based on GCAMP can be developed by taking advantage of this property, then further improvements in terms of communication savings may be achievable without loss of recovery accuracy.

From Table 3, it can be shown that GCAMP has the following outcomes:

i) Total scores for all objects \( n \in \Gamma \), where \( \Gamma \) is the support of \( x_{t+1} \). They have one-to-one mapping to non-zero entries in \( x_{t+1} \).

ii) Total scores for all objects \( n \in F \setminus \Gamma \), where \( \Gamma \) is the support of \( x_{t+1} \). These objects have \( U(n) > \beta_t \) but \( |f_t(n)| \leq \beta_t \). The total scores for all objects in i) and ii), that is, in \( F \), are saved in the column vector \( x^h_{t+1} \) as shown in Table 3.

iii) A gap \( \Delta_{t+1} \) between \( \{|f_t(n)|: n \not\in \Gamma\} \) and the threshold \( \beta_t \). For \( n \not\in \Gamma \), if \( n \in F \), which means that GCAMP obtains \( f_t(n) \) for \( n \), then

\[
\beta_t - |f_t(n)| \geq \beta_t - \max_{n \in F} |f_t(n)|; \tag{2.26}
\]

if \( n \not\in F \), which means \( U(n) \leq \beta_t \), then

\[
\beta_t - |f_t(n)| \geq \beta_t - U(n) \geq \beta_t - \max_{n \not\in F} U(n). \tag{2.27}
\]

Overall, we have
\[
\beta_t - |\mathbf{f}_t(n)| \geq \Delta_{t+1} = \beta_t - \max\{\max_{n \in F \setminus \Gamma} |\mathbf{f}_t(n)|, \max_{n \notin F} U(n)\} \tag{2.28}
\]
for all \( n \notin \Gamma \).

For GCAMP itself, i) is the only outcome of interest, and ii) and iii) seem to be meaningless byproducts. However, if an adaptive approach is developed as discussed above, where GCAMP is used as a subroutine, then outcomes in ii) and iii) will become important as shown later in the dissertation.

2.4.1 Question: Can We Save More?

In the previous sections we discussed the framework of DiAMP consisting of a series of local and global computations, where the global computation (GC) step consumes communication bandwidths. To reduce the communication cost in the GC step, we proposed GCAMP, which sifts a candidate set for the support of \( \mathbf{x}_{t+1} \) and then sends the partial scores of all the objects within the candidate set to the fusion center (Sensor 1).

While the aforementioned framework is communication efficient, it still induces more communication cost than what is necessary. This is because GCAMP is a non-adaptive approach, i.e., in each iteration \( t \), it obtains \( \mathbf{x}_{t+1} \) only based on the current intermediate data \( \mathbf{W}_t \), with no memory about \( \mathbf{W}_{t-1} \) nor \( \mathbf{x}_t \); on the other hand, AMP has a linear convergence rate such that after a few iterations, \( \mathbf{W}_{t-1} \) and \( \mathbf{W}_t \) will become very close, so it is the case for \( \mathbf{x}_t \) and \( \mathbf{x}_{t+1} \). This indicates that it is possible to adaptively learn some useful knowledge from previous data \( \mathbf{W}_{t-1} \) and \( \mathbf{x}_t \) when computing \( \mathbf{x}_{t+1} \), in return for a further reduction in communication cost.

To see this, we first define \( \Delta \mathbf{w}_t^p = \mathbf{w}_t^p - \mathbf{w}_{t-1}^p \), \( p \in [P] \), \( \Delta \mathbf{W}_t = [\Delta \mathbf{w}_t^1, \ldots, \Delta \mathbf{w}_t^P] \), and rewrite \( \mathbf{f}_t(n) \) in the following way:

\[
\mathbf{f}_t(n) = \sum_{p=1}^{P} \left( \mathbf{w}_{t-1}^p(n) + \Delta \mathbf{w}_t^p(n) \right) = \mathbf{f}_{t-1}(n) + \Delta \mathbf{f}_t(n), \tag{2.29}
\]
where we use $\Delta f_t(n)$ to denote $\sum_{p=1}^{P} \Delta w_p^t(n)$.

By applying the triangular inequality, we can easily establish an upper bound on $|f_t(n)|$:

$$|f_t(n)| \leq |f_{t-1}(n)| + |\Delta f_t(n)|. \tag{2.30}$$

Remember that after iteration $t - 1$, we have obtained the support set $S(x_t)$, and for any $n \notin S(x_t)$, we are certain that $|f_{t-1}(n)| \leq \beta_{t-1}$. Suppose in iteration $t$, we have a threshold $\beta_t > \beta_{t-1}$, then for any $n \notin S(x_t)$ satisfying $|\Delta f_t(n)| \leq \beta_t - \beta_{t-1}$, we have

$$|f_t(n)| \leq \beta_{t-1} + (\beta_t - \beta_{t-1}) = \beta_t, \tag{2.31}$$

which means that $n$ will not be in the support set of $x_{t+1}$ either. In other words, only two groups of $n$’s can be in $S(x_{t+1})$: (i) $n$’s $\in S(x_t)$, (ii) $n$’s $\notin S(x_t)$ satisfying $|\Delta f_t(n)| > \beta_t - \beta_{t-1}$. Therefore, we can use the following adaptive procedure named adaptive GCAMP (A-GCAMP) to obtain $S(x_{t+1})$.

For group i, we can run GCAMP on $W_t(S(x_t), : )$ to find all the $n$’s with $|f_t(n)| > \beta_t$, which does not consume much communication since $x_t$ is sparse, i.e., $|S(x_t)| \ll N$.

For group ii, we first need to run GCAMP on $\Delta W_t([N \setminus S(x_t), : )$ to find all the $n$’s with $|\Delta f_t(n)| > \beta_t - \beta_{t-1}$. Let $V_{t+1}$ be the set of these $n$’s, we further run GCAMP on $W_t(V_{t+1}, : )$ to find all the $n$’s with $|f_t(n)| > \beta_t$. Note that if most entries’ magnitudes in $\Delta W_t([N \setminus S(x_t), : )$ are much smaller than $\beta_t - \beta_{t-1}$, then by the mechanism of GCAMP, the induced communication cost will be negligible. But how likely is this assumption to be valid?

First, let us consider the magnitudes in $W_t$. According to [47, 64, 65], AMP has a linear convergence rate, which implies that after a few iterations, $W_{t-1}$ and $W_t$ will be very close, i.e., most entries in $\Delta W_t$ will be close to 0.

Second, we need to evaluate $\beta_t - \beta_{t-1}$. Note that the procedure mentioned above only makes sense when $\beta_t > \beta_{t-1}$. However, this seems over-optimistic since $\beta_t$
proportional to $\hat{\sigma}_t$ is generally decreasing. To circumvent this conundrum, we propose a First-Lose-Then-Win strategy in the following subsection.

### 2.4.2 First-Lose-Then-Win Strategy

The basic idea of this strategy is to design a sequence $\{\alpha_t\} \subset (0, 1]$ and transform the threshold to $\gamma_t = \alpha_t \beta_t$, so that $\gamma_t > \gamma_{t-1}$ and A-GCAMP introduced in Section 2.4.1 can be applied, as shown in Fig. 2, where $I_{t+1}$ denotes the set of objects with total scores $|f_t(n)| > \gamma_t$.

Note that after we find $I_{t+1}$, we still plug the original threshold $\beta_t$ into the soft thresholding function to obtain $x_{t+1}$. Therefore, to maintain accuracy we need to constrain $\alpha_t \leq 1$ so that any $|f_t(n)| > \beta_t$ will satisfy $|f_t(n)| > \gamma_t$. However, lowering the threshold may cause additional communication costs, which is the “First-Lose”
stage; on the other hand, we can have $\gamma_t > \gamma_{t-1}$ hold, which may lead to a significant reduction in communication cost as discussed in Section 2.4.1 and this is the “Then-Win” stage. The key is to properly design $\{\alpha_t\}$ so that what we win is more than what we lose, which will be described in the next subsection.

We provide an overview of A-GCAMP based on the strategy below:

(i) Input: $W_{t-1}, W_t, \beta_t$.

(ii) Intermediate: $\alpha_t, \gamma_t, I_{t+1} = \{n : |f_t(n)| > \gamma_t\}$.

(iii) Output: $x_{t+1}$.

**Theorem 3** A-GCAMP obtains $x_{t+1}$ which is exactly the same as that obtained by the centralized AMP using (2.1) and (2.2).

**Proof of Theorem 3:** We know that all the $n$’s in $I_{t+1} = \{n : |f_t(n)| > \gamma_t\}$ will either satisfy $n \in I_t$, or $n \notin I_t$ but $|\Delta f_t(n)| > \Delta \gamma_t$. The latter group is found by GCAMP. Denoting $V_{t+1} = \{n: n \notin I_t, |\Delta f_t(n)| > \Delta \gamma_t\}$, GCAMP will lose no accuracy when only searching in $I_t \cup V_{t+1}$ for $n$’s such that $|f_t(n)| > \gamma_t$. Since $\gamma_t \leq \beta_t$ and $f_t(n)$’s for all the $n$’s in $I_{t+1}$ are calculated, we know that A-GCAMP will return the same $x_{t+1}$ as that of the centralized AMP. Q.E.D.

2.4.3 Design of $\alpha_t$

The aim of designing $\alpha_t$ in A-GCAMP is to yield a threshold difference $\Delta \gamma_t = \gamma_t - \gamma_{t-1}$ which is much greater than most magnitudes in $\Delta f_t([N] \setminus I_t)$, so that the communication cost of running GCAMP on $\Delta W_t([N] \setminus I_t)$ can be negligible.

In Fig. 3 the flow chart of determining $\gamma_t$ is shown, where $q$ is a small number and is set to 0.05 in this dissertation, and $\theta$ is the parameter in GCAMP which is invoked to find all the $n$’s not in $I_t$ such that $|\Delta f_t(n)| > \Delta \gamma_t$. As shown in the figure, we first obtain the $P$ quantiles, take the maximal, namely $\max_p T_{(qN_t)}(\Delta w^p_t([N] \setminus I_t))$,
Fig. 3. Flow chart of determining $\gamma_t$.

where $N_t^r = N - |I_t|$, and obtain a candidate value $\Delta \gamma'_t$ for $\Delta \gamma_t$:

$$\Delta \gamma'_t = \frac{P \max I_{[qN_t]} (|\Delta w_p^t([N] \setminus I_t)|)}{\theta},$$

based on which we can obtain a candidate value

$$\gamma'_t = \gamma_{t-1} + \Delta \gamma'_t.$$  

(2.33)

Since $\gamma_t$ is upper bounded by $\beta_t$, we set

$$\gamma_t = \min \{ \gamma'_t, \beta_t \}$$  

and

$$\alpha_t = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\gamma'_t}{\beta_t} \right\}.$$  

(2.34)

Since $\beta_t$ is generally decreasing, the sequence $\{\alpha_t\}$ is typically increasing. Once $\alpha_{t-1} = 1$, we will reset $\alpha_t = \alpha^*$, where $\alpha^*$ is a predefined parameter less than 1 and set to 0.94 in this dissertation, and repeat the above process to generate $\alpha_{t+1}$.

Define

$$\Delta \Omega^p_t = \{|n \notin I_t: |\Delta w^p_t(n)|\}$$

(2.35)

for any $p \in [P]$, and

$$\Delta \Omega_t = \left\{ n \notin I_t : |\Delta f_t(n)| > \theta \Delta \gamma_t \right\}.$$  

(2.36)

It is easy to verify that if $\Delta \gamma_t = \Delta \gamma'_t$, then

$$|\Delta \Omega^p_t| \leq \left\{|n \notin I_t : |\Delta w^p_t(n)| > T_{[qN_t]} (|\Delta w^p_t([N] \setminus I_t)|) \right\} \leq q N_t^r$$

(2.37)
for any \( p \in [P] \), and

\[
|\Delta \Omega| \leq \left\{ n \notin I_t : \max_p \left| \Delta w^p_t(n) \right| > \frac{\theta \Delta \gamma_t}{P} \right\}
\]

\[
= \bigcup_{p=1}^P \left\{ n \notin I_t : |\Delta w^p_t(n)| > \max_p T_{[q \mathbb{N}_t]}(\Delta w^p_t([N] \setminus I_t)) \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{p=1}^P \left\{ n \notin I_t : |\Delta w^p_t(n)| > \max_p T_{[q \mathbb{N}_t]}(\Delta w^p_t([N] \setminus I_t)) \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{p=1}^P \left\{ n \notin I_t : |\Delta w^p_t(n)| > T_{[q \mathbb{N}_t]}(\Delta w^p_t([N] \setminus I_t)) \right\} \leq qN^r_P,
\]

where the notation \(|\{\cdot\}|\) on a set \( \{\cdot\} \) denotes its cardinality, and \(|\cdot|\) on a number, for example, \( w^p_t(n) \), denotes its magnitude.

As we can see, (2.37) sets an upper bound on number of the data points Sensor \( p \) sends to Sensor 1 at Stage I of GCAMP, and (2.38) obtains an upper bound on number of \( n \)’s with \( |\Delta f_t(n)| > \Delta \gamma_t \). The equality in (2.38) holds because the statement “the maximal of the \( P \) numbers is greater than some value” is equivalent to “at least one of the \( P \) numbers is greater than the same value”.

It is clear that if we choose the starting point \( \alpha_{\min} \) properly, then we can have \( \alpha_{t-1} < 1 \) and \( \alpha_t < 1 \), which makes \( \Delta \gamma_t = \frac{P \max_p T_{[q \mathbb{N}_t]}(\Delta w^p_t)}{\theta} \) hold in most iterations.

In computing \( x_t \), we find all the \( n \)’s such that \( |f_{t-1}(n)| > \gamma_{t-1} \), which includes the \( n \) that \( \gamma_{t-1} < |f_{t-1}(n)| \leq \beta_{t-1} \), this seems a waste of computation since we are sure \( x_t(n) = 0 \) for these \( n \)’s without knowing their total scores, that is why we call it the “first-lose” stage; however, what we win are thresholds \( \{\gamma_t\} \) and gaps \( \Delta_t \) which satisfy \( \gamma_t + \Delta_t - \gamma_{t-1} = \Delta \gamma_t > 0 \), which implies reduction of communication cost in computing \( x_{t+1} \).
2.4.4 DiAMP Based on A-GCAMP

In Fig. 4 a detailed diagram of DiAMP is shown based on A-GCAMP. In each iteration $t$, we will get $I_{t+1} = \{ n : \sum_{p=1}^{P} w^p_t(n) > \gamma_t \}$, and will also get a group of total scores for $n \in R_{t+1} \subset [N] \setminus I_{t+1}$; furthermore, we will get a gap $\Delta_{t+1}$ between $|f_t(n)|$ for $n \notin I_{t+1}$ and $\gamma_t$.

In the first iteration $t = 0$, we get these by running the original GCAMP algorithm. Starting from $t = 1$, we first need to check whether $\Delta_{t+1} = \max(\gamma_t - \gamma_{t-1} + \Delta_t, 0)$ is a large positive number compared with the magnitudes of partial scores for $n \in [N] \setminus I_t$, by checking whether

$$\sum_{p=1}^{P} |\Delta \Omega^p_t| \leq \rho_w N^r_t P$$

(2.39)

holds, where $\Delta \Omega^p_t$ is the same as defined in (2.35) and $\rho_w$ is within $(0, 1)$. This process just needs $P$ communication messages. If (2.39) does not hold, then we still run the
original GCAMP algorithm on $\W_t$ to obtain $I_{t+1}$, $R_{t+1}$ as well as the total scores $f_t(I_{t+1})$, $f_t(R_{t+1})$, and a gap $\Delta_{t+1}$. Now we mainly focus on the case that (2.39) holds.

If so, then we proceed as follows:

We first calculate total scores for all $n \in I_t = I_{t+1}^1 \cup R_{t+1}^1$, where $|f_t(n)| > \gamma_t, \forall n \in I_{t+1}^1$ and $|f_t(n)| \leq \gamma_t, \forall n \in R_{t+1}^1$; for $n \notin I_t$, we run GCAMP on $\Delta W_t$ to get $V_{t+1} = \{n: \sum_{p=1}^{P_p} \Delta w^p_t(n) > \Delta \gamma_t\}$, and a gap $\Delta_{t+1}$ between $\{|f_t(n)|: n \notin I_t \cup V_{t+1}\}$ and $\Delta \gamma_t$, where $\Delta \gamma_t = \max(\gamma_t - \gamma_{t-1} + \Delta_t, 0)$.

For each $n \in V_{t+1} \cap R_t$, we know the total scores $f_{t-1}(n)$ since $n \in R_t$ and $\sum_{p=1}^{P_p} \Delta w^p_t(n)$ since $n \in V_{t+1}$, so we can easily calculate total scores $f_t(n)$. Now partition the set $V_{t+1} \cap R_t$ into $I_{t+1}^2$ and $R_{t+1}^2$, where $|f_t(n)| > \gamma_t, \forall n \in I_{t+1}^2$ and $|f_t(n)| \leq \gamma_t, \forall n \in R_{t+1}^2$. So far, we have obtained the total scores for $n \in I_{t+1}^1 \cup I_{t+1}^2 \cup R_{t+1}^1 \cup R_{t+1}^2$.

We then calculate

$$\Delta_{t+1}^2 = \gamma_t - \max|f_t(R_{t+1}^1 \cup R_{t+1}^2)|$$

(2.40)

For $n \in V_{t+1} \setminus R_t$, we run GCAMP on $w_t^1(V_{t+1} \setminus R_t), \ldots, w_t^P(V_{t+1} \setminus R_t)$ to get a group of total scores for $n \in I_{t+1}^3 \cup R_{t+1}^3$, where $|f_t(n)| > \gamma_t, \forall n \in I_{t+1}^3$ and $|f_t(n)| \leq \gamma_t, \forall n \in R_{t+1}^3$, and a gap $\Delta_{t+1}^3$ between $\{|f_t(n)|: n \in V_{t+1} \setminus R_t, |f_t(n)| \leq \gamma_t\}$ and $\gamma_t$. Then we have the following outcomes for GCAMP:

i) $I_{t+1} = I_{t+1}^1 \cup I_{t+1}^2 \cup I_{t+1}^3$ and total scores $f_t(I_{t+1}), x_{t+1}(I_{t+1}) = \eta S(f_t(I_{t+1}); \beta_t)$ and $x_{t+1}([N] \setminus I_{t+1}) = 0$;

ii) $R_{t+1} = R_{t+1}^1 \cup R_{t+1}^2 \cup R_{t+1}^3$ and total scores $f_t(R_{t+1})$;

iii) $\Delta_{t+1} = \min(\Delta_{t+1}^1, \Delta_{t+1}^2, \Delta_{t+1}^3)$.

The total scores $f_t(I_{t+1} \cup R_{t+1})$ are saved in vector $x_{t+1}^b$.

In order to show the correctness of A-GCAMP, we first need to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 2** $\Delta_{t+1}$ calculated in A-GCAMP is a gap between $\{|f_t(n)|: n \notin I_{t+1}, |f_t(n)| \leq \gamma_t\}$ and $\{f_t(n): n \in I_{t+1}, |f_t(n)| > \gamma_t\}$.
\( \gamma_t \) and \( \gamma_t \).

**Proof of Lemma 2:** It is clear that

\[
[N] \setminus I_{t+1} = \left([N] \setminus (I_t \cup V_{t+1})\right) \cup (R_{t+1}^1 \cup R_{t+1}^2) \cup \left[V_{t+1} \setminus (I_{t+1} \cup R_t)\right]
\]  
(2.41)

Obviously, \( \Delta_{t+1}^2 \) is a gap between \( \{|f_t(n)| : n \in (R_{t+1}^1 \cup R_{t+1}^2)\} \) and \( \gamma_t \), and \( \Delta_{t+1}^3 \) is a gap between \( \{|f_t(n)| : n \in V_{t+1} \setminus (I_{t+1} \cup R_t)\} \) and \( \gamma_t \). Now we need to show that \( \Delta_{t+1}^1 \) is a gap between \( \{|f_t(n)| : n \in [N] \setminus (I_t \cup V_{t+1})\} \) and \( \gamma_t \).

By the definition of \( \Delta_{t+1}^1 \) in GCAMP algorithm, we know that

\[
\left| \sum_{p=1}^{P} \Delta w_r^p(n) \right| \leq \Delta_{t+1}^1, \forall n \in [N] \setminus (I_t \cup V_{t+1})
\]  
(2.42)

Therefore, we have

\[
|f_t(n)| = |f_{t-1}(n)| + \sum_{p=1}^{P} \Delta w_r^p(n)
\]

\[
\leq |f_{t-1}(n)| + \left| \sum_{p=1}^{P} \Delta w_r^p(n) \right|
\]

\[
\leq (\beta_t - \Delta_t) + (\Delta_{t+1}^1)
\]

\[
= \beta_t - \Delta_{t+1}^1, \forall n \in [N] \setminus (I_t \cup V_{t+1})
\]  
(2.43)

In summary, \( \Delta_{t+1}^1 = \min(\Delta_{t+1}^1, \Delta_{t+1}^2, \Delta_{t+1}^3) \) is a gap between \( \{|f_t(n)| : n \notin I_{t+1}, |f_t(n)| \leq \gamma_t\} \) and \( \gamma_t \). Q.E.D.

**Theorem 4** A-GCAMP algorithm obtains \( x_{t+1} \) which is exactly the same as that of the centralized AMP algorithm computed by (2.2).

**Proof of Theorem 4:** Applying Lemma 2, we know that \( \Delta_t \) calculated in the A-GCAMP algorithm at iteration \( t - 1 \) is a gap between \( \{|f_t(n)| : n \notin I_t, |f_t(n)| \leq \gamma_t\} \) and \( \gamma_t \). Q.E.D.
\( \gamma_{t-1} \) and \( \gamma_{t-1} \). Therefore, \( I_{t+1} \subseteq I_t \cup V_{t+1} = I_t \cup (V_{t+1} \cap R_t) \cup (V_{t+1} \setminus R_t) \).

According to the algorithm, for all \( n \in I_t \cup (V_{t+1} \cap R_t) \), we get the total scores \( f_t(n) \), and find \( I_{t+1} = \{ n : |f_t(n)| \geq \gamma_t, n \in I_t \} \) and \( I_{t+1}^2 = \{ n : |f_t(n)| > \gamma_t, n \in V_{t+1} \cap R_t \} \). For all \( n \in V_{t+1} \setminus R_t \), \( I_{t+1}^3 = n : |f_t(n)| > \gamma_t, n \in V_{t+1} \setminus R_t \) and \( f_t(I_{t+1}^3) \) are found by running the GCAMP algorithm. Therefore, \( f_t(I_{t+1}) \) with \( I_{t+1} = I_{t+1}^1 \cup I_{t+1}^2 \cup I_{t+1}^3 \) contains all the total scores with magnitude greater than \( \gamma_t \). In other words, \( |f_t(n)| \leq \gamma_t \leq \beta_t, \forall n \notin I_{t+1} \). Similar to the Proof of Theorem 2, we know that the \( x_{t+1} \) GCAMP algorithm obtains is exactly the same as that of the centralized AMP algorithm obtains. Q.E.D.

The pseudo code of A-GCAMP algorithm for iterations \( t \geq 2 \) is given in Table 4.

| Table 4.: A-GCAMP Algorithm |

**Input** \( w_t^p, \Delta w_t^p, x_t^h, \gamma_t-1, \alpha_t, \beta_t, \Delta_t, \theta, \rho_w \)

\[
\begin{align*}
I_t &= \{ n : |x_t^h(n)| > \gamma_{t-1} \};
R_t &= \{ n : 0 < |x_t^h(n)| \leq \gamma_{t-1} \};
C_t^1 &= [N] \setminus I_t;
\gamma_t &= \alpha_t \beta_t;
\text{Compute } \Delta \gamma_t;\quad \text{if } \Delta \gamma_t > 0 \\
&\hspace{1cm} \text{for sensor } p = 1 : P \\
&\hspace{2cm} \text{obtain } \Delta \Omega_p; \\
&\hspace{2cm} \text{if } p \geq 2
\end{align*}
\]
send the cardinality $|\Delta \Omega_p|$ to sensor 1;

endif

endfor

$N^g = \sum_{p=1}^{P} |\Delta \Omega_p|;$

else

$N^g = |C^1_t|P;$

endif

if $N^g \leq \rho_w|C^1_t|P$

initialize $x^h_{t+1} = 0, \Delta x^h_{t+1} = 0$;

$x^h_{t+1}(I_t) = \sum_{p=1}^{P} w^p_t(I_t);$ 

$I^1_{t+1} = \{ n : n \in I_t, |x^h_{t+1}(n)| > \gamma_t \};$

$R^1_{t+1} = I_t \setminus I^1_{t+1};$

$[\sim, \Delta x^h_{t+1}(C^1_t), \Delta x^h_{t+1}] = GCAMP(\Delta w^1_t(C^1_t), \ldots, \Delta w^P_t(C^1_t), \Delta \gamma_t, \theta);$ 

$V_{t+1} = \{ n : |\Delta x^h_{t+1}(n)| > \Delta \gamma_t \};$

$C^2_t = V_{t+1} \cap R_t;$

$x^h_{t+1}(C^2_t) = x^h_{t+1}(C^2_t) + \Delta x^h_{t+1}(C^2_t);$ 

$I^2_{t+1} = \{ n : n \in C^2_t, |x^h_{t+1}(n)| > \gamma_t \};$

$R^2_{t+1} = C^2_t \setminus I^2_{t+1};$

$\Delta^2_{t+1} = \gamma_t - \max(|x^h_{t+1}(R^1_{t+1} \cup R^2_{t+1})|);$

$C^3_t = V_{t+1} \setminus R_t;$

$[\sim, x^h_{t+1}(C^3_t), \Delta^3_{t+1}] = GCAMP(\Delta w^1_t(C^3_t), \ldots, \Delta w^P_t(C^3_t), \gamma_t, \theta);$ 

$I^3_{t+1} = \{ n : n \in C^3_t, |x^h_{t+1}(n)| > \gamma_t \};$

$R^3_{t+1} = \{ n : n \in C^3_t, 0 < |x^h_{t+1}(n)| \leq \gamma_t \};$

$I_{t+1} = I^1_{t+1} \cup I^2_{t+1} \cup I^3_{t+1};$

$R_{t+1} = R^1_{t+1} \cup R^2_{t+1} \cup R^3_{t+1};$
\[ \Delta_{t+1} = \min(\Delta_{t+1}^1, \Delta_{t+1}^2, \Delta_{t+1}^3); \]

else
\[ [\sim, x^h_{t+1}, \Delta_{t+1}] = \text{GCAMP} \left( w_i^1, \cdots, w_i^P, \gamma_t, \theta \right); \]
endif
\[ x_{t+1} = \eta(x^h_{t+1}; \beta_t); \]

**Output** \( x_{t+1}, x^h_{t+1}, \Delta_{t+1} \)

With A-GCAMP, the adaptive DiAMP approach is shown in Table 5.

**Table 5.: Adaptive DiAMP Algorithm**

**Input** \( \{y^p\}_{p=1}^P, \{A_p\}_{j=1}^P, \{\tau_{\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^L, \alpha_{\text{min}}, q, \theta, \rho_w, T_1, T_2 \)

Initialize \( x_0 = 0, z_0 = y, \alpha_0 = \alpha_{\text{min}}, \tau = \tau_1; \)

for \( \ell = 1:L \)

initialize \( t_\ell = 0; \)

while \( t_\ell < \max\{T_2, (T_1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} t_i)/(\ell - 1)\} \)

set \( t = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} t_i + t_\ell; \)

if \( t \geq 1 \)

Compute \( w_i^p \) and \( \Delta w_i^p = w_i^p - w_i^{p-1} \) by (3.251) for each \( p; \)

if \( \alpha_{t-1} = 1 \)
\(\alpha_t = \alpha_{\text{min}};\)

else

Compute \(\alpha_t\) according to (2.34);

endif

obtain an estimator \(\hat{\sigma}^2_t\) of \(\sigma^2_t\), and set \(\beta_t = \tau \hat{\sigma}_t\) and \(\gamma_t = \alpha_t \beta_t;\)

if \(t \geq 1\)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    x_{t+1}, x_{h_{t+1}}, \Delta_{t+1}
\end{bmatrix} = \text{A-GCAMP}(w_1^t, \ldots, w_P^t, \Delta_w^t, \alpha, \Delta_t, \beta_t, \Delta, \theta, \rho_w);
\]

else

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    \sim, x_{h_{t+1}}, \Delta_{t+1}
\end{bmatrix} = \text{GCAMP}(w_1^t, \ldots, w_P^t, \gamma_t);
\]

\(x_{t+1} = \eta(x_{h_{t+1}}; \beta_t);\)

endif

Compute \(z_{t+1}^p\) by (2.13) for each \(p;\)

if some convergence criterion is met

set \(\hat{\sigma}(\tau) = \sigma_{t+1}, x(\tau) = x_{t+1}, z^{p}(\tau) = z_{t+1}^p\) for \(p = 1 \cdots P\)

update \(\tau = \tau_{t+1};\)

break;

else

\(t_{\ell} \leftarrow t_{\ell} + 1;\)

continue;

endif

endwhile

endfor
2.5 Improvement on GCAMP: Quantization

2.5.1 Intuition: A Sign-Aware Approach

In GCAMP and A-GCAMP, we aimed to reduce the number of communication messages, also known as units of communication \([49]\) needed in the GC step. Seemingly a reasonable metric of communication cost to some extent, it does not account for the difference in structures of various types of data, for example, while broadcasting an object index and sending a \((n, w_p^p(n))\) pair consumes different number of bits, they are both viewed as 1 message. Furthermore, evaluating the communication cost in terms of the number of communication messages does not show the advantage of quantization, a powerful technique in data compression, since one data point, regardless of being quantized or not, needs one message to be transmitted.

From this perspective, we update the communication cost metric to the number of communication bits. The new metric is not only more practical, but also motivates us to develop more sophisticated algorithms taking account of the structure of transmitted data. When developing GCAMP in Section 2.3, we restricted the parameter \(\theta\) to be strictly less than 1, to prevent sending all the partial scores under the extreme cases where all of them have the same sign but no sensor is aware of that in advance. This restriction sometime may limit the availability of a finer upper bound \(U(n)\) on \(|f_t(n)|\). However, with the new communication cost metric in terms of the communication bits, we can get rid of this restriction by adding a “sign-awareness” step at the beginning of GCAMP, where Sensors \(p \geq 2\) send the signs of all the partial scores to

\[
\text{Output } \hat{\sigma}(\tau_\ell), \, x(\tau_\ell), \, z^p(\tau_\ell)
\]
Sensor 1, with a communication bit of only 1 bit per element. After this step, Sensor 1 is aware of all the partial scores’ signs and hence has more flexibility in choosing \( \theta \), which helps obtaining a tighter upper bound \( U(n) \) and reducing the communication cost. This is the essence of the sign-aware GC (SAGC) algorithm.

We assume that all the components in \( w^p_t \) are stored as IEEE double-precision floating-point numbers, with a 1-bit sign, an 11-bit exponent, and a 52-bit significand [66], which will be discussed in detail in Section 2.5.3. Now, we present the SAGC algorithm as follows:

**Step I:** Define \( T = \theta \beta_t/(P - 1) \) and \( \Omega_p = \{ n : |w^p_t(n)| > T \} \), where \( \theta > 0 \) is a tunable parameter for the trade-off between the communication cost in this step and that in Step III. Each sensor \( p \geq 2 \) sends to Sensor 1 the package shown in Fig. 5.

As shown in Fig. 5, the package contains four parts:

1) the sensor index \( p \), since there are \( P - 1 \) sensors other than Sensor 1, we can use \( \lceil \log_2(P - 1) \rceil \) bits to encode \( p \).

2) the 1-bit signs ("+" or ") of all the components in \( w^p_t \), which totally require \( N \) bits to represent.

3) To represent \( \Omega_p \), we can either directly encode each index (\( \lceil \log_2 N \rceil \) bits per index) in \( \Omega_p \) with \( |\Omega_p| \lceil \log_2 N \rceil \) bits in total, or use a 1/0 flag to denote whether each index \( n = 1, \ldots, N \) is in \( \Omega_p \), which requires totally \( N \) bits. We finally choose the one
using fewer bits. For the case where $|\Omega_p| \lceil \log_2 N \rceil = N$, the latter will be chosen.

4) all the absolute values of $w_t^p(\Omega_p)$, since they are all positive numbers, the total number of bits required is $63|\Omega_p|$.

Therefore, the total number of bits in Step I is

$$B_1 = (P - 1) \lceil \log_2 (P - 1) \rceil + N$$

$$+ \sum_{p=2}^{P} \min\{ |\Omega_p| \lceil \log_2 N \rceil, N \} + 63 \sum_{p=2}^{P} |\Omega_p|. \quad (2.44)$$

**Proposition 1** Sensor 1 can decode the package from Sensor $p$ without ambiguity.

**Proof of Proposition 7**: It is easy to show that there is no ambiguity decoding Parts 1) and 2): the first $\lceil \log_2 (P - 1) \rceil$ bits of the package indicate which sensor the package is from, and the next $N$ bits reveal the signs of $w_t^p$. Now we need to show that there is no ambiguity decoding $\Omega_p$ and $w_t^p(\Omega_p)$, which takes $L = \min\{ |\Omega_p| \lceil \log_2 N \rceil, N \} + 63|\Omega_p|$ bits in total.

The possible ambiguity, if any, happens only if there exists two different values $x$ and $y$ for $|\Omega_p|$ leading to different encoding patterns of $\Omega_p$ yet ending up with the same $L$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $x|\log_2 N| < N$, $y|\log_2 N| \geq N$, and $x|\log_2 N| + 63x = N + 63y = L$. We can easily show that this will not happen: since $x|\log_2 N| < N$ and $y|\log_2 N| \geq N$, we have $x < y$; on the other hand, because $x|\log_2 N| < N$ and $x|\log_2 N| + 63x = N + 63y$, we have $x > y$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, the solution $|\Omega_p|$ to the equation $L = \min\{ |\Omega_p| \lceil \log_2 N \rceil, N \} + 63|\Omega_p|$ is unique, that is, there is no ambiguity in decoding Parts 3) and 4) of the package.

**Step II**: Sensor 1 decodes the packages from other sensors as discussed above, and obtains a range $[R^L(n), R^U(n)]$ of $f_t(n)$:
\[ R^L(n) = w^1_t(n) + \sum_{p=2}^{P} w^p_t(n) \mathbb{I}(n \in \Omega_p) \]
\[ - T \sum_{p=2}^{P} \mathbb{I}(-T \leq w^p_t(n) < 0) \]  
\[ (2.45) \]

and
\[ R^U(n) = w^1_t(n) + \sum_{p=2}^{P} w^p_t(n) \mathbb{I}(n \in \Omega_p) \]
\[ + T \sum_{p=2}^{P} \mathbb{I}(0 < w^p_t(n) \leq T). \]  
\[ (2.46) \]

It can be shown that
\[ U(n) = \max \{ R^U(n), -R^L(n) \} \]  
\[ (2.47) \]
is an upper bound on \(|f_t(n)|\). Sensor 1 obtains the set \( \Pi = \{ n: U(n) \geq \beta_t \} \), represents \( \Pi \) in the same way as encoding \( \Omega_p \), and broadcasts it to all the other sensors, resulting in the number of bits used in Step II as
\[ B_2 = \min\{|\Pi|, \lfloor \log_2 N \rfloor, N\}. \]  
\[ (2.48) \]

**Step III:** Each sensor \( p \geq 2 \) reads all the indices in \( \Pi \), and sends the package shown in Fig. 6 to Sensor 1.
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Fig. 6. The structure of the package Sensor \( p \) sends to Sensor 1 in Step III.

Note that both Sensors 1 and \( p \) know \( \Pi \) and \( \Omega_p \), and there is no need to send the object indices in the set \( \Pi \setminus \Omega_p \).

Now Sensor 1 can compute \( f_t(\Pi) \) and obtain
Finally, Sensor 1 needs to broadcast the support set of $x_{t+1}$, which is $\Gamma = \{ n : x_{t+1}(n) \neq 0 \}$, and the non-zero components $x_{t+1}(\Gamma)$ to other sensors. Since $\Gamma \subset \Pi$, and each Sensor $p \geq 2$ already knows $\Pi$, Sensor 1 only needs $\min\{|\Gamma|\lceil \log_2 |\Pi| \rceil, |\Pi| \}$ bits to represent $\Gamma$. Therefore, the number of bits in Step III is

$$B_3 = (P - 1)\lceil \log_2 (P - 1) \rceil + 63 \sum_{p=2}^{P} |\Pi \setminus \Omega_p|$$

$$+ \min\{|\Gamma|\lceil \log_2 |\Pi| \rceil, |\Pi| \} + 64|\Gamma|,$$

and the total number of bits in SAGC is $\sum_{i=1}^{3} B_i$.

As we can see, $\theta$ is a parameter controlling the trade-off between the number of communication bits in Steps I and III: increasing $\theta$ leads to a larger $T$, which means less data sent to Sensor 1 in Step I; however, this can cause a more conservative upper bound $U(n)$, which increases the number of bits in Step III, and vice versa. In this dissertation, we tune $\theta$ empirically.

