



Social Sparsity! Neighborhood Systems Enrich Structured Shrinkage Operators

Matthieu Kowalski, Kai Siedenburg, Monika Dörfler

► To cite this version:

Matthieu Kowalski, Kai Siedenburg, Monika Dörfler. Social Sparsity! Neighborhood Systems Enrich Structured Shrinkage Operators. 2012. hal-00691774v1

HAL Id: hal-00691774

<https://hal.science/hal-00691774v1>

Preprint submitted on 27 Apr 2012 (v1), last revised 21 May 2013 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Social Sparsity! Neighborhood Systems Enrich Structured Shrinkage Operators

Matthieu Kowalski, Kai Siedenburg, Monika Dörfler

Abstract—Sparse and structured signal expansions on dictionaries can be obtained through explicit modeling in the coefficient domain. The originality of the present article lies in the construction and the study of generalized shrinkage operators, whose goal is to identify structured significance maps and give rise to structured thresholding. These generalize Group Lasso and the previously introduced Elitist Lasso by introducing more flexibility in the coefficient domain modeling, and lead to the notion of *social sparsity*. The proposed operators are studied theoretically and embedded in iterative thresholding algorithms. Moreover, a link between these operators and a convex functional is established. Numerical studies on both simulated and real signals confirm the benefits of such an approach.

Index Terms—Structured Sparsity, Iterative Thresholding, Convex Optimization

I. INTRODUCTION

A wide range of inverse problems arising in signal processing have benefited from *sparsity*. Introduced in the mid 90's by Chen, Donoho and Saunders [1], the idea is that a signal can be efficiently represented as a linear combination of elementary atoms chosen in an appropriate *dictionary*. Here, *efficiently* may be understood in the sense that only few atoms are needed to reconstruct the signal. The same idea appeared in the machine learning community [2], where often only few variables are relevant in inference tasks based on observations living in very high dimensional spaces.

The natural measure of the cardinality of a support set, and hence its sparsity, is the ℓ_0 “norm” which counts the number of non-zero coefficients. Minimizing such a norm leads to a combinatorial problem which is usually relaxed into a ℓ_1 norm which is convex.

Solving an inverse problem by using the sparse principle can be done by the following steps:

- Choose a dictionary where the signal of interest is supposed to be sparse. Such a choice is driven by the nature of the signal: Gabor dictionaries (for audio signals for example), wavelet dictionaries (for images) are commonly used, among others. The dictionary can even be learned directly on a class of signals [3]. In order to be able to use the sparse principle, this step of choosing an appropriate dictionary is obviously crucial.

M. Kowalski is with Laboratoire des Signaux et Systèmes, UMR 8506 CNRS - SUPELEC - Univ Paris-Sud, 91192 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France (e-mail: matthieu.kowalski@lss.supelec.fr).

K. Siedenburg is with Austrian Institute for Artificial Intelligence (OFAI), Freyung 6/6, A-1010 Vienna, Austria (e-mail: kai.siedenburg@ofai.at)

M. Dörfler is with Numerical Harmonic Analysis Group, Faculty of Mathematics, University of Vienna, Alserbachstrae 23, 1090 Wien, Austria (e-mail: monika.doerfler@univie.ac.at)




Fig. 1. Time-frequency images. Top: signal samples, bottom-left: representation adapted to transients. Bottom-right, representation adapted to tonals.

- Choose a loss in order to link the observations, or measured signals, to the sought signals. We will focus in this work on the classical ℓ_2 norms used with success in various problems.
- Apply an ℓ_1 penalty on the coefficients of the signal expanded in the dictionary.

The resulting convex optimisation problem is known as the *Basis Pursuit (Denoising)* [1] or the *Lasso* [2]. This approach, can be viewed as a *synthesis* model of the signal: one directly estimates its coefficients inside a dictionary in order to synthesize the signal from these coefficients.

One of the main limitations of this approach to sparse modeling is that all the coefficients are treated independently. Most natural signals are highly structured, however, and the structures which become visible in an *analysis* of a signal correspond to the physical prior which could be used for its processing. We instance such an observation on an audio signal.

A. From sparsity to the need of structures

Fig. I-A displays the time samples of a glockenspiel signal, and two time-frequency representations using a Modulated Discrete Cosine Transform (MDCT), one with a narrow band analysis window adapted for the tonal part (well localized in frequency) and one with a large band analysis window (well localized in time). Clearly, the time samples are not a sparse representation. The two time-frequency representations display only few “big” coefficients (in dark gray), while the organisation of these coefficients (their structure) depends of the choice of the basis. Hence an idea is to construct a dictionary as an union of two others, each adapted to the “morphological layer”. Such an approach has been proposed

in [4] as *hybrid model* for audio signals, and in [5] as *morphological model* for images.

However, inside each representation we observe a grouping effect of the coefficients. This is the main subject of this article: how can this grouping effect be taken into account? Several approaches have been proposed, most of them dealing with “overlapping groups” [6]–[9]. However, it is not always simple to define the group *a priori*, even with overlaps, because their size can change, the beginning and the end of a group is not always clear, etc. Moreover, defining groups can lead to different kinds of “block artifacts”.

Our main contribution is to propose a method of *social sparsity* where the neighborhood of a given coefficient is taken into account in order to take a decision: keeping or discarding it. For this purpose, we construct *structured shrinkage* operators and establish a link between these operators and the minimization of a convex functional, even if the minimizer is not reached. We then compare the properties of the heuristic operators and the more formal convex formulation.

B. Outline

Section II introduces the mathematical framework used for this article and Section III presents the state of the art related to this framework. The structured shrinkage operators are introduced in Section IV where their theoretical study is derived. We show in Section V some practical implementation of our approach and present numerical results of its performance in denoising tasks on audio and image-signals.

II. MATHEMATICAL FRAMEWORK

This section introduces notation used throughout the paper as well as some useful results from convex analysis.

A. Notation

We will denote the observed signal as $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^L$, obtained from the signal of interest $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^L$ corrupted by an additive noise $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^L$, i.e.

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{b}.$$

The matrix of the dictionary is denoted by $\Phi \in \mathbb{C}^{L,N}$ and the synthesis coefficients of \mathbf{s} in Φ are denoted by $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^N$, such that

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{b} = \Phi\alpha + \mathbf{b}.$$

A sparse estimation of \mathbf{s} is given by the Lasso [2] or Basis Pursuit Denoising [1]:

$$\hat{\mathbf{s}} = \Phi \argmin_{\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^N} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \Phi\alpha\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\alpha\|_1, \quad \lambda > 0. \quad (1)$$

In this article we choose to use the general convex formulation

$$\hat{\mathbf{s}} = \Phi \argmin_{\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^N} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \Phi\alpha\|_2^2 + \lambda \Omega(\alpha) \quad (2)$$

where Ω is a convex penalty. Depending of the choice made for Ω different kinds of sparsity or structure can be enforced.

Remark 1. We choose to limit our purpose to the case of the sparse regression, where the synthesis coefficients α of the

signal of interest \mathbf{s} are estimated from a single measurement \mathbf{y} only corrupted by an additive noise. However, this approach can be extended to more general inverse problems where several signals have to be estimated from several measurements such as in source separation [10].

B. Short reminder of Convex optimization

The algorithms proposed in this paper are issued from convex optimization methods and rely on the notion of the *proximity operator*, introduced by Moreau [11], which allows to deal with non-smooth functionals.

