

Non-Linear Transformations of Gaussians and Gaussian-Mixtures with implications on Estimation and Information Theory

Paolo Banelli, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract

This paper investigates the statistical properties of non-linear transformations (NLT) of random variables, in order to establish useful tools for estimation and information theory. Specifically, the paper focuses on linear regression analysis of the NLT output and derives sufficient general conditions to establish when the input-output regression coefficient is equal to the *partial* regression coefficient of the output with respect to a (additive) part of the input. A special case is represented by zero-mean Gaussian inputs, obtained as the sum of other zero-mean Gaussian random variables. The paper shows how this property can be generalized to the regression coefficient of non-linear transformations of Gaussian-mixtures. Due to its generality, and the wide use of Gaussians and Gaussian-mixtures to statistically model several phenomena, this theoretical framework can find applications in multiple disciplines, such as communication, estimation, and information theory, when part of the nonlinear transformation input is the quantity of interest and the other part is the noise. In particular, the paper shows how the said properties can be exploited to simplify closed-form computation of the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), the estimation mean-squared error (MSE), and bounds on the mutual information in additive non-Gaussian (possibly non-linear) channels, also establishing relationships among them.

Index Terms

Gaussian random variables, Gaussian-mixtures, non-linearity, linear regression, SNR, MSE, mutual information.

The author is with the Department of Electronic and Information Engineering, University of Perugia, 06125 Perugia, Italy (e-mail: paolo.banelli@diei.unipg.it).

I. INTRODUCTION

Non-linear transformations (NLT) of Gaussian random variables, and processes, is a classical subject of probability theory, with particular emphasis in communication systems. Several results are available in the literature to statistically characterize the non-linear transformation output, for both real [1]–[8] and complex [9]–[11] Gaussian-distributed input processes.

If the input to the non-linear transformation is the sum of two, or more, Gaussian random variables, then the overall input is still Gaussian and, consequently, the statistical characterization can still exploit the wide classical literature on the subject. For instance, a key point is to establish the equivalent input-output linear-gain [or linear regression coefficient (LRC)] of the non linearity. Anyway, if the interest is to infer only a part of the input by the overall output, and to establish a *partial* LRC (or linear-gain) with respect to this part of the input, it is necessary to compute multiple-folded integrals involving the non-linear transformation. This task is in general tedious and, sometimes, also prohibitive.

This paper observes that, if the NLT input is the sum of zero-mean, independent, Gaussian random variables, all the *partial* LRCs are identical, and equal to the *overall* input-output LRC. This observation, which can also be derived as a special case of the Bussgang Theorem [1], highly simplifies the computation of the partial linear-gain, which can be performed by a single-folded integral over the Gaussian probability density function (*pdf*) of the overall input. Furthermore, this property, which holds true also in other cases not covered by the Bussgang Theorem, lets to simplify the computation of the *partial* linear-gain, also when the non-linearity input is the sum of Gaussian-mixtures [12]. Gaussian-mixtures are widely used in multiple disciplines, such as to model electromagnetic interference [13], images background noise [14], financial assets returns [15], and, more generally, to statistically model clustered data sets. Actually, it is the similarity of the theoretical results for suboptimal estimators of Gaussian sources impaired by a Gaussian-mixture (impulsive) noise in [16], with those of non-linear transformations of Gaussian random variables in [17], [11], [10], that led to conjecture the existence of the theorems and lemmas analyzed in this paper.

Inspired by those similarities, this papers establishes theoretical links among NLT statistical analysis and estimation theory, in a general framework where the NLT may either represent non-ideal hardware in a communication system (such as amplifiers, A/D converters, etc.) or the non-linear estimator of the information. In particular, closed-form computation of classical performance metrics such as the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), the mean-squared error (MSE) of a non-linear estimator, and bounds on the mutual information in additive non-Gaussian (possibly non-linear) channels can be easily derived when a part

of the NLT input is the information of interest, and the other part is the noise (or the interference).

The paper is organized as follows. Section II shortly summarizes LRA for NLT and establishes a condition for the equality of the input-output LRC and the LRC of the output $Z = g(Y)$ with respect to another random variable X . Section III establishes *equal-gain* (i.e., equal-LRC) theorems when $Y = X + N$. Section IV extends the LRC analysis to Gaussian-mixtures. Section V is the main contribution of the paper where implication to SNR, MSE and mutual information analysis is highlighted, while conclusions are drawn in the last Section. Appendices are dedicated to proof theorem and lemmas, and also to highlight other examples where the *equal-gain* theorems hold true. Throughout the paper $G(\cdot; \sigma^2)$ is used to indicate a zero-mean Gaussian *pdf*, $E\{\cdot\}$ is used for statistical expectation, interchangeably with $E_{X_1 \dots X_N}\{\cdot\}$, which is used, when necessary, to highlight the (joint) *pdf* $f_{X_1, \dots, X_N}(\cdot)$ involved in the expectation integral.

II. LINEAR REGRESSION FOR NON LINEAR TRANSFORMATIONS

Lets indicate with $Z = g(Y)$ the NLT of a random variable Y . For any Y and any $g(\cdot)$, the output random variable Z can be decomposed as a scaled version of the input Y plus an uncorrelated distortion term W_y , as expressed by

$$Z = g(Y) = k_y Y + W_y, \quad (1)$$

where

$$k_y = \frac{E\{ZY\}}{E\{Y^2\}} = \frac{E_Y\{g(Y)Y\}}{E\{Y^2\}} \quad (2)$$

is the input-output linear gain (or LRC) that grants the orthogonality between Y and W_y , i.e., $E\{YW_y\} = 0$. By defining the LRC with respect to another random variable X , as expressed by

$$k_x = \frac{E\{ZX\}}{E\{X^2\}}, \quad (3)$$

the linear regression model of Z with respect to X would be expressed by

$$Z = k_x X + W_x, \quad (4)$$

where $E\{XW_x\} = 0$. For reasons that will be clarified in the next sections, it may be interesting to establish when the two LRCs are the same, as expressed by $k_y = k_x$. To this end, the following Theorem holds true

Theorem 1: Th:LinearExpectedValue¹ If X and Y are two random variables, $g(\cdot)$ is any non-linear single-valued function, and

$$E_{X|Y}\{X\} = \alpha y, \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha = \frac{E\{X^2\}}{E\{Y^2\}} \quad (5)$$

then

$$k_y = \frac{E\{g(Y)Y\}}{E\{Y^2\}} = \frac{E\{g(Y)X\}}{E\{X^2\}} = k_x. \quad (6)$$

Proof: Observing that

$$E_{XY}\{g(Y)X\} = E_Y\{g(Y)E_{X|Y}\{X\}\}, \quad (7)$$

equation (6) immediately follows by direct substitution of (5) in (7). ■

Note that the sufficient condition in (5) corresponds to identify when the Bayesian MMSE estimator [18] of X is linear (with a proper α) in the (conditional) observation $Y = y^2$.

Another remark is about the computation of k_x , which involves a double-folded integral over the *pdf* of X and Y . When Theorem 1 holds true, this complexity can be significantly reduced by computing k_y , which only requests a single-folded integral over the marginal *pdf* of Y .

III. NLT OF THE SUM OF RANDOM VARIABLES

The general result in Theorem 1, can be specialized to the case of interest in this paper, which focuses on a NLT $g(\cdot)$ that operates on the sum of two independent random variables, i.e., when the two random variables X and Y are linked by a linear model, as expressed by $Y = X + N$.

By means of (3), in this case it is possible to represent the NLT output as a linear regression with respect to either the *partial* input X , or N , as expressed by

$$Z = g(X + N) = k_x X + W_x = k_n N + W_n, \quad (8)$$

where

$$k_x = \frac{E_{XN}\{g(X + N)X\}}{P_X}, \quad k_n = \frac{E_{XN}\{g(X + N)N\}}{P_N} \quad (9)$$

¹The author is in debt with Prof. G. Moustakides for suggesting the existence of this Theorem, and its use to easily prove Theorem 3.

