Research Article About Noneigenvector Source Localization Methods

S. Bourennane, C. Fossati, and J. Marot

Ecole Centrale Marseille, Institut Fresnel, UMR 6133 CNRS, Universités Aix Marseille, Campus de Saint Jérôme, 13397 Marseille Cedex 20, France

Correspondence should be addressed to S. Bourennane, salah.bourennane@fresnel.fr

Received 23 August 2007; Revised 30 January 2008; Accepted 21 April 2008

Recommended by Fulvio Gini

Previous studies dedicated to source localization are based on the spectral matrix algebraic properties. In particular, two noneigenvector methods, namely, propagator and Ermolaev and Gershman (EG) algorithms, exhibit a low computational load. Both methods are based on spectral matrix structure. The first method is based on the spectral matrix partitioning. The second one obtains directly an approximation of noise subspace using an adjustable power parameter of the spectral matrix and choosing a threshold value. It has been shown that these algorithms are efficient in nonnoisy or high signal to noise ratio (SNR) environments. However, both algorithms will be improved. Firstly, propagator is not robust to noise. Secondly, EG algorithm that requires the knowledge of a threshold value between largest and smallest eigenvalues, which are not available as eigendecomposition, is not performed. In this paper, we aim firstly at demonstrating the usefulness of QR and LU factorizations of the spectral matrix for these methods and secondly we propose a new way to reduce the computational load of a high resolution algorithm by estimating only the needed eigenvectors. For this, we adapt fixed-point algorithm to compute only the leading eigenvectors. We evaluate the performance of the proposed methods by a comparative study.

Copyright © 2008 S. Bourennane et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. INTRODUCTION

The most popular high-resolution method for source localisation is multiple signal classification (MUSIC) [1, 2]. The principles of this method are to exploit the structure of the vector space which is spanned by the measures collected upon the sensors. This vector space is the direct sum of the signal subspace and the noise subspace, which are orthogonal. In the MUSIC method, the orthogonality between signal and noise subspaces is exploited. Source localization is based on the structure of the spectral matrix of the sensor outputs, that is, the Fourier domain version of the covariance matrix of the received signals. To cope with a spatially correlated additive noise, the appropriate "cumulant matrix" of the signals [3, 4] is used instead of spectral matrix. In practice, the main limitation for real-time implementation of the highresolution methods is the computational load. In the last two decades, several algorithms without eigendecomposition have been proposed [5-8]. In [5], propagator method is developed. It is based upon spectral matrix partitioning. In [6, 7], fast algorithms for estimating the noise subspace projection matrix are proposed. These algorithms require a

prior knowledge of threshold value and an adjustable power parameter. The problem of the choice of threshold value is not completely solved. Independently, Bischof and Shroff [8], and Strobach [9] developed two other noneigenvector algorithms for source localization based on QR factorization. All these algorithms [5–9] assume that the number of sources is known. The existing criteria [10–13] cannot be applied because the noneigenvector algorithms do not calculate the eigenvalues of the spectral matrix.

In this paper, we propose new versions of the propagator and EG localization methods [5, 7] which employ a factorized spectral matrix and which are efficient in noisy situations. To this end, we use the upper triangular matrices obtained by the LU or QR factorizations of the spectral matrix. We also propose a noneigenvector version of MUSIC algorithm, where singular value decomposition (SVD) is replaced by a faster algorithm to compute leading eigenvectors.

Following [8, 9, 14, 15] the upper triangular matrices obtained by the LU or QR factorizations of the spectral matrix contain the main information concerning the eigenelements of the spectral matrix. Both methods are meant to concentrate all the signal information in the upperleft corner block matrix of the upper triangular matrix.

We recall that the LU factorization [14, 15] consists in decomposing the spectral matrix Γ as Γ = LU where L is a unity lower triangular matrix ("unity" meaning that $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}^{H} = \mathbf{I}$, where superscript $(\cdot)^{H}$ represents the Hermitian transposition of (\cdot) and **U** is an upper triangular matrix (UTM). QR factorization consists in decomposing the spectral matrix Γ as Γ = **QR** where **Q** is a unitary matrix and R is UTM [14, 15]. In both factorizations, it has been shown that the diagonal elements of R or U matrices tend to the eigenvalues of the spectral matrix in decreasing order [14, 15]. We propose to use these elements to estimate the number of sources and to determine the threshold value needed in Ermolaev and Gershman algorithm [7]. We also exploit the benefit of the factorization algorithm regarding the new rearrangement of the elements of the spectral matrix in the resulting upper triangular matrices R or U. All the signal information is focused in the upper-left corner block matrix of size equal to the number of sources. This block matrix contains the largest diagonal elements of the factorized matrix. In other words, it concentrates the signal information which is scattered in all spectral matrix elements. This concentration improves the propagator operator. Indeed, according to the partitioning procedure defined in the propagator method [5], when we use R or U, the estimation of the propagator uses this block matrix. This is in accordance with the principle of the propagator theory, and the obtained result is similar to that obtained in the nonnoisy case. This new way leads to minimize the influence of model errors. This permits the propagator method to estimate accurately the directions-ofarrival of the sources in the presence of noise.

We also propose a new solution to accelerate the subspace-based high-resolution method. A fixed-point algorithm is adapted to compute the leading eigenvectors from the spectral matrix.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: problem statement is presented in Section 2. In Section 3, we give an overview of the propagator localization method and the outline of Ermolaev and Gershman algorithm. Section 4 details improved versions of propagator and EG methods. In particular it describes the propagator estimation using LU or QR factorization. It also details the estimation of the threshold value for the EG method. It presents how a statistical criterion can be adapted to the estimation of the number of sources. It provides a solution to accelerate the subspace-based high-resolution MUSIC method, using fixed-point algorithm. Section 5 provides a study about performance analysis of the reviewed methods. Section 6 provides the numerical complexity of the reviewed and proposed algorithms. Comparative results are given in Section 7 on simulated data. Last section concludes the paper.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider an array of *N* sensors receiving the wave field generated by P (P < N) narrow-band sources in the presence of an additive noise. The received signal vector is sampled

and the FFT algorithm is used to transform the data into the frequency domain, we present these samples by [1, 2, 5]

$$\mathbf{x}(f) = \mathbf{A}(f)\mathbf{s}(f) + \mathbf{n}(f).$$
(1)

In the rest of the paper the frequency f is omitted. In (1) **x** is the Fourier transform of the array output vector,

$$\mathbf{s} = \begin{bmatrix} s_1, \dots, s_P \end{bmatrix}^T \tag{2}$$

is the signal source vector, and

$$\mathbf{n} = [n_1, \dots, n_N]^T \tag{3}$$

is the additive noise vector. The $(N \times P)$ matrix

$$\mathbf{A} = \left[\mathbf{a}(\theta_1), \dots, \mathbf{a}(\theta_P) \right] \tag{4}$$

is the transfer matrix of the sources-sensors array system with respect to a chosen reference point. The steering vectors $\mathbf{a}(\theta_i)$, where θ_i , i = 1, ..., P, is the DOA of the *i*th source measured with respect to the normal of the array. For a linear uniform array with N sensors the steering vector is

$$\mathbf{a}(\theta_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left[1, e^{-j\varphi_i}, e^{-2j\varphi_i}, \dots, e^{-(N-1)j\varphi_i} \right]^T, \qquad (5)$$

where $\varphi_i = 2\pi f(d/c) \sin(\theta_i)$, *d* is the sensor spacing, and *c* is the wave propagation velocity. Assume that the signals and the additive noises are stationary and ergodic zero-mean complex-valued random processes. In addition, the noises are assumed to be uncorrelated between sensors, and to have identical variance σ^2 in each sensor. It follows from these assumptions that the spatial $(N \times N)$ spectral matrix of the observation vector is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{s}\mathbf{A}^{H} + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{n}, \tag{6}$$

where

$$\Gamma = E[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^{H}],$$

$$\Gamma_{s} = E[\mathbf{s}\mathbf{s}^{H}],$$

$$\Gamma_{r} = E[\mathbf{n}\mathbf{n}^{H}] = \sigma^{2}\mathbf{I},$$
(7)

where $E[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation operator and I is the ($N \times N$) identity matrix.

In the following, the propagator and EG algorithms are presented and improved.

3. OVERVIEW OF EXISTING NONEIGENVECTOR METHODS

We present in this section two noneigenvector methods, propagator and "Ermolaev and Gershman" methods.

