

THE KADISON-SINGER PROBLEM IN MATHEMATICS AND ENGINEERING

PETER G. CASAZZA AND JANET CRANDELL TREMAIN

ABSTRACT. We will see that the famous intractible 1959 Kadison-Singer Problem in C^* -algebras is equivalent to fundamental open problems in a dozen different areas of research in Mathematics and Engineering. This gives all these areas common ground on which to interact as well as explaining why each area has volumes of literature on their respective problems without a satisfactory resolution.

1. INTRODUCTION

For nearly 50 years the Kadison-Singer problem [37] has defied the best efforts of some of the most talented mathematicians of our time.

Kadison-Singer Problem (KS). *Does every pure state on the (abelian) von Neumann algebra \mathbb{D} of bounded diagonal operators on ℓ_2 have a unique extension to a (pure) state on $B(\ell_2)$, the von Neumann algebra of all bounded linear operators on the Hilbert space ℓ_2 ?*

A **state** of a von Neumann algebra \mathcal{R} is a linear functional f on \mathcal{R} for which $f(I) = 1$ and $f(T) \geq 0$ whenever $T \geq 0$ (i.e. whenever T is a positive operator). The set of states of \mathcal{R} is a convex subset of the dual space of \mathcal{R} which is compact in the w^* -topology. By the Krein-Milman theorem, this convex set is the closed convex hull of its extreme points. The extremal elements in the space of states are called the **pure states** (of \mathcal{R}).

This problem evolved from the very productive collaboration between Kadison and Singer over a 9 year period in the 1950's which culminated in their seminal work on triangular operator algebras. Their discussions often revolved around the fundamental work of Dirac on Quantum Mechanics [24]. But there was one part they kept returning to which was problematic. Dirac wants to find a "representation" (i.e. an orthonormal basis) for a compatible family of observables (i.e. a commutative family of self-adjoint operators). On page 74-75 of [24] Dirac states:

The first author was supported by NSF DMS 0405376.

“To introduce a representation in practice

- (i) We look for observables which we would like to have diagonal either because we are interested in their probabilities or for reasons of mathematical simplicity;
- (ii) We must see that they all commute - a necessary condition since diagonal matrices always commute;
- (iii) We then see that they form a complete commuting set, and if not we add some more commuting observables to make them into a complete commuting set;
- (iv) We set up an orthogonal representation with this commuting set diagonal.

The representation is then completely determined ... by the observables that are diagonal ...”

The emphasis was added. In the case of \mathbb{D} , the representation is $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$, the orthonormal basis of l_2 . But what happens if our observables have “ranges” (intervals) in their spectra? This leads Dirac to introduce his famous δ -function — vectors of “infinite length.” From a mathematical point of view, this is problematic. What we need is to replace the vectors e_i by some mathematical object that is essentially the same as the vector, when there is one, but gives us something precise and usable when there is only a δ -function. This leads to the “pure states” of $B(\ell_2)$ and, in particular, the (vector) pure states ω_x , given by $\omega_x(T) = \langle Tx, x \rangle$, where x is a unit vector in \mathbb{H} . Then $\omega_x(T)$ is the expectation value of T in the state corresponding to x . This expectation is the average of values measured in the laboratory for the “observable” T with the system in the state corresponding to x . The pure state ω_{e_i} can be shown to be completely determined by its values on \mathbb{D} ; that is, each ω_{e_i} has a *unique* extension to $B(\ell_2)$. But there are many other pure states of \mathbb{D} . (The family of all pure states of \mathbb{D} with the w^* -topology is $\beta(\mathbb{Z})$, the β -compactification of the integers.) Do these other pure states have unique extension? That is the Kadison-Singer problem (KS).

By a “complete” commuting set, Dirac means what is now called a “maximal abelian self-adjoint” subalgebra of $B(\ell_2)$; \mathbb{D} is one such. There are others. For example, another is generated by an observable with (“simple”) spectrum a closed interval. Dirac’s claim, in mathematical form, is that each pure state of a “complete commuting set” has a unique state extension to $B(\ell_2)$. Kadison and Singer show [37] that that is *not so* for each complete commuting set other than \mathbb{D} . They do show that each pure state of \mathbb{D} has a unique extension to the uniform closure of the algebra of linear combinations of operators T_π defined by $T_\pi e_i = e_{\pi(i)}$, where π is a permutation of \mathbb{Z} .

In sections 2-7 we will successively look at equivalents of the Kadison-Singer problem in operator theory, inner product theory, Banach space theory, frame theory, harmonic analysis, time-frequency analysis and finally in internet coding and signal processing. For many more equivalences of KS and a much more detailed discussion we refer the reader to [18]. To reduce the redundancy of statements of theorems, we adopt the notation: Problem A (or Conjecture A) **implies** Problem B (or Conjecture B) means that a positive solution to the former implies a positive solution to the latter. They are **equivalent** if they imply each other.

Notation: Throughout, $\ell_2(I)$ will denote a finite or infinite dimensional complex Hilbert space with a fixed orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$. If I is infinite we let $\ell_2 = \ell_2(I)$, and if $|I| = n$ write $\ell_2(I) = \ell_2^n$ with fixed orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$. For any Hilbert space \mathbb{H} we let $B(\mathbb{H})$ denote the family of bounded linear operators on \mathbb{H} . An n -dimensional subspace of $\ell_2(I)$ will be denoted \mathbb{H}_n . For an operator T on any one of our Hilbert spaces, its matrix representation $(\langle Te_i, e_j \rangle)_{i,j \in I}$ is with respect to our fixed orthonormal basis. If $J \subset I$, the **diagonal projection** Q_J is the matrix all of whose entries are zero except for the (i, i) entries for $i \in J$ which are all one. For a matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ let $\delta(A) = \max_{i \in I} |a_{ii}|$.

An apology to the authors not referenced: Because we are dealing with so many very active areas of research, a proper bibliography would be longer than the paper. Therefore, we will resort to “secondary referencing” of books, survey articles and the most recent papers whose bibliographies give a good introduction to the subject.

2. KADISON-SINGER IN OPERATOR THEORY

A significant advance on KS was made by Anderson [3] in 1979 when he reformulated KS into what is now known as the **Paving Conjecture** (Lemma 5 of [37] shows a connection between KS and Paving).

Paving Conjecture (PC). *For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a natural number r so that for every natural number n and every linear operator T on ℓ_2^n whose matrix has zero diagonal, we can find a partition (i.e. a paving) $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, so that*

$$\|Q_{A_j} T Q_{A_j}\| \leq \epsilon \|T\| \quad \text{for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, r.$$

It is important that r not depend on n in PC. PC has an equivalent formulation for operators on ℓ_2 . We will say that an arbitrary operator T satisfies PC if $T - D(T)$ satisfies PC where $D(T)$ is the diagonal of T . It is known that the class of operators satisfying PC (the **pavable operators**) is a closed subspace of $B(\ell_2)$. Also, to verify PC we only need to verify it for any one the following classes of operators [1, 18]: 1. unitary operators, 2. positive operators, 3.

orthogonal projections, 4. Gram operators of the form $T^*T = (\langle f_i, f_j \rangle)_{i,j \in I}$ where $\|f_i\| = 1$ and $Te_i = f_i$ is a bounded operator. The only large classes of operators which have been shown to be pavaable are “diagonally dominant” matrices [6, 7, 33] and matrices with all entries real and positive [8, 35].

