

Robust Reduced-Rank Adaptive Processing Based on Parallel Subgradient Projection and Krylov Subspace Techniques

Masahiro Yukawa, *Member, IEEE*, Rodrigo C. de Lamare, *Member, IEEE*,
and Isao Yamada, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we propose a novel reduced-rank adaptive filtering algorithm by blending the idea of the Krylov subspace methods with the set-theoretic adaptive filtering framework. Unlike the existing Krylov-subspace-based reduced-rank methods, the proposed algorithm tracks the optimal point in the sense of minimizing the ‘true’ mean square error (MSE) in the Krylov subspace, even when the estimated statistics become erroneous (e.g., due to sudden changes of environments). Therefore, compared with those existing methods, the proposed algorithm is more suited to adaptive filtering applications. The algorithm is analyzed based on a modified version of the adaptive projected subgradient method (APSM). Numerical examples demonstrate that the proposed algorithm enjoys better tracking performance than the existing methods for the interference suppression problem in code-division multiple-access (CDMA) systems as well as for simple system identification problems.

Index Terms—reduced-rank adaptive filtering, Krylov subspace, set-theory, subgradient methods

I. INTRODUCTION

Reduced-rank adaptive filtering has attracted significant attention over several research communities including signal processing; e.g., [1]–[36]. Whereas early works were motivated by the so-called overmodeling problem, many of the recent works were motivated mainly by computational constraints and slow-convergence problems due to a large number of parameters. Specifically, a Krylov subspace associated with the input autocorrelation matrix and the cross-correlation vector between input and output has been used in several methods: Cayley-Hamilton receiver [18], multistage Wiener filter (MSWF) [19], [21], [25], auxiliary-vector filtering (AVF) [23], [24], Powers of R (POR) receiver [21], and the conjugate gradient reduced-rank filter (CGRRF) [31], [32] (see [34] for their connections). All of those previous studies focus on minimizing a mean square error (MSE) within the Krylov subspace (see [36] for linear estimation and detection in Krylov subspaces). However, in the erroneous case (i.e., in cases where there is a mismatch in estimates of the autocorrelation matrix and the cross-correlation vector), the methods minimize an ‘erroneous’ MSE function in the Krylov

subspace. Therefore, the solution obtained at each iteration is no longer ‘optimal’ in the sense of minimizing the ‘true’ MSE within the Krylov subspace.

In this paper, we propose an adaptive technique, named *Krylov reduced-rank adaptive parallel subgradient projection (KRR-APSP) algorithm*, tracking directly the ‘optimal’ solution in the Krylov subspace. The KRR-APSP algorithm firstly performs dimensionality reduction with an orthonormal basis of the Krylov subspace, followed by adjustments of the coefficients of a lower-dimensional filter based on the *set-theoretic adaptive filtering framework*¹ [?]. As a result, in cases where the environment changes dynamically (which makes the estimates of the statistics erroneous), the KRR-APSP algorithm realizes better tracking capability than the existing Krylov-subspace-based methods (The computational complexity is comparable to the existing methods).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the motivation and the problem statement are presented, in which it is shown that, in a low-dimensional Krylov subspace, (i) the achievable MSE is close to the minimum MSE (MMSE) and (ii) system identification of high accuracy is possible, provided that the condition number of the autocorrelation matrix is close to unity. In Section III, we present the proposed reduced-rank algorithm, and discuss its tracking property and computational complexity. The KRR-APSP algorithm (i) designs multiple closed convex sets consistent with the recently arriving data, and (ii) moves the filter toward the intersection of the convex sets (to find a feasible solution) by means of parallel subgradient projection at each iteration. Because the noise is taken into account in the set design, KRR-APSP is intrinsically robust. In Section IV, to prove important properties (*monotonicity* and *asymptotic optimality*) of the proposed algorithm, we firstly present an alternative derivation of the algorithm from a modified version of the *adaptive projected subgradient method (APSM)*² [?], [?], and then present an analysis of the modified APSM. It is revealed that, in the (original) high dimensional vector space, the proposed algorithm performs parallel subgradient projection in a series of Krylov subspaces. In Section V, numerical examples are presented to verify the advantages of the proposed algorithm over CGRRF, followed by the conclusion in Section VI.

Masahiro Yukawa is with the Amari Research Unit, RIKEN, Japan (e-mail: myukawa@riken.jp). This work was partly done while he was with the Department of Electronics, University of York, UK.

Rodrigo C. de Lamare is with the Department of Electronics, University of York, UK (e-mail: rcd1500@ohm.york.ac.uk).

Isao Yamada is with the Department of Communications and Integrated Systems, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan (e-mail: isao@comm.ss.titech.ac.jp).

¹A related approach called *set-membership adaptive filtering* has independently been developed, e.g., in [?], [?].

²APSM has proven a promising tool to derive efficient algorithms in many applications [?], [?], [?], [?], [?], [?], [?], [?].




Fig. 1. $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})}(\mathbf{h}^*)$ and $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)$ with the equal error contours of the MSE surface.

II. MOTIVATION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

Let \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{N} , and \mathbb{N}^* denote the sets of all real numbers, nonnegative integers, and positive integers, respectively. We consider the following linear model:

$$d_k := \mathbf{u}_k^T \mathbf{h}^* + n_k, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_k := [u_k, u_{k-1}, \dots, u_{k-N+1}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \in \mathbb{N}^*$) denotes the input vector, $\mathbf{h}^* \in \mathbb{R}^N$ the unknown system, n_k the additive noise, and d_k the output (k : sample index, $(\cdot)^T$: transposition). The MMSE filter in the whole space \mathbb{R}^N is well-known to be characterized by the so-called Wiener-Hopf equation $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{h}_{\text{MMSE}} = \mathbf{p}$ (see, e.g., [45]), where $\mathbf{R} := \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{u}_k^T\}$ and $\mathbf{p} := \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{u}_k d_k\}$ ($\mathbb{E}\{\cdot\}$: expectation). For simplicity, we assume that \mathbf{R} is invertible and the input and the noise are (statistically) orthogonal; i.e., $\mathbb{E}\{n_k \mathbf{u}_k\} = \mathbf{0}$. In this case, $\mathbf{p} = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{u}_k (\mathbf{u}_k^T \mathbf{h}^* + n_k)\} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{h}^*$, and the MSE function $f: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is given as

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{h}) &:= \mathbb{E}\{(d_k - \mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{u}_k)^2\} = \mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{R} \mathbf{h} - 2\mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{p} + \sigma_d^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{h} - \mathbf{h}^*\|_{\mathbf{R}}^2 - \|\mathbf{h}^*\|_{\mathbf{R}}^2 + \sigma_d^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here, $\sigma_d^2 := \mathbb{E}\{d_k^2\}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{R}}$ is the \mathbf{R} -norm³ defined for any vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ as $\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathbf{R}} := \sqrt{\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{R} \mathbf{a}}$. From (2), it is seen that $\mathbf{h}^* = \mathbf{h}_{\text{MMSE}} (= \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{p})$.

Let us now consider, for $D \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, the MMSE filter within the following Krylov subspace:

$$\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p}) := \text{span}\{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{p}, \dots, \mathbf{R}^{D-1}\mathbf{p}\} \quad (3)$$

$$= \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}\mathbf{h}^*, \mathbf{R}^2\mathbf{h}^*, \dots, \mathbf{R}^D\mathbf{h}^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (4)$$

Referring to (2), the MMSE solution in $\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})$ is characterized by

$$P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*) \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})} \|\mathbf{h}^* - \mathbf{h}\|_{\mathbf{R}}, \quad (5)$$

where we denote by $P_C^{(\mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{x})$ the metric projection of a vector \mathbf{x} onto a closed convex set C in the \mathbf{A} -norm sense. In particular, the metric projection in the sense of Euclidean norm

³ The \mathbf{R} -norm is also called *the energy norm induced by \mathbf{R}* . The same norm is used in [?] to derive the CG method.




Fig. 2. An illustration of the goal of this paper. ‘Conventional’ stands for the conventional Krylov-subspace-based methods such as CGRRF.

is denoted simply by $P_C(\mathbf{x})$. In words, the MMSE filter in the subspace is the best approximation, in the \mathbf{R} -norm sense, of \mathbf{h}^* in $\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})$. Noting that $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)$ coincides with the vector obtained through D steps of the conjugate gradient (CG) method with its initial point being the zero vector, the MSE is bounded as follows [46, Theorem 10.2.6]:

$$f(P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)) \leq \left[4 \left(\frac{\sqrt{\kappa} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa} + 1} \right)^{2D} - 1 \right] \|\mathbf{h}^*\|_{\mathbf{R}}^2 + \sigma_d^2, \quad (6)$$

where $\kappa := \|\mathbf{R}\|_2 \|\mathbf{R}^{-1}\|_2 \geq 1$ is the condition number of \mathbf{R} . System identifiability in $\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})$ is discussed below.

