

# Regularization and Inverse Problems

Caroline Sieger

Host Institution: Universität Bremen

Home Institution: Clemson University

August 5, 2009



# Outline

## 1 Preliminaries

- The Inverse Problem
- The Moore-Penrose Generalized Inverse
- Eigensystems and Singular Systems

## 2 Regularization

- Classical Tikhonov Regularization
- Tikhonov Regularization with Sparsity Constraints



# Preliminaries

## Notation:

$T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is a bounded linear operator

$K : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is a compact linear operator

$\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are Hilbert spaces

## Definition

A problem is **ill-posed** if one or more of the following holds:

- a solution does not exist



# Preliminaries

## Notation:

$T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is a bounded linear operator

$K : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is a compact linear operator

$\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are Hilbert spaces

## Definition

A problem is **ill-posed** if one or more of the following holds:

- a solution does not exist
- the solution is not unique



# Preliminaries

## Notation:

$T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is a bounded linear operator

$K : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is a compact linear operator

$\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are Hilbert spaces

## Definition

A problem is **ill-posed** if one or more of the following holds:

- a solution does not exist
- the solution is not unique
- the solution does not depend continuously on the data



# The Inverse Problem

Find  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $Tx = y$ .



# The Inverse Problem

Find  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $Tx = y$ .

There may be some problems with this, i.e.

- $T^{-1}$  may not exist
- $NS(T) \neq \{0\}$  ( $\implies$  non-unique solutions)

Thus, we seek an approximate solution.



# The Inverse Problem

Find  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $Tx = y$ .

There may be some problems with this, i.e.

- $T^{-1}$  may not exist
- $NS(T) \neq \{0\}$  ( $\implies$  non-unique solutions)

Thus, we seek an approximate solution.

## Types of Solutions

- $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is a **least-squares solution** to  $Tx = y$  if
$$\|Tx - y\| = \inf\{\|Tz - y\| \mid z \in \mathcal{X}\}$$





# The Inverse Problem

Find  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $Tx = y$ .

There may be some problems with this, i.e.

- $T^{-1}$  may not exist
- $NS(T) \neq \{0\}$  ( $\implies$  non-unique solutions)

Thus, we seek an approximate solution.

## Types of Solutions

- $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is a **least-squares solution** to  $Tx = y$  if
$$\|Tx - y\| = \inf\{\|Tz - y\| \mid z \in \mathcal{X}\}$$
- $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is a **best-approximate solution** to  $Tx = y$  if  $x$  is a least-squares solution and
$$\|x\| = \inf\{\|z\| \mid z \text{ is a least-squares solution of } Tx = y\}$$



# The Moore-Penrose Generalized Inverse

## Definition: Moore-Penrose Generalized Inverse

$T^\dagger$  is the unique linear extension of  $\tilde{T}^{-1}$  to  $\text{dom}(T^\dagger)$  with  $\text{NS}(T^\dagger) = \text{range}(T)^\perp$  where  $\tilde{T} := T|_{\text{NS}(T)^\perp} : \text{NS}(T)^\perp \rightarrow \text{range}(T)$ .



# The Moore-Penrose Generalized Inverse

## Definition: Moore-Penrose Generalized Inverse

$T^\dagger$  is the unique linear extension of  $\tilde{T}^{-1}$  to  $\text{dom}(T^\dagger)$  with  $\text{NS}(T^\dagger) = \text{range}(T)^\perp$  where  $\tilde{T} := T|_{\text{NS}(T)^\perp} : \text{NS}(T)^\perp \rightarrow \text{range}(T)$ .

- If  $P$  and  $Q$  are orthogonal projectors onto  $\text{NS}(T)$  and  $\overline{\text{range}(T)}$

1.)  $TT^\dagger T = T$

2.)  $T^\dagger TT^\dagger = T^\dagger$

3.)  $T^\dagger T = I - P$

4.)  $TT^\dagger = Q|_{\text{dom}(T^\dagger)}$



# The Moore-Penrose Generalized Inverse

## Definition: Moore-Penrose Generalized Inverse

$T^\dagger$  is the unique linear extension of  $\tilde{T}^{-1}$  to  $\text{dom}(T^\dagger)$  with  $\text{NS}(T^\dagger) = \text{range}(T)^\perp$  where  $\tilde{T} := T|_{\text{NS}(T)^\perp} : \text{NS}(T)^\perp \rightarrow \text{range}(T)$ .

