

Linear and Nonlinear MMSE Estimation in One-Bit Quantized Systems under a Gaussian Mixture Prior

Benedikt Fesl, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE* and Wolfgang Utschick, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—We present new fundamental results for the mean square error (MSE)-optimal conditional mean estimator (CME) in one-bit quantized systems for a Gaussian mixture model (GMM) distributed signal of interest, possibly corrupted by additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN). We first derive novel closed-form analytic expressions for the Bussgang estimator, the well-known linear minimum mean square error (MMSE) estimator in quantized systems. Afterward, closed-form analytic expressions for the CME in special cases are presented, revealing that the optimal estimator is linear in the one-bit quantized observation, opposite to higher resolution cases. Through a comparison to the recently studied Gaussian case, we establish a novel MSE inequality and show that the signal of interest is correlated with the auxiliary quantization noise. We extend our analysis to multiple observation scenarios, examining the MSE-optimal transmit sequence and conducting an asymptotic analysis, yielding analytic expressions for the MSE and its limit. These contributions have broad impact for the analysis and design of various signal processing applications.

Index Terms—One-bit quantization, Bussgang, conditional mean estimator, mean square error, Gaussian mixture, MMSE.

I. INTRODUCTION

BAYESIAN estimators are a cornerstone in classical estimation theory, affecting many signal processing applications. In particular, the CME as the optimal estimator for all Bregman loss functions, with the MSE as the most prominent representative [1], is of great importance. This has led to the analysis of the CME and its properties under various conditions, e.g., in an AWGN channel [2] or with different noise models [3]. In particular, the cases where the CME is linear are of great interest due to the practical implications [4].

Despite its great importance in signal processing, the CME lacks theoretical understanding in quantized systems, which, e.g., occur in the modeling of analog-to-digital converters (ADCs), imposing a nonlinear inverse problem. Natural fields of application are, e.g, lossy compression [5], wireless sensor networks [6], audio coding [7], control theory [8], positioning [9], or channel estimation [10], [11]. Recently, the CME was examined in case of one-bit quantization in a jointly Gaussian setting [12], [13]; it was shown that the CME is linear in the quantized observation in many special cases, although it necessitates an elaborate numerical evaluation in general.

A viable alternative, in general, is the linear MMSE estimator, which can be derived via the Bussgang decomposition [11], [14], [15], motivated by Bussgang’s theorem [16], or, alternatively, the additive quantization noise model [17]. Moreover, the statistically equivalent linear model via the Bussgang

decomposition allows for theoretical system analysis, e.g., spectral efficiency [11], capacity [18], nonideal hardware effects [19], [20], or nonlinear system characterization [21]–[23]. However, similar to the analysis of the CME, the Bussgang estimator was mainly investigated for the case of a zero-mean Gaussian distributed signal, allowing for closed-form solutions of the Bussgang gain [24, Sec. 9.2] and the covariance matrix of the quantized observation via the *arcsine law* [25], [26].

A natural generalization of the zero-mean Gaussian case is the zero-mean GMM, which covers a wide class of probability density functions (PDFs) that can be reasonably approximated, especially in wireless communications [27], [28]. This has motivated the analysis of the Bussgang gain for GMM distributed signals [29], [30]. However, the Bussgang decomposition has not been fully investigated for the general multivariate case for one-bit quantization. More importantly, the linear MMSE and the CME for a GMM prior are not investigated thus far.

The *contributions* of this letter are as follows: We generalize the analytic expressions for the Bussgang gain and the arcsine law from the Gaussian case to the general GMM case, which is important for the evaluation of the linear MMSE estimator. Afterward, we study the CME estimator in different special cases. We derive a novel closed-form solution for the CME in the univariate case, which turns out to be linear in the observation and thus equal to the Bussgang estimator. This allows for finding an analytic expression of the cross-correlation between the signal of interest and the auxiliary quantization noise from the Bussgang decomposition, which is vanishing in both the low and high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) regimes or in the degenerate Gaussian case. Furthermore, we derive a novel MSE inequality, revealing that the GMM distribution leads to a consistently higher MSE than the Gaussian distribution under a fixed global variance constraint.