Remark 1: How accurately can the system \mathbf{h}^* be identified in the subspace $\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})$? In the system identification problem, we wish to minimize the Euclidean norm $\|\mathbf{h}^* - \mathbf{h}\|$ rather than the \mathbf{R} -norm $\|\mathbf{h}^* - \mathbf{h}\|_{\mathbf{R}}$. To clarify the difference between the MSE minimization and the system identification over $\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})$, the projections in the different senses are illustrated in Fig. 1. By the Rayleigh-Ritz theorem [?], it is readily verified that $\lambda_{\max}^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbf{R}} \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq \lambda_{\min}^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbf{R}}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where $\lambda_{\max} > 0$ and $\lambda_{\min} > 0$ denote the maximum and minimum eigenvalues of \mathbf{R} , respectively. It is thus verified that $\|P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})}(\mathbf{h}^*) - P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)\| \leq \|\mathbf{h}^* - P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)\| \leq \lambda_{\min}^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{h}^* - P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{p})}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)\|_{\mathbf{R}} \leq 2\lambda_{\min}^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{h}^*\|_{\mathbf{R}} \alpha^D(\kappa)$, where $\alpha(\kappa) := (\sqrt{\kappa} - 1)/(\sqrt{\kappa} + 1) \in [0, 1)$. Here, the first inequality is due to the basic property of projection, and the third one is verified by [46, Theorem 10.2.6]. This suggests that system identification of high accuracy would be possible for a small D when $\kappa \approx 1$ (If $\kappa \gg 1$, preconditioning⁴ should be performed). \square

In reality, \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{p} are rarely available, thus should be estimated from observed measurements. Let $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ be estimates of \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{p} , respectively, and $\hat{\mathbf{h}}^*$ be characterized by $\hat{\mathbf{R}}\hat{\mathbf{h}}^* = \hat{\mathbf{p}}$. CGRRF [?], [?], [?] computes, at each iteration, the

⁴The importance of preconditioning is well-known in numerical linear algebra; see, e.g., [?], [?] and the references therein. Also the importance is mentioned in [?] for an application of the conjugate gradient method to the adaptive filtering problem. Different types of CG-based adaptive filtering algorithms have also been proposed, e.g., in [?], [?].

best approximation of $\hat{\mathbf{h}}^*$ in $\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}, \hat{\mathbf{p}})$ in the $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$ -norm sense; i.e., $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}, \hat{\mathbf{p}})}^{(\hat{\mathbf{R}})}(\hat{\mathbf{h}}^*)$. This realizes significantly fast convergence and reasonable steady-state performance as long as good estimates are available; i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{R}} \approx \mathbf{R}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \approx \mathbf{p}$. However, once those estimates become unreliable (which happens when the environments change suddenly), $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}, \hat{\mathbf{p}})}^{(\hat{\mathbf{R}})}(\hat{\mathbf{h}}^*)$ makes little sense, and CGRRF (or the other existing Krylov-subspace-based methods) should wait until a certain amount of data arrive to recapture reasonable estimates.

The goal of this paper is to propose an alternative to the existing Krylov-subspace-based methods to address this restriction. To be specific, the main problem in this work is stated as follows. Given that the Krylov subspace is employed for dimensionality reduction, the problem is to design an efficient algorithm that can always track $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}, \hat{\mathbf{p}})}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)$, which minimizes the true MSE $f(\mathbf{h})$ over $\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}, \hat{\mathbf{p}})$ [see (2)]. Such an algorithm should have better tracking capability than the existing methods after dynamic changes of environments, because $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}, \hat{\mathbf{p}})}^{(\hat{\mathbf{R}})}(\hat{\mathbf{h}}^*)$ does not minimize the true MSE as long as the estimates $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ are erroneous. The concept is illustrated in Fig. 2, in which the estimates are assumed to become erroneous. Note in the figure that the difference between $f(\mathbf{h})$ and $\|\mathbf{h} - \mathbf{h}^*\|_{\mathbf{R}}^2$ is a constant in terms of \mathbf{h} , which makes no difference in the equal error contours. In the following section, we present an adaptive algorithm that achieves the goal.

III. PROPOSED REDUCED-RANK ADAPTIVE FILTER

We firstly present a reduced-rank version of the set-theoretic adaptive filtering algorithm named *adaptive parallel subgradient projection (APSP) algorithm* [?]. The proposed algorithm is called *Krylov Reduced-Rank Adaptive Parallel Subgradient Projection (KRR-APSP)*. We then show, for its simplest case, that the proposed algorithm tracks $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}, \hat{\mathbf{p}})}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)$, and discuss its computational complexity.

A. Proposed KRR-APSP Algorithm

Let $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_k$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_k$ be estimates of \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{p} at time $k \in \mathbb{N}$, respectively, and \mathbf{S}_k an $N \times D$ matrix whose column vectors form an orthonormal basis⁵ (in the sense of the standard inner product) of the subspace $\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_k, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_k)$. For dimensionality reduction, we force the adaptive filter $\mathbf{h}_k \in \mathbb{R}^N$ to lie in $\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_k, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_k) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ at each time instance k . Thus, with a lower dimensional vector $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k \in \mathbb{R}^D$, the adaptive filter is characterized as $\mathbf{h}_k = \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k$. In the following, a tilde will be used for expressing a D -dimensional vector (or a subset of \mathbb{R}^D). The output of the adaptive filter is given by

$$\mathbf{h}_k^T \mathbf{u}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k^T \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{u}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k^T \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \quad (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k := \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{u}_k \in \mathbb{R}^D). \quad (7)$$

The reduced-rank adaptive filtering scheme is illustrated in Fig. 3.

The idea of set-theoretic adaptive filtering is as follows:

⁵The orthonormality is essential in the analysis (see Section IV-B).




Fig. 3. Reduced-rank adaptive filtering scheme.

- 1) construct (possibly multiple) closed convex sets containing a desired filter, i.e. $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_k, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_k)}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)$ in this case, with high probability; and
 - 2) approach the intersection of those sets at each iteration.
- Let us present the design of the closed convex sets. Given $r \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}_k &:= [\mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{u}_{k-1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{k-r+1}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r} \\ \mathbf{d}_k &:= [d_k, d_{k-1}, \dots, d_{k-r+1}] \in \mathbb{R}^r \\ \mathbf{e}_k(\mathbf{h}) &:= \mathbf{U}_k^T \mathbf{h} - \mathbf{d}_k \in \mathbb{R}^r, \quad \forall \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^N. \end{aligned}$$

Then, with a simple restriction on $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ in the stochastic property set proposed in [?], the closed convex sets in \mathbb{R}^N are given as

$$C_k(\rho) := \left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k) : g_k(\mathbf{h}) := \|\mathbf{e}_k(\mathbf{h})\|^2 - \rho \leq 0 \right\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (8)$$

where $\rho \geq 0$, $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ stands for *range*, and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. Intuitively, $C_k(\rho)$ is a set of filtering vectors consistent with the data observed at time k in the sense that the norm of the error-vector is bounded by a small constant ρ . If ρ is too small, there could be no consistent solution; for an extreme example, if $\rho = 0$ and we have the data sets $(\mathbf{u}_{k_1}, d_{k_1})$ and $(\mathbf{u}_{k_2}, d_{k_2})$ such that $\mathbf{u}_{k_1} = \mathbf{u}_{k_2}$ and $d_{k_1} \neq d_{k_2}$ ($k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$), then $C_{k_1}(\rho) \cap C_{k_2}(\rho) = \emptyset$. Note however that, even in such an infeasible case, the proposed algorithm is guaranteed to move the filter closer to all the points that minimize a weighted sum of the distances to the convex sets $(C_k(\rho))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, as will be shown in Theorem 1.a in Section IV-B. The design of ρ is involved with the noise statistics (see [?]).

Let \mathcal{I}_k be the control sequence at the k th iteration; i.e., the set of indices used at time k (a typical example is $\mathcal{I}_k := \{k, k-1, \dots, k-q+1\}$ for $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$). Replacing \mathbf{h} in $C_l(\rho)$, $l \in \mathcal{I}_k$, by $\mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{h}}$, the stochastic property set in \mathbb{R}^D is obtained as follows:

$$\tilde{C}_l^{(k)}(\rho) := \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \mathbb{R}^D : g_l^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) := \|\mathbf{e}_l^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})\|^2 - \rho \leq 0 \right\}, \quad l \in \mathcal{I}_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (9)$$

Here, $\mathbf{e}_l^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) := \mathbf{U}_l^T \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{d}_l \in \mathbb{R}^r$, $\forall \tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \mathbb{R}^D$. The projection onto $\tilde{C}_l^{(k)}(\rho)$ is approximated by the projection onto the simple closed half-space $\tilde{H}_{l,k}^-(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k) \supset \tilde{C}_l^{(k)}(\rho)$ defined as

$$\tilde{H}_{l,k}^-(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k) := \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \mathbb{R}^D : \langle \tilde{\mathbf{h}} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_l^{(k)} \rangle + g_l^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k) \leq 0 \right\}, \quad l \in \mathcal{I}_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (10)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{(k)} := \nabla g_\ell^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k) := 2\mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{U}_\ell \mathbf{e}_\ell^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^D$. An important property is $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k \notin \tilde{C}_\ell^{(k)}(\rho) \Rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k \notin \tilde{H}_{\ell,k}^-(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)$ [?, Lemma 2], thus the boundary of $\tilde{H}_{\ell,k}^-(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)$ is a separating hyperplane between $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k$ and $\tilde{C}_\ell^{(k)}(\rho)$. The projection of $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k$ onto $\tilde{H}_{\ell,k}^-(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)$ is given as

$$P_{\tilde{H}_{\ell,k}^-(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k & \text{if } g_\ell^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k) \leq 0, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k - \frac{g_\ell^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{(k)}\|^2} \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_\ell^{(k)} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

which is also referred to as the *subgradient projection*⁶ relative to $g_\ell^{(k)}$ (see Appendix A). Let $w_\ell^{(k)} \in (0, 1]$, $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, denote the weight satisfying $\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k} w_\ell^{(k)} = 1$; see [?] for a strategic design of the weights. Then, the proposed KRR-APSP algorithm is presented in what follows.