²Statistical conditions that grants linearity of the MMSE estimator for a generic α are explored in Appendix A.

and $P_X = E\{X^2\}$, $E\{XW_x\} = E\{NW_n\} = 0$. In the most general case, the relationship between the three regression coefficients k_y , k_x , and k_n , is summarized by

$$\begin{aligned} P_Y k_y &= E_{XN}\{g(X+N)(X+N)\} \\ &= E_{XN}\{g(X+N)X\} + E_{XN}\{g(X+N)N\} \\ &= P_X k_x + P_N k_n, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

which highlights that the linear gain of the overall input is a weighted sum of the linear gains of each input component, as expressed by

$$k_y = \frac{P_X}{P_X + P_N + 2E\{XN\}} k_x + \frac{P_N}{P_X + P_N + 2E\{XN\}} k_n. \quad (11)$$

Note that, for special cases when $k_x = k_n$, and X , N are orthogonal, i.e., $E\{XN\} = 0$, then (11) induces also $k_y = k_x = k_n$.

A. Equal-Gain Theorems

This subsection is dedicated to investigate when the LRCs in (2) and (9) are identical, for random variables $Y = X + N$. If $\mathcal{F}\{\cdot\}$ is the Fourier transform operator, and $C_X(u) = E\{e^{j2\pi Xu}\} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{f_X(x)\}$ is the characteristic function of X , for $Y = X + N$ Appendix A proves that Theorem 1 is equivalent to the following theorem

Theorem 2: If $Y = X + N$, X and N are two independent random variables, and

$$C_X^{1-\alpha}(u) = C_N^\alpha(u), \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha = \frac{E\{X^2\}}{E\{Y^2\}} \quad (12)$$

then, for any non-linear function $g(\cdot)$ in (2), (9)

$$k_y = k_x = k_n. \quad (13)$$

Proof: Theorem 7 in Appendix A establishes that left-hand-side of (12) is equivalent to $E_{X|Y}\{\alpha y\}$, which by Theorem 1 concludes the proof. ■

As detailed in Appendix A, it is not straightforward to verify all the situations when (12) holds true. An important scenario where $k_y = k_x = k_n$ is summarized by the following Theorem 3

Theorem 3: If X and N are zero-mean Gaussian and independent, $Y = X + N$, $g(\cdot)$ any non-linear single-valued function, then property (13) holds true.

Proof: By well known properties of Gaussian random variables [19], $Y = X + N$ and X are jointly (zero-mean) Gaussian random variables, and consequently the MMSE estimator of X is linear [18], as expressed by

$$E\{X|Y\} = \frac{E\{XY\}}{E\{Y^2\}}y. \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, $E\{XY\} = E\{X(X + N)\} = E\{X^2\}$, which plugged in (14) concludes the proof by Theorem 1. Alternative proofs can be found in Appendix B by exploiting the Bussgang theorem [1], and in Appendix A by exploiting (12). ■

In general, by equations (1) and (8), it is possible to observe that,

$$\begin{aligned} E\{W_y X\} &= E\{(Z - k_y(X + N))X\} \\ &= k_x E\{X^2\} + E\{W_x X\} - k_y E\{X^2\} - k_y E\{NX\} \\ &= (k_x - k_y)P_X, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

and analogously $E\{W_y N\} = (k_n - k_y)P_N$. Due to the fact that in the derivations of (15) it is only necessary to assume X , N to be orthogonal (i.e., $E\{NX\} = 0$), and not necessarily Gaussian, it is demonstrated the following more general theorem

Theorem 4: If X and N are two orthogonal random variables, $Y = X + N$, $g(\cdot)$ is any single-valued regular function, by the definitions (1), (8)

$$E\{W_y X\} = E\{W_y N\} = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad k_y = k_x = k_n. \quad (16)$$

The property $E\{W_y X\} = E\{W_y N\} = 0$ in Theorem 4, highlights the key element that distinguishes independent zero-mean Gaussian random inputs, with respect to the general situation, when X and N are characterized by arbitrary *pdfs*. Indeed, for zero-mean Gaussian inputs, by means of Theorem 3 and the sufficient condition in Theorem 4, the distortion term W_y is orthogonal to both the input components X and N , while in general it is orthogonal only to their sum $Y = X + N$. This means that, in the general case, it is only possible to state that

$$E\{W_y X\} = -E\{W_y N\} \neq 0, \quad (17)$$

which is equivalent to link the tree linear gains by (11), rather than by the special case in (13).

Another special case is summarized in the following

Theorem 5: If X and N are two independent zero-mean random variables with identical probability density functions $f_X(\cdot) = f_N(\cdot)$, $Y = X + N$, $g(\cdot)$ is any single-valued regular function, then (13) holds true.

Proof: By observing the definitions of k_x and k_n in (9), it is straightforward to conclude that $k_x = k_n$, when $f_X(\cdot)$ is identical to $f_N(\cdot)$ (note that also $\sigma_X^2 = \sigma_N^2$) and, consequently, due to $E\{XN\} = E\{X\}E\{N\} = 0$, (13) follows from (11). An alternative proof that exploits (12), can be found in Appendix A, together with the extension to the sum of Q i.i.d. random variables. ■

B. A Simple Interpretation

An intuitive interpretation of the cases summarized by Theorems 2-5 is that the non-linear function $g(\cdot)$ statistically handles each input component in the same way, in the sense that it does not privilege or penalize any of the two, with respect to the uncorrelated distortion. In order to clarify this intuitive statement, let's assume that X and N are zero-mean and uncorrelated, i.e., $E\{XN\} = 0$, $g(\cdot)$ is an odd function, i.e., $g(y) = g(-y)$, and that the goal is to linearly infer either X , or N , or their sum $Y = X + N$, from the observation Z . Obviously, in this simplified set-up, also Z is zero-mean, and consequently the best (in the MMSE sense) linear estimators of, X , N , and Y are expressed by [18]

$$\hat{X}_{\text{mmse}}(Z) = \frac{\sigma_X}{\sigma_Z} \rho_{XZ} Z = k_x \frac{\sigma_X^2}{\sigma_Z^2} Z, \quad (18)$$

$$\hat{N}_{\text{mmse}}(Z) = \frac{\sigma_N}{\sigma_Z} \rho_{NZ} Z = k_n \frac{\sigma_N^2}{\sigma_Z^2} Z, \quad (19)$$

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{mmse}}(Z) = \frac{\sigma_Y}{\sigma_Z} \rho_{YZ} Z = k_y \frac{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_N^2}{\sigma_Z^2} Z = \hat{X}_{\text{mmse}}(Z) + \hat{N}_{\text{mmse}}(Z), \quad (20)$$

where $\rho_{XZ} = E\{XZ\}/\sigma_Y\sigma_Z$, ρ_{NZ} , and ρ_{YZ} are the cross-correlation coefficients for zero-mean random variables. Note that, as well known [18], the equality $\hat{Y}(Z) = \hat{X}(Z) + \hat{N}(Z)$ in (20) holds true also when $k_y \neq k_x \neq k_n$. Equations (18)-(20) highlight that, if the two zero-mean inputs X and N equally contribute to the input in the average power sense, i.e., when $\sigma_X^2 = \sigma_N^2$, and their non-Gaussian, and non-identical *pdfs* $f_X(x)$, and $f_N(n)$, induce $k_x > k_n$ (or $k_x < k_n$), then X (or N) appears less undistorted in the output Z and, consequently, it gives an higher contribution to the estimation of the sum, by \hat{X} (or \hat{N}).

