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ABSTRACT In this paper, the problem of direction-of-arrival (DOA) estimation for a uniform linear array with single-snapshot observations is addressed. Two non-parametric DOA estimators are developed, which can be applied in any azimuth range with one snapshot. Their main idea is iteratively updating the DOA estimates using the weighted least squares and covariance matrix. Two criteria for implementing the covariance matrix are devised, which guarantee high resolution of the proposed methods. The simulation results are included to demonstrate the superiority of our algorithms over several conventional DOA methods in terms of both estimation performance and computational complexity.

INDEX TERMS Direction-of-arrival, single snapshot, iterative adaptive approach, selective azimuth range, weighted least squares.

I. INTRODUCTION

Direction-of-arrival (DOA) estimation is an important research topic in sensor array processing and can be applied in many areas such as radar, sonar and communications [1]–[3]. It refers to accurately determining the locations of sources using a finite set of noisy measurements by means of either parametric or non-parametric methodologies [4]. In the parametric approach, the signal is assumed to be described as a known function, which allows the derivation of the optimal estimators. Nevertheless, the performance of parametric methods deteriorates if the assumed signal model and actual one are mismatched. While for the non-parametric method, there is no assumption on the signal, and therefore, it can be utilized in many applications even when there is no prior knowledge of the signal.

Among numerous non-parametric estimators developed in the literature, one representative methodology is the classical delay-and-sum (DAS) method [5], where the observed data are weighted and time-shifted for different scanning azimuth ranges in the space [0°, 180°). However, this method has high sidelobe, leading to poor resolution in the case of two closely-spaced source waveforms. To improve the performance, several algorithms such as principal-singular-vector utilization for modal analysis (PUMA) [6], Capon [7]–[9], multiple signal classification (MUSIC) [10]–[12] have been proposed, which can provide high-resolution in the scenario of high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and large number of snapshots. In [13]–[15], amplitude and phase estimator (APES) was suggested to accurately estimate the power of the source signal, which can resolve sources as well. Although these methods can obtain high accurate DOA estimation in the case of high SNR or numerous snapshots, their performance degrades when only a few snapshots are available. This is because that accurate implementation of covariance matrix in these methods requires a large number of snapshots.

Furthermore, in real-world applications, single snapshot is commonly encountered, when the environment around the sensors does not change in a short duration. Moreover, in wireless communications, single-input single-output (SISO) [16], [17] and/or multiple-input single-output (MISO) radar/sonar range-Doppler imaging [18], the mathematical model of observations aligns with that of uniform linear array (ULA) using single snapshot. Since the developed estimators such as Capon, MUSIC and APES estimators, cannot provide a satisfactory performance, the problem of DOA estimation for single snapshot has attracted considerable attention.

In [19]–[21], a super-resolution method, namely, the iterative adaptive approach (IAA), is developed, which iteratively
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obtaining DOA estimates using the weighted least squares (WLS) approach. According to the Markov estimate [22], [23], the weighting matrix in IAA is in fact the covariance matrix of observations. To ensure the high resolution, IAA updates the covariance matrix using the DOA estimate iteratively, and hence, accurate implementation of the IAA covariance matrix requires the estimates in full azimuth ranges of \( [0^\circ, 180^\circ] \). That is to say, IAA can only work well in the fixed azimuth range. However, in the case that the coarse arrival ranges of sources are known \textit{a priori}, full azimuth estimation of IAA is redundant and suffers from high computational cost. Although fast implementation of IAA [24]–[26] has been proposed, it is still not a good choice for selective range DOA estimation.

In this paper, we address the DOA estimation problem in a selective azimuth range, where ULA is taken as an illustration. Two high-resolution estimators, referred to as selective IAA I (SIAA I) and selective IAA II (SIAA II), are devised, which are realized according to the IAA cost function. To be employed in any selective azimuth range, two implementation criteria of the covariance matrix are suggested, where only the DOA estimates in the interested azimuth range are required. For SIAA I, we divide the full azimuth range into interested one and non-interested one. Then the covariance matrix is modified utilizing the DOA estimates in the interested range as well as the variance estimates outside the selective range that can be obtained by the selective DOA estimates. While in SIAA II, we redefine the mathematical model of observations as the noise-free and noisy component, where the former is described by the selective azimuth range. The covariance matrix of SIAA II is then defined by the DOA estimates and the variance of noise term.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the ULA signal model and a brief review of IAA algorithm are given. In Section III, we present the main idea of SIAA I, where the derivation of noise variance is suggested. The SIAA II is also developed, and the computational costs of both SIAA I and SIAA II are provided. Computer simulations in Section IV demonstrate that the proposed methods perform better than the Capon, APES and MUSIC estimators. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section V.

