

Blind Orthogonal Least Squares based Compressive Spectrum Sensing

Liyang Lu, *Student Member, IEEE*, Wenbo Xu, *Member, IEEE*, Yue Wang, *Member, IEEE*, Siye Wang

Abstract—Compressive spectrum sensing (CSS) has been widely studied in wideband cognitive radios, benefiting from the reduction of sampling rate via compressive sensing (CS) technology. However, the sensing performance of most existing CSS excessively relies on the prior information such as spectrum sparsity or noise variance. Thus, a key challenge in practical CSS is how to work effectively even in the absence of such information. In this paper, we propose a blind orthogonal least squares based CSS algorithm (B-OLS-CSS), which functions properly without the requirement of prior information. Specifically, we develop a novel blind stopping rule for the OLS algorithm based on its probabilistic recovery condition. This innovative rule gets rid of the need of the spectrum sparsity or noise information, but only requires the computational-feasible mutual incoherence property of the given measurement matrix. Our theoretical analysis indicates that the signal-to-noise ratio required by the proposed B-OLS-CSS for achieving a certain sensing accuracy is relaxed than that by the benchmark CSS using the OMP algorithm, which is verified by extensive simulation results.

Index Terms—Blind stopping rule, compressive spectrum sensing, orthogonal least squares, sparse signal recovery.

I. INTRODUCTION

As a fundamental component of cognitive radio network (CRN), spectrum sensing [1] can improve the utilization of scarce spectrum resources by dynamically accessing spectrum occupancy for secondary users (SUs). To alleviate the sampling cost and hardware complexity in signal acquisition, compressive sensing (CS) has been applied to wideband spectrum sensing, called compressive spectrum sensing (CSS). Among various CSS algorithms, the greedy search methods, e.g., orthogonal matching pursuit (OMP) [2] and orthogonal least squares (OLS) [3], exhibit satisfactory sensing performance with fast implementation. The iterative atom selection mechanism of greedy algorithms, however, relies on the spectrum sparsity or noise prior information, which is not always available in practice and thus hinders their applications.

Blind greedy (BG) algorithms have been developed to solve the aforementioned dilemma of requiring prior information [4]. In current literature, the blind OMP (B-OMP) algorithm, as a representative BG algorithm, keeps detecting the effective support atomic energy in the residuals blindly [2]. However, the performance of OMP is sensitive to the mutual incoherence property (MIP) [5], [6] of the measurement matrix, that is, MIP should be small enough for effective atom separation, which limits the applicability of B-OMP algorithms in practice.

L. Lu, W. Xu and S. Wang are with the Key Lab of Universal Wireless Communications, Ministry of Education, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications. W. Xu (e-mail: xuwb@bupt.edu.cn) and S. Wang (e-mail: wsy@bupt.edu.cn) are the corresponding authors.

Y. Wang is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.

By contrary, the OLS algorithm enjoys stronger capability for correct atom exploration than OMP, resulting in compelling spectrum recovery performance, even if the measurement matrix exhibits poor MIP [7]. Therefore, the OLS algorithm is more capable to guarantee the access stability of SUs when confronting various MIP conditions in practice, which motivates us to investigate blind OLS algorithm for reliable CSS performance in real CRN scenario without prior information. To the best of our knowledge, there is no study on the holistic integration of BG and OLS, and the corresponding algorithm design and performance analysis in the current literature.

