Recovery of Signal and Image with Impulsive Noise via $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ Minimization

Peng Li, Huanmin Ge and Wengu Chen

arXiv:1809.02939v2 [math.OC] 12 Oct 2018

Abstract—In this paper, we consider the efficient and robust reconstruction of signals and images via $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ ($0 < \alpha \leq 1$) minimization in impulsive noise case. To achieve this goal, we introduce two new models: the $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ minimization with ℓ_1 constraint, which is called $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -LAD, the $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ minimization with Dantzig selector constraint, which is called $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -DS. We first show that sparse signals or nearly sparse signals can be exactly or stably recovered via $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ minimization under some conditions based on the restricted 1-isometry property (ℓ_1 -RIP). Second, for $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -LAD model, we introduce unconstrained $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ minimization model denoting $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -PLAD and propose $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ algorithm to solve the $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -PLAD. Last, numerical experiments demonstrate that when the sensing matrix is illconditioned (i.e., the coherence of the matrix is larger than 0.99), the $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ method is better than the existing convex and non-convex compressed sensing solvers for the recovery of sparse signals. And for the magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) reconstruction with impulsive noise, we show that the $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ method has better performance than state-of-the-art methods via numerical experiments.

Index Terms— $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ minimization, Impulsive noise, Sparse signal recovery, Image reconstruction, Linearized ADMM, LAD, Dantzig selector, Restricted 1-isometry property.

I. INTRODUCTION

C OMPRESSED sensing predicts that sparse signals can be reconstructed from what was previously believed to be incomplete information. Since Candès, Romberg and Tao's seminal works [6], [7] and Donoho's ground-breaking work [19], this new field has triggered a large research in mathematics, engineering and medical image. In this contexts, it aims to recover an unknown signal $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ from an underdetermined system of linear equations

$$\boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z},\tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are available measurements, the matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ (m < n) models the linear measurement process and $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a measurement errors.

For the reconstruction of x, the most intuitive approach is to find the sparsest signal in the set of feasible solutions, which leads to the ℓ_0 minimization method as follows

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \text{ subject to } \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{B},$$
(2)

where $||x||_0$ (it usually is called the ℓ_0 norm of x, but is not a norm) denotes the number of nonzero coordinates, and \mathcal{B} is a bounded set determined by the error structure. However,

H. Ge is with Sports Engineering College, Beijing Sport University, Beijing 100084, China (E-mail: gehuanmin@163.com).

W. Chen is with Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics, Beijing 100088, China (E-mail: chenwg@iapcm.ac.cn). such method is NP-hard and thus computationally infeasible in high dimensional background.

Candès and Tao [8] proposed a convex relaxation of the ℓ_0 minimization method—the constrained ℓ_1 minimization method:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 \text{ subject to } \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}, \tag{3}$$

which is also called basis pursuit (BP) [15]. In noisy case, i.e., $z \neq 0$, the above method is generalized. For example, when $||z||_2 \leq \eta$ (the ℓ_2 bounded noise), [6], [20] proposed the following method:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 \text{ subject to } \|\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \le \eta$$
 (4)

for some constant $\eta > 0$, which is called quadratically constrained basis pursuit (QCBP). Instead of solving (4) directly, many authors also studied the following unconstrained Lasso method [47]:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_2^2,$$
 (5)

where $\lambda > 0$ is a parameter to balance the data fidelity term $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{b}\|_2^2/2$ and the objective function $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$. A large amount of literature on the ℓ_1 minimization has emerged.

Some nonconvex relaxations of ℓ_0 minimization as alternatives to convex relaxation ℓ_1 minimization, which can give closer approximations to ℓ_0 , promote sparsity better than ℓ_1 minimization. The popular nonconvex relaxations method include ℓ_p (0) minimization and its variants [13],[14], [11], [18], [17], [45], [46], [55], [28], [54], [53], [61] $and <math>\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ minimization in [23], [58], [31], [60], [33], [59], [32], [56], [35], [29], [30], [26]. And in this paper, we only focus on $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ minimization.

It is noted that [23], [58] focused on recovering nonnegative signal, i.e., $x \ge 0$. And in this paper, we focus on recovering signal $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. To recover $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, [29], [30] proposed $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ ($0 < \alpha \le 1$) minimization:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \text{ subject to } \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{B}.$$
(6)

When $\alpha = 1$, (6) reduces the ℓ_{1-2} minimization in [31], [60]. Specifically, Lou, et. al. in [31] considered the noiseless case $\mathcal{B} = \{0\}$, i.e.,

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \text{ subject to } \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}$$
(7)

and gave the restricted isometry property (RIP) characterization of this problem. And they also proposed a DCA method to solve the unconstrained problem corresponding to (7), which is called ℓ_{1-2} -Lasso:

3

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \ \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2) + \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_2^2. \tag{8}$$

P. Li is with Graduate School, China Academy of Engineering Physics, Beijing 100088, China (E-mail: lipeng16@gscaep.ac.cn)

Yin, et.al. [60] considered the noisy case, i.e.,

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|x\|_1 - \|x\|_2 \text{ subject to } \|Ax - b\|_2 \le \eta_1, \quad (9)$$

where $\eta_1 \geq 0$ is the noise level. The numerical examples in [31], [60] demonstrate that the $\ell_1 - \ell_2$ minimization consistently outperforms the ℓ_1 minimization and iterative strategies for ℓ_p minimization [28] when the measurement matrix A is highly coherent. In addition, ℓ_{1-2} has shown advantages in various applications such as image restoration [33], phase retrieval [59], and point source super-resolution [32] and uncertainty quantification [56] and matrix completion [35].

In order to deal with heavy tail and heteroscedastic noise, [57], [49] proposed the ℓ_1 penalized least absolute deviation (ℓ_1 -PLAD), insteading of Lasso, i.e.,

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{b}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1.$$
(10)

Numerical examples in [49] showed that the ℓ_1 -PLAD method (10) is better than the classical Lasso method (5) for the heavy tail noise.

For working with ℓ_p (0 norm, Chartrand andStaneva [14] first proposed the restricted <math>p (0 $isometry property <math>(\ell_p$ -RIP), i.e.,

$$(1 - \delta_s) \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^p \le \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_p^p \le (1 + \delta_s) \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^p$$
(11)

for all x such that $||x||_0 \le s$. In [5], Cai and Zhang used the restricted 1-isometry property to characterize the exact and stable recovery of low-rank matrices.

Motivated by [49], [5], [60], we will consider the $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ minimization with ℓ_1 constraint:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \text{ subject to } \|\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 \le \eta_1 \quad (12)$$

for some constant $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\eta_1 \geq 0$. The method is called $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -LAD. In this paper, we first give the ℓ_1 -RIP analysis for (12). Second, in order to solve (12), we present the following unconstrained problem corresponding to (12):

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \lambda \left(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \alpha\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2\right) + \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_1, \quad (13)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a regularization parameter. (13) is denoted $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -PLAD. Next, we introduce a new algorithm to compute proposed model (13). Last, numerical experiments are presented for the sparse signal and MRI image recovery problems.

The underdetermined problem (1) puts forward both theoretical and computational challenges at the interface of statistics and optimization (see, e.g., [20], [36], [63]). In [9], the socalled Dantzig selector was proposed to perform variable selection and model fitting in the linear regression model. Its mathematical form is

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 \text{ subject to } \|\boldsymbol{A}^*(\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x})\|_{\infty} \le \eta_2 \qquad (14)$$

where $\eta_2 \geq 0$ is a tuning or penalty parameter. In [9], performance of the Dantzig selector was analyzed theoretically by deriving sharp nonasymptotic bounds on the error of estimated coefficients in the ℓ_2 norm.

The Dantzig selector relates closely to Lasso (5). In some sense, Lasso estimator and Dantzig selector exhibit similar behavior. Essentially, the Dantzig selector model (14) is a linear program while the Lasso model (5) is a quadratic program. They have the same objective function but with different constraints. For an extensive study on the relation between the Dantzig selector and Lasso, we refer to a series of discussion papers which have been published in The Annals of Statistics, e.g., [2], [4], [10], [22], [25], [37], [41].

In this paper, we also consider $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ minimization with Dantzig selector constraint

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \text{ subject to } \|\boldsymbol{A}^*(\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x})\|_{\infty} \le \eta_2$$
(15)

for some constant $\eta_2 \ge 0$. We denote it as $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -DS. Especially, when $\eta_1 = 0$ in (12) or $\eta_2 = 0$ in (15), we consider

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \text{ subject to } \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}.$$
(16)

Besides establishing the ℓ_1 -RIP theory analysis, we also consider how to compute proposed model (13). Combining ADMM [3] with DCA [60], we propose an efficient algorithm $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ for $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -PLAD problem (13). Numerical experiments based on the $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ algorithm, for simulated signals and images show that the $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ algorithm is more robust than ℓ_1 -regularization based method and ℓ_p (0 < p < 1)-regularization based method. Our contributions of this paper can be stated as follows.

- (1) Two new models: $\ell_1 \alpha \ell_2 \text{LAD}$ and $\ell_1 \alpha \ell_2 \text{-DS}$, are introduced, which are suitable for impulsive noise.
- (2) In noiseless case, a uniform *l*₁-RIP condition for sparse signal recovery via (16) is established. In noisy case, the conditions based on *l*₁-RIP for the recovery of nearly sparse signals via *l*₁ α*l*₂-LAD or *l*₁ α*l*₂-DS are obtained, respectively.
- (3) Combining ADMM [3] with DCA [60], we propose $\ell_1 \alpha \ell_2$ LA algorithm to compute $\ell_1 \alpha \ell_2$ -PLAD model (13).
- (4) We present performance analysis for sparse signal and compressible image recovery by numerical experiments based on the proposed l₁ – αl₂LA algorithm.

Throughout the article, we use the following basic notations. We denote \mathbb{Z}_+ by positive integer set. For any positive integer n, let [[1, n]] denote the set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, denote $x_{\max(s)}$ as the vector x with all but the largest s entries in absolute value set to zero, and $x_{-\max(s)} = x - x_{\max(s)}$. Let x_S be the vector equal to x on S and to zero on S^c . Let $\|x\|_{\alpha,1-2}$ denote $\|x\|_1 - \alpha \|x\|_2$. And we denote $n \times n$ identity matrix by I_n . And we denote the transpose of matrix A by A^* . Use the phrase "s-sparse vector" to refer to vectors of sparsity at most s. We use boldfaced letter denote matrix or vector.

