

AD-A080 184

PENNSYLVANIA UNIV. PHILADELPHIA DEPT OF SYSTEMS ENGIN--ETC F/6 9/4  
SIGNAL PROCESSING FILTERS UNDER MODELING UNCERTAINTIES.(U)  
1979 S A KASSAM, T L LIM, L J CIMINI AFOSR-77-3154

UNCLASSIFIED


AFOSR-TR-80-0021

NL

| OF |  
AD  
A080184



END  
DATE  
FILMED  
3-80  
DDC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

*Unclassified***LEVEL II****19. REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**READ INSTRUCTIONS  
BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER

2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.

3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER

**AFOSR-TR-80-0021**

4. TITLE (and Subtitle)

**SIGNAL PROCESSING FILTERS UNDER MODELING  
UNCERTAINTIES**

5. TYPE OF REPORT &amp; PERIOD COVERED

**9 Interim rpt.**

6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER

7. AUTHOR(s)

**Saleem A. Kassam, Tong Leong Lim and  
Leonard J. Cimini**

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)

**15 ✓ AFOSR-77-3154**

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

**University of Pennsylvania  
Dept. of Systems Engineering  
Philadelphia, PA 19174**10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK  
AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS**61102F****2304 A5**

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS

**Air Force Office of Scientific Research/NM  
Bolling AFB, Washington, DC 20332**

12. REPORT DATE

**1979**

13. NUMBER OF PAGES

**20**

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME &amp; ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)

15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)

**UNCLASSIFIED**15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING  
SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

**Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.**

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT

(of abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

**YES**

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Matched and Wiener filters are considered for signal processing applications when the a priori information about signal and noise characteristics are not completely specified. The approach is to design filters which are saddle-point or max-min solutions for the criterion functional (mean-squared-error or signal-to-noise ratio) over the classes of allowable signal shapes and signal and noise spectral densities. Two-dimensional discrete-parameter processes are considered, and some numerical examples are presented.

*mt*

AD A 080184

DDC FILE COPY

**DDC**  
**RECEIVED**  
**FEB 4 1980**  
**B**

- 1 -

SIGNAL PROCESSING FILTERS UNDER  
MODELING UNCERTAINTIES

Saleem A. Kassam, Tong Leong Lim and Leonard J. Cimini

ABSTRACT

Matched and Wiener filters are considered for signal processing applications when the *a priori* information about signal and noise characteristics are not completely specified. The approach is to design filters which are saddle-point or max-min solutions for the criterion functional (mean-squared-error or signal-to-noise ratio) over the classes of allowable signal shapes and signal and noise spectral densities. Two-dimensional discrete-parameter processes are considered, and some numerical examples are presented.

I. INTRODUCTION

Classical formulations of signal processing problems assume that the characteristics of signals and noise can be modeled exactly, either deterministically or statistically. For example, if the shape of a deterministic signal is known and the noise additively corrupting it has a known power spectral density (PSD), then a filter maximizing the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) at its output can be designed; this results in the well-known matched filter. In the same way, the optimum Wiener filter can be obtained for the best linear estimate of a random signal in additive noise, when both PSD's are known.

---

This research is supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under Grant AFOSR 77-3154

S.A. Kassam and L.J. Cimini are with the Moore School of Electrical Engineering, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

T.L. Lim is with Bell Laboratories, Holmdel, N.J.

This is an extended version of a paper presented at the 1979 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing.

80 1 29 135

Approved for public release;  
distribution unlimited.

In many applications it is much more reasonable to assume that the signal and noise characteristics are not completely known, and to assume that they can only be defined as belonging to appropriate classes of characteristics. The sizes of these classes reflect the degrees of uncertainty that one has about the true signal and noise characteristics. In such cases, it is desirable to have filters which perform well over both classes of allowable signal and noise characteristics, that is, we should look for robust filters.

In general the specification of an optimum filter for processing inputs requires knowledge of the multivariate probability distribution functions characterizing the input random processes. For estimation and detection applications under the widespread assumption of Gaussian input processes the optimum filters are generally linear, and are based on the bivariate density functions, that is, the mean and covariance functions, of the input Gaussian process. Even if the input processes are not Gaussian, a restriction to linear filtering, as in Wiener and matched filtering, allows optimum filters to be obtained if mean and covariance function information is available. In this paper we will be dealing with cases of linear filtering where this bivariate information is imprecise. Other efforts in robustness theory have been concerned with the deviations from Gaussian distributions which may occur in input processes. Allowances for distributional impreciseness have led to many interesting results on robust nonlinear structures in detection and estimation theory [e.g., 1-5]; however, such results deal almost exclusively with univariate density functions and hence "white" inputs because of the major analytical difficulties which otherwise appear.

