

A TDOA technique with Super-Resolution based on the Volume Cross-Correlation Function

Hailong Shi, *Student Member, IEEE* Hao Zhang, *Member, IEEE* and Xiqin Wang *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Time Difference of Arrival (TDOA) is widely used in wireless localization systems. Among the enormous approaches of TDOA, high resolution TDOA algorithms have drawn much attention for its ability to resolve closely spaced signal delays in multipath environment. However, the state-of-art high resolution TDOA algorithms still have performance weakness on resolving time delays in a wireless channel with dense multipath effect, as well as difficulties in implementation for their high computation complexity. In this paper, we propose a novel TDOA algorithm with super resolution based on a multi-dimensional cross-correlation function: the Volume Cross-Correlation Function (VCC). The proposed TDOA algorithm has excellent time resolution capability in multipath environment, and it also has a much lower computational complexity. Because our algorithm does not require priori knowledge about the waveform or power spectrum of transmitted signals, it has great potential of usage in various passive wireless localization systems. Numerical simulations is also provided to demonstrate the validity of our conclusion.

Index Terms—Time Difference of Arrival, Volume Cross-Correlation Function, super resolution, multipath environment

I. INTRODUCTION

Among the tremendous amount of source localization techniques [1,2,3], TDOA based techniques are widely used in wireless communication [1,4], indoor microphone positioning [5], wireless sensor network [6], passive localization system [7,8], and sonar [9]. Since traditional TDOA methods, such as the Generalized Cross-Correlation algorithm (GCC) [10], have restricted ability of time resolution and can not resolve the TDOA of multipath signals with close delays, many high resolution TDOA algorithms have been proposed recently to deal with the scenario where signals from different paths have close delays.

There are mainly three branches of high resolution TDOA algorithms: one is the optimal maximal likelihood (ML) time delay estimators using techniques like expectation maximization (EM) [11], or importance sampling [12,13]; another branch is the super resolution TDOA algorithms based on subspace methods [14,15,16]; the third branch is the high resolution TDOA estimation methods using sparse recovery algorithms based on ℓ_1 optimization [17,18]. Except for those main branches, some delay estimation techniques that have

super resolution and ability of dealing with multipath environment, such as the technique of time delay estimation from low-rate samples over a union of subspaces [19,20] can also be adapted to TDOA estimation.

As we know, the TDOA corresponding to the direct path (or Line of Sight) is what we really need to localize signal sources, but cannot be determined unless we could resolve all the TDOAs caused by every pair of multipath components. Therefore, improving the time resolution and enhancing the ability of identifying each multipath TDOA are two major tasks concerned in design of TDOA techniques. In this paper, we are going to propose a highly efficient TDOA algorithm, which has strong ability to resolve multipath TDOAs.

In this paper, we develop a new TDOA estimation algorithm based on a novel multi-dimensional cross-correlation function, named the Volume Cross-Correlation function (VCC). This VCC function takes two matrices (which represent subspaces), instead of two vectors, as arguments. It calculates the geometrical volume of the high dimensional parallelotope spanned by column vectors of these two matrices. It can be regarded as a generalized distance measure of the two subspaces spanned by columns of each input matrix. In our method, the received signal is formulated as deterministic signal with unknown linear subspace structure contaminated by random noise. Then this unknown subspace is extracted from noise through singular value decomposition of some data matrix, such procedure is actually a denoising process commonly seen in modern signal processing. Afterwards the VCC function is calculated with inputs being the basis of the estimated subspace. Finally the corresponding TDOA estimation is indicated by the zeros (or equivalently, the peaks of its reciprocal) of the VCC function.

In order to analyze the performance of the proposed TDOA algorithm, we choose the passive localization system as a typical application scenario. In our analysis, the received signals commonly encountered in passive localization systems are divided into two different categories: the slowly changing subspace signal and the fast changing subspace signal. The slowly changing subspace signal means the subspace structure of the signal remains unchanged during the time interval of a large amount of observations. As for the fast changing subspace signal, contrast to the term "slowly changing", it refers to the circumstance that the subspace structure are changing among different observations; therefore there is only a single observation available to estimate the current signal subspace. The two signal categories covers most wireless signals encountered in passive localization systems, which means the proposed technique has a potential of wide usage.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section II,

H. Shi, H. Zhang, and X. Wang are with the Dept. Electronic Engineering, Tsinghua University. E-mail: shl06@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, haozhang@tsinghua.edu.cn, and wangxq_ee@tsinghua.edu.cn.

This work is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants 61422110, 41271011, and 61201356, also in part by the Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University under Grant NCET-11-0270, and the Tsinghua University Initiative Scientific Research Program.

we give the problem formulation, as well as the definition and property of VCC function. In section III and section IV, we propose and analyze our proposed TDOA algorithm based on two categories of signals, respectively. The performance of our TDOA method is demonstrated through numerical simulations in section V.

II. PRELIMINARY MATERIAL

A. TDOA estimation in multipath environment

In a typical TDOA-based localization system, due to the complicated environment where buildings and vehicles may lead to significant scattering of wireless signals, there might be dense multipath effect in the wireless channel. The received multipath signals will be:

$$x_1(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{L_1} \alpha_{1,l} s(t - \tau_{1,l}) + w_1(t), \quad (1)$$

$$x_2(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{L_2} \alpha_{2,l} s(t - \tau_{2,l}) + w_2(t), \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha_{1,l}$ and $\alpha_{2,l}$ are the propagation gains (also known as the channel coefficients) of the l th path along which the signal transmitting from source to receiver 1 and 2, respectively, $\tau_{1,l}$ and $\tau_{2,l}$ represents the corresponding path delays, L_1 and L_2 are the number of channel paths. $w_1(t)$ and $w_2(t)$ are noises.

As we know, the task of TDOA estimation is to determine the difference of time delays of the received signal from different receivers. However, from (1) and (2), it can be seen that in a multipath channel, there are theoretically multiple TDOAs which can be resolved. Denote these TDOAs by

$$\Delta\tau_{l_1, l_2} := \tau_{2, l_2} - \tau_{1, l_1}, \quad l_1 = 1, \dots, L_1, l_2 = 1, \dots, L_2, \quad (3)$$

we call these multiple TDOAs as *multipath TDOA*. Although in source localization systems, the direct path TDOA is the only concerned, which is $\Delta\tau_{1,1} = \tau_{2,1} - \tau_{1,1}$, precise estimation of the direct path TDOA $\Delta\tau_{1,1}$ actually requires resolution of every multipath TDOA in (3). In other words, because the channel path delays and propagation gains are basically unknown at the receivers, we cannot tell the difference between direct path TDOA and other indirect path TDOAs merely from the received signals. Therefore, we need to resolve every mutipath TDOA, before we pick the direct path TDOA and continue the localization process. From this point of view, the primary goal of TDOA localization in multipath environment is to precisely resolve every multipath TDOA shown in (3).

B. The Volume Cross-Correlation Function

The basic relationship between linear subspaces are generally described by principal angles [21]. The principal angle is defined as:

Definition 1: Consider linear subspaces \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 , with dimensions $\dim(\mathcal{X}_1) = d_1, \dim(\mathcal{X}_2) = d_2$, denote $m = \min(d_1, d_2)$. The principal angles between subspaces \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 , denoted by $0 \leq \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_m \leq \pi/2$, are defined recursively as

$$\begin{aligned} \cos \theta_i &= \max_{\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathcal{X}_1, \mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{X}_2} \mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{v}_i, \\ \text{subject to } & \|\mathbf{u}_i\|_2 = \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2 = 1, \\ & \mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{u}_j = 0, \mathbf{v}_i^T \mathbf{v}_j = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, i - 1$.

The principal angle is an important mathematical tool to depict the relationship between subspaces. Except for playing a key role in deriving the geodesic distance [22] for Grassmann manifold [22] [23], principal angle are used to define various distance metrics of linear subspaces [23]. The proposed VCC function in this paper is also related with the principal angle.

The Volume Cross-Correlation (VCC) function of two given matrices $\mathbf{X}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times d_1}$ and $\mathbf{X}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times d_2}$ is defined as

$$\text{vcc}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) := \frac{\text{vol}_{d_1+d_2}([\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2])}{\text{vol}_{d_1}(\mathbf{X}_1) \text{vol}_{d_2}(\mathbf{X}_2)}, \quad (5)$$

where $[\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2]$ means putting the columns of matrices \mathbf{X}_1 and \mathbf{X}_2 together into one matrix, and $\text{vol}_d(\mathbf{X})$ denotes the geometrical volume of matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times d}$ with dimension d ($d < n$). It is defined as [24]:

$$\text{vol}_d(\mathbf{X}) := \prod_{i=1}^d \sigma_i, \quad (6)$$

where $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_d \geq 0$ are singular values of matrix \mathbf{X} . Indeed, $\text{vol}_d(\mathbf{X})$ is the geometrical volume of d dimensional parallelotope spanned by the column vectors of matrix \mathbf{X} .

The relation between volume and principal angles is described by the next lemma from [21]:

Lemma 1: Consider two linear subspaces \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 in \mathbb{R}^N , their dimensions are $\dim(\mathcal{X}_1) = d_1, \dim(\mathcal{X}_2) = d_2$, and their basis matrices are $\mathbf{X}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d_1}$ and $\mathbf{X}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d_2}$, then we have

$$\frac{\text{vol}_{d_1+d_2}([\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2])}{\text{vol}_{d_1}(\mathbf{X}_1) \text{vol}_{d_2}(\mathbf{X}_2)} = \prod_{j=1}^{\min(d_1, d_2)} \sin \theta_j(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2), \quad (7)$$

where $0 \leq \theta_j(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2) \leq \pi, 1 \leq j \leq \min(d_1, d_2)$ are the principal angles between \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 .

(7) just indicates that the VCC function (5) is actually the product of sines of the principal angles between subspaces \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 . Therefore (5) can be regarded as a kind of distance measure of subspaces \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 . Intuitively, if the subspace \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 are linearly dependent, then $\dim(\mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{X}_2) > 0$. According to the definition of principal angles, there must be a vanishing principal angle $\theta_j(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2)$. That is $\text{vol}_{d_1+d_2}([\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2]) / \text{vol}_{d_1}(\mathbf{X}_1) \text{vol}_{d_2}(\mathbf{X}_2) = 0$. On the other hand, if \mathcal{X}_1 is perpendicular to \mathcal{X}_2 , then $\text{vol}_{d_1+d_2}([\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2]) / \text{vol}_{d_1}(\mathbf{X}_1) \text{vol}_{d_2}(\mathbf{X}_2) = 1$ holds obviously. As a matter of fact, VCC function measures the extent of linear dependency between subspaces [25], and will be used to derive our TDOA algorithm.

