

Estimation of block sparsity in compressive sensing

Zhiyong Zhou and Jun Yu

Abstract

Explicitly using the block structure of the unknown signal can achieve better recovery performance in compressive sensing. An unknown signal with block structure can be accurately recovered from underdetermined linear measurements provided that it is sufficiently block sparse. However, in practice, the block sparsity level is typically unknown. In this paper, we consider a soft measure of block sparsity, $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = (\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}/\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1})^{1-\alpha}$, $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$ and propose a procedure to estimate it by using multivariate isotropic symmetric α -stable random projections without sparsity or block sparsity assumptions. The limiting distribution of the estimator is given. Some simulations are conducted to illustrate our theoretical results.

Index Terms

Block sparsity; Multivariate isotropic symmetric α -stable distribution; Compressive sensing; Characteristic function.

I. INTRODUCTION

SINCE its introduction a few years ago [4], [5], [6], [9], Compressive Sensing (CS) has attracted considerable interests (see the monographs [13], [16] for a comprehensive view). Formally, one considers the standard CS model,

$$\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 1}$ is the measurements, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times N}$ is the measurement matrix, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is the unknown signal, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is the measurement error, and $m \ll N$. The goal of CS is to recover the unknown signal \mathbf{x} by using only the underdetermined measurements \mathbf{y} and the matrix A . Under the assumption of sparsity of the signal, that is \mathbf{x} has only a few nonzero entries, and the measurement matrix A is properly chosen, \mathbf{x} can be recovered from \mathbf{y} by certain algorithms, such as the Basis Pursuit (BP), or ℓ_1 -minimization approach, the Orthogonal Matching Pursuit (OMP) [31], Compressive Sampling Matching Pursuit (CoSaMP) [25] and the Iterative Hard Thresholding algorithm [2]. Specifically, when the sparsity level of the signal \mathbf{x} is $s = \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 = \text{card}\{j : x_j \neq 0\}$, if $m \geq Cs \ln(N/s)$ with some universal constant C , and A is subgaussian random matrix, then accurate or robust recovery can be guaranteed with high probability.

The sparsity level parameter s plays a fundamental role in CS, as the number of measurements, the properties of measurement matrix A , and even some recovery algorithms all involve it. However, the sparsity level of the signal is usually unknown in practice. To fill the gap between theory and practice, very recently [17], [18] proposed a numerically stable measure of sparsity $s_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\alpha}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1}\right)^{1-\alpha}$ with $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, which is in ratios of norms. By random linear projections using i.i.d univariate symmetric α -stable random variables, the author constructed the estimation equation for $s_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ by adopting the characteristic function method and obtained the asymptotic normality of the estimator.

As a natural extension of the sparsity with nonzero entries arbitrarily spread throughout the signal, we can consider the sparse signals exhibit additional structure in the form of the nonzero entries occurring in clusters. Such signals are referred to as block sparse [10], [12], [14]. Block sparse model appears in many practical scenarios, such as when dealing with multi-band signals [24], in measurements of gene expression levels [27], and in colour imaging [20]. Moreover, block sparse model can be used to treat the problems of multiple measurement vector (MMV) [7], [8], [14], [23] and sampling signals that lie in a union of subspaces [3], [14], [24].

To make explicit use of the block structure to achieve better sparse recovery performance, the corresponding extended versions of sparse representation algorithms have been developed, such as mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_1 -norm recovery algorithm [12], [14], [30], group lasso [33] or adaptive group lasso [19], iterative reweighted ℓ_2/ℓ_1 recovery algorithms [34], block version of OMP algorithm [12] and the extensions of the CoSaMP algorithm and of the Iterative Hard Thresholding to the model-based setting [1], which includes block sparse model as a special case. It was shown in [14] that if the measurement matrix A has small block-restricted isometry constants which generalizes the conventional RIP notion, then the mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_1 -norm recovery algorithm is guaranteed to recover any block sparse signal, irrespectively of the locations of the nonzero blocks. Furthermore, recovery will be robust in the presence of noise and modeling errors (i.e., when the vector is not exactly block sparse). [1] showed that the block versions of CoSaMP and Iterative Hard Thresholding exhibit provable recovery guarantees and robustness properties. In addition, with the block-coherence of A is small, the robust recovery of mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_1 -norm method, and the block version of the OMP algorithm are guaranteed in [12].

The block sparsity level plays the same central role in recovery for block sparse signals as the sparsity level in recovery for sparse signals. Namely, the required number of measurements, properties of the recovery measurement matrix (Block RIP), and some recovery algorithms for signals with block structure all depend on the block sparsity level. However, in reality, the block sparsity level of the signals are also unknown. To obtain its estimator is very important from both the theoretical and practical views.

A. Contributions

First, as a extension of the soft sparsity measure $s_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\alpha}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}$ with $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$ in [17], [18], we propose a soft measure of block sparsity, that is $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = (\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}/\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1})^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}$.

Second, we obtain an estimator for the block sparsity by using multivariate isotropic symmetric α -stable random projections. When the block size is 1, our estimation procedure reduces to the case considered in [18]. The asymptotic distributions of the estimators are obtained, similar to the results presented in [18].

Finally, a series of simulation experiments are conducted to illustrate our theoretical results.

B. Organization and Notations

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce the definition of block sparsity and a soft measure of block sparsity. In Section III, we present the estimation procedure for the block sparsity measure and obtain the asymptotic properties for the estimators. In Section IV, we conduct some simulations to illustrate the theoretical results. Section V is devoted to the conclusion. Finally, the proofs are postponed to the Appendix.

Throughout the paper, we denote vectors by boldface lower letters e.g., \mathbf{x} , and matrices by upper letters e.g., A . Vectors are columns by default. \mathbf{x}^T is the transpose of the vector \mathbf{x} . The notation x_j denotes the j -th component of \mathbf{x} . For any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we denote the ℓ_p -norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p = (\sum_{j=1}^N |x_j|^p)^{1/p}$ for $p > 0$. $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. E is the expectation function. $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the bracket function, which takes the maximum integer value. $\text{Re}(\cdot)$ is the real part function. i is the unit imaginary number. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product of two vectors. \xrightarrow{p} indicates convergence in probability, while \xrightarrow{d} is convergence in distribution.

II. BLOCK SPARSITY MEASURES

A. Definitions

We firstly introduce some basic concepts for block sparsity and propose a new soft measure of block sparsity.

