# Topics in High-Dimensional Probability and Statistics\*

## Lecture 4: Random projections and the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma

#### Contents

- 1 Approximate isometries
- 2 Reminder
- 3 Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma
- 4 Examples
- 5 Note

### 1 Approximate isometries

Consider n distinct data points  $x_1, \ldots, x_n$  in  $\mathbb{R}^D$  considered deterministic (all the following results may be easily extended to the case of random points via conditioning). If the dimension D is very large, processing this data for some given task may be computationally demanding. An interesting problem is to figure out whether there exists a way to transform the high-dimensional data points  $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^D$ , through some map

$$T: \mathbb{R}^D \to \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{for some} \quad d \ll D,$$

into lower dimensional data points  $T(x_1), \ldots, T(x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  without losing too much information about the original data.

One way to guarantee that map T preserves the information of the data is to require the geometry of the data set to be completely preserved, i.e., to require that  $T: \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \to \mathbb{R}^d$  is an isometry. Precisely, this means that, for all  $i \neq j$ ,

$$||T(x_i) - T(x_i)||_2 = ||x_i - x_i||_2,$$

where, on the left hand-side,  $\|.\|_2$  refers to the euclidean norm in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  while, on the right hand-side,  $\|.\|_2$  refers to the euclidean norm in  $\mathbb{R}^D$ .

This isn't really a reasonable requirement if we think of the data points as points sampled from a distribution with a density with respect to Lebesgue measure. Indeed, in this case for any d < D, the points  $x_1, \ldots, x_n$  all belong to a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^D$  with probability 0 so that mapping all these points isometrically into a lower dimensional space is likely to fail with high probability.

But one can be a little less demanding, and require T to be a approximate isometry. To be more precise, for a fixed  $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ , we could only ask to have, for all  $i \neq j$ ,

$$1 - \varepsilon \le \frac{\|T(x_i) - T(x_j)\|_2^2}{\|x_i - x_j\|_2^2} \le 1 + \varepsilon.$$

The goal of this lecture is to show that we can construct a random and linear map  $T: \mathbb{R}^D \to \mathbb{R}^d$  such that, for any every

 $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$ , the above property holds with probability  $1-\delta$  for d of order

 $\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\log\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\delta}}\right),\,$ 

and independently of the dimension D.

#### 1 2 Reminder

- 2 We recall a few facts, seen in lecture 2, that will be useful in the proof of the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma below.
- A basic result of interest will be the following simple version of the Bernstein's concentration inequality.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$  be independent random variables. Suppose that there exists  $s^2, b > 0$  such that, for all  $1 \le i \le n$  and for all  $\theta \in [-1/b, 1/b]$ ,

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp(\theta \{Y_i - \mathbb{E}Y_i\}) \le \frac{\theta^2 s^2}{2}.$$

Then, for all t > 0,

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_{i} - \mathbb{E}Y_{i}) > t\right\} \vee \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_{i} - \mathbb{E}Y_{i}) < -t\right\} \\ & \leq \exp\left(-\frac{nt}{2}\left\{\frac{1}{b} \wedge \frac{t}{s^{2}}\right\}\right). \end{split}$$

The second important observation is that, given a real valued and sub-gaussian random variable X with variance proxy  $\sigma^2$ , the variable  $X^2$  satisfies,

$$\forall \theta \in (-\frac{1}{a}, \frac{1}{a}), \quad \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta \{X^2 - \mathbb{E}X^2\})] \le \frac{\theta^2 a^2}{2(1 - \theta a)},$$

with

$$a := 4e\sigma^2$$

In particular,

$$\forall \theta \in [-\frac{1}{2a}, \frac{1}{2a}], \quad \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta \{X^2 - \mathbb{E}X^2\})] \leq \frac{\theta^2(2a^2)}{2}.$$

## 3 Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma

Let  $\mathfrak{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^D$  be a set of n distinct data points, considered deterministic, and fix

$$\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$$
.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times D}$  be a random matrix whose rows  $R_1, \ldots, R_d \in \mathbb{R}^D$  are independent, centered and isotropic, i.e., such that

$$\mathbb{E}[R_i] = 0 \quad and \quad \mathbb{E}[R_i R_i^\top] = I_D.$$

Suppose that each  $R_i$  is sub-gaussian with variance proxy at most  $\sigma^2$ . Define finally

$$T := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}M.$$

<sup>\*</sup>Teaching material can be found at https://www.qparis-math.com/teaching.

