

Solutions to the Examination on Mathematics of Information August 28, 2021

Problem 1

- (a) (i) For arbitrary $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we compute

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, h_k \rangle|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, (-1)^k e_k \rangle|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, e_k \rangle|^2 = \|x\|^2,$$

where the last equality holds because $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an orthonormal basis (ONB) for \mathcal{H} by assumption. This establishes that the set $\{h_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a tight frame with frame bounds $A = B = 1$.

- (ii) For arbitrary $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we compute

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, h_k \rangle|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \left| \frac{1}{k} \langle x, e_k \rangle \right|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k} |\langle x, e_k \rangle|^2. \quad (1)$$

Next, we assume towards a contradiction that there exists a lower frame bound $A > 0$, i.e., $A\|x\|^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, h_k \rangle|^2, \forall x \in \mathcal{H}$. Fix an integer N such that $\frac{1}{N} < A$ and evaluate (1) for $x = e_N \in \mathcal{H}$ to get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle e_N, h_k \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{N} |\langle e_N, e_N \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{N} \|e_N\|_2^2 < A \|e_N\|^2.$$

This stands in contradiction to the assumption that A is a lower frame bound. As A was arbitrary no lower frame bound can therefore exist and $\{h_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is thus not a frame.

- (b) (i) We prove that $\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is complete by showing that the only signal $x \in \mathcal{H}$ that satisfies $\langle x, g_k \rangle = 0, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$, is $x = 0$. Take $x \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 = \langle x, g_k \rangle = \langle x, e_k + e_{k+1} \rangle, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence,

$$\langle x, e_k \rangle = -\langle x, e_{k+1} \rangle, \forall k \in \mathbb{N},$$

which implies $|\langle x, e_k \rangle| = C, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$, for some $C \geq 0$. Further, owing to $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we have $\|x\| < \infty$ and thus

$$\infty > \|x\|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, e_k \rangle|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C^2, \quad (2)$$

where we used that $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an ONB. The proof is concluded by noting that (2) can hold only if $C = 0$ and thus $x = 0$.

- (ii) We prove that $\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is not a frame by showing that no lower frame bound $A > 0$ exists. To this end, we fix $q \in (0, 1)$, consider the signal $x_q = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} (-q)^{\ell-1} e_{\ell}$ and start by showing that $x_q \in \mathcal{H}$. Since $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an ONB by assumption, we can write

$$\|x_q\|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x_q, e_k \rangle|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (q^2)^{k-1} = \frac{1}{1-q^2} < \infty, \quad \forall q \in (0, 1),$$

which establishes that $x_q \in \mathcal{H}$. Next, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x_q, g_k \rangle|^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left| \left\langle \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} (-q)^{\ell-1} e_{\ell}, e_k + e_{k+1} \right\rangle \right|^2 \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |(-q)^{k-1} + (-q)^k|^2 \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |(1-q)(-q)^{k-1}|^2 \\ &= (1-q)^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (q^2)^{k-1} \\ &= (1-q)^2 \frac{1}{1-q^2} = (1-q)^2 \|x_q\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The equality $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x_q, g_k \rangle|^2 = (1-q)^2 \|x_q\|^2$ then establishes that there can be no $A > 0$ such that $A\|x\|^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, g_k \rangle|^2$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{H}$, as we can always find a $q \in (0, 1)$ so that $(1-q)^2 < A$.

- (c) (i) For all $g, f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\langle \mathbb{W}_{m,n}^{(T,F)} g, f \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2\pi i n F t} g(t - mT) \overline{f(t)} dt \quad (3)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2\pi i n F (t'+mT)} g(t') \overline{f(t' + mT)} dt' \quad (4)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(t') \overline{e^{-2\pi i n m T F} e^{2\pi i (-n) F t'} f(t' - (-m)T)} dt' \quad (5)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(t') \overline{e^{-2\pi i n m T F} (\mathbb{W}_{-m,-n}^{(T,F)} f)(t')} dt' \quad (6)$$

$$= \langle g, e^{-2\pi i n m T F} \mathbb{W}_{-m,-n}^{(T,F)} f \rangle \quad (7)$$

$$= \langle g, (\mathbb{W}_{m,n}^{(T,F)})^* f \rangle, \quad (8)$$

which establishes that $(\mathbb{W}_{m,n}^{(T,F)})^* = e^{-2\pi i n m T F} \mathbb{W}_{-m,-n}^{(T,F)}$.

