



# Compressive Sensing and Applications

Volkan Cevher

volkan@rice.edu

**Rice University** 

RICE UNIVERSITY





















# Acknowledgements

- Rice DSP Group (Slides)
  - Richard Baraniuk
    - Mark Davenport,
    - Marco Duarte,
    - Chinmay Hegde,
    - Jason Laska,
    - Shri Sarvotham,
    - Mona Sheikh
    - Stephen Schnelle...
  - Mike Wakin, Justin Romberg, Petros Boufounos, Dror Baron





# Outline

- Introduction to Compressive Sensing (CS)
  - motivation
  - basic concepts
- CS Theoretical Foundation
  - geometry of sparse and compressible signals
  - coded acquisition
  - restricted isometry property (RIP)
  - signal recovery
- CS in Action
- Summary



# Sensing







# **Digital Revolution**









#### Pressure is on Digital Sensors

• Success of digital data acquisition is placing increasing pressure on signal/image processing hardware and software to support

#### higher resolution / denser sampling

» ADCs, cameras, imaging systems, microarrays, ...

#### large numbers of sensors

» image data bases, camera arrays, distributed wireless sensor networks, ...

#### increasing numbers of modalities

» acoustic, RF, visual, IR, UV, x-ray, gamma ray, ...

### Pressure is on Digital Sensors

 Success of digital data acquisition is placing increasing pressure on signal/image processing hardware and software to support

#### higher resolution / denser sampling

» ADCs, cameras, imaging systems, microarrays, ...

#### Χ

#### large numbers of sensors

» image data bases, camera arrays, distributed wireless sensor networks, ...

#### x increasing numbers of modalities

» acoustic, RF, visual, IR, UV

#### deluge of data

» how to acquire, store, fuse, process efficiently?

# Digital Data Acquisition

• Foundation: Shannon/Nyquist sampling theorem

"if you sample densely enough (at the Nyquist rate), you can perfectly reconstruct the original analog data"







time

space

# Sensing by Sampling

- Long-established paradigm for digital data acquisition
  - uniformly sample data at Nyquist rate (2x Fourier bandwidth)

$$x \rightarrow \text{sample}^N$$



# Sensing by Sampling

- Long-established paradigm for digital data acquisition
  - uniformly sample data at Nyquist rate (2x Fourier bandwidth)



# Sensing by Sampling

- Long-established paradigm for digital data acquisition
  - uniformly sample data at Nyquist rate (2x Fourier bandwidth)
  - compress data



# Sparsity / Compressibility

N pixels



 $K \ll N$ large wavelet coefficients

(blue = 0)

N wideband signal samples



 $K \ll N$ large Gabor (TF) coefficients

### Sample / Compress

- Long-established paradigm for digital data acquisition
  - uniformly *sample* data at Nyquist rate
  - compress data



#### What's Wrong with this Picture?

 Why go to all the work to acquire N samples only to discard all but K pieces of data?



# What's Wrong with this Picture?



linear processing linear signal model (bandlimited subspace) nonlinear processing nonlinear signal model (union of subspaces)

IN transmit/store sample compress  $\mathcal{X}$ sparse / compressible wavelet transform  $\widehat{r}$ receive decompress

### **Compressive Sensing**

- Directly acquire "compressed" data
- Replace samples by more general "measurements"

$$K \approx M \ll N$$



#### **Compressive Sensing**

# Theory I Geometrical Perspective

# Sampling

- Signal x is K-sparse in basis/dictionary  $\Psi$  $\Psi = I$ 
  - WLOG assume sparse in space domain



# Sampling

- Signal x is K-sparse in basis/dictionary  $\Psi$ – WLOG assume sparse in space domain  $\Psi = I$
- Samples



### Compressive Sampling

• When data is sparse/compressible, can directly acquire a *condensed representation* with no/little information loss through linear *dimensionality reduction*  $y = \Phi x$ 



Projection Φ
 not full rank...

M < N



# ... and so loses information in general

- Ex: Infinitely many x 's map to the same y



• But we are only interested in *sparse* vectors

 Projection Φ not full rank...



K columns

M < N

... and so loses information in general

• But we are only interested in *sparse* vectors

•  $\Phi$  is effectively  $M \times K$ 



- But we are only interested in *sparse* vectors
- Design Φ so that each of its MxK submatrices are full rank



2K columns

- Goal: Design Φ so that its
   Mx2K submatrices are full rank
  - difference  $x_1 x_2$  between two *K*-sparse vectors is 2*K* sparse in general
  - preserve information in *K*-sparse signals
  - **Restricted Isometry Property** (RIP) of order 2K

#### Unfortunately...



2K columns

- Goal: Design Φ so that its Mx2K submatrices are full rank (Restricted Isometry Property – RIP)
- Unfortunately, a combinatorial, NP-complete design problem

# Insight from the 80's [Kashin, Gluskin]



- Draw  $\Phi$  at **random** 
  - iid Gaussian

. . .

