

Recovery of Sparse Signals Using Multiple Orthogonal Least Squares

Jian Wang and Ping Li

Department of Statistics and Biostatistics, Department of Computer Science
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Piscataway, New Jersey 08854, USA
E-mail: {jwang,pingli}@stat.rutgers.edu

Abstract—We study the problem of recovering sparse signals from compressed linear measurements. This problem, often referred to as sparse recovery or sparse reconstruction, has generated a great deal of interest in recent years. To recover the sparse signals, we propose a new method called multiple orthogonal least squares (MOLS), which extends the well-known orthogonal least squares (OLS) algorithm by allowing multiple L indices to be chosen per iteration. Owing to inclusion of multiple support indices in each selection, the MOLS algorithm converges in much fewer iterations and improves the computational efficiency over the conventional OLS algorithm. Theoretical analysis shows that MOLS ($L > 1$) performs exact recovery of all K -sparse signals within K iterations if the measurement matrix satisfies the restricted isometry property (RIP) with isometry constant $\delta_{LK} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K+2}\sqrt{L}}$. The recovery performance of MOLS in the noisy scenario is also studied. It is shown that stable recovery of sparse signals can be achieved with the MOLS algorithm when the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) scales linearly with the sparsity level of input signals.

Index Terms—Compressed sensing (CS), sparse recovery, orthogonal matching pursuit (OMP), orthogonal least squares (OLS), multiple orthogonal least squares (MOLS), restricted isometry property (RIP), signal-to-noise ratio (SNR).

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, sparse recovery has attracted much attention in applied mathematics, electrical engineering, and statistics [1]–[4]. The main task of sparse recovery is to recover a high dimensional K -sparse vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^n$ ($\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq K \ll n$) from a small number of linear measurements

$$\mathbf{y} = \Phi \mathbf{x}, \quad (1)$$

where $\Phi \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times n}$ ($m < n$) is often called the measurement matrix. Although the system is underdetermined, owing to the signal sparsity, \mathbf{x} can be accurately recovered from the measurements \mathbf{y} by solving an ℓ_0 -minimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{y} = \Phi \mathbf{x}. \quad (2)$$

This method, however, is known to be intractable due to the combinatorial search involved and therefore impractical for realistic applications. Thus, much attention has focused on developing efficient algorithms for recovering the sparse signal. In general, the algorithms can be classified into two major categories: those using convex optimization techniques [1]–[5] and those based on greedy searching principles [6]–[14]. Other algorithms relying on nonconvex methods have also

been proposed [15]–[19]. The optimization-based approaches replace the nonconvex ℓ_0 -norm with its convex surrogate ℓ_1 -norm, translating the combinatorial hard search into a computationally tractable problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{y} = \Phi \mathbf{x}. \quad (3)$$

This algorithm is known as basis pursuit (BP) [5]. It has been revealed that under appropriate constraints on the measurement matrix, BP yields exact recovery of the sparse signal.

The second category of approaches for sparse recovery are greedy algorithms, in which signal support is iteratively identified according to various greedy principles. Due to their computational simplicity and competitive performance, greedy algorithms have gained considerable popularity in practical applications. Representative algorithms include matching pursuit (MP) [7], orthogonal matching pursuit (OMP) [6], [20]–[27] and orthogonal least squares (OLS) [8], [28]–[30]. Both OMP and OLS identify the support of the underlying sparse signal by adding one index at a time, and estimate the sparse coefficients over the enlarged support. The main difference between OMP and OLS lies in the greedy rule of updating the support at each iteration. While OMP finds a column that is most strongly correlated with the signal residual, OLS seeks to maximally reduce the power of the current residual with an enlarged support set. It has been shown that OLS has better convergence property but is computationally more expensive than the OMP algorithm [30].

In this paper, with the aim of improving the recovery accuracy and also reducing the computational cost of OLS, we propose a new method called multiple orthogonal least squares (MOLS), which can be viewed as an extension of the OLS algorithm in that multiple indices are allowed to be chosen at a time. Our method is inspired by that those sub-optimal candidates in each of the OLS identification are likely to be reliable and could be utilized to better reduce the power of signal residual for each iteration, thereby accelerating the convergence of the algorithm. The main steps of the MOLS algorithm are specified in Table I. Owing to selection of multiple “good” candidates in each time, MOLS converges in much fewer iterations and improves the computational efficiency over the conventional OLS algorithm.

Greedy methods with a similar flavor to MOLS in adding multiple indices per iteration include stagewise OMP (StOMP) [9], regularized OMP (ROMP) [10], and generalized

TABLE I
THE MOLS ALGORITHM

Input	measurement matrix $\Phi \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times n}$, measurements vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{R}^m$, sparsity level K , and selection parameter $L \leq \min\{K, \frac{m}{K}\}$.
Initialize	iteration count $k = 0$, estimated support $\mathcal{T}^0 = \emptyset$, and residual vector $\mathbf{r}^0 = \mathbf{y}$.
While	$(\ \mathbf{r}^k\ _2 \geq \epsilon$ and $k < K$) or $Lk < K$, do $k = k + 1$. Identify $\mathcal{S}^k = \arg \min_{\mathcal{S}: \mathcal{S} =L} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \ \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^{k-1} \cup \{i\}}^\perp \mathbf{y}\ _2^2$. Enlarge $\mathcal{T}^k = \mathcal{T}^{k-1} \cup \mathcal{S}^k$. Estimate $\mathbf{x}^k = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}: \text{supp}(\mathbf{u})=\mathcal{T}^k} \ \mathbf{y} - \Phi \mathbf{u}\ _2$. Update $\mathbf{r}^k = \mathbf{y} - \Phi \mathbf{x}^k$.
End	
Output	the estimated support $\hat{\mathcal{T}} = \arg \min_{\mathcal{S}: \mathcal{S} =K} \ \mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}}^k\ _2$ and the estimated signal $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfying $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\Omega \setminus \hat{\mathcal{T}}} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} = \Phi_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}^\dagger \mathbf{y}$.

OMP (gOMP) [11] (also known as orthogonal super greedy algorithm (OSGA) [31]), etc. These algorithms identify candidates at each iteration according to correlations between columns of the measurement matrix and the residual vector. Specifically, StOMP picks indices whose magnitudes of correlation exceed a deliberately designed threshold. ROMP first chooses a set of K indices with strongest correlations and then narrows down the candidates to a subset based on a predefined regularization rule. The gOMP algorithm finds a fixed number of indices with strongest correlations in each selection. Other greedy methods adopting a different strategy of adding as well as pruning indices from the list include compressive sampling matching pursuit (CoSaMP) [12] and subspace pursuit (SP) [14] and hard thresholding pursuit (HTP) [13], etc.

The contributions of this paper are summarized as follows.

- i) We propose a new algorithm, referred to as MOLS, for solving sparse recovery problems. We analyze the MOLS algorithm using the restricted isometry property (RIP) introduced in the compressed sensing (CS) theory [32] (see Definition 1 below). Our analysis shows that MOLS ($L > 1$) exactly recovers any K -sparse signal within K iterations if the measurement matrix Φ obeys the RIP with isometry constant

$$\delta_{LK} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K} + 2\sqrt{L}}. \quad (4)$$

For the special case when $L = 1$, MOLS reduces to the conventional OLS algorithm. We establish the condition for the exact sparse recovery with OLS as

$$\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K} + 2}. \quad (5)$$

This condition is nearly sharp in the sense that, even with a slight relaxation (e.g., relaxing to $\delta_{K+1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$), the exact recovery with OLS may not be guaranteed.

- ii) We analyze recovery performance of MOLS in the presence of noise. Our result demonstrates that stable recovery

of sparse signals can be achieved with MOLS when the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) scales linearly with the sparsity level of input signals. In particular, for the case of OLS (i.e., when $L = 1$), we show that the scaling law of the SNR is necessary for exact support recovery of sparse signals.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In Section II, we introduce notations, definitions, and lemmas that will be used in this paper. In Section III, we give a useful observation regarding the identification step of MOLS. In Section IV and V, we analyze the theoretical performance of MOLS in recovering sparse signals. In Section VI, we study the empirical performance of the MOLS algorithm. Concluding remarks are given in Section VII.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Notations

We first briefly summarize notations used in this paper. Let $\Omega = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and let $\mathcal{T} = \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) = \{i | i \in \Omega, x_i \neq 0\}$ denote the support of vector \mathbf{x} . For $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \Omega$, $|\mathcal{S}|$ is the cardinality of \mathcal{S} . $\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ is the set of all elements contained in \mathcal{T} but not in \mathcal{S} . $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ is the restriction of the vector \mathbf{x} to the elements with indices in \mathcal{S} . $\Phi_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times |\mathcal{S}|}$ is a submatrix of Φ that only contains columns indexed by \mathcal{S} . If $\Phi_{\mathcal{S}}$ is full column rank, then $\Phi_{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger = (\Phi_{\mathcal{S}}' \Phi_{\mathcal{S}})^{-1} \Phi_{\mathcal{S}}'$ is the pseudoinverse of $\Phi_{\mathcal{S}}$. $\text{span}(\Phi_{\mathcal{S}})$ is the span of columns in $\Phi_{\mathcal{S}}$. $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{S}} = \Phi_{\mathcal{S}} \Phi_{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger$ is the projection onto $\text{span}(\Phi_{\mathcal{S}})$. $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{S}}^\perp = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the projection onto the orthogonal complement of $\text{span}(\Phi_{\mathcal{S}})$, where \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix. For mathematical convenience, we assume that Φ has unit ℓ_2 -norm columns throughout the paper.¹

B. Definitions and Lemmas

Definition 1 (RIP [32]): A measurement matrix Φ is said to satisfy the RIP of order K if there exists a constant $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$(1 - \delta) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq \|\Phi \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \quad (6)$$

for all K -sparse vectors \mathbf{x} . In particular, the minimum of all constants δ satisfying (6) is called the isometry constant δ_K .

The following lemmas are useful for our analysis.

Lemma 1 (Lemma 3 in [32]): If a measurement matrix satisfies the RIP of both orders K_1 and K_2 where $K_1 \leq K_2$, then $\delta_{K_1} \leq \delta_{K_2}$. This property is often referred to as the monotonicity of the isometry constant.

