way that each position provides a time-adjusted null constraint to the other in a linearly constrained adaptive beamforming. This multisource structure [13] performs better than MUSIC in both mobile and immove cases, as shown in Fig. 3(b). It is one of the issues reported in [13], among other generalizations [14].
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I. INTRODUCTION

The so-called blind channel identification, i.e., identifying a channel using only the channel output, has attracted increasing research attention in recent years. Since the publication of [7], several interesting eigenstructure-based approaches [2], [4], [5] have been proposed. In some simulations, there is a significant performance improvement over the algorithm proposed in [7] and [8]. Much of the performance gain can be credited to the exploitation of the special structure of the so-called filtering transform. Under the identifiability condition [5], the first two such algorithms are the subspace approach (SS) proposed by Moulines et al. [3], and the least-squares approach (LS) proposed in [2]. Stock also derived similar results using linear prediction techniques [5]. The SS method is based on the following two key results: i) The signal subspace uniquely determines the channel impulse response, and ii) the channel vector is orthogonal to the filtering transform of the noise subspace. The SS approach, on the other hand, is derived by exploiting the single-input multiple-output nature of the identification procedure.

In this correspondence, we investigate connections between the SS and LS approaches. Assuming that the same data window is used, the LS and SS approaches can be derived from the same covariance matrix of the channel outputs. The identification equations and the uniqueness of their solutions are shown in the same framework. The approach presented here offers a unified view of the two methods. The second result of this paper is to show that the two estimators are in fact identical for the special case involving two subchannels. This case is of particular importance since it corresponds to the $T/2$-fractional sampled channel that is popular in communication applications. Differences between the two approaches are also revealed in our new derivation.

II. THE MODEL

A. Channel Model and Assumptions

We consider the blind channel identification of a discrete-time single-input multiple-output model given by

$$x_i(t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{T} h_i(n)w_{i,n}. $$
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TABLE I
MODEL DEFINITION AND AN EXAMPLE. SUBSCRIPT H AND T DENOTE CONJUGATE TRANSPOSE AND TRANSPOSE, RESPECTIVELY. \( h_i \) IS A \((L + 1) \times (2L + 1)\) MATRIX. \( h_{M,L}(h) \) IS A \((L + 1) \times (2L + 1)\) MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>the number of subchannels.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( h_i(z) )</td>
<td>( h_i(z) = h_i(0) + h_i(1)z^{-1} + \cdots + h_i(L_i)z^{-L_i} )</td>
<td>( h_1(z) = 0.4 + 0.6z^{-1}, \ h_2(z) = 0.5 + 0.3z^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L )</td>
<td>( L = \max{\deg(h_i(z))} )</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( h )</td>
<td>( h = [h_1^H, \ldots, h_M^H]^H )</td>
<td>( h = [0.4, 0.6]^T, \ h_2 = [0.5, 0.3]^T )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{x}_i(t) )</td>
<td>( \bar{x}_i(t) = [x_i(t), \ldots, x_i(t - L)]^T )</td>
<td>( \bar{x}_i(t) = [x(t), x(t - 1)]^T, \ i = 1, 2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x(t) )</td>
<td>( x(t) = [\bar{x}_1^H, \ldots, \bar{x}_M^H]^H )</td>
<td>( x(t) = [x(t), x(t - 1)]^T )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_i(t) )</td>
<td>( y_i(t) = [y_i(0), \ldots, y_i(t - L)]^T )</td>
<td>( y_i(t) = [y(t), y(t - 1)]^T, \ i = 1, 2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y(t) )</td>
<td>( y(t) = [y_1^H, \ldots, y_M^H]^H )</td>
<td>( y(t) = [y(t), y(t - 1)]^T )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( w(t) )</td>
<td>( w(t) = [w_1, \ldots, w_{2L+1}]^T )</td>
<td>( w(t) = [w(t), w(t - 1), w(t - 2)]^T )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\mathcal{F}_L(h_i) = \begin{pmatrix}
    {h_i(0)}^T & \cdots & {h_i(L_i)}^T \\
    \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    {h_i(0)}^T & \cdots & {h_i(L_i)}^T
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
\mathcal{H}_{M,L}(h) = \mathcal{F}_L(h_1) \cdots \mathcal{F}_L(h_M)^H
\]

where the \( \{h_i(t)\} \) are impulse responses of subchannels to be estimated using observations \( \{y_i(t)\} \). Under the notation given in Table I, a vector representation of (1) is given by

\[
x(t) = \mathcal{H}_{M,L}(h) w(t),
\]

\[
y(t) = x(t) + n(t).
\]

We impose the following assumptions in the sequel:

A1) Subchannels do not share common zeros, i.e., \( \bigcap_{i=1}^M \mathcal{Z}[h_i(z)] = \emptyset \), where \( \mathcal{Z}[h_i(z)] \) denotes the zeros of the polynomial \( h_i(z) \).

