

# Study of Sparsity-Aware Set-Membership Adaptive Algorithms with Adjustable Penalties

Andre Flores

Centre for Telecommunications Studies (CETUC)  
PUC-Rio,

Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Email: andre.flores@cetuc.puc-rio.br

Rodrigo C. de Lamare

Centre for Telecommunications Studies (CETUC)  
PUC-Rio,

Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Department of Electronic Engineering, University of York, UK  
Email: delamare@cetuc.puc-rio.br

**Abstract**—In this paper, we propose sparsity-aware data-selective adaptive filtering algorithms with adjustable penalties. Prior work incorporates a penalty function into the cost function used in the optimization that originates the algorithms to improve their performance by exploiting sparsity. However, the strength of the penalty function is controlled by a scalar that is often a fixed parameter. In contrast to prior work, we develop a framework to derive algorithms that automatically adjust the penalty function parameter and the step size to achieve a better performance. Simulations for a system identification application show that the proposed algorithms outperform in convergence speed existing sparsity-aware algorithms.

**Keywords**—Adaptive filtering, sparsity-aware algorithms, set-membership algorithms.

## I. INTRODUCTION

A system is considered to be sparse if only a few of its elements are nonzero values. A sparse signal can be represented as a vector of a finite-dimensional space which can be expressed as a linear combination of a small number of basis vectors of the related space. There are many applications, such as echo cancellation, channel equalization, and system identification, where sparse signals and systems are found. However, traditional adaptive algorithms, including the least-mean square (LMS), the affine projection (AP), and the recursive least squares (RLS) do not exploit the sparsity of the model [1]. When dealing with learning problems, we attempt to extract as much as possible useful information from the system to obtain better results. Under this scope, the sparsity of systems has been the focus of many research works that are devoted to improving the performance of adaptive algorithms.

One of the first approaches used to exploit sparsity was the proportionate family of algorithms. These algorithms assign proportional step sizes to different weights depending on their magnitudes. These algorithms include the proportionate normalized LMS (PNLMS) [2] and the improved PNLMS (IPNLMS) [3]. Several versions of proportionate algorithms have been proposed such as the  $\mu$ -law PNLMS (MPNLMS) [4] and improved MPNLMS (IMPNLMS) [5] algorithms. In [6] an individual activation factor PNLMS (IAF-PNLMS) algorithm was presented to better distribute the adaptation over the coefficients. Additionally, the set-membership NLMS (SM-NLMS) [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13] and PNLMS (SM-PNLMS) [14], which is a data-selective version of the PNLMS algorithm, has been developed. The proportionate algorithms

were also extended to the AP algorithm, giving rise to the proportionate AP (PAP) and the improved PAP (IPAP) [15] algorithms. The PAP algorithm has also been discussed in [16]. The main advantage of these algorithms is that they accelerate the speed of convergence by reusing multiple past inputs as a single input. Moreover, a data-selective version, the set-membership PAP (SM-PAP) algorithm has been introduced in [17].

In recent years, another approach to deal with sparsity based on penalty functions has been adopted. In this context, a penalty function is added to the cost function to take into account the sparsity of the model and then a gradient-based algorithm is derived. In [18], the zero-attracting LMS (ZA-LMS) and the reweighted zero-attracting LMS (RZA-LMS) have been presented and used for sparse system identification and other applications [19], [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25], [26], [27], [28], [29], [30], [31], [32], [33], [34], [35], [36], [37], [38], [39], [40]. This idea has been extended to the AP algorithm in [41], where the zero-attracting AP (ZA-AP) and the reweighted zero-attracting AP (RZA-AP) algorithms have been proposed. Another example of this kind of algorithm is the zero-attracting RLS (ZA-RLS) [42]. Other versions of the RLS algorithm that deal with sparsity in systems have been studied in [43] and [44]. There are also data-selective versions of adaptive algorithms that incorporate a penalty function [45]. A review of common penalty functions used in the literature and another scheme to treat sparsity has been reported in [46].