\[ y_m(t) = \sum_{p=1}^{P} s_p(t) e^{-j2\pi md \cos(\varpi_p)/\lambda} + q_m(t), \quad m = 1, 2, \ldots, M \] (1)

where \( s_p(t) \) is the waveform impinging on the ULA plane at time \( t \), \( \varpi_p \in [0^\circ, 180^\circ] \) denotes the azimuth angle corresponding to the \( p \)-th source and \( \lambda \) is the wavelength. The \( q_m(t) \) denotes the noise term which is independent and identically distributed (IID) complex random variable following the zero-mean white Gaussian distribution with unknown variance \( \sigma^2 \). The task of DOA estimation is finding \( \{\varpi_p\}_{p=1}^{P} \) from observations \( \{y_m(t)\}_{m=1}^{M} \). Note that \( d \) in Figure 1 denotes the distance between two adjacent sensors, which is chosen as \( \lambda/2 \) [28].

In the following, we consider the single-snapshot DOA estimation problem. It is noted that our study can also be extended to the multiple snapshots. We first review the one-dimensional IAA [19], which can provide the high-resolution full range DOA estimation for the single snapshot data.

The observations in (1) is rewritten in vector form:

\[ y_M = A_M x_L. \] (2)

where \( y_M = [y_1 \ y_2 \ \cdots \ y_M]^T \) is observation vector with \( T \) denoting the transpose operator, and \( x_L = [x_1 \ x_2 \ \cdots \ x_L]^T \) with \( L \geq M \), \( A_M x_L = [a_M(\theta_1) \ a_M(\theta_2) \ \cdots \ a_M(\theta_L)] \) with \( a_M(\theta_l) = [e^{-j\pi \cos(\theta_l)} \ e^{-j2\pi \cos(\theta_l)} \ \cdots \ e^{-jM\pi \cos(\theta_l)}]^T \). (3)

Here, the azimuth range \( [0^\circ, 180^\circ] \) is divided into \( L \) uniform grid points \( \{\theta_l\}_{l=1}^{L} \), while \( x_l \) and \( a_M(\theta_l) \) (\( l = 1, 2, \ldots, L \)) are the amplitude and frequency-vector associated with \( \theta_l \), respectively. Assuming that \( L \) is chosen sufficiently large and in the absence of noise, we have:

\[ x_l = \begin{cases} s_p, & \theta_l = \varpi_p, \quad p = 1, 2, \ldots, P \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \] (4)

The conceptual estimate of \( x_l \), denoted by \( \hat{x}_l \), can be obtained by the WLS approach with the cost function

\[ J(x_l) = (y_M - a_M(\theta_l)x_l)^H W_l^{-1} (y_M - a_M(\theta_l)x_l), \] (5)

where \( -1 \) and \( H \) denote matrix inverse and conjugate transpose, respectively. Employing the criterion in the Markov estimates [23], the weighting matrix \( W_l \) for each \( x_l \) is:

\[ W_l = E[(y_M - a_M(\theta_l)x_l)(y_M - a_M(\theta_l)x_l)^H] = Q_M - E[|x_l|^2]a_M^H(\theta_l)a_M(\theta_l), \] (6)

where \( E[\cdot] \) denotes the expectation operator,

\[ Q_M = E[y_M y_M^H] = A_M x_L \text{ diag } \left( E[|x_1|^2] \ E[|x_2|^2] \ \cdots \ E[|x_L|^2] \right) A_M^H x_L. \] (7)
is the covariance matrix with diag (·) denoting the diagonal matrix. Since the expectation in $Q_M$ is hard to obtain, we assume $E[|x|^2] \approx |x|^2$. In this case, $Q_M$ can be regarded as a complicated function of $x$, therefore, (5) is usually solved in an iterative manner.