Lemma 2 (Consequences of RIP [12], [34]): Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \Omega$. If $\delta_{|\mathcal{S}|} < 1$ then for any vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$,

$$(1 - \delta_{|\mathcal{S}|}) \|\mathbf{u}\|_2 \leq \|\Phi_{\mathcal{S}}' \Phi_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{u}\|_2 \leq (1 + \delta_{|\mathcal{S}|}) \|\mathbf{u}\|_2, \\ \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2}{1 + \delta_{|\mathcal{S}|}} \leq \|(\Phi_{\mathcal{S}}' \Phi_{\mathcal{S}})^{-1} \mathbf{u}\|_2 \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2}{1 - \delta_{|\mathcal{S}|}}.$$

Lemma 3 (Lemma 2.1 in [35]): Let $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2 \subseteq \Omega$ and $\mathcal{S}_1 \cap \mathcal{S}_2 = \emptyset$. If $\delta_{|\mathcal{S}_1|+|\mathcal{S}_2|} < 1$, then $\|\Phi_{\mathcal{S}_1}' \Phi_{\mathcal{S}_2}\|_2 \leq \delta_{|\mathcal{S}_1|+|\mathcal{S}_2|} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2$ holds for any vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{R}^n$ supported on \mathcal{S}_2 .

¹In [33], it has been shown that the behavior of OLS is unchanged whether the columns of Φ have unit ℓ_2 -norm or not. As MOLS is a direct extension of the OLS algorithm, it can be verified that the behavior of MOLS is also unchanged whether Φ has unit ℓ_2 -norm columns or not.

Lemma 4 (Proposition 3.1 in [12]): Let $\mathcal{S} \subset \Omega$. If $\delta_{|\mathcal{S}|} < 1$, then for any vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{R}^m$, $\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{u}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{1 + \delta_{|\mathcal{S}|}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_2$.

Lemma 5 (Lemma 5 in [36]): Let $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2 \subseteq \Omega$. Then the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of $\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}_1} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{S}_2}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{S}_1}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min}(\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}_1} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{S}_2}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{S}_1}) &\geq \lambda_{\min}(\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2} \Phi_{\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2}), \\ \lambda_{\max}(\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}_1} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{S}_2}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{S}_1}) &\leq \lambda_{\max}(\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2} \Phi_{\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6: Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \Omega$. If $\delta_{|\mathcal{S}|} < 1$ then for any vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$,

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 + \delta_{|\mathcal{S}|}}} \leq \|(\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}})^\dagger \mathbf{u}\|_2 \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{|\mathcal{S}|}}}. \quad (7)$$

The upper bound in (7) has appeared in [12, Proposition 3.1] and we give a proof for the upper bound in Appendix A.

III. OBSERVATION

Let us begin with an interesting and important observation regarding the identification step of MOLS as shown in Table I. At the $(k+1)$ -th iteration ($k \geq 0$), MOLS adds to \mathcal{T}^k a set of L indices,

$$\mathcal{S}^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathcal{S}: |\mathcal{S}|=L} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}}^\perp \mathbf{y}\|_2^2. \quad (8)$$

Intuitively, a straightforward implementation of (8) requires to sort all elements in $\{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}}^\perp \mathbf{y}\|_2^2\}_{i \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}$ and then find the smallest L ones (and their corresponding indices). This implementation, however, is computationally expensive as it requires to construct $n - Lk$ different orthogonal projections (i.e., $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}}^\perp, \forall i \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}^k$). Therefore, it is highly desirable to find a cost-effective alternative to (8) for the identification step of MOLS.

Interestingly, the following proposition illustrates that (8) can be substantially simplified. It is inspired by the technical report of Blumensath and Davies [33], in which a geometric interpretation of OLS is given in terms of orthogonal projections.

Proposition 1: At the $(k+1)$ -th iteration, the MOLS algorithm identifies a set of L indices:

$$\mathcal{S}^{k+1} = \arg \max_{\mathcal{S}: |\mathcal{S}|=L} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \quad (9)$$

$$= \arg \max_{\mathcal{S}: |\mathcal{S}|=L} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2}, \mathbf{r}^k \right\rangle. \quad (10)$$

The proof of this proposition is given in Appendix B. It is essentially identical to some analysis in [28] (which is particularly for OLS), but with extension to the case of selecting multiple indices per iteration (i.e., the MOLS case). This extension is important in that it not only enables a low-complexity implementation for MOLS, but also will play an key role in the performance analysis of MOLS in Section IV and V. We thus include the proof for completeness.

One can interpret from (9) that to identify \mathcal{S}^{k+1} , it suffices to find the L largest values in $\left\{ \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \right\}_{i \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}$, which is much simpler than (8) as it involves only one projection operator (i.e., $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp$). Indeed, by numerical experiments, we

have confirmed that the simplification offers massive reduction in the computational cost.

Following the arguments in [30], [33], we give a geometric interpretation of the selection rule in MOLS: the columns of measurement matrix are projected onto the subspace that is orthogonal to the span of the active columns, and the L normalized projected columns that are best correlated with the residual vector are selected.

IV. EXACT SPARSE RECOVERY WITH MOLS

A. Main Results

In this section, we study the condition of MOLS for exact recovery of sparse signals. For convenience of stating the results, we say that MOLS makes a success at an iteration if it selects at least one correct index at the iteration. Clearly if MOLS makes a success in each iteration, it will select all support indices within K iterations. When all support indices are selected, MOLS can recover the sparse signal exactly.

Theorem 1: Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^n$ be any K -sparse signal and let $\Phi \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times n}$ be the measurement matrix. Also, let L be the number of indices selected at each iteration of MOLS. Then if Φ satisfies the RIP with

$$\begin{cases} \delta_{LK} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K+2}\sqrt{L}}, & L > 1, \\ \delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+2}}, & L = 1, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

MOLS exactly recovers \mathbf{x} from the measurements $\mathbf{y} = \Phi \mathbf{x}$ within K iterations.

Note that when $L = 1$, MOLS reduces to the conventional OLS algorithm. Theorem 1 suggests that under $\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+2}}$, OLS can recover any K -sparse signal in exact K iterations. Similar results have also been established for the OMP algorithm. In [24], [25], it has been shown that $\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}}$ is sufficient for OMP to exactly recover K -sparse signals. The condition is recently improved to $\delta_{K+1} < \frac{\sqrt{4K+1}-1}{2K}$ [37], by utilizing techniques developed in [38]. It is worth mentioning that there exist examples of measurement matrices satisfying $\delta_{K+1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$ and K -sparse signals, for which OMP makes wrong selection at the first iteration and thus fails to recover the signals in K iterations [24], [25]. Since OLS coincides with OMP for the first iteration, those examples naturally apply to OLS, which therefore implies that $\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$ is a necessary condition for the OLS algorithm. We would like to mention that the claim of $\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$ being necessary for exact recovery with OLS has also been proved in [39, Lemma 1]. Considering the fact that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+2}}$ converges to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$ as K goes large, the proposed condition $\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+2}}$ is nearly sharp.

The proof of Theorem 1 follows along a similar line as the proof in [11, Section III], in which conditions for exact recovery with gOMP were proved using mathematical induction, but with two key distinctions. The first distinction lies in the way we lower bound the correlations between correct columns and the current residual. As will be seen in Proposition 2, by employing an improved analysis, we obtain a tighter bound for MOLS than the corresponding result for gOMP [11, Lemma 3.7], which consequently leads to better recovery conditions for the MOLS algorithm. The second distinction is in how we

obtain recovery conditions for the case of $L = 1$. While in [11, Theorem 3.11] the condition for the first iteration of OMP directly applies to the general iteration and hence becomes an overall condition for OMP (i.e., the condition for success of the first iteration also guarantees the success of succeeding iterations, see [11, Lemma 3.10]), such is not the case for the OLS algorithm due to the difference in the identification rule. This means that to obtain the overall condition for OLS, we need to consider the first iteration and the general iteration individually, which makes the underlying analysis for OLS more complex and also leads to a more restrictive condition than the OMP algorithm.

B. Proof of Theorem 1

The proof works by mathematical induction. We first establish a condition that guarantees success of MOLS at the first iteration. Then we assume that MOLS has been successful in previous k iterations ($1 \leq k < K$). Under this assumption, we derive a condition under which MOLS also makes a success at the $(k + 1)$ -th iteration. Finally, we combine these two conditions to obtain an overall condition.

1) *Success of the first iteration:* From (9), MOLS selects at the first iteration the index set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}^1 &= \arg \max_{S:|S|=L} \sum_{i \in S} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \arg \max_{S:|S|=L} \sum_{i \in S} |\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle| \\ &= \arg \max_{S:|S|=L} \|\Phi'_S \mathbf{y}\|_1 = \arg \max_{S:|S|=L} \|\Phi'_S \mathbf{y}\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where (a) is because $k = 0$ so that $\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2 = \|\phi_i\|_2 = 1$. By noting that $L \leq K$,²

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^1} \mathbf{y}\|_2 &= \max_{S:|S|=L} \|\Phi'_S \mathbf{y}\|_2 \\ &\geq \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{y}\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_2 \\ &\geq \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}} (1 - \delta_K) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

On the other hand, if no correct index is chosen at the first iteration (i.e., $\mathcal{T}^1 \cap \mathcal{T} = \emptyset$), then

$$\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^1} \mathbf{y}\|_2 = \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^1} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_2 \stackrel{\text{Lemma 3}}{\leq} \delta_{K+L} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2. \quad (14)$$

This, however, contradicts (13) if $\delta_{K+L} < \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}} (1 - \delta_K)$ or

$$\delta_{K+L} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K} + \sqrt{L}}. \quad (15)$$

Therefore, under (15), at least one correct index is chosen at the first iteration of MOLS.

²Note that the average of L largest elements in $\{|\langle \phi'_i, \mathbf{y} \rangle|\}_{i \in \Omega}$ must be no less than that of any other subset of $\{|\langle \phi'_i, \mathbf{y} \rangle|\}_{i \in \Omega}$ whose cardinality is no less than L . Hence, $\sqrt{\frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}^1} |\langle \phi'_i, \mathbf{y} \rangle|^2} \geq \sqrt{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}} |\langle \phi'_i, \mathbf{y} \rangle|^2}$.