In general, adaptive algorithms that use a penalty function are computationally less expensive and they also achieve a better trade-off between performance and complexity [47] than proportionate algorithms. However, a critical step in these algorithms is the selection of the value of the regularization term. In this paper, we propose a novel framework to derive data-selective algorithms with adjustable penalties and develop algorithms to automatically adjust the regularization term and the step-size. In particular, we devise a framework for set-membership algorithms that can adjust the step-size and the penalty based on the error bound. We then develop sparsity-aware set-membership algorithms with adjustable penalties using commonly employed penalty functions. Simulations show that the proposed algorithms outperform prior art.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the problem formulation is presented. In Section III the proposed algorithms are derived. Section IV presents the simulations

and results of the algorithms developed in an application involving system identification. Finally, Section V presents the conclusions of this work.

## II. SET-MEMBERSHIP FILTERING AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

In set-membership filtering, the filter  $\mathbf{w}(i)$  is designed to achieve a specified bound on the magnitude of an estimate  $y(i)$ . As a result of this constraint, set-membership adaptive algorithms will only perform filter updates for certain data, resulting in data-selective or sparse updates. Let  $\Theta(i)$  represent the set containing all possible  $\mathbf{w}(i)$  that yield estimates upper bounded in magnitude by an error bound  $\gamma$ . Thus, we can write

$$\Theta(i) = \bigcap_{(\mathbf{x}(i)) \in \mathcal{S}} \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{R}^M : |y(i)| \leq \gamma\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}(i)$  is the input vector,  $\mathcal{S}$  is the set of all possible data pairs  $(d(i), \mathbf{x}(i))$  and the set  $\Theta(i)$  is referred to as the feasibility set, and any point in it is a valid estimate  $y(i) = \mathbf{w}^T(i)\mathbf{x}(i)$ . Since it is not practical to predict all data pairs, adaptive methods work with the membership set  $\psi_i = \bigcap_{m=1}^i \mathcal{H}_m$  provided by the observations, where  $\mathcal{H}_m = \{\mathbf{w}(i) \in \mathcal{R}^M : |y(i)| \leq \gamma\}$ . In order to devise an effective set-membership algorithm, the bound  $\gamma$  must be appropriately chosen. Prior work has considered data-selective or sparse updates, time-varying bounds [48] and exploited sparsity in  $\mathbf{w}(i)$ . We review the standard SM-NLMS algorithm next.

Let us consider the M-dimensional input vector expressed by

$$\mathbf{x}(i) = [x(i) \quad x(i-1) \quad \cdots \quad x(i-M+1)]^T \quad (2)$$

The output of the adaptive filter is given by

$$y(i) = \mathbf{w}^T(i) \mathbf{x}(i), \quad (3)$$

and the error is computed as follows:

$$e(i) = d(i) - y(i) \quad (4)$$

Let us consider a gradient descent approach, where our model is updated by the recursive equation defined by

$$\mathbf{w}(i) = \mathbf{w}(i-1) - \mu(i) \frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}(i-1)}, \quad (5)$$

where  $J$  is the cost function expressed by

$$J = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E} [|e(i)|^2] \quad (6)$$

The gradient of  $J$  is given by

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}(i-1)} = -e(i) \mathbf{x}(i) \quad (7)$$

Replacing this expression in the update equation leads to:

$$\mathbf{w}(i) = \mathbf{w}(i-1) + \mu(i) e(i) \mathbf{x}(i) \quad (8)$$

An update of a set-membership algorithm takes place only if the absolute value of the error exceeds the error bound so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= |d(i) - \mathbf{w}^T(i) \mathbf{x}(i)| \\ &= |d(i) - (\mathbf{w}(i-1) + \mu(i) e(i) \mathbf{x}(i))^T \mathbf{x}(i)| \\ &= |e(i)| (1 - \mu(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

which leads to the final step-size of the algorithm given by

$$\mu(i) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|}\right), & |e(i)| > \gamma \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

resulting in the SM-NLMS update recursion:

$$\mathbf{w}(i) = \mathbf{w}(i-1) + \mu(i) e(i) \mathbf{x}(i), \quad (11)$$

where  $\mu(i)$  is given by (10).

