

SGL and CLOT Algorithms Exhibit Both Near-Ideal Behavior and Grouping Effect

Mehmet Eren Ahsen and Mathukumalli Vidyasagar *

May 7, 2022

Abstract

In sparse regression, the LASSO algorithm exhibits near-ideal behavior, but not the grouping effect (assigning nearly equal weights to highly correlated features). In the other direction, the Elastic Net (EN) algorithm exhibits the grouping effect but not near-ideal behavior. In a companion paper by the present authors, it is shown that the Sparse Group Lasso (SGL) algorithm exhibits near-ideal behavior provided the maximum size of the groups is sufficiently small. In this paper it is shown that the SGL algorithm exhibits near-ideal behavior without any restrictions on the group sizes. In addition, it is also shown that the SGL algorithm assigns nearly equal weights to highly correlated features within the same group, but not necessarily to highly correlated features in distinct groups. As a corollary, the algorithm resulting from choosing the entire feature set as a single group, referred to here as CLOT (Combined L-One and Two) also exhibits both near-ideal behavior as well as the grouping effect. The CLOT algorithm is applied to predict the IC50 values of 116 chemical compounds on 72 lung cancer cell lines. The results show that CLOT achieves greater accuracy than EN in 105 out of the 116 regression problems, and greater accuracy than LASSO in every single regression problem. Finally, some results on compressibility in the CLOT norm are derived, which intermediate between two sets of known results, namely compressibility with respect to the ℓ_1 -norm and incompressibility with respect to the ℓ_2 -norm.

1 Introduction

The problem under study in the present paper is to reconstruct a high-dimensional but sparse (or nearly sparse) vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ from a measurement vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ of the form

$$y = Ax + \eta, \quad (1)$$

where $m \ll n$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a measurement error. Roughly speaking, if the matrix A is specified as a part of the problem formulation, such a problem is called “sparse regression,” whereas if one has the freedom to choose the matrix A , then the problem is called “compressed sensing.” The LASSO algorithm [1] and the Elastic Net (EN) algorithm [2] are two very popular algorithms for sparse regression. It is known that the EN algorithm has a very desirable property known as the “grouping effect,” whereby highly correlated features are assigned roughly similar weights. In contrast, when LASSO is presented with an A matrix where several features are highly correlated, it just chooses one of the features and ignores the rest; this is a point in favor of EN vis-a-vis LASSO. On the other

*Erik Jonsson School of Engineering and Computer Science, University of Texas at Dallas, 800 W. Campbell Road, Richardson, TX 75080. Email: {ahsen,m.vidyasagar}@utdallas.edu. This research was supported by the National Science Foundation under Award #ECCS-1306630 and the Cecil & Ida Green Endowment at UT Dallas.

hand, in compressed sensing, it is known that LASSO has a property known as “near-ideal behavior” [3, 4, 5], whereas EN is not known to have this property. Thus, among two widely used algorithms and two highly desirable properties, each algorithm possesses one of the desirable properties and fails to exhibit the other. In the case of other proposed alternatives to LASSO such as Group LASSO (GL) [6] and Sparse Group LASSO (SGL) [7, 8], neither property is known to hold.

In a companion paper by the present authors [9], it is shown that the GL and SGL algorithms also possess near-ideal behavior *provided the group sizes are sufficiently small*. One of the principal objectives of the present paper is to establish that the SGL (which contains GL as a special case) exhibits both near-ideal behavior as well as the grouping effect, *with no restrictions on the sizes of the groups*. Thus the SGL algorithm achieves both desirable properties in sparse regression and compressed sensing. As a corollary, if the entire feature set is treated as a single group, the resulting algorithm is a variant of the EN algorithm, which is referred to here as CLOT (Combined L-One and Two). Therefore CLOT also displays both near-ideal behavior and the grouping effect.

The CLOT algorithm was applied to the problem of predicting the IC50 values of 116 chemical compounds on 72 lung cancer cell lines. This is effectively a collection of 116 sparse regression problems, in which one starts with 19,464 genes, and IC50 values (some real numbers) for each of 116 compounds. All 116 regression problems are solved using CLOT, the Elastic Net (EN), and the LASSO algorithms. The following conclusions could be drawn:

- In all 116 problems, the average percentage error on the set of 72 samples achieved by the CLOT algorithm was lower than the error achieved by LASSO.
- In all 116 problems, the average percentage error on the set of 72 samples achieved by the EN algorithm was lower than the error achieved by LASSO.
- In 105 out of 116 problems, the average percentage error on the set of 72 samples achieved by the CLOT algorithm was lower than the error achieved by EN.
- There was no discernible pattern with respect to the number of features used by CLOT vis-a-vis EN.
- LASSO used substantially fewer features than CLOT, but fared far worse in terms of accuracy.

These conclusions suffice to demonstrate that the CLOT algorithm is a viable alternative to the EN and LASSO algorithms.

Finally, we study compressibility with respect to the CLOT norm. It is known [10] that compressibility is possible with respect to the ℓ_1 -norm, but not with respect to the ℓ_2 -norm [11]. We present some new results that intermediate between these, in that our results contain both the compressibility results of [10] and the incompressibility results of [11] as special cases.

2 Sparse Regression

Suppose y is given as in (1) where A is a known given matrix, and it is desired to estimate x . When $n > m$, the problem is under-determined, and there are infinitely many solutions to the problem. One possibility is to find a (or the) solution of $y = Az$ that has the fewest number of nonzero components. It is common to use the symbol $\|x\|_0$ to denote the number of nonzero components of the vector x , and to refer to $\|\cdot\|_0$ as the “ ℓ_0 -norm,” even though this quantity is not a norm. Unfortunately, this approach is impractical, because it is shown in [12] that the problem

$$\min_z \|z\|_0 \text{ s.t. } y = Az \tag{2}$$

is NP-hard. Most of the tractable approaches for choosing a solution to (2) can be captured by the general problem formulation

$$\hat{x} = \underset{z}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|y - Az\|_2^2 + l\mathcal{R}(z), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ is a term known as the regularizer, and l is a weight or Lagrange multiplier. Different choices of the regularizing term correspond to different algorithms and lead to different estimates \hat{x} . In the sequel, we will use the notation \mathcal{R}_{Alg} and \hat{x}_{Alg} to denote the regularizer used by and the estimate generated by a specific algorithm.

A significant development in sparse regression is the introduction of the Lasso algorithm in [1], wherein

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Lasso}}(z) = \|z\|_1. \quad (4)$$

Under mild conditions, the estimate returned by the Lasso algorithm has no more than m nonzero components; see [13]. Note that $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the convex relaxation of $\|\cdot\|_0$. Thus one can think of Lasso as the minimal convex program corresponding to the intractable problem in (2). The main disadvantage of the Lasso is that the subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ for which \hat{x}_{Lasso} has nonzero components can be very sensitive to the noise term η . In particular, if several columns of the measurement matrix A are highly correlated, then Lasso will choose one of the columns and ignore the rest. There are applications such as biology where this property is not desirable. In biological data sets, the measurement matrix A corresponds to the expression levels of several genes. When a group of genes acts in concert, the corresponding columns of A will be highly correlated. It would be preferable to assign roughly similar weights to all such genes, instead of choosing just one and ignoring the rest. Partly to remedy this shortcoming, the Elastic Net (EN) algorithm is introduced in [2], via the choice

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{EN}}(z) = (1 - \mu)\|z\|_1 + \mu\|z\|_2^2, \quad (5)$$

where $\mu \in [0, 1]$ is an adjustable parameter. Note that EN provides a continuum between ridge regression and Lasso, in that EN reduces to Lasso when $\mu = 0$ and to ridge regression when $\mu = 1$. It is shown in [2, Theorem 1] that, if two columns of A are highly correlated, then the corresponding components of \hat{x}_{EN} are roughly equal; this is referred to as the “grouping effect” in [2]. On the other hand, there is no *a priori* upper bound on the number of nonzero components of \hat{x}_{EN} .

