Polynomial Matrix Algebra with Applications

Stephan Weiss, Ian K. Proudler, and Fraser K. Coutts

UDRC Phase 3 Consortium on Underpinning Signal Processing
University of Strathclyde / University of Edinburgh

UDRC-EURASIP Summer School, Edinburgh, 22 June 2023

Presentation Overview

1. Overview

Part I: Polynomial Matrices and Decompositions

2. Polynomial matrices and basic operations
3. Parahermitian matrix / polynomial eigenvalue decomposition (PhEVD /PEVD)
4. Iterative PEVD algorithms
5. PEVD Matlab toolbox

Part II: Beamforming & Source Separation Applications

6. Broadband MIMO decoupling
7. Broadband angle of arrival estimation
8. Broadband beamforming
9. Source-sensor transfer function extraction
10. Weak transient signal detection

What is a Polynomial Matrix?

▶ A polynomial matrix is a polynomial with matrix-valued coefficients [52, 70], e.g.:

$$\boldsymbol{A}(z) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{array} \right] z^{-1} + \left[\begin{array}{cc} -1 & 2 \\ 1 & -1 \end{array} \right] z^{-2} \; ; \qquad (1)$$

▶ a polynomial matrix can equivalently be understood a matrix with polynomial entries, i.e.

$$\boldsymbol{A}(z) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} 1 + z^{-1} - z^{-2} & -1 + z^{-1} + 2z^{-2} \\ -1 + z^{-1} + z^{-2} & 2 - z^{-1} - z^{-2} \end{array} \right] \; ; \qquad (2)$$

▶ we may also encounter matrix-valued power series, Laurent polynomials, and Laurent series.

Matrix-Valued Polynomials and Power Series

► A power series $a(z)$ arises as the z-transform

$$a(z) = \sum_n a[n]z^{-n} \qquad \text{or} \quad \text{short} \qquad a(z) \bullet\!\!-\!\!\circ a[n] , \qquad (3)$$

► for $a(z)$ to exist as a power series, $a[n]$ must be
causal: $a[n] = 0 \ \forall n < 0$;
absolutely convergent: $\sum_n |a[n]| < \infty$

► absolute convergence implies that $a[n]$ decays at least as fast as an exponential function;

► a polynomial is a power series, but of finite length;

► polynomials or power series can form the entries of a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}(z)$.

Example of a Power Series

▶ For the geometric series

$$a[n] = \begin{cases} 0, & n < 0 \\ (\frac{1}{2})^n, & n \geq 0 \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

we have

$$\sum_n |a[n]| = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \cdots = 2 < \infty ; \tag{5}$$

▶ therefore $a[n]$ is an absolutely convergent power series, and $a(z)$ exists as an analytic function;

▶ here, for $a(z)$:

$$a(z) = 1 + \frac{1}{2}z^{-1} + \frac{1}{4}z^{-2} + \frac{1}{8}z^{-3} + \ldots = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{2}z^{-1}} ; \tag{6}$$

▶ this looks like the transfer function of a causal infinite impulse response (IIR) filter.

Laurent Series and Laurent Polynomials

▶ A Laurent series $a[n]$ is potentially infinite, but can include non-negative terms for both $n \geq 0$ and $n < 0$;

▶ for $a(z) \bullet\!\!-\!\!\circ a[n]$ to exist, $a[n]$ needs to decay at least exponentially in both positive and negative time direction;

▶ if it possesses finite support, $a(z)$ is a Laurent polynomial.

Analyticity and Polynomial Approximation

▶ Absolute convergence of $a[n]$ implies analyticity of $a(z)$ •——○ $a[n]$;

▶ the best approximation of an infinite order, analytic $a(z)$ in the least squares sense is by truncation (power series $\longrightarrow$ polynomial);

▶ likewise, a Laurent series can be approximated by a polynomial through truncation ($\longrightarrow$ Laurent polynomial) and an appropriate delay ($\longrightarrow$ polymomial);

▶ hence polynomials can typically approximate any general analytic function well, and arbitrarily closely.

Where Do Polynomial Matrices Arise?

▶ A multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) system could be made up of a number of finite impulse response (FIR) channels:


▶ writing this as a matrix of impulse responses:

$$\mathbf{H}[n] = \left[\begin{array}{cc} h_{11}[n] & h_{12}[n] \\ h_{21}[n] & h_{22}[n] \end{array} \right] . \tag{7}$$

Transfer Function of a MIMO System

▶ Example for MIMO matrix $\mathbf{H}[n]$ of impulse responses:

▶ the transfer function of this MIMO system is a polynomial matrix:

$$\boldsymbol{H}(z) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbf{H}[n]z^{-1} \qquad \text{or} \qquad \boldsymbol{H}(z) \,\bullet\!\!-\!\!\circ\, \mathbf{H}[n] \tag{8}$$

Analysis Filter Bank

▶ Critically decimated K-channel analysis filter bank [122, 123, 48]:

▶ equivalent polyphase representation:

$$\boldsymbol{H}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} H_{1,1}(z) & \ldots & H_{1,K}(z) \\ H_{2,1}(z) & \ldots & H_{2,K}(z) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ H_{K,1}(z) & \ldots & H_{K,K}(z) \end{bmatrix}$$

Polyphase Analysis Matrix

▶ With the K-fold polyphase decomposition of the analysis filters

$$H_k(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{K} H_{k,n}(z^K) z^{-n+1} \tag{9}$$

▶ the polyphase analysis matrix is a polynomial matrix:

$$\boldsymbol{H}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} H_{1,1}(z) & H_{1,2}(z) & \dots & H_{1,K}(z) \\ H_{2,1}(z) & H_{2,2}(z) & \dots & H_{2,K}(z) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ H_{K,1}(z) & H_{K,2}(z) & \dots & H_{K,K}(z) \end{bmatrix} \tag{10}$$

Synthesis Filter Bank

▶ Critically decimated K-channel synthesis filter bank:

▶ equivalent polyphase representation:

Polyphase Synthesis Matrix

▶ Analoguous to analysis filter bank, the synthesis filters $G_k(z)$ can be split into K polyphase components, creating a polyphse synthesis matrix

$$\boldsymbol{G}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} G_{1,1}(z) & G_{1,2}(z) & \dots & G_{1,K}(z) \\ G_{2,1}(z) & G_{2,2}(z) & \dots & G_{2,K}(z) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ G_{K,1}(z) & G_{K,2}(z) & \dots & G_{K,K}(z) \end{bmatrix} \tag{11}$$

▶ operating analysis and synthesis back-to-back, perfect reconstruction is achieved if

$$\boldsymbol{G}(z)\boldsymbol{H}(z) = \mathbf{I} ; \tag{12}$$

▶ i.e. for perfect reconstruction, the polyphase analysis matrix must be invertible: $\boldsymbol{G}(z) = \boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(z)$.

Space-Time Covariance Matrix

▶ Measurements obtained from M sensors are collected in a vector $\mathbf{x}[n] \in \mathbb{C}^M$:
$$\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}[n] = [x_1[n] \ \ x_2[n] \ \ \ldots \ \ x_M[n]] \ ; \tag{13}$$

▶ with the expectation operator $\mathcal{E}\{\cdot\}$, the spatial correlation is captured by $\mathbf{R} = \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{x}[n]\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{H}}[n]\}$;

▶ for spatial and temporal correlation, we require a space-time covariance matrix
$$\mathbf{R}[\tau] = \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{x}[n]\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{H}}[n-\tau]\} \tag{14}$$

▶ this space-time covariance matrix contains auto- and cross-correlation terms, e.g. for $M = 2$
$$\mathbf{R}[\tau] = \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathcal{E}\{x_1[n]x_1^*[n-\tau]\} & \mathcal{E}\{x_1[n]x_2^*[n-\tau]\} \\ \mathcal{E}\{x_2[n]x_1^*[n-\tau]\} & \mathcal{E}\{x_2[n]x_2^*[n-\tau]\} \end{array} \right] \tag{15}$$

Cross-Spectral Density Matrix

▶ example for a space-time covariance matrix $\mathbf{R}[\tau] \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$:

▶ the cross-spectral density (CSD) matrix

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) \circ\!\!\!-\!\!\!\bullet \mathbf{R}[\tau] \tag{16}$$

is a polynomial matrix.

Parahermitian Operator

- A parahermitian operation is indicated by $\{\cdot\}^{\mathrm{P}}$, and compared to the Hermitian transposition of a matrix additionally performs a time-reversal;

- example:

$$\boldsymbol{A}(z) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} & \end{array}\right]$$

- parahermitian $\boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{H}}(1/z^*)$:

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}(z) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} & \end{array}\right]$$

Parahermitian Property

▶ A polynomial matrix $\boldsymbol{R}(z)$ is parahermitian if $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \boldsymbol{R}^{\mathrm{H}}(1/z^*) = \boldsymbol{R}(z)$;

▶ this is an extension of the symmetric (if $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}$) or or Hermitian (if $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{C}$) property to the polynomial case:
transposition, complex conjugation and time reversal (in any order) do not alter a parahermitian $\boldsymbol{R}(z)$;

▶ any CSD matrix is parahermitian;

▶ example:

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \left[\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right] = \boldsymbol{R}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)$$

Paraunitary Matrices

- Recall that $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}$ (or $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}$) is a unitary (or orthonormal) matrix if $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^{\mathrm{H}} = \mathbf{A}^{\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$;

- in the polynomial case, $\mathbf{A}(z)$ is paraunitary if

$$\boldsymbol{A}(z)\boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)\boldsymbol{A}(z) = \mathbf{I} \tag{17}$$

- therefore, if $\boldsymbol{A}(z)$ is paraunitary, then the polynomial matrix inverse is simple:

$$\boldsymbol{A}^{-1}(z) = \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) \tag{18}$$

- example: polyphase analysis or synthesis matrices of perfectly reconstructing (or lossless) filter banks are usually paraunitary.

Attempt of Gaussian Elimination

▶ System of polynomial equations:

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} A_{11}(z) & A_{12}(z) \\ A_{21}(z) & A_{22}(z) \end{array} \right] \cdot \left[\begin{array}{c} X_1(z) \\ X_2(z) \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{c} B_1(z) \\ B_2(z) \end{array} \right] \tag{19}$$

▶ modification of 2nd row:

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} A_{11}(z) & A_{12}(z) \\ A_{11}(z) & \frac{A_{11}(z)}{A_{21}(z)} A_{22}(z) \end{array} \right] \cdot \left[\begin{array}{c} X_1(z) \\ X_2(z) \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{c} B_1(z) \\ \frac{A_{11}(z)}{A_{21}(z)} B_2(z) \end{array} \right] \tag{20}$$

▶ upper triangular form by subtracting 1st row from 2nd:

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} A_{11}(z) & A_{12}(z) \\ 0 & \frac{A_{11}(z)A_{22}(z) - A_{12}(z)A_{21}(z)}{A_{21}(z)} \end{array} \right] \cdot \left[\begin{array}{c} X_1(z) \\ X_2(z) \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{c} B_1(z) \\ \bar{B}_2(z) \end{array} \right] \tag{21}$$

▶ penalty: we end up with rational functions rather than polynomials.

Further Reading

- General polynomial matrices and operations [52, 70, 102];
- polyphase analysis and synthesis matrices in the context of multirate systems and filter banks [122, 123, 48];
- space-time covariance matrices [123, 86, 107, 109];
- estimation of space-time covariance matrices [45, 46, 47, 65, 68].

Parahermitian Matrix Eigenvalue Decomposition I

▶ For a Hermitian matrix $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}^H$, we know that an eigenvalue decomposition (EVD) $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^H$ exists [53, 61];

▶ for eigenvalues $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_M\}$ and eigenvectors $\mathbf{Q} = [\mathbf{q}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{q}_M]$:

$$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{q}_m = \lambda_m \mathbf{q}_m$$

▶ eigenvalues $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$;

▶ eigenvectors can be chosen as orthonormal, but may have an arbitary phase shift: $\mathbf{q}'_m = e^{j\varphi}\mathbf{q}_m$ is also an eigenvector;

▶ in case of an algebraic multiplicity C: $\lambda_m = \lambda_{m+1} = \cdots = \lambda_{m+C-1}$, only a C-dimensional subspace is defined, within which the eigenvectors can form an arbitrary orthonormal basis, with any unitary $\mathbf{V}$:

$$[\mathbf{q}'_m, \ldots \mathbf{q}'_{m+C-1}] = [\mathbf{q}_m, \ldots \mathbf{q}_{m+C-1}] \mathbf{V}, \tag{22}$$

Parahermitian Matrix Eigenvalue Decomposition II

- A standard EVD can diagonalise $\boldsymbol{R}(z) \bullet\!\!-\!\!\circ \mathbf{R}[\tau]$ only for one specific value of z or of τ, respectively;

- we are interested in the EVD of a parahermitian matrix $\boldsymbol{R}(z)$ such that

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \boldsymbol{Q}(z) \, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(z) \, \boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) , \qquad (23)$$

- $\boldsymbol{Q}(z) = [\boldsymbol{q}_1(z), \ldots, \boldsymbol{q}_M(z)]$ must be paraunitary, such that

$$\boldsymbol{Q}(z)\boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)\boldsymbol{Q}(z) = \mathbf{I} ; \qquad (24)$$

- $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(z) = \mathrm{diag}\{\lambda_1(z), \ldots, \lambda_M\}$ must be diagonal and parahermitian;
- the parahermitian property implies that on the unit circle, $\lambda(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega}) = \lambda(z)|_{z=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega}} \in \mathbb{R}$;
- we call (23) a parahermitian matrix EVD.

Analyticity of $\boldsymbol{R}(z)$

▶ The analyticity of $\boldsymbol{R}(z) \bullet\!\!-\!\!\circ \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{x}[n]\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{H}}[n-\tau]\}$ can be tied to a source model [107, 134]

▶ the innovation filters $F_\ell(z)$, $\ell = 1, \ldots, L$ describe the spectral shape of the L contributing source signals;

▶ a convolutive mixing system $\boldsymbol{H}(z) : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$ models the transfer paths between the L sources and M sensors;

▶ if $F_\ell(z)$ and $\boldsymbol{H}(z)$ are stable and causal, then $\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \boldsymbol{H}(z)\boldsymbol{F}(z)\boldsymbol{F}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)\boldsymbol{H}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)$ is analytic.

Analytic EVD

▶ Franz Rellich (1939, [110]) for a
self-adjoint, analytic $\boldsymbol{R}(t) = \boldsymbol{R}^{\mathrm{H}}(t)$,
$t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\boldsymbol{R}(t) = \boldsymbol{Q}(t)\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(t)\boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{H}}(t) \; ;$$

▶ $\boldsymbol{Q}(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(t)$ *can* be chosen analytic;

▶ similarly for an arbitrary (i.e. not necessarily Hermitian or square) analytic matrix, de
Moor & Boyd (1989, [44]) and Bunse-Gerstner (1991, [20]) established an analytic
SVD.