Set-membership adaptive algorithms have sparse updates and variable step-size, which are useful to ensure a fast learning. Prior work on set-membership algorithms that exploit sparsity includes the studies in [14], [17], [45]. However, the problem of adjusting the regularization term and the resulting penalty imposed on the cost function remains open. In this sense, we are interested in developing algorithms capable of performing sparse updates and exploiting sparsity in signals and systems. However, there has been no attempt to devise a strategy based on the error bound to automatically adjust the regularization term together with the step size.

## III. PROPOSED SPARSITY-AWARE SM ALGORITHMS WITH ADJUSTABLE PENALTIES

In this section we introduce a framework for deriving sparsity-aware set-membership adaptive algorithms with adjustable penalties using arbitrary penalty functions. Then, we derive the proposed sparsity-aware set-membership algorithms with adjustable penalties based on a gradient descent approach.

### A. Derivation framework

Let us consider a mean-square error cost function with a general penalty function as described by

$$J[\mathbf{w}(i-1)] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E} (|e(i)|^2) + \alpha(i) f_l[\mathbf{w}(i-1)], \quad (12)$$

where the function  $f_l(\mathbf{w}[i-1])$  is a general penalty function used to improve the performance of adaptive algorithms in the presence of sparsity and  $\alpha(i)$  is a regularization term that imposes the desired penalty. The cost function can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J[\mathbf{w}(i-1)] &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E} [|d(i) - \mathbf{w}^T(i-1) \mathbf{x}(i)|^2] \\ &\quad + \alpha(i) f_l[\mathbf{w}(i-1)] \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Taking the instantaneous gradient of the cost function with respect to  $\mathbf{w}(i-1)$ , we obtain

$$\frac{\partial J[\mathbf{w}(i-1)]}{\partial \mathbf{w}(i-1)} = -e(i) \mathbf{x}(i) + \alpha(i) \mathbf{p}_f(i), \quad (14)$$

where we define  $\mathbf{p}_f(i) = \frac{\partial f_l[\mathbf{w}(i-1)]}{\partial \mathbf{w}(i-1)}$ . Replacing the result in the update equation, we get

$$\mathbf{w}(i) = \mathbf{w}(i-1) - \mu(i) (-e(i) \mathbf{x}(i) + \alpha(i) \mathbf{p}_f(i)). \quad (15)$$

Note that we employ a time index in  $\mu$  to designate a variable step-size following the SM-NLMS approach and that the updates are performed only if  $|e(i)| > \gamma$ , which leads to the general equation to update the weights:

$$\mathbf{w}(i) = \mathbf{w}(i-1) + \mu(i) e(i) \mathbf{x}(i) - \rho(i) \mathbf{p}_f(i), \quad (16)$$

where  $\rho(i) = \mu(i) \alpha(i)$ . Using an equality constraint, i.e., the a posteriori error  $|e_{ap}(i)| = \gamma$  we obtain,

$$\gamma = |d(i) - \mathbf{w}^T(i) \mathbf{x}(i)| \quad (17)$$

$$= |d(i) - \mathbf{w}^T(i-1) \mathbf{x}(i) - (\mu(i) e(i) \mathbf{x}(i) - \rho(i) \mathbf{p}_f(i))^T \mathbf{x}(i)|. \quad (18)$$

Multiplying both sides of the last equation by  $\frac{e_{ap}(i)}{|e_{ap}(i)|}$  results in

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \frac{e_{ap}(i)}{|e_{ap}(i)|} &= d(i) - \mathbf{w}^T(i-1) \mathbf{x}(i) \\ &\quad - \mu(i) e(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 + \rho(i) [\mathbf{p}_f(i)]^T \mathbf{x}(i) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \text{sign}(e_{ap}(i)) &= d(i) - \mathbf{w}^T(i-1) \mathbf{x}(i) \\ &\quad - \mu(i) e(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 + \rho(i) [\mathbf{p}_f(i)]^T \mathbf{x}(i) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Since the constraint forces that  $|e_{ap}(i)| = \gamma$ , then the function  $\text{sign}(e_{ap}(i))$  generates two possible equations given by,

$$\gamma = e(i) - \mu(i) e(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 + \rho(i) [\mathbf{p}_f(i)]^T \mathbf{x}(i) \quad (21)$$

$$-\gamma = e(i) - \mu(i) e(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 + \rho(i) [\mathbf{p}_f(i)]^T \mathbf{x}(i) \quad (22)$$

