

Background

- Sparse signal: Compact representation in an appropriate basis or frame.
- ► $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \le K \ll N$, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$, $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^M$ where $\mathbf{A} = \Phi \Psi$ and $M \ll N$.





▶ Iterative hard/soft thresholding: set $\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{0}$; at iteration *t*,

$$\mathbf{x}^{t+1} = \eta_{\mathcal{K}} (\mathbf{A}^{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{z}^{t} + \mathbf{x}^{t}),$$

 $\mathbf{z}^{t} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}^{t}.$

Approximate Message Passing:

Start from $\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{z}^0 = \mathbf{y}$,

$$\mathbf{z}^{t+1} = \eta_{\mathcal{K}} (\mathbf{A}^{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{z}^{t} + \mathbf{x}^{t}),$$

 $\mathbf{z}^{t} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}^{t} + \frac{1}{\delta} \langle \eta_{\mathcal{K}}' (\mathbf{A}^{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{z}^{t-1} + \mathbf{x}^{t-1}) \rangle.$

- \mathbf{x}^t and \mathbf{z}^t are signal estimate and residual of estimation at iteration t.
- Adding an "Onsager" correction term to the algorithm, which improves the sparsity-undersampling tradeoff.

Denoiser-Based Approximate Message Passing:

- "Onsager" correction term shapes the distribution of the signal estimate: $\mathbf{x}^{t} + \mathbf{A}^{H} \mathbf{z}^{t} \approx \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n}, \, \mathbf{n} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_{t}^{2} \mathbf{I}).$
- AMP succeeds because denoiser for signal class is applied on this estimate (e.g., soft thresholding for sparse signals).
 - \implies Replace thresholding function $\eta_{\mathcal{K}}(x)$ with arbitrary denoiser $\mathbb{T}_{I}(x, \mathcal{K})$ to extend AMP applicability to arbitrary signal classes [1].
- ▶ Use *Monte Carlo* simulations to estimate the Onsager correction term [2].

Group ℓ_1 **Minimization**:

- Consider multiple signals with the same sparse support, \mathbf{x}_i stacked as columns of a matrix **X**, which will be row-sparse.
- Search for signals \mathbf{x}_i , leading to a row-sparse matrix X,

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \underset{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{2,1}, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$$

where $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,q} = \left(\sum_{i} \|\mathbf{x}_{i}\|_{p}^{q}\right)^{\overline{q}}$ with \mathbf{x}_{i} being the *i*th row of matrix **X**. Also known as Multiple Measurement Vector (MMV).

Direction of Arrival Estimation:



Compressive Direction-of-Arrival Estimation Off the Grid

Shermin Hamzehei and Marco F. Duarte

AMP with Parametric Denoisers **x** obeys a low-dimensional parametric model, e.g., array snapshots in DOA: $\mathbf{x}[\boldsymbol{p}] = \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_k e^{-j2\pi f_k \boldsymbol{p}/N}, \ \boldsymbol{p} = 1, \dots, \boldsymbol{P},$ where $f_k = \frac{\Delta}{\lambda} \sin \theta_k$ for $k = 1, \ldots, K$. Can pair statistical parameter estimation algorithms with generative signal models to provide parametric denoisers. T(x, K) x + n Parameter estimation Many algorithms suggested for estimating the frequencies from the signal, know as line-spectral estimation. MUSIC Root MUSIC $\rightarrow \widehat{a}_1, \ldots, \widehat{a}_K$ х —> ESPRIT $K \rightarrow$ $\rightarrow \widehat{f}_1, \ldots, \widehat{f}_K$ PHD $\mathbf{\hat{T}}_{l}(x,K) \longrightarrow \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \sum \hat{\alpha}_{k} \mathbf{e}(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_{k})$ Finally, $\hat{\theta}_k = \sin^{-1}(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\hat{f}_k)$ for $k = 1, \ldots, K$. MMV-Based DOA Estimation • \mathbf{x}_{p} : snapshots gathered by receiver p. • Each antenna takes measurements independent of the others, $\mathbf{y}_{p} = \Phi \mathbf{x}_{p}$. • Gather \mathbf{x}_{p} 's as columns of matrix X. $\mathbf{F} \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{\Phi} \mathbf{X}^T + \mathbf{N} = \mathbf{\Phi} \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{S}^T + \mathbf{N}.$ ► A is row-sparse, since all the columns have the same locations for the nonzero elements. Even if bearings are off the grid, the MMV returns accurate enough estimate to be used by Root MUSIC. $\mathbf{Y} \xrightarrow{\text{group } \ell_1 \text{ min.}} \hat{\mathbf{X}} \xrightarrow{\text{Root MUSIC}} \{ f_{\mu} \}$ Prior Work on DOA Estimation [3] **On-Grid**: (e.g., CS with dictionary $S(\theta)$ [4]) The DOAs are assumed to lie on a prescribed grid. Requires grid selection resulting in mismatches between the adopted discrete grid points and the true continuous DOAs. **Off-Grid**: (e.g., Group $\ell_1 \rightarrow MUSIC$) A grid is still required to perform sparse estimation but the resulted DOA estimates can go outside of this grid. Most of the presented algorithms involve nonconvexoptimization; and thus only local convergence can be guaranteed. **Gridless**: (e.g., AMP+MUSIC)

- These methods directly operate in the continuous domain.
 - ► No parameter grid required; no mismatch problem present. Existing gridless methods can only be applied to uniform or sparse linear arrays.





$$\{f_k\}_{k=1}^K \to \{\theta_k\}_{k=1}^K$$

Numerical Experiments

- length Q = 128 from K transmitters.



- tranmistters.
- the (δ, ρ) region:



- measurements MP over 100 trials.

Acknowledgments and References

[1]. D. L. Donoho, A. Maleki, and A. Montanari, "Message passing algorithms" for compressed sensing", Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., vol. 106, no. 45, pp. 18914–18919, Nov. 2009. [2]. C. A. Metzler, A. Maleki, and R. G. Baraniuk, "From denoising to compressed sensing", IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, vol. 62, no. 9, pp. 5117–5144, April 2016. [3] Z. Yang, J. Li, P. Stoica, and L. Xie, "Sparse Methods for Direction-of-Arrival Estimation". Available at arXiv:1609.09596 [4]. M. F. Duarte and R. G. Baraniuk, "Spectral compressive sensing", *Applied* and Computational Harmonic Analysis, vol. 35, pp. 111–129, July 2013.

• Consider uniform linear array of P = 128 antennas, receiving signals of

DOA estimation error: cost of the Hungarian matching between the vectors containing the true parameter values and their estimates.

• The maximum value of the normalized sparsity $\rho = K/P$, as a function of the normalized measurement rate $\delta = M/Q$ for successful DOA recovery. Successful recovery: up to 1° of average DOA estimation error over K

At least 50% successful recovery over 100 signal trials. Phase transition plot is usually interpreted as showing the division between

• Area below the curve: the probability of success goes to one as $QP \rightarrow \infty$. • Area above the curve: the probability of success goes to zero as $QP \rightarrow \infty$.

Fixed sparsity level, K = 30; fixed number of antennas, P = 128. Average DOA estimation error as a function of total number of