

Spectral analysis of short time signals

Zbyszek P. Karkuszewski

Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland
and

Los Alamos National Laboratory,
Los Alamos, NM 87545.

(Dated: September 2, 2018)

The very old problem of extracting frequencies from time signals is addressed in the case of signals that are very short as compared to their intrinsic time scales. The solution of the problem is not only important to the classic signal processing but also helps to disqualify several common formulations of the quantum mechanical time-energy uncertainty principle.

LAUR-04-5290

INTRODUCTION

The goal of many scientific efforts is to predict future evolution of physical systems on the basis of their known past behavior. One example of the very limited success of such an activity is weather forecasts. Even if the history of all important parameters like temperature, pressure, humidity, wind velocity, etc. is known for many years back at almost every point on Earth, the reasonably accurate prediction of the coming weather conditions can be made only for several days. One may argue that Earth's atmosphere is especially tough system to consider due to its intrinsic instabilities: Even a tiny perturbation of air in one place can lead to huge changes of weather on a distant continent. In this work we will not be able to deal with such instable systems either.

The other extreme is represented by very stable systems such as celestial objects. Centuries-long observations of the Moon and the Sun allowed ancient astronomers to predict accurately, Moon's phases, risings, settings and eclipses for coming millennia without any knowledge of gravitational forces or Kepler's laws. Such precision was possible because the observations of the system had been made over much longer period than the system's characteristic time scales: days, (sidereal) months and years.

Would the same quality predictions be possible if we observed the Moon just for fifteen minutes, i.e. for time much shorter than the shortest characteristic timescale?

The situation is even more interesting in quantum world where according to some formulations of the time-energy uncertainty principle it would be fundamentally impossible to accurately predict evolution of a quantum system that has been observed only for a very short period of time.

In this work we show a practical way of achieving exact predictions of a future based on a very short history of a system. Our predictions will be limited only to the quantities evolution of which can be well described by finite Fourier series. This restriction is crucial. Still, there are many important quantities that fall into this

category.

Before introducing a method designed to perform such a task let us restate the problem in a more formal way. Suppose that a continuous quantity (a signal) $c(t)$ is given only in a finite time interval $t \in [0, T]$ and that it can be expressed in the following way

$$c(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K d_k e^{-i\omega_k t}, \quad (1)$$

where K is an integer, d_k is a real positive [1] amplitude and ω_k is a real (characteristic) frequency. The quantity $c(t)$ is, for simplicity, a complex function, but it can be made real by appropriate addition of terms with opposite sign frequencies $\omega_{k'} = -\omega_k$.

Our goal is to find unknown amplitudes d_k and frequencies ω_k of given $c(t)$ in the case when length T of the time interval is much smaller than the smallest characteristic timescale $T \ll 1/\omega_{max}$. The method outlined below does not require the prior knowledge of the number of the Fourier components K in (1).

Mathematically, one can see that $c(t)$ is an analytic function of time t and, as such, can be uniquely extended beyond the interval $[0, T]$. This means that, in principle, even for tiny T it is possible to get all amplitudes and frequencies from (1) to any desired precision. Unfortunately it is difficult to solve this nonlinear problem analytically and numerical methods cannot handle continuous signals due to infinite number of data points. One way of getting around this problem is to take only finite number of points at the cost of loss of the uniqueness of the extension. From now on we will assume that the signal $c(t)$ is known only at $N + 1$ equidistant time points $t_n = n\delta t$ for $n = 0, \dots, N$ and $t_N = T$. (1) can be rewritten as a set of $N + 1$ equations

$$\sum_{k=1}^K d_k e^{-i\omega_k t_n} = c_n, \quad (2)$$

where $c_n \equiv c(n\delta t)$. This set has $2K$ real unknowns (K amplitudes and K frequencies) so the number of complex

equations $N + 1$ has to be equal or greater than K . This condition would have opened the possibility of existence of a unique solution if the equations were linear in ω_k and d_k . It is not the case here. There will always be infinite number of solutions to (2) if the set is self-consistent and no solutions otherwise. If one has an additional information about the range of frequencies ω_k in the problem (for instance Moon trajectory on the sky should not involve frequencies higher than 1/Hour) then the solution will be unique for small enough δt .

Similar problems, but for large T , are usually treated by a discrete Fourier transform method (DFT). That method *assumes* a grid of N equidistant frequencies and solves (2) only for d_k as a linear set of equations. The spacing of the assumed frequencies is proportional to $1/T$ and thus the method is useless for estimating values of c outside very short interval T .

The more challenging task of solving (2) for both amplitudes and frequencies is performed by, so called, harmonic inversion method.

