

On Random Sampling of Diffused Graph Signals with Sparse Inputs on Vertex Domain

Yingcheng Lai, *Student Member*, Li Chai, *Member, IEEE*, Jinming Xu, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—The sampling of graph signals has recently drawn much attention due to the wide applications of graph signal processing. While a lot of efficient methods and interesting results have been reported to the sampling of band-limited or smooth graph signals, few research has been devoted to non-smooth graph signals, especially to sparse graph signals, which are also of importance in many practical applications. This paper addresses the random sampling of non-smooth graph signals generated by diffusion of sparse inputs. We aim to present a solid theoretical analysis on the random sampling of diffused sparse graph signals, which can be parallel to that of band-limited graph signals, and thus present a sufficient condition to the number of samples ensuring the unique recovery for uniform random sampling. Then, we focus on two classes of widely used binary graph models, and give explicit and tighter estimations on the sampling numbers ensuring unique recovery. We also propose an adaptive variable-density sampling strategy to provide a better performance than uniform random sampling. Finally, simulation experiments are presented to validate the effectiveness of the theoretical results.

Index Terms—Graph signal processing, random sampling, interpolation, compressed sensing, sparse signal.

I. INTRODUCTION

IN recent years, graphs have been employed as a robust framework for modelling the unstructured data and their intricate interactions over networks, and graph signal processing (GSP) has emerged as a powerful tool for analyzing data from different applications [1]–[3]. The data on the graph might be personal hobbies, activity in brain regions, and traffic volume at stations. The extension of classical signal processing methods to graph signals is the goal of GSP [4], [5]. Examples of relevant problems include signal reconstruction [2], [6], modeling and inference of diffusion processes [7], [8], and topology recognition [3], [9], etc.

The number of vertices in real-world networks is typically enormous, such as urban temperature monitoring systems, social networks and neural brain networks. Collecting information from all vertices in such large scale networks is very difficult. From this perspective, the sampling and recovery problem has received considerable attention as one of the cornerstone problems in the field of GSP [6], [10], [11]. Various results and methods have been reported for smooth graph signals, which have focused on the sampling and recovery problem under the assumption that the graph signal is smooth, where graph signals have approximately band-limited characteristics on the graph Fourier basis [3], [12]–[14]. In particular, ref. [11] makes a pioneering contribution to the theory of GSP sampling

and reconstruction, providing sufficient conditions to ensure unique recovery. The necessary and sufficient conditions for unique recovery in undirected graphs were introduced in [6]. Furthermore, the sampling results are extended to directed graphs [13], [15]. The above works discuss the theoretical guarantee of unique recovery under smooth signals, while some works design specific sampling strategies for sampling problems. The sampling strategies for graph signals generally include deterministic and random sampling strategies. Currently, deterministic sampling strategies are mainly studied using greedy optimization methods [13], [15]. For the random sampling strategy, ref. [14] proposes a variable density probabilistic sampling strategy for smooth graph signals.

In contrast to smooth graph signals, other works consider non-smooth graph signals generated by localized diffusion of sparse inputs in graph diffusion models [16]–[18]. This model has practical importance in many applications, including source identification of rumors and opinions in social networks, inverse problems related to biological signals on graphs, and estimation of diffusion processes in multi-agent networks. The work [16] investigates the design of a recovery algorithm for sparse inputs using a known graph diffusion model when sampling partially diffused sparse signals. Subsequently, ref. [18] extends it to a special type of locally aggregated graph signal and discusses recovery methods for identifying sparse inputs. When the graph diffusion model is unknown, the blind identification problem is investigated in [17], [19] under the assumption that the diffused graph signals can be collected from all vertices. These methods adopt the joint estimation of the graph diffusion model and sparse inputs.

In this paper, we employ the random sampling strategy to reconstruct the unknown sparse inputs from partially observed diffused graph signals. For uniform random sampling, we present an estimation on the number of samples and prove that it can guarantee the unique recovery with high probability. We show how this number of samples relates directly to the property of the diffused graph filter and other factors. Based on this result, we obtain explicit and tight bounds for two particular graph models: Erdős-Rényi (ER) random and small-world networks. We also propose an adaptive random sampling strategy to improve the performance.

Compressed sensing states that one can recover sparse signals from far fewer samples or measurements than traditional methods by a sampling mechanism satisfying the incoherence condition [20]. The focus on frames for dictionaries and the design of random measurement matrices with Gaussian distribution has gradually become two popular research directions in compressed sensing [21], [22]. It has been widely applied

[†] Yingcheng Lai, Li Chai and Jinming Xu are with the College of Control Science and Engineering, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China. (Email: laiyingcheng@zju.edu.cn; chaili@zju.edu.cn; jimmyxu@zju.edu.cn).

in channel coding [23], data compression [24], magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) reconstruction [25], and so on. For the diffused sparse signal, the graph diffusion model cannot be considered as a frame, and the design of the sampling matrix cannot follow a Gaussian distribution either. Based on the above discussion, we have found that there are still some fundamental issues to be addressed in random sampling of non-smooth diffused graph signals with sparse inputs:

- The theoretical guarantee for recovering uniqueness is not explicit. Specifically, how many vertices need to be sampled for a given graph diffusion model to ensure accurate reconstruction of sparse inputs?
- Experiments show that compared to the ER random graph, the star-shaped graph and the regular graph exhibit poorer recovery performance for the same sample size. For ER random graphs with different connection probabilities, edges that are too sparse or too dense can lead to poor recovery. This naturally raises the question: What is the relationship between the samples number for recovery and the network structure?
- Is there an alternative sampling strategy that can be applied to diffused sparse signals with higher recovery accuracy than uniform random sampling?

To address the above problems in this paper, we derive the following new results:

- **Sufficient conditions for ensuring the uniqueness of recovery.** We present a sufficient condition for the number of samples ensuring the signal reconstruction under uniform random sampling. The result reveals that the number of samples is related to the incoherence parameter μ , the sparse condition number $\kappa(\Gamma)$ induced by the diffusion matrix and the sparsity k of the sparse inputs. Moreover, we show that the calculation of $\kappa(\Gamma)$ can be simplified when the elements in the diffusion matrix and the sparse inputs are non-negative.
- **Sampling performance analysis of typical networks.** For binary graph diffusion model, we present the direct relationship between the number of samples ensuring recovery uniqueness and the network structure. For ER random networks, approximately $\sim \log n$ samples are sufficient for recovery uniqueness. Additionally, the relationship between the number of samples required and connection probability was revealed, and it was found that the required sample number reaches its minimum when the connection probability is 0.5. For a small-world network of degree d , we characterize the relationship between the number of samples required and the adjacency matrix of the d -regular graph. We show that the number of samples needed decreases as the probability of rewiring increases.
- **New sampling strategy.** An alternative sampling strategy is proposed to exploit variable density sampling techniques. We prove that the variable density sampling strategy offers a performance guarantee with fewer samples than uniform random sampling.

Notations. X^* represents the conjugate transpose of X . $\|x\|_0$ indicates the L_0 -norm, i.e., the number of non-zero elements in

the x . $\|x\|_1 = \sum |x_i|$ and $\|x\|_1 = \sum |x_i|$ is the L_1 -norm, and $\|X\|_2$ denotes the standard Euclidean norm. $\|x\|_\infty$ represents the maximum absolute value of the vector x , and $\|X\|_\infty$ represents the maximum value in the sum of absolute values for each row of the matrix X . We use $\|X\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}$ to represent the largest L_2 -norm among all columns of X . $\|X\|_{1,1} = \sum_{i,j} |x_{ij}|$ denotes the sum of absolute values of matrix elements of X . I and $\mathbf{1}$ denote the identity matrix and the all-one vector of appropriate size, respectively.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Network and Diffusion Model

An undirected graph with n vertices is denoted as $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}, A)$, where \mathcal{N} is the set of vertices, \mathcal{E} is the set of edges, and a pair $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ indicates that there is a link between vertex i and vertex j . The matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denotes the adjacency matrix, where the $a_{i,j}$ represents the weight of the relationship between vertices i and j . The degree of vertex i is defined as $d_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}$. Associated with the given graph \mathcal{G} , a graph signal is represented as $x = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where the i -th element x_i represents the signal value at vertex i .

In this paper, we consider the following diffused graph signal model

$$x = H\alpha, \quad (1)$$

where H is the graph diffusion matrix, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the sparse inputs with sparsity k , i.e. $\|\alpha\|_0 \leq k$. Our goal is to recover sparse inputs α by randomly sampling certain number of vertices, and to explore the relationship between the number of samples ensuring unique recovery and the network structure.

B. Problem Formulation

Let $\mathcal{M} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m\}$ be the sampling set, where $m = |\mathcal{M}|$ is the number of samples and $\omega_i \in 1, \dots, n$. Then, the sampling matrix $C_{\mathcal{M}} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$ is defined as

$$[C_{\mathcal{M}}]_{i,j} \triangleq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j = \omega_i, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

To represent the sampling process, we denote the probability distribution over $\{1, \dots, n\}$ by \mathcal{P} , and the sampling probabilities of all vertices by $p = [p_1, \dots, p_n] \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which satisfies the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$. The sampling set \mathcal{M} is formed by independently selecting m indices from the vertex set according to the probability distribution p , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(\omega_j = i) = p_i, \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (3)$$

For the uniform random sampling processes, the probability of sampling each vertex is identical, i.e., $p = [1/n, \dots, 1/n]$. Note that the sampling procedure permits duplicate vertices in the sampling set \mathcal{M} . In practical engineering, each selected vertex can only be sampled once, with duplicates added artificially afterwards.

