

# Geometric Characteristics in Phaseless Operator and Structured Matrix Recovery<sup>\*</sup>

Gao Huang<sup>1</sup>, Song Li<sup>1,\*</sup>

---

## Abstract

In this paper, we first propose a unified approach for analyzing the stability of the phaseless operator for both amplitude and intensity measurement on an arbitrary geometric set, thus characterizing the robust performance of phase retrieval via the empirical minimization method. We introduce the random embedding of concave lifting operators in tangent space to characterize the unified analysis of any geometric set. Similarly, we investigate the structured matrix recovery problem through the robust injectivity of a linear rank-one measurement operator on an arbitrary matrix set. The core of our analysis is to establish a unified empirical chaos process characterization for various matrix sets. Talagrand's  $\gamma_\alpha$ -functionals are introduced to characterize the connection between the geometric constraints and the number of measurements needed to guarantee stability or robust injectivity. Finally, we construct adversarial noise to demonstrate the sharpness of the recovery bounds in the above two scenarios.

**Keywords:** Phaseless Operator; Low Rank Plus Sparse; Talagrand's Functionals; Empirical Chaos Process; Adversarial Noise.

**Mathematics Subject Classification 2010:** 94A12, 68Q87, 65C50, 60G12.

---

## 1. Introduction

Phase retrieval refers to the problem of reconstructing an unknown signal  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{F}^n$  with  $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$  from  $m$  phaseless measurements of the form

$$b_k = |\langle \boldsymbol{\phi}_k, \mathbf{x}_0 \rangle|^\ell, \quad k = 1, \dots, m, \quad \ell = 1, 2. \quad (1)$$

Here, the sample may be in two forms: for  $\ell = 1$ , the amplitude measurement  $|\langle \boldsymbol{\phi}_k, \mathbf{x}_0 \rangle|$ , and for  $\ell = 2$ , the intensity measurement  $|\langle \boldsymbol{\phi}_k, \mathbf{x}_0 \rangle|^2$ . The collection of measurement vectors  $\Phi = \{\boldsymbol{\phi}_k\}_{k=1}^m$  in  $V = \mathbb{F}^n$  is known. Phase retrieval has gained significant attention in the past few decades in various fields due to its wide range of applications, including X-ray crystallography, astronomy, optics, and diffraction imaging [8, 28].

---

<sup>\*</sup>This work was supported in part by the NSFC under grant numbers U21A20426 and 12071426.

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author

*Email addresses:* hgmath@zju.edu.cn (Gao Huang), songli@zju.edu.cn (Song Li)

<sup>1</sup>School of Mathematical Science, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310027, P. R. China

As far as applications are concerned, the robust performance of reconstruction is perhaps the most important consideration. We investigate the phaseless measurements with bounded noise  $\mathbf{z}$  (possibly deterministic or adversarial):

$$\mathbf{b} = \mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}(\mathbf{x}_0) + \mathbf{z}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}$  is phaseless operator  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell} : \mathbb{F}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} |\langle \phi_1, \mathbf{x} \rangle|^{\ell} \\ \vdots \\ |\langle \phi_m, \mathbf{x} \rangle|^{\ell} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

One of the main goals of this paper is to establish a unified framework for amplitude and intensity measurement that obtains stable recovery conditions while disregarding specific recovery approaches and establishes recovery assurances within the framework of the empirical minimization method. These two motivations point to our focus on the stability of the phaseless operator  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}$ .

The stability of  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}$  can infer stable uniqueness, signifying the identification of conditions that lead to the determination of a unique solution. It has been demonstrated that if there is no additional information about  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , a unique recovery requires at least  $m = \mathcal{O}(n)$  measurements [1, 2, 20]. However, prior assumptions on  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , such as sparse, can greatly reduce the number of measurements [46, 20]. Thus, we assume that  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{K}$  to capture the geometric structure of the signal. In many cases of interest,  $\mathcal{K}$  behaves as if it is a low-dimensional set; thus,  $m$  is significantly smaller than the dimension  $n$ . Now we provide a definition of the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}$  on  $\mathcal{K}$ , which is inspired by [20, 2, 3].

**Definition 1** (Stability of  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}$ ). For  $q \geq 1, \ell = 1, 2$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell} : \mathbb{F}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is  $C$ -stable on a set  $\mathcal{K}$ , if for every  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{K}$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}(\mathbf{v})\|_q \geq Cd_{\ell}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}). \quad (4)$$

We use two different metrics here: for  $\ell = 1$ ,  $d_1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \min_{|c|=1} \|\mathbf{u} - c \cdot \mathbf{v}\|_2$  where  $c = \{\pm 1\}$  if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  or  $c = \{e^{i\theta} : \theta \in [0, 2\pi)\}$  if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ ; for  $\ell = 2$ ,  $d_2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \|\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^*\|_F$ . For the completeness of theory, we take into account  $q \geq 1$ . Specifically,  $q = 1$  [9, 20, 17] and  $q = 2$  [2, 10, 50] have been extensively examined in previous works to recover signals through empirical risk minimization.

As mentioned above, the most natural way to estimate  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is via an empirical  $\ell_q$  ( $q \geq 1$ ) risk minimization such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \|\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{b}\|_q \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We assume that  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{K}$  and set the solutions of (5) as  $\mathbf{x}_{\star}^{\ell}$  ( $\mathbf{x}_{\star}^1$  for the amplitude case and  $\mathbf{x}_{\star}^2$  for the intensity case). All in all, we are interested in the relationship between the number of measurements  $m$  that ensure the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}$  and the intrinsic geometric features of  $\mathcal{K}$ , as well as the robust performance of model (5) to antagonize noise  $\mathbf{z}$ .

By lifting intensity measurement, phase retrieval can be cast as a structured matrix recovery problem [8]. The latter also has a wide range of applications, including

face recognition, recommender systems, linear system identification and control; see, e.g., [39]. We then focus on the structured matrix recovery problem from rank-one measurements, given the linear operator  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi : \mathbb{F}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^m$  and a corrupted vector of measurements as

$$\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}_\Phi(\mathbf{X}_0) + \mathbf{z} := \begin{pmatrix} \langle \phi_1 \phi_1^*, \mathbf{X}_0 \rangle \\ \vdots \\ \langle \phi_m \phi_m^*, \mathbf{X}_0 \rangle \end{pmatrix} + \mathbf{z}. \quad (6)$$

We wish to estimate  $\mathbf{X}_0 \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times n}$  with a specific structure, for instance, low rank or low rank plus sparse. Here,  $\mathbf{z}$  is assumed to be bounded, may be adversarial or deterministic and measurement matrices are  $\Phi = \{\phi_k \phi_k^*\}_{k=1}^m$ . The advantage of rank-one measurement systems over so-called i.i.d. Gaussian measurement systems is that the former requires much less storage space [7, 15].

Estimating structured matrix  $\mathbf{X}_0$  from measurements (6) via empirical  $\ell_q$  ( $q \geq 1$ ) risk minimization:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \|\mathbf{A}_\Phi(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{b}\|_q \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{M}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

is favored by a lot of algorithms; for instance,  $q = 1$  [29, 13] and  $q = 2$  [19, 38]. We assume  $\mathbf{X}_0 \in \mathcal{M}$  to capture the geometric structure of the matrix. For simplicity, we assume that  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{F}}^n$  ( $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{R}}^n$  denotes the vector space of all symmetric matrices in  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  denotes the vector space of all Hermitian matrices in  $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ ). Motivation is similar to deducing the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell$ , the robust performance of model (7) requires investigating the robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$  on set  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} := \mathcal{M} - \mathcal{M}$ , which is defined as follows.

**Definition 2** (Robust Injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$ ). For  $q \geq 1$ , we say  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi : \mathbb{F}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is  $C$ -robust injective on a set  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  if for all  $\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{A}_\Phi(\mathbf{X})\|_q \geq C \|\mathbf{X}\|_F. \quad (8)$$

We also take into account the measurement number that can ensure the robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$  based on the intrinsic geometric features of  $\mathcal{M}$  and the robust performance of (7). In summary, our goal is to address the following two specific issues:

**Question I:** Could we understand the values of the required measurement number to ensure the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell$  or the robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$  as a function of the intrinsic geometry of  $\mathcal{K}$  or  $\mathcal{M}$ ?

**Question II:** How to evaluate the robustness performance of models (5) and (7) using the empirical minimization approach, regardless of the algorithms used?

Our work is based on the assumption that the measurement vectors  $\phi$  are sub-gaussian random vectors that satisfy certain conditions; see Section 2.2. To prove the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell$ , we first investigate the random embedding of the concave lifting

operator  $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^p$  on a specific tangent space, where  $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^p : \mathbb{F}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is defined by:

$$\mathcal{B}_\Phi^p(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{1}{m} \begin{pmatrix} |\langle \phi_1 \phi_1^*, \mathbf{X} \rangle|^p \\ \vdots \\ |\langle \phi_m \phi_m^*, \mathbf{X} \rangle|^p \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 < p \leq 1. \quad (9)$$

The specific tangent space refers to the fact that we set  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{g}} := \mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^*$  (the tangent space of rank-1 matrix) in (9) and focus on the estimate of

$$C_1 \|\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{g}}\|_F^p \leq \|\mathcal{B}_\Phi^p(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{g}})\|_1 \leq C_2 \|\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{g}}\|_F^p \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathbf{h}$  and  $\mathbf{g}$  belong to the set  $\mathcal{K}$ . The stability of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^1$  then can be derived from the random embedding of  $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{1/2}$ , while the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^2$  is linked to the operator  $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^1$ .

The robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$  can be cast as a nonnegative empirical process. Mendelson's small ball method [30, 35] can provide a lower bound for it. The connection between the geometric features of  $\mathcal{M}$  and the measurement number  $m$  is revealed by the empirical process in the small ball method, which can be attributed to finding the upper bound of the suprema of empirical chaos process

$$\overline{S(\mathcal{M})} := \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} \left\langle \sum_{k=1}^m (\phi_k \phi_k^* - \mathbb{E} \phi_k \phi_k^*), \mathbf{X} \right\rangle \quad (11)$$

for an arbitrary  $\mathcal{M}$ . This illuminates our utilization of the chaining method [41].

Talagrand's  $\gamma_\alpha$ -functionals are quantities that can characterize the intrinsic complexity of geometric sets and have found extensive applications in various fields. Thus, they can be employed to quantify the geometric characteristic for the random embedding of  $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^p$  and the suprema of empirical chaos process  $\overline{S(\mathcal{M})}$ , which means that Talagrand's  $\gamma_\alpha$ -functionals associated with  $\mathcal{K}$  or  $\mathcal{M}$  can reveal the required measurement number to ensure the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell$  or robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$ .