Regarding the recovery accuracy of SAGC, we have the following theorem:

**Theorem 5** Given the same threshold $\beta_t = \tau \hat{\sigma}_t$, SAGC algorithm obtains exactly the same $x_{t+1}$ as that of the centralized AMP algorithm computed by using (2.2).

In other words, DiAMP based on SAGC has the same accuracy and convergence rate as the centralized AMP.

In order to prove Theorem 2, we first introduce the following lemma:

**Lemma 3** $U(n)$ is an upper bound on $|f_t(n)|$.

**Proof of Lemma 3** First, we show that $R_L(n) \leq f_t(n) \leq R_U(n)$ for any $n = 1, \cdots, N$:
\[ f_t(n) = w^1_t(n) + \sum_{p=2}^{P} w^p_t(n) I(n \in \Omega_p) \]
\[ + \sum_{p=2}^{P} w^p_t(n) I(-T \leq w^p_t(n) < 0) \]
\[ + \sum_{p=2}^{P} w^p_t(n) I(0 \leq w^p_t(n) \leq T) \]  \hfill (2.51)
\[ \geq w^1_t(n) + \sum_{p=2}^{P} w^p_t(n) I(n \in \Omega_p) \]
\[ + \sum_{p=2}^{P} (-T) \times I(-T \leq w^p_t(n) < 0) + 0 = R^L_t(n). \]

Similarly, we can prove that \( f_t(n) \leq R^U_t(n) \). Since \( R^L_t(n) \leq f_t(n) \leq R^U_t(n) \), we have \(-R^U_t(n) \leq -f_t(n) \leq -R^L_t(n) \) and hence
\[ |f_t(n)| = \max\{f_t(n), -f_t(n)\} \]
\[ \leq \max\{R^U_t(n), -R^L_t(n)\} = U_t(n). \]  \hfill (2.52)

Now we can prove Theorem 2 as follows.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** Let \( x^G_{t+1} \) and \( x^A_{t+1} \) denote the results obtained by the SAGC and the centralized AMP respectively. For any \( n \in \Pi \), according to (2.49), we have \( x^G_{t+1}(n) = \eta(f_t(n); \beta_t) = x^A_{t+1}(n) \); for any \( n \notin \Pi \), according to (2.49), we have \( x^G_{t+1}(n) = 0 \) and \( U(n) \leq \beta_t \), and according to Lemma 1 we know that \( |f_t(n)| \leq U(n) \leq \beta_t \), so \( x^A_{t+1}(n) = 0 \). Therefore, \( x^G_{t+1} = x^A_{t+1} \).

### 2.5.2 Quantized GCAMP Algorithm

In SAGC we calculate \( U(n) \) based on \( \mathbf{W}_t \) and \( T \). Since \( U(n) \) in SAGC is only an upper bound on \( |f_t(n)| \), we can use quantized \( \mathbf{W}_t \) for its calculation, and for those \( n \)'s with \( U(n) > \beta_t \), we send all the floating-point numbers \( w^p_t(n) \) to Sensor 1, which could lead to a further reduction in communication cost. For a better understanding of the proposed approach, we first give a brief review of the format of floating-point
numbers.

2.5.3 Preliminary on Floating-Point Numbers

In the IEEE standard [67], to obtain the floating-point format of a real number \( a \), we first need 1 bit to denote its sign, and then express \(|a|\) using scientific notation with base 2:

\[
|a| = S_a \times 2^{E_a},
\]

where \( E_a = \lfloor \log_2 |a| \rfloor \) is called the exponent, and \( S_a \in [1, 2) \) is called the significand in the form of \( 1.a_1a_2\cdots a_k \cdots \) (\( a_k \in \{0, 1\}, \forall k \)) with base 2. Note that \( \{a_k\} \) can be an infinite sequence.

Since \( E_a \) is an integer, if we know that \( E_a \in [E_{\min}, E_{\max}] \), then we need

\[
B_e = \lceil \log_2 (E_{\max} - E_{\min} + 1) \rceil
\]

bits to represent \( E_a \). For examples, the exponents of all the 64-bits floating-point numbers are within \([-1022, 1023]\), so the corresponding \( B_e = \lceil \log_2 (1022+1023+1) \rceil = 11 \) [67].

Regarding \( S_a \), if we only choose the first \( \ell \) items in \( \{a_k\} \), then we will obtain a number

\[
S_a^{\ell} = 1 + \frac{2^\ell (S_a - 1)}{2^\ell}.
\]

It can be shown that

\[
0 \leq S_a - S_a^{\ell} < \frac{1}{2^\ell},
\]

that is, \( S_a^{\ell} \) converges to \( S_a \) at least exponentially fast. In 64-bit floating-point numbers, the first \( B_s = 52 \) bits are used for representing the significand [67].

2.5.4 Computing \( U(n) \) Using Quantization

Here, we present the quantized GCAMP (Q-GCAMP) algorithm, which has the same structure as SAGC, only by introducing quantization in Steps I and II, and
modifying the calculation of $U(n)$:

**Step I:** Define $T$ and $\Omega_p$ the same as in SAGC, and define $N_p = |\Omega_p|$, $N'_p = N - N_p$, $U_p = \max_n |w^p_t(n)|$, and $L_p = \min_n |w^p_t(n)|$. We can carefully choose the parameter $\theta$ so that $L_p < T < U_p$ holds. Before sending anything to Sensor 1, each Sensor $p \geq 2$ uniformly quantizes $(T, U_p]$ into $\lfloor rN_p \rfloor$ bins, and $[L_p, T]$ into $\lfloor r'N'_p \rfloor$ bins, where $r, r' \in (0, 1]$ are scaling parameters and tuned empirically. Each bin inside $(T, U_p]$ or $[L_p, T]$ is indexed from 0 to $\lfloor rN_p - 1 \rfloor$ or $\lfloor r'N'_p - 1 \rfloor$. Then, Sensor $p \geq 2$ finds the quantization index of $w^p_t(n)$, which is denoted as $q^p_t(n)$, for each $n \in \Omega_p$. It is easy to show that

\begin{align}
T + q^p_t(n) \frac{U_p - T}{rN_p} &\leq |w^p_t(n)| \\
&\leq T + (q^p_t(n) + 1) \frac{U_p - T}{rN_p}, \ \forall n \in \Omega_p,
\end{align}

(2.57)

and

\begin{align}
L_p + q^p_t(n) \frac{T - L_p}{r'N'_p} &\leq |w^p_t(n)| \\
&\leq L_p + (q^p_t(n) + 1) \frac{T - L_p}{r'N'_p}, \ \forall n \notin \Omega_p.
\end{align}

(2.58)

Now, Sensor $p$ sends a package containing the sensor index $p$, $\text{sgn}(w^p_t)$, $L_p$, $U_p$, $N_p$, $\Omega_p$, and $q^p_t(\Omega_p)$ to Sensor 1.

Note that both $L_p$ and $U_p$ take 63 bits, $N_p$ takes $\lceil \log_2 N \rceil$ bits, and $q^p_t(\Omega_p)$ are integers, which take $N_p \lceil \log_2 \lfloor rN_p \rfloor \rceil$ bits. Therefore, the total number of communication bits used in Step I is

\begin{equation}
B_1 = (P - 1) \lceil \log_2 (P - 1) \rceil + N + 126 + \lceil \log_2 N \rceil \\
+ \sum_{p=2}^{P} \left( \min\{N_p \lceil \log_2 N \rceil, N\} + N_p \lceil \log_2 \lfloor rN_p \rfloor \rceil \right).
\end{equation}

(2.59)

**Step II:** On receiving a package, Sensor 1 can obtain a range $[R^L_{Q_1}(p, n), R^U_{Q_1}(p, n)]$ on $w^p_t(n)$: for any $n \in \Omega_p$, $R^L_{Q_1}(p, n)$ and $R^U_{Q_1}(p, n)$ can be obtained according to (2.57);
for any $n \notin \Omega_p$, $R^L_{Q_1}(p,n) = L_p$ and $R^U_{Q_1}(p,n) = T$ if $w_p(n) > 0$, and $R^L_{Q_1}(p,n) = -T$ and $R^U_{Q_1}(p,n) = -L_p$ otherwise.

Sensor 1 can then obtain a range $[R^L_{Q_1}(n), R^U_{Q_1}(n)]$ on $f_i(n)$:

$$R^L_{Q_1}(n) = w^1_i(n) + \sum_{p=2}^P R^L_{Q_1}(p,n), \quad (2.60)$$

and

$$R^U_{Q_1}(n) = w^1_i(n) + \sum_{p=2}^P R^U_{Q_1}(p,n). \quad (2.61)$$

Further,

$$U_{Q_1}(n) = \max \{ R^U_{Q_1}(n), -R^L_{Q_1}(n) \} \quad (2.62)$$

is an upper bound on $|f_i(n)|$. Sensor 1 broadcasts the set $F_{Q_1} = \{ n : U_{Q_1}(n) \geq \beta_t \}$ to other sensors, which requires $\min\{|F_{Q_1}|\lceil \log_2 N \rceil, N \} + 1$ bits, and receives a package containing $p$ and $q^p_i(F_{Q_1}\setminus\Omega_p)$ from each Sensor $p$, of the size $\lceil \log_2(P-1) \rceil + |F_{Q_1}\setminus\Omega_p| \lceil \log_2 [r'N'_p] \rceil$ bits.

Now, Sensor 1 can obtain a new range $[R^L_{Q_2}(p,n), R^U_{Q_2}(p,n)]$ on each $w^p_i(n)$ for each $n \in F_{Q_1}$: for $n \in \Omega_p$, the range remains the same; for $n \in F_{Q_1}\setminus\Omega_p$, the range is updated according to (2.58). Therefore, we can obtain a new range $[R^L_{Q_2}(n), R^U_{Q_2}(n)]$ on $f_i(n)$ and a new upper bound $U(n)$ on $|f_i(n)|$ for each $n \in F_{Q_1}$, in a similar way as (2.60)-(2.62).

Sensor 1 broadcasts the “refined” set $\Pi = \{ n : U(n) \geq \beta_t \}$ to other sensors, which requires $\min\{|\Pi|\lceil \log_2 |F_{Q_1}| \rceil, |F_{Q_1}| \} \text{ bits.}$

The total number of bits in Step II is

$$B_2 = \min\{|F_{Q_1}|\lceil \log_2 N \rceil, N \} + \lfloor (P-1)\lfloor \log_2(P-1) \rfloor \rfloor + \sum_{p=2}^P |F_{Q_1}\setminus\Omega_p| \lceil \log_2 [r'N'_p] \rceil + \min\{|\Pi|\lceil \log_2 |F_{Q_1}| \rceil, |F_{Q_1}| \} \text{ bits.} \quad (2.63)$$
Step III: Up to now, both Sensors 1 and $p$ know $\Pi$, and $[R^L_{Q_2}(p,n), R^U_{Q_2}(p,n)]$ for each $n \in \Pi$, so they can determine the minimum number of bits $B(p,n)$ required for Sensor 1 to know $w^p_t(n)$, in the following way:

1) Let $B^L_e(p,n)$ and $B^U_e(p,n)$ be the exponents of $R^L_{Q_2}(p,n)$ and $R^U_{Q_2}(p,n)$, if they are not the same, then Sensor $p$ needs to send $\lceil \log_2(|B^U_e(p,n) - B^L_e(p,n)| + 1)\rceil$ bits representing the exponent of $w^p_t(n)$, and all the 52 bits of the significand of $w^p_t(n)$, i.e., $B(p,n) = \lceil \log_2(|B^U_e(p,n) - B^L_e(p,n)| + 1)\rceil + 52$.

2) if $B^L_e(p,n) = B^U_e(p,n)$, then Sensor 1 knows that the exponent of $w^p_t(n)$ is also $B^L_e(p,n)$. Let $\{L^p_n(k)\}$ and $\{U^p_n(k)\}$ ($k = 1, 2, \cdots, 52$) denote the 52-bit significands of $R^L_{Q_2}(p,n)$ and $R^U_{Q_2}(p,n)$ respectively. Sensor $p$ compares $\{L^p_n(k)\}$ and $\{U^p_n(k)\}$, and counts $B_{\text{same}} = \max\{k: L^p_n(j) = U^p_n(j), \forall j = 1, \cdots, k\}$. In this case, Sensor $p$ only needs to send the last $B(p,n) = 52 - B_{\text{same}}$ bits of the significand of $w^p_t(n)$ to Sensor 1.

Finally, Sensor 1 computes $f_t(n)$ for each $n \in \Pi$, and obtains $x_{t+1}$ correspondingly. The support set $\Gamma$ takes $\min\{|\Gamma|\lceil\log_2|\Pi|\rceil, |\Pi|\}$ bits, and $x_{t+1}(\Gamma)$ takes $64|\Gamma|$ bits to broadcast.

Therefore, the number of bits in Step III is

\[B_3 = (P - 1)[\log_2(P - 1)] + \sum_{p=2}^{P} \sum_{n \in \Pi} B(p,n) + \min\{|\Gamma|\lceil\log_2|\Pi|\rceil, |\Pi|\} + 64|\Gamma|.\]  

As we can see, the major modification of Q-GCAMP based on SAGC is that in Steps I and II there is no communication of floating-point numbers other than $L_p$ and $U_p$ in Step I, the two rounds of sifting in Step II leaves a “good” candidate set $\Pi$, and in Step III, we further reduce the communication of floating-point numbers by incorporating the information of their ranges obtained in the first two steps.

Now we prove the correctness of Q-GCAMP.
**Theorem 6** Given the same threshold $\beta_t = \tau \hat{\sigma}_t$, Q-GCAM algorithm obtains exactly the same $x_{t+1}$ as that of the centralized AMP algorithm computed by (2.2).

It is straightforward to prove Theorem 6 due to the fact that for any $n \in \Gamma$, $f_t(n)$ is calculated since $U(n) \geq |f_t(n)| \geq \beta_t$.

### 2.6 Numerical Results

#### 2.6.1 Simulation Setup

In the simulation, we set $N = 10,000$, and choose $(\kappa, \rho)$ pairs below the phase transition curve $\rho = \rho(\kappa) = \max_{\tau \geq 0} \rho(\kappa, \tau)$ to generate $s_0$ with each entry drawn from i.i.d. $S_0$ which follows the Bernoulli-Gaussian distribution:

$$f_{S_0}(s) = \epsilon \phi(s) + (1 - \epsilon) \delta(s),$$

(2.65)

where $\epsilon = \kappa \rho$ denotes the normalized sparsity level of $s_0$, and $\phi(s)$ is the PDF of the standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

The sensing matrix $A$ with i.i.d. entries $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{M})$ is equally divided into $P$ parts by rows, with each sensor having a $(M/P) \times N$ measurement matrix, and the measurement noise $e$ consists of i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ entries. We determine the values of $\sigma^2$ based on given signal-to-noise ratios (SNR), which is defined as

$$\text{SNR} = 10 \log_{10} \frac{\mathbb{E}(\|As_0\|_2^2)}{\mathbb{E}(\|e\|_2^2)} \approx 10 \log_{10} \frac{\mathbb{E}(s_0^2)}{\mathbb{E}(e^2)}.$$  

(2.66)

It can be shown that for the Bernoulli-Gaussian in (2.65),

$$\text{SNR} = 10 \log_{10} \frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}.$$  

(2.67)

In order to evaluate how efficient the proposed GC algorithms are in terms of communication savings, we first consider the naive approach where each Sensor $p \geq 2$ sends the whole vector $w_{t-1}^p$ to Sensor 1 to compute $x_t$, which requires
\[ B_{t, \text{max}} = (P - 1) \left[ \lceil \log_2(P - 1) \rceil + 64N \right] + \min\{\|x_{t+1}\|_0 \lceil \log_2 N \rceil, N\} + 64\|x_{t+1}\|_0 \]

bits, where the first line of the right hand side (RHS) is the number of bits required for sending \(w_t^p\) and sensor indices \(p\) to Sensor 1, and the second line refers to that used for broadcasting the support and non-zero elements of \(x_{t+1}\) from Sensor 1 to others. For large \(N\), \(B_{t, \text{max}}\) is dominated by the item \(64N(P - 1)\), which does not depend on \(t\).

We then define the normalized bit rate \(\text{NR}_t = B_t/B_{t, \text{max}}\) for DiAMP, where \(B_t\) is the number of bits required by DiAMP in the \(t\)-th iteration.

For every proposed GC algorithm, we tune their parameters \(\theta\) empirically and choose the ones that yield the best simulation results (Different algorithms may have different “optimal” \(\theta\)). The tuned parameters are given as follows: in GCAMP, \(\theta = 0.8\); in A-GCAMP, when GCAMP is invoked on \(W_t\), we set \(\theta = \theta_1 = 0.8\), and when when GCAMP is invoked on \(\Delta W_t\), we set \(\theta = \theta_2 = 0.85\); in Q-A-GCAMP, we set \(\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 1.1\). In A-GCAMP and Q-A-GCAMP, \(\rho_w\) is set to 0.5.

Regarding when to terminate the algorithm, we use the convergence criterion \(|\hat{\sigma}_{t+1} - \hat{\sigma}_t| \leq \zeta \hat{\sigma}_t\), where \(\zeta = 1 \times 10^{-4}\). In tuning the parameter \(\tau\), we set \(L = 10\), \(T_1 = 100\), and \(T_2 = 20\). For each \((\kappa, \rho)\) pair, we have 100 Monte-Carlo simulations.

### 2.6.2 Accuracy of \(\hat{\sigma}_t^2\) in DiAMP

In this section we evaluate the accuracy of the proposed estimator \(\hat{\sigma}_t^2\) in \eqref{eq:sigt2}. In Fig. 7 we compare the proposed estimator \(\hat{\sigma}_t^2\) with \(\sigma_{t,S}^2\) obtained by the SE equation \eqref{eq:sigse}, and the empirical \(\sigma_{t,E}^2 = \sqrt{\|x_t + A^Tz_t - s_0\|^2_2/N}\). As shown in the figure, \(\hat{\sigma}_t^2\) is very close to \(\sigma_{t,E}^2\), and matches \(\sigma_{t,S}^2\) reasonably well, where the match of \(\hat{\sigma}_t^2\) and \(\sigma_{t,E}^2\) indicates that the proposed \(\hat{\sigma}_t^2\) is an accurate estimator of \(\sigma_t^2\), and the match of \(\hat{\sigma}_t^2\)
and $\sigma^2_{t,S}$ verifies that the simulation setup fits well into the large system limit where the SE equation holds.

![Empirical CDF](image)

**Fig. 7.** Empirical CDF of the absolute values of relative errors of $\hat{\sigma}^2_t$ with respect to $\sigma^2_{t,S}$ and $\sigma^2_{t,E}$.

### 2.6.3 Performance of Proposed GC Algorithms

Since the communication cost of GC algorithms is directly related to the sparsity of $x_{t+1}$, to observe their relation, we compute the normalized sparsity level of $x_{t+1}$, namely $\epsilon_t = \|x_{t+1}\|_0/N$.

In Table 6 we list the normalized sparsity levels of $x_{t+1}$ and the normalized bit rates of the proposed GC algorithms averaged over iterations, which are $\bar{\epsilon} =$
\[
\sum_{t=1}^{100} \epsilon_t/100 \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{NR} = \sum_{t=1}^{100} B_t / \sum_{t=1}^{100} B_{t,\text{max}} \quad \text{respectively.}
\]

It can be seen that the trend (increasing or decreasing) of \( \overline{NR} \) agrees well with that of \( \overline{\epsilon} \), which is not surprising: the more sparse \( x_{t+1} \) is, the lower communication cost it takes to find \( S(x_{t+1}) \).

It can be shown that MTA becomes inefficient when the total score is no longer monotone with partial scores. On the other hand, the proposed GCAMP works reasonably well and saves roughly 50% of the communication cost compared with MTA. The adaptive approach A-GCAMP improves another 7%-14% of communication savings based on GCAMP. With quantization incorporated, Q-A-GCAMP achieves further significant reduction of communication cost, ranging from 13%-26%.

More insight can be obtained from Table 6. Note that \( \epsilon_t \) is factually the lower bound on \( NR_t \). This is because the former is the percentage of \( f_t(n) \)'s with magnitudes greater than \( \beta_t \), while the latter can be approximately interpreted from another perspective — the percentage of \( f_t(n) \)'s calculated in GC algorithms. In order not to lose any accuracy, the latter must be greater than or equal to the former, and the equality holds only if \( S(x_{t+1}) \) is known in advance. In this aspect, we can see that the \( \overline{NR} \) of Q-A-GCAMP comes close to its lower bound \( \overline{\epsilon} \).

In Fig. 8 we provide more detailed information of the \( NR_t \) values obtained by different GC algorithms. The more top-left the empirical CDF curve of \( NR_t \) is located, the better communication saving a GC algorithm has achieved. It is clear that Q-A-GCAMP > A-GCAMP > GCAMP > MTA in terms of communication savings.

### 2.7 Conclusion

Assuming the sparsity of the original signal to be unknown, several DiAMP algorithms have been proposed for performing compressed sensing in distributed sensor networks, consisting a series of local and global computations. All of these algorithms have exactly the same recovery result as the centralized algorithms, given the same
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\rho = 0.1, \text{SNR} = 20\text{dB}$</th>
<th>$\rho = 0.2, \text{SNR} = 20\text{dB}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>0.20 0.30 0.40</td>
<td>0.20 0.30 0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of iterations</td>
<td>98.33 96.61 94.54</td>
<td>94.34 93.86 95.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA (%)</td>
<td>96.65 96.40 96.32</td>
<td>109.23 108.47 108.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCAMP (%)</td>
<td>42.02 44.11 45.60</td>
<td>53.29 55.57 57.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-GCAMP (%)</td>
<td>33.90 36.25 38.15</td>
<td>40.50 43.18 45.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-A-GCAMP (%)</td>
<td>10.05 12.64 14.87</td>
<td>12.94 15.94 18.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{\epsilon}$ (%)</td>
<td>4.23 6.41 8.45</td>
<td>6.13 8.92 11.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\rho = 0.1, \text{SNR} = 10\text{dB}$</th>
<th>$\rho = 0.2, \text{SNR} = 10\text{dB}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>0.20 0.30 0.40</td>
<td>0.20 0.30 0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of iterations</td>
<td>83.43 81.58 80.64</td>
<td>75.76 73.94 74.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA (%)</td>
<td>97.03 96.40 96.47</td>
<td>108.52 107.48 107.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCAMP (%)</td>
<td>43.77 45.77 47.57</td>
<td>53.23 55.13 57.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-GCAMP (%)</td>
<td>33.89 36.44 38.32</td>
<td>40.17 42.37 44.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-A-GCAMP (%)</td>
<td>10.36 13.06 15.37</td>
<td>13.18 15.83 18.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{\epsilon}$ (%)</td>
<td>4.78 7.17 9.40</td>
<td>6.25 9.00 11.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To reduce the communication cost in the GC step for both non-quantized and quantized data, we developed GCAMP, which is a communication-efficient data-querying algorithm and outperforms another popular algorithm MTA significantly. By taking into consideration the correlation of data between adjacent iterations and incorporating quantization steps, a more sophisticated algorithm Q-A-GCAMP is developed, which comes close to requiring the minimum bit rates stipulated by the sparsity of $x_{t+1}$. 

thresholds. To reduce the communication cost in the GC step for both non-quantized and quantized data, we developed GCAMP, which is a communication-efficient data-querying algorithm and outperforms another popular algorithm MTA significantly. By taking into consideration the correlation of data between adjacent iterations and incorporating quantization steps, a more sophisticated algorithm Q-A-GCAMP is developed, which comes close to requiring the minimum bit rates stipulated by the sparsity of $x_{t+1}$. 
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Fig. 8. Empirical CDF of $NR_t$ for GC algorithms.
CHAPTER 3

GAUSSIANITY IN DIAMP

3.1 Introduction

Approximate message passing (AMP) [47], a statistical algorithm originally developed for compressed sensing (CS) recovery [1], turns out to have more promising applications for general linear inverse problems, including low-rank matrix completion [68], non-negative principal component analysis (PCA) [69], and code division multiple access (CDMA) systems [70, 71], etc. The popularity of AMP is due to the universality of state evolution (SE) [72], a one-dimensional recursion that determines AMP’s performance.

Consider the linear inverse problem

\[ y = As_0 + w, \]

where \( s_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N \) is unknown and \( w \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is additive measurement noise, and \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N} \) and \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \) are given, which are known as the sensing matrix and the measurement respectively. AMP obtains a sequence of estimators \( \{x^t\}_{t \geq 0} \) for \( s_0 \), by starting from an initial estimate \( x_0 = 0 \) and residual \( z_0 = y \), and proceeding as follows:

\[ u^t = x^t + A^T z^t, \]

\[ x^{t+1} = \eta_t(u^t), \]

\[ z^{t+1} = y - Ax^t + \frac{1}{\kappa} \gamma_t z^t, \]

where \( \kappa = n/N \) is called the measurement ratio, \([\cdot]^T\) denotes transposition, \( \eta_t : \mathbb{R}^N \to \)
$\mathbb{R}^N$ is a separable denoiser, i.e.,

$$\eta_t(u') = [\eta_t(u'_1), \eta_t(u'_2), \cdots, \eta_t(u'_N)]^T,$$  

(3.5)

and

$$\gamma_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \eta'_t(u'_i),$$  

(3.6)

where $\eta'_t(u'_i)$ denotes the derivative of $\eta_t(u'_i)$ with respect to $u'_i$.

In AMP literature, it is a common assumption that the sensing matrix $A$ consists of i.i.d. Gaussian entries with zero-mean and variance $1/n$, and the entries of $s_0$ and $w$ follow i.i.d. $S_0 \sim p_{S_0}$ and $W \sim p_{W}$ respectively, where $W$ is zero-mean with variance $\sigma^2$; $u'$ and $z'$ in (3.2) and (3.4) are called pseudo data and measurement residual respectively, and $\frac{1}{\kappa} \gamma_t z_t$ in (3.4) is known as the Onsager term.

The popularity of AMP lies in its theoretical support — state evolution (SE), which depicts the performance of AMP through an one-dimensional recursive equation. More specifically, it shows that $u_t - s_0$ behaves as $\mathcal{N}(0, \tau^2_t I_N)$ [58], where $\mathcal{N}(:, :)$ denotes the normal (Gaussian) distribution, $I_N$ denotes the $N \times N$ identity matrix, and $\tau^2_t$ satisfies

$$\tau^2_{t+1} = \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathbb{E} [\eta_t(S_0 + \tau_t Z) - S_0]^2,$$  

(3.7)

where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ is independent of $S_0$. Note that $\mathbb{E} [\eta_t(S_0 + \tau_t Z) - S_0]^2$ in (3.7) is exactly the mean square error (MSE) of $x_{t+1}$. Therefore, the SE equation in (3.7) can also be written as

$$\sigma^2_{t+1} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \text{MSE}(x_{t+1}) = \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathbb{E} [\eta_t(S_0 + \tau_t Z) - S_0]^2,$$  

(3.8)

and

$$\tau^2_{t+1} = \sigma^2 + \sigma^2_{t+1}.$$  

(3.9)
The Gaussianity of \( u_t - s_0 \) comes from the Onsager term in (3.4), which is the key difference between AMP and the iterative soft thresholding (IST) algorithm in [46, 55].

SE makes AMP favorable in two aspects. First, it converts the linear inverse problem in (3.1) into a sequence of sub-problems in scalar channels:

\[
    u_t = s_0 + \theta_t, \quad \text{with} \quad \theta_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau_t^2 I^N), \quad (3.10)
\]

or simply

\[
    U_t = S_0 + \tau_t Z, \quad (3.11)
\]

which avoids complicated matrix operations such as inversion, and provides a handful of choices for the denoiser \( \eta_t \). For example, if \( s_0 \) is assumed to be sparse yet with unknown prior distribution, then the soft thresholding function [47] yields the minimax reconstruction MSE [57]; otherwise, if \( p_{s_0} \) is given, then the minimum MSE (MMSE) estimator conditioning on \( u_t \) in (3.10), or \( U_t \) in (3.11) will be the optimal denoiser in the MSE sense.

Second, the SE equations (3.8) and (3.9) can be performed offline, which makes the performance of AMP more predictable. For example, an important parameter in AMP is the compression ratio \( \kappa \), to determine what \( \kappa \) is good enough in order to achieve a recovery MSE below a designed threshold, one can find a corresponding solution by evaluating SE equations with binary search.

### 3.1.1 Existing Results about SE

In order to show the universality of SE, a generalized algorithm based on AMP was considered in [58], which we denote as AMP-G1:

\[
    b^t = A f_t(h^t, s_0) - \lambda_t g_{t-1}(b^{t-1}, w), \quad \text{and} \quad h^{t+1} = A^T g_t(b^t, w) - \xi_t f_t(h^t, s_0), \quad (3.12)
\]
where all the elements of $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ follow i.i.d. $p_{s_0}$ and $p_w$ respectively, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$ is with entries following i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/n)$, $f_t : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$ and $g_t : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ are assumed to be separable, i.e., $f_t(h, s) = [f_t(h_1, s_1), \cdots, f_t(h_N, s_N)]^T$ and $g_t(b, w) = [g_t(b_1, w_1), \cdots, g_t(b_n, w_n)]^T$, with $f_t(h, s)$ and $g_t(b, w)$ being Lipschitz continuous\(^1\) and $\lambda_t$ and $\xi_t$ are given by

\[
\lambda_t = \sum_{i=1}^N f'_t(h_t^i, s_0, i)/n, \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_t = \sum_{i=1}^n g'_t(b_t^i, w_i)/n, \tag{3.13}
\]

where the derivatives are with respect to the first arguments.

Denote

\[
q^t = f_t(h^t, s_0), \quad \text{and} \quad m^t = g_t(b^t, w). \tag{3.14}
\]

It can be shown that the original AMP is a special case of AMP-G1 with

\[
h^{t+1} = s_0 - u^t, \\
b^t = w - z^t, \\
q^t = s_0 - x^t, \\
m^t = -z^t, \\
f_t(h^t, s_0) = \eta_{t-1}(s_0 - h^t) - s_0, \\
g_t(b^t, w) = b^t - w.
\tag{3.15}
\]

AMP-G1 starts with initial values $q^0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfying some statistical property, and $m^{-1} = 0$, while the original AMP starts with $x^0 = 0$, corresponding to $q^0 = s_0$. By comparison, it is useful to model the initial value $q^0$ in AMP-G1 as a function of $s_0$ and another random vector $x^0$ independent of $s_0$.

By applying a so-called conditioning technique that originates from Spin Glass

\(^1\)A function $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^q$ is said to be Lipschitz continuous if there exists $L > 0$ only depending on $f$ such that $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^p, ||f(x) - f(y)|| \leq L||x - y||$. 
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Theory [73], in [58] it was shown that elements in $h^{t+1}$ and $b^t$ are asymptotically i.i.d. Gaussian as $N \to \infty$ and $n/N \to \kappa > 0$, with their variances $\tau^2_t$ and $\sigma^2_t$ satisfying the generalized SE:

$$
\sigma^2_t = \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathbb{E} \left[ f_t(\tau_{t-1} Z, S_0)^2 \right], \quad (3.16)
$$

and

$$
\tau^2_t = \mathbb{E} \left[ g_t(\sigma_t Z, W)^2 \right]. \quad (3.17)
$$

The essence of the conditioning technique is to view AMP-G1 as a generator of linear constraints for $A$:

$$
A q^t = b^t + \lambda_t m^{t-1},
$$

$$
A^T m^t = h^{t+1} + \xi_t q^t, \quad (3.18)
$$

Note that AMP-G1 can be divided into two stages: i) given

$$
\mathcal{S}_{t,t} \triangleq \{w, s_0, q^0, b^0, m^0, h^1, q^1, \ldots, b^{t-1}, m^{t-1}, h^t, q^t\},
$$

it obtains $b^t$ and $m^t$, and ii) given

$$
\mathcal{S}_{t+1,t} \triangleq \mathcal{S}_{t,t} \cup \{b^t, m^t\},
$$

it obtains $h^{t+1}$ and $q^{t+1}$, and has

$$
\mathcal{S}_{t+1,t+1} \triangleq \mathcal{S}_{t+1,t} \cup \{h^{t+1}, q^{t+1}\},
$$

The proof in [58] is sketched as follows: since $A$ is Gaussian, its conditional distribution under linear constraints determined by $\mathcal{S}_{t,t}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{t+1,t}$ is still Gaussian. Based on $A|\mathcal{S}_{t,t}$ and $A|\mathcal{S}_{t+1,t}$, one can further obtain the conditional distributions $b^t|\mathcal{S}_{t,t}$ and $h^{t+1}|\mathcal{S}_{t+1,t}$. Since they are linear in $A$, their conditional distributions are also Gaussian. Then, one can take the limit $N \to \infty$ and $n/N \to \kappa > 0$,
and show that their conditional distributions become irrelevant to $\mathcal{S}_{t,t}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{t+1,t}$ asymptotically, which finishes the proof.

In [74] a Bayesian optimal AMP was proposed, where the denoiser is the minimum-mean-squared-error (MMSE) estimator, for solving the linear inverse problem in (3.1), by assuming a prior knowledge of $p_{S_0}$. In that paper the sensing matrix $A$ is replaced by a so-called spatially-coupled sensing matrices, where each element is zero-mean and Gaussian, yet with different variances. In [74] it was shown that SE still holds in this case, and proved that the Bayesian optimal AMP achieves a mean-squared-error (MSE) of $O(\sigma^2)$ asymptotically as $N \to \infty$, $n/N \to \kappa > 0$, and $t \to \infty$, where $\sigma^2$ is the variance of noise.

In [75] AMP was further combined with spatially-coupled sensing matrices into a more general algorithm, which we denote as AMP-G2:

$$\Pi_t = A F_t(\Psi^t, S) - \frac{1}{\kappa} G_t^{-1}(\Pi_{t-1}, Y) J^T_{\psi,t},$$

$$\Psi_{t+1} = A^T G_t(\Pi^t, Y) - F_t(\Psi^t, S) J^T_{\pi,t},$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$ consists of i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/n)$ entries, $S$ and $Y$ are $N \times q$ and $n \times q$ matrices, with each of their rows $s_i \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and $y_j \in \mathbb{R}^q$ following i.i.d. $p_S$ and $p_Y$ correspondingly, $F_t : \mathbb{R}^{N \times q} \times \mathbb{R}^{N \times q} \to \mathbb{R}^{N \times q}$ and $G_t : \mathbb{R}^{n \times q} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times q} \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ are assumed to be row-separable, i.e., $F_t(\Psi^t, S) = [f_{t}^{row}(\psi^t_1, s_1), \cdots, f_{t}^{row}(\psi^t_N, s_N)]^T$, and $G_t(\Pi^t, Y) = [g_{t}^{row}(\pi^t_1, y_1), \cdots, g_{t}^{row}(\pi^t_n, y_n)]^T$, with $f_{t}^{row} : \mathbb{R}^q \to \mathbb{R}^q$ and $g_{t}^{row} : \mathbb{R}^q \to \mathbb{R}^q$ being Lipschitz continuous, and $J_{\psi,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ and $J_{\pi,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ are the empirical averages of Jacobian of $f_{t}^{row}(\psi^t_i, s_i)$ and $g_{t}^{row}(\pi^t_j, y_j)$ with respect to their
first arguments, i.e.,

\[
J_{\psi,t} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \nabla^T_{\psi,t} f^\text{row}_t(\psi^t_i, s_i)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial f^\text{row}_t(\psi^t_i, s_i)}{\partial \psi^t_i, 1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f^\text{row}_t(\psi^t_i, s_i)}{\partial \psi^t_i, q} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\frac{\partial f^\text{row}_t(\psi^t_i, s_i)}{\partial \psi^t_i, 1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f^\text{row}_t(\psi^t_i, s_i)}{\partial \psi^t_i, q}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(3.20)

\[
J_{\pi,t} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla^T_{\pi,t} g^\text{row}_t(\pi^t_i, y_i)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial g^\text{row}_t(\pi^t_i, y_i)}{\partial \pi^t_i, 1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial g^\text{row}_t(\pi^t_i, y_i)}{\partial \pi^t_i, q} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\frac{\partial g^\text{row}_t(\pi^t_i, y_i)}{\partial \pi^t_i, 1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial g^\text{row}_t(\pi^t_i, y_i)}{\partial \pi^t_i, q}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

It can be verified that for the case \( q = 1 \), AMP-G2 is the same as AMP-G1. By applying a conditioning technique similar to [58], in [75] it was shown that rows of \( \Pi_t \) and \( \Psi_{t+1} \) are asymptotically Gaussian as \( N \to \infty \) and \( n/N \to \kappa > 0 \). Finally, the state-of-art work in [72] showed that SE still holds for AMP-G2 when \( A \) consists of independent zero-mean subgaussian\(^2\) entries with variance \( 1/n \).