Given an arbitrary initial vector $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^D$, the sequence $(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^D$ is inductively generated as follows. Given \mathbf{h}_k and \mathcal{I}_k at each time $k \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathbf{h}_{k+1} is defined as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{k+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k + \lambda_k \mathcal{M}_k \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k} w_\ell^{(k)} P_{\tilde{H}_{\ell,k}^-(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k) - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k \right), \quad (12)$$

where $\lambda_k \in [0, 2]$, $\tilde{H}_{\ell,k}^-(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)$ is defined as in (10), and

$$\mathcal{M}_k := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } g_\ell^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k) \leq 0, \forall \ell \in \mathcal{I}_k, \\ \frac{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k} w_\ell^{(k)} \left\| P_{\tilde{H}_{\ell,k}^-(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k) - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k \right\|^2}{\left\| \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k} w_\ell^{(k)} P_{\tilde{H}_{\ell,k}^-(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k) - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k \right\|^2} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For convenience, efficient implementation of the proposed algorithm is given in TABLE I (For computational efficiency, we introduce a parameter m to control how frequently \mathbf{S}_k is updated). We mention that, although the condition for updating $\tilde{\delta}_\ell^{(k)}$ is similar to the one used in the *set-membership affine projection algorithm* [?], the major differences are that (i) the update is based on the subgradient projection, (ii) multiple closed convex sets are employed at each iteration (each set is indicated by an element of \mathcal{I}_k), and (iii) no matrix inversion is required.

We shall finish up this subsection by summarizing the parameters used in the proposed algorithm:

- r : the dimension of the orthogonal complement of the underlying subspace of $C_k(0)$ (see the definition of \mathbf{U}_k , and \mathbf{d}_k before (8)),
- q : the number of projections computed at each iteration,
- ρ : the error bound (controlling the ‘volume’ of $C_k(\rho)$),
- m : the frequency of updating \mathbf{S}_k .

⁶ Although the function $g_\ell^{(k)}$ is differentiable, the subgradient projection can be defined also for non-differentiable functions. Note that $\text{lev}_{\leq 0} g_\ell^{(k)} := \{\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \mathbb{R}^D : g_\ell^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \leq 0\} \neq \emptyset$.

TABLE I

EFFICIENT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED ALGORITHM.

Requirements: Initial transformation matrix \mathbf{S}_0 , inputs $(\mathbf{U}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, outputs $(\mathbf{d}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, control sequence \mathcal{I}_k , step size $\lambda_k \in [0, 2]$, weights $w_\ell^{(k)}$, $\forall \ell \in \mathcal{I}_k$, initial vector $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^D$, constant $\rho \geq 0$, $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$

1. Filter output: $\mathbf{y}_k := \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k^T \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k (= \mathbf{u}_k^T \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)$
2. Filter update:
 - (a) **For** $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k$, do the following:

$$\mathbf{U}_\ell^{(k)} := \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{U}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times r}$$

$$\mathbf{e}_\ell^{(k)} := (\mathbf{U}_\ell^{(k)})^T \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k - \mathbf{d}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^r$$

If $\|\mathbf{e}_\ell^{(k)}\|^2 \leq \rho$,

$$\tilde{\delta}_\ell^{(k)} := \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^D, \ell_\ell^{(k)} := 0$$

else

$$\mathbf{a}_\ell^{(k)} := \mathbf{U}_\ell^{(k)} \mathbf{e}_\ell^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^D$$

$$c_\ell^{(k)} := \|\mathbf{a}_\ell^{(k)}\|^2 \in [0, \infty)$$

$$d_\ell^{(k)} := \rho - \|\mathbf{e}_\ell^{(k)}\|^2 \in (-\infty, \rho]$$

$$\tilde{\delta}_\ell^{(k)} := w_\ell^{(k)} d_\ell^{(k)} \mathbf{a}_\ell^{(k)} / (2c_\ell^{(k)}) \in \mathbb{R}^D$$

$$\ell_\ell^{(k)} := \left(\|\tilde{\delta}_\ell^{(k)}\|^2 / w_\ell^{(k)} \right) = w_\ell^{(k)} (d_\ell^{(k)})^2 / (4c_\ell^{(k)}) \in (0, \infty)$$

endif;
 - end;**
 - (b) **If** $\|\mathbf{e}_\ell^{(k)}\|^2 \leq \rho$ for all $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k$,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{k+1} := \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k \in \mathbb{R}^D$$

else

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_k := \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k} \tilde{\delta}_\ell^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^D$$

$$\mathcal{M}_k := \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_k \right\|^{-2} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k} \ell_\ell^{(k)} \in [1, \infty)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{k+1} := \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k + \lambda_k \mathcal{M}_k \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_k \in \mathbb{R}^D$$

endif;
3. **if** $k \equiv 1 \pmod m$

Compute $\mathbf{S}_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$, an orthonormalized version of $\mathbf{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_k, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_k)$; see Section III-B

else

$$\mathbf{S}_{k+1} := \mathbf{S}_k$$

endif;

Intuitively, the convex set $C_k(\rho)$ is obtained by ‘ballooning’ the linear variety used in the affine projection algorithm (APA) [53], [54], and r corresponds to the ‘order’ of APA [45].

The tracking property and the computational complexity of the proposed algorithm are discussed in the following subsection.

B. Tracking Property and Computational Complexity

As explained in the final paragraph in Section II, an algorithm that tracks $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_k, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_k)}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)$ is expected to enjoy better tracking capability than the existing Krylov-subspace-based reduced-rank methods. In this subsection, we firstly show that the proposed algorithm (or the vector $\mathbf{h}_k (= \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, generated by the proposed algorithm) has such a property for its simplest case: $r = 1$, $\rho = 0$, $\mathcal{I}_k = \{k\}$ (i.e., $q = 1$). In this case, the proposed algorithm is reduced to

$$\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{k+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k + \bar{\lambda}_k \frac{\mathbf{d}_k - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k^T \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k\|^2} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k, \quad (13)$$

where $\bar{\lambda}_k := \lambda_k/2 \in [0, 1]$. The update equation in (13) is nothing but the NLMS algorithm (It should be mentioned that the step-size range of $\bar{\lambda}_k$ is a half of that of NLMS). Thus, (13) is a stochastic gradient algorithm for the following problem:

$$\min_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \mathbb{R}^D} E\{(d_k - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k)^2\}. \quad (14)$$

This implies that $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k$ generated by (13) tracks the minimizer of (14); for details about the tracking performance of NLMS, see [?] and the references therein. Hence, noting that $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k = \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{u}_k$, it is seen that $\mathbf{h}_k (:= \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)$ tracks the solution to the following problem (which is equivalent to (14)):

$$\min_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)} E\{(d_k - \mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{u}_k)^2\}. \quad (15)$$

Referring to (2) and (5), the minimizer of (15) is $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_k, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_k)}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)$. This verifies that $\mathbf{h}_k (= \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)$ generated by (13) tracks $P_{\mathcal{K}_D(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_k, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_k)}^{(\mathbf{R})}(\mathbf{h}^*)$.

Now, let us move to the discussion about the computational complexity (i.e., the number of multiplications per iteration) of the proposed algorithm. For simplicity, we let $\mathcal{I}_k := \{k, k-1, \dots, k-q+1\}$, which is used in Section V. We assume that, given $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_k$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_k$, the complexity to construct the matrix \mathbf{S}_k is the same as that of CGRRF⁷. As \mathbf{S}_k is computed every m iterations (see TABLE I), the average complexity for computing \mathbf{S}_k is $(D-1)N^2/m + (5D-4)N/m + 2(D-1)/m$.

What about the complexity to update $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_k$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_k$? For the system model presented in Section II, the autocorrelation matrix \mathbf{R} is known to have a *Toeplitz structure*, provided that the input process is stationary. Hence, it is sufficient to estimate $E\{u_k \mathbf{u}_k\} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, which can be done by⁸ $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1} := \gamma \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k + u_k \mathbf{u}_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, with the forgetting factor $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Similarly, the vector $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_k$ is updated as $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{k+1} := \gamma \hat{\mathbf{p}}_k + d_k \mathbf{u}_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, the complexity for updating $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_k$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_k$ is $4N$.

The rest is the complexity for the filter update. One of the distinguished advantages of the APSP algorithm is its *inherently parallel structure* [?], [?], [?], [?], [?], [?]. We start by considering the case where only a single processor is available. Because the matrices $(\mathbf{U}_\iota)_{\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k}$, used at time k , have only $q+r-1$ distinct column vectors $(\mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{u}_{k-1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{k-q-r+2})$, the complexity to compute $\mathbf{U}_\iota^{(k)}$ for all $\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k$ is $(q+r-1)DN$. Fortunately, however, this is only required when \mathbf{S}_k is updated (every m iterations), and, when \mathbf{S}_k is not updated, only the first column of $\mathbf{U}_k^{(k)}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{u}_k$) should be computed. This is because, when \mathbf{S}_k is not updated, it holds that $\mathbf{U}_\iota^{(k)} = \mathbf{U}_\iota^{(k-1)}$ for $\iota = \mathcal{I}_k \setminus \{k\}$ and $[\mathbf{U}_k^{(k)}]_{2:r} = [\mathbf{U}_{k-1}^{(k-1)}]_{1:r-1}$, where $[\mathbf{A}]_{a:b}$ designates the submatrix of \mathbf{A} consisting of the a th to b th column vectors. Thus, the average complexity for $\mathbf{U}_\iota^{(k)}$ is $[(q+r-1)DN + (m-1)DN]/m$. For the same reason as $(\mathbf{U}_\iota)_{\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k}$, the matrices $(\mathbf{U}_\iota^{(k)})_{\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k}$ also have only $q+r-1$ distinct column vectors, hence the complexity to compute $\mathbf{e}_\iota^{(k)}$ and $\mathbf{a}_\iota^{(k)}$ is no more than

⁷The Lanczos method, which is essentially equivalent to the CG method [46], can also be used for constructing \mathbf{S}_k .