To fill such a gap, this paper proposes a blind OLS-based CSS (B-OLS-CSS) algorithm. Specifically, we formulate a mapping normalization factor, which is tighter than the existing bounds, by utilizing the probabilistic norm bound and computational-friendly MIP metric. Then, a blind stopping rule for the OLS algorithm is developed via further employing the MIP-based recovery conditions. To ensure the stability of primary users' (PUs') uninterrupted communications and SUs' access, this rule focuses on the selection of all correct support atoms, and hence the B-OLS-CSS algorithm can provide occupied spectrum status with high accuracy. Our work also theoretically demonstrates that the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) required for accurate sensing of B-OLS-CSS is lower than that required of the CSS based on OMP. Furthermore, the simulation results indicate that B-OLS-CSS without prior information is competitive with the CSS algorithms given available prior knowledge and exhibits superior performance when the MIP of the measurement matrix is unfavorable.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Notations

\mathbf{D}_{S^l} is a submatrix of \mathbf{D} that contains the column set S^l selected at the l -th iteration. If the selected matrix \mathbf{D}_{S^l} has full column rank, then $\mathbf{P}_{S^l} = \mathbf{D}_{S^l} \mathbf{D}_{S^l}^\dagger$ denotes the projection onto the span(\mathbf{D}_{S^l}), where $\mathbf{D}_{S^l}^\dagger = (\mathbf{D}_{S^l}^T \mathbf{D}_{S^l})^{-1} \mathbf{D}_{S^l}^T$ represents the pseudoinverse of \mathbf{D}_{S^l} . $\mathbf{P}_{S^l}^\perp = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{S^l}$ represents the projection onto the orthogonal complement of the span(\mathbf{D}_{S^l}). The spectral norm of a matrix \mathbf{D} is given by $\rho(\mathbf{D}) = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{D})}$, where $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$ stands for the largest eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} . Throughout the paper, the measurement matrix is normalized.

B. System Model

In a wideband CRN, the received spectrum signal at a SU from K PUs is denoted by $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{R}^N$, which is sparse based on a certain basis $\Psi \in \mathcal{R}^{N \times N}$. Let $\mathbf{s} = \Psi \mathbf{x}$, where \mathbf{x} is a K -sparse signal that only contains K nonzero entries. Define $\Phi \in \mathcal{R}^{M \times N}$ as the sampling matrix, where M and N




Fig. 1. System model with B-OLS-CSS algorithm.

are the numbers of sub-Nquist-rate and Nquist-rate samples, respectively. Denoting the additive noise as $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_M)$, the compressed measurement vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{R}^M$ is given by

$$\mathbf{y} = \Phi \mathbf{s} + \epsilon = \Phi \Psi \mathbf{x} + \epsilon = \mathbf{D} \mathbf{x} + \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{D} = \Phi \Psi \in \mathcal{R}^{M \times N}$ is the measurement matrix. The SNR is defined as $\text{SNR} = \frac{\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2)}{\mathbb{E}(\|\epsilon\|_2^2)}$, the component SNR is given by $\text{SNR}_q = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_q \mathbf{D}_q\|_2^2}{M \sigma^2}$ ($q = 1, 2, \dots, N$) and the minimum component SNR_{\min} is the minimum value of the component SNRs [2].

The objective of spectrum sensing is to recover the sparse vector \mathbf{x} from the compressive observations \mathbf{y} given the measurement matrix \mathbf{D} . The system model for our proposed B-OLS-CSS algorithm is illustrated in Fig. 1. At a SU's node, the original sparse spectrum is recovered by our proposed B-OLS-CSS algorithm with the required minimum probability P_{\min} of accurate reconstruction and the trim parameter ϑ that guarantees more opportunities of selecting correct atoms for the algorithm. This trim parameter will be elaborated afterwards.

III. PROPOSED COMPRESSIVE SPECTRUM SENSING ALGORITHM

In the iterative procedure of OLS, the atom minimizing the residual power is selected and such selection continues until the conventional stopping rule is satisfied, e.g., the number of iterations is larger than a pre-known sparsity value K or the residual is smaller than a given threshold. In this section, we first develop the theoretical analysis of OLS using the blind stopping rule, which is different from the conventional OLS algorithm, and then develop the B-OLS-CSS algorithm.

A. Blind Stopping Rule for OLS

To facilitate the theoretical derivation, we present the following lemmas.