With the sampling matrix $C_{\mathcal{M}}$, the observed signal $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ can be formulated as:

$$y = C_{\mathcal{M}}x = C_{\mathcal{M}}H\alpha = H_{\mathcal{M}}\alpha, \quad (4)$$

where $H_{\mathcal{M}} \triangleq C_{\mathcal{M}}H$. The system (4) is shown by Fig. 1.




Fig. 1: The generation and sampling process of diffused sparse signals.

It is known from linear algebra that the reconstructed signal α has an infinite number of solutions when $m \ll n$. However, compressed sensing theory states that the uniqueness of the solution can be guaranteed when α is a sparse vector. It is typically relaxed to a convex optimization problem as follows [26]

$$(P_1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \min_{\alpha} \|\alpha\|_1 \\ & \text{s.t. } y = H_{\mathcal{M}}\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Various sufficient conditions have been proposed in the literature to accurately recover α in compressed sensing [22], [23]. A metric condition called Restricted Isometric Property (RIP) is introduced in [23]. Specifically, it stated that the matrix $H_{\mathcal{M}}$ satisfies the RIP of order k if

$$(1 - \delta) \|\alpha\|_2 \leq \|H_{\mathcal{M}}\alpha\|_2 \leq (1 + \delta) \|\alpha\|_2$$

holds for all k -sparse vector α with a small positive constant δ . Some random matrices satisfy this property, such as matrix's elements obeying Gaussian or Bernoulli random distributions [22]. In addition, the mutual incoherence can also guarantee the recovery of α [27], [28], which requires the matrix $H_{\mathcal{M}}$ to be approximately orthogonal, i.e.,

$$\mu(H_{\mathcal{M}}) < 1/(2k - 1),$$

$$\text{where } \mu(H_{\mathcal{M}}) \triangleq \max_{i \neq j} \frac{|h_i^T h_j|}{\|h_i\|_2 \|h_j\|_2}.$$

III. MAIN RESULT

In this section, we will establish a sufficient condition for the number of samples to ensure unique recovery of α in the problem (P_1) under uniform random sampling. First, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 1: Assume that the expectation of matrix $\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}$ is invertible.

With the Assumption 1, we define

$$\Gamma \triangleq m[\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1}. \quad (6)$$

The number of measurements required to stably sample a diffused sparse signal will depend on a quantity called incoherence. We need the following definitions:

Definition 1 (Incoherence [26]): The incoherence parameter is the smallest number μ such that

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \{|h_{i,j}|\} \leq \mu, \quad \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left\{ \left| [H\Gamma]_{i,j} \right| \right\} \leq \mu, \quad (7)$$

where $h_{i,j}$ is the (i, j) -th element of the matrix H .

Definition 2 (Sparse Condition Number [29]): The largest and smallest k -sparse eigenvalue of a matrix X are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\max}(k, X) &\triangleq \max_{\|v\|_0 \leq k} \frac{\|Xv\|_2}{\|v\|_2}, \\ \lambda_{\min}(k, X) &\triangleq \min_{\|v\|_0 \leq k} \frac{\|Xv\|_2}{\|v\|_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The k -sparse condition number of X is

$$\text{cond}(k, X) \triangleq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(k, X)}{\lambda_{\min}(k, X)}. \quad (9)$$

Denote $\kappa(X)$ as follows

$$\kappa(X) \triangleq \max \{ \text{cond}(k, X), \text{cond}(k, X^{-1}) \}. \quad (10)$$

Now we can report the main result of this paper. In Theorem 1, we provide a sufficient condition for the exact recovery of α by the problem (P_1) when uniform random sampling.

Theorem 1: Consider the system (4), where α is the k -sparse input, H the graph diffusion matrix, and $\mathcal{M} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m\}$ the sampling set with ω_i being independent random variables with uniform distribution. With Assumption 1 define the matrix Γ as (6). Then with probability $1 - e^{-\varepsilon} - 3/n$, the problem (P_1) has a unique minimizer provided that

$$m \geq C(1 + \varepsilon) \mu^2 k \kappa(\Gamma) (\log n + \log \mu), \quad (11)$$

where $C > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ are positive constants.

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section VI.

Remark 1: From (11), it can be seen that the sampling boundary that guarantees unique recovery is related to the incoherence parameter μ , the sparse condition number $\kappa(\Gamma)$, the cardinality of sparse inputs k and the number of vertices n . Given a graph diffusion model H , we can calculate the required number of samples based on (11), which provides a theoretical guide for sampling. When μ , $\kappa(\Gamma)$ and k are small, it can be observed that we only need an order of magnitude proportional to $\log n$ to achieve unique recovery.

Remark 2: The proof of Theorem 1 relies on principles from compressed sensing. Similar work [26] considers the identical sampling model as ours, where H consists of the product of two orthogonal basis, and the result shows that $m \geq C\mu^2 k \log(n/\delta)$, where $\mu = \max_{1 \leq i, j < n} \{|h_{i,j}|\}$. From our result (Theorem 1), it can be observed that when H is a matrix composed of the product of two orthogonal basis, the result is consistent with the work [26].

Ref. [30] addresses the compressed sensing based on redundant dictionaries within an analysis sparsity model. The analysis sparsity model originates from the sparse representation in harmonic analysis, assuming that the signal is sparse after transformation. In contrast, we focus on the synthesis sparsity model, where the signal is a linear combination of a few atoms in the dictionary. In addition, according to the definition of our sparsity condition number, our result reduces the lower bound of the number of samples compared to [30].

The work [14] can be regarded as a particular instance of the ref. [30] in smooth graph signals, where signals exhibit sparse features by graph Fourier transform. Specifically, according to the definition of smooth graph signals, the energy of signals in

the graph Fourier domain is mainly concentrated in the first k low frequencies [10]. Therefore, the sparse support on graph Fourier domain is known. In comparison to the work [14], our work considers a more complex problem, in which the graph signal is characterised by sparsity on the vertex domain and the sparse support on the vertex domain is unknown.

For the purpose of simplifying calculations, we show that the k -sparse condition number of $[\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1}$ will not be greater than the k -sparse condition number of $\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}$ if H is a non-negative matrix and α is a non-negative vector in the following corollary.

Corollary 1: With the same assumption of Theorem 1, if all elements of H are non-negative, the following inequality holds

$$\text{cond}\left(k, [\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1}\right) \leq \text{cond}\left(k, \mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}\right). \quad (12)$$

Moreover, if all elements of α are non-negative, then with probability $1 - e^{-\varepsilon} - 3/n$, the problem (P_1) has a unique minimizer provided that

$$m \geq C(1 + \varepsilon)\mu^2k \cdot \text{cond}\left(k, \mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cdot (\log n + \log \mu), \quad (13)$$

where $C > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ are positive constants.

Proof: Let us assume that $\beta = \mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}\alpha$, then the maximum k -sparse eigenvalue of $[\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1}$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\max}\left(k, [\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1}\right) &= \max_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k} \frac{\|[\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1}\beta\|_2}{\|\beta\|_2} \\ &= \max_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k} \frac{\|\alpha\|_2}{\|\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}\alpha\|_2} = \frac{1}{\min_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k} \frac{\|\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}\alpha\|_2}{\|\alpha\|_2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Similarly, the minimum k -sparse eigenvalue of $[\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1}$ is

$$\lambda_{\min}\left(k, [\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1}\right) = \frac{1}{\max_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k} \frac{\|\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}\alpha\|_2}{\|\alpha\|_2}}. \quad (15)$$

Combining (14) and (15), the k -sparse condition number of $[\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1}$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cond}\left(k, [\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1}\right) &= \frac{\max_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k} \frac{\|\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}\alpha\|_2}{\|\alpha\|_2}}{\min_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k} \frac{\|\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}\alpha\|_2}{\|\alpha\|_2}} \\ &\leq \text{cond}\left(k, \mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds comes from that each element of the matrix $\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}$ and the vector α is non-negative, then we have $\|\alpha\|_0 \leq \|\beta\|_0 \leq k$. According to the definition of the k -sparse condition number in Definition 2, we know that the sparse condition number increases monotonically as k increases, so the inequality holds. This completes the proof. ■

IV. BINARY DIFFUSION MODEL

In this section, we analyse the sampling rate guaranteed to uniquely recover the problem (P_1) under a type of binary diffusion model based on the results in Theorem 1. Specifically, we consider the case of $\{0, 1\}$ -binary network diffusion, i.e., $H = I + \delta A$, where A is the unweighted adjacency matrix and $0 < \delta \leq 1$. This model is of practical interest in a number of applications, including the spread of epidemics and the spread of rumors in social networks and brain networks, such as the Susceptible-Infected (SI) model [19].

For example, the social interaction between people can be modeled as an undirected, symmetric sparse graph, and the spread of epidemics can either be influenced or not. In this scenario, the impact of a vertex on its neighbors can be represented in a binary format with two possible values, namely 0 and 1. The initial number of epidemic sources initiated by a small group can be represented by α , where the support of non-zero elements represents the source of epidemics. Suppose that only part of the population of a given city is initially infected, and that the adjacency matrix is constructed on the basis of the daily social interactions between individuals. It would be desirable to identify the source of the epidemic with minimal delay. However, it is impractical to test all individuals for epidemics within a single day. Therefore, based on a preliminary understanding of the social habits of the population in the city, we hope to estimate how many people need to be tested to find the source of the epidemic.

