

Sparsity in Astrophysics: from Wavelets to Compressed Sensing

J.-L. Starck





CEA - Irfu

What is a good representation for data?

A signal *s* (*n* samples) can be represented as sum of weighted elements of a given dictionary









Sparsity Model 1: we consider a dictionary which has a fast transform/reconstruction operator:

$$\Phi = \{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_K\}$$
$$s = \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k \phi_k = \Phi \alpha$$

Local DCTStationary textures
Locally oscillatoryWavelet transformPiecewise smooth
Isotropic structuresCurvelet transformPiecewise smooth,
edge





How to measure sparsity ?

with
$$0^0 = 0$$
, $\| \alpha \|_0 = \sum_k \alpha_k^0 = \# \{ \alpha_k \neq 0 \}$

Formally, the sparsest coefficients are obtained by solving the optimization problem:

(P0) Minimize
$$\|\alpha\|_0$$
 subject to $S = \phi \alpha$

It has been proposed (*to relax and*) to replace the l_0 norm by the l_1 norm (Chen, 1995):

(P1) Minimize
$$\|\alpha\|_1$$
 subject to $S = \phi \alpha$

It can be seen as a kind of convexification of (P0).

It has been shown (Donoho and Huo, 1999) that for certain dictionary, if there exists a highly sparse solution to (P0), then it is identical to the solution of (P1).



Morphological Diversity

J.-L. Starck, M. Elad, and D.L. Donoho, Redundant Multiscale Transforms and their Application for Morphological Component Analysis, Advances in Imaging and Electron Physics, 132, 2004.

•J.-L. Starck, M. Elad, and D.L. Donoho, Image Decomposition Via the Combination of Sparse Representation and a Variational Approach, IEEE Trans. on Image Proces., 14, 10, pp 1570--1582, 2005.

•J.Bobin et al, Morphological Component Analysis: an adaptive thresholding strategy, IEEE Trans. on Image Processing, Vol 16, No 11, pp 2675--2681, 2007.







$$\phi = [\phi_1, \dots, \phi_L], \quad \alpha = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_L\}, \quad s = \phi \alpha = \sum_{k=1}^L \phi_k \alpha_k$$

Sparsity Model 2: we consider a signal as a sum of K components S_k , $s = \sum_{k=1}^{K} s_k$ each of them being sparse in a given dictionary :

 $s_k = \Phi_k \alpha_k$



$$s = \sum_{k=1}^{K} s_k = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \Phi_k \alpha_k = \Phi \alpha$$





Sparsity Model 2: Morphological Diversity:

$$\phi = [\phi_1, \dots, \phi_L], \quad \alpha = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_L\}, \quad s = \phi \alpha = \sum_{k=1}^L \phi_k \alpha_k$$

Sparsity Model 3: we adapt/learn the dictionary directly from the data

Model 3 can be also combined with model 2:

G. Peyre, M.J. Fadili and J.L. Starck, , "Learning the Morphological Diversity", SIAM Journal of Imaging Science, 3 (3), pp.646-669, 2010.



Advantages of model 1 (fixed dictionary) : extremely fast.

Advantages of model 2 (union of fixed dictionaries):

- more flexible to model 1.

- The coupling of local DCT+curvelet is well adapted to a relatively large class of images.

Advantages of model 3 (dictionary learning):

atoms can be obtained which are well adapted to the data, and which could never be obtained with a fixed dictionary.

Drawback of model 3 versus model 1,2:

We pay the price of dictionary learning by being less sensitive to detect very faint features.