3.1. Propagator method

3.1.1. Principles of propagator method

Propagator method [5, 16] relies on the partition of the transfer matrix **A**. Providing that **A** is full rank *P*, and the

first rows are linearly independent, there exists a $P \times (N - P)$ matrix Π_{Γ} called propagator operator, such that [5]

$$\widetilde{A} = \Pi_{\Gamma}^{H} \overline{A}, \tag{8}$$

where \overline{A} and \overline{A} are the $P \times P$ and $(N - P) \times P$ block matrices, respectively, obtained by partitioning the transfer matrix A:

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{\mathbf{A}}^T & \widetilde{\mathbf{A}}^T \end{bmatrix}^T.$$
(9)

Define the $N \times (N - P)$ matrix \mathbf{D}_{Γ} :

$$\mathbf{D}_{\Gamma} = \begin{bmatrix} \Pi_{\Gamma}^{T} & -\mathbf{I}_{N-P} \end{bmatrix}^{T}, \tag{10}$$

where I_{N-P} is the $(N - P) \times (N - P)$ identity matrix. Now, using (8) and (9), we have

$$\mathbf{D}_{\Gamma}^{H}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{\Pi}_{\Gamma}^{H}\,\overline{\mathbf{A}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{0}.$$
 (11)

In other words, the (N - P) columns of \mathbf{D}_{Γ} are orthogonal to the columns of \mathbf{A} . This means that the subspace spanned by the columns of the matrix \mathbf{D}_{Γ} is the same as the subspace spanned by the noise subspace given by the eigenvectors associated with the (N - P) smallest eigenvalues of matrix Γ . We then obtain the DOAs of the sources by the peak positions in the so-called spatial spectrum [5, 14]:

$$F_{\Pr}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}(\theta)^H & \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma} & \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma}^H & \mathbf{a}(\theta) \end{bmatrix}^{-1}.$$
 (12)

Equation (12) shows that the propagator algorithm is based on the noise subspace spanned by the columns of matrix D_{Γ} . The computation of matrix D_{Γ} requires a prior knowledge of the sources DOAs ((8) and (10)). In practice, these DOAs are unknown. However, the matrix D_{Γ} must be estimated only from the received data [5, 17].

3.1.2. Estimation of the propagator from the received signals

We define the data matrix **X** containing all *K* signal realizations as $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_K]$.

Matrix **X** is partitioned (in the same way as in (9)) as $\mathbf{X} = [\overline{\mathbf{X}}^T \ \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}^T]^T$. The resulting spectral matrix will be expressed as follows [18]:

$$\mathbf{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{11} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_p & \mathbf{\Gamma}_{11} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\Gamma} \\ \mathbf{\Pi}_{\Gamma}^H \mathbf{\Gamma}_{11} & \mathbf{\Pi}_{\Gamma}^H \mathbf{\Gamma}_{11} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\Gamma} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{N-p} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{11} & \mathbf{\Gamma}_{12} \\ \mathbf{\Gamma}_{21} & \mathbf{G}_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$
(13)

where Γ_{11} and Γ_{12} are, respectively, $(P \times P)$ and $(P \times (N - P))$ matrices, using the partition of matrix **A** ((8) and (9)), we have $\Gamma_{11} = \overline{\mathbf{A}}\Gamma_s \overline{\mathbf{A}}^H$.

In nonnoisy environment ($\sigma^2 = 0$) in [18], the relation $\Gamma_{12} = \Gamma_{11}\Pi_{\Gamma}$ is used to estimate Π_{Γ} :

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_{\Gamma} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{12}. \tag{14}$$

In the presence of noise, (14) is no longer valid. An estimation of the matrix Π_{Γ} is provided by minimizing the

cost function $J(\Pi_{\Gamma}) = \|\Gamma_{12} - G_{11}\Pi_{\Gamma}\|^2$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Frobenius norm. The optimal solution is given by

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_{\Gamma} = \mathbf{G}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{12}. \tag{15}$$

In practice, the data are generally impaired and the SNR value is not always high. Then, the performance of propagator method depends on the signal information contained in the block matrix G_{11} with respect to the noise and its linear dependency with the block matrix Γ_{12} . In [16], a statistical performance study concerning the propagator method is presented.

3.2. Ermolaev and Gershman method

The conventional high-resolution algorithms are based on the noise subspace spanned by the eigenvectors associated with the smallest eigenvalues of spectral matrix. In order to reduce the computational load, several methods have been proposed for estimating the noise subspace without singular value decomposition (SVD). In [6, 7], the proposed algorithms are based on the properties of the spectral matrix eigenvalues. A threshold value and an adjustable parameter are used in order to make an approximation of noise subspace projection matrix.

The Ermolaev and Gershman algorithm relies on the eigenvectors of the spectral matrix:

$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \sum_{i=1}^{P} \lambda_i \mathbf{P}_i + \sum_{i=P+1}^{N} \lambda_i \mathbf{P}_i = \mathbf{V}_s \mathbf{\Lambda}_s \mathbf{V}_s^H + \mathbf{V}_n \mathbf{\Lambda}_n \mathbf{V}_n^H, \qquad (16)$$

where λ_i , i = 1, ..., N, is the *i*th eigenvalue of Γ and $\mathbf{P}_i = \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^H$ is the associated *i*th eigenprojection operator \mathbf{V}_i , being the *i*th eigenvector. The well-known properties are [1, 2] as follows.

(i) The smallest eigenvalues of Γ are equal to σ^2 with multiplicity (N - P). Then, we have

$$\lambda_1 \ge \cdots \ge \lambda_P > \lambda_{P+1} = \lambda_{P+2} = \cdots = \lambda_N = \sigma^2,$$
 (17)

(ii) The eigenvectors associated with the smallest eigenvalues are orthogonal to the columns of matrix **A**. Namely, they are orthogonal to the signal steering vectors:

$$\mathbf{V}_{n} = \{\mathbf{v}_{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_{n+2}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N}\} \perp \{\mathbf{a}(\theta_{1}), \mathbf{a}(\theta_{2}), \dots, \mathbf{a}(\theta_{P})\},$$
(18)

where the columns of the $(N \times (N - P))$ matrix \mathbf{V}_n are the (N - P) eigenvectors associated with the (N - P)smallest eigenvalues of the spectral matrix. The columns of matrix span \mathbf{V}_n the noise subspace [2]. This orthogonality is used for estimating the DOAs. $\mathbf{V}_s = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_P]$ is called the signal subspace, $\Lambda_s = \text{diag}[\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_P]$ and $\Lambda_n =$ diag $[\lambda_{P+1}, \dots, \lambda_N]$. For any integer value *m*, the calculation of the estimate of the noise subspace projection matrix can be found in details in [7]; we have

$$\mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{en}}\mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{en}}^{H} = \lim_{m \to \infty} \left(\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{s}} \Gamma \right)^{m} + \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1}, \tag{19}$$

where the threshold value λ_s is bounded by λ_P and λ_{P+1} :

$$\lambda_P > \lambda_S > \lambda_{P+1}.\tag{20}$$

In (19), index "en" in V_{en} refers to Ermolaev and Gershman. Equation (19) shows also that the estimation of the noise subspace projection matrix depends on the threshold value λ_s which separates the largest and the smallest eigenvalues of the spectral matrix. In practice, the determination of this value still remains very difficult. In [6], the inverse power algorithm is used to calculate the threshold value, which is taken equal to the smallest eigenvalue of the spectral matrix. However, the stability of this algorithm is not always ensured. More precisely, the matrix inversibility is not ensured.

Propagator method is not robust to noise, and Ermolaev and Gershman method requires the threshold value. In the next section, we propose to solve both problems by introducing LU and QR factorization methods.

4. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS FOR NONEIGENVECTOR METHODS

In this section, we show how LU or QR factorization of the spectral matrix can improve propagator and EG algorithms. We propose a method for the estimation of the number of sources and an accelerated version of MUSIC algorithm.

4.1. Propagator method using upper triangular matrices

In this subsection, we insert an LU decomposition step in propagator method to improve the robustness to noise of propagator method. The properties of the upper triangular matrix are used to minimize the influence of model errors.

Assume that spectral matrix Γ bears LU factorization, then it is expressed as [19, 20]

$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{11} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{L}_{21} & \mathbf{I}_{N-P} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{11} & \mathbf{U}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{U}_{22} \end{pmatrix}; \quad (21)$$

we have

$$\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{11}\mathbf{U}_{11} & \mathbf{L}_{11}\mathbf{U}_{12} \\ \mathbf{L}_{21}\mathbf{U}_{11} & \mathbf{L}_{21}\mathbf{U}_{12} + \mathbf{U}_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (22)

Using (13), (14), and (22), we have

$$\mathbf{L}_{11}\mathbf{U}_{12} = \mathbf{L}_{11}\mathbf{U}_{11}\mathbf{\Pi}_U. \tag{23}$$

Finally, the novel estimate of the propagator operator using LU factorization is

$$\Pi_U = \mathbf{U}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{12}.$$
 (24)

If we calculate the following product,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{11} & \mathbf{U}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{U}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{12} \\ -\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{U}_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (25)

We show that the columns of matrix $\begin{bmatrix} U_{11}^{-1}U_{12} \\ -I \end{bmatrix}$ form a basis for the eigenvectors associated with the smallest eigenvalues and the block matrix U_{22} contains the smallest eigenvalues of matrix Γ . This result confirms that the propagator (see (15)) estimated from the LU factorized spectral matrix (24) is in accordance with the propagator principle.