IV. GENERALIZATION TO GAUSSIAN-MIXTURES

Due to the fact that the theorems derived so far mostly established sufficient, but not necessary, conditions for equal-gain, this section first describes a possible way to test if the property in (13) may hold true, or not, with respect to a wider class of *pdfs*. Furthermore, the results that are obtained are instrumental to establish inference and information theoretic insights, when random variables are distributed according to Gaussian-mixtures, as detailed in the next section. To this end, let's start from a situation we are particularly interested to, when X is Gaussian distributed and N is a zero-mean Gaussian-mixture, as expressed by

$$f_N(n) = \sum_{l=0}^L \beta_l G(n; \sigma_{N,l}^2) = \sum_{l=0}^L \frac{\beta_l}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_{N,l}^2}} e^{-\frac{n^2}{2\sigma_{N,l}^2}}, \quad (21)$$

where $\sigma_N^2 = \sum_{l=0}^L \beta_l \sigma_{N,l}^2$ is the variance, and $\sum_{l=0}^L \beta_l = 1$, i.e., $\beta_l \geq 0$ are the probability-masses associated to a discrete random variable, in order to grant that $f_N(n)$ is a proper *pdf* with unitary area. A Gaussian-mixture, by a proper choice of L and β_l , can accurately fit a wide class of symmetric, zero-mean *pdfs*, and represents a flexible way to test what happens when N departs from a Gaussian distribution. For instance, this quite general framework includes an impulsive noise N characterized by the Middleton's Class-A canonical model [13], where $L = \infty$, $\beta_l = e^{-A} \frac{A^l}{l!}$ are Poisson-distributed weights, $\sigma_{N,l}^2 = \frac{l/A + \Gamma}{1 + \Gamma} \sigma_N^2$, and A and Γ are the canonical parameters that control the impulsiveness of the noise [20]. Conversely, observe that when $L = 0$, and $\beta_0 = 1$, the hypotheses of Theorem 3 hold true, and consequently (13) is verified.

If X and N are independent, $Y = X + N$ is also distributed as a Gaussian-mixture, as expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} f_Y(y) &= f_N(y) * f_X(y) \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^L \beta_l G(y; \sigma_{N,l}^2) * G(y; \sigma_X^2) = \sum_{l=0}^L \beta_l G(y; \sigma_{Y,l}^2), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

due to the fact that the convolution of two zero-mean Gaussian functions, still produces a zero-mean Gaussian function, with variance equal to $\sigma_{Y,l}^2 = \sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N,l}^2$. Thus, the LRC k_y can be expressed by

$$k_y = \frac{E_Y\{g(Y)Y\}}{\sigma_Y^2} = \frac{1}{\sigma_Y^2} \sum_{l=0}^L \beta_l E_{Y_l}\{g(Y)Y\}, \quad (23)$$

where $Y_l = X + N_l$ stands for the l -th “virtual” Gaussian random variable that is possible to associate to the l -th Gaussian *pdf* in (22). Equation (23) suggests that in this case k_y can be interpreted as a weighted sum of other $L + 1$ regression coefficients

$$k_y^{(l)} = \frac{E_{Y_l}\{g(Y_l)Y_l\}}{\sigma_{Y,l}^2}, \quad (24)$$

as expressed by

$$k_y = \sum_{l=0}^L \frac{\sigma_{Y,l}^2}{\sigma_Y^2} \beta_l k_y^{(l)}. \quad (25)$$

Each gain $k_y^{(l)}$ in (25) is associated to the *virtual* output $Z_l = g(Y_l)$, generated by the non-linearity $g(\cdot)$ when it is applied to the Gaussian-distributed *virtual* input Y_l . Analogously

$$k_x = \frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} E_{XN} \{g(X + N)X\} = \sum_{l=0}^L \beta_l k_x^{(l)}, \quad (26)$$

$$k_n = \frac{1}{\sigma_N^2} E_{XN} \{g(X + N)N\} = \sum_{l=0}^L \frac{\sigma_{N,l}^2}{\sigma_N^2} \beta_l k_n^{(l)}, \quad (27)$$

where $k_x^{(l)}$ (and similarly $k_n^{(l)}$) is expressed by

$$k_x^{(l)} = \frac{E_{XN_l} \{g(X + N_l)X\}}{\sigma_X^2}. \quad (28)$$

Due to the fact that X , N_l , and $Y_l = X + N_l$, satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3, it is possible to conclude that

$$k_x^{(l)} = k_y^{(l)} = k_n^{(l)}, \quad (29)$$

which plugged in (25) leads to

$$k_y = \sum_{l=0}^L \frac{\sigma_{Y,l}^2}{\sigma_Y^2} \beta_l k_x^{(l)}. \quad (30)$$

By direct inspection of (30), (26), and (27), it is possible to conclude that $k_y \neq k_x \neq k_n \neq k_y$, as soon as $L > 0$, for any value of the weights β_l , and any NLT $g(\cdot)$. However, plugging (29) in (26)-(27), it is obtained

$$k_x = \sum_{l=0}^L \beta_l k_y^{(l)}, \quad k_n = \sum_{l=0}^L \frac{\sigma_{N,l}^2}{\sigma_N^2} \beta_l k_y^{(l)}, \quad (31)$$

which may be considered the *generalization* of (13), when X is a zero-mean Gaussian and N a zero-mean Gaussian-mixture. Indeed, also in this case the first equation in (31) is much simpler to compute than (26), and enables the derivation of some useful theoretical results in estimation and information theory, as detailed in the next Sections. Finally, when both X and N are zero-mean independent Gaussian-mixtures, with parameters $(\beta_l^{(x)}, \sigma_{X,l}^2, L_x)$ and $(\beta_l^{(n)}, \sigma_{N,l}^2, L_n)$, respectively, (25) and (31) can be further

generalized to

$$k_y = \sum_{l=0}^{L_x} \sum_{j=0}^{L_n} \beta_l^{(x)} \beta_j^{(n)} \frac{\sigma_{Y,(l,j)}^2}{\sigma_Y^2} k_y^{(l,j)}, \quad (32)$$

$$k_x = \sum_{l=0}^{L_x} \sum_{j=0}^{L_n} \beta_l^{(x)} \beta_j^{(n)} \frac{\sigma_{X,l}^2}{\sigma_X^2} k_x^{(l,j)}, \quad k_n = \sum_{l=0}^{L_x} \sum_{j=0}^{L_n} \beta_l^{(x)} \beta_j^{(n)} \frac{\sigma_{N,j}^2}{\sigma_N^2} k_n^{(l,j)}, \quad (33)$$

where by intuitive notation equivalence, $Y_{l,j} = X_l + N_j$, $\sigma_{Y,(l,j)}^2 = \sigma_{X,l}^2 + \sigma_{N,j}^2$, $k_y^{(l,j)} = E\{g(Y_{l,j}) Y_{l,j}\} / \sigma_{Y,(l,j)}^2$, and $k_y^{(l,j)} = k_x^{(l,j)} = k_n^{(l,j)}$. Thus, also in this case, $k_y \neq k_x$, with the equality that is possible only if X and N are characterized by identical parameters $(\beta_l^{(o)}, \sigma_{o,l}^2, L_o)$, e.g., if they are identical distributed, as envisaged by Theorem 5.

V. INFORMATION AND ESTIMATION THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

This section is dedicated to clarify how the theoretical results derived in Section III and IV are particularly pertinent to estimation and information theory, where Theorem 3 and its generalization in (29) find useful applications. Indeed, it can be observed that the theoretical framework derived so far is captured




Fig. 1. The statistical model

by the model in Fig. 1, which is quite common for instance in several communication systems, where X may represent the useful information, N the noise or interference, and $g(\cdot)$ either a distorting non-linear device (such as an amplifier, a limiter, an analog-to-digital converter, etc.), or an estimator/detector that is supposed to contrast the detrimental effect of N on X . Furthermore, the coefficient k_y in (1)-(2) is

the same coefficient that appears in the Bussgang theorem [1], which lets to extend (1) to some special random processes, such as the Gaussian ones. Specifically, for the class of stationary Bussgang processes [21], [22], it holds true that

$$Z(t) = k_y Y(t) + W_y(t), \quad (34)$$

where

$$k_y = \frac{R_{ZY}(0)}{R_{YY}(0)} = \frac{E\{Z(t)Y(t+\tau)\}}{E\{Y^2(t)\}}, \quad \forall t, \forall \tau, \quad (35)$$

$R_{ZY}(\tau) = E\{Z(t)Y(t+\tau)\}$ is the classical cross-correlation function for stationary random processes, and $R_{W_y Y}(\tau) = 0, \forall \tau$. As detailed in Appendix B the Bussgang theorem [1] can be exploited to prove Theorem 3. Furthermore, it can also be used to characterize the power spectral density of the output of a non linearity with Gaussian input processes. This fact induced an extensive technical literature, with closed form solutions for the computation of the LRC k_y for a wide class of NLT $g(\cdot)$, as detailed in [1]–[8] for real Gaussian inputs, and in [9]–[11] for complex Gaussian inputs. The Bussgang Theorem can also be used to asses the performance of such non-linear communication systems, such as the bit-error-rate (BER), the signal-to-noise power ratio (SNR), the maximal mutual information (capacity), and the mean square estimation error (MSE), whose link has attracted considerable research efforts in the last decade (see [23], [24] and references therein). Thus, taking in mind the broad framework encompassed by Fig. 1, the following subsections will clarify how some of the theorems derived in this paper impact on the computations of the SNR, the capacity, and the MSE, and will provide also insights on their interplay in non-Gaussian and non-linear scenarios.