⁸If, for example, the system model presented in Section V-C is to be considered, then \mathbf{R} is not Toeplitz in general. In such a case, at least the upper triangular portion of \mathbf{R} should be estimated (Note that \mathbf{R} is always symmetric).




Fig. 4. Complexities of the conventional methods and the proposed algorithm with (a) single processor and (b) q processors.

TABLE II
COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITIES OF ALGORITHMS.

| Algorithm | Number of multiplications per iteration |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| NLMS | $3N + 2$ |
| RLS | $4N^2 + 4N + 1$ |
| CGRRF | $(D-1)N^2/m + [(5D-4)/m + 4]N + 2(D-1)$ |
| KRR-APSP (single processor) | $(D-1)N^2/m + [(5D-4)/m + 4]N + \alpha(q, r, m)DN + 2(D-1) + (4q+2r)D + (r+7)q + 2$ |
| KRR-APSP (q processors) | $(D-1)N^2/m + [(5D-4)/m + 4]N + \beta(r, m)DN + 2(D-1) + (2r+4)D + r + 9$ |

$2(q+r-1)D$. Overall, the total complexity for the filter update is $\alpha(q, r, m)DN + (4q+2r)D + (r+7)q + 2$, where $\alpha(q, r, m) := (q+r+m-2)/m$. If we set, for instance, $D=5$, $m=10$, $r=1$, and $q=5$ (which are used in Section V-B), the complexity for the filter update is $7N + 152$.

Finally, we consider the case where q parallel processors are available. In this case, the computation of the variables corresponding to each $\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k$ is naturally assigned to each processor. We consider the complexity imposed on each processor at each iteration. The complexity to compute $\mathbf{U}_\iota^{(k)}$ is rDN , when \mathbf{S}_k is updated, and DN , when \mathbf{S}_k is not updated. The average complexity is thus $\beta(r, m)DN$, where $\beta(r, m) := (r+m-1)/m$. Overall, the per-processor complexity for the filter update is $\beta(r, m)DN + (2r+4)D + r + 9$. For $D=5$, $m=10$, $r=1$, and an arbitrary q , the complexity for the filter update is $5N + 40$.

In TABLE II, the overall complexity of the proposed algorithm is summarized with those of the NLMS algorithm, the RLS algorithm [45, Table 9.1], and CGRRF [?]; we assume for fairness that CGRRF updates the filter every m iterations. Figure 4 plots the number of multiplications against the filter length N for $D=5$, $m=10$, $r=1$, and $q=5$ (which are used in Section V-B). We can see that the complexity of the proposed algorithm is much lower than that of RLS (due to the factor m), and marginally higher than that of CGRRF; in particular, for a large value of N , the difference between

the proposed and CGRRF methods is negligible. Moreover, compared with NLMS, the proposed algorithm requires higher complexity for realizing better performance. However, the difference can be significantly reduced by increasing m ; in our experiments, the use of $m = 100$ gives almost the same performance as the use of $m = 10$. It should be mentioned that the difference (in computational complexity) between CGRRF and KRR-APSP can be further reduced by taking into account the update rate of the vector $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k$ (i.e., the rate in which it happens that $\|e_i^{(k)}\|^2 \leq \rho$). If we choose ρ appropriately, the update rate is typically less than 10 %.

In conclusion, the proposed algorithm is highly expected to realize, with comparable computational complexity, superior tracking performance to the existing Krylov-subspace-based reduced-rank methods, as will be verified by simulations in Section V. Moreover, the algorithm has a fault tolerance nature thanks to its inherently parallel structure; i.e., even if some of the engaged concurrent processors are crashed, the lack of information from the crashed processors would *not* cause any serious degradation in performance. This is because the direction of update is determined by taking into account all the directions suggested by each input data vector little by little.

In the following section, we present an analysis of the proposed algorithm.

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED ALGORITHM

In the adaptive filtering or learning, the observed measurements are mostly corrupted by noise and the environments are nonstationary in many scenarios. Under such uncertain situations, it is difficult (or nearly impossible) to guarantee that the adaptive filter approaches the optimal one monotonically at every iteration. Thus, a meaningful and realistic property desired for an adaptive algorithm would be to approach every point in an appropriately designed set of filtering vectors monotonically at each iteration. How can such a set, say $\Omega_k \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, be designed?

In our analysis, we let $\Theta_k : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a (continuous and convex) objective function, and Ω_k is defined as a set of all the vectors that achieve the infimum of Θ_k over a certain constraint set. (The constraint is associated with the requirements that the filter should lie in the Krylov subspace.) Then, the desired *monotone approximation* property is expressed as follows⁹:

$$\|\mathbf{h}_{k+1} - \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^*\| \leq \|\mathbf{h}_k - \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^*\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \in \Omega_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (16)$$

We stress that (16) insists that the monotonicity holds *for all the elements* of Ω_k .

What about ‘optimality’ in terms of the objective function Θ_k ? Is it possible to prove ‘optimality’ in any sense? As you might notice, the objective function Θ_k depends on k . Namely, what we should ‘minimize’ is *not* a fixed objective function but is a sequence of objective functions $(\Theta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. This is the major difference from the normal optimization problems, and this formulation naturally fits the adaptive signal processing because the objective function should be




Fig. 5. A geometric interpretation of the subgradient projection $T_{\text{sp}(\Theta_k)}(\mathbf{h}_k)$ when $\text{lev}_{\leq 0} \Theta_k := \{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \Theta_k(\mathbf{h}) \leq 0\} \neq \emptyset$.

changing in conjunction with changing environments. Thus, a meaningful ‘optimality’ to show would be that $(\mathbf{h}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ minimizes $(\Theta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ asymptotically; i.e.,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k) = 0, \quad (17)$$

which is called *asymptotic optimality* [?], [?].

The goal of this section is to prove that the proposed algorithm enjoys the two desired properties (16) and (17). To this end, we firstly build, with the objective function Θ_k , a unified framework named *reduced-rank adaptive projected subgradient method (R-APSM)*, and derive the proposed algorithm from R-APSM with a specific design of Θ_k . We then prove that R-APSM, including the proposed algorithm as its special case, has the desired properties under some mild conditions.

A. Alternative Derivation of the Proposed Algorithm

Recall here that \mathbf{h}_k is forced to lie in $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$ at each iteration $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For an analysis of the proposed algorithm, we define

$$\Phi_k := \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \mathbf{S}_k^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}. \quad (18)$$

Given an arbitrary $\mathbf{h}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and a sequence of continuous convex objective functions $\Theta_k : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, R-APSM¹⁰ generates a sequence $(\mathbf{h}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ by

$$\mathbf{h}_{k+1} := \begin{cases} \Phi_k \left[\mathbf{h}_k - \lambda_k \frac{\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k)}{\|\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k)\|^2} \Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k) \right] & \text{if } \Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k) \neq \mathbf{0}, \\ \Phi_k \mathbf{h}_k & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where $\lambda_k \in [0, 2]$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k) \in \partial \Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k)$ is a *subgradient* of Θ_k at \mathbf{h}_k (see Appendix A).

Suppose that $\text{lev}_{\leq 0} \Theta_k := \{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \Theta_k(\mathbf{h}) \leq 0\} \neq \emptyset$ ($\Leftrightarrow \min_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \Theta_k(\mathbf{h}) = 0$). Then, removing Φ_k , (19) for $\lambda_k = 1$

¹⁰The original APSM [?], [?] is obtained by replacing Φ_k in (19) by a projection operator onto a closed convex set of an absolute constraint.

⁹To ensure (16), *closedness and convexity* of Ω_k are essential.

is the subgradient projection relative to Θ_k [cf. (11)], which is denoted by $T_{\text{sp}(\Theta_k)}(\mathbf{h}_k)$ (see Fig. 5). The update equation in (19) can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{h}_{k+1} := \Phi_k \left[\mathbf{h}_k + \lambda_k \left(T_{\text{sp}(\Theta_k)}(\mathbf{h}_k) - \mathbf{h}_k \right) \right]. \quad (20)$$

Noticing that the thick arrow in Fig. 5 expresses $T_{\text{sp}(\Theta_k)}(\mathbf{h}_k) - \mathbf{h}_k$, the figure with (20) provides a geometric interpretation of R-APSM (except for Φ_k).