Lemma 1. (Theorem 2 in [6]) Let μ be the matrix coherence of the measurement matrix \mathbf{D} , which is defined by $\mu = \max_{i,j \neq i} |\mathbf{D}_i^T \mathbf{D}_j|$. OLS performs exact recovery if

$$K < \left(\sqrt[3]{-\frac{q}{2} + \sqrt{\Delta}} + \sqrt[3]{-\frac{q}{2} - \sqrt{\Delta}} - \frac{\beta}{3\alpha} \right) \equiv C, \quad (2)$$

where $q = \frac{27\alpha^2\delta - 9\alpha\beta\gamma + 2\beta^3}{27\alpha^3}$, $p = \frac{3\alpha\gamma - \beta^2}{3\alpha^2}$, $\alpha = -\frac{\mu^4}{2} + \frac{3}{2}\mu^3$, $\beta = \frac{\mu^4}{2} - 3\mu^3 - 4\mu^2$, $\gamma = \frac{3\mu^3}{2} + 7\mu^2 + \frac{7}{2}\mu$, $\delta = -\frac{1}{2}\mu^3 - 2\mu^2 - \frac{5}{2}\mu - 1$ and $\Delta = \left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\beta}{3\alpha}\right)^3$.

Lemma 2. For $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{R}^{M \times K}$, whose entries independently and identically satisfy the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{M})$, the smallest singular value ζ_{\min} and the largest singular value ζ_{\max} of \mathbf{B} with any $\vartheta > 0$ follow:

$$\min \left\{ \mathbb{P} \left\{ \zeta_{\min} \geq 1 - \sqrt{K/M} - \vartheta \right\}, \right. \\ \left. \mathbb{P} \left\{ \zeta_{\max} \leq 1 + \sqrt{K/M} + \vartheta \right\} \right\} \geq 1 - e^{-\frac{M\vartheta^2}{2}}. \quad (3)$$

The proof of Lemma 2 is omitted since it can be easily derived from Theorem 2.13 in [8].

Lemma 3. Suppose $\mu < \frac{1}{K-1}$, then $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{T}}} \leq \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^l}^\perp \mathbf{D}_i\|_2 \leq 1$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\} \setminus \mathbf{S}^l$ with the probability given in Lemma 2, where $\mathcal{T} = \left(1 - \frac{K\mu^2(1 + \sqrt{K/m + \vartheta})}{(1 - \sqrt{K/m - \vartheta})^2}\right)^{-1}$.

Proof: See Appendix A. \blacksquare

Notably, an appropriate ϑ guarantees that the lower bound in Lemma 3 approaches 1 with the probability given in Lemma 2. Further, in [9] and [6], the authors provide that

$$\sqrt{1 - K\mu} \leq \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^l}^\perp \mathbf{D}_i\|_2 \leq 1 \quad (4)$$

and

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{(1 + (K-1)\mu)K\mu^2}{(1 - (K-1)\mu)^2}} \leq \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^l}^\perp \mathbf{D}_i\|_2 \leq 1 \quad (5)$$

respectively. The comparison between our result in Lemma 3 and those in (4) and (5) is presented in the following remark.

Remark 1. If $\vartheta < (K-1)\mu - \sqrt{K/M}$, the lower bound of $\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^l}^\perp \mathbf{D}_i\|_2$ in Lemma 3 is closer to 1 than those in (4) and (5).

Based on the aforementioned lemmas, Theorem 1 is given as follows.

