Robust Matrix Completion with Corrupted Columns

Yudong Chen, Huan Xu, Constantine Caramanis, *Member*, and Sujay Sanghavi, *Member*

Abstract

This paper considers the problem of matrix completion, when some number of the columns are arbitrarily corrupted, potentially by a malicious adversary. It is well-known that standard algorithms for matrix completion can return arbitrarily poor results, if even a single column is corrupted. What can be done if a large number, or even a constant fraction of columns are corrupted? In this paper, we study this very problem, and develop an efficient algorithm for its solution. Our results show that with a vanishing fraction of observed entries, it is nevertheless possible to succeed in performing matrix completion, even when the number of corrupted columns grows. When the number of corruptions is as high as a constant fraction of the total number of columns, we show that again exact matrix completion is possible, but in this case our algorithm requires many more – a constant fraction – of observations. One direct application comes from robust collaborative filtering. Here, some number of users are so-called manipulators, and try to skew the predictions of the algorithm. Significantly, our results hold *without any assumptions on the number, locations or values of the observed entries of the manipulated columns*. In particular, this means that manipulators can act in a completely adversarial manner.

I. Introduction

Recent work in low-rank matrix completion [3], [9], [14] has demonstrated the following remarkable fact: Given a $p \times n$ matrix of rank r satisfying some technical assumptions (namely, incoherence – we discuss this in detail below), if its entries are sampled uniformly at random, then with high probability, the solution to a convex and in particular tractable optimization problem yields exact reconstruction of the matrix, when only $O((n+p)r\log^2(n+p))$ entries are sampled.

Yet as our simulations demonstrate, if even a single column of this matrix is corrupted, the output of these algorithms can be arbitrarily skewed from the true matrix. Partial observation makes *a priori* identification of corrupted column vs good column, a challenging task. This problem is particularly relevant in so-called collaborative filtering, or recommender systems. Here, based on only partial observation of users' preferences, one tries to give accurate predictions for their unrevealed preferences. It is also well known and well-documented [15], [34] that such recommender systems are susceptible to manipulation. It is thus of interest to develop efficiently scalable algorithms that can successfully predict preferences of the honest users, while identifying the manipulators.

This paper studies this precise problem. We do so by exploiting algebraic structure of the problem: the non-corrupted columns form a low-rank matrix, while the corrupted columns can be seen as a column-sparse matrix. Thus, the mathematical problem we address is to decompose a low-rank matrix from a column-sparse matrix, from only partial observations. Specifically, the problem this paper addresses is as follows. Suppose we are given a *partially observed* matrix M, and we know that the full matrix can be decomposed as

$$M = L_0 + C_0,$$

where L_0 is low-rank and C_0 has only a few non-zero columns. Here both components may have arbitrary magnitude; the rank and column/row space of L_0 as well as the number and positions of non-zero columns of C_0 are unknown. Can we efficiently recover the matrix L_0 on the non-corrupted columns, and also identify the non-zero columns of C_0? And, how does the number of corrupted columns impact the number of observations needed?

We provide an affirmative answer to the first question, and provide finite sample performance bounds that move towards answering the second. We give a convex optimization formulation, and sufficient conditions for when this optimization problem yields exact recovery of L_0, and identification of the corrupted columns. In particular, our results imply the following: if we observe only a vanishing fraction of entries, our convex optimization-based algorithm recovers L_0 exactly even in the face of an increasing number of corrupted columns. If a constant fraction of the columns are corrupted, then our algorithm succeeds in identifying them and recovers L_0 exactly, but now requires a constant fraction of observed entries. We require the locations of the observed entries in the non-corrupted columns (i.e. in L_0) to be chosen uniformly at random; significantly however, we do not assume anything about the number or locations of observations for the corrupted columns.

The first, third and fourth authors are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of Texas at Austin; email: (ydchen@mail.utexas.edu; caramanis@mail.utexas.edu; sanghavi@mail.utexas.edu. The second author is with the National University of Singapore; e-mail: mpexuh@nus.edu.sg)

Motivating Applications

A primary motivation for our investigation is the problem of Robust Collaborative Filtering. In online commerce and advertisement, companies collect user rankings for products and would like to predict user preferences based these incomplete rankings — this is the problem known as collaborative filtering (CF). Most popular in the news is the so-called Netflix problem [27], but such recommender systems are of increasing popularity and importance in online commerce. There is a large and growing literature on CF; see [1], [33] and the references therein. Many CF algorithms have been developed (see e.g.[12], [17], [18], [25], [24], [23], [31]). In many of the settings mentioned (again, most well-known in this category is the Netflix problem) this collaborative filtering problem is usually cast as a matrix completion problem, where one tries to recover a low-rank matrix L_0 from its partially observed entries. However, the quality of prediction may be seriously hampered by (even a small number of) manipulators – potentially malicious users, who calibrate (possibly in a coordinated way) their rankings *and the entries they choose to rank* in an attempt to skew predictions [34]. In the matrix completion framework, manipulative users correspond to the setting where some of the columns of the matrix M are provided by an adversary. As the ratings of the *authentic* users correspond to a low-rank matrix, the corrupted ratings correspond to a column-sparse matrix. Therefore, in order to perform collaborative filtering with robustness to manipulation, we need to identify the non-zero columns of C_0 and at the same time recover L_0, given only a set of incomplete entries. This falls precisely into the scope of our problem. Our robust matrix completion results therefore lead to a provably correct robust CF algorithm. We note that in this paper we assume uniform sampling of the observed entries. This assumption can be relaxed, although we do not provide the details here.

Another motivation is robust Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with partially observed data. In the robust PCA problem [35], [36] one is given a data matrix, of which most of the columns correspond to authentic data points and lie in a low-dimensional space – the space of principal components. The remaining columns are outliers. The goal is to negate the effect of outliers and recover the principal components. In many situations such as medical research (see e.g. [5]), the data matrix is only partially observed. Thus the problem of partially observed Robust PCA — recovering the principal components in the face of only partial observations, and also corrupted points — falls directly into our framework.

II. Problem Setup

Suppose there is a $p \times n$ data matrix M; among the n columns, a fraction $1-\gamma$ of them span a r-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^p$, and the remaining γn columns are arbitrarily corrupted. One is given only partial observation of the matrix M, and the goal is to infer the true subspace of the non-corrupted columns and the identities of the corrupted ones. Notice that neither the true subspace nor its dimension r is known, and no restriction is imposed on the corrupted columns except that the total number of them is controlled – they need not follow any probabilistic distributions, and they may be chosen by some adversary who aims to skew one's inference of the non-corrupted columns.

Under the above setup, it is clear that the data matrix M can be decomposed as

$$M = L_0 + C_0.$$

Here L_0 is the matrix corresponding to the non-corrupted columns; thus $\text{rank}(L_0) = r$ and at most $(1-\gamma)n$ of the columns of L_0 are non-zero. C_0 is the matrix corresponding to the corrupted columns; thus at most γn of the columns of C_0 are non-zero. Only some of the entries of M are observed. Let $\Omega \subseteq [p] \times [n]$ be the set of indices of the observed entries, and $\mathcal{P}_\Omega$ be the orthogonal projection onto the linear subspace of matrices supported on Ω, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}_\Omega(X) = \begin{cases} X_{ij}, & (i,j) \in \Omega, \\ 0, & (i,j) \notin \Omega. \end{cases}$$

With this notation, our goal is to exactly recover the column space of L_0 and the locations of the non-zero columns of C_0, given $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(M)$.

A. Assumptions

In general, it is not always possible to meet our objective of completing a low-rank matrix in the presence of corrupted columns. Indeed, under some circumstances, there are identifiability issues which makes the problem ill-posed. For example, if one row or column of L_0 is completely unobserved, there is no hope of recovering that row or column. On the other hand, if L_0 has only one non-zero column, it is also impossible to distinguish L_0 from C_0. Finally, if L_0 has only one non-zero row, recovering L_0 is infeasible unless that particular row is fully observed. To avoid such meaningless situations, we will impose that L_0 satisfy the now standard incoherence condition [3] and observed entries of L_0 are sampled uniformly at random. We note again that we make no assumptions on how the entries of C_0 are sampled, and moreover these entries could be adversarially chosen.

Incoherence Conditions: Suppose the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) of L_0 is $L_0 = U_0 \Sigma_0 V_0^\top$. Let e_i be the ith standard basis. We assume that the matrix L_0 satisfies the following two incoherence conditions, with parameter μ_0:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_i \left\| U_0^\top e_i \right\|^2 &\leq \mu_0 \frac{r}{p}, \\ \max_j \left\| V_0^\top e_j \right\|^2 &\leq \mu_0 \frac{r}{(1-\gamma)n}. \end{aligned}$$

Given a small incoherence parameter μ_0, the condition asserts that the left singular vectors of L_0 are spread out. Without such a condition, matrix completion does not make sense, since it would be possible for the matrix L_0 to also be row-sparse — one cannot hope to recover a row-sparse matrix with sparse observations, even without outliers. Consequently, this is a standard assumption made in the matrix completion literature [3], [9], [14], and μ_0 is likely to be small for many reasonable models [3].

The second condition asserts that the right singular vectors of L_0 are incoherent, and it essentially enforces the condition that the information about the column space of L_0 is spread out among the columns. This condition is important in the face of corrupted columns. If, for instance, a column of L_0 were not in the span of all the other columns, one could not hope to recover it or distinguish it from one of the corrupted columns. This condition is standard in the robust PCA literature, and most practical problems have a very small parameter μ_0 (e.g., [37]).

For the corrupted columns, we make only one assumption: they are indeed corrupted. That is, we assume only the following. Suppose an oracle were to provide the true column space, U_0, of the low-rank matrix, L_0. There would be no way to complete the observed entries of any of the columns of C_0, so that it lies in the column space of L_0. If this does not hold, then there is no reasonable way to distinguish a corrupted column from an authentic column. Moreover, such entries will not affect the recovery of the unobserved entries in the authentic columns. In terms of the collaborative filtering application, this is akin to saying that we will only call a user a "manipulator" if the corresponding entries indeed would manipulate the entries of the authentic users. Other than this identifiability requirement, we make no assumptions whatsoever on the corrupted columns. The incoherence assumptions are imposed on the column and row spaces of L_0, not on M, as are the sampling assumptions, and thus the corrupted columns are not restricted in any way by these. One consequence of this is that we are not able to recover the complete corrupted columns, but we are able to recover their identities.

Sampling Model: Let $\mathcal{I}_0 \subset [n]$ be the set of indices of the corrupted columns. Let $\tilde{\Omega} \subseteq [p] \times \mathcal{I}_0$ be the set of indices of observed entries on the non-corrupted columns (i.e. the nonzero columns of L_0). We assume that $\tilde{\Omega}$ is sampled uniformly random from all size-m subsets of $[p] \times \mathcal{I}_0$ (this is sometimes called sampling without replacement); so m is the number of observed entries on the non-corrupted columns. Note that *no* assumption whatsoever is imposed on the observed entries on the corrupted columns; the adversary may choose to fill in all entries on columns in $\mathcal{I}_0$ or just a fraction of them, and the locations of these observed entries may be chosen randomly or depending on L_0. On the other hand, as we do not aim at (and there is no hope of) recovering the unobserved entries of C_0, we can assume without loss of generality that all the unobserved entries of C_0 are zero, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(C_0) = C_0$.

B. Notation and Preliminaries

We provide here a brief summary of the notation used in the paper. We abuse notation by letting $\tilde{\Omega}$ (and $\tilde{\Omega}^c$) be both a set of matrix entries, and also the linear space of matrices supported on these entries; similarly $\mathcal{I}_0$ and $\mathcal{I}_0^c$ denote both the set of column indices and the linear space of matrices supported on these columns. For a linear subspace $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{S}$ is the orthogonal projection onto $\mathcal{S}$. The SVD of L_0 is $U_0 \Sigma_0 V_0^\top$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{U_0}$ be the projection of each column of a matrix onto the column space of L_0, given by $\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(A) = U_0 U_0^\top A$; similarly for the row space $\mathcal{P}_{V_0}(A) = A V_0 V_0^\top$. We write $A \in \mathcal{P}_{U_0}$ for any A obeying $\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(A) = A$; i.e., the column space of A is in the column space of U_0. Similarly $A \in \mathcal{P}_{V_0}$ denotes $\mathcal{P}_{V_0}(A) = A$. The subspace $\mathcal{T}_0$ is defined as the span of matrices with the same column or row space as L_0; thus we have

$$\mathcal{T}_0 = \{U_0 X^\top + Y V_0^\top,\ \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r},\ Y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_0}(A) = \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(A) + \mathcal{P}_{V_0}(A) - \mathcal{P}_{U_0}\mathcal{P}_{V_0}(A).$$

The complementary operators are defined as usual:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(A) &= (I - U_0 U_0^\top) A, \\ \mathcal{P}_{V_0^\perp}(A) &= A(I - V_0 V_0^\top), \\ \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_0^\perp}(A) &= \mathcal{P}_{V_0^\perp}\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(A) = (I - U_0 U_0^\top) A (I - V_0 V_0^\top). \end{aligned}$$

For a vector x, x_i is its ith entry. For a matrix A, A_i is its ith column and A_{ij} is its (i,j)-th entry. Five matrix norms are used: $\|A\|_*$ is the nuclear norm (the sum of singular values), $\|A\|$ is the spectral/operator norm (the largest singular values), $\|A\|_\infty$ is the matrix infinity norm (the largest absolute value of the entries), $\|A\|_{1,2}$ is the sum of ℓ_2 norms of the columns of A, $\|A\|_{\infty,2}$ is the largest ℓ_2 norm of the columns of A, and finally $\|A\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm.

Notation Related to Non-corrupted Columns: Let $n_1 = n - |\mathcal{I}_0^c| = (1-\gamma)n$ be the number of uncorrupted columns. Let $\mathcal{R}: \mathcal{I}_0^c \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{p\times n_1}$ be the following linear mapping: given $X \in \mathcal{I}_0^c$, remove all its columns in $\mathcal{I}_0$ (which by definition are zero columns), and denote the resulting column truncated matrix as $\mathcal{R}(X)$. Note that this is an injection, and thus $\mathcal{R}^{-1}$ is well-defined. (We define $\mathcal{R}$ because we frequently need to operate on the $\mathcal{I}_0^c$ portion of a matrix that is all zero on $\mathcal{I}_0$, and we can think of $\mathcal{R}$ as simply making the size of the matrix "compatible" with the operation applied to it). Note that by assumption $V_0^\top \in \mathcal{I}_0^c$; let $\tilde{V}_0 = \mathcal{R}(V_0^\top)^\top$ and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0 = \left\{ Z \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times n_1} | Z = U_0 X^\top + Y \tilde{V}_0^\top,\ \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times r},\ Y \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times r} \right\}.$$

$\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0^\perp}$ are defined accordingly. By definition $\tilde{\Omega} = \Omega \cap \mathcal{I}_0^c$ is the set of clean and observed entries, and $\tilde{\Omega}^c = \Omega^c \cap \mathcal{I}_0^c$ is the set of clean but unobserved entries. $m = \left|\tilde{\Omega}\right|$ and $\rho = \frac{m}{pn_1}$ are thus number and fraction of observed clean entries, respectively.

The letters η and c and their derivatives (η_1, c_2 etc.) denote unspecified constants that are, however, universal in that they are independent of p, n, γ, m and r.

