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Abstract:
In this paper, the steady-state performance of the Least Mean Square (LMS) adaptive second order Volterra filter, with constant step-size $\mu$, in a time-varying setting, is analysed. The quantitative evaluation of the steady-state Excess Mean Square Error (EMSE), where the contribution of the gradient misadjustment and the tracking error are well characterized, is established. The optimum step-size for time-varying second order Volterra filter is then given. Thus, we can study the correlation between the Excess MSE and the optimum step-size in one hand and the parameters of the time-varying nonlinear system, in the other hand. Furthermore, the steady-state behavior predicted by the analysis is in good agreement with the experimental results. The adaptive filter was used in a second order Volterra system identification in a non-stationary environment.

1. INTRODUCTION

The convergence analysis of the LMS adaptive algorithm in the mean and the mean square context has been studied for stationary linear filter in many works [1][2]. In the non-stationary linear filtering, the tracking properties and the problem of finding an optimal value of the step size of the adaptive LMS algorithm has been investigated widely in the literature [3][4]. It is shown that the tracking Mean Square Error (MSE) results from the tradeoff between the gradient part which is $\mu$-increasing and the lag contribution which is $\mu$-decreasing. The decoupled character of the gradient and the lag errors in the case of linear filter is proved in [5]. However, in the non linear case and more precisely the second order Volterra filter [6][7], few number of papers dealing with the convergence analysis of the LMS adaptive algorithms were presented and limited only to the stationary environment [8]. The aim of this paper is the study of the convergence of the LMS second order Volterra filter. In a first step, we present a quantitative evaluation of the Excess Mean Square Error and in a second step, the optimum value of the step-size is derived.

2. THE LMS ADAPTIVE NON LINEAR FILTER

The general nonlinear filtering problem may be represented by a second order Volterra series [8] of gaussian input $x(n)$ and zero-mean output $y(n)$:

$y(n) = A^T X(n) + tr[B]\left[X(n)X^T(n) - R_x\right]$ (1)

Where $X(n) = [x(n), \ldots, x(n-N+1)]^T$ (2)

$A = [a(0), \ldots, a(n-1)]^T$ (3)

and $B = \begin{bmatrix}
 b(0,0) & \ldots & b(0,N-1) \\
 \ldots & \ddots & \ldots \\
 b(N-1,0) & \ldots & b(N-1,N-1)
\end{bmatrix}$ (4)

$R_x$ denotes the $N$ by $N$ autocorrelation matrix of $x(n)$ i.e. $[R_x]_{i,j} = r_{x}(j-i)$. $A$ and $B$ are respectively the linear and quadratic filter operators. According [8], and assuming the hypothesis of a Gaussian input, its shown that the linear and quadratic filter weights which minimize the mean square error between filter output $y(n)$ and desired output $s(n)$ is given by

$A_0 = R_x^{-1}R_{ss}$ and $B_0 = (1/2)R_x^{-1}T_{ss}R_x^{-1}$ (5)
Where $R_{ss} = [r_{ss}(0),...,r_{ss}(N-1)]^T$ and $T_n = \begin{bmatrix} t_n(0,0) & ... & t_n(0,N-1) \\ & . & . \\ t_n(N-1,0) & ... & t_n(N-1,N-1) \end{bmatrix}$ (6)

Then, the LMS algorithm for the adaptive Second order Volterra filter is given by [8]:

$$
\begin{align}
A(n+1) &= A(n) - 2\mu_s e(n)X(n) \\
B(n+1) &= B(n) - \mu_B e(n)X(n)X^T(n)
\end{align}
$$

(9)

Where $e(n) = y(n) - s(n)$ denotes the residual error of the filter. $\mu_A$ and $\mu_B$ are the step size of the algorithm, they determine the rate of adaptation of the linear and quadratic filter part. The LMS algorithm is considered as a stochastic variant of the most well known steepest descent method [1] by assuming the independence between $A(n)$, $B(n)$ and $X(n)$. $\mu_A < 1/\lambda_{\text{max}}$ and $\mu_B < 1/\lambda_{\text{max}}^2$ are the algorithm stability conditions in a stationary environment [1][5][8]. $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ is the largest eigenvalue of $R_s$.