EVD on the Unit Circle

▶ Analyticity: $\boldsymbol{R}(z)$ is uniquely definited by its representation on the unit circle, $\boldsymbol{R}(e^{j\Omega}) = \boldsymbol{R}(z)|_{z=e^{j\Omega}}$;

▶ $\boldsymbol{R}(e^{j\Omega})$ is self-adjoint: $\boldsymbol{R}(e^{j\Omega}) = \boldsymbol{R}^{\mathrm{H}}(e^{j\Omega})$, i.e. Hermitian for every Ω;

▶ EVD on the unit circle:

$$\boldsymbol{R}(e^{j\Omega}) = \boldsymbol{Q}(\Omega) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\Omega) \cdot \boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{H}}(\Omega) . \tag{25}$$

▶ for every Ω, $\boldsymbol{Q}(\Omega)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\Omega)$ fulfill the properties of the EVD;

▶ (25) is covered by Rellich [110];

▶ $\boldsymbol{R}(e^{j\Omega})$ is 2π-periodic, but the same periodicity cannot be guaranteed for $\boldsymbol{Q}(\Omega)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\Omega)$ [135].

Matrix Perturbation Theory

▶ Intuitive explanation of Rellich [110]: if we know that $\boldsymbol{R}(e^{j\Omega})$ varies smoothly, what can be say about $\boldsymbol{Q}(\Omega)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\Omega)$?

▶ eigenvalues (Hoffman-Wielandt, 1953, [61]):

$$\sum_i |\lambda_i(\Omega) - \lambda_i(\Omega + \Delta\Omega)| \leq \|\boldsymbol{R}(e^{j\Omega}) - \boldsymbol{R}(e^{j(\Omega+\Delta\Omega)})\|_F , \qquad (26)$$

▶ subspace distance for eigenvectors / eigenspaces (Golub & van Loan, [53]):

$$\boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{H}}(\Omega) \left(\boldsymbol{R}(e^{j(\Omega+\Delta\Omega)}) - \boldsymbol{R}(e^{j\Omega}) \right) \boldsymbol{Q}(\Omega) =$$
$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} \underbrace{\mathbf{E}_{11}(e^{j\Omega}, \Delta\Omega) \quad \mathbf{E}_{21}^{\mathrm{H}}(e^{j\Omega}, \Delta\Omega)}_{C} & \underbrace{\mathbf{E}_{21}(e^{j\Omega}, \Delta\Omega) \quad \mathbf{E}_{22}(e^{j\Omega}, \Delta\Omega)}_{M-C} \end{array} \right] . \qquad (27)$$

$$\mathrm{dist}\{\mathcal{Q}_1(\Omega), \mathcal{Q}_1(\Omega + \Delta\Omega)\} \leq \frac{4}{\delta} \|\mathbf{E}_{21}(e^{j\Omega}, \Delta\Omega)\|_F . \qquad (28)$$

Existence and Uniqueness of an Analytic PhEVD

- If $\boldsymbol{R}(z) \bullet\!\!-\!\!\circ \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{x}[n]\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{H}}[n-\tau]\}$ is analytic, and the data $\mathbf{x}[n]$ does not originate from a multiplexing operation, then we have

$$\boldsymbol{R}(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega}) = \boldsymbol{Q}(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega}) \cdot \boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega}) ; \tag{29}$$

- the factors $\boldsymbol{Q}(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega})$ and $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega})$ are analytic in $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega}$;
- therefore, $\mathbf{Q}[n] \circ\!\!-\!\!\bullet \boldsymbol{Q}(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega})$ and $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}[\tau] \circ\!\!-\!\!\bullet \boldsymbol{\Lambda}[\tau]$ are absolutely convergent;
- we can reparameterise (29) as [134]

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \boldsymbol{Q}(z) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(z) \cdot \boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) ; \tag{30}$$

- the eigenvalues in $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(z)$ are unique up to a permutation;
- if eigenvalues are distinct, then eigenvectors are unique up to an allpass filter $\Psi_\ell(z)$;
- with $\boldsymbol{\Psi}(z) = \mathrm{diag}\{\Psi_1(z), \ldots, \Psi_M(z)\}$,

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \boldsymbol{Q}(z)\boldsymbol{\Psi}(z)\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(z)\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)\boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \boldsymbol{Q}(z)\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(z)\boldsymbol{\Psi}(z)\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)\boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \boldsymbol{Q}(z)\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(z)\boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) .$$

Numerical Example for a 2x2 Matrix

▶ Consider the parahermitian matrix $\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \boldsymbol{U}(z)\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(z)\boldsymbol{U}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)$:

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1-j}{2}z + 3 + \frac{1+j}{2}z^{-1} & \frac{1+j}{2}z^2 + \frac{1-j}{2} \\ \frac{1+j}{2} + \frac{1-j}{2}z^{-2} & \frac{1-j}{2}z + 3 + \frac{1+j}{2}z^{-1} \end{bmatrix}; \tag{31}$$

▶ it can be shown that for the eigenvalues,

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} z + 3 + z^{-1} & \\ & -jz + 3 + jz^{-1} \end{bmatrix}; \tag{32}$$

▶ for the eigenvectors, one possible solution is

$$\boldsymbol{U}(z) = [\boldsymbol{u}_1(z),\, \boldsymbol{u}_2(z)] \qquad \text{with} \qquad \boldsymbol{u}_{1,2}(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \pm z^{-1} \end{bmatrix}; \tag{33}$$

▶ we'll evaluate on the unit circle, and for the eigenvectors inspect the Hermitian angle $\cos\varphi_m = |\boldsymbol{q}_1^{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}0}) \cdot \boldsymbol{q}_m(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega})|$.

Numerical Example for a 2x2 Matrix cont'd

- eigenvalues $\mathbf{\Lambda}(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega}) = \mathrm{diag}\{\lambda_1(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega})\ \lambda_M(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega})\}$;

- Hermitian angles $\cos\varphi_m = |\boldsymbol{q}_1^{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}0}) \cdot \boldsymbol{q}_m(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega})|$.

Non-Existence of an Analytic PhEVD

▶ Recall due to Rellich [110]

$$\boldsymbol{R}(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega}) = \boldsymbol{Q}(\Omega) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\Omega) \cdot \boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{H}}(\Omega) ; \tag{34}$$

▶ if $\boldsymbol{R}(z)$ •—○ $\mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{x}[n]\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{H}}[n-\tau]\}$ is analytic, but the data $\mathbf{x}[n]$ is K-fold multiplexed, then $\boldsymbol{Q}(\Omega)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\Omega)$ will be $2K\pi$ periodic;

▶ as such, we can only find an analytic EVD if $\boldsymbol{R}(z)$ is K-fold oversampled [135]:

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z^K) = \boldsymbol{Q}(z)\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(z)\boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) . \tag{35}$$

Numerical Example

▶ Consider the analytic CSD matrix [121, 33]

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} 2 & 1 + z^{-1} \\ z + 1 & 2 \end{array} \right] ; \tag{36}$$

▶ this is a pseudo-circulant system [123] that can be created by the following multiplexing operation with uncorrelated $u[n] \in \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$:

Numerical Example cont'd

▶ We can find

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ z^{-\frac{1}{2}} & z^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2 + z^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \\ & -z^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2 - z^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & z^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ -1 & z^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{bmatrix} ; \quad (37)$$

▶ note that the eigenvalues are modulated versions of each other.

▶ fractional powers of z are not analytic — we need to oversample by two.

Exact Calculation for a 2×2 Matrix

- ▶ Given an arbitrary parahermitian $\boldsymbol{R}(z) \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$;
- ▶ eigenvalues $\gamma_{1,2}(z)$ can be directly computed in the z-domain as the roots of

$$\det\{\gamma(z)\mathbf{I} - \boldsymbol{R}(z)\} = \gamma^2(z) - T(z)\gamma(z) + D(z) = 0$$

- ▶ determinant $D(z) = \det\{\boldsymbol{R}(z)\}$ and trace $T(z) = \operatorname{trace}\{\boldsymbol{R}(z)\}$;
- ▶ this leads to

$$\gamma_{1,2}(z) = \frac{1}{2}T(z) \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{T(z)T^{\mathrm{P}}(z) - 4D(z)} \; ; \tag{38}$$

- ▶ awkward: $T(z)T^{\mathrm{P}}(z) - 4D(z) = S(z)S^{\mathrm{P}}(z)$ is parahermitian, but so must be the result of the square root.

Exact Calculation cont'd

▶ Maclaurin series: for every root of $S(z)$,

$$\sqrt{1 - \beta z^{-1}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \xi_n \beta^n z^{-n} \tag{39}$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \alpha z^{-1}}} = \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \xi_n \alpha^n z^{-n} \right)^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \chi_n \alpha^n z^{-n} \tag{40}$$

▶ with coefficients

$$\xi_n = (-1)^n \binom{\frac{1}{2}}{n} = \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} - i \right) , \tag{41}$$

$$\chi_n = (-1)^n \binom{-\frac{1}{2}}{n} = \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{n!} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} + i \right) . \tag{42}$$

Maclaurin Series

▶ Coefficients ξ_n and χ_n for $n = 0 \ldots 50$:

▶ these coefficients additionally dampen a geometric series;
▶ only if $S(z)$ has double zeros (and double poles) is a polynomial (rational) solution possible;
▶ in general, the result are transcendental eigenvalues.

Numerical Example

- Example from Icart & Comon (2012, [59]):

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -2z + 6 - 2z^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

- (a) solution on unit circle;
- (b) coefficients of analytic eigenvalues;
- (c) decay of coefficients.
- solution generally can be transcendental, i.e. neither finite nor rational!

Polynomial Eigenvalue Decomposition

▶ Polynomial EVD or McWhirter decomposition [86] of the CSD matrix

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) \approx \boldsymbol{U}(z)\,\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(z)\,\boldsymbol{U}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) \tag{43}$$

▶ with paraunitary, polynomial $\boldsymbol{U}(z)$, s.t. $\boldsymbol{U}(z)\boldsymbol{U}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \mathbf{I}$;

▶ diagonalised and spectrally majorised Laurent polynomial $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(z)$:

Numerical Example

▶ We return to the previous example of a parahermitian matrix:

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}(z) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} z + 3 + z^{-1} & \\ & -jz + 3 + jz^{-1} \end{array} \right]$$

$$\mathbf{Q}(z) = [\boldsymbol{q}_1(z), \, \boldsymbol{q}_2(z)] \qquad \text{with} \qquad \boldsymbol{q}_{1,2}(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \pm z^{-1} \end{array} \right] \; ;$$

▶ parahermitian matrix $\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \boldsymbol{Q}(z)\mathbf{\Lambda}(z)\boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)$:

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} \frac{1-j}{2}z + 3 + \frac{1+j}{2}z^{-1} & \frac{1+j}{2}z^2 + \frac{1-j}{2} \\ \frac{1+j}{2} + \frac{1-j}{2}z^{-2} & \frac{1-j}{2}z + 3 + \frac{1+j}{2}z^{-1} \end{array} \right].$$

Numerical Example — Analytic Solution

- ▶ Recall from earlier:
- ▶ analytic (and therefore infinitely differentiable) eigenvalues $\lambda_m(e^{j\Omega})$;
- ▶ smooth Hermitian angles
$$\cos\varphi_m = |\boldsymbol{q}_1^{\mathrm{H}}(e^{j0}) \cdot \boldsymbol{q}_m(e^{j\Omega})|.$$

Numerical Example — Ideal Spectral Majorisation

- Analytic eigenvalues are permuted where they intersect;
- resulting spectrally majorised eigenvalues are piecewise analytic but not differentiable;
- corresponding eigenvectors are piecewise analytic but not continuous.

Numerical Example — PEVD Algorithmic Solution

(a)

(b)

norm. angular frequency Ω

m=1
m=2

- Using the SBR2 algorithm in [86] to approximate the McWhirter factorisation;
- spectrally majorised eigenvalues $\mathbf{\Gamma}(z)$ of order 24;
- corresponding eigenvectors in $\boldsymbol{U}(z)$ of order 84.

Further Reading

- ▶ For the existence and uniqueness of analytic eigenvalues and eigenvectors, please see [134, 135, 17];
- ▶ McWhirter decomposition [85, 86, 107, 109, 108].
- ▶ guaranteed spectral majorisation [86].

Iterative PEVD Algorithms

- ▶ Second order sequential best rotation (SBR2, McWhirter 2007, [86]);
- ▶ iterative approach based on an elementary paraunitary operation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{S}^{(0)}(z) &= \boldsymbol{R}(z) \\
&\vdots \\
\boldsymbol{S}^{(i+1)}(z) &= \tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}^{(i+1)}(z)\boldsymbol{S}^{(i)}(z)\boldsymbol{H}^{(i+1)}(z)
\end{aligned}
$$

- ▶ $\boldsymbol{H}^{(i)}(z)$ is an elementary paraunitary operation, which at the ith step eliminates the largest off-diagonal element in $\boldsymbol{s}^{(i-1)}(z)$;
- ▶ stop after L iterations:

$$
\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}(z) = \boldsymbol{S}^{(L)}(z) \qquad , \qquad \boldsymbol{Q}(z) = \prod_{i=1}^{L} \boldsymbol{H}^{(i)}(z)
$$

- ▶ sequential matrix diagonalisation (SMD) and
- ▶ multiple-shift SMD (MS-SMD) will follow the same scheme . . .

Elementary Paraunitary Operation

▶ An elementary paraunitary matrix [123] is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{H}^{(i)}(z) = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{v}^{(i)}\mathbf{v}^{(i),\mathrm{H}} + z^{-1}\mathbf{v}^{(i)}\mathbf{v}^{(i),\mathrm{H}} \qquad , \quad \|\mathbf{v}^{(i)}\|_2 = 1$$

▶ we utilise a different definition:

$$\boldsymbol{H}^{(i)}(z) = \boldsymbol{D}^{(i)}(z)\mathbf{Q}^{(i)}$$

▶ $\boldsymbol{D}^{(i)}(z)$ is a delay matrix:

$$\boldsymbol{D}^{(i)}(z) = \mathsf{diag}\big\{1 \ \ldots \ 1 \ z^{-\tau} \ 1 \ \ldots \ 1\big\}$$

▶ $\mathbf{Q}^{(i)}(z)$ is a Givens rotation.