In the following, we will explore two particular types of graphs. First, considering the ER random graph, we demonstrate how connection probability b affects the number of samples to reconstruct a sparse signal, i.e., $m \sim -\log(b - b^2)/(b - b^2)$. For an appropriate connection probability b (without an excessive bias towards 0 or 1), approximately $\sim \log n$ samples are sufficient for the problem (P_1) . We then investigate the number of samples for recovery of small-world networks and characterize the relationship between the number of samples and the adjacency matrix of the d -regular graph. Furthermore, it is demonstrated that the number of samples required decreases as the rewiring probability b increases.

A. Erdős-Rényi Random Network

Theorem 2: For an ER random network with n vertices and edge connection probability b . Let α be a k -sparse vector diffused in the network by the binary diffusion model $H = I + \delta A$, where A is the unweighted adjacency matrix and $0 < \delta \leq 1$. Let \mathcal{M} be the sampling set as in Theorem 1. Then with probability $1 - e^{-\varepsilon} - 3/n$, the problem (P_1) has a unique minimizer provided that

$$m \geq \frac{C(1 + \varepsilon)k^{3/2}(\log n - \log \delta^2(b - b^2))}{\delta^2(b - b^2)}, \quad (16)$$

where $C > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ are positive constants.

Proof: Since the diffusion matrix is $H = I + \delta A$,

$$\mathbb{E}H^2 = \mathbb{E}(I + \delta A)^2 = \delta^2\mathbb{E}A^2 + 2\delta\mathbb{E}A + I. \quad (17)$$

The expectation of A can be computed directly as follows

$$\mathbb{E}A = b\mathbf{1}^*\mathbf{1} - bI. \quad (18)$$

Note that when $i \neq j$,

$$[\mathbb{E}A^2]_{i,j} = \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=1}^n A_{ki}A_{kj} = (n-2)b^2$$

represents the expected value of common neighbors between vertices i and j , and when $i = j$,

$$[\mathbb{E}A^2]_{i,i} = \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=1}^n A_{ki}^2 = (n-1)b$$

represents the average degree of vertex i . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}A^2 = (n-2)b^2\mathbf{1}^*\mathbf{1} + ((n-1)b - (n-2)b^2)I. \quad (19)$$

For the convenience of calculation, considering that n represents the number of vertices, when n is large enough, we make an approximation to the (19) such that

$$\mathbb{E}\hat{A}^2 = nb^2\mathbf{1}^*\mathbf{1} + (nb - nb^2)I. \quad (20)$$

Substituting (18) and (20) into (17), we have

$$\mathbb{E}H^2 = (nb^2\delta^2 + 2b\delta)\mathbf{1}^*\mathbf{1} + (nb\delta^2 - nb^2\delta^2 - 2b\delta + 1)I. \quad (21)$$

For a matrix $X = a\mathbf{1}^*\mathbf{1} + bI \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $a > 0, b > 0$, the k -sparse condition number can be calculated as

$$\text{cond}(k, X) = \sqrt{k - (k-1)\frac{b^2}{na^2 + b^2 + 2ab}}. \quad (22)$$

Combining (21) and (22), the k -sparse condition number of $\mathbb{E}H^2$ can be upper bounded as

$$\text{cond}(k, \mathbb{E}H^2) \leq \sqrt{k}. \quad (23)$$

The inverse of $\mathbb{E}H^2$ is

$$[\mathbb{E}H^2]^{-1} = f_1(I - f_2\mathbf{1}^*\mathbf{1}),$$

where

$$f_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{nb\delta^2 - nb^2\delta^2 - 2b\delta + 1},$$

and

$$f_2 \triangleq \frac{nb^2\delta^2 + 2b\delta}{n^2b^2\delta^2 - nb^2\delta^2 + nb\delta^2 + 2nb\delta - 2b\delta + 1}.$$

With a proper connection probability b , when the number of vertices n is large, $f_2 \rightarrow 0$, so we approximate $[\mathbb{E}H^2]^{-1}$ as $1/f_1I$. Therefore the k -sparse condition number of $[\mathbb{E}H^2]^{-1}$ can be approximate as

$$\text{cond}(k, [\mathbb{E}H^2]^{-1}) \approx 1. \quad (24)$$

Since $H_{\mathcal{M}}$ denotes a random selection of m rows from H , it follows that $\Gamma = m[\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1} = n\mathbb{E}[H^*H]^{-1}$. Therefore, combining (23) and (24), the k -sparse condition number of Γ can be upper bounded as $\kappa(\Gamma) \leq \sqrt{k}$, and the incoherence parameter μ is

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \{|h_{i,j}|\} &\leq 1, \\ \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left\{ \left| \frac{[H\Gamma]_{i,j}}{\delta^2(b-b^2)} \right| \right\} &\leq \frac{1}{\delta^2(b-b^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, applying Theorem 1, we can obtain the result in Theorem 2. ■

As illustrated by Theorem 2, for ER random networks, only $\sim \log n$ samples are sufficient to ensure sparse signal recovery. In addition, the number of samples and the parameter of δ have a trend of reverse change. This phenomenon can be explained by the fact that a small value of δ leads to a diagonally dominant matrix H , resulting in each vertex fusing less information from its neighbors and requiring more samples. Moreover, the right-hand side of (16) is proportional to $-\log(b-b^2)/(b-b^2)$ and reaches the minimum when $b = 0.5$. If b tends to 0 or 1, all vertices of the graph must be sampled to ensure recovery, i.e., $m = n$.

B. Small-world Network

In this subsection, we consider the binary graph diffusion models on the small-world networks. The small-world network is constructed by the Watts-Strogatz networks [31], where the adjacency matrix A can be generated as follows [32], [33]:

- **Initial regular graph:** Each vertex is connected to its nearest neighbors, forming a d -regular graph.
- **Random rewiring part:** Rewire each connection randomly with probability b .

The rewiring process is comprised of two steps. Initially, each currently connected edge is independently erased with probability b . Subsequently, each edge pair is reconnected with probability $\frac{bd}{n-1}$, allowing for multiplicity. According to the construction rules of Watts-Strogatz network, we can get [34]

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{ij} = 1) = \begin{cases} 1 - b \left(1 - b\frac{d}{n-1}\right), & \text{if } 0 < |i-j| < \theta, \\ b\frac{d}{n-1}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

where $\theta \triangleq \frac{d}{2} \bmod n - 1 - \frac{d}{2}$. Therefore, the expectation of A can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}A = (1-b) \left(1 - b\frac{d}{n-1}\right) \mathbb{E}A_{\text{reg}} + b\mathbb{E}A_{\text{rand}}, \quad (26)$$

where the A_{reg} and A_{rand} denote the adjacency matrix of d -regular graph and the adjacency matrix of a random graph connected with probability $d/(n-1)$, respectively.

The following theorem demonstrates that for small-world networks, $\kappa(\Gamma)$ has an upper bound that is associated with the d -regular graph and the rewiring probability b . To state the theorem, we need some definitions. The parameter Δ_{κ} is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\kappa} \triangleq & \delta^2(1-b)^2 \left(1 - b\frac{d}{n-1}\right)^2 \frac{\|A_{\text{reg},k}^4\|_{1,1}^{1/2}}{\|A_{\text{reg}}^2\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}} \\ & + 2\delta(1-b) \left(1 - b\frac{d}{n-1}\right) \frac{\|A_{\text{reg},k}^2\|_{1,1}^{1/2}}{\sqrt{d}} + \sqrt{k}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $A_{\text{reg},k}^2$ and $A_{\text{reg},k}^4$ is the leading $k \times k$ principal submatrix of A^2 and A^4 as $\hat{A}_{\text{reg},k}^2$ and $\hat{A}_{\text{reg},k}^4$, respectively. Note that $\|X\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}$ denotes the largest L_2 -norm among all columns of X , and $\|X\|_{1,1} = \sum_{i,j} |x_{ij}|$ denotes the sum of absolute values of matrix elements of X .

Theorem 3: For a small-world random network with n vertices, the degree of each vertex is d and the probability of rewiring an edge is b . Let α be a k -sparse vector diffused in the network by the binary diffusion model $H = I + \delta A$, where A is the unweighted adjacency matrix and $0 < \delta \leq 1$. Let \mathcal{M} be the sampling set as in Theorem 1. Then with probability $1 - e^{-\varepsilon} - 3/n$, the problem (P_1) has a unique minimizer provided that

$$m \geq C(1 + \varepsilon) k \mu^2 \cdot \Delta_\kappa \cdot (\log n + \log \mu), \quad (28)$$

where $C > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ are positive constants.