A2) The input sequence \( \{w_i\} \) is wide-sense stationary with zero mean and correlation \( R_w = E[w(t)w(t)^H] > 0 \).

A3) The noise \( n(t) \) is white with zero mean and variance \( \sigma^2 \).

Note that A1 ensures channel identifiability, and it also implies that \( \mathcal{H}_{M,L}(h) \) has a full column rank [6].

B. The Multichannel Filtering and Data Selection Transforms

The multichannel filtering transform (MFT) \( \mathcal{H}_{M,L}(B) \) plays the key role in the development of the subspace approach to blind channel identification and estimation. For the least-squares approach, on the other hand, it is the so-called data selection transform (DST) defined below that combines output from different channels to form identification equations. These two transforms have some similar properties, such as linearity and symmetry. More important, they are related by properties of orthogonality and commutativity, which form the basis of connecting the SS and LS approaches.

Let \( B \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times (L+1)} \) be a matrix consisting of vectors \( b^{(j)}_i = [b^{(j)}_i(0), \ldots, b^{(j)}_i(L)]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{L+1} \).

\[
B = \begin{pmatrix}
    B_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    B_M
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
    \begin{pmatrix}
    b^{(1)}_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    b^{(1)}_M
\end{pmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{pmatrix}
    b^{(1)}_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    b^{(1)}_M
\end{pmatrix} \\
    \begin{pmatrix}
    b^{(2)}_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    b^{(2)}_M
\end{pmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{pmatrix}
    b^{(2)}_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    b^{(2)}_M
\end{pmatrix} \\
    \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    \begin{pmatrix}
    b^{(M)}_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    b^{(M)}_M
\end{pmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{pmatrix}
    b^{(M)}_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    b^{(M)}_M
\end{pmatrix}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

1) Multichannel Filtering Transform (MFT) [3]:

\[
\mathcal{H}_{M,L}(B) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix}
    \mathcal{F}_L(b^{(1)}_1) & \cdots & \mathcal{F}_L(b^{(1)}_M) \\
    \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    \mathcal{F}_L(b^{(M)}_1) & \cdots & \mathcal{F}_L(b^{(M)}_M)
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\mathcal{F}_L(b^{(j)}_i) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix}
    b^{(j)}_i(0) & \cdots & b^{(j)}_i(L)
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(4)
2) Data Selection Transform (DST) [2]: We have (5), which appears at the bottom of the page, where \( B^* \) is the complex conjugate of \( B \), \( \otimes \) denotes the Kronecker product,

\[
T = [T_{12}, \cdots, T_{1M}, \cdots, T_{(M-1)M}] \otimes L_{+1}
\]

and \( T_{ij}, (i < j) \) is a \( M \times M \) matrix whose \((i, j)\)th entry is 1 and \((j, i)\)th entry is \(-1\) and is zero elsewhere. \( \mathbf{I} \) is an \([M(M-1)/2] \times [M(M-1)/2]\) identity matrix.

The following properties are direct consequences of the definitions. Let \( A \in C^{M(M-1)/2} \times A \in C^{M(M-1)/2} \times 2 \), and \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C} \), then and

\[
\text{Symmetry:} \quad A^H \mathcal{M}_L(B) = 0 \iff B^H \mathcal{M}_L(A) = 0
\]

Orthogonality:

\[
\mathcal{D}_M,L(h)^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) = 0.
\]

Commutativity:

\[
\mathcal{H}_M,L(\mathcal{D}_M,L(h)) = \mathcal{D}_M,L(\mathcal{H}_M,L(h)).
\]

Remarks:

1) The symmetry property is based on the commutativity of convolution. Equation (7) was also given in [3] and [5].

2) Orthogonality and commutativity between MFT and DST are special features of SIMO system, which are key properties used in this paper.

3) We note that in general, the columns of \( \mathcal{D}_M,L(h) \) do not provide the entire null space. The construction of the orthogonal complement of the channel matrix is given in [1].

III. A CONNECTION BETWEEN THE LS AND THE SS APPROACHES

Although the SS and LS approaches are motivated differently, they can be derived in the same framework using properties of MFT and DST. We examine their connections in both identification and estimation aspects.

