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Compressed sensing and -lets

Natural images are highly compressible in -lets:

⇒ -lets are widely used sparsifying transforms in compressed sensing for imaging problems.
Compressed sensing setup

Standard setup:

- \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N)^\top \in \mathbb{C}^N \) be an unknown image
- \( A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times N} \) is a sensing matrix
- \( y = Ax + e \) are measurements, where \( \|e\|_2 \leq \eta \)
- \( \Phi \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N} \) is an orthonormal sparsifying transformation

Reconstruction algorithm:

\[
\min_{z \in \mathbb{C}^N} \|\Phi^* z\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|Az - y\|_2 \leq \eta. \tag{*}
\]

Recovery guarantees: Subject to appropriate conditions on \( A \) (e.g. RIP), if \( \hat{x} \) is a minimizer of \((*)\) and \( \sigma_s(\cdot) \) is the best \( s \)-term approximation error,

\[
\|x - \hat{x}\|_2 \leq C_1 \frac{\sigma_s(\Phi^* x)}{\sqrt{s}} + C_2 \eta.
\]
Sparsity is invariant under permutations

Let $P : \{1, \ldots, N\} \to \{1, \ldots, N\}$ be a permutation. Given $x \in \mathbb{C}^N$, define the permuted image

$$\tilde{x} = \Phi P \Phi^* x.$$ 

**Example:** CS reconstruction using DB4 wavelets and $m = 8192$ random Gaussian measurements with $N = 256 \times 256$
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Beyond sparsity and incoherence

**Conclusion:** CS with *incoherent* measurements is *suboptimal* for natural images. It recovers all objects in the space

\[ \Sigma_s = \{ x \in \mathbb{C}^N : \| \Phi^* x \|_0 \leq s \}, \]

exactly, and this includes too many unphysical images.

**New approach:**

- Work with a smaller class of structured sparse objects.
- Don’t use incoherent measurements. Modify the sensing matrix \( A \) to exploit structured sparsity.
Wavelet bases can be decomposed into dyadic scales. Let

$$0 = M_0 < M_1 < \ldots < M_r = N,$$

be such that the $k^{\text{th}}$ scale corresponds to indices $\{M_{k-1} + 1, \ldots, M_k\}$. Define the sparsity in the $k^{\text{th}}$ scale as

$$s_k = |\{j \in \{M_{k-1} + 1, \ldots, M_k\} : c_j \neq 0\}|,$$

where $c = \Phi^* x$. Define the set of sparse in levels objects as

$$\Sigma_{s,M} = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^N : |\{j \in \{M_{k-1} + 1, \ldots, M_k\} : c_j \neq 0\}| \leq s_k\},$$

where $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_r)$ and $M = (M_1, \ldots, M_r)$.

**Objective:** Find a sensing matrix $A$ that promotes sparsity in levels when using $l^1$ minimization.
Natural images are asymptotically sparse in levels

We would a sensing matrix that will work for ‘most’ images. Fortunately, this is possible due to the property of asymptotic sparsity.

Wavelet coefficients are not just sparse, i.e. \( s = \sum_{k=1}^{r} s_k \ll N \), but they are asymptotically sparse in levels, i.e. \( x \in \Sigma_{s,M} \), and

\[
\frac{s_k}{(M_k - M_{k-1})} \rightarrow 0, \quad k \rightarrow \infty.
\]

Left: image. Right: percentage of wavelet coefficients per scale \( > 10^{-3} \).
Other work

Structured sparsity has been widely considered in CS.


Existing algorithms:

- Model-based CS, Baraniuk et al. (2010)
- Bayesian CS, Ji, Xue & Carin (2008), He & Carin (2009)
- Turbo AMP, Som & Schniter (2012)

Although the particulars are different, these are based on similar ideas:

- Exploit the connected tree structure of wavelet coefficients
- Use standard measurements, e.g. random Gaussians
- Modify the recovery algorithm

However, there are issues with accuracy and efficiency. See later.
Designing measurements for sparsity in levels

Write \( c = (c^{(1)}, \ldots, c^{(r)})^\top \), where \( c^{(k)} \) is the set of coefficients at the \( k^{\text{th}} \) scale. ‘Ideal’ measurements would be

\[
y^{(k)} = B^{(k)} c^{(k)}, \quad B^{(k)} \in \mathbb{C}^{m_k \times (M_k-M_{k-1})},
\]

where \( B^{(k)} \) is incoherent. Hence

\[
B = A\Phi = \text{diag} \left( B^{(1)}, \ldots, B^{(r)} \right),
\]

is block diagonal.