Subsequently, we investigate a multiple observation scenario, where the MSE-optimal observation sequence and two equivalent expressions of the CME for the noiseless case are derived. Subsequent to finding analytic expressions of the MSE and its limit, the MSE inequality is shown to also hold for this case. All theoretical results are validated with numerical experiments. In addition, more general cases are evaluated, highlighting the strong impact of *stochastic resonance*.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

We consider the generic system equation $\mathbf{R} = Q(\mathbf{Y}) = Q(\mathbf{h}\mathbf{a}^T + \mathbf{N}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times M}$ where $\mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_M]$ contains M quantized observations of the vector of interest $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ with the known vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^M$ that fulfills the power

The authors are with Chair of Signal Processing, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany (e-mail: benedikt.fesl@tum.de; utschick@tum.de).

constraint $\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 = M$. Let the vector $\mathbf{h} \sim p(\mathbf{h})$ be a zero-mean GMM random variable (RV), i.e.,

$$p(\mathbf{h}) = \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbf{h}; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{C}_k) \quad (1)$$

with the global covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}_h = \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \mathbf{C}_k$. Further, $\mathbf{N} = [\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_M]$ where $\mathbf{n}_i \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbf{0}, \eta^2 \mathbf{I})$ is AWGN and $Q(\cdot) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\text{sign}(\Re(\cdot)) + j \text{sign}(\Im(\cdot)))$ is the complex-valued one-bit quantization function, which is applied element-wise to the input vector/matrix. The system model can be equivalently described in its (column-wise) vectorized form as

$$\mathbf{r} = Q(\mathbf{y}) = Q(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{h} + \mathbf{n}) \in \mathbb{C}^{NM} \quad (2)$$

with $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{r} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{R})$, $\mathbf{y} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{Y})$, and $\mathbf{n} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{N})$.

III. THE BUSSGANG ESTIMATOR

In the context of quantization, the linear MMSE estimator is referred to as the Bussgang estimator [11], as it is motivated by Bussgang's theorem [16]. In particular, the Bussgang decomposition implies that the system (2) can be linearized as the statistically equivalent model

$$\mathbf{r} = Q(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{q}, \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{B} is the Bussgang gain, enforcing that \mathbf{q} is uncorrelated (but not independent) of \mathbf{y} . The Bussgang estimator reads as

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\text{LMMSE}} = \mathbf{C}_{hr} \mathbf{C}_r^{-1} \mathbf{r} = (\mathbf{C}_h \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{B}^H + \mathbf{C}_{hq}) \mathbf{C}_r^{-1} \mathbf{r}. \quad (4)$$

In the case of jointly zero-mean Gaussian quantizer input, it is well-known that \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{C}_r can be computed in closed-form, and $\mathbf{C}_{hq} = \mathbf{0}$, cf. [11], [24, Sec. 9.2]. Although the zero-mean GMM is a natural generalization, covering a much larger class of PDFs that can be approximated, the expressions for \mathbf{C}_{hr} , \mathbf{B} , and \mathbf{C}_r in case of one-bit quantization are not fully investigated thus far. This motivates the derivation of these expressions in the following.

Theorem 1. *The involved quantities for the linear MMSE estimator (4) are computed as*

$$\mathbf{B} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \text{diag}(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k} \mathbf{C}_y^{-1}, \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_{hr} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \mathbf{C}_k \mathbf{A}^H \text{diag}(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k})^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_r = \frac{2}{\pi} \sum_{k=1}^K p_k (\sin^{-1}(\Re(\bar{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{y}|k})) + j \sin^{-1}(\Im(\bar{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{y}|k}))) \quad (7)$$

with $\bar{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{y}|k} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k} \text{diag}(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\mathbf{C}_y = \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k}$ where $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{C}_k \mathbf{A}^H + \eta^2 \mathbf{I}$.