Theorem 1. Suppose that $K < C$ and $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_M)$. Then, if the minimum component SNR_{\min} satisfies

$$\text{SNR}_{\min} > \max \left\{ \frac{4(2 - (K - \mathcal{T})\mu)^2 \omega^2 \mu^2 \theta^2}{M(2 - (K - \mathcal{T})\mu - 2K\mathcal{T}\mu)^2 (1 - (K - 1)\mu)^2}, \right. \\ \left. \frac{\omega^2 \mu^2 (\theta + \sqrt{M + 2\sqrt{M} \log M})^2}{M(1 - \sqrt{K/M} - \vartheta - \omega\mu(1 + \sqrt{K/M} + \vartheta)\sqrt{K})^2} \right\}, \quad (6)$$

with the probability

$$\mathbb{P} > 1 - \frac{CN}{e^{0.5\omega^2\mu^2\theta^2} \sqrt{2\pi\omega^2\mu^2\theta^2}} - 2e^{-\frac{M\vartheta^2}{2}} - \frac{1}{M-C} - \frac{1}{M} \\ = \mathcal{P}(\omega), \quad (7)$$

the OLS algorithm using the blind stopping rule

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{r}^l\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{r}^l\|_2} \leq \omega\mu \quad (8)$$

can reconstruct the given K -sparse signal, where $\vartheta > 0$, $\omega > 0$ and

$$\theta = \sqrt{4(M-C) - 2} - \sqrt{M-C + 2\sqrt{(M-C) \log(M-C)}}. \quad (9)$$

Proof. See Appendix B. \square

It is observed that the right-hand-side of the stopping rule in (8) only contains the computable matrix coherence μ and a constant ω . Assume the required minimum probability of accurate reconstruction is P_{\min} , then we set $\mathcal{P}(\omega) = P_{\min}$ and thus $\omega = \mathcal{P}^{-1}(P_{\min})$, where $\mathcal{P}^{-1}(\cdot)$ represents the inverse function of $\mathcal{P}(\cdot)$. Note that the stopping rule in (8) can work blindly while independent to the sparsity level or the noise prior information and suitable for the scenario where this information is unavailable.

B. B-OLS-CSS Algorithm

In this subsection, we utilize Theorem 1 to develop the B-OLS-CSS algorithm, which is given in Algorithm 1. Note that the greedy algorithms may not select the exactly correct K support atoms within K iterations due to the presence of noise. The B-OLS-CSS algorithm is designed to address this problem by appropriately reducing the right-hand-side of the blind stopping rule in (8) and hence the algorithm runs more than K iterations for more opportunities to choose all the K correct support atoms to the best effort. Based on these arguments, the blind stopping rule in the B-OLS-CSS algorithm is set as

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{r}^l\|_{\infty}}{\|\mathbf{r}^l\|_2} \leq (\omega - \vartheta)\mu. \quad (10)$$

According to Lemma 1 and Remark 1, ϑ satisfies $0 < \vartheta < (\mathcal{C} - 1)\mu - \sqrt{\mathcal{C}/M}$. Since the stopping iteration depends on ϑ as shown in (10), we call ϑ as trim parameter. The value of ϑ should be set in a moderate scale. A large ϑ induces a loose bound of $\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^l}^{\perp} \mathbf{D}_i\|_2$, while a small one reduces the probability in (7) exponentially. Hence, this parameter is able to effectively balance the required SNR_{\min} in (6) and its target recovery probability in (7). The trade-off guarantees that B-OLS-CSS iterates slightly more than K times.

As we can see, the trim parameter ϑ is essential to the B-OLS-CSS algorithm, leading to higher probability for selecting all K correct support atoms compared with the existing blind OMP algorithms [2], which iterates K times exactly.

IV. SIMULATION TESTS

A. Simulations for Theoretical Results

In this subsection, we present simulation results to illustrate Lemma 3 and Theorem 1, and compare them with (4), (5) and Theorem 1 in [2].

We generate two $M \times N$ normalized measurement matrices (where $M = 1024$, $N = 8192$ and $M = 2048$, $N = 8192$), which are the same as those in [2]. The matrix coherences μ of these matrices are about 0.135 and 0.109 respectively. For fair comparison, we fix ϑ as 0.15 in the simulations. The results of the comparison among the lower bounds in Lemma 3, (4) and (5) are presented in Fig. 2-a. It is observed that our derived bound is generally much closer to 1 than those in (4) and (5), which verifies that our result is tighter. When matrix coherence μ is smaller, the lower bound of $\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^l}^{\perp} \mathbf{D}_i\|_2$ becomes tighter.