Complexity: Computation time, parameters, etc

INVERSE PROBLEMS

Y = HX + N $X = \Phi lpha$, and lpha is sparse

```
\min_{\alpha} \|\alpha\|_p^p \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|Y - H\Phi\alpha\|^2 \le \epsilon
```

•Denoising

Deconvolution

•Component Separation

•Inpainting

•Blind Source Separation

Minimization algorithms

•Compressed Sensing



$$\begin{split} p = 0 \\ \tilde{\alpha} &\in \arg\min_{\alpha} \frac{1}{2} \parallel Y - \Phi \alpha \parallel^2 + \frac{t^2}{2} \parallel \alpha \parallel_0 \\ \text{=> Solution via Iterative Hard Thresholding} \\ \tilde{\alpha}^{(t+1)} &= \operatorname{HardThresh}_{\mu t} (\tilde{\alpha}^{(t)} + \mu \Phi^T (Y - \Phi \tilde{\alpha}^{(t)})), \mu = 1/ \|\Phi\|^2 . \\ \tilde{\alpha}_{j,k} &= \operatorname{HardThresh}_t (\alpha_{j,k}) = \begin{cases} \alpha_{j,k} & \text{if } |\alpha_{j,k}| \ge t, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{split}$$

1st iteration solution:

$$\tilde{X} = \Phi$$
 HardThresh_t $(\Phi^T Y) = \Delta_{\Phi,t}(Y)$

Exact for Φ orthonormal.

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \underset{\alpha}{\arg\min\frac{1}{2}} \parallel Y - \Phi \alpha \parallel^2 + t \parallel \alpha \parallel_1$$

==> Solution via iterative **Soft** Thresholding

$$\tilde{\alpha}^{(t+1)} = \text{SoftThresh}_{\mu t} (\tilde{\alpha}^{(t)} + \mu \Phi^T (Y - \Phi \tilde{\alpha}^{(t)})), \mu \in (0, 2/ \|\Phi\|^2).$$
$$\tilde{\alpha}_{j,k} = \text{SoftThresh}_t (\alpha_{j,k}) = \text{sign}(\alpha_{j,k}) (\|\alpha_{j,k}\| - t)_+$$

1st iteration solution:

$$\tilde{X} = \Phi \operatorname{SoftThresh}_t(\Phi^T Y) = \Delta_{\Phi,t}(Y)$$

Exact for Φ orthonormal.

Inverse Problems and Iterative Thresholding Minimizing Algorithm

Iterative thresholding with a varying threshold was proposed in (Starck et al, 2004; Elad et al, 2005) for sparse signal decomposition in order to accelerate the convergence. The idea consists in using a different threshold $\lambda^{(n)}$ at each iteration.

For IST:
$$\alpha^{(n+1)} = \operatorname{HT}_{\lambda^{(n)}} \left(\alpha^{(n)} + \Phi^T A^T \left(Y - A \Phi \alpha^{(n)} \right) \right)$$

For IHT: $\alpha^{(n+1)} = \operatorname{ST}_{\lambda^{(n)}} \left(\alpha^{(n)} + \Phi^T A^T \left(Y - A \Phi \alpha^{(n)} \right) \right)$

More Refs: Vonesch et al, 2007; Elad et al 2008; Wright et al., 2008; Nesterov, 2008 and Beck-Teboulle, 2009; Blumensath, 2008; Maleki et Donoho, 2009; Dupe et al, 2010; Dupe et al 2011; Geyre et al, 2011, etc.



DECONVOLUTION

- E. Pantin, J.-L. Starck, and F. Murtagh, "Deconvolution and Blind Deconvolution in Astronomy", in Blind image deconvolution: theory and applications, pp 277--317, 2007.
- J.-L. Starck, F. Murtagh, and M. Bertero, "The Starlet Transform in Astronomical Data Processing: Application to Source Detection and Image Deconvolution", Springer, Handbook of Mathematical Methods in Imaging, in press, 2010.









Compressed Sensing

* E. Candès and T. Tao, "Near Optimal Signal Recovery From Random Projections: Universal Encoding Strategies?", IEEE Trans. on Information Theory, 52, pp 5406-5425, 2006.
* D. Donoho, "Compressed Sensing", IEEE Trans. on Information Theory, 52(4), pp. 1289-1306, April 2006.
* E. Candès, J. Romberg and T. Tao, "Robust Uncertainty Principles: Exact Signal Reconstruction from Highly Incomplete Frequency Information", IEEE Trans. on Information Theory, 52(2) pp. 489 - 509, Feb. 2006.