(ii) For every $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$(\mathbb{W}_{m,n}^{(T,F)})^* \mathbb{W}_{m,n}^{(T,F)} g = (\mathbb{W}_{m,n}^{(T,F)})^* (e^{2\pi i n F \bullet} g(\bullet - mT)) \quad (9)$$

$$= e^{-2\pi i n m T F} \mathbb{W}_{-m,-n}^{(T,F)} (e^{2\pi i n F \bullet} g(\bullet - mT)) \quad (10)$$

$$= e^{-2\pi i n m T F} e^{-2\pi i n F \bullet} e^{2\pi i n F(\bullet + mT)} g(\bullet + mT - mT) \quad (11)$$

$$= g, \quad (12)$$

and

$$\mathbb{W}_{m,n}^{(T,F)} (\mathbb{W}_{m,n}^{(T,F)})^* g = \mathbb{W}_{m,n}^{(T,F)} (e^{-2\pi i n m T F} \mathbb{W}_{-m,-n}^{(T,F)} g) \quad (13)$$

$$= e^{-2\pi i n m T F} \mathbb{W}_{m,n}^{(T,F)} (e^{-2\pi i n F \bullet} g(\bullet + mT)) \quad (14)$$

$$= e^{-2\pi i n m T F} (e^{2\pi i n F \bullet} e^{-2\pi i n F(\bullet - mT)} g(\bullet - mT + mT)) \quad (15)$$

$$= g. \quad (16)$$

Problem 2

(a) (i) We solve the linear system $D\hat{x} = 0$ to obtain

$$\mathcal{N}(D) = \text{span} \left(\begin{pmatrix} \frac{7}{5} \\ -\frac{3}{5} \\ -\frac{3}{5} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

(ii) In (i) we saw that $\mathcal{N}(D) \neq \{0\}$. Therefore, the columns of D are linearly dependent which implies $\text{spark}(D) \leq 4$. As $\|x\|_0 = 3$ the condition $\|x\|_0 < \frac{\text{spark}(D)}{2}$ hence does not hold.

(iii) From the proof of Theorem 3.2 in the lecture notes we know that $\text{spark}(D) \geq 1 + 1/\mu(D)$. The condition

$$\|x\|_0 < \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu(D)} \right)$$

together with $\text{spark}(D) \leq 4$ would hence require $\|x\|_0 < 2$. This is not satisfied as we have $\|x\|_0 = 3$.

(iv) We have $\mathcal{X} = x + \mathcal{N}(D)$, where $x = (1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0)^T$ is the particular solution from the problem statement. Hence,

$$\mathcal{X} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \lambda \begin{pmatrix} \frac{7}{5} \\ -\frac{3}{5} \\ -\frac{3}{5} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} : \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \quad (17)$$

(v) (P0) identifies the vector

$$\arg \min_{\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\hat{x}\|_0,$$

where \mathcal{X} denotes the solution set characterized in (17). We notice, with $\lambda = \frac{5}{3}$ in (17), that the vector

$$x' := \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \frac{7}{3} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \frac{5}{3} \end{pmatrix}$$

is contained in the solution set, i.e., $x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $\|x'\|_0 = 2 < \|x\|_0 = 3$, it

follows that the solution to (P0) is not equal to x . Hence, x is not recovered through (P0).

(vi) (P1) identifies the vector that minimizes

$$\min_{\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\hat{x}\|_1 = \min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \lambda \begin{pmatrix} \frac{7}{5} \\ -\frac{3}{5} \\ -\frac{3}{5} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_1 \quad (18)$$

$$= \min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left| 1 + \frac{7}{5}\lambda \right| + 2 \left| 1 - \frac{3}{5}\lambda \right| + |\lambda| \quad (19)$$

$$=: \min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} f(\lambda). \quad (20)$$

Noting that $f(\lambda)$ has its unique minimum at $\lambda = 0$, it follows that (P1) recovers x uniquely.

In order to formally establish that $f(\lambda)$ is minimized at $\lambda = 0$, we observe that $f(0) = 3$ and for every $\delta \in (0, \frac{5}{7})$, we have

$$f(0 + \delta) = 1 + \frac{7}{5}\delta + 2 - \frac{6}{5}\delta + \delta = 3 + \frac{6}{5}\delta > 3$$

and

$$f(0 - \delta) = 1 - \frac{7}{5}\delta + 2 + \frac{6}{5}\delta + \delta = 3 + \frac{4}{5}\delta > 3.$$

Hence, $\lambda = 0$ is a local minimum and because f is the sum of strictly convex functions also a global minimum.