II. EXACT RECOVERY VIA $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ Minimization

In this section, we will consider the exact recovery of x from (1) via the method (16). In order to characterize the exact recovery of x, we first introduce the following definition of restricted (ℓ_2, ℓ_p) -isometry property.

Definition 1. For $0 , <math>s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we define the restricted ℓ_2/ℓ_p isometry constant pair $(\delta_s^{lb}, \delta_s^{ub})$ of order s with respect to the measurement matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ as the smallest numbers δ_s^{lb} and δ_s^{ub} such that

$$(1 - \delta_s^{lb}) \| \boldsymbol{x} \|_2^p \le \| \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} \|_p^p \le (1 + \delta_s^{ub}) \| \boldsymbol{x} \|_2^p,$$
 (17)

holds for all s-sparse signals x. We say that A satisfies the (ℓ_2, ℓ_p) -RIP if δ_s^{lb} and δ_s^{ub} are small for reasonably large s.

Remark 1. When $\delta_s^{lb} = \delta_s^{ub} = \delta_s$, Definition 1 is the definition of the ℓ_p -RIP (see (11)).

A. Auxiliary Lemmas

By the proof of [56, Theorem 3.3], we have the following lemma, which is a modified cone constraint inequality for $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$.

Lemma 1. For any vectors x, \hat{x} , let $h = \hat{x} - x$. Assume that $\|\hat{x}\|_{\alpha,1-2} \leq \|x\|_{\alpha,1-2}$. Then

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} \leq \|\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)}\|_{1} + 2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2},$$
(18)

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}_{-\max(s)}\|_{2} \leq \|\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)}\|_{1} + 2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)}\|_{2}.$$
 (19)

Especially, when x is s-sparse, one has

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} \leq \|\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2},$$
(20)
$$\|\boldsymbol{h}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}_{-\max(s)}\|_{2} \leq \|\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)}\|_{2}.$$
(21)

The following lemma is the fundamental properties of the function $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2$ with $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, which is a generalization of [60, Lemma 2.1 (a)]. It will be frequently used in our proofs.

Lemma 2. For $0 \le \alpha \le 1$, suppose $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, $T = supp(\mathbf{x})$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 = s$, then

$$(s - \alpha \sqrt{s}) \min_{j \in T} |x_j| \le \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \le (\sqrt{s} - \alpha) \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2.$$
(22)

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $|x_1| \ge |x_2| \dots \ge |x_s| > |x_{s+1}| = \dots = |x_n| = 0$ and $t = \lfloor \sqrt{s} \rfloor$, one has

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{t} |x_{i}| + (\sqrt{s} - t)|x_{t+1}|,$$

which is [60, (6.1)]. Then

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{1} - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2} \ge \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{1} - \alpha (\sum_{i=1}^{t} |x_{i}| + (\sqrt{s} - t)|x_{t+1}|)$$

$$= [1 - \alpha(\sqrt{s} - t)]|x_{t+1}| + \sum_{i=t+2}^{s} |x_{i}| + (1 - \alpha) \sum_{i=1}^{t} |x_{i}|$$

$$\stackrel{(1)}{\ge} [1 - \alpha(\sqrt{s} - t)]|x_{s}| + \sum_{i=t+2}^{s} |x_{s}| + (1 - \alpha) \sum_{i=1}^{t} |x_{s}|$$

$$= (s - \alpha\sqrt{s})|x_{s}| \stackrel{(2)}{=} (s - \alpha\sqrt{s}) \min_{i \in T} |x_{i}|, \qquad (23)$$

where (1) and (2) follow from $|x_1| \ge |x_2| \cdots \ge |x_s|$ and $0 \le \alpha \le 1$.

Lemma 3. Assume that $\|\hat{x}\|_{\alpha,1-2} \leq \|x\|_{\alpha,1-2}$. Let $h = \hat{x} - x$, $T_0 = supp(h_{\max(s)})$, T_1 be the index set of the $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ largest entries of $h_{-\max(s)}$ and $T_{01} = T_0 \cup T_1$, the matrix A satisfies the (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -RIP condition of t + s order. Then

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}\|_{1} \ge \rho_{t} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} - \frac{2(1+\delta_{t}^{ub})\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{t}-\alpha}, \quad (24)$$

where

$$\rho_t = 1 - \delta_{t+s}^{lb} - \frac{(1 + \delta_t^{ub})}{a(s,t;\alpha)}$$
(25)

and $a(s,t;\alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{t-\alpha}}{\sqrt{s+\alpha}}$.

Proof. First, we partition $T_0^c = [[1, n]] \setminus T_0$ as

$$T_0^c = \bigcup_{j=1}^J T_j,$$

where T_1 is the index set of the t largest entries of $h_{-\max(s)}$, T_2 is the index set of the next t largest entries of $h_{-\max(s)}$, and so on. Notice that the last index set T_J may contain less t elements.

By $T_{01} = T_0 \cup T_1$, one has

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}\|_{1} = \left\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}} + \sum_{j\geq 2}^{J} \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j}}\right\|_{1} \geq \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{1} - \sum_{j\geq 2}^{J} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j}}\|_{1}$$
$$\geq (1 - \delta_{t+s}^{lb}) \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} - (1 + \delta_{t}^{ub}) \sum_{j\geq 2}^{J} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j}}\|_{2}, \quad (26)$$

where the last inequality is due to $T_{01} = T_0 \cup T_1$, $|T_0| \leq s$, $|T_i| \leq t$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, J$, and A satisfies the (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -RIP condition of t+s order. Thus, to show (24), it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{j\geq 2}^{J} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j}}\|_{2} \leq \frac{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2}}{a(s,t;\alpha)} + \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{t-\alpha}}.$$
 (27)

Next, we move to prove (27). For $2 \le j \le J$, it follows from the definition of T_{j-1} that

$$|h_i| \le \min_{k \in T_{j-1}} |h_k| \le \frac{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j-1}}\|_1 - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j-1}}\|_2}{t - \alpha \sqrt{t}}, \qquad (28)$$

for any $i \in T_j$, where the last inequality is from Lemma 2 and $|T_{j-1}| = t$ with $2 \le j \le J$. Then, for $2 \le j \le J$, one has

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_j}\|_2 = \left(\sum_{i \in T_j} |h_i|^2\right)^{1/2} \le \frac{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j-1}}\|_1 - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j-1}}\|_2}{\sqrt{t} - \alpha}$$

where the last inequality is from (28) and $|T_j| \le t$ with $2 \le j \le J$. Therefore, by the above inequality,

$$\sum_{j\geq 2} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j}}\|_{2} \leq \frac{\sum_{j\geq 2}^{J} (\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j-1}}\|_{1} - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j-1}}\|_{2})}{\sqrt{t} - \alpha}$$

$$\stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}}\|_{1} - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}^{c}}\|_{2}}{\sqrt{t} - \alpha}$$

$$\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}}\|_{1} + 2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}}\|_{2}}{\sqrt{t} - \alpha}$$

$$\stackrel{(3)}{\leq} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2}{a(s,t,;\alpha)} + \frac{2\|x_{-\max(s)}\|_1}{\sqrt{t-\alpha}}$$

where (1) is due to $T_0^c = \bigcup_{j=1}^J T_j$ and the fact that $\sum_{j\geq 2}^J \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j-1}}\|_2 \geq \left(\sum_{j\geq 2}^J \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{j-1}}\|_2^2\right)^{1/2}$, (2) follows from (19) and $T_0 = \operatorname{supp}(\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)})$ and (3) is from $\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_0}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{|T_0|} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_0}\|_2$, $|T_0| \leq s$, $T_{01} = T_0 \cup T_1$ and $a(s, t; k) = \frac{\sqrt{t-\alpha}}{\sqrt{s+\alpha}}$. The proof is complete.

B. Exact Recovery under (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -RIP

Now, we present our result for the exact recovery of x from (1) with z = 0 via (16).

Theorem 1. For $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, let $s \in [[1, n]]$, k > 0 such that $ks \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $a(s, ks; \alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{ks - \alpha}}{\sqrt{s + \alpha}} > 1$. Let $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ and \mathbf{x} be s-sparse. If the measurement matrix \mathbf{A} satisfies (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -RIP with

$$\delta_{ks}^{ub} + a(s, ks; \alpha) \delta_{(k+1)s}^{lb} < a(s, ks; \alpha) - 1,$$
 (29)

then (16) has unique s-sparse solution.

Remark 2. If $k \ge 4\alpha^2/(\sqrt{s}-\alpha)^2$, then the sufficient condition (29) can be replaced by

$$\delta_{ks}^{ub} + \left(\sqrt{k}/2\right)\delta_{(k+1)s}^{lb} < \sqrt{k}/2 - 1.$$
(30)

In fact, by $k \ge 4\alpha^2/(\sqrt{s} - \alpha)^2$, then $a(s, ks; \alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{ks} - \alpha}{\sqrt{s} + \alpha} \ge \sqrt{k/2} > 1$, Furthermore, by (30),

$$1 - \delta^{lb}_{(k+1)s} - \frac{1 + \delta^{ub}_{ks}}{a(s, ks; \alpha)} \ge 1 - \delta^{lb}_{(k+1)s} - \frac{2(1 + \delta^{ub}_{ks})}{\sqrt{k}} > 0,$$

which implies (29).

III. Stable Recovery via $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ Minimization

In the bounded noisy case, we will consider the stable recovery of the signal x from (1) via models (12) and (15).

