

Lecture 15

Last time

- ▷ Covering numbers via volume
- ▷ Detour: error correcting codes

Today

- ▷ Two-sided bounds on the singular values of sub-Gaussian matrices

Bounds on the singular values of sub-Gaussian matrices

We started our investigation by thinking that if

$$(X) \quad \max_{v \in S^m} \|Av\|_2 \approx \max_{v \in V} \|Av\|_2$$

then we can apply union bound to get high probability bounds $\|A\|_{\text{op}}$.

Today we will execute this plan. Our first result formalizes (X).

Lemma: Let A be a $n \times m$ matrix and $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$. Then, for any ϵ -net N of the sphere S^{m-1} , we have

$$\sup_{x \in N} \|Ax\|_2 \leq \|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \sup_{x \in N} \|Ax\|_2.$$

Proof: The lower bound is trivial since $+$

$\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$. To prove the upper bound, take $v \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ s.t. $\|Av\|_{\text{op}} = \|Ax\|_{\text{op}}$. Since \mathcal{N} is an ϵ -net, there exists $y \in \mathcal{N}$ s.t. $\|y - x\| \leq \epsilon$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|Ax\| &\leq \|Ax - Ay\| + \|Ay\| \\ &\leq \epsilon \|A\|_{\text{op}} + \|Ay\|.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, rearranging

$$\|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \|Ay\| \leq \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \max_{z \in \mathcal{N}} \|Az\|_2. \quad \square$$

We shall use a slightly different version of this lemma.

Lemma (Max): Let $A \in \mathbb{S}^n$ be a sym. matrix and $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$. Then, for any ϵ -net \mathcal{N} of the sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{N}} \langle x, Ax \rangle \leq \|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{1-2\epsilon} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle x, Ax \rangle.$$

Try to modify our previous proof to derive this result. -

We say that a random vector z in \mathbb{R}^n is **sub-Gaussian** if

$$\|z\|_{\psi_2} := \sup_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \|\langle z, v \rangle\|_{\psi_2} < \infty.$$

We say that z is isotropic if
 $\mathbb{E}zz^\top = I$.

Lemma: Show that $z \sim N(0, I)$ is sub-Gaussian and isotropic.

We are ready for the main result of today. with $m \leq n$

Theorem: Let A be an $n \times m$ random matrix with independent, mean zero, sub-Gaussian, isotropic rows A_i . Then, for any $t \geq 0$ we have

$$\sqrt{n} - CK^2(\sqrt{m} + t) \leq \sigma_m(A) \leq \sigma_1(A) \leq \sqrt{n} + CK^2(\sqrt{m} + t)$$

with probability at least $1 - 2\exp(-t^2)$, where $K = \max_i \|A_i\|_2$.

Proof: We shall use the following Lemma to rewrite the conclusion.

Lemma (Iso): For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ with $m \leq n$ and a scalar $\epsilon > 0$, the following are equivalent:

(a) $\|A^\top A - I\|_{op} \leq \epsilon$.

(b) $(1 - \epsilon) \|x\|_2^2 \leq \|Ax\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon) \|x\|_2^2 \quad \forall x$.

$$(c) \quad 1 - \epsilon \leq \sigma_m(A)^2 \leq \sigma_1(A)^2 \leq 1 + \epsilon.$$

Proof of Lemma (Iso) : (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) wlog assume $\|x\|_2 = 1$ in (b). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^T A - I\|_{op} &= \max_{x \in S^{m-1}} |x^T (A^T A - I) x| \\ &= \max_{x \in S^{m-1}} |\|Ax\|_2^2 - 1| \end{aligned}$$

Thus, this being bounded by ϵ is equivalent to (b).

(b) \Leftrightarrow (c) This follows from the variational characterization

$$\sigma_1(A) = \max_{x \in S^{m-1}} \|Ax\| \text{ and } \sigma_m(A) = \min_{x \in S^{m-1}} \|Ax\|. \quad \square$$

Recall from Lecture 8 that

$$|t^2 - 1| \leq 8\sqrt{s^2} \Rightarrow |t - 1| \leq s \quad \forall t, s \geq 0.$$

Thus, to prove the result it suffices to show that (check!)

$$(w) \quad \left\| \frac{1}{m} A^T A - I \right\|_{op} \leq K^2(8\sqrt{s^2}) \text{ with } s = C \left(\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right).$$

The proof follows in three steps.

Step 1: Approximation. Using Corollary 0

from Lecture 14 allows us to construct an $\frac{1}{4}$ -net \mathcal{W} of S^{m-1} with cardinality $|\mathcal{W}| \leq 9^m$. Then, by Lemma (Max) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{n} A^T A - I \right\|_{op} &\leq 2 \max_{x \in \mathcal{W}} \left| \left\langle \left(\frac{1}{n} A A^T - I \right) x, x \right\rangle \right| \\ &= 2 \max_{x \in \mathcal{W}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \|Ax\|_2^2 - 1 \right| \end{aligned}$$

So to prove (ii) it suffices to show

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{W}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \|Ax\|_2^2 - 1 \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ with } \epsilon = K^2(\delta \vee \delta^2).$$

Step 2: Concentration. Fix $x \in \mathcal{W}$ and express $\|Ax\|_2^2$ as

$$\|Ax\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{\langle A_i, x \rangle}_{X_i}^2.$$

By our assumptions, X_i are independent sub-Gaussian random variables with $\mathbb{E} X_i^2 = 1$ and $\|X_i\|_{\psi_2} \leq K$ (check!). This makes $X_i^2 - 1$ independent, mean zero subexponential random variables

with

$$\|x_i^2 - 1\|_{Y_2} \leq CK^2.$$

By Bernstein's inequality we get

$$P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n}\|Ax\|_2^2 - 1\right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)$$

$$= P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - 1\right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)$$

$$\leq 2 \exp\left(-c_1 \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{K^4} \wedge \frac{\varepsilon}{K^2}\right)n\right)$$

$$= 2 \exp\left(-c_1 \delta^2 n\right) \leftarrow \text{since } \frac{\varepsilon}{K^2} = \delta \vee \delta^4$$

$$\leq 2 \exp\left(-c_1 C^2(n+t^2)\right) \leftarrow (a+b)^2 \geq a^2 + b^2 \forall a, b \geq 0.$$

Step 3: Union bound. Now we can bootstrap the result for fixed x to cover all x .

Recall that $|W| \leq q^n$, then

$$P\left(\max_{x \in W} \left|\frac{1}{n}\|Ax\|_2^2 - 1\right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)$$

$$\leq q^n \cdot 2 \exp\left(-c_1 C^2(n+t^2)\right)$$

$$= 2 \exp\left(n \log q - c_1 C^2(n+t^2)\right)$$

$$\leq 2 \exp\left(n(\log q - c_1 C^2) - t^2\right) \leftarrow C \geq 1.$$

$$\leq 2 \exp(-t^2) \leftarrow C^2 \geq \frac{\log q}{c_1}.$$

Since have the freedom to pick C , we ensure

$$C^2 \geq 1 \vee \frac{\log q}{C},$$

which concludes the argument. \square

Remark: 1) Note that we never computed expectations of norms for this proof. Nonetheless, we can use this high probability bounds to derive

$$\mathbb{E} \|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq CK(\sqrt{n} + \sqrt{m}) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n} A^T A - I \right\| \leq CK^2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} + \frac{n}{m} \right).$$

- 2) The bound on the operator norm is optimal. See Exercise 4.42 of Vershynin's.
- 3) Something remarkable about this result is that we only need independence among rows (the entries per row might depend on each other).