- If  $P$  and  $Q$  are orthogonal projectors onto  $\text{NS}(T)$  and  $\overline{\text{range}(T)}$

1.)  $TT^\dagger T = T$

2.)  $T^\dagger TT^\dagger = T^\dagger$

3.)  $T^\dagger T = I - P$

4.)  $TT^\dagger = Q|_{\text{dom}(T^\dagger)}$

- $T^\dagger$  is bounded if  $\text{range}(T)$  is closed.



# The Moore-Penrose Generalized Inverse

## Definition: Moore-Penrose Generalized Inverse

$T^\dagger$  is the unique linear extension of  $\tilde{T}^{-1}$  to  $\text{dom}(T^\dagger)$  with  $\text{NS}(T^\dagger) = \text{range}(T)^\perp$  where  $\tilde{T} := T|_{\text{NS}(T)^\perp} : \text{NS}(T)^\perp \rightarrow \text{range}(T)$ .

- If  $P$  and  $Q$  are orthogonal projectors onto  $\text{NS}(T)$  and  $\overline{\text{range}(T)}$

$$1.) \quad TT^\dagger T = T$$

$$2.) \quad T^\dagger TT^\dagger = T^\dagger$$

$$3.) \quad T^\dagger T = I - P$$

$$4.) \quad TT^\dagger = Q|_{\text{dom}(T^\dagger)}$$

- $T^\dagger$  is bounded if  $\text{range}(T)$  is closed.
- If  $y \in \text{dom}(T^\dagger)$  then  $\exists$  a **unique** best-approximate solution,  $x^\dagger := T^\dagger y$



# The Moore-Penrose Generalized Inverse

## Definition: Moore-Penrose Generalized Inverse

$T^\dagger$  is the unique linear extension of  $\tilde{T}^{-1}$  to  $\text{dom}(T^\dagger)$  with  $\text{NS}(T^\dagger) = \text{range}(T)^\perp$  where  $\tilde{T} := T|_{\text{NS}(T)^\perp} : \text{NS}(T)^\perp \rightarrow \text{range}(T)$ .

- If  $P$  and  $Q$  are orthogonal projectors onto  $\text{NS}(T)$  and  $\overline{\text{range}(T)}$

1.)  $TT^\dagger T = T$

2.)  $T^\dagger TT^\dagger = T^\dagger$

3.)  $T^\dagger T = I - P$

4.)  $TT^\dagger = Q|_{\text{dom}(T^\dagger)}$

- $T^\dagger$  is bounded if  $\text{range}(T)$  is closed.
- If  $y \in \text{dom}(T^\dagger)$  then  $\exists$  a **unique** best-approximate solution,  $x^\dagger := T^\dagger y$

## Definition: Gaussian Normal Equation

For  $y \in \text{dom}(T^\dagger)$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is a least-squares solution  $\Leftrightarrow T^* T x = T^* y$ .

# Eigensystems and Singular Systems

## Definition

A selfadjoint  $K$  has the **eigensystem**  $(\lambda_n; v_n)$  where the  $\lambda_n$  are non-zero eigenvalues and the  $v_n$  are corresponding eigenvectors.

We may diagonalize  $K$  by  $Kx = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n \langle x, v_n \rangle v_n$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .



# Eigensystems and Singular Systems

## Definition

A selfadjoint  $K$  has the **eigensystem**  $(\lambda_n; v_n)$  where the  $\lambda_n$  are non-zero eigenvalues and the  $v_n$  are corresponding eigenvectors.