A. Stable Recovery Under (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -RIP

where $\rho_{ks} = 1 - \delta^{lb}_{(k+1)s} - \frac{(1+\delta^{ub}_{ks})}{a(s,ks;\alpha)}$

In the ℓ_1 bounded noisy case, we obtain the sufficient conditions for the stable recovery of the signal x from (1) via the $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ minimization model (12) in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. Consider $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}$ with $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 \leq \eta_1$. For some $s \in [[1, n]]$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, let k > 0 such that $ks \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $a(s, ks; \alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{ks-\alpha}}{\sqrt{s+\alpha}} > 1$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{\ell_1}$ be the minimizer of (12). If the measurement matrix \mathbf{A} satisfies (29), then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{x}^{\ell_{1}} - x\|_{2} &\leq \frac{2(2\sqrt{k}+1)\sqrt{s}}{(2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{s}-\alpha)\rho_{ks}}\eta_{1} \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{s}}{2\sqrt{ks}-\alpha} \Big(\frac{(2\sqrt{k}+1)(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{\rho_{ks}(\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)} + 1\Big)\frac{2\|x_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}}, \end{aligned}$$
(31)

Remark 3. Similar to the discussion in Remark 2, when

$$\delta_{ks}^{ub} + (\sqrt{k}/2)\delta_{(k+1)s}^{lb} < \sqrt{k}/2 - 1,$$

the solution \hat{x}^{ℓ_1} of (12) satisfies

$$\begin{split} \|\hat{x}^{\ell_{1}} - x\|_{2} &\leq \frac{2(2\sqrt{k}+1)\sqrt{s}}{(2\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)\tilde{\rho}_{ks}}\eta_{1} \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{s}}{2\sqrt{ks}-\alpha} \Big(\frac{(2\sqrt{k}+1)(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{\tilde{\rho}_{ks}(\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)} + 1\Big)\frac{2\|x_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}}, \\ where \ \tilde{\rho}_{ks} &= 1 - \delta_{(k+1)s}^{lb} - \frac{(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})}{\sqrt{k}/2}. \end{split}$$

Now, we consider the recovery model (1) with $||A^*z||_{\infty} \leq \eta_2$.

Theorem 3. Consider $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}$ with $\|\mathbf{A}^*\mathbf{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \eta_2$. For some $s \in [[1, n]]$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, let k > 0 such that $ks \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $a(s, ks; \alpha) = (\sqrt{ks - \alpha})/(\sqrt{s} + \alpha) > 2$ and $b(s, k; \alpha) = 8(2\sqrt{ks - \alpha})/(17\alpha(2\sqrt{k} + 1)) > 1$ satisfying $a(s, ks; \alpha)b(s, k; \alpha) < a(s, ks; \alpha) + b(s, k; \alpha)$. Let \hat{x}^{DS} be the minimizer of the $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ minimization model (15). If the measurement matrix \mathbf{A} satisfies the (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -RIP condition with

$$(b(s,k;\alpha)+1)\delta^{ub}_{ks} + a(s,ks;\alpha)b(s,k;\alpha)\delta^{lb}_{(k+1)s} < a(s,ks;\alpha)b(s,k;\alpha) - b(s,k;\alpha) - 1,$$
(32)

then

$$\begin{split} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}^{DS} - \boldsymbol{x}\|_{2} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{s}\varrho}{\sqrt{s} - \alpha\varrho} \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(2\sqrt{k}+1)\big((1+\delta_{ks}^{ub}) + a(s;\alpha,k)\rho_{ks}\big)ms}{\sqrt{k}(\sqrt{s} - \alpha\varrho)(1+\delta_{ks}^{up})\rho_{ks}^{2}}\eta_{2} \end{split}$$

$$where \ \varrho = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{k}} \bigg(\frac{17(2\sqrt{k}+1)(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})}{16a(s,ks;\alpha)\rho_{ks}} + 1 \bigg).$$

Remark 4. The conditions in Theorem 3 seem strict. In fact, these conditions can be satisfied. For example, for $\alpha = 1$, if we take k = 16, then

$$a(s,ks;\alpha) = \frac{4\sqrt{s}-1}{\sqrt{s}+1} =: a(s), b(s,k;\alpha) = \frac{8(8\sqrt{s}-1)}{153} =: b(s)$$

If we restrict $7 \le s \le 14$, we can check that a(s) > 2, b(s) > 1 and a(s)b(s) < a(s) + b(s). Therefore, (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -RIP condition (32) can be formulated as

$$(b(s)+1)\delta^{ub}_{ks} + a(s)b(s)\delta^{lb}_{(k+1)s} < a(s)b(s) - b(s) - 1.$$

And if we take $\delta_s^{lb} = \delta_s^{ub} = \delta_s$ in Remark 1, then condition (32) can be simplified as

$$\delta_{17s} < \frac{192s - 305\sqrt{s} - 137}{320s + 113\sqrt{s} + 153}.$$

IV. Computational Approach for $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -PLAD

In this section, we consider how to solve the unconstraint $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -PLAD problem (13). First, by splitting the term $\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_1$, we get an equivalent problem of (13) as follows $\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n,\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{R}^m} \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \alpha\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2) + \|\boldsymbol{y}\|_1 \text{ subject to } \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{b}.$ (33)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}; \boldsymbol{w}) = \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{1} - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}) + \|\boldsymbol{y}\|_{1} - \langle \boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{b} \rangle + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_{2}^{2} = \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{1} - \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}) + \|\boldsymbol{y}\|_{1} + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{b} - \frac{\boldsymbol{w}}{\gamma}\|_{2}^{2} - \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{2}^{2}, \quad (34)$$

which is the augmented Lagrangian function of (33) with the Lagrangian multiplier $\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and a penalty parameter $\gamma > 0$. Given $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}; \boldsymbol{w}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m$, iterations for (34) are

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{x}^{k+1} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{n}} \mathcal{L}_{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}^{k}; \boldsymbol{w}^{k}), \\ \boldsymbol{y}^{k+1} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{R}^{m}} \mathcal{L}_{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{y}; \boldsymbol{w}^{k}), \\ \boldsymbol{w}^{k+1} = \boldsymbol{w}^{k} - \gamma(\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{y}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{b}). \end{cases}$$
(35)

Now, we move to consider (35). By (34), the x-related subproblem in (35) is equivalent to

$$\boldsymbol{x}^{k+1} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{n}} \frac{\gamma}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \left(\boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{y}^{k} + \frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{k}}{\gamma}\right) \right\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{1}$$
$$- \lambda \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}$$
$$= \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left(\frac{\gamma}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^{k}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{1} \right) - \lambda \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}$$
$$= \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{n}} \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{x}) - \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{x}), \tag{36}$$

where the second equality is from $\bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k = \boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{y}^k + \boldsymbol{w}^k/\gamma$, and the last equality is due to $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1$ and $\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \lambda \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2$. In terms of the analysis for [60, (3.1)], we solve \boldsymbol{x} -related subproblem (36) using the DCA. To implement the DCA, one iteratively computes

$$oldsymbol{x}^{k+1} = rg\min_{oldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n}\mathcal{E}(oldsymbol{x}) - (\mathcal{F}(oldsymbol{x}^k) + \langleoldsymbol{h}^k,oldsymbol{x}-oldsymbol{x}^k
angle),$$

where $h^k \in \partial \mathcal{F}(x^k)$. Note that $\mathcal{F}(x)$ is differentiable with the gradient

$$\partial \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{x}) \begin{cases} = \lambda \alpha \frac{\boldsymbol{x}}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2}, & \text{for all } \boldsymbol{x} \neq \boldsymbol{0}; \\ \ni \boldsymbol{0}, & \boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{0}. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, if $x^k = 0$,

$$oldsymbol{x}^{k+1} = rg\min_{oldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n}rac{\gamma}{2}\|oldsymbol{A}oldsymbol{x} - oldsymbol{ar{b}}^k\|_2^2 + \lambda\|oldsymbol{x}\|_1,$$

otherwise,

$$\boldsymbol{x}^{k+1} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{\gamma}{2}\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \lambda\alpha\langle\boldsymbol{x},\frac{\boldsymbol{x}}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2}\rangle$$

Thus the strategy to iterate is as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{x}^{k+1} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \lambda \alpha \langle \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{v}^k \rangle$$

=: $\arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{G}_{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}, \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k),$ (37)

where

$$\boldsymbol{v}^{k} = \begin{cases} \frac{\boldsymbol{x}^{k}}{\|\boldsymbol{x}^{k}\|_{2}}, & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x}^{k} \neq \boldsymbol{0}; \\ \boldsymbol{0}, & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x}^{k} = \boldsymbol{0}. \end{cases}$$
(38)

5

By taking subdifferential of $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma}(m{x},ar{m{b}}^k)$ at $m{x}=m{x}^{k+1},$ we have

$$\mathbf{0} = \gamma \mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} + \lambda \partial \| \mathbf{x}^{k+1} \|_1 - \left(\gamma \mathbf{A}^* \bar{\mathbf{b}}^k + \lambda \alpha \mathbf{v}^k \right).$$

Whenever $A^*A = cI_n$, which essentially implies that the columns of the design matrix A are orthogonal, the closed-form solution of (37) is given by the soft shrinkage operator. However, the assumption $m \le n$ indicates that the rank of A is no bigger than m and thus the rank of A^*A should be much smaller than n. Therefore, A^*A is not the identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ when $m \le n$, and the closed-form solution of (37) is not available for this case.

To alleviate the above difficulty, we adopt the strategy of linearizing the quadratic term, which comes from Wang and Yuan [50]. In fact, the quadratic term $\frac{\gamma}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{b}}^k\|_2^2$ can be linearized:

$$\begin{split} &\frac{1}{2} \| \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k \|_2^2 \\ &\approx \frac{\gamma}{2} \bigg(\| \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}^k - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k \|_2^2 + \Big\langle 2\boldsymbol{A}^*(\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}^k - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k), \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}^k \Big\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\mu} \| \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}^k \|_2^2 \bigg) \\ &= \frac{\gamma}{2} \bigg(\| \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}^k - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k \|_2^2 + \frac{1}{\mu} \| \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}^k + \mu \boldsymbol{A}^*(\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}^k - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k) \|_2^2 \\ &\quad - \mu \| \boldsymbol{A}^*(\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}^k - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k) \|_2^2 \bigg). \end{split}$$

Then we can approximate subproblem of (37) by

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{x}^{k+1} &= \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\gamma}{2\mu} \|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}^k + \mu \boldsymbol{A}^* (\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}^k - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k)\|_2^2 \\ &+ \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 - \lambda \alpha \langle \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{v}^k \rangle \\ &=: \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{x}, \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^k). \end{aligned}$$
(39)

By taking subdifferential of $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,\lambda}(m{x},ar{m{b}}^k)$ at $m{x}=m{x}^{k+1},$ we have

$$\mathbf{0} = \frac{\gamma}{\mu} \left(\boldsymbol{x}^{k+1} + \frac{\lambda\mu}{\gamma} \partial \| \boldsymbol{x}^{k+1} \|_{1} - \left(\boldsymbol{x}^{k} - \mu \boldsymbol{A}^{*} (\boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}^{k} - \bar{\boldsymbol{b}}^{k}) + \frac{\lambda\alpha\mu}{\gamma} \boldsymbol{v}^{k+1} \right) \right).$$

Therefore,

 x^{k+1}

$$= S\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{k} - \mu \boldsymbol{A}^{*}\left(\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}^{k} - \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{y}^{k} - \frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{k}}{\gamma}\right) + \frac{\lambda\alpha\mu}{\gamma}\boldsymbol{v}^{k+1}, \frac{\lambda\mu}{\gamma}\right)$$
(40)

where

$$(S(\boldsymbol{x}, r))_i = \operatorname{sign}(x_i) \max\{|x_i| - r, 0\}$$

is the soft thresholding operator.

