

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB NO. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comment regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE March 1997	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Technical		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Consistent Method for Estimating Sinusoidal Frequencies: A Non-Iterative Approach			5. FUNDING NUMBERS DAAH04-96-1-0082	
6. AUTHOR(S) A. Mitra and D. Kundu				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Center for Multivariate Analysis 417 Thomas Bldg. Department of Statistics Penn State University University Park, PA 16802			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Office P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER ARO 35518.9-MA	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release:			12 b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)			DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2	
14. SUBJECT TERMS Sinusoidal frequency, Consistent estimates, Monte Carlo simulations, Cramer-Rao lower bound.			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 31	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OR REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

19970321 030

In this paper we consider the problem of estimating the sinusoidal frequencies by a non-iterative technique. We establish the strong consistency of the proposed estimate. We further propose a one stop modification of the non-iterative technique. It is observed in the simulation study that the proposed method performs better than the existing non-iterative techniques for reasonably small sample sizes. The mean squared errors of the proposed method reaches the Cramer-Rao lower bound in many situations. We also propose three different kinds of confidence intervals and compare their performances by simulation.

**CONSISTENT METHOD FOR ESTIMATING SINUSOIDAL FREQUENCIES:
A NON-ITERATIVE APPROACH**

Amit Mitra and Debasis Kundu

Technical Report 97-03

March 1997

Center for Multivariate Analysis
417 Thomas Building
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802

The research work of the authors is partially supported by the Army Research Office under Grant DAAHO4-96-1-0082. The United States Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation hereon.

CONSISTENT METHOD FOR ESTIMATING SINUSOIDAL FREQUENCIES:
A NON-ITERATIVE APPROACH.

AMIT MITRA¹

DEBASIS KUNDU²

Department of Mathematics
Indian Institute of Technology
Kanpur-208016.

ABSTRACT: In this paper we consider the problem of estimating the sinusoidal frequencies by a non-iterative technique. We establish the strong consistency of the proposed estimate. We further propose a one step modification of the non-iterative technique. It is observed in the simulation study that the proposed method performs better than the existing non-iterative techniques for reasonably small sample sizes. The mean squared errors of the proposed method reaches the Cramer-Rao lower bound in many situations. We also propose three different kinds of confidence intervals and compare their performances by simulation.

AMS Subject Classification: 62J02, 62E25.

Key words and Phrases: Sinusoidal frequency, Consistent estimates, Monte Carlo simulations, Cramer-Rao lower bound.

Short Running Title: Estimating Sinusoidal Frequencies.

¹The work is partly supported by the National Board of Higher Mathematics, Govt. of India.

²The work is partly supported by a Grant (No:SR/OY/M-06/93) of

the Department of Science and Technology, Govt. of India.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the following time series model;

$$Y_t = \sum_{k=1}^M \left(A_k \cos(\omega_k t) + B_k \sin(\omega_k t) \right) + \varepsilon_t \quad (1.1)$$

Here Y_t 's are observed at equidistant time points, for $t = 1, \dots, N$. $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_M)$, (A_1, \dots, A_M) and (B_1, \dots, B_M) are the unknown parameters, ω_k 's are distinct real numbers lying in $(0, \pi)$. M , the number of signals is assumed to be known a priori. (ε_t) is a sequence of real valued i.i.d. random variables with

$$E(\varepsilon_t) = 0 \text{ and } V(\varepsilon_t) = \sigma^2 \quad (1.2)$$

The problem is to estimate the unknown parameters ω_k , A_k and B_k for $k = 1, \dots, M$ and σ^2 . The estimation of the parameters of the model (1.1) is a fundamental problem in signal processing (Kay and Marple; 1981) and time series analysis. The asymptotic theory of the least squares estimates (LSE) for this model has a long history. Whittle (1951, 1953) obtained some of the earliest results. More recent results are by Hasan (1982), Hannan (1973) and Walker (1971). They formalized and extended Whittle's results. Walker (1971) introduced the concept of an approximate LSE for the model (1.1). He first estimated the frequencies by finding the maximum of the periodogram and then computing the estimates of the amplitudes. The approximate LSE were shown to be strongly consistent and the asymptotic normality of the estimates were also obtained. It may be noted that although asymptotically the approximate LSE estimates are equivalent to

the exact LSE, for finite sample sizes the performance of the exact LSE are better than the approximate ones in terms of lower mean squared errors (Kundu and Mitra; 1994). Kundu (1993a) was the first one to give a direct proof of consistency of the exact LSE for the model (1.1) under the assumption of normality of the error random variables, the consistency and asymptotic normality for general error random variables can be found in (Kundu and Mitra, 1994).

It may be noted that although the least squares estimates are the most desired estimates, the problem of finding the estimates is well known to be numerically difficult. Rice and Rosenblatt (1988) discussed the computational complexities involved to obtain the LSE. The model (1.1) being a nonlinear one, to obtain the LSE some sort of iterative search procedure must be employed. Typically, search methods start from an initial guess value and then proceed by a sequence of Gauss-Newton steps. For this nonlinear least squares problem it turns out that there are many local minima with a separation in frequency of about N^{-1} which makes the stationary point to which the iterative scheme converges extremely sensitive to the starting values. This problem gets worse as the sample size increases. It is also observed (Rice and Rosenblatt;1988) that unless the frequency is resolved at the first step with order $o(N^{-1})$, the failure to converge to the global minimum may give a very poor estimate of the amplitude. The problem becomes especially severe if one is estimating the parameters of several

harmonic components simultaneously, since in that situation the iteration is taking place in a higher dimensional space with many local minima. The method of Walker (1971) for estimating the initial values by finding the maximum of the periodogram turns out to have drawbacks. A bias can arise for moderate sample sizes that is appreciable compared to the standard deviation suggested by asymptotic theory (Rice and Rosenblatt;1988). The initial values provided to the search algorithms are thus critical. A direct search of the periodogram at a fine grid of points substantially finer than that given by the frequencies $2\pi i/N$ used by fast Fourier transform is appealing, but unfortunately has its drawbacks as well. Due to the difficulties in obtaining the least squares estimates several non-iterative techniques have been proposed in the recent past. Among the non-iterative methods for estimating the frequencies of the model (1.1) in the undamped exponential model form, the best known is the TLS-ESPRIT method of Roy and Kailath (1989). Recently, another non-iterative technique have been proposed by Quinn (1994), this involves the computation of three Fourier components; the Fourier component at the maximiser of the periodogram and at the two adjacent Fourier frequencies.

