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#### Abstract

Leveraging recent advances in additive combinatorics, we exhibit explicit matrices satisfying the Restricted Isometry Property with better parameters. Namely, for $\varepsilon=3.26 \cdot 10^{-7}$, large $k$ and $k^{2-\varepsilon} \leqslant N \leqslant$ $k^{2+\varepsilon}$, we construct $n \times N$ RIP matrices of order $k$ with $k=\Omega\left(n^{1 / 2+\varepsilon / 4}\right)$.


## 1. Introduction

Suppose $1 \leqslant k \leqslant n \leqslant N$ and $0<\delta<1$. A 'signal' $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{j}\right)_{j=1}^{N}$ is said to be $k$-sparse if $\mathbf{x}$ has at most $k$ nonzero coordinates. An $n \times N$ matrix $\Phi$ is said to satisfy the Restricted Isometry Property (RIP) of order $k$ with constant $\delta$ if for all $k$-sparse vectors $\mathbf{x}$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1-\delta)\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2} \leqslant\|\Phi \mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2} \leqslant(1+\delta)\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

While most authors work with real signals and matrices, in this paper we work with complex matrices for convenience. Given a complex matrix $\Phi$ satisfying (1.1), the $2 n \times 2 N$ real matrix $\Phi^{\prime}$, formed by replacing each element $a+i b$ of $\Phi$ by the $2 \times 2$ matrix $\left(\begin{array}{cc}a & b \\ -b & a\end{array}\right)$, also satisfies 1.1 ) with the same parameters $k, \delta$.

We know from Candès, Romberg and Tao that matrices satisfying RIP have application to sparse signal recovery (see $[\mathbf{7}, \mathbf{8}, \mathbf{9}]$ ). Given $n, N, \delta$, we wish to find $n \times N$ RIP matrices of order $k$ with constant $\delta$, and with $k$ as large as possible. If the entries of $\Phi$ are independent Bernoulli random variables with values $\pm 1 / \sqrt{n}$, then with high probability, $\Phi$ will have the required properties for $k$ of order close to $\delta n$; in different language, this was first proved by Kashin [13].

It is an open problem to find good explicit constructions of RIP matrices; see Tao's Weblog [17] for a discussion of the problem. All existent explicit constructions of RIP matrices are based on number theory. Prior to the work of Bourgain, Dilworth, Ford, Konyagin and Kutzarova [3], there were many constructions, e.g. Kashin [12], DeVore [10] and Nelson and Temlyakov [15], producing matrices with $\delta$ small and order

$$
\begin{equation*}
k \approx \delta \frac{\sqrt{n} \log n}{\log N} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The $\sqrt{n}$ barrier was broken by the aforementioned authors in [3]:
Theorem A. [3]. There are effective constants $\varepsilon>0, \varepsilon^{\prime}>0$ and explicit numbers $k_{0}, c>0$ such that for any positive integers $k \geqslant k_{0}$ and $k^{2-\varepsilon} \leqslant N \leqslant k^{2+\varepsilon}$, there is an explicit $n \times N$ RIP matrix of order $k$ with $k \geqslant c n^{1 / 2+\varepsilon / 4}$ and constant $\delta=k^{-\varepsilon^{\prime}}$.

As reported in [4], the construction in [3] produces a value $\varepsilon \approx 2 \cdot 10^{-22}$. An improved construction was presented in [4], giving Theorem A with $\varepsilon=3.6 \cdot 10^{-15}$. The values of $\varepsilon$ depend on two constants in additive combinatorics, which have since been improved. Incorporating these improvements into the argument in [4], we will deduce the following.
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Theorem 1. Let $\varepsilon=3.26 \cdot 10^{-7}$. There are $\varepsilon^{\prime}>0$ and effective numbers $k_{0}, c>0$ such that for any positive integers $k \geqslant k_{0}$ and $k^{2-\varepsilon} \leqslant N \leqslant k^{2+\varepsilon}$, there is an explicit $n \times N$ RIP matrix of order $k$ with $k \geqslant c n^{1 / 2+\varepsilon / 4}$ and constant $\delta=k^{-\varepsilon^{\prime}}$.

As of this writing, the constructions in [3] and [4] remain the only explicit constructions of RIP matrices which exceed the $\sqrt{n}$ barrier for $k$.