Next, we turn our attention to deal with y-related subproblem in (35). The y-related subproblem is just a constrained least squares problem

$$oldsymbol{y}^{k+1} = rg\min_{oldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{R}^m}\mathcal{L}_{\gamma}(oldsymbol{x}^{k+1},oldsymbol{y};oldsymbol{w}^k)$$

6

$$= \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{R}^m} \|\boldsymbol{y}\|_1 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \left\|\boldsymbol{y} - \left(\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{b} - \frac{\boldsymbol{w}^k}{\gamma}\right)\right\|_2^2,$$

which implies that

$$\boldsymbol{y}^{k+1} = S\left(\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{b} - \frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{k+1}}{\gamma}, \frac{1}{\gamma}\right).$$
(41)

Now, we present the algorithm applying the linearized ADMM and DCA to solve the unconstrained $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -PLAD problem (13).

Algorithm 1 $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 \text{LA}$ for solving (13)	
Input	A , b , α, λ, γ, μ, $(x^0, y^0; w^0)$, $k = 1$.
While	some stopping criterion is not satisfied do
1.	Compute v^k by (38).
2.	Update x^{k+1} by (40).
3.	Update \boldsymbol{y}^{k+1} by (41).
4.	$\boldsymbol{w}^{k+1} = \boldsymbol{w}^k - \gamma (\boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{y}^k).$
5.	k = k + 1.
Fnd	

Remark 5. In Algorithm 1, α is a model parameter and satisfies $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $\lambda > 0$ is a penalty parameter, $\gamma > 0, 0 < \mu < 1/\|\mathbf{A}^*\mathbf{A}\|_{2\to 2}$ are regularized parameters.

V. Numerical Experiments of $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -PLAD

In this section, we will present numerical experiments for sparse signals and compressible images to demonstrate the efficiency of $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ algorithm.

A. Sparse Signal Recovery

In this subsection, we apply the proposed $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ algorithm to reconstruct sparse signals. We also compare our $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ numerically with some efficient methods in the literature, including YALL1 [57] for penalized LAD model

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_1, \tag{42}$$

and LqLA-ADMM [51]

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_q^q + \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_{1,\varepsilon}$$
(43)

with $\varepsilon > 0$ is an approximation parameter, where $\|\boldsymbol{y}\|_{1,\varepsilon} = \sum_{j} (y_{j}^{2} + \varepsilon^{2})^{1/2}$ and 0 < q < 1. We consider two types of impulsive noises [49], [52], [51].

(1) Gaussian Mixture Noise [1], [48], [43]: we consider a typical two-term Gaussian mixture model with probability density function (pdf) given by

$$(1-\xi)\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2) + \xi\mathcal{N}(0,\kappa\sigma^2),$$

where $0 \le \xi < 1$ and $\kappa > 1$, i.e., part of the noise variables z_i are $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ random variables and part of them are $\mathcal{N}(0, \kappa \sigma^2)$ random variables. Here the two parameters ξ and $\kappa > 1$ respectively control the ratio and the strength of outliers in the noise. And the first term stands for the nominal background noise, e.g., Gaussian thermal noise, while the second term describes the impulsive behavior of the noise.

(2) Symmetric τ -stable ($S\tau S$) Noise [44], [40]: Except for a few known cases, the $S\tau S$ distributions do not have analytical formulations. The characteristic function of a zero-location $S\tau S$ distribution can be expressed as

$$\phi(\omega) = \exp(j\tau\omega - \gamma^{\tau}|\omega|^{\tau}),$$

where $0 < \tau \leq 2$ is the characteristic exponent and $\gamma > 0$ is the scale parameter or dispersion. The characteristic exponent measures the thickness of the tail of the distribution. The smaller the value of τ , the heavier the tail of the distribution and the more impulsive the noise is. We can see that the $S\tau S$ distribution becomes the Gaussian distribution with variance $2\gamma^2$ when $\tau = 2$, and it reduces to the Cauchy distribution when $\tau = 1$. The symmetric 1-stable noise is heavy tail noise.

In our experiments, we test two classes measurement matrices with different coherence. The coherence of a matrix A is the maximum absolute value of the cross-correlations between the columns of A, namely,

$$\mu(\boldsymbol{A}) := \max_{i \neq j} \frac{|\langle \boldsymbol{A}_i, \boldsymbol{A}_j \rangle|}{\|\boldsymbol{A}_i\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{A}_j\|_2}.$$

This concept is introduced in [21].

The first class: A is a random Gaussian matrix, i.e.,

$$\boldsymbol{A}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_m/m), \ i = 1, \dots, n.$$

which is incoherent and having small RIP constants with high probability.

The second class: A is a more ill-conditioned sensing matrix of significantly higher coherence. Here, A is a randomly oversampled partial DCT matrix, which is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{A}_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \cos(2\pi\xi/F)$$

where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m \sim \mathcal{U}([0,1]^m)$ the uniformly and independently distributed in $[0,1]^m$, and $F \in \mathbb{N}$ is the refinement factor. Actually it is the real part of the random partial Fourier matrix analyzed in [24]. The number F is closely related to the conditioning of \boldsymbol{A} in the sense that $\mu(\boldsymbol{A})$ tends to get larger as F increases. For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{32 \times 640}$, $\mu(A)$ easily exceeds 0.99 when F = 10. Although A sampled in this way does not have good RIP by any means, it is still possible to recover the sparse signal x provided its spikes are sufficiently separated.

In our experiments, let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a simulated s-sparse signal, where the support of x is a random index set and the s non-zeros entries obey the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$. we evaluate the compared methods using simulated sparse signals in various noise conditions. In addition, the signal x is normalized to have a unit energy value. Let \hat{x} be a reconduction of x by apply each solver (YALL1 [57], LqLA-ADMM(0 < q < 1) [51] and proposed $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$). If

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} - \boldsymbol{x}\|_2 / \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \le 10^{-2},$$

the reconstruction is a success. Each provided result is an average over 100 independent Monte Carlo runs.

For both $S\tau S$ noise and Gaussian mixture noise, we respectively design three experiments. In the first experiment, the



Fig. 1: $S\tau S$ noise. Left: $m = 128, n = 256, s = 1, 5, 10, 20, \dots, 80, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has small coherence with $\mu(A) < 0.35$; Middle: $m = 64, n = 1024, s = 1, 2, 5, 10, 15, \dots, 30, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has mild coherence with $0.5 < \mu(A) < 0.6$; Right: $m = 32, n = 640, s = 1, 2, 4, 6, \dots, 12, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has high coherence with $\mu(A) > 0.99$.



Fig. 2: Gaussian mixture noise. Left: $m = 128, n = 256, s = 1, 5, 10, 20, ..., 80, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has small coherence with $\mu(A) < 0.35$; Middle: $m = 64, n = 1024, s = 1, 2, 5, 10, 15, ..., 30, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has mild coherence with $0.5 < \mu(A) < 0.6$; Right: $m = 32, n = 640, s = 1, 2, 4, 6, ..., 12, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has high coherence with $\mu(A) > 0.99$.

sensing matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is orthonormal Gaussian random matrix with m = 128, n = 256, which has small coherence smaller than 0.35. In the second experiment, let m = 64, n = 1280 and the sensing matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be orthonormal Gaussian random matrix, which has mild coherence between 0.5 and 0.65. In the third experiment, let the sensing matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be oversampled partial DCT matrix with m = 32and n = 640, and it has high coherence larger than 0.99.

Fig. 1 presents the successful rates of recovery for the YALL1, the LqLA-ADMM(q = 0.5) and the proposed $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 \text{LA}$ ($\alpha = 1, 0.5$) versus the sparsity s in the $S\tau S$ noise case with $\tau = 1$ (Cauchy noise) and $\gamma = 10^{-4}$.In the left figure of Fig. 1, we observe the LqLA-ADMM(q = 0.5) has the best performance, followed by YALL1. In the middle figure of Fig. 1, the LqLA-ADMM(q = 0.5) still has the best performance. But, the difference between LqLA-ADMM(q = 0.5) and $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ LA becomes smaller. However, in the right figure, $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -PLAD is the best and provides the robust performance regardless of large coherence of A. And the LqLA-ADMM(q = 0.5) and YALL1 have lost efficiency.

And Fig. 2 presents the successful rates of recovery of the compared algorithms versus sparsity s in Gaussian mixture noise with $\xi = 0.1$ and $\kappa = 1000$. In Fig. 2, we observe the same conclusions for this case as that in $S\tau S$ noise.

B. MRI Reconstruction

In this subsection, we present a two-dimensional example of the reconstruction for MRI from a limited number of projections. It was first introduced in [7] to demonstrate the success of compressed sensing. The signal/image is a Shepp-Logan phantom of size 256×256 . See Fig. 3. In this case, the gradient of the signal is sparse. Thus [7], [34] proposed a model to minimize the (isotropic) total variation (TV) [42], i.e.,

$$\min \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{TV} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \boldsymbol{RFu} = \boldsymbol{b}, \tag{44}$$

where $||\boldsymbol{u}||_{TV} = ||\sqrt{|\mathcal{D}_x \boldsymbol{u}|^2 + |\mathcal{D}_y \boldsymbol{u}|^2}||_1}$ with $\mathcal{D}_x, \mathcal{D}_y$ respectively denoting the horizontal and vertical partial derivative operators, \mathcal{F} is the Fourier transform, \boldsymbol{R} is the sampling mask in the frequency space, and \boldsymbol{b} is the data. It is claimed in [7] that 22 projections are necessary to achieve exact recovery. Later, some works suggest that imposing nonconvex metrices on gradients can achieve exact recovery from fewer numbers of projections, for example ℓ_q (0 < q < 1) [13] using 10 projections, truncated ℓ_1 [27] using 8 projections. More results about MRI reconstruction, readers can refer to [12], [38], [16], [39], [62] and so on.