### 3.1.2 Our Contribution: State Evolution in Distributed AMP

Recently, the advance of distributed processing techniques has helped increase more attention to large-scale linear inverse problems, due to its potential to speed up the recovery process. In our earlier work [41], a distributed AMP (DiAMP) algorithm was developed, which decomposes \( u^t \) in (3.2) into a summation of \( P \) vectors \( u^t_p \in \mathbb{R}^N \),

\(^2\)The definition of subgaussian random variables will be introduced in Section 3.3.1.
with

\[ u_p^t = \begin{cases} 
  x^t + A_p^T z_p^t, & \text{if } p = 1, \\
  A_p^T z_p^t, & \text{otherwise,}
\end{cases} \tag{3.21} \]

where

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  A_1 \\
  \vdots \\
  A_p \\
  \vdots \\
  A_P
\end{pmatrix} = A, \quad \text{and} \quad 
\begin{pmatrix}
  z_1^t \\
  \vdots \\
  z_p^t \\
  \vdots \\
  z_P^t
\end{pmatrix} = z^t
\]

are row partitions of \( A \) and \( z^t \) respectively.

In the designed system, \( P \) sensors take the corresponding partitions \( A_p \), and compute \( u_p^t \), which dissertation AMP running in a parallel pattern. For presentation purposes, we use some different notations from the previous chapter, for example, \( A_p \) instead of \( A_p^p \) when denoting the \( p \)-th row partition of \( A \) at most places of this chapter, where the reason should be straightforward as will be shown later.

On the meantime, the summation of \( P \) vectors \( u_p^t \) implies inter-sensor communication, which can be a challenging issue as the problem size goes up. In \cite{76}, lossy compression is introduced in DiAMP in order to save communication cost, where each sensor quantizes \( u_p^t \) into

\[ Q(u_p^t) = u_p^t + v_p^t, \tag{3.22} \]

with the quantization error \( v_p^t \), and sends \( Q(u_p^t) \) to the fusion center. If the uniform scalar quantization is performed and the characteristic function of \( u_p^t \) is band limited, or if vector quantization is performed, it is a good approximation to model \( v_p^t \) as a random vector with i.i.d. zero-mean elements in addition that \( v_p^t \) is independent of \( u_p^t \) \cite{66, 77}. 
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Finally, the fusion center obtains
\[ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^t = \sum_{p=1}^{P} Q(\mathbf{u}_p^t) = \mathbf{u}^t + \mathbf{v}^t \] (3.23)
with \( \mathbf{v}^t = \sum_{p=1}^{P} \mathbf{v}_p^t \) independent of \( \mathbf{u}_p^t \), and updates the estimation of \( \mathbf{s}_0 \) as
\[ \mathbf{x}^{t+1} = \eta_t(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^t). \] (3.24)

Furthermore, compared with [41], the computation of \( \mathbf{u}_p^t \) in [76] is slightly changed:
\[ \mathbf{u}_p^t = \omega_p \mathbf{x}^t + \mathbf{A}_p^T \mathbf{z}_p^t, \] (3.25)
where \( \omega_p = n_p/n \), with \( n_p \) being the number of rows of \( \mathbf{A}_p \). The modification was made because numerical results indicate that \( \mathbf{u}_p^t - \omega_p \mathbf{s}_0 \) behaves like a random vector following \( \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \omega_p \tau_{t,Q}^2 \mathbf{I}_N) \), where
\[ \tau_{t+1,Q}^2 = \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathbb{E}[\eta_t(S_0 + \tau_{t,Q} Z + V_t) - S_0]^2, \] (3.26)
and \( V_t \) has the same distribution as all the elements in \( \mathbf{v}^t \). As we can see, if there is no quantization error (\( V_t = 0 \)), then \( \tau_{t,Q}^2 \) is exactly the same as that in (3.7). In other words, SE still holds for DiAMP, even in the presence of quantization error, which is exactly what we are trying to prove in this dissertation.

In light of the universality of SE for centralized AMP, we have good reason to conjecture that SE holds for the following more general DiAMP algorithms, which we denote as DiAMP-G1(G2):
local computation:

DiAMP-G1

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DiAMP-G1} & \quad \begin{cases} 
    b_p^t &= A_p q^t - \lambda_t g_{t-1}(b_p^{t-1}, w_p), \\
    h_{p}^{t+1} &= A_p^T g_t(b_p^t, w_p) - \omega_p \xi_t q_t,
  \end{cases} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(3.27)

DiAMP-G2

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DiAMP-G2} & \quad \begin{cases} 
    \Pi_p^t &= A_p \Phi^t - \frac{1}{\kappa} G_{t-1}(\Psi_p^{t-1}, Y_p) J_{\Psi,t}^T, \\
    \Psi_p^{t+1} &= A_p^T G_t(\Psi_p^t, Y_p) - \omega_p \Phi^t J_{\Phi,t}^T,
  \end{cases} \\
\end{align*}
\]

global computation:

DiAMP-G1: \[ q^t = f_t \left( \sum_{p=1}^P h_p^t, \nu^t, s_0 \right), \]

DiAMP-G2: \[ \Phi^t = F_t \left( \sum_{p=1}^P \Psi_p^t, \nu^t, S \right), \]

where \( \nu^t \) or \( \nu^t \) accounts for quantization noise, which is assumed to be independent of \( h_{p}^{t+1} \) or \( \Psi_p^{t+1} \), and mutually independent for different \( t \). As we can see, when \( \nu^t = 0 \) or \( \nu^t = 0 \), the proposed DiAMP algorithms are equivalent to centralized AMP algorithms.

In this dissertation, we will show stronger results for DiAMP than previous work. For simplicity of illustration, we are only going to prove that DiAMP-G1 has the following properties: (This proof can be easily extended for DiAMP-G2)

i) In addition to the Gaussianity of \( h_{p}^{t+1} = \sum_{p=1}^P h_p^{t+1} \) and \( b_p^t \) in centralized AMP where there is no quantization noise, we show that each individual \( h_p^{t+1} \) and \( b_p^t \) are also asymptotically zero-mean Gaussian with variances \( \omega_p \tau^2_t \) and \( \sigma^2_t \) respectively, where

\[
\sigma^2_t = \frac{1}{\kappa} E \left[ f_t(\tau_{t-1} Z, V_t, S_0) \right]^2,
\]

and

\[
\tau^2_t = E \left[ g_t(\sigma_t Z, W) \right]^2.
\]
ii) We provide a broader class of sensing matrices than \[72\] where SE holds for DiAMP and the centralized AMP. The proof is based on our own developed technique called *augmenting*.

Specifically, we have the following theorem:

**Theorem 7** For DiAMP-G1 in (3.27) and (3.28), if \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N} \), \( s_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N \), and \( w \in \mathbb{R}^n \) satisfy the following conditions:

i) \( A \), \( s_0 \), and \( w \) are independent;

ii) \( A \) consists of independent zero-mean entries with variance \( 1/n \), and each row (column) of \( A \) satisfies Lindeberg’s condition\(^3\);

iii) The empirical distribution\(^4\) of \( s_0 \), \( \hat{F}_{s_0}(x) \) converges weakly (in distribution) to a probability measure \( F_{s_0}(x) \) with bounded moments up to the order of \( 2k-2 \) for \( k \geq 2 \) as \( N \to \infty \), and the empirical \((2k-2)\)-th moment of \( s_0 \), \( \hat{E}_{F_{s_0}} |S_0|^{2k-2} \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{N} s_{0,i}^{2k-2} / N \to \mathbb{E}_{F_{s_0}} |S_0|^{2k-2} \);

iv) The empirical distribution of the initial value \( q_0 \), \( \hat{F}_{q_0}(x) \), \( \forall p \in [P] \), converges weakly to a probability measure \( F_{q_0}(x) \), with \( Q_0 \) being a Lipschitz continuous function of \( S_0 \) and another random variable \( X_0 \) independent of \( S_0 \), and assume that \( \langle q^0, q^0 \rangle \to k\sigma_0^2 \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |q^0_i|^{2k-2} / N < \infty \) almost surely;

v) the empirical distribution of \( w_p \), \( \hat{F}_{w_p}(x) \), \( \forall p \in [P] \), converges weakly to a common probability measure \( F_W(x) \) with bounded moments up to the order of \( 2k-2 \) for \( k \geq 2 \) as \( n_p \to \infty \), where \( n_p \) is the number of rows of \( A_p \), and the empirical \((2k-2)\)-th moment of \( w_p \), \( \hat{E}_{F_{w_p}} |W|^{2k-2} \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} w_{p,i}^{2k-2} / n_p \to \mathbb{E}_{F_W} |W|^{2k-2} \);

vi) \( v^t \) in (3.28) is independent of \( A \), \( s_0 \), and \( w \); in addition, all the elements of \( v^t \) follow i.i.d. \( F_{V_i} \), where \( V_i \) are independent for different \( t \),

---

\(^3\)Lindeberg’s condition will be introduced in Section 3.3.1.

\(^4\)Empirical distribution is defined in Section 3.2, Corollary 1.
then as $N \to \infty$ and $n/N \to \kappa > 0$ with $t$, $P$, $\omega_1$, $\cdots$, and $\omega_P$ fixed, for any pseudo Lipschitz functions $\psi_h : \mathbb{R}^{P+2} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi_b : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ of order $k$, the following holds:

$$
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \psi_h([h_1^{t+1}]_i, \cdots, [h_P^{t+1}]_i, [v^t]_i, [s_0]_i) \overset{a.s.}{\to} E\psi_h\left(\tau_t \sqrt{\omega_1} Z_1^t, \cdots, \tau_t \sqrt{\omega_P} Z_P^t, V_t, S_0\right),
$$

(3.31)

where $Z_1^t, \cdots, Z_P^t \sim i.i.d. \mathcal{N}(0,1)$, and

$$
\frac{1}{n_P} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \psi_b([b_1^t]_i, [w^t]_i) \overset{d}{\to} E\psi_b\left(\sigma_t \tilde{Z}_P^t, W\right),
$$

(3.32)

where $\tilde{Z}_1^t, \cdots, \tilde{Z}_P^t \sim i.i.d. \mathcal{N}(0,1)$.

Moreover, if $A$ only consists of i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1/n)$ entries, the weak convergences in (3.31) and (3.32) can be replaced by almost sure convergences.

Our focus in this chapter is to prove Theorem 7.

### 3.1.3 Organization, Definitions, and Notations

In the following, we will first prove the asymptotic Gaussianity of $h_{P}^{t+1}$ and $b_{P}^{t}$, under the case where $A$ consists of i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1/n)$ entries, by applying similar techniques in [58] and [75]. Then, we will present our proposed augmenting technique to show the universality of SE for more general cases, thus finishing the proof of Theorem 7.

Throughout the proof, we use the following definitions and notations similar to [58].

Upper-case and lower-case bold letters with (without) superscript and subscript denote matrices and vectors respectively. $[v_{sup}^{sub}]_i$, or simply $v_{sup}^{sub,i}$ denotes the $i$-th

---

5A function $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^q$ is said to be pseudo Lipschitz continuous of order $k$ if there exists $L > 0$ only depending on $f$ such that $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $||f(x) - f(y)|| \leq L(1+\|x\|^{k-1} + \|y\|^{k-1})\|x - y\|$. [58]
element of the vector $v_{sub}^{sup}$. Similarly, $[M_{sub}^{sup}]_{i,j}$ and $M_{sub,i,j}^{sup}$ both denote the element at the $i$-th row and $j$-th column of the matrix $M_{sub}^{sup}$. $f'(x, \cdots)$ denotes the partial derivative of the function $f$ with respect to the first argument $x$, and for $x = [x_1, \cdots, x_n]^T$, $f(x, \cdots)$ denotes $[f(x_1), \cdots, f(x_n), \cdots]^T$, and $f'(x, \cdots)$ denotes $[f'(x_1), \cdots, f'(x_n), \cdots]^T$. $\| \cdot \|_p$ denotes $\ell_p$ norm, and without specification, $\| \cdot \|$ denotes $\ell_2$ norm. Indicator function $\mathbb{I}_{\text{bool}}$ or $\mathbb{I}(\text{bool})$ returns 1 if $\text{bool}$ is true and 0 otherwise, and $\mathbb{I}_A(x)$ means $\mathbb{I}(x \in A)$. $\delta(x)$ denotes Dirac Delta function, while $\delta_{ij}$ means $\mathbb{I}(i = j)$, which is the Kronecker delta. $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the empirical average of elements in a vector, while $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v}/n$. $\mathbf{d}^{n}(1)$ denotes a sequence of length-$t$ vectors where all the elements converge to 0 almost surely as $n \to \infty$. For simplicity, we will omit the superscript $n$, and when $t = 1$, we use $o(1)$ to denote $\mathbf{d}^{1}(1)$. $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. $\text{PL}_k$ denotes the set of pseudo Lipschitz continuous functions of order $k$.

Define $\mathbf{m}^t_p = g_t(b^t_p, w_p)$ and the following:

$$H^t_p = [h^1_p | \cdots | h^t_p], M^t_p = [m^0_p | \cdots | m^{t-1}_p],$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.33)

$$B^t_p = [b^0_p | \cdots | b^{t-1}_p], Q^t = [q^0 | \cdots | q^{t-1}],$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.34)

$$X^t_p = [h^1_p + \xi_0 \omega_p q^0 | \cdots | h^t_p + \xi_{t-1} \omega_p q^{t-1}],$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.35)

$$Y^t_p = [b^0_p | b^1_p + \lambda_1 m^0_p | \cdots | b^{t-1}_p + \lambda_{t-1} m^{t-2}_p].$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.36)

It is easy to show that

$$X^t_p = H^t_p + Q^t \Xi^t_p, Y^t_p = B^t_p + [0 | M^{t-1}_p] \Lambda^t.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.37)
where

$$\Xi_p^t = \omega_p \begin{bmatrix} \xi_0 & \cdots & \xi_{t-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Lambda^t = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_0 & \cdots & \lambda_{t-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

Further,

$$X_p^{t_2} = A_p^T M_p^{t_2}, \quad Y_p^{t_1} = A_p Q_p^{t_1}, \quad \forall t_1, t_2.$$  (3.39)

From (3.39) it can be shown that

$$X_p^{t_2}^T Q_p^{t_1} = (M_p^{t_2})^T Y_p^{t_1} = (M_p^{t_2})^T A_p Q_p^{t_1}.$$  (3.40)

Define the following \(\sigma\)-algebras

$$\mathcal{G}_{t_1, t_2}^p \triangleq \{H_p^{t_1}, Q_p^{t_1}, v_1, \ldots, v_{t_1}, B_p^{t_2}, M_p^{t_2}, s_0, w_p\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_{t_1, t_2} = \bigcup_{p=1}^P \mathcal{G}_{t_1, t_2}^p.$$  (3.41)

For a full-column matrix \(M\), \(M^\dagger = (M^T M)^{-1} M^T\) denotes its pseudo inverse, \(\text{span}(M)\) denotes its column space, and \(P_M = MM^\dagger\) and \(P_M^\perp = I - P_M\) denote the projectors onto \(\text{span}(M)\), and the orthogonal complement of \(\text{span}(M)\) respectively.

Based on the above notations, we can write

$$q_t = q_t^q + q_t^\perp, \quad m_p^t = m_{p, q}^t + m_{p, \perp}^t,$$  (3.42)

where

$$q_t^q \triangleq P_Q q_t, \quad q_t^\perp \triangleq P_Q^\perp q_t,$$

$$m_{p, q}^t \triangleq P_{M_p} m_p^t, \quad m_{p, \perp}^t \triangleq P_{M_p}^\perp m_p^t.$$  (3.43)

By definition, we have

$$(Q_t^q)^T q_t^\perp = 0, \quad (M_p^t)^T m_{p, \perp}^t = 0.$$  (3.44)
and
\[ m^t_{p,i} = M^t_p \alpha^t_p, \quad q^t_i = Q^t \beta^t, \quad (3.45) \]
where
\[ \alpha^t_p = [\alpha^0_p, \alpha^1_p, \cdots, \alpha^{t-1}_p]^T = (M^t_p)^\dagger m^t_p, \]
\[ \beta^t = [\beta_0, \beta_1, \cdots, \beta_{t-1}]^T = (Q^t)^\dagger q^t. \quad (3.46) \]

Further, define
\[ \tilde{Q}^t = Q^t \left[ \frac{(Q^t)^T Q^t}{N} \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{M}^t_p = M^t_p \left[ \frac{(M^t_p)^T M^t_p}{n_p} \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \]
it is easy to show that
\[ \tilde{Q}^t (\tilde{Q}^t)^T = NP_Q, \quad \tilde{M}^t_p (\tilde{M}^t_p)^T = n_p P_{M^t_p}, \quad (3.47) \]
and
\[ (\tilde{Q}^t)^T \tilde{Q}^t = NI_t, \quad (\tilde{M}^t_p)^T \tilde{M}^t_p = n_p I_t, \quad (3.48) \]
i.e., columns of $\tilde{Q}^t/\sqrt{N}$ and $\tilde{M}^t_p/\sqrt{n_p}$ form orthonormal basis of $\text{span}(Q^t)$ and $\text{span}(M^t_p)$ respectively.

### 3.2 Proof for i.i.d. Gaussian Sensing Matrices

In this section, we focus on DiAMP where $A$ consists of i.i.d. Gaussian entries. In order to show that Theorem 7 holds for this case, we first need to prove a more thorough lemma, similar to Lemma 1 in [58].

**Lemma 4** For DiAMP-G1, given the sequence $\{\sigma^2_t\}$ and $\{\tau^2_t\}$ generated according to (3.29) and (3.30), where $A$, $s_0$, $w_p$, $q^0$, and $v^t$ satisfy all the conditions in Theorem 7 and that $A$ consists of i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1/n)$ entries, the following holds:
(a)

\[ h_{p}^{t+1}\mid \mathcal{G}_{t+t_1, t}^p \overset{d}{=} H_t^p \alpha_p^t + \tilde{A}^t_p m_{p, \perp} + \tilde{Q}^{t+1} \mathcal{O}_{t+1}(1) \]
\[ = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \alpha^i_p h_{p}^{i+1} + \tilde{A}^t_p m_{p, \perp} + \tilde{Q}^{t+1} \mathcal{O}_{t+1}(1), \]  
\[ b_{p}^{t}\mid \mathcal{G}_{t+t_1, t}^p \overset{d}{=} B_t^p \beta^t + \tilde{A}_p q_{t, \perp} + \tilde{M}_t^p \mathcal{O}_t \]
\[ = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \beta^i_p b_{p}^{i} + \tilde{A}_p q_{t, \perp} + \tilde{M}_t^p \mathcal{O}_t \]  

(3.49)

(b) for any \( \phi_h, \phi_b \in PL_k \),

\[ \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \phi_h \left( h_{1,i}^{t+1}, \ldots, h_{P,i}^{t+1}, v_1^i, \ldots, v_t^i, s_{0,i} \right) \]
\[ a.s. \quad = \mathbb{E} \{ \phi_h \left( \tau_0 \sqrt{\omega_1 Z_1^0}, \ldots, \tau_0 \sqrt{\omega_P Z_P^0}, \ldots, \tau_t \sqrt{\omega_1 Z_1^t}, \ldots, \tau_t \sqrt{\omega_P Z_P^t}, V_0^0, \ldots, V_t^t, S_0 \} \}, \]  
\[ \text{where } Z_p^t \text{ are mutually independent for different } p. \]

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \phi_b \left( b_{p,i}^0, b_{p,i}^1, \ldots, b_{p,i}^t, w_{p,i} \right) \]
\[ a.s. \quad = \mathbb{E} \{ \phi_b \left( \sigma_0 \hat{Z}_p^0, \ldots, \sigma_t \hat{Z}_p^t, W_p \} \}, \]  
\[ \text{where } \hat{Z}_p^t \text{ are mutually independent for different } p. \]

(c) \( \forall 0 \leq r, s \leq t, \)

\[ \lim_{N \to \infty} \langle h_{p}^{r+1}, h_{p}^{s+1} \rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} \omega_p \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle m_{p}^r, m_{p}^s \rangle , \]  
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle b_{p}^{r}, b_{p}^{s} \rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} \frac{1}{\kappa} \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle q^r, q^s \rangle . \]  

(3.52)
\( (d) \ \forall 0 \leq r, s \leq t, \ \forall \phi \in PL_k, \)
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \left( h^{r+1}_p, \phi \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h^{s+1}_q, v^s, s_0 \right) \right)^{a.s.} 
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.54)
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \left( h^{r+1}_p, h^{s+1}_p \right) \left( \phi' \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h^{s+1}_q, v^s, s_0 \right) \right) \),
\]
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left( b^p_r, \phi(b^s_p, w_p) \right)^{a.s.} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \left( b^p_r, b^s_p \right) \left( \phi'(b^s_p, w_p) \right). \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.55)

\( (e) \) for \( \ell = k - 1, \)
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \left( h^{r+1}_p, q^0 \right)^{a.s.} = 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.58)

\( (f) \ 0 \leq r \leq t, \)
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left( m^s_p, \perp \right) = 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.59)

\( (g) \ 0 \leq r, s \leq t, \)
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \left( h^{r+1}_p, h^{s+1}_q \right)^{a.s.} = 0, \ \forall p \neq q. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.60)

\( (h) \ \forall 0 \leq r \leq t, 0 \leq s \leq t - 1, \ \exists \rho_r, \zeta_s > 0, \ s.t. \)
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \left( q^r_p, q^r_p \right) > \rho_r, \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.61)
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left( m^s_{p,s}, m^s_{p,s} \right) > \zeta_s. \]

It can be shown that under the condition that \( A \) consists of i.i.d. \( \mathcal{N}(0, 1/n) \), Theorem \( 7 \) holds immediately once proving Lemma \( 4 \) as it is a special case of Lemma \( 4 \)(b).

In Lemma \( 4 \), denote \( B_t \) as all the conclusions regarding \( b^t_p \) and \( m^t_p \) conditioning on \( \mathcal{G}^t_{t,t} \), and denote \( \mathcal{H}_{t+1} \) as all the conclusions regarding \( h^{t+1}_p \) and \( q^t \) conditioning on \( \mathcal{G}^p_{t+1,t} \). We apply induction to prove Lemma \( 4 \) and follow the same flow of proof as in \( [58] \): \( B_0 \to \mathcal{H}_1 \to \cdots \to B_t \to \mathcal{H}_{t+1}. \)
3.2.1 Important Results In Literature

The following theoretical results in literature are important for proving Lemma 4.

**Lemma 5** (Lemma 2 in [58]) For deterministic vectors \( u \in \mathbb{R}^N \) and \( v_p \in \mathbb{R}^{np} \) and a random matrix \( \tilde{A}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{np \times N} \) consisting of i.i.d. \( \mathcal{N}(0, 1/n) \) entries, the following arguments hold:

i) \( v_p^T \tilde{A}_p u \overset{d}{=} Z \|u\| \|v_p\|/n \), where \( Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \);

ii) \( \|\tilde{A}_p u\|^2 \overset{a.s.}{=} n_p \|u\|^2 / n = \omega_p \|u\|^2 \);

iii) For a full-column rank matrix \( D_p \in \mathbb{R}^{np \times d} \) satisfying \( D_p^T D_p = n I_d \), we have \( P_{D_p} \tilde{A}_p u \overset{d}{=} \|u\| D_p x \) with \( x \to 0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \) almost surely.

**Lemma 6** (Lemma 10 in [58]) Let \( A \) be a matrix consisting of i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian entries. Given \( X, Y, M, Q \), and the linear constraints \( A Q = Y \) and \( A^T M = X \), the conditional distribution of \( A \) satisfies

\[
A | \{X, Y, M, Q\} = (XM^\dagger)^T + P_M^\perp YQ^\dagger + P_M^\perp \tilde{A} P_Q^\perp
\]

\[
= YQ^\dagger + (XM^\dagger)^T P_Q^\perp + P_M^\perp \tilde{A} P_Q^\perp,
\]

where \( \tilde{A} \) is an independent copy of \( A \), and \( P_M^\perp \) and \( P_Q^\perp \) are the orthogonal projector onto the complimentary column spaces of \( M \) and \( Q \) respectively.

**Theorem 8** (Theorem 2.1 in [78], strong low of large numbers) Let \( \{X_{n,i}\} \) \((i = 1, \ldots, n \) and \( n = 1, 2, \ldots \)) be a triangular array of zero-mean random variables with \( X_{n,i} \) being mutually independent for same \( n \) and different \( i \), and let \( \phi(t) \) be a positive even function such that \( \phi(t)/|t|^2 \) is increasing and \( \phi(t)/|t|^3 \) is decreasing on \((0, \infty)\).

If \( \{X_{n,i}\} \) satisfies

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathbb{E}|\phi(X_{n,i})|}{\phi(n)} < \infty,
\]

(3.62)
and
\[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathbb{E}(X_{n,i}^2)}{n^2} \right]^{2p} < \infty \quad (3.63)\]
for some positive integer \(p\), then
\[\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{n,i} \overset{a.s.}{=} 0. \quad (3.64)\]

**Lemma 7** (Theorem 3 in [58]) If the triangular array \(\{X_{n,i}\}\) in Theorem 8 satisfies
\[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}|X_{n,i}|^{2+\rho} \leq cn^{2+\rho} \quad (3.65)\]
for any \(\rho \in [0,1)\) and some \(c > 0\) independent of \(n\), then the strong law of large numbers (SLLN) holds.

It is straightforward to show the correctness of Lemma 7 when noticing that (3.65) implies (3.62) and (3.63).

**Lemma 8** (Stein’s Lemma, [79]) For two zero-mean and jointly Gaussian random variables \(X\) and \(Y\), let \(f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) be any function such that \(\mathbb{E}[f'(Y)]\) and \(\mathbb{E}[Xf(Y)]\) exist, then
\[\mathbb{E}[Xf(Y)] = \text{Cov}(X,Y)\mathbb{E}[f'(Y)]. \quad (3.66)\]

**Lemma 9** (Equation 1.4.14-18 in [80], fundamental equation of linear estimation) For two jointly Gaussian random vectors \(x \in \mathbb{R}^m\) and \(y \in \mathbb{R}^n\), if the covariance matrix of their joint distribution is given by
\[\Sigma_{\{x,y\}} = \begin{bmatrix} P_{xx} & P_{xy} \\ P_{yx} & P_{yy} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.67)\]
where \(P_{xx} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}\) and \(P_{yy} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) are invertible, then the covariance matrix of the conditional distribution \(p(x|y)\) is
\[\Sigma_{x|y} = P_{xx} - P_{xy}P_{yy}^{-1}P_{yx}. \quad (3.68)\]
Based on Lemma 9, we introduce the following definition.

**Pseudo conditional auto-correlation**: For two random vectors \( x \) and \( y \) with

\[
E[xx^T] = P_{xx}, \quad E[yy^T] = P_{yy}, \quad \text{and} \quad E[xy^T] = P_{xy},
\]

we define the *pseudo conditional auto-correlation* (PCAC) of \( x \) given \( y \) as

\[
\text{PCor}(x|y) = P_{xx} - P_{xy}P_{yy}^{-1}P_{yx}, \quad (3.69)
\]

Similarly, the PCAC of \( y \) given \( x \) is defined as

\[
\text{PCor}(y|x) = P_{yy} - P_{yx}P_{xx}^{-1}P_{xy}. \quad (3.70)
\]

**Lemma 10** (Lemma 7 in [58]) For a sequence of correlated \( \mathcal{N}(0,1) \) random variables \( Z_1, Z_2, \cdots, Z_t \), suppose that \( \text{Var}(Z_i|Z_1, \cdots, Z_{i-1}) \geq c > 0 \) for any \( i = 1, \cdots, t \). Let \( Y \) be another random variable independent of \( Z_1, Z_2, \cdots, Z_t \), and let \( X_i = f(Z_i, Y) \), \( i = 1, \cdots, t \), where \( f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R} \) is a Lipschitz continuous function, and the probability of \( f(Z, Y) \) being non-constant with respect to \( Y \) is greater than 0, then there exists \( c_t > 0 \) independent of \( Z_1, Z_2, \cdots, Z_t \) such that

\[
\text{PCor}(X_t|X_1, \cdots, X_{t-1}) > c_t. \quad (3.71)
\]

**Proposition 2** For any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( q > p > 0 \),

\[
\|x\|_q \leq \|x\|_p \leq n^{1/p-1/q}\|x\|_q.
\]

### 3.2.2 Induction to Prove Lemma 4

Denote \( \mathcal{B}_t \) and \( \mathcal{H}_{t+1} \) as all the conclusions in Lemma 4 given \( \mathcal{G}_t^p \) and \( \mathcal{G}_{t+1}^p \), respectively. The proof is done by induction, which has the same flow as the proof
of Lemma 1 in [58]. First, we prove the base cases $B_0$ and $H_1$. Then, we prove that $B_t$ holds based on the induction hypothesis $B_0, \ldots, B_{t-1}, H_1, \ldots, H_t$, and prove that $H_{t+1}$ holds based on the induction hypothesis $B_0, \ldots, B_{t-1}, B_t, H_1, \ldots, H_t$. The proof literally is presented in the following four steps: $B_0, H_1, B_t,$ and $H_{t+1}$.

**Step I: $B_0$**

We prove $B_0$ in the order of (a), (e), (c), (b), (d) and (h).

**$B_0$ a) Trivial since $S_{0,0}^p = \{q^0, s_0, w_p\}$, according to (3.27), we have**

$$b^1_p = A_p q^0.$$  \hfill (3.72)

**$B_0$ (e) Conditioning on $S_{0,0}^p$,**

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left( \frac{[b^0_p]_{i}}{\sqrt{N}} \right)^{2\ell} = \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left\{ \frac{[A_p q^0]_{i}}{\sqrt{N}} \right\} \approx \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left\{ \frac{Z_i \|q^0\|}{\sqrt{N}} \right\}^{2\ell} \approx \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left\{ Z_i^{2\ell} \left[ <q^0, q^0> \right]^\ell \right\} < \infty.$$ \hfill (3.73)

**$B_0$ (c) Applying Lemma 5**

$$\langle b^0_p, b^0_p \rangle = \frac{\|b^0_p\|^2}{n_p} = \frac{\|A_p q^0\|^2}{n_p} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \omega_p \|q^0\|^2 = \frac{\langle q^0, q^0 \rangle}{\kappa}.$$  

**$B_0$ (b) Define**

$$X_{n_p,i} = \phi(b^0_{p,i}, \star) - E_{A_p} \left\{ \phi_h \left( [A_p q^0]_i, \star \right) \right\},$$

where we use $\star$ to replace $w_{p,i}$.
We want to show that
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbb{E}_{A_p} |X_{n_p,i}|^{2+\rho} \leq c(n_p)^{\frac{2+\rho}{2}} \]
for any \( \rho \in [0,) \) some \( c \) independent of \( A_p \), so that Lemma 7 can be applied to show that
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} X_{n_p,i} \text{ a.s.} = 0. \]

Using Lemma 5, we have
\[ b_{p,i}^0 = [A_p q^0]_i \sim \text{i.i.d.} \frac{\|q^0\|}{\sqrt{N}} Z_i, Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \]
and
\[ \mathbb{E}_{A_p} \left\{ \phi_b \left( [A_p q^0]_i, w_{p,i} \right) \right\} = \mathbb{E}_Z \left\{ \phi_b \left( \frac{Z_i}{\sqrt{N}} \|q^0\|, w_{p,i} \right) \right\}. \]
Since \( \phi_b(\cdot, \cdot) \) is pseudo Lipschitz continuous of order \( k \), we have
\[ \mathbb{E}_{A_p} |X_{n_p,i}|^{2+\rho} = \mathbb{E}_{Z_i} \left\{ \phi_b \left( \frac{\tilde{Z}_i}{\sqrt{N}} \|q^0\|, \cdot \right) \right\} - \mathbb{E}_{Z_i} \phi_b \left( \frac{Z_i}{\sqrt{N}} \|q^0\|, \cdot \right) \right\}^{2+\rho} \]
\[ = \mathbb{E}_{Z_i} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[ \phi_b \left( \frac{Z_i}{\sqrt{N}} \|q^0\|, \cdot \right) - \phi_b \left( \frac{\tilde{Z}_i}{\sqrt{N}} \|q^0\|, \cdot \right) \right] e^{-\frac{1}{2} z_i^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \, dz_i \right\}^{2+\rho} \]
\[ \leq L \mathbb{E}_{Z_i} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |Z_i - \tilde{Z}_i| \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{\|q^0\|^2}{N} \tilde{Z}_i^2 + w_{p,i}^2 \right)^{\frac{k-1}{2}} \right] e^{-\frac{1}{2} \tilde{Z}_i^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \, dz_i \right\}^{2+\rho} \right\}. \]

Applying Proposition 2 for \( x = (\|q^0\|^2 \tilde{Z}_i^2 / N, w_{p,i}) \) or \( (\|q^0\|^2 \tilde{Z}_i^2 / N, w_{p,i}) \), \( p = 1 \)
and \( q = (k - 1)/2 \), we have

\[
\mathbb{E}_{A_p} |X_{n_p,i}|^{2+\rho} \leq L \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Z}_i} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\tilde{z}_i - z_i| \left[ 1 + 2^{k-1} \left( \langle q^0, \tilde{q}^0 \rangle^{k-1/2} \left| \tilde{z}_i^{k-1} \right| + \left| w_{p,i}^{k-1} \right| \right) \right] + 2^{k-1} \left( \langle q^0, \tilde{q}^0 \rangle^{k-1/2} \left| z_i^{k-1} \right| + \left| w_{p,i}^{k-1} \right| \right) \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} z_i^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dz_i \right\}^{2+\rho}.
\]

After integration, the above inequality has the following form:

\[
\mathbb{E}_{A_p} |X_{n_p,i}|^{2+\rho} \leq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Z}_i} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ 1 + 2^{k-1} \left( \langle q^0, \tilde{q}^0 \rangle^{k-1/2} \left| w_{p,i}^{k-1} \right| \right) \right] C_1 \right\}^{2+\rho}.
\]

Applying Proposition 2 again for \( p = 1 \) and \( q = 2 + \rho \), we can move the power \( 2 + \rho \) inside, i.e.,

\[
\mathbb{E}_{A_p} |X_{n_p,i}|^{2+\rho} \leq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Z}_i} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ 1 + 2^{k-1} \left( \langle q^0, \tilde{q}^0 \rangle^{k-1/2} \left| w_{p,i}^{k-1} \right| \right) \right] C_2 \right\}^{2+\rho}.
\]

Applying Proposition 2 again for \( p = 1 \) and \( q = 2 + \rho \), we can move the power \( 2 + \rho \) inside, i.e.,

\[
\mathbb{E}_{A_p} |X_{n_p,i}|^{2+\rho} = c_0 + c_1 \langle q^0, \tilde{q}^0 \rangle^{(k-1)(2+\rho)} + c_2 |w_{p,i}|^{(k-1)(2+\rho)}.
\]

Since

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} |w_{p,i}|^{(k-1)(2+\rho)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left\{ |w_{p,i}|^{2(k-1)} \right\}^{2+\rho} \leq \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} |w_{p,i}|^{2(k-1)} \right\}^{2+\rho/2}, \tag{3.74}
\]
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we have
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbb{E}_{A_p} |X_{n_p,i}|^{2+\rho} \leq \left[ c_0 + c_1 \left( \langle q^0, q^0 \rangle^{k-1} \right)^{\frac{\rho}{2}} \right] n_p
\]
\[+ c_2 \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} |w_{p,i}|^{2(k-1)}}{n_p} \right)^{\frac{2+\rho}{2}} (n_p)^{\frac{2+\rho}{2}} \quad \text{(3.75)}
\]

By assumption of the empirical distribution of \( q^0 \) and \( w_p \), we know that
\[
\left( \langle q^0, q^0 \rangle^{k-1} \right)^{\frac{2+\rho}{2}} < \infty, \quad \text{(3.76)}
\]
and
\[
\left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} |w_{p,i}|^{2(k-1)}}{n_p} \right)^{\frac{2+\rho}{2}} \rightarrow (\mathbb{E} W^{2k-2})^{\frac{2+\rho}{2}} < \infty, \quad \text{(3.77)}
\]
therefore
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbb{E}_{A_p} |X_{n_p,i}|^{2+\rho} \leq c(n_p)^{\frac{2+\rho}{2}}
\]
for any \( \rho \in [0, 1) \) and some \( c > 0 \) independent of \( A_p \).

Applying Lemma 7, we have
\[
\lim_{n_p \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \phi_b \left( [b^0]_i, w_{p,i} \right)
\]
\[\overset{a.s.}{=} \lim_{n_p \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbb{E}_Z \phi_b \left( \sqrt{\langle q^0, q^0 \rangle} Z, w_{p,i} \right). \quad \text{(3.78)}
\]

Let
\[
\psi(w_{p,i}) = \mathbb{E}_Z \phi_b \left( \sqrt{\langle q^0, q^0 \rangle} Z, w_{p,i} \right).
\]
Applying Lemma 4 in [58], we have

\[ \lim_{n_p \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \psi(w_{p,i}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbb{E}_W \{ \psi(W) \}, \]  

(3.79)
i.e.,

\[ \lim_{n_p \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \phi_b(b_{p,i}^0, w_{p,i}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lim_{n_p \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbb{E}_Z \phi_b(\sqrt{(q_{p,i} q_{p,i})^T \hat{Z}_{p,i}^0}, w_{p,i}) \]

(3.80)

Note that \( \hat{Z}_{p,i}^0 \) are mutually independent for different \( p \), since the corresponding \( A_p \) are mutually independent.