With $N = \sum_{j=1}^p d_j$, we define the j -th block $\mathbf{x}[j]$ of a length- N vector \mathbf{x} over $\mathcal{I} = \{d_1, \dots, d_p\}$. The j -th block is of length d_j , and the blocks are formed sequentially so that

$$\mathbf{x} = \underbrace{(x_1 \cdots x_{d_1})}_{\mathbf{x}^T[1]} \underbrace{(x_{d_1+1} \cdots x_{d_1+d_2})}_{\mathbf{x}^T[2]} \cdots \underbrace{(x_{N-d_p+1} \cdots x_N)}_{\mathbf{x}^T[p]}. \quad (2)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $d_1 = d_2 = \dots = d_p = d$, then $N = pd$. A vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is called block k -sparse over $\mathcal{I} = \{d, \dots, d\}$ if $\mathbf{x}[j]$ is nonzero for at most k indices j . In other words, by denoting the mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_0 norm

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0} = \sum_{j=1}^p I(\|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2 > 0),$$

a block k -sparse vector \mathbf{x} can be defined by $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0} \leq k$.

Despite the important theoretical role of the parameter $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$, it has a severe practical drawback of being not sensitive to small entries of \mathbf{x} . For instance, if \mathbf{x} has k large blocks and $p - k$ small blocks, then $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0} = p$ as soon as they are nonzero. To overcome this drawback, it is desirable to replace the mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_0 norm with a soft version. Specifically, we generalize the sparsity measure based on entropy to the block sparsity measure. For any non-zero signal \mathbf{x} given in (2), it induces a distribution $\pi(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ on the set of block indices $\{1, \dots, p\}$, assigning mass $\pi_j(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2 / \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}$ at index $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, where $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1} = \sum_{j=1}^p \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2$. Then the entropy based block sparsity goes to

$$k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \exp(H_\alpha(\pi(\mathbf{x}))) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where H_α is the Rényi entropy of order $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$ [18], [28], [32]. When $\alpha \notin \{0, 1, \infty\}$, the Rényi entropy is given explicitly by $H_\alpha(\pi(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln(\sum_{j=1}^p \pi_j(\mathbf{x})^\alpha)$, and the cases of $\alpha \in \{0, 1, \infty\}$ are defined by evaluating limits, with H_1 being the ordinary Shannon entropy. Then, for $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\alpha \notin \{0, 1, \infty\}$, we have the measure of block sparsity written conveniently in terms of mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_α norm as

$$k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}},$$




Fig. 1. Three vectors (red, green, blue) in \mathbb{R}^{100} are plotted with the ℓ_2 norm of blocks in decreasing order. We set $d = 5$ and compare the values $k_2(\mathbf{x})$ with $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$.

where the mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_α norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2^\alpha\right)^{1/\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 0$. The cases of $\alpha \in \{0, 1, \infty\}$ are evaluated as limits: $k_0(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$, $k_1(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \exp(H_1(\pi(\mathbf{x})))$, and $k_\infty(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\infty}}$, where $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\infty} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2$. When the block size d equals 1, our block sparsity measure $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ reduces to the nonblock sparsity measure $s_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\alpha}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}$ given by [18].

The fact that $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ ($\alpha = 2$) is a sensible measure of the block sparsity for non-idealized signals is illustrated in Figure 1. In the case that \mathbf{x} has k large blocks and $p - k$ small blocks, we have $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0} = p$, whereas $k_2(\mathbf{x}) \approx k$.

In addition, the quantity $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ has some important properties similar as $s_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$.

- Continuity: Unlike the mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_0 norm, the function $k_\alpha(\cdot)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus 0$ for all $\alpha > 0$. Thus, it is stable with respect to small perturbations of the signal.
- Range equal to $[0, p]$: For all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ given as (2) and all $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, we have

$$0 \leq k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) \leq p.$$

- Scale-invariance: For all $c \neq 0$, it holds that $k_\alpha(c\mathbf{x}) = k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$. Scale-invariance encodes the idea that block sparsity should also be based on relative (rather than absolute) magnitudes of the entries of the signal as the sparsity.
- Non-increasing in α : For any $\alpha' \geq \alpha \geq 0$, we have

$$k_\infty(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\infty}} \leq k_{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x}) \leq k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) \leq k_0(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}.$$

B. Recovery results in terms of $k_2(\mathbf{x})$

Before presenting the estimation procedure for the $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ and $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, we give the block sparse signal recovery results in terms of $k_2(\mathbf{x})$ by using mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_1 -norm optimization algorithm.

To recover the block sparse signal in CS model (1), we use the following mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_1 -norm optimization algorithm proposed in [12], [14]:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \|\mathbf{e}\|_{2,1}, \quad \text{subject to } \|\mathbf{y} - A\mathbf{e}\|_2 \leq \delta, \quad (4)$$

where $\delta \geq 0$ is an upper bound on the noise level $\|\mathbf{e}\|_2$. Then, we have the following result concerning on the robust recovery for block sparse signals.

Lemma 1 ([14]). Let $\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ be noisy measurements of a vector \mathbf{x} and fix a number $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Let \mathbf{x}^k denote the best block k -sparse approximation of \mathbf{x} , such that \mathbf{x}^k is block k -sparse and minimizes $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{f}\|_{2,1}$ over all the block k -sparse vectors \mathbf{f} , and let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ be a solution to (4), a random Gaussian matrix A of size $m \times N$ with entries $A_{ij} \sim N(0, \frac{1}{m})$, and block sparse signals over $\mathcal{I} = \{d_1 = d, \dots, d_p = d\}$, where $N = pd$ for some integer p . Then, there are constants $c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$, such that the following statement is true. If $m \geq c_0 k \ln(eN/kd)$, then with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-c_1 m)$, we have

$$\frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} \leq c_2 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_{2,1}}{\sqrt{k}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} + c_3 \frac{\delta}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}. \quad (5)$$

Remark 1. Note that the first term in (5) is a result of the fact that \mathbf{x} is not exactly block k -sparse, while the second term quantifies the recovery error due to the measurement noise. When the block size $d = 1$, this Lemma goes to the conventional CS result for sparse signals. Explicit use of block sparsity reduces the required number of measurements from $O(kd \ln(eN/kd))$ to $O(k \ln(eN/kd))$ by d times.