Employing the Woodbury matrix identity [29], $W$ can be replaced by $Q_M$ and the $(l+1)$th estimate, referred to as $x_l^{(l+1)}$, is:

$$x_l^{(l+1)} = \arg \min_{x_l} J(x_l) = \frac{a_M^H(\theta_l)(Q_M^{-1})a_M(\theta_l)}{a_M^H(\theta_l)(Q_M^{-1})a_M(\theta_l)}, \quad l = 1, 2, \ldots, L.$$  (8)

where

$$Q_M = A_M \times L \text{diag} \left( |x_1^{(l)}|^2 |x_2^{(l)}|^2 \ldots |x_L^{(l)}|^2 \right) A_M^H.$$  (9)

### III. PROPOSED METHOD

As it is discussed in (8) in Section II, the inverse operation of the covariance matrix $Q_M$ is required in each iteration. According to (9), the $Q_M$ is defined by using the spectrum of full azimuth range. In the applications that only a selective azimuth range, e.g., $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ with $0^\circ < \theta_1 < \theta_2 < 180^\circ$, is interested in, IAA still needs to calculate the full range spectrum due to the requirement of implementing $Q_M$. Since IAA is a type of grid search method, it suffers from the high computational cost for full spectrum estimation. Therefore, IAA cannot be directly applied to the DOA estimation in a selective range.

As the covariance matrix $Q_M$ is a key of IAA, in this section, we develop two implementation methods and propose two generalized IAA versions accordingly.

### A. SIAA I

Suppose all signals are located in our interested ranges $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$. Then the mathematical model in (2) can be rewritten as:

$$y_M = A_M \times L (u + v),$$  (10)

where $u$ corresponds to the spectrum in $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$, while $v$ is the spectrum of $[0^\circ, \theta_1]$ and $(\theta_2, 180^\circ)$. According to our assumption, all source directions are located in $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$. Therefore, $v$ can be regarded as the noise term in frequency domain.

It is assumed that $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ is uniformly divided into $K$ bins. Then the requirement of $180/L = (\theta_2 - \theta_1)/K$ should be satisfied. Under this assumption, (10) can be expressed as:

$$y_M = B_{M \times K} u_K + C_{M \times S} v_S,$$  (11)

where $S = L - K$ and

$$B_{M \times K} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-j\pi \cos(\theta_1)} & e^{-j\pi \cos(\theta_2)} & \ldots & e^{-j\pi \cos(\theta_K)} \\ e^{-j2\pi \cos(\theta_1)} & e^{-j2\pi \cos(\theta_2)} & \ldots & e^{-j2\pi \cos(\theta_K)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ e^{-jM\pi \cos(\theta_1)} & e^{-jM\pi \cos(\theta_2)} & \ldots & e^{-jM\pi \cos(\theta_K)} \end{bmatrix}.$$  (12)

The covariance matrix $Q_M$ in (9) can be regarded as the noise term in frequency domain. Therefore, all source directions are located in $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ and $(\theta_2, 180^\circ)$. In this case, our task becomes finding $u_K$ from $y_M$.

Denote $b_{M}(\omega_k) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-j\pi \cos(\omega_1)} \\ e^{-j\pi \cos(\omega_2)} \\ \vdots \\ e^{-j\pi \cos(\omega_K)} \end{bmatrix}^T$ as the $k$th column of $b_{M \times K}$. Employing the WLS approach, the estimate of $u_k$, denoted by $\hat{u}_k$, is obtained as

$$\hat{u}_k = \arg \min_{\hat{u}_k} (y_M - b_{M}(\omega_k)\hat{u}_k)^H P_M^{-1} (y_M - b_{M}(\omega_k)\hat{u}_k),$$  (15)

where the weighting matrix $P_M$ is defined as the same as (9). Based on (11), $P_M$ is now expressed as

$$P_M = E \left\{ (B_{M \times K} u_K + C_{M \times S} v_S) (B_{M \times K} u_K + C_{M \times S} v_S)^H \right\} = B_{M \times K} E [u_K^H u_K] B_{M \times K}^H + C_{M \times S} E [v_K^H v_K] C_{M \times S}^H.$$  (16)

From the Appendix, $E [v_K^H v_K] = \sigma_z^2 I_S$ is equal to $\sigma_z^2 I_S$ with $\sigma_z^2$ denoting the variance of noise term $v_K$ and $I_S$ being the $S \times S$ identity matrix. Therefore, (16) is now

$$P_M = B_{M \times K} \text{diag} \left( E[|u_1|^2] E[|u_2|^2] \ldots E[|u_K|^2] \right) B_{M \times K}^H + \sigma_z^2 C_{M \times S} C_{M \times S}^H.$$  (17)