In this article, we propose a new non-iterative method for estimating the frequencies of the model (1.1). The proposed method provides better frequency estimates (in terms of lower mean squared errors) than the existing non-iterative techniques for reasonably small sample sizes. The mean squared errors of

the proposed method reaches the Cramer-Rao lower bound in many situations in the cases considered in our simulation study. The proposed estimate can also be used as an efficient initial value for any optimization algorithm to obtain the least squares estimates. First we transform the model (1.1) to an undamped superimposed exponential signals model and then use extended order modelling and singular value decomposition technique to estimate the frequencies. We call the new estimates, the Noise Space Decomposition (NSD) estimates. Once the frequencies are estimated by the NSD method, the linear parameters can then be obtained using separable regression technique of Richards (1961). The proposed method is shown to give strongly consistent estimates. Since the proposed method is strongly consistent, a further one step modified estimate is also proposed which already have the same asymptotic properties as the exact LSE. Some confidence intervals of the frequencies are also proposed.

The organization of the paper is as follows; in Section 2 we describe the estimation procedure, consistency results are provided in Section 3. Modified estimates are proposed in Section 4, different confidence intervals are discussed in Section 5. Some Monte Carlo simulations study is presented in Section 6 and finally we draw conclusions in section 7.

2. ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

Observe that the model (1.1) can be written as a linear combination of $2M$ complex exponential terms in the following way;

$$y_t = \sum_{k=1}^M C_r \exp(i \omega_r t) + \sum_{k=1}^M D_r \exp(-i \omega_r t) + \varepsilon_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, N \quad (2.1)$$

where $C_r = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} A_r - i B_r \end{pmatrix}$ and $D_r = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} A_r + i B_r \end{pmatrix}$ and $i = \sqrt{-1}$.

It is well known (Prony; 1795, see Kundu; 1993b also) that in the noiseless case there exists an unique vector $C = (c_1, \dots, c_{2M+1})$ such that;

$$\sum_{k=1}^{2M+1} c_k y_{t+k} = 0$$

$$\text{for all } t=0, \dots, N-2M-1, \|C\| = 1 \text{ and } c_1 > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

The unknown constants (c_1, \dots, c_{2M+1}) are such that the roots of the polynomial equation

$$c_1 z^{2M} + c_2 z^{2M-1} + \dots + c_{2M+1} = 0 \quad (2.3)$$

are of the form $\lambda_k = \exp(\pm i \omega_k)$. Thus if we can estimate C , we can estimate the unknown frequencies ω_k 's using (2.3). Now observe that (Kahn et. al; 1993), the condition that the roots be purely imaginary means (2.3) must factorize in the form

$$\eta_0 \prod_{k=1}^M \left(\lambda^2 - (2 - \eta_k^2) \lambda + 1 \right) \quad (2.4)$$

This implies that $c_k = c_{2M+2-k}$; $k = 1, \dots, 2M+1$ and the roots are $\lambda_k = \exp(\pm i \omega_k)$, where $2 - \eta_k^2 = 2 \cos(\omega_k)$.

Consider the following $N-L \times L+1$ data matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} Y_1 & \dots & Y_{L+1} \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ Y_{N-L} & \dots & Y_N \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.5)$$

for any positive integer L such that $2M \leq L \leq N-2M$.

Let's denote by T the $L+1 \times L+1$ matrix given by

$$T = \frac{1}{N} A^* A \quad (2.6)$$

where '*' denotes the conjugate transpose of a matrix or a vector. Observe that in the noiseless case the matrix T has rank 2M. Let the singular value decomposition of T (see Rao; pp. 42, 1973) be as follows;

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^{L+1} \hat{\sigma}_i^2 \hat{U}_i \hat{U}_i^* \quad (2.7)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_1^2 > \hat{\sigma}_2^2 > \dots > \hat{\sigma}_{L+1}^2$ are the ordered eigenvalues of T and \hat{U}_i is the normalized eigenvector corresponding to $\hat{\sigma}_i^2$. The subspace generated by $\{\hat{U}_1, \dots, \hat{U}_{2M}\}$ is denoted by S and that of $\{\hat{U}_{2M+1}, \dots, \hat{U}_{L+1}\}$ is denoted by N. We call S the signal subspace and N the noise subspace. Let B_1 be any basis of the noise subspace N. We write

$$B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} b_{1,1} & \dots & b_{1,L+1-2M} \\ b_{L+1,1} & \dots & b_{L+1,L+1-2M} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.8)$$

Observe that because of (2.2), in the noiseless situation there exists an unique basis of N which has the following form

$$B_2 = \begin{bmatrix} c_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \cdot & c_1 & \dots & 0 \\ c_M & \cdot & & 0 \\ c_{M+1} & c_M & & \\ c_M & c_{M+1} & & c_1 \\ \cdot & c_M & & \cdot \\ c_1 & \cdot & & \cdot \\ 0 & c_1 & & c_M \\ \cdot & 0 & & c_{M+1} \\ 0 & \cdot & & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & c_1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.9)$$

Now observe that $B_1 = \left[\hat{U}_{2M+1}, \dots, \hat{U}_{L+1} \right]$ forms a basis of the estimated noise space. Our main aim is to obtain a basis of N which has the form similar to (2.9) and to estimate C from these.

