SUPER: Sparse signals with Unknown Phases Efficiently Recovered

Sheng Cai, Mayank Bakshi, Sidharth Jaggi, Minghua Chen
{cs010, mayank, jaggi, minghua}@ie.cuhk.edu.hk
The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR China

Abstract—Compressive phase retrieval algorithms attempt to reconstruct a “sparse high-dimensional vector” from its low-dimensional intensity measurements. Suppose $x$ is any length-$n$ input vector over $\mathbb{C}$ with exactly $k$ non-zero entries, and $A$ is an $m \times n$ $(k < m \ll n)$ phase measurement matrix over $\mathbb{C}$. The decoder is handed $m$ “intensity measurements” $(|A_1x|, \ldots, |A_mx|)$ (corresponding to component-wise absolute values of the linear measurement $Ax$) — here $A_i$’s correspond to the rows of the measurement matrix $A$. In this work, we present a class of measurement matrices $A_i$ and a corresponding decoding algorithm that we call SUPER, which can reconstruct $x$ up to a global phase from intensity measurements. The SUPER algorithm is the first to simultaneously have the following properties: (a) it requires only $O(k)$ (order-optimal) measurements, (b) the computational complexity of decoding is $O(k\log k)$ (near order-optimal) arithmetic operations, (c) it succeeds with high probability over the design of $A$. Our results hold for all $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$.

I. INTRODUCTION

Phase Retrieval: In many applications, it’s difficult to measure the phase information of the underlying signal. Instead, we recover the signal by its intensity measurements. For instance, in X-ray crystallography, optics [1] and image reconstruction for astronomy [2], signal/image is reconstructed from the intensity measurements of its Fourier transform.

Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times n}$ be used to denote the phase measurement matrix, and $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be used to denote the unknown underlying signal. Instead of linear measurements of the form $y = Ax$ as in the compressive sensing literature (see, for instance, [3]) in the phase retrieval problem we have $m$ non-linear intensity measurements of the form $b_i = |A_ix|$. Here the index $i$ is an integer in $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ (or $[m]$ for short), $A_i$ is the $i$-th row of phase measurement matrix $A$ and $|\cdot|$ is the absolute value.

Problems of this kind have been studied over the last decades. A good survey of some of the algorithms via non-convex process can be found in [4]. Recently, two convex optimization methods, PhaseLift [5] and PhaseCut [6], have been proposed by Candès et al. and Waldspurger et al. PhaseLift is able to reconstruct $x$ with $O(n \log n)$ intensity measurements by solving semidefinite programming with high probability. The $A_i$’s are independently sampled on the unit sphere of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Later, it’s shown that the number of intensity measurements can be improved to $O(n)$ where $A_i$’s are independently and identically distributed with the uniform distribution on the sphere of radius $\sqrt{n}$, or the complex normal distribution [7]. PhaseCut is inspired by solving max-cut problem via SDP. The decoding complexity for both PhaseLift and PhaseCut is $O(n^3)$, which is still computationally costly when $n$ is large.

Besides SDP-based approach, more computationally efficient algorithms are proposed such as [8], [9]. For instance, in [9], the number of intensity measurements required is $O(n \log^2 n)$. However, the decoding complexity is $O(n^2 \log n)$ which is less than that of SDP-based approach.

Compressive Phase Retrieval: Suppose $x$ is “sparse”, i.e., the number of non-zero components of $x$ is at most $k$, which is much less than the length $n$ of $x$. This assumption is not uncommon in many applications like X-ray crystallography. Then, given $A$ and $b$, the goal of compressive phrase retrieval is to reconstruct $x$ as $x$, where $x$ equals $x$ up to a global phase. That is, $x = x e^{i\Theta}$ for some arbitrary fixed $\Theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. Here $\Theta$ denotes the positive square root of $-1$. The reason we allow this degeneracy in $x$, up to a global phase factor, is that all such $x$’s result in the same measurement vector under intensity measurements. If $\hat{x}$ does indeed equal $x$ up to a global phase, then we denote this “equality” as $\hat{x} = x$.