Definition 1 (Proximity operator). Let $\varphi : \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$ be a lower semicontinuous, convex function. The proximity operator of φ denoted by $\text{prox}_\varphi : \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$ is given by

$$\text{prox}_\varphi(\mathbf{z}) = \argmin_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^N} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + \varphi(\mathbf{u}). \quad (3)$$

The most well-known example of such an operator is the shrinkage given by the ℓ_2 Thikonov regularization and the soft-thresholding given by the ℓ_1 norm.

If one is able to compute the proximity operator of a convex regularizer Ω , then the minimizer of the convex functional (2) can be obtained by using proximal algorithms. The simplest proximal algorithm was found in the ℓ_1 case by several researchers using very different approaches. In [12] Daubechies and coauthors derived the thresholded Landweber iterations using a surrogate and proved the convergence using the Opial’s fixed point theorem. In [13], Figueiredo *et al.* found the same algorithm thanks to an expectation/maximization formulation. A more general version using the proximity operators was given by the forward-backward algorithm studied by Combettes *et al.* [14]. We will refer to this algorithm as the Iterative Shrinkage/Thresholding Algorithm (ISTA) as in [15] and we restate it in Algorithm 1 for the problem studied here.

Algorithm 1: ISTA

Initialization: $\alpha^{(0)} \in \mathbb{C}^N$, $k = 1$, $\gamma = \|\Phi\Phi^*\|$
repeat
 $\alpha^{(k)} = \text{prox}_{\frac{\lambda}{\gamma}\Omega} \left(\alpha^{(k-1)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \Phi^*(\mathbf{y} - \Phi\alpha^{(k-1)}) \right);$
 $k = k + 1;$
until convergence ;

Despite its simplicity, this algorithm converges slowly in practice. Recent advances in convex optimization lead to more efficient algorithms, we refer to [16] for a thorough discussion of proximal algorithms and their accelerations. Algorithm 2 describes the Fast Iterative Shrinkage/Thresholding Algorithm as proposed in [15].

Now that notations are introduced and practical algorithms to deal with convex functionals as in (2) are presented, the next section presents some state-of-the-art approaches to go beyond the simple sparsity paradigm and take some structures into account.

Algorithm 2: FISTA

Initialization: $\alpha^{(0)} \in \mathbb{C}^N$, $k = 1$, $\gamma = \|\Phi\Phi^*\|$,
 $\mathbf{z}^{(0)} = \alpha^{(0)}$, $\tau^{(0)} = 1$.
repeat
 $\alpha^{(k)} = \text{prox}_{\frac{\lambda}{\gamma}\Omega} \left(\mathbf{z}^{(k-1)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \Phi^* (\mathbf{y} - \Phi \mathbf{z}^{(k-1)}) \right)$;
 $\tau^{(k)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\tau^{(k-1)^2}} \right)$;
 $\mathbf{z}^{(k)} = \alpha^{(k)} + \frac{\tau^{(k-1)} - 1}{\tau^{(k)}} (\alpha^{(k)} - \alpha^{(k-1)})$;
 $k = k + 1$
until convergence ;

III. STATE OF THE ART

Considering grouping structures of coefficients appears as a natural idea in the sparse regression context. A simple way to obtain such groupings is the use of mixed norms which allows to regroup coefficients. Nonetheless, they also allow for taking into account a kind of anti-correlation. We first give the definition of mixed norms and their proximity operators which will be used later. Other kinds of grouping structures which appear in the literature are presented afterwards.

A. Mixed norms

Mixed norms were introduced by Benedek and Panzone [17] in the early 1960's in mathematics.

1) *Definition on two levels:* We give here the general definition as in [18], [19].

Definition 2 (Two-level mixed-norms). *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N = \mathbb{R}^{G \times M}$ be indexed by a double index $(g, m) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ such that $\mathbf{x} = (x_{g,m})$.*

Let $p, q \geq 1$, and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{+,}^N$ be a sequence of strictly positive weights labeled by double index (g, m) . We call $\ell_{\mathbf{w};p,q}$ the mixed-norm of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ defined by*

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbf{w};p,q} = \left(\sum_{g=1}^G \left(\sum_{m=1}^M w_{g,m} |x_{g,m}|^p \right)^{q/p} \right)^{1/q}.$$

The cases $p = +\infty$ and $q = +\infty$ are obtained by replacing the corresponding sum by the supremum.

Two mixed norms appear quite naturally by playing with the different values of p and q : the ℓ_{21} and ℓ_{12} norms. The ℓ_{21} norm was used with the name Group-lasso [20] (G-Lasso) in machine learning, but also Multiple Measurement Vectors [21] or joint sparsity [22] in signal processing. In the context of regression, the main aim of such a norm is to keep or discard entire groups of coefficients: only the most energetic groups remain.

The ℓ_{12} norm was introduced under the name of Elitist-Lasso [18], [19] (E-Lasso), and latter called Exclusive Lasso in [23]. With such a penalty we keep the biggest coefficients relative to the others. Such behavior can be expected in some applications as source separation [10].

2) *Extension to 3 levels:* This notion of mixed norms can be extended to more than two levels. On three levels, the definition becomes [24]

Definition 3 (Three-level mixed-norms). *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N = \mathbb{R}^{K \times G \times M}$ be indexed by a triple index $(k, g, m) \in \mathbb{N}^3$ such that $\mathbf{x} = (x_{k,g,m})$. Let $p, q, r \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{+,*}^N$ a sequence of strictly positive weights. We call $\ell_{\mathbf{w};p,q,r}$ the mixed norm of \mathbf{x} defined by*

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbf{w};pqr} = \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\sum_{g=1}^G \left(\sum_{m=1}^M w_{k,g,m} |x_{k,g,m}|^p \right)^{q/p} \right)^{r/q} \right)^{1/r}.$$

The cases $p = +\infty$, $q = +\infty$ and $r = +\infty$ are obtained by replacing the corresponding sum by the supremum.

The ℓ_{212} mixed norm was used with success in Magnetoencephalography inverse problems [24] and could be called Elitist-Group-Lasso (EG-Lasso).

3) *Proximity Operators:* In order to optimize certain convex problems using mixed norms, their proximity operator needs to be computed. The following proposition summarizes the different operators for various norms, cf. [19].

Proposition 1 (Proximity operators for mixed norms). *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Let $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{+,*}^N$ be a vector of weights. We suppose that \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{w} are indexed by (g, m) .*

G-Lasso $\ell_{\mathbf{w};21}$ norm: *In this case, the vector of weights \mathbf{w} is used to weight each group, i.e. $\forall m, w_{g,m} = w_g$.*

The proximity operator associated to the $\ell_{\mathbf{w};21}$ norm is given by $\mathbf{x} = \text{prox}_{\lambda\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{w};21}}(\mathbf{z})$ where \mathbf{x} reads for each coordinate:

$$x_{g,m} = z_{g,m} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda \sqrt{w_g}}{\|\mathbf{z}_g\|_2} \right)^+,$$

and \mathbf{z}_g is the vector formed by the coefficients indexed by m .