Over the years some variants of Lasso have been proposed, such as the Group Lasso (GL) [6] and the Sparse Group Lasso (SGL) [8]. In the GL algorithm, the index set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ is partitioned into l disjoint sets G_1, \dots, G_g , and the regularizer is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{GL}}(z) = \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{\|z_{G_i}\|_2}{\sqrt{|G_i|}}, \quad (6)$$

where z_{G_i} denotes the projection of the vector z onto the components in G_i , and $|G_i|$ denotes the cardinality of the set G_i . Note that if $l = n$ and every set G_i is a singleton $\{i\}$, then GL reduces to Lasso. The main idea behind GL is that one is less concerned about the number of nonzero components of \hat{x} , and more concerned about the number of distinct groups containing these nonzero components. Therefore GL attempts to choose an estimate \hat{x} that has nonzero entries in as few distinct sets as possible. A further refinement of GL is the sparse group Lasso (SGL), in which the group structure is as before, but the regularizer is now defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{SGL}}(z) = \sum_{i=1}^l (1 - \mu)\|z_{G_i}\|_1 + \mu\|z_{G_i}\|_2, \quad (7)$$

where as before $\mu \in [0, 1]$. Note that if $\mu = 0$, then SGL also reduces to Lasso. In principle, SGL tries to choose an estimate \hat{x} that not only has nonzero components within as few groups as possible, but within those groups, has as few nonzero components as possible. There is empirical evidence to support these beliefs about the behavior of the GL and SGL algorithms. However, so far as the authors are aware, there are no results on the grouping effect for either of these algorithms. Finally, note that a very general framework for estimation problems is provided in [14], in which the least squares error term is replaced by a general loss function, and the regularizer is any norm. In this context, observe that the regularizer corresponding to the EN algorithm is *not a norm*, though it is a convex function. Thus the theory in [14] does not directly apply to EN.

We are now in a position to introduce the Modified Elastic Net (CLOT) algorithm, which corresponds to the regularizer

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{CLOT}}(z) = (1 - \mu)\|z\|_1 + \mu\|z\|_2 =: \|z\|_\mu. \quad (8)$$

Observe that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{CLOT}}(\cdot)$ is a special case of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{SGL}}(\cdot)$ if the number of groups l equals one, in which case the one and only group is the entire feature set $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Of course, such a choice can hardly be called “sparse.” Also, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{CLOT}}(\cdot)$ can be obtained from $\mathcal{R}_{\text{EN}}(\cdot)$ by replacing the term $\|\cdot\|_2^2$ by $\|\cdot\|_2$. However, as shown in the sequel, this seemingly small modification leads to some improvements in the theoretical properties.

3 Near-Ideal Behavior

Thus far we have discussed the regression problem, where the measurement matrix A and the noise-corrupted measurement y are both given, and the objective is to find a sparse vector \hat{x} such that $A\hat{x}$ nearly equals y . Now we change tacks and discuss the problem of compressed sensing, specifically the near-ideal behavior of some algorithms. In this case there is a “true but unknown” sparse (or nearly sparse) vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the objective is to choose the measurement matrix A (which is sometimes also called a “design matrix”), such that one can recover x from its noise-corrupted measurement y given by (1). The key point to observe is that $m \ll n$, so that the number of measurements is far less than the dimension of x . Methods for choosing the matrix A , and for recovering x from y , form the core of the rapidly emerging field of compressed sensing. In this section we briefly review some of the relevant results. For this purpose, we begin by introducing the notation used throughout the paper.

If $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and Λ is a subset of $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, n\}$, the symbol $x_\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the vector such that $(x_\Lambda)_i = x_i$ if $i \in \Lambda$, and $(x_\Lambda)_i = 0$ if $i \notin \Lambda$. For any vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{supp}(x)$ denotes its support set

$$\text{supp}(x) = \{i \in \mathcal{N} : x_i \neq 0\}.$$

The **set of k -sparse vectors** Σ_k is defined as

$$\Sigma_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\text{supp}(x)| \leq k\}.$$

For each vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, integer $k < n$, and norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^n , the symbol $\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|)$ denotes the **k -sparsity index** of x , defined as the distance from x to Σ_k . In symbols

$$\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|) = \inf\{\|x - z\| : z \in \Sigma_k\}. \quad (9)$$

In the sequel we assume two different noise models. In the first model we assume the measurement noise η satisfies $\|\eta\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for a known constant ϵ . If η is random, one can assume that the above inequality holds with some probability ζ , which is a bound on the tail probability of the random

variable η . Using this noise model most approaches to compressed sensing can be incorporated in the following set-up: To estimate the unknown vector x , define \hat{x} to be the solution of the following optimization problem:

$$\hat{x} = \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{R}(z) \text{ s.t. } \|y - Az\|_2 \leq \epsilon, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{R}(z)$ is a regularizer, which is assumed to be convex.

Our second noise model assumes that $\|A^T \eta\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$. This type of noise model has been considered in the formulation of the so-called Dantzig Selector [15]. The corresponding optimization problem is given as

$$\hat{x} = \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{R}(z) \text{ s.t. } \|A^T y - Az\|_\infty \leq \epsilon, \quad (11)$$

Next, we define the notion of near ideal behavior for an algorithm in the form of (10) or (11).

Definition 1 *The algorithm described in (10) or (11) for estimating x is said to be **near ideal** or to show **near-ideal behavior**, if there exist universal constants C_0 and C_1 that might depend on the matrix A but not on x or η such that*

$$\|\hat{x} - x\|_2 \leq C_0 \sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1) + C_1 \epsilon. \quad (12)$$

The rationale for the above definition is derived from earlier results in [4, 3, 5]. It is shown in [4] and re-derived in [5] that using the regularizer $\mathcal{R}(z) = \|z\|_1$ leads to a bound of the form (12). However, this property is not given a name as such in these references. In [3], the phrase “near-ideal behavior” is used, but the set-up and the result derived are somewhat different. Therefore we have borrowed the terminology from [3] and the relationship from [4] to define any algorithm as exhibiting near-ideal behavior if it satisfies (12). Note that the following properties are ready consequences of near-ideal behavior.

- If $x \in \Sigma_k$, then $\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1) = 0$, and (12) becomes

$$\|\hat{x} - x\|_2 \leq C_1 \epsilon.$$

Within a universal constant, this is the same error bound achieved by an “oracle” that knows the support set of the vector x . This point is explained in [5].

- If the measurements are error-free, then $\epsilon = 0$, and (12) becomes

$$\|\hat{x} - x\|_2 \leq C_0 \sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1).$$

Now \hat{x} need not be k -sparse. However, it is a known vector, so that by retaining the k largest components by magnitude, one can obtain a k -sparse vector \tilde{x} such that

$$\|\tilde{x} - \hat{x}\|_2 = \sigma_k(\hat{x}, \|\cdot\|_2).$$

Combining these two inequalities and using the triangle inequality leads to

$$\|\tilde{x} - x\|_2 \leq \sigma_k(\hat{x}, \|\cdot\|_2) + C_0 \sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1).$$

Thus we can construct a k -sparse approximation to the unknown vector x with an *a priori* upper bound on the approximation error.

- Finally, if the unknown vector x is k -sparse and the measurements are error-free, then (12) shows that $\hat{x} = x$. Thus, if the algorithm is near ideal, then it is possible to achieve perfect recovery of unknown k -sparse vectors.

Note that the definition (12) contains a mixture of the ℓ_1 - and ℓ_2 -norms. It is known [11] that if $\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1)$ on the right side of (12) is changed to $\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_2)$, then $m \sim n$, so that no compression is possible. We shall return to this point in Section 4.3.