Proof: See Appendix A.

Remark 1. *The Bussgang gain (5) is in accordance with the findings in [30]; however, the authors only discuss the univariate case, and one-bit quantization is not analyzed. In contrast to the Gaussian case, the Bussgang gain (5) is not a diagonal matrix in general, which aligns with the statement*

in [14]. The expression (7) can be interpreted as a weighted version of the arcsine law [25], [26]. Since GMMs are universal approximators [31], a straightforward application of the above results is to approximate an unknown density with a GMM, allowing to compute the linear MMSE estimator. A similar approach was adopted in [27].

Corollary 1. *Based on the results of Theorem 1, the cross-covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}_{hq} = \mathbf{C}_{hr} - \mathbf{C}_h \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{B}^H$ of the signal of interest \mathbf{h} and the auxiliary quantization noise \mathbf{q} in (3) is*

$$\mathbf{C}_{hq} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \left(\mathbf{C}_k \mathbf{A}^H \text{diag}(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k})^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{C}_h \mathbf{A}^H \text{diag}(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k} \mathbf{C}_y^{-1} \right), \quad (8)$$

contrary to the Gaussian case, where $\mathbf{C}_{hq} = \mathbf{0}$ [11].

After deriving the linear MMSE estimator for the general case, we investigate the CME in the following, where we particularly discuss special cases in which it is linear.

IV. THE CONDITIONAL MEAN ESTIMATOR

In the general case, the CME is not analytically tractable, necessitating a numeric approach to solve the involved integral expressions. However, when rewriting the CME as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{r}] &= \sum_{k=1}^K p(k|\mathbf{r}) \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}|\mathbf{r}, k] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{p_k}{\sum_{i=1}^K p_i p(\mathbf{r}|i)} \int \mathbf{h} p(\mathbf{h}|k) p(\mathbf{r}|\mathbf{h}) d\mathbf{h}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

utilizing the law of total expectation and Bayes' rule, all involved densities are conditioned on a GMM component. This allows for effectively treating them as in the Gaussian case, directly enabling simplified numerical evaluations discussed in [12], [13], whose discussion is left out due to space limitations. However, we derive novel closed-form analytic solutions of the CME for special cases in the following, accompanied by comparisons to the Gaussian case analyzed in [12], [13].

A. Univariate Case with a Single Observation

We consider the case of a scalar system $r = Q(h + n)$ with $h \sim \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \sigma_k^2)$ and $n \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \eta^2)$.

Theorem 2. *The CME for the scalar system is computed as*

$$\mathbb{E}[h|r] = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \frac{\sigma_k^2}{\sqrt{\sigma_k^2 + \eta^2}} r. \quad (11)$$

Proof: See Appendix B.

Remark 2. *Remarkably, in contrast to the high-resolution case, the CME is linear in the quantized observation, i.e., the optimal estimator becomes linear through the specific nonlinearity of the quantization process. Furthermore, the jointly Gaussian case is not unique for the CME to be linear, in contrast to linear AWGN channels [4]. The result can be immediately extended to a multivariate zero-mean GMM with diagonal covariances.*

The MSE of the CME is then computed to

$$\text{MSE}_{\text{GMM}} = \sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 - \frac{2}{\pi} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K p_k \frac{\sigma_k^2}{\sqrt{\sigma_k^2 + \eta^2}} \right)^2 \quad (12)$$

where $\sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \sigma_k^2$ is the global variance.

An interesting analysis is a comparison to the case of a Gaussian distributed RV with the same global variance, i.e., $h \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \sigma_{\text{glob}}^2)$, for which the closed-form MSE of the corresponding CME is given as, cf. [12],

$$\text{MSE}_{\text{Gauss}} = \sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 - \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\sigma_{\text{glob}}^4}{\sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 + \eta^2}. \quad (13)$$

This allows to compare the estimation performance of the CMEs when changing the distribution of the RV of interest from a Gaussian to a GMM while keeping the global variance fixed. We note that both estimators are optimal with respect to the considered distribution.