Let's partition the matrix B_1 as follows;

$$B_1^T = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} B_{11}^T & : & B_{12}^T & : & B_{13}^T \end{array} \right] \quad (2.10)$$

$L+1-2M \times L+1$ $L+1-2M \times K$ $L+1-2M \times 2M+1$ $L+1-2M \times L-K-2M$

for $k=0,1, \dots, L-2M$. Now consider the matrix

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} B_{11}^T & : & B_{13}^T \end{array} \right]$$

$L+1-2M \times K$ $L+1-2M \times L-K-2M$

Since the above is a random matrix, it is of rank $L-2M$. Therefore we can conclude that there exists an unique $L+1-2M$ vector $X_{k+1} \neq 0$, such that

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} B_{11}^T \\ K \times L+1-2M \\ B_{13}^T \\ L-K-2M \times L+1-2M \end{array} \right] X_{k+1} = 0 \quad (2.11)$$

Consider the $2M+1$ vector \hat{C}^{k+1} , where

$$\hat{C}^{k+1} = (\hat{c}_{k+1,1}, \dots, \hat{c}_{k+1,2M+1}) = B_{12} X_{k+1} \quad (2.12)$$

By properly normalizing we can make $\hat{c}_{k+1,1} > 0$ and $\|\hat{C}^{k+1}\| = 1$ for $k = 0, \dots, L-2M$. Therefore we can conclude that there exist vectors X_1, \dots, X_{L+1-2M} such that

$$B_1 \begin{bmatrix} X_1 & \dots & X_{L-2M+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_{1,1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \hat{C}_{2,1} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & 0 \\ \hat{C}_{1,2M+1} & \lambda & \dots & \hat{C}_{L-2M+1,1} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \hat{C}_{L-2M+1,2M+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.13)$$

where $\hat{c}_{k,1} > 0$ and $\|\hat{C}^k\| = 1$ for $k=1, \dots, L+1-2M$. Observe that in the noiseless situation

$$\hat{C}^1 = \hat{C}^2 = \dots = \hat{C}^{L-2M+1} = C \quad (2.14)$$

Let J be the $L+1 \times L+1$ exchange matrix given by

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.15)$$

Consider the matrix \tilde{T} given by

$$\tilde{T} = J T J \quad (2.16)$$

Observe that the eigenvalues of T and \tilde{T} are same and if x is an eigenvector of T corresponding to the eigenvalue λ , i.e.

$$T x = \lambda x \Rightarrow J T J J x = \lambda J x \Rightarrow \tilde{T} (Jx) = \lambda (Jx)$$

then $J x$ is an eigenvector for \tilde{T} corresponding to λ . Let's denote by \tilde{N} the subspace generated by $\{ J \hat{U}_{2M+1}, \dots, J \hat{U}_{L+1} \}$, we call \tilde{N} the noise space of \tilde{T} .

It can be easily seen that in the noiseless situation there exists an unique basis of the noise space of \tilde{T} of the form

$$\tilde{B}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & c_1 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \dots & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & c_{M+1} \\ c_1 & c_1 & \dots & c_M \\ \cdot & \cdot & \dots & \cdot \\ c_M & c_M & \dots & c_1 \\ c_{M+1} & c_{M+1} & \dots & 0 \\ c_M & c_M & \dots & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \dots & \cdot \\ c_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.17)$$

In this case also our aim is to obtain the basis of the estimated noise space \tilde{N} , i.e.

$$\tilde{B}_1 = \left[J\hat{U}_{2M+1} : \dots : J\hat{U}_{L+1} \right] \quad (2.18)$$

to the form similar to (2.17). Proceeding exactly as in the case of N , we reduce the basis to the following form

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdot & \hat{c}_{L-2M+1,1}^* \\ \cdot & 0 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & \hat{c}_{2,1}^* & \cdot & \hat{c}_{L-2M+1,2M+1}^* \\ \hat{c}_{1,1}^* & \cdot & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \hat{c}_{2,2M+1}^* & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hat{c}_{1,2M+1}^* & 0 & \cdot & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.19)$$

such that for each $\hat{C}_k^* = (\hat{c}_{k,1}^*, \dots, \hat{c}_{k,2M+1}^*)$, $k=1, \dots, L-2M+1$; $\hat{c}_{k,1}^* > 0$ and $\|\hat{C}_k^*\| = 1$. As in the case of N , in the noiseless situation

$$\hat{C}_1^* = \hat{C}_2^* = \dots = \hat{C}_{L+1-2M}^* = C \quad (2.20)$$

It is further observed that $G = J B_1 [X_1 \dots X_{L-2M+1}]$, i.e.

$$\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & \dots & \hat{C}_{L-2M+1,1}^* \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & \hat{C}_{2,1}^* & \dots & \hat{C}_{L-2M+1,2M+1}^* \\
\hat{C}_{1,1}^* & \vdots & \vdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \hat{C}_{2,2M+1}^* & \vdots & \vdots \\
\hat{C}_{1,2M+1}^* & 0 & \dots & 0
\end{bmatrix}
= J
\begin{bmatrix}
\hat{C}_{1,1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\
\vdots & \hat{C}_{2,1} & \dots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & 0 \\
\hat{C}_{1,2M+1} & \hat{C}_{2,2M+1} & \dots & \hat{C}_{L-2M+1,1} \\
0 & 0 & \dots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \dots & \hat{C}_{L-2M+1,2M+1} \\
0 & 0 & \dots & \vdots
\end{bmatrix}
\quad (2.21)$$

Now observe that since (2.14) and (2.20) are true, it is quite natural that any one of the \hat{C}^k for $k=1, \dots, L-2M+1$ or \hat{C}_k^* for $k = 1, \dots, L-2M+1$ can be used to estimate the frequencies. In fact the use of $\hat{C}_k^{**} = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{C}^k + \hat{C}_k^*)$; $k = 1, \dots, L-2M+1$ always ensure that the estimated coefficients of the polynomial prediction equation (2.3) satisfy the symmetry constraint and roots of

$$\hat{C}_{k,1}^{**} Z^{2M} + \hat{C}_{k,2}^{**} Z^{2M-1} + \dots + \hat{C}_{k,2M+1}^{**} = 0 \quad (2.22)$$

are of the form $\exp(\pm i\hat{\omega}_k)$, for $k = 1, \dots, L-2M+1$. We use all \hat{C}_k^{**} ; $k = 1, \dots, L-2M+1$ to estimate ω . We take the average of all \hat{C}_k^{**} 's and use (2.3) to get the final estimate $\hat{\omega}$ of ω . We call the resulting estimate $\hat{\omega}_{NSD}$, the Noise Space Decomposition (NSD) estimates.