A summary of the notation:

$\mathcal{I}_0$	Set of indices of the corrupted columns
Ω	Set of observed entries
$\tilde{\Omega}$	Set of observed entries on the non-corrupted columns (=$\Omega \cap \mathcal{I}_0^c$)
p	Number of rows of L_0
n	Number of columns of L_0
γ	Fraction of corrupted columns ($= \left\|\mathcal{I}_0\right\|/n$)
n_1	Number of non-corrupted ($= (1-\gamma)n = \left\|\mathcal{I}_0^c\right\|$)
m	Number of observed entries on the non-corrupted columns ($= \left\|\tilde{\Omega}\right\| = \left\|\Omega \cap \mathcal{I}_0^c\right\|$)
ρ	Fraction of observed entries on the non-corrupted columns ($= \frac{m}{pn_1}$).
μ_0	Coherence parameters for U_0 and V_0 (defined later).
$\mathcal{T}_0$	The span of $p \times n$ matrices with the same row space or column space as L_0.
$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0$	$\mathcal{T}_0$ restricted to the columns in $\mathcal{I}_0^c$
$\tilde{V}_0$	V_0 restricted to the columns in $\mathcal{I}_0^c$
$(\hat{L}, \hat{C})$	An optimal solution of the oracle problem (defined later).
$\hat{U}, \hat{V}$	The left and right singular vectors of $\hat{L}$, respectively (defined later).
$\hat{\mathcal{T}}$	The span of matrices with the same row or column space as $\hat{L}$ (defined later).
$\hat{\mathcal{I}}$	The column support of $\hat{C}$ (defined later).
Ω_0	A generic subset of entries of $[p] \times [n_1]$

III. Main Results and Consequences

The main result of this paper says that despite the corrupted columns, despite the partial observation, we can nevertheless simultaneously recover L_0, the non-corrupted columns, and identify $\mathcal{I}_0$, the position of the corrupted columns, as long as the the number of corrupted columns and unobserved entries are controlled. Moreover, this can be achieved efficiently by solving a *tractable* convex program. Our algorithm is as follows.

Algorithm 1 Manipulator Pursuit

Input: $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(M)$, Ω, λ

Solve for optimum (L^*, C^*):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize}_{L,C} \quad & \|L\|_* + \lambda \|C\|_{1,2} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \mathcal{P}_\Omega(L+C) = \mathcal{P}_\Omega(M) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Set $\mathcal{I}' = \{j : C^*_{ij} \neq 0 \text{ for some } i\}$, $L' = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}'^c}(L^*)$.

Output: L', $\mathcal{I}'$

We say our algorithm succeeds if we always have $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(L') = L_0$, $\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(L') = L'$, and $\mathcal{I}' = \mathcal{I}_0$. We recall our single restriction on the corrupted columns: they are indeed corrupted, in that they cannot be completed so as to lie in the column space of the true matrix L_0 — failing this, asking for $\mathcal{I}_0$ to be recovered does not make sense, nor is it even clear why such a column should be called "corrupted."

A. Main Theorems

Our first main theorem states that under some natural conditions, our algorithm exactly recovers the non-corrupted columns and the identities of the corrupted columns with high probability. Here and in what that follows, by *with high probability*, we mean with probability at least $1 - cn^{-5}$ for some constant $c > 0$. Recall that ρ is the fraction of observed entries on the non-corrupted columns and γ is the fraction of corrupted columns.

Theorem 1. *Suppose $n_1 \geq p \geq 32$ and $r \leq \bar{r}$, $\gamma \leq \bar{\gamma}$, $\rho \geq \varrho$. If $(\bar{r},\ \bar{\gamma},\ \varrho)$ satisfies*

$$\varrho \geq \eta_1 \frac{\mu_0^2 \bar{r}^2 \log^3(4n_1)}{p} \tag{2}$$

and

$$\frac{\bar{\gamma}}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \leq \eta_2 \frac{\varrho^2}{\left(1 + \frac{\mu_0 \bar{r}}{\varrho\sqrt{p}}\right)^2 \mu_0^3 \bar{r}^3 \log^6(4n_1)}, \tag{3}$$

where η_1 and η_2 are absolute constants, then with high probability Algorithm 1 with $\lambda = \frac{1}{48}\sqrt{\frac{\varrho}{\bar{\gamma}\bar{r}\mu_0 n \log^2(4n_1)}}$ strictly succeeds.

Remark. *Notice the theorem does not require any assumption on the observed entries on the* corrupted *columns. In the case of collaborative filtering, a malicious user can choose to rate any subset of products in an arbitrary way. Also notice that to choose λ, one does not need to know the exact values of ρ, γ, and r, but rather bounds on them.*

We give three corollaries to illustrate the consequences of Theorem 1.

Corollary 1. *If $r \leq \eta_1 \frac{1}{\mu_0}$, $\rho \geq \eta_2 \frac{\log(4n_1)}{p^{1/4}}$, $\gamma \leq \eta_3 \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}$, then Algorithm 1 with $\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{p^{1/4}}{n}}$ succeeds with high probability.*

Remark. *Notice that the choice λ is universal and does not depende on any unknown quantity. In the case of $p = \Theta(n_1)$, we can recover the non-corrupted columns with a vanishing fraction of entries observed and a growing number of corrupted columns.*

Corollary 2. *If $\rho \geq 0.1$ and $r \leq \bar{r} \leq \eta_1 \frac{\sqrt{p}}{\mu_0 \log^{3/2}(4n_1)}$, then Algorithm 1 with $\lambda = \frac{\mu_0 \bar{r} \log^2(4n_1)}{\sqrt{n}}$ succeeds with high probability if*

$$\gamma \leq \eta_2 \frac{1}{\mu_0^3 \bar{r}^3 \log^6(4n_1)}.$$

Remark. *With a constant fraction of entries observed, the fraction of corrupted columns can be as large as one over a polylog factor. If $\rho = 1$, we partially recover the result in [36].*

Corollary 3. *If $\gamma = 0$, $r \leq \bar{r}$, and m satisfies*

$$m \geq \eta_1 \mu_0^2 \bar{r}^2 n \log^2(4n)$$

then w.h.p. Algorithm 1 with $\lambda = n$ has a unique solution $(L_0,\ 0)$.

Remark. *This (partially) recovers the matrix completion result in [4], [28], [9].*

Benign Corruptions: Recall that thus far, the corrupted columns are not subject to any restrictions. In particular, the incoherence conditions are not imposed on C_0, and the number and locations of the observed entries on the corrupted columns can be arbitrary. If the corruptions C_0 are not entirely adversarial, however, and in fact satisfy some additional assumptions, then we can do better: the condition on γ is weaker, and the polylog factor can be eliminated. This is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Suppose $n_1 \geq p \geq 32$ and $\gamma \leq \bar{\gamma}$. In addition, assume that the entries on the corrupted columns are fully observed, and the left singular vectors of the full matrix M (and not only those of L_0) denoted by U_M, satisfy the following incoherence condition:*

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \|\mathcal{P}_{U_M} e_i\|_2^2 \leq \mu_0 \frac{r}{p}. \tag{4}$$

If $(r,\ \bar{\gamma},\ \rho)$ satisfies

$$\rho \geq \frac{\eta_1 \mu_0^2 r^2 \log^2(4n_1)}{\sqrt{p}\log(p)}, \tag{5}$$

and

$$\frac{\bar{\gamma}}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \leq \eta_2 \frac{\rho^2}{\mu_0^2 r^2 \log^2(4n_1)/\log^2(p)}, \tag{6}$$

where η_1 and η_2 are absolute constants, then wth high probability Algorithm 1 with $\lambda = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}n}}$ strictly succeeds.

Remark. *If p scales linearly with n_1, then we have no polylog gap. In particular, we can recover the non-corrupted columns L_0 exactly, in the presence of a constant fraction of corrupted columns, given a constant fraction of observations.*

B. Connections to Prior Work and Innovation

In the matrix completion problem, one seeks to recover a low rank matrix from a small number of its entries. It has recently been shown that by using convex optimization [3], [4], [9], [28] or singular value thresholding [14], one can exactly recover an $n \times n$ rank-r matrix with high probability from as few as $O(nr\mathrm{poly}\log n)$ entries. Our paper extends this line of work and shows that even if the observed entries on some columns are completely corrupted (by possibly adversarial noise), one can still recover the non-corrupted columns as well as the identity of the corrupted columns.

The centerpiece of our algorithm is a convex optimization problem, that is a convex proxy to a very natural (but intractable) algorithm for such recovery, namely, finding a low-rank matrix L and a column-sparse matrix C consistent with the observed data. Such convex surrogates for rank and support functions have been used extensively in vector problems and low-rank matrix problems (e.g., [8], [29], and more closely related to our topic of interest, matrix completion papers, e.g., [4], [9], [28]) and matrix decomposition papers [2], [6]. Our analysis also adapts important ideas from the previous literature, especially the ideas of dual certification and Golfing Scheme in [3], [9].

Besides the obvious difference in the problem setup, our paper also departs from the previous work in terms of mathematical analysis. In particular, in all the above works, the intended outcome is known *a priori* – their goal is to output a matrix or a pair of matrices, exactly equal to the original one(s). In our setting, however, the optimal solution of the convex problem is in general neither the original low rank matrix L_0 nor the matrix C_0 which consists of only the corrupted columns. This critical difference requires a novel analysis that builds on the method of the "Oracle Problem" introduced in [36].

Our work is also related to the problem of separating a low-rank matrix and an overall sparse matrix from their (possibly partially observed) sum, with sufficient condition for successful recovery provided [2], [6]. Compared to this line of work, our results indicate that separation is still possible even if the low-rank matrix is added with a *column-sparse* matrix instead of an *overall sparse* matrix. Moreover, although we don't pursue in this paper, our techniques allow us to establish results on separating three components – a low rank matrix, an overall sparse matrix, and a column-sparse matrix.

The presence of (randomly) missing entries and corrupted columns — and thus dealing with three matrix structures simultaneously — requires the introduction of new ingredients. In particular, one important technical innovation requires the development of new bounds on the $\|\cdot\|_{\infty,2}$ norms of certain random matrices.

IV. Proofs of Main Theorems

In this section we prove our main theorems. The first five subsections are devoted to the proof of Theorem 1, while the last one proves Theorem 2.

The proof is quite technical, and requires a number of intermediate results. To clarify the exposition, and also to provide a high-level roadmap of what we do and why we do it, we first outline the main steps of the proof in Section IV-A. The proof itself is contained in Sections IV-B to IV-E. Then in Section IV-F, we show that under additional assumption of the outliers, the proof of the dual certificate can be simplified, and stronger recovery result can be obtained, namely Theorem 2.

A. Skeleton of the Proof

In this section we provide a proof-skeleton of our main theorem. The full proof details are given in the subsequent sections. The main roadmap to proving a convex optimization problem recovers a desired solution, is to demonstrate that with high probability, one can find a dual certificate of optimality of the desired solution. This basic recipe underlies many of the proofs in sparse recovery and low-rank recovery [2], [3], [6]. A central roadblock to this approach is that unless the adversary's corrupted columns happen to be perfectly perpendicular to the column space of the true low-rank matrix, *the convex optimization problem given will not precisely recover L_0*. The reason is simple: if the corrupted columns have a non-perpendicular component, then some part of that will be put into the

L matrix the optimization recovers. Algorithmically, this matter is irrelevant: as long as the corrupted columns are identified, and the recovered L matches the desired L_0 on the non-corrupted columns, our objective is met, and the problem is solved. The analysis, however, is significantly complicated, since because we do not recover L_0 exactly, we no longer explicitly know for what to write a certificate of optimality.

Beyond this, significant challenges arise because of the simultaneous presence of three matrix structures: low-rank, matrix-sparse, and column-sparse. This requires a number of additional innovations. The six main steps of the proof are as follows.

Step 1. The first step is quite standard in the matrix completion literature. It says that with high probability, under the sampling regime of the stated results, the sampling operator $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}$ on the non-corrupted columns, is invertible on the span of matrices with either the same column or row space as L_0. Without such a result, matrix completion under any algorithm would be hopeless. We note that in our case, we cannot make any statements about the operator $\mathcal{P}_\Omega$ which involves sampling on the corrupted columns, since we make no assumptions on the distribution of the samples on the corrupted columns. The result we prove below, essentially says the following: when $m > \frac{64}{3}\mu_0 r(n_1+p)\beta\log(n_1+p)$, (as we require in our main theorems), then with high probability,

$$\left\| \frac{pn_1}{m}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{7}$$

We refer to this condition repeatedly in what follows.

Step 2. For the algorithm to succeed, it is sufficient for the recovered pair (L^*, C^*) to have the right column space and correct non-corrupted columns for L^*, and the right column support for C^*. To identify such a solution, we consider the following Oracle Problem; here Γ denotes the space of matrices supported on the set of all entries in the non-corrupted columns plus the observed entries in the corrupted columns.

$$\begin{array}{rl} \text{minimize}_{L,C} & \|L\|_* + \lambda \|C\|_{1,2} \\ \text{subject to} & \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(L+C) = \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(M_0) \\ & \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(L) = L \\ & \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(C) = C. \end{array}$$

The Oracle Problem is feasible, since the true pair (L_0, C_0) is feasible. Let $(\hat{L}, \hat{C})$ denote the solution to the Oracle Problem. We must identify conditions that a dual certificate must satisfy to guarantee that $(\hat{L}, \hat{C})$ is an optimal solution to Algorithm 1, and that any optimal solution to Algorithm 1 must also have the correct column space and column support.

Step 3. To state these conditions, we need some definitions.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}\hat{\Sigma}\hat{V}^\top &:= \text{the singular value decomposition of } \hat{L} \\ \hat{\mathcal{T}} &= \left\{ Z \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times n} | Z = \hat{U}X^\top + Y\hat{V}^\top, \right. \\ &\qquad \left. \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times r}, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times r} \right\} \\ \hat{\mathcal{I}} &= \text{column support of } \hat{C} \\ \mathfrak{G}(\hat{C}) &= \left\{ H \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times n} | \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(H) = 0; \right. \\ &\qquad \forall i \in \hat{\mathcal{I}},\ H_i = \frac{\hat{C}_i}{\left\|\hat{C}_i\right\|_2}; \\ &\qquad \left. \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cap (\hat{\mathcal{I}})^c,\ \|H_i\|_2 \leq 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is now straightforward to demonstrate that $\hat{Q}$ is a dual certificate as long as it satisfies the following:

$$\begin{array}{ll} (a) & \hat{Q} \in \Omega \\ (b) & \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\hat{Q}) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top = 0 \\ (c) & \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\hat{Q}) \right\| < 1 \\ (d) & \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\hat{Q}) \in \lambda\mathfrak{G}(\hat{C}) \\ (e) & \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q}) \right\|_{\infty,2} < \lambda. \end{array}$$

We construct a certificate $\hat{Q} \in \Omega$, by first constructing a certificate, Q, that satisfies (b) through (e), and then sampling it according to Ω and scaling appropriately. We then use concentration inequalities to show that the

sampling procedure is "close enough" to the identity map. Following this program requires some care. In particular, the equality constraint in (b) must be relaxed, since the concentration inequalities can only guarantee that it is approximately satisfied with high probability. This is done in the next step.