It is shown that $4k - 1$ intensity measurements suffice to uniquely reconstruct $x$ in [10] (for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$) and [11] (for $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$). However, no efficient algorithms is given. The $\ell_1$-regularized PhaseLift method is introduced in the compressive phase retrieval problem in [12]. In [13], it is shown that if the number of Gaussian intensity measurements is $O(\sqrt{k} \log n)$, $x$ can be correctly reconstructed via $\ell_1$-regularized PhaseLift.

The works in [14] and the works by Jaganathan et al. [15], [16], [17] study the case when the phase measurement matrix is a Fourier transform matrix. In [18], it is explained that SDP-based methods can reconstruct $x$ with sparsity up to $o(\sqrt{n})$. In [16], the algorithm based on reweighted $\ell_1$-minimization with $O(k^2 \log n)$ phaseless Fourier measurements is proposed to go beyond this bottleneck. When the phase measurement matrix is allowed to be designed, a combinatorial algorithm is proposed in [16] such that $x$ is correctly reconstructed with $O(k \log n)$ intensity measurements in $O(kn \log n)$ time.

To our best knowledge, in the literature, there is no construction of a measurement matrix $A$ and a corresponding reconstruction algorithm that correctly reconstructs $x$ with an order-optimal number of measurements and with near-optimal decoding complexity simultaneously.

A. Our Contribution

In this work\(^1\), we describe a randomized design of the phase measurement matrix $A$ and a corresponding decoding algorithm achieving the following guarantees:

**Theorem 1. (Main theorem)** There exists a measurement ensemble $\{A\}$ and a corresponding decoding algorithm for

\(^1\)While in this work we focus on the “sparse regime”, $k = o(n)$, our techniques work for all $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. If $k = \omega(1)$, our algorithm has the same performance stated in Theorem 1. If $k$ is a constant and error probability of our algorithm is $P_s$, then the number of measurements required is $f(P_s)k$ for some function $f$. We refer the reader to [19] for details.
compressive phase retrieval with the following performance:

1) For every \(x \in \mathbb{C}^n\), with probability \(1 - o(1)\) over the randomized design of \(A\), the algorithm exactly reconstructs \(x\) up to a global phase;
2) The number of measurements \(m = \mathcal{O}(k)\);
3) The decoding complexity is \(\mathcal{O}(k \log k)\).

II. OVERVIEW/HIGH-LEVEL INTUITION

A. Pieces of the puzzle

We first define some useful terminology.

**Singletons:** If a measurement \(b_i\) involves only a single non-zero component of \(x\), then we say that such a measurement is a singleton.\(^2\) Singletons are important since they can be used to pin down the magnitude (though not the phase) of components of \(x\). There are several challenges, however. One lies in even identifying whether a measurement is a singleton or not. The second lies in identifying which of the \(x\) components being measured in \(b_i\) corresponds to the singleton. The third is to be able to do all this blindly fast, in fact in constant time (independent of \(n\) and \(k!\)). Each of these challenges can be handled by using ideas from our prior work on compressive sensing [21]. For details, see Sections IV and V below.

**Doubletons:** Similarly, if a measurement \(b_i\) involves exactly two non-zero components of \(x\), then we say that such a measurement is a doubleton. Doubletons, especially doubletons measuring two non-zero components of \(x\) which have already been measured by singletons (we call such doubletons resolvable doubletons), are useful since they can be used to deduce the relative phases of the two non-zero components of \(x\). For example, if one is given the magnitudes \(|x_i|, |x_j|, \text{ and } |x_i + x_j|\), then one can determine the angle \(\theta\) between the phases of the complex numbers \(x_i\) and \(x_j\) (up to degeneracy of sign of \(\theta\)). In fact, even this degeneracy can be resolved by an additional judiciously chosen measurement. Similar challenges to those mentioned above vis-a-vis singletons (identifying whether or not a measurement is a doubleton/resolvable doubleton, identifying which components of \(x\) it corresponds to, and doing so in constant time) also hold for doubletons. See Sections IV and V for details.