We may diagonalize  $K$  by  $Kx = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n \langle x, v_n \rangle v_n$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

## Definition

A non-selfadjoint  $K$  has the **singular system**  $(\sigma_n; v_n, u_n)$  where

- $K^*$  is the adjoint of  $K$
- $\{\sigma_n^2\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are the non-zero eigenvalues of  $K^*K$  (and  $KK^*$ )





# Eigensystems and Singular Systems

## Definition

A selfadjoint  $K$  has the **eigensystem**  $(\lambda_n; v_n)$  where the  $\lambda_n$  are non-zero eigenvalues and the  $v_n$  are corresponding eigenvectors.

We may diagonalize  $K$  by  $Kx = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n \langle x, v_n \rangle v_n$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

## Definition

A non-selfadjoint  $K$  has the **singular system**  $(\sigma_n; v_n, u_n)$  where

- $K^*$  is the adjoint of  $K$
- $\{\sigma_n^2\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are the non-zero eigenvalues of  $K^*K$  (and  $KK^*$ )
- $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are eigenvectors of  $K^*K$
- $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are eigenvectors of  $KK^*$  defined by  $u_n := \frac{Kv_n}{\|Kv_n\|}$



# Eigensystems and Singular Systems

Properties of a singular system:

- $Kv_n = \sigma_n u_n$
- $K^*u_n = \sigma_n v_n$
- $Kx = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n \langle x, v_n \rangle u_n$
- $Ky = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n \langle y, u_n \rangle v_n$



# Eigensystems and Singular Systems

Properties of a singular system:

- $Kv_n = \sigma_n u_n$
- $K^*u_n = \sigma_n v_n$
- $Kx = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n \langle x, v_n \rangle u_n$
- $Ky = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n \langle y, u_n \rangle v_n$

Further, iff  $K$  has finite dimensional range

$\implies K$  has finitely many singular values

$\implies$  infinite series involving singular values degenerate to finite sums.



# Eigensystems and Singular Systems

Properties of a singular system:

- $Kv_n = \sigma_n u_n$
- $K^*u_n = \sigma_n v_n$
- $Kx = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n \langle x, v_n \rangle u_n$
- $Ky = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n \langle y, u_n \rangle v_n$

Further, iff  $K$  has finite dimensional range

$\implies K$  has finitely many singular values

$\implies$  infinite series involving singular values degenerate to finite sums.

## Theorem (Engl, Hanke, Neubauer)

For compact linear operator  $K$  with singular system  $(\sigma_n; v_n, u_n)$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  we have:

- 1  $y \in \text{dom}(K^\dagger) \Leftrightarrow \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\langle y, u_n \rangle|^2}{\sigma_n^2} < \infty$  (Picard Criterion for existence of a best-approximate solution.)
- 2 For  $y \in \text{dom}(K^\dagger)$ ,  $K^\dagger y = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\langle y, u_n \rangle}{\sigma_n} v_n$

# Regularization

- Recall: we seek to approximate  $x^\dagger := T^\dagger y$



# Regularization

- Recall: we seek to approximate  $x^\dagger := T^\dagger y$
- Normally, we only have an approximation of  $y$ , i.e.  $y^\delta$  such that  $\|y^\delta - y\| \leq \delta$
- in the ill-posed case,  $T^\dagger y^\delta$  is **not** a good approximation of  $x^\dagger$  because of the unboundedness of  $T^\dagger$ .



# Regularization

- Recall: we seek to approximate  $x^\dagger := T^\dagger y$
- Normally, we only have an approximation of  $y$ , i.e.  $y^\delta$  such that  $\|y^\delta - y\| \leq \delta$
- in the ill-posed case,  $T^\dagger y^\delta$  is **not** a good approximation of  $x^\dagger$  because of the unboundedness of  $T^\dagger$ .
- We seek an approximation  $x_\alpha^\delta$  of  $x^\dagger$  such that
  - 1  $x_\alpha^\delta$  depends continuously on the noisy data  $y^\delta$  (this allows stable computation of  $x_\alpha^\delta$ )
  - 2 the noise level  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  and for appropriate  $\alpha$ ,  $x_\alpha^\delta \rightarrow x^\dagger$



# Regularization

## Definition

Let  $\alpha_0 \in (0, \infty]$  then  $\forall \alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$  let  $R_\alpha : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  be a continuous operator.