One of the earliest investigations of robust linear filtering ideas was reported by Yovits and Jackson in 1955 [6]. They considered a game-theoretic problem of max-min filter design for signal estimation in additive noise with mean-squared-error as the pay-off functional, the signal having constraints on

AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (AFSC)  
NOTICE OF TRANSMITTAL TO DDC  
This technical report has been reviewed and is  
approved for public release IAW AFR 190-12 (7b).  
Distribution is unlimited.  
A. D. BLOSE  
Technical Information Officer

its mean-square derivatives. Although the realizable Wiener filter was considered, only for the white-noise case was it possible to obtain explicit results. In [7] and [8] Nahi and Weiss obtained "bounding filters" for the Wiener and Kalman filter, which were possibly lower-order filters with guaranteed error performance for classes of input characteristics. More recently, Kuznetsov [9] obtained the saddle-point matched filter for the SNR criterion; specifically, with the Fourier transform  $S(\omega)$  of a finite energy signal allowed to be a member of a class  $C_s$ , and for the noise spectral density  $N(\omega)$  allowed to be a member of a class  $C_n$ , the saddle-point solutions were obtained for the game with pay-off  $SNR(S,N;H)$ . Here  $SNR(S,N;H)$  is the SNR obtained when filter  $H$  is used for signal and noise characteristics  $S(\omega)$ ,  $N(\omega)$ , respectively. Kuznetsov obtained separately the robust filter for  $S(\omega)$  in  $C_s$  with  $N(\omega)$  known, and for  $S(\omega)$  known and  $N(\omega)$  in  $C_n$ . The class  $C_s$  was the class of finite-energy signals which are within an allowable distance  $\Delta > 0$  of a nominal  $S_0(\omega)$  characteristic, in the sense of  $L_2$  distance. The class  $C_n$  was the "band-model" class of the spectral densities bounded by given densities  $N_L(\omega) \leq N_U(\omega)$ , with a total-power constraint.

In [10], Kassam and Lim obtained the structures of robust (saddle-point) filters for the Wiener filter formulation, with both signal and noise spectral densities allowed to be members of classes of densities specified by "band-models". In [11], Poor generalizes some results on Wiener filters obtained in [10].

Here we will obtain the robust matched and Wiener filters for two-dimensional discrete-parameter systems subject to uncertainties simultaneously about signal and noise characteristics. Thus this work represents a logical extension of the recent results in [9-11].

## II. ROBUST MATCHED FILTERES

Let  $s(m,n)$  be a real, finite-energy, two-dimensional, deterministic signal sequence, where  $m,n$  are integer variables, and let  $S(u,v)$  be the two-dimensional discrete-time Fourier transform of  $s(m,n)$ . If  $N(u,v)$  is the PSD of a real, station-

|                                 |        |                |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------------|
| DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES |        |                |
| Dist.                           | AVAIL. | and/or SPECIAL |
| A                               |        |                |

ary, zero-mean, additive noise, then the matched filter with frequency response

$$H^+(u,v) = S^*(u,v)/N(u,v) \quad (1)$$

maximizes the SNR at its output at  $m=0$ ,  $n=0$ . If an arbitrary filter  $H(u,v)$  is used, the SNR functional is

$$\text{SNR}(S,N;H) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \frac{\left| \iint S(u,v)H(u,v) du dv \right|^2}{\iint |N(u,v)|^2 |H(u,v)|^2 du dv} \quad (2)$$

In (2) and the rest of this paper, except where indicated otherwise, every double integral is over the region  $\{u,v | -\pi < u, v \leq \pi\}$ . In the following, we will drop the arguments of the functions wherever no confusion results.