E-Lasso $\ell_{\mathbf{w};12}$ norm: *Let $r_{g,m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |z_{g,m}|/w_{g,m}$ and for each g , let the indexing denoted by m'_g be defined such that $\forall m'_g, r_{g,m'_g+1} \leq r_{g,m'_g}$ and re-order the $z_{g,m}$ according to this index. Let the index M_g be such that:*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \sum_{m'_g=1}^{M_g} w_{g,m'_g}^2 \left(r_{g,m'_g} - r_{g,M_g} \right) &< r_{g,M_g} \\ &\leq \lambda \sum_{m'_g=1}^{M_g+1} w_{g,m'_g}^2 \left(r_{g,m'_g} - r_{g,M_g} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The proximal operator $\mathbf{x} = \text{prox}_{\lambda\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{w};12}}(\mathbf{z})$ is given coordinate-wise:

$$x_{g,m} = \frac{z_{g,m}}{|z_{g,m}|} \left(|z_{g,m}| - \frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda K_{\mathbf{w}_g}} \sum_{m'_g=1}^{M_g} |z_{g,m'_g}| \right)^+,$$

where $K_{\mathbf{w}_g} = \sum_{m'_g=1}^{M_g} w_{g,m'_g}^2$.

EG-Lasso $\ell_{\mathbf{w};212}$ norm: *Let \mathbf{x} be indexed by (h, g, m) . Let $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be a vector of positive weights such that $\forall h, w_{h,g,m} = w_{h,g}$. Let us define $r_{h,g} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\mathbf{z}_{h,g}\|_2 / \sqrt{w_{h,g}}$.*

For each h , let the indexing denoted by g'_h be defined such that $\forall g'_h, r_{h,g'_h+1} \leq r_{h,g'_h}$. Let the index G_h be such that:

$$\lambda \sum_{g'_h=1}^{G_h} w_{h,g'_h} (r_{h,g'_h} - r_{h,G_h}) < r_{h,G_h}$$

$$\leq \lambda \sum_{g'_h=1}^{G_h+1} w_{h,g'_h} (r_{h,g'_h} - r_{h,G_h}).$$

Denoting by $[z_{h,g'_h}] = \sqrt{w_{h,g'_h}} \|z_{h,g'_h}\|_2$ and supposing that they are ordered by g'_h , then $\mathbf{x} = \text{prox}_{\lambda \|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{w};212}}(\mathbf{z})$ is given, for each coordinate (h, g, m) , by:

$$x_{h,g,m} = z_{h,g,m} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda \sqrt{w_{h,g}} \sum_{g'_h=1}^{G_h} [z_{h,g'_h}]}{1 + \lambda K_{\mathbf{w}_h} \|z_{h,g}\|_2} \right)^+,$$

where $K_{\mathbf{w}_h} = \sum_{g_h=1}^{G_h} w_{h,g_h}$.

Remark 2. The proximity operators of the ℓ_{121} mixed norms and of general mixed norms defined on more than three levels are not computable in a closed form. In fact, one needs to compute a “group-lasso” proximity operator with weights varying in groups, which does not admit a closed form.

It is interesting to note that in [25] a hierarchical formulation of the dependencies leads to a $\ell_{1,\frac{4}{3}}$ mixed norm.

One of the main shortcomings of mixed norms is that they do not permit any overlap between groups. Indeed, when a group is discarded, all the coefficients are set to zero.

B. A step beyond mixed norms

The need for overlapping groups was recognized by many authors, see [6]–[9]. In [6], the definition of a convex penalty leads to the expected results: all the coefficients belonging to the same group are kept despite the overlap. However, there is no closed form for the proximity operators corresponding to the latent variable group lasso. Still, iterative algorithms exist, cf. [7], [8], [26]. Another disadvantage of this approach is the introduction of latent variables which may lead to very high dimensional problems.

In [27] the authors introduced a hierarchy on groups. Such a behavior allows for sparsity inside the group, in addition to the sparsity between the groups. In particular, their formulation included the sums of convex penalties such as a $\ell_{21} + \ell_1$ composite norm. Such a composite norm was used with success for Magnetoencephalography inverse problems with respect to time-frequency dictionaries [28].

IV. STRUCTURED SHRINKAGE

One of the main shortcomings of the various “structured block sparsity” approaches exposed above, is that the definition of the groups must be done *a priori*. However, in many situations, we just have a general idea of the grouping structure, and fixing the groups (even with overlap) can be too rigid.

Instead of defining groups, and therewith keeping or discarding entire groups of coefficients, a notion of neighborhood-based selection was proposed in [29]. The introduction of this neighborhood gives rise to a “social sparsity”: a decision can be made coefficient by coefficient by taking into account the amplitude of coefficients which are in a close neighborhood, instead of a rigorous sparsity as with the Lasso or joint/group-sparsity of the Group-Lasso (even with overlap).

In order to present this approach, we first give the definition of the neighborhood and re-state the shrinkage operators empirically introduced in [29] and equipped with weights in [30].

A. Structured shrinkage operators

To exploit structures in the synthesis coefficients, (like persistence in time or frequency in audio signals as in Fig. I-A in the introductory Section I), we will refine some classical shrinkage operators by taking into account the neighborhood of a coefficient. To an index k in a set \mathcal{I} , we associate a weighted neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(k) = \{k' \in \mathcal{I} : w_{k'}^{(k)} \neq 0\}$ with weights $w_{k'}^{(k)}$ defined on $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{I}}$, such that $w_{k'}^{(k)} \geq 0$ for all $k' \in \mathcal{I}$, $w_k^{(k)} > 0$ and $\sum_{k' \in \mathcal{N}(k)} w_{k'}^2 = 1$. This notion of neighborhood is illustrated on Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. The neighborhood of the coefficient k_1 is given by the red window, and the neighborhood of the coefficient k_2 by the blue one. These two neighborhoods share one coefficient. When considering the red group, coefficients are weighted by some weights $w_{k'}^{k_1} > 0$, $k' \in \mathcal{N}(k_1)$. Outside the red group, the weights are equal to zero. When considering the blue group, coefficients are weighted by some weights $w_{k'}^{k_2} > 0$, $k' \in \mathcal{N}(k_2)$.

Once the neighborhood is defined, we can define shrinkage operators on it. These operators are constructed with the shrinkage operators given by the proximity operator corresponding to the Group/ Elitist/ Elitist-Group-Lasso defined in Section III, Proposition 1, by considering the “groups” formed by the neighborhood.

1) *WG-Lasso*: We first introduce the Windowed-Group-Lasso [29] shrinkage operator, defined as

$$\mathbb{S}_\lambda^{wgl}(\alpha) : \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$$

$$\alpha \mapsto \underline{\alpha}$$

such that $\forall k$,

$$\underline{\alpha}_k = \alpha_k \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{\sum_{k' \in \mathcal{N}(k)} w_{k'}^{(k)} |\alpha_{k'}|^2}} \right)^+. \quad (4)$$

The idea of this shrinkage operator is to select a coefficient if the energy of its neighborhood is sufficiently large. Consequently, an isolated “big” coefficient can be discarded, but a “small” coefficient in the middle of big ones can be kept. Such a notion of neighborhood can also be found earlier in [31], where a similar thresholding rule was studied in the context of SURE wavelet estimation.

