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Abstract: Periodic signals can be modeled as a real wave with unknown period in cascade with a piecewise linear function. A recursive Gauss-Newton prediction error method (RPEM) for joint estimation of the driving frequency and the parameters of the nonlinear output function parameterized in a number of adaptively estimated grid points is introduced. The Cramér-Rao bound (CRB) is derived for the suggested algorithm. Numerical examples indicate that the suggested algorithm gives better performance than using fixed grid point algorithms. Copyright ©2002 IFAC
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1. INTRODUCTION

There is a quite substantial literature dealing with the problem of retrieving noisy sinusoidal signals, see for example (Nehorai and Porat, 1986) and (Händel and Tichavský, 1994). In general, a periodic function with unknown fundamental frequency in cascade with a parameterized and unknown nonlinear function can be used as a signal model for an arbitrary periodic signal as shown in Fig. 1. This approach has two additional properties. First, it gives information on the underlying nonlinearity, in cases where the overtones are generated by nonlinear imperfections in the system. Second, prior information about the wave form can be used to increase the efficiency of the algorithm.

In (Wigren and Händel, 1996), (Abd-Elrady, 2000) and (Abd-Elrady, 2001b), the nonlinearity was chosen to be piecewise linear with the estimated parameters being the function values in a fixed set of grid points as shown in Fig. 2, resulting in fixed grid point adaptation. In this paper, the RPEM algorithm introduced in (Abd-Elrady, 2000) is modified to enable the algorithm

---
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2. THE SUGGESTED ALGORITHM

In order to define the parametric signal model, a periodic function being the input to the estimated static nonlinearity is needed. This function reflects any prior knowledge that is available. It could, for example, be chosen as a triangle wave in cases where the measured signal closely resembles that signal. Since the model is a cascade of two blocks as shown in Fig. 1, the differential static gain of the model will be a factor of two free parameters. It is nevertheless necessary for the algorithm to have information about where the static gain is located, or the criterion function may have an infinite number of minima. Hence, one of the parameters need to be fixed, cf. (Wigren, 1993). In (Wigren and Händel, 1996) and (Abd-Eldra, 2001 b), this was done in the driving signal block. Here, however, the opposite situation will be investigated.

In order to fix the static gain in an amplitude subinterval $I_a$ (cf. (Abd-Eldra, 2000)) contained in exactly one of the subintervals of the nonlinear block, the driving input signal $\tilde{u}(t, \theta_1)$ is modeled as

$$\tilde{u}(t, \theta_1) = X \Lambda(\omega t), \quad \theta_1 = (X \omega)^T$$

(1)

where $t$ denotes discrete time, $\omega \in [0, \pi]$ denotes the unknown normalized angular frequency, $\omega = 2\pi f / f_s$ where $f$ is the frequency, and $f_s$ is the sampling frequency. $X$ is a (possibly time varying) parameter recursively estimated to allow the linear block of the model to adapt its static gain so that the data in $I_a$ can be explained. The fact that $\Lambda(.)$ is periodic now means

**C1** $\Lambda(\omega(t + \frac{2\pi}{\omega})) = \Lambda(\omega t), \quad k \in Z$.

Then let one period of $\Lambda(\omega t)$ be divided into $L$ disjoint intervals $I_j, j = 1, \cdots, L$, and assume

**C2** $\Lambda(\omega t)$ is a monotone function of $\omega t$ on each interval $I_j, j = 1, \cdots, L$.

**Remark 1**: C2) is introduced to avoid restrictions that would reduce the generality of the approach. This can be explained as follows. Assume that one static nonlinearity is used and $\Lambda(\omega t) = \sin(\omega t)$ then the model output $f_i(\theta_1, \sin(\omega t))$ is obtained. If the unknown parameter vector $\theta_1$ of the nonlinear block is fixed, $f_i(\theta_1, \sin(\omega(\pi/\omega - t))) = f_i(\theta_1, \sin(\omega t))$ holds for all $t$. This means that the model signal in half of the time intervals of length $\pi/\omega$ is given by the signal in the remaining time intervals.