Recently, Lou, et.al. [33] proposed the following weighted difference of convex regularization

$$\min\left(\left\|\mathcal{D}_{x}\boldsymbol{u}\right\|_{1}+\left\|\mathcal{D}_{y}\boldsymbol{u}\right\|_{1}-\alpha\left\|\sqrt{\left|\mathcal{D}_{x}\boldsymbol{u}\right|^{2}+\left|\mathcal{D}_{y}\boldsymbol{u}\right|^{2}}\right\|_{1}\right)+\frac{\mu}{2}\left\|\boldsymbol{R}\mathcal{F}\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{b}\right\|_{2}^{2},$$
(45)

where $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ is a parameter for a more general model. This model was called $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -TV [33]. When $\alpha = 1$, (45) is the ℓ_{1-2} -TV model in [60]. These results of [60], [33] demonstrated that 8 projections are enough to guarantee exact recovery using $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$. However, this model is only fit for Gaussian noise. For impulsive noise, we consider the following model

$$\min \lambda \left(\|\mathcal{D}_{x}\boldsymbol{u}\|_{1} + \|\mathcal{D}_{y}\boldsymbol{u}\|_{1} - \alpha \left\| \sqrt{|\mathcal{D}_{x}\boldsymbol{u}|^{2} + |\mathcal{D}_{y}\boldsymbol{u}|^{2}} \right\|_{1} \right) \\ + \|\boldsymbol{R}\mathcal{F}\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_{1},$$
(46)

where $\boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{R}\mathcal{F}\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{z}$ with noise $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$. We call it as $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 \text{TV-PLAD}$. Here, let impulsive noise be $S\tau S$ noise.

By ADMM and DCA algorithms, we present the special algorithm to compute (46). Splitting the term $||\mathbf{RF}\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{b}||_1$, and respectively replacing $\mathcal{D}_x \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{D}_y \mathbf{u}$ by $\mathbf{d}_x, \mathbf{d}_y$, then one has an equivalent problem of (46) as follows

$$\min \lambda \left(\|\boldsymbol{d}_x\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{d}_y\|_1 - \alpha \left\| \sqrt{|\boldsymbol{d}_x|^2 + |\boldsymbol{d}_y|^2} \right\|_1 \right) + \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_1$$

s. t. $\mathcal{D}_x \boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{d}_x, \ \mathcal{D}_y \boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{d}_y, \ \boldsymbol{R} \mathcal{F} \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{b}.$ (47)

Let

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{d}_x, \boldsymbol{d}_y; \boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{h}_x, \boldsymbol{h}_y) \\ &= \lambda \bigg(\|\boldsymbol{d}_x\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{d}_y\|_1 - \alpha \bigg\| \sqrt{|\boldsymbol{d}_x|^2 + |\boldsymbol{d}_y|^2} \bigg\|_1 \bigg) + \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_1 \\ &+ \frac{\rho_1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{R} \mathcal{F} \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_2^2 - \langle \boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{R} \mathcal{F} \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{b} \rangle \\ &+ \frac{\rho_2}{2} \|\mathcal{D}_x \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{d}_x\|_2^2 - \langle \boldsymbol{h}_x, \mathcal{D}_x \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{d}_x \rangle \\ &+ \frac{\rho_2}{2} \|\mathcal{D}_y \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{d}_y\|_2^2 - \langle \boldsymbol{h}_y, \mathcal{D}_y \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{d}_y \rangle \end{split}$$

be the augmented Lagrangian function of (47) with the Lagrangian multipliers $w, h_x, h_y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$. Then using ADMM iterate scheme and DCA in d_x, d_y -subproblem, we give the special algorithm.

Remark 6. In Algorithm 2, α is a model parameter and satisfies $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $\lambda > 0$ is a penalty parameter, $0 < \rho_1$, $\rho_2 < 1$ are regularized parameters.

In this section, numerical experiments compare our $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ algorithm with some other efficient methods including YALL1 [57] for penalized LAD model

min
$$\lambda(\|\mathcal{D}_x \boldsymbol{u}\|_1 + \|\mathcal{D}_y \boldsymbol{u}\|_1) + \|\boldsymbol{R}\mathcal{F}\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_1$$
 (48)

and LqLA-ADMM [51]

min
$$\lambda(\|\mathcal{D}_x \boldsymbol{u}\|_q^q + \|\mathcal{D}_y \boldsymbol{u}\|_q^q) + \|\boldsymbol{R}\mathcal{F}\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_{1,\varepsilon},$$
 (49)

where 0 < q < 1.

Fig. 3 shows the stable recovery of 8 projections using the proposed method. In Fig. 3, the root-mean-square (RMS) error

Algorithm 2 $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ for solving $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 TV$ -PLAD-(46) Input R, b, $0 < \alpha \le 1$, λ , ρ_1, ρ_2 . Initialize

$$(u, v, d_x, d_y; w, h_x, h_y) = (u^0, v^0, d_x^0, d_y^0; w^0, h_x^0, h_y^0),$$

 $k = 0.$

While some stopping criterion is not satisfied do

1. Compute sub-gradient q^k of $\|\sqrt{|d_x|^2 + |d_y|^2}\|_1$ at point (d_x^k, d_y^k) by

$$q^k = (q_x^k; q_y^k) = \frac{(d_x; d_y)}{\sqrt{|d_x^k|^2 + |d_y^k|^2}}$$

2. Compute u^{k+1} by

$$\boldsymbol{u}^{k+1} = \left(\rho_1 \boldsymbol{R}^T \boldsymbol{R} - \rho_2 \Delta\right)^{-1} \left(\rho_1 \mathcal{F}^* \boldsymbol{R} (\boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{v}^k + \boldsymbol{w}^k) + \rho_2 \mathcal{D}_x^T (\boldsymbol{d}_x^k + \boldsymbol{h}_x^k) + \rho_2 \mathcal{D}_y^T (\boldsymbol{d}_y^k + \boldsymbol{h}_y^k)\right).$$

3. Compute v^{k+1} by $v^{k+1} = S(\mathbf{R}\mathcal{F}u^{k+1} - \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{w}^k, \frac{1}{\rho_1}).$ 4. Undate $d^{k+1} = d^{k+1}$ via

$$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{D} \textbf{pdate } \boldsymbol{d}_x^{k+1}, \ \boldsymbol{d}_y^{k+1} \text{ via} \\ \boldsymbol{d}_x^{k+1} = S\bigg((\mathcal{D}_x \boldsymbol{u}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{h}_x^k) + \frac{\lambda \alpha}{\rho_2} \boldsymbol{q}_x^k, \frac{\lambda}{\rho_2} \bigg), \\ \boldsymbol{d}_y^{k+1} = S\bigg((\mathcal{D}_y \boldsymbol{u}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{h}_y^k) + \frac{\lambda \alpha}{\rho_2} \boldsymbol{q}_y^k, \frac{\lambda}{\rho_2} \bigg) \end{aligned}$$

5. Update dual variables

$$w^{k+1} = w^k - \rho_1(R\mathcal{F}u^{k+1} - v^{k+1} - b)$$

 $h_x^{k+1} = h_x^k - \rho_2(\mathcal{D}_x u^{k+1} - d_x^{k+1})$
 $h_y^{k+1} = h_y^k - \rho_2(\mathcal{D}_y u^{k+1} - d_y^{k+1}).$
6. $k = k + 1.$
End

is used to measure the performance quantitatively. The RMS between reference and distorted images X, Y is defined as $RMS(X, Y) = ||X - Y||_2 / \sqrt{M}$, where M is the number of pixels in images X, Y. Figure 3 explains that $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ ($\alpha = 0.5$) is much better than YALL1 and LqLA-ADMM (q = 0.5) visually as well as in terms of RMS. Fig. 3 also shows that 8 projections are sufficient to have stable recovery in impulsive noise by using the $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ method.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we consider the signal and image reconstructions in impulsive noise via $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ ($0 < \alpha \le 1$) minimization. First, we propose the two new models of $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -LAD (12), and $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -DS (15) in Section I. In Section II, we obtain a sufficient condition based on (ℓ_2, ℓ_1)-RIP to guarantee the exact recovery of x from b = Ax via (16) (see Theorem 1)). And in Section III, we consider the recovery of x via (12) and (15) in the noisy case. We give the sufficient (ℓ_2, ℓ_1)-RIP conditions to guarantee the stable recovery of x from b = Ax + z (see Theorem 2 and Theorem 3).

In order to obtain the efficient algorithm of (12), we introduce the unconstrained $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ model $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ -PLAD (13). Using ADMM and DCA, we have developed a numerical scheme- $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2$ LA to efficiently solve our unconstrained problem (13) in section IV.

Last, we present numerical experiments for the sparse signal and compressible image recovery in impulsive noise case.

OrignalFBP, 0.2457LqLA(q=0.5), RMS=0.0985Image: Strain of the strain of the

Fig. 3: MRI reconstruction from observation with impulsive noise. It is demonstrated that 8 projections are enough to have stable recovery in impulsive using $L_1 - \alpha L_2$ LA. The root-mean-square (RMS) errors are provided for each method.