However, we are only allowed to design \( A \), not \( B \). Nevertheless, this suggests that good sensing matrices \( A \) for structured sparsity should yield approximate block diagonality of \( B = A\Phi \) with incoherent blocks.
The Fourier transform of wavelets

Let \( \phi_{l,k} \) be the Haar wavelet (for simplicity) with scale \( l \) and translation \( k \). Then

\[
|\mathcal{F}\phi_{l,k}(\omega)|^2 \lesssim 2^{-j} 2^{-|j-l|}, \quad 2^{j-1} \leq |\omega| \leq 2^j.
\]

\( \Rightarrow \) Wavelets give a natural division of Fourier space into dyadic bands

\[
W_0 = \{0, 1\}, \quad W_j = \{-2^j + 1, \ldots, -2^{j-1}\} \cup \{2^{j-1} + 1, \ldots, 2^j\}.
\]

Only wavelets at scale \( l \approx j \) have large spectrum within the band \( W_j \).
Local incoherence of Fourier measurements with wavelets

This means that the blocks $U^{(j,l)}$ of the matrix $U = \Psi^* \Phi$, where $\Psi$ is the DFT, have the following structure:

- Diagonal incoherence: $\mu(U^{(j,j)}) \lesssim 2^{-j}$
- Exponential off-diagonal decay: $\mu(U^{(j,l)}) \lesssim 2^{-|j-l|} \mu(U^{(j,l)})$

Where $\mu(V) = \max_{i,j} |V_{ij}|^2$.

The absolute values of $U$
Multilevel random subsampling

Pick $m_k$ indices from $W_k$ uniformly at random:

$$\Omega_k \subseteq W_k, \quad |\Omega_k| = m_k.$$ 

Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times N}$, where $m = \sum_k m_k$, be the subsampled DFT with rows corresponding to indices $\Omega_1 \cup \ldots \cup \Omega_r$.

**Choosing the $m_k$’s.** One can show that to recover an $(s, M)$-sparse image it suffices to take

$$m_k \gtrsim s_k + \sum_{l \neq k} 2^{-\frac{|k-l|}{2}} s_l.$$ 

This is a consequence of a general theory for CS based on local coherence in levels, sparsity in levels and multilevel random subsampling:

Multilevel random subsampling

Image

Asymptotic sparsity of coefficients

Matrix $U$

Subsampling map in 2D
Flip test revisited

Random Gaussian measurements: incoherent with wavelets, recover all sparse coefficients equally well.
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Random Gaussian measurements: incoherent with wavelets, recover all sparse coefficients equally well.
Flip test revisited

Multilevel subsampled Fourier measurements: Asymptotically incoherent with wavelets, recover only asymptotically sparse coefficients.
Numerical example

Example: 12.5% measurements using DB4 wavelets.

256 × 256
Err = 41.6%

512 × 512
Err = 25.3%

1024 × 1024
Err = 11.6%

First case: Gaussian random measurements.
Numerical example

Example: 12.5% measurements using DB4 wavelets.

- 256×256: Err = 21.9% (41.6%)
- 512×512: Err = 10.9% (25.3%)
- 1024×1024: Err = 3.1% (11.6%)

Second case: Subsampled Fourier measurements.
Efficient compressive imaging

Example: The Berlin cathedral with 15% sampling at various resolutions using Daubechies-4 wavelets. Comparison between random Bernoulli and subsampled multilevel subsampled Hadamard measurements.

Experiments performed using SPGL1 on an Intel i7-3770K, 32 GB RAM and an Intel Xeon E7, 256 GB RAM.
Efficient compressive imaging

Resolution: $128 \times 128$

Random Bernoulli

Hadamard

Original image

RAM (GB): 0.3
Speed (it/s): 12.4
Rel. Err. (%): 26.4
Time: 25s

RAM (GB): < 0.1
Speed (it/s): 26.4
Rel. Err. (%): 17.9
Time: 10.1s
Efficient compressive imaging