**Contributions:** The main contributions of this paper can be attributed to two framework aspects. On the one hand, our work is a unified framework applicable to arbitrary geometric sets  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$ . Talagrand's  $\gamma_\alpha$ -functionals can quantify the required number of measurements to guarantee the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell$  and the robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$ . Some examples can be investigated include  $\mathcal{K}$  being a sparse set and  $\mathcal{M}$  being a low-rank plus sparse set. To the best of knowledge, our work is the first to show a connection between the rank-one measurements (such as phase retrieval and structured matrix recovery) and Talagrand's  $\gamma_\alpha$ -functionals, as well as chaos process. On the other hand, the robust performance of models (5) or (7) can be achieved by ensuring the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell$  or robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$ , and the existence of adaptive adversarial noise  $\mathbf{z}$  can reveal the sharpness of the recovery bounds  $\frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_q}{m^{1/q}}$ . In particular, our contributions also include two specific aspects. We are the first to introduce the stability of the phaseless operator  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^1$  with random measurements, which is different from the classical stable phase retrieval [2, 3, 24]. Besides, [38] characterized the robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$  with rank-one measurements but restricted the set  $\mathcal{M}$  to at most rank- $R$  matrices; furthermore, the required number of measurements they obtained was dependent on the

additional factor  $R$ . We use the empirical chaos process to demonstrate that the factor  $R$  appears to be an artifact of the proof, and thus remove the unreasonable assumption.

**Related Work:** In [20], Eldar and Mendelson considered the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^2$  in the real case in the sense of  $\ell_1$ -norm such that

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^2(\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^2(\mathbf{v})\|_1 \geq C \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_2$$

and then derived the robust performance of (5) via the empirical  $\ell_q$  ( $q \geq 1$ ) risk minimization with random noise. Following the approach and set taken by [20], [31] provided an incoherence-based analysis of the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^2$ . The metric above is evidently unsuitable for complex case. Besides, Bandeira et al. in [2] defined the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^1$  in the real case under a specific estimator with metric  $d_1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ . However, they stated that for such a metric,  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^2$  was no longer stable. These prompt us to establish a unified form for the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}$  for both amplitude and intensity cases, both complex and real cases.

Several earlier works, including [26, 48], which derived the robust performance of the amplitude model, and [17, 27, 14], which considered the intensity model, examined the robust performance of (5); however, all of them can only conclude  $\mathcal{K}$  to be two specific sets: the entire space and the sparse set. We provide a unified perspective on the robustness performance of (5) on an arbitrary geometric set  $\mathcal{K}$ . Consequently, we can derive specific cases, such as sparse set, from our consistent results. In addition, [9, 29, 33] provided the theoretical guarantee for the lifting model based on the intensity measurement with positive semidefinite cone restriction.

Gordon’s “escape through a mesh” theorem and Gaussian width can geometrically describe the robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_{\Phi}$  for i.i.d. Gaussian measurement [12, 43, 38]. However, the coupling in rank-one measurement operator  $\mathbf{A}_{\Phi}$  prevents the Gaussian width from reflecting the geometric relationships. Talagrand’s  $\gamma_{\alpha}$ -functionals then illuminate our hope of using the chaos process for the geometric characterization. The chaos process is a powerful tool for processing structured measurements in compressed sensing [32], blind deconvolution [36], low-rank tensor recovery [25], and other related applications. Besides, the rank-one measurement has gained significant attention in recent years [15, 7, 34, 23, 19, 38], due to its applicability.

**Notation:** We review all notation used in this paper in order to ease readability. A variety of norms are used throughout this paper: Let  $\{\sigma_k\}_{k=1}^r$  be a singular value sequence of rank- $r$  matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  in descending order.  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_* = \sum_{k=1}^r \sigma_k$  is the nuclear norm;  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_F = (\sum_{k=1}^r \sigma_k^2)^{1/2}$  is the Frobenius norm;  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} = \sigma_1$  is the operator norm. In addition,  $\Gamma(x)$  denotes the Gamma function,  $\text{cone}(\mathcal{T}) := \{tx : t \geq 0, x \in \mathcal{T}\}$  denotes the conification of set  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  $\mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}$  denotes the  $\ell_2$  unit ball of  $\mathbb{F}^n$  and  $\mathbb{S}_F$  denotes the Frobenius unit ball of  $\mathbb{F}^{n \times n}$ .

**Outline:** The organization of the remainder of this paper is as follows: Some preliminaries are placed in Section 2. The main results are presented in Section 3. In Section

4, we give proofs of the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell$  and the robust performance of model (5). In Section 5, we provide proofs of the robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$  and the robust performance of model (7). In Section 6, we show the recovery bounds are theoretically sharp. The Appendix presents proofs of some auxiliary conclusions.

## 2. Preliminaries

### 2.1. Talagrand's Functionals

The following definition is Talagrand's  $\gamma_\alpha$ -functionals [41, Definition 2.7.3] and forms the core of the geometric characteristics of this paper.

**Definition 3.** For a metric space  $(\mathcal{T}, d)$ , an admissible sequence of  $\mathcal{T}$  is an increasing sequence  $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  of partitions of  $\mathcal{T}$  such that for every  $n \geq 1$ ,  $|\mathcal{A}_n| \leq 2^{2^n}$  and  $|\mathcal{A}_0| = 1$ . We denote by  $A_n(t)$  the unique element of  $\mathcal{A}_n$  that contains  $t$ . For  $\alpha \geq 1$ , define the  $\gamma_\alpha$ -functional by

$$\gamma_\alpha(\mathcal{T}, d) = \inf_{\mathcal{T}} \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{n/\alpha} \Delta(A_n(t)),$$

where the infimum is taken with respect to all admissible sequences of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\Delta(A_n(t))$  denotes the diameter of  $A_n(t)$  for  $d$ .

We require some properties of  $\gamma_\alpha$ -functionals. The first is that they can be bounded in terms of covering numbers  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T}, d, u)$  by the well-known Dudley integral,

$$\gamma_\alpha(\mathcal{T}, d) \leq C \int_0^{\text{diam}(\mathcal{T})} (\log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T}, d, u))^{1/\alpha} du. \quad (12)$$

This type of entropy integral was introduced by Dudley [18] to bound the suprema of gaussian process. In addition, Sudakov's minoration inequality [41, Exercise 2.7.8] provides a lower bound for  $\gamma_2(\mathcal{T}, d)$ ,

$$\gamma_2(\mathcal{T}, d) \geq cu \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T}, d, u)}. \quad (13)$$

The following proposition presents the subadditivity of  $\gamma_\alpha$ -functionals in vector space, its proof can refer to [36, Lemma 2.1].

**Proposition 1** (Subadditivity of  $\gamma_\alpha$ -Functionals). Let  $(\mathcal{T}, d)$  be an arbitrary vector space. Suppose  $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \subset \mathcal{T}$ . Then

$$\gamma_\alpha(\mathcal{T}_1 + \mathcal{T}_2, d) \lesssim \gamma_\alpha(\mathcal{T}_1, d) + \gamma_\alpha(\mathcal{T}_2, d).$$

### 2.2. Subgaussian Measurement

Recall that for  $s \geq 1$ , the  $\psi_s$ -norm of a random variable  $X$  is defined as

$$\|X\|_{\psi_s} := \inf\{t > 0 : \mathbb{E} \exp(|X|^s / t^s) \leq 2\}. \quad (14)$$

In particular, random variable  $X$  is called subgaussian if  $\|X\|_{\psi_2} < \infty$  and sub-exponential if  $\|X\|_{\psi_1} < \infty$ . We then present several useful properties of  $\psi_s$ -norm.

**Proposition 2** (Properties of  $\psi_s$ -norm). Let  $X$  be a random variable and  $s \geq 1$ .

- (a)  $\|X^q\|_{\psi_s} = \|X\|_{\psi_{qs}}^q$  for all  $q \geq 1$ . In particular,  $\|X^2\|_{\psi_1} = \|X\|_{\psi_2}^2$ ;
- (b)  $\|X\|_{\psi_s} \lesssim \|X\|_{\psi_l}$  for all  $l \geq s$ ;
- (c)  $(\mathbb{E}|X|^q)^{1/q} \lesssim q^{\frac{1}{s}} \|X\|_{\psi_s}$  for all  $q \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix A. □

Throughout this paper,  $\phi_k$  are given as independent copies of a random vector  $\phi$ , whose entries are i.i.d. subgaussian and satisfy some properties, as follows:

**Definition 4.** We call a random vector  $\phi$  suitable  $K$ -subgaussian if its entries  $\phi$  are i.i.d. subgaussian with  $\psi_2$ -norm  $K$ ,  $\mathbb{E}\phi = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}|\phi|^2 = 1$ . Furthermore,  $\phi$  is called suitable  $(K, \beta)$ -subgaussian if  $\phi$  is suitable  $K$ -subgaussian and its entries  $\phi$  satisfy  $\mathbb{E}|\phi|^4 \geq 1 + \beta$  for some  $\beta > 0$ .

It should be noted that Proposition 2.(c) and  $\mathbb{E}|\phi|^2 = 1$  imply  $K \gtrsim 1$ . The assumption  $\mathbb{E}|\phi|^4 > 1$  is intended to avoid some ambiguities that, if  $\phi$  is a Rademacher random variable, then it is impossible to distinguish between  $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_* = \mathbf{e}_2$  in phase retrieval. We then provide the following lemma, which provides upper bounds for high-order moments that will be used.

**Lemma 1.** Let  $q \geq 1$  and  $\phi \in \mathbb{F}^n$  is a suitable  $K$ -subgaussian random vector. Then for any  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times n}$ , we have

$$(\mathbb{E}|\phi^* \mathbf{X} \phi|^q)^{1/q} \lesssim (qK^2) \cdot \|\mathbf{X}\|_F + \|\mathbf{X}\|_*. \quad (15)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix B. □

### 3. Main Results

#### 3.1. Stability of Phaseless Operator

We first present the stability results of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell$  for both amplitude and intensity cases on an arbitrary geometric set  $\mathcal{K}$ . The outcome is the robust performance of phase retrieval within the framework of empirical risk minimization.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $\ell = 1, 2$  and  $q \geq 1$ . Suppose  $\Phi = \{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^m$  are i.i.d. suitable  $(K, \beta)$ -subgaussian random vectors and measurement number

$$m \geq L_\ell \cdot \gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}). \quad (16)$$

Then with probability exceeding  $1 - e^{-c_\ell m}$ : For all  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{K}$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell(\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell(\mathbf{v})\|_q \geq C_\ell m^{1/q} d_\ell(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}). \quad (17)$$

Besides, the model solutions  $\mathbf{x}_*^\ell$  to (5) satisfy

$$d_\ell(\mathbf{x}_*^\ell, \mathbf{x}_0) \leq \frac{2}{C_\ell} \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_q}{m^{1/q}}. \quad (18)$$

Here,  $L_1, L_2, C_1, C_2, c_1$  and  $c_2$  are positive constants dependent only on  $K$  and  $\beta$ .