III. ESTIMATING THE TDOA OF SLOWLY CHANGING SUBSPACE SIGNALS USING VCC FUNCTION

A. The slowly-changing subspace signal

In the passive localization system, information about the wireless channel as well as the source signals are generally unknown by the receivers. Hence TDOA technique is quite suitable for this kind of localization system [26,27]. Firstly, we focus on the category of signals that have a slowly changing subspace structure.

A typical type of signals we encounter in passive localization systems are radar signals radiated by non-cooperative radar transmitters. The common pulse radar waveform can be expressed as the following expression:

$$s(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} \sqrt{P_s} g(t - mT_p), \quad (8)$$

where $P_s > 0$ is the transmitting power of the radar, and $g(t) \in \mathbb{C}$ is the general form of the radar pulse waveform, T_p is the pulse repetition interval (PRI).

We consider the received signal in a signal PRI, then in the multipath environment, the received signal from the i 'th receiver ($i = 1, 2, \dots$) would be

$$x_i(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{L_i} \alpha_{i,l} \sqrt{P_s} g(t - \tau_{i,l}) + w_i(t), \quad t \in (0, T_p), \quad (9)$$

where $\alpha_{i,l}$ and $\tau_{i,l}$ are the corresponding channel coefficients and path delays, $w_i(t)$ is the Gaussian white noise of i 'th receiver. After sampling the received signal with the rate $1/T_s$, and ignore the non-integral part of the ratio $\tau_{i,l}/T_s$, take $d_{i,l} := \lfloor \tau_{i,l}/T_s \rfloor$ as the integral channel path delay, then (9) can be approximately expressed as

$$y_i(kT_s) \approx \sum_{l=1}^{L_i} \alpha_{i,l} \sqrt{P_s} g((k - d_{i,l})T_s) + w_i(kT_s). \quad (10)$$

Rewrite (10) into a vector form, we have

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \sqrt{P_s} \mathbf{G}_i \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i + \mathbf{w}_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{y}_i := [y_i(0), y_i(T_s), \dots, y_i((N-1)T_s)] \in \mathbb{C}^N$, and

$$\mathbf{G}_i = [\mathbf{g}_{i,1}, \mathbf{g}_{i,2}, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{i,L_i}] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times L_i}, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{g}_{i,l} := [g((0 - d_{i,l})T_s), g((1 - d_{i,l})T_s), \dots, g((N-1 - d_{i,l})T_s)]^T$, $l = 1, \dots, L_i$. The vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i = [\alpha_{i,1}, \dots, \alpha_{i,L_i}] \in \mathbb{C}^{L_i}$ is the channel coefficient vector composed of the corresponding channel's path gains, and \mathbf{w}_i is the noise vector. As is shown in (11), the received radar signal in a multipath channel generally has a deterministic subspace structure with the corresponding subspace $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_i)$, i.e., spanned by different time-shift versions of radar waveform $g(t)$.

Except for radar signals, the common linearly modulated wireless communication signals such as DS-CDMA, OFDM, QAM, and others that carry symbols on some periodic pulse shapes, can also be modeled as the signal with a subspace structure in (11) [28,29,30]. The subspace signal structure is mainly related with the channel's path delays $d_{i,l}$. As a matter of fact, channel delays are caused by different distances between receivers and signal sources (or reflective objects), and generally signal sources and reflective objects don't have extremely high velocities, therefore channel delays can be generally seen to be constant in a short time. On the other hand, the wireless channel's path gains $\alpha_{i,l}$ fluctuates with time, which is caused by channel fading effect. This fact also means that for a time interval long enough for the receiver to obtain relatively large samples of the received signal (according to chapter 2 of [31], the time scale of this

interval can be up to 20s in a typical channel scenario), these sample data can be formulated as

$$\mathbf{y}_i^{(j)} = \mathbf{G}_i \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i^{(j)} + \mathbf{w}_i^{(j)}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (13)$$

where j indicates different observation segment of time. Although the channel coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i^{(j)}$ is fluctuating with j , the subspace structure determined by matrix \mathbf{G}_i , will remain almost unchanged. We call this category of signals the *slowly changing subspace signal*, meaning that the subspace structure in (11) changes slowly with time, and can be treated as invariant in the observation interval.

The subspace structure $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_i)$ is unknown to the receivers, but can be estimated from multiple observation data like (13). Because a typical radar transmits a pulse waveform




Fig. 1: Getting multiple observations of radar signals

repeatedly with a PRI of T_p , we can receive segments of these multiple radar pulses as in (13) according to T_p , which can be estimated by various PRI identification techniques [32,33]. Afterwards the corresponding signal subspace is estimated using the well-known subspace methods like MUSIC, ESPRIT, etc. The process of obtaining multiple observations and estimating subspace $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_i)$ can be demonstrated in figure 1, the gradient change of the background color in figure 1 represents the fluctuation of channel coefficients $\alpha_{i,l}$, they are reasonably assumed to take independent values among different pulses' durations.

Denote these multiple data of the received radar signal by

$$\mathbf{y}_i^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_i^{(m)}, \quad (14)$$

these observation data are then used to evaluate the sampled covariance matrix

$$\hat{\mathbf{R}}_i = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{y}_i^{(j)} (\mathbf{y}_i^{(j)})^H, \quad (15)$$

According to the well-known subspace methods, the signal subspace can be estimated through eigen-decomposition of $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_i$. Indeed, as a commonly known approach, we firstly evaluate the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_i$, then we estimate the dimension of the signal subspace (if the matrix \mathbf{G}_i is full rank, the dimension will be L_i ¹) by analyzing the distribution of eigenvalues; and finally we can separate the eigenvectors of $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_i$ into bases for signal subspace as well as bases for noise subspace, The bases for signal subspace are eigenvectors with

¹In following analysis, we will assume this full-rankness to be satisfied. Indeed, a sufficient condition will be given to ensure this assumption.

respect to the L_i largest eigenvalues. As a result, we can write $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_i$ into

$$\hat{\mathbf{R}}_i = \mathbf{U}_{i,s} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i,s} \mathbf{U}_{i,s}^H + \mathbf{U}_{i,n} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i,n} \mathbf{U}_{i,n}^H, \quad (16)$$

where the matrix $\mathbf{U}_{i,s}$ is the estimated basis matrix for the signal subspace $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_i)$. It has been proved that $\text{span}(\mathbf{U}_{i,s})$ approximates the signal subspace $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_i)$ asymptotically for a sufficiently large m [34,35]. Then we will use the estimated basis of signal subspace, i.e., $\mathbf{U}_{i,s}$, to estimate TDOA using VCC function. The full algorithm is given in the next subsection.

B. TDOA estimation using VCC function for slowly changing subspace signals: Algorithm

Algorithm 1.

For $\Delta d = -N + 1, \dots, N - 1$, **Loop:**

- 1) Obtain delayed multiple observation data (for $j = 1, \dots, m$)

$$\mathbf{y}_1^{(j),[\Delta d \cdot T_s]} = \left[y_1^{(j)}((0 - \Delta d)T_s), \dots, y_1^{(j)}((N - 1 - \Delta d)T_s) \right]^T$$
 and non-delayed observation data

$$\mathbf{y}_2^{(j)} = \left[y_2^{(j)}(0 \cdot T_s), \dots, y_2^{(j)}((N - 1)T_s) \right]^T.$$
- 2) Calculate the sampled covariance matrices $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_2$ according to (15),
- 3) Perform eigenvalue decomposition of the sampled covariance matrix $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ (and $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_2$);
- 4) Estimate the dimensions of signal subspaces L_1 (and L_2) according to the distribution of their eigenvalues;
- 5) Extract the basis for the signal subspaces $\mathbf{U}_{1,s}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times L_1}$ (and $\mathbf{U}_{2,s} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times L_2}$) from the eigenvectors corresponding to the L_1 (and L_2) largest eigenvalues of $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ (and $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_2$);
- 6) Calculate the reciprocal of VCC function:

$$r_{vol}(\Delta d \cdot T_s) := 1 / \text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_{1,s}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_{2,s}]).$$

End Loop.

Find the peaks of $r_{vol}(\Delta d \cdot T_s)$ and the corresponding value of Δd .

Below are some necessary notations and remarks:

Remark 1. In our algorithm, the dimensions of signal subspaces are actually the number of channel propagation paths, i.e., L_i in (9), which are generally unknown at the receiver. Therefore the dimensions have to be estimated first before we estimate the basis for signal subspaces. Luckily there are tremendous numbers of algorithms to estimate the dimension of signal subspace from a sampled covariance matrix, such as methods based on Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) [36] Minimum Description Length (MDL) [37], Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) [38], Predictive Description Length (PDL) [39] and so on. In this paper we just assume the number of channel paths L_i is precisely estimated, and focus our analysis on the estimation of signal subspaces and its influence on TDOA estimation.

Remark 2. The basis matrices $\mathbf{U}_{1,s}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{2,s}$ are the estimated bases for the delayed signal subspace $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]})$ and non-delayed subspace $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_2)$, respectively. From the previous analysis, we know that

$$\mathbf{G}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]} = \left[\mathbf{g}_{1,1}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{1,L_1}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]} \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times L_1}, \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{g}_{1,l}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]} := [g((0 - \Delta d - d_{1,l})T_s), g((1 - \Delta d - d_{1,l})T_s), \dots, g((N - 1 - \Delta d - d_{1,l})T_s)]^T$, and

$$\mathbf{G}_2 = [\mathbf{g}_{2,1}, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{2,L_2}] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times L_2}, \quad (18)$$

where $\mathbf{g}_{2,l} := [g((0 - d_{2,l})T_s), g((1 - d_{2,l})T_s), \dots, g((N - 1 - d_{2,l})T_s)]^T$. So the VCC function $\text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_{1,s}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_{2,s}])$ is approximately measuring the linear dependence of subspaces $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]})$ and $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_2)$. It is obvious that when $\Delta d = d_{2,l_2} - d_{1,l_1}$, for any pair of l_1 and l_2 , $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]})$ and $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_2)$ are linearly dependent, which means $1 / \text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_{1,s}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_{2,s}])$ will tend to infinity; while on the other hand, when $\Delta d \neq d_{2,l_2} - d_{1,l_1}$ for all $l_1 = 1, \dots, L_1$ and $l_2 = 1, \dots, L_2$, $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]})$ and $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_2)$ may be linearly independent, meaning that $1 / \text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_{1,s}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_{2,s}])$ would have a finite value. From this observation we could expect that $r_{vol}(\Delta d \cdot T_s)$ would reach its peak at every $\Delta d = d_{2,l_2} - d_{1,l_1}$. We will give a theoretical guarantee in the next section to validate this observation.