In [1] it was shown that the following conjecture implies KS.

Conjecture 2.1. *There exist $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$ with the following property: for any orthogonal projection P on ℓ_2^n with $\delta(P) \leq \delta$, there is a diagonal projection Q such that $\|QPQ\| \leq 1 - \epsilon$ and $\|(I - Q)P(I - Q)\| \leq 1 - \epsilon$.*

It is important that ϵ, δ are independent of n in Conjecture 2.1. It is unknown if KS implies Conjecture 2.1. Recently Weaver [39] showed that a slight weakening of this will produce a conjecture equivalent to KS.

Conjecture 2.2. *There exist universal constants $0 < \delta, \epsilon < 1$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for all n and all orthogonal projections P on ℓ_2^n with $\delta(P) \leq \delta$, there is a paving $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ so that $\|Q_{A_j}PQ_{A_j}\| \leq 1 - \epsilon$, for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$.*

This needs some explanation since there is nothing in [39] which looks anything like Conjecture 2.2. In [39], Weaver introduces what he calls “Conjecture KS_r ”. A careful examination of the proof of Theorem 1 of [39] reveals that Weaver shows Conjecture KS_r implies Conjecture 2.2 which in turn implies KS which (after the theorem is proved) is equivalent to KS_r .

3. KADISON-SINGER IN HILBERT SPACE THEORY

In this section we will see that KS is actually a fundamental result concerning inner products. Recall that a family of vectors $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a **Riesz basic sequence** in a Hilbert space \mathbb{H} if there are constants $A, B > 0$ so that for all scalars $\{a_i\}_{i \in I}$ we have:

$$A \sum_{i \in I} |a_i|^2 \leq \left\| \sum_{i \in I} a_i f_i \right\|^2 \leq B \sum_{i \in I} |a_i|^2.$$

We call \sqrt{A}, \sqrt{B} the **lower and upper Riesz basis bounds** for $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$. If $\epsilon > 0$ and $A = 1 - \epsilon, B = 1 + \epsilon$ we call $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ an ϵ -**Riesz basic sequence**. If $\|f_i\| = 1$ for all $i \in I$ this is a **unit norm Riesz basic sequence**. A natural question is whether we can improve the Riesz basis bounds for a unit norm Riesz basic sequence by partitioning the sequence into subsets. This conjecture was first stated in [21] where it was shown that KS implies the conjecture.

Conjecture 3.1 (R_ϵ -Conjecture). *For every $\epsilon > 0$, every unit norm Riesz basic sequence is a finite union of ϵ -Riesz basic sequences.*

We will now show that KS is equivalent to the R_ϵ -Conjecture.

Theorem 3.2. *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The Kadison-Singer Problem.*
- (2) *If $T : \ell_2 \rightarrow \ell_2$ is a bounded linear operator with $\|Te_i\| = 1$ for all $i \in I$, then for every $\epsilon > 0$, $\{Te_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a finite union of ϵ -Riesz basic sequences.*
- (3) *The R_ϵ -Conjecture.*

Proof: (1) \Rightarrow (2): Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Given T as in (2), let $S = T^*T$. Since S has ones on its diagonal, by the (infinite form of the) Paving Conjecture there is a $r = r(\epsilon, \|T\|)$ and a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of I with so that for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ we have

$$\|Q_{A_j}(I - S)Q_{A_j}\| \leq \delta \|I - S\|$$

where $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{\|S\|+1}$. Now, for all $f = \sum_{i \in I} a_i e_i$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i T e_i \right\|^2 &= \|TQ_{A_j}f\|^2 = \langle TQ_{A_j}f, TQ_{A_j}f \rangle = \langle T^*TQ_{A_j}f, Q_{A_j}f \rangle \\ &= \langle Q_{A_j}f, Q_{A_j}f \rangle - \langle Q_{A_j}(I - S)Q_{A_j}f, Q_{A_j}f \rangle \\ &\geq \|Q_{A_j}f\|^2 - \delta \|I - S\| \|Q_{A_j}f\|^2 \\ &\geq (1 - \epsilon) \|Q_{A_j}f\|^2 = (1 - \epsilon) \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i T e_i \right\|^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): This is obvious.

(3) \Rightarrow (1): Let $T \in B(\ell_2)$ with $Te_i = f_i$ and $\|f_i\| = 1$ for all $i \in I$. We need to show that the Gram operator \mathbf{G} of $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ is pavalable. Fix $0 < \delta < 1$ and let $\epsilon > 0$. Let $g_i = \sqrt{1 - \delta^2} f_i \oplus \delta e_i \in \ell_2 \oplus \ell_2$. Then $\|g_i\| = 1$ for all $i \in I$ and for all scalars $\{a_i\}_{i \in I}$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \sum_{i \in I} |a_i|^2 &\leq \left\| \sum_{i \in I} a_i g_i \right\|^2 = (1 - \delta^2) \left\| \sum_{i \in I} a_i T e_i \right\|^2 + \delta^2 \sum_{i \in I} |a_i|^2 \\ &\leq [(1 - \delta^2) \|T\|^2 + \delta^2] \sum_{i \in I} |a_i|^2. \end{aligned}$$

So $\{g_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a unit norm Riesz basic sequence and $\langle g_i, g_k \rangle = (1 - \delta^2) \langle f_i, f_k \rangle$ for all $i \neq k \in I$. By the R_ϵ -Conjecture, there is a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ so that

for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and all $f = \sum_{i \in I} a_i e_i$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - \epsilon) \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2 &\leq \left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i g_i \right\|^2 = \left\langle \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i g_i, \sum_{k \in A_j} a_k g_k \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2 \|g_i\|^2 + \sum_{i \neq k \in A_j} a_i \overline{a_k} \langle g_i, g_k \rangle \\
&= \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2 + (1 - \delta^2) \sum_{i \neq k \in A_j} a_i \overline{a_k} \langle f_i, f_k \rangle \\
&= \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2 + (1 - \delta^2) \langle Q_{A_j}(G - D(G))Q_{A_j} f, f \rangle \\
&\leq (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Subtracting $\sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2$ through the inequality yields,

$$-\epsilon \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2 \leq (1 - \delta^2) \langle Q_{A_j}(G - D(G))Q_{A_j} f, f \rangle \leq \epsilon \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2.$$

That is,

$$(1 - \delta^2) |\langle Q_{A_j}(G - D(G))Q_{A_j} f, f \rangle| \leq \epsilon \|f\|^2.$$

Since $Q_{A_j}(G - D(G))Q_{A_j}$ is a self-adjoint operator, we have $(1 - \delta^2) \|Q_{A_j}(G - D(G))Q_{A_j}\| \leq \epsilon$. That is, $(1 - \delta^2)G$ (and hence G) is p-able. \square