Proof: Similar to (18), we can obtain

$$\mathbb{E}A_{\text{rand}} = \frac{d}{n-1} \mathbf{1}^* \mathbf{1} - \frac{d}{n-1} I. \quad (29)$$

We denote i -th column of matrix $\mathbb{E}A$ as $[\mathbb{E}A]_{:,i}$, which can be decomposed as

$$[\mathbb{E}A]_{:,i} = (1-b) \left(1 - b \frac{d}{n-1}\right) [A_{\text{reg}}]_{:,i} + \frac{bd}{n-1} \mathbb{1}_i, \quad (30)$$

where $\mathbb{1}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a hollow vector, with 0 in the i -th element and 1 in the others. For the matrix $\mathbb{E}A^2$, when $i \neq j$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbb{E}A^2]_{i,j} &= [\mathbb{E}A]_{:,i}^* [\mathbb{E}A]_{:,j} \\ &= (1-b)^2 \left(1 - b \frac{d}{n-1}\right)^2 [A_{\text{reg}}^2]_{i,j} + \left(\frac{bd}{n-1}\right)^2 (n-2) \\ &\quad + (1-b) \left(1 - b \frac{d}{n-1}\right) \frac{bd}{n-1} \left([A_{\text{reg}}]_{:,i}^* \mathbb{1}_j + \mathbb{1}_i^* [A_{\text{reg}}]_{:,j}\right) \\ &= (1-b)^2 \left(1 - b \frac{d}{n-1}\right)^2 [A_{\text{reg}}^2]_{i,j} + f_1, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where

$$f_1 \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{(n-2)b^2 d^2}{(n-1)^2} + \frac{2b(1-b)(n-1-bd)d(d-1)}{(n-1)^2}, & \text{if } (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}, \\ \frac{(n-2)b^2 d^2}{(n-1)^2} + \frac{2b(1-b)(n-1-bd)d^2}{(n-1)^2}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The second equation of (31) is derived from (30), and the third equation of (31) comes from the fact $\mathbb{1}_i^* \mathbb{1}_j = n-2$ and $[A_{\text{reg}}]_{:,i}^* \mathbb{1}_j = \mathbb{1}_i^* [A_{\text{reg}}]_{:,j} = d-1$ when $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$, otherwise $[A_{\text{reg}}]_{:,i}^* \mathbb{1}_j = \mathbb{1}_i^* [A_{\text{reg}}]_{:,j} = d$. When $i = j$, the expectation of A^2 represents the average degree of vertex i , i.e., $[\mathbb{E}A^2]_{i,i} = d$. Therefore, the expectation of A^2 can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}A^2 = (1-b)^2 \left(1 - b \frac{d}{n-1}\right)^2 A_{\text{reg}}^2 + f_1 \mathbf{1}^* \mathbf{1} + f_2 I, \quad (32)$$

where $f_2 \triangleq \left(d - (1-b)^2 \left(1 - b \frac{d}{n-1}\right)^2 d - f_1\right)$. By utilizing (26)-(32), the expectation of H^2 is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}H^2 &= \mathbb{E}(I + \delta A)^2 \\ &= I + \delta^2 \mathbb{E}A^2 + 2\delta \mathbb{E}A \\ &= \delta^2 (1-b)^2 \left(1 - b \frac{d}{n-1}\right)^2 A_{\text{reg}}^2 \\ &\quad + 2\delta (1-b) \left(1 - b \frac{d}{n-1}\right) A_{\text{reg}} + \Theta, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $\Theta \triangleq f_3 \mathbf{1}^* \mathbf{1} + f_4 I$ with $f_4 > f_3 > 0$. According to (23), we can upper bound the k -sparse condition number of

Θ as $\text{cond}(\Theta, k) \leq \sqrt{k}$. According to the properties of the d -regular graph, we can use the leading $k \times k$ principal submatrix of A_{reg}^2 to obtain the $\lambda_{\max}(k, A_{\text{reg}})$, i.e.,

$$\lambda_{\max}(k, A_{\text{reg}}) = \frac{\|A_{\text{reg},k}^2\|_{1,1}^{1/2}}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (34)$$

The $\lambda_{\min}(k, A_{\text{reg}})$ can be calculated as

$$\lambda_{\min}(k, A_{\text{reg}}) = \sqrt{\frac{d}{k}}. \quad (35)$$

Combining (34) and (35), the k -sparse condition number of the matrix A_{reg} can be represented as

$$\text{cond}(k, A_{\text{reg}}) = \frac{\|A_{\text{reg},k}^2\|_{1,1}^{1/2}}{\sqrt{d}}. \quad (36)$$

Similarly, we can use the leading $k \times k$ principal submatrix of A_{reg}^4 to obtain the $\lambda_{\max}(k, A_{\text{reg}}^2)$

$$\lambda_{\max}(k, A_{\text{reg}}^2) = \frac{\|A_{\text{reg},k}^4\|_{1,1}^{1/2}}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (37)$$

The $\lambda_{\min}(k, A_{\text{reg}}^2)$ can be calculated as

$$\lambda_{\min}(k, A_{\text{reg}}^2) = \frac{\|A_{\text{reg}}^2\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (38)$$

Combining (37) and (38), the k -sparse condition number of the matrix A_{reg}^2 can be represented as

$$\text{cond}(k, A_{\text{reg}}^2) = \frac{\|A_{\text{reg},k}^4\|_{1,1}^{1/2}}{\|A_{\text{reg}}^2\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}}. \quad (39)$$

Combining (33), (36) and (39), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cond}(k, \mathbb{E}H^2) &\leq \delta^2 (1-b)^2 \left(1 - b \frac{d}{n-1}\right)^2 \frac{\|A_{\text{reg},k}^4\|_{1,1}^{1/2}}{\|A_{\text{reg}}^2\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}} \\ &\quad + 2\delta (1-b) \left(1 - b \frac{d}{n-1}\right) \frac{\|A_{\text{reg},k}^2\|_{1,1}^{1/2}}{\sqrt{d}} + \sqrt{k}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

For a non-negative vector α and a non-negative matrix H , according to Corollary 1, $\text{cond}\left(k, [\mathbb{E}H^2]^{-1}\right) \leq \text{cond}(k, \mathbb{E}H^2)$ holds. Since $H_{\mathcal{M}}$ denotes a random selection of m rows from H , it follows that $\Gamma = m[\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}}]^{-1} = n\mathbb{E}[H^* H]^{-1}$. Therefore, we can draw the conclusion in (27). This completes the proof. ■

It can be demonstrated that if the rewiring probability b of the small-world network is equal to zero, the network is equivalent to a d -regular graph. If the rewiring probability b is equal to one, the network is equivalent to an ER random graph. It can be seen from (28) that as the b increases, the sparse condition number of Γ will decrease monotonically, and the incoherence parameters μ^2 also decrease accordingly. Consequently, the number of samples required for recovery will decrease as the rewiring probability b of the small-world network increases.

V. OPTIMAL SAMPLING DESIGN WITH VARIABLE DENSITY

In Section III, we proved a sufficient condition for achieving unique recovery of the problem (P_1) under uniform random sampling strategy. The result shows that the sampling rate is related to μ^2 , which is the worst case of $h_{i,j}^2$ and $[H\Gamma]_{i,j}^2$. Currently, variable density sampling techniques are gaining popularity in compressed sensing as a means of reducing sampling rates. Initially observed empirically in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), variable density sampling aimed to speed up data acquisition by minimizing the amount of data collected [25]. Theoretical support for its effectiveness emerged in subsequent studies [35]–[37] that explored additional measurement constraints and structured sparsity patterns. This motivates us to develop a sampling technique for diffused graph signals on vertex domain. Specifically, we define two weights for each vertex i as

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_i &\triangleq \max_{j=1,\dots,n} \{ |h_{i,j}| \}, \\ \tilde{\phi}_i &\triangleq \max_{j=1,\dots,n} \{ |[H\Gamma]_{i,j}| \}.\end{aligned}\quad (41)$$

Then we also define the sampling probability of each vertex i as

$$p_i \triangleq \frac{\sqrt{\phi_i \tilde{\phi}_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^n \sqrt{\phi_j \tilde{\phi}_j}}.\quad (42)$$

It's obviously that $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$. Now, we present a new sampling strategy and theoretical guarantee for unique recovery in following theorem.

Theorem 4: Consider the system (4), where α is the k -sparse input, H the graph diffusion matrix. Let $\mathcal{M} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m\}$ be a sampling set where ω_i is a independent random variable with a distribution follows (42). With Assumption 1 define the matrix Γ as (6). Then with probability $1 - e^{-\varepsilon} - 3/n$, the problem (P_1) has a unique minimizer provided that

$$m \geq C(1 + \varepsilon) \bar{\phi}^2 k \kappa(\Gamma) (\log n + \log \bar{\phi}),\quad (43)$$

where $C > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ are positive constants, and the average weight $\bar{\phi}$ is

$$\bar{\phi} \triangleq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \sqrt{\phi_j \tilde{\phi}_j}}{n}.\quad (44)$$

The proof of Theorem 4 is given in Section VII.

It is noted that Theorem 4 provides a performance guarantee at a lower sampling rate compared to Theorem 1. Theorem 1 relies on uniform random sampling strategies where the worst-case incoherence parameter is replaced by the average incoherence parameter $\bar{\phi}$ in Theorem 4. As defined in (44), the $\bar{\phi}$ is always no greater than the incoherence parameter μ .

VI. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

In the proof of Theorem 1, we mainly adopt the technique of [30], which is mainly based on the golfing scheme. The golfing scheme has been widely used in matrix completion [38], structured matrix completion [39], and compressed sensing [29], [40]. To facilitate this proof, we denote the sparse support

set of the sparse seed α as \mathcal{K} , where $|\mathcal{K}| = k$. The sparse support matrix $D_{\mathcal{K}} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ is constructed as a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements defined as

$$[D_{\mathcal{K}}]_{i,i} \triangleq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{K}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}\quad (45)$$

Before starting the proof of Theorem 1, we first introduce two Bernstein inequality lemmas related to random vectors and matrices.