Consider the following models for the classes of allowable signal and noise characteristics:

$$C_s = \{S(u,v) \mid \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \iint |S - S_0|^2 du dv \leq \delta\}, \quad (3)$$

$$C_n = \{N(u,v) \mid N_L(u,v) \leq N(u,v) \leq N_U(u,v) \text{ and } \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \iint N(u,v) du dv = \sigma_N^2\} \quad (4)$$

In the definition of  $C_s$ ,  $S_0(u,v)$  is a nominal signal characteristic, and signals in  $C_s$  differ in energy from the nominal signal  $s_0(m,n)$  by no more than  $\delta$ . To exclude a trivial case, we assume that the energy  $\sum_{m,n} |s_0(m,n)|^2 > \delta$ . The class  $C_s$  is a reasonable model for the allowable signal when it is known that  $s(m,n)$  is within a neighborhood of  $s_0(m,n)$ . The class  $C_n$  of noise PSD's contains PSD's with a specific total power  $\sigma_N^2$  which lie between given upper and lower bounds. Such a model is appropriate, for example, when  $N(u,v)$  is estimated from samples. In the definition of  $C_n$ , we assume that  $N_L(u,v)$  is bounded.

The robust matched filter  $H_R(u,v)$  is defined to be the max-min filter such that

$$\max_H \min_{\substack{S \in C_s \\ N \in C_n}} \text{SNR}(S,N;H) = \min_{\substack{S \in C_s \\ N \in C_n}} \text{SNR}(S,N;H_R) \quad (5)$$

If  $H_R$  is the optimum filter for a least-favorable pair of characteristics  $S_R \in C_s$ ,  $N_R \in C_n$ , then we would have

$$\text{SNR}(S, N; H_R) \geq \text{SNR}(S_R, N_R; H_R) \geq \text{SNR}(S_R, N_R; H) \quad (6)$$

for any pair  $(S, N)$  in  $C_s \times C_n$  and any linear filter  $H$ , and (5) would be satisfied. In this case, the filter  $H = H_R$  and the pair  $(S_R, N_R) \in C_s \times C_n$  will form a saddle-point for the SNR functional of (2).

The main result of this section is the following theorem, which gives the saddle-point solution for our matched filtering problem:

**Theorem 1.** For the classes  $C_s$  and  $C_n$ , the robust matched filter  $H_R$  is the optimum filter for the pair of least favorable characteristics defined by

$$S_R = \frac{S_0(u, v) N_R(u, v)}{N_R(u, v) + c} \quad (7)$$

and

$$N_R = \begin{cases} N_U(u, v) & , (u, v) \in R_U(k) \\ N_L(u, v) & , (u, v) \in R_L(k) \\ |S_R(u, v)|/k & , (u, v) \in R_M(k) \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where

$$R_U(k) = \{(u, v) \mid kN_U < |S_R|\} \quad , \quad (9)$$

$$R_L(k) = \{(u, v) \mid |S_R| \leq kN_L\} \quad , \quad (10)$$

$$R_M(k) = \{(u, v) \mid kN_L < |S_R| \leq kN_U\} \quad , \quad (11)$$

if non-negative constants  $k, c$  exist satisfying

$$\frac{c^2}{(2\pi)^2} \iint \frac{|S_0|^2}{[N_R + c]^2} \, du dv = \delta \quad , \quad (12)$$

and

$$\iint_{R_L(k)} N_L dudv + \iint_{R_U(k)} N_U dudv + \frac{1}{k} \iint_{R_M(k)} |S_R| dudv = (2\pi)^2 \sigma_N^2 \quad (13)$$

We omit the detailed proof of the theorem, since it is somewhat lengthy. However, some clarifying comments can be made, and an outline of the proof follows.

The structure of the solution is suggested by the results given in [9,10]. Eq. (12) results from conditions imposed in defining  $C_s$ , and (13) is the power constraint for the class  $C_n$ . Note that (7) and (8) are coupled, but that  $S_R$  and  $N_R$  can be expressed in terms of the known  $S_0$ ,  $N_L$ , and  $N_U$ , and constants  $k$  and  $c$ , which can be solved from two simultaneous equations derived from (12) and (13). The proof shows when such a solution for  $k$  and  $c$  will exist. The saddle-point condition (6) can be verified by noting that  $H_R$  is optimum for  $S_R$  and  $N_R$  [one part of (6)], and by showing that  $(S_R, H_R)$  minimizes the numerator in (2) over all  $(S, H_R)$  with  $S \in C_s$ ,  $(N_R, H_R)$  maximizes the denominator in (2) over all the  $(N, H_R)$  with  $N \in C_n$ .