2) *WE-Lasso*: Instead of considering a positive correlation between the coefficient in the neighborhood, one can consider a negative correlation as in the Elitist-Lasso. This leads to the following shrinkage operator, which we will call the *Windowed-Elitist-Lasso*. For each neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(k)$, let the indexing denoted by k' be defined such that $\forall k' \in \mathcal{N}(k), w_{k'+1}^{(k)} |\alpha_{k'+1}| \leq w_{k'}^{(k)} |\alpha_{k'}|$. Let the index K_k be such that:

$$\lambda \sum_{k'=1}^{K_k} \left(w_{k'}^{(k)} \alpha_{k'} - w_{K_k}^{(k)} \alpha_{K_k} \right) < \alpha_{K_k} \\ \leq \lambda \sum_{k'=1}^{K_k+1} \left(w_{k'}^{(k)} \alpha_{k'} - w_{K_k}^{(k)} \alpha_{K_k} \right)$$

Then the Elitist-Lasso shrinkage operator is given by

$$\mathbb{S}_{\lambda}^{wel}(\alpha) : \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N \\ \alpha \mapsto \underline{\alpha}$$

such that $\forall k$,

$$\underline{\alpha}_k = \frac{\alpha_k}{|\alpha_k|} \left(|\alpha_k| - \frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda K_k} \sum_{\substack{k'=1 \\ k' \in \mathcal{N}(k)}}^{K_k} w_{k'}^{(k)} |\alpha_{k'}| \right)^+ \quad (5)$$

These two heuristic shrinkage operations are computed on singly-indexed coefficients by taking into account their neighborhood. Thus the definition of neighborhood induces a double indexing in the end: one to index the neighborhood, another to index the element which belongs to a neighborhood. The shrinkage is then defined by applying the proximity operator given by the Group-Lasso or the Elitist-Lasso by using this induced double indexing.

3) *PE-Lasso*: Now, if we consider a set of coefficients which is already doubly indexed by (g, m) , we can define two kinds of neighborhoods: a first neighborhood on m and a second neighborhood on g . This will lead to triply-indexed coefficients and we can apply the Elitist-Group-Lasso shrinkage operator, as done above with Group-Lasso and Elitist-Lasso, to obtain the Persistent-Elitist-Lasso [29].

To an index (g, m) in a structured set $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_g \times \mathcal{I}_m$, we associate a weighted neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(g, m) = \{m' \in \mathcal{I}_m : w_{g,m'}^{(g,m)} \neq 0\}$ with weights $w_{g,m'}^{(g,m)}$ defined on $\mathcal{I}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, such that $w_{g,m'}^{(g,m)} \geq 0$ for all $(g, m) \in \mathcal{I}$, $m' \in \mathcal{I}_m$, and $w_{g,m}^{(g,m)} > 0$.

For defining the operator, let $[\alpha]_{g,m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{\sum_{m' \in \mathcal{N}(g,m)} w_{g,m'}^{(g,m)} \alpha_{g,m'}^2}$. For each g , let the indexing denoted by m'_g be defined such that $\forall m'_g, [\alpha]_{g,m'_g+1} \leq [\alpha]_{g,m'_g}$

and re-order the $[\alpha]$ according to this index. Let the index M_g be such that:

$$\lambda \sum_{m'_g=1}^{M_g} \left([\alpha]_{g,m'_g} - [\alpha]_{g,M_g} \right) < [\alpha]_{g,M_g} \\ \leq \lambda \sum_{m'_g=1}^{M_g+1} \left([\alpha]_{g,m'_g} - [\alpha]_{g,M_g} \right) .$$

Then the Persistent-Elitist-Lasso shrinkage operator [29] is given by

$$\mathbb{S}_{\lambda}^{pel}(\alpha) : \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N \\ \alpha \mapsto \underline{\alpha}$$

where $\forall g, m$,

$$\underline{\alpha}_k = \alpha_{g,m} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda M_g} \frac{\sum_{m'_g=1}^{M_g} [\alpha]_{g,m'_g}}{\|\alpha_{m' \in \mathcal{N}(g,m)}\|_2} \right)^+ \quad (6)$$

Here, a coefficient will be selected if its neighborhood is sufficiently energetic compared to the others. Such a structure is illustrated in Fig. 3.




Fig. 3. Persistent Elitist-LASSO. Coefficients are doubly index by (g, m) . For each we are considering the left and the right neighbor to define the neighborhood. Then, an E-Lasso selection is done between these groups.

The new operators constructed above are based on the shrinkage/thresholding operators of the proximity operators associated to the convex prior given in Proposition 1. In the present form, they are not directly linked to a convex problem themselves. In the following, we set up an explicit link between the proximity operators from Proposition 1 and the newly introduced structured shrinkage operators (4) - (6). For this purpose, the next subsection defines a mapping into a bigger space where the proximity operator can be applied.

B. Neighborhoods with latent variables

The neighborhoods, and the groups they implicitly induce, can be formally defined via an expansion operator. This operator maps the original coefficients into a bigger space, where its image consists of copies of the coefficients such that

independent groups can be defined over the neighborhood of the coefficients.

Definition 4 (Expansion operator). Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^N$. Let $\mathcal{E} : \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ be an expansion operator such that

$$\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N) \mapsto (w_1^1 \alpha_1, w_2^1 \alpha_2, \dots, w_N^1 \alpha_N, \dots, w_1^N \alpha_1, \dots, w_N^N \alpha_N)$$

with $w_i^j \geq 0$ and $\sum_j |w_i^j|^2 = 1$

In practice, the non-zeros weight are the same as the weights as in the definition of the social shrinkage operators above. We thus have constructed one group for *each* coefficient, regrouping all its neighborhood by “copying” the coefficients. Due to the condition on the weights, we can state the following proposition which will be crucial later on.

Proposition 2. \mathcal{E} is isometrical, and $\mathcal{E}^*(\mathcal{E}(\alpha)) = \alpha$.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{E}(\alpha)\|^2 &= \sum_i \sum_j |w_i^j \alpha_i|^2 = \sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 \sum_j |w_i^j|^2 \\ &= \sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 = \|\alpha\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Let \mathbf{E} denotes the matrix associated with \mathcal{E} . This matrix can be viewed as a $N^2 \times N$ matrix where each row contains at most only one non-zero element, corresponding to the weights associated to the elements of a neighborhood:

$$\mathbf{E} = [\mathbf{E}_1, \dots, \mathbf{E}_N]^T, \quad (7)$$

with $\mathbf{E}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$

$$\mathbf{E}_i = [w_1^i \mathbf{e}_1^T, \dots, w_N^i \mathbf{e}_N^T]^T,$$

where \mathbf{e}_j is the j^{th} canonical base vector of \mathbb{R}^N .

A direct consequence is that one can simply go back to the original space by using the adjoint operator. However, in order to be able to establish a link between the heuristic shrinkage operators previously defined and the common proximity operator, we need to introduce the following left inverse of \mathbf{E} :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D} : \mathbb{C}^{N \times N} &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N \\ \mathbf{z} = (z_1^1, \dots, z_N^1, \dots, z_1^N, \dots, z_N^N) &\mapsto \mathbf{x} \\ \text{such that } \forall k, x_k &= \frac{1}{w_k^k} z_k^k \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

One can easily check that we have $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{I}$ and then $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{D}$ is a bi-orthogonal (oblique) projection. Moreover \mathbf{D} is such that $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{D}^T = \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{(w_k^k)^2}\right)$. Using these operators, one immediately obtains the following proposition linking the heuristic structured shrinkage and the proximity operators from Section III-A.