Sequential Best Rotation Algorithm (McWhirter [148])

- At iteration i, consider $\boldsymbol{S}^{(i-1)}(z) \circ\!\!-\!\!\bullet\, \mathbf{S}^{(i-1)}[\tau]$

Sequential Best Rotation Algorithm (McWhirter [148])

- $\tilde{\boldsymbol{D}}^{(i)}(z)\boldsymbol{S}^{(i-1)}(z)\boldsymbol{D}^{(i)}(z)$

Sequential Best Rotation Algorithm (McWhirter [148])

▶ $\tilde{\boldsymbol{D}}^{(i)}(z)$ advances a row-slice of $\boldsymbol{S}^{(i-1)}(z)$ by T

Sequential Best Rotation Algorithm (McWhirter [148])

▶ the off-diagonal element at $-T$ has now been translated to lag zero

▶ $\mathbf{D}^{(i)}(z)$ delays a column-slice of $\boldsymbol{S}^{(i-1)}(z)$ by T

Sequential Best Rotation Algorithm (McWhirter [148])

▶ the off-diagonal element at $-T$ has now been translated to lag zero

Sequential Best Rotation Algorithm (McWhirter [148])

▶ the step $\tilde{\boldsymbol{D}}^{(i)}(z)\boldsymbol{S}^{(i-1)}(z)\boldsymbol{D}_{(i)}(z)$ has brought the largest off-diagonal elements to lag 0.

Sequential Best Rotation Algorithm (McWhirter [148])

- Jacobi step to eliminate largest off-diagonal elements by $\mathbf{Q}^{(i)}$

$$\begin{bmatrix} c & & e^{-j\vartheta}s \\ & \mathbf{I} & \\ -e^{j\vartheta}s & & c \\ & & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot$$

$$\cdot \begin{bmatrix} c & & -e^{-j\vartheta}s \\ & \mathbf{I} & \\ e^{j\vartheta}s & & c \\ & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Sequential Best Rotation Algorithm (McWhirter [148])

► iteration i is completed, having performed

$$\boldsymbol{S}^{(i)}(z) = \mathbf{Q}^{(i)}\boldsymbol{D}^{(i)}(z)\boldsymbol{S}^{(i-1)}(z)\tilde{\boldsymbol{D}}^{(i)}(z)\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^{(i)}(z)$$

SBR2 Outcome

- At the ith iteration, the zeroing of off-diagonal elements achieved during previous steps may be partially undone;

- however, the algorithm has been shown to converge, transfering energy onto the main diagonal at every step (McWhirter 2007);

- after L iterations, we reach an approximate diagonalisation

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}(z) = \boldsymbol{S}^{(L)}(z) = \tilde{\boldsymbol{Q}}(z)\boldsymbol{R}(z)\boldsymbol{Q}(z)$$

with

$$\boldsymbol{Q}(z) = \prod_{i=1}^{L} \boldsymbol{D}^{(i)}(z)\mathbf{Q}^{(i)}$$

- diagonalisation of the previous 3×3 polynomial matrix ...

SBR2 Example — Diagonalisation

SBR2 Example — Spectral Majorisation

▶ The on-diagonal elements are spectrally majorised

SBR2 — Givens Rotation

▶ A Givens rotation eliminates the maximum off-diagonal element once brought onto the lag-zero matrix;

▶ note I: in the lag-zero matrix, one column and one row are modified by the shift:

▶ note II: a Givens rotation only affects two columns and two rows in every matrix;

▶ Givens rotation is relatively low in computational cost!

SBR2 — Givens Rotation

▶ A Givens rotation eliminates the maximum off-diagonal element once brought onto the lag-zero matrix;

▶ note I: in the lag-zero matrix, one column and one row are modified by the shift:

▶ note II: a Givens rotation only affects two columns and two rows in every matrix;

▶ Givens rotation is relatively low in computational cost!

Sequential Matrix Diagonalisation (SMD, [108])

▶ Main idea — the zero-lag matrix is diagonalised in every step;

▶ initialisation: diagonalise $\mathbf{R}[0]$ by EVD and apply modal matrix to all matrix coefficients $\longrightarrow \boldsymbol{S}^{(0)}$;

▶ at the ith step as in SBR2, the maximum element (or column with max. norm) is shifted to the lag-zero matrix:

▶ an EVD is used to re-diagonalise the zero-lag matrix;

▶ a full modal matrix is applied at all lags — more costly than SBR2.

Sequential Matrix Diagonalisation (SMD, [108])

- ▶ Main idea — the zero-lag matrix is diagonalised in every step;
- ▶ initialisation: diagonalise $\mathbf{R}[0]$ by EVD and apply modal matrix to all matrix coefficients $\longrightarrow \boldsymbol{S}^{(0)}$;
- ▶ at the ith step as in SBR2, the maximum element (or column with max. norm) is shifted to the lag-zero matrix:

$$\longrightarrow$$

- ▶ an EVD is used to re-diagonalise the zero-lag matrix;
- ▶ a full modal matrix is applied at all lags — more costly than SBR2.

Multiple Shift SMD (SMD)

▶ SMD converges faster than SBR2 — more energy is transfered per iteration step [25, 23, 26, 24];

▶ SMD is more expensive than SBR2 — full matrix multiplication at every lag;

▶ this cost will not increase further if more columns / rows are shifted into the lag-zero matrix at every iteration

▶ MS-SMD will transfer yet more off-diagonal energy per iteration;

▶ because the total energy must remain constant under paraunitary operations, SBR2, SMD and MS-SMD can be proven to converge.

Multiple Shift SMD (SMD)

- ▶ SMD converges faster than SBR2 — more energy is transfered per iteration step [25, 23, 26, 24];
- ▶ SMD is more expensive than SBR2 — full matrix multiplication at every lag;
- ▶ this cost will not increase further if more columns / rows are shifted into the lag-zero matrix at every iteration

- ▶ MS-SMD will transfer yet more off-diagonal energy per iteration;
- ▶ because the total energy must remain constant under paraunitary operations, SBR2, SMD and MS-SMD can be proven to converge.

Multiple Shift SMD (SMD)

- SMD converges faster than SBR2 — more energy is transfered per iteration step [25, 23, 26, 24];
- SMD is more expensive than SBR2 — full matrix multiplication at every lag;
- this cost will not increase further if more columns / rows are shifted into the lag-zero matrix at every iteration

- MS-SMD will transfer yet more off-diagonal energy per iteration;
- because the total energy must remain constant under paraunitary operations, SBR2, SMD and MS-SMD can be proven to converge.

Multiple Shift SMD (SMD)

▶ SMD converges faster than SBR2 — more energy is transfered per iteration step [25, 23, 26, 24];

▶ SMD is more expensive than SBR2 — full matrix multiplication at every lag;

▶ this cost will not increase further if more columns / rows are shifted into the lag-zero matrix at every iteration

$\longrightarrow$

▶ MS-SMD will transfer yet more off-diagonal energy per iteration;

▶ because the total energy must remain constant under paraunitary operations, SBR2, SMD and MS-SMD can be proven to converge.

SBR2/SMD/MS-SMD Convergence

▶ Measuring the remaining normalised off-diagonal energy over an ensemble of space-time covariance matrices:

SBR2/SMD/MS-SMD Application Cost 1

▶ Ensemble average of remaining off-diagonal energy vs. order
  of paraunitary filter banks to decompose 4x4x16 matrices:

SBR2/SMD/MS-SMD Application Cost 2

▶ Ensemble average of remaining off-diagonal energy vs. order of paraunitary filter banks to decompose 8x8x64 matrices:

Further Reading

▶ Second order sequential best rotation (SBR2) algorithm [85, 86];

▶ the SBR2 family of algorithms includes various modifications, such as to the cost function to maximise the coding gain [107, 109]; multiple shift SBR2 [126, 125]; efficient implementation [60, 67]; sequential matrix diagonalisation (SMD) algorithm [108], and various SMD family versions to undertake multiple shifts [25, 23, 24], apply search space reduction [26, 25, 31, 32], numerical efficiencies [22, 27, 28, 35, 39, 29, 34, 36, 119]; a Householder approach to SMD [103];

▶ DFT domain algorithms to extract analytic solution — separate extraction of eigenvalues [140, 139] and eigenvectors [136, 138] based on smoothness criteria [133, 141, 145]; a similar attempt had been undertaken in [121] with analysis in [33, 37, 38]; a principal eigenpair can be extracted via the power method [66];

▶ support estimation [64] and trimming of polynomial matrices [51, 120, 27, 28];

▶ not shown here, but similar algorithms have been applied to other linear algebraic operations such as the QR decomposition [30, 49, 50], singular value decomposition [84, 138, 63, 62, 144] and the generalised EVD [21].

MATLAB Polynomial EVD Toolbox

▶ The MATLAB polynomial EVD toolbox can be downloaded from
  pevd-toolbox.eee.strath.ac.uk

▶ the toolbox contains a number of iterative algorithms to calculate an approximate PEVD, related functions, and demos.

Narrowband MIMO Communications

- a narrowband channel is characterised by a matrix $\mathbf{C}$ containing complex gain factors;
- problem: how to select the precoder and equaliser?

- overall system;

Narrowband MIMO Communications

▶ a narrowband channel is characterised by a matrix $\mathbf{C}$ containing complex gain factors;

▶ problem: how to select the precoder and equaliser?

▶ the singular value decomposition (SVD) factorises $\mathbf{C}$ into two unitary matrices $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{H}}$ and a diagonal matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$;

Narrowband MIMO Communications

- a narrowband channel is characterised by a matrix $\mathbf{C}$ containing complex gain factors;
- problem: how to select the precoder and equaliser?

- we select the precoder and the equaliser from the unitary matrices provided by the channel's SVD;
- the overall system is diagonalised, decoupling the channel into independent single-input single-output systems by means of unitary matrices.

Broadband MIMO Channel

▶ The channel is a matrix of FIR filters; example for a 3×4 system $\mathbf{C}[n]$:

discrete time index n

▶ the transfer function $\boldsymbol{C}(z) \bullet\!\!-\!\!\circ \mathbf{C}[n]$ is a polynomial matrix;
▶ an SVD can only diagonalise $\mathbf{C}[n]$ for one particular lag n.

Standard Broadband MIMO Approaches

- ▶ OFDM (if approximate channel length is known [55]):
    1. divide spectrum into narrowband channels;
    2. address each narrowband channel independently using narrowband-optimal techniques;

    drawback: ignores spectral coherence across frequency bins;
- ▶ optimum filter bank transceiver (if channel itself is known [112, 113, 111]):
    1. block processing;
    2. inter-block interference is eliminated by guard intervals;
    3. resulting matrix can be diagonalised by SVD;
- ▶ both techniques invest DOFs into the guard intervals, which are generally not balanced against other error sources.

$$\mathbf{y}(z) \;=\; (\quad \mathbf{C}_0 \quad + \quad \mathbf{C}_1 z^{-1} \quad) \;\cdot\; \mathbf{x}(z)$$

Standard Broadband MIMO Approaches

- ▶ OFDM (if approximate channel length is known [55]):
  1. divide spectrum into narrowband channels;
  2. address each narrowband channel independently using narrowband-optimal techniques;

  drawback: ignores spectral coherence across frequency bins;

- ▶ optimum filter bank transceiver (if channel itself is known [112, 113, 111]):
  1. block processing;
  2. inter-block interference is eliminated by guard intervals;
  3. resulting matrix can be diagonalised by SVD;

- ▶ both techniques invest DOFs into the guard intervals, which are generally not balanced against other error sources.

$$\mathbf{y}(z) \;=\; (\quad \mathbf{C}_0 \quad + \quad \mathbf{C}_1 z^{-1} \quad) \;\cdot\; \mathbf{x}(z)$$

Standard Broadband MIMO Approaches

▶ OFDM (if approximate channel length is known [55]):
   1. divide spectrum into narrowband channels;
   2. address each narrowband channel independently using narrowband-optimal techniques;

   drawback: ignores spectral coherence across frequency bins;

▶ optimum filter bank transceiver (if channel itself is known [112, 113, 111]):
   1. block processing;
   2. inter-block interference is eliminated by guard intervals;
   3. resulting matrix can be diagonalised by SVD;

▶ both techniques invest DOFs into the guard intervals, which are generally not balanced against other error sources.

$$\mathbf{y}(z) \quad = \quad (\qquad \mathbf{C}_0' \qquad \qquad \qquad) \quad \cdot \quad \mathbf{x}(z)$$

Standard Broadband MIMO Approaches

- ▶ OFDM (if approximate channel length is known [55]):
    1. divide spectrum into narrowband channels;
    2. address each narrowband channel independently using narrowband-optimal techniques;

    drawback: ignores spectral coherence across frequency bins;

- ▶ optimum filter bank transceiver (if channel itself is known [112, 113, 111]):
    1. block processing;
    2. inter-block interference is eliminated by guard intervals;
    3. resulting matrix can be diagonalised by SVD;

- ▶ both techniques invest DOFs into the guard intervals, which are generally not balanced against other error sources.

$$\mathbf{y}(z) \;=\; (\quad \mathbf{C}_0 \quad + \quad \mathbf{C}_1 z^{-1} \quad) \;\cdot\; \mathbf{x}(z)$$

Standard Broadband MIMO Approaches

- ▶ OFDM (if approximate channel length is known [55]):
  1. divide spectrum into narrowband channels;
  2. address each narrowband channel independently using narrowband-optimal techniques;

  drawback: ignores spectral coherence across frequency bins;

- ▶ optimum filter bank transceiver (if channel itself is known [112, 113, 111]):
  1. block processing;
  2. inter-block interference is eliminated by guard intervals;
  3. resulting matrix can be diagonalised by SVD;

- ▶ both techniques invest DOFs into the guard intervals, which are generally not balanced against other error sources.

$$\mathbf{y}(z) \;=\; (\quad \mathbf{C}'_0 \quad\quad\quad\quad\quad) \cdot \mathbf{x}(z)$$

Polynomial Singular Value Decompositions

▶ Iterative algorithms have been developed to determine a polynomial eigenvalue decomposition (EVD) for a parahermitian matrix $\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \boldsymbol{R}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \boldsymbol{R}^{\mathrm{H}}(z^{-1})$:

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) \approx \boldsymbol{H}(z)\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(z)\boldsymbol{H}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)$$

▶ paraunitary $\boldsymbol{H}(z)\boldsymbol{H}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \mathbf{I}$, diagonal and spectrally majorised $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(z)$;

▶ polynomial SVD of channel $\boldsymbol{C}(z)$ can be obtained via two EVDs:

$$\boldsymbol{C}(z)\boldsymbol{C}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \boldsymbol{U}(z)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{+}(z)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-}(z)\boldsymbol{U}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)$$
$$\boldsymbol{C}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)\boldsymbol{C}(z) = \boldsymbol{V}(z)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-}(z)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{+}(z)\boldsymbol{V}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)$$

finally:

$$\boldsymbol{C}(z) = \boldsymbol{U}(z)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{+}(z)\boldsymbol{V}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) \ .$$

MIMO Application Example

norm. angular frequency $\Omega/(2\pi)$

- ▶ Polynomial SVD of the previous $\boldsymbol{C}(z) : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}^{3\times 4}$;

- ▶ the singular value spectra are majorised.