The limitation of the previous bound is that the ratio term $\frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_{2,1}}{\sqrt{k}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}$ is typically unknown. Thus, it is not clear how large m should be chosen to guarantee that the relative ℓ_2 -error $\frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}$ is small with high probability. Next, we present an upper bound of the relative ℓ_2 -error by an explicit function of m and the new proposed block sparsity measure $k_2(\mathbf{x})$, which is estimable. The following result is an extension of Proposition 1 in [18]. Its proof is left to Appendix.

Lemma 2. Let $\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ be noisy measurements of a vector \mathbf{x} , and let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ be a solution to (4), a random Gaussian matrix A of size $m \times N$ with entries $A_{ij} \sim N(0, \frac{1}{m})$, and block sparse signals over $\mathcal{I} = \{d_1 = d, \dots, d_n = d\}$, where $N = pd$ for some integer p . Then, there are constants $\kappa_0, \kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3 > 0$, such that the following statement is true. If m and N satisfy $\kappa_0 \ln(\kappa_0 \frac{eN}{m}) \leq m \leq N$, then with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-\kappa_1 m)$, we have

$$\frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} \leq \kappa_2 \sqrt{\frac{k_2(\mathbf{x}) d \ln(\frac{eN}{m})}{m}} + \kappa_3 \frac{\delta}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}. \quad (6)$$

III. ESTIMATION METHOD FOR $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ AND $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$

In this section, we mainly focus on the estimation of $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$. There are two reasons to consider this interval. One is that small α is usually a better block sparsity measure than very large α in applications. And we can approximate $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ with very small α as will be shown later. The other reason is that our estimation method relies on the α -stable distribution, which requires α to lie in $(0, 2]$. The core idea to obtain the estimators for $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ and $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ is using random projections. Contrast to the conventional sparsity estimation by using projections with univariate symmetric α -stable random variables [18], [35], we use projections with the multivariate centered isotropic symmetric α -stable random vectors [26], [29] for the block sparsity estimation.

A. Multivariate Isotropic Stable Distribution

We firstly give the definition of the multivariate centered isotropic symmetric α -stable distribution.

Definition 1. For $d \geq 1$, a d -dimensional random vector \mathbf{v} has a centered isotropic symmetric α -stable distribution if there are constants $\gamma > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ such that its characteristic function has the form

$$E[\exp(i\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v})] = \exp(-\gamma^\alpha \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^\alpha), \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (7)$$

We denote the distribution by $\mathbf{v} \sim S(d, \alpha, \gamma)$, and γ is referred to as the scale parameter.

Remark 2. The most well-known example of multivariate isotropic symmetric stable distribution is the case of $\alpha = 2$ (Multivariate Independent Gaussian Distribution), and in this case, the components of the Multivariate Gaussian random vector are independent. Another case is $\alpha = 1$ (Multivariate Spherical Symmetric Cauchy Distribution [29]), unlike Multivariate




Fig. 2. Perspective and Contour Plots for the Bivariate Centered Isotropic Symmetric Stable Densities. The top ones are for the Bivariate Independent Gaussian Distribution, while the bottom ones are for the Bivariate Spherical Symmetric Cauchy Distribution.

Independent Gaussian case, the components of Multivariate Spherical Symmetric Cauchy are uncorrelated, but dependent. The perspective and contour plots for the densities of these two cases are illustrated in Figure 2. The multivariate centered isotropic symmetric α -stable random vector is a direct extension of the univariate symmetric α -stable random variable, which is the special case when the dimension parameter $d = 1$. In applications, to simulation a d -dimensional random vector \mathbf{v} from the multivariate centered isotropic symmetric α -stable distribution $S(d, \alpha, \gamma)$, we can adopt the fact that $\mathbf{v} = D^{1/2}\mathbf{q}$, where $D \sim \tilde{S}(1, \alpha/2, 2\gamma^2[\cos(\pi\alpha/4)]^{2/\alpha})$ is a independent univariate positive $(\alpha/2)$ -stable random variable and $\mathbf{q} \sim N(0, I_d)$ is a standard d -dimensional Gaussian random vector, see [26] for more details.

B. Estimation Procedure

By random projections using i.i.d multivariate centered isotropic symmetric α -stable random vectors, we can obtain the estimators for $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ and $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, which is presented as follows.

We estimate the $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ by using the random linear projection measurements:

$$y_i = \langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle + \sigma \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is i.i.d random vector, and $\mathbf{a}_i = (\mathbf{a}_{i1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{ip}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{a}_{ij}, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d, \alpha, \gamma)$. The noise term ε_i are i.i.d from a distribution F_0 and assume its characteristic function is φ_0 , the sets $\{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n\}$ and $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n\}$ are independent. $\{\varepsilon_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ are assumed to be symmetric about 0, with $0 < E|\varepsilon_1| < \infty$, but they may have infinite variance. The assumption of symmetry is only for convenience, it was explained how to drop it in Section III-B.e of [18]. A minor technical condition we place on F_0 is that the roots of its characteristic function φ_0 are isolated (i.e. no limit points). This condition is satisfied by many families of distributions, such as Gaussian, Student's t , Laplace, uniform $[a, b]$, and stable laws. And we assume that the noise scale parameter $\sigma \geq 0$ and the distribution F_0 are treated as being known for simplicity.

Since our work involves different choices of α , we will write γ_α instead of γ . Then the link with the norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ hinges on the following basic lemma.

Lemma 3. Let $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}[1]^T, \dots, \mathbf{x}[p]^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be fixed, and suppose $\mathbf{a}_1 = (\mathbf{a}_{11}^T, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{1p}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{a}_{1j}, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d, \alpha, \gamma_\alpha)$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ and $\gamma_\alpha > 0$. Then, the random variable $\langle \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ has the distribution $S(1, \alpha, \gamma_\alpha \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha)$.

Remark 3. When $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}[1]^T, \dots, \mathbf{x}[p]^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$ has different block lengths which are $\{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_p\}$ respectively, then we need choose the projection random vector $\mathbf{a}_1 = (\mathbf{a}_{11}^T, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{1p}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{a}_{1j}, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d_j, \alpha, \gamma_\alpha)$. In

that case, the conclusion in our Lemma and all the results in the followings still hold without any modifications. This Lemma is an extension of Lemma 1 in [18] from i.i.d univariate symmetric α -stable projection to i.i.d multivariate isotropic symmetric α -stable projection.