For the case where either  $\delta=0$  or  $N_L = N_U$  the above results become somewhat simpler. Theorem 1 also gives, as a special case, the robust filter for a different model, the  $\epsilon$ -model [10], for  $N(u,v)$ . We will consider this model in a simple example in the next section.

# Outline of Proof of Theorem 1

Since  $H_R$  is the optimum filter for the pair  $(S_R, N_R)$ , we have to show only that  $SNR(S, N; H_R) \geq SNR(S_R, N_R; H_R)$  for all  $(S, N)$  in  $C_s \times C_n$ .

Consider the denominator term in (2), and call it  $d(N, H)$ . Now

$$d(N, H_R) - d(N_R, H_R) = k^2 \iint_{R_M(k)} (N - N_R) + \iint_{R_L(k)} (N - N_L) |H_R|^2 + \iint_{R_U(k)} (N - N_U) |H_R|^2 \quad (14)$$

On  $R_L(k)$ ,  $|H_R|^2 \leq k^2$  and on  $R_U(k)$ ,  $|H_R|^2 \geq k^2$ ; thus using the power constraint, we find  $d(N, H_R) - d(N_R, H_R) \leq 0$ .

In showing that the numerator term in (2) is minimized for  $S=S_R$  given that  $H=H_R$ , we note that  $II[S_0^*(S)/(N_R+c)]$  is non-negative, and we consider the minimization of  $II[S_0^*(S-S_0)/(N_R+c)]$ . This last term is real, so we consider

$$\iint [ |S_0| |S-S_0| / (N_R+c) ] \cos[\arg S_0^*(S-S_0)] du dv$$

This term is a minimum when the cosine part is -1, and the result of (7) for the minimizing  $S$  can be obtained from Schwarz's inequality.

In order to show when the solution given by (7) and (8) exists, that is, when non-negative constants  $c$  and  $k$  exist which are solutions to (12) and (13), we rewrite Eqs. (12) and (13) as

$$\iint_{R_L(k,c)} N_L + \iint_{R_U(k,c)} N_U + \iint_{R_M(k,c)} \left( \frac{|S_0|}{k} - c \right) = (2\pi)^2 \sigma_N^2 \quad (15)$$

and

$$c^2 \iint_{R_L(k,c)} \frac{|S_0|^2}{[N_L+c]^2} + c^2 \iint_{R_U(k,c)} \frac{|S_0|^2}{[N_U+c]^2} + c^2 \iint_{R_M(k,c)} k^2 = (2\pi)^2 \delta \quad (16)$$

where  $R_L(k)$  of Eq. (10) has been written explicitly as

$$R_L(k, c) = \{(u, v) \mid |S_0| N_L \leq k N_L (N_L + c)\}, \quad (17)$$

and similarly

$$R_U(k, c) = \{(u, v) \mid k N_U (N_U + c) < |S_0| N_U \text{ and } N_L > 0\}, \quad (18)$$

$$R_M(k, c) = \overline{R_L(k, c)} \cap \overline{R_U(k, c)} \quad (19)$$

Suppose the condition

$$\iint_{N_L=0} |S_0|^2 dudv < (2\pi)^2 \delta < \iint_{N_L=0} |S_0|^2 dudv + \iint_{\substack{N_L > 0 \\ N_U < \infty}} |S_0|^2 dudv \quad (20)$$

is satisfied. This will be true in many models of interest; it is valid, for example, when  $N_L$  and  $N_U$  are finite and non-zero when  $|S_0|$  is positive. Then there exists a finite, positive solution  $c=c_1$  in Eq. (12) with  $N_L$  replacing  $N_R$ , and there exists also a finite, positive solution  $c=c_2 \geq c_1$  in the equation

$$\iint_{N_L=0} |S_0|^2 dudv + c^2 \iint_{N_L > 0} \frac{|S_0|^2}{(N_U + c)^2} dudv = (2\pi)^2 \delta \quad (21)$$

If the set  $\{(u, v) \mid (N_U - N_L) N_L |S_0| > 0\}$  has positive measure, then  $c_2 > c_1$ . Otherwise,  $c_2 = c_1$ .