# Regularization

## Definition

Let  $\alpha_0 \in (0, \infty]$  then  $\forall \alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$  let  $R_\alpha : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  be a continuous operator. The family  $\{R_\alpha\}$  is a **regularization** iff  $\forall y \in \text{dom}(T^\dagger) \exists$  a parameter choice rule  $\alpha = \alpha(\delta, y^\delta)$  such that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup \left\{ \|R_{\alpha(\delta, y^\delta)} y^\delta - T^\dagger y\| \mid y^\delta \in \mathcal{Y}, \|y^\delta - y\| \leq \delta \right\} = 0 \quad (1)$$



# Regularization

## Definition

Let  $\alpha_0 \in (0, \infty]$  then  $\forall \alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$  let  $R_\alpha : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  be a continuous operator. The family  $\{R_\alpha\}$  is a **regularization** iff  $\forall y \in \text{dom}(T^\dagger) \exists$  a parameter choice rule  $\alpha = \alpha(\delta, y^\delta)$  such that

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \|R_{\alpha(\delta, y^\delta)} y^\delta - T^\dagger y\| \mid y^\delta \in \mathcal{Y}, \|y^\delta - y\| \leq \delta \right\} = 0 \quad (1)$$

and  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow (0, \alpha_0)$  such that

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \alpha(\delta, y^\delta) \mid y^\delta \in \mathcal{Y}, \|y^\delta - y\| \leq \delta \right\} = 0 \quad (2)$$



# Regularization

## Definition

Let  $\alpha_0 \in (0, \infty]$  then  $\forall \alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$  let  $R_\alpha : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  be a continuous operator. The family  $\{R_\alpha\}$  is a **regularization** iff  $\forall y \in \text{dom}(T^\dagger) \exists$  a parameter choice rule  $\alpha = \alpha(\delta, y^\delta)$  such that

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \|R_{\alpha(\delta, y^\delta)} y^\delta - T^\dagger y\| \mid y^\delta \in \mathcal{Y}, \|y^\delta - y\| \leq \delta \right\} = 0 \quad (1)$$

and  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow (0, \alpha_0)$  such that

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \alpha(\delta, y^\delta) \mid y^\delta \in \mathcal{Y}, \|y^\delta - y\| \leq \delta \right\} = 0 \quad (2)$$

For a specific  $y \in \text{dom}(T^\dagger)$ , a pair  $(R_\alpha, \alpha)$  is a **regularization method** if (1) and (2) hold.



# Regularization

- If the parameter choice rule does not depend on  $y^\delta$ , we say it is **a-priori** and we write  $\alpha = \alpha(\delta)$ .
- Otherwise, it is an **a-posteriori** parameter choice rule.



# Regularization

- If the parameter choice rule does not depend on  $y^\delta$ , we say it is **a-priori** and we write  $\alpha = \alpha(\delta)$ .
- Otherwise, it is an **a-posteriori** parameter choice rule.

## Proposition (Engl,Hanke,Neubauer)

Further,  $(R_\alpha, \alpha)$  is convergent (for linear  $R_\alpha$ ) iff  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \alpha(\delta) = 0$  and

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta \|R_{\alpha(\delta)}\| = 0.$$



# Regularization

- If the parameter choice rule does not depend on  $y^\delta$ , we say it is **a-priori** and we write  $\alpha = \alpha(\delta)$ .
- Otherwise, it is an **a-posteriori** parameter choice rule.

## Proposition (Engl,Hanke,Neubauer)

Further,  $(R_\alpha, \alpha)$  is convergent (for linear  $R_\alpha$ ) iff  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \alpha(\delta) = 0$  and  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta \|R_{\alpha(\delta)}\| = 0$ .

$$\mathcal{X}_{\mu,\rho} := \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid x = (T^*T)^\mu \omega, \|\omega\| \leq \rho\}, \mu > 0$$

## Proposition (Engl,Hanke,Neubauer)

If  $\text{range}(T)$  is **non-closed**, a regularization algorithm cannot converge to zero faster than  $\delta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+1}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2\mu+1}}$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  for  $x^\dagger \in \mathcal{X}_{\mu,\rho}$ .