Now we can show the following result, which is one intuitive indication of the Gaussianity of \( b_t^p \) and \( h_{t+1}^p \).

**Corollary 1** The empirical distributions of \( b_t^p \) and \( h_{t+1}^p \), defined as

\[ \hat{F}_b^t(x) = \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbb{I}_{(-\infty,x]}(b_{p,i}^t) \]

and

\[ \hat{F}_{h}^{t+1}(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{I}_{(-\infty,x]}(h_{p,i}^{t+1}) \]

respectively, converges almost surely to

\[ \Phi_b^t(x) = \mathbb{P}(\sigma_t Z \leq x) \]

and

\[ \Phi_{h}^{t+1}(x) = \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{\omega_p} \tau_t Z \leq x) \]

as \( N \to \infty \) and \( n/N \to \kappa > 0 \).

**Proof:** Considering the base case \( B_0 \), for each given \( x \), \( \mathbb{I}_{(-\infty,x]}(b_{p,i}^0) \) is not a continuous function of \( b_{p,i}^0 \). However, we can construct the following Lipschitz continuous function
series

\[
\phi^k_x(b^0_{p,i}) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } b^0_{p,i} < x - \frac{1}{2k}, \\
\frac{1}{2} - k(b^0_{p,i} - x) & \text{if } |b^0_{p,i} - x| \leq \frac{1}{2k}, \\
0 & \text{if } b^0_{p,i} > x + \frac{1}{2k}.
\end{cases}
\]  

(3.81)

It can be shown that \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \phi^k_x(b^0_{p,i}) = \mathbb{I}_{(-\infty,x]}(b^0_{p,i}) \).

Now we apply \( B_0 \) (b) for \( \phi^k_x(b^0_{p,i}) \):

\[
\lim_{n_p \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \phi^k_x(b^0_{p,i}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbb{E} \phi^k_x(\tau_0 \tilde{Z}_p^0).
\]  

(3.82)

Let \( k \to \infty \), the left hand side becomes

\[
\frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbb{I}_{(-\infty,x]}(b^0_{p,i}) = \hat{F}_b^0(x),
\]

while the right hand side becomes

\[
\mathbb{E} \{ \mathbb{I}_{(-\infty,x]}(\sigma_0 Z) \} = \mathbb{P}(\sigma_0 Z \leq x) = \Phi^0_b(x).
\]

Therefore, \( \hat{F}_b^0(x) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \Phi^0_b(x) \).

Similarly, on proving \( B_t \) and \( H_{t+1} \), we can apply the similar technique to obtain

\[
\hat{F}_b^t(x) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \Phi^t_b(x)
\]

and

\[
\hat{F}_{h}^{t+1}(x) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \Phi_{h}^{t+1}(x).
\]

\( B_0 \) (d) Using \( B_0 \) (b) for \( \phi_0(b^0_{p,i}) = b^0_{p,i} \phi(b^0_{p,i}, w_{p,i}) \) and applying Lemma 8

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \langle b^0_p, w_p \rangle \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbb{E} \{ \sigma_0 \tilde{Z} \phi(\sigma_0 \tilde{Z}, W) \} = \sigma_0^2 \mathbb{E} \{ \phi'(\sigma_0 \tilde{Z}, W) \}.
\]  

(3.83)

Note: \( x \phi(x, \cdot) \in \text{PL}(k) \).

By Corollary 1, empirical distribution of \( (b^0_p, w_p) \) converges weakly to \( (\sigma_0 \tilde{Z}, W) \),
applying Lemma 5 in [58], we have

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \langle \phi'(b_0^p, w_p) \rangle \overset{a.s.} = \mathbb{E}\{\phi'(\sigma_0 \tilde{Z}, W)\}. \quad (3.84)
\]

Therefore,

\[
\langle b_0^p, \phi(b_0^p, w_p) \rangle \overset{a.s.} = \tau_0^2 \langle \phi'(b_0^p, w_p) \rangle \overset{a.s.} = \langle b_0^p, b_0^p \rangle \langle \phi'(b_0^p, w_p) \rangle.
\]

\(B_0 (h)\) Trivial since \(m_0^p = m_0^p, \perp, \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle m_0^p, \perp, m_0^p, \perp \rangle \overset{a.s.} = \tau_0^2 > 0.\)

**Step II: \(H_1\)**

Before proving \(H_1\), we first show the following useful proposition.

**Proposition 3** Define \(\xi_t^p = \langle g'_t(b_p^t, w_p) \rangle\), then as \(N \to \infty, n/N \to \kappa > 0\) with \(t, P\) and \(\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_P\) fixed,

\[
\xi_t^p \overset{a.s.} = \xi_t, \forall p \in [P],
\]

where \(\xi_t\) is defined in (3.13).

**Proof:** By definition, we know that

\[
\xi_t = \sum_{p=1}^P \omega_p \xi_t^p. \quad (3.86)
\]

For \(t = 0\), apply \(B_0 (b)\) for \(\phi_b(x, w) = g'_0(x, w)\), we have

\[
\xi_0^p = g'_0(b_0^p, w_p) \overset{a.s.} = \mathbb{E}g'_0(\sigma_0 Z, W), \forall p \in [P]. \quad (3.87)
\]

Therefore,

\[
\xi_0 = \sum_{p=1}^P \omega_p \xi_0^p \overset{a.s.} = \mathbb{E}g'_0(\sigma_0 Z, W) \overset{a.s.} = \xi_0^p, \forall p \in [P]. \quad (3.88)
\]

For \(t > 0\), once proving \(B_t (b)\), we will have the same conclusion that \(\xi_t^p \overset{a.s.} = \xi_t, \forall p \in [P]\).
Now we prove \( H_1 \), in the order of (a), (c), (e), (f), (g), (b), (d), and (h).

\( H_1 \) (a) Noting that \( S_{p,0} = \{ b_0^p, m_0^p, q^0, s_0^p, w_p \} \), applying Lemma 6,

\[
A_p|\mathcal{G}_{1,0}^p \overset{d}{=} \frac{b_0^p(q^0)^T}{\|q^0\|_2^2} + \tilde{A}_p P_{q^0},
\]

(3.89)

\[
\therefore h_p^1|\mathcal{G}_{1,0}^p \overset{d}{=} P_{q^0}(\tilde{A}_p)^T m_p^0 + \frac{q^0(b_0^p)^T m_p^0}{\|q^0\|_2^2} - \xi_0 \omega_p q^0
\]

(3.90)

Apply \( \mathcal{B}_0 \) (d) for \( \phi_b(x, w) = g_0(x, w) \), and then apply \( \mathcal{B}_0 \) (c) and Proposition 3,

\[
\langle b_0^p, m_0^p \rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} \frac{1}{\kappa} \langle q^0, q^0 \rangle \xi_p \overset{a.s.}{=} \frac{1}{\kappa} \langle q^0, q^0 \rangle \xi_0,
\]

i.e.,

\[
\langle b_0^p, m_0^p \rangle = \frac{1}{\kappa} \langle q^0, q^0 \rangle \xi_0 + \mathcal{O}_1(1).
\]

(3.91)

(3.92)

Therefore,

\[
\therefore h_p^1|\mathcal{G}_{1,0}^p \overset{d}{=} P_{q^0}(\tilde{A}_p)^T m_p^0 + \frac{1}{\kappa} \langle q^0, q^0 \rangle \xi_0 + \mathcal{O}_1(1) q^0
\]

(3.93)

\[
- \xi_0 \omega_p q^0 = P_{q^0}(\tilde{A}_p)^T m_p^0 + \mathcal{O}_1(1) q^0.
\]

(3.94)

Apply Lemma 5 iii),

\[
P_{q^0}(\tilde{A}_p)^T m_p^0 = (\tilde{A}_p)^T m_p^0 - P_{q^0}(\tilde{A}_p)^T m_p^0
\]

(3.95)

\[
= (\tilde{A}_p)^T m_p^0 + \mathcal{O}_1(1) \tilde{q}^0.
\]

Since \( \|q^0\|_2^2 \to N \kappa \sigma_0^2 \) has the same order of \( \|\tilde{q}^0\|_2^2 = N \), we finally show that

\[
h_p^1|\mathcal{G}_{1,0}^p \overset{d}{=} \tilde{A}_p^T m_p^0 + \mathcal{O}_1(1) q^0 \overset{d}{=} \tilde{A}_p^T m_p^0 + \mathcal{O}_1(1) \tilde{q}^0.
\]

(3.96)
\( H_1 (c) \) Apply \( B_0 (b) \) for \( \phi_b(x, w) = g_0(x, w)^2 \),

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \langle m_0^0, m_0^0 \rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{E}[g_0(\sigma_0 Z_p, W_p)] = \tau_0^2 < \infty, \tag{3.96}
\]

then apply \( H_1 (a) \) and Lemma 5 ii),

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \langle h_1^p, h_1^p \rangle |S_p^1, 0| d = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{|| (\bar{A}_p)^T m_0^0 + \bar{\sigma}_1(1) q_0^0 ||^2}{N} \overset{a.s.}{=} \lim_{N \to \infty} \omega_p \langle m_0^0, m_0^0 \rangle = \omega_p \tau_0^2. \tag{3.97}
\]

\( H_1 (e) \) Apply \( H_1 (a) \), Proposition 2 and Lemma 5,

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (h_{p,i}^1)^2 |S_{p,0}^i \overset{d}{=} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( (\tilde{A}_p^T m_0^0)_i + \bar{\sigma}_1(1) q_0^0 \right)^{2^\ell} \\
\leq \frac{2^2 \ell}{2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ (\tilde{A}_p^T m_0^0)_i^{2^\ell} + \bar{\sigma}_1(1) q_0^0 \right\}^{2^\ell} \\
\overset{a.s.}{=} \frac{2^2 \ell}{2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ \frac{Z_i \| m_0^0 \|}{\sqrt{n}}^{2^\ell} + \bar{\sigma}_1(1) q_0^0 \right\}^{2^\ell} \\
= \frac{2^2 \ell}{2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ \frac{Z_i}{\sqrt{n}}^{2^\ell} \left[ \omega_p \langle m_0^0, m_0^0 \rangle \right]^{\ell} + \bar{\sigma}_1(1) q_0^0 \right\}.
\]

Since \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} Z_i^{2^\ell}/N < \infty \), and according to (3.96) and the assumption of empirical distribution of \( q^0 \), we know that

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (h_{p,i}^1)^2 < \infty, \forall \ell \leq k. \tag{3.98}
\]
\( H_1 (f) \) Apply \( H_1 (a) \) and Lemma 5

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \langle h_1^p, q^0 \rangle = \lim_{N \to \infty} \langle \tilde{A}_p^T m_p^0 + \tilde{\sigma}_1 (1) q^0, q^0 \rangle = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{Z \| m_p^0 \| \| q^0 \|}{N \sqrt{n}} = \lim_{N \to \infty} Z \sqrt{\omega_p \langle m_p^0, m_p^0 \rangle \langle q^0, q^0 \rangle} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \overset{a.s.}{=} 0.
\]

(3.99)

\( H_1 (g) \)

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \langle h_1^p, h_1^l \rangle = \lim_{N \to \infty} \langle \tilde{A}_p^T m_p^0 + \tilde{\sigma}_1 (1) q^0, \tilde{A}_l^T m_l^0 + \tilde{\sigma}_1 (1) q^0 \rangle = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_{p,i} Z_{l,i} \| m_p^0 \| \| m_l^0 \| \frac{1}{n} \overset{a.s.}{=} 0.
\]

(3.100)

\( H_1 (b) \) Apply \( H_1 (a) \), we know that

\[
\phi_h \left( h_{1,1}, \ldots, h_{1,i}, s_0, i \right) | \mathcal{G}_{1,0} \overset{d}{=} \phi_h \left( \left[ \tilde{A}_1^T m_1^0 \right]_i + \tilde{\sigma}_1 (1) q^0_i, \ldots, \left[ \tilde{A}_p^T m_p^0 \right]_i + \tilde{\sigma}_1 (1) q^0_i, s_0, i \right).
\]

First, we want to show that

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_h \left( \left[ \tilde{A}_1^T m_1^0 \right]_i + \tilde{\sigma}_1 (1) q^0_i, \ldots, \left[ \tilde{A}_p^T m_p^0 \right]_i + \tilde{\sigma}_1 (1) q^0_i, s_0, i \right) \overset{a.s.}{=} 0.
\]

(3.101)

Let

\[
a_i = \left( \left[ \tilde{A}_1^T m_i^0 \right] + \tilde{\sigma}_1 (1) q_i^0, \ldots, \left[ \tilde{A}_p^T m_i^0 \right] + \tilde{\sigma}_1 (1) q_i^0, s_0, i \right)
\]
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and
\[ c_i = \left( \left[ \bar{\mathbf{A}}_1^T \mathbf{m}_i \right]_1, \ldots, \left[ \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{P_i}^T \mathbf{m}_i \right]_1, s_{0,i} \right), \]
by the assumption of \( \phi_h \), we have
\[ |\phi_h(\mathbf{a}_i) - \phi_h(\mathbf{c}_i)| \leq L \left\{ 1 + \|\mathbf{a}_i\|^{k-1} + \|\mathbf{c}_i\|^{k-1} \right\} |q_0^i|_1(o). \]

Let \( \mathbf{p} = [p_1, \cdots, p_N] \), where \( p_i = 1 + \|\mathbf{a}_i\|^{k-1} + \|\mathbf{c}_i\|^{k-1} \), according to Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,
\[ \mathbf{p}^T q^0 \leq \|\mathbf{p}\| \|q^0\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (1 + \|\mathbf{a}_i\|^{k-1} + \|\mathbf{c}_i\|^{k-1})^2 \|q^0\|} \]
\[ \leq \sqrt{3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} (1 + \|\mathbf{a}_i\|^{2k-2} + \|\mathbf{c}_i\|^{2k-2}) \|q^0\|}. \]

Therefore,
\[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\phi_h(\mathbf{a}_i) - \phi_h(\mathbf{c}_i)| \leq \frac{L}{N} \mathbf{p}^T q^0 \rightarrow 1(o). \]
\[ \leq L \sqrt{3 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( 1 + \|\mathbf{a}_i\|^{2k-2} + \|\mathbf{c}_i\|^{2k-2} \right) \|q^0\| \rightarrow 1(o).} \]

In order to show that \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\phi_h(\mathbf{a}_i) - \phi_h(\mathbf{c}_i)|/N \rightarrow 0 \), we need to show that
\[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\mathbf{a}_i\|^{2k-2} < \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\mathbf{c}_i\|^{2k-2} < \infty. \tag{3.102} \]
For the former, applying Proposition 2 and Lemma 3

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|a_i\|^{2k-2} = 
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ \sum_{p=1}^{P} \left[ (\tilde{A}_p^T m_0^p)_i + \tilde{\sigma}_1(1) q_0^p \right]^2 + |s_{0,i}|^2 \right\}^{k-1}
\leq \frac{2^{k-1}}{2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ \sum_{p=1}^{P} \left[ (\tilde{A}_p^T m_0^p)_i \right]^{2k-2} + |s_{0,i}|^{2k-2} \right\} =
\frac{2^{k-1}}{2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ \sum_{p=1}^{P} (\omega_p \langle m_0^p, m_0^p \rangle Z_{p,i}^2)^{k-1} + |s_{0,i}|^{2k-2} \right\} < \infty.
\]

Similarly,

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|c_i\|^{2k-2} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ \sum_{p=1}^{P} \left[ (\tilde{A}_p^T m_0^p)_i \right]^{2k-2} + |s_{0,i}|^{2k-2} \right\} < \infty.
\]

Therefore,

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \phi_h \left( \tilde{h}_{1,i}^1, \cdots, \tilde{h}_{p,i}^p, s_{0,i} \right) \overset{a.s.}{=} \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \phi_h \left( \left[ \tilde{A}_1^T m_1^0 \right]_i, \cdots, \left[ \tilde{A}_p^T m_p^0 \right]_i, s_{0,i} \right).
\]

On the other hand, following the similar technique in proof of $B_0$ (b), we can obtain

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \phi_h \left( \left[ \tilde{A}_1^T m_1^0 \right]_i, \cdots, \left[ \tilde{A}_p^T m_p^0 \right]_i, s_{0,i} \right) \overset{a.s.}{=} \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} E_Z \phi_h \left( \sqrt{\omega_1 \langle m_1^0, m_1^0 \rangle Z_1^0}, \cdots, \sqrt{\omega_P \langle m_P^0, m_P^0 \rangle Z_P^0, s_{0,i}} \right),
\]

(3.103)
According to (3.96), we further have

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \phi_h \left( \left[ \tilde{A}_T^T m_i^0 \right]_i, \cdots, \left[ \tilde{A}_P^T m_P^0 \right]_i, s_{0,i} \right)
\]

\[\overset{\text{a.s.}}{=} \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E} Z \phi_h \left( \sqrt{\omega_1} \tau_0 Z_1^0, \cdots, \sqrt{\omega_P} \tau_0 Z_P^0, s_{0,i} \right).\]

Let \( \psi(s_{0,i}) = \mathbb{E} Z \phi_h \left( \sqrt{\omega_1} \tau_0 Z_1^0, \cdots, \sqrt{\omega_P} \tau_0 Z_P^0, s_{0,i} \right) \), by the assumption of empirical distribution of \( s_0 \), we can apply Lemma 4 in [58] to obtain

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \psi(s_{0,i}) \overset{\text{a.s.}}{=} \mathbb{E} S_0 \{ \psi(S_0) \}, \tag{3.104}
\]

i.e.,

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \phi_h \left( h_{1,i}^1, \cdots, h_{P,i}^1, s_{0,i} \right)
\]

\[\overset{\text{a.s.}}{=} \mathbb{E} S_0 \mathbb{E} Z \phi_h \left( \sqrt{\omega_1} \tau_0 Z_1^0, \cdots, \sqrt{\omega_P} \tau_0 Z_P^0, S_0 \right).\]  

\( \mathcal{H}_1 \) (d) Using \( \mathcal{H}_1 \) (b) for \( \phi_h \left( h_{1,i}^1, \cdots, h_{P,i}^1, s_{0,i} \right) = h_{p,i}^1 \phi \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h_{q,i}^1, s_{0,i} \right) \) and applying Lemma 8, we have

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \left\langle h_p^1, \phi \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h_q^1, s_0 \right) \right\rangle
\]

\[\overset{\text{a.s.}}{=} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sqrt{\omega_P} \tau_0 Z_P \phi \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} \sqrt{\omega_q} \tau_0 Z_q, S_0 \right) \right\} \tag{3.106}
\]

\[= \omega_P \tau_0^2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \phi' \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} \sqrt{\omega_q} \tau_0 Z_q, S_0 \right) \right\}.
\]

On the other hand, let \( \phi_h(h_{1,i}^1, \cdots, h_{P,i}^1, s_{0,i}) = h_{p,i}^1 \), we have \( \phi'(h_{p,i}^1, s_{0,i}) = 1 \) everywhere, so

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \left\langle h_p^1, h_p^1 \right\rangle \overset{\text{a.s.}}{=} \omega_P \tau_0^2. \tag{3.107}
\]

Applying Corollary 1, we know that the empirical distribution of \( (h_p^1, s_0) \) →
\( (\sqrt{\omega_0}Z, S_0) \), according to Lemma 5 of [58],
\[
\left\langle \phi' \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h_q^1, s_0 \right) \right\rangle \overset{a.s.}{\rightarrow} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \phi' \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} \sqrt{\omega_0}Z_q, S_0 \right) \right\}. \tag{3.108}
\]

Now, by (3.106), (3.107), and (3.108), we have
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \left\langle h_1^p, \phi \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h_q^1, s_0 \right) \right\rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} \left\langle h_1^p, h_1^p \right\rangle \left\langle \phi \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h_q^1, s_0 \right) \right\rangle.
\]

\( \mathcal{H}_1 \) holds since for \( t = 0 \), \( q^0 = q_1^0 \), and \( \lim_{N \to \infty} \left\langle q_1^0, q_1^0 \right\rangle = \kappa \sigma_0^2 > 0 \).

**Step III:** \( \mathcal{B}_t \)

In this step we prove in the order of (h), (a), (e), (c), (b), and (d). \( \mathcal{B}_t \) (h) Using \( \mathcal{B}_{t-1} \) (b) for
\[
\phi_h(b_{r,i}^r, b_{s,j}^s, w_{p,i}) = g_r(b_{r,i}^r, w_{p,i})g_s(b_{s,j}^s, w_{p,i}), \tag{3.109}
\]
where \( 0 \leq r, s \leq t - 1 \), we have
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left\langle m_{p,i}^r, m_{p,i}^s \right\rangle = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} g_r(b_{r,i}^r, w_{p,i})g_s(b_{s,j}^s, w_{p,i}) \overset{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{E} \{ g_r(\sigma_r \hat{Z}_p^r, W)g_s(\sigma_s \hat{Z}_p^s, W) \}. \tag{3.110}
\]

Then, by definition of \( m_{p,i}^{t-1} \),
\[
\left\langle m_{p,i}^{t-1}, m_{p,i}^{t-1} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{n_p} \left( m_{p,i}^{t-1} \right)^T m_{p,i}^{t-1} = \frac{1}{n_p} \left\{ \left[ I - P_{M_{p,i}^{t-1}} \right] m_{p,i}^{t-1} \right\}^T \left\{ \left[ I - P_{M_{p,i}^{t-1}} \right] m_{p,i}^{t-1} \right\} = \frac{1}{n_p} \left\{ (m_{p,i}^{t-1})^T m_{p,i}^{t-1} - (m_{p,i}^{t-1})^T M_{p,i}^{t-1}(M_{p,i}^{t-1})^{-1} m_{p,i}^{t-1} \right\} \tag{3.111}
\]
\[
= \left\langle m_{p,i}^{t-1}, m_{p,i}^{t-1} \right\rangle - \frac{(m_{p,i}^{t-1})^T M_{p,i}^{t-1}}{n_p} \left[ \frac{(M_{p,i}^{t-1})^T M_{p,i}^{t-1}}{n_p} \right]^{-1} \frac{(M_{p,i}^{t-1})^T m_{p,i}^{t-1}}{n_p}.
\]
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By induction, $\forall s < t - 1$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \langle m_{p,\perp}^s, m_{p,\perp}^s \rangle > \zeta_s > 0. \quad (3.112)$$

Using Lemma 8 in [58], we have

$$\lambda_{\min} \left[ \left( \frac{(M_p^{t-1})^T M_p^{t-1}}{n_p} \right) \right] > c' \quad (3.113)$$

independent of $n$. Then, applying Lemma 9 in [58], we know that $(M_p^{t-1})^T M_p^{t-1} / n_p$ is invertible as $n \to \infty$, and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left[ \left( \frac{(M_p^{t-1})^T M_p^{t-1}}{n_p} \right) \right]_{r,s \leq t-2} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle m_r^p, m_s^p \rangle \quad (3.114)$$

$$\overset{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{E} \{ g_r(\sigma_r \hat{Z}_p^r, W) g_s(\sigma_s \hat{Z}_p^s, W) \} \triangleq [C_{t-1}]_{r,s},$$

and

$$\left[ \left( \frac{(M_p^{t-1})^T m_p^{t-1}}{n_p} \right) \right]_{0 \leq r \leq t-2} = (m_r^p)^T m_p^{t-1} / n_p \quad (3.115)$$

$$\overset{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{E} \{ g_r(\sigma_r \hat{Z}_p^r, W) g_{t-1}(\sigma_{t-1} \hat{Z}_p^{t-1}, W) \} \triangleq [u_{t-1}]_r,$$

therefore

$$\langle m_{p,\perp}^{t-1}, m_{p,\perp}^{t-1} \rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[ g_{t-1}(\sigma_{t-1} \hat{Z}_p^{t-1}, W) \right]^2 \right\} - (u_{t-1})^T (C_{t-1})^{-1} u_{t-1}. \quad (3.116)$$

Define $\hat{X}_p^r = g_r(\hat{Z}_p^r, W)$, noting that the correlation matrix of $(\hat{X}_p^0, \hat{X}_p^1, \cdots, \hat{X}_p^{t-1})$ is exactly

$$C' = \begin{bmatrix} C_{t-1} & u_{t-1} \\ (u_{t-1})^T & \mathbb{E}\left\{ g_{t-1}(\sigma_{t-1} \hat{Z}_p^{t-1}, W) \right\}^2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.117)$$
By definition of pseudo conditional auto-correlation (PCAC), we know
\[
\langle \mathbf{m}_{p,\perp}^{t-1}, \mathbf{m}_{p,\perp}^{t-1} \rangle \overset{a.s.}{\rightarrow} \text{PCor} \left( \hat{X}_{p}^{t-1} | \hat{X}_{p}^{0}, \ldots, \hat{X}_{p}^{t-2} \right). \tag{3.118}
\]

In order to prove \( B_t (h) \), we need to show that
\[
\text{PCor} \left( \hat{X}_{p}^{t-1} | \hat{X}_{p}^{0}, \ldots, \hat{X}_{p}^{t-2} \right) > \zeta_{t-1} > 0, \tag{3.119}
\]
which is a straightforward conclusion of Lemma 10, if the following holds:
\[
\text{Var} \left[ \sigma_{r} \hat{Z}_{p}^{r} | \sigma_{0} \hat{Z}_{p}^{0}, \ldots, \sigma_{\tau-1} \hat{Z}_{p}^{\tau-1} \right] > 0, \forall r \leq t - 1. \tag{3.120}
\]

Define \( \Sigma^{r+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{(r+1) \times (r+1)} \) whose elements are given by
\[
\Sigma^{r+1}_{i,j} = \sigma_{i} \sigma_{j} \mathbb{E} \left( \hat{Z}_{p}^{i} \hat{Z}_{p}^{j} \right), \forall 0 \leq i, j \leq r. \tag{3.121}
\]

Using \( B_t (b) \) for \( \phi_b (b_{0}^{0}, \ldots, b_{t-1}^{t-1}) = b_{p,\ell}^{i} b_{p,\ell}^{j} \), then
\[
\langle b_{p}^{i}, b_{p}^{j} \rangle = \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_p} b_{p,\ell}^{i} b_{p,\ell}^{j} \overset{a.s.}{\rightarrow} \mathbb{E} (\sigma_{i} \sigma_{j} \hat{Z}_{p}^{i} \hat{Z}_{p}^{j}) = \Sigma^{r+1}_{i,j},
\]
i.e.,
\[
\Sigma^{r+1} = \begin{bmatrix}
\Sigma^{r} & \Sigma^{r+1}_{r,0:(r-1),r} \\
\Sigma^{r}_{r,0:(r-1)} & \sigma^{2}_{r}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
\[
\overset{a.s.}{=} \begin{bmatrix}
\langle \mathbf{b}_{p}^{r} \rangle^{T} \mathbf{B}_{p}^{r} \\
\langle \mathbf{b}_{p}^{r} \rangle_{0\leq s \leq r-1}^{T} \mathbf{b}_{p}^{r}
\end{bmatrix}
\overset{a.s.}{=} \frac{1}{n_p} \mathbf{B}_{p}^{r+1} \mathbf{B}_{p}^{r+1}.
\tag{3.122}
\]

Using induction \( B_s (c) \) for any \( 0 \leq s \leq r \leq t - 1, \)
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\langle \mathbf{b}_{p}^{r+1} \rangle^{T} \mathbf{B}_{p}^{r+1} \\
\langle \mathbf{b}_{p}^{r+1} \rangle_{0\leq s \leq r-1}^{T} \mathbf{b}_{p}^{r+1}
\end{bmatrix}
\overset{a.s.}{=} \frac{1}{\kappa} \langle \mathbf{q}_{p}^{i}, \mathbf{q}_{p}^{j} \rangle, \tag{3.123}
\]

i.e.,
\[
\frac{(B_{r+1}^p)^T B_{r+1}^p}{n_p} \overset{a.s.}{=} \frac{1}{\kappa} \frac{(Q^{r+1})^T Q^{r+1}}{N}, \forall r \leq t - 1.
\]  
(3.124)

Therefore,
\[
\frac{1}{\kappa} \frac{(Q^{r+1})^T Q^{r+1}}{N} \overset{a.s.}{\to} \Sigma^{r+1}.
\]  
(3.125)

Applying Lemma 9, we get
\[
\text{Var} \left[ \sigma_r \hat{Z}_p | \sigma_0 \hat{Z}_p, \cdots, \sigma_{r-1} \hat{Z}_p \right] = \sigma_r^2 - \Sigma_{r,0 \leq s \leq r-1} \Sigma_{0 \leq s \leq r-1,r}^{-1} \left[ \frac{(Q^{r})^T Q^{r}}{N} \right]^{-1} \frac{(Q^{r})^T q^r}{N}
\]  
(3.126)

By induction \( \mathcal{H}_{r+1}(h) \), \( \langle q^r, q^s \rangle > \rho_s > 0 \), \( \forall s \leq r \leq t - 1 \).

Therefore, we can apply Lemma 10 to show that there exists \( \zeta_{t-1} > 0 \), such that
\[
\langle m_{t-1}^{p,\perp}, m_{t-1}^{p,\perp} \rangle > \zeta_{t-1}.
\]  
(3.127)

Furthermore, applying Lemma 8 and 9 in [58], we know that \( \exists c > 0 \) such that
\[
\lambda_{\min}((M_t^p)^T M_t^p / n_p) > c \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\min}(C^t) \geq c,
\]  
i.e., \( \lim_{n_p \to \infty} (M_t^p)^T M_t^p / n_p \overset{a.s.}{=} C^t \) is invertible.

Based on these findings we have the following corollaries, which are useful for proving (a) and (e) of \( B_t \) and \( \mathcal{H}_{t+1} \).

**Corollary 2**

\[
\alpha^t_p = (\alpha^0_p, \alpha^1_p, \cdots, \alpha^{t-1}_p)
\]  
\[
= \left[ \frac{(M^t_p)^T M^t_p}{n_p} \right]^{-1} \frac{(M^t_p)^T m_{t-1}^p}{n_p} < \infty,
\]
\[ \beta^t = (\beta^0, \beta^1, \ldots, \beta^{t-1}) \]
\[ = \left[ \frac{(Q^t)^T Q^t}{N} \right]^{-1} \frac{(Q^t)^T q^t}{N} < \infty. \]

**Corollary 3**

\[ M^t_p \overset{\mathcal{O}}{\rightarrow} (1) = \tilde{M}^t_p \overset{\mathcal{O}}{\rightarrow} (1), \quad \text{and} \]
\[ Q^t \overset{\mathcal{O}}{\rightarrow} (1) = \tilde{Q}^t \overset{\mathcal{O}}{\rightarrow} (1). \]

**Proof:** By definition,
\[ \tilde{M}^t_p = M^t_p \left[ \frac{(M^t_p)^T M^t_p}{n_p} \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \]
we need to show that
\[ \left[ \frac{(M^t_p)^T M^t_p}{n_p} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \overset{\mathcal{O}}{\rightarrow} (1) = \overset{\mathcal{O}}{\rightarrow} (1), \quad (3.128) \]
and
\[ \left[ \frac{(M^t_p)^T M^t_p}{n_p} \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \overset{\mathcal{O}}{\rightarrow} (1) = \overset{\mathcal{O}}{\rightarrow} (1), \quad (3.129) \]
which are equivalent to
\[ \left\| \left[ \frac{(M^t_p)^T M^t_p}{n_p} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \overset{\mathcal{O}}{\rightarrow} (1) \right\| = o(1), \quad (3.130) \]
and
\[ \left\| \left[ \frac{(M^t_p)^T M^t_p}{n_p} \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \overset{\mathcal{O}}{\rightarrow} (1) \right\| = o(1). \quad (3.131) \]

For (3.130), since \((M^t_p)^T M^t_p / N\) converges to \(C^t\) with each element having finite limit, while according to Gershgorin circle theorem [81], the largest eigenvalue of \(C^t\) satisfies
\[ \lambda_{\text{max}}(C^t) \leq \sup_{i \in [t]} \sum_{j=1}^{t} |C^t_{i,j}| < \infty, \quad (3.132) \]
on the other hand, since \(C^t\) is symmetric and positive definite, it is orthogonally
similar to a diagonal matrix $D_t$, i.e.,

$$C^t = UD^tU^T,$$  \(3.133\)

where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{t \times t}$ is orthogonal, and the diagonal elements of $D_t$ are all positive.

Therefore

$$\left( C^t \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = U\left( \mathcal{D}^t \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}U^T,$$  \(3.134\)

which implies that

$$\lambda_{\max} \left[ \left( C^t \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right] = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(C^t)} < \infty.$$  \(3.135\)

Hence

$$\left\| \left[ \frac{(M_p^t)^T M_p^t}{n_p} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{D}^t(1) \right\| \leq \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(C^t)} \| \mathcal{D}^t(1) \| = o(1).$$  \(3.136\)

For \((3.131)\), since $\lambda_{\min}(C^t) > c$ independent of $n_p$, we have $\lambda_{\max} \left[ \left( C^t \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right] < 1/\sqrt{c}$. Therefore

$$\left\| \left[ \frac{(M_p^t)^T M_p^t}{n_p} \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{D}^t(1) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{c}} \| \mathcal{D}^t(1) \| = o(1).$$  \(3.137\)

The same proof also applies for $Q^t$.

For \((B_t(a))\) $\mathcal{S}_{t,t}^p = \{B_p^t, M_p^t, H_{p}^t, Q^{t+1}, \mathbf{v}^1, \cdots, \mathbf{v}^t, \mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{w}_p\}$.

Applying Lemma \(\text{[6]}\) we have

$$A_p | \mathcal{S}_{t,t}^p \overset{d}{=} Y_p^t(Q^t)^\dagger + \left[ X_p^t(M_p^t)^\dagger \right]^T P_{Q^t}^\perp + P_{M_p^t}^\perp \tilde{A}_p P_{Q^t}^\perp,$$

where $X_p^t$ and $Y_p^t$ are defined in \((3.37)\)
Since \( b_p^t = A_p q_t' - \lambda_t m_p^{t-1} \),

\[
\begin{align*}
\Psi_p^{t} | S_{p,t} | = & \begin{bmatrix} X_p^t (M_p^t)^\dagger \end{bmatrix}^T q_p^t + Y_p^t (Q_t^t)^\dagger q_p^t \\
+ & P_{M_p^t}^\perp \tilde{A}_p q_p^t - \lambda_t m_p^{t-1} \\
= & \begin{bmatrix} (H_p^t + Q^t \Xi_p^t (M_p^t)^\dagger) \end{bmatrix}^T q_p^t \\
+ & (B_p^t + [0|M_p^{t-1}] \Lambda^t) (Q_t^t)^\dagger q_p^t \\
+ & P_{M_p^t}^\perp (\tilde{A}_p) q_p^t - \lambda_t m_p^{t-1},
\end{align*}
\]

(3.138)

where \( \Xi_p^t \) and \( \Lambda^t \) are defined in (3.38).

By definition of \( q_t^t, q_p^t \) and \( Q_t^t \), we have

\[
(Q_t^t)^\dagger q_p^t = \beta_p^t,
\]

and

\[
\begin{bmatrix} Q^t \Xi_p^t (M_p^t)^\dagger \end{bmatrix}^T q_p^t = \begin{bmatrix} (M_p^t)^\dagger \end{bmatrix}^T \Xi_p^t [Q^t]^T q_p^t = 0.
\]

Therefore,

\[
\begin{align*}
\Psi_p^{t} | S_{p,t} | = & \begin{bmatrix} H_p^t (M_p^t)^\dagger \end{bmatrix}^T q_p^t + B_p^t \beta_p^t \\
+ & P_{M_p^t}^\perp \tilde{A}_p q_p^t + [0|M_p^{t-1}] \Lambda^t \beta_p^t - \lambda_t m_p^{t-1}.
\end{align*}
\]

(3.139)

Now we want to show that

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix} H_p^t (M_p^t)^\dagger \end{bmatrix}^T q_p^t + [0|M_p^{t-1}] \Lambda^t \beta_p^t - \lambda_t m_p^{t-1} \\
= M_p^{t-1} \sigma_t(1),
\end{align*}
\]

(3.140)

i.e.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\Psi_p^{t} | S_{p,t} | = & B_p^t \beta_p^t + P_{M_p^t}^\perp \tilde{A}_p q_p^t + M_p^{t-1} \sigma_t(1) \\
= & \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \beta_i b_p^i + P_{M_p^t}^\perp \tilde{A}_p q_p^t + M_p^{t-1} \sigma_t(1),
\end{align*}
\]

(3.141)
Let $F = (M_p^t)^T M_p^t / N$, noting that

1. $[H_p^t(M_p^t)^{-1}]^T q_{\perp}^t$

$$= M_p^t [(M_p^t)^T M_p^t]^{-1} (H_p^t)^T q_{\perp}^t,$$

$$= [m_p^0 \cdots m_p^{t-2}] F^{-1} (H_p^t)^T q_{\perp}^t / N,$$

and

2. $[0|M_p^{t-1}] \Lambda^t \beta^t$

$$= [0|m_p^0 \cdots m_p^{t-2}] \begin{bmatrix}
\lambda_0 \beta_0 \\
\vdots \\
\lambda_{t-1} \beta_{t-1}
\end{bmatrix},$$

(3.142)

3. $- \lambda_t m_p^{t-1}$

are linear combinations of the $t$ columns in $M_p^t$. We will evaluate the coefficients of $m_p^\ell$, $0 \leq \ell \leq t-1$ in each of them separately.