A piecewise linear model is used for the parameterization of the nonlinearity, cf. (Wigren, 1993). Choosing $I_a$ to be contained in the first interval $I_1$, the grid points are defined as

$$g_j = \left\{ \left( u_{-k_1}^1 u_{-k_1}^{1+1} \cdots u_{-k_1}^{1+j} \cdots u_{k_1}^{1+j} \right), j = 1 \right\} = \left\{ u_{-k_1}^{1+j} \right\}$$

Then with $f_j(\theta_1, g_j, \tilde{u}(t, \theta_1))$ denoting the nonlinearity to be used in $I_j$. The parameters $\theta_j$ are chosen as the values of $f_j(\theta_j, g_j, \tilde{u}(t, \theta_1))$ in the grid points, i.e.

$$\theta_j = (f_{-k_j}^j \cdots f_{-k_j}^j f_{j_k}^j \cdots f_{j_k}^j)^T, \quad j = 1, \cdots, L.$$  

(2)

(3)

Here $K_o$ is the user chosen static gain constant defined as

$$\frac{\partial f_1(\theta_0, g_1, \tilde{u}(t, \theta_1))}{\partial \tilde{u}} = K_o, \quad \tilde{u}(t, \theta_1) \in I_a.$$  

(4)

Thus the model output becomes

$$\tilde{y}(t, \theta) = f_j(\theta_j, g_j, \tilde{u}(t, \theta_t)), \quad \tilde{u}(t, \theta_t) \in I_j, \quad j = 1, \cdots, L.$$  

(5)

**Remark 2**: $\tilde{u}(t, \theta_t) \in I_j$ means that the phase $\omega t$ is such that $I_j$ is in effect, cf. (Abd-Eldra, 2000).

A piecewise linear function of $\tilde{u}(t, \theta_t)$ can now be constructed from the linear segments with end points in $(u_{-k_1}^{1+j}, f_{-k_1}^j)$ and $(u_{k_1}^{1+j}, f_{k_1}^j)$. A RPEM then follows by a minimization of
\[ V(\theta) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^{N} E[\varepsilon^2(t, \theta)] \quad (6) \]

where \( E[\cdot] \) denotes expectation. Here, \( \varepsilon(t, \theta) = y(t) - \hat{y}(t, \theta) \) denotes the prediction error and \( y(t) \) is the measured signal to be modeled.

The objective of this paper is, as stated in the introduction, to estimate the grid points recursively in addition to the estimation of the fundamental frequency and the parameters of the nonlinear output function. This will give the algorithm more freedom to choose the grid points and achieve a better performance. The negative gradient of \( \hat{y}(t, \theta) \) is needed in the formulation of the recursive algorithm (Söderström and Stoica, 1989). It is given by (for \( u(t, \theta_i) \in I_j, j = 1, \ldots, L \))

\[
\psi(t, \theta) = \left( \begin{array}{cccc}
\frac{\partial f_j(\cdot)}{\partial u} & \psi_t(t) & \frac{\partial f_j(\cdot)}{\partial f_o} & 0.0 \ \frac{\partial f_j(\cdot)}{\partial \theta_j} & 0.0 \ \frac{\partial f_j(\cdot)}{\partial g_j} & 0.0
\end{array} \right) T
\quad (7)
\]

where

\[
\psi_t(t) = \left( \Lambda(\phi) \right|_{\phi=\omega t} X_t d\Lambda(\phi) \left|_{\phi=\omega t} \right)
\quad (8)
\]