Here $P_M$ is still a complicated expression of unknown $u_K$, therefore, $u_k$ can be estimated iteratively with the $(l+1)$th estimate being

$$\hat{u}_k^{(l+1)} = \frac{b_{M}(\omega_k) \left( \begin{bmatrix} \hat{u}_k^{(l)} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{u}_k^{(l)} \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} y_M}{b_{M}(\omega_k) \left( \begin{bmatrix} \hat{u}_k^{(l)} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{u}_k^{(l)} \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} b_{M}(\omega_k)}, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, K.$$  (18)

where

$$P_M^{(l)} = B_{M \times K} G_{K}^{(l)} B_{M \times K}^H + \left( \hat{\sigma}_z^2 \right)^{(l)} C_{M \times S} C_{M \times S}^H,$$  (19)

with $G_{K}^{(l)} = \text{diag} \left( |\hat{u}_1^{(l)}|^2 |\hat{u}_2^{(l)}|^2 \ldots |\hat{u}_K^{(l)}|^2 \right)$. According to the proof in the Appendix, $\hat{\sigma}_z^2$ and noise variance $\sigma^2$ are related by $\hat{\sigma}_z^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{L}$, which can be computed as [30]:

$$\left( \hat{\sigma}_z^2 \right)^{(l)} = \frac{1}{M} \left( y_M - \hat{\mu}^{(l)} B_{M \times K} \hat{u}_K^{(l)H} (y_M - \hat{\mu}^{(l)} B_{M \times K} \hat{u}_K^{(l)} \right).$$  (20)

where $\hat{\mu}^{(l)}$ is the scaling parameter because the value of $u_K$ may not exactly equal $\{s_p\}_{p=1}$. Using the least squares (LS) approach, $\hat{\mu}^{(l)}$ is obtained by minimizing

$$J(\mu) = \left( y_M - \mu B_{M \times K} \hat{u}_K^{(l)} \right)^H \left( y_M - \mu B_{M \times K} \hat{u}_K^{(l)} \right).$$  (21)
Solving (21) yields:

$$\hat{\mu}^{(\ell)} = \left( \hat{u}_K^{(\ell)} \right)^H B_{M \times K}^H y_M. \quad (22)$$

The steps of SIAA I are summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. Summary of SIAA I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Initialize ( { w_k^{(0)} }_{k=1}^M ) as all ones;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Compute ( \mathbf{F}_M^{(\ell)} (\hat{\theta}_M^{(\ell)}) ) using (19)–(22);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Update ( { w_k^{(\ell+1)} }_{k=1}^M ) using (18);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Repeat Steps (ii)–(iii) until the relative error (</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. SIAA II

Although SIAA I can provide a high-resolution spectrum in a selected frequency range \((\theta_1, \theta_2)\), the condition that \(180/L = (\theta_2 - \theta_1)/K \) should be satisfied. That is to say, SIAA I is not flexible for arbitrary selective range. In this case, we propose a more general DOA estimator, which is named SIAA II.

Here we still assume that all noise-free signals are located in the interested interval \((\theta_1, \theta_2)\). According to (2) and with assumption that all signals are in the interested range, the ULA signal model is now expressed as

$$y_M = B_{M \times K} w_K + q_M, \quad (23)$$

where \(B_{M \times K}\) is defined in (12), \(w_K = [w_1 \ w_2 \ \cdots \ w_K]^T\) is the spectrum of noise-free signal in \((\theta_1, \theta_2)\). Here the task of DOA is estimating \(w_K\) from \(y_M\).

The estimate of \(w_k\), referred to as \(\hat{w}_k\), can be computed using the WLS approach:

$$\hat{w}_k = \arg \min_{w_k} (y_M - B_M(w_k))^H F_M^{-1} (y_M - B_M(w_k)),$$ \quad (24)

where the weighting matrix \(F_M\) is still the covariance of observed data \(y_M\). According to the definition in (9), we have

$$F_M = E[(B_{M \times K} w_K + q_M)(B_{M \times K} w_K + q_M)^H], = B_{M \times K} \text{diag} \left(|w_1|^2 |w_2|^2 \cdots |w_K|^2 \right) B_{M \times K}^H + \sigma^2 I_M, \quad (25)$$

where \(I_M\) is the \(M \times M\) identity matrix.