**Mutual resolvability:** We say our decoding algorithm has thus far mutually resolved two non-zero components \(x_i\) and \(x_j\) of \(x\) if the magnitudes of both \(x_i\) and \(x_j\) have been deduced, and also the relative phase between \(x_i\) and \(x_j\) has been deduced (for instance via resolvable doubleton measurements roughly described above). Note that mutual resolvability is an equivalence relation – it is reflexive, symmetric and transitive. Note therefore that if \(x_i\) and \(x_j\) have been mutually resolved, it is not necessary that they even are involved in the same measurement; it is sufficient that \(x_i\) and \(x_j\) are part of a chain of non-zero components of \(x\) that are pairwise mutually resolved. Finally, we note that as our decoding algorithm progresses, if it is successful, in fact all the non-zero components of \(x\) are eventually mutually resolved. Hence this property of mutual resolvability is perhaps most interesting in the intermediate stages of our decoding algorithm.

**Giant component:** We say that a subset of the non-zero components of \(x\) form a giant component if it is the largest subset satisfying the two properties: 1) The subset is of size linear in \(k\). 2) Any pair of components in the subset have been mutually resolved (thus far) by the decoding algorithm.

Essentially, our algorithm proceeds by iteratively enlarging the giant component until it engorges all the non-zero components of \(x\).

**Resolvable multiton:** We say that a measurement \(b_i\) is a resolvable multiton if it is the case that exactly one (say \(x_i\)) of the non-zero components of \(x\) involved in the measurement \(b_i\) is outside the giant component, and at least one of non-zero components of \(x\) is inside the giant component. Such measurements are useful since, in the latter parts of our algorithm, there are not enough resolvable doubletons. By carefully choosing the parameters of the algorithm, one can guarantee that a constant fraction of measurements are resolvable multitons.

Judiciously designed measurements (see Section IV) enable one to mutually resolve the component \(x_i\) that is outside the giant component, with the components of \(x\) inside the giant component, by solving a quadratic equation. Care is indeed required in choosing the measurements since the amplitude measurement process is inherently non-linear, and there may not be a “clean” manner to mutually resolve \(x_i\) via arbitrary measurements – indeed the design of such a measurement process is also one of the intellectual contributions we wish to highlight in this work. We call this process “cancelling out” the already resolved components of \(x\).

B. Putting the pieces together

**Seeding phase:** In the first phase, called the seeding phase, there are \(\mathcal{O}(n/k)\) “sparse” measurements (each measurement involves, in expectation, \(\mathcal{O}(n/k)\) components of \(x\)). We demonstrate that by first examining the measurements corresponding to this phase, the decoding algorithm is already able to decode a constant fraction (say \(1/2\))\(^4\) of the components of \(x\) up to a global phase. The algorithm is able to do this since we are able to show that a “significant” fraction of measurements are singletons and resolvable doubletons. Standard results in percolation theory [22] then lead one to conclude that the number of non-zero nodes that are mutually resolvable is linear in \(k\), i.e., that there is a giant component. Hence this phase is called the “seeding” phase, since the giant component forms the nucleus on which the remainder of the algorithm builds upon.

The key technique used in our work is to segue to a different sampling process (outlined below) than “coupon collection” process [23] (wherein one has to collect at least one copy of each of \(k\) coupons by sampling with replacement) in [16], and using resolvable multitons rather than doubletons. The challenge is to make the numbers work, not only do we require only \(\mathcal{O}(k)\) measurements, but we also require our decoding complexity to be \(\mathcal{O}(k \log(k))\).\(^4\)

**Geometric-decay phase:** This phase itself comprises of \(\mathcal{O}(\log\log(k))\) separate stages. Each stage has half the number of measurements compared to the previous stage, but measurements in each stage are twice as “dense” as the measurements in the previous stage. So, for instance, if in the first stage of the geometric-decay phase, there are say \(ck\) measurements, with each measurement involving \(n/k\) components of \(x\), then in the second stage of the geometric-decay phase, there are \(ck/2\) measurements, but each measurement involves \(2n/k\) components of \(x\).