Further Reading

- General precoding and equalisation [2, 72, 73, 97, 116, 117, 119, 118];
- joint source-channel coding [128, 127, 142];
- subband coding [107, 109];
- polynomial Wiener filter as optimum receiver [71, 74, 148];
- non-linear precoding for broadband MIMO systems [1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95];
- combination with filter bank multicarrier methods [16, 87, 98, 99, 100, 106, 149];
- related transceiver design using a polynomial generalised SVD [56].

Narrowband Source Model

▶ Scenario with sensor array and far-field sources:

▶ for the narrowband case, the source signals arrive with delays, expressed by phase shifts in a steering vector

▶ data model:

$$\mathbf{x}[n] =$$

Narrowband Source Model

- Scenario with sensor array and far-field sources:

- for the narrowband case, the source signals arrive with delays, expressed by phase shifts in a steering vector $\mathbf{s}_1$
- data model:

$$\mathbf{x}[n] = s_1[n] \cdot \mathbf{s}_1$$

Narrowband Source Model

▶ Scenario with sensor array and far-field sources:

▶ for the narrowband case, the source signals arrive with delays, expressed by phase shifts in a steering vector $\mathbf{s}_1$

▶ data model:

$$\mathbf{x}[n] = s_1[n] \cdot \mathbf{s}_1$$

Narrowband Source Model

▶ Scenario with sensor array and far-field sources:

▶ for the narrowband case, the source signals arrive with delays, expressed by phase shifts in a steering vector $\mathbf{s}_1$, $\mathbf{s}_2$

▶ data model:

$$\mathbf{x}[n] = s_1[n] \cdot \mathbf{s}_1 + s_1[n] \cdot \mathbf{s_2}$$

Narrowband Source Model

▶ Scenario with sensor array and far-field sources:

▶ for the narrowband case, the source signals arrive with delays, expressed by phase shifts in a steering vector $\mathbf{s}_1$, $\mathbf{s}_2$

▶ data model:

$$\mathbf{x}[n] = s_1[n] \cdot \mathbf{s}_1 + s_1[n] \cdot \mathbf{s_2}$$

Narrowband Source Model

▶ Scenario with sensor array and far-field sources:

▶ for the narrowband case, the source signals arrive with delays, expressed by phase shifts in a steering vector $\mathbf{s}_1$, $\mathbf{s}_2$, $\ldots \mathbf{s}_R$;

▶ data model:

$$\mathbf{x}[n] = s_1[n] \cdot \mathbf{s}_1 + s_1[n] \cdot \mathbf{s_2} + \cdots + s_R[n] \cdot \mathbf{s}_R = \sum_{r=1}^{R} s_r[n] \cdot \mathbf{s}_r$$

Steering Vector

▶ A signal $s[n]$ arriving at the array can be characterised by the delays of its wavefront (neglecting attenuation):

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_0[n] \\ x_1[n] \\ \vdots \\ x_{M-1}[n] \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} s[n-\tau_0] \\ s[n-\tau_1] \\ \vdots \\ s[n-\tau_{M-1}] \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \delta[n-\tau_0] \\ \delta[n-\tau_1] \\ \vdots \\ \delta[n-\tau_{M-1}] \end{bmatrix} * s[n] \circ\!\!-\!\!\bullet \mathbf{a}_\vartheta(z)S(z)$$

▶ if evaluated at a narrowband normalised angular frequency Ω_i, the time delays τ_m in the broadband steering vector $\mathbf{a}_\vartheta(z)$ collapse to phase shifts in the narrowband steering vector $\mathbf{a}_{\vartheta,\Omega_i}$,

$$\mathbf{a}_{\vartheta,\Omega_i} = \mathbf{a}_\vartheta(z)|_{z=e^{j\Omega_i}} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-j\tau_0\Omega_i} \\ e^{-j\tau_1\Omega_i} \\ \vdots \\ e^{-j\tau_{M-1}\Omega_i} \end{bmatrix} \quad .$$

Data and Covariance Matrices

▶ A data matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times L}$ can be formed from L measurements:

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}[n] & \mathbf{x}[n+1] & \dots & \mathbf{x}[n+L-1] \end{bmatrix}$$

▶ assuming that all $x_m[n]$, $m = 1, 2, \dots M$ are zero mean, the (instantaneous) data covariance matrix is

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{x}[n]\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{H}}[n]\} \approx \frac{1}{L}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{H}}$$

where the approximation assumes ergodicity and a sufficiently large L;

▶ Problem: can we tell from $\mathbf{X}$ or $\mathbf{R}$ (i) the number of sources and (ii) their orgin / time series?

▶ w.r.t. Jonathon Chamber's introduction, we here only consider the underdetermined case of more sensors than sources, $M \geq K$, and generally $L \gg M$.

SVD of Data Matrix

▶ Singular value decomposition of $\mathbf{X}$:

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U} \quad \mathbf{\Sigma} \quad \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{H}}$$

▶ unitary matrices $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1 \dots \mathbf{u}_M]$ and $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1 \dots \mathbf{v}_L]$;

▶ diagonal $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ contains the real, positive semidefinite singular values of $\mathbf{X}$ in descending order:

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_2 & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & & 0 & \sigma_M & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

with $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_M \geq 0$.

Singular Values

▶ If the array is illuminated by $R \leq M$ linearly independent sources, the rank of the data matrix is

$$\text{rank}\{\mathbf{X}\} = R$$

▶ only the first R singular values of $\mathbf{X}$ will be non-zero;

▶ in practice, noise often will ensure that $\text{rank}\{\mathbf{X}\} = M$, with $M - R$ trailing singular values that define the noise floor:

▶ therefore, by thresholding singular values, it is possible to estimate the number of linearly independent sources R.

Subspace Decomposition

▶ If rank$\{\mathbf{X}\} = R$, the SVD can be split:

$$\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{U}_s \ \mathbf{U}_n] \left[\begin{array}{cc} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{V}_s^{\mathrm{H}} \\ \mathbf{V}_n^{\mathrm{H}} \end{array} \right]$$

▶ with $\mathbf{U}_s \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times R}$ and $\mathbf{V}_s^{\mathrm{H}} \in \mathbb{C}^{R \times L}$ corresponding to the R largest singular values;

▶ $\mathbf{U}_s$ and $\mathbf{V}_s^{\mathrm{H}}$ define the signal-plus-noise subspace of $\mathbf{X}$:

$$\mathbf{X} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sigma_m \mathbf{u}_m \mathbf{v}_m^{\mathrm{H}} \approx \sum_{m=1}^{R} \sigma_m \mathbf{u}_m \mathbf{v}_m^{\mathrm{H}}$$

▶ the complements $\mathbf{U}_n$ and $\mathbf{V}_n^{\mathrm{H}}$,

$$\mathbf{U}_s^{\mathrm{H}} \mathbf{U}_n = \mathbf{0} \qquad , \qquad \mathbf{V}_s \mathbf{V}_n^{\mathrm{H}} = \mathbf{0}$$

define the noise-only subspace of $\mathbf{X}$.

SVD via Two EVDs

▶ Any Hermitian matrix $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^{\mathrm{H}}$ allows an eigenvalue decomposition

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^{\mathrm{H}}$$

with $\mathbf{Q}$ unitary and the eigenvalues in $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ real valued and positive semi-definite;

▶ postulating $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{H}}$, therefore:

$$\begin{align}
\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{H}} &= (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{H}})(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{H}}) = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{H}} \tag{44} \\
\mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{X} &= (\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{H}})(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{H}}) = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{H}} \tag{45}
\end{align}$$

▶ (ordered) eigenvalues relate to the singular values: $\lambda_m = \sigma_m^2$;

▶ the covariance matrix $\mathbf{R} = \frac{1}{L}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}$ has the same rank as the data matrix $\mathbf{X}$, and with $\mathbf{U}$ provides access to the same spatial subspace decomposition.

Narrowband MUSIC Algorithm

▶ EVD of the narrowband covariance matrix identifies signal-plus-noise and noise-only subspaces

$$\mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{U}_s \ \mathbf{U}_n] \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{\Lambda}_s & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Lambda}_n \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{U}_s^{\mathrm{H}} \\ \mathbf{U}_n^{\mathrm{H}} \end{array} \right]$$

▶ scanning the signal-plus-noise subspace could only help to retrieve sources with orthogonal steering vectors;

▶ therefore, the multiple signal classification (MUSIC) algorithm scans the noise-only subspace for minima, or maxima of its reciprocal

$$S_{\mathrm{MUSIC}}(\vartheta) = \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{a}_{\vartheta,\Omega_i}\|_2^2}$$

Narrowband Source Separation

- Via SVD of the data matrix $\mathbf{X}$ or EVD of the covariance matrix $\mathbf{R}$, we can determine the number of linearly independent sources R;
- using the subspace decompositions offered by EVD/SVD, the directions of arrival can be estimated using e.g. MUSIC;
- based on knowledge of the angle of arrival, beamforming could be applied to $\mathbf{X}$ to extract specific sources;
- overall: EVD (and SVD) can play a vital part in narrowband source separation;
- what about broadband source separation?

▶ Compared to the narrowband case, time delays rather than phase shifts bear information on the direction of a source.

Broadband Steering Vector

▶ A signal $s[n]$ arriving at the array can be characterised by the delays of its wavefront (neglecting attenuation):

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_0[n] \\ x_1[n] \\ \vdots \\ x_{M-1}[n] \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} s[n - \tau_0] \\ s[n - \tau_1] \\ \vdots \\ s[n - \tau_{M-1}] \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \delta[n - \tau_0] \\ \delta[n - \tau_1] \\ \vdots \\ \delta[n - \tau_{M-1}] \end{bmatrix} * s[n] \circ\!\!-\!\!\bullet \mathbf{a}_\vartheta(z) S(z)$$

▶ if evaluated at a narrowband normalised angular frequency Ω_i, the time delays τ_m in the broadband steering vector $\mathbf{a}_\vartheta(z)$ collapse to phase shifts in the narrowband steering vector $\mathbf{a}_{\vartheta,\Omega_i}$,

$$\mathbf{a}_{\vartheta,\Omega_i} = \mathbf{a}_\vartheta(z)|_{z=e^{j\Omega_i}} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-j\tau_0\Omega_i} \\ e^{-j\tau_1\Omega_i} \\ \vdots \\ e^{-j\tau_{M-1}\Omega_i} \end{bmatrix} \quad .$$

Space-Time Covariance Matrix

▶ If delays must be considered, the (space-time) covariance matrix must capture the lag τ:

$$\mathbf{R}[\tau] = \mathcal{E}\left\{\mathbf{x}[n] \cdot \mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{H}}[n - \tau]\right\}$$

▶ $\mathbf{R}[\tau]$ contains auto- and cross-correlation sequences:

Cross Spectral Density Matrix

▶ z-transform of the space-time covariance matrix is given by

$$\mathbf{R}[\tau] = \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{x}_n\mathbf{x}_{n-\tau}^{\mathrm{H}}\} \quad \circ\!\!-\!\!\bullet \quad \boldsymbol{R}(z) = \sum_l S_l(z)\mathbf{a}_{\vartheta_l}(z)\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\vartheta_l}(z) + \sigma_N^2\mathbf{I}$$

with ϑ_l the direction of arrival and $S_l(z)$ the PSD of the lth source;

▶ $\boldsymbol{R}(z)$ is the cross spectral density (CSD) matrix;

▶ the instantaneous covariance matrix (no lag parameter τ)

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{x}_n\mathbf{x}_n^{\mathrm{H}}\} = \mathbf{R}[0] \ .$$

Polynomial MUSIC (PMUSIC, [11])

▶ Based on the polynomial EVD of the broadband covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{R}(z) \approx \underbrace{[\mathbf{Q}_s(z)\ \mathbf{Q}_n(z)]}_{\mathbf{Q}(z)} \underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{\Lambda}_s(z) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Lambda}_n(z) \end{array}\right]}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}(z)} \left[\begin{array}{c} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_s(z) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_n(z) \end{array}\right]$$

▶ paraunitary $\mathbf{Q}(z)$, s.t. $\mathbf{Q}(z)\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(z) = \mathbf{I}$;

▶ diagonalised and spectrally majorised $\mathbf{\Lambda}(z)$:

PMUSIC cont'd

▶ Idea —- scan the polynomial noise-only subspace $Q_n(z)$ with broadband steering vectors

$$\Gamma(z,\vartheta) = \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_\vartheta(z)\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_n(z)\mathbf{Q}_n(z)\mathbf{a}_\vartheta(z)$$

▶ looking for minima leads to a spatio-spectral PMUSIC

$$S_{\text{PSS−MUSIC}}(\vartheta,\Omega) = (\Gamma(z,\vartheta)|_{z=e^{j\Omega}})^{-1}$$

▶ and a spatial-only PMUSIC

$$S_{\text{PS−MUSIC}}(\vartheta) = \left(2\pi \oint \Gamma(z,\vartheta)|_{z=e^{j\Omega}}d\Omega\right)^{-1} = \Gamma_\vartheta^{-1}[0]$$

with $\Gamma_\vartheta[\tau] \circ\!\!-\!\!\bullet \Gamma(z,\vartheta)$.

Simulation I — Toy Problem

▶ Linear uniform array with critical spatial and temporal sampling;

▶ broadband steering vector for end-fire position:

$$\mathbf{a}_{\pi/2}(z) = [1 \ \ z^{-1} \ \ \cdots \ \ z^{-M+1}]^{\mathrm{T}}$$

▶ covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{R}(z) = \mathbf{a}_{\pi/2}(z)\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\pi/2}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & z^1 & \dots & z^{M-1} \\ z^{-1} & 1 & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ z^{-M+1} & \dots & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} .$$

▶ PEVD (by inspection)

$$\mathbf{Q}(z) = \mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{DFT}}\mathsf{diag}\big\{1 \ \ z^{-1} \ \ \cdots \ \ z^{-M+1}\big\} \quad ; \qquad \mathbf{\Lambda}(z) = \mathsf{diag}\{1 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0\}$$

▶ simulations with $M = 4$ ...

(a)

(b)

Simulation II

- $M = 8$ element sensor array illuminated by three sources;
- source 1: $\vartheta_1 = -30°$, active over range $\Omega \in [\frac{3\pi}{8}; \pi]$;
- source 2: $\vartheta_2 = 20°$, active over range $\Omega \in [\frac{\pi}{2}; \pi]$;
- source 3: $\vartheta_3 = 40°$, active over range $\Omega \in [\frac{2\pi}{8}; \frac{7\pi}{8}]$; and

- filter banks as innovation filters, and broadband steering vectors to simulate AoA;
- space-time covariance matrix is estimated from 10^4 samples.