3. CONSISTENCY RESULTS

In this section we prove the following result,

Theorem 1: Under the assumptions of the model (1.1), the estimate $\hat{\omega}$ of ω obtained by the method described in section 2 is strongly consistent, i.e.

$$\hat{\omega}_{NSD} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \omega \quad (3.1)$$

To prove theorem 1, we need the following lemmas

Lemma 1: Let $P = ((p_{ij}))$ and $Q = ((q_{ij}))$ are two Hermitian $m \times m$ matrices with spectral decompositions

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_i p_i p_i^* & \delta_1 \geq \delta_2 \geq \dots \geq \delta_m \\ Q &= \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i q_i q_i^* & \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where δ_i 's and λ_i 's are eigen values of P and Q respectively, p_i and q_i are orthogonal normalized eigenvalues associated with δ_i and λ_i respectively for $i=1, \dots, m$. Further assume that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{n_{h-1}+1} = \dots = \lambda_{n_h} = \bar{\lambda}_h, \quad n_0=0 < n_1 < \dots < n_s = p; \quad h=1, \dots, s \\ \bar{\lambda}_1 > \bar{\lambda}_2 > \dots > \bar{\lambda}_s \end{aligned}$$

and that $|p_{ik} - q_{ik}| < \alpha, \quad i, k = 1, \dots, m$

then there is a constant M independent of α such that

$$(1) \quad |\delta_i - \lambda_i| < M\alpha \quad i = 1, \dots, m$$

$$(2) \quad \sum_{i=n_{h-1}}^{n_h} p_{i+1} p_i^* = \sum_{i=n_{h-1}}^{n_h} q_{i+1} q_i^* + c^{(h)} \quad (3.3)$$

with $c^{(h)} = ((c_{lk}^{(h)}))$, $|c_{lk}^{(h)}| \leq M\alpha$

Proof: It follows from Von-Neumann's (1937) inequality, see also Bai, Miao and Rao (1991).

Lemma 2:

$$\frac{1}{N} \mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{A} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{L+1} + \Omega^{(L)} \mathbf{D} \Omega^{(L)*} + o\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log N}{N}}\right) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (3.4)$$

where $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag} \left\{ |C_1^2|, \dots, |C_M^2|, |D_1^2|, \dots, |D_M^2| \right\}$ and

$$\Omega^{(L)} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\omega_1} & \dots & e^{-i\omega_M} & e^{i\omega_1} & \dots & e^{i\omega_M} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ e^{-i(L+1)\omega_1} & \dots & e^{-i(L+1)\omega_M} & e^{i(L+1)\omega_1} & \dots & e^{i(L+1)\omega_M} \end{bmatrix}$$

$L+1 \times M$

Proof : We have

$$\frac{1}{N} \mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{T} = \frac{1}{N} ((t_{ik})) \quad (3.5)$$

with the following renaming of the parameters of (2.2) as

$$\alpha_i = \begin{cases} C_i & \text{for } i=1, \dots, M \\ D_{i-M} & \text{for } i=M+1, \dots, 2M \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

$$\beta_i = \begin{cases} \omega_i & \text{for } i=1, \dots, M \\ -\omega_{i-M} & \text{for } i=M+1, \dots, 2M \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} t_{ik} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=0}^{N-L-1} \bar{Y}_{l+1} Y_{l+k} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=0}^{N-L-1} \left(\sum_{u=1}^{2M} \bar{\alpha}_u \exp(-i\beta_u(l+1)) + \bar{\varepsilon}_{l+1} \right) \left(\sum_{u=1}^{2M} \alpha_u \exp(i\beta_u(l+k)) + \varepsilon_{l+k} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=0}^{N-L-1} \left[\sum_{u=1}^{2M} |\alpha_u|^2 \exp(i\beta_u(k-l)) + \sum_{u \neq v} \bar{\alpha}_u \alpha_v \exp(i(\beta_v(l+k) - \beta_u(l+1))) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \varepsilon_{l+k} \left(\sum_{u=1}^{2M} \bar{\alpha}_u \exp(-i\beta_u(l+1)) \right) + \bar{\varepsilon}_{l+1} \left(\sum_{u=1}^{2M} \alpha_u \exp(i\beta_u(l+k)) + \varepsilon_{l+k} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \bar{\varepsilon}_{1+1} \varepsilon_{1+k}]$$

$$= R_1 + R_2 + R_3 + R_4 + R_5 \quad (\text{say}) \quad (3.8)$$

Observe that $R_2 = o\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$ and $R_3 = o\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log N}{N}}\right)$ a.s and $R_4 = o\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log N}{N}}\right)$ a.s (see Petrove (1975, page 375) and by the law of iterative logarithm of M dependent sequence

$$R_5 = \begin{cases} o\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log N}{N}}\right) & \text{if } i \neq k \\ \sigma^2 + o\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log N}{N}}\right) & \text{if } i = k \end{cases}$$

this proves lemma 2.

Lemma 3. Let $g_n(x)$ be a sequence of polynomials of degree k , with roots $x_1^{(n)}, \dots, x_k^{(n)}$ for each n . Let $g(x)$ be a polynomial of degree Q , with roots x_1, \dots, x_Q , $Q \leq k$. If $g_n(x) \rightarrow g(x)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ then with proper rearrangement the roots of $g_n(x)$, $x_j^{(n)}$ converge to the roots of $g(x)$, ie to x_j .

Proof : See Bai et al (1986)

Proof of Theorem 1: From Lemma 2 it follows that;

$$T \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \sigma^2 I_{L+1} + \Omega^{(L)} D \Omega^{(L)*} = S$$

and
$$\tilde{T} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \sigma^2 I_{L+1} + J \Omega^{(L)} D \Omega^{(L)*} J = S_J^*$$

Observe that the eigen values of S are of the form

$$\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{2M} > \lambda_{2M+1} = \dots = \lambda_{L+1} = \sigma^2 \quad (3.9)$$

since $\Omega^{(L)} D \Omega^{(L)*}$ is of rank $2M$. Let the singular value decomposition of S be

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^{L+1} \lambda_i s_i s_i^* \quad (3.10)$$

where s_i is the normalized eigenvector corresponding to the

eigenvalue λ_1 and s_i 's are orthogonal to each other . Therefore using lemma 1

$$\sum_{i=2M+1}^{L+1} \hat{U}_i \hat{U}_i^* \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \sum_{i=2M+1}^{L+1} s_i s_i^* \quad (3.11)$$

(3.10) implies that the vector space generated by $\{\hat{U}_{2M+1}, \dots, \hat{U}_{L+1}\}$ converges to the vector space generated by $\{s_{2M+1}, \dots, s_{L+1}\}$.