Theorem 3. *For the considered scalar system, under a fixed global variance σ_{glob}^2 , it holds for all SNRs that*

$$\text{MSE}_{\text{Gauss}} \leq \text{MSE}_{\text{GMM}}. \quad (14)$$

Proof: See Appendix C.

Remark 3. *In the high SNR regime, we get*

$$\lim_{\eta^2 \rightarrow 0} \text{MSE}_{\text{GMM}} = \sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 - \frac{2}{\pi} \bar{\sigma}^2 \quad (15)$$

with $\bar{\sigma} = \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \sigma_k$, and the inequality (14) directly follows from the weighted Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\bar{\sigma}^2 \leq \sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 \quad (16)$$

with equality if and only if $\sigma_k^2 = \sigma^2$ for all $k = 1, \dots, K$, i.e., when the GMM degenerates to a Gaussian. The observation that a GMM distribution leads to a strictly higher MMSE than the Gaussian distribution under a fixed global variance constraint is not stated in the literature so far.

Due to the linearity of the CME, it is equal to the Bussgang estimator, representing the linear MMSE, cf. Section III. Using the result of Corollary 1, we can further compute

$$\mathbb{E}[hq^*] = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \left(\frac{\sigma_k^2}{\sqrt{\sigma_k^2 + \eta^2}} - \frac{\sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 \sqrt{\sigma_k^2 + \eta^2}}{\sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 + \eta^2} \right), \quad (17)$$

which is in contrast to the Gaussian case where $\mathbb{E}[hq^*] = 0$ [11, Appendix A]. Moreover, the correlation $\mathbb{E}[hq^*]$ vanishes in both the low and high SNR regime, i.e.,

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[hq^*] = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}[hq^*] = 0. \quad (18)$$

B. Univariate Noiseless Case with Multiple Observations

We consider the noiseless case with multiple pilot observations $\mathbf{r} = Q(\mathbf{a}h)$, for which the closed-form CME together with the optimal pilot sequence was derived in [12] for the Gaussian case. First, we show that the pilot sequence for the Gaussian case is also MSE-optimal for the GMM case.

Theorem 4. *The MSE-optimal pilot sequence for the considered system contains equidistant phase shifts $\psi_m = \frac{\pi(m-1)}{2M}$ for all $m = 1, \dots, M$, such that $[\mathbf{a}]_m = \exp(j\psi_m)$.*

Proof: See Appendix D.

Remark 4. *In contrast to the Gaussian case, the amplitudes of the GMM are not Rayleigh distributed, which does not impact the design of the optimal pilot sequence since the amplitude information is lost through the one-bit quantization, and the circular symmetry property is not affected [32].*

Theorem 5. *The CME for the considered system has the two equivalent expressions*

$$\mathbb{E}[h|\mathbf{r}] = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \sigma_k \mathbf{a}^H \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} \mathbf{r} \quad (19)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \frac{2M\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4M}\right) \exp(j\varphi(\mathbf{r})) \quad (20)$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1}$ is equivalent to the analytic expression that solely depends on the number of pilots from the Gaussian case [12, Lemma 1], and $\varphi(\mathbf{r}) = \angle\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M [\mathbf{r}]_m\right) - \frac{(M-1)\pi}{4M}$ [12].

Proof: See Appendix E.

Remark 5. *The result of Theorem 5 is interesting since it leads to two equivalent formulations of the CME, one being linear and one being nonlinear in the observation. This allows for different but equivalent implementations of the optimal estimator in a practical system. Moreover, the expression (20) allows for a simplified formulation of the closed-form analytic MSE in the following.*

The MSE of the CME (20) is computed to

$$\text{MSE}_{\text{GMM}} = \sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 - \frac{4M^2}{\pi} \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{4M}\right) \bar{\sigma}^2. \quad (21)$$

Thus, we get in the limit of infinitely many pilots, cf. [12],

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \text{MSE}_{\text{GMM}} = \sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 - \frac{\pi}{4} \bar{\sigma}^2. \quad (22)$$

Observing the MSE expression for the Gaussian case in [12], under a fixed global variance σ_{glob}^2 , we directly see by the weighted Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (16) that

$$\text{MSE}_{\text{Gauss}} \leq \text{MSE}_{\text{GMM}} \quad (23)$$

holds for all numbers of observations M , generalizing the result from (14).