(a)

(b)

$S_{\mathrm{PSS}}(\vartheta, e^{j\Omega})/[\mathrm{dB}]$

$S_{\mathrm{AF}}(\vartheta, e^{j\Omega})/[\mathrm{dB}]$

$\vartheta/\circ$

Ω/π

PS-MUSIC Comparison

▶ Simulation I (toy problem): peaks normalised to unity:

▶ Simulation II: inaccuracies on PEVD and broadband steering vector

AoA Estimation — Conclusions

▶ We have considered the importance of SVD and EVD for narrowband source separation;

▶ narrowband matrix decomposition real the matrix rank and offer subspace decompositions on which angle-of-arrival estimation alhorithms such as MUSIC can be based;

▶ broadband problems lead to a space-time covariance or CSD matrix;

▶ such polynomial matrices cannot be decomposed by standard EVD and SVD;

▶ a polynomial EVD has been defined;

▶ iterative algorithms such as SBR2 can be used to approximate the PEVD;

▶ this permits a number of applications, such as broadband angle of arrival estimation;

▶ broadband beamforming could then be used to separate broadband sources.

Further Reading

- General idea of broadband MUSIC [11, 9, 10, 13, 129, 34];
- implementation of broadband steering vectors [69, 114, 12];
- polynomial MUSIC robust to multipath propagation [40, 41, 42];
- polynomial MUSIC applied to speech and audio [58].

Narrowband Minimum Variance Distortionless Response Beamformer

▶ Scenario: an array of M sensors receives data $\mathbf{x}[n]$, containing a desired signal with frequency Ω_s and angle of arrival ϑ_s, corrupted by interferers;

▶ a narrowband beamformer applies a single coefficient to every of the M sensor signals:

Narrowband MVDR Problem

▶ Recall the space-time covariance matrix:

$$\mathbf{R}[\tau] = \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{x}[n]\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{H}}[n-\tau]\}$$

▶ the MVDR beamformer minimises the output power of the beamformer:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}} \mathcal{E}\{|e[n]|^2\} = \min_{\mathbf{w}} \mathbf{w}^{\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{R}[0]\mathbf{w} \tag{46}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{a}^{\mathrm{H}}(\vartheta_{\mathrm{s}}, \Omega_{\mathrm{s}})\mathbf{w} = 1 , \tag{47}$$

▶ this is subject to protecting the signal of interest by a constraint in look direction ϑ_{s};
▶ the steering vector $\mathbf{a}_{\vartheta_{\mathrm{s}},\Omega_{\mathrm{s}}}$ defines the signal of interest's parameters.

Broadband MVDR Beamformer

▶ Each sensor is followed by a tap delay line of dimension L, giving a total of ML coefficients in a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{ML}$ [19, 18, 124]

Broadband MVDR Beamformer

- A larger input vector $\mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{C}^{ML}$ is generated; also including lags;
- the general approach is similar to the narrowband system, minimising the power of $e[n] = \mathbf{v}^{\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{x}_n$;
- however, we require several constraint equations to protect the signal of interest, e.g.

$$\mathbf{C} = [\mathbf{s}(\vartheta_\mathrm{s}, \Omega_0), \ \mathbf{s}(\vartheta_\mathrm{s}, \Omega_1) \ \ldots \ \mathbf{s}(\vartheta_\mathrm{s}, \Omega_{L-1})] \tag{48}$$

- these L constraints pin down the response to unit gain at L separate points in frequency:

$$\mathbf{C}^{\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{1} ; \tag{49}$$

- generally $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{C}^{ML \times L}$, but simplifications can be applied if the look direction is towards broadside.

Generalised Sidelobe Canceller

- A quiescent beamformer $\mathbf{v}_{\mathrm{q}} = \left(\mathbf{C}^{\mathrm{H}}\right)^{\dagger}\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{C}^{ML}$ picks the signal of interest;
- the quiescent beamformer is optimal for AWGN but generally passes structured interference;
- the output of the blocking matrix $\mathbf{B}$ contains interference only, which requires $[\mathbf{B}\,\mathbf{C}]$ to be unitary; hence $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{ML \times (M-1)L}$;
- an adaptive noise canceller $\mathbf{v}_{\mathrm{a}} \in \mathbb{C}^{(M-1)L}$ aims to remove the residual interference:

- note: all dimensions are determined by $\{M, L\}$.

Polynomial Matrix MVDR Formulation

- Power spectral density of beamformer output: $R_e(z) = \tilde{\boldsymbol{w}}(z)\boldsymbol{R}(z)\boldsymbol{w}(z)$
- proposed broadband MVDR beamformer formulation:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{w}(z)} \oint_{|z|=1} R_e(z)\frac{dz}{z} \tag{50}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}(\vartheta_{\mathrm{s}}, z)\boldsymbol{w}(z) = F(z) . \tag{51}$$

- precision of broadband steering vector, $|\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}(\vartheta_{\mathrm{s}}, z)\boldsymbol{a}(\vartheta_{\mathrm{s}}, z) - 1|$, depends on the length T of the fractional delay filter:

Generalised Sidelobe Canceller

▶ Instead of performing constrained optimisation, the GSC projects the data and performs adaptive noise cancellation:

▶ the quiescent vector $\mathbf{w}_{q}(z)$ is generated from the constraints and passes signal plus interference;

▶ the blocking matrix $\boldsymbol{B}(z)$ has to be orthonormal to $\mathbf{w}_{q}(z)$ and only pass interference.

Design Considerations

- The blocking matrix can be obtained by completing a paraunitary matrix from $\mathbf{w}_q(z)$;
- this can be achieved by calculating a PEVD of the rank one matrix $\mathbf{w}_q(z)\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_q(z)$;
- this leads to a block matrix of order N that is typically greater than L;
- maximum leakage of the signal of interest through the blocking matrix:

Computational Cost

- With M sensors and a TDL length of L, the complexity of a standard beamformer is dominated by the blocking matrix;
- in the proposed design, $\mathbf{w}_a \in \mathbb{C}^{M-1}$ has degree L;
- the quiescent vector $\mathbf{w}_q(z) \in \mathbb{C}^M$ has degree T;
- the blocking matrix $\boldsymbol{B}(z) \in \mathbb{C}^{(M-1) \times M}$ has degree N;
- cost comparison in multiply-accumulates (MACs):

	GSC cost	
component	polynomial	standard
quiescent beamformer	MT	ML
blocking matrix	$M(M{-}1)N$	$M(M{-}1)L^2$
adaptive filter (NLMS)	$2(M{-}1)L$	$2(M{-}1)L$

Example

- We assume a signal of interest from $\vartheta = 30°$;
- three interferers with angles $\vartheta_i \in \{-40°, -10°, 80°\}$ active over the frequency range $\Omega = 2\pi \cdot [0.1;\ 0.45]$ at signal to interference ratio of -40 dB;

- $M = 8$ element linear uniform array is also corrupted by spatially and temporally white additive Gaussian noise at 20 dB SNR;
- parameters: $L = 175$, $T = 50$, and $N = 140$;
- cost per iteration: 10.7 kMACs (proposed) versus 1.72 MMACs (standard).

▶ Directivity pattern of quiescent standard broadband beamformer:

Quiescent Beamformer

▶ Directivity pattern of quiescent proposed broadband beamformer:

Adipation

▶ Convergence curves of the two broadband beamformers, showing the residual mean squared error (i.e. beamformer output minus signal of interest):

Adapted Beamformer

▶ Directivity pattern of adapted proposed broadband beamformer:

Adapted Beamformer

▶ Directivity pattern of adapted standard broadband beamformer:

Gain in Look Direction

- Gain in look direction $\vartheta_s = 30°$ before and after adaptation:

- due to signal leakage, the standard broadband beamformer after adaptation only maintains the point constraints but deviates elsewhere.

Broadband Beamforming Conclusions

▶ Based on the previous AoA estimation, beamforming can help to extract source signals and thus perform "source separation";

▶ broadband beamformers usually assume pre-steering such that the signal of interest lies at broadside;

▶ this is not always given, and difficult for arbitary array geometries;

▶ the proposed beamformer using a polynomial matrix formulation can implement abitrary constraints;

▶ the performance for such constraints is better in terms of the accuracy of the directivity pattern;

▶ because the proposed design decouples the complexities of the coefficient vector, the quiescent vector and block matrix, and the adaptive process, the cost is significantly lower than for a standard broadband adaptive beamformer.

Further Reading

- broadband beamforming [19, 18, 57, 77, 78, 76, 81, 80, 79, 82, 83, 75, 124, 143, 137, 146]
- implementation of broadband steering vectors [69, 114, 12];
- polynomial methods for beamforming [130, 15, 14];
- beamforming and source compression applied to speech and audio [101].

Source Extraction Application

▶ We take M-array measurements of a single source:

▶ 2nd order statistics: $\boldsymbol{R}_i(z) = S(z)\boldsymbol{a}_i(z)\boldsymbol{a}_i^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \gamma_{i,m}(z)\boldsymbol{u}_i(z)\boldsymbol{u}_i^{\mathrm{P}}$.

Application Example

- 2nd order stats: $\boldsymbol{R}_i(z) = S(z)\boldsymbol{a}_i(z)\boldsymbol{a}_i^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \gamma_{i,m}(z)\boldsymbol{u}_i(z)\boldsymbol{u}_i^{\mathrm{P}}$;
- difference: $\boldsymbol{u}_i(z)$ is normal, $\boldsymbol{u}_i^{\mathrm{P}}(z)\boldsymbol{u}_i(z) = 1$, while $\boldsymbol{a}_i(z)$ is not:

$$\boldsymbol{a}_i^{\mathrm{P}}(z)\boldsymbol{a}_i(z) = A_{i,(-)}(z)A_{i,(+)}(z) = A_{i,(+)}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)A_{i,(+)}(z)$$

with minimum-phase $A_{(+)}(z)$;

- therefore:

$$\boldsymbol{u}_i(z) = \frac{\boldsymbol{a}_i(z)}{A_{i,(+)}(z)}$$
$$\gamma_i(z) = A_{i,(+)}(z)S(z)A_{i,(+)}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) \ ,$$

- for a single measurement, we can say nothing about $\boldsymbol{a}_i^{\mathrm{P}}(z)$ or $S(z)$.

Application — Multiple Measurements

▶ If we have several measurements $i = 1 \ldots I$:

$$\boldsymbol{u}_i(z) = \frac{\boldsymbol{a}_i(z)}{A_{i,(+)}(z)}$$

$$\gamma_i(z) = A_{i,(+)}(z) S(z) A_{i,(+)}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) \,,$$

▶ we can extract $S(z)$ as the greatest common divisor

$$\hat{S}(z) = \mathsf{GCD}\{\lambda_1(z) \ \ldots \ \lambda_I(z)\} \,; \tag{52}$$

▶ we can also extract the $A_{i,(+)}(z)$, and hence determine the vectors $\boldsymbol{a}_i(z)$ save of an arbitrary phase response.

Application — Frequency Domain Attempt

▶ As an alternative, we take measurements in independent frequency bins:

$$\mathbf{R}_{i,k} = \boldsymbol{R}_i(e^{j\Omega_k}) = \boldsymbol{a}_i(e^{j\Omega_k})S(e^{j\Omega_k})\boldsymbol{a}_i^{\mathrm{H}}(e^{j\Omega_k}) + \sigma_n^2\mathbf{I} \tag{53}$$

$$= \mathbf{q}_{i,k}\lambda_{i,k}\mathbf{q}_{i,k}^{\mathrm{H}} . \tag{54}$$

▶ principal eigenvectors and eigenvalues for the measurement campaigns are

$$\mathbf{q}_{i,k} = \frac{\boldsymbol{a}_i(e^{j\Omega_k})}{|\boldsymbol{a}_i(e^{j\Omega_k})|} , \tag{55}$$

$$\lambda_{i,k} = S(e^{j\Omega_k})|\boldsymbol{a}_i(e^{j\Omega_k})|^2 . \tag{56}$$

▶ because of the normalisation, nothing can be extracted about the source or the transfer functions.

Application — Results I

▶ Eigenvalues / source PSD for two measurements $i = \{0, 1\}$:

Application — Results II

▶ Eigenvectors / magnitude response for measurement $i = \{0\}$:

Application — Summary

- we can extract the source PSD and the magnitude responses once we have at least two measurements;
- an independent frequency bin approach does not yield anything;
- the polynomial approach rests on an accurate parahermitian EVD, and an accurate root finding / GCD algorithm;
- root finding is numerically challenging;
- nevertheless the example gives a glimpse of the type of advantages that a "holistic" broadband approach offers [132];
- if impulse responses can be determined, it is possible to infer on the geometry of the environment [96];

Problem & Model

▶ A number of broadband stationary sources $s_\ell[n]$, $\ell = 1, \ldots, L$, illuminate an M-element sensor array;

▶ each transfer path is modelled by a vector of impulse responses $\mathbf{a}_\ell[n] \in \mathbb{C}^M$;

▶ stationary additive, spatially and temporally uncorrelated noise $\mathbf{v}[n] \in \mathbb{C}^M$;

$$\mathbf{x}[n] = \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \mathbf{a}_\ell[n] * s_\ell[n] + \mathbf{v}[n]$$

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONIC & ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

Problem & Model

- ▶ A number of broadband stationary sources $s_\ell[n]$, $\ell = 1, \ldots, L$, illuminate an M-element sensor array;

- ▶ each transfer path is modelled by a vector of impulse responses $\mathbf{a}_\ell[n] \in \mathbb{C}^M$;

- ▶ stationary additive, spatially and temporally uncorrelated noise $\mathbf{v}[n] \in \mathbb{C}^M$;

- ▶ a broadband transient signal $s_{L+1}[n]$ enters the scene at some point in time;

- ▶ aim: we want to detect the onset of this transient signal, which may be weak in power [131];

- ▶ assumption: $M > L$.

