

SWAGGER: Sparsity Within and Across Groups for General Estimation and Recovery

Charles Saunders and Vivek K Goyal

Abstract—Penalty functions or regularization terms which promote structured solutions to optimization problems are of great interest in many fields. Proposed in this work is a nonconvex structured sparsity penalty that promotes one-sparsity within arbitrary overlapping groups in a vector. We show multiple example use cases, demonstrate synergy between it and other regularizers, and propose an algorithm to efficiently solve problems regularized or constrained by the proposed penalty.

Index Terms—sparsity, structured sparsity, group sparsity, regularization, inverse problems

I. INTRODUCTION

SPARSITY-promoting regularization is an integral component of modern-day signal processing, optimization and machine learning. The most prevalent sparsity penalty, LASSO [1], uses the ℓ_1 norm to promote solutions to optimization problems that have few nonzero coefficients. More recently, within some application domains there has been significant interest in structured sparsity. For instance, group sparsity aims to set entire groups of components within a vector entirely to zero and allow the components in other groups to take on any value [2]. This is often achieved using the $\ell_{2,1}$ norm over groups, called group LASSO (G-LASSO) [3]. Conversely, we propose a sparsity penalty that promotes intra-group sparsity, that is, ensuring groups within a vector, or groups within a transformation of the vector, are sparse. This allows us to encode mutual exclusivity between components, which has already been used to great success in areas such as deep learning [4], computer vision [5], [6], and medicine [7], [8]. Previous work in this area includes exclusive [9], [10], or elitist LASSO (E-LASSO) [11] which result in sparse, disjoint groups, and ‘sparsity within and across groups’ (SWAG) [12] plus extensions [13] that allow for overlapping groups of components.

We propose here a more general, nonconvex structured sparsity penalty that allows for sparsity within and across overlapping groups for general estimation and recovery (SWAGGER). The SWAGGER formulation encodes mutual exclusivity between pairs of components, or a transform of the components, using a easily constructed sparsity structure matrix. This results in one-sparse groups with minimal bias in the non-zero entries, where bias is typically an unwanted byproduct of using convex sparsity penalties such as elitist LASSO. We demonstrate the utility of SWAGGER in a number of settings, including a novel total variation-style denoising in one and two dimensions and modeling occlusions plus allowing mutually exclusive discretizations in imaging problems. Additionally, we introduce a novel algorithm to efficiently solve problems regularized or constrained by this proposed penalty.

II. PROPOSED PENALTY

We introduce a general structured sparsity penalty

$$R(\mathbf{x}) = \Phi(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x})^T \mathbf{S} \Phi(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}), \quad (1)$$

for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. For certain choices of the matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, where M is any integer, function $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$, and matrix $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$, this penalty encodes deviation from a selected form of structured sparsity. Possible prototypes for \mathbf{B} include the identity matrix, finite difference matrices, or a transform to a different basis; see Section VII. The function Φ introduces a nonlinearity that helps to bound the penalty from below. We constrain Φ in Prop. 1 below, and examples are discussed in Section VI. The matrix \mathbf{S} is key, as it encodes the structural sparsity properties. It is also constrained in Prop. 1 below, and examples are given in Section V.

We can consider \mathbf{S} defined in a probabilistic setting as $\mathbf{S}_{i,j} = \mathbf{S}_{j,i} = P(\mathbf{z}_j = 0 \mid \mathbf{z}_i \neq 0)$, where $\mathbf{z} = \Phi(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x})$. In other words, given that one element in $\Phi(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x})$ is nonzero, what is the likelihood that a different element is nonzero? Given this interpretation, the diagonal of \mathbf{S} will be zero and hence \mathbf{S} will typically be indefinite, resulting in nonconvexity. A second consequence is to consider $\mathbf{S}_{i,j} = 1$ as establishing that the i th and j th components in the vector are *mutually exclusive*.

In order for the penalty function to be useful in regularizing minimization problems, it must be bounded from below. Proposition (1) outlines sufficient conditions for this.

Proposition 1: In order for (1) to be bounded from below:

- 1) $\mathbf{S}_{i,j} \geq 0 \quad \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$
- 2) $\Phi(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{x}$

Unless specifically noted otherwise, we assume here that $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ is the absolute value $|\mathbf{x}|$, which satisfies this criteria.