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

For each simulation, we draw 10,000 samples from a GMM for estimating the normalized MSE $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{h} - \hat{\mathbf{h}}\|_2^2] / \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{h}\|_2^2]$.

In Fig. 1, we choose a ground-truth GMM with $K = 2$ components with the weights $p_1 = 0.8$ and $p_2 = 0.2$ and $N = 64$ -dimensional randomly chosen covariances following to the procedure in [12], which are afterward scaled with a factor of 0.1 and 10 for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$, respectively. This resembles a simple GMM where the differences to the Gaussian case are evident. We compare the linear MMSE estimator (4) with the quantities derived in Theorem 1 to the suboptimal linear




Fig. 1. Comparison of the linear MMSE estimator with the suboptimal estimator assuming a Gaussian prior for $N = 64$ and $M \in \{1, 8, 16, 32\}$.




Fig. 2. MSE results of the CME from Theorem 2 for the univariate case $r = Q(h + n)$ in comparison with the Gaussian case, validating Theorem 3.

Bussgang estimator assuming a Gaussian prior $\mathcal{N}_C(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{C}_h)$ (mism. Gauss) for $M \in \{1, 8, 16, 32\}$ with the pilot sequence from Theorem 4. The Gaussian approximation is tight in the low SNR regime but shows a considerable gap for medium and high SNRs, highlighting the importance of the novel derived linear MMSE estimator for the GMM case.

In the following, we consider the same GMM but for $N = 1$, where we choose $\sigma_1^2 = 0.1$ and $\sigma_2^2 = 10$, which are afterward normalized such that $\sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 = 1$. This ensures that the inequality (16) has a non-negligible gap.

We first verify the result of Theorem 2 for the univariate case with $N = M = 1$ in Fig. 2. It can be seen that the analytic MSE expression (12) is on par with the evaluation of the CME (11), converging to the noiseless case (15). Additionally, we have evaluated the estimator where the cross-correlation $\mathbb{E}[hq^*]$ is neglected (mism. corr.), which shows a performance loss in the medium SNR regime, being in accordance with (18); the estimator that erroneously assumes a Gaussian distributed input, evaluating the CME from [12] (mism. Gauss) deteriorates from the CME with a considerable gap. The CME when the distribution is changed to a Gaussian and its limit show a clearly lower MSE over the whole SNR range, validating Theorem 3 and Remark 3.

Fig. 3 assesses the CME from Theorem 5 for the MSE-optimal pilot sequence in Theorem 4 in the noiseless case. It can be observed that the limit is achieved already with a few observations, similar to the Gaussian case [12], which yields a lower MSE for all observations, cf. (23).




Fig. 3. Performance of the CME from Theorem 5 for the MSE-optimal pilot sequence from Theorem 4 in comparison to the Gaussian case.




Fig. 4. Comparison of the CME with the MSE-optimal transmit sequence to the Gaussian case for $r = Q(ah + n)$ with $M \in \{1, 5, 10\}$.

Finally, Fig. 4 evaluates the CME for the noisy case with multiple observations, i.e., $r = Q(ah + n)$, which has no analytic expression and is computed numerically via the algorithm from [33], implemented in [34], cf. [12]. It can be seen that the MSE limit for infinitely many observations without AWGN is drastically outperformed with only a few observations and finite SNRs. This behavior is attributed to the fundamental effect of *stochastic resonance* [35], where noise can improve the performance in a quantized system. In comparison to the Gaussian case with the same global variance $\sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 = 1$ (CME Gauss), the stochastic resonance effect seems to be more pronounced, and the MSE inequality does not hold anymore, especially with more observations and in the low SNR regime. Moreover, the sub-optimal low-complexity linear MMSE estimator (4) (LMMSE GMM) degrades from the CME, especially for higher numbers of observations.