Proposition 3. Let \mathbb{S} be the shrinkage operator of the WG-Lasso (4), WE-Lasso (5) or PE-Lasso (6) and Ω the regularizer of the G-Lasso, E-Lasso and GE-Lasso, respectively (see

Prop. 1). Let \mathbf{E} be the expansion operator (7) and \mathbf{D} its left inverse (8). Then

$$\mathbb{S}_\lambda = \mathbf{D} \circ \text{prox}_{\lambda\Omega} \circ \mathbf{E}$$

Proof: For the sake of simplicity, we give the proof for the WG-Lasso. The proofs for WE-Lasso and PE-Lasso are similar.

Thanks to the introduction of the expanded operator \mathbf{E} in Definition 4, we have for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and for a given neighborhood \mathcal{N} on its indices:

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \sqrt{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}(k)} w_\ell^{(k)} |\alpha_\ell|^2} = \|\mathbf{E}\alpha\|_{21}.$$

Then, $\mathbf{z} = \text{prox}_{\lambda\Omega}(\mathbf{E}\alpha)$ is given coordinatewise by:

$$\forall \ell \in \mathcal{N}(k), z_\ell^k = w_\ell^k \alpha_k \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{\sum_{k' \in \mathcal{N}(k)} w_{k'}^{(k)} |\alpha_{k'}|^2}} \right)^+.$$

Therefore, by definition (8) of \mathbf{D} the claim follows. ■

Having established the link between social shrinkage and proximity operators, we can construct various algorithms to deal with the problem of “social sparsity”.

C. Algorithms for social sparsity

We proceed by introducing heuristic algorithms, based on popular algorithms presented in Section III, in order to embed the previously introduced “social-shrinkage” operators. We then derive a more conventional convex approach thanks to the previously introduced expansion operator, and compare the advantages and shortcomings of the different algorithms.

1) *ISTA with social sparsity operator:* A natural question is how these operators behave if they are used inside iterative thresholding algorithms. Algorithm 3 rewrites ISTA with a given shrinkage operator \mathbb{S} .

Algorithm 3: ISTA with heuristic shrinkage

Initialization: $\alpha^{(0)} \in \mathbb{C}^N$, $k = 1$, $\gamma = \|\Phi\Phi^*\|$
repeat
 $\alpha^{(k)} = \mathbb{S}_{\lambda/\gamma}(\alpha^{(k-1)} + \frac{1}{\gamma}\Phi^*(\mathbf{y} - \Phi\alpha^{(k-1)}))$;
 $k = k + 1$;
until convergence ;

As the shrinkage operators \mathbb{S} defined in Equations (4), (5) and (6) are not even non-expansive, the convergence study of Algorithm 3 is difficult and remains an open problem. However, experiments show a very good behavior of Algorithm 3 with *any* left inverse of \mathbf{E} . Our observations are specified in the following

Conjecture 1. Let \mathbb{S} be the shrinkage operator of the WG-Lasso (4), WE-Lasso (5) or PE-Lasso (6), and set $\gamma = \|\Phi\Phi^*\|$. Let us introduce the operator

$$T(\alpha) = \mathbb{S}_{\lambda/\gamma}(\alpha + \frac{1}{\gamma}\Phi^*(\mathbf{y} - \Phi\alpha)). \quad (9)$$

Then the sequence $\{\alpha^k\}$, generated by Algorithm 3, converges to a fixed point of T .

Moreover, we have also used the same shrinkage operators with FISTA, and have observed the same accelerating effect on the speed of convergence compared to the switch from ISTA to FISTA in the classic convex case.

In the next subsection, we conceptually link the heuristic ISTA with the optimization of a convex functional.

2) *Neighborhood as a convex prior*: Thanks to the expansion operator \mathbf{E} , we can introduce new convex priors which are closely related to our shrinkages, which we denote as cvx-^* .

Definition 5 (Social Sparsity Convex Regularizers). Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^N$ and let \mathbf{E} be the expansion operator (7).

cvx-Windowed-Group-Lasso:

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_{wgl}(\alpha) &= \sum_{k=1}^N \sqrt{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}(k)} w_{\ell}^{(k)} |\alpha_{\ell}|^2} \\ &= \|\mathbf{E}\alpha\|_{21}\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

cvx-Windowed-Elitist-Lasso:

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_{wel}(\alpha) &= \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}(k)} w_{\ell}^{(k)} |\alpha_{\ell}| \right)^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{E}\alpha\|_{12}^2\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

cvx-Persistent-Elitist-Lasso:

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_{pel}(\alpha) &= \sum_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{I}_m|} \left(\sum_{g=1}^{|\mathcal{I}_g|} \sqrt{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}(g,m)} w_{g,\ell}^{(g,m)} |\alpha_{g,\ell}|^2} \right)^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{E}\alpha\|_{212}^2\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

A natural convex functional is then

$$F(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \Phi\alpha\|^2 + \lambda \Omega(\alpha). \quad (13)$$

where Ω is one of the convex penalty defined above, and one can look for

$$\hat{\alpha} = \underset{\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^N}{\operatorname{argmin}} F(\alpha).$$

or equivalently (see [32]) :

$$\hat{\alpha} = \mathbf{E}^T \underset{\mathbf{u}, s.t. \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\mathbf{y} - \Phi\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{u}\|_*$$

where $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the corresponding (eventually squared) norm used to define the penalty Ω .

Let us introduce the two following functionals:

$$F_{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{u}) = \|\mathbf{y} - \Phi\mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{u}\|^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{u}\|_* \quad (14)$$

and

$$F_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{u}) = \|\mathbf{y} - \Phi\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{u}\|_* \quad (15)$$

As $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{u} \Rightarrow \mathbf{D}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{u}$, we have

$$\hat{\alpha} = \mathbf{E}^T \underset{\mathbf{u}, s.t. \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} F_{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{D} \underset{\mathbf{u}, s.t. \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} F_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{u}).$$

Such an approach was also proposed to deal with “overlapping” groups in [9]. Seeking for an estimate of α as a minimizer of F , it is possible to apply an algorithm as the

one proposed in [33], where the proximity operator of the sum of two convex functions is derived from a Douglas Rachford Algorithm. We present such an algorithm with the “ISTA” framework in Algorithm 4, but it can be embedded in FISTA instead. Other approaches such as augmented Lagrangian can also be used (see [9]).

Algorithm 4: Proximal algorithm to minimize F (13).