By using this result, if we generate a set of i.i.d measurement random vectors $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n\}$ as given above and let $\tilde{y}_i = \langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle$, then $\{\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n\}$ is an i.i.d sample from the distribution $S(1, \alpha, \gamma_\alpha \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha)$. Hence, in the special case of random linear measurements without noise, estimating the norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ reduces to estimating the scale parameter of a univariate stable distribution from an i.i.d sample.

Next, we present the estimation procedure by using the characteristic function method [18], [21], [22]. We use two separate sets of measurements to estimate $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$. The respective sample sizes of each measurements are denoted by n_1 and n_α . To unify the discussion, we will describe just the procedure to obtain $\widehat{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha}$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, since $\alpha = 1$ is a special case. The two estimators are combined to obtain the estimator for $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$, which follows as:

$$\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\left(\widehat{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}{\left(\widehat{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}. \quad (9)$$

In fact, the characteristic function of y_i has the form:

$$\Psi(t) = E[\exp(it y_i)] = \exp(-\gamma_\alpha^\alpha \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha |t|^\alpha) \cdot \varphi_0(\sigma t), \quad (10)$$

where $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha = -\frac{1}{\gamma_\alpha^\alpha |t|^\alpha} \log \left| \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{\Psi(t)}{\varphi_0(\sigma t)} \right) \right|.$$

By using the empirical characteristic function

$$\hat{\Psi}_{n_\alpha}(t) = \frac{1}{n_\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{n_\alpha} e^{i t y_i}$$

to estimate $\Psi(t)$, we obtain the estimator of $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ given by

$$\widehat{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha} =: \hat{v}_\alpha(t) = -\frac{1}{\gamma_\alpha^\alpha |t|^\alpha} \log \left| \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{\hat{\Psi}_{n_\alpha}(t)}{\varphi_0(\sigma t)} \right) \right|, \quad (11)$$

when $t \neq 0$ and $\varphi_0(\sigma t) \neq 0$.

C. Asymptotic Properties

Then, similar to the Theorem 2 in [18], we have the uniform central limit theorem (CLT) [11] for $\hat{v}_\alpha(t)$. Before presenting the result, we introduce the noise-to-signal ratio constant

$$\rho_\alpha = \frac{\sigma}{\gamma_\alpha \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}}.$$

Theorem 1 (Uniform CLT for Mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_α Norm Estimator). Let $\alpha \in (0, 2]$. Let \hat{t} be any function of $\{y_1, \dots, y_{n_\alpha}\}$ that satisfies

$$\gamma_\alpha \hat{t} \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha} \xrightarrow{p} c_\alpha, \quad (12)$$

as $(n_\alpha, N) \rightarrow \infty$ for some finite constant $c_\alpha \neq 0$ and $\varphi_0(\rho_\alpha c_\alpha) \neq 0$. Then, we have

$$\sqrt{n_\alpha} \left(\frac{\hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \theta_\alpha(c_\alpha, \rho_\alpha)) \quad (13)$$

as $(n_\alpha, N) \rightarrow \infty$, where the limiting variance $\theta_\alpha(c_\alpha, \rho_\alpha)$ is strictly positive and defined according to the formula

$$\theta_\alpha(c_\alpha, \rho_\alpha) = \frac{1}{|c_\alpha|^{2\alpha}} \left(\frac{\exp(2|c_\alpha|^\alpha)}{2\varphi_0(\rho_\alpha |c_\alpha|)} + \frac{\varphi_0(2\rho_\alpha |c_\alpha|)}{2\varphi_0(\rho_\alpha |c_\alpha|)^2} \exp((2-2^\alpha)|c_\alpha|^\alpha) - 1 \right). \quad (14)$$

For simplicity, we use the \hat{t}_{pilot} instead of the optimal \hat{t}_{opt} in [18]. Since it is simple to implement, and still gives a reasonably good estimator. To describe the pilot value, let $\eta_0 > 0$ be any number such that $\varphi_0(\eta) > \frac{1}{2}$ for all $\eta \in [0, \eta_0]$ (which exists for any characteristic function). Also, we define the median absolute deviation statistic $\hat{m}_\alpha = \text{median}\{|y_1|, \dots, |y_{n_\alpha}|\}$ and define $\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}} = \min\{\frac{1}{\hat{m}_\alpha}, \frac{\eta_0}{\sigma}\}$. Then we obtain the consistent estimator $\hat{c}_\alpha = \gamma_\alpha \hat{t}_{\text{pilot}} [\hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}})]^{1/\alpha}$ of a constant $c_\alpha = \min\left(\frac{1}{\text{median}(|S_1 + \rho_\alpha \varepsilon_1|)}, \frac{\eta_0}{\rho_\alpha}\right)$, where random variable $S_1 \sim S(1, 1, 1)$ (see the Proposition 3 in [18]), and the consistent estimator of ρ_α , $\hat{\rho}_\alpha = \frac{\sigma}{\gamma_\alpha [\hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}})]^{1/\alpha}}$. Therefore, the consistent estimator of the limiting variance $\theta_\alpha(c_\alpha, \rho_\alpha)$ is $\theta_\alpha(\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{\rho}_\alpha)$. Thus, we immediately have the following corollary to obtain the confidence intervals for $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$.

Corollary 1 (Confidence Interval for $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$). Under the conditions of Theorem 1, as $(n_\alpha, N) \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\sqrt{\frac{n_\alpha}{\theta_\alpha(\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{\rho}_\alpha)}} \left(\frac{\hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1). \quad (15)$$

Then, it follows that the asymptotic $1 - \beta$ confidence interval for $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ is

$$\left[\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\theta_\alpha(\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{\rho}_\alpha)}{n_\alpha}} z_{1-\beta/2}\right) \hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}}), \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\theta_\alpha(\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{\rho}_\alpha)}{n_\alpha}} z_{1-\beta/2}\right) \hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}}) \right], \quad (16)$$

where $z_{1-\beta/2}$ is the $(1 - \beta/2)$ -quantile of the standard normal distribution.