We can express equations (21) and (22) as a single equation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} e(i) \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|}\right) &= \mu(i) e(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 \\ &\quad - \alpha(i) \mu(i) [\mathbf{p}_f(i)]^T \mathbf{x}(i), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where we take into account that the term  $\left(1 + \frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|}\right)$  would produce a growing step-size, leading to a divergent algorithm. Isolating the step-size from the last equation we obtain

$$\mu(i) = \frac{e(i) \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|}\right)}{\left(e(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 - \alpha(i) \left[\frac{\partial f_l[\mathbf{w}(i-1)]}{\partial \mathbf{w}(i-1)}\right]^T \mathbf{x}(i)\right)}. \quad (24)$$

We then use equation (23) to update  $\alpha(i)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(i+1) \mu(i) [\mathbf{p}_f(i)]^T \mathbf{x}(i) &= e(i) \frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|} \\ &\quad + e(i) \mu(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 - e(i), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

TABLE I  
PENALTY FUNCTIONS

Function	Partial derivative
$f_l[\mathbf{w}(i)] = \ \mathbf{w}(i)\ _1$	$\text{sign}[\mathbf{w}(i)]$
$f_l[\mathbf{w}(i)] = \sum_{m=1}^M \log\left(1 + \frac{ \mathbf{w}_m(i) }{\varepsilon'}\right)$	$\left(\frac{\text{sign}[\mathbf{w}(i)]}{\varepsilon' +  \mathbf{w}(i) }\right)$
$f_l[\mathbf{w}(i)] = \ \mathbf{w}(i)\ _0 \approx \sum_{m=1}^M (1 - e^{-\beta \mathbf{w}_m(i) })$	$\beta e^{-\beta \mathbf{w}(i) } \text{sign}[\mathbf{w}(i)]$

$$\alpha(i+1) = \frac{e(i) \left[\frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|} + \mu(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 - 1\right]}{\mu(i) [\mathbf{p}_f(i)]^T \mathbf{x}(i)} \quad (26)$$

Equations (16), (24), (26) fully describe the proposed sparsity-aware SM-NLMS algorithm with adjustable penalties. We can easily show that if we set  $\alpha(i)$  to zero, which means that there is no penalty function being applied, then we get the conventional step size of the SM-NLMS algorithm. Table I summarizes the penalty functions used and their derivatives.

### B. Proposed ZA-SM-NLMS-ADP algorithm

In this section, we employ the previous derivation framework and the  $f_l[\mathbf{w}(i)] = \|\mathbf{w}(i)\|_1$  penalty function to devise the proposed zero-attracting SM-NLMS with adjustable penalties algorithm (ZA-SM-NLMS-ADP). Substituting the  $l_1$  regularization function and its derivative, we obtain the recursion and the step-size:

$$\mathbf{w}(i) = \mathbf{w}(i-1) + \mu(i) e(i) \mathbf{x}(i) - \rho(i) \text{sign}[\mathbf{w}(i-1)], \quad (27)$$

$$\mu(i) = \frac{e(i) \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|}\right)}{\left(e(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 - \alpha(i) \text{sign}[\mathbf{w}^T(i-1) \mathbf{x}(i)]\right)} \quad (28)$$

The regularization parameter that applies the adjustable penalties is given by

$$\alpha(i+1) = \frac{e(i) \left(\frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|} + \mu(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 - 1\right)}{\mu(i) \text{sign}[\mathbf{w}^T(i-1) \mathbf{x}(i)]} \quad (29)$$