\(^{4}\)Here, \(1/2\) is arbitrarily chosen to simplify the presentation of intuition. The actual fraction of resolved non-zero components in the seeding phase is different from \(1/2\). See Section VII for details. Here, the parameter \(1/2\) for the geometric-decay phase in this section is due to the same reason.

\(^{2}\)We borrow this terminology (of singletons, doubletons, multitons, etc) from the compressive sensing work of Pawar et al [20].
There are two reasons for this choice of parameters. Firstly, with such a geometric decay in the number of measurements in each stage, the overall number of measurements in the geometric-decay phase is still $O(k)$. Secondly, we show that with the geometric increase in the density of measurements, a significant fraction of measurements in each stage lead to resolvable multtons, and use this to show that the number of unresolved components decays geometrically.

The reason we run the geometric-decay phase for only $O(\log(\log(k)))$ stages is also two-fold. Firstly, after that many stages, with the number of unresolved components halving at every stage, the number of unresolved components of $x$ is, in expectation, $O(k/\log(k))$. Hence the concentration inequalities (which depend on the number of unresolved components) we use to control the probabilities of error get progressively weaker (though they still result in good concentration at the last stage of the geometric-decay phase). Secondly, and more importantly, the number of non-zero components in each resolvable multiton increases geometrically as the number of stages increases. This has implications for the time-complexity of the decoding algorithm, since the time-complexity depends directly on the number of non-zero components in each measurement that need to be “cancelled out”. By terminating the geometric-decay phase after $O(\log(\log(k)))$ stages ensures that, in expectation, the number of such “cancellations” is at most $O(\log(k))$, and hence the overall time-complexity of the algorithm scales as $O(k \cdot \log(k))$.

Cleaning-up phase: Finally, we segue to what we call the “cleaning-up” phase. As noted above, after the geometric-decay phase the number of unresolved components of $x$ is, in expectation, $k' \leq O(k/\log(k))$. To fit our budget of $O(k)$ measurements, and $O(k \cdot \log(k))$ decoding time, we now segue to using “coupon collection” as a primitive. This may be viewed as restarting the seeding (first) phase, but with different parameters. In particular, the problem dimension has now been significantly reduced (since there are now only $k'$ unresolved components of $x$). Therefore we can now afford to pay the coupon collection penalty that we avoided in the seeding phase by moving to the geometric-decay phase.

Specifically, in this cleaning-up phase we take $O(k' \cdot \log(k'))$ measurements so as to resolve the remaining $k'$ unresolved components of $x$. Note that $O(k' \cdot \log(k'))$ scales as $O(k)$. Each measurement we take has the same density as the measurements in the last stage of the geometric decay phase, and hence the time-complexity of resolving measurements also scales in the same manner. However, since there are many more measurements than in the last stage of the geometric-decay phase, by standard arguments corresponding to the coupon collection problem we are able to argue that for each unresolved component of $x$ there is at least one resolvable multiton that helps resolve it.

III. GRAPH PROPERTIES

We construct a series of bipartite graphs with some desirable properties outlined in this section. We then use the structure of the bipartite graphs to generate our measurement matrix $A$ in Section IV and design the corresponding reconstruction algorithm in Section V. Each left node of a bipartite graph represents a component of $x$ and each right node represents a set of intensity measurements. For each edge in a bipartite graph, it is assigned different weights which are discussed in Section IV.

A. Seeding Phase

The properties of the bipartite graph, $G_I$, in the first phase are as follows: 1) There are $ck$ right nodes, where $c$ is a constant. 2) Each edge in $G_I$ appears with probability $1/k$. 3) Many singleton nodes: In expectation, a constant fraction of right nodes are singleton nodes. 4) Many resolvable doubleton nodes: In expectation, a constant fraction of right nodes are resolvable doubleton nodes. For properties 4) and 5), see Section VI for details.