HARMONIC INVERSION

The historical roots of the method can be traced back to the two centuries old work by Gaspard Riche (Baron de Prony) [2]. A numerical implementation of the original approach can be found in [3]. Here we present yet another derivation of the algorithm.

The key idea behind the harmonic inversion method is to replace the nonlinear problem (2) with an eigenvalue problem for some fictitious operator \hat{U} .

It is not necessary but very convenient to use basic formalism of quantum mechanics to introduce mathematical structure of the method. We will also benefit from this formalism when we turn our attention to quantum time-energy uncertainty principles.

Suppose that an evolution of a normalized quantum state $|\Phi_0\rangle$ is generated by an unitary operator $\hat{U}(\delta t)$ and $|\Phi_n\rangle \equiv \hat{U}^n(\delta t)|\Phi_0\rangle$. For every signal c in (2) there exists such an evolution operator \hat{U} that the signal can be presented as the following autocorrelation function

$$c_n = \langle \Phi_0 | \Phi_n \rangle. \quad (3)$$

It is enough to find eigenvalues $u_k = \exp(-i\omega_k \delta t)$ of the operator $U(\delta t)$ to find all characteristic frequencies. The matrix elements of \hat{U} in the basis of states $|\Phi_n\rangle$ can be expressed in terms of c_n alone

$$U_{ij} \equiv \langle \Phi_i | U | \Phi_j \rangle = \langle \Phi_0 | U^{j-i+1} | \Phi_0 \rangle = c_{j-i+1} \quad (4)$$

where $i, j = 0, \dots, N - 1$. The negative indices of c in the equation above introduce no complication since $c_{-n} = c_n^*$. To obtain K eigenvalues the dimension N of the matrix U must be equal or greater than K . This means that the number of complex signal points c_n required by

the method exceeds the half of the number of unknowns. Vectors $|\Phi_n\rangle$ are not orthogonal, thus the eigenequation for matrix U takes the form

$$U|u_k\rangle = u_k S|u_k\rangle, \quad (5)$$

where S is a matrix of scalar products $S_{ij} \equiv \langle \Phi_i | \Phi_j \rangle = c_{j-i}$ with $i, j = 0, \dots, N - 1$. The rank of the matrix S gives the number of Fourier components of the signal K for $N \geq K$.

The harmonic inversion method consists of two stages. First, one numerically solves the generalized eigenvalue problem (5), in order to get all frequencies. Second, when all frequencies in (2) are known, a linear set of equations for the amplitudes d_k is solved.

This brilliant algorithm has been developed and used by physicists and chemists for several years now, [4, 5, 6]. The only problem is that it fails when applied to short (small T) signals, [6]. This limitation has been phrased in a form of Fourier-like uncertainty relation stating that the local density of frequencies that can be resolved by harmonic inversion must be smaller than the length T of the time span of the signal [6].

Here we claim that the applicability of the method is not limited by the length T of the time interval but rather by noise affecting the signal $c(t)$.

In short, solving (5) requires calculating an inverse of the Hermitian scalar product matrix S . S has K positive and $N - K$ zero eigenvalues. There are algebraic techniques to cope with singular matrices, see [7]. However, the smallest positive eigenvalue λ_{min} becomes very small for small T or large K .

$$\frac{\lambda_{min}}{KN} \approx [f(\omega_k)T\Omega]^{2(K-1)} \quad (6)$$

where $f(\omega_k)$ is a function of order of unity, and Ω stands for the greatest frequency magnitude present in the signal. The formula above is valid only for short signals, $\Omega T \ll 1$, and the expression in rectangular brackets is less than 1.

Even small addition of noise to the signal may result in such a perturbation of λ_{min} that it will be impossible to distinguish it from, also perturbed, zero eigenvalues of the matrix S . When that happens harmonic inversion fails. The optimistic approach to (6) notices that λ_{min} increases very fast with increasing T .

Assuming that the signal $c(t)$ is corrupted by noise $\eta(t)$, $\eta(t) \in [-\eta_{max}, \eta_{max}]$, the new signal $\tilde{c}_n = c_n + \eta_n$ has to be used to build matrices in (5). Harmonic inversion will extract all frequencies if

$$\lambda_{min} \geq 4N\eta_{max} \quad (7)$$

which is a necessary condition assuring that all K positive eigenvalues of S can be found. Presence of noise leads to a set of perturbed frequencies $\tilde{\omega}_k$, which differ from ω_k

$$|\tilde{\omega}_k - \omega_k|T \leq \frac{2KN^2}{\lambda_{min}}\eta_{max}. \quad (8)$$

Notice that this is a "certainty" rather than uncertainty relation. The accuracy of frequencies found with the harmonic inversion can be made as high as needed by reducing the amplitude of noise η_{max} . This is the central result of this work.