Remark 3. As is mentioned, $r_{vol}(\Delta d \cdot T_s)$ will reach its peak if $\Delta d = d_{2,l_1} - d_{1,l_2}$. Therefore, we are expecting to resolve every multipath TDOA, i.e.,

$$\Delta d_{l_2, l_1} := d_{2,l_2} - d_{1,l_1},$$

for all $l_1 = 1, \dots, L_1$, and $l_2 = 1, \dots, L_2$. It is another independent problem about how can find the TDOA corresponding to the direct channel path, i.e., identifying $\Delta d_{1,1} = d_{2,1} - d_{1,1}$ among all of the multipath TDOA, which is known as the disambiguation of TDOA [40,41]. So the adaptation of our TDOA algorithm to these disambiguation strategies won't be discussed in this paper and will be left for a future work.

C. A Theoretical Guarantee for Algorithm 1

We will show in this subsection that, the performance of the proposed algorithm is theoretically guaranteed, and related with the auto-correlation function of the transmitted radar waveform. The auto-correlation function is well known as the ambiguity function of a radar waveform along the zero-Doppler axis, it is an important characteristic of the radar pulse waveform. Denote the auto-correlation function of radar waveform $g(k \cdot T_s)$ by

$$R_g(\Delta k \cdot T_s) := \sum_{k=1}^N g(kT_s) \cdot g^*((k - \Delta k)T_s),$$

the following theorem validates the feasibility of the proposed algorithm:

Theorem 1: consider the matrices $\mathbf{G}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ and \mathbf{G}_2 in (17) and (18), we let:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_0 &:= \max_{1 \leq l_1 \neq l_1' \leq L_1} |R_g((d_{1,l_1} - d_{1,l_1'})T_s)| \\ \hat{\mu}_1 &:= \max_{1 \leq l_2 \neq l_2' \leq L_2} |R_g((d_{2,l_2} - d_{2,l_2'})T_s)| \\ \hat{\mu}_2 &:= \max_{1 \leq l \leq L_1, 1 \leq l' \leq L_2} |R_g((d_{1,l_1} + \Delta d - d_{2,l_2'})T_s)| \end{aligned}$$

and let $\tilde{\mu}_s := \max\{\frac{\hat{\mu}_0}{|R_g(0)|}, \frac{\hat{\mu}_1}{|R_g(0)|}\}$, $\tilde{\mu}_m := \frac{\hat{\mu}_2}{|R_g(0)|}$.
First, if

$$\tilde{\mu}_s \leq \frac{1}{L_1 + L_2 - 1}, \quad (19)$$

then $\dim(\mathbf{G}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}) = L_1$, $\dim(\mathbf{G}_2) = L_2$.

Second, under condition of (19), we will have the following conclusions:

- If there exist l_1^* and l_2^* , such that $\Delta d = d_{2,l_2^*} - d_{1,l_1^*}$, then

$$\text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2]) = 0. \quad (20)$$

- If for every $1 \leq l_1 \leq L_1$ and $1 \leq l_2 \leq L_2$, $\Delta d \neq d_{2,l_2} - d_{1,l_1}$, and

$$\tilde{\mu}_m \leq \frac{1}{L_1 + L_2 - 1}, \quad (21)$$

we have

$$\text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2]) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^{L/2}. \quad (22)$$

The matrices $\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ and \mathbf{U}_2 here are orthogonal basis matrices for subspaces $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]})$ and $\text{span}(\mathbf{G}_2)$, $\mu = \max\{\tilde{\mu}_s, \tilde{\mu}_m\}$, and the parameter ε is

$$\varepsilon = \frac{L_1 L_2 \cdot \mu^2}{[1 - (L_1 - 1)\mu][1 - (L_2 - 1)\mu]}. \quad (23)$$

Theorem 1 provides a theoretical guarantee for our proposed TDOA estimation algorithm. The theorem just describes that, when there exist l_1^* and l_2^* , such that $\Delta d = d_{2,l_2^*} - d_{1,l_1^*}$, the volume function will be zero; while on the other hand, given the radar waveform $g(kT_s)$, when $\Delta d \neq d_{2,l_2} - d_{1,l_1}$, as long as the delays, i.e., d_{1,l_1} , d_{2,l_2} and Δd satisfy (19) and (21), the volume function $\text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2])$ will be non-zero as shown in (22). Therefore Theorem 1 just ensures that under certain conditions, the volume function $\text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2])$ takes different values for different cases of Δd , which validates the feasibility of our proposed algorithm for identifying TDOA.

(19) and (21) are conditions under which Theorem 1 takes effect. They are obviously related with the auto-correlation function of the radar waveform $R_g(\Delta k \cdot T_s)$. Typically the auto-correlation function of any given signal always has its maximum value at zero point, namely, $R_g(\Delta k \cdot T_s)$ reaches its maxima at $\Delta k = 0$; and $R_g(\Delta k \cdot T_s)$ will eventually (or oscillatorily) decrease as Δk increases. From this point of view, given the radar signal $g(kT_s)$, (19) and (21) are actually conditions on the time delays, i.e., d_{1,l_1} , d_{2,l_2} , and Δd . To be more specific, the conditions (19) and (21) are explained as below:

1). When the channel delays from receiver i ($i = 1, 2$) are sufficiently separated, such that their time differences $d_{i,l_i^*} - d_{i,l_i^{*'}}$ are large enough, then (19) will be ensured, and all the multipath TDOAs will be resolvable. On the other hand, even if there is a situation where there exist some l_i^* and $l_i^{*'}$, such that $d_{i,l_i^*} - d_{i,l_i^{*'}}$ is not large enough to ensure (19), our algorithm can still work. Actually, in this scenario, the worst case may be that d_{i,l_i^*} and $d_{i,l_i^{*'}}$ are mistakenly regarded as a single path delay, then all TDOAs related with d_{i,l_i^*} and

$d_{i,l_i^{*'}}$ will not be resolved by our algorithm; however, the other TDOAs satisfying the constraint in (19) are still guaranteed to be resolvable.

2). As is seen, Theorem 1 provides a theoretical guarantee of the value of $\text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2])$, for scenarios when the value of Δd equals one $d_{2,l_2^*} - d_{1,l_1^*}$, or not so close to any $d_{2,l_2} - d_{1,l_1}$. Although there still exists an interval of Δd where we cannot ensure the value of $\text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2])$, because Theorem 1 is a sufficient condition, we either cannot conclude that when Δd is in such interval, the VCC function would yield a false peak which could cause an estimation error; actually, Theorem 1 didn't imply the time resolution capability of our proposed TDOA algorithm. The effect of super-resolution comes from the fact that $1/\text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2])$ could approximately reach infinity when $\Delta d = d_{2,l_2^*} - d_{1,l_1^*}$, thus the VCC function would reveal sharp peaks at these locations.

3). (19) and (21) also implies that signals with different auto-correlation functions will bring different TDOA estimation performance in our algorithm. Because the width and sharpness of mainlobe of auto-correlation function is actually related with the corresponding signal's bandwidth, and signals with sharp auto-correlation functions will ensure better TDOA resolution. Thus, wideband radar signals would bring better precision in our TDOA estimation algorithm, simulation will be carried out to support this conclusion.

IV. ESTIMATING THE TDOA OF FAST CHANGING SUBSPACE SIGNALS USING VCC FUNCTION

A. The fast changing subspace signal

Contrast to the slowly changing subspace signal model, there are also a large category of signals that don't have a steady subspace structure as in (11). For example, in passive localization systems, FM radio transmitters, TV broadcast stations are usually the signal sources to localize, or are used as the illuminators-of-opportunity to localize a reflective target. Because this category of signals are randomly varying with time and have no repeating waveforms, we cannot get multiple observations of the received signal as in (13) that have the same subspace structure. This category of signals is called the *fast changing subspace signal*. In our problem settings, for fast changing subspace signal, the received baseband signal from the i th receiver is in the form of:

$$x_i(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{L_i} \alpha_{i,l} s(t - \tau_{i,l}) + w_i(t), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (24)$$

where $\alpha_{i,l}$ and $\tau_{i,l}$ are channel's path gain and path delay, respectively. The original transmitted signal $s(t)$ can be FM, PSK or AM signals, etc.

In fact, although we cannot estimate the signal subspace from multiple observations as in the previous section, there is still a method to extract a time-dependent signal subspace from a single observation data. For a single observation data $\mathbf{x} = [x(0), x(1), \dots, x(N-1)]^T$, we can construct its Hankel

matrix (also referred to as the trajectory matrix), which is

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} x(0) & x(1) & \cdots & x(K-1) \\ x(1) & x(2) & \cdots & x(K) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x(M-1) & x(M) & \cdots & x(N-1) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

where $1 < M < N, K = N - M + 1$. Large numbers of literatures are focusing on the left singular vectors of the Hankel matrix \mathbf{X} , because they contain important information about the signal \mathbf{x} [42]. Therefore the subspace spanned by a subset of these left singular vectors is called "the signal subspace" (generally the left singular vectors corresponding to larger singular values would be chosen). As a matter of fact, this signal subspace extracted from the Hankel matrix has been used to perform noise reduction, signal forecasting, and change point detection, etc [43,44]. The Hankel matrix technique can be used to analyze a wide variety of signals, like wireless signals, seismologic, meteorological, geophysical time series as well as economic time series. Because no statistical assumption concerning the signal is needed while performing the subspace extraction from Hankel matrices, this methodology is suitable to deal with the fast changing subspace signal and develop our TDOA algorithm.