**Remark 1.** [20] demonstrated the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^2$  in the real case and in the sense of  $\ell_1$ -norm via an empirical process method. Our result is unified for both  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^2$ , both real and complex cases and in the sense of  $\ell_q$ -norm ( $q \geq 1$ ). Our geometric characterization involves Talagrand’s  $\gamma_2$ -functional, which is distinct from Gaussian width in [20] and more convenient in the complex case.

Subsequently, we investigate some special cases of  $\mathcal{K}$  in Theorem 1. The first case involves the entire space  $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{F}^n$ . [9, 10, 50, 45, 17] focused on utilizing least absolute deviations ( $q = 1$ ) or least square ( $q = 2$ ) to solve (5). The second case is that  $\mathcal{K}$  is a sparse set that  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{S}_{n,s} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}^n : \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq s\}$ , and then (5) can be attributed to the sparse phase retrieval problem [6, 5]. According to the subsequent corollary,  $m = \mathcal{O}(s \log n)$  is sufficient to ensure the robust performance of (5); it is also consistent with the results in [20, 26, 27, 48]. This differs from  $m = \mathcal{O}(s^2 \log n)$ , which is necessary to guarantee the algorithm’s convergence [6, 47, 4, 49] due to the initialization stage. The final case is that  $\mathcal{K}$  is a finite set in  $\mathbb{F}^n$ .

**Corollary 1.** The number of measurements  $m$  in Theorem 1 we require is:

- I.  $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{F}^n$ , then  $m \gtrsim_{K,\beta} n$ .
- II.  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{S}_{n,s}$ , then  $m \gtrsim_{K,\beta} s \log(en/s)$ .
- III.  $\mathcal{K}$  is a finite set that  $|\mathcal{K}| < \infty$ , then  $m \gtrsim_{K,\beta} \log |\mathcal{K}|$ .

### 3.2. Robust Injectivity of Structured Matrix Recovery

This subsection presents the robust injectivity results of  $\mathbf{A}_{\Phi}$  and deduces the robust performance of structured matrix recovery.

**Theorem 2.** Let  $q \geq 1$  and  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{S}_F^n$ . Suppose  $\Phi = \{\phi_k \phi_k^*\}_{k=1}^m$  where  $\phi_k$  are independent copies of a suitable  $(K, \beta)$ -subgaussian random vector and measurement number

$$m \geq L \left( \gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_F) + \gamma_1(\text{cone}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_{op}) \right). \quad (19)$$

Then with probability exceeding  $1 - e^{-cm}$ : For all  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{M} - \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{A}_{\Phi}(\mathbf{X})\|_q \geq C m^{1/q} \|\mathbf{X}\|_F. \quad (20)$$

In addition, the model solution  $\mathbf{X}_{\star}$  to (7) satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{X}_{\star} - \mathbf{X}_0\|_F \leq \frac{2 \|\mathbf{z}\|_q}{C m^{1/q}}. \quad (21)$$

Here,  $L, C$  and  $c$  are positive constants dependent only on  $K$  and  $\beta$ .

**Remark 2.** If we choose  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K}$ , we can also derive the intensity case ( $\ell = 2$ ) in Theorem 1 using a slightly different measurement number that involves  $\gamma_1$ -functional.

**Remark 3.** As shown in [38, Lemma 2.12], the author characterized the robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_{\Phi}$  by restricting the set  $\mathcal{M}$  to at most rank- $R$  matrices, provided

$$m \gtrsim_{K,\beta} R \cdot \gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_F) + \gamma_1(\text{cone}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_{op}). \quad (22)$$

The estimate above is far from optimal and unusable, as the additional factor  $R$  appears to be an artifact of the proof. We aid in resolving this issue and removing this artifact, and in many cases, we can obtain the near-optimal measurement number.

We investigate two special cases of  $\mathcal{M}$  in Theorem 2. The first case is all at most rank- $R$  matrix set. The second case is the low rank plus sparse set that has been extensively studied in the past few years [37, 22, 19, 38, 42]. We provide the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.** The number of measurements  $m$  in Theorem 2 we require is:

**I.**  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{S}^R := \{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times n} : \text{rank}(\mathbf{X}) \leq R\}$ , then  $m \gtrsim_{K,\beta} R \cdot n$ .

**II.**  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{S}_s^R := \left\{ \mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times n} : \text{rank}(\mathbf{X}) \leq R, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{2,0} \leq s, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{0,2} \leq s \right\}$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_{2,0}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{0,2}$  count the number of non-zero rows and columns. Then  $m \gtrsim_{K,\beta} R \cdot s \log(en/s)$ .

### 3.3. Sharp Recovery Bound

We construct adversarial noise  $\mathbf{z}$  to demonstrate the sharpness of recovery bounds  $\frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_q}{m^{1/q}}$  in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

**Theorem 3.** Let  $\ell = 1, 2$  and  $1 \leq q < \infty$  and suppose  $\Phi = \{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^m$  are independent copies of a suitable  $K$ -subgaussian random vector. For any fixed  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{F}^n$ , there exists a class of adversarial noise  $\mathbf{z}$  such that with probability exceeding  $1 - 1/m$ , the solutions  $\mathbf{x}_\star^\ell$  to (5) satisfy

$$d_\ell(\mathbf{x}_\star^\ell, \mathbf{x}_0) \gtrsim \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_q}{(\sqrt{q}K)^\ell \cdot m^{1/q}}. \quad (23)$$

**Remark 4.** [27, 48] provided the sharp recovery bound  $\frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_2}{\sqrt{m}}$  for least square method ( $q = 2$ ), but extra assumptions were needed for the measurement number and signal  $\mathbf{x}_0$ . Furthermore, their method is not applicable for  $\ell_q$ -minimization except for  $q = 2$ , due to the use of gradient descent method.

**Theorem 4.** Let  $1 \leq q < \infty$  and suppose  $\Phi = \{\phi_k \phi_k^*\}_{k=1}^m$  where  $\phi_k$  are independent copies of a suitable  $K$ -subgaussian random vector. For any fixed  $\mathbf{X}_0 \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times n}$ , there exists a class of adversarial noise  $\mathbf{z}$  such that with probability exceeding  $1 - 1/m$ , the solution  $\mathbf{X}_\star$  to (7) satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{X}_\star - \mathbf{X}_0\|_F \gtrsim \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_q}{(qK^2) \cdot m^{1/q}}. \quad (24)$$

**Remark 5.** The aforementioned theorem can demonstrate that the sharpness of recovery bounds stated in [9, Theorem 1.3], [29, Theorem 1.4] and [33, Theorem 1].

## 4. Proofs of Stability Results

We first demonstrate the random embedding of the concave lifting operator  $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^p$ . The stability of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^1$  is then based on operator  $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{1/2}$ , and  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^2$  is related to  $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^1$ . The robust performance of model (5) can be derived from the stability of  $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell$ . Our unified results allow us to identify several instances of  $\mathcal{K}$ .

#### 4.1. Random Embedding of $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^p$

**Theorem 5.** Let  $0 < p \leq 1$  and  $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2 \subset \mathbb{F}^n$ . Suppose  $\Phi = \{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^m$  are i.i.d. suitable  $(K, \beta)$ -subgaussian random vectors and the measurement number satisfies

$$m \geq L \max\{\gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}_1) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2), \gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}_2) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2)\}.$$

Then the following holds with probability exceeding  $1 - \mathcal{O}(e^{-cm})$ : Let  $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} := \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^*$ , for all  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}_1, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{K}_2$ , operator  $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^p$  satisfies

$$C_1 \|\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}\|_F^p \leq \|\mathcal{B}_\Phi^p(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}})\|_1 \leq C_2 \|\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}\|_F^p. \quad (25)$$

Here,  $L, c, C_1$  and  $C_2$  are positive absolute constants dependent only on  $K, \beta$  and  $p$ .

*Proof. Step 1: Moment Argument.* For fixed  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}_1, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{K}_2$ , let  $\Psi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} := \frac{\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}}{\|\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}\|_F}$  and set random variable  $X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} = |\phi^* \Psi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} \phi|$ . Since  $\text{rank}(\Psi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}) \leq 2$ , using the eigenvalue decomposition of  $\Psi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}$ , we can assume that  $\Psi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} = \lambda_1 \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^* + \lambda_2 \mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}^*$ , where  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}^n$  satisfy  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 = 1, \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle = 0$  and  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfy  $\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 = 1$ . On the one hand, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}^p &= \mathbb{E}|\lambda_1 |\phi^* \mathbf{x}|^2 + \lambda_2 |\phi^* \mathbf{y}|^2|^p \\ &\leq \left(|\lambda_1| \cdot \mathbb{E}|\phi^* \mathbf{x}|^2 + |\lambda_2| \cdot \mathbb{E}|\phi^* \mathbf{y}|^2\right)^p \\ &= \left(|\lambda_1| + |\lambda_2|\right)^p \leq 2, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where in the second line we use Jensen's inequality. On the other hand, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}^2 \leq (\mathbb{E}X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}^p)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \cdot (\mathbb{E}X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}^4)^{\frac{2-p}{4-p}}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{E}X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}^p \geq (\mathbb{E}X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}^2)^{\frac{4-p}{2}} / (\mathbb{E}X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}^4)^{\frac{2-p}{2}}. \quad (27)$$

By direct calculation, we can get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}^2 &= \mathbb{E}|\phi^* \Psi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} \phi|^2 = \mathbb{E}(\lambda_1 |\phi^* \mathbf{x}|^2 + \lambda_2 |\phi^* \mathbf{y}|^2)^2 \\ &= \lambda_1^2 \mathbb{E}|\phi^* \mathbf{x}|^4 + \lambda_2^2 \mathbb{E}|\phi^* \mathbf{y}|^4 + 2\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \mathbb{E}|\phi^* \mathbf{x}|^2 \mathbb{E}|\phi^* \mathbf{y}|^2 \\ &= (\beta + 1)(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2) + 2\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \\ &\geq \beta(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2) = \beta > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