III. ALGORITHMS

First, we note that when $\Phi(\cdot) = |\cdot|$ and $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}$, the penalty can be expressed

$$R(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|^T \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}| = \|\mathbf{x}\|_1^2 - \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 - |\mathbf{x}|^T (\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T - \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{I}) |\mathbf{x}|, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is a column vector of 1s of appropriate dimension. An efficient algorithm to evaluate the proximal operator of the ℓ_1^2 norm is available (see Appendix A) [14]. Hence, we can efficiently solve any problem of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}} &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & |\mathbf{x}|^T \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}| = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

using projected gradient descent (Algorithm 1). This simply requires us to evaluate the (sub)gradient of $f(\mathbf{x}) - \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 -$

$|\mathbf{x}|^T(\mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^T - \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{I})|\mathbf{x}|$ and the proximal operator of $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1^2$. In practice, we find the convergence speed of this algorithm is not negatively affected by the use of a subgradient of $-|\mathbf{x}|^T(\mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^T - \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{I})|\mathbf{x}|$ as this term will always aim to push the components of \mathbf{x} away from the discontinuity in the gradient at $\mathbf{x} = 0$. Furthermore, in cases with no overlapping groups, this term equals zero.

As this penalty is nonconvex, it is prudent to start with an initial estimate of \mathbf{x} that minimizes the data fidelity. Given this, Algorithm 1 outlines the projected gradient descent scheme that can be used to solve the problem in (3).

Algorithm 1 Projected gradient descent for SWAGGER constrained problems

Input: Initial estimate $\mathbf{x}^0 = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x})$, $\lambda^0 = 0$

Output: $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$

```

1: while not converged do
2:    $\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = P_{\alpha\lambda^k}(\mathbf{x}^k - \alpha(\nabla_x f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \lambda^k |\mathbf{x}|^T(\mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^T - \mathbf{S})|\mathbf{x}|))$ 
3:    $\lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \alpha(|\mathbf{x}^k|^T \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}^k|)$ 
4: end while
5: return  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}^{k+1}$ 

```

In Algorithm 1, $P_{\alpha\lambda^k}$ is the proximal operator associated with the ℓ_1^2 term, $\|\cdot\|_1^2$, and α is a step size that can be fixed or computed dynamically. There exists an accelerated projected gradient descent algorithm which is guaranteed to converge to a stationary point even for nonconvex problems [15], which could be used here also. The algorithm for this is outlined in Appendix B.

When \mathbf{B} is not the identity, we instead solve a problem of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} \quad & f(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{z} \\ & |\mathbf{z}|^T \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{z}| = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

using the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM), which also uses Algorithm 1 or an accelerated variation thereof at each iteration.

IV. PROPERTIES OF THE SWAGGER PENALTY

When $\Phi(\cdot) = |\cdot|$, the Hessian of the penalty is given by

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 R(\mathbf{x}) = 2 \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X},$$

where $\mathbf{X} = \text{diag}(\text{sign}(\mathbf{x}))$. The sparsity structure matrix, \mathbf{S} , is symmetric and has zeros along its main diagonal. \mathbf{S} must be indefinite as it has at least one positive eigenvalue (see [16]) and the sum of the eigenvalues is zero (since the trace of a symmetric matrix is equal to the sum of its eigenvalues and $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{S}) = 0$). The Hessian has the same structure, and can therefore not be positive semidefinite unless $\mathbf{x} = 0$. More analysis of the eigenvalues of matrices of this kind can be found in [17]. Thus, the penalty is *always* nonconvex for practical purposes.

We can compare SWAGGER with the E-LASSO penalty in the context of a one-sparse group (see Section V-A), that is, where $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}_c = \mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^T - c\mathbf{I}$. In this case, we have introduced a




Fig. 1. (a) \mathbf{S} matrix that promotes a one-sparse solution. (b) \mathbf{S} matrix that promotes one-sparse groups in the solution. (c) \mathbf{S} matrix that promotes a minimum separation distance between nonzero components in the solution.

scalar parameter $c \in [0, 1]$ which gives us E-LASSO for $c = 0$ and SWAGGER for $c = 1$:

$$R(\mathbf{x}) = R_c(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|^T \mathbf{S}_c |\mathbf{x}| = \|\mathbf{x}\|_1^2 - c \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2.$$

This makes the nonconvexity of SWAGGER clear, as when $c > 0$ we are subtracting a convex function, giving a non-convex function overall. In the case of a more general \mathbf{S} , the closest convex penalty would be to replace \mathbf{S} with $\mathbf{S} - c\mathbf{I}$, where c takes on the value of the smallest eigenvalue of \mathbf{S} .

Maintaining convexity of a full cost function: There has recently been interest in so called ‘convex nonconvex’ sparsity regularization where some parameter for a nonconvex penalty is set to a value which maintains convexity of the full cost function with the data fidelity, e.g. [18]. This is achievable with the SWAGGER penalty, also. When using a cost function $\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 + \lambda |\mathbf{x}|^T (\mathbf{S} - c\mathbf{I}) |\mathbf{x}|$, one can use $c = \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{S}) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A})$ to achieve nonconvex regularization whilst maintaining the overall convexity of the problem (see derivation in Appendix D). This is only useful when the smallest eigenvalue of $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}$ is not too small and the regularization strength parameter λ is not too large. The work presented in this paper is focused on only the $c = 1$ case, but further analysis of the intermediate convexity paradigm may be of interest.