Further results are shown in Appendix F.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have presented novel fundamental results for the linear MMSE estimator and the CME in one-bit quantized systems for GMM distributed inputs. In addition to novel closed-form solutions for the CME, highlighting its linearity in special cases, a new MSE inequality regarding the Gaussian and GMM case was established, which also holds in the analyzed asymptotic regime. However, this inequality does not hold in the general case as the GMM shows a more pronounced stochastic resonance effect. The presented results are of use for various signal processing applications.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. We first observe that $\mathbf{y} \sim \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k})$ with $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{C}_k\mathbf{A}^H + \eta^2\mathbf{I}$ due to the Gaussianity of the noise. Thus, $\mathbf{y}|k \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k})$, which is used in the following. Utilizing the law of total expectation for the definition of the Bussgang gain, cf. [14], yields

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbb{E}[Q(\mathbf{y})\mathbf{y}^H] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}^H]^{-1} \quad (24)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \mathbb{E}[Q(\mathbf{y})\mathbf{y}^H|k] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}^H]^{-1}. \quad (25)$$

The solution of $\mathbb{E}[Q(\mathbf{y})\mathbf{y}^H|k] = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \text{diag}(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k}$ is known from the Gaussian case, cf., e.g., [24, Sec. 9.2], yielding the result in (5). Similarly, the cross-covariance matrix (6) is computed as

$$\mathbf{C}_{hr} = \mathbb{E}[h\mathbf{r}^H] = \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \mathbb{E}[hQ(\mathbf{y})^H|k] \quad (26)$$

where $\mathbb{E}[hQ(\mathbf{y})^H] = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \mathbf{C}_k \mathbf{A}^H \text{diag}(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{y}|k})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is known from the Gaussian case, cf., e.g., [11]. Finally, the computation of the covariance matrix \mathbf{C}_r is a direct consequence of the law of total expectation, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}^H] = \mathbb{E}[Q(\mathbf{y})Q(\mathbf{y})^H] = \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \mathbb{E}[Q(\mathbf{y})Q(\mathbf{y})^H|k] \quad (27)$$

and the known solution for the Gaussian case, known as the *arcsine law*, cf. [25], [26]. \square

B. Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. We observe that $p(k|\mathbf{r}) = p_k$ for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ in (9) since the zero-mean GMM is symmetric around the origin, and thus, the quantized observation is uninformative for evaluating the responsibility. The solution of

$$\mathbb{E}[h|r, k] = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{\sigma_k^2}{\sqrt{\sigma_k^2 + \eta^2}} r \quad (28)$$

is known from the Gaussian case, see, e.g., [12]. \square

C. Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. Comparing (12) and (13), after removing the equivalent terms and taking the square root on both sides, we need to show that

$$\sum_{k=1}^K p_k \frac{\sigma_k^2}{\sqrt{\sigma_k^2 + \eta^2}} \leq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K p_k \sigma_k^2}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^K p_k \sigma_k^2 + \eta^2}}. \quad (29)$$

Since the weights p_k form a convex combination, (29) holds if $f(x) = \frac{x}{\sqrt{x+\eta^2}}$ is a concave function for all $x > 0$ based on the definition of concave functions [36, Sec. 3.1.8]. Since

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} f(x) = -\frac{x + 4\eta^2}{4\sqrt{(\eta^2 + x)^5}} < 0 \text{ for all } x, \eta^2 > 0, \quad (30)$$

it follows that $f(x)$ is a concave function for all $x > 0$. Thus, (29) is fulfilled, finishing the proof. \square

D. Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. As a direct consequence of the circular symmetry of the individual Gaussians, it immediately follows that the zero-mean GMM distribution is also circularly symmetric and thus has uniformly distributed phases [32]. Based on this, the same proof holds as in [12, Appendix B], yielding the same MSE-optimal sequence. \square