As mentioned in several papers [12, 19, 21], (25) shows that the smallest eigenvalues are in the lower-right corner of **U**, that is, the block matrix U_{22} . The useful signal components are concentrated in matrices U_{11} and U_{12} . This yields a better robustness to noise compared to the case, where the classical propagator method is applied.

Following similar calculations with the QR factorization, we obtain

$$\Pi_R = \mathbf{R}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_{12}.$$
 (26)

In the same way as for LU-based method, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11} & \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ -\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{R}_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (27)

As in the LU factorization the smallest eigenvalues are in the lower-right corner of **R**, that is, the block matrix \mathbf{R}_{22} . The columns of matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{R}_{12} \\ -\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}$ form a basis for the eigenvectors associated with the smallest eigenvalues and the block matrix \mathbf{R}_{22} contains the smallest eigenvalues of matrix Γ .

Let the matrices

$$\mathbf{D}_U = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Pi}_U^T & -\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}^T,$$

$$\mathbf{D}_R = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Pi}_R^T & -\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}^T.$$
 (28)

It follows that the DOAs of the sources are given by the positions of the maxima of the following functions:

$$F_{U-\Pr}(\theta) = \left[\mathbf{a}^{H}(\theta) \mathbf{D}_{U} \mathbf{D}_{U}^{H} \mathbf{a}(\theta) \right]^{-1},$$

$$F_{R-\Pr}(\theta) = \left[\mathbf{a}^{H}(\theta) \mathbf{D}_{R} \mathbf{D}_{R}^{H} \mathbf{a}(\theta) \right]^{-1}.$$
(29)

Column vectors of \mathbf{D}_U and \mathbf{D}_R do not form an orthonormal basis, as was provided by SVD method. However, in general, this is not necessary since the roots of $F_{U-Pr}(\theta)$ or $F_{R-Pr}(\theta)$ are, respectively, identical for all basis \mathbf{D}_U or \mathbf{D}_R of the noise subspace [8].

Both LU and QR factorization procedures rearrange the elements of the spectral matrix by concentrating all the signal information in the upper-left corner block matrix of the upper triangular matrix, whereas signal information is scattered arbitrarily in the initial matrix. Indeed, this block matrix contains the largest elements of the factorized matrix. This permits the propagator method to keep its good performance even in the presence of noise.

4.2. Improvement of EG method: threshold value estimation using triangular factorization of spectral matrix

In this subsection, we show how the upper triangular matrices can be used to estimate the threshold value in the EG algorithm [7]. We propose an analytical solution based on the linear algebra results developed in [19] and recently improved in [20] concerning the eigenvalues of the symmetric and definite positive matrices.

Let us consider that the spectral matrix Γ has a numerical LU factorization, then its factorization is [19, 20]

$$\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{11} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{L}_{21} & \mathbf{I}_{N-P} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{11} & \mathbf{U}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{U}_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (30)

Following the algebra results published in [19, 20], we have

$$\lambda_P \ge \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{L}_{11}\mathbf{U}_{11}) \gg ||\mathbf{U}_{22}|| \gg \lambda_{P+1}, \quad (31)$$

where \mathbf{L}_{11} is a $(P \times P)$ unit lower triangular block matrix, \mathbf{U}_{11} is $(P \times P)$ upper triangular block matrix, \mathbf{L}_{21} , \mathbf{U}_{12} , and \mathbf{U}_{22} are the $(N - P) \times P$, $P \times (N - P)$ and $(N - P) \times (N - P)$ block matrices, respectively. $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{L}_{11}\mathbf{U}_{11})$ is the minimal eigenvalue of the $(P \times P)$ matrix $\mathbf{L}_{11}\mathbf{U}_{11}$. Several papers [19– 22] were dedicated to the question of whether there is a strategy that will force entries with magnitudes comparable to those of eigenvalues to concentrate them in the lower-right corner of \mathbf{U} , so that LU factorization reveals the numerical rank.

The QR factorization of the spectral matrix is [19, 20]

$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q}\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11} & \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (32)$$

where **R** is an $(N \times N)$ UTM and **Q** is a $(N \times N)$ matrix with orthonormal columns. **R**₁₁, **R**₁₂, and **R**₂₂ are the $(P \times P)$, $P \times (N - P)$, and $(N - P) \times (N - P)$ block matrices, respectively. Besides being able to reveal rank deficiency of **Γ**, a QR factorization with a small **R**₂₂ block is very useful in many applications, such as in rank deficient least squares computation [22]. Following [20] we have the minimal eigenvalue of **R**₁₁, denoted by $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{R}_{11})$, and the maximal eigenvalue of **R**₂₂, denoted by $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{R}_{22}) = ||\mathbf{R}_{22}||$, bounded [19, 20, 22] by

$$\lambda_P \ge \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{R}_{11}) \gg ||\mathbf{R}_{22}|| \gg \lambda_{P+1}.$$
(33)

The EG algorithm [7] requires the prior knowledge of the last signal eigenvalue and the first noise eigenvalue to estimate the threshold. In this paper, we propose to improve the traditional EG algorithm concerning crucial threshold value estimation problem. According to the previous expressions (25), (27), (31), and (33) the values $||\mathbf{U}_{22}||$ or $||\mathbf{R}_{22}||$ can be chosen as threshold value λ_s .

The spatial spectrum corresponding to EG algorithm for source localization becomes

$$F(\theta) = \lim_{m \to \infty} \left[\mathbf{a}^{H}(\theta) \left(\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{S}} \mathbf{\Gamma} \right)^{m} + \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{a}(\theta) \right]^{-1}.$$
 (34)

with $\lambda_S = \lambda_S^U = ||\mathbf{U}_{22}||$ or $\lambda_S = \lambda_S^R = ||\mathbf{R}_{22}||$.

We have concluded from numerous simulations that values close to 10 are convenient. Close values were experimentally shown, in [6, 7, 23], to be the appropriate ones.

4.3. Estimation of the number of sources using the upper triangular matrices

In this subsection we show how to estimate the number of sources. We use the diagonal elements, which are in decreasing order, of the matrices \mathbf{R} or \mathbf{U} for this purpose. We propose to add this step in the noneigenvector source localization procedures, which currently suffer with this problem in real-world applications. Indeed, in propagator method, we need the number of sources to partition matrices $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, \mathbf{R} , or \mathbf{U} .

The estimation of the number *P* of sources is a delicate problem. Several methods have been developed. The two most popular methods are akaike information criterion (AIC) [10] and minimum description length (MDL) [11]. These algorithms are based on spectral matrix eigenvalues. This is the main difficulty, while applying the noneigenvector methods, as the eigenvalues are supposed to be known. In this paper, we propose to use the diagonal elements of the UTM obtained thanks to the triangular factorizations of the spectral matrix for estimating the number of sources. Indeed, asymptotically the diagonal elements of **R** or **U** matrix tend to the eigenvalues of Γ .

Algorithms for LU factorization based on Gaussian transformations are given, for example, in [15, Section 3.2] or in [24]. Algorithms for QR factorization based on Householder and Givens orthogonalization procedures are described in [15, Sections 5.2 and 5.3] and in [25]. In this paper, we refer to the Householder orthogonalization procedure, which is generally preferred to Givens method because it is twice fast.

The estimation of the number of sources is usually based on the application of AIC or MDL criteria to the eigenvalues of the spectral matrix. We propose to use the diagonal elements of the matrix **U** or **R** instead of eigenvalues, as these elements tend to the eigenvalues [14, 15]. According to [23], another simple way to estimate the number of sources is based on the successive comparison of diagonal elements of the matrix **U** or **R** defined as

$$\Lambda_u = \operatorname{diag}\left[\frac{u_1}{u_N}, \frac{u_2}{u_N}, \dots, \frac{u_N}{u_N}\right]$$
(35)

or

$$\Lambda_R = \operatorname{diag}\left[\frac{r_1}{r_N}, \frac{r_2}{r_N}, \dots, \frac{r_N}{r_N}\right],$$
(36)

where u_i and r_i for i = 1, ..., N are the diagonal elements of **U** and **R** in decreasing order, respectively.

For instance, we have $u_1 \ge u_2 \ge \cdots \ge u_N$ and $r_1 \ge r_2 \ge \cdots \ge r_N$.

It is easy to see that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \Lambda_U^{-1} = \lim_{t\to\infty} \Lambda_R^{-1} = \text{diag}[0, 0, ..., 1, 1]$. Then, the number of zeros in this diagonal matrix gives the number of sources. Choosing a too small value of *t* does not permit to distinguish clearly between null and 1 values, choosing a too high value of *t* increases the computational load.

According to the numerous simulations we performed, a value of t less than 10 gives good results, which is in accordance with the results presented in [6, 7, 23].