Algorithm 1 B-OLS-CSS Algorithm

Input: \mathbf{D} , \mathbf{y} , reconstruction probability P_{\min} and the trim parameter ϑ

Output: The recovered spectrum $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^N$, $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$

- 1: **Initialization** : $l = 0$, $\mathbf{r}^0 = \mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{S}^0 = \emptyset$, $\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{0}$
- 2: Calculate $\omega = \mathcal{P}^{-1}(P_{\min})$ according to (7)
- 3: Calculate the matrix coherence μ of \mathbf{D}
- 4: **while** $\frac{\|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{r}^l\|_{\infty}}{\|\mathbf{r}^l\|_2} > (\omega - \vartheta)\mu$ **do**
- 5: Set $i^{l+1} = \arg \min_{j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \mathbf{S}^l} \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^l \cup \{j\}}^{\perp} \mathbf{y}\|_2^2$
- 6: Augment $\mathbf{S}^{l+1} = \mathbf{S}^l \cup \{i^{l+1}\}$
- 7: Estimate $\mathbf{x}^{l+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}: \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{S}^{l+1}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$
- 8: Update $\mathbf{r}^{l+1} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}^{l+1}$
- 9: $l = l + 1$
- 10: **end while**
- 11: **return** $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}^l$ and $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^l$

The lower bounds of SNR_{\min} for high probability of exact recovery in Theorem 1 and the Theorem 1 in [2] are presented in Fig. 2-b. The probabilities of exact recovery are set as 0.9 : 0.01 : 0.99. When the matrix coherence becomes smaller, the lower bounds of SNR_{\min} decrease. The results indicate that our derived bound of SNR_{\min} for OLS is lower than that of OMP, which implies that OLS is more suitable for spectrum sensing in noisy scenarios.




Fig. 2. Lower bounds of (a) $\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^l}^{\perp} \mathbf{D}_i\|_2$; (b) SNR_{\min} with $K = 4$.

B. Simulations for Spectrum Sensing

In this subsection, we present simulations to demonstrate the superiority of our proposed B-OLS-CSS algorithm beyond the existing benchmarks. We call the CSS using conventional OMP algorithm as OMP-CSS, while the one using OLS algorithm is called OLS-CSS. The spectrum is regarded to be successfully recovered if the recovered spectrum is within a certain small Euclidean distance of the ground truth. The locations of the sparse nonzero atoms are selected uniformly at random. The nonzero entries in the spectrum are set to be independently and identically distributed as $\mathcal{N}(1, 0.01)$ for illustration [10]. The minimum recovery probability P_{\min} in (7) is fixed as 0.95 and the trim parameter ϑ is set to be 0.175. All CSS algorithms run over 1,000 Monte Carlo trials.




Fig. 3. CSS performance using Gaussian measurement matrix with $M = 1024$ and $N = 2048$.




Fig. 4. CSS performance using hybrid measurement matrix with $M = 256$ and $N = 512$.

We first perform simulations to compare the sensing performance of the B-OLS-CSS with the OLS-CSS, which stops exactly at the K -th iteration. As shown in Fig. 3, the performance of the B-OLS-CSS is almost the same as that of the OLS-CSS given perfectly known prior knowledge on K and σ , which demonstrates that even if the B-OLS-CSS algorithm does not know the sparsity level or the noise information in advance, its sensing performance is still competitive, where the performance of both algorithms degrades as K increases.