Consider Eq. (16). Let  $k=k_s(c)$  be the solution for  $k$  with  $c \in [c_1, c_2]$ . For  $c=c_1$ , we define  $k_s(c_1)$  as the ess sup over the set  $\{(u, v) \mid N_L |S_0| > 0\}$  of  $|S_0|/(N_L + c_1)$ , and for  $c=c_2$  we define  $k_s(c_2)$  similarly as the ess inf, over the same set, of  $|S_0|/(N_U + c_2)$ . The solution  $k_s(c)$  is a smooth, non-increasing function of  $c$  on  $[c_1, c_2]$ .

Suppose the condition

$$(2\pi)^2 \sigma_N^2 < \iint N_L dudv + \iint N_U dudv \quad (22)$$

$$|S_0|=0 \quad |S_0|N_L > 0$$

is satisfied. This is also generally true. Then the solution  $k=k_n(c)$  with  $c \in [c_1, c_2]$  for Eq. (15) exists, and we have  $k_s(c_2) < k_n(c_2) \leq k_n(c_1) < k_s(c_1)$ . (Note that (22) is not compatible with  $c_1=c_2>0$ , given that  $\iint N_L dudv < (2\pi)^2 \delta < \iint N_U dudv$ ). The solution  $k_n(c)$  is also a smooth, non-increasing function of  $c$  on  $[c_1, c_2]$ . Thus, positive solutions  $k, c$  always exist, when (20) and (22) are satisfied, for the simultaneous equations (12) and (13).

If (20) is true but (22) is not, we may pick  $N_R=N_U$  when  $|S_0|N_L > 0$ ,  $N_R=0$  when  $N_L=0$  and  $|S_0|>0$ , and  $N_R$  arbitrary otherwise, with  $S_R$  as in Eq. (7) and  $c=c_2$ . Similar special cases can be considered when (20) is not satisfied, for example when  $N_U$  is unbounded everywhere.

If the set  $\{(u,v) | (N_U-N_L)N_L|S_0|>0\}$  has measure zero (for example,  $N_L=N_U$ ) and  $\delta>0$  we take  $c=c_1=c_2$  (assuming the LHS inequality in (20) is valid, otherwise the solution is trivial) and  $N_R=N_L$  when  $|S_0|>0$ , arbitrary otherwise. If  $\delta=0$  and  $\{(u,v) | (N_U-N_L)N_L|S_0|>0\}$  has positive measure, we can set  $c=0$  and take  $k=k_n(0)$  the finite, positive solution of Eq. (15), assuming (22) is true (otherwise the solution is trivial). We will consider another special case in the next section.

### III. A NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

We will now consider a simple specific model for the signal and noise characteristics and derive some numerical results. Consider the case where  $N(u,v)$  and  $S(u,v)$  are circularly symmetric, so that we may express  $N(u,v)$  as  $N(r)$  and  $S(u,v)$  as  $S(r)$  where  $r = \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}$ . We define a particular nominal signal Fourier transform by

$$S_0(r) = \begin{cases} 4.0, & 0 \leq r \leq 2.5 \\ 0, & r > 2.5 \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

In our first example, we will assume that we have precise information about the noise,

$$\begin{aligned} N(r) &= N_0(r) \\ &= N_L(r) \\ &= N_U(r) \\ &= \begin{cases} 2.5-r, & 0 \leq r \leq 2.5 \\ 0, & r > 2.5 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

If we take  $\delta=0.55$ , which represents an uncertainty of about 7% of the total signal energy, we can easily solve for the value  $c=0.1$ . Thus we have

$$S_R(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{4.0(2.5-r)}{2.6-r}, & 0 \leq r \leq 2.5 \\ 0, & r > 2.5 \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

and the robust filter is

$$H_R(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{4.0}{2.6-r}, & 0 \leq r \leq 2.5 \\ 0, & r > 2.5 \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

The effect of the  $\delta$ -uncertainty in the signal definition thus prescribes a filter designed on the assumption of an added white-noise component of level 0.1 for the noise spectrum. This white-noise components results in a non-singular signal detection solution, whereas the "optimum" filter  $H_0$  designed for the nominal signal  $S_0$  and noise  $N$  results in a theoretically infinite  $SNR(S_0, N; H_0)$ . However, if  $H_0$  is used when  $S \neq S_0$ , we could get very different results. For example, it turns out that  $SNR(S_R, N; H_0) = -\infty$  dB, but with  $H_R$  we get  $SNR(S_R, N; H_R) = 10$  dB,

which forms the lower bound for performance. When  $H_R$  is used and the nominal signal is in effect, we get  $\text{SNR}(S_0, N; H_R) = 14$  dB.