(b) (i) We first establish the inequality provided in the Hint.

$$|\langle u, v \rangle| = \left| \sum_{k=1}^N u_k \overline{v_k} \right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^N |u_k| |v_k| \leq \max_{\ell} |v_{\ell}| \sum_{k=1}^N |u_k| = \|v\|_{\infty} \|u\|_1.$$

Next, we show that under (C1) for all $z \neq x$ with $Dz = y = Dx$, we have $\|z\|_1 > \|x\|_1$ as this implies that the minimization problem (P1) has the unique solution x as desired. To this end, we define $v := z - x$ and note that $Dv = D(z - x) = Dz - Dx = 0$, i.e., $v \in \mathcal{N}(D)$. We now bound

$$\|z\|_1 = \|v + x\|_1 = \|v_S + x_S\|_1 + \|v_{S^c}\|_1 \quad (21)$$

$$= \|v_S + x_S\|_1 \|\text{sgn}(x_S)\|_{\infty} + \|v_{S^c}\|_1 \quad (22)$$

$$\geq |\langle x_S + v_S, \text{sgn}(x_S) \rangle| + \|v_{S^c}\|_1 \quad (23)$$

$$> |\langle x_S + v_S, \text{sgn}(x_S) \rangle| + |\langle v_S, \text{sgn}(x_S) \rangle| \quad (24)$$

$$\geq |\langle x_S, \text{sgn}(x_S) \rangle| - |\langle v_S, \text{sgn}(x_S) \rangle| + |\langle v_S, \text{sgn}(x_S) \rangle| \quad (25)$$

$$= \left| \sum_{k \in S} x_k \frac{\overline{x_k}}{|x_k|} \right| = \|x_S\|_1 = \|x\|_1, \quad (26)$$

where in (22) we used $\|\text{sgn}(x_S)\|_\infty = 1$, for $x_S \neq 0$, in (23) we applied the Hint, in (24) we used (C1), and in (25) we employed the reverse triangle inequality.

(ii) First note that for all $v \in \mathcal{N}(D) \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$0 = Dv = D_S v_S + D_{S^c} v_{S^c} \quad (27)$$

and hence $D_S v_S = -D_{S^c} v_{S^c}$. Further, we realize that $(D^H h)_S = (D_S)^H h$, $\forall h \in \mathbb{C}^m$. Next, we assume that (C2) holds and show that this implies (C1). Let $h \in \mathbb{C}^m$ be such that

$$(D^H h)_S = \text{sgn}(x_S) \text{ and } \|(D^H h)_{S^c}\|_\infty < 1. \quad (28)$$

Such an $h \in \mathbb{C}^m$ exists by assumption (C2). With $(D^H h)_S = (D_S)^H h$ this implies (C1) as follows,

$$\left| \sum_{j \in S} v_j \overline{(\text{sgn}(x))_j} \right| = \langle v_S, \text{sgn}(x_S) \rangle = \langle v_S, (D^H h)_S \rangle \quad (29)$$

$$= |\langle v_S, (D_S)^H h \rangle| = |\langle D_S v_S, h \rangle| \quad (30)$$

$$= |\langle -D_{S^c} v_{S^c}, h \rangle| = |\langle v_{S^c}, (D_{S^c})^H h \rangle| \quad (31)$$

$$= |\langle v_{S^c}, (D^H h)_{S^c} \rangle| \leq \|v_{S^c}\|_1 \|(D^H h)_{S^c}\|_\infty \quad (32)$$

$$< \|v_{S^c}\|_1. \quad (33)$$

To see that the final inequality is, indeed, strict, we note that $v_{S^c} \neq 0$ as otherwise $v \neq 0$ would imply $v_S \neq 0$ and (27) would imply $D_S v_S = 0$. This would, however, stand in contradiction to $\mathcal{N}(D_S) = \{0\}$. Therefore, we have $\|v_{S^c}\|_1 \neq 0$. Together with $\|(D^H h)_{S^c}\|_\infty < 1$, which is by (28), this guarantees strict inequality.