2) *Success of the general iteration:* Assume that MOLS has selected at least one correct index at each of the previous k ($1 \leq k < K$) iterations and denote by ℓ the number of correct indices in \mathcal{T}^k . Then $\ell = |\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^k| \geq k$. Also, assume that \mathcal{T}^k does not contain all correct indices, that is, $\ell < K$. Under these assumptions, we will establish a condition that ensures MOLS to select at least one correct index at the $(k + 1)$ -th iteration.

For analytical convenience, we introduce the following two quantities: i) u_1 denotes the largest value of $\frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2}$, $i \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k$ and ii) v_L denotes the L -th largest value of $\frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2}$, $i \in \Omega \setminus (\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k)$. It is clear that if

$$u_1 > v_L, \quad (16)$$

u_1 belongs to the set of L largest elements among all elements in $\left\{ \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \right\}_{i \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}$. Then it follows from (9) that at least one correct index (i.e., the one corresponding to u_1) will be selected at the $(k + 1)$ -th iteration of MOLS. The following proposition gives a lower bound for u_1 and an upper bound for v_L .

Proposition 2: We have

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &\geq \frac{1 - \delta_{K+Lk-\ell}}{\sqrt{K-\ell}} \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2, \\ v_L &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\delta_{Lk+1}^2}{1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk+1}^2} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad \times \left(\delta_{L+K-\ell} + \frac{\delta_{L+Lk} \delta_{Lk+K-\ell}}{1 - \delta_{Lk}} \right) \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2}{\sqrt{L}}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Proof: See Appendix C. \blacksquare

By noting that $1 \leq k \leq \ell < K$ and $1 \leq L \leq K$, we can use monotonicity of isometry constant to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} K - \ell < LK &\Rightarrow \delta_{K-\ell} \leq \delta_{LK}, \\ Lk + K - \ell \leq LK &\Rightarrow \delta_{Lk+K-\ell} \leq \delta_{LK}, \\ Lk < LK &\Rightarrow \delta_{Lk} \leq \delta_{LK}, \\ Lk + 1 \leq LK &\Rightarrow \delta_{Lk+1} \leq \delta_{LK}, \\ L + Lk \leq LK &\Rightarrow \delta_{L+Lk} \leq \delta_{LK}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Using (17) and (19), we have

$$u_1 \geq \frac{(1 - \delta_{LK}) \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2}{\sqrt{K-\ell}}. \quad (20)$$

Also, using (18) and (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_L &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\delta_{Lk}^2}{1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk}^2} \right)^{1/2} \left(\delta_{Lk} + \frac{\delta_{Lk}^2}{1 - \delta_{Lk}} \right) \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2}{\sqrt{L}} \\ &= \frac{\delta_{Lk} \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2}{\sqrt{L} (1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk}^2)^{1/2} (1 - \delta_{Lk})^{1/2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

From (20) and (21), $u_1 > v_L$ holds true whenever

$$\frac{1 - \delta_{LK}}{\sqrt{K-\ell}} > \frac{\delta_{Lk}}{\sqrt{L} (1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk}^2)^{1/2} (1 - \delta_{Lk})^{1/2}}. \quad (22)$$

Equivalently (see Appendix D),

$$\delta_{LK} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K} + 2\sqrt{L}}. \quad (23)$$

Therefore, under (23), MOLS selects at least one correct index at the $(k+1)$ -th iteration.

3) *Overall condition:* So far, we have obtained condition (15) for the success of MOLS at the first iteration and condition (23) for the success of the general iteration. We now combine them to get an overall condition that ensures selection of all support indices within K iterations of MOLS. Clearly the overall condition is governed the more restrictive one between (15) and (23). We consider the following two cases:

- $L \geq 2$: Since $\delta_{Lk} \geq \delta_{K+L}$ and also $\frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K+L}} > \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K+2L}}$, (23) is more restrictive than (15) and hence becomes the overall condition of MOLS for this case.
- $L = 1$: In this case, MOLS reduces to the conventional OLS algorithm and conditions (15) and (23) become

$$\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}+1} \text{ and } \delta_K < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}+2}, \quad (24)$$

respectively. One can easily check that both conditions in (24) hold true if

$$\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}+2}. \quad (25)$$

Therefore, under (25), OLS exactly recovers the support of K -sparse signals in K iterations.

We have obtained the condition ensuring selection of all support indices within K iterations of MOLS. When all support indices are selected, we have $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^l$ where l ($\leq K$) denotes the number of actually performed iterations. Since $L \leq \min\{K, \frac{m}{K}\}$ by Table I, the number of totally selected indices of MOLS, (i.e., lK) does not exceed m , and hence the sparse signal can be recovered with a least squares (LS) projection:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}^l}^l &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} \|\mathbf{y} - \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^l} \mathbf{u}\|_2 \\ &= \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^l}^\dagger \mathbf{y} = \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^l}^\dagger \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^l} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}^l} = \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}^l}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

As a result, the residual vector becomes zero ($\mathbf{r}^l = \mathbf{y} - \Phi \mathbf{x}^l = \mathbf{0}$), and hence the algorithm terminates and returns exact recovery of the sparse signal ($\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}$).

C. Convergence Rate

We can gain good insights by studying the rate of convergence of MOLS. In the following theorem, we show that the residual power of MOLS decays exponentially with the number of iterations.

Theorem 2: For any $0 \leq k < K$, the residual of MOLS satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{r}^{k+1}\|_2^2 \leq (\alpha(k, L))^{k+1} \|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2, \quad (27)$$

where

$$\alpha(k, L) := 1 - \frac{L(1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk+1}^2)(1 - \delta_{K+Lk})^2}{K(1 + \delta_L)(1 - \delta_{Lk})(1 + \delta_{K+Lk})}.$$

The proof is given in Appendix E. Using Theorem 2, one can roughly compare the rate of convergence of OLS and MOLS. When Φ has small isometry constants, the upper bound of the convergence rate of MOLS is better than that

of OLS in a factor of $\frac{\alpha(k, L)}{\alpha(k, L)} \left(\approx \frac{K-1}{K-L} \right)$. We will see later in the experimental section that MOLS has a faster convergence than the OLS algorithm.

V. SPARSE RECOVERY WITH MOLS UNDER NOISE

A. Main Results

In this section, we consider the general scenario where the measurements are contaminated with noise as

$$\mathbf{y} = \Phi \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}. \quad (28)$$

Note that in this scenario exact sparse recovery of \mathbf{x} is not possible. Thus we employ the ℓ_2 -norm distortion (i.e., $\|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2$) as a performance measure and will derive conditions ensuring an upper bound for the recovery distortion.

Recall from Table I that MOLS runs until neither “ $\|\mathbf{r}^k\|_2 \geq \epsilon$ and $k < K$ ” nor “ $Lk < K$ ” is true.³ Since $L \geq 1$, one can see that the algorithm terminates when $\|\mathbf{r}^k\|_2 < \epsilon$ or $k = K$. In the following we will analyze the recovery distortion of MOLS based on these two termination cases. We first consider the case that MOLS is finished by the rule $\|\mathbf{r}^k\|_2 < \epsilon$. The following theorem provides an upper bound on $\|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2$ for this case.

Theorem 3: Consider the measurement model in (28). If MOLS satisfies $\|\mathbf{r}^l\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ after l ($< K$) iterations and Φ satisfies the RIP of orders $Ll + K$ and $2K$, then the output $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2 \leq \frac{2\epsilon\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2K}} + 2(\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2K}} + \sqrt{1 - \delta_{Ll+K}})\|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{(1 - \delta_{Ll+K})(1 + \delta_{2K})}}. \quad (29)$$

Proof: See Appendix F. ■

Next, we consider the second case where MOLS terminates after K iterations. In this case, we parameterize the dependence on the noise \mathbf{v} and the signal \mathbf{x} with two quantities: i) the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and ii) the minimum-to-average ratio (MAR) [40] which are defined as

$$\text{snr} := \frac{\|\Phi \mathbf{x}\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2} \text{ and } \kappa := \frac{\min_{j \in \mathcal{T}} |x_j|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 / \sqrt{K}}, \quad (30)$$

respectively. The following theorem provides an upper bound on the ℓ_2 -norm of the recovery distortion of MOLS.

Theorem 4: Consider the measurement model in (28). If the measurement matrix Φ satisfies (11) and the SNR satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \sqrt{\text{snr}} \geq \frac{2(1 + \delta_{K+1})}{\kappa(1 - (\sqrt{K} + 2)\delta_{K+1})} \sqrt{K}, & L = 1, \\ \sqrt{\text{snr}} \geq \frac{(\sqrt{L} + 1)(1 + \delta_{LK})}{\kappa(\sqrt{L} - (\sqrt{K} + 2\sqrt{L})\delta_{LK})} \sqrt{K}, & L > 1, \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

then MOLS chooses all support indices in K iterations (i.e., $\mathcal{T}^K \supseteq \mathcal{T}$) and generates an estimate of \mathbf{x} satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_K}}, & L = 1, \\ \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{1 - \delta_{2K}}{1 - \delta_{LK}}}\right) \frac{2\|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 + \delta_{2K}}}, & L > 1. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

³The constraint $Lk \geq K$ actually ensures MOLS to select at least K candidates before stopping. These candidate are then narrowed down to exact K ones as the final output of the algorithm.

One can interpret from Theorem 4 that MOLS can catch all support indices of \mathbf{x} in K iterations when the SNR scales linearly with the sparsity K . In particular, for the special case of $L = 1$, the algorithm exactly recovers the support of \mathbf{x} (i.e., $\hat{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{T}$). It is worth noting that the SNR being proportional to K is necessary for exact support recovery with OLS. In fact, there exist a measurement matrix Φ satisfying (11) and a K -sparse signal, for which the OLS algorithm fails to recover the support of the signal under

$$snr \geq K. \quad (33)$$

Example 1: Consider an identity matrix $\Phi^{m \times m}$, a K -sparse signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^m$ with all nonzero elements equal to one, and an 1-sparse noise vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{R}^m$ as follows,

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & \\ & 1 & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and } \mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then the measurements are given by

$$\mathbf{y} = \left[\overbrace{1 \ \dots \ 1}^K \ \overbrace{0 \ \dots \ 0}^{m-K-1} \ 1 \right]'$$

In this case, we have $\delta_{K+1} = 0$ (so that condition (11) is fulfilled) and $snr = K$; however, OLS may fail to recover the support of \mathbf{x} . Specifically, OLS is not guaranteed to make a correct selection at the first iteration.