3.EVALUATION OF THE EXCESS MEAN SQUARE ERROR IN THE TIME-VARYING CONTEXT

Let’s now examine the ability of the LMS algorithm to operate in a non stationary environment. Assume that the linear and quadratic optimum filter weights vary following:

$$
\begin{align}
A_0(n+1) &= A_0(n) + \Delta A_0(n) \\
B_0(n+1) &= B_0(n) + \Delta B_0(n)
\end{align}
$$

(10)

$\sigma_{\text{NSA}}^2 = \text{cov}(\Delta A_0(n))$ and $\sigma_{\text{NSB}}^2 = \text{cov}(\Delta B_0(n))$ are defined as the scalar covariance of the filter increment standard deviation. Then the LMS algorithm has the task not only seeking the minimum point of the error performance surface but also tracking the continually changing position of this minimum point. Since gradient and lag errors are decoupled [5] and according to the procedure used in [8], the total MSE is:

$$
J(n) = J_{\text{min}} + j_A(n) + j_B(n)
$$

(11)

where:

$J_{\text{min}} = \text{cov}(e(n))$ if we omit the additive noise.

$$
J_A(n) = E\left[\text{tr}\left(\Delta A^T(n)R_s\Delta A(n)\right)\right]
$$

(12)

$$
J_B(n) = E\left[\text{tr}\left(\Delta B^T(n)R_s\Delta B(n)\right)\right]
$$

(13)

$$
\Delta A(n) = A(n) - A_0(n)
$$

(14)

$$
\Delta B(n) = B(n) - B_0(n)
$$

(15)

The evaluation of the steady-state MSE for the linear part, i.e. $\hat{j}_A = \lim_{n\to\infty} \{j_A(n)\}$, is given by [2][5]:

$$
J_A = J_{\text{min}} + \mu_A N\sigma_{\text{NSA}}^2 + \frac{N\sigma_{\text{NSB}}^2}{4\mu_A}
$$

(16)

In a similar fashion, we shall evaluate now the steady-state MSE for the quadratic part, i.e. $\hat{j}_B = \lim_{n\to\infty} \{j_B(n)\}$. Hence by using (9)(10) and (15), yields:

$$
\Delta B(n+1) = B(n+1) - B_0(n+1) = \Delta B(n) - \mu_B e(n)X(n)X^T(n) - \Delta B_0(n)
$$

(17)

which can be reformulated as follows:

$$
\Delta B(n+1) = \Delta B(n) - \mu_B [2R_s\Delta B(n)R_s + W(n)] - \Delta B_0(n)
$$

(18)

where $W(n) = e(n)X(n)X^T(n) - 2R_s\Delta B(n)R_s$.

Assuming that the measurement noise is uncorrelated with $\Delta B(n)$ and $\Delta B_0(n)$ is uncorrelated with the inputs $X(n)$ and with $\Delta B(n)$, this gives:

$$
E\left[\text{tr}\left(\Delta B(n+1)\right)\right] = E\left[\text{tr}(\Delta B(n))\right] - 4\mu_B E\left[\text{tr}(\Delta B(n)R_s\Delta B(n)R_s)\right] + 4\mu_B^2 E\left[\text{tr}(R_s\Delta B(n)R_s)\right]
$$

(20)

Where the matrix norm of a given matrix $A$ is denoted by $\|A\|$ and defined by the quantity: $\|A\| = \sqrt{\text{tr}(AA^T)}$.

In the steady state of the adaptation, and assuming slow time variation of the optimal filter weights, we can assume that:

$$
E\left[\text{tr}\left(\Delta B(n+1)\right)\right] = E\left[\text{tr}(\Delta B(n))\right]
$$

(21)

In addition, for $\mu_B < \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}}^{-2}}{}$, it can be proved [8] that:

$$
\mu_B E\left[\text{tr}(R_s\Delta B(n)R_s)\right] < E\left[\text{tr}(\Delta B(n)R_s\Delta B(n)R_s)\right]
$$

(22)

More over, from (20), we write:
4μ_kE[tr(ΔB(n)R_k)ΔB(n)R_k] = μ_k^2E[∥W(n)∥^2] + E[∥ΔB_k(n)∥^2] (22)

Furthermore, by using the asymptotic assumption B(n) = B_0(n), W(n) = e(n)X(n)X^T(n), the independence between e(n) and x(n), and the hypothesis of a Gaussian input, it results:

\[ E[∥W(n)∥^2] = J_{min}[tr(R_k^2) + tr(R_k^2) + tr(R_k^2)] \]
\[ = J_{min}[2tr(R_k^2) + N^2(σ_x^2)^2] \] (23)

The second term of the right hand side of (22) may be evaluated by:

\[ E[∥ΔB_k(n)∥^2] = E[tr(ΔB_0(n)ΔB_0^T(n))] = Nσ_{NS}^2 \] (24)

Then:

\[ J_B = \lim_{n→∞} E[tr(ΔB(n)R_k)ΔB(n)R_k] = \]
\[ J_{min}\left[\frac{μ_k}{4}[2tr(R_k^2) + N^2(σ_x^2)^2]\right] + \frac{Nσ_{NS}^2}{4μ_B} \] (25)

Note that the second term of the right hand side of (25) is the nonlinear Excess MSE Lag caused by variation ΔB_0 of B_0(n). The first term corresponds to the stationary gradient misadjustment [8]. The resulting expression of the total steady-state Excess MSE is given by:

\[ J = \lim_{n→∞}(J(n) - J_{min}) = J_A + J_B = \]
\[ J_{min}\left[μ_ANσ_{NS}^2 + \frac{μ_k}{4}[2tr(R_k^2) + N^2(σ_x^2)^2]\right] \]
\[ + \frac{Nσ_{NS}^2}{4μ_A} + \frac{Nσ_{NS}^2}{4μ_B} \] (26)