Remark 3.3. *The proof of (3) \Rightarrow (1) of Theorem 3.2 illustrates a standard method for turning conjectures about unit norm Riesz basic sequences $\{g_i\}_{i \in I}$ into conjectures about unit norm families $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ with $T \in B(\ell_2(I))$ and $T e_i = f_i$. Namely, given $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $0 < \delta < 1$ let $g_i = \sqrt{1 - \delta^2} f_i \oplus \delta e_i \in \ell_2(I) \oplus \ell_2(I)$. Then $\{g_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a unit norm Riesz basic sequence and for δ small enough, g_i is close enough to f_i to pass inequalities from $\{g_i\}_{i \in I}$ to $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$.*

Remark 3.4. *There are standard methods for turning our finite dimensional conjectures into infinite dimensional ones and vice-versa (see [17], Proposition 2.1 and the proof of Theorem 2.2 or [18]).*

It follows from Remark 3.4 that (2) of Theorem 3.2 has a finite dimensional equivalent:

Conjecture 3.5. *For every $\epsilon > 0$ and every $T \in B(\ell_2^n)$ with $\|T e_i\| = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ there is an $r = r(\epsilon, \|T\|)$ and a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ so that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and all scalars $\{a_i\}_{i \in A_j}$ we have*

$$(1 - \epsilon) \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2 \leq \left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i T e_i \right\|^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2.$$

By Remark 3.3, we can reformulate Conjecture 3.5 into a statement about unit norm Riesz basic sequences.

One advantage of the R_ϵ -Conjecture is that it can be shown to students right at the beginning of a course in Hilbert spaces. We note that this conjecture fails for equivalent norms on a Hilbert space. For example, if we renorm ℓ_2 by: $|\{a_i\}| = \|a_i\|_{\ell_2} + \sup_i |a_i|$ then the R_ϵ -Conjecture fails for this equivalent norm. To see this let $f_i = \frac{e_{2i} + e_{2i+1}}{\sqrt{2}+1}$ where $\{e_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the unit vector basis of ℓ_2 . This is now a unit norm Riesz basic sequence but no infinite subset satisfies the R_ϵ -Conjecture. To check this let $J \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|J| = n$ and $a_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ for $i \in J$. Then

$$|\sum_{i \in J} a_i f_i| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} + 1} \left(\sqrt{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$$

Since the norm above is bounded away from one for $n \geq 2$, we cannot satisfy the requirements of the R_ϵ -Conjecture. It follows that a positive solution to KS would imply a fundamental new result concerning “inner products”, not just norms. Actually, the R_ϵ -Conjecture is way too strong for proving KS. As we will see, either the upper or the lower inequalities are sufficient for proving KS and for each of these we only need a universal constant instead of $1 - \epsilon$ or $1 + \epsilon$.

4. KADISON-SINGER IN BANACH SPACE THEORY

In 1987 Bourgain and Tzafriri [10] proved a fundamental result in Banach space theory known as the **restricted invertibility principle**. This gave rise to a problem in the area which has received a great deal of attention [11, 18, 21].

Bourgain-Tzafriri Conjecture (BT). *There is a universal constant $A > 0$ so that for every $B > 1$ there is a natural number $r = r(B)$ satisfying: For any natural number n , if $T \in B(\ell_2^n)$ is a linear operator with $\|T\| \leq B$ and $\|Te_i\| = 1$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then there is a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ so that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and all choices of scalars $\{a_i\}_{i \in A_j}$ we have:*

$$\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i T e_i \|^2 \geq A \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2.$$

It had been “folklore” for years that KS and BT must be equivalent. But no one was quite able to actually give a proof of this fact. Recently Casazza and Vershynin [21] gave a formal proof of the equivalence of KS and BT. Sometimes BT is called **strong BT** since there is a weakening of it called **weak BT**. In weak BT we allow A to depend upon the norm of the operator T . A significant amount of effort has been invested in trying to show that strong and weak BT are equivalent [6, 17, 18, 21]. In [17] it was shown that weak BT is equivalent

to the Feichtinger Conjecture (See Section 5). We will now end this search by showing that all these conjectures are equivalent to KS. First, we state another conjecture which is formally weaker than weak BT.

Conjecture 4.1. *There exists a constant $A > 0$ and a natural number r so that for all natural numbers n and all $T : \ell_2^n \rightarrow \ell_2^n$ with $\|Te_i\| = 1$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $\|T\| \leq 2$, there is a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ so that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and all scalars $\{a_i\}_{i \in A_j}$ we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i T e_i \right\|^2 \geq A \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2.$$

Now we establish the equivalence of weak BT and KS.

Theorem 4.2. *Conjecture 4.1 is equivalent to KS.*

Proof. Since KS implies the R_ϵ -Conjecture implies weak BT implies Conjecture 4.1, we just need to show that Conjecture 4.1 implies Conjecture 2.2. So choose r, A satisfying Conjecture 4.1. Fix $0 < \delta \leq \frac{3}{4}$ and let P be an orthogonal projection on ℓ_2^n with $\delta(P) \leq \delta$ (notation from Section 1). Now, $\langle P e_i, e_i \rangle = \|P e_i\|^2 \leq \delta$ implies $\|(I - P)e_i\|^2 \geq 1 - \delta \geq \frac{1}{4}$. Define $T : \ell_2^n \rightarrow \ell_2^n$ by $T e_i = \frac{(I - P)e_i}{\|(I - P)e_i\|}$. For any scalars $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i T e_i \right\|^2 &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{\|(I - P)e_i\|} (I - P)e_i \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{a_i}{\|(I - P)e_i\|} \right|^2 \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^2. \end{aligned}$$

So $\|T e_i\| = 1$ and $\|T\| \leq 2$. By Conjecture 4.1, there is a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ so that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and all scalars $\{a_i\}_{i \in A_j}$ we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i T e_i \right\|^2 \geq A \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i (I - P)e_i \right\|^2 &= \left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i \|(I - P)e_i\| T e_i \right\|^2 \\ &\geq A \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2 \|(I - P)e_i\|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{A}{4} \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that for all scalars $\{a_i\}_{i \in A_j}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2 &= \left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i P e_i \right\|^2 + \left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i (I - P) e_i \right\|^2 \\ &\geq \left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i P e_i \right\|^2 + \frac{A}{4} \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, for all $f = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i$ we have

$$\|PQ_{A_j} f\|^2 = \left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i P e_i \right\|^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{A}{4}\right) \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2.$$

Thus,

$$\|Q_{A_j} P Q_{A_j}\| = \|P Q_{A_j}\|^2 \leq 1 - \frac{A}{4}.$$

So Conjecture 2.2 holds. \square

Finally, let us note that Remark 3.3 and BT imply that KS is equivalent to just the lower inequality in the R_ϵ -Conjecture and even without the lower constant having to be close to one.