Now the former one has a unique basis of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_{1,1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \hat{C}_{2,1} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & 0 \\ \hat{C}_{1,2M+1} & \hat{C}_{2,2M+1} & \dots & \hat{C}_{L-2M+1,1} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \hat{C}_{L-2M+1,2M+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.12)$$

with $\hat{C}_{k,1} > 0$ and $\|\hat{C}^k\| = 1$ where $\hat{C}^k = (\hat{C}_{k,1}, \dots, \hat{C}_{k,2M+1})$ for $k = 1, \dots, L-2M+1$, whereas the later one has a unique basis of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_1 & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ c_2 & c_1 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ c_{2M+1} & c_2 & \dots & \dots & c_1 \\ 0 & c_{2M+1} & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \dots & c_{2M+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.13)$$

where $c_1 > 0$ and $\|C\| = 1$ with $C = (c_1, \dots, c_{2M+1})$.

This implies that

$$\hat{C}_k^k \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} c \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, L-2M+1 \quad (3.14)$$

Similar analysis for \tilde{T} shows that

$$\hat{C}_k^* \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} c \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, L-2M+1 \quad (3.15)$$

Thus we have

$$\hat{C}_k^{**} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} c \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, L-2M+1 \quad (3.16)$$

Therefore from Lemma 3 we can say that the roots obtained using \hat{C}_k^{**} are consistent estimators of ω 's for all $k = 1, \dots, L-2M+1$.

4. MODIFIED NOISE SPACE DECOMPOSITION METHOD

It may be noted that the model (1.1) is a nonlinear regression model. So the least squares method should be the preferred estimation technique at least as far as efficiency is concerned. It is observed that for this particular nonlinear least squares problem there are many local minima with a separation in frequency about N^{-1} which makes the point of convergence of iterative scheme extremely sensitive to the initial values. The need for non-iterative estimation procedures thus arise mostly from the fact that good starting values are needed in numerical optimization of the residual sum of squares. In some cases, for instance when the signals have to be detected on line, the iterative least squares method might be too time consuming. If the motivation for the use of a non-iterative technique is the latter, the following improvement of the NSD estimates can be suggested.

It is well known (Harvey; 1981, Ch. 4.5) that when a regular

likelihood (differentiable upto third order) is maximized through the Newton-Raphson, scoring or a related algorithm, the estimates obtained after one single round of iteration already have the same asymptotic properties as the exact least squares estimates. This holds, if the starting values have been chosen \sqrt{N} - consistently. Now, since the NSD method is strongly consistent we combine the NSD method with one single round of scoring algorithm. This way the asymptotic error variances should (in theory, at least) coincide with the asymptotic variance irrespective of the distributional form of the error term. We call the resulting estimates obtained after one round of iteration with NSD as starting values, the Modified Noise Space Decomposition (MNSD) estimates.

One way of implementing this idea would be the following:
Let us write the model (1.1) in the vector form

$$Y = A(\omega) \alpha + \epsilon \quad (4.1)$$

where $A(\omega) = \begin{bmatrix} A_1(\omega) & A_2(\omega) & \dots & A_N(\omega) \end{bmatrix}^T$ with $A_k(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\omega_1 k) \\ \sin(\omega_1 k) & \dots & \cos(\omega_M k) & \sin(\omega_M k) \end{pmatrix}^T$, $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 & \dots & A_M & B_M \end{pmatrix}$, $Y = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 & \dots & Y_N \end{pmatrix}^T$ and $\epsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1 & \dots & \epsilon_N \end{pmatrix}^T$.

Now consider the concentrated residual sum of squares

$$Y^* \left[I - P_A(\omega) \right] Y = Y^* \left[I - A(\omega) \left(A^*(\omega) A(\omega) \right)^{-1} A^*(\omega) \right] Y \quad (4.2)$$

To obtain the least squares estimates first (4.2) can be minimized with respect to ω and then the estimate of α can be obtained using linear regression technique. For details see

Kundu (1993b). We obtain the MNSD estimates after one step minimization of (4.2) using NSD estimates as starting values.

5. CONFIDENCE INTERVALS

In this section we propose different confidence intervals for the frequencies. We propose an asymptotic confidence interval and two bootstrap confidence intervals.

5a. Asymptotic Confidence intervals

In this subsection we discuss the confidence intervals for the frequencies based on their asymptotic distribution. It may be observed that (Kundu and Mitra; 1994) that the asymptotic distribution of the exact LSE of the frequencies is of the following form

$$N^{-3/2} \left[\hat{\omega}_k - \omega_k \right] \sim N \left(0, \frac{24 \sigma^2}{(A_k^2 + B_k^2)} \right) \quad (5a.1)$$

which eventually coincides with the distribution of the approximate LSE proposed by Walker (1971).

Based on (5a.1), the following $100(1-\alpha)\%$ confidence interval for ω_k is proposed by

$$\left[\hat{\omega}_k - \tau_{\alpha/2} \left(\frac{24 \hat{\sigma}^2}{N^3 (\hat{A}_k^2 + \hat{B}_k^2)} \right)^{1/2}, \hat{\omega}_k + \tau_{\alpha/2} \left(\frac{24 \hat{\sigma}^2}{N^3 (\hat{A}_k^2 + \hat{B}_k^2)} \right)^{1/2} \right] \quad (5a.2)$$

Since the MNSD estimates proposed in section 4 has the same asymptotic properties as the exact LSE, we take the MNSD estimates as $\hat{\omega}_k$ in (5a.2).

5b. Percentile Bootstrap Confidence intervals

In this subsection we construct the percentile bootstrap

confidence intervals for ω_k 's using the method suggested by Efron (1982).

Suppose we have a sample of size N ; Y_1, \dots, Y_N coming from (1.1). We propose the following algorithm to obtain the confidence intervals

(1) Estimate $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_M)$ from Y_1, \dots, Y_N using MNSD method.

(2) Estimate $\hat{\epsilon}_i = Y_i - \hat{Y}_i$, $i=1, \dots, N$, where

$$\hat{Y}_i = \sum_{k=1}^M \left[\hat{A}_k \cos(\hat{\omega}_k t) + \hat{B}_k \sin(\hat{\omega}_k t) \right].$$

(3) Draw a random sample of size N from $\{ \hat{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \hat{\epsilon}_N \}$ with replacement, let it be $\{ \hat{\epsilon}_{B_1}, \dots, \hat{\epsilon}_{B_N} \}$.