As a consequence, we can obtain a CLT and a confidence interval for $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ by combining the estimators \hat{v}_α and \hat{v}_1 with their respective \hat{t}_{pilot} . Before we present the main result, for each $\alpha \in (0, 2] \setminus \{1\}$, we assume that there is a constant $\bar{\pi}_\alpha \in (0, 1)$, such that $(n_1, n_\alpha, N) \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\pi_\alpha := \frac{n_\alpha}{n_1 + n_\alpha} = \bar{\pi}_\alpha + o(n_\alpha^{-1/2}).$$

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic Property for $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$). Let $\alpha \in (0, 2] \setminus \{1\}$ and the conditions of Theorem 1 hold. Then as $(n_1, n_\alpha, N) \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{n_1 + n_\alpha}{\hat{w}_\alpha}} \left(\frac{\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})}{k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \quad (17)$$

where $\hat{w}_\alpha = \frac{\theta_\alpha(\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{\rho}_\alpha)}{\pi_\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right)^2 + \frac{\theta_1(\hat{c}_1, \hat{\rho}_1)}{1-\pi_\alpha} \left(\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right)^2$. And consequently, the asymptotic $1 - \beta$ confidence interval for $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ is

$$\left[\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\hat{w}_\alpha}{n_1 + n_\alpha}} z_{1-\beta/2}\right) \hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}), \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\hat{w}_\alpha}{n_1 + n_\alpha}} z_{1-\beta/2}\right) \hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) \right], \quad (18)$$

where $z_{1-\beta/2}$ is the $(1 - \beta/2)$ -quantile of the standard normal distribution.

D. Estimating $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ with $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ and Small α

Next, we present the approximation of $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ to $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ when α is close to 0. To state the theorem, we define the block dynamic range of a non-zero signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ given in (2) as

$$\text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\infty}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\min}}, \quad (19)$$

where $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\min}$ is the smallest ℓ_2 norm of the non-zero block of \mathbf{x} , i.e. $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\min} = \min\{\|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2 : \mathbf{x}[j] \neq \mathbf{0}, j = 1, \dots, p\}$. When the block size $d = 1$, our BDNR(\mathbf{x}) goes to the DNR(\mathbf{x}) defined in [18]. The following result involves no randomness and is applicable to any estimator $\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$.

Theorem 3. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is non-zero signal given in (2), and let $\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ be any real number. Then, we have

$$\left| \frac{\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}} - 1 \right| \leq \left| \frac{\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})}{k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})} - 1 \right| + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \left(\ln(\text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x})) + \alpha \ln(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}) \right). \quad (20)$$

Remark 4. This theorem is a direct extension of Proposition 5 in [18], which corresponds the special case of the block size $d = 1$. When choosing $\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ to be the proposed estimator $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$, the first term in (20) is already controlled by Theorem 2. As pointed out in [18], the second term is the approximation error that improves for smaller choices of α . When the ℓ_2 norms of the signal blocks are similar, the quantity of $\ln(\text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x}))$ will not be too large. In this case, the bound behaves well and estimating $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ is of interest. On the other hand, if the ℓ_2 norms of the signal blocks are very different, that is $\ln(\text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x}))$ is large, then $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ may not be the best measure of block sparsity to estimate.

IV. SIMULATION

In this section, we conduct some simulations to illustrate our theoretical results. We focus on choosing $\alpha = 2$, that is we use $\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})$ to estimate the block sparsity measure $k_2(\mathbf{x})$. When estimating $k_2(\mathbf{x})$, we requires a set of n_1 measurements by using multivariate isotropic symmetric cauchy projection, and a set of n_2 by using multivariate isotropic symmetric normal projection. We generated the samples $\mathbf{y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and $\mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ according to

$$\mathbf{y}_1 = A_1 \mathbf{x} + \sigma \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1 \text{ and } \mathbf{y}_2 = A_2 \mathbf{x} + \sigma \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_2, \quad (21)$$

where $A_1 = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{n_1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times N}$, with $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is i.i.d random vector, and $\mathbf{a}_i = (\mathbf{a}_{i1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{ip}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{a}_{ij}, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d, 1, \gamma_1)$, we let $\gamma_1 = 1$. Similarly, $A_2 = (\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n_2}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times N}$, with $\mathbf{b}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is i.i.d random vector, and $\mathbf{b}_i = (\mathbf{b}_{i1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{ip}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{b}_{ij}, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d, 2, \gamma_2)$, we let $\gamma_2 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$. The noise terms $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_2$ are generated with i.i.d entries from a standard normal distribution. We considered a sequence of pairs for the sample sizes $(n_1, n_2) = (50, 50), (100, 100), (200, 200), \dots, (500, 500)$. For each experiments, we replicates 200 times. Consequently, we have 200 realizations of $\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})$ for each (n_1, n_2) . We then averaged the quantity $|\frac{\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})}{k_2(\mathbf{x})} - 1|$ as an approximation of $E|\frac{\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})}{k_2(\mathbf{x})} - 1|$.

A. Exactly Block Sparse Case

First, we let our signal \mathbf{x} be a very simple exactly block sparse vector, that is

$$\mathbf{x} = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \mathbf{1}_{10}^T, \mathbf{0}_{N-10}^T \right)^T,$$

where $\mathbf{1}_q$ is a vector of length q with entries all ones, $\mathbf{0}_q$ is the zero vector. Then it is obvious that $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,2} = \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = 1$, while $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}$ and $k_2(\mathbf{x})$ depend on the block size d that we choose.

a) We set $\eta_0 = 1$. The simulation is conducted under several choices of the parameters, N , d and σ —with each parameter corresponding to a separate plot in Figure 3. The signal dimension N is set to 1000, except in the top left plot, where $N = 20, 100, 500, 1000$. We set $d = 5$ in all cases, except in top right plot, where $d = 1, 2, 5, 10$, corresponding the real value $k_2(\mathbf{x}) = 10, 5, 2, 1$, which also equals $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$, the exact block sparsity level of our signal \mathbf{x} with the block size to be d . In turn, $\sigma = 0.1$ in all cases, except in the bottom plot where $\sigma = 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3$. In all three plots, the theoretical curves are computed in the following way. From Theorem 2, we have $|\frac{\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})}{k_2(\mathbf{x})} - 1| \approx \frac{\sqrt{\omega_2}}{\sqrt{n_1+n_2}} |Z|$, where Z is a standard Gaussian random variable, and we set $\omega_2 = \frac{\theta_2(c_2, \rho_2)}{\pi_2} + 4 \frac{\theta_1(c_1, \rho_1)}{1-\pi_2}$. Since $E|Z| = \sqrt{2/\pi}$, the theoretical curves are simply $\frac{\sqrt{2\omega_2/\pi}}{\sqrt{n_1+n_2}}$, as a function of $n_1 + n_2$. Note that ω_2 depends on σ and d , which is why there is only one theoretical curve in top left plot for error dependence on N .