5. KADISON-SINGER IN FRAME THEORY

A family $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ of elements of a (finite or infinite dimensional) Hilbert space \mathbb{H} is called a **frame** for \mathbb{H} if there are constants $0 < A \leq B < \infty$ (called the **lower and upper frame bounds** respectively) so that for all $f \in \mathbb{H}$

$$(5.1) \quad A\|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{i \in I} |\langle f, f_i \rangle|^2 \leq B\|f\|^2.$$

If we only have the right hand inequality in Equation 5.1 we call $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ a **Bessel sequence with Bessel bound B**. If $A = B$ we call this a **A -tight frame** and if $A = B = 1$ it is called a **Parseval frame**. If all the frame elements have the same norm this is an **equal norm frame** and if the frame elements have norm 1 it is a **unit norm frame**. The numbers $\{\langle f, f_i \rangle\}_{i \in I}$ are the **frame coefficients** of the vector $f \in \mathbb{H}$. If $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a Bessel sequence, the **synthesis operator** for $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ is the bounded linear operator $T : \ell_2(I) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ given by $T(e_i) = f_i$ for all $i \in I$. The **analysis operator** for $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ is T^* and satisfies: $T^*(f) = \sum_{i \in I} \langle f, f_i \rangle e_i$. So for all $f \in \mathbb{H}$, $\|T^*(f)\|^2 = \sum_{i \in I} |\langle f, f_i \rangle|^2$ and hence the smallest Bessel bound for $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ equals $\|T^*\|^2$. The **frame operator** for the frame is the positive, self-adjoint invertible operator $S = TT^* : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ satisfying $Sf = \sum_{i \in I} \langle f, f_i \rangle f_i$, for all $f \in \mathbb{H}$. **Reconstruction** of vectors in the space is achieved via the formula: $f = \sum_{i \in I} \langle f, f_i \rangle S^{-1} f_i$. A frame is Parseval if and only if $S = I$. In the finite dimensional case, if $\{g_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is an orthonormal basis of ℓ_2^n consisting of eigenvectors for S with respective eigenvalues $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^n$, then for every $1 \leq j \leq n$, $\sum_{i \in I} |\langle f_i, g_j \rangle|^2 = \lambda_j$.

In particular, $\sum_{i \in I} \|f_i\|^2 = \text{trace } S$ ($= n$ if $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a Parseval frame). For an introduction to frame theory we refer the reader to Christensen [22].

A fundamental result in frame theory was proved independently by Naimark and Han/Larson [22, 34].

Theorem 5.1. *A family $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a Parseval frame for a Hilbert space \mathbb{H} if and only if there is a containing Hilbert space $\mathbb{H} \subset \ell_2(I)$ with an orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$ so that the orthogonal projection $P_{\mathbb{H}}$ of $\ell_2(I)$ onto \mathbb{H} satisfies $P_{\mathbb{H}}(e_i) = f_i$ for all $i \in I$.*

Weaver [39] established an important relationship between frames and KS by showing that the following conjecture is equivalent to KS.

Conjecture 5.2. *There are universal constants $B \geq 4$ and $\epsilon > \sqrt{B}$ and an $r \in \mathbb{N}$ so that the following holds: Whenever $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^M$ is a unit norm B -tight frame for ℓ_2^n , there exists a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ so that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and all $f \in \ell_2^n$ we have*

$$(5.2) \quad \sum_{i \in A_j} |\langle f, f_i \rangle|^2 \leq (B - \epsilon) \|f\|^2.$$

Using Conjecture 5.2 we can show that the following conjecture is equivalent to KS:

Conjecture 5.3. *There is a universal constant $1 \leq D$ so that for all $T \in B(\ell_2^n)$ with $\|Te_i\| = 1$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, there is an $r = r(\|T\|)$ and a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ so that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and all scalars $\{a_i\}_{i \in A_j}$*

$$\left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i Te_i \right\|^2 \leq D \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2.$$

Theorem 5.4. *Conjecture 5.3 is equivalent to KS.*

Proof: Since Conjecture 3.5 clearly implies Conjecture 5.3, we just need to show that Conjecture 5.3 implies Conjecture 5.2. So choose D as in Conjecture 5.3 and choose $B \geq 4$ and $\epsilon > \sqrt{B}$ so that $D \leq B - \epsilon$. Let $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a unit norm B tight frame for ℓ_2^n . If $Te_i = f_i$ is the synthesis operator for this frame then $\|T\|^2 = \|T^*\|^2 = B$. So by Conjecture 5.3 there is an $r = r(B)$ and a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ so that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and all scalars $\{a_i\}_{i \in A_j}$

$$\left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i Te_i \right\|^2 = \left\| \sum_{i \in A_j} a_i f_i \right\|^2 \leq D \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2 \leq (B - \epsilon) \sum_{i \in A_j} |a_i|^2.$$

So $\|TQ_{A_j}\|^2 \leq B - \epsilon$ and for all $f \in \ell_2^n$ we have

$$\sum_{i \in A_j} |\langle f, f_i \rangle|^2 = \|(Q_{A_j}T)^* f\|^2 \leq \|TQ_{A_j}\|^2 \|f\|^2 \leq (B - \epsilon) \|f\|^2.$$

This verifies that Conjecture 3.5 holds and so KS holds. \square

Remark 3.3 and Conjecture 5.3 show that we only need any universal upper bound in the R_ϵ -Conjecture to hold to get KS.

In his work on time-frequency analysis, Feichtinger [18, 21] noted that all of the Gabor frames he was using (see Section 7) had the property that they could be divided into a finite number of subsets which were Riesz basic sequences. This led to the conjecture:

Feichtinger Conjecture (FC). *Every bounded frame (or equivalently, every unit norm frame) is a finite union of Riesz basic sequences.*

There is a significant body of work on this conjecture [6, 7, 18, 21, 33]. Yet it remains open even for Gabor frames. In [17] it was shown that FC is equivalent to the weak BT (and hence is implied by KS). We now know by Theorem 4.2 that FC is equivalent to KS.

6. KADISON-SINGER IN HARMONIC ANALYSIS

A deep and fundamental question in Harmonic Analysis is to understand the distribution of the norm of a function $f \in \text{span} \{e^{2\pi i n t}\}_{n \in I} =: S(I)$ over $[0, 1]$. It is known [8] if $[a, b] \subset [0, 1]$ and $\epsilon > 0$ then there is a partition of \mathbb{Z} into arithmetic progressions $A_j = \{nr + j\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$, $0 \leq j \leq r - 1$ so that for all $f \in S(A_j)$ we have

$$(1 - \epsilon)(b - a)\|f\|^2 \leq \|f \cdot \chi_{[a,b]}\|^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)(b - a)\|f\|^2.$$

What this says is that the functions in $S(A_j)$ have their norms nearly uniformly distributed across $[a, b]$ and $[0, 1] \setminus [a, b]$. The central question is whether such a result is true for arbitrary measurable subsets of $[0, 1]$ (but it is known that the partitions can no longer be arithmetic progressions [12, 18, 35]). If E is a measurable subset of $[0, 1]$ let P_E denote the orthogonal projection of $L^2[0, 1]$ onto $L^2(E)$. i.e. $P_E(f) = f \cdot \chi_E$. The fundamental question here is then

Conjecture 6.1. *If $E \subset [0, 1]$ is measurable and $\epsilon > 0$ is given, there is a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of \mathbb{Z} so that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and all $f \in S(A_j)$*

$$(6.1) \quad (1 - \epsilon)|E|\|f\|^2 \leq \|P_E(f)\|^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)|E|\|f\|^2.$$

Despite Harmonic Analysis having some of the deepest theory in mathematics, almost nothing is known about the distribution of the norms of functions coming from the span of a finite subset of the characters: except that this question has connections to very deep questions in Number Theory [12]. Very little progress has ever been made on Conjecture 6.1 except for a specialized result of Bourgain and Tzafriri [11]. Any advance on this problem would have broad applications throughout the field.