A. SNR considerations

In order to define a meaningful SNR, it is useful to separate the non-linear device output as the sum of the useful information with an uncorrelated distortion, as in (8). For simplicity, we assume in the following that all the random variables are zero-mean, i.e., $P_X = \sigma_X^2$. Thus, the SNR at the non-linearity output, is expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SNR}_x &= k_x^2 \frac{E\{X^2\}}{E\{W_x^2\}} = \frac{k_x^2 \sigma_X^2}{E\{Z^2\} - k_x^2 \sigma_X^2} \\ &= \left(\frac{E_Y\{g^2(Y)\}}{k_x^2 \sigma_X^2} - 1 \right)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where the second equality is granted by the orthogonality between X and W_x .

In the general case, in order to obtain a closed form expression for (36), it would be necessary to solve the double folded integral in (9), for the computation of k_x . However, if X and N are zero-mean,

independent, and Gaussian, by Theorem 3 the computation can be simplified by exploiting that $k_x = k_y$ and, consequently, the computation of the SNR would request to solve only single-folded integrals, e.g., (2) and $E_Y\{g^2(Y)\}$. Note that, in this case also $Y = X + N$ would be Gaussian and, consequently, the computations of k_y and $E_Y\{g^2(Y)\}$ can benefit of the results available in the literature [1], [2], [4], [6]–[8], [10], [11], [17].³

Actually, it could be argued that the SNR may be also defined by exploiting (1) rather than (8). Indeed, by rewriting (1) as

$$Z = g(X + N) = k_y X + k_y N + W_y, \quad (37)$$

it is possible to define another SNR, as expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SNR}_y &= \frac{k_y^2 E\{X^2\}}{k_y^2 E\{N^2\} + E\{W_y^2\}} = \frac{k_y^2 \sigma_X^2}{E_Y\{g^2(Y)\} - k_y^2 \sigma_X^2} \\ &= \left(\frac{E_Y\{g^2(Y)\}}{k_y^2 \sigma_X^2} - 1 \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Theorem 3 states that the two SNRs in (38) and (36) are identical if X and N are zero-mean, independent, and Gaussian. When N (and/or X) is non-Gaussian, it is possible to approximate its *pdf* with infinite accuracy [26] by the Gaussian-mixture (21) in Section IV, which represents a wide class of zero-mean noises with symmetrical *pdfs*. In this case, $k_x \neq k_y$ and (36) should be used instead of (38). However, although (38) cannot be used to compute the SNR, Theorem 3 turns out to be useful to compute k_x , by exploiting

$$k_x = \sum_{l=0}^L \beta_l k_x^{(l)}, \quad k_x^{(l)} = k_y^{(l)} = \frac{E_{Y_l}\{g(Y_l)Y_l\}}{\sigma_{Y,l}^2}, \quad (39)$$

which again involves only the computations of single-folded integrals. Note that, all the integrals $E_{Y_l}\{g(Y_l)Y_l\}$ in (39) share the same closed-form analytical solution for the Gaussian *virtual* inputs Y_l .

³An alternative way to simplify the computation of the linear gain k_x by a single-folded integral could exploit hybrid non-linear moments analysis of Gaussian inputs [25] [26], where it is proven that $E\{Xg(Y)\} = E\{X[a_0 + a_1(Y - E\{Y\})]\}$, with $a_0 = E\{g(Y)\}$ and $a_1 = E\{dg(Y)/dY\}$. When $Y = X + N$, with zero-mean X and N , it leads to $E_{XN}\{xg(X + N)\} = \sigma_X^2 E_Y\{dg(Y)/dY\}$. This fact highlights that $k_y = k_x = E_Y\{dg(Y)/dY\}$, i.e., for Gaussian inputs the statistical linear gain k_y is equivalent to the average of the first-order term of the MacLaurin expansion of the non linearity. Similarly, if Y (N) is a Gaussian-Mixture, it is possible to exploit $E\{Xg(Y)\} = \sum \beta_l E\{Xg(Y_l)\}$ and $E_{XN}\{Xg(Y)\} = \sigma_X^2 E_{Y_l}\{dg(Y)/dY\}$.

B. Estimation theory and MSE considerations

The definition of the error at the non-linearity output may depend on the non-linearity purpose. If the NLT $g(\cdot)$ represents an estimator of X given the observation $Y = X + N$, as expressed by

$$\hat{X} = g(X + N) = k_x X + W_x, \quad (40)$$

the estimation error is defined as

$$e = \hat{X} - X = (k_x - 1)X + W_x. \quad (41)$$

Exploiting the uncorrelation between X and N , which induces

$$E\{W_x^2\} = E_Y\{g^2(Y)\} - k_x^2 E\{X^2\}, \quad (42)$$

the MSE at the non-linearity output can be expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE} &= E\{e^2\} = (k_x - 1)^2 E\{X^2\} + E\{W_x^2\} \\ &= E_Y\{g^2(Y)\} + (1 - 2k_x) E\{X^2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

However, looking at (40) from another point of view, it is also possible to consider $g(\cdot)$ as a distorting device that scales by k_x the useful information X , i.e., (43) represents the MSE of a (conditionally) biased estimator. In this view, it is possible to define an unbiased estimator $\hat{X}_u = \hat{X}/k_x$ and the associated unbiased estimation error as

$$e_u = \hat{X}/k_x - X = W_x/k_x, \quad (44)$$

whose mean square-value is expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE}_u &= E\{e_u^2\} = E\{W_x^2\}/k_x^2 \\ &= E_Y\{g^2(Y)\}/k_x^2 - E\{X^2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

It is straightforward to verify that, for a given information power $E\{X^2\}$, the non-linearities that maximize the two MSE are different, as expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\text{mmse}}(\cdot) &= \arg \min_{g(\cdot)} [\text{MSE}] = \arg \min_{g(\cdot)} [\log(\text{MSE})] \\ &= \arg \min_{g(\cdot)} [E\{g^2(Y)\}/k_x], \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

and

$$g_{\text{u-mmse}}(\cdot) = \arg \min_{g(\cdot)} [\text{MSE}_u] = \arg \min_{g(\cdot)} [E\{g^2(Y)\}/k_x^2]. \quad (47)$$

The first criterion corresponds to the classical Bayesian minimum MSE (MMSE) estimator, that is $g_{\text{mmse}}(Y) = E_{X|Y}\{X\}$. By means of (36) and (47), the second criterion, which is the unbiased-MMSE (U-MMSE) estimator, is equivalent to the maximum-SNR (MSNR) criterion. Note that k_x depends on $g(\cdot)$ by (9) and consequently, in general

$$g_{\text{u-mmse}}(\cdot) \neq \frac{g_{\text{mmse}}(\cdot)}{k_x^{(\text{mmse})}}. \quad (48)$$

Indeed, the right-hand term in (48) is a (conditionally) unbiased estimator, but not the (U-MMSE) optimal one, because it has been obtained by first optimizing the MSE, and by successively compensating the biasing gain k_x , while $g_{\text{u-mmse}}(Y)$ should be obtained the other way around, as expressed by (44) and (47). The two criteria tend to be quite similar when the functional derivative $\frac{\delta k_x(g(\cdot))}{\delta g(\cdot)} \approx 0$ in the neighborhood of the optimal solution $g_{\text{mmse}}(\cdot)$.