Lemma 1: (Vector Bernstein Inequality [41]): Let v_i be a finite sequence of independent random vectors. Suppose that $\mathbb{E}v_i = 0$ and $\|v_i\|_2 \leq B$ almost surely for all i and $\sum_{i=1}^n \|v_i\|_2^2 \leq \sigma^2$. Then for all $0 \leq t \leq \sigma^2/B$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \right\|_2 \geq t \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{8\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{4} \right).\quad (46)$$

Lemma 2: (Matrix Bernstein Inequality [40]): Let $\{X_i\} \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ be a finite sequence of independent random matrices. Suppose that $\mathbb{E}X_i = 0$ and $\|X_i\|_2 \leq B$ almost surely for all i and

$$\max \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}X_i X_i^* \right\|_2, \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}X_i^* X_i \right\|_2 \right\} \leq \sigma^2.\quad (47)$$

Then for all $t \geq 0$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right\|_2 \geq t \right) \leq 2d \exp \left(\frac{-t^2/2}{\sigma^2 + Bt/3} \right).\quad (48)$$

A. Local Isometry

Lemma 3 (Local Isometry): Let \mathcal{K} be a fixed subset of \mathcal{N} satisfying $|\mathcal{K}| = k$. Let $\mathcal{M} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m\}$ be a sampling set with ω_i being independent random variables with uniform distribution. Then for each $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| D_{\mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{1}{m} \Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} - I \right) D_{\mathcal{K}} \right\|_2 \geq t \right\} \\ \leq 2k \exp \left(-\frac{mt^2/2}{\mu^2 k \kappa(\Gamma) + 2\mu^2 kt/3} \right).\end{aligned}\quad (49)$$

Proof of Lemma 3: The following elementary bounds will be used repeatedly:

$$\|D_{\mathcal{K}} h_i^*\|_2 \leq \mu \sqrt{k},\quad (50)$$

$$\|D_{\mathcal{K}} \Gamma h_i^*\|_2 \leq \mu \sqrt{k}.\quad (51)$$

We begin with the proof for the case of sampling with replacement. Define

$$M_i \triangleq D_{\mathcal{K}} (\Gamma h_i^* h_i - I) D_{\mathcal{K}}, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, m,\quad (52)$$

where $h_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ represents the i -th row vector of matrix $H_{\mathcal{M}}$. Note that $\mathbb{E}M_i = 0$. The upper bound of $\|M_i\|_2$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\|M_i\|_2 &= \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \Gamma h_i^* h_i D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 + 1 \\ &\leq \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \Gamma h_i^*\|_2 \|h_i D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 + 1 \leq 2\mu^2 k,\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality comes from (50) and (51). For the upper bound of $\|\mathbb{E}M_i^*M_i\|_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbb{E}M_i^*M_i\|_2 \\
&= \|\mathbb{E}D_{\mathcal{K}}(h_i^*h_i\Gamma - I)D_{\mathcal{K}}(\Gamma h_i^*h_i - I)D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 \\
&= \|\mathbb{E}D_{\mathcal{K}}h_i^*h_i\Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}}\Gamma h_i^*h_iD_{\mathcal{K}} - \mathbb{E}D_{\mathcal{K}}\Gamma h_i^*h_iD_{\mathcal{K}} \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}D_{\mathcal{K}}h_i^*h_i\Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}} + D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\mathbb{E}D_{\mathcal{K}}(h_i^*h_i\Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}}\Gamma h_i^*h_i - I)D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 \\
&\leq \max\left(\|D_{\mathcal{K}}\Gamma h_i^*\|_2^2 \|\mathbb{E}D_{\mathcal{K}}h_i^*h_iD_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2, 1\right) \\
&\leq \max(\mu^2k \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\Gamma^{-1}D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2, 1) \\
&\leq \mu^2k\kappa(\Gamma).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\|\mathbb{E}M_iM_i^*\|_2 \leq \mu^2k\kappa(\Gamma)$. Since

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m M_i = D_{\mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{1}{m} \Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} - I \right) D_{\mathcal{K}},$$

applying the above results to Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| D_{\mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{1}{m} \Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} - I \right) D_{\mathcal{K}} \right\|_2 \geq t \right\} \\
&\leq 2k \exp \left(- \frac{mt^2/2}{\mu^2k\kappa(\Gamma) + 2\mu^2kt/3} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

B. Low Distortion

Lemma 4 (Low Distortion): Let $\mathcal{M} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m\}$ be a sampling set with ω_i being independent random variables with uniform distribution. The α is a fixed vector and the \mathcal{K} is a fixed subset of \mathcal{N} , where $|\mathcal{K}| = k$. Then for each $0 \leq t \leq 1/2$, the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| D_{\mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{1}{m} \Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} - I \right) D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \right\|_2 \geq t \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2 \right\} \\
&\leq \exp \left(- \frac{mt^2}{8\mu^2k\kappa(\Gamma)} + \frac{1}{4} \right). \tag{53}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 4: Define

$$v_i \triangleq D_{\mathcal{K}}(\Gamma h_i^*h_i - I)D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, m. \tag{54}$$

Then v_i satisfies $\mathbb{E}v_i = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v_i\|_2 &= \|D_{\mathcal{K}}(\Gamma h_i^*h_i - I)D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha\|_2 \\
&\leq \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\Gamma h_i^*\|_2 \|h_iD_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha\|_2 + \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha\|_2 \\
&\leq 2\mu^2k \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the upper bound of $\|\mathbb{E}v_i\|_2^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{E}v_i\|_2^2 &= \mathbb{E}\alpha^* D_{\mathcal{K}}(h_i^*h_i\Gamma - I)D_{\mathcal{K}}(\Gamma h_i^*h_i - I)D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\alpha^* D_{\mathcal{K}}h_i^*h_i\Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}}\Gamma h_i^*h_iD_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha - \alpha^* D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha \\
&\leq \mu^2k\kappa(\Gamma) \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m v_i = D_{\mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{1}{m} \Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} - I \right) D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha,$$

applying the above results to Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| D_{\mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{1}{m} \Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} - I \right) D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \right\|_2 \geq t \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2 \right\} \\
&\leq \exp \left(- \frac{mt^2}{8\mu^2k\kappa(\Gamma)} + \frac{1}{4} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

■

C. Off-Support Incoherence

Lemma 5 (Off-Support Incoherence): Let $\mathcal{M} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m\}$ be a sampling set with ω_i being independent random variables with uniform distribution. The α is a fixed vector and the \mathcal{K} is a fixed subset of \mathcal{N} , where $|\mathcal{K}| = k$. Then for each $t > 0$, the following inequality

$$\frac{1}{m} \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c} H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} \Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_{\infty} < t \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2 \tag{55}$$

holds except with probability

$$2n \exp \left(- \frac{mt^2/2}{\mu^2\kappa(\Gamma) + \mu^2\sqrt{kt}/3} \right), \tag{56}$$

where \mathcal{K}^c represents the complement of \mathcal{K} .

Proof of Lemma 5: Let $j \in \mathcal{K}^c$ be arbitrarily fixed. Define

$$r_i \triangleq \langle e_j, h_i^* h_i \Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \rangle, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, m. \tag{57}$$

Then r_i satisfies $\mathbb{E}r_i = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
|r_i| &\leq |e_j^* h_i^* h_i \Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha| \\
&\leq |e_j^* h_i^*| \|h_i \Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2 \\
&\leq \mu^2 \sqrt{k} \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the upper bound of $\|\mathbb{E}r_i^* r_i\|_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{E}r_i^* r_i\|_2 &= \|\mathbb{E}\alpha^* D_{\mathcal{K}} \Gamma h_i^* h_i e_j e_j^* h_i^* h_i \Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2 \\
&\leq |e_j^* h_i^*|^2 \|\mathbb{E}\alpha^* D_{\mathcal{K}} \Gamma h_i^* h_i \Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2 \\
&\leq \mu^2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \mu^2 \kappa(\Gamma) \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m r_i = \frac{1}{m} \langle e_j, H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} \Gamma D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \rangle, \tag{58}$$

applying the Lemma 2 for $d = 1$ and the union bound over all $j \in \mathcal{K}^c$ yields the claim. ■

D. Dual Certification

Lemma 6 (Uniqueness by An Inexact Dual Certificate): Suppose that

$$\left\| D_{\mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{1}{m} \Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} - I \right) D_{\mathcal{K}} \right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{59}$$

If there exists a vector γ in the row space of $H_{\mathcal{M}}$ satisfying

$$\|D_{\mathcal{K}}(\gamma - \text{sgn}(\alpha))\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{7\|\Gamma H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2} \|H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}} \tag{60}$$

and

$$\|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\gamma\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (61)$$

then α is the unique minimizer to the problem (P_1) .

Proof of Lemma 6: Let $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha + \beta$ be the minimizer to (4) and note that $H_{\mathcal{M}}\beta = 0$ since both α and $\hat{\alpha}$ are feasible. To prove the claim, it suffices to show that $\beta = 0$.

Case 1: We first consider the case when β satisfies

$$\|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2 \leq 3\|\Gamma H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}\|H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}\|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_2.$$

We begin by observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\alpha}\|_1 &= \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha + D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_1 + \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_1 \\ &\geq \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha\|_1 + \langle \text{sgn}(D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha), D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \rangle + \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

The second term on the right side of the inequality in (62) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \text{sgn}(D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha), D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \rangle \\ &= \langle \text{sgn}(D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha) - D_{\mathcal{K}}\gamma, D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \rangle + \langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\gamma, D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \rangle \\ &= \langle \text{sgn}(D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha) - D_{\mathcal{K}}\gamma, D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \rangle - \langle D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\gamma, D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\gamma, D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \rangle = \langle \gamma, \beta \rangle - \langle D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\gamma, D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta \rangle = -\langle D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\gamma, D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta \rangle$ and $\langle \gamma, \beta \rangle = 0$ since γ is in the row space of H . Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\gamma - \text{sgn}(D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha), D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \rangle + \langle D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\gamma, D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta \rangle| \\ &\leq \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\gamma - \text{sgn}(D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha)\|_2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2 + \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\gamma\|_\infty \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{7n\|\Gamma H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}\|H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}} \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2 + \frac{1}{2} \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from (60) and (61). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\alpha}\|_1 &\geq \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha\|_1 - \frac{1}{7\|\Gamma H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}\|H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}} \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2 + \frac{1}{2} \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_1 \\ &\geq \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha\|_1 - \frac{3}{7} \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_2 + \frac{1}{2} \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_2 \\ &\geq \|\alpha\|_1 + \frac{1}{14} \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from (62) and $D_{\mathcal{K}}\alpha = \alpha$. Then $\|\hat{\alpha}\|_1 \leq \|\alpha\|_1 \leq \|\hat{\alpha}\|_1$. This implies $D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta = 0$, which in turn implies $\|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2 = 0$ by (62). Therefore, it follows that $\beta = 0$.