– iid Bernoulli  $\pm 1$ 



 $2K\,{
m columns}$ 

- Then  $\Phi$  has the RIP with high probability as long as  $M = O(K \log(N/K)) \ll N$ 
  - Mx2K submatrices are full rank
  - stable embedding for sparse signals
  - extends to compressible signals in  $\,\ell_p\,$  balls

### **Compressive Data Acquisition**

- Measurements  $\mathcal{Y} = random linear combinations$  of the entries of  $\mathcal{X}$
- WHP does not distort structure of sparse signals

   no information loss



• Goal: Recover signal x from measurements y



 Challenge: Random projection Φ not full rank (ill-posed inverse problem)

 Solution: Exploit the sparse/compressible geometry of acquired signal x

Sparse signal:

only *K* out of *N* coordinates nonzero





- Sparse signal: only K out of N coordinates nonzero
  - model: union of K-dimensional subspaces aligned w/ coordinate axes





- Sparse signal: only K out of N
   coordinates nonzero
  - model: union of K-dimensional subspaces



Compressible signal:

sorted coordinates decay rapidly to zero



- Sparse signal: only K out of N coordinates nonzero
  - model: union of K-dimensional subspaces





- Random projection Φ not full rank
- Recovery problem: given  $y = \Phi x$  find x
- Null space
- So search in null space for the "best" *x* according to some criterion
  - ex: least squares



Recovery:
 (ill-posed inverse problem)

given  $y = \Phi x$ find x (sparse)

•  $\ell_2$  fast

 $\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x} \|x\|_2$ 

$$\widehat{x} = (\Phi^T \Phi)^{-1} \Phi^T y$$

pseudoinverse

- Recovery:
   (ill-posed inverse problem)
- given  $y = \Phi x$ find x (sparse)

•  $\ell_2$  fast, wrong

 $\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x} \|x\|_2$ 





 ${\mathcal X}$ 

 $\widehat{x} = (\Phi^T \Phi)^{-1} \Phi^T y$ 

pseudoinverse
# Why $\ell_2$ Doesn't Work

for signals sparse in the **space/time domain** 

$$\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x'} \|x'\|_2$$

least squares, minimum  $\ell_2$  solution is almost **never sparse** 



null space of  $\Phi$ translated to  $\mathfrak{X}$ (random angle)

• Reconstruction/decoding: given  $y = \Phi x$ (ill-posed inverse problem) find x

• 
$$\ell_2$$
 fast, wrong

•  $\ell_0$ 

 $\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x} \|x\|_2$ 

$$\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{\substack{y = \Phi x}} \|x\|_{0}$$

$$\uparrow$$
number of
nonzero
entries

"find sparsest  $\mathcal{X}$  in translated nullspace"

given Reconstruction/decoding:  $\Phi x$ y =find  $\mathcal{X}$ (ill-posed inverse problem)

· l? fast, wrong

•  $\ell_0$ 

correct: only *M=2K* measurements required to reconstruct K-sparse signal  $\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x} \|x\|_2$ 

```
\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x} \|x\|_0
                number of
```

nonzero entries

given  $y = \Phi x$  Reconstruction/decoding: find  $\mathcal{X}$ (ill-posed inverse problem)

· l? fast, wrong

•  $\ell_0$ 

correct: only M=2Kmeasurements required to reconstruct K-sparse signal  $\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x} \|x\|_2$ 

 $\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x} \|x\|_0$ number of nonzero

entries

**slow:** NP-complete algorithm

- Recovery: (ill-posed inverse problem)
- $\ell_2$  fast, wrong
- $\ell_0$  correct, slow

• l<sub>1</sub>

given  $y = \Phi x$ find x (sparse)

- $\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x} \|x\|_2$
- $\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x} \|x\|_0$
- $\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x} \|x\|_1$

linear program

number of measurements required  $M = O(K \log(N/K)) \ll N$ 

correct, efficient

mild oversampling

[Candes, Romberg, Tao; Donoho]



# Why $\ell_1$ Works

for signals sparse in the **space/time domain** 

$$\widehat{x} = \arg\min_{y = \Phi x'} \|x'\|_1$$

minimum  $\ell_1$  solution = sparsest solution (with high probability) if

 $M = O(K \log(N/K)) \ll N$ 



## Universality

 Random measurements can be used for signals sparse in any basis

$$x = \Psi \alpha$$



## Universality

 Random measurements can be used for signals sparse in *any* basis

$$y = \Phi x = \Phi \Psi \alpha$$



## Universality

 Random measurements can be used for signals sparse in *any* basis

$$y = \Phi x = \Phi \Psi \alpha = \Phi' \alpha$$

$$y \qquad \Phi' \qquad \alpha$$

$$N \times 1$$

sparse coefficient vector

#### *K* nonzero entries

#### **Compressive Sensing**

- Directly acquire "compressed" data
- Replace *N* samples by *M* random projections

$$M = O(K \log(N/K))$$



#### **Compressive Sensing**

# Theory II Stable Embedding

#### Johnson-Lindenstrauss Lemma

• JL Lemma: random projection stably embeds a cloud of *Q* points whp provided  $M = O(\log Q)$ 