In the compressed sensing literature, near-ideal behavior of the algorithm (10) is achieved by ensuring that the measurement matrix A satisfies a variety of properties, such as the restricted isometry property (RIP) [10] and the coherence property [3]. The focus in this paper is on the RIP property, which is defined next.

Definition 2 Suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Then we say that A satisfies the **Restricted Isometry Property (RIP)** of order k with constant δ_k if

$$(1 - \delta_k)\|u\|_2^2 \leq \|Au\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta_k)\|u\|_2^2, \quad \forall u \in \Sigma_k, \quad (13)$$

where Σ_k denotes the set of all $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|\text{supp}(u)| \leq k$.

Now we state a well-known result in compressed sensing, which provides a point of comparison with the results proved in the present paper.

Theorem 1 ([4, Theorem 1.2], [5, Theorem 1.9]) Suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ satisfies the RIP of order $2k$ with constant $\delta_{2k} < \sqrt{2} - 1$, and that $y = Ax + \eta$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\|\eta\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. Define

$$\hat{x} = \underset{z \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{argmin}} \|z\|_1 \text{ s.t. } \|y - Az\|_2 \leq \epsilon. \quad (14)$$

Then

$$\|\hat{x} - x\|_2 \leq C_0 \frac{\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1)}{\sqrt{k}} + C_1 \epsilon, \quad (15)$$

where

$$C_0 = 2 \frac{1 + (\sqrt{2} - 1)\delta_{2k}}{1 - (\sqrt{2} + 1)\delta_{2k}} = 2 \frac{1 + \alpha}{1 - \alpha}, \quad (16)$$

$$C_1 = \frac{4\sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}}}{1 - (\sqrt{2} + 1)\delta_{2k}} = \frac{4\sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}}}{(1 - \delta_{2k})(1 - \alpha)}, \quad (17)$$

with

$$\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{2}\delta_{2k}}{1 - \delta_{2k}}. \quad (18)$$

The formulas for C_0, C_1 are written slightly differently from those in [5, Theorem 1.9] but are easily shown to be equivalent to them. Also, C_1 is called C_2 in [5].

The optimization problem analyzed in Theorem 1 is

$$\min_z \|z\|_1 \text{ s.t. } \|y - Az\|_2 \leq \epsilon. \quad (19)$$

The Lagrangian formulation of this optimization problem is

$$\min_z \|z\|_1 + l(\|y - Az\|_2 - \epsilon),$$

where l is the Lagrange multiplier. Dividing through by l leads to

$$\min_z \|y - Az\|_2 + l' \|z\|_1, \quad (20)$$

which is the Lasso algorithm given in (4), in Lagrangian form. Therefore, Theorem 1 implies that the Lasso algorithm exhibits near-ideal behavior. As mentioned above, this implies that if we have noise free measurement such that $\epsilon = 0$, then (15) implies that we can exactly recover any k -sparse vector x by solving an ℓ_1 -norm minimization problem. This result is established in [10]; see also [16].

4 Main Theoretical Results

This section contains the main theoretical results of the paper. First it is shown in Section 4.1 that the SGL exhibits near ideal behavior, *without any restrictions* on the sizes of the groups G_1, \dots, G_g into which the feature set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ is partitioned. In a companion paper [9], the present authors derive some very general results on near ideal behavior when the ℓ_1 -norm is replaced by an arbitrary γ -decomposable norm. These results imply, among others, that the SGL algorithm exhibits near-ideal behavior *provided* each group is smaller than k in cardinality, and thus do not apply to the problem under study. It follows as a corollary that CLOT also exhibits near-ideal behavior. Next, it is shown in Section 4.2 that the SGL algorithm assigns nearly equal weights to highly correlated features *within the same group*, though not necessarily to highly correlated features from different groups. It follows as a corollary that CLOT assigns nearly equal weights to highly correlated features. This result is to be compared with [2, Theorem 1]. Finally, it is known [11] that if $\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1)$ on the right side of (12) is changed to $\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_2)$, then $m \sim n$, so that no compression is possible. On the other hand, the results of [10, 4] clearly show that compression *is* possible with the ℓ_1 -norm. This raises the question as to whether compressibility is possible with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_\mu$ as defined in (8), which is a convex combination of the ℓ_1 - and ℓ_2 -norms. Some results are derived in Section 4.3 that contain both the compressibility results of [4] and the incompressibility results of [11] as special cases.

4.1 Near Ideal Behaviour of the Sparse Group Lasso Algorithm

The main result in this subsection is Theorem 2, stating that the SGL algorithm also exhibits near-ideal behavior. It follows as a corollary that the CLOT also exhibits near-ideal behavior. Note that when $\mu = 0$ the SGL algorithm reduces to Lasso. Moreover, the bounds in Theorem 2 reduce to those in Theorem 1 when $\mu = 0$. Therefore, our results are a true generalization of Theorem 1. In order to facilitate the presentation of 2, we introduce some additional Let \mathcal{G} denote a specific partition of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into the sets G_1, \dots, G_g , and let the SGL norm $\|z\|_{\mu, \mathcal{G}}$ and CLOT norm $\|z\|_\mu$ be defined as

$$\|z\|_{\mu, \mathcal{G}} := \sum_{i=1}^g [(1 - \mu)\|z_{G_i}\|_1 + \mu\|z_{G_i}\|_2], \quad (21)$$

$$\|z\|_\mu := (1 - \mu)\|z\|_1 + \mu\|z\|_2, \quad (22)$$

Note that (22) is the same as (8). Further, define

$$\theta := 2^{\lceil \lg g \rceil / 2}, \gamma := \frac{\mu\theta}{\sqrt{k}(1 - \mu)}. \quad (23)$$

where \lg denotes \log_2 . Note that $\theta \leq \sqrt{g}$. So if desired, a more conservative bound can be obtained by replacing θ by \sqrt{g} throughout. We now state the main result of this section under the assumption that $\|\eta\|_2 \leq \epsilon$.

Theorem 2 Suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ satisfies the RIP of order $2k$ with constant δ_{2k} , and that $y = Ax + \eta$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\|\eta\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. Define

$$\hat{x}_{SGL} := \underset{z}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|z\|_{\mu, G} \text{ s.t. } \|y - Az\|_2 \leq \epsilon. \quad (24)$$

Define α as in (31), and suppose that $\delta_{2k} < \sqrt{2} - 1$, which guarantees that $\alpha < 1$. Suppose μ and δ_{2k} together satisfy

$$\gamma < \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 + \alpha}. \quad (25)$$

Then

$$\|\hat{x}_{SGL} - x\|_2 \leq C_{0, \mu, G} \frac{\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1)}{\sqrt{k}} + C_{2, \mu, G} \epsilon, \quad (26)$$

where

$$C_{0, \mu, G} = \frac{2(1 + \alpha)}{1 - \alpha - (1 + \alpha)\gamma}, \quad (27)$$

$$C_{2, \mu, G} = \frac{4\sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}}}{(1 - \delta_{2k})(1 - \alpha - (1 + \alpha)\gamma)}. \quad (28)$$

It is easy to verify that if $\mu = 0$, then $\gamma = 0$, and the expressions in (27) and (28) reduce to those in (16) and (17) respectively.