Then, provided

$$d \geq \frac{64e^2\sigma^4}{\varepsilon^2}\log\left(\frac{2n^2}{\delta}\right),$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\forall i \neq j: 1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\|T(x_i) - T(x_j)\|_2^2}{\|x_i - x_j\|_2^2} \leq 1 + \varepsilon\right) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Proof. Denote

$$\mathcal{Z} := \left\{ \frac{x_i - x_j}{\|x_i - x_j\|_2} : i \neq j \right\}.$$

By linearity of T, the statement we need to prove is then equivalent to

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{z\in\mathcal{Z}}|\|T(z)\|_2^2-1|>\varepsilon\right)<\delta.$$

Using a union bound, observe that

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\|T(z)\|_2^2 - 1| > \varepsilon\right) \\ & \leq |\mathcal{Z}| \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{P}\left(|\|T(z)\|_2^2 - 1| > \varepsilon\right) \\ & = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{P}\left(|\|T(z)\|_2^2 - 1| > \varepsilon\right) \\ & < n^2 \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{P}\left(|\|T(z)\|_2^2 - 1| > \varepsilon\right). \end{split}$$

As a result, it is enough to prove that, for all  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\|T(z)\|_{2}^{2}-1|>\varepsilon\right)\leq\frac{\delta}{n^{2}}.$$

For  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , note that

$$T(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} Mz$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} (\langle R_1, z \rangle, \dots, \langle R_d, z \rangle)^{\top}.$$

As a result,

$$|||T(z)||_2^2 - 1| = |\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \langle R_i, z \rangle^2 - 1|.$$

Note finally that, since  $||z||_2 = 1$  for every  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ , each random variable  $\langle R_i, z \rangle$  is sub-gaussian with variance proxy at most  $\sigma^2$ . According to results mentioned in the previous section, this implies that variables

$$Y_i := \langle R_i, z \rangle^2,$$

satisfy, for all  $1 \le i \le d$  and for all  $\theta \in [-1/b, 1/b]$ ,

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp(\theta \{ Y_i - \mathbb{E} Y_i \}) \le \frac{\theta^2 s^2}{2},$$

where  $b = 8e\sigma^2$  and  $s^2 = 32e^2\sigma^4$ . As a result, we deduce that, for every  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\|T(z)\|_{2}^{2} - 1| > \varepsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{d\varepsilon}{2} \left\{\frac{1}{b} \wedge \frac{\varepsilon}{s^{2}}\right\}\right)$$

$$= 2 \exp\left(-\frac{d\varepsilon}{16e\sigma^{2}} \left\{1 \wedge \frac{\varepsilon}{4e\sigma^{2}}\right\}\right)$$

$$= 2 \exp\left(-\frac{d\varepsilon^{2}}{64e^{2}\sigma^{4}}\right),$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and that  $\sigma^2 \geq 1/4e$  by assumption. To sum up, the statement follows provided

$$2\exp\left(-\frac{d\varepsilon^2}{64e^2\sigma^4}\right) \le \frac{\delta}{n^2},$$

which is equivalent to

$$d \geq \frac{64e^2\sigma^4}{\varepsilon^2}\log\left(\frac{2n^2}{\delta}\right).$$

## 4 Examples

We give two explicit constructions of matrix M satisfying the assumptions of the theorem.

**Example 4.1.** Suppose that  $M = (M_{i,j})$  where entries  $M_{i,j}$  are independent and, for all  $i \in \{1, ..., d\}$  and all  $j \in \{1, ..., D\}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = -1) = \mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = +1) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then it satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 with  $\sigma^2 = 1$ .

**Example 4.2.** Suppose that  $M = (M_{i,j})$  where entries  $M_{i,j}$  are independent and, for all  $i \in \{1, ..., d\}$  and all  $j \in \{1, ..., D\}$ ,

$$M_{i,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$$
.

Then it satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 with  $\sigma^2 = 1$ .

#### 5 Note

For an application of Theorem 3.1 in the context of clustering, we refer the reader to [2]. We also recommend Chapter 5 in [1] for further applications of the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma.

#### References

- [1] A. Bandeira. Ten lectures and forty-two open problems in the mathematics of data science. Lecture notes, 2016.
- [2] G. Biau, L. Devroye, and G. Lugosi. On the performance of clustering in Hilbert spaces. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 54(2):781–790, 2008.