Another graph $H$ is implied by $G_I$. Each vertex in $H$ represents a non-zero component of $x$ and there is an edge in $H$ if and only if two left nodes involved are mutually resolved. $H$ has the following property: $H$ has a giant connected component: The connected component, $H'$ contains a constant fraction of nodes in $H$. This property is formally stated in Section VI.

B. Geometric-decay phase

There are $L = O(\log \log k)$ separate bipartite graphs/stages in this phase. The properties of the $l$-th bipartite graph, $G_{II,l}$ ($l = 1, 2, \ldots, L$), are as follows: 1) There are $cf_{II,l-1}k$ right nodes, where $f_{II,l-1}$ is the expected fraction of unresolved non-zero components of $x$ after the $(l-1)$-th stage of decoding process in the second phase. $f_{II,0} = f_{II}$ is the expected fraction of unresolved non-zero components after seeding phase. The value of $f_{II,l}$ is discussed in Section VI. 2) Each edges in $G_{II,l}$ appears with probability $1/(f_{II,l-1}k)$. 3) Many resolvable multiton nodes: In expectation, a constant fraction of right nodes are resolvable multiton nodes. See Section VI for details.

For a newly resolved non-zero component, the corresponding node in $H$ is appended to the giant connected component, $H'$. In expectation, there are $(f_{II,l-1}f_{II,l})k$ non-zero components decoded in the $l$-th stage of decoding. After $O(\log \log k)$ stages, there are $O(k/\log k)$ unresolved non-zero components of $x$ left.

C. Cleaning-up phase

The properties of the bipartite graph, $G_{III}$, in the last phase are as follows: 1) There are $c(k/\log k)\log(k/\log k) = O(k)$ right nodes. 2) Each edges in $G_{III}$ appears with probability $\log(k/\log k)$. 3) Many resolvable multiton nodes.

In this stage, all the resolved non-zero components of size $O(k/\log k)$ are finally recovered using resolvable multiton nodes by “Cancelling out” process and a Coupon Collection argument.

IV. MEASUREMENT DESIGN

For a bipartite graph $G$ ($G$ is one of the $G_I$, $G_{II,l}$’s and $G_{III}$), there are $n$ nodes on the left and $m_{G}$ nodes on the right. $A(G)'$ is the dimension-$m_{G} \times n$ adjacent matrix of $G$ where the entry at $i$-th row and $j$-th column equals to 1 if and only if $i$-th right node connects to the $j$-th left node for $j \in [n]$, and $i \in [m_{G}]$. The dimension-$m_{G} \times n$ phase measurement matrix $A(G)$ is designed based on $A(G)'$ where $m_{G} = 5m_{G}$. By appending all the matrix $A(G)$ sequentially, we get the actual $m \times n$ measurement matrix $A$ where $m = \Sigma_{i}m_{G}$. For $i$-th row $A(G)_{i}$ of $A(G)'$, a set of rows (of size $5i$) of $A(G)$ are designed for $i \in [m_{G}]$. If the $j$-th entry of $A(G)_{i}$ is zero, then corresponding set of entries of $A(G)$ are all zero for all $j \in [n]$. In the following measurement matrix design, we design the entries corresponding to non-zero entries in $A(G)'$. See Section V for how these measurements are used for decoding.

1) Trigonometric entries: The $j$-th entries of the $(5i - 4)$-th and $(5i - 3)$-th rows of $A(G)$ are denoted by $a_{i,j}^{(G,1)}$ and $a_{i,j}^{(G,2)}$. 
The values are set to be $\cos(j\pi/(2n))$ and $\sin(j\pi/(2n))$, respectively. Here $\theta$ denotes the positive square root of $-1$ and $\pi/(2n)$ can be treated as the unit phase of the entry design.