Thus the RPEM algorithm becomes

\[
\varepsilon(t) = y(t) - \hat{y}(t), \quad \lambda(t) = \lambda_0 + \lambda(t - 1) + 1 - \lambda_0, \quad S(t) = \psi^T(t) P(t-1) \psi(t) + \lambda(t)
\]

\[
P(t) = (P(t-1) - \psi(t) S^{-1}(t) \psi^T(t) P(t-1)) / \lambda(t)
\]

\[
\left( \begin{array}{c}
\hat{\theta}_t(t) \\
\hat{\theta}_n(t) \\
\hat{\theta}_b(t)
\end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c}
\hat{\theta}_t(t-1) \\
\hat{\theta}_n(t-1) \\
\hat{\theta}_b(t-1)
\end{array} \right) + P(t) \psi(t) \varepsilon(t)
\quad (9)
\]

\[
\phi = \tilde{\omega}(t)(t+1) \quad \tilde{\omega}(t+1) = \tilde{X}(t) \Lambda(\phi)
\]

\[
\psi_t(t+1) = \left( \Lambda(\phi) \right|_{\phi=\omega t} \tilde{X}(t+1) \left|_{\phi=\omega t} \right) \frac{d\Lambda(\phi)}{d\phi}
\quad (T)
\]

when \( \tilde{u}(t+1) \in I_1 \)

\[
\hat{y}(t+1) = \tilde{f}_1 u_{-1} - (K u_{-1} + f_o) u_{-1} + K u_{-1} + f_o \tilde{f}_1 - \tilde{f}_1 u_{-1} \tilde{u}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial u_{-1}} = \left( \begin{array}{c}
\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial u_{-1}} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial f_o} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial g_j}
\end{array} \right) T
\]

\[
\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial u_{-1}} = K u_{-1} + f_o - f_o - f_o \tilde{f}_1 - \tilde{f}_1 u_{-1} \tilde{u}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial f_o} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial \theta_j} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial g_j} = 0, \quad \forall l
\]

\[
\text{when } \tilde{u}(t+1) \in [u_{-2}, u_{-1}]
\]

\[
\hat{y}(t+1) = K \hat{u} + f_o
\]

\[
\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial \theta_j} = 0, \quad \forall l
\]

\[
\text{end}
\]

\[
\text{end}
\]

Here \( D_M \) indicates that the algorithms described in (Ljung and Söderström, 1983) are used to keep the predictor in the model set.

\textbf{Remark 3:} It is considered here that some precautions are taken to prevent grid miss ordering during the estimation process. This is stated as

\textbf{C3} Grid ordering is included in the definition of the model set.

\textbf{3. THE CRAMÉR-RAO BOUND}

In this section the CRB of the proposed parameterization is calculated. Introduce the following condition:

\textbf{C4} The linear block and the static nonlinearity of the system are contained in the model set.
Then there are vectors $\theta^g$ such that the output of the static nonlinearity of the system is described by

$$y(t) = f_j(\theta_x^g, \theta_y^g, \tilde{u}(t, \theta^g_x)) + w(t), \quad \tilde{u} \in I_j. \quad (11)$$
where $w(t)$ is the disturbance which satisfies the following condition,

**C5** $E[w(t)w(s)] = \sigma^2 \delta_{t,s}$ and $w(t)$ is zero mean Gaussian.

Furthermore, introduce the following condition,

**C6** $N > N_o$ such that there exist a time instant $t < N_o$ where $\tilde{u} \in I_j$ and $\tilde{u} \in [u^i_j, u^{i+1}_j]$ \forall $i, j \in \{i = -k^-_j, \ldots, k^+_j - 1, j = 1, \ldots, L\}$.

**Remark 4:** **C6** means that there is signal energy in each subinterval of the model, cf. (Wigren and Händel, 1996).

Then the following theorem holds

**Theorem 1.** Under the Conditions C1)-C6), the CRB for $(\theta^T_x, \theta^T_y, \theta^T_o)^T$ is given by

$$CRB(\theta) = \sigma^2 \left( \sum_{t=1}^{N} I(t) \right)^{-1} \quad (12)$$

where $I(t)$ given by (10) for $\tilde{u}(t, \theta_x) \in [u^i_j, u^{i+1}_j] \in I_j, \ t = -k^-_j, \ldots, k^-_j - 1, j = 1, \ldots, L$ and