Initialization: $\alpha^{(0)} \in \mathbb{C}^N$, $k = 1$, $\gamma = \|\Phi\Phi^*\|$

repeat –ISTA loop–

$$\alpha^{k+1/2} = \alpha^{(k)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \Phi^*(\mathbf{y} - \Phi\alpha);$$

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{E}\alpha^{k+1/2};$$

repeat –Douglas-Rachford loop–

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T \left(\frac{\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{y}}{2} \right);$$

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} + \operatorname{prox}_{\frac{\lambda}{\gamma} \|\cdot\|_*} (2\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{u}$$

until convergence;

$$\alpha^{k+1} = \mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{u};$$

$$k = k + 1;$$

until convergence;

Coming back to ISTA with social-shrinkage operators, Algorithm 3, we can rewrite the main iteration as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{S}(\alpha + \frac{1}{\gamma} \Phi^*(\mathbf{y} - \Phi\alpha), \frac{\lambda}{\gamma}) &= \\ \mathbf{D} \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \ell_{F_{\mathbf{E}}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{E}\alpha) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{E}\alpha\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

where $\ell_{F_{\mathbf{E}}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{E}\alpha)$ is the linearization of F in $\mathbf{E}\alpha$:

$$\ell_{F_{\mathbf{E}}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{E}\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \Phi\alpha\|^2 + \langle \mathbf{E}\Phi^*(\mathbf{y} - \Phi\alpha), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{E}\alpha \rangle + \|\mathbf{u}\|_*.$$

Moreover, using a latent variable \mathbf{z} such that $\alpha = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{z}$, due to the bi-orthogonality of $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{D}$, the main iteration of Algorithm 3 becomes

$$\mathbf{z}^{(k)} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{D} \operatorname{prox}_{\frac{\lambda}{\gamma} \|\cdot\|_*} \left(\left(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{(k-1)} \right) \right)$$

$$\alpha^k = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{z}^k$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{(k-1)} = \mathbf{z}^{(k-1)} + \frac{\mathbf{E}}{\gamma} \Phi^*(\mathbf{y} - \Phi\mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{z}^{(k-1)})$$

This can be seen as a the gradient-proximal step followed by an oblique projection.

This remark further leads to the use the natural left inverse \mathbf{E}^T instead of \mathbf{D} in Proposition 3. We then obtain a “WG-Lasso-like” shrinkage operator, the **orth-WG-Lasso**:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{S}_{\lambda}(\alpha) : \mathbb{C}^N &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N \\ \alpha &\mapsto \underline{\alpha}\end{aligned}$$

such that $\forall k$,

$$\underline{\alpha}_k = \alpha_k \sum_j \frac{1}{w_j^j} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{N}(j)} w_{j'}^{(j)} |\alpha_{k'}|^2}} \right)^+ \quad (16)$$

One can see in (16) than in this case, a coefficient will be set to zero only if all the coefficients belonging to its neighborhood are also set to zero.

In this case, Algorithm 3 can be seen as the composition of a proximity operator and an orthogonal projection:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}^{(k)} &= \mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T \text{prox}_{\frac{\lambda}{\gamma}\|\cdot\|_*} \left(\left(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{(k-1)} \right) \right) \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}^k &= \mathbf{D}\mathbf{z}^k \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{(k-1)} = \mathbf{z}^{(k-1)} + \frac{\mathbf{E}}{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\Phi}^* (\mathbf{y} - \boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{z}^{(k-1)})$$

As $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T$ is an orthogonal projection, this algorithm converges to a fixed point by applying [34, Theorem 6.3 and Corollary 6.5].

In conclusion, the introduction of the social sparsity operators has led to three algorithms related to the minimization of (13). Additionally to the last conjecture on the convergence of ISTA in conjunction with the social sparsity operators, we remarked that the social sparsity operators are the composition of an oblique projection and a proximity operator, which makes it possible to instead use an orthogonal projection approach. Thirdly, we noted that (13) can be minimized directly using a Douglas-Rachford algorithm to compute the proximity operator of the corresponding regularizer Ω . Let us stress that using the social sparsity operators in ISTA as proposed in Algorithm 3 enables to always work directly on the coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ without the need of the latent variables.

V. SOCIAL SPARSITY IN PRACTICE

While the idea of social sparsity was motivated from the stance of time-frequency analysis in the introduction, it can be in fact employed with any type of dictionary. Here, we focus on time-frequency and wavelet-dictionaries and evaluate the developed concepts with respect to audio and image denoising tasks. Although we formally proposed a variety of different shrinkage operators above, their practical exploration will stay confined to the WG-Lasso for the sake of brevity. For applications using other social sparse operators, see [10], [24], [30].

The necessary condition $\sum_j |w_i^j|^2 = 1$ on the weights in order to have the isometrical property and the condition $\sum_i |w_i^j|^2 = 1$ given in the definition of the neighborhood are of course totally compatible. The simplest case is when each coefficient is repeated the same number of times, say K , and then the non zero weights are equal to $\frac{1}{K}$. When a “sliding” window is used, the condition is obviously satisfied. Such a window also bears the advantage that the corresponding sums in the persistent shrinkage operators can be computed by fast convolution algorithms. However, it can be interesting to have an asymmetric or a smoother window.

The following numerical evaluation proceeds in three steps. Firstly, the behavior of the WG-Lasso (4) and its counterparts cvx-WGL (10) and orth-WGL (16) is characterized by experiments in significance map estimation and denoising employing synthetic signals and a MDCT-dictionary. Testing for real-life audio signals, it is secondly argued that WGL is a valuable alternative to the state of the art in audio denoising in conjunction with Gabor dictionaries. Finally, it is suggested how to use the social sparse approach with wavelet-dictionaries for image denoising.

A MatLab toolbox available at <http://homepage.univie.ac.at/monika.doerfler/StrucAudio.html> provides most of the social shrinkage operators and corresponding algorithms for audio denoising.

A. Time-Frequency Dictionaries

Time-frequency dictionaries as Gabor frames (a.k.a. the Short Time Fourier Transform) or the Modified Discrete Cosine Transform (MDCT) are extensively used in a variety of audio-processing tasks. In order to show the relevance of the social sparsity approach, we mainly make two kinds of experiments. First, we simulate a signal in order to show the ability of our approach to well recover its significance map (ie, the set of non-zeros coefficients). Then, we compare several approaches for a standard denoising problem on real audio signals.

1) *Simulations in the orthogonal basis case:* Let us assume that $\{\varphi_{(k)}\}_{k=1,\dots,N}$ is a MDCT basis. The following experiment uses such an orthonormal basis with window lengths of 2048 samples. The time-persistent neighborhoods are constructed by setting for any time-frequency index $k = (g, m)$, $\mathcal{N}(k) = \mathcal{N}(g, m) = \{(g-2, m), \dots, (g, m), \dots, (g+2, m)\}$ with g referring to time indices, i.e. each neighborhood comprises two coefficients before and after the centered one.

Here, we consider signals of the form $y = \sum_{k \in \Delta} x_k \varphi_k + b$ where b is an additive Gaussian noise, and Δ is a structured sparse significance map (i.e. the set of the index of non-zero coefficients). The latter is generated using fixed frequency Markov chains as introduced in [35], while drawing the synthesis coefficients x_k from a standard normal distribution. An example of such a map is displayed in Fig. 4. This produces an overall signal to noise ratio of about 5 dB.




Fig. 4. Time-frequency significance map with 9% non-zero coefficients.

We first compare the ability of various approaches (Lasso, WG-Lasso, orth-WG-Lasso and cvx-WG-Lasso) to recover the significance map Δ . For such a task, we use Type 1 and Type 2 errors defined in the following.

Type 1: $\pi_1 = \mathbb{P}\{(t, f) \notin \hat{\Delta} \mid (t, f) \in \Delta\}$;

Type 2: $\pi_2 = \mathbb{P}\{(t, f) \in \hat{\Delta} \mid (t, f) \notin \Delta\}$.

where $\hat{\Delta}$ is the estimated significance map, i.e. the set of the estimated index of non-zeros coefficients). In other words, Type 1 error refers to the number of false positives, Type 2 error to the number of false-negatives. Fig. 5 depicts type one

and two errors as functions of the estimated significance map size. Clearly, the three structured estimators WG-Lasso, cvx-WG-Lasso and orth-WG-Lasso outperform the non-structured Lasso. While the behavior of cvx-WG-Lasso and orth-WG-Lasso seem to be almost indistinguishable, WG-Lasso appears to perform slightly worse regarding type one errors in a certain sparsity range. However, it exhibits very similar behavior as the two minimization-functional-based estimators for Type 2 errors.