Case 2: Next, we consider the complementary case when β satisfies

$$\|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2 > 3\|\Gamma H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}\|H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}\|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_2. \quad (63)$$

Since $\hat{\alpha}$ is feasible for (5). Thus $H_{\mathcal{M}}\beta = H_{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha) = 0$, which implies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left\langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta, \frac{1}{m}\Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}}\beta \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta, \frac{1}{m}\Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}}D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \right\rangle + \left\langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta, \frac{1}{m}\Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}}D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

The magnitude of the first term in the right-hand side of (64) is lower-bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta, \left(\frac{1}{m}\Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} + I - I \right) D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \right\rangle \\ &= |\langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta, D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \rangle| - \left| \left\langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta, \left(I - \frac{1}{m}\Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} \right) D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \right\rangle \right| \\ &\geq \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2^2 - \left\| I - \frac{1}{m}D_{\mathcal{K}}\Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}}D_{\mathcal{K}} \right\|_2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where the last step follows from the assumption in (59). The second term in the right-hand side of (64) is then upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta, \frac{1}{m}\Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}}D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta \right\rangle \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{m}\Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} \right\|_2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\Gamma H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}\|H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}\|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Applying (65) and (66) to (64) provides

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \left| \left\langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta, \frac{1}{m}\Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}}D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta \right\rangle \right| - \left| \left\langle D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta, \frac{1}{m}\Gamma H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}}D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta \right\rangle \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2^2 - \|\Gamma H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}\|H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2}\|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta\|_2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{3} \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{6} \|D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta\|_2^2 \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality comes from (63). Then it is implied that $D_{\mathcal{K}}\beta = 0$. By (63), we also have $D_{\mathcal{K}^c}\beta = 0$. Therefore, $\beta = 0$, which completes the proof. \blacksquare

E. Existence of An Inexact Dual Certificate

Lemma 7 (Existence of An Inexact Dual Certificate): With probability $1 - e^{-\varepsilon} - 3/n$, there exists a vector γ in the row space of $H_{\mathcal{M}}$ satisfying (60) to (61) when

$$m \geq C(1 + \varepsilon)\mu^2 k\kappa(\Gamma)(\log n + \log \mu). \quad (67)$$

Proof of Lemma 7: Recall that the $\mathcal{M} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m\}$ is a sampling set consists of i.i.d. random indices. We partition the multi-set \mathcal{M} into l multi-sets so that \mathcal{M}_1 consists of the first m_1 elements of \mathcal{M} , \mathcal{M}_2 consists of the next m_2 elements of \mathcal{M} , and so on, where $\sum_{i=1}^l m_i = m$.

The version of the golfing scheme in this paper generates a dual certificate γ from intermediate vectors b_i for $i = 0, \dots, l-1$ by

$$\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{m_i} H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} \Gamma b_{i-1},$$

where b_i are generated as follows: first, initialize $b_0 = \text{sgn}(\alpha)$. Thus it follows that γ lies in the row space of H (since H is symmetric). Next, generate b_i recursively by

$$b_i = D_{\mathcal{K}} \left(I - \frac{1}{m_i} H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} \Gamma \right) b_{i-1}.$$

The rest of the proof is devoted to show that γ satisfies (60) and (61). We show that b_i satisfies the following two properties with high probability for each i . First,

$$\|b_i\|_2 \leq c_i \|b_{i-1}\|_2. \quad (68)$$

Second,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{m_i} D_{\mathcal{K}^c} H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} \Gamma b_{i-1} \right\|_{\infty} \leq t_i \|b_{i-1}\|_2. \quad (69)$$

Let $p_1(i)$ (resp. $p_2(i)$) denote the probability that the inequality in (68) (resp. (69)) does not hold. Since b_{i-1} is independent of \mathcal{M}_i , by Lemma 4, $p_1(i)$ is upper bounded by

$$\exp\left(-\frac{c_i^2 m_i}{8\mu^2 k \kappa(\Gamma)} + \frac{1}{4}\right).$$

Therefore, $p_1(i) \leq \frac{1}{\tau} e^{-\varepsilon}$ if

$$m_i \geq \frac{(\varepsilon + 1/4 + \log \tau) 8\mu^2 k \kappa(\Gamma)}{c_i^2}.$$

On the other hand, since $D_{\mathcal{K}} b_{i-1} = b_{i-1}$ by Lemma 5, $p_2(i)$ is upper bounded by

$$2n \exp\left(-\frac{m_i t_i^2 / 2}{\mu^2 \kappa(\Gamma) + \mu^2 \sqrt{k} t_i / 3}\right). \quad (70)$$

Therefore, $p_2(i) \leq \frac{1}{\tau} e^{-\varepsilon}$ if

$$m_i \geq 2(\log 2\tau + \varepsilon + \log n) \mu^2 \kappa(\Gamma) k \left(\frac{1}{k t_i^2} + \frac{1}{3 t_i \sqrt{k}} \right). \quad (71)$$

We set the parameters similarly to the proof of [40, Lemma 3.3] as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} l &= \left\lceil \log_2 \sqrt{k} \|H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2} \|\Gamma H\|_{1 \rightarrow 2} \right\rceil + 3, \\ c_i &= \begin{cases} 1/\lceil 2\sqrt{\log n} \rceil, & i = 1, 2, 3, \\ 1/2, & 3 < i \leq l, \end{cases} \\ t_i &= \begin{cases} 1/\lceil 4\sqrt{k} \rceil, & i = 1, 2, 3, \\ \log n / \lceil 4\sqrt{k} \rceil, & 3 < i \leq l, \end{cases} \\ m_i &= \lceil 10(1 + \log 6 + \varepsilon) \mu^2 \kappa(\Gamma) k c_i^{-2} \rceil. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

By the construction of γ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mathcal{K}} \gamma &= \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{n}{m_i} D_{\mathcal{K}} H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} \Gamma b_{i-1} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^l \left(D_{\mathcal{K}} b_{i-1} - D_{\mathcal{K}} \left(I - \frac{1}{m_i} H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} \Gamma \right) b_{i-1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^l (b_{i-1} - b_i) = b_0 - b_l = \text{sgn}(\alpha) - b_l \\ &= D_{\mathcal{K}} \text{sgn}(\alpha) - b_l. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (68) implies

$$\|D_{\mathcal{K}}(\gamma - \text{sgn}(\alpha))\|_2 = \|b_l\|_2 \leq \prod_{i=1}^l c_i \|\text{sgn}(\alpha)\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{k}}{2^l \log n}.$$

Next, by (68) and (69), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_{\mathcal{K}^c} \gamma\|_{\infty} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^l \left\| \frac{1}{m_i} D_{\mathcal{K}^c} H_{\mathcal{M}}^* H_{\mathcal{M}} \Gamma b_{i-1} \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^l t_i \|b_{i-1}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{k} \left(t_1 + \sum_{i=2}^l t_i \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} c_j \right). \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

By setting parameters as in (72), the right-hand side in (73) is further upper bounded by

$$\frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log n}} + \frac{\log n}{4 \log n} + \dots \right) < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then we have shown that γ satisfies (61).

It remains to show that (68) and (69) hold with the desired probability. From (70) and (72), it follows that

$$p_j(i) \leq \frac{1}{6} e^{-\varepsilon}, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, l\}, \forall j = 1, 2.$$

In particular, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^3 p_j(i) \leq e^{-\varepsilon}.$$

This implies that the first three \mathcal{M}_i satisfy (68) and (69) except with probability $e^{-\varepsilon}$. On the other hand, we also have

$$p_1(i) + p_2(i) < \frac{1}{3}, \quad \forall i = 4, \dots, l.$$

In other words, the probability that \mathcal{M}_i satisfies (68) and (69) is at least $2/3$. The union bound doesn't show that \mathcal{M}_i satisfies (68) and (69) for all $i \geq 4$ with the desired probability.