\[
\begin{align*}
I_{x,x} &= \frac{\partial f_{j}(-)}{\partial u} \Lambda^2(\phi) \\
I_{w,w} &= \frac{\partial f_{j}(-)}{\partial u} X_t^2 \left[ \frac{d \Lambda(\phi)}{d \phi} \right]^2 \\
I_{x,w} &= \frac{\partial f_{j}(-)}{\partial f_{o}} X_t \Lambda(\phi) \frac{d \Lambda(\phi)}{d \phi} \\
I_{x,f_{o}} &= \frac{\partial f_{j}(-)}{\partial f_{o}} \Lambda(\phi)
\end{align*}
\]
\[ I_{u^j_{i+1},u^j_i} = \left[ \frac{\partial f_j(\cdot)}{\partial u^j_{i+1}} \right]^2 \]

\[ I_{u^j_i,u^j_{i+1}} = \frac{\partial f_j(\cdot)}{\partial u^j_i} \frac{\partial f_j(\cdot)}{\partial u^j_{i+1}} \]

\[ I_{f^j_i,u^j_i} = \frac{\partial f^j_i(\cdot)}{\partial f^j_i(\cdot)} \frac{\partial f^j_i(\cdot)}{\partial u^j_i} \]

\[ I_{f^j_i,u^j_{i+1}} = \frac{\partial f^j_i(\cdot)}{\partial f^j_{i+1}} \frac{\partial f^j_{i+1}(\cdot)}{\partial u^j_i} \]

\[ I_{f^j_{i+1},u^j_i} = \frac{\partial f^j_{i+1}(\cdot)}{\partial f^j_i(\cdot)} \frac{\partial f^j_i(\cdot)}{\partial u^j_i} \]

\[ I_{f^j_{i+1},u^j_{i+1}} = \frac{\partial f^j_{i+1}(\cdot)}{\partial f^j_{i+1}(\cdot)} \frac{\partial f^j_{i+1}(\cdot)}{\partial u^j_{i+1}} \]

\[ \phi = \omega t \]  

(13)

**Proof:** See Appendix A. \qed

4. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

The adaptive grid point algorithm was studied by numerical examples in (Abd-Elra0, 2001a) to investigate its local convergence and the ability to track both the damped amplitude and the frequency variations. Also, the following examples were performed.

**Example 1:** Comparison with the fixed grid point algorithm.

In order to compare the performance of the adaptive grid point algorithm with the fixed grid point algorithm (cf. (Abd-Elra0, 2000)), 100 Monte Carlo simulations were performed with different noise realizations. The data were generated according to: the driving wave was given by

\[ u(t, \theta) = \sin \omega t \quad \text{where} \quad \omega = 2\pi \times 0.05 \]

The static nonlinearity was chosen as

\[ f(u) = \begin{cases} 
(5/3)u^2 + 0.15 & u \geq 0.3 \\
-0.3 \leq u < 0.3 \\
-0.15 & u < -0.3 
\end{cases} \]

The algorithms were initialized with \( \lambda(0) = 0.95, \lambda_0 = 0.99, \lambda_0 = 0.01, K_0 = 1, X = 1, f_0 = 0 \) and \( \omega(0) = 2\pi \times 0.02 \). Further, two static nonlinearities \( (L = 2) \) were used, where \( \tilde{u}(t, \theta_1) \in I_1 \) for positive slopes and \( \tilde{u}(t, \theta_1) \in I_2 \) for negative slopes, respectively. The nonlinearities were initialized as straight lines with unity slope in the following grid points

\[ g_1 = (-2, -1, 0, 1, 0.3, 0.1) \]

\[ g_2 = (-2, -1, -0.3, 0.3, 1, 2) \]

The mean square error (MSE) for the two algorithms for different signal to noise ratios (SNR) was calculated. The results are plotted in Fig. 3 which shows that the adaptive grid point algorithm gives lower MSE than the fixed grid point algorithm for moderate and high SNR. This results indicates that the modeling error is lower for the adaptive grid point algorithm.