V. NOTABLE CASES FOR \mathbf{S}

A. Canonical One-sparsity

Define $\Phi(\cdot) = |\cdot|$ and $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}$. In this case, we obtain:

$$R(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|^T \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}|. \quad (5)$$

This is the ‘sparsity within and across overlapping groups’ formulation which is introduced in [13]. If we define $\mathbf{S} = \mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^T - \mathbf{I}$, then we see that:

$$\begin{aligned} R(\mathbf{x}) &= |\mathbf{x}|^T \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}| = |\mathbf{x}|^T (\mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^T - \mathbf{I}) |\mathbf{x}| \\ &= (|\mathbf{x}|^T \mathbb{1})^2 - |\mathbf{x}|^T |\mathbf{x}| = \|\mathbf{x}\|_1^2 - \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which is equal to zero for any one-sparse \mathbf{x} . Hence, this can be used to promote one-sparse solutions to optimization problems. See Fig. 1(a) for a graphical depiction.

B. Intra-group Sparsity

Define $\Phi(\cdot) = |\cdot|$ and $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}$. Consider a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{gn}$ where g is a number of groups and n is the number of

components in each group. Then, we can promote one-sparsity within each group using $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{gn \times gn}$ defined in blocks:

$$\mathbf{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{S}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{S}} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{S}} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top - \mathbf{I}_n$ (see Fig. 1(b)). This is now a block-separable problem, equivalent to applying the penalty defined in Section V-A to different sections of \mathbf{x} , i.e., $\sum_{k=1}^g |\mathbf{x}_k|^\top \tilde{\mathbf{S}} |\mathbf{x}_k|$, where k indexes blocks of n components. One use case for this formulation is in modeling occlusions in imaging problems, which we address with an example in Section VII-C.

C. Local Neighborhood Sparsity

Sparsity can be promoted in overlapping local neighborhoods by restricting the nonzeros to a band around the diagonal, to form a symmetric Toeplitz matrix (see Fig. 1(c)):

$$\mathbf{S}_{n=1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \ddots \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \ddots \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \ddots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

In the local neighborhood case, a row in \mathbf{S} is given by

$$\mathbf{S}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} P(\mathbf{x}_j = 0 \mid \mathbf{x}_i \neq 0), & |i - j| \leq n; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This imposes local- n -neighborhood one-sparsity, which ensures nonzeros in a solution occur with a minimum separation distance of n indices.

VI. CHOICES FOR $\Phi(\cdot)$

The typical choice for $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the absolute value $|\cdot|$. This is the main focus of this paper and admits fast algorithms to result in one-sparse groups with a prescribed structure, with minimal bias. However, we note that other choices can enjoy interesting properties. For instance, using $\Phi(\mathbf{x}) = \max(0, \mathbf{x})$ or $\Phi(\mathbf{x}) = \max(0, -\mathbf{x})$ acts on positive or negative values only, respectively and meets the condition outlined in Prop. 1. Thus, combining two constraint terms,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}} &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \max(0, \mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{S} \max(0, \mathbf{x}) = 0 \\ & \max(0, -\mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{S} \max(0, -\mathbf{x}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

can result in a solution where only *positive* correlation is penalized, i.e., a group may contain one positive and negative component, rather than being one-sparse. In [4], exclusive sparsity regularization is used to reduce redundancy in the learned kernels in convolution neural networks. The $\Phi(\cdot) = \max(0, \cdot)$ formulation could function as a relaxed approach to this, allowing more degrees of freedom in the filter kernels.

In a case where there can be a large disparity between the size of components within groups in the solution vector, one may wish to impose a nonlinear scaling and use $\Phi(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|^\kappa$ where $\kappa < 1$. This reduces the effect of large but possibly incorrect components on other, potentially correct components. This can be seen in use in the two dimensional local neighborhood total variation example in Section VII-B.