A. Identification Equations

The covariance matrix of received data is given by

\[
\mathbf{R}_y(h) = E[y(t)y^H(t)] = \mathcal{H}_M,L(h) \mathbf{R}_u \mathcal{H}_M,L(h)^H + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}. \tag{11}
\]

Let the singular value decomposition (SVD) of \( \mathbf{R}_y(h) \) be

\[
\mathbf{R}_y(h) = \mathbf{U}_c(h) \Lambda(h) \mathbf{U}_c(h)^H + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I},
\]

where \( \mathbf{U}_c(h) \) consists of the singular vectors associated with singular values greater than \( \sigma^2 \), and \( \mathbf{U}_n(h) \) consists of the singular vectors associated with singular values equal to \( \sigma^2 \). Columns of \( \mathbf{U}_c(h) \) and \( \mathbf{U}_n(h) \) span the “signal” and “noise” subspaces, respectively. The following theorem gives the identification equations for LS and SS methods and shows the uniqueness of their identification.

Theorem 1: Given \( \mathbf{R}_u(h) \) and its noise eigenmatrix \( \mathbf{U}_n(h) \), the following relationships (13)–(15) hold and are as well equivalent.

\[
a) \quad h = \alpha h, \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \Rightarrow h_i(z) = j(z) h_i(z), \quad \forall i, j \tag{13}
\]

\[
b) \quad h^H \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{I} \otimes [\mathbf{R}_n(h) - \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}]) h^H = 0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_M,L(h)^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) = 0 \tag{14}
\]

\[
c) \quad h^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) \mathbf{U}_n(h) h^H = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{U}_n(h)^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) \mathbf{U}_n(h) = 0 \tag{15}
\]

where \( h_i(z) \) and \( h_n(z) \) are \( z \)-transforms of \( h_i(u) \) and \( h_n(u) \), respectively.

Remark: Equations (14) and (15) in b) and c) provide identification equations of the LS and the SS methods, respectively. The equivalence of a), b), and c) shows that the identification equations of LS and SS have a unique solution. Differences between the LS and SS approaches are also evident from (14) and (15). The SS method uses the entire noise subspace spanned by the columns of \( \mathbf{U}_n(h) \), whereas the LS method uses only the noise subspace spanned by the columns of \( \mathcal{D}_M,L(h) \). In particular, \( \{\mathcal{D}_M,L(h)\} \subseteq \{\mathbf{U}_n(h)\} \). The use of the entire noise subspace is not necessary. Moulines et al. also gave a variation of the SS approach by using a part of the noise subspace [3].

Proof: First, we prove the equivalences within a), b), and c).

The equivalence in c) is an obvious consequence of the symmetry property of MFT (7). For a), it is obvious that \( h = \alpha h \Rightarrow h_i(z) = h_j(z) \), \( \forall i, j \). To show the converse of \( \{\mathcal{H}_M,L(h)\} \subseteq \{\mathbf{U}_n(h)\} \cup \{\mathbf{U}_c(h)\} \). Hence, under \( \mathbf{A} \), \( \mathcal{H}_M,L(h) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_M,L(h) \cup \mathcal{H}_M,L(h) = \mathcal{H}_M,L(h) \cup \mathcal{H}_M,L(h) \). Since \( \text{deg} \{h_i(z)\} \leq L, h_i(z) = \alpha h_i(z) \) for an arbitrary constant \( \alpha \). For b)

\[
h^H \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{I} \otimes [\mathbf{R}_n(h) - \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}]) h^H = 0 \tag{16}
\]

\[
\Rightarrow h^H \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathcal{M}_L(h)^H \mathbf{R}_n \mathcal{M}_L(h)^H) h^H = 0
\]

\[
\Rightarrow h^H \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathcal{H}_M,L(h))^H \mathbf{R}_n (\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{R}_n)^H h^H
\]

\[
\Rightarrow h^H \mathcal{D}_M,L(h)^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) = 0
\]

Since \( \mathbf{R}_u(h) > 0 \), \( h^H \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{I} \otimes [\mathbf{R}_n(h) - \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}]) h^H = 0 \) if and only if \( h^H \mathcal{D}_M,L(h)^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) = 0 \). By the commutativity property (10), \( h^H \mathcal{D}_M,L(h)^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) = 0 \). By the symmetry property (7), \( \mathcal{D}_M,L(h)^H \mathcal{H}_M,L(h) = 0 \). Now, we prove that

1) a) \( \Rightarrow \) c): Since \( \mathbf{U}_n(h)^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) = 0 \), therefore, \( \mathbf{U}_n(h)^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) = 0 \).

2) c) \( \Rightarrow \) b): From the orthogonality property, \( \mathcal{D}_M,L(h)^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) = 0 \). From (15), there is an \( \mathbf{A} \) such that \( \mathcal{D}_M,L(h) = \mathbf{U}_c(h) \mathbf{A} \). We now have \( \mathcal{D}_M,L(h)^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) = \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{U}_n(h)^H \mathcal{M}_L(h) = 0 \).