# Regularization

$\Delta(\delta, \mathcal{M}, R_\alpha) := \sup \{ \|R_\alpha y^\delta - x\| \mid x \in \mathcal{M}, y^\delta \in \mathcal{Y}, \|Tx - y^\delta\| \leq \delta \}$  for  
some  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{X}$



# Regularization

$\Delta(\delta, \mathcal{M}, R_\alpha) := \sup \{ \|R_\alpha y^\delta - x\| \mid x \in \mathcal{M}, y^\delta \in \mathcal{Y}, \|Tx - y^\delta\| \leq \delta \}$  for some  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{X}$

## Definition

We say  $(R_\alpha, \alpha)$  is **optimal** in  $\mathcal{X}_{\mu, \rho}$  if  $\Delta(\delta, \mathcal{X}_{\mu, \rho}, R_\alpha) = \delta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+1}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2\mu+1}}$  holds  $\forall \delta > 0$ .





# Regularization

$\Delta(\delta, \mathcal{M}, R_\alpha) := \sup \{ \|R_\alpha y^\delta - x\| \mid x \in \mathcal{M}, y^\delta \in \mathcal{Y}, \|Tx - y^\delta\| \leq \delta \}$  for some  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{X}$

## Definition

We say  $(R_\alpha, \alpha)$  is **optimal** in  $\mathcal{X}_{\mu, \rho}$  if  $\Delta(\delta, \mathcal{X}_{\mu, \rho}, R_\alpha) = \delta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+1}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2\mu+1}}$  holds  $\forall \delta > 0$ .

$(R_\alpha, \alpha)$  is of **optimal order** in  $\mathcal{X}_{\mu, \rho}$  if  $\exists C \geq 1$  such that

$$\Delta(\delta, \mathcal{X}_{\mu, \rho}, R_\alpha) \leq C \delta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+1}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2\mu+1}} \quad \forall \delta > 0$$



# Regularization

$\Delta(\delta, \mathcal{M}, R_\alpha) := \sup \{ \|R_\alpha y^\delta - x\| \mid x \in \mathcal{M}, y^\delta \in \mathcal{Y}, \|Tx - y^\delta\| \leq \delta \}$  for some  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{X}$

## Definition

We say  $(R_\alpha, \alpha)$  is **optimal** in  $\mathcal{X}_{\mu, \rho}$  if  $\Delta(\delta, \mathcal{X}_{\mu, \rho}, R_\alpha) = \delta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+1}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2\mu+1}}$  holds  $\forall \delta > 0$ .

$(R_\alpha, \alpha)$  is of **optimal order** in  $\mathcal{X}_{\mu, \rho}$  if  $\exists C \geq 1$  such that

$$\Delta(\delta, \mathcal{X}_{\mu, \rho}, R_\alpha) \leq C \delta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+1}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2\mu+1}} \quad \forall \delta > 0$$

## Theorem (Engl, Hanke, Neubauer)

Let  $\tau > \tau_0 \geq 1$ , then if  $(R_\alpha, \alpha_\tau)$  is of optimal order in  $\mathcal{X}_{\mu, \rho}$  for some  $\mu > 0$  and  $\forall \rho > 0$  then all  $(R_\alpha, \alpha_{\tilde{\tau}})$  with  $\tilde{\tau} > \tau_0$  are convergent for  $y \in \text{range}(T)$  and of optimal order  $\forall \mathcal{X}_{\nu, \rho}$  with  $0 < \nu \leq \mu$  and  $\rho > 0$ .

# Classical Tikhonov Regularization

## The Tikhonov Functional

$$\Phi(x) := \|Tx - y^\delta\|^2 + \alpha\|x\|^2$$

## Theorem (Engl, Hanke, Neubauer)

$x_\alpha^\delta := (T^*T + \alpha I)^{-1} T^* y^\delta$  is the unique minimizer of  $\Phi(x)$ .