From Figure 3, we can see that the black theoretical curves agree well with the colored empirical ones. In addition, the averaged relative error has no observable dependence on N or d (when σ is fixed), as expected from Theorem 2, and the dependence on the σ is mild.

b) Next, a simulation study is conducted to illustrate the asymptotic normality of our estimators in Corollary 1 and Theorem 2. We have 1000 replications for these experiments, that is we have 1000 samples of the standardized statistics $\text{res1} = \sqrt{\frac{n_1}{\theta_1(\hat{c}_1, \hat{\rho}_1)}} \left(\frac{\hat{v}_1(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}} - 1 \right)$, $\text{res2} = \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{\theta_2(\hat{c}_2, \hat{\rho}_2)}} \left(\frac{\hat{v}_2(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,2}^2} - 1 \right)$ and $\text{res} = \sqrt{\frac{n_1+n_2}{\hat{w}_2}} \left(\frac{\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})}{k_2(\mathbf{x})} - 1 \right)$. We consider four cases, with $(n_1, n_2) = (500, 500), (1000, 1000)$ and the noise is standard normal and $t(2)$ which has infinite variance. In all the cases, we set $N = 1000$, $d = 5$, and $\sigma = 0.1$.

Figure 4 shows that the density curves of the standardized statistics all are very close to the standard normal density curve, which verified our theoretical results. And these results hold even when the noise distribution is heavy-tailed. Comparing the four plots, we see that it leads to improve the normal approximation by increasing the sample size $n_1 + n_2$ and reducing the noise variance.

B. Nearly Block Sparse Case

Second, we consider our signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ to be not exactly block sparse but nearly block sparse, that is the entries of j -th block all equal $\frac{c}{\sqrt{d}} \cdot j^{-1}$, with c chosen so that $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,2} = \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = 1$. In this case, the ℓ_2 norm of blocks decays like j^{-1} for $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. With the same settings as in the previous subsection, we obtain the similar simulation results as the exactly block sparse case in Figure 5 and Figure 6.




Fig. 3. The averaged relative error $|\frac{\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})}{k_2(\mathbf{x})} - 1|$ depending on N , d and σ for the exactly block sparse case.

C. Estimating $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ with $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ and Small α

Third, we consider the estimation of the mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_0 norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ by using $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ with $\alpha = 0.06$. We consider the signals $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ of the form

$$c' \left(\underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \dots \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}}_d \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \frac{1/\sqrt{d}}{2} \dots \frac{1/\sqrt{d}}{2}}_d \dots \underbrace{\frac{1/\sqrt{d}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}} \dots \frac{1/\sqrt{d}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}}}_d 0 \dots 0 \right)$$

with c' chosen so that $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,2} = \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = 1$. In this experiment, we set $N = 1000, d = 5$. To obtain $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$, we generate the samples $\mathbf{y}_1 = A_1 \mathbf{x} + \sigma \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1$ and $\mathbf{y}_\alpha = A_\alpha \mathbf{x} + \sigma \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_\alpha$, where $A_1 = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{n_1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times N}$, with $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is i.i.d random vector, and $\mathbf{a}_i = (\mathbf{a}_{i1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{ip}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{a}_{ij}, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d, 1, \gamma_1)$, we let $\gamma_1 = 1$. Similarly, $A_\alpha = (\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_{n_2}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times N}$, with $\mathbf{h}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is i.i.d random vector, and $\mathbf{h}_i = (\mathbf{h}_{i1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{h}_{ip}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{h}_{ij}, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d, \alpha, \gamma_\alpha)$, we let $\gamma_\alpha = 1$. The noise terms $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_2$ are generated with i.i.d entries from a standard normal distribution. The noise level was set to $\sigma = 0.1$. We considered a sequence of pairs for the sample sizes




Fig. 4. The density plots of the stanardized statistics for the exactly block sparse case. The dashed black curve is the standard normal density in all four plots.

$(n_1, n_2) = (50, 50), (100, 100), (200, 200), \dots, (500, 500)$. For each experiments, we replicates 200 times. Then, we have 200 realizations of $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ for each (n_1, n_2) . We varied $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ and $\text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x})$, and averaged the quantity $\left| \frac{\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}} - 1 \right|$. Specifically, we considered the four cases $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0} = \text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x}) = 10, 50, 100, 200$.

Figure 7 shows that $\hat{k}_{0.06}(\mathbf{x})$ estimates $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ accurately over a wide range of the parameters $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ and $\text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x})$, and these parameters have a small effect on the relative estimate error $\left| \frac{\hat{k}_{0.06}(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}} - 1 \right|$, which is expected in Theorem 3.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed a new soft measure of block sparsity and obtained its estimator by adopting multivariate centered isotropic symmetric α -stable random projections. The asymptotic properties of the estimators were presented. A series of simulation experiments illustrated our theoretical results.

There are some interesting issues left for future research. Throughout the paper, we assume that the noise scale parameter σ and the characteristic function of noise ψ_0 are known. In practice, however, they are usually unknown and need to be estimated. Although [18] considered the effects of adopting their estimators in estimation procedure, how to estimate these parameters based on our random linear projection measurements \mathbf{y} itself is still unknown. In addition, we have been considering the sparsity and block sparsity estimations for real-valued signals so far. It will be interesting to generalize the existing results to the case of complex-valued signals.

APPENDIX A PROOFS

Our main theoretical results Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 follow from Theorem 2 and Corollary 1 in [18], since in both estimation procedures, the measurements without noise both have the univariate symmetric stable distribution but with different




Fig. 5. The averaged relative error $|\frac{\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})}{k_2(\mathbf{x})} - 1|$ depending on N , d and σ for the nearly block sparse case.

scale parameters after the random projection, $\gamma_\alpha \|\mathbf{x}\|_\alpha$ for sparsity estimation, $\gamma_\alpha \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}$ for block sparsity estimation. Therefore, the asymptotic results for the scale parameters estimators by using characteristic function method are rather similar. In order not to repeat, all the details are omitted. Next, we only present the proofs for Lemma 2, Lemma 3 and Theorem 3.