VII. EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS

A. Comparison with Other Methods

Three experiments were performed, where measurements \mathbf{y} were generated using $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$, with white Gaussian noise added to achieved a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of 25 dB. Matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{25 \times 60}$ has random Gaussian entries realized for each trial. The vector \mathbf{x} has entries $\pm U(0.5, 1.5)$ and is made to fit a specific sparsity structure such that $|\mathbf{x}|^\top \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}| \approx 0$ for some \mathbf{S} . Details of how this is achieved are presented in Appendix C. In the first experiment, \mathbf{S} is fixed and enforces intra-group one-sparsity in ten groups (see Section V-B), where $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{6 \times 6}$. In the second experiment, a local neighborhood \mathbf{S} (see Section V-C) is used, with a band of ones four wide around the diagonal. In the third experiment, a new binary \mathbf{S} is generated per trial with entries equal to zero or one with 50% probability. We compare the performance of the SWAGGER penalty with other typical sparsity regularizers, both structured and unstructured. The problems solved are of the form $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 + \lambda R(\mathbf{x})$, where $R(\mathbf{x})$ is:

- 1) LASSO: $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$
- 2) p-shrinkage [19], with $p = 0.5$
- 3) E-LASSO/ $\ell_{1,2}$: $\sum_i \|\mathbf{x}_{g_i}\|_1^2$

The exclusive sparsity penalty uses a sum of the ℓ_1 -squared term over groups. We form one group per row in \mathbf{S} , where each group contains the non-zero components in each row (and the diagonal), i.e., $g_i = \{j \mid \mathbf{S}_{i,j} + \mathbf{I} = 1\}$. This penalty is not designed for overlapping groups, so the results are poor in the local neighborhood and random \mathbf{S} experiments. The pseudo-inverse is used in the initialization for the nonconvex penalties, $\mathbf{x}^0 = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{y}$.

Table I shows the results from the three experiments. The metrics evaluated are the percentage of components correctly identified as nonzero, the Jacard index (the intersection of the true support and estimated support divided by the union), and the mean-squared error (MSE) for the components that are nonzero in the ground truth. We see that SWAGGER outperforms the other algorithms in almost every case. It is unsurprising the unstructured sparsity regularizers (LASSO and p-shrinkage) perform especially poorly in the group \mathbf{S} and local neighborhood settings as the true support is not especially sparse overall – whereas SWAGGER is agnostic to the overall sparsity level. Furthermore, the E-LASSO ($\ell_{1,2}$) regularizer performs poorly when groups are overlapping, whereas SWAGGER handles this gracefully and without any additional effort required. We also see that the MSE within the correct support is particularly low with SWAGGER, as it implicitly de-biases the solutions (this can be readily seen from the $-\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$ term in (6)). Of particular interest are the results where λ is tuned to result in the correct sparsity

Table I
SIMULATED RESULTS OVER 1000 TRIALS FOR THREE DIFFERENT SPARSITY STRUCTURES. METRICS ARE THE PERCENTAGE OF NONZERO COMPONENTS IDENTIFIED, THE JACARD INDEX (0 - 1), AND THE MEAN-SQUARED ERROR (MSE) WHERE THE GROUND TRUTH IS NONZERO.

| Experiment | Support correct (%) | Jacard Index | MSE in support |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Group S | | | |
| λ tuned for sparsity level | | | |
| SWAGGER | 75.69 | 0.646 | 1.987 |
| E-LASSO | 59.84 | 0.398 | 4.634 |
| p-shrinkage | 68.89 | 0.559 | 2.564 |
| LASSO | 56.71 | 0.404 | 3.813 |
| λ tuned for Jacard index | | | |
| SWAGGER | 84.10 | 0.699 | 1.633 |
| E-LASSO | 87.38 | 0.509 | 2.849 |
| p-shrinkage | 77.82 | 0.638 | 2.122 |
| LASSO | 73.91 | 0.492 | 3.221 |
| Local neighborhood S | | | |
| λ tuned for sparsity level | | | |
| SWAGGER | 79.89 | 0.701 | 1.653 |
| E-LASSO | 60.37 | 0.241 | 5.432 |
| p-shrinkage | 68.02 | 0.545 | 2.671 |
| LASSO | 56.46 | 0.402 | 3.813 |
| λ tuned for Jacard index | | | |
| SWAGGER | 85.18 | 0.754 | 1.328 |
| E-LASSO | 82.18 | 0.306 | 5.278 |
| p-shrinkage | 76.92 | 0.625 | 2.187 |
| LASSO | 72.10 | 0.479 | 3.318 |
| Random S | | | |
| λ tuned for sparsity level | | | |
| SWAGGER | 95.32 | 0.927 | 0.171 |
| E-LASSO | 56.20 | 0.147 | 3.151 |
| p-shrinkage | 89.68 | 0.845 | 0.461 |
| LASSO | 70.90 | 0.563 | 1.708 |
| λ tuned for Jacard index | | | |
| SWAGGER | 95.84 | 0.932 | 0.151 |
| E-LASSO | 88.64 | 0.206 | 3.173 |
| p-shrinkage | 93.15 | 0.888 | 0.327 |
| LASSO | 88.26 | 0.661 | 1.173 |

level. The SWAGGER results are particularly favorable in this setting, and this is the most typical use case – as it is roughly equivalent to solving the constrained SWAGGER problem in (3), and hence requires no user tuning of the regularization strength.