Actually, the MMSE and the MSNR criteria are equivalent from an information theoretic point of view only when $g(\cdot)$ is linear, as detailed in [23], in which case $g_{\text{u-mmse}}(\cdot)$ is equivalent to right-hand side of (48). For instance, this happens when X and N are both zero-mean, independent, and Gaussian as in Theorem 3, in which case it is well known that [18]

$$\hat{X}_{\text{mmse}} = g_{\text{mmse}}(Y) = \frac{\sigma_X^2}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_N^2} Y = \frac{\sigma_X^2}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_N^2} (X + N) \quad (49)$$

is just a scaled version of the U-MMSE

$$\hat{X}_{\text{u-mmse}} = g_{\text{u-mmse}}(Y) = Y = X + N. \quad (50)$$

By noting that the SNR is not influenced by a scaling coefficient, because it affects both the useful information and the noise, it is confirmed that for linear $g(\cdot)$ the MMSE optimal solution is also MSNR optimal [23].

Conversely, when N is not Gaussian distributed, its *pdf* may be (or approximated by) a Gaussian-mixture as in (21). In this case, analogously to the consideration for the SNR computation, Theorem 3 turns out to be useful to compute k_x , and thus the MSE in (43), and (45), by the single-folded integrals involved in (31), rather than by the double-folded integrals in (26). The reader interested in this point, may find a deeper insights and a practical application in [27], where these considerations have been fully exploited to characterize the performance of MMSE and MSNR estimators for a Gaussian source impaired by impulsive Middleton's Class-A noise.

C. Capacity considerations

Equations (8) or (37) can also be exploited to compute the mutual information of the non-linear information channel $X \rightarrow Z = g(X + N)$ summarized by Fig. 1. Actually, the exact computation of

the mutual information is in general prohibitive due to the complicated expression for the *pdf* of the two disturbance components W_x and $k_y N + W_y$, in (8) and (37), respectively. Anyway, it is possible to exploit the theoretical results derived so far, to establish some useful bounds on the mutual information in a couple of scenarios, as detailed in the following.

1) *Non-linear channels with non-Gaussian noise:*

When the noise N is not Gaussian, it is difficult to compute in closed form the mutual information $I(X \rightarrow Y)$ even in the absence of the non-linearity $g(\cdot)$, and only bounds are in general available [28]. Actually, when the noise N is the Gaussian-mixture summarized by (21), it does not either exist a closed form expression for the differential entropy $h(N)$, which can only be bounded as suggested in [29]. However, when X is Gaussian, the results in this paper can be exploited to compute simple lower-bounds for the mutual information $I(X, Z)$ at the output of any non linearity $Z = g(Y)$, which may model for instance A/D converters, amplifiers, and so forth. These lower bounds are provided by the AWGN capacity of (8) and (37), when the disturbance is modeled as (the maximum-entropy [30]) zero-mean Gaussian noise with variance $E\{Z^2\} - k_x^2 \sigma_X^2$ and $E\{Z^2\} - k_y^2 \sigma_X^2$, respectively. Thus, exploiting (8) and (36), it is possible to conclude that

$$I(X, Z) \geq C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{snr}_x)} = \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \text{SNR}_x), \quad (51)$$

while, by exploiting (37) and (38), it would be possible to conclude that

$$I(X, Z) \geq C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{snr}_y)} = \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \text{SNR}_y). \quad (52)$$

By Theorem 3, the two lower-bounds are equivalent if X and N are zero-mean independent Gaussians. Otherwise, the correct SNR is (36) and the correct lower bound is (51). For instance, in the simulation examples either when N is Laplace distributed and independent of X (see Fig. 2(c)), or when it is Gaussian distributed and positively correlated with X (see Fig. 2(d)), $k_x > k_y$ and consequently by (36) and (38), $C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{snr}_x)} > C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{snr}_y)}$. As detailed in the previous subsections, the computations of such lower bounds are simplified by the results in this paper when X is zero-mean Gaussian, and N is either zero-mean Gaussian or a Gaussian mixture.

2) *Linear channels with non-Gaussian noise:*

It is also possible to derive a bound for the mutual information of the non-Gaussian additive channel $Y = X + N$, in the absence or before the NLT $g(\cdot)$, by exploiting the interplay between MSE and mutual information. Indeed, for non-Gaussian additive channels, exploiting the corollary of Theorem 8.6.6 in

[31], it is possible to readily derive that

$$I(X, Y) \geq h(X) - \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e \text{MSE}). \quad (53)$$

which holds true for the MSE of any estimator $\hat{X} = g(Y)$. Thus, for a Gaussian source X , (53) simply becomes

$$I(X, Y) \geq C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{mse})} = \frac{1}{2} \log\left(\frac{\sigma_X^2}{\text{MSE}}\right), \quad (54)$$

where, the lower bound $C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{mse})}$ can be computed by plugging (43) in (54). Taking in mind that an estimator is generally non-linear, it is possible to exploit the information processing inequality [31], to establish another lower bound by means of (51)

$$I(X, Y) \geq I(X, \hat{X}(Y)) \geq C_{g_{\text{mmse}}(\cdot)}^{(\text{snr}_x)}, \quad (55)$$

by properly computing the linear gain k_x and output power $E\{\hat{X}(y)^2\}$ associated to the estimator $\hat{X}(Y)$. It is natural to ask which of the two bounds in (54) and (55) is the tightest, and should be used in practice. To this end, lets note that by (36) and (43) MSE and SNR_x are linked by

$$\text{SNR}_x = \frac{k_x^2 \sigma_X^2}{E\{W_x^2\}} = \frac{k_x^2 \sigma_X^2}{\text{MSE} - (1 - k_x)^2 \sigma_X^2}, \quad (56)$$

which lets to establish the following general Theorem

Theorem 6: For any additive noise channel $Y = X + N$, and any estimator $\hat{X}(Y)$, the capacity lower bound based on the SNR is always tighter, (or at least equivalent), than the capacity lower bound based on the MSE, as summarized by

$$C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{snr}_x)} \geq C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{mse})}. \quad (57)$$

Proof: See Appendix C. ■

The two lower bounds are a valuable alternative to the pessimistic lower bound that models the noise as completely Gaussian, which is expressed by

$$I(X, Y) \geq C_{\text{AWGN}} = \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \text{SNR}), \quad (58)$$

where the total SNR is defined as $\text{SNR} = \frac{\sigma_x^2}{\sigma_n^2}$. For any estimator such that $\text{MSE} \leq \sigma_n^2 \frac{\text{SNR}}{\text{SNR}+1}$, by means of (54) and (58), $C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{mse})} \geq C_{\text{AWGN}}$. Actually, any useful estimator should significantly reduce the estimation error power with respect to the original noise power [e.g., the estimation error power with $g(y) = y$], as expressed by $\text{MSE} \ll \sigma_n^2$: this fact consequently induces that $C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{mse})} > C_{\text{AWGN}}$ is verified for any practical estimator and SNR, as it will be confirmed in the simulations section. Note that, the lower

bound in (53) has been also derived in [24] for the MMSE estimator $g_{\text{mmse}}(\cdot)$, which obviously provides the tightest MSE bound among all the estimators. In the light of Theorem 6, the bound in (51) together with (56) is an alternative (possibly better) approximation of the relationship between mutual information and MMSE, which recently attracted several research [23] [24].

Applying the analytical framework derived in this paper, the general result given by Theorem 6, can be exploited when the noise N can be modeled, or approximated, by the Gaussian-mixture in (21), as in the case of a Class-A impulsive noise. Indeed, in this case Theorem 3 turns out to be useful to establish both the MSE bound in (54), and the tighter bound $C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{snr}_x)}$ in (51) because, as already explained, the computation of the gain k_x in (39) and $E\{g^2(Y)\}$ involve only single-folded integrals. The tightest bounds would be provided by the MMSE estimator, i.e., by computing (39) and $E\{g^2(Y)\}$ with $g(\cdot) = g_{\text{mmse}}(\cdot)$: actually, for a Gaussian-mixture noise the MMSE estimator is characterized by the rather involved expression [27]

$$g_{\text{mmse}}(y) = \frac{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma_x^2}{\sigma_x^2 + \sigma_m^2} \beta_m G(y; \sigma_x^2 + \sigma_m^2)}{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \beta_m G(y; \sigma_x^2 + \sigma_m^2)} y, \quad (59)$$

which prevents closed form solutions. Thus, the computation of the lower bound in (54) requests (single-folded) numerical (or Montecarlo) integration techniques⁴. Alternatively, in order to come up with capacity lower bounds (e.g., MSE and SNR_x) in closed form expressions, it is possible to exploit a suboptimal estimator for the Class-A noise, such as the blanker non-linearity (BN)

$$g_{\text{BN}}(y) = y \cdot \mathbf{u}_{-1}(y_{\text{th}} - |y|), \quad (60)$$

which nulls out all the inputs, whose absolute value overpasses a (MMSE optimal) threshold y_{th} [27] [32]. Such a BN is slightly suboptimal in MSE (and SNR) with respect to the MMSE estimator, and consequently provides slightly looser lower bounds with respect to $C_{g_{\text{mmse}}(\cdot)}^{(\text{snr}_x)}$ and $C_{g_{\text{mmse}}(\cdot)}^{(\text{mse})}$, as it will be verified in the next section.