4.4. MUSIC without eigendecomposition

In this subsection, we present an overview of the traditional multiple signal characterization (MUSIC) method and propose a noneigenvector version of MUSIC.

4.4.1. Principles of MUSIC method

MUSIC method provides the DOAs of the sources by the peak positions in the so-called spatial spectrum [5, 14]:

$$F_{\text{music}}(\theta) = \left[\mathbf{a}^{H}(\theta)\mathbf{V}_{n}\mathbf{V}_{n}^{H}\mathbf{a}(\theta)\right]^{-1}.$$
 (37)

The maximum values of F_{music} (θ) yield the source DOAs.

MUSIC requires the eigenvectors of the spectral matrix that span the noise subspace. Traditionally, singular value decomposition (SVD) of the spectral matrix is performed. We propose to replace singular value decomposition by fixed-point algorithm [26] and thereby accelerate MUSIC algorithm.

4.4.2. Acceleration of MUSIC algorithm with fixed-point algorithm

We present the fixed-point algorithm for computing leading eigenvectors and show how it can be inserted in MUSIC to compute the noise subspace.

Fixed-point algorithm for computing the P orthonormal basis vectors is summarized in the seven following steps.

- (1) Choose P, the number of eigenvectors to be estimated. Consider spectral matrix Γ and set $p \leftarrow 1$.
- (2) Initialize eigenvector \mathbf{v}_p of size $N \times 1$, for example, randomly.
- (3) Update \mathbf{v}_p as $\mathbf{v}_p \leftarrow \Gamma \mathbf{v}_p$.
- (4) Do the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization process $\mathbf{v}_p \leftarrow \mathbf{v}_p - \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} (\mathbf{v}_p^T \mathbf{v}_j) \mathbf{v}_j.$
- (5) Normalize \mathbf{v}_p by dividing it by its norm: $\mathbf{v}_p \leftarrow \mathbf{v}_p/$ $\|\mathbf{v}_p\|.$
- (6) If \mathbf{v}_p has not converged, go back to step (3).
- (7) Increment counter $p \leftarrow p + 1$ and go to step (2) until p equals P.

The eigenvector with dominant eigenvalue will be measured first. Similarly, all remaining P-1 basis vectors (orthonormal to the previously measured basis vectors) will be measured one by one in a reducing order of dominance. The previously measured (p - 1)th basis vectors will be utilized to find the *p*th basis vector. The algorithm for *p*th basis vector will converge when the new value \mathbf{v}_p^+ and old value \mathbf{v}_P are such that $\mathbf{v}_p^T \mathbf{v}_p^+ = 1$. It is usually economical to use a finite tolerance error to satisfy the convergence criterion $| \mathbf{v}_P^T \mathbf{v}_P^+ 1 \mid < \delta$, where δ is a prior fixed threshold and $|\cdot|$ is the absolute value. Let $\mathbf{V}_s = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_P]$ be the matrix whose columns are the P orthonormal basis vectors. Then, \mathbf{V}_s is the subspace spanned by the *P* eigenvectors associated with the largest eigenvalues. It is also called "signal subspace." The projector onto the noise subspace spanned by the (N - P)

eigenvectors associated with the (N - P) smallest eigenvalues is $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_s \mathbf{V}_s^H = \mathbf{V}_{fn} \mathbf{V}_{fn}^H$. This estimated projector can be used in (37). In \mathbf{V}_{fn} and \mathbf{V}_{fn}^{H} , index "fn" refers to fixed point.

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS OF 5. THE CONSIDERED ALGORITHMS

In this section, we investigate the performance of the considered methods in terms of mean-squared error of the source bearing estimates. This investigation is inspired by previous results in [27–29].

A common model for the null spectrum function associated with the propagator, EG algorithm as well as with MUSIC is

$$M(\theta) = \mathbf{a}^{H}(\theta)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{a}(\theta) , \qquad (38)$$

where $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{D} \mathbf{D}^{H}$ with $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma}$, \mathbf{D}_{U} , or \mathbf{D}_{R} or $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{V}_{n} \mathbf{V}_{n}^{H}$, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{V}_{fn} \mathbf{V}_{fn}^{H}$, or $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{V}_{en} \mathbf{V}_{en}^{H}$

The DOAs are the arguments of the minima of $M(\theta)$, when no perturbation affects matrix **B**. When noise is present in the data, or when there are some uncertainties on the data model, the function from which we search for the minima in order to determine the DOA estimates is

$$\widehat{M}(\theta) = \mathbf{a}^{H}(\theta)\widehat{\mathbf{B}}\mathbf{a}(\theta) \tag{39}$$

with a first-order expansion of the first derivative $\widehat{M}'(\theta)$ of $\widehat{M}(\theta)$ around the bearing estimates $\widehat{\theta}_{p}$ and with a firstorder expansion $\hat{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{B} + \Delta \mathbf{B}$ it has been shown in [28] that the error on the bearing estimates, $\Delta \theta_p = \theta_p - \hat{\theta}_p$, is given by

$$\Delta \theta_p = -\frac{\text{Real}(\mathbf{a}^H(\theta_p) \Delta \mathbf{B} \mathbf{g}(\theta_p))}{\mathbf{g}^H(\theta_p) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{g}(\theta_p)},$$
(40)

where $\mathbf{g}(\theta)$ is the vector whose components are the first derivative of the components of $\mathbf{a}(\theta)$. In order to compute the DOA estimation error (40), it is necessary to evaluate matrix $\Delta \mathbf{B}$ when the data matrix is perturbed by $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_f + \mathbf{X}_f$ ΔX , where $X = [x_1, \dots, x_K]$ with K number of snapshots of measurement vectors \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{X}_f is the data matrix with no perturbation and where ΔX is the additive perturbation matrix. From the partition (9), we can write $\mathbf{X}_f = [\overline{\mathbf{X}}_f^T \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_f^T]^T$.

Following the calculation given in [27, 28], in the case of the MUSIC method using SVD, that is, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{V}_n \mathbf{V}_n^H$, the authors of [28] have shown that

$$\Delta \theta_p = -\frac{\text{Real}(\mathbf{a}^H(\theta_p)\mathbf{T}_1 \Delta \mathbf{X}^H \mathbf{Bg}(\theta_p))}{\mathbf{g}^H(\theta_p) \mathbf{Bg}(\theta_p)}$$
(41)

with $\mathbf{T}_1 = \mathbf{V}_s \Lambda_s^{-1} \mathbf{V}_s^H$, $\mathbf{V}_s = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_P]$, $\Lambda_s = \text{diag}[\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N]$ λ_P] which gives the error on the bearing estimates for the EG and fixed point, by replacing **B** by $\mathbf{V}_{en}^{H}\mathbf{V}_{en}^{H}$ and $\mathbf{V}_{fn}\mathbf{V}_{fn}^{H}$, respectively.

Following the same calculations [27, 28], we obtain for the propagator method

$$\Delta \theta_p = -\frac{\text{Real}(\mathbf{a}^H(\theta_p)\mathbf{T}_2\Delta \mathbf{X}^H \mathbf{D} \mathbf{D}^H \mathbf{g}(\theta_p))}{\mathbf{g}^H(\theta_p)\mathbf{D} \mathbf{D}^H \mathbf{g}(\theta_p)}$$
(42)

...

with $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma}$, \mathbf{D}_{U} , or \mathbf{D}_{R}

$$\mathbf{T}_{2} = -\begin{bmatrix} (\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{f} \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{f}^{H})^{-1} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{f} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
(43)

In [28, 29], the MSE, that is, $E[|\Delta \theta_p|^2]$ has been derived from (41) for an additive perturbation matrix ΔX with zeromean uncorrelated random components with equal variance σ^2 (see [28, 29]), for the MUSIC method, we have

$$E[|\Delta\theta_p|^2] = \sigma^2 \frac{\mathbf{a}^H(\theta_p)\mathbf{T}_1\mathbf{T}_1^H\mathbf{a}(\theta_p)}{2\mathbf{g}^H(\theta_p)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{g}(\theta_p)}$$
(44)

with $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{V}_{en} \mathbf{V}_{en}^{H}$.

When EG method is considered $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{V}_{en}\mathbf{V}_{en}^{H}$, and when MUSIC with fixed-point algorithm is considered, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{V}_{fn}\mathbf{V}_{fn}^{H}$.

We easily deduce that the MSE expressions are

$$E[|\Delta\theta_p|^2] = \sigma^2 \frac{(\mathbf{g}^H(\theta_p)\mathbf{D}\mathbf{D}^H\mathbf{D}\mathbf{D}^H\mathbf{g}(\theta_p))\mathbf{a}^H(\theta_p)\mathbf{T}_2\mathbf{T}_2^H\mathbf{a}(\theta_p)}{2(\mathbf{g}^H(\theta_p)\mathbf{D}\mathbf{D}^H\mathbf{g}(\theta_p))^2}$$
(45)

with $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma}$, $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{U}}$, or $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{R}}$.