Proof of Lemma 2. The proof procedure follows from the proof of Proposition 1 in [18] with some careful modifications. Let c_0 be as in Lemma 1, and let $\kappa_0 \geq 1$ be any number such that

$$\frac{2 \ln(\kappa_0) + 2}{d\kappa_0} + \frac{2}{\kappa_0} \leq \frac{1}{c_0}. \quad (22)$$

Define the positive number $t = \frac{m/\kappa_0}{d \ln(\frac{\varepsilon N}{m})}$, and choose $k = \lfloor t \rfloor$ in Lemma 1. Note that when $m \leq N$, this choice of k is clearly




Fig. 6. The density plots of the standardized statistics for the nearly block sparse case. The dashed black curve is the standard normal density in all four plots.

at most p , and hence lies in $\{1, \dots, p\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 k \ln\left(\frac{eN}{kd}\right) &\leq (t+1) \ln\left(\frac{eN}{td}\right) \\
 &= \left(\frac{m/\kappa_0}{d \ln\left(\frac{eN}{m}\right)} + 1\right) \cdot \ln\left(\frac{\kappa_0 eN}{m} \cdot \ln\left(\frac{eN}{m}\right)\right) \\
 &\leq \left(\frac{m/\kappa_0}{d \ln\left(\frac{eN}{m}\right)} + 1\right) \cdot \ln\left[\left(\kappa_0 \frac{eN}{m}\right)^2\right] \\
 &= \frac{2m/\kappa_0}{d \ln\left(\frac{eN}{m}\right)} \left(\ln(\kappa_0) + \ln\left(\frac{eN}{m}\right)\right) + 2 \ln\left(\kappa_0 \frac{eN}{m}\right) \\
 &\leq \left(\frac{2 \ln(\kappa_0) + 2}{d \kappa_0} + \frac{2}{\kappa_0}\right) m \leq \frac{m}{c_0}
 \end{aligned}$$

by using our assumption $N \geq m \geq \kappa_0 \ln(\kappa_0 \frac{eN}{m})$. Hence, our choice of κ_0 ensures $m \geq c_0 k \ln(eN/kd)$. To finish the proof, let $\kappa_1 = c_1$ be as in Lemma 1 so that the bound (5) holds with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-\kappa_1 m)$. Moreover, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_{2,1} \leq \frac{1}{t} \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1} = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_0}}{\sqrt{m}} \sqrt{d \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}^2 \ln\left(\frac{eN}{m}\right)}.$$




Fig. 7. The average relative error $\left| \frac{\hat{\kappa}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}} - 1 \right|$ with $\alpha = 0.06$ depending on $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ and $\text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x})$.

Let c_2 and c_3 be as in (5), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} &\leq c_2 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_{2,1}}{\sqrt{k}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} + c_3 \frac{\delta}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} \\ &\leq c_2 \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_0}}{\sqrt{m}} \sqrt{d \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}^2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2} \ln\left(\frac{eN}{m}\right)} + c_3 \frac{\delta}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}, \end{aligned}$$

then the proof is completed by setting $\kappa_2 = c_2\sqrt{\kappa_0}$, $\kappa_3 = c_3$ and noticing the fact that $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,2}$.

Proof of Lemma 3. By using the independence of \mathbf{a}_{1j} , $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the characteristic function of $\langle \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ has the form:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\exp(it\langle \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{x} \rangle)] &= E \left[\exp \left(it \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{x}[j]^T \mathbf{a}_{1j} \right) \right) \right] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^p E[\exp(it\mathbf{x}[j]^T \mathbf{a}_{1j})] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^p \exp(-\gamma_\alpha^\alpha \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2^\alpha) \\ &= \exp \left[-\gamma_\alpha^\alpha \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2^\alpha \right) |t|^\alpha \right] \\ &= \exp(-(\gamma_\alpha \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha})^\alpha |t|^\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the Lemma follows from the Definition 1.

Proof of Theorem 3. The triangle inequality implies

$$\frac{|\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) - \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}} \leq \frac{|\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) - k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}} + \frac{|k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) - \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}}.$$

As $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$, we have

$$\left| \frac{\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}} - 1 \right| \leq \left| \frac{\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})}{k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})} - 1 \right| + \frac{|k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) - \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}}.$$

Thus, it suffices to bound the last term on the right side. Since $k_0(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ and $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ is a non-increasing function of α , then

$$|k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) - \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}| = \int_0^\alpha \left| \frac{d}{du} k_u(\mathbf{x}) \right| du.$$

We now derive a bound on $\left| \frac{d}{du} k_u(\mathbf{x}) \right|$. For $u \in (0, \alpha]$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, if we define the probability vector $\omega_j = \frac{\pi_j(\mathbf{x})}{\|\pi(\mathbf{x})\|_u}$ with $j = 1, \dots, p$, $\pi_j(\mathbf{x})$ and $\pi(\mathbf{x})$ defined as Section II.A, then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d}{du} k_u(\mathbf{x}) \right| &= -\frac{d}{du} k_u(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= -\frac{d}{du} \exp(H_u(\pi(\mathbf{x}))) \\ &= -k_u(\mathbf{x}) \frac{d}{du} H_u(\pi(\mathbf{x})) \\ &= -k_u(\mathbf{x}) \left(\frac{-1}{(1-u)^2} \sum_{j: \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2 \neq 0} \omega_j(\mathbf{x}) \log \left(\frac{\omega_j(\mathbf{x})}{\pi_j(\mathbf{x})} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}}{(1-u)^2} \sum_{j: \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2 \neq 0} \omega_j(\mathbf{x}) \log \left(\frac{\omega_j(\mathbf{x})}{\pi_j(\mathbf{x})} \right), \end{aligned}$$

by using $k_u(\mathbf{x}) \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ and the formula for $\frac{d}{du} H_u(\pi(\mathbf{x}))$. Next, as $\frac{\omega_j(\mathbf{x})}{\pi_j(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{\pi_j(\mathbf{x})^{u-1}}{k_u(\mathbf{x})^{1-u}}$, then for j with $\|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2 \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\omega_j(\mathbf{x})}{\pi_j(\mathbf{x})} &\leq \frac{\pi_j(\mathbf{x})^{u-1}}{k_\infty(\mathbf{x})^{1-u}}, \text{ since } k_\infty(\mathbf{x}) \leq k_u(\mathbf{x}) \\ &\leq \frac{\pi_j(\mathbf{x})^{-1}}{k_\infty(\mathbf{x})} \cdot k_\infty(\mathbf{x})^u, \text{ since } \pi_j(\mathbf{x}) \in (0, 1] \\ &= \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}}{\|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2} \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\infty}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}} \cdot k_\infty(\mathbf{x})^u, \text{ since } k_\infty(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\infty}} \\ &\leq \text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}^u, \text{ since } k_\infty(\mathbf{x}) \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}. \end{aligned}$$