B. Proof of Theorem 4

Our proof of Theorem 4 extends the proof technique in [11, Theorem 3.4 and 3.5] (which studied the recovery condition for the gOMP algorithm in the noiseless situation) by considering the measurement noise. We mention that [11, Theorem 4.2] also provided a noisy case analysis based on the ℓ_2 -norm distortion of signal recovery, but the corresponding result is far inferior to the result established in Theorem 4. Indeed, while the result in [11] suggested a recovery distortion upper bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{K})\|\mathbf{v}\|_2$, our result shows that the recovery distortion with MOLS is at most proportional to the noise power. The result in Theorem 4 is also closely related to the results in [37], [41], in which the researchers considered the OMP algorithm with data driven stopping rules (i.e., residual based stopping rules), and established conditions for exact support recovery that depend on the minimum magnitude of nonzero elements of input signals. It can be shown that the results of [37], [41] essentially require a same scaling law of the SNR as the result in Theorem 4.

The key idea in the proof is to derive a condition ensuring MOLS to select at least one good index at each iterations. As long as at least one good index is chosen in each iteration, all support indices will be included in K iterations of MOLS (i.e., $\mathcal{T}^K \supseteq \mathcal{T}$) and consequently the algorithm produces a stable recovery of \mathbf{x} .

Proposition 3: Consider the measurement model in (28). If the measurement matrix Φ satisfies the RIP of order LK , then MOLS satisfies (32) provided that $\mathcal{T}^K \supseteq \mathcal{T}$.

Proof: See Appendix G. ■

Now we proceed to derive the condition ensuring the success of MOLS at each iteration. Again, the notion ‘‘success’’ means that MOLS selects at least one good index at this iteration. We first derive a condition for the success of MOLS at the first iteration. Then we assume that MOLS has been successful in the previous k iterations and derive a condition guaranteeing MOLS to make a success as well at the $(k+1)$ -th iteration. Finally, we combine these two conditions to obtain an overall condition for MOLS.

1) *Success at the first iteration:* From (12), we know that at the first iteration, MOLS selects the set \mathcal{T}^1 of L indices such that $\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^1}\mathbf{y}\|_2 = \max_{S:|S|=L} \|\Phi'_S\mathbf{y}\|_2$. Since $L \leq K$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^1}\mathbf{y}\|_2 &\geq \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}}\mathbf{y}\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}}\Phi\mathbf{x} + \Phi'_{\mathcal{T}}\mathbf{v}\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}} (\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}}\Phi\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_2 - \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}}\mathbf{v}\|_2) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}} \left((1 - \delta_K)\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 - \sqrt{1 + \delta_K}\|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where (a) is from the triangle inequality and (b) is from the RIP and Lemma 4.

On the other hand, if no correct index is chosen at the first iteration (i.e., $\mathcal{T}^1 \cap \mathcal{T} = \emptyset$), then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^1}\mathbf{y}\|_2 &= \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^1}\Phi\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}} + \Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^1}\mathbf{v}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^1}\Phi\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_2 + \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^1}\mathbf{v}\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 3, 4}}{\leq} \delta_{K+L}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + \sqrt{1 + \delta_K}\|\mathbf{v}\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

This, however, contradicts (34) if

$$\delta_{K+L}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + \sqrt{1 + \delta_K}\|\mathbf{v}\|_2 < \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}} \left((1 - \delta_K)\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 - \sqrt{1 + \delta_K}\|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \right).$$

Equivalently,

$$\left((1 - \delta_{K+1})\sqrt{\frac{L}{K}} - \delta_{K+L} \right) \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_2} > \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}} \right) \sqrt{1 + \delta_{K+L}}. \quad (36)$$

Furthermore, since

$$\|\Phi\mathbf{x}\|_2 \stackrel{\text{RIP}}{\leq} \sqrt{1 + \delta_K}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \stackrel{\text{Lemma 1}}{\leq} \sqrt{1 + \delta_{K+L}}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2, \quad (37)$$

using (30) we can show that (36) holds true if

$$\sqrt{snr} > \frac{(1 + \delta_{K+L})(\sqrt{K} + \sqrt{L})}{\sqrt{L} - (\sqrt{K} + \sqrt{L})\delta_{K+L}}. \quad (38)$$

Therefore, under (38), at least one correct index is chosen at the first iteration of MOLS.

2) *Success at the $(k+1)$ -th iteration:* Similar to the analysis of MOLS in the noiseless case in Section IV, we assume that MOLS selects at least one correct index at each of the previous k ($1 \leq k < K$) iterations and denote by ℓ' the number of correct indices in \mathcal{T}^k . Then, $\ell' = |\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^k| \geq k$. Also, we assume that \mathcal{T}^k does not contain all correct indices ($\ell' < K$). Under these assumptions, we derive a condition that ensures

MOLS to select at least one correct index at the $(k+1)$ -th iteration.

We introduce two quantities that are useful for stating results. Let u'_1 denote the largest value of $\frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2}$, $i \in \mathcal{T}$ and let v'_L denote the L -th largest value of $\frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2}$, $i \in \Omega \setminus (\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k)$. It is clear that if

$$u'_1 > v'_L, \quad (39)$$

then u'_1 belongs to the set of L largest elements among all elements in $\left\{ \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \right\}_{i \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}$. Then it follows from (9) that at least one correct index (i.e., the one corresponding to u'_1) will be selected at the $(k+1)$ -th iteration. The following proposition gives a lower bound for u'_1 and an upper bound for v'_L .

Proposition 4: We have

$$u'_1 \geq \frac{(1 - \delta_{K+Lk-\ell'}) \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 - \sqrt{1 + \delta_{K+Lk-\ell'}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{K - \ell'}}, \quad (40)$$

$$v'_L \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \left(\left(\delta_{L+K-\ell'} + \frac{\delta_{L+Lk} \delta_{Lk+K-\ell'}}{1 - \delta_{Lk}} \right) \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 + \sqrt{1 + \delta_{L+Lk}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \right) \left(1 + \frac{\delta_{Lk+1}^2}{1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk+1}^2} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (41)$$

Proof: See Appendix H. \blacksquare

By noting that $1 \leq k \leq \ell' < K$ and $1 \leq L \leq K$, and also using Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} K - \ell' < LK &\Rightarrow \delta_{K-\ell'} \leq \delta_{LK}, \\ Lk + K - \ell' \leq LK &\Rightarrow \delta_{Lk+K-\ell'} \leq \delta_{LK}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

From (19), (41), and (42), we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_L &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \left(1 + \frac{\delta_{LK}^2}{1 - \delta_{LK} - \delta_{LK}^2} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad \times \left(\left(\delta_{LK} + \frac{\delta_{LK}^2}{1 - \delta_{LK}} \right) \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 + \sqrt{1 + \delta_{LK}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \left(\frac{1 - \delta_{LK}}{1 - \delta_{LK} - \delta_{LK}^2} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\delta_{LK} \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2}{1 - \delta_{LK}} + \sqrt{1 + \delta_{LK}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Also, from (19), (40), and (42), we have

$$u_1 \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K - \ell'}} \left((1 - \delta_{LK}) \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 - \sqrt{1 + \delta_{LK}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \right). \quad (44)$$

From (43) and (44), $u'_1 > v'_L$ can be guaranteed by

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\sqrt{K - \ell'}} \left((1 - \delta_{LK}) \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 - \sqrt{1 + \delta_{LK}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \right) \\ &> \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \left(\frac{1 - \delta_{LK}}{1 - \delta_{LK} - \delta_{LK}^2} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\delta_{LK} \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2}{1 - \delta_{LK}} + \sqrt{1 + \delta_{LK}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

which is true under (see Appendix I)

$$\sqrt{snr} \geq \frac{(\sqrt{L} + 1)(1 + \delta_{LK})}{\kappa(\sqrt{L} - (\sqrt{K} + 2\sqrt{L})\delta_{LK})} \sqrt{K}, \quad (46)$$

Therefore, under (46), MOLS selects at least one correct index at the $(k+1)$ -th iteration.

3) *Overall condition:* Thus far we have obtained condition (38) for the success of MOLS at the first iteration and condition (46) for the success of the general iteration. We now combine them to get an overall condition of MOLS ensuring selection of all support indices in K iterations. Clearly the overall condition can be the more restrictive one between (38) and (46). We consider the following two cases.

- $L \geq 2$: Since $\delta_{LK} \geq \delta_{K+L}$, (46) is more restrictive than (38) and becomes the overall condition.
- $L = 1$: In this case, the MOLS algorithm reduces to the conventional OLS algorithm. Since $\delta_{K+1} \geq \delta_K$, one can verify that both (38) and (46) hold true under

$$\sqrt{snr} \geq \frac{2(1 + \delta_{K+1})}{\kappa(1 - (\sqrt{K} + 2)\delta_{K+1})} \sqrt{K}. \quad (47)$$

Therefore, (47) ensures selection of all support indices in K iterations of OLS.

The proof is now complete.


VI. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

In this section, we empirically study the performance of MOLS in recovering sparse signals. We consider both the noiseless and noisy scenarios. In the noiseless case, we adopt the testing strategy in [11], [14], [42] which measures the performance of recovery algorithms by testing their empirical frequency of exact reconstruction of sparse signals, while in the noisy case, we employ the mean square error (MSE) as a metric to evaluate the recovery performance. For comparative purposes, we consider the following recovery approaches in our simulation:


- 1) OLS and MOLS;
- 2) OMP;
- 3) StOMP (<http://sparselab.stanford.edu/>);
- 4) ROMP (<http://www.cmc.edu/pages/faculty/DNeedell/>);
- 5) CoSaMP (<http://www.cmc.edu/pages/faculty/DNeedell/>);
- 6) BP (or BPDN for the noisy case) (<http://cvxr.com/cvxr/>);
- 7) Iterative reweighted LS (IRLS);
- 8) Linear minimum MSE (LMMSE) estimator.