(4) Obtain bootstrap sample Y_1^*, \dots, Y_N^* ; where

$$Y_i^* = \hat{Y}_i + \hat{\epsilon}_{B_i}, \quad i=1, \dots, N.$$

(5) Estimate $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_M)$ from Y_1^*, \dots, Y_N^* using MNSD method. Denote it by ω_k^* , $K=1, \dots, M$.

(6) Repeat the steps (3) to (5) NBOOT times.

(7) Order these NBOOT estimates corresponding to each ω_k .

(8) Estimate $\hat{L}_{PB}(\alpha/2)$ by NBOOT $\alpha/2$ th order statistics and $\hat{U}_{PB}(\alpha/2)$ by NBOOT $(1-\alpha/2)$ th order statistics for each set of ω_k^* and claim that $(\hat{L}_{PB}(\alpha/2), \hat{U}_{PB}(\alpha/2))$ to be the $100(1-\alpha)\%$ percentile bootstrap confidence interval for ω_k .

5c. Bootstrap-t Confidence intervals

In this subsection we construct the bootstrap-t confidence

intervals based on the method suggested by Hall (1988).

We propose the following algorithm for computing the bootstrap-t confidence intervals,

- (1) From the original sample y_1, \dots, y_N estimate $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_M)$ by MNSD method and then (A_1, \dots, A_M) and (B_1, \dots, B_M) by separable regression technique and estimate σ^2 by

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(y_i - \hat{y}_i \right)^2$$

- (2) Estimate the errors by $\hat{\varepsilon}_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i, i=1, \dots, N$.

- (3) Draw a random sample of size N from $\left\{ \hat{\varepsilon}_1, \dots, \hat{\varepsilon}_N \right\}$ with replacement, let it be $\left\{ \hat{\varepsilon}_{B_1}, \dots, \hat{\varepsilon}_{B_N} \right\}$.

- (4) Obtain bootstrap sample y_1^*, \dots, y_N^* ; where

$$y_i^* = \hat{y}_i + \hat{\varepsilon}_{B_i}, i=1, \dots, N.$$

- (5) Estimate $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_M)$ from y_1^*, \dots, y_N^* using MNSD method, denote it by $\hat{\omega}_k^*$ and also the estimate of σ^2 as $\hat{\sigma}_B^2$.

- (6) Obtain for each $\omega_i, i=1, \dots, M$

$$T_i = \frac{\sqrt{N} (\hat{\omega}_k^* - \hat{\omega}_k)}{\hat{\sigma}_B}$$

- (7) Repeat the steps (3) to (6) NBOOT times.

- (8) For each ω_i , order the NBOOT number of T_i 's. Estimate $\hat{L}_{TB}(\alpha/2)$ by $\hat{\omega}_i + \sqrt{N} \hat{\sigma} \left[\text{NBOOT } \alpha/2 \text{ th order statistics from } T_i \text{'s} \right]$ and $\hat{U}_{TB}(\alpha/2)$ by $\hat{\omega}_i + \sqrt{N} \hat{\sigma} \left[\text{NBOOT } (1-\alpha/2) \text{ th order statistics from } T_i \text{'s} \right]$. Now claim that $(\hat{L}_{TB}(\alpha/2), \hat{U}_{TB}(\alpha/2))$ to be the $100(1-\alpha)\%$ bootstrap-t confidence interval for ω_i .

6. MONTE CARLO SIMULATIONS

We have performed Monte Carlo simulation study to ascertain the behavior of NSD and MNSD estimates and to compare it's performance with the best known non-iterative techniques for moderate sample sizes and different ranges of the error variances σ^2 . All these simulations have been done on the HP-9000 computer at the Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, using the IMSL random deviate generator.

We consider the following model of one harmonic component;

$$Y_t = 1.5 \text{ Cos}(\omega t) + 1.5 \text{ Sin}(\omega t) + \varepsilon_t, \quad t=1, \dots, 25 \quad (6.1)$$

The error random variable (ε_t) is white and Gaussian with variances σ^2 . The frequency ω is taken to be 0.25π , 0.50π , 0.75π in three different sets of simulations. For each ω , 100 independent trials using different ε_t sequences are performed. The variance of the error random variables is varied from 0.01 to 1.5. In each case we computed $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_M)$ by NSD, MNSD, TLS-ESPRIT and Quinn's (1994) method. For each ω , we computed the average estimates and the mean squared errors (MSE) over 100 replications and also the corresponding Cramer-Rao lower bound (CRLB).

It is observed that the performance of the NSD and TLS-ESPRIT estimates change with the different values of L. We observed that the MSE starts decreasing as L increases for both the methods and for $N=25$, the best performance (min MSE) for the NSD occurs at $L=15$ ($\cong \frac{3}{5}N$) and at $L=12$ ($\cong \frac{1}{2}N$) for TLS-ESPRIT. The

performance of the MNSD estimates does not seem to be much affected with the variation of L . We report the performances of MNSD, Quinn's method (1994) and the best performance of the NSD and TLS-ESPRIT along with their CRLB in Table 1.

We also performed a simulation study to investigate the performance of the different confidence intervals discussed in section 5 with respect to their average length and coverage probabilities. We consider the simulation model (6.1) with ε_t white and Gaussian having error variance σ^2 . Results are obtained for $\omega = 0.25\pi$, 0.50π and 0.75π . For each ω , simulations were performed for $\sigma^2 = 0.01$, 0.05 and 0.1 . Average length of the confidence intervals (with nominal level 0.90) and the corresponding coverage probabilities over 100 simulations are reported for all the methods in table 2. The bootstrapping number NBOOT is taken as 100 for both the bootstrap methods.

7. CONCLUSIONS

In this article, we propose a new non-iterative method for estimating the frequencies of the model (1.1) when the number of frequencies is known a priori. If the number of harmonic components is unknown, then we can first estimate the number of frequencies by the method of Kundu (1992) and then use the proposed method to estimate the frequencies. First we transform the model (1.1) to an undamped superimposed exponential signals model, then use extended order modelling and decompose the noise space by singular value decomposition technique. It is further

proved that the proposed non-iterative technique yields estimates that are strongly consistent.