*Proof*



# Classical Tikhonov Regularization

## The Tikhonov Functional

$$\Phi(x) := \|Tx - y^\delta\|^2 + \alpha\|x\|^2$$

## Theorem (Engl, Hanke, Neubauer)

$x_\alpha^\delta := (T^*T + \alpha I)^{-1} T^* y^\delta$  is the unique minimizer of  $\Phi(x)$ .

*Proof*

## Theorem (Engl, Hanke, Neubauer)

For  $x_\alpha^\delta := (T^*T + \alpha I)^{-1} T^* y^\delta$ ,  $y \in \text{range}(T)$ ,  $\|y - y^\delta\| \leq \delta$  if  $\alpha = \alpha(\delta)$  such that  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \alpha(\delta) = 0$  and  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta^2}{\alpha(\delta)} = 0$  then  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} x_{\alpha(\delta)}^\delta = T^\dagger y$ .



# Classical Tikhonov Regularization

## Proposition (Engl, Hanke, Neubauer)

As long as  $\mu \leq 1$ , Tikhonov regularization with the a-priori choice rule  $\alpha \sim \left(\frac{\delta}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{2}{2\mu+1}}$  is of optimal order in  $\mathcal{X}_{\mu,\rho}$ , the **best possible convergence rate** for  $\mu = 1$  is:

$$\alpha \sim \left(\frac{\delta}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|x_{\alpha}^{\delta} - x^{\dagger}\| = O\left(\delta^{\frac{2}{3}}\right)$$



# Tikhonov Regularization with Sparsity Constraints

- In some applications, we require a sparse solution
- So use an  $\ell^p$  norm of the coefficients of  $x$  wrt an orthonormal basis  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $1 \leq p \leq 2$



# Tikhonov Regularization with Sparsity Constraints

- In some applications, we require a sparse solution
- So use an  $\ell^p$  norm of the coefficients of  $x$  wrt an orthonormal basis  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $1 \leq p \leq 2$
- Decreasing  $p$  from 2 to 1, we increase the penalty on “small” coefficients *and* decrease the penalty on “large” coefficients,
- i.e. we encourage representations with large, but fewer coefficients wrt the orthonormal basis  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$



# Tikhonov Regularization with Sparsity Constraints

- In some applications, we require a sparse solution
- So use an  $\ell^p$  norm of the coefficients of  $x$  wrt an orthonormal basis  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $1 \leq p \leq 2$
- Decreasing  $p$  from 2 to 1, we increase the penalty on “small” coefficients *and* decrease the penalty on “large” coefficients,
- i.e. we encourage representations with large, but fewer coefficients wrt the orthonormal basis  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$
- Generally, we restrict ourselves to  $p \geq 1$  since the functional is no longer convex for  $p < 1$ .





# Tikhonov Regularization with Sparsity Constraints

- In some applications, we require a sparse solution
- So use an  $\ell^p$  norm of the coefficients of  $x$  wrt an orthonormal basis  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $1 \leq p \leq 2$
- Decreasing  $p$  from 2 to 1, we increase the penalty on “small” coefficients *and* decrease the penalty on “large” coefficients,
- i.e. we encourage representations with large, but fewer coefficients wrt the orthonormal basis  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$
- Generally, we restrict ourselves to  $p \geq 1$  since the functional is no longer convex for  $p < 1$ .

## The Tikhonov Functional with $\ell^1$ Penalty

$$\Psi(x) := \|Tx - y^\delta\|^2 + \alpha \sum_i |\langle \varphi_i, x \rangle|$$

Denote  $x_\alpha^\delta$  to be the minimizer of  $\Psi(x)$ .



# Tikhonov Regularization with Sparsity Constraints

## Definition

For  $x^\dagger \in \mathcal{X}$  and a regularization  $R_\alpha$ ,  $x^\dagger$  is an  **$R_\alpha$ -minimizing solution** if  $Tx^\dagger = y$  and  $R_\alpha(x^\dagger) = \min\{R_\alpha(x) \mid Tx = y\}$ .