- Proved via concentration inequality
- Same techniques link JLL to RIP [Baraniuk, Davenport, DeVore, Wakin, *Constructive Approximation*, 2008]

## Connecting JL to RIP

Consider effect of random JL  $\Phi$  on each K-plane

- construct covering of points Q on unit sphere
- JL: isometry for each point with high probability
- union bound  $\rightarrow$  isometry for all points q in Q
- extend to isometry for all x in K-plane



## Connecting JL to RIP

Consider effect of random JL  $\Phi$  on each K-plane

- construct covering of points Q on unit sphere
- JL: isometry for each point with high probability
- union bound  $\rightarrow$  isometry for all points q in Q
- extend to isometry for all x in K-plane
- union bound  $\rightarrow$  isometry for all K-planes



#### Favorable JL Distributions

• Gaussian

$$\phi_{i,j} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{1}{M}\right)$$

• Bernoulli/Rademacher [Achlioptas]

$$\phi_{i,j} := \begin{cases} +\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \end{cases}$$

with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ , with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

- "Database-friendly" [Achlioptas]
  - with probability  $\frac{1}{6}$ ,
  - with probability  $\frac{2}{3}$ ,
  - with probability  $\frac{1}{6}$

$$\phi_{i,j} := \begin{cases} +\sqrt{\frac{3}{M}} \\ 0 \\ -\sqrt{\frac{3}{M}} \end{cases}$$

• Random Orthoprojection to R<sup>M</sup> [Gupta, Dasgupta]

#### RIP as a "Stable" Embedding

• RIP of order 2K implies: for all K-sparse  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ .

$$(1 - \delta_{2K}) \leq \frac{\|\Phi x_1 - \Phi x_2\|_2^2}{\|x_1 - x_2\|_2^2} \leq (1 + \delta_{2K})$$



#### **Compressive Sensing**

#### **Recovery Algorithms**

# CS Recovery Algorithms

- Convex optimization:
  - noise-free signals
    - Linear programming (Basis pursuit)
    - FPC
    - Bregman iteration, ...
  - noisy signals
    - Basis Pursuit De-Noising (BPDN)
    - Second-Order Cone Programming (SOCP)
    - Dantzig selector
    - GPSR, ...
- Iterative greedy algorithms
  - Matching Pursuit (MP)
  - Orthogonal Matching Pursuit (OMP)
  - StOMP
  - CoSaMP
  - Iterative Hard Thresholding (IHT), ...

**software @** dsp.rice.edu/cs

#### SOCP

- Standard LP recovery  $\min \|x\|_1 \ \ \text{subject to} \ y = \Phi x$
- Noisy measurements

$$y = \Phi x + n$$

• Second-Order Cone Program

min  $||x||_1$  subject to  $||y - \Phi x||_2 \le \epsilon$ 

• Convex, quadratic program

## BPDN

- Standard LP recovery  $\min \|x\|_1 \ \ \text{subject to} \ y = \Phi x$
- Noisy measurements

$$y = \Phi x + n$$

• Basis Pursuit De-Noising

$$\min \frac{1}{2} \|y - \Phi x\|_2 + \lambda \|x\|_1$$

• Convex, quadratic program

# Matching Pursuit

- Greedy algorithm
- Key ideas:

(1) measurements y composed of sum of *K* columns of  $\Phi$ 



(2) identify which K columns sequentially according to size of contribution to  $\mathcal{Y}$ 

# Matching Pursuit

• For each column  $\phi_i$  compute

 $\widehat{x}_i = \langle y, \phi_i \rangle$ 



- Choose largest  $|\widehat{x}_i|$  (greedy)
- Update estimate  $\widehat{x}$  by adding in  $\widehat{x}_i$

- Form residual measurement y and iterate until convergence

$$y' = y - x_i \phi_i$$

# Orthogonal Matching Pursuit

• Same procedure as Matching Pursuit

- $\begin{array}{c} y \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \Phi \\ \hline \end{array} \\ i \end{array}$
- Except at each iteration:
  - remove selected column  $\phi_i$
  - re-orthogonalize the remaining columns of  $\,\Phi\,$
- Converges in *K* iterations