To extend this example, let us introduce distinct upper and lower bounds for  $N$ :

$$N_L(r) = (1-\epsilon) N_0(r) , \quad (27)$$

$$N_U(r) = \infty , \quad (28)$$

with  $\epsilon = 0.1$  and noise variance  $\sigma_N^2$  assumed known to be the variance of  $N_0(r)$ , the "nominal" noise spectrum. This model may be interpreted as expressing a 90% confidence in the validity of  $N_0(r)$  for the noise spectrum, with an arbitrary noise component allowed otherwise. In order to obtain  $S_R$  and  $N_R$ ,  $c=c_1$  was first found as the solution of Eq. (12) with  $N_L$  replacing  $N_R$ . The correct  $c$  has to be larger than this. The solution  $k=k_s(c)$  for  $c > c_1$  in Eq. (16) was then computed numerically. Similarly, the solution  $k=k_n(c)$  for  $c > c_1$  was computed numerically for Eq. (15). The intersection of these two results gave the value of  $c=0.23$  and  $k=5.9$ . These results give

$$N_R(r) = \begin{cases} 0.9(2.5-r) & , \quad 0 \leq r \leq 2.0 \\ 0.45 & , \quad 2.0 < r \leq 2.5 \\ 0 & , \quad r > 2.5 \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

and

$$S_R(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{3.6(2.5-r)}{0.9(2.5-r) + 0.23} & , \quad 0 \leq r \leq 2.0 \\ 2.65 & , \quad 2.0 < r \leq 2.5 \\ 0 & , \quad r > 2.5 \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

so that

$$H_R(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{4.0}{2.5-0.9r} & , \quad 0 \leq r \leq 2.0 \\ 5.9 & , \quad 2.0 < r \leq 2.5 \\ 0 & , \quad r > 2.5 \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

Figure 1 shows a sketch of these functions. Numerical values for SNR's can also be computed for this case of signal and noise uncertainty; the robust filter lower bound on SNR will now be somewhat less than 10 dB, because of the additional noise uncertainty.

#### IV. ROBUST WIENER FILTERS

Let  $S(u,v)$  now be the PSD of a real, wide-sense stationary random signal observed as a mixture with real, wide-sense stationary, zero-mean, additive noise with PSD  $N(u,v)$ . It is well-known that the optimum linear filter giving the minimum mean-squared-error (MSE) estimate of the signal is given by

$$H^+(u,v) = \frac{S(u,v)}{S(u,v) + N(u,v)} \quad (32)$$

without realizability constraints.

In general, if an arbitrary filter  $H(u,v)$  is used, the MSE is given by

$$e(S,N;H) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \iint [S(u,v) |1-H(u,v)|^2 + N(u,v) |H(u,v)|^2] du dv \quad (33)$$

and the minimum MSE is given by

$$e^+(S,N) = e(S,N;H^+) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \iint \frac{S(u,v)N(u,v)}{S(u,v) + N(u,v)} du dv \quad (34)$$

We would like to consider a method for designing the estimating filter  $H(u,v)$  when the PSD's of the signal and noise processes are not precisely known. The approach which will be followed is a direct extension of the one-dimensional case given in [10].

We now assume that both the signal and noise PSD's belong to upper-lower bounded classes of the form of (4). Thus we now have the allowable signal and noise PSD's to be members of classes  $D_s$  and  $D_n$  defined by

$$D_s = \{S(u,v) \mid S_L(u,v) \leq S(u,v) \leq S_U(u,v) \text{ and } \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \iint S(u,v) du dv = \sigma_s^2\} \quad (35)$$

and

$$D_n = C_n \quad (36)$$

where  $C_n$  was defined in (4). We assume that the upper and lower bounds and the total powers of the signal and noise processes are known, with  $S_L(u,v)$  and  $N_L(u,v)$  bounded.

The most robust filter  $H_R(u,v)$  is defined as in (5), but now we require the minimization of the MSE rather than maximization of SNR. If  $H_R(u,v)$  is the optimum filter for a pair of least favorable PSD's  $S_R \in D_s$ ,  $N_R \in D_n$ , then  $H_R(u,v)$  must satisfy

$$e(S, N; H_R) \leq e(S_R, N_R; H_R) \leq e(S_R, N_R; H) \quad (37)$$

for any pair  $(S, N)$  in  $D_s \times D_n$  and any linear filter  $H(u,v)$ . The filter  $H_R(u,v)$  and the least favorable pair  $S_R(u,v)$ ,  $N_R(u,v)$  will form a saddle-point for the MSE.