As this bound does not depend on j and ω_j sum to 1, we obtain for all $u \in (0, \alpha]$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d}{du} k_u(\mathbf{x}) \right| &\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}}{(1-u)^2} \left(\log \text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x}) + u \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}}{(1-u)^2} \left(\log \text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x}) + \alpha \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}) \right). \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Finally, the basic integral result $\int_0^\alpha \frac{1}{(1-u)^2} du = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}$ completes the proof.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is supported by the Swedish Research Council grant (Reg.No. 340-2013-5342).

REFERENCES

- [1] Baraniuk, R. G., Cevher, V., Duarte, M. F., & Hegde, C. (2010). Model-based compressive sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **56**(4) 1982–2001.
- [2] Blumensath, T., & Davies, M. E. (2009). Iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* **27**(3) 265–274.
- [3] Blumensath, T., & Davies, M. E. (2009). Sampling theorems for signals from the union of finite-dimensional linear subspaces. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55**(4) 1872–1882.

- [4] Candes, E. J., Romberg, J. K., & Tao, T. (2006). Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **59(8)** 1207–1223.
- [5] Candes, E. J., & Tao, T. (2005). Decoding by linear programming. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **51(12)** 4203–4215.
- [6] Candes, E. J., & Tao, T. (2006). Near-optimal signal recovery from random projections: Universal encoding strategies?. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **52(12)** 5406–5425.
- [7] Chen, J., & Huo, X. (2006). Theoretical results on sparse representations of multiple-measurement vectors. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **54(12)** 4634–4643.
- [8] Cotter, S. F., Rao, B. D., Engan, K., & Kreutz-Delgado, K. (2005). Sparse solutions to linear inverse problems with multiple measurement vectors. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **53(7)** 2477–2488.
- [9] Donoho, D. L. (2006). Compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **52(4)** 1289–1306.
- [10] Duarte, M. F., & Eldar, Y. C. (2011). Structured compressed sensing: From theory to applications. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **59(9)** 4053–4085.
- [11] Dudley, R. M. (1999). Uniform central limit theorems (Vol. 23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Eldar, Y. C., Kuppinger, P., & Bolcskei, H. (2010). Block-sparse signals: Uncertainty relations and efficient recovery. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **58(6)** 3042–3054.
- [13] Eldar, Y. C., & Kutyniok, G. (2012). Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications. Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Eldar, Y. C., & Mishali, M. (2009). Robust recovery of signals from a structured union of subspaces. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55(11)** 5302–5316.
- [15] Elhamifar, E., & Vidal, R. (2012). Block-sparse recovery via convex optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **60(8)** 4094–4107.
- [16] Foucart, S., & Rauhut, H. (2013). A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing. New York, NY, USA: Springer-Verlag.
- [17] Lopes, M. E. (2013). Estimating Unknown Sparsity in Compressed Sensing. In *ICML* (3) (pp. 217–225).
- [18] Lopes, M. E. (2016). Unknown Sparsity in Compressed Sensing: Denoising and Inference. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **62(9)** 5145–5166.
- [19] Lv, X., Bi, G., & Wan, C. (2011). The group lasso for stable recovery of block-sparse signal representations. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **59(4)** 1371–1382.
- [20] Majumdar, A., & Ward, R. K. (2010). Compressed sensing of color images. *Signal Processing* **90(12)** 3122–3127.
- [21] Markatou, M., & Horowitz, J. L. (1995). Robust scale estimation in the error-components model using the empirical characteristic function. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* **23(4)** 369–381.
- [22] Markatou, M., Horowitz, J. L., & Lenth, R. V. (1995). Robust scale estimation based on the the empirical characteristic function. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **25(2)** 185–192.
- [23] Mishali, M., & Eldar, Y. C. (2008). Reduce and boost: Recovering arbitrary sets of jointly sparse vectors. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **56(10)** 4692–4702.
- [24] Mishali, M., & Eldar, Y. C. (2009). Blind multiband signal reconstruction: Compressed sensing for analog signals. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **57(3)** 993–1009.
- [25] Needell, D., & Tropp, J. A. (2009). CoSaMP: Iterative signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate samples. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* **26(3)** 301–321.
- [26] Nolan, J. P. (2013). Multivariate elliptically contoured stable distributions: theory and estimation. *Computational Statistics* **28(5)** 2067–2089.
- [27] Parvaresh, F., Vikalo, H., Misra, S., & Hassibi, B. (2008). Recovering sparse signals using sparse measurement matrices in compressed DNA microarrays. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* **2(3)** 275–285.
- [28] Plan, Y., & Vershynin, R. (2013). OneBit Compressed Sensing by Linear Programming. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **66(8)** 1275–1297.
- [29] Press, S. J. (1972). Multivariate stable distributions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **2(4)** 444–462.
- [30] Stojnic, M., Parvaresh, F., & Hassibi, B. (2010). On the reconstruction of block-sparse signals with an optimal number of measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **57(8)** 3075–3085.
- [31] Tropp, J. A., & Gilbert, A. C. (2007). Signal recovery from random measurements via orthogonal matching pursuit. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **53(12)** 4655–4666.
- [32] Vershynin, R. (2015). Estimation in high dimensions: a geometric perspective. In *Sampling Theory, a Renaissance* (pp. 3–66). Springer International Publishing.
- [33] Yuan, M., & Lin, Y. (2006). Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **68(1)** 49–67.
- [34] Zeinalkhani, Z., & Banihashemi, A. H. (2015). Iterative Reweighted ℓ_2/ℓ_1 Recovery Algorithms for Compressed Sensing of Block Sparse Signals. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **63(17)** 4516–4531.
- [35] Zolotarev, V. M. (1986). One-dimensional stable distributions (Vol. 65). Providence, RI, USA: AMS, 1986.