Step 4. Consider any feasible perturbation, $(\hat{L}+\Delta_1, \hat{C}+\Delta_2)$. Given a $\hat{Q}$ that satisfies properties $(a)-(e)$ above, it is immediate to show that $(\hat{L}+\Delta_1, \hat{C}+\Delta_2)$ is suboptimal:

$$\left\|\hat{L}\right\|_* + \lambda \left\|\hat{C}\right\|_{1,2} \leq \left\|\hat{L}+\Delta_1\right\|_* + \lambda \left\|\hat{C}+\Delta_2\right\|_{1,2}.$$

Condition (b) above, $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\hat{Q}) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top = 0$, comes from the need to show that the above inequality holds for all values of the perturbation, Δ_1, and in particular, its projection onto $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}$, the column and row space of $\hat{L}$. However, Δ_1 cannot be arbitrary.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $\Delta_1,\ \Delta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times n}$ are feasible perturbations, i.e., they satisfy $P_\Omega(\Delta_1)+P_\Omega(\Delta_2)=0$. Then under the sampling regime in the above results, the condition (7) holds with high probability, and we have*

$$\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\Delta_1\right\|_F \leq \sqrt{\frac{2pn_1}{m}}\left(\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}\Delta_1\right\|_* + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\Delta_2\right\|_{1,2}\right).$$

Then, since Δ_1 cannot be arbitrary, the equality of condition (b) can be relaxed. This leads to alternative conditions that $\hat{Q}$ must satisfy.

Proposition 1 (Alternative Dual Certificate Condition)**.** *Suppose $\lambda < 1$. Then with high probability, under the sampling regime of the results, the condition (7) holds, and $(\hat{L},\ \hat{C})$ is an optimal solution to* (1) *if there exists $\hat{Q}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&(a) \qquad \hat{Q} \in \Omega,\\
&(b') \qquad \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\hat{Q}) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top = \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(D),\\
&\qquad\qquad \textit{for some } D \textit{ with } \|D\|_F \leq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{m}{2pn_1}}\lambda,\\
&(c') \qquad \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\hat{Q})\right\| \leq \frac{1}{2},\\
&(d) \qquad \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\hat{Q}) \in \lambda\mathfrak{G}(\hat{C})\\
&(e') \qquad \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})\right\|_{\infty,2} \leq \frac{\lambda}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

If both inequalities are strict, and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}\cap\mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}} = \{0\}$, then any optimal solution $(L',\ C')$ to (1) *satisfies $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(L') = L_0$, $\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(L') = L'$, and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0\cap\Omega}(C') = C'$, which means Algorithm 1 succeeds.*

Step 5. The next step requires constructing a dual certificate Q, that satisfies properties $(b)-(e)$, and also $(b')-(e')$. Ignoring the requirement of (a), essentially allows us to consider the fully observed problem of separating a low-rank matrix from a column-sparse matrix — a substantially more manageable problem. The Q that we obtain satisfies all constraints except for (a), and thus is the Q that we then sample. The sampling procedure is described next.

Step 6. The final step requires us to sample Q to obtain $\hat{Q}$, and then show using concentration inequalities, that the resulting $\hat{Q}$ satisfies $(a')-(e')$ with high probability. The naive approach does not quite work, and thus requires a different sampling scheme. We do this using a modification of the approach coined "The Golfing Scheme" [9], [10]. We sample Ω by a modified batched sampling-with replacement scheme. The final step requires showing that Bernstein's inequality still holds under this scheme (since the sampled entries are no longer all independent).

The Oracle Problem approach, the conditions on Δ_1 and Δ_2 in the Lemma above, the alternative conditions for the certificate that we present here, and the validation of our choice of the certificate, are new. Moreover, because our objective involves a $\|\cdot\|_{1,2}$–term, our results require us to obtain new concentration results for the dual $\|\cdot\|_{\infty,2}$ bound, that are previously not known (at least to us).

B. Proof of Alternative Dual Certificate Conditions

In this Section, we prove the alternative dual certificate conditions given in Proposition 1. The main idea is simple: The equality constraint of the condition (b), namely, $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\hat{Q}) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top = 0$, comes from considering a perturbation (Δ_1, Δ_2), where Δ_1 has arbitrary projection onto the space $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}$. However, we need only consider feasible perturbations, i.e., pairs (Δ_1, Δ_2) that satisfy $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(\Delta_1)+\mathcal{P}_\Omega(\Delta_2)=0$. We show that any such pair need obey an additional constraint on $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)$, as given above in Lemma 1. This then allows us to replace the equality constraint of (b) by the inequality in (b'). Now for the details.

The first result is quite standard in the matrix completion literature, and at some level indicates why matrix completion from a small collection of entries is even possible. It says, essentially, that in the space $\mathcal{T}_0$ of matrices with the same column or row space as the low-rank matrix L_0, the sampling operator $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}$ causes no loss of information, i.e., it is invertible. More specifically, the result bounds the operator norm of $\frac{pn_1}{m}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}$. The proof follows that of [28, Theorem 3.4]. The only difference is that [28, Theorem 3.4] assumes sampling *with* replacement, while we assume sampling *without* replacement, which does not cause a problem as recently shown in [11].

Lemma 2. *Suppose $\Omega_0 \in [p]\times[n_1]$ is a set of m_0 entries sampled uniformly at random without replacement. Then for all $\beta > 1$,*

$$\left\|\frac{pn_1}{m_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\right\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{16\beta\mu_0 r(n_1+p)\log(n_1+p)}{3m_0}} \tag{8}$$

with probability at least $1-2\max\{n_1,\ p\}^{2-2\beta}$ provided that $m_0 > \frac{16}{3}\mu_0 r(n_1+p)\beta\log(n_1+p)$.

Remark. *In particular, when $m > \frac{64}{3}\mu_0 r(n_1+p)\beta\log(n_1+p)$, which is satisfied under the assumption of our main theorems, we have w.h.p. that the condition (7) given above, holds:*

$$\left\|\frac{pn_1}{m}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\right\| \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

and thus $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}$ is invertible on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0$. We will make use of this result throughout the paper.

The next three lemmas prove some important properties of $(\hat{L},\ \hat{C})$, as well as the column and row spaces of $\hat{L}$ and L_0. Indeed, one of the challenges of developing a certificate for the solution to the Oracle Problem, is that we must relate properties of $\hat{L}$, $\hat{U}$ and $\hat{V}$, to properties of L_0, and in particular U_0 and V_0. We use these lemmas repeatedly in the sequel. Lemma 3 is an analog of [37, Lemmas 4 and 5].

Lemma 3. *Let $\left(\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)^\top = \mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{V}^\top)\right)$. We have $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{L}) = L_0$, $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{U}} = \mathcal{P}_{U_0}$, $\hat{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_0$, and there exists orthnormal $\bar{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times r}$ and invertible $N \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times r}$ such that*

$$\hat{U}\hat{V}^\top = U_0\bar{V}^\top \tag{9}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}} = \mathcal{P}_{V_0} \tag{10}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} = \mathcal{P}_{U_0}+\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}-\mathcal{P}_{U_0}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} \tag{11}$$

$$\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} = \tilde{V}_0 N \tag{12}$$

Proof: By definition of the oracle problem, we have $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(\hat{L}+\hat{C}) = \mathcal{P}_\Gamma(L_0+C_0)$. Applying $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}$ to both sides of the equality and noticing that $L_0 \in \mathcal{I}_0^c$, $C_0,\ \hat{C} \in \mathcal{I}_0$, we obtain $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{L}) = L_0$. Then everything except the last equality can be proved in excatly the same way as in [37, Lemma 4, 5].

Now for the last equality in the lemma. Since $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{L}) = L_0$, the columns of $\tilde{V}_0$ and $\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}^c}$ span the same space. Thus there exists an invertible $N \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times r}$ such that$\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} = \tilde{V}_0 N$. ∎

The next lemma is an analog of [37, Lemma 6].

Lemma 4. *There exists some $\hat{H}$ such that $\hat{H} \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{G}(\hat{C})$ and*

$$\hat{U}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\hat{V}) = U_0\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\bar{V}^\top) = \lambda\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(\hat{H}) \tag{13}$$

Proof: The proof is almost identical to that of [37, Lemma 6]. Since $(\hat{L},\ \hat{C})$ is an optimal solution to the Oracle Problem, by convex analysis there exists Q_1, Q_2, A', and B' such that

$$Q_1+\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(A') = Q_2+\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(B') \in \Gamma$$

where Q_1, Q_2 are subgradients to $\left\|\hat{L}\right\|_*$ and to $\lambda\left\|\hat{C}\right\|_{1,2}$. This means that $Q_1 = \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top+Z_1 = U_0\bar{V}^\top+Z_1$ for some $Z_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}$ and $Q_2 = \lambda(\hat{H}+Z_2)$ for some $\hat{H} \in \mathfrak{G}(\hat{C})$ and $Z_2 \in \mathcal{I}_0^c$. Let $A = Z_1+A'$, $B = \lambda Z_2+B'$, we have

$$\hat{U}\hat{V}^\top+\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(A) = UV_0^\top+\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(A) = \lambda\hat{H}+\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(B) \in \Gamma.$$

Notice that $\hat{H} \in \mathcal{I}_0$ and $\lambda\hat{H}+\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(B) \in \Gamma$ imply $\hat{H} \in \Omega$. Applying $\mathcal{P}_{U_0}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}$ to the above equality gives the equality (13). ∎

Finally, we have the following simple technical lemma, which manipulates the operators $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0^\perp}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}$, $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}^{-1}$. This lemma in particular, is used repeatedly below.

Lemma 5. *For any $X \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times n}$ and $Z \in \mathcal{I}_0^c$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(X)\right) &= \mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(X)\right) &(14)\\
\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(Z)\right) &= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(Z) &(15)\\
\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(P_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0^\perp}\mathcal{R}(Z)\right) &= \mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0^\perp}\mathcal{R}(Z)\right). &(16)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof: For the first equality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(X)\right) &= \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}^c}P_{U_0}(X) + \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}}(X)\right)\\
&= \mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(X)\right) + \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(X)\hat{V}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{V}^\top)\right)\\
&= \mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(X)\right) + \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(X)\hat{V}\left(\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)^\top\\
&= \mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(X)\right) + \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(X)\hat{V}N^\top\tilde{V}_0^\top\\
&= \mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(X)\right) + \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(X)\hat{V}N^\top\tilde{V}_0^\top\\
&= \mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(X)\right) + \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(X)\hat{V}\left(\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)^\top\\
&= \mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(X)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use Lemma 3.

For $Z \in \mathcal{I}_0^c$, denote $\tilde{Z} = \mathcal{R}(Z)$. The second equality is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(\tilde{Z})\right) &= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(\tilde{Z}) + \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(\tilde{Z})\right)\\
&= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(\tilde{Z})\right) + \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}P_{\hat{V}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}P_{\tilde{V}_0}(\tilde{Z})\right)\\
&= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(Z) + \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\tilde{Z})\tilde{V}_0\tilde{V}_0^\top\right)\hat{V}\hat{V}^\top\\
&= \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(Z) + \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\tilde{Z})\tilde{V}_0\tilde{V}_0^\top\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\hat{V}^\top\\
&= \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(Z) + \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\tilde{Z})\tilde{V}_0\tilde{V}_0^\top\tilde{V}_0N\hat{V}^\top\\
&= \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(Z) + \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\tilde{Z})\tilde{V}_0N\hat{V}^\top\\
&= \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(Z) + \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\tilde{Z})\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\hat{V}^\top\\
&= \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(Z) + \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(Z)\hat{V}\hat{V}^\top\\
&= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(Z).
\end{aligned}$$

The third equality is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(P_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0^\perp}(\tilde{Z})\right) &= (I - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}})\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left((I - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0})(\tilde{Z})\right)\\
&= Z - \mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(\tilde{Z})\right) - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(Z) + \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(\tilde{Z})\right)\\
&= Z - \mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(\tilde{Z})\right) - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(Z) + \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(Z)\\
&= Z - \mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(\tilde{Z})\right)\\
&= \mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0^\perp}(\tilde{Z})\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we make use of the second equality. ∎

The next step is important — we now prove Lemma 1 stated above, showing that if Δ_1 and Δ_2 are feasible perturbations, then $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)$ must satisfy an additional constraint. Using this, we are then able to relax the equality constraint of the certificate, to an inequality. As pointed out earlier, the idea of obtaining conditions for a dual certificate with relaxed equality constraint, have appeared earlier, first in [9] and then also in [2], [28]. The following constraints, however, are new, as are the relaxed dual certificate constraints. We restate Lemma 1 here.

Lemma 1. Suppose $\Delta_1,\ \Delta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times n}$ are feasible perturbations, i.e., they satisfy $P_\Omega(\Delta_1) + P_\Omega(\Delta_2) = 0$. When Eq.(7) holds, we have

$$\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F \leq \sqrt{\frac{2pn_1}{m}}\left(\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_* + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2}\right). \quad (17)$$

Proof: We have following chain of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2} \geq \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}(\Delta_2)\right\|_F &= \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F \\ &= \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1) + \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F \\ &\geq \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F - \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F \\ &\geq \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F - \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F \\ &\geq \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F - \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_*.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $\mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right) \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0$ by the first equality in Lemma 5. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F^2 &= \left\langle \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1),\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1),\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right),\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right)\right\rangle \\ &= \Big\langle \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(\mathcal{R}P_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right),\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right) \\ &\qquad -\frac{m}{pn_1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right) + \frac{m}{pn_1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right)\Big\rangle \\ &\geq \frac{m}{2pn_1}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F^2,\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses Eq.(7). Collecting these facts, we obtain

$$\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_* + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2} \geq \sqrt{\frac{m}{2pn_1}}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F.$$

■

We now turn to the proof of Proposition 1.

Proof: (of Proposition 1) The first part of the proof (the proof of non-strict success) is standard. To prove $(\hat{L},\ \hat{C})$ is optimal to (1), we need to show that any other feasible solution $(\hat{L}+\Delta_1,\ \hat{C}+\Delta_2)$ with $P_\Omega(\Delta_1)+P_\Omega(\Delta_2)=0$ can not have a objective value lower than that of $(\hat{L},\ \hat{C})$. Take $W_1 \in \hat{T}^\perp$ such that $\|W_1\|=1$, $\left\langle W_1,\ \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}\Delta_1\right\rangle = \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}\Delta_1\right\|_*$ and $W_2 \in \mathcal{I}_0^c$ such that $\|W_2\|_{\infty,2}=1$, $\left\langle W_2,\ \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\Delta_2\right\rangle = \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\Delta_2\right\|_{1,2}$. Then $\hat{U}\hat{V}^\top + W_1$ is a subgradient of $\left\|\hat{L}\right\|_*$, and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\hat{Q}) + \lambda W_2$ is a subgradient of $\lambda\left\|\hat{C}\right\|_{1,2}$. Notice that

$$\left\langle \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(D),\ \Delta_1\right\rangle = \left\langle \mathcal{R}^{-1}(D),\ \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\Delta_1\right\rangle.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\hat{L}+\Delta_1\right\|_* + \lambda\left\|\hat{C}+\Delta_2\right\|_{1,2} - \left\|\hat{L}\right\|_* - \lambda\left\|\hat{C}\right\|_{1,2} \\ \overset{(1)}{\geq}\ &\left\langle \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top + W_1,\ \Delta_1\right\rangle + \left\langle \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\hat{Q}) + \lambda W_2,\ \Delta_2\right\rangle \\ \overset{(2)}{=}\ &\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_* + \lambda\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2} + \left\langle \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top - \hat{Q},\ \Delta_1\right\rangle + \left\langle \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\hat{Q}) - \hat{Q},\ \Delta_2\right\rangle \\ =\ &\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_* + \lambda\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2} + \left\langle \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(D) - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\hat{Q}),\ \Delta_1\right\rangle + \left\langle -\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q}),\ \Delta_2\right\rangle \\ \overset{(3)}{\geq}\ &\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_* + \lambda\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2} - \|D\|_F\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F - \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\hat{Q})\right\|\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_* \\ &- \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})\right\|_{\infty,2}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2} \\ =\ &\left(1-\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\hat{Q})\right\|\right)\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_* + \left(\lambda - \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})\right\|_{\infty,2}\right)\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2} - \|D\|_F\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F \\ \overset{(4)}{\geq}\ &\left(1-\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\hat{Q})\right\|\right)\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_* + \left(\lambda - \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})\right\|_{\infty,2}\right)\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2} \\ &-\sqrt{\frac{2pn_1}{m}}\|D\|_F\left(\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_* + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2}\right) \\ =\ &\left(1-\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\hat{Q})\right\| - \sqrt{\frac{2pn_1}{m}}\|D\|_F\right)\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F + \left(\lambda - \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})\right\|_{\infty,2} - \sqrt{\frac{2pn_1}{m}}\|D\|_F\right)\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2} \\ \overset{(5)}{\geq}\ &0,\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (1) follows by the definition of subgradient, equality (2) follows due to the fact that $\hat{Q} \in \Omega$, inequality (3) uses the property of dual norms, inequality (4) follows from Lemma 1, and finally inequality (5) uses the assumption of the proposition at hand. Therefore, $(\hat{L},\ \hat{C})$ is an optimal solution.