The main result is the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.** For the classes  $D_s$  and  $D_n$ , the most robust Wiener filter  $H_R(u,v)$  exists. It is the optimum filter for the pair of least favorable PSD's defined according to the following:

$$S_R(u,v) = \begin{cases} k_s N_L(u,v) & (u,v) \in \alpha_1(k_s) \\ S_U(u,v) & (u,v) \in \alpha_2(k_s) \\ S_L(u,v) & (u,v) \in \bar{\alpha}(k_s) \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

and

$$N_R(u,v) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k_n} S_L(u,v) & (u,v) \in \beta_1(k_n) \\ N_U(u,v) & (u,v) \in \beta_2(k_n) \\ N_L(u,v) & (u,v) \in \bar{\beta}(k_n) \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha_1(k_g) &= \{(u,v) \mid S_L(u,v) < k_g N_L(u,v) \leq S_U(u,v)\} , \\
 \alpha_2(k_g) &= \{(u,v) \mid S_L(u,v) \leq S_U(u,v) < k_g N_L(u,v)\} , \\
 \bar{\alpha}(k_g) &= \{(u,v) \mid S_L(u,v) \geq k_g N_L(u,v)\} , \\
 \beta_1(k_n) &= \{(u,v) \mid k_n N_L(u,v) \leq S_L(u,v) < k_n N_U(u,v)\} , \\
 \beta_2(k_n) &= \{(u,v) \mid k_n N_L(u,v) \leq k_n N_U(u,v) \leq S_L(u,v)\} , \\
 \bar{\beta}(k_n) &= \{(u,v) \mid k_n N_L(u,v) > S_L(u,v)\} ,
 \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

if solutions  $k_g < k_n$  exist to the power constraint equations

$$P_S(z) \mid k_g = \sigma_S^2 , \tag{41a}$$

$$P_N(z) \mid k_n = \sigma_N^2 , \tag{41b}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_S(z) &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \left[ \iint_{\alpha_1(z)} z N_L(u,v) du dv + \iint_{\alpha_2(z)} S_U(u,v) du dv \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \iint_{\bar{\alpha}(z)} S_L(u,v) du dv \right] ,
 \end{aligned} \tag{42a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_N(z) &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \left[ \iint_{\beta_1(z)} \frac{1}{z} S_L(u,v) du dv + \iint_{\beta_2(z)} N_U(u,v) du dv \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \iint_{\bar{\beta}(z)} N_L(u,v) du dv \right]
 \end{aligned} \tag{42b}$$

There are two parts to the proof of the theorem, one showing the robustness of the solutions and the other showing existence. The existence proof which depends on finding a solution to (41) or other equations is similar to that given in [10] and will be omitted. The robustness proof is simpler, and we will outline it here.

In order to show that the above solution satisfies the condition for robustness, we must show (as in [10]) that

$$e(S, N; H_R) - e(S_R, N_R; H_R) \leq 0 \tag{43}$$

when  $H_R(u,v)$  is the optimum filter for  $S_R(u,v)$  and  $N_R(u,v)$ .

We can consider the two terms, signal and noise, in (33) separately.

Define

$$\Delta e_{\text{signal}} = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \iint [S(u,v) - S_R(u,v)] \left[\frac{1}{1+S_R/N_R}\right]^2 du dv \quad (44)$$

On  $\alpha_1(k_s)$ ,  $S_R/N_R = k_s$  and, on  $\beta_1(k_n)$ ,  $S_R/N_R = k_n$  so that  $1/(1+S_R/N_R) \leq 1/(1+k_s)$ .

On  $\alpha_2(k_s)$ ,  $(S-S_R)$  is non-positive and  $S_R/N_R \leq k_s$  so that  $1/(1+S_R/N_R) \geq 1/(1+k_s)$

and, on  $\beta_2(k_n)$ , the integrand is non-negative and  $1/(1+S_R/N_R) \leq 1/(1+k_s)$ .