A non linear sampling theorem

"Signals with exactly K components different from zero can be recovered perfectly from ~ K log N incoherent measurements"







al, 2009; Suskimo, 2009; Feng et al, 2011).

CS-Radio Astronomy

The Applications of Compressive Sensing to Radio Astronomy: I Deconvolution <u>Feng Li, Tim J. Cornwell</u> and <u>Frank De hoog</u>, ArXiv:1106.1711, A&A, 528, A31, 2011.



Australian Square Kilometer Array Pathfinder (ASKAP) radio telescope.

œ

CEA - Irfu

CS-Radio Astronomy



CEA - Irfu



- Bad pixels, cosmic rays, point sources in 2D images, ...

COROT: HD170987 with inarXiv:1003.5178 painting

Transfering Spatial Data to the Earth

Bobin, J.-L. Starck, and R. Ottensamer, "Compressed Sensing in Astronomy", IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing, Vol 2, no 5, pp 718--726, 2008.

Transfering Data to the Earth

Observed Herschel Data During the Calibration Phase, November 2010, without any compression.

A scan (16 x 16 pixels at 40 Hz during 25 min each, we obtained 60000 images.

Official Pipeline Reconstruction: Averaging

N. Barbey, M.Sauvage, J.-L. Starck, and R. Ottensamer, <u>"Feasibility and performances of compressed-sensing and sparse map-making with Herschel/PACS data"</u>, Astronomy and Astrophysics, 527, 102, 2011.

Compressed Sensing Reconstruction

Official Pipeline Reconstruction: Averaging

Pseudo-3D Weak Lensing

CEA - Irfu

3D Weak Lensing

The convergence κ , as seen in sources of a given redshift bin, is the linear transformation of the matter density contrast, δ , along the line-of-sight (Simon et al 2009):

$$\mathcal{K} = Q\delta + N \quad \text{with} \quad \delta(r) \equiv \rho(r)/\overline{\rho} - 1$$
$$Q_{i\ell} = \frac{3H_0^2\Omega_M}{2c^2} \int_{w_\ell}^{w_{\ell+1}} dw \frac{\overline{W}^{(i)}(w)f_K(w)}{a(w)} , \quad \overline{W}^{(i)}(w) = \int_0^{w^{(i)}} dw' \frac{f_K(w-w')}{f_K(w')} \left(p(z)\frac{dz}{dw} \right)_{z=z(w')}$$

where H_0 is the hubble parameter, Ω_M is the matter density parameter, c is the speed of light, a(w) is the scale parameter evaluated at comoving distance w, and

$$f_K(w) = \begin{cases} K^{-1/2} \sin(K^{1/2}w), & K > 0\\ w, & K = 0\\ (-K)^{-1/2} \sinh([-K]^{1/2}w) & K < 0 \end{cases}$$

gives the comoving angular diameter distance as a function of the comoving distance and the curvature, K, of the Universe.

œ

3D Weak Lensing

Matter in the Universe as a Natural Compressed Sensing Operator

A. Leonard, F.-X. Dupe, J.-L. Starck, "A compressed sensing approach to 3D weak lensing", Astronomy and Astrophysics, <u>arXiv:1111.6478</u>, A&A, in press.

$$\min_{\delta} \| \delta \|_1 \quad s.t. \quad \frac{1}{2} \| \kappa - Q\delta \|_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}}^2 \leq \epsilon$$

Recent optimization method, based on proximal theory, such as Chambolle & Pock (2010) can be used to find the solution.

CEA - Irfu

Sparsity/CS in Astrophysics

- Sparsity is very efficient for
 - Inverse problems (denoising, deconvolution, etc).
 - Inpainting
 - Component Separation.
- Compressed Sensing
 - New algorithms to process radio-interferommetric data
 - New approaches to analyze data.
 - New instruments design.

Perspectives

- PLANCK component separation.
- Euclid