In our setting, at the receiver i ($i = 1, 2$), given the sampling rate T_s , the sampled signal vector is $[x_i(0), x_i(T_s), \dots, x_i((N-1) \cdot T_s)]^T$ with length N , the corresponding Hankel matrix, denoted by $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times K}$, is

$$\mathbf{X}_i = \begin{bmatrix} x_i(0 \cdot T_s) & x_i(1 \cdot T_s) & \cdots & x_i((K-1)T_s) \\ x_i(1 \cdot T_s) & x_i(2 \cdot T_s) & \cdots & x_i(KT_s) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_i((M-1)T_s) & x_i(MT_s) & \cdots & x_i((N-1)T_s) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

where $1 < M < N, K = N - M + 1$.

if we take $d_{i,l} := \lfloor \tau_{i,l}/T_s \rfloor$, the Hankel matrix \mathbf{X}_i can also be approximately written as

$$\mathbf{X}_i \approx \sum_{l=1}^{L_i} \alpha_{i,l} \mathbf{S}^{[d_{i,l} \cdot T_s]} + \mathbf{W}_i, \quad (27)$$

where

$$\mathbf{S}^{[d_{i,l} \cdot T_s]} := \begin{bmatrix} s((0 - d_{i,l})T_s) & \cdots & s((K-1 - d_{i,l})T_s) \\ s((1 - d_{i,l})T_s) & \cdots & s((K - d_{i,l})T_s) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ s((M-1 - d_{i,l})T_s) & \cdots & s((N-1 - d_{i,l})T_s) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

is the Hankel matrix of the sampled transmitted signal $s(kT_s)$ delayed by $d_{i,l} \cdot T_s$. \mathbf{W}_i is the Hankel matrix of noise $w_i(kT_s)$. Denote the column vectors of matrix $\mathbf{S}^{[d_{i,l} \cdot T_s]}$ by $\mathbf{s}_{i,l}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{i,l}^{(K)}$, in the following analysis, we just assume these column vectors to have equal length, or instant power, i.e., $\|\mathbf{s}_{i,l}^{(1)}\|_2 = \dots = \|\mathbf{s}_{i,l}^{(K)}\|_2$. This assumption is quite general because signals we are interested in are nearly random so the power can be regarded as time-invariant during the time of a single observation. The full algorithm for TDOA estimation of fast changing subspace signal is given in the next subsection.

B. TDOA estimation using VCC function for the slowly changing subspace signals: Algorithm

Algorithm 2.

For $\Delta d = -M + 1, \dots, M - 1$, **Loop:**

1) Construct delayed Hankel matrix

$$\mathbf{X}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1((0 - \Delta d)T_s) & \cdots & x_1((N - M - \Delta d)T_s) \\ x_1((1 - \Delta d)T_s) & \cdots & x_1((N - M - \Delta d + 1)T_s) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_1((M - \Delta d - 1)T_s) & \cdots & x_1((N - \Delta d - 1)T_s) \end{bmatrix},$$

and non-delayed Hankel matrix

$$\mathbf{X}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} x_2(0 \cdot T_s) & \cdots & x_2((N - M)T_s) \\ x_2(1 \cdot T_s) & \cdots & x_2((N - M + 1)T_s) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_2((M - 1)T_s) & \cdots & x_2((N - 1)T_s) \end{bmatrix}.$$

2) Perform singular value decomposition of $\mathbf{X}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ and \mathbf{X}_2 , then we choose a subset of their left singular vectors, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{u}_{1,1}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{1,K_1}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \quad 1 \leq K_1 \leq \min(M, K)$$

and

$$\mathbf{u}_{2,1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{2,K_2}, \quad 1 \leq K_2 \leq \min(M, K)$$

which correspond to the singular values $\sigma_{1,1} \geq \sigma_{1,2}, \dots, \geq \sigma_{1,K_1} > 0$ of matrix $\mathbf{X}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ and singular values $\sigma_{2,1} \geq \sigma_{2,2}, \dots, \geq \sigma_{2,K_2} > 0$ of matrix \mathbf{X}_2 . Then the matrices

$$\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]} := [\mathbf{u}_{1,1}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{1,K_1}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K_1}$$

and

$$\mathbf{U}_2 := [\mathbf{u}_{2,1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{2,K_2}] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K_2}$$

are basis matrices for the signal subspaces of receiver 1 and 2.

3) Calculate the reciprocal of VCC function:

$$r_{vol}(\Delta d \cdot T_s) := 1 / \text{vol}_{K_1 + K_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2]),$$

End Loop.

Find the peaks of $r_{vol}(\Delta d \cdot T_s)$ and corresponding value of Δd .

Below are some necessary notations and discussions.

- 1) There are two important parameters when constructing the Hankel matrix, i.e., the dimensions M and K . It is a difficult problem that how to choose these two dimensions in order to meet different requirements in diverse applications [44], so in this paper we just choose these two dimensions empirically based on the experiments and simulations.
- 2) The eigenvector extraction procedure can be regarded as both feature extraction and noise reduction. An important parameter affecting the extraction of signal subspace and calculation of VCC function is the dimension of signal subspaces, i.e., K_i . This parameter will be also determined empirically. Actually, in the numerical simulation which will be shown in the next section, K_i is chosen to be 3 times of L_i .

C. Theoretical Guarantee of Algorithm 2

The theoretical guarantee for algorithm 2 is given as follows, which is also related with the auto-correlation function of signal $s(kT_s)$:

Theorem 2: Denote the auto-correlation function of transmitted signal $s(kT_s)$ by $R_s(\Delta kT_s)$, consider the Hankel matrices $\mathbf{X}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ and \mathbf{X}_2 in Algorithm 2, and let

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}_1 &:= \max_{\substack{1 \leq l_1 \neq l_1' \leq L_1 \\ 1 \leq k, k' \leq K}} |R_s((d_{1,l_1} - d_{1,l_1'} + k - k')T_s)| \\ \hat{\mu}_2 &:= \max_{\substack{1 \leq l_2 \neq l_2' \leq L_2 \\ 1 \leq k, k' \leq K}} |R_s((d_{2,l_2} - d_{2,l_2'} + k - k')T_s)|\end{aligned}\quad (29)$$

then we have the following conclusions:

- If for every $1 \leq l_1 \leq L_1, 1 \leq l_2 \leq L_2, d_{1,l_1} + \Delta d \neq d_{2,l_2}$, let

$$\hat{\mu}_0 := \max_{\substack{1 \leq l_1 \leq L_1, 1 \leq l_2 \leq L_2 \\ 1 \leq k, k' \leq K}} |R_s((d_{1,l_1} + \Delta d - d_{2,l_2} + k - k')T_s)|\quad (30)$$

and denote $\mu := \max\{\frac{\hat{\mu}_0}{|R_s(0)|}, \frac{\hat{\mu}_1}{|R_s(0)|}, \frac{\hat{\mu}_2}{|R_s(0)|}\}$, then if

$$\mu \leq \frac{\sigma_{1,K_1} \sigma_{2,K_2}}{K \cdot C_1 \cdot C_2}\quad (31)$$

the volume function in algorithm 2 must satisfy

$$\text{vol}_{K_1+K_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2]) \geq (1 - \varepsilon^2)^{K_{\min}/2}\quad (32)$$

where the parameter $\varepsilon = \frac{K \cdot C_1 \cdot C_2}{\sigma_{1,K_1} \sigma_{2,K_2}} \mu$, and $K_{\min} := \min\{K_1, K_2\}$, $C_1 = \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|$, $C_2 = \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2}|$, $\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1} = \alpha_{1,l_1} \cdot \|\mathbf{s}_{1,l_1}^{(k)[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}\|_2$, $\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2} = \alpha_{2,l_2} \cdot \|\mathbf{s}_{2,l_2}^{(k')}\|_2$.

- If there exists l_1^* and l_2^* , such that $\Delta d = d_{2,l_2^*} - d_{1,l_1^*}$, let

$$\hat{\mu}_0 := \max_{\substack{1 \leq l_1 \leq L_1, l_1 \neq l_1^* \\ 1 \leq l_2 \leq L_2, l_2 \neq l_2^* \\ 1 \leq k, k' \leq K}} |R_s((d_{1,l_1} + \Delta d - d_{2,l_2} + k - k')T_s)|\quad (33)$$

and denote $\mu := \max\{\frac{\hat{\mu}_0}{|R_s(0)|}, \frac{\hat{\mu}_1}{|R_s(0)|}, \frac{\hat{\mu}_2}{|R_s(0)|}\}$, then if

$$\mu \leq D/(L-1),\quad (34)$$

the volume function will satisfy

$$\text{vol}_{K_1+K_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2]) \leq (1 - \gamma^2)^{K_{\min}/2},\quad (35)$$

in addition, the right side of (35) is less than the right side of (32). The parameters

$$\begin{aligned}D &= \sqrt{\frac{(L-1)B_1B_2\sigma_{1,K_1}\sigma_{2,K_2}}{A_1A_2[C_1C_2 + (C_1-B_1)(C_2-B_2)]K}} + \frac{1}{4}} - \frac{1}{2}, \\ \gamma &= \frac{B_1B_2}{A_1A_2} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (L-1)\mu} - (C_1-B_1)(C_2-B_2) \cdot \frac{K}{\sigma_{1,K_1}\sigma_{2,K_2}} \cdot \mu,\end{aligned}$$

and $L = \min\{L_1, L_2\}$, $A_1 = \sqrt{\sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|^2}$, $A_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2}|^2}$, $B_1 = |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1^*}|$, $B_2 = |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2^*}|$.

Theorem 2 provides a similar theoretical guarantee for the proposed algorithm 2 as Theorem 1 does. It also guarantees the different values of $\text{vol}_{K_1+K_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2])$ when Δd lies in

different intervals, i.e., when the value of Δd as well as d_{1,l_1} and d_{2,l_2} enables condition (31) or (34).

However, there is a major difference between Theorem 2 and Theorem 1. When there exists some l_1^* and l_2^* , such that $\Delta d = d_{2,l_2^*} - d_{1,l_1^*}$, the volume function $\text{vol}_{K_1+K_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2])$ won't necessarily be zero, as the result in (35) shows. The upper bound of $\text{vol}_{K_1+K_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2])$ is related with the parameter γ , which is mainly dependent upon μ , L , and B_1B_2/A_1A_2 , $(C_1 - B_1)(C_2 - B_2)$. Roughly, when μ is sufficiently small, the upper bound of $\text{vol}_{K_1+K_2}([\mathbf{U}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{U}_2])$ is approximately constrained by B_1B_2/A_1A_2 , which actually equals $\frac{|\alpha_{1,l_1^*}| |\alpha_{1,l_2^*}|}{\sqrt{\sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\alpha_{1,l_1}|^2} \sqrt{\sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |\alpha_{2,l_2}|^2}}$. Therefore, the VCC function will show a finite peak at $\Delta d = d_{2,l_2^*} - d_{1,l_1^*}$, rather than the infinite one in the analysis of Theorem 1, while the corresponding paths' "normalized" channel gain, i.e., $\frac{|\alpha_{1,l_1^*}|}{\sqrt{\sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\alpha_{1,l_1}|^2}}$ and $\frac{|\alpha_{1,l_2^*}|}{\sqrt{\sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |\alpha_{2,l_2}|^2}}$ will affect the sharpness of their corresponding peak, then influence the precision of estimation of their TDOAs.