Then, we provide simulations to investigate the sensing performance of the OMP-CSS, OLS-CSS, CSS with the blind OMP in [2] (we call it as B-OMP-CSS) and B-OLS-CSS. We adopt the hybrid measurement matrix \mathbf{D} given in [7], whose columns satisfy $\mathbf{D}_i = \mathbf{n}_i + c_i \mathbf{1}$, where \mathbf{n}_i is distributed as standard Gaussian distribution, the scalar c_i obeys the uniform distribution on $[0, 10]$ and $\mathbf{1}$ is the all 1 vector. As shown in Fig. 4, when $K = 8$, B-OLS-CSS performs the best, even better than the OLS-CSS algorithm, which reveals that the blind stopping rule in (10) works better than the one ensuring exact K iterations in OLS-CSS. Meanwhile, OMP-CSS behaves the worst, which is consistent with the theoretical statement in [7] that OMP performs poorly in dealing with high coherence measurement matrices. We further conduct the sensing performance of these algorithms with

$K = 12$. Except B-OLS-CSS, the performance of the other algorithms degenerates rapidly and they end up unable to perform exact recovery. In this case, B-OMP-CSS exhibits the worst performance degradation due to the unquantifiable stopping rule and the poor performance of the OMP with high coherence measurement matrix. In contrast, the B-OLS-CSS algorithm provides satisfactory performance, which indicates that it is more suitable for the practical spectrum sensing scenarios where the prior information is unavailable.

V. CONCLUSION

This work is motivated by the challenge that the prior information such as the spectrum sparsity and noise variance is usually unavailable for CSS techniques in the practical CRN. To address this issue, we propose a B-OLS-CSS algorithm, which works properly even in the absence of such prior information. The theoretical analysis demonstrates that the SNR required for the exact recovery of our B-OLS-CSS is lower than the existing blind algorithm, leading to theoretical guarantee for the robustness of the proposed B-OLS-CSS algorithm to the low SNR environments. Simulation results reveal that the proposed B-OLS-CSS algorithm can provide comparable performance to that achieved in the ideal case with perfectly known sparsity and noise information and it indeed outperforms the other existing blind CSS techniques in terms of better spectrum recovery accuracy.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA 3

Proof. Due to submultiplicativity, we have

$$\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^t} \mathbf{D}_i\|_2 \leq \rho(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{S}^t}) \rho((\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{S}^t}^T \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{S}^t})^{-1}) \|\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{S}^t} \mathbf{D}_i\|_2. \quad (11)$$

By Lemma 2, we obtain

$$\rho(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{S}^t}) = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{S}^t}^T \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{S}^t})} \leq \sqrt{1 + \sqrt{K/M} + \vartheta}. \quad (12)$$

Then, similar to the proof procedures in [6], we have

$$\rho((\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{S}^t}^T \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{S}^t})^{-1}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \sqrt{K/M} - \vartheta}. \quad (13)$$

Since $\|\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{S}^t} \mathbf{D}_i\|_2 \leq \sqrt{K\mu^2}$,

$$\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^t} \mathbf{D}_i\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{K\mu^2(1 + \sqrt{K/M} + \vartheta)}}{1 - \sqrt{K/M} - \vartheta}. \quad (14)$$

Finally, for any $\vartheta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\geq \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^t}^\perp \mathbf{D}_i\|_2 = \sqrt{1 - \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^t} \mathbf{D}_i\|_2^2} \\ &\geq \sqrt{1 - \frac{K\mu^2(1 + \sqrt{K/M} + \vartheta)}{(1 - \sqrt{K/M} - \vartheta)^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

□

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Preparation lemmas are first given as follows.

Lemma 4. (Lemma 5.1 in [11]). The Gaussian noise $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_M)$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\epsilon\|_2 \leq \sigma\sqrt{M + 2\sqrt{M \log M}}\right\} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{M}. \quad (16)$$

Lemma 5. Suppose $K < \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}_i}^\perp \epsilon\|_2^2 \geq \theta^2 \sigma^2\right\} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{M - \mathcal{C}} \quad (17)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}_i}^\perp \epsilon\|_\infty \leq \omega\mu\theta\sigma\right\} > 1 - \frac{N}{e^{0.5\omega^2\mu^2\theta^2} \sqrt{2\pi\omega^2\mu^2\theta^2}}. \quad (18)$$

The proof of Lemma 5 is omitted since it is similar to that of Lemma 3 in [2]. Based on Lemmas 4 and 5, the proof of Theorem 1 is given as follows.