$s_1[n]$

$s_2[n]$

$s_L[n]$

$\mathbf{a}_1[n]$

$\mathbf{a}_2[n]$

$\mathbf{a}_L[n]$

$\mathbf{a}_{L+1}[n]$

$s_{L+1}[n]$

$\mathbf{v}[n]$

$\mathbf{x}[n]$

$$\mathbf{x}[n] = \sum_{\ell=1}^{L+1} \mathbf{a}_\ell[n] * s_\ell[n] + \mathbf{v}[n]$$

Model

- Each source, $s_\ell[n]$, contributes to the data vector $\mathbf{x}[n] = [x_1[n], \ldots, x_M[n]]^\mathrm{T}$ via a steering vector $\mathbf{a}_\ell[n] = [A_{\ell,1}[n], \ldots A_{\ell,M}[n]]^\mathrm{T}$;

- compact with $\mathbf{A}[n] = [\mathbf{a}_1[n] \ldots \mathbf{a}_L[n]]$ and $\mathbf{s}[n] = [s_1[n], \ldots, s_L[n]]^\mathrm{T}$:

$$\mathbf{x}[n] = \mathbf{A}[n] * \mathbf{s}[n] + \mathbf{v}[n] ;$$

- space-time covariance: $\mathbf{R}[\tau] = \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{x}[n]\mathbf{x}^\mathrm{H}[n-\tau]\}$:

$$\mathbf{R}[\tau] = \mathbf{A}[\tau] * \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{s}[n]\mathbf{s}^\mathrm{H}[n-\tau]\} * \mathbf{A}^\mathrm{H}[-\tau] + \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{v}[n]\mathbf{v}^\mathrm{H}[n-\tau]\} \tag{57}$$

$$= \mathbf{A}[\tau] * \mathbf{\Gamma}[\tau] * \mathbf{A}^\mathrm{H}[-\tau] + \sigma_v^2 \mathbf{I}_M \delta[\tau] . \tag{58}$$

Cross-Spectral Density Matrix

▶ Transfer function matrix $\boldsymbol{A}(z) = \sum_n \mathbf{A}[n]z^{-n}$ (short $\boldsymbol{A}(z) \bullet\!\!-\!\!\circ \mathbf{A}[n]$) is a polynomial in $z \in \mathbb{C}$;

▶ cross-spectral density $\boldsymbol{R}(z) \bullet\!\!-\!\!\circ \mathbf{R}[\tau]$:

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \boldsymbol{A}(z)\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(z)\boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) + \sigma_v^2 \mathbf{I}_M \; ;$$

▶ parahermitian property:

$$\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \boldsymbol{R}^{\mathrm{H}}(1/z^*) = \boldsymbol{R}(z) \; ;$$

▶ when evaluated for a specific normalised angular frequency Ω_0: $\mathbf{R}_0 = \boldsymbol{R}(z)|_{z=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j}\Omega_0}}$;

▶ $\mathbf{R}_0$ is a constant matrix that describes a *narrowband* problem;

▶ $\mathbf{R}_0$ is Hermitian $\longrightarrow$ eigenvalue decomposition (EVD) $\mathbf{R}_0 = \mathbf{Q}_0 \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{Q}_0^{\mathrm{H}}$.

Narrowband EVD and Subspace Decomposition

- We assume an ordered EVD $\mathbf{R}_0 = \mathbf{Q}_0 \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{Q}_0^{\mathrm{H}}$, where $\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 = \mathrm{diag}\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_M\}$ with $\lambda_\ell \geq \lambda_{\ell+1}$, $\ell = 1, \ldots, (M-1)$;

- partitioning enables a subspace decomposition:

$$\mathbf{R}_0 = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} & \\ \mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{s}} & \mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{n}} \\ & \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{\Lambda}_s + \sigma_v^2 \mathbf{I}_L & \\ \hline & \sigma_v^2 \mathbf{I}_{M-L} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{H}} \\ \hline \mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{n}}^{\mathrm{H}} \end{array} \right]$$

- source enumeration: eigenvalues above noise floor = number of uncorrelated sources;
- $\mathbf{y}[n] = \mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{n}}^{\mathrm{H}} \mathbf{x}[n] \in \mathbb{C}^{M-L}$ only contains noise;
- power in $\mathbf{y}[n]$: $\mathcal{E}\{\|\mathbf{y}[n]\|_2^2\} = (M-L)\sigma_v^2$ because of orthonormality of $\mathbf{Q}$.

Broadband EVD

- Space-time covariance $\mathbf{R}[\tau]$ or equivalently the CSD matrix $\boldsymbol{R}(z)$ are only diagonalised by the EVD for a specific value τ or z;
- for an analytic $\boldsymbol{R}(z)$ that is not derived from multiplexed data, there exists a parahermitian matrix EVD [134, 135]

$$\boldsymbol{R}(z) = \boldsymbol{Q}(z)\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(z)\boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) ; \tag{59}$$

- $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(z)$ is diagonal, parahermitian, analytic, and unique;
- eigenvectors in $\boldsymbol{Q}(z)$ are paraunitary, analytic, and unique up to an arbitrary allpass function;
- paraunitarity $\boldsymbol{Q}(z)\boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) = \boldsymbol{Q}^{\mathrm{P}}(z)\boldsymbol{Q}(z) = \mathbf{I}$ implies losslessness;
- a number of algorithms can approximate (59) [86, 107, 108, 140, 136, 139].

Broadband Subspace Decomposition

▶ The parahermitian matrix EVD $R(z) = Q(z)\Lambda(z)Q^{\mathrm{P}}(z)$ enables a broadband subspace decomposition:

$$R(z) = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{\mathrm{s}}(z) & Q_{\mathrm{n}}(z) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_s(z) \\ +\sigma_v^2\mathbf{I}_L & \\ & \sigma_v^2\mathbf{I}_{M-L} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) \\ Q_{\mathrm{n}}^{\mathrm{P}}(z) \end{bmatrix}$$

▶ $\mathbf{Q}[n] \circ\!\!-\!\!\bullet\, Q(z)$ describes a lossless filter bank;

▶ data vector component in the noise-only subspace: $\mathbf{y}[n] = \mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{n}}^{\mathrm{H}}[-n] * \mathbf{x}[n]$;

▶ again, it can be shown that ideally $\mathcal{E}\big\{\|\mathbf{y}[n]\|_2^2\big\} = (M - L)\sigma_v^2$.

'Syndrome' Idea

▶ We estimate $\boldsymbol{R}(z) \bullet\!\!-\!\!\circ \mathbf{R}[\tau]$ over a window of data, with $L < M$ stationary sources present;

▶ compute parahermitian matrix EVD, perform source enumeration, and determine the eigenvectors spanning the noise-only subspace, $\boldsymbol{Q}_{\mathrm{n}}(z)$;

▶ if an additional source $s_{L+1}[n]$ enters the scene, it will likely protrude into the noise-only subspace;

▶ we therefore monitor the syndrome vector

$$\mathbf{y}[n] = \mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{n}}^{\mathrm{H}}[-n] * \mathbf{x}[n] \tag{60}$$

for a change in power, or for any structured / correlated components.

$$\mathbf{x}[n] \circ\!\!\!-\!\!\!\!\!\diagup\!\!\!\!\!-\!\!\!\!\boxed{\mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{n}}^{\mathrm{H}}[-n]}\!\!\!-\!\!\!\!\!\diagup\!\!\!\!\!-\!\!\!\circ \mathbf{y}[n]$$
$$M \qquad\qquad\qquad M-L$$

Intuitive Example I

- $M = 6$ sensors, $L = 3$ stationary sources; weak transient source at $n = 5000$;
- monitoring a sensor output $x_1[n]$:

Intuitive Example II

- $M = 6$ sensors, $L = 3$ stationary sources; weak transient source at $n = 5000$;
- monitoring a syndrome element $y_1[n]$:

Proposed Approach

▶ We use the statistics and evaluated parahermitian matrix EVD of a previous time window, and utilise the broadband noise-only subspace spanned by the columns of $\boldsymbol{Q}_{\mathrm{n}}(z)$;

▶ being analytic, $\boldsymbol{Q}_{\mathrm{n}}(z)$ can typically be approximated well by low-order polyomials, and is relatively inexpensive to implement;

▶ because of the processing, elements of the syndrome vector $\mathbf{y}[n]$ are spatially and temporally correlated;

▶ decimation by D can break temporal correlation and further reduces complexity;

▶ we can average over consecutive syndrome vectors to increase discrimination;

▶ $\xi_{n,D}^{(K)}$ is generalised χ^2 distributed if temporal correlation is suppressed [115, 43].

Decimated Processor

▶ The proposed subspace projection is followed by a decimation by D:

$$\mathbf{x}[n] \circ\!\!-\!\!/\!\!-\!\!\boxed{\mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{n}}^{\mathrm{H}}[-n]}\xrightarrow{\mathbf{y}[n]}\!\!/\!\!-\!\!\bigcirc\!\!D\xrightarrow{\mathbf{y}[\nu]}\!\!/\!\!-\!\!\boxed{\|\cdot\|_2^2}\longrightarrow\boxed{\textstyle\sum_K}\!\!-\!\!\circ\,\xi_{n,D}^{(K)}$$

$$M \qquad\qquad\quad M-L \qquad M-L$$

▶ cost advantage: a polyphase implementation integrates the decimation with the processor, reducing operations by a factor of D;

▶ temporal decorrelation: if the temporal correlation does not exceed D lags, the decimation will temporally decorrelate susequent snapshots of the syndrome vector $\mathbf{y}[\nu]$.

Results I — Statistics

▶ $M = 6$ sensors, $L = 2$ stationary sources, transfer functions determined by radio propagation model for dense urban environment (polynomial order ≈ 40);

▶ statistics of output for I_0: no transient versus I_1: transient present; $K = 1$;

Results I — Statistics

- $M = 6$ sensors, $L = 2$ stationary sources, transfer functions determined by radio propagation model for dense urban environment (polynomial order ≈ 40);
- statistics of output for I_0: no transient versus I_1: transient present; $K = 10$;

Results II — Sources and Propagation Environment

Engineering

University of
Strathclyde
Engineering

- ▶ Realistic 20MHz urban scenario with dispersive impulse responses;
- ▶ $M = 6$ sensors;
- ▶ total power of contributions of three different sources:

signal	power
source 1	0.0000 dB
source 2	-4.3494 dB
source 3	-13.2865 dB
noise	-16.2865 dB

- ▶ we use either source 2 or 3 as transient signal; the two remaining sources are stationary.

Results III — Discrimination vs Decision Time

- Averaging increasingly separates the distributions for I_0 and I_1 — measured as discrimination $\mathcal{D}$: derived from the ROC [54];

- averaging also increases the time to compute $\xi_{n,D}^{(T)} \longrightarrow$ decision time $\mathcal{T}$ (for a 20MHz channel);

- N here is the window over which the space-time covariance is estimated [45, 46, 47].

Summary

- We have discussed a broadband subspace approach to detect the presence of weak transient signals;

- this is based on second order statistics of sensor array data — the space-time covariance matrix — and a polynomial matrix EVD;

- this covariance matrix and its decomposition can be computed off-line; for low-cost implementations, see e.g. [36, 67]

- a subspace decomposition for the noise-only subspace determines a syndrome vector;

- in the absence of a transient signal, this syndrome only contains noise;

- a transient signal is likely to protrude into the noise-only subspace, and a change in energy can be detected even if the signal is weak;

- discrimination can be traded off against decision time;

- in audio, the approach is utilised to detect the onset of weak speakers;

- in future, we may investigate time-varying channels and subspace leakage.

Further Reading

- the idea of a syndrome vector to detecting weak transient RF signals is described in [131];
- a similar approach to detecting transient signals has been applied in the speech domain, where the detection of a step change in energy can be accomplished by a voice activity detector [105, 104];

References I

[1] W. Al-Hanafy, A. P. Millar, C. H. Ta, and S. Weiss.
     Broadband SVD and non-linear precoding applied to broadband MIMO channels.
     In *42nd Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, pages 2053–2057, Pacific Grove, CA, USA, Oct. 2008.

[2] W. Al-Hanafy and S. Weiss.
     Comparison of precoding methods for broadband mimo systems.
     In *Third International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing*, Aruba, Dutch Antilles, Dec. 2009.

[3] W. Al-Hanafy and S. Weiss.
     A new low-cost discrete bit loading using greedy power allocation.
     In *Third Mosharaka International Conference on Communications, Computers and Applications*, Amman, Jordan, October 2009.
     (best paper award).

[4] W. Al-Hanafy and S. Weiss.
     Sum-rate maximisation comparison using incremental approaches with different constraints.
     In *Third Mosharaka International Conference on Communications, Computers and Applications*, Amman, Jordan, October 2009.

[5] W. Al-Hanafy and S. Weiss.
     Greedy power allocation for multicarrier systems with reduced complexity.
     In *National Radio Science Conference*, Menoufia, Egypt, March 2010.

[6] W. Al-Hanafy and S. Weiss.
     Reduced complexity schemes to greedy power allocation for multicarrier systems.
     In *18th International Conference on Microwave, Radar and Wireless Communications*, 2010.

[7] W. Al-Hanafy and S. Weiss.
     Trade-off between complexity and ber performance of a polynomial svd-based broadband mimo transceiver.
     In *27th National Radio Science Conference*, Menoufia, Egypt, March 2010.

References II

[8]   W. Al-Hanafy and S. Weiss.
      An adaptive modulation precoding scheme for mean ber minimisation of isi mimo channels.
      In *19th European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 1638–1642, Barcelona, Spain, August 2011.

[9]   M. Alrmah, M. Hussin, S. Weiss, and S. Lambotharan.
      Comparison of broadband direction of arrival estimation algorithms.
      In *9th IMA Mathematics in Signal Processing Conference*, Birmingham, UK, December 2012.

[10] M. Alrmah and S. Weiss.
      Filter bank based fractional delay filter implementation for widely accurate broadband steering vectors.
      In *5th IEEE International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing*, Saint Martin, December 2013.

[11] M. Alrmah, S. Weiss, and S. Lambotharan.
      An extension of the MUSIC algorithm to broadband scenarios using polynomial eigenvalue decomposition.
      In *19th European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 629–633, Barcelona, Spain, August 2011.

[12] M. Alrmah, S. Weiss, and J. McWhirter.
      Implementation of accurate broadband steering vectors for broadband angle of arrival estimation.
      In *IET Intelligent Signal Processing*, London, UK, December 2013.

[13] M. Alrmah, S. Weiss, S. Redif, S. Lambotharan, and J. McWhirter.
      Angle of arrival estimation for broadband signals: A comparison.
      In *IET Intelligent Signal Processing*, London, UK, December 2013.

[14] A. Alzin, F. Coutts, J. Corr, S. Weiss, I. Proudler, and J. Chambers.
      Polynomial matrix formulation-based Capon beamformer.
      In *IMA International Conference on Signal Processing in Mathematics*, Birmingham, UK, December 2016.

References III

[15] A. Alzin, F. Coutts, J. Corr, S. Weiss, I. K. Proudler, and J. A. Chambers.
Adaptive broadband beamforming with arbitrary array geometry.
In *IET/EURASIP Intelligent Signal Processing*, London, UK, December 2015.

[16] V. Anis, C. Delaosa, L. H. Crockett, and S. Weiss.
Energy-efficient wideband transceiver with per-band equalisation and synchronisation.
In *IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference*, April 2018.