Let us now derive the proposed algorithm from R-APSM. Let \mathcal{I}_k be the control sequence, and $w_\iota^{(k)} \in (0, 1]$, $\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the weight, both of which are defined in the same way as in Section III-A. An outer approximating closed half-space $H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \supset C_\iota(\rho)$ is defined as [see (8)]

$$H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) := \left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \left\langle \mathbf{h} - \mathbf{h}_k, \mathbf{s}_\iota^{(k)} \right\rangle + g_\iota(\mathbf{h}_k) \leq 0 \right\}, \\ \iota \in \mathcal{I}_k, k \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\mathbf{s}_\iota^{(k)} := \nabla g_\iota(\mathbf{h}_k) := 2\mathbf{U}_\iota \mathbf{e}_\iota(\mathbf{h}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Because

- 1) $H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k)$, $\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k$, contains favorable vectors because of the definition of $C_\iota(\rho)$, and
- 2) \mathbf{h}_k should lie in $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k) = \mathcal{K}_D(\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_k, \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_k)$,

the distance to $H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$ is a natural candidate of objective function. Moreover, for assigning a larger weight to a farther set, the weight $d(\mathbf{h}_k, H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k))$ is given to the distance function $d(\mathbf{h}, H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k))$. With a normalization factor $L_k := \sum_{\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k} w_\iota^{(k)} d(\mathbf{h}_k, H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k))$, the resulting objective function is given as follows:

$$\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{L_k} \sum_{\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k} w_\iota^{(k)} d(\mathbf{h}_k, H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)) \\ \quad \times d(\mathbf{h}, H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)) & \text{if } L_k \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

An application of R-APSM to $\Theta_k(\mathbf{h})$ in (21) yields (cf. [?])

$$\mathbf{h}_{k+1} = \Phi_k \left[\mathbf{h}_k + \lambda_k \mathcal{M}_k \left(\sum_{\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k} w_\iota^{(k)} P_{H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}(\mathbf{h}_k) - \mathbf{h}_k \right) \right], \quad (22)$$

where $\lambda_k \in [0, 2]$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\mathcal{M}_k := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } g_\iota(\mathbf{h}_k) \leq 0, \forall \iota \in \mathcal{I}_k, \\ \frac{\sum_{\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k} w_\iota^{(k)} \left\| P_{H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}(\mathbf{h}_k) - \mathbf{h}_k \right\|^2}{\left\| \sum_{\iota \in \mathcal{I}_k} w_\iota^{(k)} P_{H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}(\mathbf{h}_k) - \mathbf{h}_k \right\|^2} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Noticing $\mathbf{h}_k \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$ and defining $\mathbf{Q}_k := \mathbf{S}_k \mathbf{S}_k^T$, the projection of \mathbf{h}_k onto $H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$ is given as follows:

$$P_{H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}(\mathbf{h}_k) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{h}_k & \text{if } g_\iota(\mathbf{h}_k) \leq 0, \\ \mathbf{h}_k - \frac{g_\iota(\mathbf{h}_k)}{\left\| \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{s}_\iota^{(k)} \right\|^2} \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{s}_\iota^{(k)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Letting $\mathbf{h}_k = \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k$, we obtain $\mathbf{e}_\iota(\mathbf{h}_k) = \mathbf{e}_\iota^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)$, $g_\iota(\mathbf{h}_k) = g_\iota^{(k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)$, and $\mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{s}_\iota^{(k)} = \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_\iota^{(k)}$, from which and $P_{H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}(\mathbf{h}_k) \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$ we can verify

$$P_{H_\iota^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}(\mathbf{h}_k) = \mathbf{S}_k P_{\tilde{H}_{\iota,k}^-(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k)}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k). \quad (24)$$

Substituting (24) and $\mathbf{h}_k = \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k$ into (22), and left-multiplying both sides of (22) by \mathbf{S}_k^T , we obtain the proposed algorithm. Taking a look at the update equation in (22), it is seen that it has the same form as the *linearly constrained adaptive filtering algorithm* [?] except for the mapping Φ_k from $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$ to $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_{k+1})$. Hence, viewing the behavior of the proposed algorithm in \mathbb{R}^N , it performs *parallel subgradient projection in a series of (constraint) Krylov subspaces* $(\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

B. Analysis of R-APSM

We prove that the sequence $(\mathbf{h}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ generated by R-APSM satisfies the desired properties (16) and (17). In the analysis, the *fixed point set* of the ‘mapping’ $\Phi_k (:= \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \mathbf{S}_k^T) : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_{k+1})$, $\mathbf{a} \mapsto \Phi_k \mathbf{a}$, plays an important role. *What is the fixed point set?* Given a mapping $T : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfying $T(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ is called a *fixed point* of T . Moreover, the set of all such points, i.e. the set $\text{Fix}(T) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N : T(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}\}$, is called the *fixed point set* of T . The set $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k)$ is characterized as below.

Proposition 1: (Characterizations of $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k)$)

- (a) $\mathbf{0} \in \text{Fix}(\Phi_k)$.
- (b) $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_{k+1})$.
- (c)

$$\text{Fix}(\Phi_k) = \left\{ \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} : \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \text{Fix}(\mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{S}_{k+1}) \subset \mathbb{R}^D \right\}, \quad (25)$$

and

$$\text{Fix}(\mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{S}_{k+1}) = \{ \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^D : \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \}. \quad (26)$$

- (d) If $\mathbf{S}_{k+1} = \mathbf{S}_k$, then $\Phi_k = P_{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}$ and $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$.

Proof: See Appendix B. \square

Define

$$\Theta_k^* := \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{Fix}(\Phi_k)} \Theta_k(\mathbf{x}), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (27)$$

$$\Omega_k := \{ \mathbf{h} \in \text{Fix}(\Phi_k) : \Theta_k(\mathbf{h}) = \Theta_k^* \}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (28)$$

(As mentioned before (16), the constraint set $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k)$ is associated with the requirements $\mathbf{h}_k \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.) Then, the following theorem holds.

Theorem 1: The sequence $(\mathbf{h}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ generated by R-APSM satisfies the following.

- (a) (Monotone Approximation)

- (I) Assume $\Omega_k \neq \emptyset$. Then, for any $\lambda_k \in [0, 2(1 - \Theta_k^*/\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k))]$, (16) holds.
- (II) Assume in addition $\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k) > \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \Theta_k(\mathbf{x}) > 0$. Then, for any $\lambda_k \in (0, 2(1 - \Theta_k^*/\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k)))$,

$$\left\| \mathbf{h}_{k+1} - \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \right\| < \left\| \mathbf{h}_k - \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \right\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \in \Omega_k.$$

(29)

(b) (Boundedness, Asymptotic Optimality) Assume

$$\exists K_0 \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } \begin{cases} \text{(i) } \Theta_k^* = 0, \forall k \geq K_0, \text{ and} \\ \text{(ii) } \Omega := \bigcap_{k \geq K_0} \Omega_k \neq \emptyset. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

Then $(\mathbf{h}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. In particular, if there exist $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that $\lambda_k \in [\varepsilon_1, 2 - \varepsilon_2] \subset (0, 2)$, then (17) holds, provided that $(\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded.

Proof: See Appendix C. \square

Finally, for the Θ_k specified by (21), we discuss the assumptions made in Theorem 1. First, it is worth mentioning that \mathbf{S}_k tends to stop moving when the estimates of \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{p} become reliable, and, in such a case, Proposition 1 implies $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$. Hence, we assume $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$ for simplicity here. Moreover, it mostly holds that $\bigcap_{l \in \mathcal{I}_k} H_l^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k) \neq \emptyset$ at each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, unless the observed data are highly inconsistent. In this case, $(\Theta_k^* = 0)$ and $\Omega_k = \bigcap_{l \in \mathcal{I}_k} H_l^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k) (\neq \emptyset)$, thus (16) holds. We remark that, under $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$, the condition $\bigcap_{l \in \mathcal{I}_k} H_l^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k) \neq \emptyset$ is sufficient but not necessary for (16) to hold. (In fact, Ω_k can be nonempty even if $\bigcap_{l \in \mathcal{I}_k} H_l^-(\mathbf{h}_k) = \emptyset$.)

Under $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$, the conditions in (30) are satisfied when $\bigcap_{k \geq K_0} [\bigcap_{l \in \mathcal{I}_k} H_l^-(\mathbf{h}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)] \neq \emptyset$, which mostly holds if the observed data are consistent for $k \geq K_0$. We mention that $(\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ for the Θ_k in (21) is automatically bounded [?].


In dynamic environments, it is hardly possible to ensure $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$ for all $k \geq K_0$, since \mathbf{S}_k will move when the environments change. In this case, the asymptotic optimality is difficult to be guaranteed. However, it is possible that the monotone approximation is guaranteed, because the environments would be nearly static in some (short) periods and, within such periods, \mathbf{S}_k may stop moving.

V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES


This section provides numerical examples to verify the advantages of the proposed algorithm over the CGRRF method [?] (Note: we omit a comparison with the RLS algorithm, because it is known that CGRRF provides convergence comparable to RLS with lower computational complexity and it does not suffer from any numerical instability problems [?], [?]). In the current study, weakly correlated input signals are employed in order to avoid preconditioning for conciseness. In simple system identification problems, we firstly examine the performance of the proposed algorithm for different values of D and q , and then compare the proposed algorithm with CGRRF. We finally apply the two methods to a multiple access interference suppression problem in code-division multiple-access (CDMA) wireless communication systems. In all the simulations, we set $\mathcal{I}_k := \{k, k-1, \dots, k-q+1\}$, and the matrix \mathbf{S}_k is updated every $m = 10$ iterations with $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 := \mathbf{O}$, $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_0 := \mathbf{0}$, and $\gamma = 0.999$.