The proof of Theorem 1 depends on two key results in additive combinatorics. For subsets $A, B$ of an additive finite group $G$, we write

$$
\begin{aligned}
A \pm B & =\{a \pm b: a \in A, b \in B\} \\
E(A, B) & =\#\left\{\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, b_{1}, b_{2}\right): a_{1}+b_{1}=a_{2}+b_{2} ; a_{1}, a_{2} \in A ; b_{1}, b_{2} \in B\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Also set $x \cdot B=\{x b: b \in B\}$. Here we will mainly work with the group of residues modulo a prime $p$.
Proposition 1. For some $c_{0}$, the following holds. Assume $A, B$ are subsets of residue classes modulo $p$, with $0 \notin B$ and $|A| \geqslant|B|$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{b \in B} E(A, b \cdot A)=O\left(\left(\min (p /|A|,|B|)^{-c_{0}}|A|^{3}|B|\right)\right. \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

This theorem, without an explicit $c_{0}$, was proved by Bourgain [2]. The first explicit version of Proposition 1. with $c_{0}=1 / 10430$, is given in Bourgain and Glibuchuk [6], and this is the value used in the papers [3, 4]. Murphy and Petridis [14, Lemma 13] made a great improvement, showing that Proposition 1 holds with $c_{0}=1 / 3$. It is conceivable that $c_{0}$ may be taken to be any number less than 1 . Taking $A=B$ we see that $c_{0}$ cannot be taken larger than 1 .

We also need a version of the Balog-Szemerédi-Gowers lemma, originally proved by Balog and Szemerédi [1] and later improved by Gowers [11]. The version we use is a later improvement due to Schoen [16].

Proposition 2. For some positive $c_{1}, c_{2}, c_{3}$ and $c_{4}$, the following holds. If $E(A, A)=|A|^{3} / K$, then there exists $A^{\prime}, B^{\prime} \subseteq A$ with $\left|A^{\prime}\right|,\left|B^{\prime}\right| \geqslant c_{2} \frac{|A|}{K^{c_{4}}}$ and $\left|A^{\prime}-B^{\prime}\right| \leqslant c_{3} K^{c_{1}}\left|A^{\prime}\right|^{1 / 2}\left|B^{\prime}\right|^{1 / 2}$.

The constants $c_{2}, c_{3}$ are relatively unimportant. The best result to date is due to Schoen [16], who showed that any $c_{1}>7 / 2$ and $c_{4}>3 / 4$ is admissible. It is conjectured that $c_{1}=1$ is admissible. The papers [3, 4] used Proposition 2 with the weaker values $c_{1}=9$ and $c_{4}=1$, this deducible from Bourgain and Garaev [5], Lemma 2.2].

## 2. Construction of the matrix

Our construction is identical to that in [4]. We fix an even integer $m \geqslant 100$ and let $p$ be a large prime. For $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $e_{p}(x)=e^{2 \pi i x / p}$. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{u}_{a, b}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\left(e_{p}\left(a x^{2}+b x\right)\right)_{1 \leqslant x \leqslant p} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We take

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha=\frac{1}{2 m}, \quad \mathscr{A}=\left\{1,2, \ldots\left\lfloor p^{\alpha}\right\rfloor\right\} . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

To define the set $\mathscr{B}$, we take

$$
\beta=\frac{1}{2.01 m}, \quad r=\left\lfloor\frac{\beta \log p}{\log 2}\right\rfloor, \quad M=\left\lfloor 2^{2.01 m-1}\right\rfloor
$$

and let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{B}=\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{r} x_{j}(2 M)^{j-1}: x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r} \in\{0, \ldots, M-1\}\right\} . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We interpret $\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B}$ as sets of residue classes modulo $p$. We notice that all elements of $\mathscr{B}$ are at most $p / 2$, and $|\mathscr{A}||\mathscr{B}|$ lies between two constant multiples of $p^{1+\alpha-\beta}=p^{1+1 /(402 m)}$.