The proof of Theorem 2 makes use of three simple lemmas from [5], which are restated here for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 1 ([5, Lemma A.2]) Suppose u, v are orthogonal vectors. Then

$$\|u\|_2 + \|v\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2}\|u + v\|_2. \quad (29)$$

Lemma 2 ([5, Lemma A.4]) Let $\Lambda_0 \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ be arbitrary, with $|\Lambda_0| \leq k$. For $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $s = \lceil (n - |\Lambda_0|)/k \rceil$, and define index sets $\Lambda_i, i = 1, \dots, s$ as follows; Λ_1 consists of the index set corresponding to the k largest components by magnitude of u in Λ_0^c , and in general, Λ_{j+1} consists of the index set corresponding to the k largest components of u in $(\cup_{i=0}^j \Lambda_i)^c$. Note that Λ_s could have fewer than k elements. With this notation, we have that

$$\sum_{j=2}^s \|u_{\Lambda_j}\|_2 \leq \frac{\|u_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}}.$$

Lemma 3 ([5, Lemma 1.3]) Suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ satisfies the RIP of order $2k$ with constant δ_{2k} . Let $\Lambda_0 \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ be arbitrary, with $|\Lambda_0| \leq k$, and let $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be given. Define Λ_1 to be the index set corresponding to the k largest components by magnitude of $h_{\Lambda_0^c}$, and let $\Lambda = \Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1$. Then

$$\|h_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \alpha \frac{\|h_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}} + \beta \frac{|\langle Ah_\Lambda, Ah \rangle|}{\|h_\Lambda\|_2}, \quad (30)$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{2}\delta_{2k}}{1 - \delta_{2k}}, \beta = \frac{1}{1 - \delta_{2k}}. \quad (31)$$

Proof of Theorem 2: In order to have more compact formulas, we introduce two new symbols, namely

$$a = \frac{2}{\sqrt{k}}\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1), b = 2\epsilon \frac{\sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}}}{1 - \delta_{2k}}. \quad (32)$$

Lemma 1 states that if u and v in \mathbb{R}^n are orthogonal, then

$$\sqrt{2}\|u + v\|_2 \geq \|u\|_2 + \|v\|_2,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\|u + v\|_2 \geq 2^{-1/2}(\|u\|_2 + \|v\|_2).$$

For the purposes of this proof, it is necessary to extend the above inequality to the situation where $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is written as the sum of g orthogonal vectors z^1 through z^g . We do this iteratively. We group the first $g/2$ vectors and the last $g/2$ vectors and apply the above inequality, and subdivide again and repeat until we finally wind up with just one vector per group. If g is an exact power of 2, then we can do this $\lg g$ times, whereas if g is not an exact power of 2, then after $\lg g$ steps we will have some groups with two entries. We can apply the above inequality to those groups and throw away the factor of $\sqrt{2}$, thus leading to the following observation: If $z = \sum_{j=1}^g z^j$ and the vectors are pairwise orthogonal, then

$$\|z\|_2 \geq 2^{-\lfloor \lg g \rfloor / 2} \sum_{j=1}^g \|z^j\|_2,$$

or equivalently

$$\theta \|z\|_2 \geq \sum_{j=1}^g \|z^j\|_2. \quad (33)$$

Define $h = \hat{x}_{\text{SGL}} - x$. Let Λ_0 denote the index set corresponding to the k largest components of x in magnitude, Λ_1 to be the index set corresponding to the k largest components of $h_{\Lambda_0^c}$ in magnitude, and $\Lambda = \Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1$. By assumption, we have that

$$\|x\|_{\mu, \mathcal{G}} \geq \|\hat{x}_{\text{SGL}}\|_{\mu, \mathcal{G}} = \|x + h\|_{\mu, \mathcal{G}}.$$

Now write this as

$$(1 - \mu)\|x\|_1 + \mu \sum_{j=1}^g \|x^j\|_2 \geq (1 - \mu)\|x + h\|_1 + \mu \sum_{j=1}^g \|x^j + h^j\|_2. \quad (34)$$

Now observe that, by the triangle inequality, we have that

$$\|h^j\|_2 \geq \|x^j\|_2 - \|x^j + h^j\|_2,$$

and as a consequence

$$\sum_{j=1}^l \|h^j\|_2 \geq \sum_{j=1}^l [\|x^j\|_2 - \|x^j + h^j\|_2].$$

Combining this with (33) gives

$$\theta \|h\|_2 \geq \sum_{j=1}^l [\|x^j\|_2 - \|x^j + h^j\|_2].$$

Substituting this into (34) leads to

$$(1 - \mu)\|x\|_1 + \mu\theta\|h\|_2 \geq (1 - \mu)\|x + h\|_1. \quad (35)$$

The next several manipulations closely mimic those in the proof of [5, Lemma 1.6]. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x + h\|_1 &= \|x_{\Lambda_0} + h_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + \|x_{\Lambda_0^c} + h_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 \\ &\geq \|x_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 - \|h_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 - \|x_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 + \|h_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\|x\|_1 = \|x_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + \|x_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1.$$

Substituting these two relationships into (35) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \mu)[\|x_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + \|x_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1] + \mu\theta\|h\|_2 \\ \geq (1 - \mu)[\|x_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 - \|h_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 \\ - \|x_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 + \|h_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1]. \end{aligned}$$

Now the term $(1 - \mu)\|x_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1$ is common to both sides and cancels. Rearranging, noting that $\|x_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1$ equals $\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1)$, and dividing through by $1 - \mu$ gives

$$\|h_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 \leq \|h_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + 2\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1) + \frac{\mu\theta}{1 - \mu}\|h\|_2. \quad (36)$$

So from Lemma 2, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 &= \left\| \sum_{j=2}^s h_{\Lambda_j} \right\|_2 \leq \sum_{j=2}^s \|h_{\Lambda_j}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \|h_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \|h_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + a + \gamma\|h\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where a is defined in (32) and γ is defined in (23). Now we make two observations. First, by Schwarz' inequality,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \|h_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 \leq \|h_{\Lambda_0}\|_2 \leq \|h_{\Lambda}\|_2.$$

Second, by the triangle inequality,

$$\|h\|_2 \leq \|h_{\Lambda}\|_2 + \|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2.$$

Substituting both observations into (37) leads to

$$\|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 \leq \|h_{\Lambda}\|_2 + \gamma[\|h_{\Lambda}\|_2 + \|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2] + a.$$

Collecting all the unknown quantities on the left side leads to

$$-(1 + \gamma)\|h_{\Lambda}\|_2 + (1 - \gamma)\|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 \leq a. \quad (38)$$

This is the first of two inequalities that we need. The second inequality is obtained from Lemma 3, which states that

$$\|h_{\Lambda}\|_2 \leq \alpha \frac{\|h_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}} + \beta \frac{|\langle Ah_{\Lambda}, Ah \rangle|}{\|h_{\Lambda}\|_2}, \quad (39)$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{2}\delta_{2k}}{1 - \delta_{2k}}, \beta = \frac{1}{1 - \delta_{2k}}.$$

At this stage, several simplifications are possible. First, both x and \hat{x}_{SGL} belong to $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(y)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ah\|_2 &= \|Ax - A\hat{x}_{\text{SGL}}\|_2 \\ &= \|Ax - y - (A\hat{x}_{\text{SGL}} - y)\|_2 \\ &\leq \|Ax - y\|_2 + \|(A\hat{x}_{\text{SGL}} - y)\|_2 \\ &\leq 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Second, since $h_\Lambda \in \Sigma_{2k}$, the RIP implies that

$$\|Ah_\Lambda\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta_{2k})\|h_\Lambda\|_2^2,$$

or equivalently

$$\|Ah_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}}\|h_\Lambda\|_2.$$

Therefore, from Schwarz' inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \frac{|\langle Ah_\Lambda, Ah \rangle|}{\|h_\Lambda\|_2} &\leq \beta \frac{\|Ah_\Lambda\|_2 \cdot \|Ah\|_2}{\|h_\Lambda\|_2} \\ &\leq 2\beta\epsilon\sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}} \\ &= b, \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where b is defined in (32). Substituting this into (39) gives

$$\|h_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \alpha \frac{\|h_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}} + b. \tag{41}$$