Fig. 5. Top: type 1 error. Bottom: type 2 error.

Fig. 6 shows the corresponding denoising results measured in SNR (dB). We choose to display evolution of the SNR versus the number of non-zeros coefficient, and versus the hyperparameter λ . While the WG-Lasso achieves significantly higher SNR than the plain Lasso, its convex counterpart, cvx-WG-Lasso performs slightly better, although only for much higher number of non-zero coefficients. In terms of SNR there does not seem to be a difference between the orth-WG-Lasso and the WG-Lasso, except that the WG-Lasso achieves the same SNR with fewer coefficients. In conclusion, the experiments using signals generated from structured significance maps demonstrate that the WG-Lasso behaves not identically, but quite similar to its convex and orthonormal counterparts. It thus appears as an efficient alternative to these operators, tractable for many real-life applications.

In light of Fig. 7, one can remark that for the three social-sparsity approaches, the cardinality of the maps presents a fast transition with respect to lambda, compared to the Lasso approach. Moreover, as shown on the top of Fig. 6, the SNR reaches its maximum quickly and then decreases slowly for the the three social-sparsity approaches compared to the Lasso. The practical implication of these remarks is that

the social sparsity approaches are much less sensitive to the hyperparameter tuning than the Lasso.




Fig. 6. Top: snr vs non zeros coeff. Bottom: snr vs hyperparameter λ




Fig. 7. Evolution of the cardinality of the estimated map

Another advantage of the WG-Lasso and orth-WG-Lasso over cvx-WG-Lasso is their computational speed. WG-Lasso can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(NK)$ operations where N is the number of coefficients, and K the size of the neighborhood. orth-WG-Lasso has a similar complexity in $\mathcal{O}(2NK)$ while cvx-WG-Lasso must be solved by convex optimization.

2) *Real signals and the overcomplete case:* We proceed to demonstrate the benefits of the social sparse approach for audio denoising, using “real-life” signals and an overcomplete Gabor-dictionary. The latter dictionary was also employed by the state of the art in audio denoising, namely the *Block-Thresholding* algorithm [36]. To compare these approaches, we use WG-Lasso with a neighborhood extending over time

with 4 coefficients before and after the center coefficient and employ a tight Gabor-frame with Hann-window of length 1024 samples and overlap 4. The chosen test signal is a 6-sec excerpt of a Jazz-quintet producing a complex mixture of drums, double-bass, piano, saxophone and trumpet. In [36], the variance of the noise is supposed to be known, but we choose here to use its value as a parameter of the method. Then, all algorithms depend on only one parameter, which can be tuned according to the variance of the noise.




Fig. 8. SNR vs hyperparameter λ for the five operators Lasso, WG-Lasso, orth-WG-Lasso, cvx-WG-Lasso and Block-Thresholding using a 6 sec complex audio signal containing drums, double-bass, piano, saxophone and trumpet.

Figure 8 shows the corresponding denoising results measured in SNR as functions of the hyperparameter λ for ground-noise levels of 0 and 20 dB SNR. While the Lasso performs constantly worse, Block-Thresholding performs better than WG-Lasso for the 0 dB noise level, and vice versa for the 20 dB case. Let us note that WG-Lasso, orth-WG-Lasso and cvx-WG-Lasso perform equally well. In addition, Figure 9 shows the SNR versus the number of coefficients remaining in the significance map. One can observe the same behavior as with the simulated signal in Fig. 6. WG-Lasso reaches its maximum for sparser significance maps than the orth-WG-Lasso and cvx-Lasso.

It has to be noted that in terms of SNR, block-thresholding seems to be favorable for some other signals and noise levels we tested. On the contrary, the social sparse approach bears many important advantages over block-thresholding: It is computationally much more efficient (in our setting around a factor 2, obviously depending on the number of iterations) and seems to provide perceptually preferable results, cf. [37]. It should also be noticed that no post-processing was executed




Fig. 9. SNR vs the size of the significance map for the four operators Lasso, WG-Lasso, orth-WG-Lasso and cvx-WG-Lasso using a 6 sec complex audio signal containing drums, double-bass, piano, saxophone and trumpet.

here on the results given by the various *-Lasso approaches, and in particular, we did not perform any Wiener estimate contrary to the Block-Thresholding algorithm. Such a post-processing can increase the SNR [36], but we choose to show the raw results of the *-Lasso.

From a computational point of view, cvx-WG-Lasso is very time-consuming and intractable in practice. Fig. 10 depicts the evolution of the value of the functional (13) over the number of iterations for cvx-WG-Lasso, and the FISTA and ISTA versions of the orth-WG-Lasso and WG-Lasso for the 20 dB case and $\lambda \simeq 10^{-3}$. cvx-WG-Lasso was implemented with ISTA with only one iteration of the douglas-rachford inner loop: this strategy appeared to be the most efficient to obtain our results; in particular, FISTA was divergent in practice because of its sensibility to the error done to approximate the proximity operator with the douglas-rachford inner loop.

We close the practical investigation of audio denoising with a comparison of the time-frequency maps given by the Lasso, WG-Lasso and orth-WG-Lasso in the 20 dB case for $\lambda \simeq 10^{-3}$. One can observe in Fig. 11 very structured time-frequency maps for WG-Lasso and orth-WG-Lasso compared to the Lasso, and in particular their abilities to keep high frequency coefficients. This confirms our experience that WG-Lasso gives sparser map than orth-WG-Lasso.

B. Wavelet Dictionaries

While the proposed approach might be particularly intuitive for exploiting persistence in time-frequency representations, it turns out to be similarly promising in conjunction with wavelet




Fig. 10. Functional (13) value with respect to the time for the five algorithms used.

dictionaries for applications in image processing, for instance. Here, structures such as sharp edges are sparsely represented, but at the same time exhibit persistence properties along the wavelet tree: if a given coefficient is active, it is highly likely that its respective “father” is so, as well. We hence explore the usage of an asymmetric neighborhood system which emphasizes this directed relation between “father and son”, as depicted in Fig. 12.

Initial experiments on image denoising were conducted using the well-known Lena-image to which a Gaussian white noise was added, yielding a peak signal to noise ratio (PSNR) of 20 dB. Fig. 13 compares the performance of the WGL-operator using the described neighborhood system with the plain Lasso estimate, depicting PSNR of the reconstruction as function of the number of non-zero coefficients. Clearly, WG-Lasso outperforms the Lasso leading to a gain in SNR of about 1 dB.

VI. CONCLUSION

Social sparsity operators allow to shrink dictionary coefficients with respect to its weighted neighborhood. In summary, three different but related approaches were presented: the oblique projected proximal algorithm, an orthogonal projected proximal algorithm and the minimization of a convex functional. While the convergence of the last two approaches can be proven, the convergence of the oblique projected proximal algorithm remains an open problem. Moreover, the algorithm can be accelerated with FISTA as for classical convex optimization. In particular for WG-Lasso, various experiments on both simulated and real signals demonstrate a very good behavior in denoising tasks: its performance is comparable to the state-of-the art Block-Thresholding algorithm but it is considerably faster.