B. Local Neighborhood Total Variation

The well established total variation (TV) penalty, $\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_1$ where multiplying by \mathbf{D} takes finite differences, aims to sparsify the changes along the solution vector \mathbf{x} . We propose here a local neighborhood total variation (LN-TV) penalty using SWAGGER. LN-TV is achieved by assigning $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{D}$ and using an \mathbf{S} that promotes sparsity in local neighborhoods as defined in Section V-C. LN-TV simply ensures that changes in the vector are spaced apart by a certain distance – but it allows changes of any amplitude. This is a prior which suggests the vector is piecewise-constant with a certain minimum segment length. If a typical minimum separation distance between significant changes in a vector is known, LN-TV can outperform TV and Moreau-enhanced TV (a convex-




Fig. 2. The proposed local neighborhood total variation (LN-TV) denoising, which only allows changes in the derivative to occur with some minimum separation, compared to standard total variation (TV) and Moreau-enhanced total variation (M-TV) compared to denoising.

nonconvex variation) [20] in a denoising setting, as seen in Fig. 2.

For more general problems, where a piecewise approximation is helpful but the segments do not necessarily have a minimum length well known *a priori*, the LN-TV penalty can be combined with the traditional TV by solving a problem of the form:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 + \underbrace{\lambda_1 \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_1}_{\text{LN-TV}} + \underbrace{\lambda_2 \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_1}_{\text{TV}} \quad (8)$$

where the λ 's are parameters that control the strength of the regularization. If $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$, this acts to denoise the input \mathbf{y} , but different choices of \mathbf{A} can be used to solve deconvolution or deblurring problems, super-resolution, and so on. The addition of the LN-TV term can help avoid the ‘staircasing’ artefacts that often arise when using TV, and allow for weaker TV regularization, which reduces the bias in the result. We present an example of these favorable effects in Fig. 3. Here, the \mathbf{S} matrix used promotes sparsity in $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}$ within five indices either side of a nonzero component. This formulation is distinct from the one discussed in (3), as instead of a constraint we are using the SWAGGER term as a regularization with a strength prescribed by λ_1 . This allows us to have some more nuance by having a linear ramp from 1 to 0.5 in the band around the diagonal, to make close changes less likely than ones a greater distance away.

We can extend this formulation to a 2D setting also. Using the penalty formulation in (9), we promote horizontal and vertical differences that occur only with some minimal separation distance:

$$R(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda \left(\underbrace{\|\mathbf{D}_h \mathbf{x}\|_1}_{\text{Horizontal}} + \underbrace{\|\mathbf{D}_v \mathbf{x}\|_1}_{\text{Vertical}} \right), \quad (9)$$

where \mathbf{D}_v and \mathbf{D}_h are matrices that take finite differences along the vertical columns and horizontal rows, respectively, and \mathbf{S}_v and \mathbf{S}_h impose local neighborhood sparsity in the vertical and horizontal directions. We choose $\Phi(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|^\kappa$ which introduces another parameter κ as discussed in Section VI.




Fig. 3. Combining local neighborhood total variation with standard total variation can help to reduce bias and avoid ‘staircasing’ artefacts.




Fig. 4. (a) A test image blurred with a Gaussian kernel and corrupted with Gaussian noise. (b) Reconstruction using total variation. (c) Reconstruction using local neighborhood TV only. (d) Reconstruction using a combination of both.

We find that, in general, κ should be kept somewhat smaller than one if the initial estimate is especially blurred or noisy, and larger than one if there exist hard edges in the initial estimate that should be maintained.

C. Modeling Mutual Surface Occlusions in Non-Line-of-Sight (NLOS) Imaging

The aim of NLOS imaging is to form reconstructions of scenes hidden from the direct line of sight of the observer. Typical methods to achieve this rely on the use of ultra-fast pulsed lasers and time-resolved single photon counting to infer

the hidden geometry by measuring round-trip distances [21], [22], [23], [24]. Often, to recover a 3D scene, the hidden area will be discretized into patches or surfaces in some manner. Some of these patches may occlude others: if a surface is actually present in the scene, light coming from others behind it may have no paths to the measurement device. As the discretization is prescribed beforehand, the surfaces occluded by each other are known *a priori*, and they should be mutually exclusive. Therefore, we can use SWAGGER to ensure that groups of surfaces that occlude one another will be one-sparse in the recovered output. This provides two benefits. Firstly, the recovered output will be physically plausible as surfaces that cannot contribute any light in the measurements will not be present in the solution. Secondly, ensuring this physical constraint is met *during* the optimization process should lead to better estimations overall.