Proof of Theorem 1. The proof of Theorem 1 contains three parts: (1) Developing the condition for choosing a correct entry in each iteration; (2) Proving that the OLS algorithm does not stop at the i -th iteration ($i < K$); (3) Proving that the OLS algorithm stops after K iterations.

We first prove that a correct support can be chosen at each iteration. By using Lemma 4 in [2] and Theorem 5 in [6], we obtain that if

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{0 \setminus \mathbf{S}}\|_2 > \frac{2\sqrt{K-l}(2 - (K - \mathcal{T})\mu)\omega\mu\sigma\theta}{(2 - (K - \mathcal{T})\mu - 2K\mathcal{T}\mu)(1 - (K - 1)\mu)}, \quad (19)$$

OLS selects a correct atom with the probability $\mathbb{P}\{\|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}_i}^\perp \epsilon\|_\infty \leq \omega\mu\theta\sigma\}$.

Since $\frac{1}{\sigma}\|\mathbf{x}_{0 \setminus \mathbf{S}}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{q \in 0 \setminus \mathbf{S}} M \times \text{SNR}_q}$, (19) becomes

$$\text{SNR}_{\min} > \frac{4(2 - (K - \mathcal{T})\mu)^2 \omega^2 \mu^2 \sigma^2 \theta^2}{M(2 - (K - \mathcal{T})\mu - 2K\mathcal{T}\mu)^2 (1 - (K - 1)\mu)^2}. \quad (20)$$

Next, for $l < K$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{r}^l\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{r}^l\|_2} \\ & \geq \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{K-l}} \|\mathbf{D}_{0 \setminus \mathbf{S}}^T \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}_i}^\perp \mathbf{D}_{0 \setminus \mathbf{S}} \mathbf{x}_{0 \setminus \mathbf{S}}\|_2 - \omega\mu\theta\sigma}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}_i}^\perp \mathbf{D}_{0 \setminus \mathbf{S}} \mathbf{x}_{0 \setminus \mathbf{S}}\|_2 + \sqrt{M + 2\sqrt{M \log M}}\sigma} \\ & \geq \frac{\frac{1 - \sqrt{K/M} - \vartheta}{\sqrt{K-l}} \|\mathbf{x}_{0 \setminus \mathbf{S}}\|_2 - \omega\mu\theta\sigma}{(1 + \sqrt{K/M} + \vartheta) \|\mathbf{x}_{0 \setminus \mathbf{S}}\|_2 + \sqrt{M + 2\sqrt{M \log M}}\sigma} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

with the probability $\mathbb{P}\left\{\bigcap_{l=1}^K \|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}_i}^\perp \epsilon\|_\infty \leq \omega\mu\theta\sigma, \zeta_{\min} \geq 1 - \sqrt{K/M} - \vartheta, \zeta_{\max} \leq 1 + \sqrt{K/M} + \vartheta, \|\epsilon\|_2 \leq \sqrt{M + 2\sqrt{M \log M}}\sigma\right\}$. Then, if

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{SNR}_{\min} \\ & > \frac{\omega^2 \mu^2 (\theta + \sqrt{M + 2\sqrt{M \log M}})^2}{M(1 - \sqrt{K/M} - \vartheta - \omega\mu(1 + \sqrt{K/M} + \vartheta)\sqrt{K})^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

we have $\frac{\|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{r}^l\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{r}^l\|_2} > \omega\mu$, which indicates that OLS does not stop at the l -th iteration.