Problem 3

- (a) First, recall the definition of the operator norm as $\|P_{\mathcal{W}}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} := \sup_{\|g\|_2=1} \|P_{\mathcal{W}}g\|_2$, which implies that, for all $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $h \neq 0$,

$$\|P_{\mathcal{W}}h\|_2 = \left\| P_{\mathcal{W}} \frac{h}{\|h\|_2} \right\|_2 \|h\|_2 \leq \sup_{\|g\|_2=1} \|P_{\mathcal{W}}g\|_2 \|h\|_2 = \|P_{\mathcal{W}}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \|h\|_2. \quad (34)$$

We follow the Hint and observe that for all $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\|P_{\mathcal{W}}g\|_2^2 \stackrel{\text{Plancherel}}{=} \left\| \widehat{P_{\mathcal{W}}g} \right\|_2^2 = \int_{\mathcal{W}} |\hat{g}(w)|^2 dw \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\hat{g}(w)|^2 dw \stackrel{\text{Plancherel}}{=} \|g\|_2^2,$$

and that if moreover g has its Fourier transform \hat{g} supported on \mathcal{W} , then $P_{\mathcal{W}}g = g$. We have therefore proven that

$$1 \leq \|P_{\mathcal{W}}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \leq 1,$$

and hence

$$\|P_{\mathcal{W}}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} = 1. \quad (35)$$

Next, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}f\|_2 &\stackrel{\text{triang. ineq.}}{\leq} \|f - P_{\mathcal{W}}f\|_2 + \|P_{\mathcal{W}}f - P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}f\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{(34)}{\leq} \|f - P_{\mathcal{W}}f\|_2 + \|P_{\mathcal{W}}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \|f - P_{\mathcal{T}}f\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{(35)}{=} \|f - P_{\mathcal{W}}f\|_2 + \|f - P_{\mathcal{T}}f\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_{\mathcal{W}} + \varepsilon_{\mathcal{T}}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where the last inequality holds as f is $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{T}}$ -concentrated to \mathcal{T} and simultaneously $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{W}}$ -concentrated to \mathcal{W} .

- (b) As it has been assumed in the problem statement that $\|f\|_2 = 1$, applying the reverse triangle inequality yields the desired result according to

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} &\stackrel{(34)}{\geq} \|P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}f\|_2 = \|f - (f - P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}f)\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{\text{RTI}}{\geq} \|f\|_2 - \|f - P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}f\|_2 \stackrel{(36)}{\geq} 1 - \varepsilon_{\mathcal{T}} - \varepsilon_{\mathcal{W}}. \end{aligned}$$

- (c) Plugging in the definition of $P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}g$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}g)(s) &= \int_{\mathcal{W}} e^{2\pi iws} \left(\widehat{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{T}}g} \right)(w) dw \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{W}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2\pi iw(s-t)} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{T}}(t) g(t) dt dw \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{W}} e^{2\pi iw(s-t)} dw \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{T}}(t) \right\} g(t) dt \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} q(s, t) g(t) dt, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where (*) follows from Fubini's theorem, and we set

$$q(s, t) = \int_{\mathcal{W}} e^{2\pi i w(s-t)} dw \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{T}}(t).$$

The condition for the application of Fubini's theorem, namely absolute integrability in (37), is satisfied as \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{W} are bounded sets. Now, fixing $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\|g\|_2 = 1$ and using (38), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}g\|_2^2 &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} q(s, t)g(t) dt \right|^2 ds \\ &\stackrel{\text{C.S.}}{\leq} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q(s, t)|^2 dt \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |g(u)|^2 du}_{=1} \right\} ds \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q(s, t)|^2 dt ds, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where C.S. stands for 'Cauchy-Schwarz inequality'. As the right hand side of (39) does not depend on g , we can conclude, by taking the supremum over all g satisfying $\|g\|_2 = 1$, that, as desired,

$$\|P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}^2 = \sup_{\|g\|_2=1} \|P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}g\|_2^2 \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q(s, t)|^2 dt ds.$$

(d) We observe that

$$q(s+t, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2\pi i w s} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{W}}(w) dw \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{T}}(t) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{W}}\}(s) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{T}}(t),$$

where $\mathcal{F}^{-1}\{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{W}}\}(s)$ is the inverse Fourier transform of the indicator function $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{W}}$ evaluated at s . This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q(s, t)|^2 ds &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q(s+t, t)|^2 ds \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\mathcal{F}^{-1}\{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{W}}\}(s)|^2 ds \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{T}}(t) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Pl.}}{=} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\mathcal{F}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{W}}\}(w)|^2 dw \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{T}}(t) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{W}}(w) dw \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{T}}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where we used the Plancherel identity, abbreviated as 'Pl.'. Upon integration over t , (40) results in