If $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is an essentially bounded function, we define the Töplitz operator T_ϕ on $L^2[0, 1]$ by $T_\phi(f) = f \cdot \phi$. In the 1980's much effort was put into

showing that the class of Töplitz operators satisfies the Paving Conjecture (see Berman, Halpern, Kaftal and Weiss [8, 35] and the references) during which time the uniformly pivable operators were classified and it was shown that T_ϕ is pivable if ϕ is Riemann integrable [8]. But to this day the KS problem for Toplitz operators remains a deep mystery. The next theorem helps explain why so little progress has been made on KS for Töplitz operators. Because this is equivalent to the deep question facing Harmonic Analysis stated above. To prove the theorem we will first look at the decomposition of Töplitz operators of the form P_E .

Proposition 6.2. *If $E \subset [0, 1]$ and $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ then for every $f \in L^2[0, 1]$ we have*

$$\|P_E Q_A f\|^2 = |E| \|P_A f\|^2 + \langle Q_A (P_E - D(P_E)) Q_A f, f \rangle,$$

where Q_A is the orthogonal projection of $L^2[0, 1]$ onto $\text{span} \{e^{2\pi i n t}\}_{n \in A}$.

Proof: For any $f = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n e^{2\pi i n t} \in L^2[0, 1]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_E Q_A f\|^2 &= \langle P_E Q_A f, P_E Q_A f \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{n \in A} a_n P_E(e^{2\pi i n t}), \sum_{m \in A} a_m P_E(e^{2\pi i m t}) \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{n \in A} |a_n|^2 \|\chi_E \cdot e^{2\pi i n t}\|^2 + \sum_{n \neq m \in A} a_n \overline{a_m} \langle P_E e^{2\pi i n t}, e^{2\pi i m t} \rangle \\ &= |E| \sum_{n \in A} |a_n|^2 + \langle (P_E - D(P_E)) \sum_{n \in A} a_n e^{2\pi i n t}, \sum_{n \in A} a_n e^{2\pi i n t} \rangle \\ &= |E| \|Q_A f\|^2 + \langle Q_A (P_E - D(P_E)) Q_A f, f \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we are ready for the theorem.

Theorem 6.3. *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *Conjecture 6.1.*
- (2) *For every measurable $E \subset [0, 1]$ the Töplitz operator P_E satisfies KS.*
- (3) *All Töplitz operators satisfy KS.*

Proof: (2) \Leftrightarrow (3): This follows from the fact that the class of pivable operators is closed and the class of Töplitz operators are contained in the closed linear span of the Töplitz operators of the form P_E . i.e. Arbitrary bounded measurable functions on $[0, 1]$ are uniformly approximable by simple functions.

(1) \Leftrightarrow (2): By Proposition 6.2, given $\epsilon > 0$, there is a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ so that Equation 6.1 holds if and only if for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and all $f \in L^2[0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \epsilon) |E| \|Q_{A_j} f\|^2 &\leq |E| \|Q_{A_j} f\|^2 + \langle Q_{A_j} (P_E - D(P_E)) Q_{A_j} f, f \rangle \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon) |E| \|Q_{A_j} f\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting like terms through the inequality yields that this inequality is equivalent to

$$(6.2) \quad |\langle Q_{A_j}(P_E - D(P_E)Q_{A_j})f, f \rangle| \leq \epsilon |E| \|Q_{A_j}f\|^2.$$

Since $Q_{A_j}(P_E - D(P_E)Q_{A_j})$ is a self-adjoint operator, Equation 6.2 is equivalent to $\|Q_{A_j}(P_E - D(P_E)Q_{A_j})\| \leq \epsilon |E|$. i.e. P_E is pivable. \square

7. KADISON-SINGER IN TIME-FREQUENCY ANALYSIS

Although the Fourier transform has been a major tool in analysis for over a century, it has a serious lacking for signal analysis in that it hides in its phases information concerning the moment of emission and duration of a signal. What was needed was a localized time-frequency representation which has this information encoded in it. In 1946 Gabor [29] filled this gap and formulated a fundamental approach to signal decomposition in terms of elementary signals. Gabor's method has become the paradigm for signal analysis in Engineering as well as its mathematical counterpart: Time-Frequency Analysis.

To build our elementary signals, we choose a **window function** $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ we define **modulation by x** and **translation by y** of g by:

$$M_x g(t) = e^{2\pi i x t} g(t), \quad T_y g(t) = g(t - y).$$

If $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\{E_x T_y g\}_{(x,y) \in \Lambda}$ forms a frame for $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ we call this an (irregular) **Gabor frame**. Standard Gabor frames are the case where Λ is a lattice $\Lambda = a\mathbb{Z} \times b\mathbb{Z}$ where $a, b > 0$ and $ab \leq 1$. For an introduction to time-frequency analysis we recommend the excellent book of Grochenig [32].

It was in his work on time-frequency analysis that Feichtinger observed that all the Gabor frames he was working with could be decomposed into a finite union of Riesz basic sequences. This led him to formulate the Feichtinger Conjecture - which we now know is equivalent to KS. There is a significant amount of literature on the Feichtinger Conjecture for Gabor frames as well as wavelet frames and frames of translates [6, 7, 12, 18]. It is known that Gabor frames over rational lattices [17] and Gabor frames whose window function is "localized" satisfy the Feichtinger Conjecture [6, 7, 33]. But the general case has defied solution.

Translates of a single function play a fundamental role in frame theory, time-frequency analysis, sampling theory and more [2, 12]. If $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, $\lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\{T_{\lambda_n} g\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a frame for its closed linear span, we call this a **frame of translates**. Although considerable effort has been invested in the Feichtinger Conjecture for frames of translates, little progress has been made. One exception is a surprising result from [16].

Theorem 7.1. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{Z}$ be bounded below, $a > 0$ and $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Then $\{T_{na}g\}_{n \in I}$ is a frame if and only if it is a Riesz basic sequence.*

A recent theorem of the authors helps to explain why the Feichtinger Conjecture has been so intractable for Gabor frames, frames of translates and wavelet frames. That is, this problem is equivalent to a variation of the deep problem facing Harmonic Analysis (Conjecture 6.1). The proof of this result is quite substantial and will have to wait for another time.