Now suppose both (b') and (d) are strict. If the last inequality is strict, then $(\hat{L},\ \hat{C})$ is the unique optimal solution. Otherwise, we must have

$$\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\Delta_1)\right\|_F = \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2)\right\|_{1,2} = 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(\Delta_1) = -\mathcal{P}_\Omega(\Delta_2)$ and $\Delta_2 \in \mathcal{I}_0$, we have $\mathcal{P}_\Omega \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_1) = -\mathcal{P}_\Omega \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_2) = 0$. Because $\Delta_1 \in \hat{T}$, we have $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_1)) \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0$ by the first equality in Lemma 5. It follows that

$$\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_1)) = \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}} \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_1)) = 0.$$

Applying $\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}$ to both sides of the above equality gives $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\Delta_1) = 0$, which means $\Delta_1 \in \mathcal{I}_0$. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\Delta_1) \\ = \ & \Delta_1 - \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(\Delta_1) \\ = \ & \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Delta_1) - \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(\Delta_1) \\ = \ & \mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\Delta_1), \end{aligned}$$

and thus $\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\Delta_1) \in \mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}$. This implies $\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\Delta_1) = 0$ because $\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\Delta_1) \in \mathcal{I}_0$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} \cap \mathcal{I}_0 = \{0\}$. Therefore $\Delta_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{U_0}$. On the other hand, if $(\hat{L} + \Delta_1,\ \hat{C} + \Delta_2)$ is an optimal solution, we must have $\Delta_2 \in \Omega$; otherwise $(\hat{L} + \Delta_1,\ \hat{C} + \mathcal{P}_\Omega(\Delta_2))$ will have strictly lower objective value. Putting all together, we conclude that for $(\hat{L} + \Delta_1,\ \hat{C} + \Delta_2)$ to be optimal, we must have $\Delta_1 \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cap \mathcal{P}_{U_0}$, $\Delta_2 \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cap \Omega$, and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{L} + \Delta_1) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{L}) = L_0$, where the last equality is shown in Lemma 3. This completes the proof. ■

C. Technical Lemmas

In this sub-section we collect several technical lemmas, which are required for constructing the dual certificate. These lemmas bound the norms of certain random operators/matrices.

Our basic tool for bounding matrix norms is the Noncommutative Bernstein inequality. The version presented below is from [28], except that here we assume the sampling *without* replacement model; this is possible because it has been shown that the Noncommutative Bernstein Inequality still holds under this model [11].[1]

Lemma 6 (Noncommutative Bernstein Inequality)**.** *[28, Theorem 3.4] Let $X_1, \dots X_L$ be zero-mean random matrices of dimension $d_1 \times d_2$ sampled uniformly without replacement from some finite set. Suppose $\sigma_k^2 = \max\left\{\left\|\mathbb{E} X_k X_k^\top\right\|,\ \left\|\mathbb{E} X_k^\top X_k\right\|\right\}$ and $\|X_k\| \le M$ a.s. for all k. Then for any $\tau > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{L} X_k\right\| > \tau\right] \le (d_1 + d_2) \exp\left(\frac{-\tau^2/2}{\sum_{k=1}^{L} \sigma_k^2 + M\tau/3}\right).$$

Remark. *Observe that the right hand side is less than $(d_1+d_2)\exp\left(-\frac{3}{8}\tau^3 / \sum_{k=1}^{L} \sigma_k^2\right)$ as long as $\tau \le \frac{1}{M}\sum_{k=1}^{L} \sigma_k^2$.*

The next lemma states that for a fixed matrix in $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0$, the operator $\left(\frac{pn_1}{m}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}} - I\right)$ does not increase the matrix infinity norm. Its proof largely follows that of [28, Lemma 3.6] and uses the Noncommutative Bernstein Inequality, with the modification that sampling without replacement is assumed.

Lemma 7. *[28, Lemma 3.6] Suppose $\Omega_0 \in [p] \times [n_1]$ is a set of m_0 entries sampled uniformly at random without replacement. Let $Z \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0$ be a fixed $p \times n_1$ matrix. Then for all $\beta > 2$,*

$$\left\|\frac{pn_1}{m_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}(Z) - Z\right\|_\infty \le \sqrt{\frac{8\beta\mu_0 r(n_1+p)\log(n_1+p)}{3m_0}}\,\|Z\|_\infty$$

with probability at least $1 - 2\max\{n_1,\ p\}^{2-\beta}$ provided that $m_0 > \frac{8}{3}\beta\mu_0 r(n_1+p)\log(n_1+p)$.

The next lemma bounds the operator norm of $\left(\frac{pn_1}{m}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}(Z) - Z\right)$ with the infinity norm of Z. Again one can adapt the proof in [28] to the sampling without replacement model.

[1]Intuitively, this is because sampling without replacement implies negative association in some sense, although this argument does not really work as a rigorous proof due to the lack of total order for matrices; the proof in [11] uses a coupling argument.

Lemma 8. *[28, Theorem 3.5] Suppose $\Omega_0 \in [p] \times [n_1]$ is a set of m_0 entries sampled uniformly at random without replacement and let Z be a fixed $p \times n_1$ matrix. Then for all $\beta > 1$,*

$$\left\| \frac{pn_1}{m_0} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}(Z) - Z \right\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{8\beta p n_1 \max\{p,\ n_1\} \log(n_1 + p)}{3m_0}} \, \|Z\|_\infty$$

with probability at least $1 - (n_1 + p)^{1-\beta}$. provided that $m_0 > 6\beta \min\{n_1, p\} \log(n_1 + p)$.

The bounds in the next two lemmas are new. The first one states that for a fixed matrix in $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0$, the operator $\left(\frac{pn_1}{m} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \right)$ does not increase its infinity-two norm too much. The proof uses the Noncommutative Bernstein Inequality and is given in Appendix A.

Lemma 9. *Suppose $p \leq n_1$ and $\Omega_0 \in [p] \times [n_1]$ is a set of m_0 entries sampled uniformly at random without replacement. For any $Z \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0$ and $\beta > 1$, we have*

$$\left\| \frac{pn_1}{m_0} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z) \right\|_{\infty,2} \leq \frac{16}{3} \beta \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 p n_1^2}{m_0^2} \log^2(2n_1)} \, \|Z\|_{\infty,2}$$

with probability at least $1 - (2n_1)^{2-2\beta}$.

The next lemma states that the operator $\frac{pn_1}{m} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}$ dos not increase the infinity-two norm of a matrix whose column space is the same as U_0. The proof is given in Appendix B.

Lemma 10. *Suppose $\Omega_0 \in [p] \times [n_1]$ is a set of m_0 entries sampled uniformly at random without replacement. For any matrix $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$, we have*

$$\left\| \frac{pn_1}{m_0} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0} \left(U_0 \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \left(Z^\top \right) \right) \right\|_{\infty,2} \leq \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{16\beta \mu_0 r (n_1 + p) p \log(n_1 + p)}{3m_0}} \right) \left\| U_0 \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \left(Z^\top \right) \right\|_{\infty,2}$$

with probability at least $1 - (n_1 + p)^{2-2\beta}$ provided $m_0 \geq \frac{64}{3} \beta \mu_0 r (n_1 + p) \log(n_1 + p)$.

D. Constructing the Dual Certificate via the Golfing Scheme

In this section, we construct the dual certificate, which builds on the dual certificate used in [37] and utilizes the Golfing Scheme.

Recall that Lemma 4 guarantees the existence of an $\hat{H}$ satisfying Eq.(13). Following [37], let

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1 &= \lambda \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(\hat{H}) = U_0 \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\bar{V}^\top) \\ \Lambda_2 &= \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} (\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}})^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\lambda \hat{H}) \\ Q &= \hat{U} \hat{V}^\top + \lambda \hat{H} - \Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2, \end{aligned}$$

and let $\psi \triangleq \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\bar{V}^\top) \left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\bar{V}^\top) \right)^\top \right\|$. By [37, Proof of Theorem 4], when $\psi < 1$, the following holds.

1) $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(Q) = \hat{U} \hat{V}^\top$;
2) $\left\| \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(Q) \right\| = \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\lambda \hat{H}) + \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\Lambda_2) \right\| \leq \lambda \sqrt{\gamma n} + \frac{1}{1-\psi} \lambda \sqrt{\gamma n}$;
3) $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(Q) = \lambda \hat{H}$;
4) $\left\| \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(Q) \right\|_{\infty,2} = \left\| U_0 \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\bar{V}^\top) - \Lambda_2 \right\|_{\infty,2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} + \frac{\lambda \sqrt{\gamma n} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}}{1-\psi}$.

This dual certificate Q, satisfies all the conditions in Proposition 1 except the requirement of being in Ω. Moreover, this requirement can only potentially fail on the columns in $\mathcal{I}_0$. Thus, there is a natural candidate solution: build $\hat{Q}$ identical to Q on the columns in $\mathcal{I}_0$, and for the columns $\mathcal{I}_0^c$, *sample the certificate Q according to Ω*. That is, $\hat{Q} \triangleq \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(Q) + Z$, where $Z = \mathcal{R}^{-1} \left(\frac{pn_1}{m_1} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(Q) \right)$. Evidently, $\hat{Q} \in \Omega$, while $\mathbb{E}[Z] = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(Q)$, and hence $\mathbb{E}[\hat{Q}] = Q$ and thus satisfies all the required properties. We may then use matrix concentration inequalities to show that with high probability, $\hat{Q}$ itself satisfies the required conditions. Note that not requiring the random part of $\hat{Q}$, namely, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})$, to satisfy any equality constraints, is critical (whence the need for the alternative sufficient conditions of Proposition 1.

The details are slightly more complicated, and require us to use the Golfing Scheme to construct the desired dual certificate. For technical reasons, we need to modify our sampling model as follows. [2]

[2]This is because we need a certain amount of independence in Ω, due to the fact that the bounds in Lemma (7)-(10) are not uniform in Z. See [9], [11] for discussion of this issue.

Sampling with batch replacement model: We assume that $\tilde{\Omega}$ consists of s batch of entries sampled from the $\mathcal{I}^c$ columns, with each batch of size q, where the sampling operation proceeds as follows. We draw the first batch $\tilde{\Omega}_1$ of q entries uniformly random from $[p] \times [n_1]$ *without* replacement. Then we replace all the entries in the first batch and draw the second batch $\tilde{\Omega}_2$ of q entries independently of the first batch. We repeat this procedure for s times. In this way, we obtain a total of $m = q \times s$ (perhaps non-distinct) entries $\tilde{\Omega} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{s} \tilde{\Omega}_i$. Notice that every single batch contains distinct elements, while the batches are independent of each other.

In Appendix C, we argue the following: if there exists a dual certificate with high probability under the sampling with batch replacement model, then the probability that there exists a dual certificate under the sampling without replacement model with the same m can only be higher. Therefore, we only need to construct the dual certificate under the sampling with batch replacement model.

Since by assumption $m = \rho p n_1$ satisfies

$$m \geq \eta_1 \mu_0^2 r^2 n_1 \log^2(4n_1), \tag{18}$$

we may choose $s = \left\lceil 2 \cdot \frac{5}{4} \log(4n_1) \right\rceil$ and $q = m/s \geq c_1 \mu_0^2 r^2 n_1 \log(4n_1)$ for some constant c_1 sufficiently lareg. Define

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0 &= 0 \\ Y_i &= Y_{i-1} + \frac{pn_1}{q} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i} \left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(Q) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1}) \right), \quad i = 1, \ldots, s \\ \hat{Q} &= \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(Q) + \mathcal{R}^{-1}(Y_s). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that under the above construction, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\hat{Q}) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(Q)$. Thus we are using the Golfing Scheme only for the $\mathcal{I}_0^c$ part of Q. We show now that $\hat{Q}$ is the desired dual certificate, i.e., satisfying the conditions of success in Proposition 1.

To simplify the subsequent presentation, we introduce one more piece of notation and define

$$K = \mu_0 r \log^2(4n_1).$$

We collect below several inequalities which will be used in the proof of the dual certificate. (These inequalities are just condensed form of Lemma 2 and Lemma 7-10.) Let c denote some constant sufficiently large, and suppose ρ obeys the lower bound in Theorem 1 with a sufficiently large η_1. By Lemma 2 the following holds w.h.p. for each i,

$$\left\| \frac{pn_1}{q} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \right\| \leq c \sqrt{\frac{K}{p\rho}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tag{19}$$

By Lemma 7 the following holds w.h.p. for each i and any $Z \in \tilde{T}$,

$$\left\| \frac{pn_1}{q} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}(Z) - Z \right\|_\infty \leq c \sqrt{\frac{K}{p\rho}} \|Z\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2} \tag{20}$$

By Lemma 8 the following holds w.h.p. for each i and any Z,

$$\left\| \left(\frac{pn_1}{q} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i} - I \right)(Z) \right\| \leq 6 \sqrt{\frac{n_1 K}{\mu_0 r \rho}} \|Z\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{\frac{pn_1}{\mu_0^2 r^2}} \tag{21}$$

By Lemma 9 the following holds w.h.p. for each i and any $Z \in \tilde{T}$,

$$\left\| \frac{pn_1}{q} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} P_{\tilde{\Omega}_i} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z) - Z \right\|_{\infty,2} \leq c \frac{K}{\rho \sqrt{p}} \|Z\|_{\infty,2} \tag{22}$$

By Lemma 10 the following holds w.h.p. for each i.

$$\left\| \frac{pn_1}{q} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i} \left(U_0 \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \left(\bar{V}^\top \right) \right) \right\|_{\infty,2} \leq \left(c \sqrt{\frac{K}{\rho}} \right) \left\| U_0 \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \left(\bar{V}^\top \right) \right\|_{\infty,2} \tag{23}$$

Also notice that $\left\| U_0 \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \left(\bar{V}^\top \right) \right\|_{\infty,2} = \max_i \left\| U_0 \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \left(\bar{V}^\top \right) e_i \right\|_2 = \max_i \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \left(\bar{V}^\top \right) e_i \right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}$.