A. Performance of the Proposed Algorithm for System Identification

To compute arithmetic averages of MSE and system mismatch, i.e. $\|\mathbf{h}^* - \mathbf{h}_k\|^2 / \|\mathbf{h}^*\|^2$, 300 independent experiments



(a)



(b)


Fig. 6. Performance of the proposed algorithm for $D = 3, 5, 8$, $q = 4$, and $r = 1$ under $\text{SNR} = 15$ dB in (a) system mismatch and (b) MSE.

are performed. In each experiment, \mathbf{h}^* is generated randomly for $N = 50$, and the input signal is generated by passing a white Gaussian signal through a length-30 finite impulse response (FIR) filter whose coefficients are chosen randomly (the resulting input signal has weak autocorrelation). The signal to noise ratio (SNR) is set to $\text{SNR} := 10 \log_{10} (E\{z_k^2\} / E\{n_k^2\}) = 15$ dB, where $z_k := \langle \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{h}^* \rangle$.


The parameters are set to¹¹ $\lambda_k = 0.03$, $\rho = 0.15$, $q = 4$, $r = 1$, $\mathbf{h}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, and $D = 3, 5, 8$. The results are depicted in Fig. 6. It is seen that, from $D = 3$ to $D = 5$, an increase of D leads to better steady-state performance both in system mismatch and MSE. However, from $D = 5$ to $D = 8$, the gain in MSE is slight, although a significant gain is obtained in system mismatch. This is because the value of $\|\mathbf{h}_k - \mathbf{h}^*\|$ at the steady state is still not small enough in the case of $D = 5$, but the value of $\|\mathbf{h}_k - \mathbf{h}^*\|_{\mathbf{R}}$ is already small enough (see Section II).

Next we fix the value of $D = 8$, and change the value of q as $q = 1, 2, 3, 5, 8$. The rest of the parameters are the same as in Fig. 6. The results are depicted in Fig. 7. As a benchmark, the performance curves of NLMS for step size $\lambda_k = 0.03$

¹¹ In the current study, we only focus on the case of $r = 1$ to make the parameter settings simple. In fact, it has been reported in [?], [?], [?], [?], [?] that fast convergence and good steady-state performance are attained when we use $r = 1$ and a large value of q (e.g., $q = 8, 16, 32$) for the N within the range of 64 to 2000 in the (full-rank) APSP algorithm [?].



(a)



(b)


Fig. 7. Performance of the proposed algorithm for $D = 8$, $q = 1, 2, 3, 5, 8$, and $r = 1$ under $\text{SNR} = 15$ dB in (a) system mismatch and (b) MSE.

are also drawn. It is seen that an increase of q (the number of parallel projections computed at each iteration) raises the speed of convergence significantly.


B. Proposed versus CGRRF for System Identification

We compare the performance of the proposed algorithm with CGRRF and the NLMS algorithm. The \mathbf{h}^* and the input signals are generated in the same way as in Section V-A, and the SNR is set to $\text{SNR} = 20$ dB. We consider the situation where \mathbf{h}^* changes dynamically at 1000th iteration; the input statistics are *unchanged*, which means that only the crosscorrelation vector \mathbf{p} is changed. For all the algorithms (except for CGRRF), the step size is set to $\lambda_k = 0.05$, and for the proposed algorithm, we set $\rho = 0.1$, $q = 1, 5$, $r = 1$, $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, and $D = 5$. For CGRRF, the Krylov subspace dimension is set also to $D = 5$, and the initial vector at each time instant is set to the zero vector.

Figure 8 plots the results. As expected from the discussion in Section II, the tracking speed of CGRRF after the sudden change of \mathbf{h}^* is slow, although its convergence speed at the initial phase is fast. On the other hand, the proposed algorithm for $q = 5$ achieves fast initial convergence and good tracking performance simultaneously.



(a)



(b)

Fig. 8. The proposed algorithm versus CGRRF and NLMS under $\text{SNR} = 20$ dB in (a) system mismatch and (b) MSE. For the proposed algorithm, $\lambda_k = 0.05$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $D = 5$, $\rho = 0.1$, and $r = 1$. For CGRRF, $D = 5$. For NLMS, $\lambda_k = 0.05$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$.




Fig. 9. Interference suppression capability in CDMA systems under $\text{SNR} = 15$ dB in static environments. The number of users is $K = 8$, and the amplitudes of all users are equal. For the proposed algorithm, $\lambda_k = 0.02$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $D = 5$, $\rho = 0.01$, and $r = 1$. For CGRRF, $D = 5$.

C. Proposed versus CGRRF for Interference Suppression Problem in CDMA Systems

We apply the proposed algorithm and CGRRF to the multiple access interference suppression problem occurring in




Fig. 10. Interference suppression capability in CDMA systems under SNR = 10 dB in dynamic environments. The number of users is changed at the bit number 1000 from $K = 4$ to $K = 2$. For the proposed algorithm, $\lambda_k = 0.02$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $D = 5$, $\rho = 0.1$, and $r = 1$. For CGRRF, $D = 5$.

the CDMA systems (see, e.g., [?]). The received data vector, corresponding to the input vector \mathbf{u}_k , is given as

$$\mathbf{u}_k := \mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{b}_k + \mathbf{w}_k. \quad (31)$$

Here, letting K denote the number of users accessing the same channel, $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times K}$ is the signature matrix (each column corresponds to each user), $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ a diagonal matrix with the amplitudes from the K users, $\mathbf{b}_k \in \{1, -1\}^K$ the data symbol vector of the K users, and $\mathbf{w}_k \in \mathbb{R}^N$ the vector of additive white Gaussian noise with zero mean. The output d_k in Fig. 3 corresponds to the element of \mathbf{b}_k associated with the desired user. For simplicity, we assume chip-synchronous but code-asynchronous systems, as usual in the literature on this problem, and fading of the channels is not considered. Also we assume that the training sequence is available to adapt the filter \mathbf{h}_k . For the spreading codes, the length-31 Gold sequences are employed (i.e., $N = 31$).

In the first simulation, we assume static environments with $K = 8$ users having equal amplitudes under SNR = 15 dB. We set $D = 5$ for both CGRRF and the proposed algorithm, and $\lambda_k = 0.02$, $\rho = 0.01$, $r = 1$, and $q = 1, 5$ for the proposed algorithm. At the iteration $k = 0$, the rank-reduction matrix $\mathbf{S}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$ is firstly computed, and then the lower-dimensional adaptive filter \mathbf{h}_k is initialized as $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0 := \mathbf{S}_1^T \mathbf{s}$, where $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is the signature vector of the desired user. For CGRRF, the initial vector at each time instant is set to \mathbf{s} . The results are depicted in Fig. 9.

In the second simulation, we assume dynamic environments under SNR = 10 dB. At the beginning, there are $K = 4$ users accessing the same channel simultaneously, and, at the bit number 1000, all the interfering users stop their access and another interfering user establishes a new connection to the channel (i.e., the total number of accessing users after the bit number 1000 is $K = 2$). All the interfering signals have twice larger amplitudes than the desired one. For the proposed algorithm, we set $\rho = 0.1$ and the other parameters are the same as in the first simulation. The parameters for CGRRF are the same as in the first simulation. The results are depicted in Fig. 10.

From Fig. 9, it is seen that the proposed algorithm (for $q = 5$) performs similarly to CGRRF in the static environments. From Fig. 10, on the other hand, it is seen that the proposed algorithm exhibits better tracking performance than CGRRF. This is consistent with the results in Fig. 8 and also with the discussion in Section II.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper has presented a robust reduced-rank adaptive filtering algorithm based on the Krylov subspace and the set-theoretic adaptive filtering method. The proposed algorithm provides excellent tradeoff between performance (in particular, tracking capability) and computational complexity. The valuable properties (monotone approximation and asymptotic optimality) of the proposed algorithm have been proven within the framework of the modified APSM. It would be worth repeating that the algorithm has a fault tolerance nature due to its inherently parallel structure. The numerical examples have demonstrated that the proposed algorithm exhibits much better tracking performance than CGRRF (with comparable computational complexity). This suggests that the proposed algorithm should perform better than the existing Krylov-subspace-based reduced-rank methods in nonstationary environments. We finally mention that the proposed algorithm has no numerical problems, since it requires no matrix inversion, which implies that the algorithm is easy to implement.

APPENDIX A MATHEMATICAL DEFINITIONS

Let \mathcal{H} denote a real Hilbert space equipped with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and its induced norm $\|\cdot\|$. We introduce some mathematical definitions used in this paper.