On the other hand, the condition (31) and (34) also indicates that, as long as the auto-correlation function $R_s(\Delta kT_s)$ has a high mainlobe peak level, or equivalently a low sidelobe level, the performance of the proposed algorithm can be theoretically better. This also means that the proposed algorithm prefers signals that are "weakly" related from different observation time, which just coincides with our fast-changing subspace signal model. Because in our model's assumption, the signal has no repeated subspace structure, and is more like a random process, thus it has a "sharp" autocorrelation function.

V. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

A. TDOA of Linear Frequency Modulation (LFM) signals

Firstly, a demonstration of the TDOA algorithm's output is given by simulation in figure 2. In the simulation, a linear frequency modulation (LFM) waveform is chosen as a typical slowly changing subspace signal, which is the most commonly seen waveforms in radar systems. The radar waveform in (8) is generated with a sample rate $1MHz$, its length are 2048, and the frequency sweeps linearly from $50kHz$ to $500kHz$. The multipath channel are manually generated, and the multipath delay are chosen arbitrarily to be $\{d_{1,l_1}\}_{l_1=1}^{L_1} = \{40, 75, 200\}$ and $\{d_{2,l_2}\}_{l_2=1}^{L_2} = \{50, 100, 185, 250\}$. The multiple observations in the form of (13) are directly generated by Monte-Carlo method, in which the channel coefficients $\alpha_i^{(j)} = [\alpha_{i,1}^{(j)}, \dots, \alpha_{i,L_i}^{(j)}]$ with respect to different j are generated independently from complex Gaussian distributions in order to simulate the channel fading effect. In addition, the mean value of $|\alpha_{i,1}|$ is greater than the mean value of $|\alpha_{i,l}|$, $l > 1$, meaning that the direct path has a greater propagation gain than the reflective path. The length N of each observation vector is 512, and totally 512 observation data are generated.

In the simulation, we compare our proposed TDOA algorithm with the publicly known super resolution MUSIC-Type TDOA algorithm proposed by Fengxiang Ge in [15], because both algorithms have super resolution and can




Fig. 2: Comparison of Ge’s MUSIC-Type algorithm and our VCC algorithm for TDOA estimation

make use of multiple observation data. Since the simulation focuses on demonstrating the ability of resolving multipath TDOA, we just assume the dimensions of signal subspaces in both algorithms, i.e., the number of channel paths L_i , have been accurately estimated. The normalized TDOA estimation results of both algorithms are plotted in figure 2, where the signal-to-noise ratio SNR , defined as the power ratio of signal and noise, is set to be $-10dB$. According to the simulation setting, there should be peaks at $\Delta d = -150, -100, -25, -15, 10, 25, 50, 60, 110, 145, 175, 210$ in the TDOA estimation outputs. The position of these peaks are labeled in the figure. As shown in figure 2, when the SNR is low, the MUSIC-Type algorithm fails to reveal most of the peaks of multipath TDOA, but our VCC algorithm can still show clear peaks.

Secondly, the overall performance of both algorithms are given in figure 3. In the simulation, 120 independent trials of both algorithms with arbitrary multipath delays are carried out for different SNR levels. Because the output of these algorithms have different scale, we define the mean square errors (MSE) of TDOA estimation to be $MSE = \sum_{\Delta d} (r(\Delta d) - I(\Delta d))^2$, where $r(\Delta d)$ is the normalized output result shown in figure 2 of each algorithm, and $I(\Delta d)$ is the "standard output vector" which takes value 1 when Δd is at these multipath TDOA positions and 0 otherwise. The simulation results in figure 3 implies that, the proposed VCC algorithm outperforms Ge’s Music-Type algorithm at all SNRs; besides, our VCC algorithm will have better performance when source signals have wide bandwidths.

B. TDOA of Frequency Modulation (FM) broadcast signals

In this part of simulation, we chose a set of real-world frequency modulation (FM) broadcast signals as one example of the fast changing subspace signal, to demonstrate the TDOA estimation performance of our proposed method. The FM signals used here are baseband signals transmitted by a real world radio broadcast station gathered from several remote located radio receivers.




Fig. 3: Performance of our VCC algorithm and MUSIC-Type algorithm (above) and Performance of our VCC algorithm using LFM signal with different frequency range (below)

1) Real world FM signal, when only one single path exists:

In the simulation, the FM signals of a radio station are sampled from two separately located radio receivers, the sample rate of received baseband signals is 256kHz, and the length is 4096.

We firstly increase the original sample rate of the raw signals by a factor of 4 before we use them for TDOA estimation, a part of the waveform in time domain and the frequency spectrum of these two baseband signals are plotted in figure 4. From the waveform of both signals, we can see that the corresponding discrete time TDOA is from 14 to 16.

In the simulation, we compared our VCC algorithm with the traditional GCC-PHAT method, the high resolution ℓ_1 regularization algorithm, and also the super resolution MUSIC-Type algorithm by Ge. In the simulation of ℓ_1 regularization algorithm, the power spectrum of the transmitted signal is required to be known, while the other three algorithms don’t use knowledge of the power spectrum. In our algorithm, the parameters N , M and K_i are chosen empirically to be $N = 544, M = 512, K_1 = K_2 = 3$. The normalized TDOA estimation results of GCC-PHAT, ℓ_1 regularization, MUSIC-Type as well as VCC algorithm are shown in figure 5. It can be seen that in a channel with only a single path, both our proposed VCC algorithm and Ge’s MUSIC-Type algorithm outperforms the traditional GCC-PHAT and the ℓ_1 regularization algorithms; because the latter two methods give a much wider peak, and also reveal too many false peaks except for the real TDOA peak. Although our VCC method and MUSIC-Type algorithm have similar super resolution ability, the computational complexity of our method is much lower.

2) Real world FM signal, the multipath channel is manually simulated:

In this simulation, the received signals from two receivers are generated as the following expression:

$$y_1(kT_s) = \alpha_{1,1}s(kT_s) + \alpha_{1,2}s((k-60)T_s) + \alpha_{1,3}s((k-120)T_s),$$

$$y_2(kT_s) = \alpha_{2,1}s((k-25)T_s) + \alpha_{2,2}s((k-100)T_s) + \alpha_{2,3}s((k-195)T_s).$$




Fig. 4: Real world FM signals from two separated receivers




Fig. 5: Comparison of different TDOA techniques in a single path channel environment

The $s(kT_s)$ here is a real world original FM signal mentioned before, which is also one among the two signals plotted in figure 4. The channel coefficients $\alpha_{i,j}$, $i = 1, 2, j = 1, 2, 3$ are also generated to simulate a Rician fading channel, among these coefficients the mean value of $|\alpha_{i,1}|$ is greater than that of the other coefficients. In the simulation, the parameters N , M and K_i are also chosen empirically to be $N = 896$, $M = 768$, $K_1 = K_2 = 9$. The TDOA estimation results of GCC-PHAT, ℓ_1 regularization, MUSIC-Type and our method are shown in figure 6.




Fig. 6: Comparison of different TDOA techniques in a simulated multipath channel environment

For clearance, we labeled the theoretical peaks of multipath TDOAs in the simulation results. As is seen, both Ge's MUSIC-Type algorithm and our VCC algorithm outperforms the other two methods. However, Ge's MUSIC-Type method and our VCC algorithm have their advantages and disadvantages at different aspect. We can see that the MUSIC-Type method has a much sharper peak, but fails to resolve every multipath TDOA, and still has some false peaks, while our VCC method may not have such sharp peaks, but successfully reveals every TDOA peak precisely with no false peak. In addition, our VCC algorithm has much lower computational efficiency, because both the MUSIC-Type algorithm and the ℓ_1 regularization algorithm contain a convex optimization step.

C. Simulations on non-integer multipath delays

In the previous analysis, we assume the multipath delays to be exactly on the sampling grid, i.e., $\tau_{i,l} = d_{i,l} \cdot T_s$. In this simulation, we validate the performance of our proposed algorithm when there is non-integer multipath delays. The simulation results for both categories of signals are shown in figure 7. As we can see, although the proposed algorithm cannot resolve non-integer TDOA, the estimated peak position will naturally result in a nearest integer value, as is labeled in the figure. Besides, some unwanted false peaks also appears, which will degrade the estimation performance.