Given large $k$ and $k^{2-\varepsilon} \leqslant N \leqslant k^{2+\varepsilon}$, let $p$ be a prime in the interval $\left[k^{2-\varepsilon}, 2 k^{2-\varepsilon}\right]$ (such $p$ exists by Bertrand's postulate). Let $\Phi_{p}$ be a $p \times(|\mathscr{A}| \cdot|\mathscr{B}|)$ matrix formed by the column vectors $\mathbf{u}_{a, b}$ for $a \in \mathscr{A}, b \in \mathscr{B}$ (the columns may appear in any order). We also have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { if } \varepsilon \leqslant \frac{1}{403 m} \text {, then } N \leqslant p^{\frac{2+\varepsilon}{2-\varepsilon}} \leqslant|\mathscr{A}||\mathscr{B}| \text {. } \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Take $\Phi$ to be the matrix formed by the first $N$ columns of $\Phi_{p}$. Let $n=p$. Our task is to show that $\Phi$ satisfies the RIP condition with $\delta=p^{-\varepsilon^{\prime}}$ for some constant $\varepsilon^{\prime}>0$, and of order $k$.

## 3. Main tools

Lemma 3.1. Assume that $c_{0} \leqslant 1$ and that Proposition $\square$ holds. Fix an even integer $m \geqslant 100$, and define $\alpha, \mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B}$ by (2.2) and 2.3). Suppose that $p$ is sufficiently large in terms of $m$. Assume also that for some constant $c_{5}>0$ and constant $0<\gamma \leqslant \frac{1}{4 m}, \mathscr{B}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall S \subseteq \mathscr{B} \text { with }|S| \geqslant p^{0.49}, \quad E(S, S) \leqslant c_{5} p^{-\gamma}|S|^{3} . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define the vectors $\mathbf{u}_{a, b}$ by (2.1). Then for any disjoint sets $\Omega_{1}, \Omega_{2} \subset \mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{B}$ such that $\left|\Omega_{1}\right| \leqslant \sqrt{p}$, $\left|\Omega_{2}\right| \leqslant \sqrt{p}$, the inequality

$$
\left|\sum_{\left(a_{1}, b_{1}\right) \in \Omega_{1}} \sum_{\left(a_{2}, b_{2}\right) \in \Omega_{2}}\left\langle\mathbf{u}_{a_{1}, b_{1}}, \mathbf{u}_{a_{2}, b_{2}}\right\rangle\right|=O\left(p^{1 / 2-\varepsilon_{1}}(\log p)^{2}\right)
$$

holds, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{1}=\frac{\frac{c_{0} \gamma}{8}-\frac{47 \alpha-23 \gamma}{2 m}}{1+93 / m+c_{0} / 2} . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The constant implied by the $O$-symbol depends only on $c_{0}, \gamma$ and $m$.
Lemma 3.1 follows by combining Lemmas 2 and 4 from [4]; the assumption of Proposition 1 is inadvertently omitted in the statement of [4] Lemma 4].

Using Lemma 3.1, we shall show the following.
Theorem 2. Assume the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1 let $\varepsilon=2 \varepsilon_{1}-2 \varepsilon_{1}^{2}$ and assume that $\varepsilon \leqslant \frac{1}{403 m}$. There is $\varepsilon^{\prime}>0$ such that for sufficiently large $k$ and $k^{2-\varepsilon} \leqslant N \leqslant k^{2+\varepsilon}$, there is an explicit $n \times N$ RIP matrix of order $k$ with $n=O\left(k^{2-\varepsilon}\right)$ and constant $\delta=k^{-\varepsilon^{\prime}}$.

To prove Theorem 2, we first recall another additive combinatorics result from [4].
Lemma 3.2 ([4, Theorem 2, Corollary 2]). Let $M$ be a positive integer. For the set $\mathscr{B} \subset \mathbb{F}_{p}$ defined in (2.3) and for any subsets $A, B \subset \mathscr{B}$, we have $|A-B| \geqslant|A|^{\tau}|B|^{\tau}$, where $\tau$ is the unique positive solution of

$$
\left(\frac{1}{M}\right)^{2 \tau}+\left(\frac{M-1}{M}\right)^{\tau}=1
$$

From [4] we have the easy bounds

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\log 2}{\log M}\left(1-\frac{1}{\log M}\right) \leqslant 2 \tau-1 \leqslant \frac{\log 2}{\log M} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Corollary 1. Take $\mathscr{B}$ as in (2.3) and assume Proposition 2. Then (3.1) holds with

$$
\gamma=\frac{0.49(2 \tau-1)}{c_{1}+c_{4}(2 \tau-1)}
$$

Proof. Just like the proof of [4, Lemma 3], except that we incorporate Proposition 2, Suppose that $S \subseteq \mathscr{B}$ with $|S| \geqslant p^{0.49}$ and $E(S, S)=|S|^{3} / K$. By Proposition 2, there are sets $T_{1}, T_{2} \subset S$ such that $\left|T_{1}\right|,\left|T_{2}\right| \geqslant$ $c_{2} \frac{|S|}{K^{c_{4}}}$ and $\left|T_{1}-T_{2}\right| \leqslant c_{3} K^{c_{1}}\left|T_{1}\right|^{1 / 2}\left|T_{2}\right|^{1 / 2}$. By Lemma 3.2.