[17] G. Barbarino and V. Noferini.
On the Rellich eigendecomposition of para-Hermitian matrices and the sign characteristics of ∗-palindromic matrix polynomials.
Linear Algebra and its Applications, 672:1–27, Sept. 2023.

[18] K. M. Buckley.
Spatial/Spectral Filtering with Linearly Constrained Minimum Variance Beamformers.
IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, ASSP-35(3):249–266, March 1987.

[19] K. M. Buckley and L. J. Griffith.
An Adaptive Generalized Sidelobe Canceller with Derivative Constraints.
IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation, 34(3):311–319, March 1986.

[20] A. Bunse-Gerstner, R. Byers, V. Mehrmann, and N. K. Nicols.
Numerical computation of an analytic singular value decomposition of a matrix valued function.
Numer. Math, 60:1–40, 1991.

[21] J. Corr, J. Pestana, S. Redif, I. Proudler, and Moonen.
Investigation of a polynomial matrix generalised evd for multi-channel wiener filtering.
In *50th Asilomar Conference on Signals Systems and Computers*, Pacific Grove, CA, November 2016.

[22] J. Corr, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, J. McWhirter, and I. Proudler.
Cyclic-by-row approximation of iterative polynomial EVD algorithms.
In *Sensor Signal Processing for Defence*, pages 1–5, Edinburgh, Scotland, Sept 2014.

[23] J. Corr, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, J. McWhirter, and I. Proudler.
Maximum energy sequential matrix diagonalisation for parahermitian matrices.
In *48th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, pages 470–474, Pacific Grove, CA, USA, November 2014.

[24] J. Corr, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, J. McWhirter, and I. Proudler.
Performance trade-offs in sequential matrix diagonalisation search strategies.
In *IEEE 6th International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing*, pages 25–28, Cancun, Mexico, December 2015.

[25] J. Corr, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, J. McWhirter, S. Redif, and I. Proudler.
Multiple shift maximum element sequential matrix diagonalisation for parahermitian matrices.
In *IEEE Workshop on Statistical Signal Processing*, pages 312–315, Gold Coast, Australia, June 2014.

[26] J. Corr, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, I. Proudler, and J. McWhirter.
Reduced search space multiple shift maximum element sequential matrix diagonalisation algorithm.
In *IET/EURASIP Intelligent Signal Processing*, London, UK, December 2015.

[27] J. Corr, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, I. Proudler, and J. McWhirter.
Row-shift corrected truncation of paraunitary matrices for PEVD algorithms.
In *23rd European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 849–853, Nice, France, August/September 2015.

[28] J. Corr, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, I. Proudler, and J. McWhirter.
Shortening of paraunitary matrices obtained by polynomial eigenvalue decomposition algorithms.
In *Sensor Signal Processing for Defence*, Edinburgh, Scotland, September 2015.

[29] F. Coutts, J. Corr, K. Thompson, I. Proudler, and S. Weiss.
Divide-and-conquer sequential matrix diagonalisation for parahermitian matrices.
In *Sensor Signal Processing for Defence Conference*, pages 1–5, London, UK, December 2017.

[30] F. Coutts, J. Corr, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, P. I.K., and J. McWhirter.
Multiple shift QR decomposition for polynomial matrices.
In *IMA International Conference on Mathematics in Signal Processing*, Birmingham, UK, December 2016.

[31] F. Coutts, J. Corr, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, I. Proudler, and J. McWhirter.
Complexity and search space reduction in cyclic-by-row PEVD algorithms.
In *50th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, Pacific Grove, CA, November 2016.

[32] F. Coutts, K. Thompson, I. Proudler, and S. Weiss.
Restricted update sequential matrix diagonalisation for parahermitian matrices.
In *IEEE 7th International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing*, Curacao, December 2017.

[33] F. Coutts, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, and I. Proudler.
A comparison of iterative and DFT-based polynomial matrix eigenvalue decompositions.
In *IEEE 7th International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing*, Curacao, December 2017.

[34] F. Coutts, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, and I. Proudler.
Impact of fast-converging PEVD algorithms on broadband AoA estimation.
In *Sensor Signal Processing for Defence Conference*, pages 1–5, London, UK, December 2017.

[35] F. K. Coutts, J. Corr, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, I. Proudler, and J. G. McWhirter.
Memory and complexity reduction in parahermitian matrix manipulations of PEVD algorithms.
In *24th European Signal Processing Conference*, Budapest, Hungary, Aug. 2016.

References VI

[36] F. K. Coutts, I. K. Proudler, and S. Weiss.
Efficient implementation of iterative polynomial matrix evd algorithms exploiting structural redundancy and parallelisation.
IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers, 66(12):4753–4766, Dec. 2019.

[37] F. K. Coutts, K. Thompson, J. Pestana, I. Proudler, and S. Weiss.
Enforcing eigenvector smoothness for a compact DFT-based polynomial eigenvalue decomposition.
In *10th IEEE Workshop on Sensor Array and Multichannel Signal Processing*, pages 1–5, July 2018.

[38] F. K. Coutts, K. Thompson, I. K. Proudler, and S. Weiss.
An iterative dft-based approach to the polynomial matrix eigenvalue decomposition.
In *52nd Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*, pages 1011–1015, Oct 2018.

[39] F. K. Coutts, K. Thompson, S. Weiss, and I. K. Proudler.
Analysing the performance of divide-and-conquer sequential matrix diagonalisation for large broadband sensor arrays.
In *2017 IEEE International Workshop on Signal Processing Systems*, pages 1–6, Lorient, France, October 2017.

[40] W. Coventry, C. Clemente, and J. Soraghan.
Enhancing polynomial music algorithm for coherent broadband sources through spatial smoothing.
In *2017 25th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, pages 2448–2452, 2017.

[41] W. Coventry, C. Clemente, and J. Soraghan.
Polynomial root-music algorithm for efficient broadband direction of arrival estimation.
In *2017 Sensor Signal Processing for Defence Conference (SSPD)*, pages 1–5, 2017.

[42] W. Coventry, C. Clemente, and J. Soraghan.
Broadband sparse sensing: A polynomial matrix approach to co-prime and super nested arrays.
In *2019 IEEE Radar Conference (RadarConf)*, pages 1–6, 2019.

References VII

[43] A. Das and W. S. Geisler.
A method to integrate and classify normal distributions.
arXiv e-prints, page arXiv:2012.14331, Dec. 2020.

[44] B. De Moor and S. Boyd.
Analytic properties of singular values and vectors.
Technical report, KU Leuven, 1989.

[45] C. Delaosa, F. K. Coutts, J. Pestana, and S. Weiss.
Impact of space-time covariance estimation errors on a parahermitian matrix EVD.
In *10th IEEE Workshop on Sensor Array and Multichannel Signal Processing*, pages 1–5, July 2018.

[46] C. Delaosa, J. Pestana, N. J. Goddard, S. Somasundaram, and S. Weiss.
Sample space-time covariance matrix estimation.
In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pages 8033–8037, Brighton, UK, May 2019.

[47] C. Delaosa, J. Pestana, N. J. Goddard, S. D. Somasundaram, and S. Weiss.
Support estimation of a sample space-time covariance matrix.
In *Sensor Signal Processing for Defence*, Brighton, UK, March 2019.

[48] N. J. Fliege.
Multirate Digital Signal Processing: Multirate Systems, Filter Banks, Wavelets.
John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1994.

[49] J. Foster, J. McWhirter, M. Davies, and J. Chambers.
An algorithm for calculating the qr and singular value decompositions of polynomial matrices.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 58(3):1263–1274, March 2010.

[50]   J. Foster, J. McWhirter, S. Lambotharan, I. Proudler, M. Davies, and J. Chambers.
Polynomial matrix qr decomposition for the decoding of frequency selective multiple-input multiple-output communication channels.
IET Signal Processing, 6(7):704–712, September 2012.

[51]   J. Foster, J. G. McWhirter, and J. Chambers.
Limiting the order of polynomial matrices within the SBR2 algorithm.
In *IMA International Conference on Mathematics in Signal Processing*, Cirencester, UK, December 2006.

[52]   I. Gohberg, P. Lancaster, and L. Rodman.
Matrix Polynomials.
Academic Press, New York, 1982.

[53]   G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan.
Matrix Computations.
John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 3rd edition, 1996.

[54]   J. A. Hanley and B. J. McNeil.
The Meaning and Use of the Area under a Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curve.
Radiology, 143:26–36, 1982.

[55]   L. Hanzo, M. Münster, B. J. Choi, and T. Keller.
OFDM and MC-CDMA for Broadband Multi-User Communications, WLANs, and Broadcasting.
IEEE and John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK, 2003.

[56]   D. Hassan, S. Redif, J. G. McWhirter, and S. Lambotharan.
Polynomial gsvd beamforming for two-user frequency-selective mimo channels.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 69:948–959, 2021.

References IX

[57] M. W. Hoffman and K. M. Buckley.
Robust Time-Domain Processing of Broadband Microphone Array Data.
IEEE Transactions on Speech and Audio Processing, 3(3):193–203, May 1995.

[58] A. Hogg, V. Neo, S. Weiss, C. Evers, and P. Naylor.
A polynomial eigenvalue decomposition MUSIC approach for broadband sound source localization.
In *IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics*, New Paltz, NY, Oct. 2021.

[59] S. Icart and P. Comon.
Some properties of Laurent polynomial matrices.
In *9th IMA Conference on Mathematics in Signal Processing*, Birmingham, UK, December 2012.

[60] S. Kasap and S. Redif.
Novel field-programmable gate array architecture for computing the eigenvalue decomposition of para-hermitian polynomial matrices.
IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems, 22(3):522–536, March 2014.

[61] T. Kato.
Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators.
Springer, 1980.

[62] F. Khattak, I. Proudler, J. McWhirter, and S. Weiss.
Generalised sequential matrix diagonalisation for the SVD of polynomial matrices.
In *International Conference on Defence for Signal Processing*, Edinburgh, Scotland, Sept. 2023.
submitted.

[63] F. Khattak, I. Proudler, and S. Weiss.
Generalized polynomial power method.
In *International Conference on Sensor Signal Processing for Defence*, Edinburgh, Scotland, Sept. 2023.
submitted.

References X

[64] F. Khattak, I. K. Proudler, and S. Weiss.
Support estimation of analytic eigenvectors of parahermitian matrices.
In *International Conference on Recent Advances in Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences*, Islamabad, Pakistan, October 2022.

[65] F. A. Khattak, I. K. Proudler, and S. Weiss.
Enhanced space-time covariance estimation based on a system identification approach.
In *Sensor Signal Processing for Defence Conference*, London, UK, Sept. 2022.

[66] F. A. Khattak, I. K. Proudler, and S. Weiss.
Extension of power method to para-Hermitian matrices: polynomial power method.
In *EUSIPCO*, Helsinki, Finland, Sept. 2023.
accepted.

[67] F. A. Khattak, S. Weiss, and I. K. Proudler.
Fast givens rotation approach to second order sequential best rotation algorithms.
In *International Conference in Sensor Signal Processing for Defence*, pages 40–44, Edinburgh, Scotland, September 2021.

[68] F. A. Khattak, S. Weiss, I. K. Proudler, and J. G. McWhirter.
Space-time covariance matrix estimation: Loss of algebraic multiplicities of eigenvalues.
In *56th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*, Pacific Grove, CA, Oct. 2022.

[69] T. I. Laakso, V. Välimäki, M. Karjalainen, and U. K. Laine.
Splitting the Unit Delay.
IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 13(1):30–60, January 1996.

[70] P. Lancaster and M. Tismenetsky.
The Theory of Matrices.
Academic Press, 1985.

[71] C. Liu, M. Hadef, C. H. Ta, and S. Weiss.
A Coding and Equalisation Approach for Dispersive Channels with Structured Additive Noise.
In S. Weiss, editor, *IEE/EURASIP Conference on DSP Enabled Radio*, volume 2005/11086, pages 33/1–33/4, Southampton, UK, September 2005.

[72] C. Liu, C. H. Ta, and S. Weiss.
Joint precoding and equalisation design using oversampled filter banks for dispersive channels with correlated noise.
In *IEEE Workshop on Signal Processing Systems*, pages 232–236, Shanghai, China, October 2007.

[73] C. Liu. and S. Weiss.
A precoding and equalisation design based on oversampled filter banks for dispersive channels with correlated noise.
In *15th European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 511–514, Poznan, Poland, September 2007.

[74] C. Liu, S. Weiss, S. Redif, T. Cooper, L. Lampe, and J. G. McWhirter.
Channel Coding for Power Line Communication Based on Oversampled Filter Banks.
In L. Lampe, editor, *International Symposium on Power Line Communications and Its Applications*, pages 246–249, Vancouver, CA, April 6-8 2005.

[75] W. Liu and S. Weiss.
Wideband Beamforming — Concepts and Techniques.
Wiley, 2010.

[76] W. Liu, S. Weiss, and L. Hanzo.
A Novel Method for Partially Adaptive Broadband Beamforming.
In *IEEE Workshop on Signal Processing Systems*, pages 361–372, Antwerp, September 2001.

[77] W. Liu, S. Weiss, and L. Hanzo.
Subband Adaptive Broadband Beamforming.
In *Third Conference on Postgraduate Research in Electronics, Photonics, Communications and Software*, University of Keele, UK, April 2001. EPSRC.

[78] W. Liu, S. Weiss, and L. Hanzo.
Subband Adaptive Generalized Sidelobe Canceller for Broadband Beamforming.
In *11th IEEE Signal Processing Workshop on Statistical Signal Processing*, volume 1, pages 591–594, Singapore, August 2001.

[79] W. Liu, S. Weiss, and L. Hanzo.
Low-Complexity Frequency-Domain GSC for Broadband Beamforming.
In *6th International Conference on Signal Processing*, volume 1, pages 386–389, Bejing, China, August 26–30 2002.

[80] W. Liu, S. Weiss, and L. Hanzo.
Partially Adaptive Broadband Beamforming with a Subband Selective Transformation Matrix.
In *Sensor Array and Multichannel Signal Processing Workshop*, pages 43–47, Washington, DC, August 4–6 2002.

[81] W. Liu, S. Weiss, and L. Hanzo.
Subband-Selective Partially Adaptive Broadband Beamforming with Cosine-Modulated Blocking Matrix.
In *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, volume 3, pages 2913–2916, Orlando, FL, May 2002.

[82] W. Liu, S. Weiss, and L. Hanzo.
A Novel Method for Partially Adaptive Broadband Beamforming.
Journal of VLSI Signal Processing, 33(3):337–344, March 2003.
ISSN 0922-5773.

[83] W. Liu, S. Weiss, and L. Hanzo.
A Subband-Selective Transform-Domain GSC with Low Computational Complexity.
In *Seventh Conference on Postgraduate Research in Electronics, Photonics, Photonics, Communications and Software*, University of Exeter, UK, April 14–16 2003.