This idea extends to any situation in which an ideal discretization of some physical area, field, etc., involves some mutual exclusivity between elements of the discretization. Typically, to deal with this one may instead use a discretization that is less desirable but avoids or reduces this exclusivity requirement, use post-processing to make the recovery fit the expected structure, or simply ignore it. Using SWAGGER can instead ensure that reconstructions both fit the expected structure prescribed by the underlying physics of the problem, and also enjoy improved estimates due to the knowledge of the structure being used within the optimization procedure.

One NLOS imaging system, Edge-Resolved Transient Imaging [25], uses a laser to illuminate the floor at numerous positions in an arc around a vertical edge, such as a doorway, to form a 3D reconstruction of the room beyond. For each measurement position, a histogram of the arrival times of photons reaching a single photon avalanche diode (SPAD) detector is accumulated using time-correlated single photon counting. Each subsequent laser position illuminates more of the hidden scene, and by taking differences between measurement histograms one can recover a noisy measurement containing photon arrivals originating mostly from within a single wedge in the hidden area.

From this difference histogram measurement, one can attempt to fit surfaces to the scene within a wedge, to reconstruct the hidden area. It is assumed that surfaces always start at the ground, extend to a certain height, and are a certain distance from the corner. We can form a reconstruction by solving the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \geq 0} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 + \lambda_1 \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & |\mathbf{x}|^T \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}| = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where \mathbf{y} is a difference histogram measurement and \mathbf{A} is a matrix governing the light transport to and from surfaces at different distances from the edge, and with different heights. Fig. 5 shows reconstructions of a wedge using experimental data from [25]. One reconstruction uses only the $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$ term and no constraints, and a second that includes the SWAGGER constraint. In [25], a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method was used to form the reconstructions as it could implicitly include occlusions model and needed to only estimate




Fig. 5. (a) Experimental measurement data containing predominantly photon returns from a single wedge in a hidden area. The data corresponds to the 18th wedge in the ‘Staircase’ scene, Figure 4 in [25]. (b) The ground truth scene and the reconstruction using SWAGGER. The displayed reflectivity estimate is enhanced by scaling based on the amount of the surface that is occluded. (c) The sparsity matrix used to model occlusion and mutual exclusivity of surfaces occupying the same space. (d) Reconstructions without using SWAGGER, with increasing regularization strength. No choice of λ gives accuracy comparable to the reconstruction using SWAGGER in (b).

parameters for a small number of surfaces, rather than use a full scene discretization. Here, we use SWAGGER and a full scene discretization to ensure that surfaces which should occlude those behind them, and vice versa, are accurately modeled. Secondly, it permits us to use a discretization with mutually exclusive elements – surfaces in the same position but with differencing heights – where only one should be present in the solution. As such, the result is a physically plausible reconstruction, which is quite accurate in both support, height and reflectivity.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Using SWAGGER as a constraint allows one to recover solutions to problems which fit a known sparsity structure, including any number of one-sparse overlapping groups within the solution vector or a transform thereof. This is useful in modeling a wide variety of phenomena, such as occlusions in imaging problems. We illustrate the usefulness of the proposed penalty for some example use cases where, by simply constructing a sparsity structure matrix \mathbf{S} , one can ensure estimates fit known hard structured sparsity constraints derived from domain knowledge of the problem. This results in solutions that are both physically plausible and also improved overall. Similarly, SWAGGER can be used as a

regularization term with some strength, to promote solutions that fit a sparsity structure whilst allowing more nuance, which gives rise to local-neighborhood total variation. SWAGGER can be readily combined with other priors, regularization terms and constraints to improve estimations. A proximal gradient descent algorithm (and accelerated algorithm) have been proposed to quickly solve SWAGGER-constrained and SWAGGER-regularized problems.

APPENDIX

A. Proximity Operator Algorithm for ℓ_1^2

Algorithm 2 reproduces the method from [14] to compute the proximal operator for the ℓ_1^2 norm (with $O(N \log N)$ complexity).

Algorithm 2 Proximity operator of ℓ_1^2

Input: $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\lambda \geq 0$

Output: $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{q}} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{q}\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|\mathbf{q}\|_1^2$

- 1: sort entries of $|\mathbf{z}|$ into \mathbf{y} s.t. $(\mathbf{y}_1 \geq \dots \geq \mathbf{y}_N)$
 - 2: set $\rho = \max\{j \in \{1 \dots N\} \mid \mathbf{y}_j - \frac{\lambda}{1+j\lambda} \sum_{r=1}^j \mathbf{y}_r > 0\}$
 - 3: **return** $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \max(|\mathbf{z}| - \tau, 0) \text{sign}(\mathbf{z})$
where $\tau = \frac{\lambda}{1+j\lambda} \sum_{r=1}^{\rho} \mathbf{y}_r$
-

B. Accelerated SWAGGER Algorithm

In [15], a monotonic accelerated proximal gradient descent algorithm is outlined that is guaranteed to converge to a stationary point for nonconvex problems. Algorithm 3 applies this acceleration to Algorithm 1, where α_x , α_y and α_λ are step sizes that can be fixed or computed dynamically with a back-tracking scheme.