As in the proof of [40, Lemma 3.3], we adopt the oversampling and refinement strategy by Gross [38]. Recall that each random support set \mathcal{M}_i consists of i.i.d. random indices. Thus \mathcal{M}_i are mutually independent. In particular, we set \mathcal{M}_i are of the same cardinality in (72). Therefore, \mathcal{M}_i are i.i.d. random variables. We generate a few extra copies of \mathcal{M}_i for $i = l+1, \dots, l'+3$ where $l' = 3(l-3)$. Then by Hoeffding's inequality, there exists at least $l' = 3(l-3)$ for $i \geq 4$ that satisfy (68) and (69) with probability $1 - 3/n$. (We refer to more technical details for this step to [40, Sec. III.B]). Therefore, there are l good \mathcal{M}_i s satisfying (68) and (69) with probability $1 - e^{-\varepsilon} - 3/n$, and the dual certificate v is constructed from these good \mathcal{M}_i . The total number of sampling for this construction requires

$$m \geq 40(1 + \log 6 + \varepsilon) \mu^2 k \kappa(\Gamma) (3 \log n + 3l).$$

It can be simplified as

$$m \geq C(1 + \varepsilon) \mu^2 k \kappa(\Gamma) (\log n + \log \mu),$$

where C is a positive constant. \blacksquare

VII. PROOF OF THEOREM 4

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &\triangleq \text{diag}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n), \\ \tilde{\Phi} &\triangleq \text{diag}(\tilde{\phi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\phi}_n). \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Using the definition of Φ , $\tilde{\Phi}$ and $\bar{\phi}$, we construct a pair of weighted transforms $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{M}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{M}} &\triangleq \bar{\phi} C_{\mathcal{M}} H \Phi^{-1}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{M}} &\triangleq \bar{\phi} C_{\mathcal{M}} H \Gamma \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}.\end{aligned}\quad (75)$$

According the definition of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{M}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|D_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbf{h}_i^*\|_2 &\leq \bar{\phi} \sqrt{k}, \\ \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^*\|_2 &\leq \bar{\phi} \sqrt{k},\end{aligned}\quad (76)$$

where \mathbf{h}_i and $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i$ represent the i -th row vector of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{M}}$, respectively. Firstly, we focus on proving the local isometry property of variable density sampling. Define $M_i \triangleq D_{\mathcal{K}} (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i - I) D_{\mathcal{K}}$. The upper bound of $\|M_i\|_2$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\|M_i\|_2 &= \|D_{\mathcal{K}} (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i - I) D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^*\|_2 \|\mathbf{h}_i D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 + 1 \leq 2\bar{\phi}^2 k.\end{aligned}$$

Then referring to (53), the upper bound of $\|\mathbb{E} M_i^* M_i\|_2$ can be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbb{E} M_i^* M_i\|_2 &= \|\mathbb{E} D_{\mathcal{K}} (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i - I) D_{\mathcal{K}} (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i - I) D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 \\ &= \|\mathbb{E} D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i^* D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i D_{\mathcal{K}} - \mathbb{E} D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i D_{\mathcal{K}} \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i D_{\mathcal{K}} + D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbb{E} D_{\mathcal{K}} (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i^* D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i - I) D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 \\ &\leq \max \left(\|D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^*\|_2^2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \Gamma^{-1} D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2, 1 \right) \\ &\leq \bar{\phi}^2 k \kappa(\Gamma).\end{aligned}$$

For the local isometry property, the following probability inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| D_{\mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{1}{m} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{M}}^* \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{M}} - I \right) D_{\mathcal{K}} \right\|_2 \geq t \right\} \\ \leq 2k \exp \left(- \frac{mt^2/2}{\bar{\phi}^2 k \kappa(\Gamma) + 2\bar{\phi}^2 kt/3} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Next, we will low distortion property. Refer to (54) for the definition of v_i , define $v_i \triangleq D_{\mathcal{K}} (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i - I) D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha$. The upper bound is

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_i\|_2 &= \|D_{\mathcal{K}} (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i - I) D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2 \\ &\leq \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^*\|_2 \|\mathbf{h}_i D_{\mathcal{K}}\|_2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2 + \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2 \\ &\leq 2\bar{\phi}^2 k \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbb{E} v_i\|_2^2 &= \mathbb{E} \alpha^* D_{\mathcal{K}} (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i - I) D_{\mathcal{K}} (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i - I) D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \alpha^* D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i^* D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha - \alpha^* D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \\ &\leq \bar{\phi}^2 k \kappa(\Gamma) \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2^2.\end{aligned}$$

For the low distortion property, the following probability inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| D_{\mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{1}{m} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{M}}^* \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{M}} - I \right) D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \right\|_2 \geq \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2 \right\} \\ \leq \exp \left(- \frac{mt^2}{8\bar{\phi}^2 k \kappa(\Gamma)} + \frac{1}{4} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Next, we will prove off-support incoherence. Refer to (57) for the definition of r_i , we have $r_i \triangleq \langle e_j, \mathbf{h}_i^* \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \rangle$. Then r_i satisfies $\mathbb{E} r_i = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}|r_i| &\leq \left| e_j^* \mathbf{h}_i^* \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \right| \\ &\leq |e_j^* \mathbf{h}_i^*| \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^*\|_2 \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2 \\ &\leq \bar{\phi}^2 \sqrt{k} \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} r_i r_i^* &= \mathbb{E} \alpha^* D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \mathbf{h}_i e_j e_j^* \mathbf{h}_i^* \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \\ &\leq |e_j^* \mathbf{h}_i^*|^2 \mathbb{E} \alpha^* D_{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^* \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \\ &\leq \bar{\phi}^2 \kappa(\Gamma) \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2^2.\end{aligned}$$

Applying the above results to Lemma 2 implies that

$$\left| \langle e_j, \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^* \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{M}} D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \rangle \right| < t \|D_{\mathcal{K}} \alpha\|_2,$$

holds except with probability

$$2n \exp \left(- \frac{mt^2/2}{\bar{\phi}^2 \kappa(\Gamma) + \bar{\phi}^2 \sqrt{k} t/3} \right).$$

Referring to the subsequent proof of Theorem 1, we can draw the conclusion of Theorem 4.

VIII. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we present several simulation experiments to show the effectiveness of the theoretical results. In Examples I-III, we demonstrate the effect of sampling performance under binary diffusion models, which are described in Section IV with $\delta = 1$. Specifically, different graphs with same number of vertices and same number of edges are tested in Example I. The ER random networks with distinct connection probabilities are tested in Example II and small-world networks with distinct rewiring probabilities are tested in Example III. We examine the proposed variable density sampling strategy in the case where the graph diffusion models are generated by the doubly stochastic matrices in Example IV. All experiments are performed under different types of graphs available in the GSP toolbox [42]. We solve the problem (5) by performing the basis pursuit algorithms [43] to recover the sparse inputs for each experiment, and measure the accuracy of the recovery using the normalized average recovery error calculated by $\|\alpha - \hat{\alpha}\|_2 / \|\hat{\alpha}\|_2$. For each number of samples, we do 500 iterations and average them.




Fig. 2: Three types of graphs.

Example I: Different Graphs with Binary Diffusion Model

This subsection presents the sampling performance of binary diffusion models for different graphs under random sampling strategies. Three distinct types of graphs were considered, each comprising the same number of vertices and same number of edges: the regular network, the ER random network, and the star-like network, which are illustrated in Fig. 2. We refer to Fig. 2c as a star-like graph where one vertex is connected to all other vertices. In this experiment, the number of vertices is set as $n = 501$, and the number of edges as $|\mathcal{E}| = 8417$ for all these three graphs. In addition, the sparse inputs α is randomly chosen to be a vector with $k = 4$ sparsity in each experiment. The recovery error is shown in Fig. 3, and the relevant parameters of μ and $\kappa(\Gamma)$ involved in Theorem 1 are reported in Table I.

It can be seen from Fig. 3 that the ER random graph requires fewer samples to ensure accurate recovery compared to regular and star-like graphs, and the μ and $\kappa(\Gamma)$ in the ER random graph are relatively small in Table I. This fact aligns with the theoretical results in Theorem 1. Although the star-like graph displaying larger incoherence parameters μ and sparse condition numbers $\kappa(\Gamma)$ compared to the regular graph, they exhibit similar sampling performance. This fact comes from the star-like graph has only one fully connected vertex, and if this vertex does not belong to \mathcal{K} , the incoherence parameter μ and sparse condition number $\kappa(\Gamma)$ are relatively small.

TABLE I: The relevant parameters of three types of graphs.

type	regular graph	ER random graph	star-like graph
μ	221.03	30.86	400.8
$\kappa(\Gamma)$	8.58	2	271

Example II: ER Random Networks with Binary Diffusion Model

In this experiment, the same binary diffusion model used in Example I was employed to evaluate the sampling and recovery performance of the ER random network under different connection probabilities. We consider the large-scale networks with a fixed number of vertices $n = 10000$. The experiment




Fig. 3: Comparison of sampling effects of several different types of graphs. The horizontal axis represents the number of samples and the vertical axis indicates the normalized average recovery error computed by $\|\alpha - \hat{\alpha}\|_2 / \|\hat{\alpha}\|_2$.

results for the ER random networks with connection probabilities $b = 0.03, 0.3, 0.7, 0.95, 0.991$ are presented in Fig. 4, and the incoherence parameters μ are given in Table II. It can be seen from Table II and Fig. 4 that the number of samples to ensure high probability recovery increases as the incoherence parameter μ increases. The result in (28) shows that the relationship between the number of samples m and the connection probability b is $m \sim -\log(b - b^2) / (b - b^2)$. Therefore, if b tends to 0 or 1, the number of samples for recovery is relatively large. For an appropriate connection probability b , only samples proportional to the order of $\log n$ are needed to recover the signal with a high probability. From the table II and Fig. 4, it can be seen that when $b = 0.3$ and $b = 0.7$, the recovery performance is relatively close, which is consistent with our theoretical results (m is symmetric around $b = 0.5$).

TABLE II: The relevant parameters of ER random networks with different connection probabilities.

b	0.03	0.3	0.7	0.95	0.991
μ	34.36	4.76	4.76	21.05	112.12




Fig. 4: Comparison of sampling effects of ER random networks with different connection probabilities.