### C. Proposed RZA-SM-NLMS-ADP algorithm

Here, we consider the derivation framework and use the log-sum penalty function  $f_l[\mathbf{w}(i)] = \sum_{n=1}^N \log\left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{w}_n(i)}{\varepsilon'}\right)$  to develop the reweighted zero-attracting SM-NLMS with adjustable penalties (ZA-SM-NLMS-ADP) algorithm whose recursions are given by

$$\mathbf{w}(i) = \mathbf{w}(i-1) + \mu(i) e(i) \mathbf{x}(i) - \rho(i) \left(\frac{\text{sign}[\mathbf{w}(i-1)]}{\varepsilon' + |\mathbf{w}(i-1)|}\right) \quad (30)$$

$$\mu(i) = \frac{e(i) \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|}\right)}{\left(e(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 - \alpha(i) \left(\frac{\text{sign}[\mathbf{w}^T(i-1)]}{\varepsilon' + |\mathbf{w}^T(i-1)|}\right) \mathbf{x}(i)\right)} \quad (31)$$

$$\alpha(i+1) = \frac{e(i) \left(\frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|} + \mu(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 - 1\right)}{\mu(i) \left(\frac{\text{sign}[\mathbf{w}^T(i-1)]}{\varepsilon' + |\mathbf{w}^T(i-1)|}\right) \mathbf{x}(i)} \quad (32)$$

#### D. Proposed EZA-SM-NLMS-ADP algorithm

Finally, we consider the derivation framework and an approximation to the  $l_0$  regularization function given by  $f_l[\mathbf{w}(i)] = \sum_{m=1}^M (1 - e^{-\beta|w_m(i)|})$  to devise the exponential zero-attractor SM-NLMS with adjustable penalties (EZA-SM-NLMS-ADP) algorithm. Consider the vector  $\mathbf{z}(i)$  defined by

$$\mathbf{z}(i) = \beta\rho(i) e^{-\beta|\mathbf{w}(i)|}. \quad (33)$$

Then, the update equation, the step size and the regularization term are given by

$$\mathbf{w}(i) = \mathbf{w}(i-1) + \mu(i) e(i) \mathbf{x}(i) - \mathbf{z}(i) (\text{sign}(\mathbf{w}(i))), \quad (34)$$

$$\mu(i) = \frac{e(i) \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|}\right)}{(e(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 - \mathbf{z}^T(i) (\text{sign}(\mathbf{w}^T(i-1))) \mathbf{x}(i))}, \quad (35)$$

$$\alpha(i+1) = \frac{e(i) \left(\frac{\gamma}{|e(i)|} + \mu(i) \|\mathbf{x}(i)\|^2 - 1\right)}{\mu(i) \mathbf{z}^T(i) (\text{sign}(\mathbf{w}^T(i-1))) \mathbf{x}(i)}. \quad (36)$$

#### IV. SIMULATIONS

In this section we assess the performance of the proposed algorithms for a sparse system identification task. For this purpose we consider a system modeled by a finite impulse response (FIR) filter with 64 taps in three different scenarios. The first scenario represents a sparse system where only four taps have values different from zero. In the second case, a semi-sparse model with 32 equispaced nonzero coefficients is considered. In the last scenario, we explore the case where there is no sparsity in the system, so that all taps contribute to calculate the output. The input signal follows a Gaussian distribution with a signal to noise ratio of 20 dB. The desired signal is corrupted by white additive Gaussian noise with  $\sigma_n = 0.04$ . The step-size for the NLMS and the PNLMS algorithms was set to 0.5 and the error bound was fixed to  $\gamma = \sqrt{5}\sigma_n$ . A maximum value of  $\alpha(i+1) = 10^{-3}$  was set to maintain the stability of the algorithms.