3) b) \( \Rightarrow \) a): \( \mathcal{D}_M,L(h)^H \mathcal{H}_M,L(h) = 0 \) is the matrix form of \( h_i(z) h_i(z) = h_j(z) h_j(z), \forall i, j \). □

\[
\mathbf{D}_M,L(h) = \begin{pmatrix}
B_2 & B_3 & \cdots & B_M \\
-B_1 & B_1 & \cdots & B_M \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
-B_1 & \cdots & -B_2 & B_{M-1}
\end{pmatrix}^* = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{B}^*) \tag{5}
\]
B. The LS and SS Estimators

In channel estimation, $\mathbf{R}_n(h)$ may be replaced by the sample covariance $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_n$. There is a number of different implementations of the LS and SS methods (see e.g., [2] and [3]). In this correspondence, we shall consider the LS and SS estimators defined by

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{LS} = \arg\min_{\|\hat{h}\|_1} \| \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{I} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}) \hat{h} \|,$$  \hfill (19)

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{SS} = \arg\min_{\|\hat{h}\|_1} \| \mathbf{H}_M \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{\mathbf{U}}_n) \mathbf{H}_M \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{\mathbf{U}}_n) \hat{h} \|.$$  \hfill (20)

In the original development [2], the LS estimator was referred to as a deterministic approach that minimizes the following least-squares cost: $\min_{\|\hat{h}\|_1} \| \mathbf{D}_M \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{\mathbf{U}}_n) \mathbf{H}_M \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{\mathbf{U}}_n) \hat{h} \|^2$. Since $\mathbf{D}_M \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{\mathbf{U}}_n) = \mathbf{H}_M \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{\mathbf{U}}_n) \mathbf{H}_M \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{\mathbf{U}}_n)$, it is easy to verify that this optimization is equivalent to (19). The following theorem shows that when $M = 2$, the two estimators are identical.

**Theorem 2:** When $M = 2$, $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{LS} = \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{SS}$ with probability one.

**Proof:** For this case, $\mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{h}) = \mathbf{T} \mathbf{g}^*$, and $\mathbf{T} = [\mathbf{T}] \otimes \mathbf{L}_{1,1} = [\mathbf{T}] \otimes \mathbf{L}_{1,1}$ is an orthogonal matrix. Assumption A1 implies that (see [6]) rank $[\mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_L (\mathbf{g})] = 2L + 1$. The dimension of the noise subspace of $\mathbf{U}_n(h)$ is $1$. Therefore, range $[\mathbf{U}_n(h)] = \text{range} \{ [\mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{h})] \} = \text{range} \{ \mathbf{T} \mathbf{g}^* \}$. When the sample covariance $\mathbf{R}_n$ is used, the estimated noise subspace is given by the eigenvector $\mathbf{g}$ associated with the smallest eigenvalue. Note also that with probability 1, $\mathbf{g}$ satisfies assumption A1. Hence $\mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_L (\mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{g}$ is row-rank deficient by 1. Again, by the orthogonality property, $\mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{H}_L (\mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{g}$. Therefore

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{SS} = \arg\min_{\|\hat{h}\|_1} \| \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_L (\mathbf{g}) \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_L (\mathbf{g}) \hat{h} \|.$$  \hfill (21)

On the other hand, since $\mathbf{T}$ is orthogonal

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{LS} = \arg\min_{\|\hat{h}\|_1} \| \mathbf{T} \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{h}) \|$$

$$= \arg\min_{\|\hat{h}\|_1} \| (\mathbf{T} \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{h})) \|$$

$$= (\mathbf{T} \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{h}))^{-1} \arg\min_{\|\hat{h}\|_1} \| \mathbf{T} \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_L (\hat{h}) \|.$$  \hfill (22)

We now have shown that the two estimators are identical.

IV. CONCLUSION

By exploiting key properties of the multichannel filtering and the data selection transforms, we have presented a unified presentation of identification and estimation using LS and SS approaches. We also show that the two estimators are identical for the special case that there are two subchannels. The differences between the two approaches are revealed in their realizations of the noise subspace, especially when more than two subchannels are involved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to acknowledge comments from Prof. Willett that improved the presentation of this paper.

REFERENCES


Alignment Blur in Coherently Averaged Images

D. M. Monro and D. M. Simpson

Abstract—Blurring of coherently averaged images due to imperfect alignment is studied, and two restoration methods are proposed and evaluated. It is shown that iterative realignment is more powerful than post-filtering in reducing blur. The value of averaging and restoration is illustrated on human subjects in noisy video sequences.

I. INTRODUCTION

In signal and image processing applications, data is often corrupted by noise, and many techniques have been proposed to reduce its effect. If multiple aligned versions of the data are available, each with uncorrelated additive noise, signal averaging will increase the signal-to-noise-ratio (SNR). This technique is widely applied in signal processing but is used less often in the enhancement of images, perhaps because of the additional degrees of freedom arising from the
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