We are ready to show that $\hat{Q}$ satisfies the condition of success.

Proposition 2. *If $n_1 \geq 32$, m satisfies Eq.*(18)*, and λ satisfies*

$$\frac{c_1 \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{K}}{\rho\sqrt{p}} \right) \frac{\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{(1-\gamma)}}}{\sqrt{n} \left(1 - c_2 \left(1 + \frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}} \right) \frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)} \mu_0 r} \right)} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{48} \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\gamma n K}}, \tag{24}$$

for some c_1 and c_2 sufficiently small, then the certificate $\hat{Q}$ constructed above satisfies

(a) $\hat{Q} \in \Omega$,

and satisfies the remaining conditions of Proposition 1 with high probability:

(b) $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}}(\hat{Q}) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top = \mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}} R^{-1}(D)$ for some $\|D\|_F \leq \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\rho}\lambda$;

(c) $\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}(\hat{Q})\right\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$;

(d) $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\hat{Q}) \in \lambda \mathfrak{G}(\hat{C})$;

(e) $\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})\right\|_{\infty,2} \leq \frac{\lambda}{2}$.

Proof: We know that $\hat{H} \in \Omega$ by Lemma 4, and $Y_s \in \Omega$ by construction. Therefore $\hat{Q} = \lambda\hat{H} + \mathcal{R}^{-1}(Y_s) \in \Omega$. Denote $\mathcal{I}_0^c = \mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} Q\right)$. We first derive an equality which we make use of in the rest of the proof. For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_i) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}) \\
= \; & -\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}) + \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1}) + \frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} P_{\tilde{\Omega}_s}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right) \\
= \; & \left(\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\right)\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right) \qquad (25) \\
= \; & \cdots \\
= \; & \prod_{j=1}^{i}\left(\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_j}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\right)\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}), \qquad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by recursion.

Also notice that by our assumption on λ, we have $\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n} \leq \frac{1}{48}\sqrt{\frac{p}{K}} \leq \frac{1}{80}$. It follows from [37, Lemma 7] that

$$1 - \psi \geq 1 - \lambda\sqrt{\gamma n} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Step 1: Let $D = \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_s) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})$. By the second equality of Lemma 5, we have $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} R^{-1}(Y_s) = \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(D) + \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(Q)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\hat{Q}) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top &= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(Q) + \mathcal{R}^{-1}(Y_s)\right) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top \\
&= \left(\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}} P_{\mathcal{I}}(Q) + \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(D) + \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(Q)\right) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top \\
&= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(Q) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top + \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(D) \\
&= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(D),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses the properties of Q.

The rest of this step is standard when one uses the Golfing scheme. Recall that we want $\hat{Q}$ to be close to $\hat{U}\hat{V}^\top$ on $\hat{T}$, and notice that $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\hat{Q}) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top = \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_s) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}^c})$. So $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_i) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})$ can viewed as the "error" after the i iterations of the Golfing Scheme. The proof consists of showing that the error decreases geometrically at each iteration. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\hat{Q}) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top\right\|_F &= \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(D)\right\|_F \\
&= \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_s) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right\|_F \\
&\overset{(1)}{\leq} \left\|\prod_{j=1}^{s}\left(\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\right)\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)\right\|_F \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^s \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right\|_F \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^s \sqrt{n_1}\left\|Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
&\overset{(2)}{\leq} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^s \sqrt{n_1}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} + \frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}}{1-\psi}\right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^s \sqrt{n_1}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} + 2\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}\right) \qquad (27) \\
&\overset{(3)}{\leq} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^s \sqrt{n_1}\lambda. \qquad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

Here, inequality (1) uses Eq.(19), inequality (2) is due to [37, Proof of Theorem 4, Step 5], and inequality (3) is proved in Step 4 below. Since $s = 2 \cdot \frac{5}{4}\log(4n_1)$, and $\sqrt{\rho} \geq \frac{1}{2n_1}$, the last line is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^s \sqrt{n_1}\lambda &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2\cdot\frac{5}{4}\log(4n_1)} \sqrt{n_1}\lambda \\ &\leq 2^{-2\log_2(4n_1)}\sqrt{n_1}\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{(4n_1)^2}\sqrt{n_1}\lambda \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\rho}\lambda.\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Step 2: Modulo some technical issues, and some previously established facts from [37], this step is also standard when one uses the Golfing Scheme; the key is showing $\left\|P_{\tilde{T}_0^\perp}(Y_s)\right\|$ is small. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(Y_s) &= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Y_s) + \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0^\perp}(Y_s) + \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}^c}) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Y_s) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right) + \mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0^\perp}(Y_s) - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Y_s) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right) + \mathcal{R}^{-1}P_{\tilde{T}_0^\perp}(Y_s) - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses the third equality in Lemma 5. Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}(\hat{Q})\right\| &= \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(Q) + \mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(Y_s)\right\| \\ &\leq \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(Q)\right\| + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Y_s) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}^c})\right)\right\| + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0^\perp}(Y_s)\right\| + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)\right\| \\ &\leq \left\|\lambda\hat{H}\right\| + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Y_s) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right\| + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0^\perp}(Y_s)\right\| + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)\right\|.\end{aligned}$$

We bound each of the four terms on the right hand side, separately.

By [37, Lemma 2], the first term is bounded as $\left\|\lambda\hat{H}\right\| \leq \lambda\sqrt{\gamma n} \leq \frac{1}{80}$.

The second term can be bounded using results from Step 1:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Y_s) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}}(Q_{\mathcal{I}^c})\right\| &\leq \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}_0}(Y_s) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}}(Q_{\mathcal{I}^c})\right\|_F \\ &= \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{T}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(D)\right\|_F \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}(n_1+p)^{1/2}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} + \frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}}{1-\psi}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2n_1}}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} + \frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}}{1-\psi}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2n_1}} + \frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}}{1-\psi} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2n_1}} + 2\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n} \\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{16} + 2\cdot\frac{1}{80},\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is due to $\mu_0 \leq \frac{n_1}{r}$ and (b) is due to $n_1 \geq 32$.

For the third term, let $\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top = \mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\bar{V}^\top)$. We have the following chain of inequalities. The key steps are inequality (1) and (2) below, where we bound $\|\cdot\|$ with $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ using Lemma 8, and then bound $\|\cdot\|$ using Lemma 7; these are where we need the $\tilde{\Omega}_i$'s to be independent of each other.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0^\perp}(Y_s)\right\| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{s}\left\|\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0^\perp}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right)\right\| \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{s}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0^\perp}\frac{pn_1}{q}P_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})-P_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right)-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0^\perp}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})-P_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right)\right\| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{s}\left\|\left(\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}-I\right)\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})-P_{\tilde{T}}(Y_{i-1})\right)\right\| \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^{s}6\sqrt{\frac{n_1K}{\mu_0 r\rho}}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})-P_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right\|_\infty \\
&= 6\sqrt{\frac{n_1K}{\mu_0 r\rho}}\sum_{i=1}^{s}\left\|\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}\left(\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_j}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}}\right)\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)\right\|_\infty \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} 6\sqrt{\frac{n_1K}{\mu_0 r\rho}}\sum_{i=1}^{s}\frac{1}{2^{i-1}}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right\|_\infty \\
&\leq 6\sqrt{\frac{n_1K}{\mu_0 r\rho}}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right\|_\infty \\
&\leq 6\sqrt{\frac{n_1K}{\mu_0 r\rho}}\left(\left\|U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top\right\|_\infty+\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)\right\|_\infty\right) \qquad (30) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{8}\sqrt{\frac{pn_1}{\mu_0^2 r^2}}\left\|U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top\right\|_\infty+6\sqrt{\frac{n_1K}{\mu_0 r\rho}}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} \frac{1}{8}\sqrt{\frac{pn_1}{\mu_0^2 r^2}}\cdot\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{pn_1}}+6\sqrt{\frac{n_1K}{\mu_0 r\rho}}\cdot\frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}}{1-\psi} \\
&= \frac{1}{8}+6\frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}}{1-\psi}\sqrt{\frac{K}{\rho}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{8}+12\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{K}{\rho}} \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} \frac{1}{8}+12\cdot\frac{1}{48}\sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\gamma nK}}\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{K}{\rho}} \\
&\leq \frac{3}{8}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here, inequality (a) follows from Eq.(21), inequality (b) from Eq.26 and (20), and inequality (c) from the incoherence assumption and the following inequalities (similar to [37, Proof of Theorem 7, Step 5]):

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
=\ &\max_{1\leq i\leq n_1}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)e_i\right\|_2 \\
=\ &\max_{1\leq i\leq n_1}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}(\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}})^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}(\lambda\hat{H})e_i\right\|_2 \\
=\ &\max_{1\leq i\leq n_1}\left\|(I-U_0U_0^\top)(\lambda\hat{H})\bar{V}\bar{V}^\top\left[I+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}(\bar{V}G^i\bar{V}^\top)\right]\bar{V}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\bar{V}^\top)\tilde{V}_0\tilde{V}_0^\top e_i\right\|_2 \\
\leq\ &\max_{1\leq i\leq n_1}\left\|I-U_0U_0^\top\right\|\left\|\lambda\hat{H}\right\|\left\|\bar{V}\bar{V}^\top\right\|\left\|I+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}(\bar{V}G^i\bar{V}^\top)\right\|\left\|\bar{V}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\bar{V}^\top)\right\|\left\|\tilde{V}_0\right\|\left\|\tilde{V}_0^\top e_i\right\|_2 \\
\leq\ &\frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}}{1-\psi}. \qquad (31)
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally (d) is due to our choice λ.

The fourth term can be bounded in a way similar to [37, Theorem 7, Step 4] as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)\right\| &= \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\left(U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)\right)\right\| \\
&= \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top) - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}(\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}})^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\lambda\hat{H})\right\| \\
&\leq \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top)\right\| + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}(\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}})^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}(\lambda\hat{H})\right\| \\
&= \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}\left(U_0\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\bar{V}^\top)\right)\right\| + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}(\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}})^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}}(\lambda\hat{H})\right\| \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} 0 + \frac{\lambda\left\|\hat{H}\right\|}{1-\psi} \\
&\leq \frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}}{1-\psi} \\
&\leq 2\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n} \\
&\leq 2\cdot\frac{1}{80},
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from [37, Theorem 7, Step 4].

Collecting the bounds for the four terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0^\perp}(\hat{Q})\right\| &\leq \frac{1}{80} + \left(\frac{1}{16} + 2\cdot\frac{1}{80}\right) + \frac{3}{8} + 2\cdot\frac{1}{80} \\
&\leq 5\cdot\frac{1}{80} + \frac{1}{16} + \frac{3}{8} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 3: Using the properties of Q, we have $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\hat{Q}) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(Q) = \lambda\hat{H} \in \lambda\mathfrak{G}(\hat{C})$.

Step 4: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})\right\|_{\infty,2} &= \|Y_s\|_{\infty,2} \\
&= \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{s}\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{s}\frac{pn_1}{q}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
&\leq \frac{pn_1}{q}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} + \frac{pn_1}{q}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_2}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_1)\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
&\qquad + \frac{pn_1}{q}\sum_{i=3}^{s}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right)\right\|_{\infty,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We bound the three terms on the right hand side separately. (The reason for doing this is that higher order terms in the above sum are easier to bound, so we need to isolate the first two terms in order to get tighter bounds.) The new inequalities we derive on the $\|\cdot\|_{\infty,2}$ norm, are critical here.

We bound the first term using Lemma 10. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{pn_1}{q}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} &= \frac{pn_1}{q}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_1}\left(U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
&\leq \frac{pn_1}{q}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_1}\left(U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} + \frac{pn_1}{q}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}\left(\Lambda_2\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} c_3\sqrt{\frac{K}{\rho}}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} + c_4\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}}{1-\psi}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} \\
&\leq c_3\sqrt{\frac{K}{\rho}}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} + c_5\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, inequality (a) is due to Eqs. (23) and (31). In the first equality above, one might be tempted to write $\left\|P_{\tilde{\Omega}_1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} \leq \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right\|_{\infty,2}$ and then use the established bound on $\left\|Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right\|_{\infty,2}$ from [37], but this leads to a looser bound. Instead, we bound the "$U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top$ part" and the "$\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)$ part" of $P_{\tilde{\Omega}_1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)$ separately.

The second term is bounded using Lemma 9. We have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{pn_1}{q}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_2}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_1)\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
= & \frac{pn_1}{q}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_2}\left(\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}P_{\tilde{\Omega}_1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\right)\left(U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top+\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
\overset{(a)}{\leq} & \frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{p}\left\|\left(\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\right)\left(U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top\right)\right\|_{\infty}+\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\left\|\left(\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\right)\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
\overset{(b)}{\leq} & \frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{p}c_6\sqrt{\frac{K}{p\rho}}\left\|U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top\right\|_{\infty}+\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}c_7\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\left\|P_{\tilde{T}}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
\overset{(c)}{\leq} & c_6\frac{\sqrt{K}\log(2n_1)}{\rho\sqrt{\rho}}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2r^2}{pn_1}}+c_8\frac{K\log(2n_1)}{\rho^2\sqrt{p}}\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here, (b) is due to Eq. (20) and (22), and (c) follows from the incoherence assumption and [37, Proof of Theorem 7, Step 5]. Again, bounding the "$U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top$ part" and the "$\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)$ part" separately in (a) gives a better bound.

The third term is of high order and thus easier to control than the first two terms. It suffices to use the loose bound $\|\cdot\|_{\infty,2}\leq\sqrt{p}\,\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$. We have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\sum_{i=3}^{s}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
\leq & \frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{p}\sum_{i=3}^{s}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right)\right\|_{\infty} \\
\leq & \frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{p}\sum_{i=3}^{s}\left\|\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}\left(\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_j}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\right)\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)\right\|_{\infty} \\
\overset{(a)}{\leq} & \frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{p}\sum_{i=3}^{s}\left(c_1\sqrt{\frac{K}{p\rho}}\right)^{i-1}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right\|_{\infty} \\
\overset{(b)}{\leq} & \frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{p}\cdot c_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{K}{p\rho}}\right)^{2}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right\|_{\infty} \\
= & c_2\frac{K\log(2n_1)}{\rho^2\sqrt{p}}\left\|U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top+\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)\right\|_{\infty} \\
\leq & c_2\frac{K\log(2n_1)}{\rho^2p}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2r^2}{n_1}}+c_2\frac{K\log(2n_1)}{\rho^2\sqrt{p}}\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where (a) follows from Eq.(20) (here we use the independence between the $\tilde{\Omega}_i$'s again), and (b) is due to the fact that $c_1\sqrt{\frac{K}{p\rho}}\leq\frac{1}{2}$.