Fig. 1. Learning curves of the NLMS-based algorithms

In the first example, we compare the performance of NLMS-type algorithms without adjustable penalties. Each algorithm runs for 3500 iterations, where the first 1000 corresponds to

TABLE II  
% OF UPDATES

Algorithm	Update Rate
ZA-SM-NLMS-ADP	%
RZA-SM-NLMS-ADP	%
EZA-SM-NLMS-ADP	%

the first scenario described, the next 1000 iterations corresponds to the second scenario and the last 1500 iterations considered the third scenario. A total of 3000 runs were performed and then averaged to obtain the final learning curves. The results shown in Fig. 1 indicate that the sparsity-aware SM-NLMS algorithms with different penalty functions outperform the conventional NLMS and the PNLMS algorithms.

In the second example, we evaluate the performance of the proposed RZA-SM-NLMS-ADP algorithm. For this comparison we also considered the oracle SM-NLMS algorithms [46] that assumes the knowledge of the positions of the nonzero coefficients. In this sense, the oracle algorithm fully exploits the sparsity of the system, being considered as the optimal algorithm. In this example, a total of 4000 iterations were performed, where the first 2000 iterations corresponds to the sparse scenario and the last 2000 iterations considered the semi-sparse scenario. All other parameters remain the same. The results depicted in Fig. 2 show that the adjustable penalties  $\alpha(i)$  can provide a small but consistent gain over the fixed penalty approach. Table II summarizes the update rate performed by the proposed algorithms in a sparse scenario.




Fig. 2. Learning curves of the RZA-SM-NLMS based algorithms

In the third example, we assess the proposed EZA-SM-NLMS-ADP algorithm against the other proposed and existing techniques. The results shown in Fig. 3 demonstrate that EZA-SM-NLMS-ADP has the fastest convergence speed among the conventional and sparsity-aware algorithms.

Finally, we consider two different correlated inputs to evaluate the performance of the proposed EZA-SM-NLMS-ADP algorithm. The input is generated by a white Gaussian sequence  $v(i)$ , uncorrelated with the noise. Then this signal




Fig. 3. Learning curves of the proposed EZA-SM-NLMS-ADP and other algorithms

is passed through two different IIR filters described by

$$x_1(i) = 0.7x(i-1) + v(i) \quad (37)$$

$$x_4(i) = 0.8x(i-1) + 0.19x(i-2) + 0.09x(i-3) - 0.5x(i-4) + v(i), \quad (38)$$

which corresponds to first- and fourth-order autoregressive (AR) processes, respectively [1]. For the learning curves, we consider a total of 5000 iterations, where the first 5000 iterations corresponds to the sparse scenario and the last set of iterations represent the semi-sparse scenario. The results in Fig. 4 show that a correlated input slows the converge speed and increases the steady-state MSE. In such cases, applying a penalty function improves both results, the convergence speed and the steady-state MSE.




Fig. 4. Performance of the EZA-SM-NLMS-ADP and the SM-NLMS algorithm with correlated inputs

## V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper data selective sparsity-aware algorithms with adjustable penalty functions have been presented, namely, the ZA-SM-NLMS-ADP, the RZA-SM-NLMS-ADP and the EZA-SM-NLMS-ADP adaptive algorithms. These algorithms have a faster convergence speed than conventional algorithms

that implement fixed penalty functions. In addition, the data-selective updates performed by these algorithms can save computational resources. Future work will focus on the statistical analysis of the proposed algorithms.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the CNPq, and FAPERJ Brazilian agencies for funding.  
sorting