## Compressive Sensing In Action

Cameras

#### "Single-Pixel" CS Camera



#### "Single-Pixel" CS Camera



- Flip mirror array *M* times to acquire *M* measurements
- Sparsity-based (linear programming) recovery









#### First Image Acquisition



target 65536 pixels



11000 measurements (16%)



1300 measurements (2%)



#### Second Image Acquisition





4096 pixels

#### 500 random measurements

# CS Low-Light Imaging with PMT







true color low-light imaging

256 x 256 image with 10:1 compression

[Nature Photonics, April 2007]

## Hyperspectral Imaging







### Compressive Sensing In Action

#### **A/D Converters**

# Analog-to-Digital Conversion

- Nyquist rate limits reach of today's ADCs
- "Moore's Law" for ADCs:
  - technology Figure of Merit incorporating sampling rate and dynamic range doubles every 6-8 years
- DARPA Analog-to-Information (A2I) program
  - wideband signals have high Nyquist rate but are often sparse/compressible
  - develop new ADC technologies to exploit
  - new tradeoffs among
     Nyquist rate, sampling rate,
     dynamic range, ...

frequency hopper spectrogram


### Analog-to-Information Conversion

 Sample near signal's (low) "information rate" rather than its (high) Nyquist rate



#### Example: Frequency Hopper

Nyquist rate sampling

20x sub-Nyquist sampling



#### spectrogram

#### sparsogram



### Compressive Sensing In Action

### **Data Processing**

### Information Scalability

 Many applications involve signal *inference* and not *reconstruction*

**detection** < **classification** < **estimation** < **reconstruction** 



fairly computationally intense

### Information Scalability

 Many applications involve signal *inference* and not *reconstruction*

**detection** < **classification** < **estimation** < **reconstruction** 

 Good news: CS supports efficient learning, inference, processing directly on compressive measurements

 Random projections ~ sufficient statistics for signals with concise geometrical structure

### Matched Filter

- Detection/classification with K unknown articulation parameters
  - Ex: position and pose of a vehicle in an image
  - Ex: time delay of a radar signal return
- Matched filter: joint parameter estimation and detection/classification
  - compute sufficient statistic for each potential target and articulation
  - compare "best" statistics to detect/classify



## Matched Filter Geometry

- Detection/classification with K unknown articulation parameters
- Images are points in  $\mathbf{R}^N$
- Classify by finding closest target template to data for each class (AWG noise)
   distance or inner product

target templates from generative model or training data (points)



 $\mathbf{R}^N$ 

data

# Matched Filter Geometry

- Detection/classification with K unknown articulation parameters
- Images are points in  $\mathbf{R}^N$
- Classify by finding closest target template to data
- As template articulation parameter changes, points map out a *K*-dim nonlinear manifold
- Matched filter classification
   = closest manifold search



data

### CS for Manifolds

#### • Theorem:

 $M = O(K \log N)$ <br/>random measurements<br/>stably embed manifold<br/>whp

[Baraniuk, Wakin, *FOCM* '08] related work: [Indyk and Naor, Agarwal et al., Dasgupta and Freund]

- Stable embedding
- Proved via concentration inequality arguments (JLL/CS relation)



### CS for Manifolds

#### • Theorem:

 $M = O(K \log N)$ random measurements stably embed manifold whp

- Enables parameter estimation and MF detection/classification directly on compressive measurements
  - K very small in many applications (# articulations)



### Example: Matched Filter

- Detection/classification with K=3 unknown articulation parameters
  - 1. horizontal translation
  - 2. vertical translation
  - 3. rotation







#### Smashed Filter

 Detection/classification with K=3 unknown articulation parameters (manifold structure)

 Dimensionally reduced matched filter directly on compressive measurements

 $M = O(K \log N)$ 



#### **Smashed Filter**

- Random shift and rotation (*K*=3 dim. manifold)
- Noise added to measurements
- Goal: identify most likely position for each image class identify most likely class using nearest-neighbor test



### **Compressive Sensing**

### Summary

### CS Hallmarks

CS changes the rules of the data acquisition game

 exploits a priori signal *sparsity* information

#### Stable

acquisition/recovery process is numerically stable

#### Universal

- same random projections / hardware can be used for any compressible signal class (generic)
- Asymmetrical (most processing at decoder)
  - conventional: smart encoder, dumb decoder
  - CS: dumb encoder, smart decoder
- Random projections weakly encrypted

### CS Hallmarks

#### Democratic

- each measurement carries the same amount of information
- robust to measurement loss and quantization simple encoding
- Ex: wireless streaming application with data loss
  - conventional: complicated (unequal) error protection of compressed data
    - DCT/wavelet low frequency coefficients
  - CS: merely stream additional measurements and reconstruct using those that arrive safely (fountain-like)

#### After the Break

Beyond Sparsity with structured sparsity models.

# volkan@rice.edu

# dsp.rice.edu/cs