Collecting the bounds for the three terms, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
\leq & c_1\left(\sqrt{\frac{K}{\rho}}+\frac{\sqrt{\mu_0 rK}\log(2n_1)}{\rho\sqrt{\rho p}}+\frac{\sqrt{\mu_0 r}K\log(2n_1)}{\rho^2p}\right)\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} \\
& \qquad +c_2\left(\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}+\frac{K\log(2n_1)}{\rho^2\sqrt{p}}+\frac{K\log(2n_1)}{\rho^2\sqrt{p}}\right)\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} \\
\leq & c_1\left(\sqrt{\frac{K}{\rho}}+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{\rho p}}+\frac{K^2}{\rho^2p}\right)\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}+c_2\left(\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}+\frac{K\log(2n_1)}{\rho^2\sqrt{p}}+\frac{K\log(2n_1)}{\rho^2\sqrt{p}}\right)\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} \\
\leq & c_3\left(\sqrt{\frac{K}{\rho}}+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{\rho p}}\right)\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}+c_4\left(\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}+\frac{K\log(2n_1)}{\rho^2\sqrt{p}}\right)\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} \\
= & c_3\left(1+\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}+c_4\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Solving, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& c_3\left(1+\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}+c_4\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}\le\frac{\lambda}{2}\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}-c_4\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}\right)\ge c_3\left(1+\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & \lambda\ge\frac{c_5\left(1+\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{(1-\gamma)}}}{\sqrt{n}\left(1-c_6\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)}\mu_0 r}\right)}
\end{aligned}$$

as long as $1-c_6\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\log(2n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)}\mu_0 r}>0$. This is proved in the next section. Notice that when λ satisfies the above conditions, the inequality (27) in Step 1 holds. ■

E. Under what conditions is such a λ possible?

In the last section we require a λ that satisfies

$$\frac{c_1\left(1+\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{(1-\gamma)}}}{\sqrt{n}\left(1-c_2\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\log(4n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)}\mu_0 r}\right)}\le\lambda\le\frac{1}{48}\sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\gamma nK}}. \tag{32}$$

If we know $r\le\bar{r}$, $\gamma\le\bar{\gamma}$, $\rho\ge\underline{\rho}$, then such λ exists if

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{c_1\left(1+\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{(1-\gamma)}}}{\sqrt{n}\left(1-c_2\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\log(4n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)}\mu_0 r}\right)}\le\frac{1}{48}\sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\gamma nK}}\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & \frac{c_3\left(1+\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{K}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma\mu_0 r}{(1-\gamma)}}}{1-c_2\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\log(4n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)}\mu_0 r}}\le 1\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & c_3\left(1+\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{K}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma\mu_0 r}{(1-\gamma)}}\le 1-c_2\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\log(4n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)}\mu_0 r}\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}}\left[c_3\left(1+\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{K}{\rho}\sqrt{\mu_0 r}+c_2\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{\log(4n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{\mu_0 r}\right]\le 1\\
\Leftarrow\quad & \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}}\left[\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{K}{\rho}\sqrt{\mu_0 r}+\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)\frac{K}{\rho}\sqrt{\mu_0 r}\right]\le c_4\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}\le\frac{c_5}{\left(1+\frac{K}{\rho\sqrt{p}}\right)^2\frac{K^2}{\rho^2}\mu_0 r}\\
\Leftarrow\quad & \frac{\bar{\gamma}}{1-\bar{\gamma}}\le c_5\frac{\underline{\rho}^2}{\left(1+\frac{\mu_0\bar{r}}{\underline{\rho}\sqrt{p}}\right)^2\mu_0^3\bar{r}^3\log^6(4n_1)}
\end{aligned}$$

In this case we can choose

$$\lambda=\frac{1}{48}\sqrt{\frac{\underline{\rho}}{\bar{\gamma}n\mu_0\bar{r}\log^2(4n_1)}}.$$

Combing the above discussion with Lemma 2, Propositions 1 and 2, and the union bound, concludes the proof of our main result, Theorem 1.

F. When can we eliminate the polylog gap?

In this section, we prove Theorem 2, which states that the polylog gap can be eliminated under additional assumptions on the corrupted columns. The bounds in Theorem 2 are stronger than those in Theorem 1, and the proof is simpler.

In Theorem 2, we assume that the corrupted columns too satisfy the same incoherence condition as the non-corrupted columns:

$$\max_{1\le i\le p}\|\mathcal{P}_{U_M}(e_i)\|_2\le\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}},$$

where U_M is the left singular vectors of M. Since the nonzero columns of L_0 is a subset of the columns of M, we have Range$(\mathcal{P}_{U_0}) \subseteq$ Range$(\mathcal{P}_{U_M})$, and thus $\mathcal{P}_{U_M}$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathcal{P}_{U_M} = \mathcal{P}_{U_0} + \mathcal{P}_{U_{\hat{C}}^\perp},$$

where Range$(\mathcal{P}_{U_{\hat{C}}^\perp})$ is a subspace of Range$(\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp})$, and $U_{\hat{C}}^\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r_c}$ is an orthogonal basis of $\mathcal{P}_{U_{\hat{C}}^\perp}$. Observe that the incoherence of $\mathcal{P}_{U_M}$ implies that of $\mathcal{P}_{U_{\hat{C}}^\perp}$; that is

$$\max_{1\le i\le p} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{U_{\hat{C}}^\perp}(e_i) \right\|_2 \le \max_{1\le i\le p} \left\| (\mathcal{P}_{U_0} + \mathcal{P}_{U_{\hat{C}}^\perp})(e_i) \right\|_2 = \max_{1\le i\le p} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{U_M}(e_i) \right\|_2 \le \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}}.$$

Let us focus on the jth column of $\hat{C}$ and $\hat{H}$; w.l.o.g. we assume $\hat{C}_j \neq 0$. Because $\hat{C} = L_0 + C_0 - \hat{L}$ and $\hat{L} \in \mathcal{P}_{U_0}$, the column space of $\hat{C}$ is a subspace of Range$(\mathcal{P}_{U_M})$. Therefore we can write $\hat{C}_j = \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(\hat{C}_j) + \mathcal{P}_{U_{\hat{C}}^\perp}(\hat{C}_j) = U_0 x + U_{\hat{C}}^\perp y$ for some column vectors $x \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^{r_c}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\hat{H}_j) &= \frac{\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\hat{C}_j)}{\left\|\hat{C}_j\right\|_2} \\
&= \frac{U_{\hat{C}}^\perp y}{\left\|U_0 x + U_{\hat{C}}^\perp y\right\|_2} \\
&= \frac{U_{\hat{C}}^\perp y}{\sqrt{\|U_0 x\|_2^2 + \left\|U_{\hat{C}}^\perp y\right\|_2^2}}
\end{aligned}$$

. Thus we can bound the ith component of $\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\hat{H}_j)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \left(\mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\hat{H}_j) \right)_i \right| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\|U_0 x\|_2^2 + \left\|U_{\hat{C}}^\perp y\right\|_{2_2}^2}} \left| e_i^\top U_{\hat{C}}^\perp y \right| \\
&\le \frac{1}{\left\|U_{\hat{C}}^\perp y\right\|_2} \left| e_i^\top U_{\hat{C}}^\perp y \right| \\
&\overset{(1)}{\le} \frac{1}{\|y\|_2} \left\| e_i^\top U_{\hat{C}}^\perp \right\|_2 \|y\|_2 \\
&= \left\| e_i^\top U_{\hat{C}}^\perp \right\|_2 \\
&= \left\| P_{U_{\hat{C}}^\perp}(e_i) \right\|_2 \\
&\le \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}},
\end{aligned}$$

where in (1) we use $\left\|U_{\hat{C}}^\perp y\right\|_2 = \|y\|_2$ and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Since i and j are arbitrary, it follows that

$$\left\| \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\hat{H}) \right\|_\infty \le \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}}.$$

Now we expand $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0}(\Lambda_2)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0}(\Lambda_2) &= \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0} \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} (\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}})^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\lambda \hat{H}) \\
&= \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_{V_0} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} (\mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c} \mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}})^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\bar{V}} \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\lambda \hat{H}) \\
&= \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\lambda \hat{H}) \bar{V} \bar{V}^\top \left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \bar{V} G^i \bar{V}^\top \right] \bar{V} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\bar{V}^\top) V_0 V_0^\top.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any (a,b) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{T}}(\Lambda_2)\right)_{ab}\right| &= \left| e_a^\top \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\lambda\hat{H})\bar{V}\bar{V}^\top \left[1+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\bar{V}G^i\bar{V}^\top\right]\bar{V}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\bar{V}^\top)V_0V_0^\top e_b\right| \\
&\leq \left\|e_a^\top \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\lambda\hat{H})\right\|_2 \left\|\bar{V}\bar{V}^\top \left[1+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\bar{V}G^i\bar{V}^\top\right]\bar{V}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\bar{V}^\top)V_0V_0^\top e_b\right\|_2 \\
&\leq \lambda\left\|e_a^\top \mathcal{P}_{U_0^\perp}(\lambda\hat{H})\right\|_2 \left\|\bar{V}\bar{V}^\top\right\| \left\|1+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\bar{V}G^i\bar{V}^\top\right\| \left\|\bar{V}\right\| \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\bar{V}^\top)\right\| \left\|V_0V_0^\top e_b\right\|_2 \\
&\leq \lambda\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}}\frac{1}{1-\psi}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}} \\
&= \frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}}{1-\psi}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{pn_1}}
\end{aligned}$$

and subsequently

$$\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(\Lambda_2)\right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}}{1-\psi}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{pn_1}}. \tag{33}$$

With the bound Eq.(33) on the matrix infinity norm of $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(\Lambda_2)$, we can derive tighter bounds in the proof of the dual certificate.

First, we use a dual certificate that is slightly more "economical" than the one we used before. When $m = \rho p n_1$ satisfies

$$m \geq \eta_1 \mu_0^2 r^2 n_1 \sqrt{p}\log^2(4n_1)/\log(p),$$

we may partition $\tilde{\Omega}$ into s partitions of size q such that $s = 5\log(4n_1)/\log(p)$, and $q = m/s \geq c_1 n_1\sqrt{p}r^2\log(4n_1)$. Let $\hat{Q}$ be defined as before except that s and q now have different values.

With this choice of $\hat{Q}$ and the new bound (33), Proposition 2 now becomes

Proposition 3. *If $n_1 \geq 32$, and λ satisfies*

$$\frac{c_1\frac{\log(4n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{1-\gamma}}}{\sqrt{n}\left(1-c_2\frac{\log(4n_1)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}\mu_0^2 r^2}\right)} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{1}{\gamma n}} \tag{34}$$

for some η sufficiently small, then $\hat{Q} \in \Omega$, and the following holds with high probability

(a) $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}(\hat{Q}) - \hat{U}\hat{V}^\top = \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(D)$ *for some* $\|D\|_F \leq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{m}{pn_1}}\lambda$

(b) $\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^\perp}(\hat{Q})\right\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$

(c) $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0}(\hat{Q}) \in \lambda\mathfrak{G}(\hat{C})$.

(d) $\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})\right\|_{\infty,2} \leq \frac{\lambda}{2}$

Proof: The proof is based on that of Proposition 2 with only minor modifications; we will point out where modifications are needed. We will refer to the proof of Proposition 2 as the "previous proof".

Similar to the previous proof, we have $\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and hence $1-\psi \geq 1-\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n} \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

Step 1: Since $\rho \geq \eta_1\mu_0^2 r^2\log^2(4n_1)/(\sqrt{p}\log(p))$, Eq.(29) in the previous proof becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sqrt{\frac{K}{p\rho}}\right)^s \sqrt{n_1}\lambda &\leq (p)^{-s/4}\sqrt{n_1}\lambda \\
&\leq (p)^{-\frac{1}{4}\cdot 5\log(4n_1)/\log p}\sqrt{n_1}\lambda \\
&= (p)^{-\frac{5}{4}\log_p(4n_1)}\sqrt{n_1}\lambda \\
&= (4n_1)^{-\frac{5}{4}}\sqrt{n_1}\lambda \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\rho}\lambda
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2 : When the bound (33) holds, Eq.(30) in the previous proof is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{8}\sqrt{\frac{pn_1}{\mu_0^2 r^2}}\left(\left\|U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top\right\|_\infty + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_2)\right\|_\infty\right) \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{8}\sqrt{\frac{pn_1}{\mu_0^2 r^2}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{pn_1}} + \frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}}{1-\psi}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{pn_1}}\right) \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{pn_1}{\mu_0^2 r^2}}\lambda\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \gamma n}{pn_1}} \\
=\ & \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{4}\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n} \\
\leq\ & \frac{3}{8}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds due to our assumption on λ.

Step 3 : No modification is needed.

Step 4 : In the previous proof, we write $\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})\right\|_{\infty,2}$ as three terms and bound them separately. In the current case, it turns out that they can be bounded all at once. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}(\hat{Q})\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
=\ & \|Y_s\|_{\infty,2} \\
=\ & \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{s}\frac{pn_1}{q}P_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
\leq\ & \sum_{i=1}^{s}\frac{pn_1}{q}\left\|\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Y_{i-1})\right)\right\|_{\infty,2} \\
\leq\ & \frac{pn_1}{q}\sqrt{p}\sum_{i=1}^{s}\left\|\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}\left(\frac{pn_1}{q}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}_j}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\right)\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\left(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\right)\right\|_\infty \\
\overset{(1)}{\leq}\ & \frac{pn_1}{q}\sqrt{p}\sum_{i=1}^{s}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{i-1}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right\|_\infty \\
=\ & \frac{pn_1}{q}\sqrt{p}\cdot 2\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Q_{\mathcal{I}_0^c})\right\|_\infty \\
=\ & \frac{pn_1}{q}2\sqrt{p}\left\|U_0\bar{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}^\top - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(\Lambda_2)\right\|_\infty \\
\leq\ & \frac{5\log(4n_1)/\log(p)}{\rho}\cdot 2\sqrt{p}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{pn_1}} + \frac{\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}}{1-\psi}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{pn_1}}\right) \\
=\ & \frac{c_3\log(4n_1)/\log(p)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{n_1}} + \frac{c_3\log(4n_1)/\log(p)}{\rho}\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{n_1}}
\end{aligned}$$

where (1) is due to Eq.(20). Solving, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{c_3\log(4n_1)/\log(p)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{n_1}} + \frac{c_3\log(4n_1)/\log(p)}{\rho}\lambda\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{n_1}} \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \lambda\left(1 - \frac{c_4\log(4n_1)/\log(p)}{\rho}\sqrt{\gamma n}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{n_1}}\right) \geq \frac{c_5\log(4n_1)/\log(p)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{n_1}} \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \lambda \geq \frac{\frac{c_5\log(4n_1)/\log(p)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{1-\gamma}}}{\sqrt{n}\left(1 - \frac{c_4\log(4n_1)/\log(p)}{\rho}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}\mu_0^2 r^2}\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

■

Algorithm 2 The ALM Algorithm for Robust Matrix Completion

input: $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(M) \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times n}$, $\Omega \subseteq [p]\times[n]$, λ (assuming $P_{\Omega^c}(M) = 0$)
initialize: $Y^{(0)} = 0$; $L^{(0)} = 0$; $C^{(0)} = 0$; $E^{(0)} = 0$; $u_0 > 0$; $\alpha > 1$; $k = 0$.
while not converged **do**
$(U, S, V) = \text{svd}(M - E^{(k)} - C^{(k)} + u_k^{-1}Y^{(k)})$;
$L^{(k+1)} = U\mathfrak{L}_{u_k^{-1}}(S)V^\top$;
$C^{(k+1)} = \mathfrak{C}_{\lambda u_k^{-1}}(M - E^{(k)} - L^{(k+1)} + u_k^{-1}Y^{(k)})$;
$E^{(k+1)} = P_{\Omega^c}(M - L^{(k+1)} - C^{(k+1)} + u_k^{-1}Y^{(k)})$;
$Y^{(k+1)} = Y^{(k)} + u_k(M - E^{(k+1)} - L^{(k+1)} - C^{(k+1)})$;
$u_{k+1} = \alpha u_k$;
$k = k + 1$;
end while
return $(L^{(k+1)}, C^{(k+1)})$

In the last proposition, we require λ satisfies condition (34). Following similar lines in section IV-E, such λ exists if $\gamma \le \bar{\gamma}$ with

$$\frac{\bar{\gamma}}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \le \eta_2 \frac{\rho^2}{\mu_0^2 r^2 \log^2(4n_1)/\log^2(p)}$$

for some η_2 sufficiently small. In this case, we can take

$$\lambda \;=\; \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{1}{\bar{\gamma}n}}.$$

This proves Theorem 2.