By Lemma 1, the facts that  $\text{rank}(\Psi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}) \leq 2$  and  $K \gtrsim 1$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}^4 \lesssim (K^2 + \|\Psi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}\|_*)^4 \lesssim K^8. \quad (29)$$

Therefore, from (28) and (29), it can be concluded that

$$\mathbb{E}X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}^p \gtrsim \beta^{\frac{4-p}{2}} / K^{4(2-p)} > 0. \quad (30)$$

**Step 2: Fixed Point Argument.** We claim that  $X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}^p$  have finite  $\psi_1$ -norm. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}\|_{\psi_1} &= \left\| |\lambda_1 |\phi^* \mathbf{x}|^2 + \lambda_2 |\phi^* \mathbf{y}|^2| \right\|_{\psi_1} \\ &\leq |\lambda_1| \cdot \left\| |\phi^* \mathbf{x}|^2 \right\|_{\psi_1} + |\lambda_2| \cdot \left\| |\phi^* \mathbf{y}|^2 \right\|_{\psi_1} \\ &= |\lambda_1| \cdot \|\phi^* \mathbf{x}\|_{\psi_2} + |\lambda_2| \cdot \|\phi^* \mathbf{y}\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim K. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.(a) implies that  $\|X_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}^p\|_{\psi_{1/p}} = \|X_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}\|_{\psi_1}^p$ . Therefore, by Proposition 2.(b),  $X_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}^p$  is sub-exponential with  $\psi_1$ -norm:

$$\|X_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}^p\|_{\psi_1} \lesssim \|X_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}\|_{\psi_{1/p}} \lesssim K^p \lesssim K.$$

Bernstein-type inequality then yields that for a fixed pair  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  and any  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ ,

$$\beta^{\frac{4-p}{2}} / K^{4(2-p)} - \varepsilon_1 \lesssim \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m X_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}^p \leq 2 + \varepsilon_1 \quad (31)$$

established with probability exceeding  $1 - 4 \exp\left(-cm \min\left\{\frac{\varepsilon_1^2}{K^2}, \frac{\varepsilon_1}{K}\right\}\right)$ .

**Step 3: Tangent Space Conversion.** We set  $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{K}_1 + \mathcal{K}_2$  and  $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{K}_1 - \mathcal{K}_2$ . A simple calculation yields

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}} = \frac{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^*}{\|\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^*\|_F} = \frac{\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^*}{\|\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^*\|_F} := \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}}. \quad (32)$$

By homogeneity, we can assume that  $\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}$ . Thus we have

$$\mathbf{h} \in \text{cone}(\mathcal{K}_1 + \mathcal{K}_2) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2} := \mathcal{K}^+ \text{ and } \mathbf{g} \in \text{cone}(\mathcal{K}_1 - \mathcal{K}_2) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2} := \mathcal{K}^-.$$

Let  $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^+$  and  $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^-$  be the  $\varepsilon$ -net of  $\mathcal{K}^+$  and  $\mathcal{K}^-$ . Then for all  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{K}^+, \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{K}^-$ , there exist  $\mathbf{h}_0 \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^+$  and  $\mathbf{g}_0 \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^-$  such that  $\|\mathbf{h} - \mathbf{h}_0\|_2 \leq \varepsilon, \|\mathbf{g} - \mathbf{g}_0\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$ .

We then claim that

$$\left\| \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}} - \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0} \right\|_F \leq 16\varepsilon. \quad (33)$$

To prove the above claim, we provide the following two estimations:

$$\|\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^*\|_F^2 = 2 + \mathbf{h}^* \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^* \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{g}^* \mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* \mathbf{h} = 2 + 2|\mathbf{h}^* \mathbf{g}|^2 \in [2, 4].$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^* - \mathbf{h}_0\mathbf{g}_0^* - \mathbf{g}_0\mathbf{h}_0^*\|_F \leq 4\varepsilon.$$

Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}} - \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0} \right\|_F &= \frac{\|(\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^*) \cdot \|\mathbf{h}_0\mathbf{g}_0^* + \mathbf{g}_0\mathbf{h}_0^*\|_F - (\mathbf{h}_0\mathbf{g}_0^* + \mathbf{g}_0\mathbf{h}_0^*) \cdot \|\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^*\|_F\|_F}{\|\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^*\|_F \cdot \|\mathbf{h}_0\mathbf{g}_0^* + \mathbf{g}_0\mathbf{h}_0^*\|_F} \\ &\leq \left| \|\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^*\|_F - \|\mathbf{h}_0\mathbf{g}_0^* + \mathbf{g}_0\mathbf{h}_0^*\|_F \right| \cdot \|\mathbf{h}_0\mathbf{g}_0^* + \mathbf{g}_0\mathbf{h}_0^*\|_F \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^* - \mathbf{h}_0\mathbf{g}_0^* - \mathbf{g}_0\mathbf{h}_0^*\|_F \cdot \|\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^*\|_F \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^* - \mathbf{h}_0\mathbf{g}_0^* - \mathbf{g}_0\mathbf{h}_0^*\|_F \cdot (\|\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^*\|_F + \|\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^* + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}^*\|_F) \\ &\leq 4\varepsilon \cdot 4 \leq 16\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Subsequently, since  $\tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}} - \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0}$  is at most rank-4, similar to the decomposition in **Step 1**, we can assume that

$$\frac{\tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}} - \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0}}{\left\| \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}} - \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0} \right\|_F} = \sum_{k=1}^4 \lambda_k \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^*,$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{F}^n$  satisfy  $\|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 = 1, \langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$  and  $\lambda_k \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfy  $\sum_{k=1}^4 \lambda_k^2 = 1$ . Then similar to the argument in **Step 2**,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \left\langle \phi \phi^*, \frac{\tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}} - \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0}}{\left\| \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}} - \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0} \right\|_F} \right\rangle \right|^p \leq \left| \sum_{k=1}^4 |\lambda_k| \cdot \mathbb{E} |\phi^* \mathbf{x}_k|^2 \right|^p = \left| \sum_{k=1}^4 |\lambda_k| \right|^p \leq 4. \quad (34)$$

Thus, by Bernstein-type inequality we have

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \left| \langle \phi\phi^*, \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}} - \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0} \rangle \right|^p \leq (4 + \epsilon_2) \cdot \left\| \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}} - \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0} \right\|_F^p \leq (4 + \epsilon_2) \cdot (16\epsilon)^p \quad (35)$$

with probability exceeding  $1 - 2 \exp\left(-cm \min\left\{\frac{\epsilon_2^2}{K^2}, \frac{\epsilon_2}{K}\right\}\right)$ .

**Step 4: Uniform Argument.** To achieve consistent result, we choose  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon$  small enough such that  $\epsilon_1 = \mathcal{O}\left(\beta^{\frac{4-p}{2}}/K^{4(2-p)}\right)$ ,  $\epsilon_2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$  and  $\epsilon^p = \mathcal{O}\left(\beta^{\frac{4-p}{2}}/K^{4(2-p)}\right)$ .

By (31) and (35), for any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}_1, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{K}_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{B}_{\Phi}^p(\Psi_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}})\|_1 &\geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \left| \langle \phi\phi^*, \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0} \rangle \right|^p - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \left| \langle \phi\phi^*, \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}} - \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0} \rangle \right|^p \\ &\gtrsim \left( \beta^{\frac{4-p}{2}}/K^{4(2-p)} - \epsilon_1 \right) - (4 + \epsilon_2) \cdot (16\epsilon)^p \\ &\gtrsim \beta^{\frac{4-p}{2}}/K^{4(2-p)} \gtrsim C_1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{B}_{\Phi}^p(\Psi_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}})\|_1 &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \left| \langle \phi\phi^*, \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0} \rangle \right|^p + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \left| \langle \phi\phi^*, \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g}} - \tilde{\Psi}_{\mathbf{h}_0,\mathbf{g}_0} \rangle \right|^p \\ &\leq (2 - \epsilon_1) + (4 + \epsilon_2) \cdot (16\epsilon)^p \lesssim C_2. \end{aligned}$$

The entropy of  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}^+, \ell_2, \epsilon)$  can be bounded that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}^+, \ell_2, \epsilon) &\lesssim \epsilon^{-2} \gamma_2^2(\mathcal{K}^+, \ell_2) \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{-2} \max\left\{ \gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}_1) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2), \gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}_2) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where the first inequality due to Sudakov's minoration inequality (13) and the second inequality due to the subadditivity of  $\gamma_2$ -functional in Proposition 1. Similarly, we have

$$\log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}^-, \ell_2, \epsilon) \lesssim \epsilon^{-2} \max\left\{ \gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}_1) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2), \gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}_2) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2) \right\}.$$

Thus, provided  $m$  obeys condition of the theorem, the successful probability exceeding

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - (4 \exp(-cm\epsilon_1^2/K^2) + 2 \exp(-cm\epsilon_2^2/K^2)) \cdot \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}^+, \ell_2, \epsilon) \cdot \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}^-, \ell_2, \epsilon) \\ &\geq 1 - \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-cm\epsilon_1^2/K^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

#### 4.2. Proof of Theorem 1

Robust performance of (5) can be revealed through the following proposition, which indicates that we only need to determine the stability condition (4) for  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}$ .