VI. SIMULATIONS

This section reports some computer-aided simulations to give further evidence and insights to the Theorems, and also to assist the estimation and information theory implications. To this end, it is

⁴An alternative numerical approach to the computation of $E\{g_{\text{mmse}}^2(Y)\}$ is to expand $g_{\text{mmse}}(\cdot)$ as a series of opportune functions (Hermite polynomials, etc.) that admit closed form expressions for their averages over Gaussian *pdfs* (see [4], [8], [10] and references therein). This is however out of the scope of this paper, and a possible subject for further investigations.

considered a simple soft-limiting (SL) NLT

$$g_{\text{SL}}(y) = \begin{cases} y & , |y| < y_{\text{th}} \\ y_{\text{th}} \text{sign}(y) & , |y| \geq y_{\text{th}} \end{cases} . \quad (61)$$

In a first set of simulations the clipping threshold has been fixed as $y_{\text{th}} = 1$, and the average input power is always set to $P_Y = 10$, in order to evidence the non-linear behavior, by frequently clipping the input $Y = X + N$. Samples of the random variables X and N have been generated according to either a zero-mean Gaussian [i.e., $f(\alpha) = G(\alpha; \sigma^2)$], or a zero-mean Laplace *pdf* [i.e., $f(\alpha) = L(\alpha; \sigma^2) = 0.5\lambda e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}|\alpha|}{\sigma}}$], or a uniform *pdf* [i.e., $f(\alpha) = U(\alpha; \sigma^2) = 0.5\mathbf{u}_{-1}(|\alpha - \sqrt{3}\sigma_x|)$], or a triangular zero-mean *pdf* [i.e., $f(\alpha) = T(\alpha; \sigma^2) = U(\alpha; \sigma^2/2) * U(\alpha; \sigma^2/2)$]. The regression coefficients k_y , k_x , and k_n have been estimated by substituting each expected value in (2) and (9), with the corresponding sample-mean over 10^6 samples.

Fig. 2(a)-Fig. 2(d) plot the linear-regression coefficients versus the mean square ratio $\rho_p = P_X/(P_X + P_N)$, which represents the power percentage of $Y = X + N$ that is absorbed by X , when X and N are independent.

Fig. 2(a), where the input of the soft-limiter is the sum of two independent zero-mean Gaussians, confirms Theorem 3, with all the three regression coefficients that are identical, independently of how the input power $P_Y = P_X + P_N$ is split between X and N .

Conversely, in Fig. 2(b) the input is the sum of two (zero-mean) independent Laplace random variables, and $k_y \neq k_x \neq k_n$. However, when $\rho_p = 0.5$, i.e., when the input power P_Y is equally split between X and N , the three coefficients are equal, as predicted by Theorem 5.

In Fig. 2(c), where X is zero-mean Gaussian while N is an independent zero-mean Laplacian, it is clearly shown that $k_y \neq k_x \neq k_n$ for any ρ_p , as it happens in general.

This is also confirmed by Fig. 2(d) where, differently from Fig. 2(a), the two Gaussian inputs X and N are not independent, and they are correlated with a correlation coefficient $\rho_{XN} = 0.3$. It is observed that also in this case, all the regression coefficients are different, except when $\rho_p = 0.5$, i.e., when $P_X = P_N$ and each variable absorbs a fraction equal to $(1 - 2\rho_{XN})/2$ of the total power P_Y . Note however that, also in this specific case where $P_X = P_N$, $k_y < k_x = k_n$ due to (11), which becomes $k_y = k_x/(1 + \rho_{XN})$. Additionally, it is possible to observe that k_y in Fig. 2(d) should be equal to the value in Fig. 2(a), because the non-linearity in both cases has a Gaussian input Y , with the same power $P_Y = \sigma_Y^2 = 10$. Another interpretation of this result is the following: due to the correlation ρ_{XN} , it is possible to express each separate component, for instance N , as a function of the other one, i.e., $N = \rho_{XN}X + \varepsilon$, with $\varepsilon \sim G(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$, ε independent of X , and σ_ε^2 such that $P_Y = (1 + \rho_{XN})^2\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_\varepsilon^2$. Thus, for $Y = U + \varepsilon$,





Fig. 2. Linear regression coefficients versus the input power ratio, when $P_Y = 10$ and the inputs are a) independent and Gaussians pdfs; b) independent and Laplace pdfs; c) independent Gaussian and Laplace pdfs; d) correlated Gaussians pdfs.


$U = (1 + \rho_{XN})X$ the hypotheses of Theorem 3 are satisfied and consequently $k_y = k_u = k_\varepsilon$, where by straightforward substitutions $k_u = E\{ZU\}/P_U = k_x/(1 + \rho_{XN})$.

In Fig. 3(b) $X \sim U(x; \sigma_X^2)$ is a zero-mean uniform random variable and $N \sim T(n; \sigma_N^2)$ has an independent zero-mean triangular pdf: it can be observed that in general $k_y \neq k_x \neq k_n$ unless when $P_N = 2P_X = 2P_Y/3$ ($\rho_p = 1/3$), i.e., when $f_N(n) = f_X(n) * f_X(n)$. This fact confirms Example 1 in Appendix A, where, generalizing Theorem 5, it has been highlighted that in this case Y can be interpreted as $Y = X + (N_1 + N_2)$, e.g., as the sum of three (uniform) i.i.d. random variables, and $k_y = k_x = k_{n_1} = k_{n_2}$.

A final set of results is dedicated to derive capacity bounds for a Gaussian source X impaired by an impulsive noise N , modeled as a Gaussian mixture, according to the Middleton's Class-A noise model. The analytical expression in (59) has been used to compute by a Montecarlo semi-analytical approach



(a) $X \sim U(x; P_X)$, $N \sim U(n; P_N/2) * U(n; P_N/2)$



(b) $X \sim N(x; P_X)$, $N \sim \text{Middleton's Class-A noise}$

Fig. 3. Linear regression coefficients versus the input power ratio, when $P_Y = 10$ and the inputs are independent a) Uniform and Triangular pdfs; b) Gaussian and Gaussian-Mixture pdfs

$k_x^{(\text{mmse})} = E\{xg_{\text{mmse}}(y)/\sigma_X^2\}$ and $E\{g_{\text{mmse}}(y)^2\}$: the obtained values are substituted in (43) and (36) to estimate the mutual information lower bounds in (54) and (51), respectively. Fig. 4 shows the capacity bounds versus SNR when the impulsive noise is characterized by the parameters $A = 0.01$ and the power-ratio between AWGN and impulsive noise $T = \sigma_t^2/\sigma_l^2 = 0.01$. Furthermore, Fig. 4 shows also the mutual information $I(X, Y)$, which has been computed by approximating the joint and marginal *pdfs* of X and Y by the corresponding histograms, obtained by simulation trials over 10^8 samples. It is possible to appreciate that the mutual information lower bounds are tight when the total SNR < 0 dB, while they are quite loose for total SNR ≥ 10 dB, where they almost coincide with the classical AWGN capacity lower bound in (58). Note anyway that the total SNR is defined as $\text{SNR} = \frac{\sigma_x^2}{\sigma_t^2 + \sigma_l^2} = \frac{T}{T+1} \text{SNR}_{\text{awgn}}$, which in this case leads to $\text{SNR} \simeq 0.01 \cdot \text{SNR}_{\text{awgn}}$: thus, the bounds are quite tight, and useful, for $\text{SNR}_{\text{awgn}} \in [-10, 20]$ dB, in the presence of strong impulsive noise, which is a regime of practical interest. Fig. 4 confirms that $C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{snr}_x)} \geq C_{g(\cdot)}^{(\text{mse})}$, as predicted by Theorem 6: this is clearer at low SNRs for the suboptimal BN estimator $g_{\text{BN}}(\cdot)$ [27] [32], which allow the closed form computations of the two lower bounds (e.g., of k_x and $E\{g(\cdot)^2\}$). Conversely, the two lower bounds seem to coincide for the MMSE estimator $g_{\text{mmse}}(\cdot)$. Further note that the lower-bound $C_{g_{\text{BN}}(\cdot)}^{(\text{snr}_x)}$ is a tight approximation of the MMSE lower bound $C_{g_{\text{mmse}}(\cdot)}^{(\text{mse})}$. A deeper analysis for different values of the Class-A noise parameters A and T , as well as for different Gaussian mixture noises may be the subject for future investigation and is beyond the scope of this paper, whose aim is to establish the general theoretical framework.