E. Proof of Theorem 5

Proof. Similar to Theorem 2, the responsibility $p(k|\mathbf{r}) = p_k$ since the pilot observations contain no amplitude information. The solution $\mathbb{E}[h|\mathbf{r}, k]$ is given in [12]. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{y}|k} = \mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^H$ for all $k = 1, \dots, K$, the computation of \mathbf{C}_r in (7) degenerates to the Gaussian case. As both functions (19) and (20) lead to the same MSE [12], they are equivalent on the discrete input domain by the uniqueness of the CME [1, Th. 1]. \square

F. Additional Numerical Results

Fig. 5 shows the correlation $\mathbb{E}[hq^*]$ from (17) over the SNR for the same setting as in Fig. 2, which is vanishing in the low and high SNR regime in accordance with (18) and the performance loss in Fig. 2.




Fig. 5. Correlation of the RV of interest h with the quantization noise q , cf. Corollary 1, for the univariate case $r = Q(h+n)$.

Fig. 6 evaluates the same setting as in Fig. 4 but compares the MSE-optimal sequence for the noiseless case derived in Theorem 4 with the all-ones sequence $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{1}$. It can be observed that the pilot sequence from Theorem 4 outperforms the all-ones sequence in medium to high SNRs, highlighting its superiority also in the non-asymptotic SNR regime.