In each trial, we construct an $m \times n$ matrix (where $m = 128$ and $n = 256$) with entries drawn independently from a Gaussian distribution with zero mean and $\frac{1}{m}$ variance. For each value of K in $\{5, \dots, 64\}$, we generate a K -sparse signal of size $n \times 1$ whose support is chosen uniformly at random and nonzero elements are 1) drawn independently from a standard Gaussian distribution, or 2) chosen randomly from the set $\{\pm 1\}$. We refer to the two types of signals as the sparse Gaussian signal and the sparse 2-ary pulse amplitude modulation (2-PAM) signal, respectively. We mention that reconstructing sparse 2-PAM signals is a particularly challenging case for OMP and OLS.

In the noiseless case, we perform 2,000 independent trials for each recovery approach and plot the empirical frequency of exact reconstruction as a function of the sparsity level. By comparing the maximal sparsity level, i.e., the so called *critical sparsity* [14], of sparse signals at which exact reconstruction is



(a) Sparse Gaussian signal.




(b) Sparse 2-PAM signal

Fig. 1. Frequency of exact recovery of sparse signals as a function of K .


always ensured, recovery accuracy of different algorithms can be compared empirically.⁴ As shown in Fig. 1, for both sparse Gaussian and sparse 2-PAM signals, the MOLS algorithm outperforms other greedy approaches with respect to the critical sparsity. Even when compared to the BP and IRLS methods, the MOLS algorithm still exhibits very competitive reconstruction performance. For the Gaussian case, the critical sparsity of MOLS is 43, which is higher than that of BP and IRLS, while for the 2-PAM case, MOLS, BP and IRLS have

⁴Note that for MOLS, the selection parameter should obey $L \leq K$. We thus choose $L = 3, 5$ in our simulation. Interested reader may try other options. We suggest to choose L to be small integers and have empirically confirmed that choices of $L = 2, 3, 4, 5$ generally lead to similar recovery performance. For StOMP, there are two thresholding strategies: false alarm control (FAC) and false discovery control (FDC) [9]. We exclusively use FAC, since the FAC outperforms FDC. For OMP and OLS, we run the algorithm for exact K iterations before stopping. For CoSaMP: we set the maximal iteration number to 50 to avoid repeated iterations. We implement IRLS (with $p = 1$) as featured in [16].




(a) Running time (Gaussian signals).

(b) Running time (2-PAM signals).



(c) Running time without BP and IRLS (Gaussian signals).

(d) Running time without BP and IRLS (2-PAM signals).



(e) # of iterations (Gaussian signals).

(f) # of iterations (2-PAM signals).

Fig. 2. Running time and number of iterations for exact reconstruction of K -sparse Gaussian and 2-PAM signals.

almost identical critical sparsity (around 37).

In Fig. 2, we plot the running time and the number of iterations for exact reconstruction of K -sparse Gaussian and 2-PAM signals as a function of K . The running time is measured using the MATLAB program under the 28-core 64-bit processor, 256Gb RAM, and Windows Server 2012 R2 environments. Overall, we observe that for both sparse Gaussian and 2-PAM cases, the running time of BP and IRLS is longer than that of OMP, CoSaMP, StOMP and MOLS. In particular, the running time of BP is more than one order of magnitude higher than the rest of algorithms require. This is because the complexity of BP is a quadratic function of the number of measurements ($\mathcal{O}(m^2n^{3/2})$) [43], while that of greedy algorithms is $\mathcal{O}(Kmn)$. Moreover, the running time of MOLS is roughly two to three times as much as that of OMP. We also observe that the number of iterations of MOLS for exact reconstruction is much smaller than that of the OLS algorithm since MOLS can include more than one support index at a time. The associated running time of MOLS is also




Fig. 3. Frequency of exact recovery of sparse signals as a function of m .

much less than that of OLS.


In Fig. 3, by varying the number of measurements m , we plot empirical frequency of exact reconstruction of K -sparse Gaussian signals as a function of m . We consider the sparsity level $K = 45$, for which none of the reconstruction methods in Fig. 1(a) are guaranteed to perform exact recovery. Overall, we observe that the performance comparison among all reconstruction methods is similar to Fig. 1(a) in that MOLS performs the best and OLS, OMP and ROMP perform worse than other methods. Moreover, for all reconstruction methods under test, the frequency of exact reconstruction improves as the number of measurements increases. In particular, MOLS roughly requires $m \geq 135$ to ensure exact recovery of sparse signals, while BP, CoSaMP and StOMP seem to always succeed when $m \geq 150$.

In the noisy case, we empirically compare MSE performance of each recovery method. The MSE is defined as


$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \hat{x}_i)^2, \quad (48)$$

where \hat{x}_i is the estimate of x_i . In obtaining the performance result for each simulation point of the algorithm, we perform 2,000 independent trials. In Fig. 4, we plot the MSE performance for each recovery method as a function of SNR (in dB) (i.e., $\text{SNR} := 10 \log_{10} \text{snr}$). In this case, the system model is expressed as $\mathbf{y} = \Phi \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$ where \mathbf{v} is the noise vector whose elements are generated from Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{K}{m} 10^{-\frac{\text{SNR}}{10}})$.⁵ The benchmark performance of Oracle least squares estimator (Oracle-LS), the best possible estimation having prior knowledge on the support of input signals, is plotted as well. In general, we observe that for all reconstruction methods, the MSE performance improves with the SNR. For the whole SNR region under test, the MSE

⁵Since the components of Φ have power $\frac{1}{m}$ and the signal \mathbf{x} is K -sparse with nonzero elements drawn independently from a standard Gaussian distribution, $\mathbb{E}|(\Phi \mathbf{x})_i|^2 = \frac{K}{m}$. From the definition of SNR, we have $\mathbb{E}|v_i|^2 = \mathbb{E}|(\Phi \mathbf{x})_i|^2 \cdot 10^{-\frac{\text{SNR}}{10}} = \frac{K}{m} 10^{-\frac{\text{SNR}}{10}}$.



(a) $K = 10$



(b) $K = 20$

Fig. 4. MSE performance of recovery methods for recovering sparse 2-PAM signals as a function of SNR.

performance of MOLS is very competitive compared to that of other methods. In particular, in the high SNR region the MSE of MOLS matches with that of the Oracle-LS estimator. This is essentially because the MOLS algorithm detects all support indices of sparse signals successfully in that SNR region. An interesting point we would like to mention is that the actual recovery error of MOLS may be much smaller than indicated in Theorem 4. Consider MOLS ($L = 5$) for example. When $\text{SNR} = 20\text{dB}$, $K = 20$, and $v_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{K}{m} 10^{-\frac{\text{SNR}}{10}})$, we have $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{v}\|_2 = (K \cdot 10^{-\frac{\text{SNR}}{10}})^{1/2} = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{5}$. Thus, by assuming small isometry constants we obtain from Theorem 4 that $\|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2 \leq \frac{4\sqrt{5}}{5}$.⁶ Whereas, the ℓ_2 -norm of the actual recovery error of MOLS is $\|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2 = (n \cdot \text{MSE})^{1/2} \approx 0.2$ (Fig. 4(b)),

⁶In this case, we can verify that condition (31) in Theorem 4 is fulfilled. To be specific, since sparse 2-PAM signals have $\kappa = 1$ and $\text{snr} = 10^{\frac{\text{SNR}}{10}} = 100$, when the measurement matrix Φ has small isometry constants, (31) roughly becomes $\sqrt{100} \geq \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{\sqrt{5}} \cdot \sqrt{20}$, which is true.

which is much smaller. The gap between the theoretical and empirical results is perhaps due to 1) that our analysis is based on the RIP framework and hence is essentially the worst-case-analysis, and 2) that some inequalities (relaxations) used in our analysis may not be tight.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have studied a sparse recovery algorithm called MOLS, which extends the conventional OLS algorithm by allowing multiple candidates entering the list in each selection. Our method is inspired by the fact that ‘‘sub-optimal’’ candidates in each of the OLS identification are likely to be reliable and can be selected to accelerate the convergence of the algorithm. We have demonstrated by RIP analysis that MOLS ($L > 1$) performs exact recovery of any K -sparse signal within K iterations if $\delta_{LK} \leq \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K+2}\sqrt{L}}$. In particular, for the special case of MOLS when $L = 1$ (i.e., the OLS case), we have shown that any K -sparse signal can be exactly recovered in K iterations under $\delta_{K+1} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+2}}$, which is a nearly optimal condition for the OLS algorithm. We have also extended our analysis to the noisy scenario. Our result showed that stable recovery of sparse signals can be achieved with MOLS when the SNR has a linear scaling in the sparsity level of signals to be recovered. In particular, for the case of OLS, we demonstrated from a counterexample that the linear scaling law for the SNR is essentially necessary. In addition, we have shown from empirical experiments that the MOLS algorithm has lower computational cost than the conventional OLS algorithm, while exhibiting improved recovery accuracy. The empirical recovery performance of MOLS is also competitive when compared to the state of the art recovery methods.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work is supported in part by ONR-N00014-13-1-0764, NSF-III-1360971, AFOSR-FA9550-13-1-0137, and NSF-Bigdata-1419210.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA 6

Proof: We focus on the proof for the upper bound. Since $\delta_{|S|} < 1$, Φ_S has full column rank. Suppose that Φ_S has singular value decomposition $\Phi_S = \mathbf{U}\Sigma\mathbf{V}'$. Then from the definition of RIP, the minimum diagonal entries of Σ satisfies $\sigma_{\min} \geq \sqrt{1 - \delta_{|S|}}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (\Phi_S^\dagger)' &= ((\Phi_S' \Phi_S)^{-1} \Phi_S')' \\ &= \mathbf{U}\Sigma\mathbf{V}'((\mathbf{U}\Sigma\mathbf{V}')' \mathbf{U}\Sigma\mathbf{V}')^{-1} = \mathbf{U}\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{V}', \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where Σ^{-1} is the diagonal matrix formed by replacing every (non-zero) diagonal entry of Σ by its reciprocal. Hence, all singular values of $(\Phi_S^\dagger)'$ are upper bounded by $\frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{|S|}}}$, which completes the proof. ■

APPENDIX B PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

Proof: Since $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}}^\perp \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}} \mathbf{y}$ are orthogonal,

$$\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}}^\perp \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}} \mathbf{y}\|_2^2,$$

and hence (8) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{S}^{k+1} = \arg \max_{S: |S|=L} \sum_{i \in S} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}} \mathbf{y}\|_2^2. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