Fig. 4. Capacity lower-bounds, for a zero-mean Gaussian source impaired by a Class-A (Gaussian-Mixture) impulsive noise with $A = 0.01$ and $T = 0.01$

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The first contribution of this paper has been to prove and analyze some general and interesting theorems for non-linear transformations of the sum of independent Gaussian random variables, and Gaussian-Mixtures. Due to the widespread use of Gaussian and Gaussian-Mixtures, these theorems can be useful in several fields, which include estimation theory, information theory, and non-linear system characterization. Furthermore, the paper has highlighted that these theorems are particularly useful to compute the SNR, the MSE, and mutual information bounds associated with communication systems dealing with non-linear devices, and/or impaired by a Gaussian-mixture noise.

APPENDIX A

Theorem 7: Given two independent random variables X , N , and $Y = X + N$

$$E_{X|Y}\{X\} = \alpha y \iff C_X^{1-\alpha}(u) = C_N^\alpha(u). \quad (62)$$

Proof: Observing that

$$E_{X|Y}\{X\} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x f_{X|Y}(x; y) dx = \frac{1}{f_Y(y)} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x f_{XY}(x, y) dx, \quad (63)$$

clearly l.h.s. of (63) holds true if and only if

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x f_{XY}(x, y) dx = \alpha y f_Y(y). \quad (64)$$

If $Y = X + N$, with X independent of N , it is well known [19] that $f_{XY}(x, y) = f_X(x) f_{Y|X}(y; x) = f_X(x) f_N(y - x)$ and $f_Y(y) = f_X(y) * f_N(y)$, where $*$ stands for the convolution integral operator. Thus, (64) becomes

$$p(y) * f_N(y) = \alpha y \cdot [f_X(y) * f_N(y)], \quad (65)$$

where $p(x) = x f_X(x)$. By applying the inverse Fourier transform, (65) becomes

$$P(u) C_N(u) = \frac{\alpha}{j2\pi} \frac{d}{du} [C_X(u) C_N(u)], \quad (66)$$

where $P(u) = \frac{1}{j2\pi} \frac{d}{du} [C_X(u)] = \frac{1}{j2\pi} C'_X(u)$, and consequently

$$C'_X(u) C_N(u) = \alpha [C'_X(u) C_N(u) + C_X(u) C'_N(u)]. \quad (67)$$

The last equality is a differential equation, with separable variables, as expressed by

$$(1 - \alpha) \frac{C'_X(u)}{C_X(u)} = \alpha \frac{C'_N(u)}{C_N(u)}, \quad (68)$$

which can be solved by direct integration, leading to

$$(1 - \alpha) \log(C_X(u)) = \alpha \log(C_N(u)) + C_o, \quad (69)$$

where $C_o = 0$ is imposed by the boundary conditions $C_X(0) = C_N(0) = 1$. Equation (69) is equivalent to

$$C_X^{1-\alpha}(u) = C_N^\alpha(u), \quad (70)$$

which concludes the proof. ■

It is possible to observe that, for a given $f_X(x)$ [or a given $f_N(n)$], (70) and (62) do not always admit a solution $f_N(n)$ [or $f_X(x)$]. For a fixed *pdf* $f_X(x)$, the existence of a solution is equivalent to

$$f_N(n) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{C_X^\rho(u)\}, \quad (71)$$

i.e., to the existence of the inverse Fourier transform of $C_X^\rho(u)$, where $\rho = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} = \frac{P_Y - P_X}{P_X}$. To this end, it can be observed that $\forall \rho > 0$ the function $C_X^\rho(u)$ preserves the conjugate symmetry of $C_X(u) = C_X^*(-u)$ and the unitary area of the *pdf* by $C_X(0) = 1$. Moreover, if $\rho \in [0, 1]$ and if $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |C_X(u)| du < +\infty$,

then also $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |C_X^\rho(u)| du < +\infty$, which is a sufficient condition for the existence of the inverse Fourier transform. Although it is beyond the scope of the paper to establish (if possible) all the possible conditions where (70) or (71) admit feasible solutions, it is highlighted that $\rho = \frac{P_N}{P_X}$ when X and N are independent, and consequently $\rho \in [0, 1]$ when $P_X \geq P_N$. Furthermore, some examples are listed in the following to clarify the subject and identifying some specific cases of interest.

Example 1: If $\alpha = p/q < 1$ with $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$, then (70) is equivalent to

$$C_X^{q-p}(u) = C_N^p(u). \quad (72)$$

This means that for a fixed $f_X(x)$, and a fixed $\alpha = p/q < 1$, Theorem 7 holds true if the random variable N is characterized by a pdf $f_N(n)$ that satisfies

$$f_N(n) \underbrace{* \cdots *}_{q-p-1} f_N(n) = f_X(n) \underbrace{* \cdots *}_p f_X(n). \quad (73)$$

Note that (73) is a (multiple) auto-deconvolution problem in $f_N(n)$, which is well known to be ill-posed for several functions $h(n) = f_X(n) \underbrace{* \cdots *}_p f_X(n)$, even in the simple case $q - p = 2$ where $f_N(n) * f_N(n) = h(n)$.

The problem admits a solution when $\alpha = 2/3$ ($\rho = 1/2$), where it boils down to $f_N(n) = f_X(n) * f_X(n)$. This means that N can be thought as the sum of two other (independent) random variables $N = N_1 + N_2$, each one with the same distribution of X . This is actually equivalent to a generalization of Theorem 5 to the sum of three i.i.d. random variables. The generalization to the sum of $Q + 1$ i.i.d. random variables is obtained for $\alpha = Q/(Q + 1)$ ($\rho = 1/Q$).

Example 2: If X is Gaussian, with mean m_X and variance σ_X^2 , then (70) (apparently) admits always a solution for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, and would lead us to (erroneously) conclude that also $f_N(n)$ should be non-zero mean Gaussian. Indeed, the characteristic function of a Gaussian pdf is a Gaussian function, and any (positive) exponential of a Gaussian function is still a Gaussian function. Thus, recalling that $C_X(u) = e^{-2(\pi\sigma_X u)^2 + j2\pi m_X u}$, we would conclude that

$$f_N(n) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{C_X^\rho(u)\} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{e^{-2(\pi\sqrt{\rho}\sigma_X u)^2 + j2\pi\rho m_X u}\} = G(n - \rho m_X; \rho\sigma_X^2), \quad (74)$$

which holds true when $\rho > 0$, i.e., when $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $P_Y > P_X$. Actually, it should be observed that right-hand side of (74) implicitly contains the constraints $\sigma_N^2 = \rho\sigma_X^2$, $m_N = \rho m_X$ that, by the definition of ρ , can be jointly satisfied iff $m_X = m_N = 0$, and $\forall \sigma_X, \forall \sigma_N$. Thus, the equal gain condition holds true for Gaussian inputs, only if they are zero-mean, as expressed by Theorem 3.

Example 3: When $\alpha = 1/2$, i.e., $\rho = 1$, equation (62) boils down to the trivial case $C_X(u) = C_N(u)$, i.e., the sufficient condition for $k_y = k_x = k_n$ is satisfied if the independent random variables X and N are identically distributed (and zero-mean) with $f_X(\cdot) = f_N(\cdot)$. This is an alternative proof for Theorem 5.