Example III: Small-world Networks with Binary Diffusion Model

Here, we test the sampling and recovery performance for the small-world networks with different rewiring probabilities b , where the binary diffusion model is the same as in Example I. In this experiment, we set the number of vertices in all involved networks to be $n = 2001$ and the degree to be $d = 41$. The experiment results for the small-world networks with $b = 0, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 1$ are shown in Fig. 5. It is noted from Section IV.B that due to the high degree of clustering of the regular network A_{reg} , the condition number κ_s is relatively large. The Theorem 3 shows that the condition number of $\mathbb{E}H_{\mathcal{M}}^*H_{\mathcal{M}}$ decreases as the rewiring probability b increases. This result is supported by Fig. 5, which shows that the number of samples decreases as the rewiring probability increases.




Fig. 5: Comparison of sampling effects of small-world networks with different rewiring probabilities.

Example IV: Diffusion Model with Doubly Stochastic Adjacency Matrices

In this subsection, we evaluate the effectiveness of the variable density sampling proposed in Section V when the diffusion matrix is a doubly stochastic matrix, i.e., $H = A$, $A\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{1}^*A = \mathbf{1}$. We conduct the experiments in a network with $n = 1000$ and we set the graph diffusion model

as $H = A$, where A is the doubly stochastic matrix, which is that are formed by the Metropolis rule [44]. The sparse inputs α for each experiment is randomly set to be a vector with sparsity $k = 50$. The result of the experiment is shown in Fig. 6. It is clear from Fig. 6. that the proposed variable density sampling strategy can improve the recovery performance to some extent.




Fig. 6: Comparison of sampling effects of the doubly stochastic matrix with different sampling probabilities.

IX. CONCLUSION

This paper establishes sufficient conditions to guarantee recovery uniqueness for uniform random sampling, providing sampling guidelines for a given diffusion model. For specific binary diffusion models, a detailed analysis of the number of samples required for ER random networks and small-world networks has been conducted. In the case of ER random networks, it is demonstrated that a mere $\sim \log n$ samples are sufficient to guarantee sparse signal recovery, and how connection probability affects the number of samples required. For small-world networks, the number of samples required and the rewiring probability tend to change inversely. Additionally, an adaptive sampling strategy is proposed to improve sampling performance by exploiting variable density sampling technology from compressed sensing. In future work, we will consider how to explore the network structure to design better recovery algorithms.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Ortega, P. Frossard, J. Kovačević, J. M. Moura, and P. Vandergheynst, "Graph signal processing: Overview, challenges, and applications," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 5, pp. 808–828, 2018.
- [2] D. I. Shuman, S. K. Narang, P. Frossard, A. Ortega, and P. Vandergheynst, "The emerging field of signal processing on graphs: Extending high-dimensional data analysis to networks and other irregular domains," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 83–98, 2013.
- [3] A. Sandryhaila and J. M. F. Moura, "Discrete signal processing on graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 61, no. 7, pp. 1644–1656, 2013.
- [4] L. Stanković and E. Sejdić, *Vertex-frequency Analysis of Graph Signals*. Springer, 2019.
- [5] P. Djurić and C. Richard, *Cooperative and Graph Signal Processing: Principles and Applications*. Academic Press, 2018.

- [6] A. Anis, A. Gadde, and A. Ortega, "Towards a sampling theorem for signals on arbitrary graphs," in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 3864–3868, IEEE, 2014.
- [7] A. Loukas, A. Simonetto, and G. Leus, "Distributed autoregressive moving average graph filters," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 1931–1935, 2015.
- [8] S. Segarra, A. G. Marques, and A. Ribeiro, "Optimal graph-filter design and applications to distributed linear network operators," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 15, pp. 4117–4131, 2017.
- [9] A. G. Marques, S. Segarra, G. Leus, and A. Ribeiro, "Stationary graph processes and spectral estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 22, pp. 5911–5926, 2017.
- [10] S. K. Narang, A. Gadde, and A. Ortega, "Signal processing techniques for interpolation in graph structured data," in *2013 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 5445–5449, IEEE, 2013.
- [11] I. Pesenson, "Sampling in paley-wiener spaces on combinatorial graphs," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 360, no. 10, pp. 5603–5627, 2008.
- [12] M. Tsitsvero, S. Barbarossa, and P. Di Lorenzo, "Signals on graphs: Uncertainty principle and sampling," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 18, pp. 4845–4860, 2016.
- [13] A. Anis, A. Gadde, and A. Ortega, "Efficient sampling set selection for bandlimited graph signals using graph spectral proxies," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 14, pp. 3775–3789, 2016.
- [14] G. Puy, N. Tremblay, R. Gribonval, and P. Vandergheynst, "Random sampling of bandlimited signals on graphs," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 446–475, 2018.
- [15] S. Chen, R. Varma, A. Sandryhaila, and J. Kovaev, "Discrete signal processing on graphs: Sampling theory," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 24, 2015.
- [16] D. Ramírez, A. G. Marques, and S. Segarra, "Graph-signal reconstruction and blind deconvolution for diffused sparse inputs," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 4104–4108, IEEE, 2017.
- [17] F. J. Iglesias, S. Segarra, S. Rey-Escudero, A. G. Marques, and D. Ramírez, "Demixing and blind deconvolution of graph-diffused sparse signals," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 4189–4193, IEEE, 2018.
- [18] A. G. Marques, S. Segarra, G. Leus, and A. Ribeiro, "Sampling of graph signals with successive local aggregations," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 7, pp. 1832–1843, 2015.
- [19] S. Segarra, G. Mateos, A. G. Marques, and A. Ribeiro, "Blind identification of graph filters," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 1146–1159, 2017.
- [20] E. J. Candès and M. B. Wakin, "An introduction to compressive sampling," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 21–30, 2008.
- [21] H. Rauhut, K. Schnass, and P. Vandergheynst, "Compressed sensing and redundant dictionaries," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 2210–2219, 2008.
- [22] R. Baraniuk, M. Davenport, R. DeVore, and M. Wakin, "A simple proof of the restricted isometry property for random matrices," *Constructive Approximation*, vol. 28, pp. 253–263, 2008.
- [23] E. J. Candès and T. Tao, "Decoding by linear programming," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 51, no. 12, pp. 4203–4215, 2005.
- [24] H. Palangi, R. Ward, and L. Deng, "Distributed compressive sensing: A deep learning approach," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 17, pp. 4504–4518, 2016.
- [25] M. Lustig, D. Donoho, and J. M. Pauly, "Sparse MRI: The application of compressed sensing for rapid mr imaging," *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 1182–1195, 2007.
- [26] E. J. Candès and J. Romberg, "Sparsity and incoherence in compressive sampling," *Inverse Problems*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 969–985(17), 2006.
- [27] M. Elad and A. M. Bruckstein, "On sparse signal representations," in *Proceedings 2001 International Conference on Image Processing (Cat. No. 01CH37205)*, vol. 1, pp. 3–6, IEEE, 2001.
- [28] D. L. Donoho, X. Huo, et al., "Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decomposition," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 2845–2862, 2001.
- [29] R. Kueng and D. Gross, "Ripless compressed sensing from anisotropic measurements," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 441, pp. 110–123, 2014.
- [30] K. Lee, Y. Li, K. H. Jin, and J. C. Ye, "Unified theory for recovery of sparse signals in a general transform domain," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 5457–5477, 2018.
- [31] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, "Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks," *Nature*, vol. 393, no. 6684, pp. 440–442, 1998.
- [32] M. A. Porter, "Small-world network," *Scholarpedia*, vol. 7, no. 2, p. 1739, 2012.
- [33] M. Rudolph-Lilith and L. E. Muller, "Algebraic approach to small-world network models," *Physical Review E*, vol. 89, no. 1, p. 012812, 2014.
- [34] T. Cai, T. Liang, and A. Rakhlin, "On detection and structural reconstruction of small-world random networks," *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 165–176, 2017.
- [35] N. Chauffert, P. Ciuciu, and P. Weiss, "Variable density compressed sensing in MRI. Theoretical vs heuristic sampling strategies," in *2013 IEEE 10th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging*, pp. 298–301, IEEE, 2013.
- [36] C. Boyer, J. Bigot, and P. Weiss, "Compressed sensing with structured sparsity and structured acquisition," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 312–350, 2019.
- [37] J. Bigot, C. Boyer, and P. Weiss, "An analysis of block sampling strategies in compressed sensing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2016.
- [38] D. Gross, "Recovering low-rank matrices from few coefficients in any basis," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 1548–1566, 2011.
- [39] Y. Chen and Y. Chi, "Robust spectral compressed sensing via structured matrix completion," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 10, no. 60, pp. 6576–6601, 2014.
- [40] E. J. Candès and Y. Plan, "A probabilistic and ripless theory of compressed sensing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 7235–7254, 2011.
- [41] J. A. Tropp, "User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices," *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 389–434, 2012.
- [42] N. Perraudin, J. Paratte, D. Shuman, L. Martin, V. Kalofolias, P. Vandergheynst, and D. K. Hammond, "Gspbox: A toolbox for signal processing on graphs," *arXiv:1408.5781*, 2014.
- [43] S. S. Chen, D. L. Donoho, and M. A. Saunders, "Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit," *SIAM review*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 129–159, 2001.
- [44] A. H. Sayed et al., "Adaptation, learning, and optimization over networks," *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 7, no. 4-5, pp. 311–801, 2014.