Now we work on the term $\|h_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1$. It is already known from (36) that

$$\|h_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 \leq \|h_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + 2\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1) + \frac{\mu\theta}{1 - \mu}\|h\|_2.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\|h_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\|h_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + a + \gamma\|h\|_2 \\ &\leq \|h_{\Lambda_0}\|_2 + a + \gamma\|h\|_2 \\ &\leq \|h_\Lambda\|_2 + a + \gamma\|h\|_2 \\ &\leq \|h_\Lambda\|_2 + a + \gamma[\|h_\Lambda\|_2 + \|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2]. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into (41) leads to

$$\|h_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \alpha\|h_\Lambda\|_2 + \alpha a + \alpha\gamma[\|h_\Lambda\|_2 + \|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2] + b.$$

Collecting all terms involving h on the left side leads to the second inequality, namely

$$(1 - \alpha - \alpha\gamma)\|h_\Lambda\|_2 - \alpha\gamma\|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 \leq \alpha a + b. \tag{42}$$

The two inequalities (42) and (38) can be written compactly as

$$M \begin{bmatrix} \|h_\Lambda\|_2 \\ \|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 \end{bmatrix} \leq \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} a + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} b \right\}, \quad (43)$$

where the coefficient matrix M is given by

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \alpha - \alpha\gamma & -\alpha\gamma \\ -(1 + \gamma) & 1 - \gamma \end{bmatrix}$$

To complete the proof, observe that

$$\det(M) = 1 - \alpha - \gamma - \alpha\gamma =: \Delta.$$

Hence if $\Delta > 0$, then

$$M^{-1} = \frac{1}{\Delta} \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \gamma & \alpha\gamma \\ 1 + \gamma & 1 - \alpha - \alpha\gamma \end{bmatrix}$$

is strictly positive. Therefore we can multiply both sides of (43) by M^{-1} , which leads to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \|h_\Lambda\|_2 \\ \|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 \end{bmatrix} \leq \frac{1}{\Delta} \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \gamma & \alpha\gamma \\ 1 + \gamma & 1 - \alpha - \alpha\gamma \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} a + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} b \right\},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|h\|_2 &\leq \|h_\Lambda\|_2 + \|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 = [1 \quad 1] \begin{bmatrix} \|h_\Lambda\|_2 \\ \|h_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\Delta} [1 \quad 1] \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \gamma & \alpha\gamma \\ 1 + \gamma & 1 - \alpha - \alpha\gamma \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} a + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} b \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\Delta} [2 \quad 1 - \alpha] \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} a + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} b \right\} \\ &= \frac{(1 + \alpha)a + 2b}{\Delta}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the same as (26). □

The near-ideal behavior of the CLOT algorithm is simply a corollary of Theorem 2.

Corollary 1 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2 define*

$$\hat{x}_{CLOT} := \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(y)} \|z\|_\mu, \quad (44)$$

where $\|z\|_\mu$ is the CLOT norm defined in (22). Suppose μ and δ_{2k} together satisfy

$$\phi < \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 + \alpha}, \quad (45)$$

where

$$\phi = \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{k}(1 - \mu)}. \quad (46)$$

Then

$$\|\hat{x}_{CLOT} - x\|_2 \leq C_{0,\mu} \frac{\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1)}{\sqrt{k}} + C_{2,\mu}\epsilon, \quad (47)$$

where

$$C_{0,\mu} = \frac{2(1+\alpha)}{1-\alpha-(1+\alpha)\phi}, \quad (48)$$

$$C_{2,\mu} = \frac{4\sqrt{1+\delta_{2k}}}{(1-\delta_{2k})(1-\alpha-(1+\alpha)\phi)}. \quad (49)$$

Proof: Note that CLOT is a special case of SGL with one single group of order n . Therefore we can set $g = 1$ in Theorem 2, so that θ and γ defined in (23) can be calculated as

$$\theta = 1, \gamma = \phi = \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{k}(1-\mu)}.$$

Hence the bounds in (47) follow from (26) by setting $\gamma = \phi$. \square

From (25) we see that the larger the number of groups (the integer g), the larger the value of γ , and thus the more restrictive the condition (26). Thus the best chance of satisfying (26) is to choose just one group, that is, to use CLOT instead of SGL. This gives a justification for using CLOT instead of SGL. On the other hand, in real life applications such as biology one may prefer SGL to CLOT and group features belonging to the same pathway together in order to have better insights of the underlying biological mechanism. Corollary 1 shows a clear advantage of CLOT over the EN, as it is not known whether or not the latter exhibits near ideal behavior. In the next section we will show that CLOT also shows the grouping effect, mimicking a desirable property of the EN.

Next we consider the same problem under the second noise model. Hence, we assume that

$$\|A^T \eta\|_\infty \leq \epsilon. \quad (50)$$

Next Theorem provides a bound on the reconstruction error of an unknown sparse signal using the SGL norm under the above noise model.

Theorem 3 *Suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ satisfies the RIP of order $2k$ with constant δ_{2k} , and that $y = Ax + \eta$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\|A^T \eta\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$. Define*

$$\hat{x}_{SGL} := \underset{z}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|z\|_{\mu,G} \text{ s.t. } \|A^T(y - Az)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon. \quad (51)$$

Again let α be as in (31), and suppose that $\delta_{2k} < \sqrt{2} - 1$. Suppose μ and δ_{2k} together satisfy

$$\gamma < \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}. \quad (52)$$

Then

$$\|\hat{x}_{SGL} - x\|_2 \leq C_{0,\mu,G} \frac{\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1)}{\sqrt{k}} + C_{3,\mu,G} \epsilon, \quad (53)$$

where

$$C_{0,\mu,G} = \frac{2(1+\alpha)}{1-\alpha-(1+\alpha)\gamma}, \quad (54)$$

$$C_{3,\mu,G} = \frac{4\sqrt{2k}}{(1-\delta_{2k})(1-\alpha-(1+\alpha)\gamma)} \quad (55)$$

Proof: The proof of this theorem mimics that of Theorem 2. Therefore, unless otherwise told, we will use the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 2. Suppose x is the unknown vector we would like to recover. Due to the assumption that $\|A^T \eta\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$, we have

$$\|A^T(y - Ax)\|_\infty = \|A^T \eta\|_\infty \leq \epsilon.$$

Therefore, x is a feasible point of the optimization problem given in (51), which implies that $\|\hat{x}_{\text{SGL}}\|_{\mu, G} \leq \|x\|_{\mu, G}$. Again let $h = x - \hat{x}_{\text{SGL}}$, and notice that

$$\|A^T Ah\|_\infty \leq \|A^T(Ax - y)\|_\infty + \|A^T(y - A\hat{x}_{\text{SGL}})\|_\infty \leq 2\epsilon.$$

Again from Schwarz's inequality we obtain

$$|\langle Ah_\Lambda, Ah \rangle| = |\langle h_\Lambda, A^T Ah \rangle| \leq \|h_\Lambda\|_2 \|A^T Ah\|_2.$$

Since $\|A^T Ah\|_\infty < 2\epsilon$, we have

$$|\langle Ah_\Lambda, Ah \rangle| \leq \|h_\Lambda\|_2 2\sqrt{2k}\epsilon. \quad (56)$$

The rest of proof follows from the proof of Theorem 2 by letting $b = 2\sqrt{2k}\beta\epsilon$ in (40). Hence, we obtain

$$\|\hat{x}_{\text{SGL}} - x\|_2 \leq C_{0, \mu, \mathcal{G}} \frac{\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1)}{\sqrt{k}} + C_{3, \mu, \mathcal{G}} \epsilon,$$

where

$$C_{3, \mu, \mathcal{G}} = \frac{4\sqrt{2k}}{(1 - \delta_{2k})(1 - \alpha - (1 + \alpha)\gamma)}$$

□

As a corollary we again give the near-ideal behavior of the CLOT algorithm.