Fig. 6. Comparison of the CME with the MSE-optimal and the all-ones sequence for the case $r = Q(\mathbf{a}h+n)$ with $M \in \{1, 2, 5, 10\}$ and $\sigma_{\text{glob}}^2 = 1$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Banerjee, X. Guo, and H. Wang, "On the optimality of conditional expectation as a Bregman predictor," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 2664–2669, 2005.
- [2] D. Guo, Y. Wu, S. S. Shitz, and S. Verdú, "Estimation in Gaussian noise: Properties of the minimum mean-square error," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 2371–2385, 2011.
- [3] A. Dytso and H. V. Poor, "Properties of the conditional mean estimator in Poisson noise," in *IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2019, pp. 1–5.
- [4] E. Akyol, K. Viswanatha, and K. Rose, "On conditions for linearity of optimal estimation," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3497–3508, 2012.
- [5] A. Kipnis, Y. C. Eldar, and A. J. Goldsmith, "Fundamental distortion limits of analog-to-digital compression," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 64, no. 9, pp. 6013–6033, 2018.
- [6] S. Khobahi and M. Soltanalian, "Signal recovery from 1-bit quantized noisy samples via adaptive thresholding," in *52nd Asilomar Conf. Signals, Syst., Comput.*, 2018, pp. 1757–1761.
- [7] Y. You, *Audio Coding: Theory and Applications*. Springer NY, 2010.
- [8] R. E. Curry, *Estimation and Control with Quantized Measurements*. MIT Press, 1970.
- [9] F. Wendler, M. Stein, A. Mezghani, and J. A. Nossek, "Quantization-loss reduction for 1-bit BOC positioning," in *ION Int. Tech. Meeting (ITM)*, 2013, pp. 509–518.
- [10] M. Ivrlac and J. Nossek, "On MIMO channel estimation with single-bit signal-quantization," in *ITG Workshop Smart Antennas*, 2007.
- [11] Y. Li, C. Tao, G. Seco-Granados, A. Mezghani, A. L. Swindlehurst, and L. Liu, "Channel estimation and performance analysis of one-bit massive MIMO systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 65, no. 15, pp. 4075–4089, 2017.
- [12] B. Fesl, M. Koller, and W. Utschick, "On the mean square error optimal estimator in one-bit quantized systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 71, pp. 1968–1980, 2023.
- [13] M. Ding, I. Atzeni, A. Tölili, and A. L. Swindlehurst, "On the optimal MMSE channel estimation for one-bit quantized MIMO systems," 2024, arXiv preprint: 2404.05536.
- [14] O. T. Demir and E. Björnson, "The Bussgang decomposition of nonlinear systems: Basic theory and MIMO extensions [lecture notes]," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 131–136, 2021.
- [15] Q. Wan, J. Fang, H. Duan, Z. Chen, and H. Li, "Generalized Bussgang LMMSE channel estimation for one-bit massive MIMO systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 4234–4246, 2020.
- [16] J. J. Bussgang, "Crosscorrelation functions of amplitude-distorted Gaussian signals," MIT Res. Lab. Electron., Tech. Rep. 216, 1952.
- [17] A. K. Fletcher, S. Rangan, V. K. Goyal, and K. Ramchandran, "Robust predictive quantization: Analysis and design via convex optimization," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 618–632, 2007.
- [18] A. Mezghani and J. Nossek, "Capacity lower bound of MIMO channels with output quantization and correlated noise," in *Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2012.
- [19] E. Björnson, J. Hoydis, M. Kountouris, and M. Debbah, "Massive MIMO systems with non-ideal hardware: Energy efficiency, estimation, and capacity limits," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 11, pp. 7112–7139, 2014.
- [20] E. Björnson, L. Sanguinetti, and J. Hoydis, "Hardware distortion correlation has negligible impact on UL massive MIMO spectral efficiency," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 1085–1098, 2019.
- [21] P. Banelli and S. Cacciopardi, "Theoretical analysis and performance of OFDM signals in nonlinear AWGN channels," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 430–441, 2000.
- [22] D. Dardari, V. Tralli, and A. Vaccari, "A theoretical characterization of nonlinear distortion effects in OFDM systems," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 1755–1764, 2000.
- [23] A. Fakhrizadeh Esfahani, J. Schoukens, and L. Vanbeylen, "Using the best linear approximation with varying excitation signals for nonlinear system characterization," *IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas.*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 1271–1280, 2016.
- [24] A. Papoulis and S. U. Pillai, *Probability, Random Variables and Stochastic Processes*. McGraw-Hill Education, 2002.
- [25] J. Van Vleck and D. Middleton, "The spectrum of clipped noise," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 2–19, 1966.
- [26] G. Jacovitti and A. Neri, "Estimation of the autocorrelation function of complex Gaussian stationary processes by amplitude clipped signals," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 239–245, 1994.
- [27] B. Fesl, N. Turan, B. Böck, and W. Utschick, "Channel estimation for quantized systems based on conditionally Gaussian latent models," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 72, pp. 1475–1490, 2024.
- [28] B. Böck, M. Baur, N. Turan, D. Semmler, and W. Utschick, "A statistical characterization of wireless channels conditioned on side information," 2024, arXiv preprint: 2406.04282.
- [29] S. Zhidkov, "Performance analysis and optimization of OFDM receiver with blanking nonlinearity in impulsive noise environment," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 234–242, 2006.
- [30] P. Banelli, "Non-linear transformations of Gaussians and Gaussian-mixtures with implications on estimation and information theory," 2013, arXiv preprint: 1111.5950.
- [31] T. T. Nguyen, H. D. Nguyen, F. Chamroukhi, and G. J. McLachlan, "Approximation by finite mixtures of continuous density functions that vanish at infinity," *Cogent Math. Statist.*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 1750861, 2020.
- [32] B. Picinbono, "On circularity," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 42, no. 12, pp. 3473–3482, 1994.
- [33] A. Genz, "Numerical computation of multivariate normal probabilities," *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 141–149, 1992.
- [34] P. Virtanen *et al.*, "SciPy 1.0: Fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python," *Nat. Methods*, vol. 17, pp. 261–272, 2020.
- [35] M. D. McDonnell, N. G. Stocks, C. E. M. Pearce, and D. Abbott, *Stochastic Resonance: From Suprathreshold Stochastic Resonance to Stochastic Signal Quantization*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [36] S. P. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.