Now it remains to prove that OLS stops exactly at the K -th iteration. With the probability $\mathbb{P}\{\|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^K}^\perp \epsilon\|_\infty \leq \omega\mu\theta\sigma, \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^K}^\perp \epsilon\|_2 \geq \theta\sigma\}$, we have

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{r}^K\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{r}^K\|_2} = \frac{\|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^K}^\perp \epsilon\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^K}^\perp \epsilon\|_2} \leq \omega\mu, \quad (23)$$

which means that OLS stops at the K -th iteration. Finally, combining (20) and (22), we obtain that if the minimum component SNR_{\min} satisfies (6), OLS chooses K correct atoms in K iterations with the probability

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} & = \mathbb{P}\left\{\bigcap_{l=1}^K \|\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}_i}^\perp \epsilon\|_\infty \leq \omega\mu\theta\sigma, \right. \\ & \quad \zeta_{\min} \geq 1 - \sqrt{K/M} - \vartheta, \zeta_{\max} \leq 1 + \sqrt{K/M} + \vartheta, \\ & \quad \left. \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{S}^K}^\perp \epsilon\|_2 \geq \theta\sigma, \|\epsilon\|_2 \leq \sqrt{M + 2\sqrt{M \log M}}\sigma\right\} \\ & > 1 - \frac{KN}{e^{0.5\omega^2\mu^2\theta^2} \sqrt{2\pi\omega^2\mu^2\theta^2}} - \frac{2}{e^{\frac{M\vartheta^2}{2}}} - \frac{1}{M - \mathcal{C}} - \frac{1}{M}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Since $K < \mathcal{C}$, we finally obtain (7). \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (61871050), US National Science Foundation (2136202) and Virginia Research Investment Fund (CCI-223996).

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Yang, Z. Song, Y. Gao, X. Gu, and Z. Feng, "Adaptive compressed spectrum sensing for multiband signals," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 20, no. 11, pp. 7642–7654, Nov. 2021.
- [2] S. Chen, Z. Cheng, C. Liu, and F. Xi, "A blind stopping condition for orthogonal matching pursuit with applications to compressive sensing radar," *Signal Process.*, vol. 165, no. Dec., pp. 331–342, 2019.
- [3] J. Kim, J. Wang, and B. Shim, "Optimal restricted isometry condition of normalized sampling matrices for exact sparse recovery with orthogonal least squares," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 69, pp. 1521–1536, Feb. 2021.
- [4] Y. Luo, J. Dang, and Z. Song, "Optimal compressive spectrum sensing based on sparsity order estimation in wideband cognitive radios," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 68, no. 12, pp. 12094–12106, Dec. 2019.
- [5] J. Yu, X. Liu, H. Qi, and Y. Gao, "Long-term channel statistic estimation for highly-mobile hybrid mmWave multi-user MIMO systems," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 69, no. 12, pp. 14277–14289, Dec. 2020.
- [6] L. Lu, W. Xu, Y. Wang, Z. Tian, Y. Cui, and S. Wang, "Recovery conditions of sparse signals using orthogonal least squares-type algorithms," *arXiv:2201.04914*, Jan. 2022.
- [7] C. Soussen, R. Gribonval, J. Idier, and C. Herzet, "Joint k -step analysis of orthogonal matching pursuit and orthogonal least squares," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 3158–3174, May 2013.
- [8] K. R. Davidson and S. J. Szarek, "Local operator theory, random matrices and banach spaces," In *W.B. Johnson and J. Lindenstrauss, Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces*, pp. 317–366, 2002.
- [9] T. T. Cai and L. Wang, "Orthogonal matching pursuit for sparse signal recovery with noise," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 4680–4688, Jul. 2011.
- [10] Y. Wang, Z. Tian, and C. Feng, "Sparsity order estimation and its application in compressive spectrum sensing for cognitive radios," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 2116–2125, Jun. 2012.
- [11] T. T. Cai, G. Xu, and J. Zhang, "On recovery of sparse signals via ℓ_1 minimization," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3388–3397, Jul. 2009.