The coefficient of $m_p^\ell$ in (2) is $\lambda_{\ell+1} \beta_{\ell+1}$, $0 \leq \ell \leq t-2$ and 0 for $\ell = t-1$.

The coefficient of $m_p^\ell$ in (1) is $[F^{-1}(H_p^t)^T q_{\perp}^t / N]_\ell$, where

$$\left[ F^{-1}(H_p^t)^T q_{\perp}^t \right]_\ell = \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} [F^{-1}]_{\ell,r} \left[ (H_p^t)^T q_{\perp}^t \right]_{r},$$

$$= \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} [F^{-1}]_{\ell,r} \frac{(h_p^r)^T q_{\perp}^t}{N} = \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} [F^{-1}]_{\ell,r} \langle h_p^r, q_{\perp}^t \rangle$$

$$= \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} [F^{-1}]_{\ell,r} \langle h_p^r, q^t - q^t_s \rangle$$

(3.143)

$$= \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} [F^{-1}]_{\ell,r} \left\{ \langle h_p^r, q^t \rangle - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_s q^s \right\}$$

$$= \sum_{r=0}^t \left\{ [F^{-1}]_{\ell,r} \langle h_p^r, q^t \rangle - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_s [F^{-1}]_{\ell,r} \langle h_p^r, q^s \rangle \right\}.$$
Applying Lemma 8, we have

\[
\langle h^r_p, q^s \rangle = \left\langle h^r_p, f_s \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h^s_q, v^s, s_0 \right) \right\rangle
\]

\[
= a.s. \left\langle h^r_p, \sum_{q=1}^{P} h^s_q \right\rangle \left\langle f_s \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h^s_q, v^s, s_0 \right) \right\rangle
\]

\[
= \kappa \lambda_s \langle h^r_p, h^s_p \rangle = \kappa \lambda_s \omega_p \langle m_p^{r-1}, m_p^{s-1} \rangle
\]

\[
= \lambda_s \left( \frac{m_p^{r-1}}{N} \right)^T m_p^{s-1} = \lambda_s F_{r,s}, \forall 0 \leq s \leq t - 1,
\]

and

\[
\left[ F^{-1} \left( H_p^r \right)^T q^t_p \right]_{\ell} = a.s. \sum_{r=0}^{t} \left[ F^{-1} \right]_{\ell, r} \left( \lambda_t F_{r,t} - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_s \lambda_s F_{r,s} \right)
\]

\[
= \lambda_t \left[ F^{-1} F \right]_{\ell, t} - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_s \lambda_s \left[ F^{-1} F \right]_{\ell, s} = \lambda_t \delta_{t, t} - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_s \lambda_s \delta_{t, s}
\]

\[
= \begin{cases} 
- \lambda_{\ell+1} \beta_{\ell+1}, & 0 \leq \ell \leq t - 2, \\
\lambda_t, & \ell = t - 1.
\end{cases}
\]

The coefficient of \( m_p^\ell \) in (3) is 0, \( \forall 0 \leq \ell \leq t - 2 \) and \( \lambda_t \) for \( \ell = t - 1 \).

Therefore, (3.140) holds, further, according to Lemma 5, we have

\[
P_{\tilde{M}^t_p} (\tilde{A}_p) q^t_p \overset{d}{=} \tilde{M}^t_p \mathcal{O}_t(1).
\]

Therefore, applying Corollary 3 we get

\[
b^t_p | \mathcal{E}_{t,t}^p \overset{d}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \beta_i b^i_p + \tilde{A}_p q^t_p + \tilde{M}^t_p \mathcal{O}_t(1) + M^t_p \mathcal{O}_t(1)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \beta_i b^i_p + \tilde{A}_p q^t_p + \tilde{M}^t_p \mathcal{O}_t(1).
\]
According to (3.141) and Proposition 2,

\[
\frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} [b^t_{p,i}]^{2\ell} = \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left[ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_s b^s_{p,i} + P^\perp_{M_p} \tilde{A}_{p} q^0 + M_p^t \tilde{\sigma}_t(1) \right]^{2\ell}_i
\]

\[
\leq \frac{(t + 2)^\ell}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left\{ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_s^{2\ell} [b^s_{p,i}]^{2\ell}_i + \left[ P^\perp_{M_p} \tilde{A}_{p} q^0 \right]^{2\ell}_i + \left[ m^s_{p,i} \right]^{2\ell}_i o(1) \right\},
\]

(3.148)

According to Corollary 2 and induction \( B_r \) for any \( r \leq t - 1, \)

\[
\frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_s^{2\ell} [b^s_{p,i}]^{2\ell}_i < \infty.
\]

(3.149)

Considering that

\[
\left[ P^\perp_{M_p} \tilde{A}_{p} q^t_\perp \right]_i = e^i_\perp P^\perp_{M_p} \tilde{A}_{p} q^t_\perp = \frac{d}{Z_i} \frac{\|P^\perp_{M_p} e_i\| \|q^t_\perp\|}{\sqrt{n}},
\]

(3.150)

we have

\[
\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left[ P^\perp_{M_p} \tilde{A}_{p} q^t_\perp \right]^{2\ell}_i}{n_p} = d \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} Z_i \frac{\|P^\perp_{M_p} e_i\| \|q^t_\perp\|}{\sqrt{n}}^{2\ell}
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \frac{Z_i^{2\ell}}{n_p} \left[ \|q^t_\perp\| \right]^{2\ell} < \infty.
\]

(3.151)

Further, since \( g_t(\cdot, \cdot) \) is Lipschitz continuous, we know that \( \exists L > 0, \) such that

\[ |m^s_{p,i}| = |g_t(b^s_{p,i}, w^s_{p,i})| \leq |g_t(0, 0)| + L \sqrt{|b^s_{p,i}|^2 + |w^s_{p,i}|^2}. \]

Therefore, we have

\[
\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} [m^s_{p,i}]^{2\ell}_i o(1)}{n_p} \leq \frac{L'}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} (1 + |b^s_{p,i}|^{2\ell} + |w^s_{p,i}|^{2\ell}) o(1) < \infty,
\]

and \( B_r \) (e) holds.
We consider three cases: i) $r < t$ and $s < t$, ii) $s = t$ and $r < t$, and iii) $r = s = t$.

i) $\mathcal{B}_t$ (c) holds $\forall r, s < t$ by induction.

ii) $s = t, r < t$, according to (3.141),
\begin{align*}
\langle b_t^r, b_p^r \rangle | \mathcal{S}_{t,t} & = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \beta_i \langle b_i^r, b_p^r \rangle \\
& + \langle P_{M_p}^t \tilde{A}_p q_t^r, b_p^r \rangle + \sum_{i=0}^{t} o(1) \langle m_p^i, b_p^r \rangle.
\end{align*}

By induction $\mathcal{B}_{t-1}(d)$, $\langle m_p^i, b_p^r \rangle < \infty, \forall r \leq t - 1, \forall i \leq t$.
\begin{align*}
& \therefore \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{i=0}^{t} o(1) \langle m_p^i, b_p^r \rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} 0.
\end{align*}

By Lemma 5
\begin{align*}
\langle P_{M_p}^t \tilde{A}_p q_t^r, b_p^r \rangle & \overset{d}{=} \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{Z}{n_p \sqrt{t}} \| q_t^r \| \| P_{M_p}^t b_p^r \| \\
& \leq \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{Z}{n_p \sqrt{t}} \| q_t^r \| \| b_p^r \| = \lim_{N \to \infty} \sqrt{\langle q_t^r, q_t^r \rangle \langle b_p^r, b_p^r \rangle} \frac{Z}{\sqrt{N^2}}.
\end{align*}

By induction hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_t$ (b) and $\mathcal{B}_{t-1}$ (c), we know that
\begin{align*}
\sqrt{\langle q_t^r, q_t^r \rangle \langle b_p^r, b_p^r \rangle} < \infty.
\end{align*}

Therefore,
\begin{align*}
\langle P_{M_p}^t \tilde{A}_p q_t^r, b_p^r \rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} 0.
\end{align*}

Hence
\begin{align*}
\langle b_p^r, b_p^r \rangle & \overset{a.s.}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \beta_i \langle b_p^i, b_p^r \rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \beta_i \langle q_t^i, q_t^r \rangle \\
& = \frac{1}{K} \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle q_t^r, q_t^r \rangle = \frac{1}{K} \lim_{n \to \infty} \langle q_t^r, q_t^r \rangle.
\end{align*}
ii) \( r = s = t, \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle b_p^i, b_p^j \rangle | & \mathbb{S}_t \overset{d}{=} \\
\left( \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \beta_i b_p^i + P_{M_p}^t \bar{A}_p q_{t}^i + \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} m_p^i o(1), \right. \\
& \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \beta_j b_p^j + P_{M_p}^t \bar{A}_p q_{t}^j + \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} m_p^j o(1) \left. \right) \\
& = \sum_{i,j=0}^{t-1} \beta_i \beta_j \langle b_p^i, b_p^j \rangle \ (iii) \\
& + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \beta_i \left( P_{M_p}^t \bar{A}_p q_{t}^i, b_p^i \right) \ (iii) \\
& + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \beta_i \langle b_p^i, m_p^j \rangle o(1) \ (iii) \\
& + \left( P_{M_p}^t \bar{A}_p q_{t}^i, P_{M_p}^t \bar{A}_p q_{t}^j \right) \ (iv) \\
& + 2 \sum_{j=0}^{t} \left( P_{M_p}^t \bar{A}_p q_{t}^i, m_p^j o(1) \right) \ (v) \\
& + \sum_{i,j=0}^{t-1} \langle m_p^i, m_p^j \rangle o(1) \ (vi). \\
\end{align*}
\]

By (3.155), \( \mathcal{B}_{i-1} \) (d) and (b), we know that (iii), (iii), and (vi) \( a.s. \rightarrow 0. \)

Consider (vi),

\[
\left( P_{M_p}^t \bar{A}_p q_{t}^i, m_p^j o(1) \right) \overset{d}{=} Z \frac{\|q_{t}^i\| \|P_{M_p}^t m_p^j\| o(1)}{n_p \sqrt{n}} \overset{a.s.}{\rightarrow} 0, \tag{3.156}
\]

\( \overset{iii}{\Rightarrow} \),

\[
\sum_{i,j=0}^{t-1} \beta_i \beta_j \langle b_p^i, b_p^j \rangle = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i,j=0}^{t-1} \beta_i \beta_j \langle q^i, q^j \rangle \\
= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \beta_i \langle q^i, q^i \rangle = \frac{1}{K} \langle q^i, q^i \rangle, \tag{3.157}
\]
and \((\text{i})\),

\[
\langle P_{M_p^t}^\perp \tilde{A}_p q_{t}, P_{M_p^t}^\perp \tilde{A}_p q_{t} \rangle = \langle A_p q_{t}^t, A_p q_{t}^t \rangle - \langle P_{M_p^t}^\perp \tilde{A}_p q_{t}^t, P_{M_p^t}^\perp \tilde{A}_p q_{t}^t \rangle
\]

\[
\xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{\|q_{t}^t\|^2}{n} - \|\tilde{M}_{p}^t \vec{\sigma}_t (1)\|^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{1}{\kappa} \langle q_{t}^t, q_{t}^t \rangle.
\]

Therefore,

\[
\langle b_p^t, b_p^t \rangle \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{1}{\kappa} \langle q_{t}^t, q_{t}^t \rangle + \frac{1}{\kappa} \langle q_{t}^t, q_{t}^t \rangle = \frac{1}{\kappa} \langle q_{t}^t, q_{t}^t \rangle.
\]

\((3.159)\)

\(B_t (b)\) Apply \(B_t (a)\),

\[
\phi_b \left(\left[ [b_p^0]_i, \cdots, [b_p^{t-1}]_i, [b_p^t]_i, [w_p]_i \right] \right) \mid \mathcal{S}_{t,t}^p = \phi_b \left( \left[ [b_p^0]_i, \cdots, [b_p^{t-1}]_i, \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \beta_r b_p^r + \tilde{A}_p q_{t}^t + \tilde{M}_{p}^t \vec{\sigma}_t (1) \right]_i, [w_p]_i \right).
\]

\((3.160)\)

Let

\[
a_i = \left( [b_p^0]_i, \cdots, [b_p^{t-1}]_i, \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \beta_r b_p^r + \tilde{A}_p q_{t}^t + \tilde{M}_{p}^t \vec{\sigma}_t (1) \right)_i, [w_p]_i,
\]

and

\[
c_i = \left( [b_p^0]_i, \cdots, [b_p^{t-1}]_i, \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \beta_r b_p^r + \tilde{A}_p q_{t}^t \right)_i, [w_p]_i.
\]

Similar to \(B_0 (b)\), we want to show that

\[
\frac{1}{n_p} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} [\phi_b(a_i) - \phi_b(c_i)] \right| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.
\]

\((3.161)\)

Applying the property of pseudo Lipschitz continuous function of order \(k\), we
\[
\frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} |\phi_b(a_i) - \phi_b(c_i)| \leq \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} |\phi_b(a_i) - \phi_b(c_i)| \\
\leq \frac{L}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} (1 + \|a_i\|^k + \|c_i\|^k) \left[ \tilde{M}_{i}^{\text{tr}}(1) \right]_i \\
\leq \frac{L}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} (1 + \|a_i\|^k + \|c_i\|^k)^2 \sqrt{\frac{\|\tilde{M}^{\text{tr}}_i(1)\|^2}{n_p}} \\
\leq L' \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left( 1 + \|a_i\|^{2k-2} + \|c_i\|^{2k-2} \right) o(1)},
\]

where

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \|a_i\|^{2\ell} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left\{ \sum_{r=0}^{t} \left[ b_{i}^r \right]_i^2 + \left[ w_{i}^r \right]_i^2 \right\} N \\
\leq (t + 2)^\ell \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left\{ \sum_{r=0}^{t} \left[ b_{i}^r \right]_i^{2\ell} + \left[ w_{i}^r \right]_i^{2\ell} \right\} \\
< \infty, \text{ due to } B_t(e),
\]

and

\[
c_i = a_i - \left( 0, \cdots, [\tilde{M}^{\text{tr}}_i(1)]_i, 0 \right).
\]

Applying Corollary 3, we know that

\[
c_i = a_i - \left( 0, \cdots, [M^{\text{tr}}_i(1)]_i, 0 \right),
\]

which satisfies

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \|c_i\|^{2\ell} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \|a_i\|^{2\ell} + \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left( \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \left[ m_{i}^r \right]_i o(1) \right)^{2\ell} \\
\leq C' \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \|a_i\|^{2\ell} + C'' \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left[ m_{i}^{2\ell} \right]_i o(1) \\
< \infty.
\]
Similar to the proof of $\mathcal{B}_0$ (b), using Lemma 5, we have

$$\frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \phi_h \left( b_{p,i}^0, \ldots, b_{p,i}^{t-1}, \left[ \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \beta_r b_{p,i}^r + \tilde{A}_p q_{\perp}^t \right]_i, w_{p,i} \right) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbb{E}_Z \phi_h \left( b_{p,i}^0, \ldots, b_{p,i}^{t-1}, \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \beta_r b_{p,i}^r + \frac{\|q_{\perp}^t\| Z}{\sqrt{n}}, w_{p,i} \right).$$

The right hand side of the above equation is a function of $(b_{p,i}^0, \ldots, b_{p,i}^{t-1})$, so we can use induction $\mathcal{B}_{t-1}$ (b) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbb{E}_Z \phi_h \left( b_{p,i}^0, \ldots, b_{p,i}^{t-1}, \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \beta_r b_{p,i}^r + \frac{\|q_{\perp}^t\| Z}{\sqrt{n}}, w_{p,i} \right) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \mathbb{E}_Z \phi_h \left( \sigma_0 \tilde{Z}_p^0, \ldots, \sigma_{t-1} \tilde{Z}_p^{t-1}, \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \beta_r \sigma_r \tilde{Z}_p^r + \frac{\|q_{\perp}^t\| Z}{\sqrt{n}}, w_{p,i} \right).$$

Now we need to show that

$$\text{Var} \left\{ \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \beta_r \sigma_r \tilde{Z}_r \right\} + \frac{\|q_{\perp}^t\|^2}{n} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \sigma_t^2.$$

Using induction $\mathcal{H}_t$ (b) with

$$\phi_h ([h_1]_i, \ldots, [h_P]_i, [s_0]_i)$$

$$= \left[ f_t \left( \left[ \sum_{p=1}^{P} h_p^t \right]_i, [v_t]_i, [s_0]_i \right) \right]^2,$$

we have

$$\langle q^t, q^t \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ f_t \left( \left[ \sum_{p=1}^{P} h_p^t \right]_i, [v_t]_i, [s_0]_i \right) \right]^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} K \sigma_t^2.$$

On the other hand,

$$\langle q^t, q^t \rangle = \langle q_{\perp}^t, q_{\perp}^t \rangle + \langle q_{\perp}^t, q_{\parallel}^t \rangle,$$

where

$$\langle q_{\perp}^t, q_{\perp}^t \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ f_t \left( \left[ \sum_{p=1}^{P} h_p^t \right]_i, [v_t]_i, [s_0]_i \right) \right]^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} K \sigma_t^2.$$
where
\[
\langle q_t, q_t \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \beta^r q^r_s, \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_s q_s \right\rangle
= \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_r \beta_s \langle q^r, q^s \rangle. \tag{3.169}
\]

Applying \( B_t \) (c) and induction hypothesis \( B_{t-1} \) (b) for \( \phi_b(\cdots) = b_t^r, b_s^t, 0 \leq r, s \leq t-1, \)
we have
\[
\langle q_t^t, q_t^t \rangle = \frac{1}{\kappa} \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_r \beta_s \langle b_t^r, b_s^t \rangle
\overset{a.s.}{=} \kappa \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \beta_r \beta_s \mathbb{E}(\sigma_r \hat{Z}_p^r \sigma_s \hat{Z}_p^s) = \kappa \text{Var} \left\{ \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \beta_r \sigma_r \hat{Z}_p^r \right\}.
\]

Therefore, (3.165) holds. Applying Lemma 4 in [58], we finally have
\[
\lim_{n_p \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \phi_b \left( [b_0^p]^i, \cdots, [b_t^p]^i, [w_p]^i \right) \overset{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{E} \hat{Z}_W \phi_b \left( \sigma_0 \hat{Z}_p^0, \cdots, \sigma_{t-1} \hat{Z}_p^{t-1}, \sigma_t \hat{Z}_p^t, W \right). \tag{3.170}
\]

\( B_t \) (d) Using \( B_t \) (b) and Lemma 8,
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \langle b_t^t, \phi(b_s^t, w_p) \rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{E} \{ \sigma_t \hat{Z}_p^t \phi(\sigma_s \hat{Z}_p^s, W) \}
\overset{a.s.}{=} \text{Cov}(\sigma_t \hat{Z}_p^t, \sigma_s \hat{Z}_p^s) \mathbb{E} \{ \phi'(\sigma_s \hat{Z}_p^s, W) \} \tag{3.171}
\overset{a.s.}{=} \langle b_t^t, b_s^t \rangle \langle \phi'(b_s^t, w_p) \rangle.
\]

**Step IV:** \( H_{t+1} \)

The proofs of \( H_{t+1} \) (c), (e), and (h) are very similar to those of \( B_t \) and are skipped. For the remain parts, we prove them in the order of (a), (b), (g), (d), and (f).

\( H_{t+1} \) (a) \( \mathcal{S}_{t+1,t}^p = \{ B_p^{t+1}, M_p^{t+1}, H_p^t, v^1, \cdots, v^t, Q^{t+1}, s_0, w_p \} \).
Applying Lemma 6, we have

\[ A_p \parallel S_{t+1} = P_{M_p}^\perp Y_p^{t+1}(Q^{t+1})^\dagger + [X_p^t(M_p^t)^\dagger]^T + P_{M_p}^\perp \tilde{A}_p P_{Q^{t+1}}. \] (3.172)

Since \( h_p^{t+1} = A_p^T m_p^t - \omega_p \xi_t q^t \),

\[
\begin{align*}
    h_p^{t+1} \parallel S_{t+1} & \overset{d}{=} X_p^t(M_p^t)^\dagger m_p^t + [Y_p^{t+1}(Q^{t+1})^\dagger]^T m_p^t, \\
    & \quad + P_{Q^{t+1}}^\perp (\tilde{A}_p)^T m_p^t - \omega_p \xi_t q^t \\
    & = [H_p^t + Q^{t+1}_p] \alpha_p^t + [B_p^{t+1} + [0|M_p^t] (Q^{t+1})^\dagger]^T m_p^t, \\
    & \quad + P_{Q^{t+1}}^\perp \tilde{A}_p^T m_p^t - \omega_p \xi_t q^t \\
    & = H_p^t \alpha_p^t + P_{Q^{t+1}}^\perp (\tilde{A}_p)^T m_p^t \\
    & \quad + Q^{t+1}_p \alpha_p + [B_p^{t+1} (Q^{t+1})^\dagger]^T m_p^t - \omega_p \xi_t q^t.
\end{align*}
\]

Similar to the proof of \( B_t \) (a), we can show that

\[
Q^{t+1}_p \alpha_p^t + [B_p^{t+1} (Q^{t+1})^\dagger]^T m_p^t - \omega_p \xi_t q^t = Q^{t+1} \overrightarrow{\sigma}_{t+1}(1). \] (3.173)

Therefore,

\[
\begin{align*}
    h_p^{t+1} \parallel S_{t+1} & \overset{d}{=} H_p^t \alpha_p^t + P_{Q^{t+1}}^\perp \tilde{A}_p^T m_p^t + Q^{t+1} \overrightarrow{\sigma}_{t+1}(1) \\
    & = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \alpha_p^i h_p^{i+1} + P_{Q^{t+1}}^\perp \tilde{A}_p^T m_p^t + Q^{t+1} \overrightarrow{\sigma}_{t+1}(1). \] (3.174)

Applying Lemma 6, we have

\[ P_{Q^{t+1}}^\perp (\tilde{A}_p)^T m_p^t \overset{d}{=} Q^{t+1} \overrightarrow{\sigma}_{t+1}(1). \] (3.175)

Then applying Corollary 3, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
    h_p^{t+1} \parallel S_{t+1} & \overset{d}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \alpha_p^i h_p^{i+1} + (\tilde{A}_p)^T m_p^t + Q^{t+1} \overrightarrow{\sigma}_{t+1}(1).
\end{align*}
\]
Applying $\mathcal{H}_t$ (a) and following a similar proof in $\mathcal{B}_t$ (b),

$$
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \phi_h \left( h_{1,i}, \ldots, h_{P,i}, \ldots, h_{t+1,i}, \ldots, h_{P,i}, v_1, \ldots, v_t, s_0 \right)
$$

\text{a.s.}\rightarrow \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E} Z \phi_h \left( \tau_0 \sqrt{\omega_1 Z_1^0}, \ldots, \tau_0 \sqrt{\omega_1 Z_0}, \ldots, \tau_{t-1} \sqrt{\omega_1 Z_{t-1}^0}, \right.

\ldots, \tau_{t-1} \sqrt{\omega_1 Z_{P-1}^0}, \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \sqrt{\omega_1 \alpha_p r} Z_1^r + \frac{\|m_{p,\perp}\|}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots,

\sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \sqrt{\omega_p \alpha_p r} Z_P^r + \frac{\|m_{p,\perp}\|}{\sqrt{n}}, V_1, \ldots, V_{t-1}, v_t, s_0 \bigg).

(3.176)

Now we need to show that

$$
\text{Var} \left\{ \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \sqrt{\omega_p \alpha_p r} Z_P^r \right\} + \frac{\|m_{p,\perp}\|^2}{n} \overset{\text{a.s.}}{=} \omega_p \tau_t^2, \forall p.
$$

(3.177)

Using induction $\mathcal{B}_t$ (b) with $\phi_h([b_{p,i}^0], \ldots, [b_{p,i}^t], [w_{p,i}]) = [g_t([b_{p,i}^t], [w_{p,i}])]_2^2$, we have

$$
\langle m_{p,i}^t, m_{p,i}^t \rangle = [g_t([b_{p,i}^t], [w_{p,i}])]_2^2 \overset{\text{a.s.}}{=} \tau_t^2.
$$

(3.178)

On the other hand,

$$
\langle m_{p,i}^t, m_{p,i}^t \rangle = \langle m_{p,i}^t, m_{p,i}^t \rangle + \langle m_{p,\perp}^t, m_{p,\perp}^t \rangle,
$$

(3.179)

where

$$
\langle m_{p,\perp}^t, m_{p,\perp}^t \rangle = \left( \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \alpha_p r m_{p,\perp}^r, \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha_p s m_{p,\perp}^s \right)
$$

$$
= \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha_p r \alpha_p s \langle m_{p,\perp}^r, m_{p,\perp}^s \rangle,
$$

(3.180)

applying $\mathcal{H}_{t+1}$ (c) and induction $\mathcal{H}_t$ (b) with $\phi_h([h_{1,i}^1], \ldots, [h_{P,i}^1], [s_{0,i}]) = [h_{p+1,i}^r] [h_{p+1,i}^s]$,
we have

\[
\langle m^t_{p,q}, m^t_{p,q} \rangle = \frac{1}{\omega_p} \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha_p^r \alpha_p^s \langle h^{r+1}_p, h^{s+1}_p \rangle
\]

\[= \text{a.s.} \frac{1}{\omega_p} \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha_p^r \alpha_p^s \mathbb{E}(\sqrt{\omega_p \tau_r} Z^r_p \sqrt{\omega_p \tau_s} Z^s_p)
\]

\[= \text{Var} \left\{ \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \alpha_p^r \tau_r Z^r_p \right\}. \tag{3.181}
\]

Therefore, (3.177) holds, and apply Lemma 4 in [58],

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \phi_h(h^1_{1,i}, \ldots, h^{t+1}_{1,i}, \ldots, h^t_{P,i}, v^t_{i}, \ldots, v^t_{i}, s_0,i)
\]

\[\text{a.s.} \mathbb{E}_Z \phi_h(\tau_0 \sqrt{\omega_i} Z^0, \ldots, \tau_0 \sqrt{\omega_P} Z^0, \ldots, \tau_t \sqrt{\omega_i} Z^t, \ldots,
\]

\[\tau_t \sqrt{\omega_1} Z^t, V_1, \ldots, V_t, S_0). \]

Also, since Z^t_p only depends on Z^s_q for any s < t, by induction \( \mathcal{H}_t \) (b), we can see that it is independent of any Z^s_q for q \neq p.

\( \mathcal{H}_{t+1} \) (g) Using \( \mathcal{H}_{t+1} \) (b) with \( \phi_h([h^r_1]_i, \ldots, s_0) = [h^r_{p,i} [h^s_q]_i \text{ for } r, s \leq t+1 \text{ and } p \neq q, \)

we have

\[\langle h^r_p, h^s_q \rangle \overset{\text{a.s.}}{\to} \mathbb{E}_Z Z^r_p^{-1} Z^s_q = 0. \tag{3.182}\]

\( \mathcal{H}_{t+1} \) (d) Let

\[
\phi_h(h^1_{1,i}, \ldots, h^{t+1}_{P,i}, v^t_{i}, \ldots, v^t_{i}, s_0,i) =
\]

\[h^{t+1}_{p,i} \phi_p \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h^{s+1}_{q,i}, v^s_{i}, s_0,i \right), \tag{3.183}\]
using $\mathcal{H}_{t+1}$ (b) and Lemma 8, we have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \left\langle h_{t+1}^{p}, \phi \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h_{q}^{s+1}, v^{s}, s_{0} \right) \right\rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} E \left\{ \sqrt{\omega_{t}^{2} Z_{p}^{t}} \right\} \left\{ \sum_{q=1}^{P} \sqrt{\omega_{q}^{2} Z_{q}^{s}}, V_{s}, S_{0} \right\} \right\} \right\} \overset{a.s.}{=} \omega_{p} \text{Cov}(\tau_{t} Z_{p}^{t}, \tau_{s} Z_{q}^{s}) E \left\{ \phi' (\tau_{s} Z_{s}, V_{s}, S_{0}) \right\} \right\}. \quad (3.184)$$

On the other hand, let

$$\phi_{h}(h_{1,1}^{t}, \ldots, h_{t+1}^{t}, v_{1}^{t}, \ldots, v_{t}^{t}, s_{0}) = h_{t+1}^{p,1} h_{p}^{s+1}, \quad (3.185)$$

we have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \left\langle h_{t+1}^{p}, h_{p}^{s+1} \right\rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} E \left\{ \sqrt{\omega_{p}^{2} Z_{p}^{t}} \sqrt{\omega_{p}^{2} Z_{p}^{t}} \right\} \left\{ \sum_{q=1}^{P} \sqrt{\omega_{q}^{2} Z_{q}^{s}}, V_{s}, S_{0} \right\} \right\} \right\} \overset{a.s.}{=} \omega_{p} \text{Cov}(\tau_{t} Z_{p}^{t}, \tau_{s} Z_{p}^{s}). \quad (3.186)$$

Since empirical distribution of $(\sum_{q=1}^{P} h_{q}^{s+1}, v^{s}, s_{0}) \to (\tau_{s} Z_{s}, V_{s}, S_{0})$, applying Lemma 5 in [58], we have

$$\phi' \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h_{q}^{s+1}, v^{s}, s_{0} \right) \overset{a.s.}{=} E \left\{ \phi' (\tau_{s} Z_{s}, V_{s}, S_{0}) \right\}. \quad (3.185)$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \left\langle h_{t+1}^{p}, \phi \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h_{q}^{s+1}, v^{s}, s_{0} \right) \right\rangle \overset{a.s.}{=} \left\langle h_{t+1}^{p}, h_{p}^{s+1} \right\rangle \left\langle \phi' \left( \sum_{q=1}^{P} h_{q}^{s+1}, v^{s}, s_{0} \right) \right\rangle \left\rangle \right\}. \quad (3.186)$$
\( \mathcal{H}_{t+1} \) Using (3.174), \( \mathcal{H}_r \) for \( r \leq t - 1 \) and Corollary 2

\[
\langle h_{t+1}^p, q^0 \rangle | \mathcal{G}_{t+1,t} \overset{d}{=} \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha_s^p \langle h_{t+1}^{s+1}, q^0 \rangle + \langle P_{Q_{t+1}^\perp} (\mathbf{A}_p)^T m_{p,\perp}^t, q^0 \rangle + \langle Q_{t+1}^\perp \mathbf{d}_{t+1}(1), q^0 \rangle \quad (3.187)
\]

\[
\overset{a.s.}{\rightarrow} \frac{Z \| P_{Q_{t+1}^\perp} q^0 \| \| m_{p,\perp}^t \|}{N \sqrt{n}} + \sum_{s=0}^{t} \langle q^s, q^0 \rangle o(1).
\]

Now

\[
\frac{\| P_{Q_{t+1}^\perp} q^0 \| \| m_{p,\perp}^t \|}{N \sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{\| q^0 \| \| m_{p}^t \|}{N \sqrt{n}} \quad (3.188)
\]

\[
= \frac{\sqrt{N} \langle q^0, q^0 \rangle \sqrt{n_p \langle m_{p}^t, m_{p}^t \rangle}}{N \sqrt{n}} \overset{a.s.}{\rightarrow} 0,
\]

and,

\[
\langle q^s, q^0 \rangle \leq \sqrt{\langle q^s, q^s \rangle \langle q^0, q^0 \rangle} < \infty, \quad (3.189)
\]

we have

\[
\langle h_{t+1}^p, q^0 \rangle \overset{a.s.}{\rightarrow} 0. \quad (3.190)
\]

By now we finish the proof of Lemma 4.

### 3.3 Universality of SE

#### 3.3.1 Families of Distributions Satisfying Lindeberg’s Condition

In the previous section we prove that SE holds for DiAMP-G1 where \( \mathbf{A} \) consists of i.i.d. \( \mathcal{N}(0, 1/n) \) entries. In this section, we will show that the universality of SE can be extended to more general cases, even broader than the class of matrices composed of independent subgaussian entries.
First, we introduce Lindeberg Central Limit Theorem (CLT) \[82\].

**Theorem 9** For \( n \) independent (not necessarily identically distributed) random variables \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \), with each \( X_i \) of finite mean \( \mu_i \) and \( \sigma_i^2 \), define \( s_n = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i^2} \). If Lindeberg’s condition is satisfied:

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{s_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \{ |X_i - \mu_i|^2 \mathbb{1}_{(\epsilon s_n, \infty)}(|X_i - \mu_i|) \} = 0 \quad (3.191)
\]

for any \( \epsilon > 0 \), then as \( n \to \infty \),

\[
\frac{1}{s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \mu_i) \overset{d}{\to} \mathcal{N}(0,1). \quad (3.192)
\]

The Lindeberg’s condition in (3.191) seems very stringent, it yet holds for a broad class of distributions. Here we list two families of distributions that satisfy Lindeberg’s condition — one is the so-called subgaussian distribution \[83\], and another is sublaplacian distribution defined by us.

**Definition 1:** If the moment generating function (m.g.f.) of a random variable \( X \) satisfies

\[
M_X(t) = \mathbb{E}(e^{tX}) \leq e^{bt^2/2}, \forall t, \text{ for some } b > 0,
\]

then \( X \) is called **subgaussian** or **\( b \)-subgaussian**.

**Examples:** The continuous uniform distribution

\[
f_X(x) = \frac{1}{2a} \mathbb{1}_{[-a,a]}(x)
\]

and the symmetric Bernoulli distribution

\[
g_X(x) = \frac{1}{2} \delta(x + a) + \frac{1}{2} \delta(x - a)
\]

are both \( a \)-subgaussian.

Subgaussian random variables have the following properties:
Proposition 4 All $b$-subgaussian random variables have mean 0 and variance not greater than $b^2$.

Proposition 5 If random variables $X_1$ and $X_2$ are $b_1, b_2$-subgaussian random variables respectively, then $c_1X_1 + c_2X_2$ is $(\lvert c_1\rvert b_1 + \lvert c_2\rvert b_2)$-subgaussian. Moreover, if $X_1$ and $X_2$ are independent, then $c_1X_1 + c_2X_2$ is $\sqrt{c_1^2b_1^2 + c_2^2b_2^2}$-subgaussian.

Proposition 6 A random variable $X$ is subgaussian if and only if there exists $b > 0$ such that
\[ \Pr(\lvert X \rvert \geq t) \leq 2e^{-\frac{t^2}{2b^2}} \text{ for any } t > 0. \]

Definition 2: If the probability density function (PDF) of a random variable $X$ is an even function, and there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that
\[ \Pr(\lvert X \rvert \geq t) \leq \alpha^2 e^{-t/\beta}, \forall t > 0 \]
then $X$ is called sublaplacian or $(\alpha, \beta)$-sublaplacian.

Regarding all the sublaplacian random variables, we have the following results.

Proposition 7 All $(\alpha, \beta)$-sublaplacian random variables have mean 0 and variance not greater than $2\alpha^2\beta^2$.

Proof: It is trivial to show that all the sublaplacian random variables are zero-mean since they have even PDFs by definition. For the variance of a $(\alpha, \beta)$-sublaplacian random variable $X$, by definition, we have
\[
\text{Var}(X) = \mathbb{E}\left\{X^2\right\} - \mathbb{E}\left\{|X|^2\right\} = \\
\int_0^\infty t^2 \frac{d\Pr(\lvert X \rvert \leq t)}{dt} dt - \int_0^\infty t^2 \frac{d\Pr(\lvert X \rvert > t)}{dt} dt \\
= t^2 \Pr(\lvert X \rvert > t) \bigg|_0^\infty + \int_0^\infty 2t\Pr(\lvert X \rvert > t) dt.
\]
(3.193)
By definition,
\[
P(|X| > t) \leq \alpha^2 e^{-t/\beta},
\] (3.194)
we have
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} t^2 \mathbb{P}(|X| > t) = 0.
\] (3.195)

Therefore,
\[
\text{Var}(X) = \int_0^\infty 2t \mathbb{P}(|X| > t) dt \leq \int_0^\infty 2t \alpha^2 e^{-t/\beta} dt = 2 \alpha^2 \beta^2.
\] (3.196)

**Proposition 8** If \( X \) is \((\alpha, \beta)\)-sublaplacian, then \( cX \) is \((\alpha, |c|\beta)\)-sublaplacian.

**Proof:** Let \( Y = cX \), then
\[
\mathbb{P}(|Y| \geq t) = \mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t/|c|) \leq \alpha^2 e^{-t/(|c|\beta)}.
\]
Therefore, \( Y \) is \((\alpha, |c|\beta)\)-sublaplacian.

**Proposition 9** For a finite set of distributions \( \{f_{X_1}(x), \cdots, f_{X_k}(x)\} \), where \( f_{X_i}(x) \) is \((\alpha_i, \beta_i)\)-sublaplacian, \( \forall i \in [k] \), then any mixture of the \( k \) distributions is \((\max\{\alpha_i\}, \max\{\beta_i\})\)-sublaplacian.