Theorem 7.2. *The Feichtinger Conjecture for frames of translates is equivalent to FC for Töplitz operators (which in turn is equivalent to a slightly weaker form of Conjecture 6.1 [18]).*

8. KADISON-SINGER IN ENGINEERING

Frames have traditionally been used in signal processing because of their resilience to additive noise, resilience to quantization, numerical stability of reconstruction and the fact that they give greater freedom to capture important signal characteristics [23, 31]. Recently, Goyal, Kovačević and Vetterli [31] proposed using the redundancy of frames to mitigate the losses in packet based transmission systems such as the internet. These systems transport packets of data from a “source” to a “recipient”. These packets are sequences of information bits of a certain length surrounded by error-control, addressing and timing information that assure that the packet is delivered without errors. It accomplishes this by not delivering the packet if it contains errors. Failures here are due primarily to buffer overflows at intermediate nodes in the network. So to most users, the behavior of a packet network is not characterized by random loss but rather by *unpredictable transport time*. This is due to a protocol, invisible to the user, that retransmits lost or damaged packets. Retransmission of packets takes much longer than the original transmission and in many applications retransmission of lost packets is not feasible. If a lost packet is independent of the other transmitted data, then the information is truly lost. But if there are dependencies between transmitted packets, one could have partial or complete recovery despite losses. This leads us to consider using frames for encoding. But which frames? In this setting, when frame coefficients are lost we call them **erasures**. It was shown in [30] that an equal norm frame minimizes mean-squared error in reconstruction with erasures if and only if it is tight. So a fundamental question is to identify the optimal classes of equal norm Parseval frames for doing reconstruction with erasures. Since the lower frame bound of a family of vectors determines the computational complexity of reconstruction, it is this constant we need to control. Formally, this is a max/min problem which looks like:

Problem 8.1. *Given natural numbers k, K find the class of equal norm Parseval frames $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{Kn}$ in ℓ_2^n which maximize the minimum below:*

$$\min \{A_J : J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, |J| = k, A_J \text{ the lower frame bound of } \{f_i\}_{i \in J^c}\}.$$

This problem has proved to be untouchable at this time. We only have a complete solution to the problem for two erasures [9, 19, 36]. It was hoped that some special cases of the problem would be more tractible and serve as a starting point for the classification since the frames we are looking for are contained in this class.

Conjecture 8.2. *There exists an $\epsilon > 0$ so that for large K , for all n and all equal norm Parseval frames $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{Kn}$ for ℓ_2^n , there is a $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, Kn\}$ so that both $\{f_i\}_{i \in J}$ and $\{f_i\}_{i \in J^c}$ have lower frame bounds at least ϵ .*

The ideal situation would be for Conjecture 8.2 to hold for all $K \geq 2$. In order for $\{f_i\}_{i \in J}$ and $\{f_i\}_{i \in J^c}$ to both be frames for ℓ_2^n , they at least have to span ℓ_2^n . So the first question is whether we can partition our frame into spanning sets. This will follow from the Rado-Horn theorem [20].

Theorem 8.3 (Rado-Horn). *Let I be a finite or countable index set and let $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a collection of vectors in a vector space. There is a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ such that for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$, $\{f_i\}_{i \in A_j}$ is linearly independent if and only if for all finite $J \subset I$*

$$(8.1) \quad \frac{|J|}{\dim \text{span } \{f_i\}_{i \in J}} \leq r.$$

The Rado-Horn Theorem will decompose our frames for us.

Proposition 8.4. *Every equal norm Parseval frame $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{Kn}$ for ℓ_2^n can be partitioned into K linearly independent spanning sets.*

Proof: If $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, Kn\}$, let P_J be the orthogonal projection of ℓ_2^n onto $\text{span } \{f_i\}_{i \in J}$. Since $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{Kn}$ is a equal norm Parseval frame (see Section 5) $\sum_{i=1}^{Kn} \|f_i\|^2 = Kn \|f_1\|^2 = n$. Now,

$$\dim(\text{span } \{f_i\}_{i \in J}) = \sum_{i=1}^{Kn} \|P_J f_i\|^2 \geq \sum_{i \in J} \|P_J f_i\|^2 = \sum_{i \in J} \|f_i\|^2 = \frac{|J|}{K}.$$

So the Rado-Horn conditions hold with constant $r = K$. If we divide our family of Kn vectors into K linearly independent sets, since each set cannot contain more than n -elements, it follows that each has exactly n -elements. \square

If we are going to be able to erase arbitrary k -element subsets of our frame, then the frame must be a union of erasure sets. So a generalization of Conjecture 8.2 which is a class containing the class given in Problem 8.1 is

Conjecture 8.5. *There exists $\epsilon > 0$ and a natural number r so that for all large K and all equal norm Parseval frames $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{Kn}$ in ℓ_2^n there is a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, Kn\}$ so that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ the Bessel bound of $\{f_i\}_{i \in A_j}$ is $\leq 1 - \epsilon$.*

No progress has been made on any of this list of problems. But before we discuss why, let us turn to another setting where these problems arise. For many years Engineers have believed that it should be possible to do signal reconstruction without phase. Recently, Balan, Casazza and Edidin [4] verified this longstanding conjecture of the signal processing community by construction new classes of equal norm Parseval frames. This problem comes from a fundamental problem in speech recognition technology called the “cocktail party problem”.

Cocktail Party Problem. *We have a tape recording of a group of people talking at a cocktail party. Can we recover each individual voice with all of its voice characteristics?*

As we will see, the main problem here is “signal reconstruction with noisy phase”. The standard format for signal processing (i.e. removing noise from a signal) is to take a signal (i.e. a $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$) and digitalize it by sending it through the **fast Fourier transform** [4]. This procedure just computes the frame coefficients of f with respect to a Gabor frame (see Section 7), say $\{\langle f, f_i \rangle\}_{i \in I}$. Next, we take the absolute values of the frame coefficients to be **processed** and **store** the phases

$$X_i(f) = \frac{\langle f, f_i \rangle}{|\langle f, f_i \rangle|}.$$

There are countless methods for processing a signal. One of the simplest is **thresholding**. This is a process of deleting any frame coefficients whose moduli fall outside of a “threshold interval” say $[A, B]$ where $0 < A < B$. The idea is that if our frame is chosen carefully enough then the deleted coefficients will represent the “noise” in the signal. Now it is time to reconstruct a clear signal. This is done by passing our signal back through the inverse fast Fourier transform (i.e. we are inverting the frame operator). But to do this we need phases for our coefficients. So we take our stored $X_i(f)$ and put them back on the processed frame coefficients which are at this time all non-negative real numbers. This is where the problem arises. If the noise in the signal was actually in the phases (which occurs in speech recognition), then we just put the noise back into the signal. The way to avoid this is to construct frames for which reconstruction can be done directly from the absolute value of the frame coefficients and not needing the phases. This was done in [4].

Theorem 8.6. *For a generic real frame on ℓ_2^n with at least $(2n - 1)$ -elements the mapping $\pm f \rightarrow \{|\langle f, f_i \rangle|\}_{i \in I}$ is one-to-one.*

For a generic complex frame on ℓ_2^n with at least $(4n - 2)$ -elements, the mapping $cf \rightarrow \{|\langle f, f_i \rangle|\}_{i \in I}$, $|c| = 1$, is one-to-one.