In numerical studies where the method failed for small T the role of noise was played by roundoff errors. Figure 1 shows an exemplary application of the harmonic inversion to a very short signal. The values of parameters in the example were deliberately chosen to expose the importance of the precision of the signal.




FIG. 1: As an example, the harmonic inversion method was applied to a signal with $K = 10$ frequencies drawn from the interval $(0.5, 1.0)$, sampled at $N + 1 = 14$ points with $T = 0.01$ (upper plot). 85 digits precision, i.e. $\eta_{max} = 10^{-84}$, was used. Based on the points of the upper plot the signal is reconstructed (red line) with the help of harmonic inversion. Exact (black line) and reconstructed (red line) signals are indistinguishable (middle plot). In fact, the two lines start to differ by 1% for $t > 1,000,000$. The discrepancies, that are due to roundoff errors (noise) of the initial points, are visible in the bottom plot. In the example above $\lambda_{min} = 4.07 \times 10^{-78}$ and this justifies the used 85 digits precision. As a curiosity, the DFT algorithm applied to this signal would give just one frequency $\omega = 0$, so that the prediction would be a horizontal line at $|c(t)| = 1$.

Coming back to the problem of determining the future positions of the Moon in the sky just from a short observation we see that it is possible under one condition: The observation has to be very accurate. The major obstacle in achieving required accuracy would be refraction of the incoming moonbeams in the Earth's atmosphere, which results in a significant shift of the apparent Moon's position with respect to the actual position [8].

The method described above can be applied to any signal of classical or quantum origin as long as it has the form of (2). When applied to quantum systems, it gives important insight to the problem of validity of several formulations of the time-energy uncertainty relations.

QUANTUM UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS

Uncertainty principles play a central role in quantum mechanics. They impose constraints on the states allowed by the theory. For example, no quantum state can yield a product of momentum and position standard deviations smaller than $\hbar/2$ i.e. $\Delta p \Delta x \geq \hbar/2$, where momentum p and position x are a pair of canonically conjugate operators $[x, p] = i\hbar$. This also means that if we prepare a large number of quantum systems, all in the same state, and perform an *exact* measurement of position on half of them and an *exact* measurement of momentum on the other half then the spread of measured values must satisfy the uncertainty principle above.

Similar in form is the relation often provided for time t and energy E

$$\Delta E \Delta t \geq \hbar/2, \quad (9)$$

which is interpreted in various ways in literature. Unlike energy, time is just a parameter in quantum mechanics and the analogy between (9) and other uncertainty relations cannot be carried too far. One of the formulations of the time-energy uncertainty relation is presented in textbooks on quantum mechanics [9, 10] as follows: The measurement of energy of a quantum system performed over time Δt inevitably results in inaccuracy ΔE , so that (9) is satisfied. For more examples of absurd interpretations of the uncertainty see [11].

It has been pointed out by Aharonov and Bohm [12] that the above interpretation is wrong and one can measure accurate energy of a quantum system in as short time interval as one pleases. With the use of harmonic inversion we can provide a simple argument supporting that claim. Moreover, the argument outlined below is much simpler and more general than the one used in [12].

Suppose that the state of an isolated quantum system spans over a finite number K of its energy eigenstates $|k\rangle$, so that at any time t it assumes the form

$$|\Phi(t)\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^K a_k e^{-i\omega_k t} |k\rangle, \quad (10)$$

where a_k is a complex number and eigenenergy $E_k = \hbar\omega_k$.

We will show that, in principle, not only an expectation value of the energy but all energies E_k that contribute to the evolution of the system can be measured exactly no matter how short the measurement time is.

First, it has been experimentally proved that one can actually measure a wave function $\Phi(x)$ in position representation. The technique used in the measurement is known as quantum tomography. The relevant theory and applications are reviewed in [13].

Second, being able to measure $\Phi(x)$ at different times implies that the time autocorrelation function itself

$c(t) = \langle \Phi(0) | \Phi(t) \rangle$ can be measured. Moreover, accuracy of the estimates of $c(t)$ improves systematically with the increasing number of copies of the system on which such measurements are performed.

The third and the last step is to use harmonic inversion described above to extract all eigenenergies and respective amplitudes from $c(t)$.

In short, the accuracy of obtained eigenenergies E_k is only limited by the precision of the measured autocorrelation function $c(t)$ and this precision can be, in principle, as high as one needs.