**Proof:** Let \( f_X(x) = \sum_{i=1}^k p_i f_{X_i}(x) \) be any mixture, where \( p_i \geq 0, \forall i \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^k p_i = 1 \). Then we have
\[
\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) = \sum_{i=1}^k p_i \mathbb{P}(|X_i| \geq t) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k p_i \alpha_i^2 e^{-t/\beta_i} \leq \left[ \max_{i \in [k]} \{\alpha_i\} \right]^2 e^{-t/\left[ \max_{i \in [k]} \{\beta_i\} \right]}.
\] (3.197)

**Proposition 10** If \( X \) has an even PDF \( f_X(x) \), and there exists \( \alpha, \beta > 0 \) such that
\[
f_X(x) \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{2\beta} e^{-x/\beta}, \ \forall x
\]
then \(X\) is \((\alpha, \beta)\)-sublaplacian.

**Proof:** by the above assumption on \(f_X(x)\),

\[
\mathbb{P}(|X| > t) = 2 \int_t^\infty f_X(x) dx \\
\leq 2 \int_t^\infty \frac{\alpha^2}{2\beta} e^{-t/\beta} dx \leq \alpha^2 e^{-t/\beta}.
\]  
(3.198)

Therefore, \(X\) is \((\alpha, \beta)\)-sublaplacian.

**Examples:** The Laplace distribution

\[
f_X(x) = \frac{1}{2\beta} e^{-|x|/\beta}
\]  
(3.199)

is \((1, \beta)\)-sublaplacian, but it is not subgaussian since

\[
\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) = e^{-t/\beta},
\]
and \(\forall b > 0\), as long as \(t > \max\{2b^2/\beta, \beta \ln 2\}\), we will have

\[
\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) > 2 e^{-t^2/2b^2},
\]
which violates the condition in Proposition 6.

Another example is zero-mean Logistic distribution

\[
g_X(x) = \frac{e^{x/\beta}}{\beta(1 + e^{x/\beta})^2}.
\]  
(3.200)

It is \((\sqrt{2}, \beta)\)-sublaplacian, since

\[
g_X(x) = g_X(|x|) = \frac{e^{|x|/\beta}}{\beta(1 + e^{|x|/\beta})^2} \leq \frac{1}{\beta} e^{-|x|/\beta}.
\]

However, it is not subgaussian, since

\[
g_X(x) = g_X(|x|) = \frac{e^{|x|/\beta}}{\beta(1 + e^{|x|/\beta})^2} \geq \frac{1}{4\beta} e^{-|x|/\beta},
\]
which implies that
\[
P(|X| \geq t) \geq 2 \int_t^\infty \frac{1}{4\beta} e^{-x/\beta} dx = \frac{1}{2} e^{-t/\beta},
\]
and contradicts the condition in Proposition 3.

Furthermore, we can plug \( \beta = 1/\sqrt{2} \) into \( f_X(x) \) in (3.199) and \( \beta = 3/\sqrt{\pi} \) into \( g_X(x) \) in (3.200), which makes both distributions with unit variance. According to Proposition 9, their mixture \( pf_X(x) + (1 - p)g_X(x) \) for any \( p \in [0,1] \) is \((\sqrt{2},3/\sqrt{\pi})\)-sublaplacian with unit variance.

**Lemma 11** For \( n \) independent zero-mean random variables \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \), with each \( X_i \) either being \( b \)-subgaussian, or \( (\alpha, \beta) \)-sublaplacian, if there exists some \( \rho \in (0,1] \) such that \( \text{Var}(X_i) = \sigma_i^2 \geq \max\{b^2, 2\alpha^2\beta^2\} \rho \) for any \( i \), then Lindeberg’s condition holds.

**Proof of Lemma 11**: Define \( s_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 \). We have
\[
E \left\{ X_i^2 1_{(\epsilon s_n, \infty)}(|X_i|) \right\} = \int_0^{\infty} s_n^2 1_{(\epsilon s_n, \infty)}(t) \frac{dP(|X_i| \leq t)}{dt} dt
\]
\[
= -\int_{\epsilon s_n}^{\infty} s_n^2 \frac{dP(|X_i| > t)}{dt} dt
\]
\[
= t^2 P(|X_i| > t)|_{\epsilon s_n}^\infty + \int_{\epsilon s_n}^{\infty} 2t P(|X_i| > t) dt.
\]

Since \( X_i \) is either \( b \)-subgaussian or \( (\alpha, \beta) \)-subgaussian,
\[
P(|X_i| > t) \leq \max\{2e^{-\frac{t^2}{2b^2}},\alpha^2 e^{-t/\beta}\},
\]
we have
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} tP(|X_i| > t) = 0,
\]
\[
t^2P(|X_i| > t)|_{t=\epsilon s_n}^{\infty} \leq s_n^2 \max\{2e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2 s_n^2}{2b^2}},\alpha^2 e^{-\epsilon s_n/\beta}\},
\]
and
\[
\int_{\epsilon s_n}^{\infty} 2tP(|X_i| > t)dt \leq \max \left\{ \int_{\epsilon s_n}^{\infty} 4te^{-\frac{t^2}{2a^2}} dt, \int_{\epsilon s_n}^{\infty} 2ta^2e^{-t/\beta} dt \right\}
\]
\[
= \max \left\{ 4b^2e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2 s_n^2}{2b^2}}, 2a^2\beta(\epsilon s_n + \beta)e^{-\epsilon s_n/\beta} \right\}.
\]

Therefore,
\[
\frac{1}{s_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} E \{ X_i^2 P_{(\epsilon s_n, \infty)}(|X_i|) \}
\]
\[
\leq ne^2 \max \{ 2e^{-\frac{t^2}{2b^2}}, a^2e^{-t/\beta} \} + \frac{n}{s_n^2} \max \left\{ 4b^2e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2 s_n^2}{2b^2}}, 2a^2\beta(\epsilon s_n + \beta)e^{-\epsilon s_n/\beta} \right\}.
\]

Note that \( \sigma_i^2 \geq \max \{ b^2, 2a^2\beta^2 \} \rho \) implying that
\[
b^2 \leq \frac{b^2}{s_n^2} = \frac{b^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i^2} \leq \frac{1}{\rho n},
\]
and
\[
2a^2\beta^2 \leq \frac{2a^2\beta^2}{s_n^2} = \frac{2a^2\beta^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i^2} \leq \frac{1}{\rho n},
\]
i.e.,
\[
s_n^2/b^2 = O(n), \text{ and } s_n/\beta = O(n^{1/2}).
\]

Since either \( e^{-n} \) and \( e^{-n^{1/2}} \) decays to 0 faster than any polynomial of \( n \) increases to \( \infty \), we have
\[
\frac{1}{s_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} E \{ X_i^2 P_{(\epsilon s_n, \infty)}(|X_i|) \} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty,
\]
that is, Lindeberg’s condition holds.

**Remarks:** The condition \( \sigma_i^2 \geq b^2\rho \) or \( \sigma_i^2 \geq 2a^2\beta^2\rho \) is actually a natural property for many subgaussian and sublaplacian distributions. For example, the continuous
uniform distribution over $[-a, a]$ is $a$-subgaussian with variance $\sigma^2 = a^2/3$, where $\rho = 1/3$, and the symmetric Bernoulli distribution over $\{-a, a\}$ is also $a$-subgaussian with variance $\sigma^2 = a^2$, where $\rho = 1$. For the Laplace distribution in (3.199), $\sigma^2 = 2\beta^2$ while $2\alpha^2\beta^2 = 2\beta^2$, $\rho = 1$, and for the logistic distribution in (3.200), $\sigma^2 = \beta^2\pi^2/3$ while $2\alpha^2\beta^2 = 4\beta^2$, $\rho = \pi^2/12$.

### 3.3.2 Augmenting Technique to Prove SE’s Universality

Now we can extend the theoretical results of SE for sensing matrices with i.i.d. Gaussian entries to more general cases. Specifically, we have the following lemma. This is done by a augmenting technique proposed by us.

**Lemma 12** In Lemma 4, if all the entries in sensing matrix $A$ is changed to be independent (not necessarily identically distributed) random variables with mean $0$ and variance $1/n$, and the elements in each row or column satisfy Lindeberg’s condition, then all of the conclusions in Lemma 4 hold with the almost-sure convergence being replaced by convergence in distribution.

Since the core of the proof of SE is the distribution of $A_p$ conditioning on $S_{t_1,t_2}$, we need to first prove that $A_p|S_{t_1,t_2}$ remains the same as that for $A$ with i.i.d. Gaussian entries in the large system limit, which is the following lemma:

**Lemma 13** If $A$ satisfies the condition in Lemma 12, then

$$A_p|S_{t_1,t_2} \xrightarrow{d} [X_{t_2}^T(M_{t_2}^p)^\dagger]^T + P_{M_{t_2}^p, Y_{t_1}^p}^\perp + P_{\tilde{A}_p, P_{Q_{t_1}}^\perp}^\perp,$$

where $\tilde{A}_p$ consists of i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/n)$ entries independent of $A_p$. 
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Proof: Let us construct a matrix series \( \{P_k\}_{k \geq 0} \) as follows:

\[
P_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix}
P_{k-1} & P_{k-1} \\
P_{k-1} & -P_{k-1}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(3.211)

with initial value \( P_0 = [1] \). It can be easily verified that \( P_k \) is an orthogonal matrix of order \( 2^k \), and all the elements in \( P_k \) have the same magnitude \( 2^{-k/2} \).

Consider the case where each row of \( A \) satisfies Lindeberg’s condition. Now augment \( A_p \) into a \( n_p \times 2^K \) matrix \( A_p^a \), where \( 2^K > N \):

\[
A_p^a = [A_p | C_p],
\]

(3.212)

where \( C_p \) is independent of \( A_p \), and consists of i.i.d. \( N(0, 1/\sqrt{n}) \). Let

\[
S_p = A_p^a P_K = A_p P_K^A + C_p P_K^C,
\]

(3.213)

where \( P_K^A \) and \( P_K^C \) as the first \( N \) rows and the last \( R = 2^K - N \) rows of \( P_K \). It is easy to show that

\[
P_K^A (P_K^A)^T = I_N, \quad P_K^C (P_K^C)^T = I_R,
\]

(3.214)

\[
P_K^A (P_K^C)^T = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times R},
\]

(3.215)

and

\[
A_p^a = S_p (P_K)^T, \quad A_p = S_p (P_K^A)^T, \quad C_p = S_p (P_K^C)^T.
\]

(3.216)

Using (3.216), then \( h_{t+1}^p \) and \( b_t^p \) in (3.216) become

\[
h_{t+1}^p = P_K^A S_p^T m_t^p - \xi_t^p \omega p q_t^p,
\]

(3.217)

\[
b_t^p = S_p (P_K^A)^T q_t^p - \lambda_t m_t^{p-1},
\]

and the linear constraints in (3.39) can be written as

\[
P_K^A S_p^T M_p = X_p^{t_2}, \quad Y_p^t = S_p (P_K^A)^T Q^{t_1}.
\]

(3.218)
The element in the \( i \)-th row and \( j \)-th column of \( S_p \) is

\[
s^p_{i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^{2^K} [A^a_p]_{i,k} [P_K]_{k,j}
\]

\[
= \sum_{k=1}^{N} [A_p]_{i,k}[P_K]_{k,j} + \sum_{k=N+1}^{2^K} [C_p]_{i,k-N}[P_K]_{k,j}.
\]

Since the \( N \) random variables \([A_p]_{i,1}, \ldots, [A_p]_{i,N}\) satisfy Lindeberg’s condition, we have

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N/n} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbb{E} \left\{ [A_p]_{i,k}^2 1_{(\epsilon \sqrt{N/n}, \infty)}(|[A_p]_{i,k}|) \right\} = 0,
\]

for any \( \epsilon > 0 \). Noting that \(|[P_K]_{k,j}| = 2^{-K/2}\) for all \( i \) and \( k \), it is easy to verify that \([A_p]_{i,k}[P_K]_{k,j}\) for \( k = 1, \ldots, N \) also satisfy Lindeberg’s condition. Therefore, we can apply Lindeberg Central Limit Theorem (CLT) to obtain

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{N} [A_p]_{i,k}[P_K]_{k,j} \xrightarrow{d} N \left( 0, \frac{N}{2K} \frac{1}{n} \right).
\]

(3.220)

Now consider the rest \( R \) random variables \([C_p]_{i,k-N}\). Since they are i.i.d. \( \mathcal{N}(0, 1/n) \), it is easy to show that

\[
\sum_{k=N+1}^{2^K} [C_p]_{i,k-N}[P_K]_{k,j} \xrightarrow{d} N \left( 0, \frac{R}{2K} \frac{1}{n} \right).
\]

(3.221)

Therefore

\[
s^p_{i,j} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1/n), \text{ as } K \to \infty, \forall i, j.
\]

(3.222)

Using the independence of entries in \( A^a_p \) and the orthogonality of \( P_K \), we can further show that

\[
\text{Cov}(s^p_{i_1,j_1}, s^p_{i_2,j_2}) = \frac{1}{n} \delta_{i_1,i_2} \delta_{j_1,j_2}, \forall i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2.
\]

(3.223)

Therefore

\[
S_p \xrightarrow{d} S^G_p, \text{ as } K \to \infty,
\]

(3.224)
where \( S_p^G \) consists of i.i.d. \( \mathcal{N}(0, 1/n) \) entries.

We can apply Lemma 11 in [58] to obtain

\[
\mathcal{S}_p|_{\mathcal{G}_t_{t_1,t_2}} \overset{d}{\rightarrow} \mathcal{L}_{t_{t_1,t_2}} + \mathcal{P}_{t_{t_1,t_2}}(\mathcal{S}_p^G),
\]

(3.225)

where \( \mathcal{L}_{t_{t_1,t_2}} \) is the least-square-solution of

\[
\arg \min_S \| S \|_F^2, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathcal{P}_K^A S^T M_{t_2} = X_{t_2}, \; Y_{t_1} = S(\mathcal{P}_K^A)^T Q_{t_1},
\]

\( \mathcal{S}_p^G \) consists of i.i.d. \( \mathcal{N}(0, 1/n) \) entries independent of \( S_p \), and \( \mathcal{P}_{t_{t_1,t_2}} \) is the orthogonal projector onto the following subspace

\[
\mathcal{S} = \{ S : \mathcal{P}_K^A S^T M_{t_2} = 0, S(\mathcal{P}_K^A)^T Q_{t_1} = 0 \}.
\]

(3.226)

The way of obtaining \( \mathcal{L}_{t_{t_1,t_2}} \) and \( \mathcal{P}_{t_{t_1,t_2}}(\mathcal{S}_p^G) \) is similar to that of conditional distribution of \( A \) in [58]. We will still present the process, yet in a way easier for readers to follow.

**Obtain \( \mathcal{L}_{t_{t_1,t_2}} \):** Write the Lagrangian

\[
J(S, \Theta, \Gamma) = \| S \|_F^2 + tr \{ \Theta^T \left[ Y_{t_1} - S(\mathcal{P}_K^A)^T Q_{t_1} \right] \} + tr \{ \Gamma^T \left[ X_{t_2} - \mathcal{P}_K^A S^T M_{t_2} \right] \},
\]

where \( \Theta \) and \( \Gamma \) are Lagrangian multipliers to be determined, \( tr\{\cdot\} \) denotes the trace of a matrix, and \( tr\{A^T B\} \) is a well-defined inner product for vector spaces \( V \) where all the elements are matrices.

Note that

\[
tr\{\Theta^T S(\mathcal{P}_K^A)^T Q_{t_1} \} = tr\{ (\mathcal{P}_K^A)^T Q_{t_1} \Theta^T S \}
\]

\[
= tr\{ S^T \Theta (Q_{t_1})^T \mathcal{P}_K^A \},
\]

(3.227)
and
\[
\text{tr}\{\Gamma^T P_K^A S^T M_p^{t_2}\} = \text{tr}\{S^T M_p^{t_2} \Gamma^T P_K^A\}
\] (3.228)

Applying the KKT condition, we have
\[
\nabla_S J(S, \Theta, \Gamma) = 2S - [\Theta(Q^{t_1})^T + M_p^{t_2} \Gamma^T] P_K^A = 0.
\] (3.229)

Post-multiplying the left hand side of (3.229) by \((P_K^A)^T\), according to (3.214), we get
\[
2S(P_K^A)^T = \Theta(Q^{t_1})^T + M_p^{t_2} \Gamma^T.
\] (3.230)

Post-multiplying both sides of (3.230) by \(Q^{t_1}\), plugging in the linear constraints in (3.218), we get
\[
\Theta(Q^{t_1})^T Q^{t_1} + M_p^{t_2} \Gamma^T Q^{t_1} = 2Y_p^{t_1}.
\] (3.231)

Take transposition and then post-multiply \(M_p^{t_2}\) on both sides of (3.230), plug in the linear constraints in (3.218) again, we have
\[
Q^{t_1} \Theta^T M_p^{t_2} + \Gamma(M_p^{t_2})^T M_p^{t_2} = 2X_p^{t_2}.
\] (3.232)

From (3.231) we can get
\[
\Theta = 2Y_p^{t_1} \left[\left(Q^{t_1}\right)^T Q^{t_1}\right]^{-1} - M_p^{t_2} \left[\left(Q^{t_1}\right)^\dagger \Gamma\right]^T.
\] (3.233)

Plugging it in (3.232), we have
\[
P_{Q^{t_1} \Gamma} = 2 \left\{X_p^{t_2} - \left[\left(M_p^{t_2}\right)^T Y_p^{t_1} Q^{t_1}\right]^\dagger\right\} \left[\left(M_p^{t_2}\right)^T M_p^{t_2}\right]^{-1}.
\] (3.234)
Plugging (3.40) in, the right hand side becomes
\[
2 \left\{ X^{t_2}_p - \left[ (M^{t_2}_p)^T Y^{t_1}_p (Q^{t_1}_1)^\dagger \right]^T \right\} \left[ (M^{t_2}_p)^T M^{t_2}_p \right]^{-1}
\]
\[
= 2 \left\{ X^{t_2}_p - \left[ (X^{t_2}_p)^T Q^{t_1}_1 (Q^{t_1}_1)\dagger \right]^T \right\} \left[ (M^{t_2}_p)^T M^{t_2}_p \right]^{-1}
\]
\[
= 2P^\perp_{Q^{t_1}_1} X^{t_2}_p \left[ (M^{t_2}_p)^T M^{t_2}_p \right]^{-1}.
\]

\( \Gamma \) has infinitely many solutions since \( P_{Q^{t_1}_1}^\perp \) is not full rank. Nevertheless, we can take the most straightforward one
\[
\Gamma = 2X^{t_2}_p \left[ (M^{t_2}_p)^T M^{t_2}_p \right]^{-1}.
\]

Plugging it back to (3.233), we obtain
\[
\Theta = 2P^\perp_{M^{t_2}_p} Y^{t_1}_p \left[ (Q^{t_1}_1)^T Q^{t_1}_1 \right]^{-1}.
\]

Plugging (3.236) and (3.233) in (3.229), we finally obtain
\[
L^{p}_{t_1, t_2} = \left\{ P^\perp_{M^{t_2}_p} Y^{t_1}_p (Q^{t_1}_1)^\dagger + \left[ X^{t_2}_p (M^{t_2}_p)^\dagger \right]^T \right\} P^A_K
\]
\[
= \left\{ Y^{t_1}_p (Q^{t_1}_1)^\dagger + \left[ X^{t_2}_p (M^{t_2}_p)^\dagger \right]^T P^\perp_{Q^{t_1}_1} \right\} P^A_K.
\]

Obtaining \( P_{t_1, t_2}(\tilde{S}^G_p) \): First, we try to construct a linear operator \( \mathcal{P} : \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times 2K} \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \), where \( \mathcal{S} \) is the subspace described in (3.226).

\( \forall \ S \in \mathcal{S} \), we have \( P^A_K S^T M^{t_2}_p = 0 \) and \( S(\mathcal{P}^A_K)^T Q^{t_1}_1 = 0 \). Now we want to find such a \( S \).

Let us consider \( P^A_K S^T M^{t_2}_p = 0 \) only. It is easy to show that for any \( V_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times N} \), all the \( S \) satisfying \( S(\mathcal{P}^A_K)^T = P^\perp_{M^{t_2}_p} V_1 \) will suffice for \( P^A_K S^T M^{t_2}_p = 0 \).

Let us consider \( S(\mathcal{P}^A_K)^T Q^{t_1}_1 = 0 \) only, It is easy to show that for any \( V_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times N} \), all the \( S \) satisfying \( S(\mathcal{P}^A_K)^T = V_2 P^\perp_{Q^{t_1}_1} \) will suffice for \( S(\mathcal{P}^A_K)^T Q^{t_1}_1 = 0 \).

Now, if we want \( S \) to satisfy both, then \( V_1 \) and \( V_2 \) are coupled though \( P^\perp_{M^{t_2}_p} V_1 = V_2 P^\perp_{Q^{t_1}_1} \). To decouple, we pick up another arbitrary \( V_A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times N} \), and let \( V_1 = V_2 P^\perp_{Q^{t_1}_1} \).
$V_A \mathbf{P}_{Q_1}^\perp$ and $V_2 = \mathbf{P}_{M_p}^\perp V_A$, then it is easy to show that $\mathbf{P}_{M_p}^\perp V_1 = V_2 \mathbf{P}_{Q_1}^\perp = \mathbf{P}_{M_p}^\perp V_A \mathbf{P}_{Q_1}^\perp$. In other words, $\forall V_A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times N}$, any $S$ that satisfies $S(P_A K)^T = \mathbf{P}_{M_p}^\perp V_A \mathbf{P}_{Q_1}^\perp$ will suffice for $S \in \mathcal{S}$, and this condition is equivalent to

$$S(P_A K)^T = \mathbf{P}_{M_p}^\perp V_A \mathbf{P}_{Q_1}^\perp$$

will suffice for $S \in \mathcal{S}$, and this condition is equivalent to

$$S = \mathbf{P}_{M_p}^\perp V_A \mathbf{P}_{Q_1}^\perp + V_c \mathbf{P}_K, \forall V_A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times N},$$

$$\forall V_c \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times R}, where R = 2^K - N. (3.239)$$

Since $V_A$ and $V_C$ are arbitrary, they form an arbitrary $V = [V_A | V_C] \mathbf{P}_K \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times 2^K}$ with $V_A = V(P_A K)^T$ and $V_C = V(P_K)^T$. Plugging them back, we get the following operator $P_{t_1,t_2}(V)$:

$$P_{t_1,t_2}(V) = \mathbf{P}_{M_p}^\perp V_A \mathbf{P}_{Q_1}^\perp + V_c \mathbf{P}_K = V(P_A K)^T \mathbf{P}_{Q_1}^\perp + V(P_K)^T \mathbf{P}_K. (3.240)$$

To show that $P \triangleq P_{t_1,t_2}$ is indeed the projector onto $\mathcal{S}$, we need to verify that

a) $\forall V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times 2^K}, P(V) \in \mathcal{S}$, i.e., projection of any matrix should not go beyond $\mathcal{S}$.

b) $P(S) = S$ for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$.

c) $\forall S \in \mathcal{S}, \exists V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times 2^K}$, s.t. $P(V) = S$.

d) $P \circ P = P$, i.e., projection of projection should remain the same.

e) $\forall V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times 2^K}, \forall S \in \mathcal{S}, tr \{ S^T [V - P(V)] \} = 0$. Geometrically, this can be interpreted as $(V - P(V)) \perp \mathcal{S}$, i.e., projection should be orthogonal.

Verification of Properties (a) $\sim$ (e) of $P$:

(a) $\forall V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times 2^K}$, we have

$$P_A K P(V)^T M_p^{t_2} =$$

$$P_A K \left[ \mathbf{P}_{M_p}^\perp V(P_A K)^T \mathbf{P}_{Q_1}^\perp + V(P_K)^T \mathbf{P}_K \right]^T M_p^{t_2} = 0,$$
and

\[
\mathcal{P}(V)(P_A^T)^T Q^t_1 =
\left[ P_{M_p^2} V(P_A^T)^T P_{Q^t_1}, P_A^T + V(P_K^T) P_K^C \right] (P_K^T)^T Q^t_1 = 0.
\]

So \( \mathcal{P}(V) \in S \).

(b) \( \forall S \in S \), we have \( P_A^T S^T M_{p^2} = 0 \), \( S(P_A^T)^T Q^t_1 = 0 \),

\[
\mathcal{P}(S) = P_{M_p^2} S(P_A^T)^T P_{Q^t_1} + P_A^T + S(P_K^T) P_K^C = \left( I - P_{M_p^2} \right) S(P_A^T)^T P_A^T + S(P_K^T) P_K^C = S(P_A^T)^T P_A^T + S(P_K^T) P_K^C = S.
\]

(c) is a direct result of (b) by plugging \( V = S \).

(d) \( \forall V \in \mathbb{R}_p^{n \times 2^K} \), applying (a), we have \( \mathcal{P}(V) \in S \). Denote \( \mathcal{P}(V) = S \), apply (b), we have \( \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P}(V) = \mathcal{P}(S) = S = \mathcal{P}(V) \).

(e) \( \forall V \in \mathbb{R}_p^{n \times 2^K} \),

\[
V - \mathcal{P}(V) =
V - P_{M_p^2} V(P_A^T)^T P_{Q^t_1} + V(P_K^T) P_K^C = V(P_A^T)^T P_K^A - V(P_K^T) P_K^C
\]

(3.241)

\[
= V(P_A^T)^T P_K^A - (I - P_{M_p^2}) V(P_K^T) P_{Q^t_1} P_K^A
\]

\[
= V(P_A^T)^T P_K^A - (I - P_{M_p^2}) V(P_K^T) P_{Q^t_1} P_K^A + P_{M_p^2} V(P_K^T) P_{Q^t_1} P_K^A.
\]

Therefore, \( \forall S \in S \), we have

\[
tr \left\{ S^T [V - \mathcal{P}(V)] \right\} = tr \left\{ S^T V(P_A^T)^T P_{Q^t_1} P_K^A \right\}
\]

(3.242)

\[
+ tr \left\{ S^T P_{M_p^2} V(P_A^T)^T P_{Q^t_1} P_K^A \right\}.
\]
Since $S \in S$, $P^A_K S^T M^t_p = 0, S(P^A_K)^T Q^t = 0$, we have

$$tr \{S^T V(P^A_K)^T P Q^t, P^A_K\}$$

$$= tr \{V(P^A_K)^T P Q^t, P^A_K S^T\}$$

$$= tr \{V(P^A_K)^T [S(P^A_K)^T Q^t (Q^t)^T]\} = 0,$$

and

$$tr \{S^T P_{M^p} \hat{V}(P^A_K)^T P_{Q^t}, P^A_K\}$$

$$= tr \{P^A_K S^T M^t_p (M^t_p)^T V(P^A_K)^T P_{Q^t}, P^A_K\} = 0.$$

So

$$tr \{S^T [V - P(V)]\} = 0.$$

Now we have shown that

$$S_p | G^p_{t_1,t_2} \xrightarrow{d} I_{t_1,t_2} + P_{t_1,t_2}(\tilde{S}_p) =$$

$$\left\{ P\frac{1}{M^t_p} Y^t_{p}(Q^t)^T + [X^t_{p}(M^t_{p})]^T\right\} P^A_K +$$

$$P\frac{1}{M^t_p} \tilde{S}_p (P^A_K)^T P_{Q^t}, P^A_K + \tilde{S}_p (P^C_K)^T P^C.$$

Since $A_p = S_p (P^A_K)^T$, we have

$$A_p | G^p_{t_1,t_2} \xrightarrow{d} I_{t_1,t_2} (P^A_K)^T + P_{t_1,t_2}(\tilde{S}_p)(P^A_K)^T =$$

$$\left\{ P\frac{1}{M^t_p} Y^t_{p}(Q^t)^T + [X^t_{p}(M^t_{p})]^T\right\} P^A_K (P^A_K)^T +$$

$$P\frac{1}{M^t_p} \tilde{S}_p (P^A_K)^T P_{Q^t}, P^A_K (P^A_K)^T + \tilde{S}_p (P^C_K)^T P^C (P^A_K)^T =$$

$$= P\frac{1}{M^t_p} Y^t_{p}(Q^t)^T + [X^t_{p}(M^t_{p})]^T + P\frac{1}{M^t_p} \tilde{S}_p (P^A_K)^T P_{Q^t}.$$

Noting that $(P^A_K)^T$ has orthogonal columns, it is easy to show that $\tilde{A}_p = \tilde{S}_p (P^A_K)^T$ consists of i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1/n)$ entries. Now we finish the proof of Lemma 13 for the case where each row of $A$ satisfies Lindeberg’s condition. For the case where each column of $A$ satisfies Lindeberg’s condition, we can augment $A_p$ from the
row direction into a $2^K \times N$ matrix, where $2^K > n_p$, and apply the same proof to show that Lemma 13 holds.

Proof of Lemma 12: According to Lemma 13, $A_{p|S_{t1,t2}}^p$ will converge in distribution to the same result as the case where $A$ consists of i.i.d Gaussian entries. None of the assumptions used in the proof of Lemma 4 requires any type of convergences stronger than convergence in distribution, and for all the conclusions obtained during the proof of Lemma 4 there are no converge types weaker than convergence in distribution. Therefore, the same flow of proof works for Lemma 12 by replacing all the almost-sure convergences in the conclusions in Lemma 4 by convergences in distribution (weak convergence).

Corollary 4 For DiAMP-G1, if all the entries in sensing matrix $A$ are independent zero-mean random variables with variance $1/n$, with each one being either $(b/\sqrt{n})$-subgaussian, or $(\alpha, \beta/\sqrt{n})$-sublaplacian, then all of the conclusions in Lemma 4 hold with the almost-sure convergence being replaced by convergence in distribution.

It is straightforward to prove Corollary 4 by applying Lemma 11 to show that each row or column of $A$ satisfies Lindeberg’s condition.

Lemma 12 provides a class of sensing matrices for DiAMP-G1 where SE still holds, which is even broader than the set of matrices consisting of independent sub-gaussian random variables with variance $1/n$, as described in Section 3.3.1 and Corollary 4. This greatly extends the universality of SE on the theoretical level. Applying Lemma 4 and Lemma 12 (b) directly, we can show that Theorem 7 holds.

Remarks: The crucial part of proof of Lemma 13 is the augmenting. The orthogonal matrix $P_K$ serves as a group of well-designed weights, to transform a non-Gaussian matrix into an asymptotic Gaussian matrix. In most cases, to apply Lindeberg’s CLT for $n$ independent random variables, a prerequisite is that their variances should be
in the same level, i.e., there should be no one’s variance dominating the others so that when taking summations, the averaging effect “turns on” in terms of asymptotic Gaussianity. This implies that all the elements in $P_K$ should be on the same level. However, there is no guarantee of the existence of such orthogonal matrices, unless it is of order $2^K$.

3.4 Numerical Illustrations of Gaussianity in DiAMP

Having proved that SE holds in DiAMP, we now give some illustrations of Gaussianity in DiAMP, Q-Q Plot, hypothesis testing, and negentropy.

3.4.1 Q-Q Plot

Considering the DiAMP framework in (3.23), (3.24), and (3.21), on each Sensor $p$ we further partition $A_p$ equally by rows and obtain $A_{p,1}$, $A_{p,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{M_p/2 \times N}$, and the corresponding $y^{p,1}$, $y^{p,2}$, $z^{p,1}$, $z^{p,2}$, etc. Denoting $u_{p,i}^t = (\omega_p/2)x^t + A_{p,i}^Tz_{p,i}^t (i = 1, 2)$, it can be shown that in the large system limit, the $2P$ random vectors $r_{p,i}^t = u_{p,i}^t - (\omega_p/2)s_0$ behave like i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, (\omega_p/2)\sigma^2_t I_N)$, where $I_N$ is the $N \times N$ identity matrix. In Fig. 9 an example is provided illustrating the Gaussianity of $r_{p,i}^t$ with soft thresholding function as the denoiser. As shown in the figure, all the Q-Q plots are close to straight lines, which is a good evidence of Gaussianity.

3.4.2 Hypothesis Test

Let us introduce an $N \times 2P$ matrix $G$, with each column $g_{2(p-1)+i} = \sqrt{2/\omega_p}r_{p,i}^t$. If the Gaussianity assumption is valid, then all the elements $g_{ij}$ in $G$ follows i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_t)$. Therefore, we can design the following nonparametric hypothesis test:

$H_0$: $g_{ij}$ follows i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_t)$;

$H_1$: $g_{ij}$ does not follow i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_t)$,
which can be performed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test [84]. Note that K-S test for large sample is highly sensitive to outliers [85], whereas the sample size in our case is $2NP$ with the order of $10^5$ or even larger, which may cause numerical instability if we directly run K-S on the sample. In the following we propose a hierarchical approach, which contains two layers of tests.

**Layer 1:** Randomly reorder the elements in $G$, and then partition them equally into $K_B$ blocks, with each block having $S_B = 2NP/K_B$ elements. For each block $i \in [K_B]$, run K-S test and obtain the corresponding p-value $p_{L1}(i)$.

**Layer 2:** If the null hypothesis in Layer 1 is true, then all the p-values $p_{L1}(i)$ should follow i.i.d. $U(0, 1)$ [86, 87], where $U$ denotes uniform distribution; otherwise, most $p_{L1}(i)$’s should concentrate near 0, which implies that the true CDF of $p_{L1}(i)$’s, say $F_{L1}(x)$, will soon increase to 1, i.e., $F(x) > x$. Therefore, we can build the following one-sided hypothesis test:

$H_0$: $F_{L1}(x) = x$;

$H_1$: $F_{L1}(x) > x$, 

Fig. 9. QQ-plots of $r_{p,i}^t$ ($p = 1, \cdots , P$ and $i = 1, 2$) at the 1-st and 20-th iterations of AMP with soft thresholding, with $P = 2$ and $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0.5$. 


where we can perform K-S test again, and obtain the corresponding p-value $p_{L_2}$. Note that the test will be performed in each iteration of DiAMP, and there will be $K_B p_{L_1}$'s and 1 $p_{L_2}$ per iteration. The larger $p_{L_2}$, the better, as is shown in the numerical results later on.

![Empirical CDF of $p_{L_1}$](image1.png)

![p-Values of the K-S test in the second layer](image2.png)

Fig. 10. $p$-Values of the proposed two-layer tests. In the first sub-figure, the $x$-axis corresponds to all the p-Values $p_{L_1}$'s of the first layer obtained in simulations, the $F_{L_1}(x)$-axis corresponds to their CDF values, and the color bar indicates the percentage of $(x, F_{L_1}(x))$'s falling into each bin (in %). The second sub-figure shows all the p-Values $p_{L_2}$'s of the second layer in DiAMP iterations, where the color bar indicates the percentage of $(t, p_{L_2})$'s falling into each bin (in %).

In Fig. 10 $p$-Values of the proposed two-layer tests are shown. As we can see, the distribution of the p-Values $p_{L_1}$'s of the first layer, that is, $p$-Values of Gaussianity
test of $r_{p,i}^t$ in DiAMP, is very close to $\mathcal{U}(0, 1)$; furthermore, the p-Values $p_{L_2}$'s of the second layer, that is, that of the uniformity test of $p_{L_1}$'s, are concentrated in the range $[0, 1]$, which verifies the uniformity of $p_{L_1}$'s, thereby validating the Gaussianity of $r_{p,i}^t$ in DiAMP.

3.4.3 Negentropy

We can also validate the Gaussianity in $r_{p,i}^t$ by observing its negentropy, a non-Gaussianity measure of a given distribution $Y \sim P_Y$ with zero mean and unit variance:

$$J_Y = \frac{[E(Y^3)]^2}{12} + \frac{[E(Y^4) - 3]^2}{48}, \tag{3.247}$$

where $J_Y$ is a nonnegative number, the smaller it is, the more close it is to a standard normal distribution.

In Fig. 11, the negentropy values of $r_{p,i}^t$ are shown in DiAMP, which are distributed within $[2 \times 10^{-7}, 2 \times 10^{-5}]$, very close to 0. This verifies the Gaussianity of $r_{p,i}^t$ in DiAMP.

3.5 Applications: Lossy DiAMP

3.5.1 AMP with Bayesian MMSE Estimator

In previous sections on AMP, we assume no prior knowledge on $s_0$, where the soft thresholding function is nearly a minimax risk denoiser. On the other hand, if we know that $s_0$ follows some prior distribution, then the optimal denoiser in the mean-square-error (MSE) sense is the minimum MSE (MMSE) estimator:

$$\eta_t(F_t) = E[S_0 | S_0 + \sigma_t Z = F_t]. \tag{3.248}$$

For simplicity of illustration, we assume that $S_0$ follows the Bernoulli Gaussian
distribution:

$$p_{S_0}(s) = \epsilon \mathcal{N}(s; \mu_s, \sigma^2_s) + (1 - \epsilon)\delta(s),$$

(3.249)

where $\delta(s)$ denotes the Dirac delta function, the notation $\mathcal{N}(s; \mu_s, \sigma^2_s)$ denotes the value of Gaussian PDF $\mathcal{N}(\mu_s, \sigma^2_s)$ evaluated at $s$, and $S_0$ typically has mean $\mu_s = 0$. The denoiser is easily derived and given as follows:

$$\eta_t(F_t) = \frac{\epsilon \mathcal{N}(F_t; \mu_s, \sigma^2_s + \sigma^2_t)}{\epsilon \mathcal{N}(F_t; \mu_s, \sigma^2_s + \sigma^2_t) + (1 - \epsilon) \mathcal{N}(F_t; 0, \sigma^2_t)} \times \frac{F_t \sigma^2_s + \mu_s \sigma^2_t}{\sigma^2_s + \sigma^2_t}.$$  

(3.250)

In this dissertation we set $\mu_s = 0$.