By noting that $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} + \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp = \mathbf{I}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}} &= \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}} + \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}} \\ &= \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} + \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}} \\ &= \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} + \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp [\Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}, \phi_i] \left(\begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}' \\ \phi_i' \end{bmatrix} [\Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}, \phi_i] \right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}' \\ \phi_i' \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}' \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k} & \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}' \phi_i \\ \phi_i' \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k} & \phi_i' \phi_i \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}' \\ \phi_i' \end{bmatrix} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}_1 & \mathbf{M}_2 \\ \mathbf{M}_3 & \mathbf{M}_4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}' \\ \phi_i' \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} + \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i (\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i)^{-1} \phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where (a) is from the partitioned inverse formula and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_1 &= (\Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k})^{-1}, \\ \mathbf{M}_2 &= -(\Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k})^{-1} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}' \phi_i (\phi_i' \phi_i)^{-1}, \\ \mathbf{M}_3 &= -(\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i)^{-1} \phi_i' \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}' (\Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}' \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k})^{-1}, \\ \mathbf{M}_4 &= (\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k \cup \{i\}} \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 &= \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i (\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i)^{-1} \phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i (\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i)^{-1} \phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 + \frac{|\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{y}|^2 \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2}{|\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i|^2} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 + \frac{|\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{y}|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 + \left(\frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \right)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where (a) is because $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i (\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i)^{-1} \phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{y}$ are orthogonal, (b) follows from that fact that $\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{y}$ and $\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i$ are scalars, (c) is from

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp = (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp)^2 = (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp)'. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and hence $|\phi_i' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i| = |\phi_i' (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp)' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i| = \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2$, and (d) is due to $\mathbf{r}^k = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{y}$.

By relating (B.1) and (B.4), we have

$$\mathcal{S}^{k+1} = \arg \max_{S: |S|=L} \sum_{i \in S} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2}.$$

Furthermore, if we write $|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle| = |\phi_i' (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp)' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{y}| = |\langle \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|$, then (9) becomes

$$\mathcal{S}^{k+1} = \arg \max_{S: |S|=L} \sum_{i \in S} \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2}, \mathbf{r}^k \right\rangle.$$

This completes the proof. ■

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

Proof: We first prove (17) and then prove (18).

1) *Proof of (17):* Since u_1 is the largest value of $\left\{ \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &\geq \sqrt{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2}} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k|}} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} |\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2} \\ &= \frac{\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2}{\sqrt{K - \ell}} = \frac{\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi \mathbf{x}\|_2}{\sqrt{K - \ell}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where (a) is because $\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2 \leq \|\phi_i\|_2 = 1$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi \mathbf{x}\|_2 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{\|\mathbf{x}'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{x}'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \frac{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2} \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\geq} \lambda_{\min}(\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}) \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{(e)}{\geq} \lambda_{\min}(\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k}) \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{(f)}{\geq} (1 - \delta_{K+Lk-\ell}) \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where (a) is because $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k} = \mathbf{0}$, (b) is from the norm inequality, (c) and (d) are from (B.5), (e) is from Lemma 5, and (f) is from the RIP. (Note that $|\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k| = |\mathcal{T}| + |\mathcal{T}^k| - |\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k| = K + Lk - \ell$.)

Using (C.1) and (C.2), we obtain (17).

2) *Proof of (18):* Let \mathcal{F} be the index set corresponding to L largest elements in $\left\{ \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \right\}_{i \in \Omega \setminus (\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k)}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \right)^{1/2} &\leq \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} |\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\min_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} |\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{1 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \phi_i\|_2^2} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{\delta_{Lk+1}^2}{1 - \delta_{Lk}} \right)^{-1/2} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

where (a) is because for any $i \notin \mathcal{T}^k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \phi_i\|_2^2 &= \|(\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^k})' \Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^k} \phi_i\|_2^2 \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 6}}{\leq} \frac{\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^k} \phi_i\|_2^2}{1 - \delta_{Lk}} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 3}}{\leq} \frac{\delta_{Lk+1}^2}{1 - \delta_{Lk}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

By noting that $\mathbf{r}^k = \mathbf{y} - \Phi \mathbf{x}^k = \mathbf{y} - \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\dagger \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\frac{1 - \delta_{Lk}}{1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk+1}^2} \right)^{1/2} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1 - \delta_{Lk}}{1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk+1}^2} \right)^{1/2} \left(\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Since \mathcal{F} and $\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k$ are disjoint (i.e., $\mathcal{F} \cap (\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k) = \emptyset$), and also noting that $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^k = \ell$ by hypothesis, we have $|\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k| = L + K - \ell$. Using this together with Lemma 3, we have

$$\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \leq \delta_{L+K-\ell} \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Moreover, since $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{T}^k = \emptyset$ and $|\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{T}^k| = L + Lk$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \\ &\leq \delta_{L+Lk} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \\ &= \delta_{L+Lk} \|(\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k})^{-1} \Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 2}}{\leq} \frac{\delta_{L+Lk}}{1 - \delta_{Lk}} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 3}}{\leq} \frac{\delta_{L+Lk} \delta_{Lk+K-\ell}}{1 - \delta_{Lk}} \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

where in the last inequality we have used the fact that $|\mathcal{T}^k \cup (\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k)| = Lk + K - \ell$. (Note that \mathcal{T}^k and $\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k$ are disjoint and $|\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k| = K - \ell$.)

Invoking (C.6) and (C.7) into (C.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\frac{1 - \delta_{Lk}}{1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk+1}^2} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad \times \left(\delta_{L+K-\ell} + \frac{\delta_{L+Lk} \delta_{Lk+K-\ell}}{1 - \delta_{Lk}} \right) \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

On the other hand, since v_L is the L -th largest value in $\left\{ \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{F}}$, we have

$$\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \right)^{1/2} \geq \sqrt{L} v_L, \quad (\text{C.9})$$

which, together with (C.8), implies (18). \blacksquare

APPENDIX D
PROOF OF (23)

Proof: Observe that (22) is equivalent to

$$\sqrt{\frac{K - \ell}{L}} < \frac{(1 - \delta_{LK})^{3/2} (1 - \delta_{LK} - \delta_{LK}^2)^{1/2}}{\delta_{LK}}. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Let $f(\delta_{LK}) = \frac{(1 - \delta_{LK})^{3/2} (1 - \delta_{LK} - \delta_{LK}^2)^{1/2}}{\delta_{LK}}$ and $g(\delta_{LK}) = \frac{1}{\delta_{LK}} - 2$. Then one can check that $\forall \delta_{LK} \in (0, \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2})$,

$$f(\delta_{LK}) > g(\delta_{LK}). \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Hence, (D.1) is ensured by $\sqrt{\frac{K-\ell}{L}} < \frac{1}{\delta_{LK}} - 2$, or equivalently,

$$\delta_{LK} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K-\ell} + 2\sqrt{L}}. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Since $K - \ell < K$, (D.3) is guaranteed by (23). ■

APPENDIX E PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Proof: We prove Theorem 2 in two steps. First, we show that the residual power difference of MOLS satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{r}^{k+1}\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk+1}^2}{(1 + \delta_L)(1 - \delta_{Lk})} \max_{S:|S|=L} \|\Phi'_S \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2. \quad (\text{E.1})$$

In the second step, we show that

$$\max_{S:|S|=L} \|\Phi'_S \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 \geq \frac{L(1 - \delta_{K+Lk})^2}{K(1 + \delta_{K+Lk})} \|\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2. \quad (\text{E.2})$$

The theorem is established by combining (E.1) and (E.2).

1) *Proof of (E.1):* First, from the definition of MOLS (see Table I), we have that for any integer $0 \leq k < K$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}^k - \mathbf{r}^{k+1} &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^{k+1}} \mathbf{y} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^{l+1}} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^{l+1}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^l}) \mathbf{y} \\ &= \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^{l+1}} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^l} \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^{l+1}} \mathbf{r}^k, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.3})$$

where (a) is from that $\mathbf{x}^k = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}: \text{supp}(\mathbf{u})=\mathcal{T}^k} \|\mathbf{y} - \Phi \mathbf{u}\|_2$, and hence

$\Phi \mathbf{x}^k = \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\dagger \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^l} \mathbf{y}$, and (b) is because $\text{span}(\Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k}) \subseteq \text{span}(\Phi_{\mathcal{T}^{k+1}})$ so that $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^{k+1}} (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{y})$. Since $\mathcal{T}^{k+1} \supseteq \mathcal{S}^{k+1}$, we have $\text{span}(\Phi_{\mathcal{T}^{k+1}}) \supseteq \text{span}(\Phi_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}})$ and

$$\|\mathbf{r}^k - \mathbf{r}^{k+1}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^{k+1}} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 \geq \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2.$$

By noting that $\|\mathbf{r}^k - \mathbf{r}^{k+1}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{r}^{k+1}\|_2^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{r}^{k+1}\|_2^2 &\geq \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \|(\Phi_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}}^\dagger)' \Phi'_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 \\ \stackrel{\text{Lemma 6}}{\geq} &\frac{\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2}{1 + \delta_{|\mathcal{S}^{k+1}|}} = \frac{\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2}{1 + \delta_L}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.4})$$

where (a) is because $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}} = \mathbf{P}'_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}} = (\Phi_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}}^\dagger)' \Phi'_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}}$.

Next, we build a lower bound for $\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2$. Denote $S^* = \arg \max_{S:|S|=L} \|\Phi'_S \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} &\stackrel{(9)}{=} \max_{S:|S|=L} \sum_{i \in S} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \\ &\geq \sum_{i \in S^*} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sum_{i \in S^*} |\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2 = \max_{S:|S|=L} \|\Phi'_S \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.5})$$

where (a) holds because ϕ_i has unit ℓ_2 -norm and hence $\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2 \leq 1$.

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} &\leq \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}^{k+1}} |\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\min_{i \in \mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}^{k+1}} |\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{1 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \phi_i\|_2^2} \\ &\stackrel{(C.4)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{\delta_{Lk+1}^2}{1 - \delta_{Lk}}\right)^{-1} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.6})$$

Combining (E.5) and (E.6) yields

$$\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{S}^{k+1}} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 \geq \left(1 - \frac{\delta_{Lk+1}^2}{1 - \delta_{Lk}}\right) \max_{S:|S|=L} \|\Phi'_S \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2. \quad (\text{E.7})$$

Finally, using (E.4) and (E.7), we obtain (E.1).