**Proposition 3.** If  $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}$  is  $C$ -stable with respect to  $\ell_q$ -norm, then we have

$$d_{\ell}(\mathbf{x}_{\star}^{\ell}, \mathbf{x}_0) \leq 2 \|\mathbf{z}\|_q / C. \quad (37)$$

*Proof.* The optimality of  $\mathbf{x}_{\star}^{\ell}$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \|\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}(\mathbf{x}_{\star}^{\ell}) - \mathbf{b}\|_q - \|\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathbf{b}\|_q = \|\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}(\mathbf{x}_{\star}^{\ell}) - \mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathbf{z}\|_q - \|\mathbf{z}\|_q \\ &\geq \|\mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}(\mathbf{x}_{\star}^{\ell}) - \mathcal{A}_{\Phi}^{\ell}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_q - 2\|\mathbf{z}\|_q \geq Cd_{\ell}(\mathbf{x}_{\star}^{\ell}, \mathbf{x}_0) - 2\|\mathbf{z}\|_q. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Case I: Intensity Measurement.** We set  $p = 1$  and  $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{K}_2 = \mathcal{K}$  in Theorem 5, then with certain probability and provided  $m \gtrsim_{\mathcal{K},\beta} \gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_\Phi^2(\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{A}_\Phi^2(\mathbf{v})\|_q}{m^{1/q}} &\geq \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_\Phi^2(\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{A}_\Phi^2(\mathbf{v})\|_1}{m} \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m |\langle \phi \phi^*, \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^* \rangle| = \|\mathcal{B}_\Phi^1(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}})\|_1 \gtrsim d_2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}). \end{aligned}$$

**Case II: Amplitude Measurement.** We first declare the following three facts.

**Fact 1.** The first one establishes the correlation between  $d_2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  and  $d_1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ :

$$2d_2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \geq (\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_2) \cdot d_1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}). \quad (38)$$

Indeed, we choose  $\theta := \text{Phase}(\mathbf{u}^*\mathbf{v})$  and set  $\bar{\mathbf{v}} = \exp(i\theta)\mathbf{v}$ , then  $\langle \mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{v}} \rangle \geq 0$  and

$$d_1^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = d_1^2(\mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}) = \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + \|\bar{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^2 - 2\langle \mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{v}} \rangle.$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} d_2^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) &= d_2^2(\mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}) \\ &= \|\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^* - \bar{\mathbf{v}}\bar{\mathbf{v}}^*\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^4 + \|\bar{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^4 - 2|\langle \mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{v}} \rangle|^2 \\ &= \left( \sqrt{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^4 + \|\bar{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^4} - \sqrt{2}\langle \mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{v}} \rangle \right) \cdot \left( \sqrt{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^4 + \|\bar{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^4} + \sqrt{2}\langle \mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{v}} \rangle \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} (\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + \|\bar{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^2 - 2\langle \mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{v}} \rangle) \cdot (\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + \|\bar{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^2 + 2\langle \mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{v}} \rangle) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} d_1^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \cdot (\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

**Fact 2.** Furthermore, we set  $p = 1/2$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}_2 = \emptyset$  in Theorem 5, then with certain probability and provided  $m \gtrsim_{\mathcal{K},\beta} (\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2)$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m |\langle \phi, \mathbf{u} \rangle| = \left\| \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{1/2}(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^*) \right\|_1 \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}\|_2, \text{ for all } \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (39)$$

**Fact 3.** We then set  $p = 1/2$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{K}_2 = \mathcal{K}$  in Theorem 5, with certain probability and provided  $m \gtrsim_{\mathcal{K},\beta} \gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m |\langle \phi \phi^*, \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^* \rangle|^{1/2} = \left\| \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{1/2}(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}) \right\|_1 \gtrsim d_2^{1/2}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}), \text{ for all } \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (40)$$

Finally, provided  $m \gtrsim_{\mathcal{K},\beta} \gamma_2^2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2)$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_\Phi^1(\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{A}_\Phi^1(\mathbf{v})\|_q}{m^{1/q}} &\geq \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_\Phi^1(\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{A}_\Phi^1(\mathbf{v})\|_1}{m} \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \left| |\langle \phi_k, \mathbf{u} \rangle| - |\langle \phi_k, \mathbf{v} \rangle| \right| \geq \frac{\left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \sqrt{|\langle \phi_k, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^2 - |\langle \phi_k, \mathbf{v} \rangle|^2} \right)^2}{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m (|\langle \phi_k, \mathbf{u} \rangle| + |\langle \phi_k, \mathbf{v} \rangle|)} \\ &= \frac{\left\| \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{1/2}(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}) \right\|_1^2}{\left\| \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{1/2}(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^*) \right\|_1 + \left\| \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{1/2}(\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^*) \right\|_1} \gtrsim \frac{d_2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})}{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_2} \geq \frac{1}{2} d_1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}). \end{aligned}$$

We used Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the first two inequalities, **Fact 2** and **Fact 3** for the third inequality, and **Fact 1** for the final inequality.

### 4.3. Proof of Corollary 1

We only need to determine  $\gamma_2$ -functional for various  $\mathcal{K}$ .

**Case I.** If  $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{F}^n$ , then  $\text{cone}(\mathbb{F}^n) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2} = \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}$ . By  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2, u) \leq (1 + \frac{2}{u})^n$  [44, Corollary 4.2.13] and Dudley integral in (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_2(\mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2) &\leq C \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2, u)} du \\ &= C\sqrt{n} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log(1 + 2/u)} du \leq \tilde{C}\sqrt{n}. \end{aligned}$$

**Case II.** If  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{S}_{n,s}$ , let  $\mathcal{D}_{n,s} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}^n : \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = 1, \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq s\}$ . The volumetric argument yields

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}_{n,s}, \ell_2, u) \leq \sum_{k=1}^s \binom{n}{k} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2}{u}\right)^s \leq \left(\frac{en}{s}\right)^s \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2}{u}\right)^s,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}_{n,s}) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2) &= \gamma_2(\mathcal{D}_{n,s}, \ell_2) \\ &\leq C\sqrt{s} \left( \sqrt{\log(en/s)} + \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log(1 + 2/u)} du \right) = \tilde{C}\sqrt{s \log(en/s)}. \end{aligned}$$

**Case III.** If  $|\mathcal{K}| < \infty$ , we can restrict  $n$  to satisfy that  $|\mathcal{A}_n| \leq 2^{2^n} \leq |\mathcal{K}|$ . Thus  $2^n \leq \log |\mathcal{K}|$ . By the definition of  $\gamma_2$ -functional,

$$\gamma_2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}, \ell_2) \leq \text{diam}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{K}) \cap \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}) \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\log \log |\mathcal{K}|} 2^{n/2} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\log \log |\mathcal{K}|} 2^{n/2} \lesssim \sqrt{\log |\mathcal{K}|}.$$

## 5. Proofs of Robust Injectivity Results

We first investigate the suprema of chaos process and its empirical form with subgaussian random vectors. Combining this with the small ball method, we characterize the robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$  and the robust performance of model (7) on an arbitrary matrix set  $\mathcal{M}$ . Some special cases, such as  $\mathcal{M}$  being a low rank plus sparse matrix set then can be investigated.

### 5.1. Suprema of Chaos Process

Let  $\phi$  be a suitable  $K$ -subgaussian random vector and  $\mathcal{M}$  be a matrix set, we will first found the upper bound for the quantity

$$S(\mathcal{M}) := \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} |\langle \phi\phi^* - \mathbb{E}\phi\phi^*, \mathbf{X} \rangle| = \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} \langle \phi\phi^* - \mathbb{E}\phi\phi^*, \mathbf{X} \rangle$$

where  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M} - \mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = -\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ . Besides, let  $\phi_k$  ( $k = 1, \dots, m$ ) be independent copies of a suitable  $K$ -subgaussian random vectors, then we consider the empirical form for  $S(\mathcal{M})$ :

$$\overline{S(\mathcal{M})} = \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} \left\langle \sum_{k=1}^m \phi_k\phi_k^* - m\mathbb{E}\phi\phi^*, \mathbf{X} \right\rangle.$$

We would like in fact to understand the values of  $S(\mathcal{M})$  and  $\overline{S(\mathcal{M})}$  as function of the geometry of  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**Theorem 6.** For a matrix set  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{S}_F^n$ , we have

$$S(\mathcal{M}) \lesssim K^2 \cdot \gamma_2(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_F) + K^2 \cdot \gamma_1(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{op}) \quad (41)$$

and

$$\overline{S(\mathcal{M})} \lesssim \sqrt{m}K^2 \cdot \gamma_2(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_F) + K^2 \cdot \gamma_1(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{op}). \quad (42)$$

*Proof.* Our proof is divided into four steps, following [41, Theorem 15.1.4].

**Step1: Preliminary.** We denote by  $\Delta_1(A)$  and  $\Delta_2(A)$  the diameter of the set  $A$  for norm  $\|\cdot\|_{op}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_F$ , respectively. We then consider an admissible sequence  $(\mathcal{B}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  such that

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} 2^n \Delta_1(B_n(\mathbf{X})) \leq 2\gamma_1(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{op}), \quad \forall \mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$$

and an admissible sequence  $(\mathcal{C}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  such that

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{n/2} \Delta_2(C_n(\mathbf{X})) \leq 2\gamma_2(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_F), \quad \forall \mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}.$$

Here  $B_n(\mathbf{X})$  is the unique element of  $\mathcal{B}_n$  that contains  $\mathbf{X}$  (etc.). The definition of partitions  $\mathcal{A}_n$  of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  is as follows: we set  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}\}$ , and for  $n \geq 1$ , we define  $\mathcal{A}_n$  as the partition generated by  $\mathcal{B}_{n-1}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1}$ , i.e., the partition that consists of the sets  $B \cap C$  for  $B \in \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$  and  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{n-1}$ . Thus  $|\mathcal{A}_n| \leq |\mathcal{B}_{n-1}| \cdot |\mathcal{C}_{n-1}| \leq 2^{2^n}$  and the sequence  $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is admissible.

**Step2: Chaining Method.** We construct a subset  $\mathcal{M}_n$  of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  by taking exactly one point in each set  $A$  of  $\mathcal{A}_n$  and thus  $|\mathcal{M}_n| \leq 2^{2^n}$ . For any  $\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ , we consider  $\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathcal{M}_n$  such that  $\pi_n(\mathbf{X})$  are successive approximations of  $\mathbf{X}$ . We assume that  $\mathcal{M}_0$  consists of a single element  $\mathbf{X}_0$ , which means that  $\pi_0(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{X}_0$ . Let random variable  $Y_{\mathbf{X}} = \langle \phi\phi^* - \mathbb{E}\phi\phi^*, \mathbf{X} \rangle$ , then we have that

$$Y_{\mathbf{X}} - Y_{\mathbf{X}_0} = \sum_{n \geq 1} (Y_{\pi_n(\mathbf{X})} - Y_{\pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})}).$$

By Hanson-Wright inequality, there exists numerical constant  $c > 0$  and for  $v > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(|Y_{\pi_n(\mathbf{X})} - Y_{\pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})}| \geq v) \\ & \leq 2 \exp \left( -c \min \left\{ \frac{v^2}{K^4 \|\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_F^2}, \frac{v}{K^2 \|\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_{op}} \right\} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

We reformulate the above inequality as follows: when  $u \geq 0$ , with probability exceeding  $1 - 2 \exp(-u^2 2^{n-1})$

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_{\pi_n(\mathbf{X})} - Y_{\pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})}| & \leq u \cdot K^2 2^{n/2} \|\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_F / \sqrt{c} \\ & \quad + u^2 \cdot K^2 2^n \|\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_{op} / c \end{aligned}$$