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q(s, t)|^2 ds dt = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{W}}(w) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{T}}(t) dw dt = |\mathcal{W}| |\mathcal{T}|. \quad (41)$$

As \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{W} are bounded sets by assumption, the right hand side of (41) is finite

and we can hence apply Fubini's theorem to conclude, as desired, that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q(s, t)|^2 dt ds = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q(s, t)|^2 ds dt = |\mathcal{W}||\mathcal{T}|.$$

(e) We combine the results established in the previous subproblems according to

$$|\mathcal{W}||\mathcal{T}| \stackrel{(d)}{=} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q(s, t)|^2 dt ds \stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \|P_{\mathcal{W}}P_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}^2 \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} (1 - (\varepsilon_{\mathcal{T}} + \varepsilon_{\mathcal{W}}))^2.$$

Problem 4

In this solution, to avoid confusion, we write x_i for the i -th vector in the set $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ and $x_{(i)}$ for the i -th component of the vector x .

- (a) (i) The first inequality is obtained by taking the square root in the following inequality

$$\|x\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_{(i)}|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_{(i)}|^2 + \sum_{i,j,i \neq j} |x_{(i)}| |x_{(j)}| = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_{(i)}| \right)^2 = \|x\|_1^2, \quad (42)$$

and the second one follows by application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality according to

$$\|x\|_1 = \langle x, \text{sgn}(x) \rangle \stackrel{\text{C.S.}}{\leq} \|x\|_2 \|\text{sgn}(x)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n} \|x\|_2, \quad (43)$$

with $\text{sgn}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ defined as

$$\text{sgn}(x)_{(i)} := \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } x_{(i)} < 0, \\ +1, & \text{if } x_{(i)} > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } x_{(i)} = 0. \end{cases}$$

- (ii) Let $\{y_1, \dots, y_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an ε -covering of K with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_1$ -norm. For every $y \in K$, there hence exists an index i , $1 \leq i \leq N$, such that $\|y - y_i\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ and therefore

$$\|y - y_i\|_2 \stackrel{(42)}{\leq} \|y - y_i\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

We have hence established that every ε -covering of K with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_1$ -norm is also an ε -covering of K with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_2$ -norm, which in turn implies

$$\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_2) \leq \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_1).$$

Likewise, let $\{z_1, \dots, z_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an (ε/\sqrt{n}) -covering of K with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_2$ -norm. For every $z \in K$, there hence exists an index i , $1 \leq i \leq N$, such that $\|z - z_i\|_2 \leq \varepsilon/\sqrt{n}$ and therefore

$$\|z - z_i\|_1 \stackrel{(43)}{\leq} \sqrt{n} \|z - z_i\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n} \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}} = \varepsilon.$$

We have hence established that every (ε/\sqrt{n}) -covering of K with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_2$ -norm is also an ε -covering of K with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_1$ -norm, which in turn implies

$$\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_1) \leq \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon/\sqrt{n}; K, \|\cdot\|_2).$$

(iii) First note that from $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_2) \leq \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_1)$, one has for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_2)}{\log_2(1/\varepsilon)} \leq \frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_1)}{\log_2(1/\varepsilon)}.$$

Taking the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ on both sides yields

$$\dim_{\|\cdot\|_2}(K) \leq \dim_{\|\cdot\|_1}(K). \quad (44)$$

Likewise, it follows from $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_1) \leq \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon/\sqrt{n}; K, \|\cdot\|_2)$, that for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_1)}{\log_2(1/\varepsilon)} \leq \frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon/\sqrt{n}; K, \|\cdot\|_2)}{\log_2(1/\varepsilon)} = \frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon/\sqrt{n}; K, \|\cdot\|_2)}{\log_2(\sqrt{n}/\varepsilon) - \log_2(\sqrt{n})}.$$