2) *Proof of (E.2):* Since $L \leq K$,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{S:|S|=L} \|\Phi'_S \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 &\geq \frac{L}{K} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{L}{K} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{L}{K} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^k)_{\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2^2 \\ &\stackrel{\text{RIP}}{\geq} \frac{L}{K} (1 - \delta_{K+Lk})^2 \|(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^k)_{\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2^2 \\ &\stackrel{\text{RIP}}{\geq} \frac{L(1 - \delta_{K+Lk})^2}{K(1 + \delta_{K+Lk})} \|\Phi_{\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^k)_{\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{L(1 - \delta_{K+Lk})^2}{K(1 + \delta_{K+Lk})} \|\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.8})$$

where (a) is because $\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{r}^k = \Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^k} (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{y}) = \Phi'_{\mathcal{T}^k} (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^k})' \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}$.

From (E.4) and (E.8),

$$\|\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{r}^{k+1}\|_2^2 \geq \frac{L(1 - \delta_{K+Lk})^2}{K(1 + \delta_L)(1 + \delta_{K+Lk})} \left(1 - \frac{\delta_{Lk+1}^2}{1 - \delta_{Lk}}\right) \|\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2,$$

which implies that $\|\mathbf{r}^{k+1}\|_2^2 \leq \alpha(k, L) \|\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2$ where

$$\alpha(k, L) := 1 - \frac{L(1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk+1}^2)(1 - \delta_{K+Lk})^2}{K(1 + \delta_L)(1 - \delta_{Lk})(1 + \delta_{K+Lk})}. \quad (\text{E.9})$$

Repeating this we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{r}^{k+1}\|_2^2 \leq \prod_{i=0}^{k+1} \alpha(i, L) \|\mathbf{r}^0\|_2^2 \leq (\alpha(k, L))^{k+1} \|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2, \quad (\text{E.10})$$

which completes the proof. ■

APPENDIX F PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Proof: We consider the best K -term approximation $(\mathbf{x}^l)_{\mathcal{T}}$ of \mathbf{x}^l and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathbf{x}^l)_{\mathcal{T}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 &= \|(\mathbf{x}^l)_{\mathcal{T}} - \mathbf{x}^l + \mathbf{x}^l - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \|(\mathbf{x}^l)_{\mathcal{T}} - \mathbf{x}^l\|_2 + \|\mathbf{x}^l - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2\|\mathbf{x}^l - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{\text{RIP}}{\leq} \frac{2\|\Phi(\mathbf{x}^l - \mathbf{x})\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{Ll+K}}} = \frac{2(\|\mathbf{r}^l\|_2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_2)}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{Ll+K}}} \\ &\leq \frac{2(\epsilon + \|\mathbf{v}\|_2)}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{Ll+K}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.1})$$

where (a) is from the triangle inequality and (b) is because $(\mathbf{x}^l)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}$ is the best K -term approximation to \mathbf{x}^l and hence is a better approximation than \mathbf{x} .

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\mathbf{x}^l)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \\
& \stackrel{\text{RIP}}{\geq} \frac{\|\Phi((\mathbf{x}^l)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} - \mathbf{x})\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2K}}} = \frac{\|\Phi(\mathbf{x}^l)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} - \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2K}}} \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \frac{\|\Phi(\mathbf{x}^l)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} - \mathbf{y}\|_2 - \|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2K}}} \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{\|\Phi\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{y}\|_2 - \|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2K}}} = \frac{\|\Phi(\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{v}\|_2 - \|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2K}}} \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \frac{\|\Phi(\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x})\|_2 - 2\|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2K}}} \\
& \stackrel{\text{RIP}}{\geq} \frac{\sqrt{1 + \delta_{2K}}\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 - 2\|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2K}}}, \tag{F.2}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) and (c) are from the triangle inequality and (b) is because $(\mathbf{x}^l)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}$ is supported on $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} = \Phi_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}^\dagger \mathbf{y} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} \|\mathbf{y} - \Phi_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} \mathbf{u}\|_2$ (see Table I).

By combining (F.1) and (F.2) we obtain (29). ■

APPENDIX G PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3

Proof: We first consider the case of $L = 1$. In this case, $\mathcal{T}^K = \mathcal{T}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}^K = \Phi_{\mathcal{T}}^\dagger \mathbf{y}$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 &= \|\mathbf{x} - \Phi_{\mathcal{T}}^\dagger \mathbf{y}\|_2 = \|\Phi_{\mathcal{T}}^\dagger \mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\stackrel{\text{RIP}}{\leq} \frac{\|\Phi_{\mathcal{T}} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}}^\dagger \mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_K}} = \frac{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_K}} \\
&\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_K}}. \tag{G.1}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we prove the case of $L > 1$. Consider the best K -term approximation $(\mathbf{x}^K)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}$ of \mathbf{x}^K and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\mathbf{x}^K)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 &= \|(\mathbf{x}^K)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} - \mathbf{x}^K + \mathbf{x}^K - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \|(\mathbf{x}^K)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} - \mathbf{x}^K\|_2 + \|\mathbf{x}^K - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2\|\mathbf{x}^K - \mathbf{x}\|_2 = 2\|\mathbf{x} - \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^K}^\dagger \mathbf{y}\|_2 \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2\|\Phi_{\mathcal{T}^K}^\dagger \mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\stackrel{\text{RIP}}{\leq} \frac{2\|\Phi_{\mathcal{T}^K} \Phi_{\mathcal{T}^K}^\dagger \mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{|\mathcal{T}^K|}}} \\
&= \frac{2\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^K} \mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{LK}}} \leq \frac{2\|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{LK}}}, \tag{G.2}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is from the triangle inequality, (b) is because $(\mathbf{x}^K)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}$ is the best K -term approximation to \mathbf{x}^K and hence is a better approximation than \mathbf{x} (note that both $(\mathbf{x}^K)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}$ and \mathbf{x} are K -sparse), and (c) is because $\mathcal{T}^K \supseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbf{y} = \Phi_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$.

On the other hand, following the same argument in (F.2), one can show that

$$\|(\mathbf{x}^K)_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \geq \frac{\sqrt{1 + \delta_{2K}}\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 - 2\|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{1 - \delta_{2K}}}. \tag{G.3}$$

Combining (G.2) and (G.3) yields the desired result. ■

APPENDIX H PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4

Proof: In the following, we provide the proofs of (40) and (41), respectively.

1) *Proof of (40):* Since u'_1 is the largest value of $\left\{ \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
u'_1 &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sqrt{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \frac{\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2}} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle^2}{|\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k|}} \\
&= \frac{\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2}{\sqrt{K - \ell'}} = \frac{\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp (\Phi_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v})\|_2}{\sqrt{K - \ell'}} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{x}\|_2 - \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{K - \ell'}}, \tag{H.1}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is due to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (b) is from the triangle inequality. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{v}\|_2 &= \|(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T}})' \mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}((\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T}})' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T}})} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\stackrel{\text{(B.5)}}{=} \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Phi'_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T}})} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5}}{\leq} \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k})} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{1 + \delta_{K+Lk-\ell'}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2. \tag{H.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Also, from (C.2), we have

$$\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{x}\|_2 \geq (1 - \delta_{K+Lk-\ell'}) \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2. \tag{H.3}$$

Using (H.1), (H.3) and (H.2), we obtain (40).

2) *Proof of (41):* Let \mathcal{F}' be the index set corresponding to L largest elements in $\left\{ \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \right\}_{i \in \Omega \setminus (\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}^k)}$. Following (C.3), we can show that

$$\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}'} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \right)^{1/2} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\delta_{Lk+1}^2}{1 - \delta_{Lk}} \right)^{-1/2} \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2. \tag{H.4}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{r}^k\|_2 &= \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp (\Phi_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v})\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{x}\|_2 + \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&= \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 + \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 + \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\quad + \|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \tag{H.5}
\end{aligned}$$

Following (C.6) and (C.7), we have

$$\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \leq \delta_{L+K-\ell'} \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2, \tag{H.6}$$

$$\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \leq \frac{\delta_{L+Lk} \delta_{Lk+K-\ell'}}{1 - \delta_{Lk}} \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2. \tag{H.7}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \mathbf{v}\|_2 &= \|(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{F}'}')' \mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}((\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{F}'}')' \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{F}'}')} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\stackrel{\text{(B.5)}}{=} \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}'} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \Phi_{\mathcal{F}'}')} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5}}{\leq} \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Phi'_{\mathcal{F}' \cup \mathcal{T}^k} \Phi_{\mathcal{F}' \cup \mathcal{T}^k})} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{1 + \delta_{|\mathcal{F}' \cup \mathcal{T}^k|}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 = \sqrt{1 + \delta_{L+Lk}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{H.8}$$

Using (H.4), (H.5), (H.6), (H.7), and (H.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}'} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\frac{1 - \delta_{Lk}}{1 - \delta_{Lk} - \delta_{Lk+1}^2} \right)^{1/2} \left(\|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 \right. \\
&\quad \times \left. \left(\delta_{L+K-\ell'} + \frac{\delta_{L+Lk} \delta_{Lk+K-\ell'}}{1 - \delta_{Lk}} \right) + \sqrt{1 + \delta_{L+Lk}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \right). \tag{H.9}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by noting that v'_L is the L -th largest value in $\left\{ \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2} \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{F}'}$, we have

$$\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}'} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{T}^k}^\perp \phi_i\|_2^2} \right)^{1/2} \geq \sqrt{L} v'_L. \tag{H.10}$$

Using (H.9) and (H.10), we obtain (41). \blacksquare

APPENDIX I PROOF OF (46)

Proof: Rearranging the terms in (45) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{\frac{L}{K-\ell'}} (1 - \delta_{LK}) - \frac{\delta_{LK}}{1 - \delta_{LK}} \left(1 + \frac{\delta_{LK}^2}{1 - \delta_{LK} - \delta_{LK}^2} \right)^{1/2} \\
&> \left(\left(1 + \frac{\delta_{LK}^2}{1 - \delta_{LK} - \delta_{LK}^2} \right)^{1/2} + \sqrt{\frac{L}{K-\ell'}} \right) \frac{\sqrt{1 + \delta_{LK}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2}. \tag{I.1}
\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we will show that (I.1) is guaranteed by (46). First, since