V. Implementation and Simulations

To facilitate fast and efficient solution, we use a family of algorithms called Augmented Lagrange Multiplier (ALM) methods (see e.g., [16]), shown to be effective on problems involving nuclear norm minimization. We have adapted this method to our $\|\cdot\|_* + \lambda\|\cdot\|_{1,2}$-type problem; see Algorithm 2.

Here $\mathfrak{L}_\epsilon(S)$ is the entry-wise soft-thresholding operator: if $|S_{ij}| \le \epsilon$, then set it to zero, otherwise, let $S_{ij} := S_{ij} - \epsilon S_{ij}/|S_{ij}|$. Similarly, $\mathfrak{C}_\epsilon(C)$ is the column-wise soft-thresholding operator: if $\|C_i\|_2 \le \epsilon$, then set it to zero, otherwise let $C_i := C_i - \epsilon C_i/\|C_i\|_2$. In our experiments, we choose $u_0 = \left(\|M\|_{1,2}\right)^{-1}$ and $\alpha = 1.1$, and the criterion for convergence is

$$\left\|M - E^{(k)} - L^{(k)} - C^{(k)}\right\|_F / \|M\|_F \le 10^{-6}.$$

The first set of experiments demonstrates the power of the manipulator, as we show that even a single adversarially corrupted column can arbitrarily skew the prediction of standard matrix completion algorithms. In our experiments, we fix $n = p = 400$, and $\gamma = 1/400$. For different ρ and r, we generate the low-rank matrix L_0 by forming the product $L_0 = AB^\top$. The matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times r}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n(1-\gamma)\times r}$, have i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries. The single corrupted column $C_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times 1}$ is chosen identical to first column of L_0 except for the last entry, which is assigned a large value (10 in our experiments). (In Collaborative Filtering this corresponds to a manipulator trying to promote the last movie.) The set of observed entries in the uncorrupted columns is chosen uniformly at random from all subsets of $[p]\times[n]$ of size $\rho \times pn_1$. Set $M = \left[\begin{array}{cc} L_0 & C_0 \end{array}\right]$. $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(M)$ and Ω are then given as input. We apply both our algorithm and standard nuclear-norm-based matrix completion. As shown in Figure 1, standard matrix completion fails essentially for all values of ρ and r, while our algorithm is almost unaffected. Here for each pair of $(\rho,\ \gamma)$ we run the experiment for 5 times, and plot the frequency of success. Our figures show the number of successes by grayscale, where white denotes all success and black denotes all failure.

Next, we investigate our algorithm's performance under different numbers of corrupted columns, and neutral and adversarial corruption. In the first case, each entry of C_0 is i.i.d. Gaussian. In the second case, the corrupted columns are constructed as follows. For $1 \le i \le \gamma n$, corrupted column i copies the observed entries of clean column i and fills other entries with i.i.d. Gaussian noise. We fix $r = 10$ and vary $(\rho,\ \gamma)$. In both cases, each entry in C_0 is observed with probability ρ independently. Other settings are the same as in the first set of experiments. The results for our algorithm and standard matrix completion are shown in the left and right panes of Figure 2 for the first corruption scheme, and in Figure 3 for the second corruption scheme.



Fig. 1. Experiment results for 400×400 matrix with one corrupted column. We plot the probability of successful recovery of the low rank matrix. Panes (a) and (b) show the results of our approach with and without the corrupted column, respectively. Pane (c) shows the essentially complete failure of standard matrix completion, due to the corrupted column.



Fig. 2. Experiment results for 400×400 rank-10 matrix with different fraction of observed entries ρ and fraction of corrupted columns γ. Corrupted columns are generated neutrally random. Panes (a) and (c) show the results of our approach and standard matrix completion, repectively. Pane (b) shows the results of minimizing a convex combination of the nuclear norm and the matrix ℓ_1 norm.

Comparison to Low-rank Plus Sparse. When only a small fraction of the entries are observed, the corrupted columns $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(C_0)$ can be viewed as a sparse matrix. Therefore, to separate L_0 from $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(C_0)$, one might think it is possible to apply the techniques in [2], [6], which decompose a low-rank matrix and a sparse matrix from their sum. In particular, given input $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(M)$, one attempts to decompose it by solving the following convex program:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \|L\|_* + \lambda \|C\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathcal{P}_\Omega(L + C) = \mathcal{P}_\Omega(M). \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Our approach specifically deals with corrupted columns, in order to deal with persistent corruption. It is no surprise that using the above algorithm instead should not be successful. Indeed, this is the case, and we illustrate this numerically in Figures 2 and 3, using the same synthetic data described above.

VI. Discussion

In this paper, we provide an efficient algorithm for matrix completion, when some number of the columns are arbitrarily corrupted. As our computational results show, ignoring the outliers can have severe consequences, with even a single corrupted column jeopardizing the recovery of the low-rank matrix. Similarly, other approaches dealing with corruption in matrix completion, in particular those considering matrix-sparse (as opposed to column-sparse) corruption, are not able to handle the presence of corrupted columns. Our results give sufficient conditions for number of samples needed versus the number of columns corrupted, to enable recovery. To the best of our knowledge, these are the first results along these lines. That said, improving these bounds, and also proving lower bounds, seems to be an important future direction.

Our results make no assumptions on the corrupted columns, or on the elements of those columns that are revealed. In particular, both the revealed entries and their values can be arbitrarily (potentially maliciously) chosen.



Fig. 3. Experiment results for adversarial corruptions. Other settings are the same as in Fig. 2.

One arena of application of these results, is the problem of robust collaborative filtering. Our results provide an efficient algorithm for efficient collaborative filtering, impervious to the effect of malicious or manipulative users. In this paper we have assumed uniform sampling on the authentic columns. Although we do not provide the details here, this assumption can be relaxed to other sampling distributions. Finally, we note that the results presented here enable the matrix decomposition into a low-rank, sparse, and column spare matrix.

APPENDIX

A. *Proof of Lemma 9*

In this section we use $(v)_i$ to denote the ith component of a vector v. One observes that by assumption,

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{V_0}(e_i)\|_2 \quad \leq \quad \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}}$$

for all i. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_i)\right)_j &= e_j^\top \tilde{V}_0 \tilde{V}_0^\top e_i \\
&= \left(e_j^\top \tilde{V}_0 \tilde{V}_0^\top\right)\left(\tilde{V}_0 \tilde{V}_0^\top e_i\right) \\
&= \left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_j)\right)^\top \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_i) \\
&\leq \|\mathcal{P}_{V_0}(e_j)\|_2 \, \|\mathcal{P}_{V_0}(e_i)\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}
\end{aligned}$$

We repeat the lemma below for convenience.

Lemma. *Suppose $p \leq n_1$ and $\Omega_0 \in [p] \times [n_1]$ is a set of m_0 entries sampled uniformly at random without replacement. For any $Z \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0$ and $\beta > 1$, we have*

$$\left\| \frac{pn_1}{m_0} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z) - \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z) \right\|_{\infty,2} \leq \frac{16}{3} \beta \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 p n_1^2}{m_0^2} \log^2(2n_1)} \, \|Z\|_{\infty,2}$$

with probability at least $1 - (2n_1)^{2-2\beta}$.

Proof: Sample (a, b) uniformly at random without replacement. Define $\xi = \left\langle e_a e_b^\top, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} Z \right\rangle \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) - \frac{1}{pn_1}(Z)$,

then the ith column of ξ is $\xi_i = \left\langle e_a e_b^\top, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) e_i - \frac{1}{pn_1} Z_i$. We have $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i] = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\xi_i\| &= \|\xi_i\|_2 \\
&\le \left\|\left\langle e_a e_b^\top,\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) e_i\right\|_2 + \left\|\frac{1}{pn_1} Z_i\right\|_2 \\
&\le \|Z\|_{\infty,2} \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) e_i\right\|_2 + \frac{1}{pn_1}\|Z\|_{\infty,2} \\
&\le \|Z\|_{\infty,2} \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)\right\|_F + \frac{1}{pn_1}\|Z\|_{\infty,2} \\
&\le \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r(n_1+p)}{pn_1}} + \frac{1}{pn_1}\right)\|Z\|_{\infty,2} \\
&\le 2\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r(n_1+p)}{pn_1}}\,\|Z\|_{\infty,2}
\end{aligned}$$

We now compute the second moment.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^\top \xi_i] \\
=\ & \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left\langle e_a e_b^\top, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) e_i - \frac{1}{pn_1} Z_i\right)^\top \left(\left\langle e_a e_b^\top, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) e_i - \frac{1}{pn_1} Z_i\right)\right] \\
=\ & \mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle e_a e_b^\top, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle^2 \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) e_i\right\|_2^2\right] - \frac{1}{p^2 n_1^2}\|Z_i\|_2^2 \\
=\ & \frac{1}{pn_1}\sum_{a,b}\left\langle e_a e_b^\top, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle^2 \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) e_i\right\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{p^2 n_1^2}\|Z_i\|_2^2
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

To proceed, we expand $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) e_i$. Because $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) = \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a) e_b^\top + e_a \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_b)^\top - \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a)\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_b)^\top$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) e_i\right\|_2 \\
=\ & \left\|\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a) e_b^\top e_i + e_a \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_b)^\top e_i - \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a)\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_b)^\top e_i\right\|_2 \\
=\ & \left\|\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a) e_b^\top e_i + \left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_b)\right)_i e_a - \left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_b)\right)_i \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a)\right\|_2 \\
\le\ & \begin{cases} \|\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a)\|_2 + \left|\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_b)\right)_b\right| + \left|\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_b)\right)_b\right| \|\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a)\|_2, & b = i \\ \left|\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_b)\right)_i\right| + \left|\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{V}_0}(e_b)\right)_i\right| \|\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a)\|_2, & b \ne i \end{cases} \\
\le\ & \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}} + \frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1} + \frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}}, & b = i \\ \frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1} + \frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}}, & b \ne i \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{pn_1}\sum_{a,b}\left\langle e_a e_b^\top,\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} Z\right\rangle^2 \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) e_i\right\|_2^2 \\
\le\ & \frac{1}{pn_1}\sum_{a}\left\langle e_a e_i^\top,\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} Z\right\rangle^2 \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_i^\top) e_i\right\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{pn_1}\sum_{a}\sum_{b\ne i}\left\langle e_a e_b^\top,\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0} Z\right\rangle^2 \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top) e_i\right\|_2^2 \\
\le\ & \frac{1}{pn_1}\sum_{a}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}} + \frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1} + \frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}}\right)^2 Z_{ai}^2 + \frac{1}{pn_1}\sum_{a}\sum_{b\ne i}\left(\frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1} + \frac{\mu_0 r}{n_1}\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}}\right)^2 Z_{ab}^2 \\
\le\ & \frac{1}{pn_1}\cdot\frac{9\mu_0 r}{p}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}^2 + \frac{n_1 - 1}{pn_1}\cdot\frac{4\mu_0^2 r^2}{n_1^2}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}^2 \\
\le\ & \frac{13\mu_0^2 r^2}{p^2 n_1}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where in the last two inequalities we use $p \le n_1$. Subsititing back into Eq.(36), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^\top \xi_i]\right\| &\le \max\left\{\frac{1}{pn_1}\sum_{a,b}\left\langle e_a e_b^\top, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle^2 \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)e_i\right\|_2^2,\ \frac{1}{p^2 n_1^2}\|Z_i\|_2^2\right\} \\ &\le \frac{13\mu_0^2 r^2}{p^2 n_1}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}^2\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\mathbb{E}[\xi_i \xi_i^\top]\right\| \\ =\ &\left\|\mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle e_a e_b^\top,\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)e_i - \frac{1}{pn_1}Z_i\right)\left(\left\langle e_a e_b^\top,\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)e_i - \frac{1}{pn_1}Z_i\right)^\top\right\| \\ =\ &\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle e_a e_b^\top,\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle^2 \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)e_i e_i^\top \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)^\top\right] - \frac{1}{p^2 n_1^2}Z_i Z_i^\top\right\| \\ \le\ &\max\left\{\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle e_a e_b^\top,\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle^2 \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)e_i e_i^\top \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)^\top\right]\right\|,\ \frac{1}{p^2 n_1^2}\left\|Z_i Z_i^\top\right\|\right\} \\ \le\ &\max\left\{\left\|\frac{1}{pn_1}\sum_{a,b}\left\langle e_a e_b^\top,\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle^2 \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)e_i e_i^\top \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)^\top\right\|,\ \frac{1}{p^2 n_1^2}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}^2\right\} \\ \le\ &\max\left\{\frac{1}{pn_1}\sum_{a,b}\left\|\left\langle e_a e_b^\top,\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle^2 \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)e_i e_i^\top \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)^\top\right\|,\ \frac{1}{p^2 n_1^2}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}^2\right\} \\ =\ &\max\left\{\frac{1}{pn_1}\sum_{a,b}\left\langle e_a e_b^\top,\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\rangle^2 \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(e_a e_b^\top)e_i\right\|_2^2,\ \frac{1}{p^2 n_1^2}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}^2\right\} \\ \le\ &\max\left\{\frac{13\mu_0^2 r^2}{p^2 n_1}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}^2,\ \frac{1}{p^2 n_1^2}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}^2\right\} \\ =\ &\frac{13\mu_0^2 r^2}{p^2 n_1}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}^2\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Eq.(37). Now note that $\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z) - \frac{m_0}{pn_1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right)_i = \sum_{k=1}^{m_0}\xi_i^{(k)}$ where $\xi_i^{(k)}$'s are copies of ξ_i sampled without replacement. We are ready to use the Noncommutative Bernstein Inequality to bound the probability

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{m_0}\xi_i^{(k)}\right\| \ge \tau\right].$$

We now have $M = 2\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2(n_1+p)}{pn_1}}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}$ and $\rho_k^2 = \frac{13\mu_0^2 r^2}{p^2 n_1}\|Z\|_{\infty,2}^2$. Set

$$\tau = \frac{8}{3}\cdot 2\beta\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{p}\log^2(2n_1)}\,\|Z\|_{\infty,2}.$$

Since we have

$$\tau \ge \sum_{k=1}^{m_0}\rho_k^2/M,$$

then Bernstein inequality thus gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left[\left\|\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z) - \frac{m_0}{pn_1}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right)_i\right\|_2 \ge \frac{8}{3}\cdot 2\beta\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2}{p}\log^2(2n_1)}\,\|Z\|_{\infty,2}\right] \\ \le\ &(p+1)\exp\left(-\frac{3\tau}{8M}\right) \\ =\ &(p+1)\exp\left(-\log(2n_1)\right) \\ \le\ &(2n_1)^{1-2\beta}.\end{aligned}$$

By union bound, we have

$$\left\|\frac{pn_1}{m_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)-\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0}(Z)\right\|_{\infty,2}\leq\frac{16}{3}\beta\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2r^2pn_1^2}{m_0^2}\log^2(2n_1)}\left\|Z\right\|_{\infty,2}$$

with probability at least $1-(2n_1)^{2-2\beta}$. ∎

B. Proof of Lemma 10

We need the following straightforward lemma, whose proof is omitted.