Corollary 2 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3 define*

$$\hat{x}_{\text{CLOT}} := \underset{z}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|z\|_\mu \text{ s.t. } \|A^T(y - Az)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon. \quad (57)$$

Suppose μ and δ_{2k} together satisfy

$$\phi < \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 + \alpha}, \quad (58)$$

where ϕ is defined in (46). Then

$$\|\hat{x}_{\text{CLOT}} - x\|_2 \leq C_{0, \mu} \frac{\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1)}{\sqrt{k}} + C_{3, \mu} \epsilon, \quad (59)$$

where

$$C_{0, \mu} = \frac{2(1 + \alpha)}{1 - \alpha - (1 + \alpha)\phi}, \quad (60)$$

$$C_{3, \mu} = \frac{4\sqrt{2k}}{(1 - \delta_{2k})(1 - \alpha - (1 + \alpha)\phi)}. \quad (61)$$

Proof: The proof of this corollary is exactly the same as that of of corollary 2, and will be skipped.

□

4.2 Selection of Correlated Features

One advantage of the EN over Lasso is that the former assigns roughly equal weights to highly correlated features, as shown in [2, Theorem 1] and referred to as the grouping effect. In contrast, if Lasso chooses one feature among a set of highly correlated features, then it assigns a zero weight to all the rest. The drawback of this is that the finally selected feature set is very sensitive to noise in the measurements. In this section we prove an analog of [2, Theorem 1] for SGL algorithm. Our result states that if two highly correlated features within the same group are chosen by SGL, then they will have roughly similar weights. In other words, highly correlated features from the same group tend to be assigned similar weights. Since CLOT is a special case of SGL with the entire feature set treated as one group, it follows that CLOT assigns roughly similar weights to highly correlated features in the entire set of features. As a result, the final feature sets obtained using SGL or CLOT are less sensitive to noise in measurements than the ones obtained using Lasso.

Theorem 4 *Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be some vector and matrix respectively. Without loss of generality, suppose that y is centered, i.e. $y^t \mathbf{e}_m = 0$, where \mathbf{e}_m denotes a column vector consisting of m ones, and that A is standardized, i.e. $\|a_j\|_2 = 1$ where a_j denotes the j -th column of A . Suppose $\mu > 0$, and let G denote a partition of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into g disjoint subsets. Define*

$$\hat{x} := \underset{z}{\operatorname{argmin}} l \|y - Az\|_2^2 + \|z\|_{\mu, G}, \quad (62)$$

where $l > 0$ is a Lagrange multiplier. Suppose that, for two indices i, j belonging to the same group G_s , we have that $\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_j \neq 0$. By changing the sign of one of the columns of A if necessary, it can be assumed that $\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_j > 0$. Define

$$d(i, j) := \frac{|\hat{x}_i - \hat{x}_j|}{2l \|y\|_2}, \rho(i, j) = a_i^t a_j.$$

Then

$$d(i, j) \leq \frac{\sqrt{2(1 - \rho(i, j))} \|\hat{x}^s\|_2}{\mu}. \quad (63)$$

Proof: Define

$$\begin{aligned} L(z, \mu) &:= l \|y - Az\|_2^2 + \|z\|_{\mu, G} \\ &= l \|y - Az\|_2^2 + (1 - \mu) \|z\|_1 + \mu \sum_{s=1}^g \|z^s\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Then L is differentiable with respect to z_i whenever $z_i \neq 0$. In particular, since both \hat{x}_i and \hat{x}_j are nonzero by assumption, it follows that

$$\left. \frac{\partial L}{\partial z_i} \right|_{z=\hat{x}} = \left. \frac{\partial L}{\partial z_j} \right|_{z=\hat{x}} = 0.$$

Expanding the partial derivatives leads to

$$\begin{aligned} -2la_i^t(y - A\hat{x}) + (1 - \mu)\operatorname{sign}(\hat{x}_i) + \mu \frac{\hat{x}_i}{\|\hat{x}^s\|_2} &= 0, \\ -2la_j^t(y - A\hat{x}) + (1 - \mu)\operatorname{sign}(\hat{x}_j) + \mu \frac{\hat{x}_j}{\|\hat{x}^s\|_2} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting one equation from the other gives

$$2l(a_j^t - a_i^t)(y - A\hat{x}) + \mu \frac{\hat{x}_i - \hat{x}_j}{\|\hat{x}^s\|_2} = 0.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\hat{x}_i - \hat{x}_j|}{\|\hat{x}^s\|_2} &= \frac{2l}{\mu} |(a_j^t - a_i^t)(y - A\hat{x})| \\ &\leq \frac{2l}{\mu} \|a_j - a_i\|_2 \|y - A\hat{x}\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{2l}{\mu} \sqrt{2(1 - \rho(i, j))} \|y\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we use the fact that

$$\|y - A\hat{x}\|_2 \leq \|y - A\mathbf{0}\|_2 = \|y\|_2.$$

Rearranging gives

$$\frac{1}{2l} \frac{|\hat{x}_i - \hat{x}_j|}{\|y\|_2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2(1 - \rho(i, j))} \|\hat{x}^r\|_2}{\mu},$$

which is the desired conclusion. \square

Let us illustrate the above result using the CLOT algorithm. In the case of CLOT algorithm we have $g = 1$, $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1\}$, $G_1 = \{1, \dots, n\}$, and the inequality in (63) becomes

$$d(i, j) \leq \frac{\sqrt{2(1 - \rho(i, j))} \|\hat{x}\|_2}{\mu}, \quad (64)$$

where \hat{x} is the solution of the CLOT algorithm given in (44) and

$$d(i, j) = \frac{|\hat{x}_i - \hat{x}_j|}{2l\|y\|_2}. \quad (65)$$

Now suppose that two indices i and j are highly correlated such that $\rho(i, j) \approx 1$, so that the right hand side of the inequality in (64) is almost equal to zero. Combining this with (65) we can conclude $\hat{x}_i \approx \hat{x}_j$, so CLOT assigns similar weights to highly correlated variables.

Though the focus of the present paper is not on the GL algorithm, we digress briefly to discuss the implications of Theorem 4 for GL. This theorem also implies that the GL algorithm exhibits the grouping effect, because GL is a special case of SGL with $\mu = 1$. Indeed, it can be observed from (63) that the bound on the right side is minimized by setting $\mu = 1$, that is, using GL instead of SGL. This is not surprising, because SGL not only tries to minimize the number of distinct groups containing the support of \hat{x} , but within each group, tries to choose as few groups as possible. Thus, within each group, SGL inherits the weaknesses of Lasso. Thus one would expect that, within each group, the feature set chosen would become more sensitive as we decrease μ .

4.3 Compressibility with respect to CLOT norm

In this subsection we analyze the compressibility properties of the CLOT norm defined in (22). Observe that the CLOT norm $\|\cdot\|_\mu$ is a convex combination of the ℓ_1 - and the ℓ_2 -norm. Previously known results reprised in Section 3 show that compressed sensing, or compressibility, is achievable when the

ℓ_1 -norm is used to define the sparsity index $\sigma_k(\cdot, \|\cdot\|_1)$. In contrast, if one uses the sparsity index $\sigma_k(\cdot, \|\cdot\|_2)$, then compressed sensing is not possible, as shown in [11]. In the present section we study what happens when we use the sparsity index $\sigma_k(\cdot, \|\cdot\|_\mu)$. The results proved in this section contain both sets of earlier results as special cases. We begin by reprising the incompressibility result from [11].

Theorem 5 ([11, Theorem 5.1]). *Suppose there exist a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a demodulation map $\Delta : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\|x - \Delta(Ax)\|_2 \leq C\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_2) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (66)$$

Then $n \leq C^2m$.