Further studies will be devoted to two aspects. On the one hand, a theoretical study of the oblique-projected proximal algorithm must be conducted. On the other hand, we plan to build a practical audio denoising algorithm, using WG-Lasso with hybrid decompositions [4] and a few instinctive, or ideally none, hyperparameters.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to warmly thank Bruno Torr sani for fruitful discussions and his previous advices.




Fig. 11. Time-Frequency maps. From top to bottom: original signal, noisy signal, Lasso, WG-Lasso, orth-WG-Lasso




Fig. 12. Asymmetric neighborhoods of wavelet coefficients: each coefficients at scale $j - 1$ is grouped with its father at scale j .




Fig. 13. Top: snr vs non zeros coeff. Bottom: snr vs hyperparameter λ

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Chen, D. Donoho, and M. Saunders, "Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit," *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 33–61, 1998.
- [2] R. Tibshirani, "Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Serie B*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 267–288, 1996.
- [3] R. Rubinstein, A. Bruckstein, and M. Elad, "Dictionaries for sparse representation modeling," *Proceedings of IEEE - Special Issue on Applications of Sparse Representation & Compressive Sensing*, vol. 98, no. 6, pp. 1045–1057, 2010.
- [4] L. Daudet and B. Torrèsani, "Hybrid representations for audiophonic signal encoding," *Signal Processing*, vol. 82, no. 11, pp. 1595–1617, 2002.
- [5] M. Elad, J.-L. Starck, D. L. Donoho, and P. Querre, "Simultaneous cartoon and texture image inpainting using morphological component analysis (mca)," *Journal on Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 19, pp. 340–358, November 2005.
- [6] L. Jacob, G. Obozinski, and J.-P. Vert, "Group lasso with overlap and graph lasso," in *ICML*, 2009.
- [7] J.-J. Fuchs, "Extension of the global matched filter to structured groups of atoms: Application to harmonic signals," in *Proc. International Conference on Audio Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, May 2011.
- [8] I. Bayram, "Mixed norms with overlapping groups as signal priors," in *Proc. International Conference on Audio Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, May 2011.
- [9] G. Peyré and J. Fadili, "Group sparsity with overlapping partition functions," in *Eusipco'11*, 2011.
- [10] M. Kowalski, E. Vincent, and R. Gribonval, "Beyond the narrowband approximation: Wideband convex methods for under-determined reverberant audio source separation," *IEEE Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing, Special Issue on: "Processing Reverberant"*, vol. 17, no. 7, pp. 1818–1829, 2010.
- [11] J.-J. Moreau, "Proximité et dualité dans un espace hilbertien," *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, vol. 93, pp. 273–299, 1965.
- [12] I. Daubechies, M. Defrise, and C. D. Mol, "An iterative thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems with a sparsity constraint," *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 1413–1457, August 2004.
- [13] M. Figueiredo and R. Nowak, "An em algorithm for wavelet-based image restoration," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 12, no. 8, pp. 906–916, 2003.
- [14] P. Combettes and V. Wajs, "Signal recovery by proximal forward-backward splitting," *Multiscale Modeling and Simulation*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 1168–1200, Nov. 2005.
- [15] A. Beck and M. Teboulle, "A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems," *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 183–202, 2009.
- [16] P. Tseng, "Approximation accuracy, gradient methods, and error bound for structured convex optimization," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 125, pp. 263–295, 2010, 10.1007/s10107-010-0394-2.
- [17] A. Benedek and R. Panzone, "The space l^p with mixed norm," *Duke Mathematical Journal*, vol. 28, pp. 301–324, 1961.
- [18] M. Kowalski and B. Torrèsani, "Sparsity and persistence: mixed norms provide simple signals models with dependent coefficients," *Signal, Image and Video Processing*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 251–264, 2008.
- [19] M. Kowalski, "Sparse regression using mixed norms," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 303–324, 2009.
- [20] M. Yuan and Y. Lin, "Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Serie B*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 49–67, 2006.
- [21] S. F. Cotter, B. D. Rao, K. Engan, and K. Kreutz-Delgado, "Sparse solutions to linear inverse problems with multiple measurement vectors," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 53, no. 7, pp. 2477–2488, July 2005.
- [22] M. Fornasier and H. Rauhut, "Recovery algorithm for vector-valued data with joint sparsity constraints," *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 577–613, 2008.
- [23] Y. Zhou, R. Jin, and S. C. Hoi, "Exclusive lasso for multi-task feature selection," in *Proceeding of the 14th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, May 2010.
- [24] A. Gramfort and M. Kowalski, "Improving m/eeg source localization with an inter-condition sparse prior," in *ISBI*, 2009.
- [25] M. Szafranski, Y. Grandvalet, and P. Morizet-Mahoudeaux, "Hierarchical penalization," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20 (NIPS)*, J. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. Roweis, Eds. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008.
- [26] S. Mosci, S. Villa, A. Verri, and L. Rosasco, "A primal-dual algorithm for group sparse regularization with overlapping groups," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20 (NIPS)*, J. Lafferty, C. K. I. Williams, J. Shawe-Taylor, R. S. Zemel, and A. Culotta, Eds. Kaufmann, 2010, pp. 2604–2612.
- [27] R. Jenatton, J. Mairal, G. Obozinski, and F. Bach, "Proximal methods for hierarchical sparse coding," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 12, pp. 2297–2334, 2011.
- [28] A. Gramfort, D. Strohmeier, J. Haueisen, M. Hmlinen, and M. Kowalski, "Functional brain imaging with m/eeg using structured sparsity in time-frequency dictionaries," in *IPMI*, 2011.
- [29] M. Kowalski and B. Torrèsani, "Structured sparsity: from mixed norms to structured shrinkage," in *Proceeding of Signal Processing with Adaptive Sparse Structured Representations (SPARS)*, April 2009.
- [30] K. Siedenburg and M. Dörfler, "Structured sparsity for audio signals," in *Proceeding of 14th conference on digital audio effects (DAFx)*, September 2011.
- [31] T. Cai and B. W. Silverman, "Incorporating information on neighbouring coefficients into wavelet estimation," *shankhya: the indian journal of statistic. Special issue on wavelets. Series B.*, vol. 63, pp. 127–148, 2001.
- [32] M. Elad, P. Milanfar, and R. Rubinstein, "Analysis versus synthesis in signal priors," *Inverse Problems*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 947–968, June 2007.
- [33] C. Chau, J.-C. Pesquet, and N. Pustelnik, "Nested iterative algorithms for convex constrained image recovery problems," *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 730–762, 2009.
- [34] P. Combettes, "Solving monotone inclusions via compositions of nonexpansive averaged operators," *Optimization*, vol. 53, no. 5-6, pp. 475–504, Dec. 2004.
- [35] S. Molla and B. Torrèsani, "A hybrid scheme for encoding audio signal using hidden markov models of waveforms," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 2005.
- [36] G. Yu, S. Mallat, and E. Bacry, "Audio denoising by time-frequency block thresholding," *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON SIGNAL PROCESSING*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 1830–1839, 2008.

- [37] K. Siedenburg and M. Dörfler, “Audio denoising by generalized time-frequency thresholding,” in *Proceedings of the AES 45th Conference on Applications of Time-Frequency Processing in Audio*, March 2012.