Resolution: $256 \times 256$

Random Bernoulli

Hadamard

Original image

RAM (GB): 4.8
Speed (it/s): 1.31
Rel. Err. (%): 22.4
Time: 4m27s

RAM (GB): < 0.1
Speed (it/s): 18.1
Rel. Err. (%): 14.7
Time: 18.6s
Efficient compressive imaging

Resolution: $512 \times 512$

Random Bernoulli

Hadamard

Original image

RAM (GB): 76.8
Speed (it/s): 0.15
Rel. Err. (%): 19.0
Time: 42m

RAM (GB): < 0.1
Speed (it/s): 4.9
Rel. Err. (%): 12.2
Time: 1m13s

Bernoulli only possible on the Xeon 256 GB RAM.
Efficient compressive imaging

Resolution: $1024 \times 1024$

Random Bernoulli

Hadamard

Original image

Bernoulli not possible. Grey values are extrapolated.
Efficient compressive imaging

Resolution: $2048 \times 2048$

Random Bernoulli Hadamard Original image

Bernoulli not possible. Grey values are extrapolated.
Efficient compressive imaging

Resolution: $4096 \times 4096$

Random Bernoulli  Hadamard  Original image

RAM (GB): 314,573  RAM (GB): < 0.1
Speed (it/s): $1.98e-4$  Speed (it/s): 0.041
Rel. Err. (%): ?  Rel. Err. (%): 6.6
Time: 25d1h  Time: 1h37m

Bernoulli not possible. Grey values are extrapolated.
Efficient compressive imaging

Resolution: \(8192 \times 8192\)

Random Bernoulli

Hadamard

Original image

Bernoulli not possible. Grey values are extrapolated.
Example with other -lets

Example: 6.25% subsampling at $2048 \times 2048$ resolution. Comparing wavelets, curvelets, contourlets and shearlets.

Note: The sampling pattern is not optimized to the sparsifying transformation.
Example with other -lets

wavelets
curvelets
contourlets
shearlets
Comparison with other structured CS algorithms

Multilevel subsampling with Fourier/Hadamard matrices
- Use standard recovery algorithm ($l^1$ minimization)
- Exploit asymptotic sparsity in levels structure in the sampling process, e.g. Fourier/Hadamard

Other structured CS algorithms
- E.g. model-CS, Bayesian CS, Turbo AMP
- Use standard sensing matrices (random Gaussian/Bernoulli)
- Exploit connected tree structure by modifying the recovery algorithm
Comparison: 12.5% sampling at 256 × 256 resolution

Original

$\ell^1$ Gauss., Err = 15.7%

Model-CS, Err = 17.9%

BCS, Err = 12.1%

TurboAMP, Err = 17.7%

Mult. Four., Err = 8.8%
Comparison: 12.5% sampling at 256 × 256 resolution

Original

$\ell^1$ Bern., Err = 41.2%

Model-CS, Err = 41.8%

BCS, Err = 29.6%

TurboAMP, Err = 39.3%

Mult. Four., Err = 18.2%
Multilevel Fourier with other sparsifying transformations

wavelets, $\text{Err} = 18.2\%$

curvelets, $\text{Err} = 17.4\%$

shearlets, $\text{Err} = 16.5\%$

TV, $\text{Err} = 17.6\%$
Summary

1. Standard CS using incoherent sensing matrices, e.g. random Gaussians, is highly suboptimal for imaging with -lets.

2. Images are not just sparse, but always possess a distinct asymptotic sparsity in levels structure.

3. Such structure can be exploited using multilevel subsampling of Fourier/Hadamard matrices.

4. These matrices are not incoherent with wavelets, but have a distinct asymptotic incoherence structure.

5. By doing so, one obtains substantial improvements in accuracy and computational efficiency over standard CS, and also outperforms other structured CS algorithms.
Final remarks

The majority of CS theory is based on sparsity and incoherence. This work suggests more general concepts of sparsity in levels and local coherence in levels are better suited in applications involving -lets.

- Moreover, these concepts naturally arise in many CS applications, due to the specific measurements (e.g. medical imaging, microscopy,...).

A new CS theory: based on sparsity in levels, local coherence and multilevel random subsampling. See

- As a corollary, provides the comprehensive recovery guarantees for CS in the above applications.

Open problems: Take your favourite CS concept, e.g. RIP, instance optimality, phase transitions, iterative algorithms,...., and generalize it to sparsity with levels. Also, optimal sampling strategies, optimal measurements, structured sampling + structured recovery,...