3) Structured unit complex entries: The $j$-th entry of the $(5i-2)$-th row of $A(\mathcal{G})$ is denoted by $a_{i,j}^{(G)}$. The value is set to be $\exp(j\pi/(2n))$.

4) Random unit complex entries: The $j$-th entry of the $(5i-1)$-th row of $A$ is denoted by $a_{i,j}^{(R)}$. The value is set to be 1.

5) Unit entries: The $i$-th row of $A$ is denoted by $a_{i,\cdot}^{(U)}$. The value is set to be $\exp(i\phi_{i,\cdot})$.

V. RECONSTRUCTION ALGORITHM

Let $b_{i,j}^{(G,q)}$ denote the $[5(i-1)+q]$-th measurement generated by $A(\mathcal{G})$. Here, $\mathcal{G}$ is one of the $G_t, G_{11,1}$'s and $G_{11,1}, i \in [n_G]$, and $q \in [5]$.

A. Seeding phase

Initialization: We initialize by setting the signal estimate vector $\hat{x}$ to all-zero vector $0^n$. Each right node $i \in [n'_G]$ attaches an empty neighbor list $N(i)$, let $\mathcal{D}$ denote a list of the resolvable doubletons. Initially, $\mathcal{D}$ is empty. Set $i = 1$.

Singleton Identification, Verification and Magnitude Recovery: Compute $s_i = \arctan\left(\frac{b_{i,2}^{(G,2)}}{b_{i,1}^{(G,1)}}\right) / \pi(2n)$. Check whether $s_i$ is an integer. If $s_i$ is not an integer, increment $i$ by 1 and start a new iteration. If $s_i$ is an integer, we do the following steps:

1) Magnitude Estimation: Assume that $s_i$-th entry of $x$ is non-zero and $|\hat{x}_{s_i}| = b_{i,s_i}^{(G,2)}/b_{i,s_i}^{(G,1)}$.

2) Verification: If $|\hat{x}_{s_i}| \neq b_{i,s_i}^{(G,2)}$, the verification fails and increment $i$ by 1 and start a new iteration. If verification passes, we do the following steps:

a) Updating Neighbor List: $s_i$ is appended to the neighbor lists of all its neighbors. For $i \in [n'_G]$, it is no longer considered in the later process if $|N(i)| \geq 3$ since in the next step we only care about doubleton whose neighbor list size equals 2.

b) Increment $i$ by 1 and start a new iteration.

Doubleton Identification: For each $i$ whose neighbor list is of size 2, it is appended to the resolvable doubleton list $\mathcal{D}$ where $\mathcal{N}(i)[1]$ and $\mathcal{N}(i)[2]$ (or $i_1$ and $i_2$ for short) are the two indices of non-zero components whose magnitudes have been recovered.

Relative Phase Recovery: To compute connected component of $\mathcal{H}$, Depth first search (DFS) [24] for adjacent list representation of $\mathcal{H}$ is applied in this step. For each $i \in \mathcal{D}$, the elements in $\mathcal{N}(i)$ tell which two vertices in $\mathcal{H}$ are connected. DFS outputs connected components of graph $\mathcal{H}$. For the first node in a connected component, its phase is set to be zero. We run the DFS, for each edge in $\mathcal{H}$, with additional steps stated below:

1) Relative Phase Estimation: We know that $i$'s two neighbors are $i_1$ and $i_2$. The fourth measurement is used to derive the phase between $i_1$-th and $i_2$-th components of $x$. $\theta = \theta_i - \theta_{i_2}$, by Law of Cosines.

2) Resolving Degeneracy and Verification: The verification measurement helps to resolve the degeneracy of sign of $\theta$ (i.e., whether $\theta$ or $-\theta$ is the actual phase difference we are interested in) by checking whether $||\hat{x}| | \exp((i\phi_{i_1,i}) + |\hat{x}| | \exp(i(\phi_{i_1,i_2} + \theta)) = |b_{i_{1,2}}^{(G,5)}|$, or $||\hat{x}| | \exp(i(\phi_{i_1,i_2}) + |\hat{x}| | \exp(i(\phi_{i_2,i} - \theta)) = |b_{i_{1,2}}^{(G,5)}|$. If neither of the above equations holds, then $i$ is not a resolvable doubleton. Namely, there is no edge between $\mathcal{N}(i)[1]$-th and $\mathcal{N}(i)[2]$-th components of $x$.