They demonstrate the efficiency of $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ method (see section V). In signal recovery experiments, let sensing matrix A has different coherence: small coherence $\mu(A) < 0.35$, mild coherence $0.5 < \mu(A) < 0.65$ and high coherence $\mu(A) > 0.99$. Although our method performs not well when sensing matrix has small coherence, the difference is smaller when the coherence increases. And when the measurement matrix has high coherence, our method becomes the best. And the MRI phantom image recovery test also demonstrates that $\ell_1 - \alpha \ell_2 LA$ is highly effective and comparable to state-of-theart methods.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Proof. Let \hat{x} be the minimizer of (16). Clearly, $\boldsymbol{b} = A\hat{x}$ and $\|\hat{x}\|_{\alpha,1-2} \leq \|x\|_{\alpha,1-2}$. Let $\boldsymbol{h} = \hat{x} - x$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathcal{N}(A) \setminus \{0\}$. Then by (20) in Lemma 1, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} \le \|\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2}.$$
 (50)

From b = Ax and $b = A\hat{x}$, it follows that

$$\|Ah\|_1 = \|A\hat{x} - Ax\|_1 = 0.$$
 (51)

Let $T_0 = \operatorname{supp}(\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)})$, $t = ks \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, T_1 be the index set of the $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ largest entries of $\boldsymbol{h}_{-\max(s)}$ and $T_{01} = T_0 \cup T_1$. Thus, by the facts that \boldsymbol{A} satisfies the (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -RIP condition of (k+1)s order, t = ks, x is s-sparse and Lemma 3, ones have a lower bound of $||Ah||_1$

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}\|_{1} \ge \rho_{ks} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2}, \tag{52}$$

where $\rho_{ks} = 1 - \delta^{lb}_{(k+1)s} - \frac{(1+\delta^{ub}_{ks})}{a(s,ks;\alpha)}$ with $a(s,ks;\alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{ks-\alpha}}{\sqrt{s+\alpha}} > 1.$

Combining the lower bound (52) with (51), we have

$$0 \ge \left(1 - \delta_{(k+1)s}^{lb} - \frac{1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub}}{a(s, ks; \alpha)}\right) \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2.$$
(53)

Note that the condition (29) implies that

$$1 - \delta_{(k+1)s}^{lb} - \frac{1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub}}{a(s, ks; \alpha)} > 0,$$

i.e., $\rho_{ks} > 0$. Then by (53), it is clear that

 $\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2 \leq 0,$

Therefore, by the definition of T_{01} , h = 0, which contradicts with the assumption $h \in \mathcal{N}(A) \setminus \{0\}$. We complete the proof.

APPENDIX B **PROOF OF THEOREM 2**

Proof. Let $h = \hat{x}^{\ell_1} - x$. Since \hat{x}^{ℓ_1} is the minimizer of (12), $\|m{b} - A\hat{x}^{\ell_1}\|_1 \leq \eta_1$ and $\|\hat{x}^{\ell_1}\|_{\alpha, 1-2} \leq \|x\|_{\alpha, 1-2}$. Then, by (19) in Lemma 1, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} \leq \|\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)}\|_{1} + 2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2}.$$
(54)

By the facts that $\|\boldsymbol{z}\|_1 = \|\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 \leq \eta_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{A}\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\ell_1}\|_1 \leq \eta_1$ η_1 , one has

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}\|_{1} = \|\boldsymbol{A}\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\ell_{1}} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_{1} \leq \|\boldsymbol{A}\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\ell_{1}} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_{1} \\ + \|\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_{1} \leq \eta_{1} + \eta_{1} = 2\eta_{1}.$$
(55)

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, let $T_0 = \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)})$, $t = ks \in \mathbb{Z}_+, T_1$ be the index set of the t = ks largest entries of $h_{-\max(s)}$ and $T_{01} = T_0 \cup T_1$. Thus, by the facts that A satisfies the (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -RIP condition of (k+1)s order, t = ks, and Lemma 3, ones obtain a lower bound of $||Ah||_1$

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}\|_{1} \ge \rho_{ks} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} - (1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub}) \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{ks} - \alpha}, \quad (56)$$

where $\rho_{ks} = 1 - \delta^{lb}_{(k+1)s} - \frac{(1+\delta^{ub}_{ks})}{a(s,ks;\alpha)}$ with $a(s,ks;\alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{ks}-\alpha}{\sqrt{s}+\alpha}$. By (56) and (55), we have

$$2\eta_{1} \ge \left(1 - \delta_{(k+1)s}^{lb} - \frac{(1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub})}{a(s, ks; \alpha)}\right) \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} - (1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub}) \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{ks} - \alpha}.$$
(57)

where $a(s; ks, \alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{ks-\alpha}}{\sqrt{s+\alpha}} > 1$. Furthermore, the condition (29) implies that

$$1 - \delta_{(k+1)s}^{lb} - \frac{(1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub})}{a(s, ks; \alpha)} > 0$$

that is $\rho_{ks} > 0$. Then, by (57), one has

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} \leq \frac{2}{\rho_{ks}}\eta_{1} + \frac{(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{(\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)\rho_{ks}}\frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}}.$$
 (58)

By the fact that $\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_2 = \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2^2}$, to show (31), we need to estimate the upper bound of $\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}^c}\|_2$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $|h_1| \geq \cdots \geq |h_s| \geq$ $|h_{s+1}| \geq \cdots \geq |h_{s+t}| \geq \cdots \geq |h_n|$ with $t = ks \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then,

$$\begin{split} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}^{c}}\|_{2} &\leq \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}^{c}}\|_{1}\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}^{c}}\|_{\infty}} \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \sqrt{\left(\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}^{c}}\|_{1} - \sum_{j \in T_{1}} |h_{j}|\right)|h_{s+t}|} \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \sqrt{\left(\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}^{c}}\|_{1} - t|h_{s+t}|\right)|h_{s+t}|} \\ &= \sqrt{-t\left(|h_{s+t}| - \frac{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}^{c}}\|_{1}}{2t}\right)^{2} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}^{c}}\|_{1}^{2}}{4t}} \\ &\leq \frac{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}^{c}}\|_{1}}{2\sqrt{t}} \end{split}$$

$$\stackrel{(3)}{\leq} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)}\|_{1} + 2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2}}{2\sqrt{t}} \\ \stackrel{(4)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{s}{t}} \Big(\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} + \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2}}{\sqrt{s}}\Big) \\ \stackrel{(5)}{=} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{k}} \Big(\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} + \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2}}{\sqrt{s}}\Big),$$

$$(59)$$

where (1) and (2) are from $T_{01} = T_0 \cup T_1$, $|T_1| = t$ and the assumption $|h_1| \geq \cdots \geq |h_s| \geq |h_{s+1}| \geq \cdots \geq |h_{s+t}| \geq$ $\cdots \geq |h_n|$, (3) follows from (54), (4) is due to $\|\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)}\|_1 \leq$ $\sqrt{s} \| \boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)} \|_2$, $T_0 = \sup(\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)})$ and $T_{01} = T_0 \cup T_1$, and (5) follows from $t = ks \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

By (59), ones have

$$egin{aligned} \|m{h}\|_2 &= \sqrt{\|m{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2^2 + \|m{h}_{T_{01}^c}\|_2^2} \ &\leq \sqrt{\|m{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2^2 + rac{1}{4k} igg(\|m{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2 + rac{2\|m{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_1 + lpha\|m{h}\|_2}{\sqrt{s}}igg)^2} \ &\leq igg(1 + rac{1}{2\sqrt{k}}igg)\|m{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2 + rac{1}{2\sqrt{k}}rac{2\|m{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_1}{\sqrt{s}} + rac{1}{2\sqrt{k}}rac{lpha\|m{h}\|_2}{\sqrt{s}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the basic inequality $\sqrt{a^2 + b^2} \le a + b$ for $a, b \ge 0$. Since $0 \le \alpha \le 1$ and $ks \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $1 - \frac{\alpha}{2\sqrt{ks}} > 0$. Thus, based on (60), we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2} \leq \frac{(2\sqrt{k}+1)\sqrt{s}}{2\sqrt{ks}-\alpha} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} + \frac{\sqrt{s}}{2\sqrt{ks}-\alpha} \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}}$$

Substituting (58) into the above inequality, ones get

$$\begin{split} \|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2} &\leq \frac{(2\sqrt{k}+1)\sqrt{s}}{2\sqrt{ks}-\alpha} \Big(\frac{2}{\rho_{ks}}\eta_{1} + \frac{(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{\rho_{ks}(\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)} \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}} \Big) \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{s}}{2\sqrt{ks}-\alpha} \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{2}}{\sqrt{s}} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{s}}{2\sqrt{ks}-\alpha} \Big(\frac{(2\sqrt{k}+1)(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{\rho_{ks}(\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)} + 1\Big) \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}} \\ &+ \frac{2(2\sqrt{k}+1)\sqrt{s}}{(2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{s}-\alpha)\rho_{ks}}\eta_{1}. \end{split}$$

We complete the proof of Theorem 2.

We complete the proof of Theorem 2.

APPENDIX C **PROOF OF THEOREM 3**

Proof. Take $h = \hat{x}^{DS} - x$. Since \hat{x}^{DS} is the minimizer of (15), which implies $\|\hat{x}^{DS}\|_{\alpha,1-2} \le \|x\|_{\alpha,1-2}$ and $\|A^*(b - a)\|_{\alpha,1-2}$ $|A\hat{x}^{DS}\rangle||_{\infty} \leq \eta_2$, (54) still holds. From the facts $||A^*z||_{\infty} =$ $\|\boldsymbol{A}^*(\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x})\|_{\infty} \leq \eta_2$ and $\|\boldsymbol{A}^*(\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{A}\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}^{DS})\|_{\infty} \leq \eta_2$, we have the following tube constraint inequality

$$egin{aligned} \|oldsymbol{A}^*oldsymbol{A} h\|_\infty &= \|oldsymbol{A}^*(oldsymbol{A}^*x^{DS} - oldsymbol{A}x)\|_\infty \ &\leq &\|oldsymbol{A}^*(oldsymbol{A}\hat{x}^{DS} - oldsymbol{b})\|_\infty + \|oldsymbol{A}^*(oldsymbol{b} - oldsymbol{A}x)\|_\infty \ &\leq &\eta_2 + \eta_2 = 2\eta_2 \end{aligned}$$

instead of (55).

Similarly, let $T_0 = \operatorname{supp}(\boldsymbol{h}_{\max(s)}), t = ks \in \mathbb{Z}_+, T_1$ be the index set of the $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ largest entries of $oldsymbol{h}_{-\max(s)}$ and $T_{01} = T_0 \cup T_1$. Since A satisfies the (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -RIP condition of (k+1)s order, t = ks, and Lemma 3, (56) holds, which then the inequality (63) is equivalent to presents a lower bound of $||Ah||_1$.

Next, we estimate the upper bound of $||Ah||_1$ using new technology, which is completely different from that of the proof for Theorem 2.