Simulation results show very satisfactory performance of the proposed method. The proposed method performs better than the best known non-iterative techniques like TLS-ESPRIT (Roy and Kailath; 1989) and Quinn's method (1994) even for reasonably small sample sizes and at all σ^2 levels. The performance of MNSD almost attains the CRLB in the cases considered.

The choice of L obviously affects the performance of the NSD estimates. Clearly L should be at least $M+1$, but the natural question is why it should be larger than that? Although no theoretical justifications have been given in the literature, but it is observed that extended order modelling always helps to improve the performance of the estimators. Some heuristic justifications can be found in Tufts and Kumaresan (1982) . It seems more theoretical work is needed in this direction. Here we have observed that as L increases the MSE starts decreasing for NSD. It reaches a minimum at $L=15$ ($\cong \frac{3}{5}N$), when the sample size is 25. The performance of the MNSD estimates does not seem to be affected much with variation in L .

Among the three confidence intervals for the frequencies discussed in section 5, the bootstrap-t confidence intervals gives the highest coverage probabilities although the average length of these intervals is marginally larger than the other two. It is also observed that the asymptotic confidence interval performs better than the percentile bootstrap intervals in terms

of shorter average length and higher coverage probabilities when $\omega = 0.50\pi$. But the percentile bootstrap gives higher coverage probabilities and almost same length intervals when $\omega = 0.25\pi$ or 0.75π as compared with the asymptotic confidence intervals. It is further observed that all the three confidence intervals are symmetric about the true parameter in the cases considered. Based on the results of the simulations, we recommend to use bootstrap-t method for finding confidence intervals.

The research of the authors is partially supported by the Army Research Office under the Grant DAAH04-96-1-0082.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. D. Bai, P. R. Krishnaiah and L. C. Zhao, "On the simultaneous estimation of the number of signals and frequencies under a model with multiple sinusoids," Technical Report 86-37, Center for Multivariate Analysis, University of Pittsburgh, 1986.
- [2] Z. D. Bai, B. Q. Miao and C. R. Rao, "Estimation of direction of arrival of signals: Asymptotic results," *Advances in Spectrum Analysis and Array Processing*, vol II, pp. 327-347, Ed. S. Haykins, Prentice-Hall, NJ, 1990.
- [3] B. Efron, "The Jackknife, the Bootstrap and other resampling plans", *SIAM, CBMS-NSF Regional conference series in Appl. Maths*, Vol. 38, 1982.
- [4] P. Hall, "Theoretical comparison of bootstrap confidence intervals", *Ann. Stat.*, 16, 3, pp. 927-953, 1988.
- [5] E. J. Hannan, "The estimation of frequency", *Jour. Appl. Prob.*, 10, pp. 510-519, 1973.

- [6] A. C. Harvey, *The Econometric Analysis of Time Series*, Philip Allan, New York, 1981.
- [7] T. Hasan, "Nonlinear time series regression for a class of amplitude modulated cosinusoids", *Jour. Time Series Analysis*, 3, 109-122, 1982.
- [8] M.S. Kahn, M. Mackisack, M. R. Osborne and G. K. Smyth, "On the consistency of Prony's method and related algorithms", *Jour. Graphical and Computational Stat.*, Vol 1, no. 4, pp. 329-349, 1993.
- [9] S. M. Kay and S. L. Marple, "Spectral analysis - A modern prospective," *Proc. IEEE*, vol 69, pp. 1380-1419, Nov 1981.
- [10] D. Kundu, "Estimating the number of signals using information theoretic criterion," *Journal of Statistical Computation and simulation*, 44, pp. 117-131, 1992.
- [11] D. Kundu, "Estimating the parameters of undamped exponential signals," *Technometrics*, 35, 2, pp. 215-218, 1993b.
- [12] D. Kundu, "A modified Prony algorithm to estimate damped or undamped exponential signals", *To appear in Sankhya, series B*, 1994.
- [13] D. Kundu, "Asymptotic theory of least squares estimates of a particular nonlinear regression model", *Statistics & Prob. Letters*, 18, 1, 13-17, 1993a.
- [14] D. Kundu and A. Mitra, "Asymptotic behavior of the least squares estimates of a particular nonlinear time series model", *Communicated*, 1994.

- [15] V. V. Petrov, *Sum of Independent Random Variables*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1975.
- [16] Prony, R., "Essai experimentale et analytique", *Jour. Ecole Polytechnique* (Paris)., 1, pp. 24-76, 1795.
- [17] B. G. Quinn, "Estimating frequency by interpolation using Fourier coefficients", *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol.42 No. 5, pp. 1264-1268, 1994.
- [18] C. R. Rao, *Linear Statistical inference and it's applications*, 2nd Ed., Wiley Eastern, 1973.
- [19] J. A. Rice and M. Rosenblatt, "On frequency estimation", *Biometrika*, 75, 3, pp. 477-484, 1988.
- [20] R. Roy and T. Kailath, "ESPRIT - Estimation of Signal Parameters via Rotational Invariance Techniques", *IEEE Trans. Acoust. Speech and Signal Processing*, Vol. 37, No.7, pp. 984-995, 1989.
- [21] F. S. G. Richards, " A method of maximum likelihood estimation", *Jour. Royal Stat. Soc., B*, 23, pp. 469-475, 1961.
- [22] D. W. Tufts and R. Kumaresan, "Estimation of frequencies of multiple sinusoids: Making linear prediction perform like maximum likelihood," *Proc IEEE*, special issue on spectral estimation, 70, pp. 975-989, 1982.
- [23] J. Von-Neumann, " Some matrix inequalities and metrization of metric space," *Tomsk Univ. Rev.* , 1, 386-400, 1937.
- [24] A. M. Walker, "On the estimation of a harmonic component in a time series with stationary independent residuals",

Biometrika, 58, pp. 21-36, 1971.

- [25] P. Whittle, "Hypothesis testing in time series analysis",
Uppsala; Almqvist and Wiksells Boktryckeri, 1951.
- [26] P. Whittle, "The simultaneous estimation of a time series'
harmonic component and covariance structure", *Trab. Estad.*,
3, pp. 43-57, 1953.

