## 1. Dictionary Learning Problem

$\checkmark$ Target: factorizing the matrix of training signals into the dictionary with unit norm columns (atoms), and the coefficient matrix with sparse columns, i.e.,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \{\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{X}\}=\underset{\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{X}}{\operatorname{argmin}}\|\mathbf{Y}-\mathbf{D} \mathbf{X}\|_{F}^{2} \\
& \text { s.t. } \quad\left\|\mathbf{x}_{k}\right\|_{0} \leq N_{0}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq K \\
& \quad\left\|\mathbf{d}_{n}\right\|_{2}=1, \quad 1 \leq n \leq N
\end{aligned}
$$



Fig 1. Schematic diagram of dictionary learning problem.

## $>$ Typical Solution. $---->$ Alternation Minimization

I. Sparsification:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\quad \mathbf{X}=\underset{\mathbf{X}}{\operatorname{argmin}}\|\mathbf{Y}-\mathbf{D X}\|_{F}^{2} \\
\text { s.t. }\left\|\mathbf{x}_{k}\right\|_{0} \leq N_{0}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq K
\end{gathered}
$$

The training signals are considered statistically independent.

$$
\mathbf{x}_{k}=\underset{\mathbf{x}_{1}}{\operatorname{argmin}}\left\|\mathbf{y}_{k}-\mathbf{D} \mathbf{x}_{k}\right\|_{F}^{2} \quad \text { s.t. }\left\|\mathbf{x}_{k}\right\|_{0} \leq N_{0}
$$

I. Dictionary Update:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathbf{D}=\underset{\mathbf{D}}{\operatorname{argmin}}\|\mathbf{Y}-\mathbf{D X}\|_{F}^{2} \\
\text { s.t. }\left\|\mathbf{d}_{n}\right\|_{2}=1, \quad 1 \leq n \leq N
\end{gathered}
$$

## 2. Considered Model

$\checkmark$ Target: Performing dictionary learning when the training signals are not statistically independent, and have the first-order Markovian dependency.


Fig 2. Schematic diagram of the considered model for dictionary learning problem.

- The set of unknown parameters: $\Omega=\underbrace{\{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{X}\}}_{\Theta} \cup\left\{s_{1}, s_{2}, \ldots, s_{K}\right\}$


Fig 3. In the considered model, assigning $y_{k}$ to one of the atoms is not independent form the activated state (or atom) for $y_{k-1}$.

## 3. Model Parameters Estimation

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Theta=\underset{\Theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \log \left\{\sum_{s=1}^{S} p\left(s_{k}=s \mid \mathbf{Y}, \Theta\right) f\left(\mathbf{y}_{k} \mid s_{k}=s, \Theta\right)\right\} \\
\text { s.t. } \quad\left\|\mathbf{d}_{l}^{(s)}\right\|_{2}=1, \quad\left\|\mathbf{x}_{k}^{(s)}\right\|_{0} \leq N_{0} \\
s=1,2, \ldots, S, \quad l=1,2, \ldots, L, \quad k=1,2, \ldots, K
\end{gathered}
$$

Expectation - MMinimization
1 By determination of $\theta$, the sequence of states, i.e., $\left\{s_{1}, s_{2}, \ldots, s_{K}\right\}$ is determined using Viterbi algorithm.

## 4. Results

$>$ First Scenario: Independent training signals.

$$
\mathbf{P}_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
0.55 & 0.45 \\
0.45 & 0.55
\end{array}\right]
$$

| SNR $_{d B}$ | Method | $N_{0}=3$ | $N_{0}=4$ | $N_{0}=5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | MOD | 80.6 | 72.4 | 4.3 |
|  | New MOD | 81.2 | 72.8 | 4.8 |
|  | K-SVD | 83.4 | 81.8 | 12.9 |
|  | New K-SVD | 83.7 | 82.2 | 14.1 |
| 20 | MOD | 86.5 | 85.3 | 77.9 |
|  | New MOD | 86.9 | 85.8 | 77.1 |
|  | K-SVD | 88.3 | 87.5 | 83.5 |
|  | New K-SVD | 88.4 | 88.2 | 82.9 |
| 30 | MOD | 89.1 | 86.6 | 83.4 |
|  | New MOD | 89.6 | 88.4 | 85.7 |
|  | K-SVD | 90.5 | 89.5 | 86.2 |
|  | New K-SVD | 91.7 | 90.4 | 86.8 |
| 100 | MOD | 90.1 | 88.3 | 85.8 |
|  | New MOD | 90.3 | 88.6 | 86.8 |
|  | K-SVD | 92.3 | 90.7 | 89.5 |
|  | New K-SVD | 92.4 | 91.1 | 89.6 |

Table 1. Percentage of successful recovery rate in the first scenario where the states are activated almost independently from each other.

Second Scenario: Dependent training signals.
$\mathbf{P}_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}0.95 & 0.05 \\ 0.10 & 0.90\end{array}\right]$

| $\mathrm{SNR}_{d B}$ | Method | $N_{0}=3$ | $N_{0}=4$ | $N_{0}=5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | MOD | 70.3 | 63.6 | $\simeq 0$ |
|  | New MOD | 81.4 | 71.9 | 4.6 |
|  | K-SVD | 75.6 | 69.3 | 3.9 |
|  | New K-SVD | 82.8 | 83.1 | 14.4 |
|  | MOD | 75.3 | 68.4 | 51.8 |
|  | New MOD | 87.1 | 84.9 | 77.2 |
|  | K-SVD | 79.6 | 76.4 | 72.4 |
|  | New K-SVD | 88.8 | 86.5 | 81.6 |
| 30 | MOD | 85.6 | 84.2 | 80.6 |
|  | New MOD | 88.6 | 87.7 | 86.4 |
|  | K-SVD | 89.8 | 86.7 | 83.1 |
|  | New K-SVD | 92.1 | 91.3 | 85.9 |
|  | MOD | 88.2 | 87.1 | 84.9 |
|  | New MOD | 89.8 | 87.5 | 85.1 |
|  | K-SVD | 91.3 | 90.1 | 88.2 |
|  | New K-SVD | 92.5 | 92.3 | 88.7 |

Table 2. Percentage of successful recovery rate in the first scenario where the states are dependent.

## 7. Conclusion

$\checkmark$ Dependency among the training signals degrade the performance of current dictionary learning algorithm.
$\checkmark$ We investigated the dictionary learning problem when there is the first-order Markovian model in the generation of signals.