Algorithm 3 Accelerated Projected gradient descent for SWAGGER

Input: $\mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_0$, $t_1 = 1$, $t_0 = 0$

Output: $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$

- 1: **while** not converged **do**
 - 2: $\mathbf{y}^k = \mathbf{x}^k + \frac{t^k - 1}{t^k} (\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^k) + \frac{t^k - 1 - 1}{t^k} (\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^{k-1})$
 - 3: $\mathbf{z}^{k+1} = P_{\ell_1^2}(\mathbf{y}^k - \alpha_y (\nabla_x f(\mathbf{y}^k) - |\mathbf{y}|^T (\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T - \mathbf{S})|\mathbf{y}|))$
 - 4: $\mathbf{v}^{k+1} = P_{\ell_1^2}(\mathbf{x}^k - \alpha_x (\nabla_x f(\mathbf{x}^k) - |\mathbf{x}|^T (\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T - \mathbf{S})|\mathbf{x}|))$
 - 5: $\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}^{k+1}, & F(\mathbf{z}^{k+1}) \leq F(\mathbf{v}^{k+1}); \\ \mathbf{v}^{k+1}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
 - 6: $t^{k+1} = \frac{1}{2} (\sqrt{4(t^k)^2 + 1} + 1)$
 - 7: $\lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \alpha_\lambda (|\mathbf{x}^k|^T \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}^k|)$
 - 8: **end while**
 - 9: **return** $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}^{k+1}$
-

C. Generating Test Vectors

For the experiments in Section VII-A, we must generate a test vector \mathbf{x} for each trial which fits the sparsity structure described by a specific \mathbf{S} matrix. To do so, we use Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4 Generate a vector \mathbf{x}_S s.t. $|\mathbf{x}^i|^\top \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}^i| \approx 0$

Input: $\mathbf{x}^0 \sim N(0, 1)$, \mathbf{S} , $\mu \ll 1$

Output: \mathbf{x}_S

```

1: while  $|\mathbf{x}^i|^\top \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}^i| \geq \mu$  do
2:    $\mathbf{x}^{i+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} \|\mathbf{x}^i - \mathbf{x}\| + |\mathbf{x}|^\top \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}|$ 
3: end while
4: return  $\mathbf{x}_{S,j} = \begin{cases} 0, & \mathbf{x}_j^{i+1} = 0; \\ \text{sign}(\mathbf{x}_j^{i+1})u_j, & \mathbf{x}_j^{i+1} \neq 0 \end{cases}$ 

```

where $\mathbf{u}_i \sim U(0.5, 1.5)$, i.e. is drawn from a random uniform distribution.

D. The Choice of c for Convex Nonconvexity

The Hessian of the cost function

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 + \lambda |\mathbf{x}|^\top \mathbf{S} |\mathbf{x}|$$

is given by $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} + 2\lambda \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X}$ (where $\mathbf{X} = \text{diag}(\text{sgn}(\mathbf{x}))$). We introduce a term $c\mathbf{I}$ to the \mathbf{S} matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} + 2\lambda \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{S} - c\mathbf{I})\mathbf{X} &= \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} + 2\lambda \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X} - 2\lambda c \mathbf{X} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{X} \\ &= \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} + 2\lambda \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X} - 2\lambda c \mathbf{I}. \end{aligned}$$

To maintain convexity, we wish to have

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} + 2\lambda \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X}) - 2\lambda c \geq 0,$$

or equivalently

$$2\lambda c \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} + 2\lambda \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X}).$$

Since $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ and $2\lambda \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X}$ are both Hermitian,

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} + 2\lambda \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X}) \geq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) + \lambda_{\min}(2\lambda \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X})$$

by Weyl's inequality [26]. Finally, we note

$$\min_{\mathbf{X}} \lambda_{\min}(2\lambda \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X}) = 2\lambda \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{S}),$$

providing us with a bound for the choice of c :

$$c \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) + \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{S}).$$