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k}\|_2 &\geq \sqrt{|\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^k|} \min_{j \in \mathcal{T}} |x_j| \stackrel{\text{(30)}}{=} \frac{\kappa \sqrt{K-\ell'} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2}{\sqrt{K}} \\
&\stackrel{\text{RIP}}{\geq} \frac{\kappa \sqrt{K-\ell'} \|\Phi \mathbf{x}\|_2}{\sqrt{K(1 + \delta_{LK})}} \stackrel{\text{(30)}}{=} \frac{\kappa \sqrt{(K-\ell') \text{snr}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{K(1 + \delta_{LK})}},
\end{aligned}$$

by denoting

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta &:= \left(1 + \frac{\delta_{LK}^2}{1 - \delta_{LK} - \delta_{LK}^2} \right)^{1/2}, \\
\gamma &:= \sqrt{\frac{L}{K-\ell'}}, \\
\delta &:= \delta_{LK}, \\
\tau &:= \frac{\sqrt{K}}{\kappa \sqrt{(K-\ell') \text{snr}}},
\end{aligned}$$

we can rewrite (I.1) as

$$\gamma(1 - \delta - (1 + \delta)\tau) > \beta \left(\frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} + (1 + \delta)\tau \right). \tag{I.2}$$

Since (D.2) implies $\beta < \frac{(1-\delta)^2}{1-2\delta}$, it is easily shown that (I.1) is ensured by

$$\gamma > \frac{1 - \delta}{1 - 2\delta} \cdot \frac{\delta + (1 - \delta^2)\tau}{1 - \delta - (1 + \delta)\tau}. \tag{I.3}$$

Moreover, since $1 - \delta^2 \leq 1 + \delta$, (I.3) holds true under $\gamma > \frac{1-\delta}{1-2\delta} \cdot \frac{\delta+(1+\delta)\tau}{1-\delta-(1+\delta)\tau}$, or equivalently,

$$\delta < \frac{1}{1 + \tau} \left(\frac{\gamma}{u + \gamma} - \tau \right) \text{ where } u := \frac{1 - \delta}{1 - 2\delta}. \tag{I.4}$$

Next, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K-\ell'} + 2\sqrt{L}} &\Leftrightarrow \delta < \frac{\gamma}{1 + 2\gamma}, \\
&\Leftrightarrow \frac{1 - \delta}{1 - 2\delta} < 1 + \gamma, \\
&\Leftrightarrow u < 1 + \gamma, \\
&\Leftrightarrow \frac{\gamma}{u + \gamma} > \frac{\gamma}{1 + 2\gamma}. \tag{I.5}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $\delta < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K-\ell'} + 2\sqrt{L}}$, then we can derive from (I.4) and (I.5) that (I.1) holds true whenever

$$\delta < \frac{1}{1 + \tau} \left(\frac{\gamma}{1 + 2\gamma} - \tau \right) = \frac{1}{1 + \tau} \left(\frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K-\ell'} + 2\sqrt{L}} - \tau \right). \tag{I.6}$$

That is

$$\sqrt{\text{snr}} > \frac{(1 + \delta_{LK})(\sqrt{K-\ell'} + \sqrt{L})}{\kappa(\sqrt{L} - (\sqrt{K-\ell'} + 2\sqrt{L})\delta_{LK})\sqrt{K-\ell'}} \sqrt{K}. \tag{I.7}$$

Finally, since $K - \ell' < K$, (I.7) is guaranteed by (46), this completes the proof. \blacksquare

REFERENCES

- [1] D. L. Donoho and P. B. Stark, "Uncertainty principles and signal recovery," *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 906–931, 1989.
- [2] D. L. Donoho, "Compressed sensing," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 1289–1306, Apr. 2006.
- [3] E. J. Candès and T. Tao, "Near-optimal signal recovery from random projections: Universal encoding strategies?," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 12, pp. 5406–5425, Dec. 2006.
- [4] E. J. Candès, J. Romberg, and T. Tao, "Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 489–509, Feb. 2006.
- [5] S. S. Chen, D. L. Donoho, and M. A. Saunders, "Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit," *SIAM review*, pp. 129–159, 2001.
- [6] Y. C. Pati, R. Rezaifar, and P. S. Krishnaprasad, "Orthogonal matching pursuit: Recursive function approximation with applications to wavelet decomposition," in *Proc. 27th Annu. Asilomar Conf. Signals, Systems, and Computers*. IEEE, Nov. Pacific Grove, CA, Nov. 1993, vol. 1, pp. 40–44.
- [7] S. G. Mallat and Z. Zhang, "Matching pursuits with time-frequency dictionaries," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 41, no. 12, pp. 3397–3415, Dec. 1993.
- [8] S. Chen, S. A. Billings, and W. Luo, "Orthogonal least squares methods and their application to non-linear system identification," *International Journal of control*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 1873–1896, 1989.
- [9] D. L. Donoho, I. Drori, Y. Tsaig, and J. L. Starck, "Sparse solution of underdetermined linear equations by stagewise orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 1094–1121, Feb. 2012.
- [10] D. Needell and R. Vershynin, "Signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements via regularized orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 310–316, Apr. 2010.

- [11] J. Wang, S. Kwon, and B. Shim, "Generalized orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 6202–6216, Dec. 2012.
- [12] D. Needell and J. A. Tropp, "Cosamp: Iterative signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate samples," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 301–321, Mar. 2009.
- [13] S. Foucart, "Hard thresholding pursuit: an algorithm for compressive sensing," *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, vol. 49, no. 6, pp. 2543–2563, 2011.
- [14] W. Dai and O. Milenkovic, "Subspace pursuit for compressive sensing signal reconstruction," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 5, pp. 2230–2249, May. 2009.
- [15] R. Chartrand, "Exact reconstruction of sparse signals via nonconvex minimization," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 14, no. 10, pp. 707–710, Oct. 2007.
- [16] R. Chartrand and W. Yin, "Iteratively reweighted algorithms for compressive sensing," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process. (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 3869–3872.
- [17] S. Foucart and M. Lai, "Sparsest solutions of underdetermined linear systems via q -minimization for $0 < q \leq 1$," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 395–407, 2009.
- [18] I. Daubechies, R. DeVore, M. Fornasier, and C. S. Güntürk, "Iteratively reweighted least squares minimization for sparse recovery," *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 1–38, 2010.
- [19] L. Chen and Y. Gu, "The convergence guarantees of a non-convex approach for sparse recovery using regularized least squares," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process. (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 3350–3354.
- [20] J. A. Tropp, "Greed is good: Algorithmic results for sparse approximation," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 2231–2242, Oct. 2004.
- [21] J. A. Tropp and A. C. Gilbert, "Signal recovery from random measurements via orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 12, pp. 4655–4666, Dec. 2007.
- [22] M. A. Davenport and M. B. Wakin, "Analysis of Orthogonal Matching Pursuit using the restricted isometry property," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4395–4401, Sep. 2010.
- [23] T. Zhang, "Sparse recovery with orthogonal matching pursuit under rip," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 9, pp. 6215–6221, Sep. 2011.
- [24] Q. Mo and Y. Shen, "A remark on the restricted isometry property in orthogonal matching pursuit algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3654–3656, Jun. 2012.
- [25] J. Wang and B. Shim, "On the recovery limit of sparse signals using orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 60, no. 9, pp. 4973–4976, Sep. 2012.
- [26] J. Wen, X. Zhu, and D. Li, "Improved bounds on restricted isometry constant for orthogonal matching pursuit," *Electronics Letters*, vol. 49, no. 23, pp. 1487–1489, 2013.
- [27] J. Wang, "Support recovery with orthogonal matching pursuit in the presence of noise," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 63, no. 21, pp. 5868–5877, Nov. 2015.
- [28] L. Rebollo-Neira and D. Lowe, "Optimized orthogonal matching pursuit approach," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 137–140, Apr. 2002.
- [29] S. Foucart, "Stability and robustness of weak orthogonal matching pursuits," in *Recent Advances in Harmonic Analysis and Applications*, pp. 395–405. Springer, 2013.
- [30] C. Soussen, R. Gribonval, J. Idier, and C. Herzet, "Joint k -step analysis of orthogonal matching pursuit and orthogonal least squares," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 3158–3174, May 2013.
- [31] E. Liu and V. N. Temlyakov, "The orthogonal super greedy algorithm and applications in compressed sensing," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 2040–2047, Apr. 2012.
- [32] E. J. Candès and T. Tao, "Decoding by linear programming," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 12, pp. 4203–4215, Dec. 2005.
- [33] T. Blumensath and M. E. Davies, "On the difference between orthogonal matching pursuit and orthogonal least squares," 2007.
- [34] S. Kwon, J. Wang, and B. Shim, "Multipath matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2986–3001, May 2014.
- [35] E. J. Candès, "The restricted isometry property and its implications for compressed sensing," *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, vol. 346, no. 9–10, pp. 589–592, 2008.
- [36] T. T. Cai and L. Wang, "Orthogonal matching pursuit for sparse signal recovery with noise," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 4680–4688, Jul. 2011.
- [37] L. Chang and J. Wu, "An improved RIP-based performance guarantee for sparse signal recovery via orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 9, pp. 5702–5715, Sep. 2014.
- [38] L. Chang and J. Wu, "Achievable angles between two compressed sparse vectors under norm/distance constraints imposed by the restricted isometry property: a plane geometry approach," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 2059–2081, Apt. 2013.
- [39] C. Herzet, C. Soussen, J. Idier, and R. Gribonval, "Exact recovery conditions for sparse representations with partial support information," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 7509–7524, Nov 2013.
- [40] A. K. Fletcher and S. Rangan, "Orthogonal matching pursuit: A brownian motion analysis," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 1010–1021, March 2012.
- [41] R. Wu, W. Huang, and D. Chen, "The exact support recovery of sparse signals with noise via orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 403–406, April 2013.
- [42] E. Candès, M. Rudelson, T. Tao, and R. Vershynin, "Error correction via linear programming," in *IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2005, pp. 668–681.
- [43] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovskii, *Interior-point polynomial algorithms in convex programming*. SIAM, 1994.