“Generic” here means that the set of frames with this property is dense in the class of all frames in the Zariski topology on the Grassman manifold [4].

In the process of looking for algorithms for doing reconstruction directly from the absolute value of the frame coefficients, it was discovered in the real case (the complex case is much more complicated) that the standard algorithms failed when the vector was getting approximately half it's norm from the positive frame coefficients and half from the negative coefficients [5]. The algorithms behave as if one of these sets has been "erased". The necessary conditions for reconstruction without phase in [4] help explain why. These conditions imply that every vector in the space must be reconstructable from either the positive frame coefficients or the negative ones. It is also shown in [5] that signal reconstruction without phase is equivalent to a (P_0) problem with additional constraints (See formula 8.2 below). So once again we have bumped into Problem 8.1 and Conjectures 8.2 and 8.5.

Our next theorem helps to explain why all of these reconstruction problems have proved to be so difficult. Namely, because KS has come into play again.

Theorem 8.7. (1) *Conjecture 8.2 implies Conjecture 8.5.*

(2) *Conjecture 8.5 is equivalent to KS.*

Proof: (1): Fix $\epsilon > 0$, r, K as in Conjecture 8.2. Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{Kn}$ be an equal norm Parseval frame for an n -dimensional Hilbert space \mathbb{H}_n . By Theorem 5.1 there is an orthogonal projection P on ℓ_2^{Kn} with $Pe_i = f_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, Kn$. By Conjecture 8.2, there is a $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, Kn\}$ so that $\{Pe_i\}_{i \in J}$ and $\{Pe_i\}_{i \in J^c}$ both have lower frame bound $\epsilon > 0$. Hence, for $f \in \mathbb{H}_n = P(\ell_2^{Kn})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{Kn} |\langle f, Pe_i \rangle|^2 = \sum_{i \in J} |\langle f, Pe_i \rangle|^2 + \sum_{i \in J^c} |\langle f, Pe_i \rangle|^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{i \in J} |\langle f, Pe_i \rangle|^2 + \epsilon \|f\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\sum_{i \in J} |\langle f, Pe_i \rangle|^2 \leq (1 - \epsilon) \|f\|^2$. So the upper frame bound of $\{Pe_i\}_{i \in J}$ (which is the norm of the analysis operator $(PQ_J)^*$ for this frame) is $\leq 1 - \epsilon$. Since PQ_J is the synthesis operator for this frame, we have that $\|Q_J PQ_J\| = \|PQ_J\|^2 = \|(PQ_J)^*\|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon$. Similarly, $\|Q_{J^c} PQ_{J^c}\| \leq 1 - \epsilon$. So Conjecture 8.5 holds for $r = 2$.

(2): We will show that Conjecture 8.5 implies Conjecture 5.2. Choose an integer K and an $r, \epsilon > 0$ with $\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} < \epsilon$. Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^M$ be a unit norm K -tight frame for an n -dimensional Hilbert space \mathbb{H}_n . Then (see Section 5) $M = \sum_{i=1}^M \|f_i\|^2 = Kn$. Since $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} f_i\}_{i=1}^M$ is an equal norm Parseval frame, by Theorem 5.1, there is an orthogonal projection P on ℓ_2^M with $Pe_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} f_i$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$. By Conjecture 8.5, we have universal $r, \epsilon > 0$ and a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ so that the Bessel bound $\|(PQ_{A_j})^*\|^2$ for each family

$\{f_i\}_{i \in A_j}$ is $\leq 1 - \epsilon$. So for $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and any $f \in \ell_2^n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in A_j} \left| \left\langle f, \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} f_i \right\rangle \right|^2 &= \sum_{i \in A_j} \left| \left\langle f, P Q_{A_j} e_i \right\rangle \right|^2 = \sum_{i \in A_j} \left| \left\langle Q_{A_j} P f, e_i \right\rangle \right|^2 \leq \|Q_{A_j} P f\|^2 \\ &\leq \|Q_{A_j} P\|^2 \|f\|^2 = \|(P Q_{A_j})^*\|^2 \|f\|^2 \leq (1 - \epsilon) \|f\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{i \in A_j} |\langle f, f_i \rangle|^2 \leq K(1 - \epsilon) \|f\|^2 = (K - K\epsilon) \|f\|^2.$$

Since $K\epsilon > \sqrt{K}$, we have verified Conjecture 5.2.

For the converse, choose r, δ, ϵ satisfying Conjecture 2.2. If $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{Kn}$ is an equal norm Parseval frame for an n -dimensional Hilbert space \mathbb{H}_n with $\frac{1}{K} \leq \delta$, by Theorem 5.1 we have an orthogonal projection P on ℓ_2^{Kn} with $P e_i = f_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, Kn$. Since $\delta(P) = \|f_i\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{K} \leq \delta$ (See the proof of Proposition 8.4), by Conjecture 2.2 there is a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, Kn\}$ so that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$,

$$\|Q_{A_j} P Q_{A_j}\| = \|P Q_{A_j}\|^2 = \|(P Q_{A_j})^*\|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Since $\|(P Q_{A_j})^*\|^2$ is the Bessel bound for $\{P e_i\}_{i \in A_j} = \{f_i\}_{i \in A_j}$, we have that Conjecture 8.5 holds. \square

Theorem 8.7 yields yet another equivalent form of KS. That is, KS is equivalent to finding a quantitative version of the Rado-Horn Theorem.

Recently, a slight weakening of KS has appeared. There is currently a flurry of activity surrounding sparse solutions to vastly underdetermined systems of linear equations. This has applications to problems in signal processing (recovering signals from highly incomplete measurements), coding theory (recovering an input vector from corrupted measurements) and much more. If A is an $n \times m$ matrix with $n < m$, the sparsest solution to $Af = g$ is

$$(8.2) \quad (P_0) \quad \min_{f \in \mathbb{R}^m} \|f\|_{\ell_0} \quad \text{subject to } Af = g,$$

where $\|f\|_{\ell_0} = |\{i : f(i) \neq 0\}|$. The problem with (P_0) is that it is NP hard in general. This led researchers to consider the ℓ_1 version of the problem known as *basis pursuit*.

$$(P_1) \quad \min_{f \in \mathbb{R}^m} \|f\|_{\ell_1} \quad \text{subject to } Af = g,$$

where $\|f\|_{\ell_1} = \sum_{i=1}^m |f(i)|$. Building on the groundbreaking work of Donoho and Huo [26], it has now been shown [13, 15, 14, 25, 27, 28, 38] that there are classes of matrices for which the problems (P_0) and (P_1) have the same unique solutions. Since (P_1) is a convex program, it can be solved by its classical reformulation as a linear program. A recent approach to these problems involves *restricted isometry constants* [15]. If A is a matrix with column vectors

$\{v_j\}_{j \in J}$, for all $1 \leq S \leq |J|$ we define the S -restricted isometry constants δ_S to be the smallest constant so that for all $T \subset J$ with $|T| \leq S$ and for all $\{a_j\}_{j \in T}$,

$$(1 - \delta_S) \sum_{j \in T} |a_j|^2 \leq \left\| \sum_{j \in T} a_j v_j \right\|^2 \leq (1 + \delta_S) \sum_{j \in T} |a_j|^2.$$