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank S. W. Seidel, J. Rapp, J. Murray-Bruce and I. Selesnick for discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Tibshirani, "Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 267–288, 1996.
- [2] S. Bakin, "Adaptive regression and model selection in data mining problems," Ph.D. dissertation, Australian National University, 1999.
- [3] M. Yuan and Y. Lin, "Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 49–67, Feb. 2006.
- [4] J. Yoon and S. J. Hwang, "Combined group and exclusive sparsity for deep neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, D. Precup and Y. W. Teh, Eds., vol. 70. International Convention Centre, Sydney, Australia: PMLR, 06–11 Aug 2017, pp. 3958–3966. [Online]. Available: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v70/yoon17a.html>
- [5] F. Song, X. Tan, and S. Chen, "Exploiting relationship between attributes for improved face verification," *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, vol. 122, pp. 143 – 154, 2014. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1077314214000368>
- [6] A. Wang, J. Cai, J. Lu, and T.-J. Cham, "Modality and component aware feature fusion for rgb-d scene classification," in *The IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2016.
- [7] D. Paz-Linares, M. Vega-Hernández, P. A. Rojas-López, P. A. Valdés-Hernández, E. Martínez-Montes, and P. A. Valdés-Sosa, "Spatio-temporal eeg source imaging with the hierarchical bayesian elastic net and elitist lasso models," *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, vol. 11, p. 635, 2017.
- [8] N. Rao, C. Cox, R. Nowak, and T. T. Rogers, "Sparse overlapping sets lasso for multitask learning and its application to fmri analysis," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, Eds. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013, pp. 2202–2210.
- [9] M. Kowalski, "Sparse regression using mixed norms," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 303–324, 2009.
- [10] M. Kowalski and B. Torrèsani, "Sparsity and persistence: Mixed norms provide simple signal models with dependent coefficients," *Signal Image and Video Processing*, vol. 3, pp. 251–264, Sep. 2009.
- [11] Y. Zhou, R. Jin, and S. C. Hoi, "Exclusive lasso for multi-task feature selection," in *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Y. W. Teh and M. Titterton, Eds., vol. 9. Chia Laguna Resort, Sardinia, Italy: PMLR, 13–15 May 2010, pp. 988–995. [Online]. Available: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v9/zhou10a.html>
- [12] İlker Bayram and S. Bulek, "A penalty function promoting sparsity within and across groups," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 16, pp. 4238–4251, Aug 2017.
- [13] İlker Bayram, "Sparsity within and across overlapping groups," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 288–292, Feb 2018.
- [14] A. F. T. Martins, N. Smith, E. Xing, P. Aguiar, and M. Figueiredo, "Online learning of structured predictors with multiple kernels," in *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, G. Gordon, D. Dunson, and M. Dudík, Eds., vol. 15. Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA: PMLR, 11–13 Apr 2011, pp. 507–515.
- [15] H. Li and Z. Lin, "Accelerated proximal gradient methods for nonconvex programming," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*, C. Cortes, N. D. Lawrence, D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, and R. Garnett, Eds. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015, pp. 379–387.
- [16] S. Walker and P. V. Miegheem, "On lower bounds for the largest eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 429, no. 2, pp. 519 – 526, 2008. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024379508001420>
- [17] Z. B. Charles, M. Farber, C. R. Johnson, and L. Kennedy-Shaffer, "Nonpositive eigenvalues of hollow, symmetric, nonnegative matrices," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 1384–1400, 2013.
- [18] I. Selesnick, "Sparse regularization via convex analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 17, pp. 4481–4494, 2017.
- [19] J. Woodworth and R. Chartrand, "Compressed sensing recovery via nonconvex shrinkage penalties," *Inverse Problems*, vol. 32, no. 7, p. 075004, May 2016.
- [20] I. Selesnick, "Total variation denoising via the moreau envelope," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 216–220, 2017.
- [21] A. Kirmani, T. Hutchison, J. Davis, and R. Raskar, "Looking around the corner using transient imaging," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Computer Vision*, 2009, pp. 159–166.
- [22] A. Velten, T. Willwacher, O. Gupta, A. Veeraraghavan, M. G. Bawendi, and R. Raskar, "Recovering three-dimensional shape around a corner using ultrafast time-of-flight imaging," *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 3, p. 745, 2012.
- [23] F. Heide, L. Xiao, W. Heidrich, and M. B. Hullin, "Diffuse mirrors: 3D reconstruction from diffuse indirect illumination using inexpensive time-of-flight sensors," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2014, pp. 3222–3229.
- [24] M. O'Toole, D. B. Lindell, and G. Wetzstein, "Confocal non-line-of-sight imaging based on the light-cone transform," *Nature*, p. 25489, Mar. 2018.
- [25] J. Rapp, C. Saunders, J. Tachella, J. Murray-Bruce, Y. Altmann, J.-Y. Tournet, S. McLaughlin, R. M. A. Dawson, F. N. C. Wong, and V. K. Goyal, "Seeing around corners with edge-resolved transient imaging," arXiv:2002.07118v1 [eess.IV], Feb. 2020.
- [26] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis: Second Edition*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.