APPENDIX B

An alternative proof of Theorem 3 for Gaussians r.v. can exploit the Bussgang Theorem for jointly-Gaussian random processes $x(t)$ and $y(t)$, which states that [1], [17], [19]

$$E\{x(t)g[y(t+\tau)]\} = \frac{E\{y(t)g[y(t+\tau)]\}}{\sigma_Y^2} E\{x(t)y(t+\tau)\}, \forall \tau. \quad (75)$$

Setting $X = x(t)$, $Y = y(t)$, and $\tau = 0$, then (75) easily leads to

$$k_x = k_y \frac{E\{XY\}}{\sigma_X^2}, \quad (76)$$

which reduces to $k_x = k_y$ for $Y = X + N$, when X and N are zero-mean and independent (and Gaussian to let Y be Gaussian).

Some Lemmas of Theorem 3 follow.

Lemma 1: If X and N are zero-mean Gaussian and independent, $Y = \alpha_x X + \alpha_n N$, with $\alpha_x, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\frac{E\{ZY\}}{\sigma_Y^2} = \frac{1}{\alpha_x} \frac{E\{ZX\}}{\sigma_X^2} = \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \frac{E\{ZN\}}{\sigma_N^2}.$$

Proof: By Theorem 3 with $\tilde{X} = \alpha_x X$ and $\tilde{N} = \alpha_n N$. ■

Lemma 2: If $Y = \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j X_j$, $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}$, X_j and N are independent zero-mean Gaussian random variables, then

$$\frac{E\{ZY\}}{\sigma_Y^2} = \frac{1}{\alpha_i} \frac{E\{ZX_i\}}{\sigma_{X_i}^2}, \quad \forall i.$$

Proof: By Theorem 1 and Lemma 1 with $X = \alpha_i X_i$ and $N = \sum_{(j \neq i)} \alpha_j X_j$. ■

APPENDIX C

PROOF OF THEOREM 6

Proving that $C_{\text{lb}}^{(\text{snr}_x)} > C_{\text{lb}}^{(\text{mse})}$ corresponds to prove that $1 + \text{SNR}_x > \frac{\sigma_x^2}{\text{MSE}}$. Thus, when $|k_x| \geq 1$ it is straightforward to verify that

$$1 + \frac{k_x^2 \sigma_x^2}{P_{W_x}} = 1 + \frac{k_x^2 \sigma_x^2}{\text{MSE} - (1 - k_x)^2 \sigma_x^2} \geq 1 + \frac{k_x^2 \sigma_x^2}{\text{MSE}} > \frac{\sigma_x^2}{\text{MSE}}. \quad (77)$$

More generally the inequality $1 + \text{SNR}_x > \frac{\sigma_X^2}{\text{MSE}}$ holds true when

$$\frac{P_{W_x} + k_x^2 \sigma_X^2}{P_{W_x}} \geq \frac{\sigma_X^2}{P_{W_x} + (1 - k_x)^2 \sigma_X^2}, \quad (78)$$

that is when

$$P_{W_x}^2 + 2P_{W_x} k_x (1 - k_x) \sigma_X^2 + (1 - k_x)^2 k_x^2 \sigma_X^2 \geq 0. \quad (79)$$

Clearly, (79) holds true when $|k_x| \leq 1$, which together with (77) lets to conclude that the inequality holds true for $\forall k_x \in R$, concluding the proof.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. J. Bussgang, "Crosscorrelation functions of amplitude-distorted gaussian signals," *M.I.T. RLE Technical Report*, no. 216, pp. 1–14, march 1952. [Online]. Available: <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/4847>
- [2] R. Baum, "The correlation function of smoothly limited gaussian noise," *IRE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. IT-3, pp. 193–197, Sep 1957.
- [3] R. Price, "A useful theorem for nonlinear devices having gaussian inputs," *IRE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 4, pp. 69–72, June 1958.
- [4] W. B. Davenport Jr. and W. L. Root, *An Introduction to the Theory of Random Signals and Noise*. Mc Graw Hill, 1958.
- [5] N. Blachman, "The uncorrelated output components of a nonlinearity," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 250–255, Mar 1968.
- [6] J. H. Van Vleck and D. Middleton, "The spectrum of clipped noise," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 2–19, 1966.
- [7] R. Baum, "The correlation function of gaussian noise passed through nonlinear devices," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 448–456, July 1969.
- [8] B. R. Levin and A. Sokova, *Fondements théoriques de la radiotechnique statistique*. Editions Mir, 1973.
- [9] J. Minkoff, "The role of am-to-pm conversion in memoryless nonlinear systems," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 139–144, 1985.
- [10] P. Banelli and S. Cacciopardi, "Theoretical analysis and performance of ofdm signals in nonlinear awgn channels," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 430–441, Mar 2000.
- [11] D. Dardari, V. Tralli, and A. Vaccari, "A theoretical characterization of nonlinear distortion effects in ofdm systems," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 1755–1764, Oct 2000.
- [12] S. V. Vaseghi, *Advanced digital signal processing and noise reduction*, 4th ed. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Son's, 2009.
- [13] D. Middleton, "Statistical-physical models of urban radio-noise environments - part i: Foundations," *IEEE Trans. Electromagn. Compat.*, vol. EMC-14, no. 2, pp. 38–56, May 1972.
- [14] D.-S. Lee, "Effective gaussian mixture learning for video background subtraction," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 827–832, May 2005.
- [15] I. Buckley, D. Saunders, and L. Seco, "Portfolio optimization when asset returns have the gaussian mixture distribution," *Europ. Jour. of Operat. Research*, vol. 185, no. 3, pp. 1434–1461, Mar 2008.
- [16] S. Zhidkov, "Performance analysis and optimization of ofdm receiver with blanking nonlinearity in impulsive noise environment," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 234–242, Jan 2006.

- [17] H. E. Rowe, "Memoryless nonlinearities with gaussian inputs: Elementary results," *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, vol. 61, no. 7, pp. 1519–1525, Sep 1982.
- [18] S. M. Kay, *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing. Vol. 1, Estimation Theory*. Prentice-Hall, 1993.
- [19] A. Papoulis, *Probability, Random Variables, and Stochastic Processes*. McGraw-Hill, 1991.
- [20] L. A. Berry, "Understanding middleton's canonical formula for class a noise," *IEEE Trans. Electromagn. Compat.*, vol. EMC-23, no. 4, pp. 337–344, Nov 1981.
- [21] A. H. Nuttall, "Theory and application of the separable class of random processes," Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dept. of Electrical Engineering, 1958.
- [22] F. Rocca, B. Godfrey, and F. Muir, "Busgang processes," Stanford Exploration Project, Tech. Rep. 16, Apr 1979, available at <http://sepwww.stanford.edu>.
- [23] D. Guo, S. Shamai (Shitz), and S. Verdú, "Mutual information and minimum mean-square error in gaussian channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 1261–1283, Apr 2005.
- [24] S. Prasad, "Certain relations between mutual information and fidelity of statistical estimation," *arXiv preprint <http://arxiv.org/abs/1010.1508v1>*, Oct 2010.
- [25] L. Cheded, "Invariance property of gaussian signals: a new interpretation, extension and applications," *Circuits, systems, and signal processing*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 523–536, Sep 1997.
- [26] G. Scarano, "Cumulant series expansion of hybrid nonlinear moments of complex random variables," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1001–1003, Apr 1991.
- [27] P. Banelli, "Bayesian estimation of gaussian sources in middleton's class-a impulsive noise," *arXiv:1111.6828v2 [cs.IT]*, pp. 1–30, November 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1111.6828v1>
- [28] S. Ihara, "On the capacity of channels with additive non-gaussian noise," *Information and Control*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 34–39, Apr 1978.
- [29] M. F. Huber, T. Bailey, H. Durrant-Whyte, and U. D. Hanebeck, "On entropy approximation for gaussian mixture random vectors," in *IEEE Int. Conf. on Multis. Fusion and Integr. for Intell. Syst.* IEEE, Aug 2008, pp. 181–188.
- [30] S. N. Diggavi and T. M. Cover, "The worst additive noise under a covariance constraint," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 3072–3081, Nov 2001.
- [31] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
- [32] S. Zhidkov, "Analysis and comparison of several simple impulsive noise mitigation schemes for ofdm receivers," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 5–9, Jan 2008.