Theorem 5 says that, if we specify a constant C and want to choose an $m \times n$ matrix A such that (66) holds, then $m \geq n/C^2$. Since m is linear in n , no compression is possible. Another interpretation is that, in order to achieve compression with respect to the ℓ_2 -norm, the universal constant C must be of order \sqrt{n} or larger. It is easy to see that this bound is readily achievable, because for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have that

$$\|x\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|x\|_2.$$

As a consequence, with Λ_0 denoting the index set of the k largest components in magnitude of x , we have that

$$\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1) = \|x_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|x_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_2 = \sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_2).$$

Hence *any* algorithm that achieves (15) also satisfies (66) with $C = C_0\sqrt{n}$. On the other hand, the results cited in Section 3 show that compression is indeed possible with respect to the ℓ_1 -norm. It is therefore worth exploring whether compression is possible with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\mu$. We hope to establish a result that intermediates between Theorems 1 and 5, in that it should reduce to the former when we set $\mu = 0$ and to the latter when we set $\mu = 1$. Stating and proving such a result is the contribution of this subsection. We begin with a useful lemma.

Lemma 4 *Suppose there exist a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a demodulation map $\Delta : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\|x - \Delta(Ax)\|_2 \leq C\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_\mu) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (67)$$

Let $\mathcal{N}(A)$ denote the null space of the matrix A . Then

$$\|z\|_2 \leq C\|z_{T^c}\|_\mu \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{N}(A) \text{ with } |T| \leq 2k. \quad (68)$$

The proof is omitted as it entirely parallels that of [11, Theorem 3.2].

Theorem 6 *Suppose there exist a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a demodulation map $\Delta : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\|x - \Delta(Ax)\|_2 \leq C\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_\mu) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (69)$$

Then

$$n \leq (C[(1 - \mu)\sqrt{n - 1} + \mu])^2m. \quad (70)$$

It is easy to see that if we set $\mu = 1$ in (69), then (70) becomes the bound in Theorem 5.

Proof: The proof closely parallels that of [11, Theorem 5.1]. Apply Lemma 4, specifically (68), with $k = 1$. This implies that

$$\|z\|_2 \leq C \|z_{T^c}\|_\mu \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{N}(A) \text{ with } |T| \leq 2.$$

Moreover, if $T_1 \subseteq T_2$, then $\|z_{T_2^c}\|_\mu \leq \|z_{T_1^c}\|_\mu$. Therefore

$$\|z\|_2 \leq C \|z_{T^c}\|_\mu \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{N}(A) \text{ with } |T| \leq 1.$$

Let $T = \{j\}$ for some specific index j . Then by Schwarz' inequality it follows that

$$\|z_{T^c}\|_1 = \sum_{i \neq j} |z_i| \leq \sqrt{n-1} \sum_{i \neq j} |z_i|^2 = \sqrt{n-1} \|z_{T^c}\|_2.$$

So (68) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\|_2 &\leq C[(1-\mu)\|z_{T^c}\|_1 + \mu\|z_{T^c}\|_2] \\ &\leq C[(1-\mu)\sqrt{n-1} + \mu]\|z_{T^c}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply the proof of [11, Theorem 5.1] with their C_0 replaced by the constant on the right side, namely $C[(1-\mu)\sqrt{n-1} + \mu]$. This leads to the desired inequality (70). \square

Theorem 6 shows that compression is impossible not just when $\mu = 1$ (the earlier known result), but also when μ is close to 1. Next it is shown that compression is indeed possible when μ is close to 0.

Theorem 7 *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\Delta : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ together satisfy*

$$\|x - \Delta(Ax)\|_2 \leq C \sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (71)$$

Then

$$\|x - \Delta(Ax)\|_2 \leq C_\mu \sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_\mu), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (72)$$

where

$$C_\mu = \frac{C}{1 - \mu(1 - 1/\sqrt{n})} \quad (73)$$

Note that $C_\mu = C$ when $\mu = 0$, and $C_\mu = C\sqrt{n}$ when $\mu = 1$. So in some sense Theorem 7 interpolates the bounds for the ℓ_1 -norm and the ℓ_2 -norm.

Proof: The proof is just a routine application of Schwarz' inequality. Note that

$$\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_2), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Therefore (71) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - \Delta(Ax)\|_2 &\leq C[(1-\mu)\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1) + \mu\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1)] \\ &\leq C[(1-\mu)\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1) + \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{n}}\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Therefore the theorem is proved if it can be established that the right side is bounded by $C_\mu \sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_\mu)$. Towards this end, let us choose constants $c \in (0, 1)$, $d > 0$ such that

$$1 - c = d(1 - \mu), \quad c\sqrt{n} = d\mu.$$

The solution of these linear equations is

$$c = \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{n}(1-\mu) + \mu}, d = \frac{1}{1 - \mu(1 - 1/\sqrt{n})}.$$

Then (74) leads to

$$\|x - \Delta(Ax)\|_2 \leq dC[(1-\mu)\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_1) + \mu\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_2)] = dC\sigma_k(x, \|\cdot\|_\mu).$$

The proof is completed by noting that $dC = C_\mu$. □

5 Computational Results

5.1 CLOT with RFE and Stability Selection

When applying CLOT in a practical situation, it is strongly suggested to apply both RFE (Recursive Feature Elimination) [17] in order to reduce the size of the final feature set, and also a bootstrapping approach referred to as “stability selection” [18] to increase the stability of the final feature set. The details of the implementation are as follows.

1. **Normalization of Feature Vectors:** Normalize each of the feature vector by subtracting the mean over all m samples and then scaling so that the resulting vector has Euclidean norm of one. The resulting vector is just the set of Z -score divided by \sqrt{m} . Set the iteration counter to $i = 1$, and proceed to the iterative loop.
2. **Stability Selection:** Fix an integer l . Choose at random k out of the m samples as the “training” set. Repeat this random choice l times, so that there are l different training samples.
3. **Solve the Corresponding Regression Problem:** For each k training samples, solve Lasso, EN or CLOT optimization problems given in (4), (5) and (8), respectively.
4. **Recursive Feature Elimination (RFE):** The previous step results in l different optimal weight vectors $\mathbf{z}_1^i, \dots, \mathbf{z}_l^i$, where i is the iteration count. Each weight vector will have a different number of nonzero components. Compute the average number of nonzero components, and round upwards to the next integer. Denote this integer as r^i . Compute the average of all l weight vectors. Retain the r^i components with the largest magnitude and discard the rest. Increment the iteration counter i , set $s^{i+1} = r^i$, and proceed to Step 3. If $r^i = s^i$, meaning that no features can be discarded, the iterative step is over. Proceed to the final step.
5. **Final Regressor Generation:** When this step is reached, the set of features is finalized. We run the corresponding regression algorithm last time on l different randomly chosen k training samples to generate l different classifiers, and evaluate the performance of each of the l classifiers on the remaining $m - k$ test samples. As the final regressor, we take average of the b best performing regressors, where b is a number specified by the user. One easy way to determine b is to count all the regressors with an absolute error below an acceptable threshold.

5.2 Predicting IC50 Values of Compounds in Lung Cancer

In the preceding sections, we analyzed the performance of the CLOT algorithm from a theoretical standpoint. To assess its performance in practice, we applied CLOT to a lung cancer data set. For comparison purposes, Lasso and EN were also applied to the same dataset.