Lemma 11. *For any two matrices A and B, we have* $\langle A,B\rangle\leq\left\|A\right\|_{1,2}\left\|B\right\|_{\infty,2}$.

Now we proceed to prove Lemma 10. We repeat the lemma below for convenience.

Lemma. *Suppose $\Omega_0\in[p]\times[n_1]$ is a set of m_0 entries sampled uniformly at random without replacement. For any matrix $Z\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times r}$, we have*

$$\left\|\frac{pn_1}{m_0}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}\left(U_0\mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\left(Z^\top\right)\right)\right\|_{\infty,2}\leq\left(1+\sqrt{\frac{16\beta\mu_0r(n_1+p)p\log(n_1+p)}{3m_0}}\right)\left\|U_0\mathcal{R}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\left(Z^\top\right)\right\|_{\infty,2}$$

with probability at least $1-(n_1+p)^{2-2\beta}$ provided $m_0\geq\frac{64}{3}\beta\mu_0r(n_1+p)\log(n_1+p)$.

Proof: Let $\tilde{Z}^\top=\mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0^c}\left(Z^\top\right)\right)$. Sample (a,b) uniformly at random without replacement from $[p]\times[n_1]$. Define $\xi=\left\langle e_ae_b^\top,\,U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\rangle e_ae_b^\top-\frac{1}{pn_1}U_0\tilde{Z}^\top$, then for $1\leq i\leq n_1$, the ith column of ξ is $\xi_i=\left\langle e_ae_b^\top,\,U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\rangle e_ae_b^\top e_i-\frac{1}{pn_1}U_0\tilde{Z}^\top e_i$. We have $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i]=0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\xi_i\right\| &= \left\|\xi_i\right\|_2\\
&\leq \left\|\left\langle e_ae_b^\top,\,U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\rangle e_ae_b^\top e_i\right\|_2+\left\|\frac{1}{pn_1}U_0\tilde{Z}^\top e_i\right\|_2\\
&= \left\|\left\langle \mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a)e_b^\top,\,U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\rangle e_ae_b^\top e_i\right\|_2+\left\|\frac{1}{pn_1}U_0\tilde{Z}^\top e_i\right\|_2\\
&\leq \left\|\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a)e_b^\top\right\|_{1,2}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}\left\|e_ae_b^\top e_i\right\|_2+\frac{1}{pn_1}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}\\
&\leq \left\|\mathcal{P}_{U_0}(e_a)\right\|_2\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}+\frac{1}{pn_1}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}\\
&\leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0r}{p}}+\frac{1}{pn_1}\right)\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}\\
&\leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0r}{p}}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^\top\xi_i]\right\| &= \left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle e_ae_b^\top,\,U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\rangle^2e_i^\top e_be_b^\top e_i\right]-\frac{1}{pn_1}\left\|\left(U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right)_i\right\|_2^2\right\|\\
&\leq \max\left\{\frac{\mu_0r}{pn_1}\left\|(U_0\tilde{Z}^\top)_i\right\|_2^2,\,\frac{1}{p^2n_1^2}\left\|\left(U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right)_i\right\|_2^2\right\}\\
&\leq \frac{\mu_0r}{pn_1}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}^2
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathbb{E}[\xi_i\xi_i^\top]\right\| &= \left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle e_ae_b^\top,\,U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\rangle^2e_ae_b^\top e_ie_i^\top e_be_a^\top\right]-\frac{1}{p^2n_1^2}(U_0\tilde{Z}^\top)_i(U_0\tilde{Z}^\top)_i^\top\right\|\\
&\leq \max\left\{\frac{\mu_0r}{pn_1}\left\|(U_0\tilde{Z}^\top)_i\right\|_2^2,\,\frac{1}{p^2n_1^2}\left\|\left(U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right)_i\right\|_2^2\right\}\\
&\leq \frac{\mu_0r}{pn_1}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}^2
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\left(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Omega}}(U_0\tilde{Z}^\top)-\frac{m_0}{pn_1}U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right)_i=\sum_{k=1}^{m_0}\xi_i^{(k)}$, where $\xi_i^{(k)}$'s are copies of ξ_i sampled without replacement. We are ready to use the Noncommutative Bernstein Inequality to bound the probability

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{m_0}\xi_i^{(k)}\right\|\geq\tau\right]$$

We now have $M = 2\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r}{p}} \left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}$ and $\rho_k^2 = \frac{\mu_0 r}{pn_1}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}^2$. Set

$$\begin{aligned}\tau &= \sqrt{\frac{\frac{64}{3}\beta m_0\mu_0 r(n_1+p)\log(n_1+p)}{4pn_1^2}}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{16\beta m_0\mu_0 r(n_1+p)\log(n_1+p)}{3pn_1^2}}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2},\end{aligned}$$

then we have

$$\tau \le \frac{1}{M}\sum_{k=1}^{m_0}\rho_k^2 = \frac{m_0\sqrt{\mu_0 r}}{2n_1\sqrt{p}}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}$$

provided $m_0 \ge \frac{64}{3}\beta(n_1+p)\log(n_1+p)$. The Noncommutative Bernstein Inequality thus gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left[\left\|\left(\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}(U_0\tilde{Z}^\top) - \frac{m_0}{pn_1}U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right)_i\right\|_2 \ge \sqrt{\frac{16\beta m_0\mu_0 r(n_1+p)\log(n_1+p)}{3pn_1^2}}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}\right] \\ =\ &\mathbb{P}\left[\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{m_0}\xi_i^{(k)}\right\| \ge \tau\right] \\ \le\ &(1+p)\exp\left(-\frac{3}{8}\tau^2/\sum_{k=1}^{m_0}\rho_k^2\right) \\ =\ &(1+p)\exp\left(-\frac{2\beta(n_1+p)}{n_1}\log(n_1+p)\right) \\ \le\ &(1+p)(n_1+p)^{-2\beta}\end{aligned}$$

By union bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left[\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}(U_0\tilde{Z}^\top) - \frac{m_0}{pn_1}U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2} \ge \sqrt{\frac{16\beta m_0\mu_0 r(n_1+p)\log(n_1+p)}{3pn_1^2}}\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}\right] \\ \le\ &(1+p)n_1(n_1+p)^{-2\beta} \\ \le\ &(n_1+p)^{2-2\beta}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with probability at least $1-(n_1+p)^{2-2\beta}$,

$$\left\|\frac{pn_1}{m_0}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}(U_0\tilde{Z}^\top)\right\|_{\infty,2} \le \left(1+\sqrt{\frac{16\beta\mu_0 r(n_1+p)p\log(n_1+p)}{3m_0}}\right)\left\|U_0\tilde{Z}^\top\right\|_{\infty,2}$$

■

C. Sampling with batch replacement

In this section we argue that if a dual certificate exists with high probability under the sampling with batch replacement (SWBR) model, then the probability that a dual certificate exists under the sampling without replacement (SWoR) model with the same number of observations m can only be higher. The argument follows the same spirit as [11]. Suppose under the sampling with batch replacement model, we sample for a total of $m = s \times q$ times and obtain a set of $\bar{m} \le m$ distinct entries.

Recall that in Section IV-D, we prove that under the following set of (deterministic) conditions

- $c < 1$,
- $n_1 \ge 32$,
- λ satisfies Eq.24,

$\hat{Q}$ is a dual certificate with high probability under SWBR. Then under SWoR the probability that a dual certificate exists is at least as high. This is because

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_{\text{SWBR}}\left[\hat{Q} \text{ is a dual certificate}\right] \\
= & \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{P}_{\text{SWBR}}\left[\bar{m}=i\right] \mathbb{P}_{\text{SWBR}}\left[\hat{Q} \text{ is a dual certificate } |\bar{m}=i\right] \\
\leq & \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{P}_{\text{SWBR}}\left[\bar{m}=i\right] \mathbb{P}_{\text{SWBR}}\left[\text{a dual certificate exists in the space spanned by the } \bar{m} \text{ distinct entries } |\bar{m}=i\right] \\
\leq & \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{P}_{\text{SWBR}}\left[\bar{m}=i\right] \mathbb{P}_{\text{SWoR}}\left[\text{a dual certificate exists in the space spanned by the } m \text{ entries }\right] \\
= & \mathbb{P}_{\text{SWoR}}\left[\text{a dual certificate exists in the space spanned by the } m \text{ entries }\right]
\end{aligned}$$

There is one more subtlety here. When we write

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{SWBR}}\left[\hat{Q} \text{ is a dual certificate } |\bar{m}=i\right],$$

the randomnese comes not only from the locations of the $\bar{m}$ distinct entries, but also from how these $\bar{m}$ entries are allocated to the s batches in the Golfing Scheme. On the other hand, for

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{SWBR}}\left[\text{a dual certificate exists in the space spanned by the } \bar{m} \text{ distinct entries } |\bar{m}=i\right],$$

the only randomnese is the locations of the $\bar{m}$ entries. However, the following relation still holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_{\text{SWBR}}\left[\hat{Q} \text{ is a dual certificate } |\bar{m}=i\right] \\
\leq & \mathbb{P}_{\text{SWBR}}\left[\text{a dual certificate exists in the space spanned by the } \bar{m} \text{ distinct entries } |\bar{m}=i\right]
\end{aligned}$$

as can be shown by a straightforward counting argument.

REFERENCES

[1] G. Adomavicius and A. Tuzhilin. Toward the next generation of recommender systems: A survey of the state-of-the-art and possible extensions. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, pages 734–749, 2005.

[2] E. Candès, X. Li, Y. Ma, and J. Wright. Robust principal component analysis? *Arxiv preprint arXiv:0912.3599*, 2009.

[3] E. Candès and B. Recht. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 9(6):717–772, 2009.

[4] E. Candès and T. Tao. The power of convex relaxation: Near-optimal matrix completion. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 56(5):2053–2080, 2010.

[5] N. Cesa-Bianchi, S. Shalev-Shwartz, and O. Shamir. Efficient learning with partially observed attributes. In *Proceedings of the 27th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 216–223, Haifa, Israel, 2010. ACM.

[6] V. Chandrasekaran, S. Sanghavi, P. Parrilo, and A. Willsky. Rank-Sparsity Incoherence for Matrix Decomposition. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:0906.2220*, 2009.

[7] P. Drineas, I. Kerenidis, and P. Raghavan. Competitive recommendation systems. In *Proceedings of the thiry-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 82–90. ACM, 2002.

[8] M. Fazel. *Matrix rank minimization with applications.* PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2002.

[9] D. Gross. Recovering low-rank matrices from few coefficients in any basis. *CoRR, abs/0910.1879*, 2009.

[10] D. Gross, Y. Liu, S. Flammia, S. Becker, and J. Eisert. Quantum state tomography via compressed sensing. *CoRR, abs/0909.3304*, 2009.

[11] D. Gross and V. Nesme. Note on sampling without replacing from a finite collection of matrices. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1001.2738*, 2010.

[12] J. Herlocker, J. Konstan, A. Borchers, and J. Riedl. An algorithmic framework for performing collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 22nd annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 230–237. ACM, 1999.

[13] D. Hsu, S. M. Kakade, and T. Zhang. Robust Matrix Decomposition with Outliers. *ArXiv e-prints*, Nov. 2010.

[14] R. Keshavan, S. Oh, and A. Montanari. Matrix Completion from a Few Entries. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:0901.3150*, 2009.

[15] S. Lam and J. Riedl. Shilling recommender systems for fun and profit. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on World Wide Web*, page 402. ACM, 2004.

[16] Z. Lin, M. Chen, L. Wu, and Y. Ma. The Augmented Lagrange Multiplier Method for Exact Recovery of Corrupted Low-Rank Matrices. *UIUC Technical Report UILU-ENG-09-2215*, 2009.

[17] G. Linden, B. Smith, and J. York. Amazon. com recommendations: Item-to-item collaborative filtering. *IEEE Internet computing*, 7(1):76–80, 2003.

[18] P. Massa and P. Avesani. Trust-aware recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM conference on Recommender systems*, page 24. ACM, 2007.

[19] B. Mehta, T. Hofmann, and W. Nejdl. Robust collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM conference on Recommender systems*, pages 49–56. ACM, 2007.

[20] B. Mehta and W. Nejdl. Attack resistant collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 31st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 75–82. ACM, 2008.

[21] B. Mobasher, R. Burke, R. Bhaumik, and C. Williams. Effective attack models for shilling item-based collaborative filtering systems. In *Proceedings of the 2005 WebKDD Workshop*, page 13. Citeseer, 2005.

[22] B. Mobasher, R. Burke, R. Bhaumik, and C. Williams. Toward trustworthy recommender systems: An analysis of attack models and algorithm robustness. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology (TOIT)*, 7(4):23, 2007.

[23] B. Mobasher, R. Burke, and J. Sandvig. Model-based collaborative filtering as a defense against profile injection attacks. In *Proceedings of the National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 21, page 1388. Menlo Park, CA; Cambridge, MA; London; AAAI Press; MIT Press; 1999, 2006.

[24] S. Moon and G. Russell. Predicting product purchase from inferred customer similarity: An autologistic model approach. *Management Science*, 54(1):71, 2008.

[25] R. Motwani and S. Vassilvitskii. Tracing the path: new model and algorithms for collaborative filtering. In *Data Engineering Workshop, 2007 IEEE 23rd International Conference on*, pages 853–862. IEEE, 2007.

[26] S. Negahban and M. Wainwright. Restricted strong convexity and weighted matrix completion: Optimal bounds with noise. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1009.2118*, 2010.

[27] Netflix Prize. http://www.netflixprize.com/. 2009.

[28] B. Recht. A Simpler Approach to Matrix Completion. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:0910.0651*, 2009.

[29] B. Recht, M. Fazel, and P. Parrilo. Guaranteed Minimum-Rank Solutions of Linear Matrix Equations via Nuclear Norm Minimization. *SIAM Review*, 52(471), 2010.

[30] P. Resnick and R. Sami. The information cost of manipulation-resistance in recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM conference on Recommender systems*, pages 147–154. ACM, 2008.

[31] J. Sandvig, B. Mobasher, and R. Burke. Robustness of collaborative recommendation based on association rule mining. In *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM conference on Recommender systems*, page 112. ACM, 2007.

[32] B. Sarwar, G. Karypis, J. Konstan, and J. Riedl. Application of dimensionality reduction in recommender system-a case study. In *Proceeding of ACM WebKDD Web Mining for E-Commerce Workshop*. ACM, 2000.

[33] J. Schafer, J. Konstan, and J. Riedl. E-commerce recommendation applications. *Data mining and knowledge discovery*, 5(1):115–153, 2001.

[34] B. Van Roy and X. Yan. Manipulation Robustness of Collaborative Filtering. 2010.

[35] H. Xu, C. Caramanis, and S. Mannor. Principal component analysis with contaminated data: The high dimensional case. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1002.4658*, 2010.

[36] H. Xu, C. Caramanis, and S. Sanghavi. Robust PCA via outlier pursuit. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2010.

[37] H. Xu, C. Caramanis, and S. Sanghavi. Robust PCA via outlier pursuit. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1010.4237*, 2010.

[38] S. Zhang, Y. Ouyang, J. Ford, and F. Makedon. Analysis of a low-dimensional linear model under recommendation attacks. In *Proceedings of the 29th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 517–524. ACM, 2006.