We define the event  $\Omega_{u,n}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_{\pi_n(\mathbf{X})} - Y_{\pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})}| &\leq u \cdot K^2 2^{n/2} \|\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_F / \sqrt{c} \\ &\quad + u^2 \cdot K^2 2^n \|\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_{op} / c, \quad \forall \mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}. \end{aligned}$$

The number of possible pairs  $(\pi_n(\mathbf{X}), \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X}))$  is bounded by

$$|\mathcal{M}_n| \cdot |\mathcal{M}_{n-1}| \leq 2^{2^{n+1}}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{u,n}^c) \leq 2 \cdot 2^{2^{n+1}} \exp(-u^2 \cdot 2^{n-1}).$$

We define  $\Omega_u = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \Omega_{u,n}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(u) &:= \mathbb{P}(\Omega_u^c) \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{u,n}^c) \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} 2 \cdot 2^{2^{n+1}} \exp(-u^2 \cdot 2^{n-1}) \\ &\leq \sum_{n \geq 1} 2 \cdot 2^{2^{n+1}} \exp(-u^2/2 - 2^{n+1}) \\ &\leq \sum_{n \geq 1} 2 \cdot \left(\frac{2}{e}\right)^{2^{n+1}} \exp(-u^2/2) \leq 4 \exp(-u^2/2), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we use  $u^2 \cdot 2^{n-1} \geq u^2/2 + 2^{n+1}$  for any  $n \geq 1, u > 0$ . Thus when  $\Omega_u$  occurs, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_{\mathbf{X}} - Y_{\mathbf{X}_0}| &\leq u \cdot K^2 \sum_{n \geq 1} 2^{n/2} \|\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_F / \sqrt{c} \\ &\quad + u^2 \cdot K^2 \sum_{n \geq 1} 2^n \|\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_{op} / c \\ &:= u \cdot K^2 S_1 + u^2 \cdot K^2 S_2, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} |Y_{\mathbf{X}} - Y_{\mathbf{X}_0}| \geq 2 \max\{u \cdot K^2 S_1, u^2 \cdot K^2 S_2\}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} |Y_{\mathbf{X}} - Y_{\mathbf{X}_0}| \geq u \cdot K^2 S_1 + u^2 \cdot K^2 S_2\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(u) \leq 4 \exp(-u^2/2). \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

There exists constant  $c$  such that  $c \min\left\{\frac{t}{K^2 S_2}, \frac{t^2}{K^4 S_1^2}\right\} \leq u^2/2$ , thus we can rewrite (44) as

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} |Y_{\mathbf{X}} - Y_{\mathbf{X}_0}| \geq t\right) \leq 4 \exp\left(-c \min\left\{\frac{t}{K^2 S_2}, \frac{t^2}{K^4 S_1^2}\right\}\right). \tag{45}$$

**Step3: Expectation Form.** In particular, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
S(\mathcal{M}) &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} Y_{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} (Y_{\mathbf{X}} - Y_{\mathbf{X}_0}) \leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} |Y_{\mathbf{X}} - Y_{\mathbf{X}_0}| \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} |Y_{\mathbf{X}} - Y_{\mathbf{X}_0}| \geq t \right) dt \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty 4 \exp \left( -c \min \left\{ \frac{t}{K^2 S_2}, \frac{t^2}{K^4 S_1^2} \right\} \right) dt \\
&\lesssim (K^2 S_1) \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} |Y_{\mathbf{X}} - Y_{\mathbf{X}_0}| \geq u \cdot K^2 S_1 \right) du \\
&\quad + (K^2 S_2) \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} |Y_{\mathbf{X}} - Y_{\mathbf{X}_0}| \geq u^2 \cdot K^2 S_2 \right) du \lesssim K^2 S_1 + K^2 S_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Besides, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 &= \sum_{n \geq 1} 2^{n/2} \|\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_F / \sqrt{c} \\
&\leq \sum_{n \geq 1} 2^{n/2} \|\mathbf{X} - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_F / \sqrt{c} + \sum_{n \geq 1} 2^{n/2} \|\mathbf{X} - \pi_n(\mathbf{X})\|_F / \sqrt{c} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{n/2} \Delta_2(C_n(\mathbf{X})) \\
&\lesssim \gamma_2(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \|\cdot\|_F) \lesssim \gamma_2(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_F).
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is due to Proposition 1. Similarly, we have  $S_2 \lesssim \gamma_1(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{op})$ . Thus, we have proved (41).

**Step4: Empirical Form.** We then use (41) to prove (42). Let random variable  $\overline{Y}_{\mathbf{X}} = \langle \sum_{k=1}^m \phi_k \phi_k^* - m \mathbb{E} \phi \phi^*, \mathbf{X} \rangle$ . We can rewrite it as

$$\overline{Y}_{\mathbf{X}} = (\phi_1^* \quad \cdots \quad \phi_m^*) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \mathbf{X} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \phi_m \end{pmatrix} := \widetilde{\phi}^* \mathbf{Z} \widetilde{\phi},$$

where  $\widetilde{\phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$ ,  $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{mn \times mn}$ . As  $\|\mathbf{Z}\|_F = \sqrt{m} \|\mathbf{X}\|_F$  and  $\|\mathbf{Z}\|_{op} = \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}$ , we can rewrite (43) as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(|\overline{Y}_{\pi_n(\mathbf{X})} - \overline{Y}_{\pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})}| \geq v) \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left( -c \min \left\{ \frac{v^2}{m K^4 \|\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_F^2}, \frac{v}{K^2 \|\pi_n(\mathbf{X}) - \pi_{n-1}(\mathbf{X})\|_{op}} \right\} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We can then obtain (42) by following the above steps.  $\square$

## 5.2. Proof of Theorem 2

We use the small ball method to characterize the lower bound of the robust injectivity of  $\mathbf{A}_\Phi$ . We first provide the small ball method that is suitable for our version.

**Lemma 2** (Small Ball Method [43, 16]). Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a matrix set and  $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^m$  be independent copies of a random vector  $\phi$  in  $\mathbb{F}^n$ . Consider the marginal tail function

$$\mathcal{Q}_\xi(\mathcal{T}; \phi\phi^*) = \inf_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{P}(|\langle \phi\phi^*, \mathbf{X} \rangle| \geq \xi) \quad (46)$$

and suprema of empirical process

$$\mathcal{R}_m(\mathcal{T}; \phi\phi^*) = \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \varepsilon_k \langle \phi_k \phi_k^*, \mathbf{X} \rangle \right|, \quad (47)$$

where  $\{\varepsilon_k\}_{k=1}^m$  is a Rademacher sequence independent of everything else.

Then for any  $q \geq 1, \xi > 0$  and  $t > 0$ , with probability exceeding  $1 - \exp(-2t^2)$ ,

$$\inf_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{T}} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m |\langle \phi_k \phi_k^*, \mathbf{X} \rangle|^q \right)^{1/q} \geq \xi \mathcal{Q}_\xi(\mathcal{T}; \phi\phi^*) - 2\mathcal{R}_m(\mathcal{T}; \phi\phi^*) - \frac{\xi t}{\sqrt{m}}. \quad (48)$$

Now we let  $\mathcal{T}$  be  $\mathcal{T} := \text{cone}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}) \cap \mathbb{S}_F$ . Following the argument in [34, 33], we can get that for suitable  $(K, \beta)$ -subgaussian random vector  $\phi$ , the marginal tail function

$$\mathcal{Q}_\xi(\text{cone}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}) \cap \mathbb{S}_F; \phi\phi^*) \gtrsim (1 - \xi)^2 \frac{\beta^2}{K^8}. \quad (49)$$

Giné–Zinn symmetrization principle [44, Lemma 6.4.2] and the empirical chaos process in Theorem 6 then give that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_m(\text{cone}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}) \cap \mathbb{S}_F; \phi\phi^*) &\leq \frac{2}{m} \overline{S}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}) \\ &\lesssim K^2 \cdot \frac{\gamma_2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_F)}{\sqrt{m}} + K^2 \cdot \frac{\gamma_1(\text{cone}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_{op})}{m}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Finally, we set  $\xi = 1/2, t = C \frac{\sqrt{m}}{K^8}$  in Lemma 2, then with probability exceeding  $1 - e^{-C \frac{m}{K^8}}$ , we have

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{A}_\Phi(\mathbf{X})\|_q}{m^{1/q}} = \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m |\langle \phi_k \phi_k^*, \mathbf{X} \rangle|^q \right)^{1/q} \gtrsim \frac{\beta^2}{K^8}, \text{ for all } \mathbf{X} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \quad (51)$$

provided  $m$  obeys the condition of the theorem.

The proof of (22) then follows from similar argument to Proposition 3.

### 5.3. Proofs of Corollary 2

We determine the upper bounds of the  $\gamma_1$ -functional and  $\gamma_2$ -functional in Theorem 2.

**Case I :**  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{S}^R$ . [11, Lemma 3.1] provided the entropy number of  $\text{cone}(\mathcal{S}^R) \cap \mathbb{S}_F$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_F$ :

$$\log \mathcal{N}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{S}^R) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_F, \epsilon) \leq R(2n+1) \cdot \log(9/\epsilon).$$

Thus, by Dudley integral we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_2(\text{cone}(\mathcal{S}^R) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_F) &\lesssim \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{S}^R) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_F, \epsilon)} d\epsilon \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \sqrt{R(2n+1) \cdot \log(9/\epsilon)} d\epsilon \lesssim \sqrt{Rn} \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

and due to  $\|\cdot\|_{op} \leq \|\cdot\|_F$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 \left( \text{cone}(\mathcal{S}^R) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_{op} \right) &\leq \gamma_1 \left( \text{cone}(\mathcal{S}^R) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_F \right) \\ &\lesssim \int_0^1 R(2n+1) \cdot \log(9/\epsilon) d\epsilon \lesssim Rn. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Combining (52) and (53) we can get  $m \gtrsim_{K,\beta} R \cdot n$ .

**Case II :**  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{S}_s^R$ . [21, Lemma 7.2] provided the entropy number of  $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{S}_s^R) \cap \mathbb{S}_F$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_F$ :

$$\log \mathcal{N} \left( \text{Cone}(\mathcal{S}_s^R) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_F, \epsilon \right) \leq R(2s+1) \log(9/\epsilon) + 2Rs \log(en/s).$$

Then similar to **Case I**, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_2 \left( \text{cone}(\mathcal{S}_s^R) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_F \right) &\lesssim \sqrt{R(2s+1)} + 2\sqrt{Rs \log(en/s)} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{Rs \log(en/s)} \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

and

$$\gamma_1 \left( \text{cone}(\mathcal{S}_s^R) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_{op} \right) \leq \gamma_1 \left( \text{cone}(\mathcal{S}_s^R) \cap \mathbb{S}_F, \|\cdot\|_F \right) \lesssim Rs \log(en/s). \quad (55)$$

Combining the above estimations we can get  $m \gtrsim_{K,\beta} R \cdot s \log(en/s)$ .