As a measure of the measurement noise level and recovery accuracy, we define
the signal-to-noise-ratio (SNR) as
\[
\text{SNR} = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \|A s_0\|^2 \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[ \|e\|^2 \right]} \right)
\approx 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \|s_0\|^2 \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[ \|e\|^2 \right]} \right) = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\rho}{\sigma_e^2} \right),
\]
where \( \rho = \epsilon / \kappa \), and the signal-to-distortion-ratio (SDR) at iteration \( t \) as
\[
\text{SDR}(t) = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \|s_0\|^2 \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[ \|x_t - s_0\|^2 \right]} \right).
\]
Using the SE equation in (2.5), we have
\[
\text{SDR}(t) = 10 \log_{10} \left[ \frac{\rho}{\sigma_t^2 - \sigma_e^2} \right].
\]
Note that the Bernoulli Gaussian assumption in this paper is only for illustration, and our work is easily extended to other prior distributions \( p_{S_0} \).

3.5.2 Multi-Processor AMP Framework

Consider a system with \( P \) processors and one fusion center. Each processor \( p \in \{1, \cdots, P\} \) takes \( M/P \) rows of \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} \), namely \( A^p \), and obtains \( y^p = A^p s_0 + e^p \).

The procedures in (2.1) — (2.3) can then be rewritten in a distributed manner:

Local Computation (LC) performed by each processor \( p \):
\[
z^p_t = y^p - A^p x_t + \frac{1}{\kappa} \eta_t(f_{t-1}) z^p_{t-1},
\]
\[
f^p_t = \frac{x_t}{P} + (A^p)^T z^p_t.
\]

Global Computation (GC) performed by the fusion center:
\[
f_t = \sum_{p=1}^{P} f^p_t / \eta_t(f_t), \quad \text{and} \quad x_{t+1} = \eta_t(f_t).
\]

It can be seen that in the GC step of MP-AMP, each processor \( p \) sends \( f^p_t \) to the fusion center, and the fusion center sums them to obtain \( f_t \) and \( x_{t+1} \), and sends \( x_{t+1} \).
to each processor. Our goal in this dissertation is to reduce these communication costs while barely impacting recovery performance.

Suppose that all the elements in $f_p^t$ are computed as 32-bit single-precision floating-point numbers. As shown in previous sections, SE still holds in DiAMP even in the presence of quantization noises, we can compress $f_p^t$ lossily up to some reasonable distortion level, and send the compressed output to the fusion center. By applying SE in DiAMP, we can link $\sigma_t^2$ to the quantization error $D$, while by applying rate-distortion theory [77], we can further connect $D$ to the bit rates we use in lossy compression. In other words, we can precisely control the trade-off between recovery accuracy and communication cost, based on the one-to-one map from the bit rate per element $R$, and $\sigma_t^2$ in DiAMP, a measure of its accuracy.

### 3.5.3 Lossy Compression of $f_p^t$

Due to the proof of SE in DiAMP in previous sections of this chapter, we know that elements of $f_p^t - (1/P)s_0$ are i.i.d. Gaussian with mean 0 and variance $\sigma_t^2/P$. Furthermore, $f_p^t - (1/P)s_0$ and $f_q^t - (1/P)s_0$ are independent for different processors $p$ and $q$. In light of this property, $f_p^t$ can be described as a scalar channel:

$$F_p^t = S_0/P + (\sigma_t/\sqrt{P})Z_p,$$

where $Z_p \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$.

For the Bernoulli Gaussian distribution (3.249),

$$F_p^t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_s/P, (\sigma_s^2 + P\sigma_t^2)/P^2) + (1-\epsilon)\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_t^2/P).$$

**Scalar Quantization:** Next, we propose a uniform quantizer with entropy coding, also known as entropy coded scalar quantization (ECSQ) [89].

---

6In order to calculate each $z_{t+1}^p$, the fusion center also needs to send $\tilde{y}_t(f_t)$ to all the processors. This is a scalar, and the corresponding communication cost is negligible compared with that of transmitting a vector.
Let $\Psi(u)$ denote the characteristic function of $F_t^p$, it can be shown that
\[
|\Psi(u)| \leq \epsilon \exp \left[ -0.5 \left( \sigma_s^2 + P \sigma_t^2 \right) u^2 / P^2 \right] + (1 - \epsilon) \exp \left( -0.5 \sigma_t^2 u^2 / P \right) \leq \exp \left( -0.5 \sigma_t^2 u^2 / P \right)
\]
is nearly band-limited. Due to this property, it is possible to develop a uniform quantizer of $f_t^p \sim$ i.i.d. $F_t^p$, where the quantization error $v_t^p$ is approximately statistically equivalent to a uniformly distributed noise $V_t^p \sim U[ -0.5 \Delta_Q, 0.5 \Delta_Q]$ uncorrelated to $F_t^p$. Actually, a quantization bin size $\Delta_Q \leq 2 \sigma_t / \sqrt{P}$ will suffice for validation of $v_t^p \sim$ i.i.d. $V_t^p$.

The fusion center will receive the quantized data $\tilde{f}_t^p \sim$ i.i.d. $\tilde{F}_t^p$, and calculate
\[
\tilde{F}_t = \sum_{p=1}^{P} \tilde{F}_t^p = F_t + V_t, \quad V_t = \sum_{p=1}^{P} V_t^p. \tag{3.251}
\]
Applying the central limit theorem, $V_t$ approximately follows $\mathcal{N}(0, P \sigma_Q^2)$ for large $P$, where $\sigma_Q^2 = \Delta_Q^2 / 12$.

**Entropy Coding and Optimum Bit Rate:** Let $p_i$ be the probability that $F_t^p$ falls into the $i$-th quantization bin. The entropy of quantized $F_t^p$, $\tilde{F}_t^p$, is $H_Q = -\sum_i p_i \log_2 (p_i)$, that is, the sensors need $H_Q$ bits on average to represent each element in $\tilde{f}_t^p$ to the fusion center, which is achievable through entropy coding.

In rate distortion (RD) theory, we are given a length-$n$ random sequence $Y_n = \{Y_n,i\}_{i=1}^{n} \sim$ i.i.d. $F_Y$, and our goal is to identify a reconstruction sequence $\hat{Y}_n = \{\hat{Y}_n,i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ that can be encoded at low rate while the distortion $d(Y_n, \hat{Y}_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i d(Y_n,i, \hat{Y}_n,i)$ (e.g., squared error distortion) between the input and the reconstruction sequence is small. RD theory has characterized the fundamental best-possible trade-off between the distortion $D = d(Y_n, \hat{Y}_n)$ and coding rate $R(D)$, which is called the rate distortion function. The RD function $R(D)$ can be computed numerically (cf. Blahut and Arimoto). For the uniform quantizer that yields a quantiza-
tion MSE of $\sigma_Q^2$ with a coding rate $H_Q$ bits per element, the RD function will give a bit rate $R(D = \sigma_Q^2) < H_Q$, which is achievable through vector quantization [89].

**New SE Equation:** For both ECSQ and RD-based vector quantization that lead to a quantization MSE of $\sigma_Q^2$, the fusion center will have $\tilde{F}_t = S_0 + \sqrt{\sigma_t^2 + P\sigma_Q^2} \tilde{Z}$, where $\tilde{Z} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The new denoiser and SE equation become

$$\eta_t^Q(\tilde{F}_t) = \mathbb{E}\left[S_0 \mid S_0 + \sqrt{\sigma_t^2 + P\sigma_Q^2} \tilde{Z} = \tilde{F}_t\right]$$

and

$$\sigma_{t+1}^2 = \sigma_t^2 + (1/\kappa)\mathbb{E}\left[\eta_t^Q\left(S_0 + \sqrt{\sigma_t^2 + P\sigma_Q^2} \tilde{Z}\right) - S_0\right]^2. \quad (3.252)$$

Currently, we only consider compression of $f^p_t$. When broadcast from the fusion center to the $P$ processors is allowed in the network topology, the communication cost of sending $x_t$ – even uncompressed – is smaller than that of communicating the $P$ vectors $f^p_t$. We are considering the case where broadcast is not allowed in our ongoing work.

### 3.5.4 Online Back-tracking (BT-MP-AMP)

Let $\sigma_{t,C}^2$ and $\sigma_{t,D}^2$ denote the $\sigma_t^2$ obtained by the centralized AMP (2.5) and MP-AMP (3.252), respectively. In order to reduce communication while maintaining high fidelity, we first constrain $\sigma_{t,D}^2$ so that it will not deviate much from $\sigma_{t,C}^2$, and then determine the minimum coding rate required in each iteration. This can be done through an online back-tracking algorithm, which we name BT-MP-AMP and present below.

In each iteration $t$, before quantizing $f^p_t$, we first compute $\sigma_{t+1,C}^2$ for the next iteration. Then we find the maximum quantization MSE $\sigma_Q^2$ allowed so that the ratio $\sigma_{t+1,D}^2/\sigma_{t+1,C}^2$ does not exceed some constant, provided that the required bit rate does not exceed some threshold. Based on the obtained $\sigma_Q^2$ we construct the corresponding quantizer.
Note that the SE in (3.252) is only an approximation, and we do not know the true value of $\sigma^2_{t,D}$ in the current iteration. To better predict $\sigma^2_{t+1,D}$, we use $\hat{\sigma}^2_{t,D} = \|z^p_t\|^2/M$, which is a good estimator for $\sigma^2_{t,D}$[57, 58], to compute $\sigma^2_{t+1,D}$. To obtain $\hat{\sigma}^2_{t,D}$, each processor $p$ sends the scalar $\|z^p_t\|^2$ to the fusion center, which then sends the scalar $\hat{\sigma}^2_{t,D} = \sum_{p=1}^P \|z^p_t\|^2/M$ to all the processors. The corresponding communication cost is also negligible compared with that of communicating $f^p_t$.

### 3.5.5 Dynamic Programming (DP-MP-AMP)

While back-tracking is a useful heuristic, it is possible for a given coding budget $R$ per element, total number of AMP iterations $T$, and initial noise level $\sigma^2_0$ in the scalar channel to compute the coding rate allocations among the AMP iterations that minimize the final MSE, $\sigma^2_{T,D}$.

To do so, note that we can evaluate $\sigma^2_{t,C}$ offline and hence obtain the number of iterations required to reach the steady state, which would be a reasonable choice for $T$. Second, recalling the new SE equation in (3.252), $\sigma^2_{t,D}$ depends on $\sigma^2_{t-1,D}$ and $\sigma^2_Q$, which is a function of $R_t$, the coding rate allocated in the $t$-th iteration. Therefore, we can rewrite $\sigma^2_{t,D}$ as follows:

$$
\sigma^2_{t,D} = f_1(\sigma^2_{t-1,D}, R_t) = f_2(\sigma^2_{t-2,D}, R_{t-1}, R_t) = \cdots = f_t(\sigma^2_0, R_1, \cdots, R_{t-1}, R_t),
$$

(3.253)

that is, given $\sigma^2_0$, $\sigma^2_{T,D}$ is only a function of $R_t$ for $t \in \{1, 2, \cdots, T\}$. Denoting $\mathcal{F}_T(R) = \{R_1, \cdots, R_T \geq 0: \sum_{t=1}^T R_t = R\}$, minimizing $\sigma^2_{T,D}$ for a given $R$ can be formulated as the following optimization problem:

$$
\min_{\mathcal{F}_T(R)} \sigma^2_{T,D} = \min_{\mathcal{F}_T(R)} f_T(\sigma^2_0, R_1, \cdots, R_T).
$$

(3.254)

Since $\sigma^2_{t,D}$ is increasing with $\sigma^2_{t-1,D}$, it is easy to verify the following recursive rela-
tionship:
\[
\min_{\mathcal{F}_T(R)} \sigma^2_{T,D} = \min_{0 \leq R_T \leq R} f_1 \left( \min_{\mathcal{F}_{T-1}(R-R_T)} \sigma^2_{T-1,D}, R_T \right) = \cdots ,
\]
which makes the problem solvable through dynamic programming (DP).

To implement DP, we need to discretize \( \mathcal{F}_T(R) \) into \( \{ R_1, \cdots, R_T \} \), where \( \Omega = \{ R^{(1)}, \cdots, R^{(S)} \} \) with \( R^{(s)} = R(s-1)/(S-1) \), \( \forall s \in \{1, \cdots, S\} \). In this dissertation, we set the bit rate resolution \( \Delta R = R/(S - 1) = 0.1 \) bits per element. Then, we create an \( S \times T \) array \( \Sigma \), with the element in the \( s \)-th row \( (s \in \{1, \cdots, S\}) \) and \( t \)-th column \( (t \in \{1, \cdots, T\}) \) denoted as \( \sigma^2_D(s,t) \), storing the optimal value of \( \sigma^2_{T,D} \) when a total of \( R^{(s)} \) bits per element are used in the first \( t \) iterations. By the definition of \( \sigma^2_D(s,t) \), we have
\[
\sigma^2_D(s,t) = \min_{r \in \{1,2,\cdots,s\}} f_1 \left( \sigma^2_D(r,t-1), R^{(s-r+1)} \right),
\]
and the first column of elements in \( \Sigma \) is obtained by:
\[
\sigma^2_D(s,1) = f_1 \left( \sigma^2_0, R^{(s)} \right), \ \forall s \in \{1,2,\cdots,S\}.
\]

After obtaining \( \Sigma \), the optimal value of \( \sigma^2_{T,D} \), by definition, is \( \sigma^2_D(S,T) \). Meanwhile, to obtain the optimal bit allocation strategy, we need another \( S \times T \) array \( \mathbf{R} \) to store the optimal bit rate \( R_{DP}(s,t) \) that is allocated at iteration \( t \) when a total of \( R^{(s)} \) bits per element are used in the first \( t \) iterations. Similar to BT-MP-AMP, we name the proposed MP-AMP approach combined with DP as DP-MP-AMP.

### 3.6 Numerical Results

We evaluate BT-MP-AMP and DP-MP-AMP in an MP system with \( P = 30 \) processors at SNR= 20 dB, where we set \( N = 10,000, \ M = 3,000 \), i.e., \( \kappa = 0.3 \), and generate Bernoulli-Gaussian sequences \( \mathbf{s}_0 \) with \( \epsilon \in \{0.03, 0.05, 0.1\} \), \( \mu_s = 0 \), and \( \sigma_s = 1 \).

We first evaluate the SE equation (2.5) of centralized AMP for the three sparsity
Fig. 12. SDR and bit rates as functions of iteration number $t$. ($N=10,000$, $M=3,000$, $\kappa=0.3$, $\mu_s=0$, $\sigma_s=1$, $\text{SNR}=20\,\text{dB}$.)

levels. As shown in Fig. 12, they reach the steady state after $T=8$, 10, and 20 iterations respectively. Then, we run BT-MP-AMP and DP-MP-AMP, where for the latter the total rates are $R=2T$ bits per element and the RD-function models the relation between $R_t$ and $\sigma_Q^2$.

According to RD theory, in the high rate limit, we should expect a gap of roughly 0.255 bits per element between the entropy and RD function for a given distortion level [89]. Therefore, in an implementation of DP-MP-AMP where we apply ECSQ, we add 0.255 bits per element to the results in each iteration obtained by DP. Note that the two solid curves in the top three panels are obtained through offline calculation and optimization, and the two dash-dotted curves are obtained through AMP simulations. As shown in Fig. 12, BT-MP-AMP uses fewer than 6 bits per element in each iteration, more than 80% communication savings compared with 32-bit single-precision floating-point transmission, while achieving almost the same SDR’s as in centralized AMP. On the other hand, there are clear gaps between the SDR’s of
Table 7. Total bits per element of MP-AMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ε</th>
<th>0.03</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT-MP-AMP (RD prediction)</td>
<td>33.82</td>
<td>46.43</td>
<td>96.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT-MP-AMP (ECSQ simulation)</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>49.19</td>
<td>101.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP-MP-AMP (RD prediction)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP-MP-AMP (ECSQ simulation)</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td>45.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DP-MP-AMP and centralized AMP during the first few iterations, but they vanish quickly as \( t \) approaches \( T \), in return for over 50% communication reduction beyond that provided by BT-MP-AMP, as shown in Table 7.

Note also that the ECSQ implementation of DP-MP-AMP has lower SDR’s than that predicted by DP results based on the RD function at the beginning. This is because the 0.255-bits gap only holds in the high rate limit. However, due to the robustness of SE to disturbances, and the increasingly high rates as \( t \) approaches \( T \), the ECSQ implementation matches the predicted DP results at the last iteration.

3.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, we proved that SE still holds in a distributed AMP framework, where quantization noise is incorporated. Furthermore, compared to previous theoretical results which assume that the sensing matrix consists of independent subgaussian entries, our work further extends the validity of SE to more general sensing matrices, which strengthens the theoretical support of AMP in general applications. Taking advantage of this theoretical progress, we proposed a multi-processor approximate message passing framework with lossy compression. We used a uniform quantizer with entropy coding to reduce communication costs, and reformulated the SE equation while accounting for quantization noise. Combining the quantizers and modified state evolution equation, an online back-tracking approach and another method based on dynamic programming were developed to determine the coding rate in each
iteration by controlling the induced error. The numerical results showed that our approaches can maintain a high signal-to-distortion-ratio despite a significant and often dramatic reduction in inter-processor communication costs.
4.1 Introduction

Different from AMP, iterative hard thresholding (IHT) is a deterministic greedy algorithm [44, 45]. Taking an input parameter $K$, the sparsity level of the sparse signal of $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, IHT aims to find a local minimum of (1.2) close to $s_0$; provided that the sensing matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ satisfies the RIP condition [16] well and there is no measurement noise, IHT hopefully converges to $s_0$ [45]. The term “deterministic” is from the modeling perspective, meaning that there are no quantities in the CS measurement model in (1.1) that are viewed as random variables. The term “greedy” depicts its nature, since in each iteration it minimizes a surrogate function which is an upper bound on the objective function in (1.2). IHT has a linear convergence rate [44], which is good for most CS recovery algorithms, and compared with other iterative greedy algorithms like orthogonal matching pursuit (OMP), it has a lower complexity in each iteration, since no matrix inversion is performed.

Denote IHT with the input parameter $K$ as $\text{IHT}_K$. It starts with $x_0 = 0$ and $z_0 = y$, and repeats the following process:

\begin{align*}
    f_t &= x_t + \mu A^T z_t \\
    x_{t+1} &= \eta(f_t; K) \\
    z_{t+1} &= y - Ax_{t+1}
\end{align*}

where the step size $\mu$ can be any positive number within $(0, 1/\|A\|_2)$, and $u = \eta(v; K)$
for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called hard thresholding function, where $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ only keeps the $K$ largest-in-magnitude components in $\mathbf{v}$ and has other components all zero, that is

$$u(k) = v(k)\mathbb{1}(|v(k)| \geq T_K(v)), \forall k \in [n] \quad (4.4)$$

Like DiAMP, we can introduce a similar intermediate matrix $\mathbf{W}_t = [\mathbf{w}_1^t, \cdots, \mathbf{w}_P^t]$ for distributed IHT (DIHT) [40]:

$$\mathbf{w}_t^p = \begin{cases} x_t + \mu (\mathbf{A}^p)^T \mathbf{z}_t^p, & p = 1, \\ \mu (\mathbf{A}^p)^T \mathbf{z}_t^p, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

It is easy to show that

$$f_t = \sum_{p=1}^P \mathbf{w}_t^p \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$x_{t+1} = \eta(f_t; K) = \eta \left( \sum_{p=1}^P \mathbf{w}_t^p; K \right) \quad (4.7)$$

$$z_{t+1}^p = y^p - \mathbf{A}^p x_{t+1}, \forall p = 1, \cdots, P \quad (4.8)$$

also hold for DIHT.

To save the communication cost in the GC step of DIHT, a modified TA (MTA) approach was proposed in [40], which has been introduced in Chapter 2. As shown in Table 8, in each iteration of the modified TA (MTA), there is an object being selected and the corresponding total score is computed; then an upper bound $\nu$ on magnitudes of the total scores that have not been computed yet is obtained. The algorithm terminates if the $K$-th largest magnitude of computed total scores is greater than $\nu$. 
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Table 8. MTA Algorithm for DIHT

Input $w_1, \ldots, w_P, K$

Initialize $x_{t+1} = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\text{count} = 0$, $\tau_T = +\infty$, $\tau_B = +\infty$, $u_p = +\infty$, $\ell_p = -\infty$, $\forall p = 1, \ldots, P$;
Mark all the pairs $(n, w_p(n))$ as “unsent”, $\forall n, p$;
while TRUE
for sensor $p = 1$:
    obtain $R = \{n : (n, w_p(n)) \text{ is marked as “unsent”}\}$;
    if $\tau_T \geq \tau_B$
        set $n_s = \arg \max_{n \in R} w_p(n)$;
        update $u_p = w_p(n_s)$ and $\tau_T = \max\{0, \sum_{q=1}^P u_q\}$;
    else
        set $n_s = \arg \min_{n \in R} w_p(n)$;
        update $\ell_p = w_p(n_s)$ and $\tau_B = -\min\{0, \sum_{q=1}^P \ell_q\}$;
    endif
* broadcast $(n_s, w_p(n_s))$ and mark it as “sent”;
for sensor $q \neq p$
* send $(n_s, w_q(n_s))$ to sensor $p$ and mark it as “sent”;
    store $w_p(n_s)$ as the new $u_p$ or $\ell_p$;
endfor
* compute $f_t(n_s)$ and broadcast it to other sensors;
$\text{count} = \text{count} + 1$;
let $\beta$ be $K$-th largest element in $\{|f_t(n)| : n \notin R \setminus \{n_s\}\}$;
if $\max\{\tau_T, \tau_B\} < \beta$ or $\text{count} \geq N$
    update $x_{t+1}(n) = f_t(n)$ if $|f_t(n)| > \beta$, $\forall n \notin R \setminus \{n_s\}$;
    set $N_s = \text{count}$, the algorithm terminates;
endif
endfor
endwhile
Output $x_{t+1}$

4.2 Proposed GC Algorithms for DIHT

4.2.1 GC.$K$ Algorithm

For DIHT, according to (4.4), $x_{t+1}(n) = 0$ if $|f_t(n)| < T_K(f_t)$. Therefore, the GC in DIHT turns out to be a Top-$K$ problem, that is, to find the $K$ largest-in-magnitude total scores $f_t(n) = \sum_{p=1}^P w_p(n)$, as well as the indices $n$’s of objects they correspond to. Similar to the derivation of GCAMP, what we are going to do is not using TPUT.
to solve the problem since entries in $W_t$ can either be positive or negative, but following the essence of the TPUT algorithm to develop our own Top-$K$ algorithm.

Before presenting GC.$K$, we first give the following straightforward propositions and lemmas, which shows the intuitive essence of GC.$K$.

**Proposition 11** Let $f(x)$ be a scalar-valued function with domain $\Omega_G$, then for any $\Omega_L \subset \Omega_G$, we have

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega_G} f(x) \geq \sup_{x \in \Omega_L} f(x) \quad (4.9)$$

**Proposition 12** Let $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ be two scalar-valued functions with a common domain $\Omega$, if $f(x) \geq g(x)$ holds for any $x \in \Omega$, then we have

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega} f(x) \geq \sup_{x \in \Omega} g(x) \quad (4.10)$$

With Propositions 11 and 12, we have the following Lemma.

**Lemma 14** Given $v \in \mathbb{R}^N$, for arbitrary $\Omega \subset [N]$, let $u = v(\Omega)$ and $u^c = v([N] \setminus \Omega)$, we have

$$T_K(v) \geq T_K(u), \forall K \leq |\Omega|. \quad (4.11)$$

The equality holds if $|u^c(j)| < T_K(v), \forall j \in [N - |\Omega|]$.

Furthermore, if $l \in \mathbb{R}^{[N]}$ satisfies $l(j) \leq u(j), \forall j \in [|\Omega|]$, then

$$T_K(v) \geq T_K(l), \forall K \leq |\Omega|. \quad (4.12)$$

Lemma 14 is straightforward after applying Propositions 11 and 12. With Lemma 14, we develop the following GC.$K$ algorithm, of which the essence is to get lower bounds on $T_K(|f_t|)$ and upper bounds on $|f_t(n)|$ for each $n \in [N]$.

Let $\Omega^1_p$ be the set of indices of the largest-in-magnitude $K$ partial scores $w^p_t(n)$ on Sensor $p$. First, each Sensor $p \geq 2$ sends the $(n, w^p_t(n))$ pairs for all $n \in \Omega^1_p$ to Sensor 1. Sensor 1 then computes a partial sum $P(n)$ for each $n \in \bigcup_{p=1}^P \Omega^1_p$, where a
partial sum for \( n \) is defined as the summation of partial scores Sensor 1 now collects for \( n \) (including \( w_1^t(n) \)). Denote \( F^1 \) as the set of indices for the largest-in-magnitude \( K \) partial sums, then Sensor 1 broadcasts a request for all the partial scores for each \( n \in F^1 \) from other Sensors, computes the total score \( f_i(n) \) for each \( n \in F^1 \), and obtains \( \nu_1 = T_K(\|f_i(F^1)\|) \).

The following process is very similar to GCAMP algorithm. Set \( T = \theta \nu_1/(P-1) \), where \( \theta \in (0,1) \). For \( p \geq 2 \), define \( \Omega_p^2 = \{ n \notin F^1 \cup \Omega_p^1 : |w_p^t(n)| \geq T \} \). Each Sensor \( p \geq 2 \) sends the \((n, w_p^t(n))\) pairs for all \( n \in \Omega_p^2 \) to Sensor 1. So far, Sensor 1 has obtained partial scores from Sensor \( p \) for all \( n \in \Omega_p = \Omega_p^1 \cup \Omega_p^2 \cup F^1 \), and the set

\[
S_n = \{ p \in [P] \setminus \{ 1 \} : n \in \Omega_p \}
\]

(4.13)

for each \( n \notin F^1 \). Sensor 1 then computes

\[
L(n) = \max(|w_1^t(n) + \sum_{p \in S_n} w_p^t(n)| - (P - 1 - |S_n|)T, 0)
\]

(4.14)

and

\[
U(n) = |w_1^t(n) + \sum_{p \in S_n} w_p^t(n)| + (P - 1 - |S_n|)T
\]

(4.15)

for each \( n \notin F^1 \). Denote \( \nu_2 \) as the \( K \)-th largest lower bound \( L(n) \) and set \( \nu = \max(\nu_1, \nu_2) \), Sensor 1 obtains the set \( F^2 = \{ n \notin F^1 : U(n) \geq \nu \} \), requests all the partial scores for each \( n \in F^2 \) from other sensors, and computes the total score \( f_i(n) \).

Up to now, we have obtained total scores for all \( n \in F = F^1 \cup F^2 \).

Finally, compute \( x_{t+1} \) as follows: for any \( n \in F \),

\[
x_{t+1}(n) = f_i(n) \mathbb{I}(f_i(n) \geq T_K(f_i(F)))
\]

(4.16)

and for any \( n \notin F \), \( x_{t+1}(n) = 0 \).

**Lemma 15** \( L(n) \) in (4.14) is a lower bound on \( |f_i(n)| \), and \( U(n) \) in (4.15) is an
upper bound on $|\mathbf{f}_t(n)|$.

The proof of Lemma 15 is very similar to that of Lemma 1, by applying the triangular inequality and the fact that $|w_p^t(n)| < T$ for all $p \notin S_n$.

**Theorem 10** In each iteration, GC.K algorithm gives exactly the same $x_{t+1}$ as that of the centralized IHT algorithm computed by (4.2).

**Proof of Theorem 10** Let $x_{t+1}^G$ and $x_{t+1}^I$ denote the result obtained by the GC.K and the centralized IHT respectively. According to Lemma 14, $\nu_1$ is a lower bound on $T_K(|\mathbf{f}_t|)$. For all $n \notin F$, according to Lemma 15, $L(n) \leq |\mathbf{f}_t(n)|$; applying Lemma 14 again, $\nu_2$ is another lower bound on $T_K(|\mathbf{f}_t|)$. Therefore, $T_K(\mathbf{f}_t) \geq \nu = \max(\nu_1, \nu_2)$.

Now, $\forall n \notin F$, we have $x_{t+1}^G(n) = 0$; according to Lemma 15, we have $|\mathbf{f}_t(n)| \leq U(n) < \nu \leq T_K(|\mathbf{f}_t|)$, so $x_{t+1}^I(n) = 0$ and according to Lemma 14, $T_K(|\mathbf{f}_t|) = T_K(|\mathbf{f}_t(F)|)$. $\forall n \in F$, according to (4.2), (4.4), (4.16), and the fact that as we $T_K(\mathbf{f}_t) = T_K(\mathbf{f}_t(F))$ just showed, we have $x_{t+1}^G(n) = x_{t+1}^I(n)$. Therefore, $x_{t+1}^G = x_{t+1}^I$.

The pseudo code of the GC.K algorithm is shown in Table 9 which contains 8 steps. It can be shown that the total number of messages is $\sum_{p=1}^{P} |\Omega_p \cup F| + (|F| + 1)$, where the first part is the number of data other sensors send to Sensor 1, and the second part is the number of broadcasting messages Sensor 1 sends to others.

Table 9: GC.K algorithm

| Input $w_{t}^{1}, \cdots, w_{t}^{P}$, $K$, $\theta$ |

| Step I |
for sensor \( p = 1 \):

obtain \( \Omega_1^p = \{ n : |w_1^p(n)| \geq \mathcal{T}_K(w_t^p) \} \);

Sensors \( p \geq 2 \) send all \( (n, w_1^p(n)) \) pairs for \( n \in \Omega_1^p \) to Sensor 1

endfor

Step II define \( x_{t+1}^h \in \mathbb{R}^N \) and initialize \( x_{t+1}^h = 0 \); for \( n \in \bigcup_{p=1}^P \Omega_1^p \)  

get \( R_n := \{ p : n \in \Omega_1^p \} \);  

Compute a partial sum \( P(n) = w_t^1(n) + \sum_{p \in R_n \setminus \{1\}} w_t^p(n) \);

endfor

Sort all the \((n,P(n))\) pairs in the descending order of \(|P(n)|\);

Broadcast \( F^1 \), which is the set of \( n \)’s in the first \( K \) pairs of the sorted list;

Step III Upon receiving the broadcast message from sensor 1

for sensor \( p = 2 \):

send all \((n, w_1^p(n))\) pairs for \( n \in F^1 \setminus \Omega_1^p \) to sensor 1.

endfor

Step IV Sensor 1 assigns \( x_{t+1}^h(F^1) = f_t(F^1) \), obtain \( \nu_1 = \mathcal{T}_K(|x_{t+1}^h(F_1)|) \) and broadcast \( \nu_1 \);

Step V Upon receiving \( \nu_1 \) from sensor 1

for sensor \( p = 2 \):

Set \( T = \nu_1 \theta / (P - 1) \) and obtain \( \Omega_2^p = \{ n : |w_t^p(n)| > T \} \setminus (\Omega_1^p \cup F_1) \);  

\( \Omega_p = \Omega_1^p \cup \Omega_2^p \cup F_1 \);  

send all \((n, w_1^p(n))\) pairs for \( n \in \Omega_2^p \) to sensor 1.

endfor

Step VI On sensor 1,

for \( n \in [N] \setminus F_1 \)
get \( S_n \) as defined in (4.13), compute \( L(n) \) and \( U(n) \) according to (4.14) and (4.15);

endfor

Define \( \nu_2 \) as the \( K \)-th largest \( L(n) \) and set \( \nu = \max(\nu_1, \nu_2) \);

Broadcast \( F^2 := \{ n \in [N] \setminus F^1 : U(n) \geq \nu \} \);

**Step VII**

for sensor \( p = 2:P \)

send all \((n, w^p_t(n))\) pairs for \( n \in F^2 \setminus \Omega_p \) to sensor 1.

endfor

**Step VIII** for Sensor 1, assign \( x_{t+1}^h(F^2) = f_t(F^2) \)

obtain \( F = F^1 \cup F^2 \) and \( \Gamma = \{ n : |x_{t+1}^h(n)| \geq \tau_K(|x_{t+1}^h(F)|) \} \);

compute \( x_{t+1}^h(\Gamma) = x_{t+1}^h(\Gamma) \) and set \( x_{t+1}([N] \setminus \Gamma) = 0 \);

**Output** \( x_{t+1} \).

In Figs. 13 and 14 an example of GC. \( K \) was shown with the same input data as in Fig. 1. Suppose \( K = 2 \), in Step I, each Sensor \( p \) obtains the set of indices \( \Omega^1_p \) for the largest-in-magnitude partial scores, as we can see, \( \Omega^1_1 = \{ 6, 4 \}, \Omega^1_2 = \{ 6, 2 \}, \) and \( \Omega^1_3 = \{ 1, 7 \} \). Sensors \( p \geq 2 \) send the \((n, w^p_t(n))\) pairs for \( n \in \Omega^1_p \) to Sensor 1. In Step II, Sensor 1 receives the data and computes a partial sum for each \( n \in \bigcup_{p=1}^P \Omega^1_p = \{ 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 \} \). As we can see, the indices of the 2 largest-in-magnitude partial sums are 6 and 7, so sensor 1 broadcasts \( F^1 = \{ 6, 7 \} \) to other sensors. In Step III, Sensor 2 and 3 send \( w^2_t(7) \) and \( w^3_t(6) \) to Sensor 1. In Step IV, Sensor 1 computes \( f_t(n) = \sum_{p=1}^P w^p_t(n) \) for \( n \in F^1 \) by (3.251), gets \( \nu_1 = 21 \), which is the second largest-in-magnitude total score for \( n \in F_1 \), and broadcasts it to other sensors. Step V
to VIII are very similar to GCAMP except for the threshold for the upper bounds $U(n)$ obtained. Instead of directly applying $\nu_1$ as the threshold, as in GCAMP, we compute a lower bound $L(n)$ for each $n \in [N]\setminus F^1$, and get the second largest lower bound $\nu_2 = 0$, and the threshold for $U(n)$ is $\nu = \max(\nu_1, \nu_2) = 21$. Finally, we obtain the non-zero components of $x_{t+1}$, which are $x_{t+1}(6) = 23$ and $x_{t+1}(7) = -21$; meanwhile, we save all the total scores we calculated in $x_{t+1}^h$, which are $x_{t+1}^h(6) = 23$, $x_{t+1}^h(7) = -21$ and $x_{t+1}^h(4) = 7$. Overall, in this example, 10 data points are sent from the sensors to sensor 1, and the total number of messages is 14 (10 data points plus 4 broadcast requests).

4.2.1.1 The step size $\mu$ in DIHT

Theoretically, $\mu$ in AIHT can be any value within $(0, 1/\|A\|_2)$, while from the convergence perspective, $\mu$ should be as large as possible. Therefore, in the centralized AIHT, we can just set $\mu$ to be $1/\|A\|_2$ minus a very small positive number. However, this is intractable in DIHT, since the exact computation of $1/\|A\|_2$ needs the access to the entire global sensing matrix, and this contradicts the basic assumption of our proposed DCS framework. An alternative was to get an upper bound on $\|A\|_2$, as proposed in [43], in which each Sensor $p \geq 2$ gets the $\ell_2$ norm of its own sensing matrix $A^p$, and sends $\|A^p\|_2$ to Sensor 1, then Sensor 1 can get $\sqrt{\sum_{p=1}^P \|A^p\|_2^2}$, which is an upper bound on $\|A\|_2$, sets $\mu = 1/\sqrt{\sum_{p=1}^P \|A^p\|_2^2}$, and broadcasts $\mu$ to other sensors. However, this approach has a very conservative upper bound for $\|A\|_2$ and leads to a much smaller $\mu$ than the centralized IHT can get. Here, we propose a new approach which gives a very good estimate of $\|A\|_2$, by applying the random matrix theory (RMT).