$$
c_{3} K^{c_{1}}\left|T_{1}\right|^{1 / 2}\left|T_{2}\right|^{1 / 2} \geqslant\left|T_{1}-T_{2}\right| \geqslant\left|T_{1}\right|^{\tau}\left|T_{2}\right|^{\tau}
$$

and hence

$$
c_{3} K^{c_{1}} \geqslant\left(\left|T_{1}\right| \cdot\left|T_{2}\right|\right)^{\tau-1 / 2} \geqslant\left(\frac{c_{2} p^{0.49}}{K^{c_{4}}}\right)^{2 \tau-1}
$$

It follows that $K \geqslant\left(1 / c_{5}\right) p^{-\gamma}$ for an appropriate constant $c_{5}>0$.
Finally, we need a tool from [3] which states that in (1.1) we need only consider vectors $\mathbf{x}$ whose components are 0 or 1 (so-called flat vectors).
Lemma 3.3 ([3, Lemma 1]). Let $k \geqslant 2^{10}$ and $s$ be a positive integer. Assume that for all $i \neq j$ we have $\left\langle\mathbf{u}_{i}, \mathbf{u}_{j}\right\rangle \leqslant 1 / k$. Also, assume that for some $\delta \geqslant 0$ and any disjoint $J_{1}, J_{2} \subset\{1, \ldots, N\}$ with $\left|J_{1}\right| \leqslant k,\left|J_{2}\right| \leqslant k$ we have

$$
\left|\left\langle\sum_{j \in J_{1}} \mathbf{u}_{j}, \sum_{j \in J_{2}} \mathbf{u}_{j}\right\rangle\right| \leqslant \delta k .
$$

Then $\Phi$ satisfies the RIP property of order $2 s k$ with constant $44 s \sqrt{\delta} \log k$.
Now we show how to deduce Theorem2, By Lemma3.1 and standard bounds for Gauss sums, $\Phi$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.3 with $k=\lfloor\sqrt{p}\rfloor$ and $\delta=O\left(p^{-\varepsilon_{1}} \log ^{2} p\right)$. Let $\varepsilon_{0}<\varepsilon_{1} / 2$ and take $s=\left\lfloor p^{\varepsilon_{0}}\right\rfloor$. By Lemma 3.3. $\Phi$ satisfies RIP with order $\geqslant p^{1 / 2+\varepsilon_{0}}$ and constant $O\left(p^{-\varepsilon_{1} / 2+\varepsilon_{0}}(\log p)^{3}\right)$. If $\varepsilon_{0}$ is sufficiently close to $\varepsilon_{1} / 2$, Theorem 2 follows with

$$
\varepsilon=2-\frac{2}{1+2 \varepsilon_{0}}=\frac{4 \varepsilon_{0}}{1+2 \varepsilon_{0}}>2 \varepsilon_{1}-2 \varepsilon_{1}^{2}
$$

To prove Theorem 1, we take the construction in Section 2 . We have (3.1) by Corollary 1 . Also take

$$
\eta=10^{-100}, \quad c_{0}=\frac{1}{3}, \quad c_{1}=7 / 2+\eta, \quad c_{4}=3 / 4+\eta, \quad m=7586
$$

These values were optimized with a computer search. By Corollary 1 and $(3.3)$, we have $\gamma \geqslant 9.182 \cdot 10^{-6}$. It is readily verified that $\gamma \leqslant \frac{1}{4 m}, \varepsilon_{1}>1.631 \cdot 10^{-7}$ and $\varepsilon=2 \varepsilon_{1}-2 \varepsilon_{1}^{2}$ satisfies $3.26 \cdot 10^{-7} \leqslant \varepsilon \leqslant \frac{1}{403 m}$. Theorem 1 now follows.
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