We therefore provided the expressions of the error ((41) and (42)) and variance ((44) and (45)) for the DOA estimation by the considered methods.

6. ALGORITHM COMPLEXITIES

In this version, we provide the theoretical expressions of the numerical complexities of the proposed noneigenvector methods.

6.1. Propagator and Ermolaev and Gershman methods

The main advantage of the methods presented in this paper, namely, propagator (29) and Ermolaev and Gershman methods (34) is their low computational load. Indeed, these methods do not require the costly eigendecomposition of the spectral matrix. The complexity of the LU factorization algorithm is [19, 25] $N_{op}^{LU}(N) \approx N^3/3$. The number of operations required by Householder QR factorization algorithm [25] is $N_{op}^{QR}(N) \approx 2N^3/3$. The number of multiplications involved in calculating an upper triangular matrix inversion is N^2 . Proposed EG method requires consequently around $N^3/3 + N^2$ operations. It is well known that the number of operations to calculate an $(N \times N)$ matrix Γ inversion is N^3 , so the original EG method needs around N^3 operations. Considering the number of sensors which is usually used, the proposed method is faster than the traditional one.

Following [16] the cost involved by the estimation of the propagator from the spectral matrix of the received signals (15) is $N^2P + P^2N + P^3$. The computational load involved by the LU or QR-based methods to obtain Π_U (24) or Π_R (26) is $P^2(N - P + 1)$. The proposed methods are based on the LU or QR factorization which requires considerably less computations than eigendecomposition. This result is interesting for large arrays with few sources which is often the case in underwater acoustics.

6.2. MUSIC algorithm and accelerated version

The traditional MUSIC method estimates the noise subspace eigenvectors by singular value decomposition (SVD). Then, we compare the computational complexities of the traditional MUSIC method and the proposed accelerated version of MUSIC method through the comparison of the computational complexities of SVD and fixed-point algorithm.

One well-known SVD method is the cyclic Jacobi's method. The Jacobi's method which diagonalizes an $(N \times N)$ symmetric matrix requires around N^3 computations. The computational complexity of fixed-point algorithm is computed as follows. Let *It* be the number of iterations used in converging the algorithm to obtain \mathbf{v}_p . Then, the estimated computational complexity is given in the following steps.

- (i) The Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization for v_p (any value of p) implies around NP It operations.
- (ii) Which yields, for all p = 1, ..., P basis vectors, around NP^2 It operations.
- (iii) The updating process for all p = 1, ..., P basis vectors implies around N^2P It operations.
- (iv) Then, the total estimated is then $It (NP^2 + N^2P)$ operations.

If dimension N is large compared to P the computational complexity can be estimated to be around N^2 . Then, replacing SVD by fixed-point algorithm, the gain in terms of computational complexity is of an order of magnitude. Therefore, MUSIC with fixed-point algorithm has the smallest computational load.

7. SIMULATION RESULTS

In the following simulations, a linear antenna of N = 15 equispaced sensors $d = c/2 f_0$ is used, where f_0 is the source frequency and c is the velocity of the propagation. Eight uncorrelated source signals of equal power have DOA values: 5° , 10° , 20° , 25° , 35° , 40° , 50° , and 55° , and are temporally stationary zero-mean with the same central frequency $f_0 = 115$ Hz. The additive noise is not correlated with the signals and it is also assumed white. The number of snapshots taken was 1000 and the number of observations was 1000. Taking an elevated number of snapshots yields a good estimation of the spectral matrix. Then, the performance of each method can be evaluated independently from the accuracy of the estimation of the spectral matrix. Choosing a number of snapshots equal to 100, such as in [1, 2, 6, 7, 23], does not change the results.

Reducing these numbers while keeping for them the same order of magnitude does not change the DOA estimation performance. The SNR is defined by SNR = $10\log_{10}(s/\sigma^2)$, where *s* is the power of the source and σ^2 is the noise variance.

The following experiments are carried out in order to study the performance of the noneigenvector source localization algorithms based on the U or R matrix properties. This section is divided into two experiments: one is devoted

1.4 1.2 1 Localization function 0.8 0.6 0.4 0.2 0 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 Azimuth (deg)

FIGURE 1: Π_{Γ} -propagator with SNR = 0 dB.

to the propagator method and the other concerns the EG algorithm.

7.1. Experiment 1: Propagator method

In order to study the source localization using the propagator methods based on the **U** or **R** matrices, we have considered several simulations with different SNR values. Firstly, the employed propagator methods are calculated using (15), (24), and (26) with SNR = 0 dB. The number of sources is estimated from the matrices of (36), parameter *t* is chosen as t = 10. We have obtained a correct estimated number of sources P = 8.

It has been shown that, in the presence of an additive noise, the performances of the standard propagator (15) are considerably degraded [16, 18]. However, the results obtained show that these degradations are not significant when the proposed propagator algorithms are used even if the values of SNR are relatively low. Indeed Figures 1, 2, and 3 show that only the proposed methods have localized all the sources when the SNR is equal to 0 dB.

We propose a statistical study to measure the robustness of the considered methods. The criterion that is used is the standard deviation (std) defined by

std =
$$\left[\frac{1}{8T}\sum_{j=1}^{8}\sum_{i=1}^{T} |\theta - \hat{\theta}_{ji}|^{2}\right]^{1/2}$$
, (46)

where *T* is the number of trials, $\hat{\theta}_i$ is the estimate of the DOA from *i*th trial, and $\theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4, \theta_5, \theta_6, \theta_7, \theta_8\}$.

The results provided in Figure 4 show that the std values obtained with the propagator method based on U or R matrix are lower than those obtained with the classical propagator for all SNR values.

The previous results have shown that even in the presence of noise, the propagator algorithms localize all the sources when LU or QR factorization is used.

These results could be expected according to the theoretical results obtained in Section 4 (see (24) and (26)).



FIGURE 2: Π_U -propagator with SNR = 0 dB.



FIGURE 3: Π_R -propagator with SNR = 0 dB.

The estimation of matrix Π leads exactly to the noise subspace (see (25) and (27)). In contrast to the case where the traditional propagator method is used in the presence of noise, only a least square solution is possible to implement. That is why the corresponding results are more biased.

To assess these first results, we performed another study: in place of studying the bias over angle estimation we study the bias over the estimation of Π . We refer to the basic definition of the propagator, that is, $\widetilde{A} = \Pi^H \overline{A}$. We compute Π from all considered methods ((15), (24), and (26)) and for several numbers of sensors. We considered the following error criterion:

$$e = ||\widetilde{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{\Pi}^H \overline{\mathbf{A}}||, \tag{47}$$

where \widetilde{A} and \overline{A} are the matrices used for simulating the data.

The evolution of the error criterion with respect to the number of sensors for all propagator operators Π_{Γ} , Π_{U} , and



FIGURE 4: std of estimation errors as a function of SNR for propagator and modified propagator.



FIGURE 5: Error obtained with different propagator operators as a function of the number of sensors.

 Π_R is represented in Figure 5. The main outcome of this figure is that whatever the number of sensors, the error obtained with LU or QR-based factorization techniques is lower than the one obtained with the spectral matrix-based technique. QR-based factorization technique gives slightly better results compared to LU-based factorization technique, especially for low SNR values (less than -10 dB).

This confirms that better estimation of Π leads to better estimation of angles.

Note that during our simulations, in order to verify that the information about the source localization is totally



FIGURE 6: std value obtained with EG method with variable value of parameter m and P = 8.

confined in the matrices **U** or **R**, we have used the lower unit triangular matrix **L**, instead of the matrix **U**, with several high SNR values. Our conclusion is that the lower matrix cannot be used to localize the sources.

7.2. Experiment 2: Ermolaev and Gershman algorithm

In this experiment, we first justify the choice of parameter m involved in EG method, and we then study its performance in terms of accuracy of source localization and robustness to noise. The number of sources is taken equal to 8 as in experiment 1.

7.2.1. Choice of parameter m value

We performed a specific study concerning the EG method: in the current experimental conditions, with SNR = 0 dB, we vary the value of parameter m (see (34)). We use QR factorisation and we will keep the same conclusions while using further LU decomposition. The std value over the estimation of source DOAs is decreasing until m = 10and is then steady (Figure 6). Then, we deduce that the best compromise between reliability of DOA estimation and computational load is reached by choosing m = 10, in the considered experimental conditions. This result is in accordance with studies performed in [6, 7, 23].

7.2.2. Performance of EG method for source localization

In order to compare the performance of the considered algorithms based on our thresholds λ_s^U or λ_s^R to one based on the threshold value λ_s arbitrarily chosen between λ_P and λ_{P+1} as suggested by [10], several experiments with the same experimental conditions as in the previous subsection are carried out with m = 10 and P = 8. Figure 7 plots the std values over the angles obtained with each considered method and for several SNR values. Therefore, the proposed

1



0.9 0.8 Localization functions 0.7 0.6 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 Azimth (deg) $--\lambda_S^R$ $- - \lambda_s$

FIGURE 7: std of estimation errors as functions of SNR when the spectra of EG algorithm is used with m = 10.