The fundamental principle here is the construction of (nearly) unit norm frames for which subsets of a fixed size are (nearly) Parseval (or better, nearly orthogonal). The conjecture related to this is:

Conjecture 8.8. *For every $S \in \mathbb{N}$ and B and every $0 < \delta < 1$, there is a natural number $r = r(\delta, S, B)$ so that for every n and every unit norm B -Bessel sequence $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^M$ for ℓ_2^n there is a partition $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ so that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$, $\{f_i\}_{i \in A_j}$ is a frame sequence with S -restricted isometry constant $\delta_S \leq \delta$.*

A particularly interesting case of this arises in Harmonic Analysis. Let E be a measurable subset of $[0, 1]$ of positive measure. Does the family

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{|E|}} e^{2\pi i n t} \chi_E \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}},$$

satisfy Conjecture 8.8? It is clear the R_ϵ -Conjecture implies Conjecture 8.8. The question of whether these conjectures were equivalent has been an open problem. Recently, however, it was shown [18] that Conjecture 8.8 is “formally” weaker than KS and actually it has a positive solution.

REFERENCES

- [1] C.A. Akemann and J. Anderson, *Lyapunov theorems for operator algebras*, Mem. AMS **94** (1991).
- [2] A. Aldroubi, *p frames and shift-invariant subspaces of L^p* , Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications **7** (2001) 1-21.
- [3] J. Anderson, *Restrictions and representations of states on C^* -algebras*, Trans. AMS **249** (1979) 303-329.
- [4] R. Balan, P.G. Casazza and D. Edidin, *Signal reconstruction without phase*, Jour. Appl. and Comput. Harmonic Anal. (To appear).
- [5] R. Balan, P.G. Casazza and D. Edidin, *Algorithms for signal reconstruction without phase*, In preparation.
- [6] R. Balan, P.G. Casazza, C. Heil and Z. Landau, *Density, overcompleteness and localization of frames. I. Theory*, Preprint.
- [7] R. Balan, P.G. Casazza, C. Heil and Z. Landau, *Density, overcompleteness and localization of frames. II. Gabor systems*, Preprint.
- [8] K. Berman, H. Halpern, V. Kaftal and G. Weiss, *Matrix norm inequalities and the relative Dixmier property*, Integ. Eqns. and Operator Theory **11** (1988) 28-48.
- [9] B. Bodmann and V.I. Paulsen, *Frames, graphs and erasures*, Linear Alg. and Appls. **404** (2005) 118-146.

- [10] J. Bourgain and L. Tzafriri, *Invertibility of “large” submatrices and applications to the geometry of Banach spaces and Harmonic Analysis*, Israel J. Math. **57** (1987) 137-224.
- [11] J. Bourgain and L. Tzafriri, *On a problem of Kadison and Singer*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **420** (1991), 1-43.
- [12] M. Bownik and D. Speegle, *The Feichtinger conjecture for wavelet frames, Gabor frames and frames of translates*, Preprint.
- [13] E. Candes, J. Romberg and T. Tao, *Robust uncertainty principles: exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information*, Preprint.
- [14] E. Candes and T. Tao, *Near optimal signal recovery from random projections: universal encoding strategies?*, Preprint.
- [15] E. Candes and T. Tao, *Decoding by linear programming*, Preprint.
- [16] P.G. Casazza, O. Christensen and N.J. Kalton, *frames of translates*, Collect. Math. **52** No. 1 (2001) 35-54.
- [17] P.G. Casazza, O. Christensen, A. Lindner and R. Vershynin, *Frames and the Feichtinger conjecture*, Proceedings of AMS, **133** No. 4 (2005) 1025-1033.
- [18] P.G. Casazza, M. Fickus, J.C. Tremain, and E. Weber, *The Kadison-Singer Problem in Mathematics and Engineering: Part II: A detailed account*. Preprint.
- [19] P.G. Casazza and J. Kovačević, *Equal norm tight frames with erasures*, Adv. Comp. Math **18** (2003) 387-430.
- [20] P.G. Casazza, G. Kutyniok and D. Speegle, *A redundant version of the Rado-Horn theorem*, Preprint.
- [21] P.G. Casazza and R. Vershynin, *Kadison-Singer meets Bourgain-Tzafriri*, preprint.
- [22] O. Christensen, *An introduction to frames and Riesz bases*, Birkhauser, Boston, 2003.
- [23] I. Daubechies, *Ten Lectures on Wavelets*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 1992.
- [24] P.A.M. Dirac, *Quantum Mechanics, 3rd Ed.*, Oxford University Press, London (1947).
- [25] D.L. Donoho, *For most large underdetermined systems of linear equations the minimal ℓ_1 -norm solution is also the sparsest solution*, Preprint.
- [26] D.L. Donoho and X. Huo, *Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decomposition*, IEEE Trans. on Information Theory **47** (2001) 2845-2862.
- [27] D.L. Donoho and M. Elad, *Optimally sparse representation in general (nonorthogonal) dictionaries via ℓ_1 minimization*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **100** (2003) 2197-2202.
- [28] M. Elad and A.M. Burckstein, *A generalized uncertainty principle and sparse representation in pairs of \mathbb{R}^N bases*, IEEE Transactions on Inform. Theory **48** (202) 2558-2567.
- [29] D. Gabor, *Theory of communication*, Jour. IEEE **93** (1946) 429-457.
- [30] V. Goyal, J. Kovačević and J.A. Kelner, *Quantized frame expansions with erasures* Jour. Appl. and Comput. Harmonic Anal. **10** (2001) 203-233.
- [31] V. Goyal, J. Kovačević and M. Vetterli, *Multiple description transform coding: Robustness to erasures using tight frame expansions*, Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Th., Cambridge, MA (1998) 388-397.
- [32] K.H. Gröchenig, *Foundations of time-frequency analysis*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2000.
- [33] K.H. Gröchenig, *Localized frames are finite unions of Riesz sequences*, Adv. Comp. Math. **18** (2003) 149-157.
- [34] D. Han and D.R. Larson, *Frames, bases and group representations*, Memoirs AMS **697** (2000).
- [35] H. Halpern, V. Kaftal and G. Weiss, *Matrix pavings and Laurent operators*, J. Op. Th. **16** (1986)121-140.

- [36] R.B. Holmes and V.I. Paulsen, *Optimal frames for erasures*, Linear Algebra and Appl. **377** (2004) 31-51.
- [37] R. Kadison and I. Singer, *Extensions of pure states*, American Jour. Math. **81** (1959), 547-564.
- [38] J. Tropp, *Greed is good: Algorithmic results for sparse representation*, Preprint.
- [39] N. Weaver, *The Kadison-Singer Problem in discrepancy theory*, Discrete Math. **278** (2004), 227-239.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA, COLUMBIA,
MO 65211

E-mail address: janet,pete@math.missouri.edu