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}\|_{1} &\leq \sqrt{m} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2} = \sqrt{m} \langle \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h} \rangle^{1/2} \\ &= \sqrt{m} \langle \boldsymbol{A}^{*}\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{h} \rangle^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{m} \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{A}^{*}\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}\|_{\infty}} \|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{1} \\ &= \sqrt{m} \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{A}^{*}\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{h}\|_{\infty}} (\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}}\|_{1} + \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}^{c}}\|_{1}) \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \sqrt{m} \sqrt{2\eta_{2}(2\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{0}}\|_{1} + 2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2})} \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \sqrt{2m\sqrt{s}\eta_{2}} \left(2\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} + \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2}}{\sqrt{s}}\right) \end{aligned}$$
(62)

where (1) is from (61), (2) is due to $T_{01} = T_0 \cup T_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_0}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{s} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_0}\|_2$ with $|T_0| \leq s$.

Combining (56) with (62), we have

$$\rho_{ks} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} - \frac{(1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{ks - \alpha}} \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}} \\
\leq \sqrt{2m\sqrt{s}\eta_{2} \left(2\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} + \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2}}{\sqrt{s}}\right)}, \tag{63}$$

where $\rho_{ks} = 1 - \delta_{t+s}^{lb} - \frac{(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})}{a(s,ks;\alpha)}$ with $a(s,ks;\alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{ks-\alpha}}{\sqrt{s+\alpha}} > 1$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \delta^{lb}_{(k+1)s} &- \frac{1 + \delta^{ub}_{ks}}{a(s, ks; \alpha)} \\ > 1 - \delta^{lb}_{(k+1)s} &- \frac{(1 + b(s, k; \alpha))(1 + \delta^{ub}_{ks})}{a(s, ks; \alpha)b(s, k; \alpha)} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the first and last inequalities are from $b(s, k; \alpha) =$ $\frac{8(2\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)}{17\alpha(2\sqrt{k}+1)} > 0 \text{ with } 0 < \alpha \le 1 \text{ and } (32), \text{ respectively.}$

To estimate $\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2$ from (63), we consider the following two cases.

First, if

$$\rho_{ks} \| \boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}} \|_2 - \frac{(1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{ks} - \alpha} \frac{2 \| \boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)} \|_1}{\sqrt{s}} < 0,$$

i.e.,

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} < \frac{(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{(\sqrt{ks}-lpha)
ho_{ks}} \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}}.$$

Second, if

$$\frac{\left(1 - \delta_{t+s}^{lb} - \frac{1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub}}{a(s; ks, \alpha)}\right) \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2}}{-\frac{(1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{ks} - \alpha} \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}} \ge 0,$$

which implies

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} \geq \frac{(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{(\sqrt{ks}-lpha)
ho_{ks}} \frac{2\|x_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}},$$

$$\left(\rho_{ks} \| \boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}} \|_{2} - \frac{(1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{ks} - \alpha} \frac{2 \| \boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)} \|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}} \right)^{2} \\ \leq 2m \sqrt{s} \eta_{2} \left(2 \| \boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}} \|_{2} + \frac{2 \| \boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)} \|_{1} + \alpha \| \boldsymbol{h} \|_{2}}{\sqrt{s}} \right).$$
(64)

Let $X = \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2$ and $Y = \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_1 + \alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}\|_2}{\sqrt{s}}$. By $\frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_1}{\sqrt{s}} \leq Y$, to guarantee that (64) holds, it suffices to show

$$\rho_{ks}^2 X^2 - \left(\frac{2\rho_1(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{ks}-\alpha}Y + 4m\sqrt{s\eta_2}\right)X - 2m\sqrt{s\eta_2}Y \le 0.$$
(65)

For the one-variable quadratic inequality $aZ^2 - bZ - c \leq 0$ with the constants a, b, c > 0, there is the fact that

$$Z \le \frac{b + \sqrt{b^2 + 4ac}}{2a} \le \frac{b}{a} + \sqrt{\frac{c}{a}}.$$

Hence,

$$X \leq \frac{2\rho_{ks}\frac{(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{ks-\alpha}}Y + 4m\sqrt{s\eta_2}}{\rho_{ks}^2} + \sqrt{\frac{2m\sqrt{s\eta_2\varepsilon Y}}{\rho_{ks}^2\varepsilon}}$$
$$\leq \frac{2(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{(\sqrt{ks-\alpha})\rho_{ks}}Y + \frac{4m\sqrt{s}}{\rho_{ks}^2}\eta_2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{2m\sqrt{s}}{\rho_{ks}^2\varepsilon}\eta_2 + \varepsilon Y\right)$$
$$= \left(\frac{2(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{(\sqrt{ks-\alpha})\rho_{ks}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)Y + \left(4+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\frac{m\sqrt{s}}{\rho_{ks}^2}\eta_2, \quad (66)$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is to be determined later. By the above discussion and

$$\begin{split} &\left(\frac{2(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{(\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)\rho_{ks}}+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)Y+\left(4+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\frac{m\sqrt{s}}{\rho_{ks}^2}\eta_2\\ &=\left(\frac{2(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{(\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)\rho_1}+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)\frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_1+\alpha\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_2}{\sqrt{s}}\\ &+\left(4+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\frac{m\sqrt{s}}{\rho_1^2}\eta_2\\ &\geq\frac{(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{(\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)\rho_{ks}}\frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_1}{\sqrt{s}}, \end{split}$$

the inequality (64) always holds when

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_{2} \leq & \left(\frac{2(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{(\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)\rho_{ks}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2}}{\sqrt{s}} \\ & + \left(4 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{m\sqrt{s}}{\rho_{ks}^{2}}\eta_{2}, \end{aligned}$$
(67)

which presents an upper bound $\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}}\|_2$.

Next, we will estimate $\|\boldsymbol{h}_{T_{01}^c}\|_2$. In terms of the derivations of (59) and (60), they still hold.

Substituting (67) into (60), ones obtain

$$\begin{split} \|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2} &\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{k}}\right) \left(\left(4 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{m\sqrt{s}}{\rho_{ks}^{2}} \eta_{2} \\ &+ \left(\frac{2(1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub})\sqrt{s}}{(\sqrt{ks} - \alpha)\rho_{ks}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1} + \alpha\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2}}{\sqrt{s}} \end{split}$$

$$\begin{split} &+ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{k}} \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}} + \frac{\alpha}{2\sqrt{k}} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2}}{\sqrt{s}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{k}} \bigg((2\sqrt{k}+1) \bigg(\frac{2(\sqrt{s}+\alpha)(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})}{(\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)\rho_{ks}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \bigg) + 1 \bigg) \\ &\times \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{k}} \bigg((2\sqrt{k}+1) \bigg(\frac{2(\sqrt{s}+\alpha)(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})}{(\sqrt{ks}-1)\rho_{ks}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \bigg) + 1 \bigg) \\ &\times \frac{\alpha \|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2}}{\sqrt{s}} \\ &+ \bigg(1 + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{k}} \bigg) \bigg(4 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \bigg) \frac{m\sqrt{s}}{\rho_{ks}^{2}} \eta_{2} \\ &= \varrho \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{x}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}} + \frac{\alpha\varrho}{\sqrt{s}} \|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2} \\ &+ \bigg(4 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \bigg) \frac{(2\sqrt{k}+1)m\sqrt{s}}{2\sqrt{k}\rho_{1}^{2}} \eta_{2}, \end{split}$$

where the last equality is from

$$\varrho = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{k}} \left((2\sqrt{k}+1) \left(\frac{2(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})}{a(s,ks;\alpha)\rho_{ks}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) + 1 \right)$$

Taking

$$\varepsilon = \frac{2(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})}{8a(s,ks;\alpha)\rho_{ks}},$$

then

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{k}} \left((2\sqrt{k} + 1) \frac{17(1 + \delta_{ks}^{ub})}{16a(s, ks; \alpha)\rho_{ks}} + 1 \right) < \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\alpha}, \quad (68)$$

where the last inequality is from (32). In fact,

$$\begin{split} \varrho &- \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\alpha} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{k}} \left((2\sqrt{k}+1) \frac{3(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub})}{a(s,ks;\alpha)\rho_{ks}} + 1 \right) - \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\alpha} \\ &= \frac{17(2\sqrt{k}+1)}{16\sqrt{k}a(s,ks;\alpha)\rho_{ks}} \\ &\left(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub} - \left(1-\frac{2\sqrt{ks}}{\alpha}\right) \frac{8}{17(2\sqrt{k}+1)}a(s,ks;\alpha)\rho_{ks} \right) \\ &=: \frac{17(2\sqrt{k}+1)}{16\sqrt{k}a(s,ks;\alpha)\rho_{ks}} \left(1+\delta_{ks}^{ub} - a(s,ks;\alpha)b(s,k;\alpha)\rho_{ks} \right), \end{split}$$

where

$$b(s,k;\alpha) = \left(1 - \frac{2\sqrt{ks}}{\alpha}\right) \frac{8}{17(2\sqrt{k}+1)} = \frac{8(2\sqrt{ks}-\alpha)}{17\alpha(2\sqrt{k}+1)}.$$

Then,

$$\varrho - \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\alpha} = \frac{17(2\sqrt{k}+1)}{16\sqrt{k}a(s,ks;\alpha)\rho_{ks}} \times \left((b(s,k;\alpha)+1)\delta^{ub}_{ks} + a(s,ks;\alpha)b(s,k;\alpha)\delta^{ub}_{(k+1)s} - \left(a(s,ks;\alpha)b(s,k;\alpha) - b(s,k;\alpha) - 1\right) \right) \\ < 0$$

where the equality is from the definition of ρ_{ks} . Therefore

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{s\varrho}}{\sqrt{s} - \alpha \varrho} \frac{2\|\boldsymbol{\mathbf{x}}_{-\max(s)}\|_{1}}{\sqrt{s}} + \frac{2(2\sqrt{k}+1)\left((1+\delta_{ks}^{ub}) + a(s,ks;\alpha)\rho_{ks}\right)ms}{\sqrt{k}(\sqrt{s} - \alpha \varrho)(1+\delta_{ks}^{up})\rho_{ks}^{2}}\eta_{2},$$

which finishes the proof of Theorem 3.

Acknowledgement: Peng Li would like to thank Dr. Jiaxin Xie (Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, CAS) and Meng Huang (Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, CAS) for some discussions and suggestions about the ℓ_{1-2} minimization. Peng Li also thanks Jingjing Liu (Graduate School, China Academy of Engineering Physics) for her discussion about image process. Wengu Chen is supported by Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11871109) and NSAF (Grant No.U1830107).