Table 1

σ^2		$\omega = .25\pi$	$\omega = .50\pi$	$\omega = .75\pi$
0.01	CRLB	0.785398 3.94548E-06	1.570796 3.41880E-06	2.356194 3.03997E-06
	NSD	0.785401 4.26988E-06	1.570874 4.28355E-06	2.356232 4.24039E-06
	MNSD	0.785388 3.47565E-06	1.570840 3.55599E-06	2.356200 3.18853E-06
	TLS-ESP	0.785362 4.31333E-06	1.570867 3.74651E-06	2.356207 3.69340E-06
	QUINN	0.780761 2.91065E-05	1.571113 4.54485E-06	2.366536 1.10624E-04
0.02	CRLB	0.785398 7.89097E-06	1.570796 6.83761E-06	2.356194 6.07997E-06
	NSD	0.785426 8.53331E-06	1.570906 8.57883E-06	2.356228 8.50615E-06
	MNSD	0.785370 6.93120E-06	1.570855 7.12682E-06	2.356217 6.39456E-06
	TLS-ESP	0.785353 8.64388E-06	1.570896 7.50853E-06	2.356210 7.41247E-06
	QUINN	0.780733 3.70177E-05	1.571124 9.01441E-06	2.366513 1.13813E-04
0.03	CRLB	0.785398 1.18364E-05	1.570796 1.02564E-05	2.356194 9.11991E-06
	NSD	0.785455 1.27951E-05	1.570932 1.28827E-05	2.356218 1.27903E-05
	MNSD	0.785352 1.03701E-05	1.570865 1.07106E-05	2.356235 9.61498E-06
	TLS-ESP	0.785348 1.29883E-05	1.570917 1.12857E-05	2.356211 1.11506E-05
	QUINN	0.780704 4.49808E-05	1.571126 1.34930E-05	2.366489 1.17011E-04

Table 1 (continued)

σ^2		$\omega = .25\pi$	$\omega = .50\pi$	$\omega = .75\pi$
0.04	CRLB	0.785398 1.57819E-05	1.570796 1.36752E-05	2.356194 1.21598E-05
	NSD	0.785486 1.70573E-05	1.570953 1.71940E-05	2.356203 1.70906E-05
	MNSD	0.785331 1.38102E-05	1.570873 1.43069E-05	2.356254 1.28486E-05
	TLS-ESP	0.785344 1.73457E-05	1.570935 1.50783E-05	2.356212 1.49056E-05
	QUINN	0.780674 5.29854E-05	1.571122 1.79825E-05	2.366466 1.20221E-04
0.05	CRLB	0.785398 1.97274E-05	1.570796 1.70940E-05	2.356194 1.51998E-05
	NSD	0.785519 2.13213E-05	1.570972 2.15121E-05	2.356185 2.14056E-05
	MNSD	0.785313 1.72385E-05	1.570880 1.79152E-05	2.356274 1.60951E-05
	TLS-ESP	0.785343 2.17155E-05	1.570951 1.88861E-05	2.356213 1.86763E-05
	QUINN	0.780644 6.10271E-05	1.571116 2.24838E-05	2.366442 1.23440E-04
0.5	CRLB	0.785398 1.97274E-04	1.570796 1.70940E-04	2.356194 1.51998E-04
	NSD	0.787414 2.24305E-04	1.571413 2.20710E-04	2.354701 2.28583E-04
	MNSD	0.784367 1.70489E-04	1.570889 1.92013E-04	2.357353 1.75043E-04
	TLS-ESP	0.785474 2.31914E-04	1.571154 2.10385E-04	2.356044 2.04808E-04
	QUINN	0.779592 5.06561E-04	1.568753 3.31991E-04	2.364463 3.94745E-04

Table 1 (continued)

σ^2		$\omega = .25\pi$	$\omega = .50\pi$	$\omega = .75\pi$
1.0	CRLB	0.785398 3.94548E-04	1.570796 3.41880E-04	2.356194 3.03997E-04
	NSD	0.790650 5.39997E-04	1.571914 4.52201E-04	2.351608 5.40340E-04
	MNSD	0.783273 3.47738E-04	1.570815 4.13789E-04	2.358698 3.88778E-04
	TLS-ESP	0.777414 6.67020E-03	1.570930 5.15182E-04	2.356122 4.89108E-04
	QUINN	0.783841 1.28470E-03	1.564314 7.40184E-04	2.365571 5.00275E-03
1.5	CRLB	0.785398 5.91823E-04	1.570796 5.12821E-04	2.356194 4.55995E-04
	NSD	0.800560 4.07110E-03	1.574451 8.08582E-04	2.341074 4.22644E-03
	MNSD	0.785737 2.82607E-03	1.570805 6.72624E-04	2.341074 2.82559E-03
	TLS-ESP	0.778216 7.82090E-03	1.600983 5.08289E-02	2.368486 1.00645E-02
	QUINN	0.781995 2.01329E-03 1.08511E-02	1.563569 1.72613E-03 8.09113E-03	2.365616 8.79353E-03 2.46323E-02

Table 2

$\sigma^2 = 0.01$

	$\omega = .25\pi$	$\omega = .50\pi$	$\omega = .75\pi$
Asymptotic	0.005736	0.005716	0.005712
(Cov. Prob.)	(.82)	(.85)	(.82)
Per - Boot	0.006129	0.005764	0.005495
(Cov. Prob.)	(.88)	(.84)	(.81)
Bootstrap-t	0.006784	0.006377	0.006062
(Cov. Prob.)	(.89)	(.84)	(.82)

$\sigma^2 = 0.05$

	$\omega = .25\pi$	$\omega = .50\pi$	$\omega = .75\pi$
Asymptotic	0.012842	0.012799	0.012784
(Cov. Prob.)	(.81)	(.85)	(.82)
Per - Boot	0.013704	0.012916	0.012348
(Cov. Prob.)	(.88)	(.84)	(.81)
Bootstrap-t	0.015194	0.014297	0.013623
(Cov. Prob.)	(.89)	(.85)	(.82)

$\sigma^2 = 0.10$

	$\omega = .25\pi$	$\omega = .50\pi$	$\omega = .75\pi$
Asymptotic	0.040683	0.040699	0.040576
(Cov. Prob.)	(.80)	(.83)	(.85)
Per - Boot	0.044158	0.042171	0.040593
(Cov. Prob.)	(.85)	(.80)	(.86)
Bootstrap-t	0.048558	0.047150	0.044962
(Cov. Prob.)	(.88)	(.86)	(.86)