Fig. 7: TDOA estimation with non-integer multipath delays

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a super resolution TDOA estimation technique using the Volume Cross-Correlation function is proposed. This technique firstly estimates the unknown signal subspace from the received signal, and estimate the time difference through the novel VCC function, which calculates the linear dependency of these subspaces. We analyzed the performance of our TDOA estimation algorithm upon two typical categories of signals, i.e., the slowly changing subspace signal and the fast changing subspace signal. Both categories can cover various kinds of wireless signals encountered in passive localization systems. Analysis and numerical simulations have demonstrated that our algorithm has an advantage of high efficiency and excellent capability of super resolution for TDOA estimation in a multipath environment.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. H. Reed, K. J. Krizman, B. D. Woerner, and T. S. Rappaport, "An overview of the challenges and progress in meeting the E-911 requirement for location service," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 30–37, 1998.
- [2] J. Caffery and G. L. Stuber, "Subscriber location in CDMA cellular networks," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 406–416, 1998.
- [3] S. Gezici, "A survey on wireless position estimation," *Wireless Personal Communications*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 263–282, 2008.
- [4] L. Cong and W. Zhuang, "Hybrid TDOA/AOA mobile user location for wideband CDMA cellular systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 439–447, 2002.
- [5] J. Benesty, J. Chen, and Y. Huang, *Microphone array signal processing*. Springer, 2008, vol. 1.
- [6] G. Mao, B. Fidan, and B. Anderson, "Wireless sensor network localization techniques," *Computer networks*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 2529–2553, 2007.
- [7] A. Quazi, "An overview on the time delay estimate in active and passive systems for target localization," *IEEE Trans. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process.*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 527–533, 1981.
- [8] A. Dersan and Y. Tanik, "Passive radar localization by time difference of arrival," in *MILCOM 2002. Proceedings*, vol. 2. IEEE, 2002, pp. 1251–1257.
- [9] Y. Huang, J. Benesty, G. W. Elko, and R. M. Mersereati, "Real-time passive source localization: A practical linear-correction least-squares approach," *IEEE Trans. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process.*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 943–956, 2001.
- [10] C. Knapp and G. C. Carter, "The generalized correlation method for estimation of time delay," *IEEE Trans. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process.*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 320–327, 1976.
- [11] M. Feder and E. Weinstein, "Parameter estimation of superimposed signals using the em algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 477–489, 1988.
- [12] A. Masmoudi, F. Bellili, S. Affes, and A. Stephenne, "A maximum likelihood time delay estimator in a multipath environment using importance sampling," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 182–193, 2013.
- [13] —, "A non-data-aided maximum likelihood time delay estimator using importance sampling," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 4505–4515, 2011.
- [14] H. Zi-qiang and W. Zhen-dong, "A new method for high resolution estimation of time delay," in *ICASSP'82.*, vol. 7. IEEE, 1982, pp. 420–423.
- [15] F.-X. Ge, D. Shen, Y. Peng, and V. O. Li, "Super-resolution time delay estimation in multipath environments," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 1977–1986, 2007.
- [16] H. Saarnisaari, "Tls-esprit in a time delay estimation," in *Vehicular Technology Conference, 1997, IEEE 47th*, vol. 3. IEEE, 1997, pp. 1619–1623.
- [17] C. R. Comsa, A. M. Haimovich, S. Schwartz, Y. Dobyans, and J. A. Dabin, "Source localization using time difference of arrival within a sparse representation framework," in *ICASSP'2011*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 2872–2875.
- [18] C. R. Comsa, A. M. Haimovich, S. C. Schwartz, Y. H. Dobyans, and J. A. Dabin, "Time difference of arrival based source localization within a sparse representation framework," in *Information Sciences and Systems (CISS), 2011 45th Annual Conference on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 1–6.
- [19] K. Gedalyahu and Y. C. Eldar, "Time-delay estimation from low-rate samples: A union of subspaces approach," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3017–3031, 2010.
- [20] K. Gedalyahu, R. Tur, and Y. C. Eldar, "Multichannel sampling of pulse streams at the rate of innovation," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 1491–1504, 2011.
- [21] J. Miao and A. Ben-Israel, "On principal angles between subspaces in \mathbb{R}^n ," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 171, pp. 81–98, 1992.
- [22] P.-A. Absil, R. Mahony, and R. Sepulchre, "Riemannian geometry of grassmann manifolds with a view on algorithmic computation," *Acta Applicandae Mathematica*, vol. 80, no. 2, pp. 199–220, 2004.
- [23] L. Qiu, Y. Zhang, and C.-K. Li, "Unitarily invariant metrics on the grassmann space," *SIAM journal on matrix analysis and applications*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 507–531, 2005.
- [24] A. Ben-Israel, "A volume associated with $m \times n$ matrices," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 167, pp. 87–111, 1992.
- [25] D. W. Robinson, "Separation of subspaces by volume," *American Mathematical Monthly*, pp. 22–27, 1998.
- [26] K. Ho and M. Sun, "Passive source localization using time differences of arrival and gain ratios of arrival," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 464–477, 2008.
- [27] K. Ho, X. Lu, and L.-o. Kovavisaruch, "Source localization using TDOA and FDOA measurements in the presence of receiver location errors: analysis and solution," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 684–696, 2007.
- [28] C. Therrien, S. Koutreas, and K. Smith, "Time delay estimation using a signal subspace model," in *Signals, Systems and Computers, 2000. Conference Record of the Thirty-Fourth Asilomar Conference on*, vol. 2. IEEE, 2000, pp. 832–836.
- [29] O. Simeone, Y. Bar-Ness, and U. Spagnolini, "Pilot-based channel estimation for OFDM systems by tracking the delay-subspace," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 315–325, 2004.
- [30] G. Fock, P. Schulz-Rittich, A. Schenke, and H. Meyr, "Low complexity high resolution subspace-based delay estimation for DS-CDMA," in *Communications, 2002. ICC 2002. IEEE International Conference on*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2002, pp. 31–35.
- [31] D. Tse and P. Viswanath, *Fundamentals of wireless communication*. Cambridge university press, 2005.
- [32] A. Ata'a and S. Abdullah, "Deinterleaving of radar signals and prf identification algorithms," *Radar, Sonar & Navigation, IET*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 340–347, 2007.
- [33] J. Liu, H. Meng, Y. Liu, and X. Wang, "A mutual information-based time-frequency atom extraction algorithm for radar emitter recognition," in *Radar Conference (RADAR), 2011 IEEE*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 602–605.
- [34] P. Stoica and N. Arye, "MUSIC, maximum likelihood, and Cramer-Rao bound," *IEEE Trans. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process.*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 720–741, 1989.
- [35] D. Jeffries and D. Farrier, "Asymptotic results for eigenvector methods," in *IEE Proceedings F (Communications, Radar and Signal Processing)*, vol. 132, no. 7. IET, 1985, pp. 589–594.
- [36] H. Akaike, "A new look at the statistical model identification," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 716–723, 1974.
- [37] M. Wax and T. Kailath, "Detection of signals by information theoretic criteria," *IEEE Trans. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 387–392, 1985.
- [38] G. Schwarz *et al.*, "Estimating the dimension of a model," *The annals of statistics*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 461–464, 1978.
- [39] S. Valaee and P. Kabal, "An information theoretic approach to source enumeration in array signal processing," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 1171–1178, 2004.
- [40] J. Scheuing and B. Yang, "Disambiguation of tdoa estimates in multipath multi-source environments (datemm)," in *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, 2006. ICASSP 2006 Proceedings. 2006 IEEE International Conference on*, vol. 4. IEEE, 2006, pp. IV–IV.
- [41] —, "Disambiguation of tdoa estimation for multiple sources in reverberant environments," *Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 1479–1489, 2008.
- [42] I. Jolliffe, *Principal component analysis*. Wiley Online Library, 2005.
- [43] D. R. Brillinger, *Time series: data analysis and theory*. Siam, 2001, vol. 36.
- [44] N. Golyandina and A. Zhigljavsky, *Singular Spectrum Analysis for time series*. Springer, 2013.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Theorem 1:

In order to prove Theorem 1, several lemmas are needed first.

Lemma 2: Given a matrix $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_L] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times L}$, $L < N$, denote its maximal column correlation (or coherence) by

$$\mu := \max_{l \neq l'} \frac{|\langle \mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{x}_{l'} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{x}_l\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{x}_{l'}\|_2}, \quad (36)$$

then if

$$\mu \leq \frac{1}{L-1}, \quad (37)$$

the matrix \mathbf{X} is full rank.

Proof of Lemma 2: Denote the column-normalized matrix of \mathbf{X} by:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}} := [\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_L], \quad (38)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_l = \mathbf{x}_l / \|\mathbf{x}_l\|_2, l = 1, \dots, L$.

Taking $\mathbf{H} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^H \tilde{\mathbf{X}}$, and denote \mathbf{H} 's eigenvalues by $\lambda_i, i = 1, \dots, L$, then according to Gershgorin's Circle Theorem, we have

$$|\lambda_i - \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\|_2^2| \leq \sum_{l \neq k} |\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_l, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k \rangle|, i = 1, \dots, L, \quad (39)$$

because for each $l \neq k, |\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_l, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k \rangle| \leq \mu$, so $\mu \leq \frac{1}{L-1}$ will be sufficient to ensure $\lambda_i > 0$. Lemma 2 is now proved.

Lemma 3: Consider the matrices $\mathbf{X}_1 = [\mathbf{x}_{1,1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{1,L_1}] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times L_1}$ and $\mathbf{X}_2 = [\mathbf{x}_{2,1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{2,L_2}] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times L_2}, L_1, L_2 < N$ denote the maximum column correlation (also known as coherence) of matrix $[\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2]$, as well as the maximum column correlation of matrices \mathbf{X}_1 and \mathbf{X}_2 by

$$\mu_0 := \max_{1 \leq l_1 \leq L_1, 1 \leq l_2 \leq L_2} \frac{|\langle \mathbf{x}_{1,l_1}, \mathbf{x}_{2,l_2} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{x}_{1,l_1}\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{x}_{2,l_2}\|_2}, \quad (40)$$

$$\mu_1 := \max_{1 \leq l_1 \neq l_1' \leq L_1} \frac{|\langle \mathbf{x}_{1,l_1}, \mathbf{x}_{1,l_1'} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{x}_{1,l_1}\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{x}_{1,l_1'}\|_2}, \quad (41)$$

$$\mu_2 := \max_{1 \leq l_2 \neq l_2' \leq L_2} \frac{|\langle \mathbf{x}_{2,l_2}, \mathbf{x}_{2,l_2'} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{x}_{2,l_2}\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{x}_{2,l_2'}\|_2}, \quad (42)$$

taking $\mu = \max\{\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2\}$, then if

$$\mu \leq \frac{1}{L_1 + L_2 - 1}, \quad (43)$$

we have

$$\text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2]) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^{L/2},$$

where the matrices $\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2$ are orthogonal bases for subspaces $\text{span}(\mathbf{X}_1)$ and $\text{span}(\mathbf{X}_2)$, and $L = \min\{L_1, L_2\}$,

$$\varepsilon = \frac{L_1 L_2 \cdot \mu^2}{[1 - (L_1 - 1)\mu][1 - (L_2 - 1)\mu]}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3:

Similar to the previous proof, we use the column-normalized versions of matrices \mathbf{X}_1 and \mathbf{X}_2 , which are denoted by $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1 = [\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{1,1}, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{1,L_1}], \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2 = [\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{2,1}, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{2,L_2}]$ in the following proof. Therefore we have $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{1,l_1} = \mathbf{x}_{1,l_1} / \|\mathbf{x}_{1,l_1}\|_2, l_1 = 1, \dots, L_1$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{2,l_2} = \mathbf{x}_{2,l_2} / \|\mathbf{x}_{2,l_2}\|_2, l_2 = 1, \dots, L_2$. It is easy to verify that $\text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1) = \text{span}(\mathbf{X}_1)$ and $\text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2) = \text{span}(\mathbf{X}_2)$.