- A set $C \subset \mathcal{H}$ is said to be *convex* if $\nu\mathbf{x} + (1-\nu)\mathbf{y} \in C$, $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in C$, $\forall \nu \in (0, 1)$. A function $\Theta : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *convex* if $\Theta(\nu\mathbf{x} + (1-\nu)\mathbf{y}) \leq \nu\Theta(\mathbf{x}) + (1-\nu)\Theta(\mathbf{y})$, $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{H}$, $\forall \nu \in (0, 1)$; the inequality is sometimes called *Jensen's inequality* [?].
- A mapping T is said to be (i) *nonexpansive* if $\|T(\mathbf{x}) - T(\mathbf{y})\| \leq \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$, $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{H}$; (ii) *attracting nonexpansive* if T is nonexpansive with $\text{Fix}(T) \neq \emptyset$ and $\|T(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}\|^2 < \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{f}\|^2$, $\forall (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}) \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \text{Fix}(T) \times \text{Fix}(T)$; and (iii) *strongly or η -attracting nonexpansive* if T is nonexpansive with $\text{Fix}(T) \neq \emptyset$ and there exists $\eta > 0$ s.t. $\eta\|\mathbf{x} - T(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{f}\|^2 - \|T(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}\|^2$, $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}$, $\forall \mathbf{f} \in \text{Fix}(T)$.
- Given a continuous convex function $\Theta : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the *subdifferential* of Θ at any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{H}$, defined as $\partial\Theta(\mathbf{y}) := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{H} : \langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{a} \rangle + \Theta(\mathbf{y}) \leq \Theta(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}\}$, is nonempty. An element of the subdifferential $\partial\Theta(\mathbf{y})$ is called a *subgradient* of Θ at \mathbf{y} .
- Suppose that a continuous convex function $\Theta : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\text{lev}_{\leq 0}\Theta := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H} : \Theta(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0\} \neq \emptyset$. Then, for a subgradient $\Theta'(\mathbf{x}) \in \partial\Theta(\mathbf{x})$, a mapping $T_{\text{sp}(\Theta)} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ defined by

$$T_{\text{sp}(\Theta)}(\mathbf{x}) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{x} - \frac{\Theta(\mathbf{x})}{\|\Theta'(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \Theta'(\mathbf{x}) & \text{if } \Theta(\mathbf{x}) > 0 \\ \mathbf{x} & \text{if } \Theta(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

is called a *subgradient projection relative to* Θ (see, e.g., [?]).

APPENDIX B

PROPERTIES OF Φ_k AND PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

This appendix presents basic properties of Φ_k , the proof of Proposition 1, and some results regarding the attracting nonexpansivity of Φ_k (see Appendix A).

Lemma B.1: (Basic properties of Φ_k)

- (a) $\Phi_k \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ for all $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^D$ and $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$.
- (b) For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\|\Phi_k \mathbf{x}\| \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|$; the equality holds if and only if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$. Moreover, the mapping Φ_k is *nonexpansive* (cf. Appendix A). \square

Proof of Lemma B.1.a: For all $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^D$, we have $\Phi_k \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$.

Proof of Lemma B.1.b: $\mathbf{S}_{k+1}^T \mathbf{S}_{k+1} = \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{S}_k = \mathbf{I}$, we have, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_k \mathbf{x}\| &= \left\| \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{x} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \mathbf{S}_k \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{x} \right\| \\ &= \left\| P_{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}(\mathbf{x}) \right\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{x}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The inequality is verified by the nonexpansivity of the projection operator; the equality holds if and only if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$. (B.1) and the linearity of Φ_k suggest the nonexpansivity of Φ_k . \square

Proof of Proposition 1

Proof of Proposition 1.a: $\Phi_k \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$ implies $\mathbf{0} \in \text{Fix}(\Phi_k)$.

Proof of Proposition 1.b: Suppose $\mathbf{h} \in \text{Fix}(\Phi_k)$. Then, $\mathbf{h} = \Phi_k \mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_{k+1})$. Moreover, by Lemma B.1.b, $\Phi_k \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{h} \Rightarrow \mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$. Hence $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_{k+1})$, implying that $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_{k+1})$.

Proof of Proposition 1.c: To prove (26), it is sufficient to show

$$\mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Assume $\mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \tilde{\mathbf{z}}$. Then, we have

$$\mathbf{S}_k \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow P_{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}(\mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\Rightarrow \|P_{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}(\mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\| = 0 \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow P_{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}(\mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Here, the equivalence between (B.4) and (B.5) is verified by the well-known Pythagorean theorem. From (B.3) and (B.6), we obtain $\mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}}$. The converse is obvious, which verifies (B.2).

By Proposition 1.b, any element $\mathbf{z} \in \text{Fix}(\Phi_k)$ can be expressed as $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}$, $\exists \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \text{Fix}(\Phi_k) &\Leftrightarrow \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \text{Fix}(\mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{S}_{k+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

which with (26) verifies (25).

Proof of Proposition 1.d: The orthonormality of \mathbf{S}_k and \mathbf{S}_{k+1} imply that $\Phi_k = P_{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}$ [?]. Moreover, due to the basic property of projection, we obtain $\text{Fix}(\Phi_k) = \text{Fix}(P_{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)$. \square

Finally, thanks to Proposition 1, we can show that Φ_k is attracting nonexpansive if and only if $\mathbf{S}_k = \mathbf{S}_{k+1}$, as described below.

Lemma B.2 (On attracting nonexpansivity of Φ_k):

- (a) If $\mathbf{S}_k = \mathbf{S}_{k+1}$, then Φ_k is the projection matrix thus *1-attracting nonexpansive*.
- (b) If $\mathbf{S}_k \neq \mathbf{S}_{k+1}$, then Φ_k is nonexpansive but *not* attracting nonexpansive.

Proof of Lemma B.2.a: By Proposition 1.d, $\mathbf{S}_k = \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \Rightarrow \Phi_k = P_{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k)}$, $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{S}_k) = \text{Fix}(\Phi_k)$. Hence, by the Pythagorean theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x} - \Phi_k \mathbf{x}\|^2 &= \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{f}\|^2 - \|\Phi_k \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{f}\|^2, \\ \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \forall \mathbf{f} \in \text{Fix}(\Phi_k). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

This means that the mapping Φ_k is 1-attracting nonexpansive.

Proof of Lemma B.2.b: By $\mathbf{S}_k \neq \mathbf{S}_{k+1}$, there exists $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^* \in \mathbb{R}^D$ s.t. $\mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^* \neq \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*$. For such a $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*$, it holds that $\Phi_k \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^* = \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \mathbf{S}_k^T \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^* = \mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^* \neq \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*$, implying $\mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^* \notin \text{Fix}(\Phi_k)$. Hence, we obtain

$$\|\Phi_k \mathbf{z}^* - \mathbf{0}\| = \|\mathbf{S}_{k+1} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*\| = \|\mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*\| = \|\mathbf{z}^* - \mathbf{0}\|, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

where $\mathbf{z}^* := \mathbf{S}_k \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^* \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \text{Fix}(\Phi_k)$ and $\mathbf{0} \in \text{Fix}(\Phi_k)$. This verifies that Φ_k is not attracting nonexpansive. \square

APPENDIX C

PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Proof of (a)-(I): If $\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k) = \mathbf{0}$, then, $\forall \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \in \Omega_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{h}_{k+1} - \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^*\|^2 &= \left\| \Phi_k \mathbf{h}_k - \Phi_k \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \left\| \mathbf{h}_k - \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Assume now $\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k) \neq \mathbf{0}$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \mathbf{h}_{k+1} - \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \right\|^2 \\ &= \left\| \Phi_k \left[\mathbf{h}_k - \lambda_k \frac{\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k)}{\|\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k)\|^2} \Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k) \right] - \Phi_k \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \left\| \mathbf{h}_k - \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* - \lambda_k \frac{\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k)}{\|\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k)\|^2} \Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k) \right\|^2 \\ &= \left\| \mathbf{h}_k - \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \right\|^2 - 2\lambda_k \frac{\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k)}{\|\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k)\|^2} \left\langle \Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k), \mathbf{h}_k - \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \lambda_k^2 \frac{\Theta_k^2(\mathbf{h}_k)}{\|\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k)\|^2} \\ &\leq \left\| \mathbf{h}_k - \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^* \right\|^2 - \lambda_k \left[2 \left(1 - \frac{\Theta_k^*(\mathbf{h}_k)}{\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k)} \right) - \lambda_k \right] \\ &\quad \times \frac{\Theta_k^2(\mathbf{h}_k)}{\|\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k)\|^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

which verifies (16). Here, the first and second inequalities are verified by the nonexpansivity of Φ_k and the definition of subgradient (see Lemma B.1 and Appendix A), respectively.

Proof of (a)-(II): Noting that $\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k) > \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \Theta_k(\mathbf{x})$ implies $\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k) \neq \mathbf{0}$, we can readily verify (29) by (C.2).

Proof of (b): From Theorem 1.a.I, we see that the nonnegative sequence $(\|\mathbf{h}_k - \boldsymbol{\omega}\|)_{k \geq K_0}$ for any $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \Omega$ is convergent, hence $(\mathbf{h}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Moreover, since $\mathbf{0} \in \partial\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k)$ implies $\Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k) = 0$, it is sufficient to check the case $\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k) \neq \mathbf{0}$. In this case, by (C.2), we have

$$\|\mathbf{h}_k - \boldsymbol{\omega}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{h}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{\omega}\|^2 \geq \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{\Theta_k^2(\mathbf{h}_k)}{\|\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k)\|^2} \geq 0. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Therefore, the convergence of $(\|\mathbf{h}_k - \boldsymbol{\omega}\|)_{k \geq K_0}$ implies