Finally, on the rest of the  $(u,v)$  plane,  $S_R/N_R = S_L/N_L \geq k_s$  and the integrand is non-negative. Thus,

$$\Delta e_{\text{signal}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{1+k_s}\right)^2 \iint [S(u,v) - S_R(u,v)] du dv, \quad (45)$$

and from the power constraint we get

$$\Delta e_{\text{signal}} \leq 0 \quad (46)$$

In a similar way, the noise term can be shown to be non-positive and robustness is proved.

Notice that although Theorem 2 asserts the existence of a least-favorable pair of PSD's, it only defines them for a particular case when the equations in (41) have solutions with  $k_s < k_n$ . This also turns out usually to be the case. Otherwise, the least-favorable densities can be obtained directly from the detailed version of the theorem in [10] for the one-dimensional case.

This theorem specifies the least-favorable spectral densities as a pair of spectral densities which tend to be as similar as possible, within the given classes. This is apparent from (38) and (39), and is a reasonable solution from intuitive considerations. In fact, it is possible to prove that in a generalized sense of "distance" between two spectral densities, the solution of Theorem 2 species the minimum distance pair [12].

It should be noted that the result of Theorem 2 can also be applied to another pair of classes  $E_s$  and  $E_n$  for the signal and noise PSD's, defined by

$$E_s = \{S(u,v) | S(u,v) = (1-\epsilon_s)S_0(u,v) + \epsilon_s S_c(u,v) \text{ and}$$

$$\iint S_0(u,v) du dv = \iint S_c(u,v) du dv\} \quad (47)$$

and similarly for  $E_n$ . Here  $S_0(u,v)$  is a known nominal signal spectral density,  $\epsilon_s$  is an assumed degree of contamination allowed for  $S_0(u,v)$ , and  $S_c(u,v)$  is an otherwise arbitrary spectral density. With  $S_L(u,v) = (1-\epsilon_s) S_0(u,v)$  and  $S_U(u,v)$  everywhere unbounded in (35), the class  $D_s$  becomes the above  $E_s$ . Numerical results for such classes in the one-dimensional case given in [10] show the usefulness of these concepts of robust Wiener filtering.

#### V. CONCLUSION

A design philosophy for filtering signals in noise has been presented, applicable in cases where signal and noise characteristics cannot be modeled precisely. The robust matched and Wiener filters have been derived for two-dimensional discrete-time applications. Such filters can be useful in many two-dimensional signal detection and estimation applications.

## REFERENCES

1. J.B. Thomas, "Nonparametric detection," Proc. IEEE, vol. 58, pp. 623-631, May 1970
2. R.D. Martin, "Robust estimation of signal amplitude," IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. IT-18, pp. 596-606, Sept. 1972.
3. R.F. Dwyer, "Robust sequential detection of narrowband acoustic signals in noise," Proc. IEEE International Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, pp. 140-143, 1979.
4. B.V. Cox and L.K. Timothy, "Rank-order speech classification algorithm (RASCAL)," Proc. IEEE International Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, pp. 759-673, 1979.
5. A.R. Pratt, "Local estimation of delay parameter following robust detection," Proc. IEEE International Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, pp. 132-135, 1979.
6. M.C. Yovits and J.L. Jackson, "Linear filter optimization with game theory considerations," IRE National Conv. Rec., pt. 4, pp. 193-199, 1955.
7. N.E. Nahi and I.M. Weiss, "Optimum Wiener bounding filters in the presence of uncertainties," Info. & Control, vol. 28, pp. 179-191, 1975.
8. N.E. Nahi and I.M. Weiss, "Bounding filter: a simple solution to lack of exact a priori statistics," Info. & Control, vol. 39, pp. 212-224, 1978.
9. V.P. Kuznetsov, "Stable detection when the signal and spectrum of normal noise are inaccurately known," Telecom. & Radio Eng., vol. 30/31, pp. 58-64, March 1976.
10. S.A. Kassam and T.L. Lim, "Robust Wiener filters," J. Franklin Inst. vol. 304, pp. 171-185, Oct./Nov. 1977.
11. H.V. Poor, "Some results in robust Wiener filtering," Proc. IEEE Decision & Control Conf., pp. 725-730, Dec. 1978.
12. S.A. Kassam, "Robust hypothesis testing with band-models for the probability densities." to be published.

FIGURE CAPTION

Figure 1. Robust filter and least-favorable characteristics considered in Section III.




Fig. 1 Kassam/Lim/Cim