According to the relation of volume and principal angles, the volume function $\text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2])$ satisfies

$$\text{vol}_{L_1+L_2}([\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2]) = \prod_{i=1}^L \sin \theta_i(\text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1), \text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2)),$$

where $L = \min\{L_1, L_2\}$, and $\theta_i(\text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1), \text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2))$ are principal angles of subspaces $\text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1)$ and $\text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2)$. From the definition of principal angles, it can be derived that, given any principal angle $\theta_i(\text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1), \text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2)), i = 1, \dots, L$, there must exist a pair of vectors \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{v}_i , which satisfy

$$\mathbf{u}_i \in \text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1), \|\mathbf{u}_i\|_2 = 1, \quad (44)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_i \in \text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2), \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2 = 1, \quad (45)$$

and

$$\cos \theta_i(\text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1), \text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2)) = |\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle|. \quad (46)$$

Then according to Lemma 2, the condition in (43) implies the full-rankness of matrix $[\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2]$, which also means that $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1$

and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2$ are full rank; as a result, there must exist a series of coefficients $a_{1,1}, \dots, a_{1,L_1}$ and $a_{2,1}, \dots, a_{2,L_2}$ that are not all zero, such that

$$\mathbf{u}_i = \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} a_{1,l_1} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{1,l_1}, \mathbf{v}_i = \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} a_{2,l_2} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{2,l_2}, \quad (47)$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle| &\leq \left| \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} a_{1,l_1} a_{2,l_2} \right| \cdot \mu \\ &\leq \sqrt{L_1 \cdot \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |a_{1,l_1}|^2} \sqrt{L_2 \cdot \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |a_{2,l_2}|^2} \cdot \mu, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

the last inequality is derived from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Because $\|\mathbf{u}_i\|_2 = 1$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = \|\mathbf{u}_i\|_2^2 &\geq \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |a_{1,l_1}|^2 - \sum_{l_1 \neq l_1'} a_{1,l_1} \overline{a_{1,l_1'}} \mu \\ &\geq \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |a_{1,l_1}|^2 - (L_1 - 1) \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |a_{1,l_1}|^2 \cdot \mu, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

the last inequality is also derived from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Then we can know from (49) that,

$$\sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |a_{1,l_1}|^2 \leq \frac{1}{1 - (L_1 - 1)\mu}, \quad (50)$$

similarly we also have

$$\sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |a_{2,l_2}|^2 \leq \frac{1}{1 - (L_2 - 1)\mu}, \quad (51)$$

combining (50) and (51) with (48), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \cos \theta_i(\text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1), \text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2)) &= |\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{L_1 \cdot L_2 \cdot \mu^2}{[1 - (L_1 - 1)\mu][1 - (L_2 - 1)\mu]}}, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

or in another word,

$$\sin \theta_i(\text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1), \text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2)) \geq \sqrt{1 - \frac{L_1 \cdot L_2 \cdot \mu^2}{[1 - (L_1 - 1)\mu][1 - (L_2 - 1)\mu]}}, \quad (53)$$

holds for every $i, i = 1, \dots, L$. If we let $\varepsilon = \frac{L_1 \cdot L_2 \cdot \mu^2}{[1 - (L_1 - 1)\mu][1 - (L_2 - 1)\mu]}$, Lemma 3 is now proved.

Proof of Theorem 1:

Because the matrices $\mathbf{G}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ in (17) and \mathbf{G}_2 in (18) are actually composed of different delayed versions of the waveform signal $g(k \cdot T_s)$, so (40-42) together with (43) is actually constraining the auto-correlation function of $g(k \cdot T_s)$, therefore we have when

$$\max_{1 \leq l_1 \neq l_1' \leq L_1} |R_g((d_{1,l_1} - d_{1,l_1'})T_s)| \leq \frac{|R_g(0)|}{L_1 + L_2 - 1},$$

$$\max_{1 \leq l_2 \neq l_2' \leq L_2} |R_g((d_{2,l_2} - d_{2,l_2'})T_s)| \leq \frac{|R_g(0)|}{L_1 + L_2 - 1},$$

$$\max_{1 \leq l_1 \leq L_1, 1 \leq l_2 \leq L_2} |R_g((d_{1,l_1} + \Delta d - d_{2,l_2})T_s)| \leq \frac{|R_g(0)|}{L_1 + L_2 - 1},$$

the result of Theorem 1 will hold.

B. Proof of Theorem 2:

Before proving Theorem 2, the following two lemmas are firstly given as intermediate results.

Lemma 4: Consider the linear combinations of several matrices:

$$\mathbf{H}_1 = \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \alpha_{1,l_1} \mathbf{H}_{1,l_1} = \left[\sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \alpha_{1,l_1} \mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(1)}, \dots, \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \alpha_{1,l_1} \mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(K)} \right], \quad (54)$$

and

$$\mathbf{H}_2 = \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} \alpha_{2,l_2} \mathbf{H}_{2,l_2} = \left[\sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} \alpha_{2,l_2} \mathbf{h}_{2,l_2}^{(1)}, \dots, \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} \alpha_{2,l_2} \mathbf{h}_{2,l_2}^{(K)} \right], \quad (55)$$

with $\mathbf{H}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times K}$ and $\mathbf{H}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times K}$, and $\|\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(1)}\|_2 = \dots = \|\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(K)}\|_2$, $\|\mathbf{h}_{2,l_2}^{(1)}\|_2 = \dots = \|\mathbf{h}_{2,l_2}^{(K)}\|_2$; we let

$$\mu_1 = \max_{\substack{1 \leq k, k' \leq K \\ 1 \leq l_1 \neq l_1' \leq L_1}} \frac{|\langle \mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(k)}, \mathbf{h}_{1,l_1'}^{(k')} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(k)}\|_2 \|\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1'}^{(k')}\|_2} \quad (56)$$

$$\mu_2 = \max_{\substack{1 \leq k, k' \leq K \\ 1 \leq l_2 \neq l_2' \leq L_2}} \frac{|\langle \mathbf{h}_{2,l_2}^{(k)}, \mathbf{h}_{2,l_2'}^{(k')} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{h}_{2,l_2}^{(k)}\|_2 \|\mathbf{h}_{2,l_2'}^{(k')}\|_2} \quad (57)$$

and let

$$\mu_0 = \max_{\substack{1 \leq k, k' \leq K \\ 1 \leq l_1 \leq L_1, 1 \leq l_2 \leq L_2}} \frac{|\langle \mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(k)}, \mathbf{h}_{2,l_2}^{(k')} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(k)}\|_2 \|\mathbf{h}_{2,l_2}^{(k')}\|_2}. \quad (58)$$

Taking

$$\mu = \max\{\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2\}, \quad (59)$$

then we have the same result as in (31) and (32).

Lemma 5: Consider the matrices \mathbf{H}_1 and \mathbf{H}_2 in (54) and (55), if there exists $1 \leq l_1^* \leq L_1$ and $1 \leq l_2^* \leq L_2$, such that $\mathbf{H}_{1,l_1^*} = \mathbf{H}_{2,l_2^*}$; we let

$$\mu_0 = \max_{\substack{1 \leq l \leq L_1, l \neq l_1^*, 1 \leq l' \leq L_2, l' \neq l_2^*}} \frac{|\langle \mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(k)}, \mathbf{h}_{2,l_2}^{(k')} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(k)}\|_2 \|\mathbf{h}_{2,l_2}^{(k')}\|_2} \quad (60)$$

$L := \min\{L_1, L_2\}$, and let

$$\mu = \max\{\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2\} \quad (61)$$

then we have the same results as in (34) and (35).

Proof of Lemma 4: For simplicity, we take the matrix \mathbf{H}_1 for example. Before we start the proof, for convenience, we will use the column-normalized matrices of \mathbf{H}_{1,l_1} as our main target, namely, we take $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{1,l_1} = [\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{1,l_1}^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{1,l_1}^{(K)}] = [\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(1)} / \|\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(1)}\|_2, \dots, \mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(K)} / \|\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(K)}\|_2]$. Because we have assumed $\|\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(1)}\|_2 = \dots = \|\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(K)}\|_2$, then the matrices \mathbf{H}_1 can be equivalently written into

$$\mathbf{H}_1 = \left[\sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{1,l_1}^{(1)}, \dots, \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{1,l_1}^{(K)} \right] \quad (62)$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1} = \alpha_{1,l_1} \cdot \|\mathbf{h}_{1,l_1}^{(k)}\|_2$, $k = 1, \dots, K$.

According to the definition of singular value decomposition, we have

$$\mathbf{H}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\min\{M,K\}} \sigma_{1,i} \mathbf{u}_{1,i} \mathbf{v}_{1,i}^H, \quad (63)$$

Then the left singular vectors of matrix \mathbf{H}_1 (or \mathbf{H}_2), corresponding to its K_1 largest singular values, namely those $\mathbf{u}_{1,1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{1,K_1}$, can be written as

$$\mathbf{u}_{1,r} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{1,r}} \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{v}_{1,r}, \quad r = 1, \dots, K_1, \quad (64)$$

As a matter of fact, these vectors are actually regarded as the basis for each receiver's signal subspaces, and the basis matrices are

$$\mathbf{U}_1 = [\mathbf{u}_{1,1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{1,K_1}] \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times K_1}, \mathbf{U}_2 = [\mathbf{u}_{1,2}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{1,K_2}] \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times K_2}.$$

On the other hand, according to the definition of principal angles, take $K_{\min} = \min\{K_1, K_2\}$, then for every principal angle of subspaces $\text{span}(\mathbf{U}_1)$ and $\text{span}(\mathbf{U}_2)$, i.e., $\theta_i(\text{span}(\mathbf{U}_1), \text{span}(\mathbf{U}_2))$, $i = 1, \dots, K_{\min}$, there must exist a pair of vectors $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{2,i}$, satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i} &\in \text{span}(\mathbf{U}_1), \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}\|_2 = 1, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{2,i} &\in \text{span}(\mathbf{U}_2), \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{2,i}\|_2 = 1, \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\cos \theta_i(\text{span}(\mathbf{U}_1), \text{span}(\mathbf{U}_2)) = |\langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{2,i} \rangle|.$$