This application falls into the category of sparse regression, in which one is given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $m \ll n$, and the objective is to find a sparse vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that Ax nearly equals y . In the lung cancer dataset, the matrix A represents the expression levels of n genes in m samples. The first dataset consists of expression levels of 19,464 genes in 72 lung cancer cell lines. A total of 116 chemical compounds were applied to each of the cell lines, and the IC50 value of each drug on each cell line was measured. This data is obtained from the laboratory of Prof. Michael A. White of the UT Southwestern Medical Center. The IC50 value, also written as IC₅₀, is an acronym for “half maximal inhibitory concentration.” It denotes the concentration of a drug required to inhibit 50% of a specific biological function. Therefore the application actually consists of 116 different sparse regression problems, in each of which $n = 19,464$ and $m = 72$. For each chemical compound, by identifying a small number of genes within the 19,464 that can be used to make an accurate prediction of that compound’s IC50 value on each lung cancer cell line, we can make an educated guess as to the “mechanism of action” of the compound, that is, the genes through which the compound does its work. Moreover, by testing CLOT on 116 different regression problems that are broadly similar, we should be able to draw some inferences regarding its performance vis-a-vis other algorithms such as EN or LASSO.

We applied three algorithms, namely EN, LASSO, and CLOT, together with recursive feature elimination (RFE), to the lung cancer data set. The values of y are nonnegative but vary over a considerable range. Thus we used the absolute percentage error as a measure of performance of the algorithm. It is also possible to convert all values of y into their logarithms and then apply linear regression; we did not attempt this.

Figure 1 shows the actual and predicted values of the compound known as 008135 on the 72 lung cancer cell lines. Note that out of the 72 cell lines, about 40 have an IC50 value of 50, which means that the particular drug (SW008135) is not lethal at all against that cell line.




Figure 1: Prediction by the CLOT Algorithm(Absolute Error= 3.25%, Final Number of Features=32)

Table 1 shows that CLOT produces a good predictor of the IC50 value with an error of only 3.25%, using the expression values of just 32 genes out of 19,464 genes.

Next, we compare the performance of CLOT with those of EN and LASSO, both in terms of the absolute percentage error achieved and the number of features used. Figure 2(a) shows the absolute error of CLOT vs. that of EN on all 116 chemical compounds. Out of 116 compounds, CLOT achieves a lower absolute percentage error than EN. Figure 2(b) does the same comparison for CLOT vs. LASSO. It can be seen that *for every single compound* CLOT achieves a lower absolute percentage error than LASSO. Figure 2(c) compares the number of features used by CLOT to that used by EN. For the most part, EN uses fewer features than CLOT, but as shown in Figure 2(a), this comes at

Table 1: Prediction of the IC50 values

Algorithm	No of Features	Accuracy
Lasso	27	8.21%
EN	102	4.09%
CLOT	32	3.25%




Figure 2: Comparison of the CLOT Algorithm with EN and LASSO

the expense of significantly larger absolute percentage error. It can also be seen that the maximum number of features used by EN in the 116 regression problems is 56, whereas the maximum for CLOT is only 45. On the other hand, EN uses as few as 21 features in one regression problem, while the minimum number used by CLOT is 33. Thus CLOT is fairly constant in the final number of features selected, whereas the number of features used by EN varies far more widely. Finally, Figure 2(d) shows the number of features used by CLOT and by LASSO. As the theory predicts, LASSO *always* uses fewer features than CLOT. Again, as shown in Figure 2(b), this is at the expense of substantially worse absolute percentage error.

6 Conclusions

In this paper we have introduced a new regression algorithm called the modified elastic net (CLOT), which is a special case of the SGL algorithm, and is also closely related to the elastic net (EN) algorithm. It is shown that both SGL and CLOT combine some of the best features of Lasso and EN,

in that both algorithms exhibit near-ideal behavior (like Lasso but unlike EN), and also exhibit the “grouping effect” whereby highly correlated features are assigned nearly equal weights (like EN but unlike Lasso). We have also applied CLOT, EN and Lasso to lung cancer dataset. Our computational results suggest that CLOT along with Lasso produces more sparse solutions than EN. On the other hand, CLOT and EN are more accurate than Lasso. In other words, our computational results suggest that CLOT combines the accuracy of EN with the sparsity of Lasso.

There are several promising avenues for future research. In its current form SGL assumes that the various groups in the partition are non-overlapping. There are variants of SGL with overlapping groups, provided they satisfy some additional constraints; see [20, 21] for example. In a companion paper [9], the present authors show that the SGL algorithm with overlapping groups also exhibits near-ideal behavior. However, the cardinality of the groups is still restricted to be smaller than k , the integer with respect to which one computes the sparsity index. No such restriction applies in the present paper. It would therefore be of interest to extend the results in the present paper on the near-ideal behavior of the SGL algorithm, without any *a priori* restriction on group sizes, to the case of overlapping groups. Finally, further theoretical research is required to determine whether CLOT indeed combines the sparsity of Lasso and the accuracy of EN.

References

- [1] R. Tibshirani, “Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, vol. 58(1), 1996.
- [2] H. Zou and T. Hastie, “Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, vol. 67, pp. 301–320, 2005.
- [3] E. J. Candès and Y. Plan, “Near ideal model selection by ℓ_1 minimization,” *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 37(5A), pp. 2145–2177, 2009.
- [4] E. Candès, “The restricted isometry property and its implications for compressed sensing,” *Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Sciences, Série I*, vol. 346, pp. 589–592, 2008.
- [5] M. A. Davenport, M. F. Duarte, Y. C. Eldar, and G. Kutyniok, “Introduction to compressed sensing,” in *Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications*, Y. C. Eldar and G. Kutyniok, Eds. Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 1–68.
- [6] M. Yuan and Y. Lin, “Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, vol. 68, pp. 49–67, 2006.
- [7] J. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani, “A note on the group lasso and sparse group lasso,” <http://www-stat.stanford.edu/~tibs/ftp/sparse-grlasso.pdf>, 2010.
- [8] N. Simon, J. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani, “A sparse group lasso,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, vol. 22(2), pp. 231–245, 2013.
- [9] M. E. Ahsen and M. Vidyasagar, “Near-ideal behavior of compressed sensing algorithms,” *arXiv*, p. 1401.6623, 2014.
- [10] E. J. Candès and T. Tao, “Decoding by linear programming,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 51, pp. 4203–4215, 2005.

- [11] A. Cohen, Wolfgang Dahmen, and R. DeVore, “Compressed sensing and best k -term approximation,” *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 22(1), pp. 211–231, 2009.
- [12] B. K. Natarajan, “Sparse approximate solutions to linear systems,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 24, pp. 227–234, 1995.
- [13] M. R. Osborne, B. Presnell, and B. A. Turlach, “On the LASSO and its dual,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, vol. 9, pp. 319–337, 2000.
- [14] S. Negabhan, P. Ravikumar, M. J. Wainwright, and B. Yu, “A unified framework for high-dimensional analysis of m -estimators with decomposable regularizers,” *Statistical Science*, vol. 27(4), pp. 538–557, 2012.
- [15] E. J. Candès and T. Tao, “The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n ,” *Annals of Statistics*, vol. 35(6), pp. 2313–2351, 2007.
- [16] D. Donoho, “Compressed sensing,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52(4), pp. 1289–1306, 2006.
- [17] I. Guyon, J. Weston, S. Barnhill, and V. Vapnik, “Gene selection for cancer classification using support vector machines,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 46, pp. 389–422, 2002.
- [18] N. Meinshausen and P. Bühlmann, “Stability selection,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Part B*, pp. 417–483, 2010.
- [19] The Cancer Genome Atlas Network, “Integrated genomic analyses of ovarian carcinoma,” *Nature*, vol. 474, pp. 609–615, 2011.
- [20] R. Jenetton, J. Mairal, G. Obozinski, and F. Bach, “Proximal methods for hierarchical sparse coding,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 12, pp. 2297–2334, 2011.
- [21] G. Obozinski, L. Jacob, and J.-P. Vert, “Group lasso with overlaps: The latest group lasso approach,” *arxiv*, p. 1110.0413, 2011.