## 6. Adversarial Noise to Sharp Recovery Bound

This section will showcase the potent application of adversarial noise. We construct adaptive adversarial noise to show the sharpness of recovery bounds  $\frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_q}{m^{1/q}}$ .

### 6.1. Proof of Theorem 3

Prior to demonstrating Theorem 3, we present the subsequent lemma.

**Lemma 3.** Let  $\ell = 1, 2$  and  $1 \leq q < \infty$ . Suppose  $\phi$  is a suitable  $K$ -subgaussian random vector. Then

$$\mathcal{M}_\ell(K, q) := \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}^n} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{|\langle \phi, \mathbf{u} \rangle|^\ell - |\langle \phi, \mathbf{v} \rangle|^\ell}{d_\ell(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})} \right|^q \lesssim (\sqrt{q}K)^{\ell q}. \quad (56)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix C. □

Now we choose any  $\mathbf{x}_* \in \mathbb{F}^n$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_*$  and  $\mathbf{x}_0$  are not in the same equivalence class, i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}_* \neq c\mathbf{x}_0$  for some  $|c| = 1$ . Then we set

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell(\mathbf{x}_0). \quad (57)$$

Let loss function  $\mathcal{L}_q(\mathbf{x}) = \min \|\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{b}\|_q$  with  $\mathbf{b} = \mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell(\mathbf{x}_0) + \mathbf{z}$ . Thus  $\mathcal{L}_q(\mathbf{x}_*) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{L}_q(\mathbf{x}_0) = \|\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_q = \|\mathbf{z}\|_q > 0$ .

By Chebyshev's inequality, with probability exceeding  $1 - 1/t^2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_q^q}{d_\ell^q(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_0)} &= \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathcal{A}_\Phi^\ell(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_q^q}{d_\ell^q(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_0)} = \sum_{k=1}^m \left| \frac{|\langle \phi_k, \mathbf{x}_* \rangle|^\ell - |\langle \phi_k, \mathbf{x}_0 \rangle|^\ell}{d_\ell(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_0)} \right|^q \\ &\leq m \left( \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{|\langle \phi, \mathbf{x}_* \rangle|^\ell - |\langle \phi, \mathbf{x}_0 \rangle|^\ell}{d_\ell(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_0)} \right|^q + t \cdot \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{|\langle \phi, \mathbf{x}_* \rangle|^\ell - |\langle \phi, \mathbf{x}_0 \rangle|^\ell}{d_\ell(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_0)} \right|^{2q}} / m \right) \\ &\leq m \left( \mathcal{M}_\ell(K, q) + t \sqrt{\cdot \mathcal{M}_\ell(K, 2q) / m} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We choose  $t = \sqrt{m}$  and by Lemma 3, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} d_\ell(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_0) &\geq \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_q}{\left( \mathcal{M}_\ell(K, q) + \sqrt{\mathcal{M}_\ell(K, 2q)} \right)^{1/q} \cdot m^{1/q}} \\ &\gtrsim \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_q}{(\sqrt{q}K)^\ell \cdot m^{1/q}}, \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

with probability exceeding  $1 - 1/m$ .

### 6.2. Proof of Theorem 4

The proof of Theorem 4 is similar to Theorem 3. By the SVD of  $\mathbf{X}_0$ , we can choose  $\mathbf{X}_* \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times n}$  such that  $\mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0$  is a rank-one matrix. Then, let adversarial noise be

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{A}_\Phi(\mathbf{X}_*) - \mathbf{A}_\Phi(\mathbf{X}_0) = \mathbf{A}_\Phi(\mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0). \tag{59}$$

Thus,  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}_\Phi(\mathbf{X}_0) + \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{A}_\Phi(\mathbf{X}_*)$  and the solution to model (7) is  $\mathbf{X}_*$ . By Lemma 1 and Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_q^q}{\|\mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0\|_F^q} &= \frac{\|\mathbf{A}_\Phi(\mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0)\|_q^q}{\|\mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0\|_F^q} \\ &\leq m \left( \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\langle \phi\phi^*, \mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0 \rangle}{\|\mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0\|_F} \right|^q + \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\langle \phi\phi^*, \mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0 \rangle}{\|\mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0\|_F} \right|^{2q}} \right) \\ &\lesssim m \left( qK^2 + \left\| \frac{\mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0}{\|\mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0\|_F} \right\|_* \right)^q \lesssim m (qK^2)^q, \end{aligned}$$

with probability exceeding  $1 - 1/m$ . Finally, we can get

$$\|\mathbf{X}_* - \mathbf{X}_0\|_F \gtrsim \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_q}{(qK^2) \cdot m^{1/q}}. \tag{60}$$

## Appendix A. Properties of $\psi_s$ -Norm

(a) By definition of  $\psi_s$  norm and variable substitution,

$$\begin{aligned} \|X^q\|_{\psi_s} &= \inf\{t > 0 : \mathbb{E} \exp(|X|^{qs} / t^s) \leq 2\} \\ &= \inf\{u^p : u > 0 \text{ and } \mathbb{E} \exp(|X|^{qs} / u^{qs}) \leq 2\} \\ &= (\inf\{u > 0 : \mathbb{E} \exp(|X|^{qs} / u^{qs}) \leq 2\})^q \\ &= \|X\|_{\psi_{qs}}^q. \end{aligned}$$

(b) We first claim that if  $\|X\|_{\psi_s} \leq K < \infty$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-t^s/K^s)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . This follows from the definition of  $\psi_s$ -norm and Markov's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) = \mathbb{P}(e^{X^s/K^s} \geq e^{t^s/K^s}) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}e^{X^s/K^s}}{e^{t^s/K^s}} \leq 2 \exp(-t^s/K^s). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume  $\|X\|_{\psi_s} = 1$ . By (A.1), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-t^s) = 2 \exp(-t^s \cdot t^{l-s}).$$

When  $t > 1$ , we have  $t^{l-s} \geq 1 > \log 2$ . When  $t \in [0, 1]$ , we have  $2 \exp(-t^s \log 2) = 2 \cdot 2^{-t^s} \geq 1$ . These lead to that

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-t^s \log 2). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

With a change of variable  $x = e^{\frac{u}{3/\log 2}}$  on interval  $(1, \infty)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \exp\left(\frac{|X|^s}{3/\log 2}\right) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(e^{\frac{|X|^s}{3/\log 2}} \geq x\right) dx \\ &\leq \int_0^1 1 dx + \frac{1}{3/\log 2} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(|X|^s \geq u) e^{\frac{u}{3/\log 2}} du. \end{aligned}$$

By (A.2),  $\mathbb{P}(|X|^s \geq u) = \mathbb{P}(|X| \geq u^{1/s}) \leq 2 \exp(-u \log 2)$ , then we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \exp\left(\frac{|X|^s}{3/\log 2}\right) &\leq 1 + \frac{2 \log 2}{3} \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-u \log 2 + \frac{u}{3/\log 2}\right) du \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{2 \log 2}{3} \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{2 \log 2}{3} u\right) du = 2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\|X\|_{\psi_s} \leq 3/\log 2.$$

(c) Without loss of generality, we can assume  $\|X\|_{\psi_s} = 1$ . By variable substitution  $u = t^s$  and (A.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X|^q &= \int_0^\infty qt^{q-1} \mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty qu^{\frac{q-1}{s}} 2e^{-u} \frac{1}{s} u^{\frac{1}{s}-1} du \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{2q}{s} u^{\frac{q}{s}-1} e^{-u} du = \frac{2q}{s} \Gamma\left(\frac{q}{s}\right) = 2\Gamma\left(\frac{q}{s} + 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that for  $r > 0$ ,

$$\Gamma(r+1) = \int_0^\infty (x^r e^{-\frac{x}{2}}) e^{-\frac{x}{2}} dx \leq (2r)^r e^{-r} \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{x}{2}} dx = 2 \left(\frac{2r}{e}\right)^r, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where we used the fact that  $x^r e^{-\frac{x}{2}}$  attains maximum at  $x = 2r$  as

$$\frac{d}{dx} (x^r e^{-\frac{x}{2}}) = x^{r-1} e^{-\frac{x}{2}} \left(r - \frac{x}{2}\right).$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}|X|^q \leq 4 \left(\frac{2q}{se}\right)^{\frac{q}{s}} = 4 \left(\frac{2}{se}\right)^{\frac{q}{s}} q^{\frac{q}{s}} \leq 4q^{\frac{q}{s}} \leq \left(4q^{\frac{1}{s}}\right)^q.$$

## Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 1

By Hanson-Wright inequality in [40], we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} |\phi^* \mathbf{X} \phi - \mathbb{E} [\phi^* \mathbf{X} \phi]|^q \\
&= \int_0^\infty qt^{q-1} \mathbb{P} (|\phi^* \mathbf{X} \phi - \mathbb{E} [\phi^* \mathbf{X} \phi]| > t) dt \\
&\leq 2q \left( \int_0^\infty t^{q-1} \exp \left( -c \frac{t^2}{K^4 \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2} \right) dt + \int_0^\infty t^{q-1} \exp \left( -c \frac{t}{K^2 \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}} \right) dt \right) \\
&= 2q \left( K^{2q} \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^q \int_0^\infty x^{q-1} \exp(-cx^2) dx + K^{2q} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^q \int_0^\infty x^{q-1} \exp(-cx) dx \right) \\
&\leq 2qK^{2q} \max \{c^{q/2-1}, c^{q-1}\} \left( \Gamma \left( \frac{q}{2} \right) + \Gamma(q) \right) \cdot \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^q \\
&\leq 4qK^{2q} (\max \{c, 1\})^q \Gamma(q) \cdot \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^q \\
&\leq (4 \max \{c, 1\} qK^2)^q \cdot \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^q.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we use the behavior of the Gamma function  $\Gamma(x)$  in (A.3).