UNBREAKABLE RELATION

Many formulations of the time-energy uncertainty principle were invented using intuition or dimensional analysis. And, as in the case discussed above, they are of limited applicability or simply wrong. There is, however, one formulation that is rigorously derived from the quantum theory [14].

The Heisenberg uncertainty relations are manifestations of the following theorem: If \hat{A} and \hat{B} are two self-adjoint operators and a state $|\Psi\rangle$ belongs simultaneously to the domains of \hat{A} , \hat{B} , $\hat{A}\hat{B}$, $\hat{B}\hat{A}$, \hat{A}^2 and \hat{B}^2 , then

$$\Delta A \Delta B \geq \frac{1}{2} |\langle [\hat{A}, \hat{B}] \rangle|, \quad (11)$$

where $(\Delta A)^2 \equiv \langle \hat{A}^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{A} \rangle^2$ and $\langle \dots \rangle \equiv \langle \Psi | \dots | \Psi \rangle$. The uncertainty above is an intrinsic feature of the state $|\Psi\rangle$ and has nothing to do with measurement inaccuracies.

This theorem applied to the position and momentum operators yields familiar relation for standard deviations of position and momentum. In the case of time and energy, however, (11) results in $0 \geq 0$ since time enters the Schrödinger equation as a parameter rather than an operator. On the other hand if \hat{A} in (11) is replaced with a Hamiltonian \hat{H} and $|\Phi\rangle$ is not a stationary state, then using Heisenberg equation of motion for an incompatible operator \hat{B} , $d\langle \hat{B} \rangle / dt = i/\hbar \langle [\hat{H}, \hat{B}] \rangle$, one arrives at

$$\Delta H \frac{\Delta B}{\left| \frac{d\langle \hat{B} \rangle}{dt} \right|} \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \quad (12)$$

the uncertainty relation of energy and something that has dimension of time – the lifetime of the state $|\Psi\rangle$ with respect to the observable B . This uncertainty relation cannot be broken or circumvented, it holds as long as quantum mechanics is valid.

There is also a time-energy relation introduced for the case where only one copy of a quantum system is used [15].

SUMMARY

In this work we show a practical way of extracting accurate frequencies and amplitudes from a signal that is available only over very short period of time. The price is that the signal itself must be known to a very high precision. The required precision is not achievable in real world experiments where observed signals are both short and involve many frequencies. The situation is somewhat better in numerical simulations where one has more control over generated data. The role of this letter is to identify the source of the difficulty with a spectral decomposition of short signals and present a tool to perform such a decomposition when possible.

The method equips us also with a powerful argument against some interpretations of time-energy uncertainty relations in quantum mechanics.

Harmonic inversion can also be applied to signals with continuous spectra. In this case it provides lowest moments of the relevant frequency distribution.

Harmonic inversion is superior to DFT even when long time signals are considered. Readers interested in testing the method on long signals and where complex frequencies might be involved should read [6].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Jacek Dziarmaga, Krzysztof Sacha, Jakub Zakrzewski and George Zweig for many stimulating discussions. Work supported by KBN grant 5 P03B 088 21.

-
- [1] Negative amplitudes would only require replacing an ordinary scalar product with a symmetric scalar product in this Letter, see [6] for details.
 - [2] Baron de Prony, *J. E. Polytech.*, **1** 24 (1795).
 - [3] S. L. Marple, Jr., *Digital Spectral Analysis*, Prentice-Hall, Inc. (1987).
 - [4] M. R. Wall and D. Neuhauser, *J. Chem. Phys.* **102**, 8011 (1995)
 - [5] V. A. Mandelshtam and H. S. Taylor, *J. Chem. Phys.* **106**, 5085 (1997).
 - [6] V. A. Mandelshtam and H. S. Taylor, *J. Chem. Phys.* **107**, 6756 (1997).
 - [7] G. H. Golub and C. F. van Loan, "Matrix computations", The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 1996.
 - [8] U. Fantz, *Contemp. Phys.* **45** 93 (2004).
 - [9] L. I. Schiff, *Quantum Mechanics*, McGraw-Hill Companies, 3rd ed. (1968).
 - [10] A. Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, Dover Publications (2000).
 - [11] A. Peres, "Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods", (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1995).
 - [12] Y. Aharonov and D. Bohm, *Phys. Rev.* **122**, 1649 (1961).
 - [13] M. G. Raymer, *Contemp. Phys.* **38** 343 (1997).

- [14] L. Madelshtam and I. Tamm, J. Phys. (USSR) **9** 249 (1945). 052107 (2002).
- [15] Y. Aharonov, S. Massar, S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. A **66**,