Taking the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ on both sides yields

$$\dim_{\|\cdot\|_1}(K) \leq \dim_{\|\cdot\|_2}(K). \quad (45)$$

Combining (44) and (45), we get the desired result

$$\dim_{\|\cdot\|_1}(K) = \dim_{\|\cdot\|_2}(K).$$

(iv) We proceed as above but for general norms $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|'$ on \mathbb{R}^n . From the norm equivalence in finite dimensions, it follows that there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$C^{-1}\|x\| \leq \|x\|' \leq C\|x\|,$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\{y_1, \dots, y_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a $(C^{-1}\varepsilon)$ -covering of K with respect to the $\|\cdot\|$ -norm. For every $y \in K$, there hence exists an index i , $1 \leq i \leq N$, such that $\|y - y_i\| \leq C^{-1}\varepsilon$ and therefore

$$\|y - y_i\|' \leq C\|y - y_i\| \leq C C^{-1}\varepsilon = \varepsilon.$$

We have hence established that every $(C^{-1}\varepsilon)$ -covering of K with respect to the $\|\cdot\|$ -norm is an ε -covering with respect to the $\|\cdot\|'$ -norm, which implies

$$\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|') \leq \mathcal{N}(C^{-1}\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|). \quad (46)$$

A similar argument with the roles of the $\|\cdot\|$ -norm and the $\|\cdot\|'$ -norm reversed yields

$$\mathcal{N}(C\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|) \leq \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|'). \quad (47)$$

Combining (46) and (47) allows us to conclude that

$$\frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(C\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|)}{\log_2(1/(C\varepsilon)) + \log_2(C)} \leq \frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|')}{\log_2(1/\varepsilon)} \leq \frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(C^{-1}\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|)}{\log_2(1/(C^{-1}\varepsilon)) - \log_2(C)}.$$

Taking the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ yields the desired result

$$\dim_{\|\cdot\|}(K) = \dim_{\|\cdot\|'}(K).$$

- (b) (i) We first prove the result for $R = 1$. Following the Hint, we use the relation between metric entropy and the volume ratio provided in the Handout and applied to the unit ball $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}' = B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, 1)$ to obtain

$$\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^n \leq \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; \mathcal{B}, \|\cdot\|) \leq \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} + 1\right)^n, \quad (48)$$

where we used

$$\text{vol}\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{B}'\right) = \text{vol}\left(\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} + 1\right)\mathcal{B}\right) = \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} + 1\right)^n \text{vol}(\mathcal{B}).$$

The bounds in (48) now yield $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; \mathcal{B}, \|\cdot\|) \asymp \varepsilon^{-n}$, which in turn implies

$$\dim(B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, 1)) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; \mathcal{B}, \|\cdot\|)}{\log_2(1/\varepsilon)} = n.$$

For general $R > 0$, we observe that, by scaling, according to the Hint, we have

$$\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, 1), \|\cdot\|) = \mathcal{N}(R\varepsilon; B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, R), \|\cdot\|), \quad (49)$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, R)) &= \lim_{\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon'; B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, R), \|\cdot\|)}{\log_2(1/\varepsilon')} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(R\varepsilon; B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, R), \|\cdot\|)}{\log_2(1/(R\varepsilon))} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(R\varepsilon; B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, R), \|\cdot\|)}{\log_2(1/\varepsilon)} \\ &\stackrel{(49)}{=} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, 1), \|\cdot\|)}{\log_2(1/\varepsilon)} \\ &= \dim(B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, 1)) = n, \end{aligned}$$

where we took $\varepsilon' = R\varepsilon$.

- (ii) Take $R > 0$ large enough such that $K \subset B_\infty(0, R)$, where $B_\infty(0, R)$ is the ball with respect to the infinity norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ centered at the origin and of radius R . Such an R exists as K is compact. This inclusion now implies a bound on the covering number according to $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; B_\infty(0, R), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, and consequently also on the following ratio

$$\frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_\infty)}{\log_2(1/\varepsilon)} \leq \frac{\log_2 \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; B_\infty(0, R), \|\cdot\|_\infty)}{\log_2(1/\varepsilon)}.$$

Taking the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ yields the bound $\dim_{\|\cdot\|_\infty}(K) \leq \dim_{\|\cdot\|_\infty}(B_\infty(0, R))$. The desired bound according to

$$\dim(K) \leq \dim(B_\infty(0, R)) \stackrel{(b)(i)}{=} n,$$

is now a consequence of the result in (a)(iv).

- (iii) Consider $K = \{x\}$, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon; K, \|\cdot\|_\infty) = 1$, which yields $\dim(K) = 0 < n$.