- [1] C. R. Baker and A. F. Gualtierotti, Likelihood ratios and signal detection for nongaussian processes, Stochastic Process in Underwater Acoustics, C. R. Baker, Ed. NewYork: Springer-Verlag, 1986, 154-180.
- [2] P. J. Bickel, Discussion: "The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than $n_{,,}$ Ann. Statist., 35(2007), 2352-2357.
- [3] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, P. Borja and E. Jonathan, Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers, Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning, 3(2011), 1-122.
- [4] T. Cai and J. Lv, Discussion: "The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n,", Ann. Statist., 35(2007), 2365-2369.
- [5] T. T. Cai and A. Zhang, ROP: Matrix recovery via rank-one projections, Ann. Statist., 43(2015), 102-138.
- [6] E. J. Candès, J. K. Romberg and T. Tao, Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 59(2006), 1207-1223.
- [7] E. J. Candès, J. K. Romberg and T. Tao, Robust uncertainly principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, 52(2006), 489-509.
- [8] E. J. Candès and T. Tao, Decoding by linear programming, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, 51(2005), 4203-4215.
- [9] E. Candès and T. Tao, The dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n, Ann. Statist., 35(2007), 2313-2351.
- [10] E. Candès and T. Tao, Rejoinder: "The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n,", Ann. Statist., 35(2007), 2392-2404
- [11] E. J. Candés, M. B. Wakin and S. P. Boyd, Enhancing sparsity by reweighted ℓ_1 minimization, J. Fourier Anal. Appl., 14(2008), 877-905.
- [12] T. F. Chan and S. Esedo \bar{q} lu, Aspects of total variation regularized L^1 function approximation, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 65(2005), 1817-1837.
- [13] R. Chartrand, Exact reconstruction of sparse signals via nonconvex minimization, IEEE Trans. Signal Process., 10(2007), 707-710.
- [14] R. Chartrand and V. Staneva, Restricted isometry properties and nonconvex compressive sensing, Inverse Problems, 24(2008), 035020-1-035020-14
- [15] S. S. Chen, D. L. Donoho and M. A. Saunders, Atomic Decomposition by Basis Pursuit, SIAM. J. Sci. Comput., 20(1998), 33-61.
- [16] X. Chen, M. K. Ng and C. Zhang, Non-Lipschitz ℓ_p -regularization and box constrained model for image restoration, IEEE Trans. Image Process., 21(2012), 4709-4721.
- [17] I. Daubechies, R. Devore, M. Fornasier, and C. S. Güntürk, Iteratively reweighted least squares minimization for sparse recovery, Commun. Pure Appl. Math., 63(2010), 1-38.
- [18] M. E. Davies and R. Gribonval, Restricted isometry constants where ℓ^p sparse recovery can fail for 0 , IEEE Trans. Inform.Theory, 55(2009), 2203-2214.
- [19] D. L. Donoho, Compressed Sensing, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, 52(2006), 1289-1306.

- [20] D. L. Donoho, M. Elad and V. N. Temlyakov, Stable recovery of sparse overcomplete representations in the presence of noise, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, 52(2006), 6-18.
- [21] D. Donoho and X. Huo, Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decomposition, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, 47(2001), 2845-2862.
- [22] B. Efron, T. Hastie and R. Tibshirani, Discussion:"The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n,", Ann. Statist., 35 (2007), 2358-2364.
- [23] E. Esser, Y. Lou and J. Xin, A method for finding structured sparse solutions to non-negative least squares problems with applications, SIAM J. Imag. Sci., 6(2013), 2010-2046.
- [24] A. Fannjiang and W. Liao, Coherence pattern-guided compressive sensing with unresolved grids, SIAM J. Imag. Sci., 5(2012), 179-202.
- [25] M. P. Friedlander and M. A. Saunders, Discussion: "The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n,", Ann. Statist., 35(2007), 2385-2391.
- [26] H. Ge, J. Wen and W. Chen, The null space property of the truncated ℓ_{1-2} -minimization, IEEE Signal Process. Letters, 8(2018), 1261-1265.
- [27] W. Guo and W. Yin, Edge guided reconstruction for compressive imaging, SIAM J. Imag. Sci., 5(2012), 809-834.
- [28] M.-J. Lai, Y. Xu and W. Yin, Improved iteratively reweighted least squares for unconstrained smoothed ℓ_q minimization, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 51(2013), 927-957.
- [29] T. Liu and T. K. Pong, Further properties of the forward-backward envelope with applications to difference-of-convex programming, Comput. Optim. Appl., 67(2017), 489-520.
- [30] Y. Lou and M. Yan, Fast $L_1 L_2$ minimization via a proximal operator, J. Sci. Comput., 74(2018), 767-785.
- [31] Y. Lou, P. Yin, Q. He and J. Xin, Computing sparse representation in a highly coherent dictionary based on difference of ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 , J. Sci. Comput., 64(2015), 178-196.
- [32] Y. Lou, P. Yin and J. Xin, Point source super-resolution via nonconvex ℓ₁ based methods, J. Sci. Comput., 68(2016), 1082-1100.
- [33] Y. Lou, T. Zeng, S. Osher and J. Xin, A weighted difference of anisotropic and isotropic total variation model for image processing, SIAM J. Imag. Sci., 8(2015), 1798-1823.
- [34] M. Lustig, D. Donoho and J. M. Pauly, Sparse MRI: The application of compressed sensing for rapid MR imaging, Magn. Reson. Med., 58(2007), 1182-1195.
- [35] T.-H. Ma, Y. Lou and T.-Z. Huang, Truncated ℓ_{1-2} models for sparse recovery and rank minimization, SIAM J. Imag. Sci., 10(2017), 1346-1380.
- [36] N. Meinshausen and P. Bühlmann, High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the Lasso, Ann. Statist., 34(2006), 1436-1462.
- [37] N. Meinshausen, G. Rocha and B. Yu, A tale of three cousins: Lasso, L2 Boosting and Dantzig, Discussion: "The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n,", Ann. Statist., 35(2007), 2373-2384.
- [38] M. Nikolova, M. K. Ng and C.-P. Tam, Fast nonconvex nonsmooth minimization methods for image restoration and reconstruction, IEEE Trans. Image Process., 19(2010), 3073-3088.
- [39] M. Nikolova, M. K. Ng and C.-P. Tam, On ℓ₁ data fitting and concave regularization for image recovery, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 35(2013), A397-A430.
- [40] J. P. Nolan, Stable distributions-models for heavy tailed data, Boston, MA, USA: Birkhauser, 2012.
- [41] Y. Ritov, Discussion: "The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n,", Ann. Statist., 35(2007), 2370-2372.
- [42] L. Rudin, S. Osher and E. Fatemi, Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms, Phys. D, 60(1992), 259-268.
- [43] K. J. Sangston and K. R. Gerlach, Coherent detection of radar targets in a nongaussian background, IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Efectron. Syst., 30(1994), 330-340.
- [44] G. Samorodnitsky and M. S. Taqqu, Stable non-Gaussian random processes. Stochastic Models With Infinite Variance, NewYork, NY, USA: Chapman and Hall, 1994.
- [45] Q. Sun, Sparse approximation property and stable recovery of sparse signals from noisy measurements, IEEE Trans. Signal Process., 2011, 59(10), 5086-5090.
- [46] Q. Sun, Recovery of sparsest signals via l_p-minimization, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal., 2012, 32(3), 329-341.
- [47] R. Tibshirani, Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso, J. Roy. Stat. Soc. B, 58(1996), 267-288.

- [48] D. M. Titterington, A. E. M. Smith and U. E. Makov, Statistical analysis of finite mixture distributions, NewYork, Wiley, 1985, 35-52.
- [49] L. Wang, The L_1 penalized LAD estimator for high dimensional linear regression, J. Multivariate Anal., 120(2013), 135-151.
- [50] X. Wang and X. Yuan, The linearized alternating direction method of multipliers for Dantzig selector, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 34(2012), A2792-A2811.
- [51] F. Wen, L. Pei, Y. Yang, W. Yu and P. Liu, Efficient and robust recovery of sparse signal and image using generalized nonconvex regularization, IEEE Trans. Comput. Imaging, 3(2017), 566-579.
- [52] F. Wen, P. Liu, Y. Liu, R. C. Qiu and W. Yu, Robust sparse recovery in impulsive noise via $\ell_p \ell_1$ optimization, IEEE Trans. Signal Process., 65(2016), 105-118.
- [53] J. Wen, D. Li and F. Zhu, Stable recovery of sparse signals via *l*_pminimization, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal., 38(2015), 161-176.
- [54] R. Wu and D.-R. Chen, The improved bounds of restricted isometry constant for recovery via l_p -minimization, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, 59(2013), 6142-6147.
- [55] Z. Xu, X. Chang, F. Xu, and H. Zhang, L_{1/2} regularization: A thresholding representation theory and a fast solver, IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst., 23(2012), 1013-1027.
- [56] L. Yan, Y. Shin and D. Xiu, Sparse approximation using $\ell_1 \ell_2$ minimization and its application to stochastic collocation, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 39(2017), A229-A254.
- [57] J. Yang and Y. Zhang, Alternating direction algorithms for *ℓ*₁problems in compressive sensing, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 33(2011), 250-278.
- [58] P. Yin, E. Esser and J. Xin, Ratio and difference of l_1 and l_2 norms and sparse representation with coherent dictionaries, Commun. Inf. Syst., 14(2014), 87-109.
- [59] P. Yin and J. Xin, PhaseLiftOff: An accurate and stable phase retrieval method based on difference of trace and Frobenius norms, Commun. Math. Sci., 13(2015), 1033-1049.
- [60] P. Yin, Y. Lou, Q. He and J. Xin, Minimization of ℓ_{1-2} for compressed sensing, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 37(2015), A536-A563.
- [61] R. Zhang, S. Li. Optimal RIP bounds for sparse signals recovery via ℓ_p minimization, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal., 2017, doi:10.1016/j.acha.2017.10.004.
- [62] X. Zhang, M. Bai and M. K. Ng, Nonconvex-TV based image restoration with impulse noise removal, SIAM J. Imag. Sci., 10(2017), 1627-1667.
- [63] P. Zhao and B. Yu, On model selection consistency of Lasso, J. Mach. Learn. Res., 7(2006), 2541-2563.