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Theta_k^2(\mathbf{h}_k)}{\|\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k)\|^2} = 0, \quad (\text{C.4})$$

hence the boundedness of $(\Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k))_{k \geq \mathbb{N}}$ ensures $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, \Theta'_k(\mathbf{h}_k) \neq \mathbf{0}} \Theta_k(\mathbf{h}_k) = 0$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] D. W. Tufts, R. Kumaresan, and I. Kirsteins, Data adaptive signal estimation by singular value decomposition of a data matrix, *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 70, pp. 684685, Jun. 1982.
- [2] W. F. Gabriel, Using spectral estimation techniques in adaptive processing antenna systems, *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propagat.*, vol. AP-34, pp. 291300, Mar. 1986.
- [3] L. L. Scharf and D. W. Tufts, Rank reduction for modeling stationary signals, *IEEE Trans. Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, vol. ASSP-35, no. 3, pp. 350355, Mar. 1987.
- [4] B. D. Van Veen and R. A. Roberts, Partially adaptive beamformer design via output power minimization, *IEEE Trans. Acoust., Speech, Signal Processing*, vol. ASSP-35, pp. 15241532, Nov. 1987.
- [5] L. L. Scharf, The SVD and reduced rank signal processing, *Signal Processing*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 113133, 1991.
- [6] A. M. Haimovich and Y. Bar-Ness, An eigenanalysis interference canceler, *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 7684, Jan. 1991.
- [7] J. S. Goldstein and I. S. Reed, "Reduced-rank adaptive filtering," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 492496, Feb. 1997.
- [8] X. Wang and H. V. Poor, "Blind multiuser detection: A subspace approach," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 677690, Mar. 1998.
- [9] E. G. Strom and S. L. Miller, "Properties of the single-bit single-user MMSE receiver for DS-CDMA system," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 47, pp. 416425, Mar. 1999.
- [10] Y. Song and S. Roy, "Blind adaptive reduced-rank detection for DSCDMA signals in multipath channels," *IEEE J. Selected Areas in Commun.*, vol. 17, no. 11, pp. 19601970, Nov. 1999.
- [11] R. C. de Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, "Adaptive reduced-rank MMSE filtering with interpolated FIR filters and adaptive interpolators," *IEEE Signal Processing Lett.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 177180, Mar. 2005.
- [12] M. Yukawa, R. C. de Lamare, and R. Sampaio-Neto, Efficient acoustic echo cancellation with reduced-rank adaptive filtering based on selective decimation and adaptive interpolation, *IEEE Trans. Audio, Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 696710, May 2008.
- [13] R. C. de Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, "Adaptive Reduced-Rank MMSE Parameter Estimation based on an Adaptive Diversity Combined Decimation and Interpolation Scheme", *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, April 15-20, 2007, vol. 3, pp. III-1317-III-1320.
- [14] R. C. de Lamare, R. Sampaio-Neto, "Spacetime adaptive reduced-rank processor for interference mitigation in DS-CDMA systems", *IET communications*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 388-397, 2008.
- [15] 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, July 2009, pp. 2503 - 2514.
- [16] R.C. de Lamare, R. Sampaio-Neto and M. Haardt, "Blind Adaptive Constrained Constant-Modulus Reduced-Rank Interference Suppression Algorithms Based on Interpolation and Switched Decimation," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, vol.59, no.2, pp.681-695, Feb. 2011.
- [17] S. Li, R. C. de Lamare, R. Fa, "Reduced-rank linear interference suppression for DS-UWB systems based on switched approximations of adaptive basis functions", *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 485-497, 2011.
- [18] S. Moshavi, E. G. Kanterakis, and D. L. Schilling, "Multistage linear receivers for DS-CDMA systems," *International Journal of Wireless Information Networks*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 117, 1996.
- [19] J. S. Goldstein, I. S. Reed, and L. L. Scharf, "A multistage representation of the Wiener filter based on orthogonal projections," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 44, no. 7, pp. 29432959, Nov. 1998.
- [20] M. L. Honig and W. Xiao, "Performance of reduced-rank linear interference suppression," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 19281946, July 2001.
- [21] M. L. Honig and J. S. Goldstein, "Adaptive reduced-rank interference suppression based on multistage Wiener filter," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 986994, Jun. 2002.
- [22] 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 Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 56., no. 6, June 2008.
- [23] A. Kansal, S. N. Batalama, and D. A. Pados, "Adaptive maximum SINR RAKE filtering for DS-CDMA multipath fading channels," *IEEE J. Selected Areas in Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 9, pp. 17651773, Dec. 1998.
- [24] D. A. Pados and S. N. Batalama, "Joint space-time auxiliary-vector filtering for DS/CDMA systems with antenna arrays," *IEEE Trans. Communications*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 14061415, Sep. 1999.
- [25] M. L. Honig and W. Xiao, "Adaptive reduced-rank interference suppression with adaptive rank selection," in *Proc. Milcom*, 2000, vol. 2, pp. 747751.
- [26] R. C. de Lamare, L. Wang, and R. Fa, "Adaptive reduced-rank LCMV beamforming algorithms based on joint iterative optimization of filters: Design and analysis," *Signal Processing*, vol. 90, no. 2, pp. 640-652, Feb 2010.
- [27] R. C. de Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, "Reduced-Rank Adaptive Filtering Based on Joint Iterative Optimization of Adaptive Filters", *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, Vol. 14, no. 12, December 2007.
- [28] L. Wang, RC de Lamare, M. Yukawa, "Adaptive reduced-rank constrained constant modulus algorithms based on joint iterative optimization of filters for beamforming", *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 2983-2997, 2010.
- [29] 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, March 2010, pp.1217-1228.
- [30] 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.
- [31] S. Chowdhury and M. D. Zoltowski, "Application of conjugate gradient methods in MMSE equalization for the forward link of DS-CDMA," in *Proc. IEEE VTC 2001-Fall*, Oct. 2001, pp. 24342438.
- [32] L. Wang, and R.C.de Lamare, "Constrained adaptive filtering algorithms based on conjugate gradient techniques for beamforming", *IET Signal Processing*, vol. 4, issue. 6, pp. 686-697, Feb. 2010.
- [33] 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 Trans. Sig. Proc.*, 2010, vol. 58, no. 8, pp.4182-4194.
- [34] W. Chen, U. Mitra, and P. Schniter, "On the equivalence of three reduced rank linear estimators with applications to DS-CDMA," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 2609-2614, Sept. 2002.
- [35] S. Burykh and K. Abed-Meraim, Reduced-rank adaptive filtering using Krylov subspace, *EURASIP J. Appl. Signal Processing*, no. 12, pp. 1387-1400, Dec. 2002.
- [36] G. K. E. Dietl, Linear estimation and detection in Krylov subspaces Foundations in signal processing, communications and networking, Springer, 2007.
- [37] S. Gollamudi, S. Nagaraj, S. Kapoor, and Y. H. Huang, "Set-membership filtering and a set-membership normalized LMS algorithm with an adaptive step size," *IEEE Signal Processing Lett.*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 111114, May 1998.
- [38] L. Guo, A. Ekpenyong, and Y. H. Huang, "Frequency-domain adaptive filtering A set-membership approach," in *Proc. Asilomar Conf. Signals, Syst., Comput.*, 2003, pp. 2073-2077.
- [39] I. Yamada, K. Slavakis, and K. Yamada, "An efficient robust adaptive filtering algorithm based on parallel subgradient projection techniques," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 10911101, May 2002.

- [40] R. C. de Lamare and P. S. R. Diniz, "Set-Membership Adaptive Algorithms based on Time-Varying Error Bounds for CDMA Interference Suppression", *IEEE Trans. on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 58, no. 2, February 2009, pp. 644 - 654.
- [41] 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 Trans. on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 60, no. 9, 2011, pp. 4324-4337.
- [42] 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.
- [43] M. Yukawa and I. Yamada, "Pairwise optimal weight realization Acceleration technique for set-theoretic adaptive parallel subgradient projection algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 54, no. 12, pp. 4557-4571, Dec. 2006.
- [44] M. Yukawa, K. Slavakis, and I. Yamada, "Adaptive parallel quadratic-metric projection algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Audio, Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 1665-1680, July 2007.
- [45] S. Haykin, *Adaptive Filter Theory*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 4th edition, 2002.
- [46] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 3rd edition, 1996.
- [47] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.
- [48] O. Axelsson, "A survey of preconditioned iterative methods for linear systems of algebraic equations," *BIT*, vol. 25, pp. 166-187, 1985.
- [49] Y. Saad, *Iterative methods for sparse linear systems*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2nd edition, 2003.
- [50] A. W. Hull and W. K. Jenkins, "Preconditioned conjugate gradient methods for adaptive filtering," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Circuits Syst.*, Jun. 1991, pp. 540-543.
- [51] G. K. Boray and M. D. Srinath, "Conjugate gradient techniques for adaptive filtering," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 110, Jan. 1992.
- [52] P. S. Chang and A. N. Willson, Jr., "Analysis of conjugate gradient algorithms for adaptive filtering," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 409-418, Feb. 2000.
- [53] T. Hinamoto and S. Maekawa, "Extended theory of learning identification," *Trans. IEE Japan*, vol. 95, no. 10, pp. 227-234, 1975, in Japanese.
- [54] K. Ozeki and T. Umeda, "An adaptive filtering algorithm using an orthogonal projection to an affine subspace and its properties," *IEICE Trans.*, vol. 67-A, no. 5, pp. 1261-1266, 1984, in Japanese.
- [55] P. L. Combettes, "The foundations of set theoretic estimation," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 182-208, Feb. 1993.
- [56] H. H. Bauschke and J. M. Borwein, "On projection algorithms for solving convex feasibility problems," *SIAM Review*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 367-426, 1996.
- [57] Y. Censor and S. A. Zenios, *Parallel Optimization: Theory, Algorithm, and Optimization*, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- [58] D. Butnariu, Y. Censor, and S. Reich, Eds., *Inherently parallel algorithms in feasibility and optimization and their applications*, New York: Elsevier, 2001.
- [59] U. Madhow and M. L. Honig, "MMSE interference suppression for direct-sequence spread-spectrum CDMA," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 42, no. 12, pp. 3178-3188, Dec. 1994.
- [60] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [61] G. Strang, *Linear algebra and its applications*, Saunders College Publishing, 3rd edition, 1988.