# Tikhonov Regularization with Sparsity Constraints

## Definition

For  $x^\dagger \in \mathcal{X}$  and a regularization  $R_\alpha$ ,  $x^\dagger$  is an  **$R_\alpha$ -minimizing solution** if  $Tx^\dagger = y$  and  $R_\alpha(x^\dagger) = \min\{R_\alpha(x) \mid Tx = y\}$ .

Recall,  $R_\alpha(x) := \alpha \sum_i |\langle \phi_i, x \rangle|$



# Tikhonov Regularization with Sparsity Constraints

## Definition

For  $x^\dagger \in \mathcal{X}$  and a regularization  $R_\alpha$ ,  $x^\dagger$  is an  **$R_\alpha$ -minimizing solution** if  $Tx^\dagger = y$  and  $R_\alpha(x^\dagger) = \min\{R_\alpha(x) \mid Tx = y\}$ .

Recall,  $R_\alpha(x) := \alpha \sum_i |\langle \phi_i, x \rangle|$

## Proposition (Grasmair, Haltmeier, Scherzer)

Assume that  $T$  is injective (or finite basis injectivity holds), then  $\exists$  a unique minimizer  $x_\alpha^\delta$  of  $\Psi(x)$  and  $\exists$  a unique  $R_\alpha$ -minimizing solution  $x^\dagger$ . For  $y \in \text{range}(T)$  and  $\|y - y^\delta\| \leq \delta$  if  $\alpha$  satisfies  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \alpha(\delta) = 0$  and

$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta}{\alpha(\delta)} = 0$ , then  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} x_\alpha^\delta = x^\dagger$ .



# Tikhonov Regularization with Sparsity Constraints

## Theorem (Grasmair, Haltmeier, Scherzer)

Assume that  $\partial R_\alpha(x^\dagger) \cap \text{range}(T^*) \neq \emptyset$ , that the finite basis injectivity property holds, and that  $Tx = y$  has an  $R_\alpha$ -minimizing solution that is sparse wrt  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then for parameter choice strategy  $\alpha \sim \delta$ , we have  $\|x_\alpha^\delta - x^\dagger\| = O(\delta)$



# Tikhonov Regularization with Sparsity Constraints

## Theorem (Grasmair, Haltmeier, Scherzer)

Assume that  $\partial R_\alpha(x^\dagger) \cap \text{range}(T^*) \neq \emptyset$ , that the finite basis injectivity property holds, and that  $Tx = y$  has an  $R_\alpha$ -minimizing solution that is sparse wrt  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then for parameter choice strategy  $\alpha \sim \delta$ , we have  $\|x_\alpha^\delta - x^\dagger\| = O(\delta)$

In fact, Grasmair, Haltmeier, Scherzer also prove that for  $1 \leq p \leq 2$ , if we know in advance the solution is sparse in the basis  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  then we obtain  $\|x_\alpha^\delta - x^\dagger\| = O(\delta^{1/p})$ .



# Tikhonov Regularization with Sparsity Constraints

## Theorem (Grasmair,Haltmeier,Scherzer)

Assume that  $\partial R_\alpha(x^\dagger) \cap \text{range}(T^*) \neq \emptyset$ , that the finite basis injectivity property holds, and that  $Tx = y$  has an  $R_\alpha$ -minimizing solution that is sparse wrt  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then for parameter choice strategy  $\alpha \sim \delta$ , we have  $\|x_\alpha^\delta - x^\dagger\| = O(\delta)$

In fact, Grasmair,Haltmeier,Scherzer also prove that for  $1 \leq p \leq 2$ , if we know in advance the solution is sparse in the basis  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  then we obtain  $\|x_\alpha^\delta - x^\dagger\| = O(\delta^{1/p})$ .

We have not yet answered how to find this minimizer  $x_\alpha^\delta$ . However, Jack will discuss this in his presentation.