**Example 2:** Performance of the adaptive grid point algorithm as compared to the Cramér-Rao bound (CRB).

In order to compare the performance of the adaptive grid point algorithm with the derived CRB for the fundamental frequency estimation, 100 Monte Carlo simulations were performed with different noise realizations. The data were generated as in Example 1 with a static nonlinearity given by

\[ g_1 = (-1, -0.3, 0.15, 0.3, 1) \]

\[ g_2 = (-1, -0.3, 0.3, 1) \]

\[ \theta_1 = (-0.8, 0.3, 0.3, 0.8), \tilde{u}(t, \theta_1) \in I_1 \]

\[ \theta_2 = (-0.8, -0.5, 0.5, 0.8), \tilde{u}(t, \theta_1) \in I_2 \]

Also, the algorithm was initialized as in Example 1 except that \( P = 0.0001 \). The statistics are based on excluding simulations that do not satisfy a margin of 5 standard deviations (as predicted by the CRB) from the true fundamental frequency. Both the CRB for the fundamental frequency estimate and the MSE value were evaluated for different SNR. The statistical results are plotted in Fig. 4 which shows that the adaptive grid point...
point algorithm gives good results, in particular for moderate values of the SNR.

5. CONCLUSIONS

A recursive harmonic signal estimation scheme has been presented. It estimates the grid points in addition to the fundamental frequency and the parameters of the static nonlinearity. Local convergence of the suggested algorithm was investigated by numerical examples and the CRB was calculated for this algorithm. Monte Carlo experiments show that the suggested algorithm gives significantly better results than using fixed grid point algorithms.
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APPENDIX A: PROOF OF THEOREM 1

The log-likelihood function is given by

\[ l(\theta) = \kappa - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{t=1}^{N} (y(t) - \tilde{y}(t, \theta))^2 \]  

where \( \kappa \) is a constant. Let,

\[ \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta} = \left( \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta_t} \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta_n} \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta_y} \right) \]  

where

\[ \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta_t} = \left( \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \omega} \right) \]

\[ \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta_n} = \left( \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial f_0} \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial f_1} \ldots \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial f_L} \right) \]

\[ \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta_j} = \left( \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial g_1} \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial g_2} \ldots \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial g_L} \right) \]

\[ \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta_l} = \left( \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial u_{-k_j^-}} \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial u_{-k_j^-}} \ldots \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial u_{k_j^+}} \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial u_{k_j^+}} \right) \]  

Then, the Fisher information matrix (Söderström and Stoica, 1989) can be written as

\[ J = -E \left( \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right)^T \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \]

\[ = -E \left( \begin{array}{cccc}
\frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta_t} & \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta_n} & \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta_y} \\
\frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \omega} & \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta_t}
\end{array} \right) \]  

In order to calculate \( J \), note that for \( \bar{u}(t, \theta_l) \in [u_{i-1}, u_{i+1}] \in I_j, i = -k_j^-, \ldots, k_j^+ - 1, j = 1, \ldots, L \), it holds that

\[ \frac{\partial y(t, \theta_l)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial f_j(\cdot)}{\partial u} X \frac{dA(\phi)}{d\phi} \]

Thus using the signal model \( C4 \) and \( C5 \), the blocks of (20) can be evaluated as in (Abd-Elady, 2001a). Introduce the notation in (13) and use the facts that \( \frac{\partial^2 I(t)}{\partial \theta_n \partial \theta_n} = 0 \) and \( \frac{\partial^2 I(t)}{\partial \theta_n \partial \theta_n} = 0 \) for \( m \neq n \) and \( J = 1/\sigma^2 \sum_{t=1}^{N} I(t) \). Then (12) directly follows from \( C6 \), see (Abd-Elady, 2001a).