Let $G = AA^T$ be the Gram matrix of rows of $A$, and let $L_1 > \cdots > L_M$ be the $M$ eigenvalues of $G$, then $\|A\|_2 = \sqrt{L_1}$. In RMT, for $A := [a_{ij}]_{M \times N}$ with $a_{ij} \sim \text{i.i.d.}$
$\mathcal{N}(0, 1/M)$, the corresponding Gram matrix $G$ is called Wishart matrix. According to [92], the largest eigenvalue $L_1$ of $G$ has the following almost sure (a.s.) convergence in the large system limit:

$$L_1 \xrightarrow{a.s.} (1 + \sqrt{N/M})^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.17)

This implies that for large $M$ and $N$, $L_1$ will become very close to a deterministic number, which only depends on the ratio between $M$ and $N$, that is, the variability of $L_1$ vanishes in the large system limit. Further, the distribution of $L_1$ was studied
in [93] and the following results were given: Let us define

\[
\mu_{MN} = (1 + \sqrt{(N - 1)/M})^2
\]

\[
\sigma_{MN} = \frac{\sqrt{M + \sqrt{N - 1}}}{M} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N - 1}} \right)^{1/3}
\]

then

\[
L_1 \overset{D}{\rightarrow} \mu_{MN} + \sigma_{MN}T_1 \text{ with } T_1 \sim F_1
\]
where $F_1$ is the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of Tracy-Widom (TW) law of order 1 \cite{94}:

$$F_1(s) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \int_s^\infty \left[ q(x) + (x-s)q(x)^2 \right] dx \right\} \quad (4.21)$$

where $q(s)$ is the solution to the Painlevé type II equation

$$q''(s) = sq(s) + 2q(s)^3 \quad (4.22)$$

with the boundary condition

$$q(s) \sim \text{Ai}(s), \text{ as } s \to +\infty \quad (4.23)$$

where Ai$(s)$ is Airy function defined as

$$\text{Ai}(s) = \frac{1}{3} \int_0^\infty \cos \left( \frac{t^3}{3} + st \right) dt \quad (4.24)$$

It has been shown that for $T_1 \sim F_1$, its mean is -1.21 and standard deviation is 1.27.

In the large system limit, the standard deviation of $L_1$ approaches $1.27\sigma_{MN} \to 0$, which means that the distribution of $L_1$ will become more and more concentrated on its mean $\mu_{MN} - 1.21\sigma_{MN} \to (1 + \sqrt{N/M})^2$ as the dimensionality of $A$ increases.

Taking advantage of the asymptotic deterministic property of $L_1$, we can get an approximate $q = 1 - \alpha$ quantile for $L_1$ ($\alpha$ is a smaller number, e.g. 0.01), which is $L(\alpha) = \mu_{MN} + \sigma_{MN}F_1^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$ and serves as a statistical upper bound on $L_1$.

Due to the fact $\sigma_{MN} \to 0$, this bound will be very tight. We set the step length $\mu = 1/\sqrt{L(\alpha)}$. Note that each sensor can calculate $\mu$ which only depends on $M$ and $N$, without any data transmission between sensors.
4.2.1.2 Numerical Results

We fix $N = 5,000$, set $M = N\kappa$ and $K = M\rho$, where $\kappa \in \{0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5\}$ and $\rho \in \{0.1, 0.15, 0.2, 0.25\}$, and choose $P \in \{10, 15, \ldots, 50\}$. $s_0$ is generated with random support and non-zero components drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The noise $e \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_M)$ with $\sigma \in \{0.01, 0.02, \ldots, 0.09\}$. IHT terminates if $\|x_{t+1} - x_t\|_2 \leq 0.001\|x_t\|_2$ or if it runs up to 100 iterations. $\theta$ in GC.$K$ is set to 0.8. We have the following setup: i) fix $(P, \sigma) = (10, 0.02)$, and change $(\kappa, \rho)$; ii) fix $(\kappa, \rho, P) = (0.2, 0.1, 10)$, and change $\sigma$; iii) fix $(\kappa, \rho, \sigma) = (0.2, 0.1, 0.02)$, and change $P$. Under each parameter setting, we take $n_{\text{sim}} = 100$ Monte-Carlo runs.

For evaluating the communication cost, considering the approach sending all the data to Sensor 1, which has a total number of messages $N(P - 1)$, we use the ratio between the number of messages of GC.$K$ and $N(P - 1)$, denoted as $\mu_M$, to measure the efficiency of GC.$K$. After Sensor 1 obtains $x_{t+1}$, it needs $K$ messages to broadcast the non-zero components in $x_{t+1}$ to other sensors. So we also define $T_M = \mu_M + K/[N(P - 1)]$ to evaluate the performance of GC.$K$-based DIHT.

For MTA, as shown in Table 8 in each for-loop iteration inside the while-loop, the algorithm consumes $P + 1$ messages, and there are totally $N_s$ such iterations. So the number of messages in MTA is $N_s(P + 1)$. It can be shown that if we run MTA on the data in Fig. then we will get $N_s = 9$, which corresponds to $9 \times (3 + 1) = 36$ messages. After MTA terminates, each sensor has obtained the same $x_{t+1}$, and there are no additional broadcast messages for the non-zero components of $x_{t+1}$. Since the communication cost is proportional to $N_s \leq N$, we define $\mu_M$ for the MTA as $\mu_M = N_s/N$, and $T_M = N_s(P + 1)/[N(P - 1)]$. Note that the definitions of $\mu_M$ in GC.$K$ and MTA are slightly different.

We first compare the GC.$K$-based DIHT.S and MTA-based DIHT.S. Since they
have the same recovery results, we only compare their communication cost, i.e., $\mu_M$ and $T_M$ defined above.

In Fig. 15 we show $\bar{T}_M$, the sample mean of $T_M$’s, obtained by the two algorithms. As $\sigma$, $P$ and $K$ increase, the values of $\bar{T}_M$ in MTA become close to 1, which means that MTA hardly saves any communication cost, while GC.K can still work efficiently. In all the cases, GC.K outperforms MTA. In Fig. 16 the cumulative distributions of $\mu_M$ for GC.K and MTA are given under two extreme settings (large $P$ and large $K$). In all iterations under these two settings, the number of messages in MTA are greater than $0.8N(P - 1)$, while GC.K can save at least $0.35N(P - 1)$ messages in 80% of the total iterations.

Fig. 15. Communication cost of GC.K and MTA.
Next, we compare GC.K-based DIHT.S with the oracle-aided approach GC.K-based DIHT.C, where $\|A\|_2$ is known and $\mu = 0.99/\|A\|_2$. The recovery accuracy is measured in terms of relative root mean squared error (RRMSE), which is defined as

$$\text{RRMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{sim}}} \| (x^*_i - s_0 ) \|_2^2 / n_{\text{sim}}}{\|s_0\|_2}},$$

where $x^*_i$ is the recovered signal in the $i$-th Monte-Carlo run. The convergence rate is evaluated in terms of $\bar{n}_{\text{iter}} := \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{sim}}} n_{\text{iter}} / n_{\text{sim}}$, where $n_{\text{iter}}$ is the number of iterations in the $i$-th Monte-Carlo run. In Fig. 17 we show these quantities as well as the communication cost of DIHT.S and DIHT.C respectively, under all parameter settings, where $\bar{\mu}_M$ denotes the sample mean of $\mu_M$’s. As we can see, DIHT.S performs similarly to DIHT.C.

We also observe the ratios $\bar{\mu}_M / \bar{T}_M$ for GC.K under all parameter settings, and find that they are within the interval $[0.9771, 0.9989]$, which means that GC.K incurs most of the communication cost in the corresponding DIHT algorithms.
4.2.2 Sign-Aware Data Querying

4.2.2.1 Improvement on GC.K

GC.K uses the number of communication messages (transmitted data points) as the metric of communication cost. Similar to SAGC, an improvement on GCAMP in Chapter 2, we notice that if we evaluate the communication cost in terms of the number of communication bits, which is more practical and informative than the number of communication messages, and dissertation taking advantage of the structure of transmitted data, then a further improvement on GC.K is achievable.

Here, we propose a new distributed data querying algorithm, sign-aware data querying (SADQ), which obtains an upper bound on $|f_i(n)|$ and a lower bound on
\( \mathcal{T}_K(\mathbf{f}_t) \), and decides whether to transmit all the \( \mathbf{w}_t^p(n) \)'s or not by comparing the two bounds. When calculating the number of bits needed in communication, we assume that all the entries in \( \mathbf{w}_t^p \) are stored as 64-bits floating-pointing numbers, with 1-bit sign and 63-bits magnitudes. The SADQ algorithm contains the following 3 major steps:

**Step I:** The key idea of this step is to obtain a Top-\( K \) candidate in \( \mathbf{f}_t \). First, each sensor \( p \geq 2 \) sends a package as shown in Fig. [18] to Sensor 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensor index ( p )</th>
<th>Signs of ( \mathbf{w}_t^p ) (&quot;+&quot; or &quot;-&quot;)</th>
<th>( \Omega_1^1 ): Indices of top( K ) Magnitudes of ( \mathbf{w}_t^p )</th>
<th>Top ( K ) Magnitudes of ( \mathbf{w}_t^p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \lceil \log_2 (p-1) \rceil ) bits</td>
<td>( N ) bits</td>
<td>( \min { K \lfloor \log_2 N \rfloor, N } ) bits</td>
<td>63( K ) bits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 18. The structure of the package Sensor \( p \) sends to Sensor 1 in Step I

Note that there are two ways for Sensor \( p \) to send \( \Omega_1^1 \): It can either directly represent each index in \( \Omega_1^1 \) using binary codes, or use a 1/0 flag to denote whether each index \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \) is in \( \Omega_1^1 \). The former requires \( K \lfloor \log_2 N \rfloor \) bits, and the latter requires \( N \) bits. Sensor \( p \) will compare them and choose the one with fewer bits.

Let \( O = \bigcup_{p=1}^P \Omega_1^1 \) and define \( C_n = \{ p \geq 2 : n \in \Omega_1^1 \} \) for each \( n \in O \), Sensor 1 computes \( P(n) = \mathbf{w}_t^1(n) + \sum_{p \in C_n} \mathbf{w}_t^p(n) \) for each \( n \in O \). Denote \( F^1 \) as the set of indices for the largest-in-magnitude \( K P(n)'s \). Sensor 1 broadcasts \( F^1 \) to other sensors, similar to encoding \( \Omega_1^1 \), it takes \( \min \{ K \lfloor \log_2 N \rfloor, N \} \) bits to represent \( F^1 \).

Now Sensor 1 knows \( F^1, \Omega_1^1, \text{and} \ \mathbf{w}_t^p(\Omega_1^1) \), Sensor \( p \) only needs to send the sensor index \( p \), and the magnitudes of \( \mathbf{w}_t^p(\Omega_1^1 \setminus F^1) \) to Sensor 1, i.e., there is no need to send the indices set \( F^1 \setminus \Omega_1^1 \). So it takes \( \lceil \log_2 (P - 1) \rceil + 63|F^1 \setminus \Omega_1^1| \) bits to send these data from Sensor \( p \) to 1. Finally, Sensor 1 computes \( \mathbf{f}_t(F^1) \), obtains \( \nu_1 = \mathcal{T}_K(\mathbf{f}_t(F^1)) \), and
broadcasts it to other sensors, which requires 63 bits.

The number of required communication bits in this step is

\[
B_1 = \left\lceil \log_2(P - 1) \right\rceil + N + \min\{K \left\lceil \log_2 N \right\rceil, N\} + 63K\right\rceil (P - 1) \text{ Sensor } p \text{ to } 1
\]

\[
+ \min\{K \left\lceil \log_2 N \right\rceil, N\} \text{ Sensor } 1 \text{ to } p
\]

\[
+ (P - 1)\left\lceil \log_2(P - 1) \right\rceil + 63 \sum_{p=2}^{P} |F^1 \setminus \Omega_p^1| \text{ Sensor } p \text{ to } 1
\]

\[
+ 63 \text{ Sensor } 1 \text{ to } p
\]

**Step II:** This step is to bound \(|f_t(n)|\) for each \(n \notin F^1\).

Set \(T = \theta \nu_1/(P - 1)\), where \(\theta\) is a parameter trading off the communication cost of the current step and the following step. Each sensor \(p \geq 2\) sends the package as shown in Fig. [19] to Sensor 1.

| Sensor index \(p\) | \(\Omega_p^2 \triangleq \left\{ n \notin \Omega_p^1 \cup F^1 : |w_{\nu_t}^p(n)| \geq T \right\} \) | \(|w_{\nu_t}^p(\Omega_p^2)|\) |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| \([\log_2(P-1)]\) | \(\min\left\{\Omega_p^2, \left\lceil \log_2(N - |F^1 \cup \Omega_p^1|) \right\rceil, N - |F^1 \cup \Omega_p^1|\right\} \) | 63 \(|\Omega_p^2|\) bits |

Fig. 19. The structure of the package Sensor \(p\) sends to Sensor 1 in Step II

Define \(\Omega_p := \Omega_p^1 \cup \Omega_p^2 \cup F^1\) for each \(p \geq 2\), which contains the indices of the entries Sensor \(p\) has sent to Sensor 1 by now, and \(S_n := \{p \geq 2 : n \in \Omega_p\}\) for each \(n \notin F^1\). Sensor 1 obtains a range \([L_t^p(n), U_t^p(n)]\) of \(w_t^p(n)\) for \(n \notin \Omega_p^1\): \([0, T]\) if \(w_t^p(n) > 0\) and \([-T, 0]\) otherwise.

Next, Sensor 1 obtains a range \([B_t^L(n), B_t^U(n)]\) of \(f_t(n)\) as \(B_t^L(n) = w_t^1(n) + \sum_{p \in S_n} w_t^p(n) + \sum_{p \notin S_n} L_t^p(n)\) and \(B_t^U(n) = w_t^1(n) + \sum_{p \in S_n} w_t^p(n) + \sum_{p \notin S_n} U_t^p(n)\).
Therefore, we can compute an upper bound $U(n)$ and a lower bound $L(n)$ on $|f_t(n)|$ for each $n \notin F^1$ based on the range. Denote $\nu_2$ as the $K$-th largest $L(n)$ and set $\nu = \max(\nu_1, \nu_2)$, which is a lower bound on $T_K(f_t)$. Sensor 1 obtains the set $F^2 = \{n \notin F^1 : U(n) \geq \nu\}$, and sends $F^2$ to other sensors.

Similar to Step I, we can compute the number of bits in this step:

$$B_2 = (P - 1)\lfloor \log_2(P - 1) \rfloor + 63 \sum_{p=2}^{P} |\Omega^2_p| +$$

$$\sum_{p=2}^{P} \min(\lfloor \log_2 \left( N - |F^1 \cup \Omega^1_p| \right) \rfloor \Omega^2_p, N - |F^1 \cup \Omega^1_p|) \text{ Sensor } p \text{ to } 1$$

$$+ \min\{ |F^2| \lfloor \log_2(N - K) \rfloor, N - K \}. \text{ Sensor } 1 \text{ to } p$$

**Step III:** Each sensor $p \geq 2$ sends its sensor index $p$ and $w^p_t(F^2 \setminus \Omega_p)$ to Sensor 1. Sensor 1 computes $f_t(n)$ for each $n \in F^2$. It can be shown that $F = F^1 \cup F^2$ contains all the indices of the $f_t(n)$’s such that $|f_t(n)| \geq T_K(f_t)$. Finally, Sensor 1 broadcasts the largest-in-magnitude $K$ $f_t(n)$’s as well as their indices to other sensors.

The number of required communication bits in this step is

$$B_3 = (P - 1)\lfloor \log_2(P - 1) \rfloor + 63 \sum_{p=2}^{P} |F^2 \setminus \Omega_p| \text{ Sensor } p \text{ to } 1$$

$$+ \min(K \lfloor \log_2 |F| \rfloor, |F|) + 64K. \text{ Sensor } 1 \text{ to } p$$

In a naive approach in which other sensors directly send all the 64-bits numbers to Sensor 1, the communication cost can be easily derived and denoted as $B_{\text{max}}$. We define the normalized number of bits required by SADQ as $n_B = \sum_{i=1}^{3} B_i / B_{\text{max}}$.

4.2.2.2 Numerical Results

We set $N = 5,000$, $M = 1,000$, and $K = 100$. $s_0$ is generated with random support and non-zero components $\sim$ i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$. The noise $e \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$ with
Table 10. Average communication costs of SADQ-based DIHT and MTA-based DIHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\theta^*$ in SADQ</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{n}_B$ in MTA</td>
<td>0.2355</td>
<td>0.7116</td>
<td>1.0228</td>
<td>1.0962</td>
<td>1.0938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{n}_B$ in SADQ</td>
<td>0.0984</td>
<td>0.1355</td>
<td>0.1704</td>
<td>0.2006</td>
<td>0.2288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{n}_B$ in MTA</td>
<td>0.0801</td>
<td>0.0685</td>
<td>0.0597</td>
<td>0.0529</td>
<td>0.0475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta^*$ in SADQ</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{n}_B$ in SADQ</td>
<td>0.2505</td>
<td>0.2708</td>
<td>0.2861</td>
<td>0.3026</td>
<td>0.3161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{n}_B$ in MTA</td>
<td>1.0801</td>
<td>1.0685</td>
<td>1.0597</td>
<td>1.0529</td>
<td>1.0475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\sigma = 0.02$. We tune $\theta$ in SADQ, and obtain the optimal $\theta^*$, as well as the corresponding mean value of $n_B$, $(\bar{n}_B)$ based on 100 Monte-Carlo runs. We also implement the MTA, another data querying algorithm proposed in [40]. As shown in Table 10, the SADQ-based DIHT outperforms the MTA-based DIHT significantly in terms of communication savings.

4.3 Improvement on GC. $K$: Adaptive Approach

IHT needs the sparsity level $K$ of $s_0$ as an input parameter, which is unrealistic for most real-world applications. However, a good property is that IHT will always converge, regardless of whether $K$ is the real sparsity level of $s_0$. Due to this property, we can develop an adaptive IHT algorithm, which can tune $K$ itself, i.e., can infer the sparsity level of $s_0$ purely based on the measurement $y$ and the sensing matrix $A$.

4.3.1 Adaptive IHT Algorithm without Prior Knowledge of $K$

Since IHT needs the sparsity level $K$ as an input, we denote IHT with a specific $K$ as IHT$_K$. We first introduce the following two theoretical results in [45] and [95]:

**Theorem 11** *(Theorem 5 in [45])* Given a noisy observation $y = As_0 + e$, where $s_0$ is $K$-sparse. If $A$ has the RIP with $\delta_{3K} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{32}}$, then IHT$_K$ will eventually convergence.
to $\mathbf{x}^*$ such that
\[
\|\mathbf{s}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|_2 \leq 6\|\mathbf{e}\|_2 \tag{4.25}
\]

**Lemma 16** (Lemma 6.1 in [95]) Given a noisy observation $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{s}_0 + \mathbf{e}$, where $\mathbf{s}_0$ is an arbitrary vector. Let $\mathbf{s}_0^K$ be the best $K$-sparse approximation to $\mathbf{s}_0$ and $\mathbf{s}_r = \mathbf{s}_0 - \mathbf{s}_0^K$. If $\mathbf{A}$ has the RIP with $(K, \delta_K)$, then $\mathbf{y}$ can be rewritten in terms of $\mathbf{s}_0^K$ such that
\[
\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{s}_0^K + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{s}_r + \mathbf{e} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{s}_0^K + \tilde{\mathbf{e}} \tag{4.26}
\]
where $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}$ is bounded by
\[
\|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{1 + \delta_K}\|\mathbf{s}_0 - \mathbf{s}_0^K\|_2 + \sqrt{1 + \delta_K}\frac{\|\mathbf{s}_0 - \mathbf{s}_0^K\|_1}{\sqrt{K}} + \|\mathbf{e}\|_2 \tag{4.27}
\]

According to Theorem 11 and Lemma 16, we can directly obtain the following theoretical result:

**Corollary 5** Given a noisy observation $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{s}_0 + \mathbf{e}$, where $\|\mathbf{s}_0\|_0 = K_0$. Let $\mathbf{x}^K$ be the final estimate given by $\text{IHT}_K$, where $K < K_0$. If $\mathbf{A}$ has the RIP for sparsities with $\delta_{3K_0} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{32}}$, then we have the following error bound:
\[
\|\mathbf{s}_0 - \mathbf{x}^K\|_2 \leq 6\left(\sqrt{1 + \delta_K}\|\mathbf{s}_0 - \mathbf{s}_0^K\|_2 + \sqrt{1 + \delta_K}\frac{\|\mathbf{s}_0 - \mathbf{s}_0^K\|_1}{\sqrt{K}} + \|\mathbf{e}\|_2\right) \tag{4.28}
\]

**Proposition 13** A necessary condition for any CS recovery algorithm is $M \geq 2K$. [96]

According to Corollary 5, even if $\|\mathbf{s}_0\|_0 > K$, $\text{IHT}_K$ will still recover $\mathbf{s}_0$ with a bounded error. Similar to the tuning procedure for the parameter $\tau$ in AMP, we derive the following adaptive IHT (AIHT) algorithm, which runs the original IHT as a subroutine for a list of candidate sparsity levels $\{K_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L$, where $K_1 < K_2 < \cdots < K_L = M/2$.

**Lemma 17** (Theorem 4 in [44]) For any given $K \leq N$, the sequence $\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_l\|^2$ in $\text{IHT}_K$ is non-increasing and converges to a local minimum of (1.2).
Table 11. Adaptive IHT algorithm

**Input** $y$, $A$, $K_1, \ldots, K_L$, $T_1$, $T_2$, $\epsilon_1$, $\epsilon_2$

**Initialization** $x_0 = 0, z_0 = y$

for $\ell = 1:L$

initialize $t_\ell = 0$

while $t_\ell < \max\{T_2, (T_1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} t_i)/(\ell - 1)\}$

$x_{t_\ell+1} = \eta(x_{t_\ell} + ATz_{t_\ell}; K_\ell)$;

$z_{t_\ell+1} = y - Ax_{t_\ell+1}$;

if $\|x_{t_\ell+1} - x_{t_\ell}\| \leq \epsilon_1 \|x_{t_\ell}\|$

$x(K_\ell) = x_{t_\ell+1}, z(K_\ell) = z_{t_\ell+1}$

break

else

update $t_\ell \leftarrow t_\ell + 1$

continue

endif

endwhile

if $\|x(K_\ell) - x(K_{\ell-1})\| \leq \epsilon_2 \|x(K_{\ell-1})\|$

$x^* = x_{K_\ell}, K^* = K_\ell$

break;

else

update $x_0 = x_{t_\ell+1}, z_0 = z_{t_\ell+1}$;

endif

endfor

**Output** $x^*$, $K^*$.

Regarding the performance of AIHT, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 12** Given a noisy observation $y = As_0 + e$, where $\|s_0\|_0 = K$. The sequence $\|y - Ax(K_\ell)\|^2$ in AIHT is non-increasing. Furthermore, if AIHT returns $x^*$ with $\|x^*\|_0 = K^*$, and $A$ has RIP with $\delta_{3K} < 1/\sqrt{32}$ and $\delta_{3K^*} < 1/\sqrt{32}$, then

$$
\|x^* - s_0\| \leq \begin{cases} 
6.51\|s_0 - s_0^{K^*}\|_2 + 6.51\|s_0 - s_0^{K^*}\|_1/\sqrt{K^*} + 6\|e\|_2 & \text{if } K^* \leq K \\
7.1\|e\|_2 & \text{if } K^* > K.
\end{cases}
$$

(4.29)
Proof of Theorem 12. The $\ell$-th outer loop of AIHT runs IHT$_K$, which starts from $x(K_{\ell-1})$ with sparsity level $K_{\ell-1}$, which is a feasible solution of the optimization problem

$$\min_{\|x\|_0 \leq K_\ell} \|y - Ax\|^2$$

since $K_{\ell-1} < K_\ell$. By Lemma 17, the value of the objective function keeps non-increasing and IHT$_K$ will converge to a local optimum $x(K_\ell)$. Therefore, we have

$$\|y - Ax(K_{\ell-1})\|^2 \geq \|y - Ax(K_\ell)\|^2.$$ 

If $K^* \leq K$, according to Lemma 5, we have

$$\|s_0 - x^*\| \leq 6\|\tilde{e}\|_2 \leq 6.51\|s_0 - s_0^{K^*}\|_2 + 6.51\|s_0 - s_0^{K^*}\|_1/\sqrt{K^*} + 6\|e\|_2.$$ (4.31)

If $K^* > K$, letting $s_e = A^T(AA^T)^{-1}e$, we have $As_e = e$. Further, letting $s_e^{K^*-K}$ be the best $(K^* - K)$-sparse approximation of $s_e$, we have

$$y = A(s_0 + s_e) = A(s_0 + s_e^{K^*-K}) + A(s_e - s_e^{K^*-K}).$$ (4.32)

Since $s_0$ is $K$-sparse and $s_e^{K^*-K}$ is $(K^* - K)$-sparse, $s_0 + s_e^{K^*-K}$ is $K^*$-sparse. Applying Lemma 17, we have

$$\|s_0 - x^* - s_e^{K^*-K}\| \leq 6\|A(s_e - s_e^{K^*-K})\|_2 \leq 6\|As_e\|_2 = 6\|e\|_2.$$ (4.33)

By the RIP property,

$$\|s_e^{K^*-K}\|_2 \leq \|As_e^{K^*-K}\|_2/\sqrt{1 - \delta_{K^*-K}} \leq 1.1\|As_e\|_2 = 1.1\|e\|_2.$$ (4.34)

Therefore,

$$\|s_0 - x^*\|_2 \leq \|s_0 - x^* - s_e^{K^*-K}\|_2 + \|s_e^{K^*-K}\|_2 \leq 7.1\|e\|_2.$$ (4.35)
4.3.2 More Efficient GC Algorithms for DIHT

Similar to GCAMP in the previous chapter, GC.K and SADQ for DIHT are non-adaptive approaches. If we can propose an adaptive approach that takes advantage of the strong correlation between \( W_t \) and \( W_{t-1} \), then we may obtain significant communication savings.

Like GCAMP, GC.K and SADQ have the following outcomes:

i) A new sparse estimate \( x_{t+1} \) with support \( \Gamma \subset F \).

ii) A group of total scores \( f_t(n) \) for \( n \in F \).

iii) A lower bound \( \nu \) for \( T_K(f_t) \).

iv) A gap \( \Delta_{t+1} \) between \( \{|f_t(n)| : n \in [N], |f_t(n)| < \nu\} \) and \( \nu \).

The adaptive GC.K (A-GC.K) approach can use GC.K or SADQ as a subroutine, and utilize these outcomes as intermediate results.

4.3.3 A-GC.K Algorithm

The essence of the A-GC.K algorithm is quite similar to that of A-GCAMP. Suppose in the outer loop of AIHT, \( K \) is the current candidate sparsity, and at the inner loop iteration \( t - 1 \), we obtained \( x_t \) as well as a group of total scores \( f_{t-1}(n) \) for \( n \in I_t \) with magnitudes greater than a threshold \( \gamma_{t-1} \leq T_K(|f_{t-1}|) \), and a gap \( \Delta_t \) between \( \{|f_{t-1}(n)| : n \notin I_t\} \) and \( \gamma_{t-1} \). Then at iteration \( t \), we can first calculate the total scores for \( n \in I_t \). Note that \( |I_t| \geq K \), so we can obtain \( T_K(|f_t(I_t)|) \), which is a tight lower bound on \( T_K(|f_t|) \). Due to the linear convergence rate of AIHT, after a few iterations, \( x_t \) and \( x_{t+1} \) will be very close and may even have the same support. Therefore, \( T_K(|f_t(I_t)|) \) is a tight lower bound. Then, we let \( \gamma_t = \alpha_t T_K(|f_t(I_t)|) \), where \( \alpha_t \in (0, 1) \), and run the A-GCAMP algorithm to get all the total scores for \( n \notin I_t \) with magnitudes greater than \( \gamma_t \).
Similar to the A-GCAMP algorithm, how to design the sequence \( \{\alpha_t\} \) for \( t \geq 1 \) is also an important problem in A-GC. First, we set up an upper bound \( \alpha_{\text{max}} \) for \( \{\alpha_t\} \), where \( \alpha_{\text{max}} \) is close to 1, e.g., 0.99. Once \( \alpha_{t-1} \) reaches \( \alpha_{\text{max}} \), we will reset \( \alpha_t = \alpha_{\text{rst}} \), where \( \alpha_{\text{rst}} \in (0, 1) \) is a constant, and if \( \alpha_{t-1} < \alpha_{\text{max}} \), or if \( t = 1 \), we compute \( \gamma'_t \) as defined in (2.34), and obtain \( \alpha_t \) as follows:

\[
\alpha_t = \min \left( \frac{\gamma'_t}{T_K(|f_t(I_t)|)}, \alpha_{\text{max}} \right).
\] (4.36)

Then, like in A-GCAMP, we can check whether (2.39) holds. If not, then we run the GCAMP to get all the total scores for \( n \notin I_t \) with magnitudes greater than \( \gamma_t \). If (2.39) holds, then we apply the A-GCAMP algorithms to get these total scores, which will save a lot of communication cost.

In Tables 12 and 13 we give the pseudo code of the A-GC.K algorithm and the corresponding DAIHT algorithm respectively.

**Table 12.: A-GC.K Algorithm**

**Input** \( w^p_t, \Delta w^p_t \), \( x^h_t \), \( \text{rst} \), \( \gamma_{t-1} \), \( \Delta_t \), \( K \), \( \alpha_{\text{rst}} \), \( \alpha_{\text{max}} \), \( q \), \( \theta \), \( \rho_w \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set } I_t &= \{ n : |x^h_t(n)| > \gamma_{t-1} \}, \quad R_t = \{ n : 0 < |x^h_t(n)| \leq \gamma_{t-1} \}, \quad \text{and } C_t^t = [N] \setminus I_t; \\
\text{Initialize } x^h_{t+1} &= 0 \text{ and } \Delta x^h_{t+1} = 0; \\
\text{Obtain } x^h_{t+1}(I_t) &= \sum_{p=1}^p w^p_t(I_t) \text{ and } \beta_t = T_K(|x^h_{t+1}(I_t)|); \\
\text{if } \text{rst} &= 1 \\
\alpha_t &= \alpha_{\text{rst}}; \\
\text{else} \\
\text{Compute } \alpha_t \text{ according to (4.36)};
\end{align*}
\]
endif
\gamma_t = \alpha_t \beta_t;

Compute $\Delta \gamma_t$ as defined in (2.34);

if $\Delta \gamma_t > 0$

for sensor $p = 1 : P$

  obtain $\Delta \Omega_t^p$ as defined in (2.35);

  if $p \geq 2$

    send the cardinality $|\Delta \Omega_t^p|$ to sensor 1;

  endif

endfor

$N^g = \sum_{p=1}^P |\Delta \Omega_t^p|;$

else

  $N^g = |C_t^1| P;$

endif

if $N^g \leq \rho_w |C_t^1| P$

  $[\sim, x_{t+1}^{h}(C_t^1), \Delta_{t+1}^1] = \text{A-GCAMP}(w_t^1(C_t^1), \cdots, w_t^P(C_t^1),$
  $\Delta w_t^1(C_t^1), \cdots, \Delta w_t^P(C_t^1), \gamma_{t-1}, \alpha_t, \beta_t, \Delta_t, \theta, \rho_w);$

else

  $[\sim, x_{t+1}^{h}(C_t^1), \Delta_{t+1}^1] = \text{GCAMP}(w_t^1(C_t^1), \cdots, w_t^P(C_t^1), \gamma_t, \theta);$

endif

$\Delta_{t+1}^2 = \gamma_t - \max(\{|x_{t+1}^{h}(n)| : n \in I_t, |x_{t+1}^{h}(n)| \leq \gamma_t\});$

$\Delta_{t+1} = \min(\Delta_{t+1}^1, \Delta_{t+1}^2);$

$x_{t+1} = \eta^H(x_{t+1}^h; K);
Output $x_{t+1}, x_{t+1}^h, \gamma_t, \Delta_{t+1}, \alpha_t$

Table 13.: DAIHT Algorithm Based on A-GC. $K$

Input $\{y^p\}_{p=1}^P$, $\{A^p\}_{p=1}^P$, $\{K^\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L$, $\mu$, $\alpha_{rst}$, $\alpha_{max}$, $q$, $\theta$, $\rho_w$, $T_1$, $T_2$

Initialize $x_0 = 0$, $z_0 = y$, $K = K_1$;

for $\ell = 1:L$

initialize $t_\ell = 0$;

while $t_\ell < \min\{T_2, T_1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} T_i/(\ell - 1)\}$

set $t = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} t_i + t_\ell$;

if $t \geq 1$

Compute $w_t^p$ and $\Delta w_t^p = w_t^p - w_{t-1}^p$ by (4.5);

if $t \geq 2$ and $\alpha_{t-1} = \alpha_{max}$

$rst=1$;

else

$rst=0$;

endif

$[x_{t+1}, x_{t+1}^h, \gamma_t, \Delta_{t+1}, \alpha_t] = A$-GC.$K(w_t^1, \cdots, w_t^P, \Delta w_t^1, \cdots,$
$\Delta w_t^P, x_t^h, rst, \gamma_{t-1}, \Delta_t, K, \alpha_{rst}, \alpha_{max}, q, \theta, \rho_w)$;

else

$[x_{t+1}, x_{t+1}^h, \gamma_t, \Delta_{t+1}] = GC.K(w_t^1, \cdots, w_t^P, K, \theta)$;

endif
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Compute $z_{t+1}^{p}$ by (2.13) for each $p$

if $\|x_{t+1} - x_t\| \leq \epsilon_1 \|x_t\|$

$x(K_\ell) = x_{t+1}, z^p(K_\ell) = z_{t+1}^p$ for $p = 1 \cdots P$

update $K = K_{t+1}$;

break;

else

$t_\ell \leftarrow t_\ell + 1$;

continue;

endif

endwhile

if $\|x(K_\ell) - x(K_{\ell-1})\| \leq \epsilon_2 \|x(K_{\ell-1})\|$

set $x^* = x(K_\ell)$ and $K^* = K_\ell$;

break;

endif

endfor

Output $x^*, z^{p*}$

Regarding the accuracy of A-GC.K, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 13** Given the same step size $\mu$, A-GC.K algorithm obtains $x_{t+1}$ which is exactly the same as that of the centralized AIHT algorithm computed by (4.2).

The proof is very straightforward and is not presented in this dissertation due to the space limit.
Like DiAMP, we can also use the quantization procedure to further reduce the communication cost in $\text{GC}.K$ and $\text{A-GC}.K$, namely, $\text{Q-GC}.K$ and $\text{Q-A-GC}.K$.

4.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, we proposed an tuning algorithm for IHT which can tuning the sparsity level of $s_0$ automatically. In the GC step of DIHT, we proposed a communication-efficient GC algorithm $\text{GC}.K$ for DIHT. For the computation of the step size, we proposed a statistical approach $\text{DIHT}.S$ which provides a very tight statistical upper bound on $\|A\|_2$ that only depends on the dimensionality of $A$. Like DiAMP, similar improvements can be made based on $\text{GC}.K$, by incorporating quantization, such as SADQ and $\text{Q-GC}.K$, and using adaptive approach, by first finding a lower bound on $T_K(f_i)$ and then performing the GC step of DIHT by $\text{A-GCAMP}$ algorithm.
Fig. 20. SADQ Algorithm
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this dissertation, two classes of distributed algorithms were developed for sparse signal recovery in large sensor networks. First, a distributed compressed sensing (DCS) framework was developed based on approximate message passing (AMP). The distributed AMP (DiAMP) framework does not need a prior knowledge of the sparsity of the original signal, and has exactly the same recovery result as the centralized AMP. Just like the centralized AMP, DiAMP is also an iterative approach, where each iteration contains a local computation (LC) step, and a global computation (GC) step, where the latter incurs communication among sensors. To reduce the communication cost in the global computation (GC) step, we developed GCAMP, which is a communication-efficient data-querying algorithm and significantly outperforms modified thresholding algorithm (MTA), another popular data query algorithm. By taking into consideration the correlation of data between adjacent iterations and incorporating quantization steps, a more sophisticated algorithm quantized-adaptive-GCAMP (Q-A-GCAMP) was developed, which comes close to requiring the minimum bit rates stipulated by the sparsity of the signal to be estimated.

Furthermore, we prove that state evolution (SE), a fundamental property of AMP that in high dimensionality limit, the output data are asymptotically Gaussian regardless of the distribution of input data, also holds for DiAMP, even in the presence of quantization noise. In addition, compared with the most recent theoretical results that SE holds for sensing matrices with independent subgaussian entries, we proved that the universality of SE can be extended to far more general sensing
matrices. These two theoretical results provided strong guarantee for AMP’s performance, and greatly broaden its potential applications. As a direct application of this theoretical progress, we proposed a multi-processor approximate message passing framework with lossy compression. We used a uniform quantizer with entropy coding to reduce communication costs, and reformulated the state evolution formalism while accounting for quantization noise. Combining the quantizers and modified state evolution equation, an online back-tracking approach and another method based on dynamic programming were developed to determine the coding rate in each iteration by controlling the induced error. The numerical results suggest that our approaches can maintain a high signal-to-distortion-ratio despite a significant and often dramatic reduction in inter-processor communication costs.

Finally, in Chapter 4, another DCS approach was developed based on iterative hard thresholding (IHT). For distributed IHT (DIHT), there is a step size $\mu$ which depends on the $\ell_2$ norm of the global sensing matrix $A$. The exact computation of $\|A\|_2$ is non-separable. We proposed a new method, based on the random matrix theory (RMT), to give a very tight statistical upper bound of $\|A\|_2$, and the calculation of that upper bound is separable without any communication cost. Similar to DiAMP, DIHT also contains a LC step and a GC step in each iteration. In the GC step of DIHT, we developed another algorithm named GC.K, which is also communication-efficient and outperforms MTA. Then, by converting the GC step of DIHT into a GCAMP problem, we can apply the same improvement on GCAMP, such as the adaptive approach and quantization, to further improve the communication savings in DIHT.
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