FIGURE 8: EG algorithm as a function of the threshold values λ_S^U and λ_s with m = 10 and SNR = -5 dB.

threshold values lead to better results for all SNR values. Figures 8 and 9 exemplify the obtained localization results.

The good performances of the proposed modified EG method are reached thanks to the estimation of the number of sources using diagonal elements and the proposed threshold values. The results obtained show that the rank revealing triangular factorizations improve DOA localization. This can be explained as follows.

In [7], the approximation of (19) depends strongly on the threshold λ_s between signal subspace and noise subspace eigenvalues of the spectral matrix.

FIGURE 9: EG method as a function of the threshold values λ_S^R and λ_s with m = 10 and SNR = -5 dB.

Supposing that *P* is the correct number of sources, choosing a value of λ_s which is too close to λ_p induces the overestimation of noise subspace dimension as signal subspace vectors may be included in the noise subspace, which leads to the degradation of the localization using the EG algorithm.

Now, if *P* is chosen inadequately, std increases. Indeed several simulations have shown the following behavior. If the number of sources is underestimated the estimated DOA values are uncorrect and if the number of sources is overestimated one observes unexpected DOA values depending on the experiment.

Then, the problem of the estimation of λ_s required in EG algorithm could be solved thanks to LU or QR factorizations of the spectral matrix.

7.3. Experiment 3: Fixed-point algorithm and MUSIC

We exemplify the proposed fixed-point algorithm with source localization based on MUSIC method. Several experiments with the same experimental conditions as in the previous subsections are carried out with various numbers (see Figure 10 and Table 1, N = 20 up to 250) of sensors, to study the computational load of the proposed algorithm as a function of the antenna size. Parameter δ is fixed to 10^{-6} and SNR to 0 dB with P = 8 sources. DOA values are 5°, 10° , 20° , 25° , 35° , 40° , 50° , and 55° .

The number of realizations is 1000, and the number of observations is 1000. By taking into account the computational time needed to localize the sources at each experiment, the mean computational load is then up to 2.5 times less with fixed-point algorithm than with SVD. Both versions of MUSIC provide the same pseudospectra (Figures 11 and 12).

| S. | Bourennane | et | al. |
|----|------------|----|-----|
|----|------------|----|-----|

TABLE 1: Computational time needed to run MUSIC, using SVD and fixed point, for various numbers of sensors.

| Number of sensors | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 |
|-------------------------------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Time SVD (10^{-2} second) | 0.95 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 4.4 | 7.1 |
| Time fixed point (second) | 0.5 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 2.8 |
| Ratio SVD/fixed poin | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.5 |



FIGURE 10: Computational time for MUSIC with SVD (\cdot) and for MUSIC with fixed-point algorithm (+).



FIGURE 11: Pseudospectrum of MUSIC obtained using SVD.

Figure 10 and Table 1 show that MUSIC method with fixed-point algorithm is up to 2.5 faster than MUSIC method using SVD.

7.4. Experiment 4: Performance of noneigenvector methods

In this experiment, we study the robustness to noise of propagator and of the EG method both using QR factoriza-



FIGURE 12: Pseudospectrum of MUSIC obtained using fixed point.



FIGURE 13: Standard deviation values for various SNR values obtained with noneigenvector EG method (+), MUSIC method (*), propagator method (0), Cramér Rao bound (*-).

tion of the accelerated MUSIC algorithm. Indeed we noticed (see Figures 4 and 7) that the results obtained are the best when QR factorization is used. Moreover, using fixed-point algorithm in place of SVD does not alter the results in terms of performance.

Figure 13 provides the std values for various SNR values and for the three considered noneigenvector methods and Cramér-Rao bound for MUSIC method (which exhibits the lowest Cramér Rao bound values).

We used the formulas provided in [27].

7.5. Performance in the estimation of the number of sources

In the algorithms studied in this paper, one major point is the estimation of the number of sources.

The accuracy of DOA estimation is conditioned by the correct estimation of the number of sources.

We proposed (36) to estimate the number of sources. This method was tested with several simulations, and we validated this criterion for several values of number of sources and SNR values.

In all simulations, we retrieve the correct number of sources.

8. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have improved two noneigenvector highresolution methods, namely, the propagator method and the Ermolaev and Gershman algorithm. We proposed a noneigenvector version of MUSIC algorithm, replacing singular value decomposition by fixed-point algorithm. The improvement of the propagator method and Ermolaev and Gershman algorithms is based on LU or QR factorization of the spectral matrix. This leads to an efficient localization of the narrow-band sources even if the SNR is low. Actually, the upper triangular matrices contain the information enabling source localization. We have modified the existing methods to estimate the number of sources based on eigenvalues by introducing the diagonal elements of the upper triangular matrix. The existing propagator method is a least square solution and still very sensitive to noise. On the opposite, the modified propagator method is calculated accurately from the upper triangular matrix even in the presence of noise. A major problem of the Ermolaev and Gershman algorithm is the estimation of the threshold. New and analytical thresholds are proposed to apply Ermolaev and Gershman algorithm. The threshold values are estimated thanks to the norm of the block matrix of the upper-right corner triangular matrix. The resulting algorithm for the localization without eigendecomposition is an approximation method, but the numerical results show its high accuracy even when the SNR is low. By adapting fixed-point algorithm for the estimation of leading eigenvectors, we obtained a noneigenvector source localization method. MUSIC algorithm has been shown to be up to 2.5 times faster with this improvement. We compared the performances of the three proposed noneigenvector methods, propagator and EG and MUSIC using fixed-point algorithm, by providing std evolution for several SNR values. MUSIC and propagator yield close std results. MUSIC with fixed-point algorithm has the smallest computational load and exhibits the best performance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the reviewers for their careful reading and their helpful comments which contributed to improve the quality of the paper.

REFERENCES

- R. O. Schmidt, "Multiple emitter location and signal parameter estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 276–280, 1986.
- [2] G. Bienvenu and L. Kopp, "Optimality of high resolution array processing using the eigensystem approach," *IEEE Transactions* on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 1235–1248, 1983.
- [3] S. Bourennane and A. Bendjama, "Locating wide band acoustic sources using higher order statistics," *Applied Acoustics*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 235–251, 2002.
- [4] T.-H. Liu and J. M. Mendel, "Cumulant-based subspace tracking," *Signal Processing*, vol. 76, no. 3, pp. 237–252, 1999.
- [5] J. Munier and G. Y. Delisle, "Spatial analysis using new properties of the cross-spectral matrix," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 746–749, 1991.
- [6] M. Frikel and S. Bourennane, "High-resolution methods without eigendecomposition for locating the acoustic sources," *Applied Acoustics*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 139–154, 1997.
- [7] V. T. Ermolaev and A. B. Gershman, "Fast algorithm for minimum-norm direction-of-arrival estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 42, no. 9, pp. 2389–2394, 1994.
- [8] C. H. Bischof and G. M. Shroff, "On updating signal subspaces," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 96–105, 1992.
- [9] P. Strobach, "Square-root QR inverse iteration for tracking the minor subspace," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 48, no. 11, pp. 2994–2999, 2000.
- [10] H. Akaike, "Maximum likelihood identification of Gaussian autoregressive moving average models," *Biometrika*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 255–265, 1973.
- [11] J. Rissanen, "Modeling by shortest data description," *Automatica*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 465–471, 1978.
- [12] W. Chen, K. M. Wong, and J. P. Reilly, "Detection of the number of signals: a predicted eigen-threshold approach," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1088– 1098, 1991.
- [13] P. Comon and G. H. Golub, "Tracking a few extreme singular values and vectors in signal processing," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 78, no. 8, pp. 1327–1343, 1990.
- [14] G. Quintana-Ortí and E. S. Quintana-Ortí, "Parallel codes for computing the numerical rank," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, vol. 275-276, pp. 451–470, 1998.
- [15] G. H. Golub and V. Loan, *Matrix Computations*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Md, USA, 3rd edition, 1996.
- [16] S. Marcos, A. Marsal, and M. Benidir, "The propagator method for source bearing estimation," *Signal Processing*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 121–138, 1995.
- [17] S. Bourennane and M. Frikel, "An improved frequency smoothing method for bearing estimation," in *Proceedings* of the 1st Forum Acusticum (ACTA ACUSTICA), p. S253, Antwerpen, Belgium, April 1996.
- [18] S. Bourennane, A. Bendjama, and J. P. Sessarego, "Propagator methods for finding wideband source parameters," *Applied Acoustics*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 253–281, 2002.