Note that when  $q \geq 1$ , the triangle inequality then yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{E} |\phi \mathbf{X} \phi|^q)^{1/q} &\leq (\mathbb{E} |\phi^* \mathbf{X} \phi - \mathbb{E} [\phi^* \mathbf{X} \phi]|^q)^{1/q} + (\mathbb{E} |\phi \mathbf{X} \phi|^q)^{1/q} \\
&= (\mathbb{E} |\phi^* \mathbf{X} \phi - \mathbb{E} [\phi^* \mathbf{X} \phi]|^q)^{1/q} + |\text{Tr}(\mathbf{X})| \\
&\leq (\mathbb{E} |\phi^* \mathbf{X} \phi - \mathbb{E} [\phi^* \mathbf{X} \phi]|^q)^{1/q} + \|\mathbf{X}\|_* \\
&\lesssim (qK^2) \cdot \|\mathbf{X}\|_F + \|\mathbf{X}\|_*.
\end{aligned}$$

## Appendix C. Proof of Lemma 3

When  $\ell = 1$ , for any  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}^n$ , choosing  $\theta := \text{Phase}(\mathbf{v}^* \mathbf{u})$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_1(K, q) &= \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}^n} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{|\langle \phi, \mathbf{u} \rangle| - |\langle \phi, \mathbf{v} \rangle|}{d_1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})} \right|^q \\
&\leq \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}^n} \mathbb{E} \left| \left\langle \phi, \frac{\mathbf{u} - e^{i\theta} \mathbf{v}}{d_1(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})} \right\rangle \right|^q = \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}_{\ell_2}} \mathbb{E} |\langle \phi, \mathbf{w} \rangle|^q \lesssim (\sqrt{q}K)^q.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from Proposition 2.(c) as  $|\langle \phi, \mathbf{w} \rangle|$  is subgaussian.

When  $\ell = 2$ , by Lemma 1, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_2(K, q) = \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}^n} \mathbb{E} \left| \left\langle \phi \phi^*, \frac{\mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}^*}{\|\mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}^*\|_F} \right\rangle \right|^q \lesssim (qK^2 + \sqrt{2})^q \lesssim (qK^2)^q.$$

We have used the facts that  $\mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}^*$  is at most rank 2 and  $K \gtrsim 1$ .

## References

- [1] Radu Balan, Pete Casazza, and Dan Edidin. On signal reconstruction without phase. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 20(3):345–356, 2006.

- [2] Afonso S Bandeira, Jameson Cahill, Dustin G Mixon, and Aaron A Nelson. Saving phase: Injectivity and stability for phase retrieval. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 37(1):106–125, 2014.
- [3] Jameson Cahill, Peter Casazza, and Ingrid Daubechies. Phase retrieval in infinite-dimensional hilbert spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, Series B*, 3(3):63–76, 2016.
- [4] Jian-Feng Cai, Jingyang Li, and Juntao You. Provable sample-efficient sparse phase retrieval initialized by truncated power method. *Inverse Problems*, 39(7):075008, 2023.
- [5] Jian-Feng Cai, Jingzhi Li, Xiliang Lu, and Juntao You. Sparse signal recovery from phaseless measurements via hard thresholding pursuit. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 56:367–390, 2022.
- [6] T Tony Cai, Xiaodong Li, and Zongming Ma. Optimal rates of convergence for noisy sparse phase retrieval via thresholded Wirtinger flow. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(5):2221–2251, 2016.
- [7] T Tony Cai and Anru Zhang. Rop: Matrix recovery via rank-one projections. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(1):102–138, 2015.
- [8] Emmanuel J Candès, Yonina C Eldar, Thomas Strohmer, and Vladislav Voroninski. Phase retrieval via matrix completion. *SIAM Review*, 57(2):225–251, 2015.
- [9] Emmanuel J Candès and Xiaodong Li. Solving quadratic equations via phaselift when there are about as many equations as unknowns. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 14:1017–1026, 2014.
- [10] Emmanuel J Candès, Xiaodong Li, and Mahdi Soltanolkotabi. Phase retrieval via Wirtinger flow: Theory and algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(4):1985–2007, 2015.
- [11] Emmanuel J Candès and Yaniv Plan. Tight oracle inequalities for low-rank matrix recovery from a minimal number of noisy random measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(4):2342–2359, 2011.
- [12] Venkat Chandrasekaran, Benjamin Recht, Pablo A Parrilo, and Alan S Willsky. The convex geometry of linear inverse problems. *Foundations of Computational mathematics*, 12(6):805–849, 2012.
- [13] Vasileios Charisopoulos, Yudong Chen, Damek Davis, Mateo Díaz, Lijun Ding, and Dmitriy Drusvyatskiy. Low-rank matrix recovery with composite optimization: good conditioning and rapid convergence. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 21(6):1505–1593, 2021.

- [14] Junren Chen and Michael K. Ng. Error bound of empirical  $\ell_2$  risk minimization for noisy standard and generalized phase retrieval problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13827*, 2022.
- [15] Yuxin Chen, Yuejie Chi, and Andrea J Goldsmith. Exact and stable covariance estimation from quadratic sampling via convex programming. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(7):4034–4059, 2015.
- [16] Sjoerd Dirksen, Guillaume Lécué, and Holger Rauhut. On the gap between restricted isometry properties and sparse recovery conditions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(8):5478–5487, 2016.
- [17] John C Duchi and Feng Ruan. Solving (most) of a set of quadratic equalities: Composite optimization for robust phase retrieval. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 8(3):471–529, 2019.
- [18] Richard M Dudley. The sizes of compact subsets of hilbert space and continuity of gaussian processes. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 1(3):290–330, 1967.
- [19] Henrik Eisenmann, Felix Krahmer, Max Pfeffer, and André Uschmajew. Riemannian thresholding methods for row-sparse and low-rank matrix recovery. *Numerical Algorithms*, 93(2):669–693, 2023.
- [20] Yonina C Eldar and Shahar Mendelson. Phase retrieval: Stability and recovery guarantees. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 36(3):473–494, 2014.
- [21] Massimo Fornasier, Johannes Maly, and Valeriya Naumova. Robust recovery of low-rank matrices with non-orthogonal sparse decomposition from incomplete measurements. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 392:125702, 2021.
- [22] Simon Foucart, Rémi Gribonval, Laurent Jacques, and Holger Rauhut. Jointly low-rank and bispase recovery: Questions and partial answers. *Analysis and Applications*, 18(01):25–48, 2020.
- [23] Simon Foucart and Srinivas Subramanian. Iterative hard thresholding for low-rank recovery from rank-one projections. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 572:117–134, 2019.
- [24] Dan Freeman, Timur Oikhberg, Ben Pineau, and Mitchell A Taylor. Stable phase retrieval in function spaces. *Mathematische Annalen*, pages 1–43, 2023.
- [25] Cullen A Haselby, Mark A Iwen, Deanna Needell, Michael Perlmutter, and Elizaveta Rebrova. Modewise operators, the tensor restricted isometry property, and low-rank tensor recovery. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 66:161–192, 2023.

- [26] Meng Huang and Zhiqiang Xu. The estimation performance of nonlinear least squares for phase retrieval. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(12):7967–7977, 2020.
- [27] Meng Huang and Zhiqiang Xu. Performance bounds of the intensity-based estimators for noisy phase retrieval. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 68:101584, 2024.
- [28] Kishore Jaganathan, Yonina C Eldar, and Babak Hassibi. Phase retrieval: An overview of recent developments. *Optical Compressive Imaging*, pages 279–312, 2016.
- [29] Maryia Kabanava, Richard Kueng, Holger Rauhut, and Ulrich Terstiege. Stable low-rank matrix recovery via null space properties. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 5(4):405–441, 2016.
- [30] Vladimir Koltchinskii and Shahar Mendelson. Bounding the smallest singular value of a random matrix without concentration. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2015(23):12991–13008, 2015.
- [31] Felix Krahmer and Yi-Kai Liu. Phase retrieval without small-ball probability assumptions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(1):485–500, 2017.
- [32] Felix Krahmer, Shahar Mendelson, and Holger Rauhut. Suprema of chaos processes and the restricted isometry property. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 67(11):1877–1904, 2014.
- [33] Felix Krahmer and Dominik Stöger. Complex phase retrieval from subgaussian measurements. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 26(6):89, 2020.
- [34] Richard Kueng, Holger Rauhut, and Ulrich Terstiege. Low rank matrix recovery from rank one measurements. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 42(1):88–116, 2017.
- [35] Guillaume Lecué and Shahar Mendelson. Regularization and the small-ball method I: Sparse recovery. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(2):611–641, 2018.
- [36] Kiryung Lee and Marius Junge. Rip-like properties in subsampled blind deconvolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06146*, 2015.
- [37] Kiryung Lee, Yihong Wu, and Yoram Bresler. Near-optimal compressed sensing of a class of sparse low-rank matrices via sparse power factorization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(3):1666–1698, 2017.
- [38] Johannes Maly. Robust sensing of low-rank matrices with non-orthogonal sparse decomposition. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 67:101569, 2023.

- [39] Benjamin Recht, Maryam Fazel, and Pablo A Parrilo. Guaranteed minimum-rank solutions of linear matrix equations via nuclear norm minimization. *SIAM Review*, 52(3):471–501, 2010.
- [40] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. Hanson-wright inequality and sub-gaussian concentration. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 18:1–9, 2013.
- [41] Michel Talagrand. *Upper and lower bounds for stochastic processes*, volume 60. Springer, 2014.
- [42] Jared Tanner and Simon Vary. Compressed sensing of low-rank plus sparse matrices. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 64:254–293, 2023.
- [43] Joel A Tropp. Convex recovery of a structured signal from independent random linear measurements. *Sampling Theory, a Renaissance: Compressive Sensing and Other Developments*, pages 67–101, 2015.
- [44] Roman Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*, volume 47. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [45] Gang Wang, Georgios B Giannakis, and Yonina C Eldar. Solving systems of random quadratic equations via truncated amplitude flow. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(2):773–794, 2017.
- [46] Yang Wang and Zhiqiang Xu. Phase retrieval for sparse signals. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 37(3):531–544, 2014.
- [47] Fan Wu and Patrick Rebeschini. Hadamard wirtinger flow for sparse phase retrieval. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 982–990. PMLR, 2021.
- [48] Yu Xia and Zhiqiang Xu. The performance of the amplitude-based model for complex phase retrieval. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 13(1):iaad053, 2024.
- [49] Mengchu Xu, Yuxuan Zhang, and Jian Wang. Exponential spectral pursuit: An effective initialization method for sparse phase retrieval. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [50] Huishuai Zhang, Yi Zhou, Yingbin Liang, and Yuejie Chi. A nonconvex approach for phase retrieval: Reshaped wirtinger flow and incremental algorithms. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18:5164–5198, 2017.