[84] J. G. McWhirter.
An algorithm for polynomial matrix SVD based on generalised Kogbetliantz transformations.
In *18th European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 457–461, Aalborg, Denmark, August 2010.

References XIII

[85] J. G. McWhirter and P. D. Baxter.
A Novel Technqiue for Broadband SVD.
In *12th Annual Workshop on Adaptive Sensor Array Processing*, MIT Lincoln Labs, Cambridge, MA, 2004.

[86] J. G. McWhirter, P. D. Baxter, T. Cooper, S. Redif, and J. Foster.
An EVD Algorithm for Para-Hermitian Polynomial Matrices.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 55(5):2158–2169, May 2007.

[87] X. Mestre and D. Gregoratti.
A parallel processing approach to filterbank multicarrier MIMO transmission under strong frequency selectivity.
In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pages 8078–8082, May 2014.

[88] A. Millar, S. Weiss, and R. Stewart.
THP transceiver design for MIMO relaying with direct link and partial CSI.
IEEE Communications Letters, 17(6):1204–1207, May 2013.

[89] A. Millar, S. Weiss, and R. Stewart.
Training based channel estimation algorithms for dual hop MIMO OFDM relay systems.
IEEE Transactions on Communications, 63(12):4711–4726, December 2015.

[90] A. P. Millar and S. Weiss.
Design of ZF and MMSE filter-banks in relay networks with average and peak power constraints.
In *IEEE Workshop on Statistical Signal Processing*, Cardiff, UK, August 2009.

[91] A. P. Millar and S. Weiss.
Transceiver design for non-regenerative MIMO relay systems with decision feedback detection.
In *18th European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 402–406, Aalborg, Denmark, August 2010.

References XIV

[92] A. P. Millar, S. Weiss, and R. W. Stewart.
Precoder design for MIMO relay networks with direct link and decision feedback equalisation.
IEEE Communications Letters, 15(10):1044–1046, October 2011.

[93] A. P. Millar, S. Weiss, and R. W. Stewart.
Tomlinson Harashima precoding design for non-regenerative MIMO relay networks.
In *IEEE 73rd Vehicular Technology Conference*, pages 1–5, Budapest, Hungary, May 2011.

[94] A. P. Millar, S. Weiss, and R. W. Stewart.
ZF DFE transceiver design for MIMO relay systems with direct source-destination link.
In *19th European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 1824–1828, Barcelona, Spain, August 2011.

[95] A. P. Millar, S. Weiss, and R. W. Stewart.
Robust transceiver design for mimo relay systems with tomlinson harashima precoding.
In *20th European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 1374–1378, Bukarest, Romania, August 2012.

[96] A. H. Moore, M. Brookes, and P. A. Naylor.
Room geometry estimation from a single channel acoustic impulse response.
In *21st European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 1–5, Sep. 2013.

[97] N. Moret, A. Tonello, and S. Weiss.
Mimo precoding for filter bank modulation systems based on psvd.
In *IEEE 73rd Vehicular Technology Conference*, pages 1–5, May 2011.
(best paper award).

[98] A. Nagy and S. Weiss.
Comparison of different filter-bank based multicarrier systems with fractionally spaced equalisation.
In *IMA International Conference on Mathematics in Signal Processing*, Birmingham, UK, December 2016.

[99] A. Nagy and S. Weiss.
Synchronisation and equalisation of an fbmc/oqam system by a polynomial matrix pseudo-inverse.
In *IEEE International Symposium on Signal Processing and Information Technology*, Bilbao, December 2017.

[100] A. A. Nagy and S. Weiss.
Channel equalisation of a MIMO FBMC/OQAM system using a polynomial matrix pseudo-inverse.
In *10th IEEE Workshop on Sensor Array and Multichannel Signal Processing*, April 2018.

[101] V. Neo, C. Evers, S. Weiss, and P. Naylor.
Signal compaction using polynomial EVD for spherical array processing with applications.
IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, submitted December 2022.

[102] V. Neo, S. Redif, J. McWhirter, J. Pestana, I. Proudler, S. Weiss, and N. P.A.
Polynomial eigenvalue decomposition for multichannel broadband signal processing.
IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, submitted November 2023.

[103] V. W. Neo and P. A. Naylor.
Second order sequential best rotation algorithm with householder reduction for polynomial matrix eigenvalue decomposition.
In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pages 8043–8047, Brighton, UK, May 2019.

[104] V. W. Neo, S. Weiss, S. W. McKnight, A. O. T. Hogg, and P. A. Naylor.
Polynomial eigenvalue decomposition-based target speaker voice activity detection in the presence of competing talkers.
In *17th International Workshop on Acoustic Signal Enhancement*, Bamberg, Germany, Sept. 2022.

[105] V. W. Neo, S. Weiss, and P. A. Naylor.
A polynomial subspace projection approach for the detection of weak voice activity.
In *Sensor Signal Processing for Defence Conference*, pages 1–5, London, UK, Sept. 2022.

References XVI

[106] A. I. Pérez-Neira, M. Caus, R. Zakaria, D. L. Ruyet, E. Kofidis, M. Haardt, X. Mestre, and Y. Cheng.
MIMO signal processing in offset-QAM based filter bank multicarrier systems.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 64(21):5733–5762, November 2016.

[107] S. Redif, J. McWhirter, and S. Weiss.
Design of FIR paraunitary filter banks for subband coding using a polynomial eigenvalue decomposition.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 59(11):5253–5264, November 2011.

[108] S. Redif, S. Weiss, and J. McWhirter.
Sequential matrix diagonalization algorithms for polynomial EVD of parahermitian matrices.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 63(1):81–89, January 2015.

[109] S. Redif, S. Weiss, and J. G. McWhirter.
An approximate polynomial matrix eigenvalue decomposition algorithm for para-hermitian matrices.
In *11th IEEE International Symposium on Signal Processing and Information Technology*, pages 421–425, Bilbao, Spain, December 2011.

[110] F. Rellich.
Störungstheorie der Spektralzerlegung. III. Mitteilung. Analytische, nicht notwendig beschränkte Störung.
Mathematische Annalen, 116:555–570, 1939.

[111] A. Scaglione, G. B. Giannakis, and S. Barbarossa.
Filterbank Transceivers Optimizing Information Rate in Block Transmission over Dispersive Channels.
IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 45(4):1019–1032, April 1999.

[112] A. Scaglione, G. B. Giannakis, and S. Barbarossa.
Redundant Filterbank Precoders and Equalizers. I. Unification and Optimal Designs.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 47(7):1988–2006, July 1999.

[113] A. Scaglione, G. B. Giannakis, and S. Barbarossa.
Redundant Filterbank Precoders and Equalizers. II. Blind Channel Estimation, Synchronization, and Direct Equalization.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 47(7):2007–2022, July 1999.

[114] J. Selva.
An efficient structure for the design of variable fractional delay filters based on the windowing method.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 56(8):3770–3775, August 2008.

[115] H. Solomon and M. A. Stephens.
Distribution of a sum of weighted chi-square variables.
Journal of the American Statistical Association, 72(360):881–885, 1977.

[116] C. H. Ta and S. Weiss.
Design of Precoding and Equalisation for MIMO Broadband Transmission.
In S. Weiss, editor, *IEE/EURASIP Conference on DSP Enabled Radio*, volume 2005/11086, pages 30/1–30/5, Southampton, UK, September 2005.

[117] C. H. Ta and S. Weiss.
A Design of Precoding and Equalisation for Broadband MIMO Systems.
In *15th International Conference on Digital Signal Processing*, pages 571–574, Cardiff, UK, July 2007.

[118] C. H. Ta and S. Weiss.
A design of precoding and equalisation for broadband MIMO systems.
In *Forty-First Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, pages 1616–1620, Pacific Grove, CA, USA, Nov. 2007.

[119] C. H. Ta and S. Weiss.
A Jointly Optimal Precoder and Block Decision Feedback Equaliser Design With Low Redundancy.
In *15th European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 489–492, Poznan, Poland, September 2007.

[120] C. H. Ta and S. Weiss.
Shortening the order of paraunitary matrices in SBR2 algorithm.
In *6th International Conference on Information, Communications & Signal Processing*, pages 1–5, Singapore, Dec. 2007.

[121] M. Tohidian, H. Amindavar, and A. M. Reza.
A DFT-based approximate eigenvalue and singular value decomposition of polynomial matrices.
EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing, 2013(1):1–16, 2013.

[122] P. P. Vaidyanathan.
Multirate Digital Filters, Filter Banks, Polyphase Networks, and Applications: A Tutorial.
Proceedings of the IEEE, 78(1):56–93, January 1990.

[123] P. P. Vaidyanathan.
Multirate Systems and Filter Banks.
Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1993.

[124] B. D. Van Veen and K. M. Buckley.
Beamforming: A Versatile Approach to Spatial Filtering.
IEEE Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing Magazine, 5(2):4–24, April 1988.

[125] Z. Wang, J. McWhirter, J. Corr, and S. Weiss.
Order-controlled multiple shift sbr2 algorithm for para-hermitian polynomial matrices.
In *9th IEEE Sensor Array and Multichannel Signal Processing Workshop*, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, July 2016.

[126] Z. Wang, J. G. McWhirter, J. Corr, and S. Weiss.
Multiple shift second order sequential best rotation algorithm for polynomial matrix EVD.
In *23rd European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 844–848, Nice, France, September 2015.

[127] S. Weiss.
Design of Overcomplete Expansions for Channel Coding.
In *6th IMA International Conference on Mathematics in Signal Processing*, volume 1, pages 215–218, Royal Agricultural College, Cirencester, UK, December 14–16, 2004.

[128] S. Weiss.
On the design of oversampled filter banks for channel coding.
In *European Signal Processing Conference*, volume 1, pages 885–888, Vienna, Austria, September 2004.
invited paper.

[129] S. Weiss, M. Alrmah, S. Lambotharan, J. McWhirter, and M. Kaveh.
Broadband angle of arrival estimation methods in a polynomial matrix decomposition framework.
In *IEEE 5th International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing*, pages 109–112, Dec 2013.

[130] S. Weiss, S. Bendoukha, A. Alzin, F. Coutts, I. Proudler, and J. Chambers.
MVDR broadband beamforming using polynomial matrix techniques.
In *23rd European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 839–843, Nice, France, September 2015.

[131] S. Weiss, C. Delaosa, J. Matthews, I. Proudler, and B. Jackson.
Detection of weak transient signals using a broadband subspace approach.
In *International Conference on Sensor Signal Processing for Defence*, pages 65–69, Edinburgh, Scotland, Sept. 2021.

[132] S. Weiss, N. J. Goddard, S. Somasundaram, I. K. Proudler, and P. A. Naylor.
Identification of broadband source-array responses from sensor second order statistics.
In *Sensor Signal Processing for Defence Conference*, pages 1–5, London, UK, December 2017.

[133] S. Weiss and M. D. Macleod.
Maximally smooth dirichlet interpolation from complete and incomplete sample points on the unit circle.
In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, Brighton, UK, May 2019.

[134] S. Weiss, J. Pestana, and I. K. Proudler.
On the existence and uniqueness of the eigenvalue decomposition of a parahermitian matrix.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 66(10):2659–2672, May 2018.

[135] S. Weiss, J. Pestana, I. K. Proudler, and F. K. Coutts.
Corrections to "on the existence and uniqueness of the eigenvalue decomposition of a parahermitian matrix".
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 66(23):6325–6327, Dec 2018.

[136] S. Weiss, I. Proudler, F. Coutts, and J. Deeks.
Extraction of analytic eigenvectors from a parahermitian matrix.
In *International Conference on Sensor Signal Processing or Defence*, Edinburgh, UK, 2020.

[137] S. Weiss and I. K. Proudler.
Comparing Efficient Broadband Beamforming Architectures and Their Performance Trade-Offs.
In *14th International Conference on Digital Signal Processing*, volume I, pages 417–422, Santorini, Greece, July 1–3 2002.
(invited paper).

[138] S. Weiss, I. K. Proudler, G. Barbarino, J. Pestana, and J. G. McWhirter.
On properties and structure of the analytic singular value decomposition.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 2023.
to be submitted.

[139] S. Weiss, I. K. Proudler, and F. K. Coutts.
Eigenvalue decomposition of a parahermitian matrix: extraction of analytic eigenvalues.
IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 69:722–737, 2021.

[140] S. Weiss, I. K. Proudler, F. K. Coutts, and J. Pestana.
Iterative approximation of analytic eigenvalues of a parahermitian matrix EVD.
In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, Brighton, UK, May 2019.

[141] S. Weiss, I. K. Proudler, and M. D. Macleod.
Measuring smoothness of real-valued functions defined by sample points on the unit circle.
In *Sensor Signal Processing in Defence Conference*, Brighton, UK, May 2019.

[142] S. Weiss, S. Redif, T. Cooper, C. Liu, P. Baxter, and J. McWhirter.
Paraunitary oversampled filter bank design for channel coding.
EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing, 2006:1–10, 2006.

[143] S. Weiss, G. W. Rice, and R. W. Stewart.
Multichannel Equalization in Subbands.
In *IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics*, pages 203–206, New Paltz, NY, October 1999.

[144] S. Weiss, S. J. Schlecht, O. Das, and E. de Sena.
Polynomial Procrustes problem: Paraunitary approximation of matrices of analytic functions.
In *EUSIPCO*, Helsinki, Finland, 2023.

[145] S. Weiss, J. Selva, and M. D. Macleod.
Measuring smoothness of trigonometric interpolation through incomplete sample points.
In *28th European Signal Processing Conference*, pages 2319–2323, Amsterdam, Netherlands, Jan. 2021.

[146] S. Weiss, R. W. Stewart, and W. Liu.
A Broadband Adaptive Beamforming Structure with Scaled Aperture.
In *Thirty-Sixth Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, volume 2, pages 1298–1302, Pacific Grove, CA, November 3–6 2002.

[147] S. Weiss, R. W. Stewart, A. Stenger, and R. Rabenstein.
Performance Limitations of Subband Adaptive Filters.
In *9th European Signal Processing Conference*, volume III, pages 1245–1248, Rodos, Greece, September 1998.

[148] S. Weiss, C. H. Ta, and C. Liu.
A wiener filter approach to the design of filter bank based single-carrier precoding and equalisation.
In *IEEE International Symposium on Power Line Communications and Its Applications*, pages 493–498, Pisa, Italy, March 26-28 2007.

[149] S. Weiss, P. Yarr, W. Al-Hanafy, A. Millar, and C.-H. Ta.
An oversampled modulated filter bank transmultiplexer with precoding and equalisation.
In *Third Workshop on Power Line Communications*, Udine, Italy, October 2009.