- [19] C.-T. Pan, "On the existence and computation of rankrevealing LU factorizations," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, vol. 316, no. 1–3, pp. 199–222, 2000.
- [20] L. Miranian and M. Gu, "Strong rank revealing LU factorizations," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, vol. 367, pp. 1–16, 2003.
- [21] T.-M. Hwang, W.-W. Lin, and D. Pierce, "Improved bound for rank revealing LU factorizations," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, vol. 261, no. 1–3, pp. 173–186, 1997.
- [22] T. F. Chan, "Rank revealing QR factorizations," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, vol. 88-89, pp. 67–82, 1987.
- [23] J. Choi, I. Song, and H. M. Kim, "On estimating the direction of arrival when the number of signal sources is unknown," *Signal Processing*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 193–205, 1993.
- [24] D. Stott Parker, "Schur complements obey Lambek's categorial grammar: another view of Gaussian elimination and LU decomposition," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, vol. 278, no. 1–3, pp. 63–84, 1998.
- [25] N. J. Higham, "QR factorization with complete pivoting and accurate computation of the SVD," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, vol. 309, no. 1–3, pp. 153–174, 2000.
- [26] A. Hyvärinen and E. Oja, "A fast fixed-point algorithm for independent component analysis," *Neural Computation*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 1483–1492, 1997.
- [27] P. Stoica and A. Nehorai, "MUSIC, maximum likelihood, and Cramér-Rao bound: further results and comparisons," *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, vol. 38, no. 12, pp. 2140–2150, 1990.
- [28] F. Li and R. J. Vaccaro, "Unified analysis for DOA estimation algorithms in array signal processing," *Signal Processing*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 147–169, 1991.
- [29] A. L. Swindelhurst and T. Kailath, "A performance analysis of subspace-based methods in the presence of model errors—I: the MUSIC algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 40, no. 7, pp. 1758–1774, 1992.

Special Issue on Software-Defined Radio and Broadcasting

Call for Papers

The wireless industry is experiencing an unprecedented increase in number and sophistication of wireless communication and broadcasting systems. As mobile devices are miniaturizing, more functionalities are required every time a new device emerges. Multiple concurrent communication protocols, digital TV, multimedia broadcasting, and navigation all require their own antenna, radio, and baseband processing. This convergence impacts both the cost and the size of the device.

Software-defined radios (SDRs), multiband antennas, reconfigurable radios, and cognitive radios offer a programmable and dynamically reconfigurable method of reusing hardware to implement frequency agile communications and broadcasting systems. An SDR-based device can dynamically change protocols and update communications or broadcasting systems over the air as a service provider allows. Digital signal processors (DSPs) are now capable of executing many billions of operations per second at power efficiency levels appropriate for handset deployment. This has brought SDR-based communication and broadcasting to prominence.

Promoting state-of-the-art contributions from different research and industrial fields directly involved or applicable in solving the issues and obstacles of frequency agile SDRs is the scope of this special issue. Topics of interest include (but are not limited to):

- SDR with multiband and smart antennas
- Theory and algorithm for SDR and software-defined broadcasting (SDB)
- Reconfigurable RF
- Reconfigurable baseband signal processing
- Digital signal processors (DSPs) for SDR and SDB
- System-on-chip SDR implementations and complexity analyses
- FPGA fabrics for SDR
- Radio systems design
- SDR applications to communication, IPTV and digital TV
- Processor architectures for SDR
- Compiler technology and development tools for SDR

- Communications system implementations for SDR
- Spectrum sensing and spectrum management
- Cognitive radio for broadcasting and communication
- Standardization on SDR, SDB and cognitive radio
- Testbeds and hardware prototypes

Authors should follow the International Journal of Digital Multimedia Broadcasting manuscript format described at the journal site http://www.hindawi.com/journals/ijdmb/. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/ according to the following timetable:

| Manuscript Due | September 1, 2008 |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| First Round of Reviews | December 1, 2008 |
| Publication Date | March 1, 2009 |

Guest Editors

Daniel lancu, Sandbridge Technologies, Inc., Tarrytown, NY 10591, USA; diancu@sandbridgetech.com

John Glossner, Sandbridge Technologies, Inc., Tarrytown, NY 10591, USA; jglossner@sandbridgetech.com

Peter Farkas, University of Slovakia, Bratislava, Slovakia; farkas@ktl.elf.stuba.sk

Mihai Sima, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada V8W 2Y2; msima@ece.uvic.ca

Michael McGuire, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada V8W 2Y2; mmcguire@ece.uvic.ca

Special Issue on Enhanced Physical Layer and Diversity Techniques for Digital Terrestrial and Wireless Broadband

Call for Papers

Recent success in delivering high-definition TV (HDTV) services over digital terrestrial and Internet Protocol Television (IPTV) has aspired service providers to offer more extensive HDTV services with wider coverage and accessibility. For digital terrestrial broadcasting systems, this implies that more efficient utilization of spectrum must be realized with the help of enhanced physical layer (PHY) techniques. On the other hand, in the domain of IPTV, service providers are looking forward to offer HDTV services through wireless broadband channels such as WiMAX, WiFi, UWB, and 3G/4G cell phone. In view of the high data throughput requirement of HDTV signals, innovative techniques that facilitate efficient delivery of HDTV services over wireless broadband channels must address issues such as capacity and real-time implementation.

The purpose of this special issue is to report recent progress in enhanced physical layer and diversity techniques that would facilitate HDTV to be delivered over both terrestrial and wireless broadband channels. Of special concerns are innovative techniques that improve spectrum usage, channel capacity, bandwidth, coverage, and quality of services (QoS). Experts from both academia and industry are invited to submit high-quality manuscripts that describe the latest research results. Discussions on existing systems/standards are also welcomed if the results include objective comparison of different technical solutions and concrete suggestions on how to improve existing systems/standards to achieve significant performance enhancement.

Topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

- Coding and modulation: Turbo codes/LDPC, COFDM, BST-OFDM, SOFDM, VSB
- Transmit/receive diversity techniques: cyclic delay diversity (CDD), discontinue Doppler diversity (DDoD), equal gain combining (EGC), maximal ratio combining (MRC)
- MIMO techniques, wideband MIMO channel models, channel estimation and equalization, and time and/or frequency synchronization
- Practical issues relevant to enhanced PHY: frequency utilization, dynamic bandwidth/robustness control,

backward compatibility, coexistence receiving techniques, network planning, service coverage and onchannel repeater design consideration

• Hardware prototyping, that is, system-on-chip and software-defined radio techniques, field testing and measurement campaign relevant to enhanced PHY

Authors should follow the International Journal of Digital Multimedia Broadcasting manuscript format described at the journal site http://www.hindawi.com/journals/ijdmb/. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/, according to the following timetable:

| Manuscript Due | August 1, 2008 |
|------------------------|------------------|
| First Round of Reviews | November 1, 2008 |
| Publication Date | February 1, 2009 |

Guest Editors

Jonathan Loo, School of Engineering and Design, Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, UK; jonathan.loo@brunel.ac.uk

Yue Zhang, Anritsu Corporation, Stevenage, Hertfordshire SG1 2EF, UK; yue.zhang@anritsu.com

Jie Zhu, Intel Corporation, Digital Home Group, Santa Clara, CA 95054, USA; jie.z.zhu@intel.com

Chih-Yang Kao, Department of Information and Telecommunication Engineering, Ming Chuan University, Gui-Shan District, Taoyuan County 333, Taiwan; cykaoo@mcu.edu.tw

Yu-Hen Hu, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Wisconsin - Madison, 1415 Engineering Drive, Madison, WI 53706, USA; hu@engr.wisc.edu

Special Issue on Secure Steganography in Multimedia Content

Call for Papers

Steganography, the art and science of invisible communication, aims to transmit information that is embedded invisibly into carrier data. Different from cryptography it hides the very existence of the secret. Its main requirement is undetectability, that is, no method should be able to detect a hidden message in carrier data. This also differentiates steganography from watermarking where the secrecy of hidden data is not required. Watermarking serves in some way the carrier, while in steganography, the carrier serves as a decoy for the hidden message.

The theoretical foundations of steganography and detection theory have been advanced rapidly, resulting in improved steganographic algorithms as well as more accurate models of their capacity and weaknesses.

However, the field of steganography still faces many challenges. Recent research in steganography and steganalysis has far-reaching connections to machine learning, coding theory, and signal processing. There are powerful blind (or universal) detection methods, which are not fine-tuned to a particular embedding method, but detect steganographic changes using a classifier that is trained with features from known media. Coding theory facilitates increased embedding efficiency and adaptiveness to carrier data, both of which will increase the security of steganographic algorithms. Finally, both practical steganographic algorithms and steganalytic methods require signal processing of common media like images, audio, and video. The field of steganography still faces many challenges, for example,

- how could one make benchmarking steganography more independent from machine learning used in steganalysis?
- where could one embed the secret to make steganography more secure? (content adaptivity problem).
- what is the most secure steganography for a given carrier?