When the DFS terminates, we can find the largest connected component of $\mathcal{H}$.

B. Geometric-decay and Cleaning-up phases

Claim 2. (“Cancelling out” Process) For a bipartite graph $G$ in geometric-decay phase or cleaning-up phase, if a right node $i$ is a resolvable multiton node, it involves exactly one (unknown) undecoded non-zero component, $x_j$, and at least one (known) resolved non-zero components. Then, we are able to find the location of $x_j$, $j$, and resolve $x_j$ (both magnitude and relative phase).

We omit the proof here and refer the reader to [19, Claim 2] for a detailed proof. In each stage at geometric-decay phase and cleaning-up phase, we go through all the right nodes, find resolvable multtons and use them to recover unresolved non-zero components by the “cancelling out” process. For a newly resolved component of $x$, the corresponding node in $\mathcal{H}$ is appended to $\mathcal{H}'$. In the end, the size of the node set of $\mathcal{H}'$ should be $k$.

VI. PARAMETERS DESIGN

All the parameters designed in this section are calculated based on expectation. The actual performance of our algorithm will be discussed in Section VII. We refer the reader to [19, Section VI] for detailed calculation.

A. Seeding phase

1) Magnitude Recovery by singletons

The probability of a right node being a singleton node, $P_S$, equals $\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)(1/k)(1 - 1/k)^{k-1}$ which converges to $e^{-1}$ as $k$ goes to infinity. The expected number of singletons is $ck \times P_S$. Thus, the expected number of different non-zero components whose magnitudes are recovered is $k(1 - \exp(-cP_S))$ by [19, Lemma 3].

2) Relative Phase Recovery by resolvable doubletons

The probability of a right node being a doubleton node, $P_D$, equals $\left(\frac{5}{2}\right)(1/k)^2(1 - 1/k)^{k-2}$. The expected number of doubletons is $ck \times P_D$. The expected number of resolvable doubletons is $\left[\left(\frac{k}{2}(1 - \exp(-cP_S))\right)/\left(\frac{5}{2}\right)\right] \cdot ckP_D$ which converges to $(1 - \exp(-cP_S))^2ck^{-1}/2$ as $k$ goes to infinity. So, the expected number of different pairs of components whose relative phase is recovered by resolvable doubletons is $(1 + O(1/k))(1 - \exp(-cP_S))^2ckP_D$ by [19, Lemma 3].

3) The giant connected components

We need to find the size of giant connected component of a random graph with $k(1 - \exp(-cP_S))$ nodes and $(1 + O(1/k))(1 - \exp(-cP_S))^2ckP_D$ distinct edges. Let's say the size is $(1 - f_l)k$ where $f_l$ is the function of $c$. By

$\cos \Delta = \left(\frac{|A|^2 + |B|^2 - |A + B|^2}{2|A||B|}\right)$.
show that \( O(\log \log k \cdot k^{-1/3}) \). In the end of geometric-decay phase, we show that \((1 - \epsilon_i) f_{I,I,L} \leq g_{I,I,L} \leq (1 + \epsilon_i) f_{I,I,L}\) holds with probability \(1 - O(\log \log k \cdot k^{-1/3})\), and \(\epsilon_i\) scales as \(O(k^{-1/3})\). Finally, when the cleaning-up phase ends, all the remaining non-zero components are resolved with probability \(1 - O(\log k/k)\) given the concentration results in the previous phases are correct by [19, Theorem 5]. Therefore, by Union bound, SUPER algorithm resolves all the non-zero components with probability \(1 - o(1)\).

REFERENCES