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Haykin, *Adaptive Filter Theory*, fifth edition ed. Pearson, 2014.
- [2] D. L. Duttweiler, "Proportionate normalized least-mean-squares adaptation in echo cancelers," *IEEE Transactions on Speech and Audio Processing*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 508 – 518, August 2000.
- [3] J. Benesty and S. L. Gay, "An improved PNLM algorithm," *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, 2002.
- [4] H. Deng and M. Doroslovacki, "Proportionate adaptive algorithms for network echo cancellation," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 1794 – 1803, April 2006.
- [5] L. Liu, M. Fukamoto, and S. Saiki, "An improved mu-law proportionate NLMS algorithm," *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2008.
- [6] F. de Sousa, O. Tobias, R. Seara, and D. R. Morgan, "A PNLM algorithm with individual activation factors," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 2036 – 2047, April 2010.
- [7] S. Gollamudi, S. Nagaraj, and Y. Kapoor, S. and Huang, "Set-membership filtering and a set-membership normalized LMS algorithm with an adaptive step size," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 111–114, May 1998.
- [8] R. de Lamare and P. Diniz, "Set membership adaptive filtering algorithms based on time-varying error bounds and their application to interference suppression," in *IEEE Intern. Telecom. Symp.*, 2006, pp. 563–567.
- [9] T. Wang, R. C. de Lamare, and P. D. Mitchell, "Low-complexity set-membership channel estimation for cooperative wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 2594–2607, 2011.
- [10] P. Clarke and R. C. de Lamare, "Low-complexity reduced-rank linear interference suppression based on set-membership joint iterative optimization for ds-cdma systems," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 60, no. 9, pp. 4324–4337, 2011.
- [11] R. C. De Lamare and P. S. Diniz, "Blind adaptive interference suppression based on set-membership constrained constant-modulus algorithms with dynamic bounds," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, no. 99, pp. 1–1, 2013.
- [12] L. Wang and R. C. DeLamare, "Low-complexity constrained adaptive reduced-rank beamforming algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 2114–2128, 2013.
- [13] L. Wang and R. C. de Lamare, "Set-membership constrained conjugate gradient adaptive algorithm for beamforming," *IET Signal Processing*, vol. 6, no. 8, pp. 789–797, 2012.
- [14] S. Werner, J. A. Apolinário, P. S. R. Diniz, and T. I. Laakso, "A set-membership approach to normalized proportionate adaptation algorithms," *13th European Signal Processing Conference*, 2005.
- [15] O. Hoshuyama, R. A. Goubran, and A. Sugiyama, "A generalized proportionate variable step-size algorithm for fast changing acoustic environments," *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2004.
- [16] C. Paleologu, S. Ciochina, and J. Benesty, "An efficient proportionate affine projection algorithm for echo cancellation," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 165 – 168, February 2010.
- [17] S. Werner, J. A. Apolinário, and P. S. R. Diniz, "Set-membership proportionate affine projection algorithms," *EURASIP Journal on Audio, Speech and Music Processing*, 2007.
- [18] Y. Chen, Y. Gu, and A. Hero, "Sparse LMS for system identification," *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. 3125–3128, April 2009.
- [19] R. C. De Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, "Adaptive reduced-rank mmse filtering with interpolated fir filters and adaptive interpolators," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 177–180, 2005.