Material for experimental evaluation will be made available at http://dud.inf.tu-dresden.de/~westfeld/rsp/rsp.html.

The main goal of this special issue is to provide a stateof-the-art view on current research in the field of steganographic applications. Some of the related research topics for the submission include, but are not limited to:

• Performance, complexity, and security analysis of steganographic methods

- Practical secure steganographic methods for images, audio, video, and more exotic media and bounds on detection reliability
- Adaptive, content-aware embedding in various transform domains
- Large-scale experimental setups and carrier modeling
- Energy-efficient realization of embedding pertaining encoding and encryption
- Steganography in active warden scenario, robust steganography
- Interplay between capacity, embedding efficiency, coding, and detectability
- Steganalytic application in steganography benchmarking and digital forensics
- Attacks against steganalytic applications
- Information-theoretic aspects of steganographic security

Authors should follow the EURASIP Journal on Information Security manuscript format described at the journal site http://www.hindawi.com/journals/is/. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/ according to the following timetable:

| Manuscript Due | August 1, 2008 |
|------------------------|------------------|
| First Round of Reviews | November 1, 2008 |
| Publication Date | February 1, 2009 |

Guest Editors

Miroslav Goljan, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Watson School of Engineering and Applied Science, Binghamton University, P.O. Box 6000, Binghamton, NY 13902-6000, USA; mgoljan@binghamton.edu

Andreas Westfeld, Institute for System Architecture, Faculty of Computer Science, Dresden University of Technology, Helmholtzstraße 10, 01069 Dresden, Germany; westfeld@inf.tu-dresden.de

Special Issue on Active Antennas for Space Applications

Call for Papers

Over the last years, many journal articles appeared on the principles, analysis, and design of active and active integrated antennas (AAs and AIAs). An AA is a single system comprising both a radiating element and one or more active components which are tightly integrated. This gives clear advantages in terms of costs, dimensions, and efficiency. In the case of an AIA, both the active device and the radiator are integrated on the same substrate. Both options lead to very compact, lowloss, flexible antennas, and this is very important especially at high frequencies, such as those typical of a satellite link. As microwave integrated-circuit and the microwave monolithic integrated-circuit technologies have ripened, AA and AIA applications have become more and more interesting, not only at a scientific level but also from a commercial point of view, up to the point that they have recently been applied to phased array antennas on board moving vehicles for satellite broadband communication systems.

The goal of this special issue it to present the most recent developments and researches in this field, with particular attention to space-borne applications, as well as to enhance the state of the art and show how AAs and AIAs can meet the challenge of the XXI century telecommunications applications.

Topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

- Active (integrated) antenna design, analysis, and simulation techniques
- Active (integrated) antenna applications in arrays, retrodirective arrays and discrete lenses
- Millimeter-wave active (integrated) antennas

Authors should follow International Journal of Antennas and Propagation manuscript format described at the journal site http://www.hindawi.com/journals/ijap/. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through th journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/, according to the following timetable:

| Manuscript Due | September 1, 2008 |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| First Round of Reviews | December 1, 2008 |
| Publication Date | March 1, 2009 |

Guest Editors

Stefano Selleri, Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, University of Florence, Via C. Lombroso 6/17, 50137 Florence, Italy; stefano.selleri@unifi.it

Giovanni Toso, European Space Rechearch and Technology Center (ESTEC), European Space Agency (ESA), Keplerlaan 1, PB 299, 2200 AG Noordwijk, The Netherlands; giovanni.toso@esa.int

Special Issue on Formal Techniques for Embedded Systems Design and Validation

Call for Papers

Computing platforms that are embedded within larger systems they control, called embedded systems, are inherently very complex as they are responsible for controlling and regulating multiple system functionalities. Often embedded systems are also safety-critical requiring high degree of reliability and fault tolerance. Examples include distributed microprocessors controlling the modern cars or aircrafts and airport baggage handling system that track and trace unsafe baggage. To address this growing need for safety and reliability, formal techniques are increasingly being adapted to suit embedded platforms. There has been widespread use of synchronous languages such as Esterel for the design of automotive and flight control software that requires stronger guarantees. Languages like Esterel not only provide nice features for high-level specification but also enable model checkingbased verification due to their formal semantics. Other semiformal notations are also being proposed as standards to specify industrial embedded systems using, for example, the newly developed IEC61499 standard for process control. This standard primarily focuses on component-oriented description of embedded control systems. The goal of this special issue is to bring together a set of high-quality research articles looking at different applications of formal or semiformal techniques in specification, verification, and synthesis of embedded systems.

Topics of interest are (but not limited to):

- Verification of system-level languages
- Verification of embedded processors
- Models of computation and verification
- Models of computation for heterogeneous embedded systems
- IP verification issues
- Open system verification techniques such as module checking and applications of module checking
- Formal techniques for protocol matching and interface process generation
- Applications of DES control theory in open system verification

- Adaptive techniques for open system verification
- Verification techniques for automatic debugging of embedded systems
- Formal approaches for secure embedded systems
- Hardware-software coverification of embedded systems
- Compositional approaches for SOC verification
- Verification of distributed embedded system

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at http://www .hindawi.com/journals/es/guidelines.html. Authors should follow the EURASIP Journal on Embedded Systems manuscript format described at the journal's site http://www .hindawi.com/journals/es/. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal's Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts .hindawi.com/, according to the following timetable:

| Manuscript Due | August 1, 2008 |
|------------------------|------------------|
| First Round of Reviews | November 1, 2008 |
| Publication Date | February 1, 2009 |

Guest Editors

Partha S. Roop, Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, University of Auckland, Auckland 1142, New Zealand; p.roop@auckland.ac.nz

Samik Basu, Department of Computer Science, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, USA; sbasu@cs.iastate.edu

Chong-Min Kyung, Department of Electrical Engineering, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Daejeon 305-701, South Korea; kyung@ee.kaist.ac.kr

Gregor Goessler, INRIA Grenoble-Rhône-Alpes, 38334 Saint Ismier Cedex, France; gregor.goessler@inrialpes.fr

Research Letters in Signal Processing

Why publish in this journal?

Research Letters in Signal Processing is devoted to very fast publication of short, highquality manuscripts in the broad field of signal processing. Manuscripts should not exceed 4 pages in their final published form. Average time from submission to publication shall be around 60 days.

Why publish in this journal?

Wide Dissemination

All articles published in the journal are freely available online with no subscription or registration barriers. Every interested reader can download, print, read, and cite your article.

Quick Publication

The journal employs an online "Manuscript Tracking System" which helps streamline and speed the peer review so all manuscripts receive fast and rigorous peer review. Accepted articles appear online as soon as they are accepted, and shortly after, the final published version is released online following a thorough in-house production process.

Professional Publishing Services

The journal provides professional copyediting, typesetting, graphics, editing, and reference validation to all accepted manuscripts.

Keeping Your Copyright

Authors retain the copyright of their manuscript, which is published using the "Creative Commons Attribution License," which permits unrestricted use of all published material provided that it is properly cited.

Extensive Indexing

Articles published in this journal will be indexed in several major indexing databases to ensure the maximum possible visibility of each published article.

Submit your Manuscript Now...

In order to submit your manuscript, please visit the journal's website that can be found at **http://www.hindawi.com/journals/rlsp/** and click on the "Manuscript Submission" link in the navigational bar.

Should you need help or have any questions, please drop an email to the journal's editorial office at **rlsp@hindawi.com**

ISSN: 1687-6911; e-ISSN: 1687-692X; doi:10.1155/RLSP

Hindawi Publishing Corporation 410 Park Avenue, 15th Floor, #287 pmb, New York, NY 10022, USA

HINDA

Research Letters in Signal Processing

Editorial Board

Tyseer Aboulnasr, Canada T. Adali, USA S. S. Agaian, USA Tamal Bose, USA Jonathon Chambers, UK Liang-Gee Chen, Taiwan P. Dan Dan Cristea, Romania Karen Egiazarian, Finland Fary Z. Ghassemlooy, UK Ling Guan, Canada M. Haardt, Germany Peter Handel, Sweden Alfred Hanssen, Norway Andreas Jakobsson, Sweden Jiri Jan, Czech Republic Soren Holdt Jensen, Denmark Stefan Kaiser, Germany C. Chung Ko, Singapore S. Maw Kuo, USA Miguel Angel Lagunas, Spain James Lam, Hong Kong Mark Liao, Taiwan Stephen Marshall, UK Stephen McLaughlin, UK Antonio Napolitano, Italy C. Richard, France M. Rupp, Austria William Allan Sandham, UK Ravi Sankar, USA John J. Shynk, USA A. Spanias, USA Yannis Stylianou, Greece Jarmo Henrik Takala, Finland S. Theodoridis, Greece Luc Vandendorpe, Belgium Jar-Ferr Kevin Yang, Taiwan