In this simplified expression for the steady-state Excess MSE, the contribution of the gradient misadjustment and the tracking error are well characterized. Clearly, there is an optimum of the adaptation step size when μ_A = μ_B = μ which is:

\[ μ_{opt} = \sqrt{\frac{Nσ_{NS}^2 + Nσ_{NS}^2}{J_{min}\left[4Nσ_x^2 + 2tr(R_k^2) + N^2(σ_x^2)^2\right]}} \] (27)

Note that this optimum is exact only in the case of slow variation [9]. The dependence between the Excess MSE and the optimum step-size in one hand and the parameters of the time-varying nonlinear system, in the other hand, can be studied.

4. COMPUTER SIMULATIONS

In order to illustrate the performance of the algorithm, we have performed extensive computer simulations. The adaptive LMS filter was used to estimate a second order Volterra system with gaussian input x_k and output y_k in a non stationary and noisy environment:

\[ y_k = 0.8x_k - 0.5x_{k-1} + 0.7x_k^2 + 0.1x_{k-1}^2 - 0.4x_kx_{k-1} + n_k \]

For all the experiments, the signal-to-noise ratio is defined as: SNR dB = 10log(σ_y^2/σ_n^2). σ_n^2 is the variance of the additive noise n_k. μ_A = μ_B = μ.

The norm of the coefficient-error vector defined as:

\[ Er(dB) = 10\log\left(\left\|\hat{Θ} - Θ\right\|\right) \]

is plotted in Fig.3 versus time iterations for different ‘variance of the non stationarity’ σ_{NS} (Θ is a vector containing all the time varying weights).

Fig.2 shows that the theoretical and experimental Excess MSE versus step-size are in quite good agreement. The theoretical total Excess MSE is plotted in Fig.1 versus step-size μ and in Fig.4 for different input power σ_x^2. The optimal step-size is plotted in Fig.5 versus minimum MSE J0 = J_{min}. 5. CONCLUSION In this paper, we have studied the steady-state performance of the adaptive second order Volterra filter controlled by the LMS algorithm, with constant step-size μ_k in a time-varying context. We have provided a method to determine a quantitative evaluation of the steady-state Excess MSE. The optimum step-size for time-varying second order Volterra filter is then given. Extensive computer simulation have been performed and show the correlation between the Excess MSE and the optimum step-size in one hand and the parameters of the time-varying nonlinear system, such as input power, variance of non stationarity and step size, in the other hand. These results are exact in the case of a slow non stationarity. Further works concerning the analysis of the nonlinear LMS algorithm in the non stationary context need to be done. Note that the independence between the spectral characteristics of the input signal and the convergence behavior of the LMS algorithm imposes a bound on the step-size of the algorithm depending on the eigenvalue spread of the autocorrelation matrix of the input signal.
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Fig. 1: Theoretical total Excess MSE (1) = stationary EMSE (2) + Lag MSE versus step-size (3) (SNR=25dB, $\sigma_x^2=0.17$, $\mu_{opt}=0.0071$, $\sigma_{NSA} = \sigma_{NSB} = 10^{-4}$)

Fig. 2: Theoretical (—) and experimental (●) Excess MSE versus step-size. (SNR=25dB, $\sigma_x^2=0.17$, $\mu_{opt}=0.0071$, $\sigma_{NS} = \sigma_{NSA} = 10^{-4}$)

Fig. 3: Norm of coef-error vector versus time for different $\sigma_{NS}$: (1) $\sigma_{NS}=10^{-4}$, (2) $\sigma_{NS}=10^{-5}$, (3) $\sigma_{NS}=0$ (SNR=∞DB, $\sigma_x^2=0.17$, $\mu = \mu_{opt}=0.0071$, $\sigma_{NS} = \sigma_{NSA} = \sigma_{NSB}$)

Fig. 4: Theoretical total Excess MSE versus step-size for different $\sigma_x^2$ (SNR=10dB, $\sigma_{NSA} = \sigma_{NSB} = 5.10^{-4}$) (1) $\sigma_x^2=0.011$ (2) $\sigma_x^2=0.0017$
Fig. 5: Optimal step-size versus min MSE $J_0$ for different $\sigma_{NSA}^2$ and $\sigma_{NSB}^2$ ($\sigma^2 = 0.0017$)

(1) $\sigma_{NSA}^2 = \sigma_{NSB}^2 = 2.5 \times 10^{-6}$ (2) $\sigma_{NSA}^2 = 0$, $\sigma_{NSB}^2 = 2.5 \times 10^{-6}$