- [20] —, “Reduced-rank adaptive filtering based on joint iterative optimization of adaptive filters,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 14, no. 12, pp. 980–983, 2007.
- [21] R. C. de Lamare, M. Haardt, and R. Sampaio-Neto, “Blind adaptive constrained reduced-rank parameter estimation based on constant modulus design for cdma interference suppression,” *IEEE Trans on Signal Processing*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 2470–2482, 2008.
- [22] N. Song, R. C. de Lamare, M. Haardt, and M. Wolf, “Adaptive widely linear reduced-rank interference suppression based on the multistage wiener filter,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 4003–4016, 2012.
- [23] N. Song, W. U. Alokzai, R. C de Lamare, and M. Haardt, “Adaptive widely linear reduced-rank beamforming based on joint iterative optimization,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, no. 99, pp. 1–1, 2014.
- [24] L. Wang and R. C. de Lamare, “Constrained adaptive filtering algorithms based on conjugate gradient techniques for beamforming,” *IET Signal Processing*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 686–697, 2010.
- [25] R. C. De Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, “Reduced-rank space–time adaptive interference suppression with joint iterative least squares algorithms for spread-spectrum systems,” *IEEE transactions on vehicular technology*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 1217–1228, 2010.
- [26] L. Landau, R. C. de Lamare, and M. Haardt, “Robust adaptive beamforming algorithms using the constrained constant modulus criterion,” *IET Signal Processing*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 447–457, 2013.
- [27] R. C. De Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, “Adaptive reduced-rank equalization algorithms based on alternating optimization design techniques for mimo systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 2482–2494, 2011.
- [28] R. C. de Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, “Adaptive reduced-rank processing based on joint and iterative interpolation, decimation, and filtering,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 2503–2514, 2009.
- [29] R. Fa, R. C. de Lamare, and L. Wang, “Reduced-rank stap schemes for airborne radar based on switched joint interpolation, decimation and filtering algorithm,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 8, pp. 4182–4194, 2010.
- [30] Y. Zhaocheng, R. De Lamare, and L. Xiang, “L1 regularized stap algorithm with a generalized sidelobe canceler architecture for airborne radar,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 674–686, 2012.
- [31] R. Fa and R. C. De Lamare, “Reduced-rank stap algorithms using joint iterative optimization of filters,” *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 1668–1684, 2011.
- [32] Z. Yang, R. C. De Lamare, and X. Li, “Sparsity-aware space–time adaptive processing algorithms with l1-norm regularisation for airborne radar,” *IET signal processing*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 413–423, 2012.
- [33] Y. Cai, R. C. de Lamare, B. Champagne, B. Qin, and M. Zhao, “Adaptive reduced-rank receive processing based on minimum symbol-error-rate criterion for large-scale multiple-antenna systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 4185–4201, 2015.
- [34] H. Ruan and R. C de Lamare, “Robust adaptive beamforming using a low-complexity shrinkage-based mismatch estimation algorithm,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 60–64, 2014.
- [35] F. G. A. Neto, R. C. De Lamare, V. H. Nascimento, and Y. V. Zakharov, “Adaptive reweighting homotopy algorithms applied to beamforming,” *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 1902–1915, 2015.
- [36] S. Xu, R. C. de Lamare, and H. V. Poor, “Adaptive link selection algorithms for distributed estimation,” *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing*, vol. 2015, no. 1, p. 86, 2015.
- [37] L. Qiu, Y. Cai, R. C. de Lamare, and M. Zhao, “Reduced-rank doa estimation algorithms based on alternating low-rank decomposition,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 565–569, 2016.
- [38] H. Ruan and R. de Lamare, “Robust adaptive beamforming based on low-rank and cross-correlation techniques,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 15, pp. 3919–3932, 2016.
- [39] S. Xu, R. C. de Lamare, and H. V. Poor, “Distributed compressed estimation based on compressive sensing,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 1311–1315, 2015.
- [40] T. G. Miller, S. Xu, R. C. de Lamare, and H. V. Poor, “Distributed spectrum estimation based on alternating mixed discrete-continuous adaptation,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 551–555, 2016.
- [41] R. Meng, R. C. de Lamare, and V. H. Nascimento, “Sparsity-aware affine projection adaptive algorithms for system identification,” *Sensor Signal Processing for Defence*, 2011.
- [42] X. Hong, J. Gao, and S. Chen, “Zero attracting recursive least squares algorithms,” *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 2016.
- [43] E. M. Eksioğlu and A. K. Tanc, “RLS algorithm with convex regularization,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 470 – 473, August 2011.
- [44] D. Angelosante, J. Bazerque, and G. Giannakis, “Online adaptive estimation of sparse signals: Where RLS meets the  $\ell_1$ -norm,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 3436–3447, July 2010.
- [45] M. Lima, T. Ferreira, A. Martins, and P. Diniz, “Sparsity-aware data-selective adaptive filters,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, no. 17, pp. 4557–4572, August 2014.
- [46] R. de Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, “Sparsity-aware adaptive algorithms based on alternating optimization and shrinkage,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 225–229, January 2014.
- [47] B. K. Das, L. A. Azpicueta-Ruiz, M. Chakraborty, and J. Arenas-Garcia, “A comparative study of two popular families of sparsity-aware adaptive filters,” *4th International Workshop on Cognitive Information Processing*, 2014.
- [48] R. C. de Lamare and P. Diniz, “Set-membership adaptive algorithms based on time-varying error bounds for CDMA interference suppression,” *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 644 – 654, February 2009.