As a matter of fact, these pair of vectors whose angles are principal angles, i.e., $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{2,i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, K_{\min}$, are actually the left and right singular vectors of matrix $\mathbf{U}_1^H \mathbf{U}_2$. Therefore, they can be orthogonally represented by the orthogonal basis matrices \mathbf{U}_1 and \mathbf{U}_2 , which means, there exist a series of coefficients $q_{1,i}^{(1)}, \dots, q_{1,i}^{(K_1)}$ and $q_{2,i}^{(1)}, \dots, q_{2,i}^{(K_2)}$ that are not all zero, such that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i} = \sum_{r=1}^{K_1} q_{1,i}^{(r)} \mathbf{u}_{1,r}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{2,i} = \sum_{r'=1}^{K_2} q_{2,i}^{(r')} \mathbf{u}_{2,r'},$$

also $\sum_{r=1}^{K_1} |q_{1,i}^{(r)}|^2 = \sum_{r'=1}^{K_2} |q_{2,i}^{(r')}|^2 = 1$. If we denote $\mathbf{q}_{1,i} := [q_{1,i}^{(1)}, \dots, q_{1,i}^{(K_1)}]^T$, then we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i} = \mathbf{H}_1 \cdot [\mathbf{v}_{1,1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{1,K_1}] \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, \sigma_{1,K_1}^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{q}_{1,i}, \quad (65)$$

letting $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,i} = [\mathbf{v}_{1,1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{1,r_1}] \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, \sigma_{1,K_1}^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{q}_{1,i}$, then (65) are equivalently

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i} = \mathbf{H}_1 \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,i} = \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{1,l_1}^{(k)}, \quad (66)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,i} = [\tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(K)}]^T$. It is not hard to prove that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,i}\|_2 = \|\text{diag}(\sigma_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, \sigma_{1,K_1}^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{q}_{1,i}\|_2 \leq \sigma_{1,K_1}^{-1}. \quad (67)$$

Similarly, if we denote $\mathbf{q}_{2,i} := [q_{2,i}^{(1)}, \dots, q_{2,i}^{(K_2)}]^T$, we have similar results:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{2,i} = \mathbf{H}_2 \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,i} = \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{v}_{2,i}^{(k)} \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} \hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{2,l_2}^{(k)}, \quad (68)$$

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,i}\|_2 = \|\text{diag}(\sigma_{2,1}^{-1}, \dots, \sigma_{2,K_2}^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{q}_{2,i}\|_2 \leq \sigma_{2,K_2}^{-1}. \quad (69)$$

According to the previous analysis, we have

$$|\langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{2,i} \rangle| = \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{k'=1}^K \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \overline{\tilde{v}_{2,i}^{(k')}} \left\langle \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{1,l_1}^{(k)}, \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} \hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{2,l_2}^{(k')} \right\rangle \right| \quad (70)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left| \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1} \cdot \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \right| \cdot \left| \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} \hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2} \right| \cdot \left| \sum_{k'=1}^K \overline{\tilde{v}_{2,i}^{(k')}} \right| \cdot \mu \right. \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1} \right| \sqrt{K \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K |\tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)}|^2} \cdot \left| \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} \hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2} \right| \sqrt{K \cdot \sum_{k'=1}^K |\tilde{v}_{2,i}^{(k')}|^2} \cdot \mu \quad (71) \\ &\leq \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}| \cdot \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2}| \cdot \frac{K \cdot \mu}{\sigma_{1,K_1} \sigma_{2,K_2}} \quad (72) \end{aligned}$$

holds for every $i = 1, \dots, K_{\min}$. The inequality in (71) is based on the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the inequality in (72) is based on (67) and (69). If we take $C_1 = \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|$, $C_2 = \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2}|$, Lemma 4 is now proved.

Proof of Lemma 5:

Similar to the proof of Lemma 4, we use (66) and (68) to prove Lemma 5. According to (70), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{2,i} \rangle| &= \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{k'=1}^K \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \overline{\tilde{v}_{2,i}^{(k')}} \left\langle \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{1,l_1}^{(k)}, \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} \hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{2,l_2}^{(k')} \right\rangle \right| \\ &\geq |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1^*} \hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2^*}| \cdot \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \right| \cdot \left| \sum_{k'=1}^K \tilde{v}_{2,i}^{(k')} \right| - \\ &\quad \sum_{l_1=1, l_1 \neq l_1^*}^{L_1} \sum_{l_2=1, l_2 \neq l_2^*}^{L_2} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}| \cdot |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2}| \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{k'=1}^K |\tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)}| \cdot |\tilde{v}_{2,i}^{(k')}| \cdot \mu \\ &\geq |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1^*} \hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2^*}| \cdot \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \right| \cdot \left| \sum_{k'=1}^K \tilde{v}_{2,i}^{(k')} \right| - \\ &\quad \sum_{l_1=1, l_1 \neq l_1^*}^{L_1} \sum_{l_2=1, l_2 \neq l_2^*}^{L_2} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}| \cdot |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2}| \cdot \frac{K}{\sigma_{1,K_1} \sigma_{2,K_2}} \cdot \mu \quad (73) \end{aligned}$$

Then, the constraint $\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}\|_2 = 1$ is considered, we can prove

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}\|_2^2 &\leq \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1} \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{1,l_1}^{(k)} \right\|_2^2 \\ &+ \left[\left| \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1} \right|^2 \cdot \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \right|^2 - \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|^2 \cdot \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \right|^2 \right] \mu \quad (74) \end{aligned}$$

because the geometrical average is greater than the arithmetic average, we have

$$\frac{\sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|}{L_1} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|^2}{L_1}}, \quad (75)$$

therefore (74) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}\|_2^2 &\leq \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{1,l_1}^{(k)} \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{1,l_1}^{(k)} \right\|_2^2 + \\ &\quad \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|^2 \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \right|^2 (L_1 - 1) \mu, \quad (76) \end{aligned}$$

because

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{1,l_1}^{(k)} \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{1,l_1}^{(k)} \right\|_2^2 \leq |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|^2 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K |\tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)}|^2 \quad (77)$$

(74) becomes

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|^2 \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \right|^2 [1 + (L_1 - 1) \mu], \quad (78)$$

therefore we have

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{v}_{1,i}^{(k)} \right|^2 \geq \frac{1}{\sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|^2 [1 + (L_1 - 1) \mu]}. \quad (79)$$

Using the same technique, we can derive

$$\left| \sum_{k'=1}^K \tilde{v}_{2,i}^{(k')} \right|^2 \geq \frac{1}{\sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2}|^2 [1 + (L_2 - 1) \mu]}. \quad (80)$$

Combined with (73) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{2,i} \rangle| &\geq \frac{|\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1^*} \hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2^*}|}{\sqrt{\sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|^2 \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2}|^2}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{[1 + (L_1 - 1) \mu] [1 + (L_2 - 1) \mu]}} \\ &- \sum_{l_1=1, l_1 \neq l_1^*}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}| \sum_{l_2=1, l_2 \neq l_2^*}^{L_2} |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2}| \cdot \frac{K}{\sigma_{1,K_1} \sigma_{2,K_2}} \cdot \mu \quad (81) \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, if we take $L = \min\{L_1, L_2\}$, and let $A_1 = \sqrt{\sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|^2}$, $A_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2}|^2}$, $B_1 = |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1^*}|$, $B_2 = |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2^*}|$, $C_1 = \sum_{l_1=1}^{L_1} |\hat{\alpha}_{1,l_1}|$, $C_2 = \sum_{l_2=1}^{L_2} |\hat{\alpha}_{2,l_2}|$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{1,i}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{2,i} \rangle| &\geq \frac{B_1 B_2}{A_1 A_2} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (L - 1) \mu} \\ &- (C_1 - B_1)(C_2 - B_2) \cdot \frac{K}{\sigma_{1,K_1} \sigma_{2,K_2}} \cdot \mu, \quad (82) \end{aligned}$$

sufficiently, if $\mu \leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{(L-1)B_1 B_2 \sigma_{1,K_1} \sigma_{2,K_2}}{A_1 A_2 [C_1 C_2 + (C_1 - B_1)(C_2 - B_2)] K}} + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \right) / (L - 1)$, the lower bound of (82) will always be greater than the upper bound of (71). The lemma is proved.

Proof of Theorem 2:

The result of Lemma 4 and Lemma 5 can be directly used to derive Theorem 2. Actually, the matrices \mathbf{H}_1 and \mathbf{H}_2 will be replaced by the Hankel matrices $\mathbf{X}_1^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ and \mathbf{X}_2 , then the \mathbf{H}_{1,l_1} and \mathbf{H}_{2,l_2} are just $\mathbf{S}_{1,l_1}^{[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}$ and \mathbf{S}_{2,l_2} ; and the noise's Hankel matrix \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 can also be regarded as \mathbf{H}_{1,L_1+1} and \mathbf{H}_{2,L_2+1} , whose columns will naturally have low correlations with those of the signal's Hankel matrices because of statistical independence. Therefore the expressions (56-58) in Lemma 4 and (60) in Lemma 5 are actually related with the auto-correlation function of $s(k \cdot T_s)$, namely, they conditions can be translated into:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\langle \mathbf{s}_{1,l_1}^{(k)[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{s}_{2,l_2}^{(k')} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{s}_{1,l_1}^{(k)[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}\|_2 \|\mathbf{s}_{2,l_2}^{(k')}\|_2} &= \frac{|R_s((d_{1,l_1} + \Delta d - d_{2,l_2} + k - k')T_s)|}{|R_s(0)|} \\ \frac{|\langle \mathbf{s}_{1,l_1}^{(k)[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}, \mathbf{s}_{1,l_1'}^{(k')[\Delta d \cdot T_s]} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{s}_{1,l_1}^{(k)[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}\|_2 \|\mathbf{s}_{1,l_1'}^{(k')[\Delta d \cdot T_s]}\|_2} &= \frac{|R_s((d_{1,l_1} - d_{1,l_1'} + k - k')T_s)|}{|R_s(0)|} \\ \frac{|\langle \mathbf{s}_{2,l_2}^{(k)}, \mathbf{s}_{2,l_2'}^{(k')} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{s}_{2,l_2}^{(k)}\|_2 \|\mathbf{s}_{2,l_2'}^{(k')}\|_2} &= \frac{|R_s((d_{2,l_2} - d_{2,l_2'} + k - k')T_s)|}{|R_s(0)|} \end{aligned}$$

After translating (81) or (82) into volume, Theorem 2 is now proved.