Similarly, (24) is solved in an iterative manner. The \((\ell + 1)\)th estimate, namely, \(\hat{w}_k^{(\ell+1)}\), is computed as

$$\hat{w}_k^{(\ell+1)} = \frac{b_{M \times K}^H (\mathbf{F}_M^{(\ell)})^{-1} y_M}{b_{M \times K}^H (\mathbf{F}_M^{(\ell)})^{-1} B_{M \times K} (w_k)}, \quad k = 1, 2, \cdots, K,$$ \quad (26)

where

$$\mathbf{F}_M^{(\ell)} = B_{M \times K} \mathbf{O}_K^{(\ell)} B_{M \times K}^H + \left( \sigma^2 \right)^{(\ell)} M, \quad (27)$$

with \(\left( \sigma^2 \right)^{(\ell)}\) being

$$\left( \sigma^2 \right)^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{M} (y_M - \hat{\mu}^{(\ell)} B_{M \times K} \hat{w}_K^{(\ell)})^H (y_M - \hat{\mu}^{(\ell)} B_{M \times K} \hat{w}_K^{(\ell)}),$$ \quad (28)

$$\mathbf{O}_K^{(\ell)} = \text{diag} \left(|\hat{w}_1^{(\ell)}|^2 |\hat{w}_2^{(\ell)}|^2 \cdots |\hat{w}_K^{(\ell)}|^2 \right),$$ \quad (29)

and \(\hat{\mu}^{(\ell)}\) is also updated using (22).

Finally, we summarize the steps of SIAA II in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2. Summary of SIAA II.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Initialize ( { w_k^{(0)} }_{k=1}^M ) as all ones;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Compute ( \mathbf{F}_M^{(\ell)} (\hat{\theta}_M^{(\ell)}) ) using (22)–(29);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Update ( { w_k^{(\ell+1)} }_{k=1}^M ) using (26);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Repeat Steps (ii)–(iii) until the relative error (</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY

The complexity of IAA, SIAA I and SIAA II is investigated in this section. At each iteration, the numbers of multiplications required are \(2LM^2 + LM + M^3, 2KM^2 + 2KM + M^3 + LM\) and \(2KM^2 + 3KM + M^3\), respectively. In the proposed schemes, the additional computational cost of \(2KM\) is due to the calculation of \(\hat{\theta}^{(\ell)}\) and \(\hat{\mu}^{(\ell)}\). That is to say, when the increment of scanning grid is identical among IAA, SIAA I and SIAA II, the proposed ones are more computationally efficient. It is worth pointing that in the case of large number of sensors, fast implementation of SIAA I and SIAA II can be realized according to [24]–[26].

### IV. SIMULATION RESULTS

To evaluate the performance of the proposed methods, computer simulations have been conducted. We employ the empirical mean square error (MSE) and absolute bias of \(\hat{\sigma}\), defined as \(E[(\hat{\sigma} - \sigma)^2]\) and \(|\sigma - E[\hat{\sigma}]|\), as the performance metrics. The Cramér-Rao lower bound (CRLB) [31] is included as the benchmark while comparisons with the Capon, APES and MUSIC methods are also provided. The received signal is generated according to (1). For the IAA, Capon, APES and MUSIC estimators, the scanning grid is uniformly with the increment between adjacent points being \(1^\circ\), while the selective range in the proposed methods is chosen as \(\theta_1 = 30^\circ\) and \(\theta_2 = 60^\circ\) with same increment. Therefore, \(K\) and \(L\) are 30 and 180, respectively. All results are simulated using Matlab running on Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-4790 CPU@3.60GHz and Windows 7 for 1000 Monte Carlo trials with \(M = 80\) sensors in ULA.

First, we investigate the estimation performance versus SNR. Here we consider one source located at \(41.1^\circ\) and the three-point parabolic interpolation [32] is utilized to remove the estimation bias. Figures 2 and 3 show the MSE and bias of \(\hat{\sigma}\) versus SNR. It is seen that the performance of SIAA I and SIAA II is superior to IAA and Capon estimators, since they can provide reliable performance when SNR < \(-1\) dB. It is noted that the APES fails to estimate \(\hat{\sigma}\)
correctly because of the few snapshots. Figure 4 shows the complexity of all estimators versus the number of sensors $M$. The stopwatch timer is employed as the measure of empirical computational cost. It is indicated that our proposed schemes are significantly faster than IAA and changes slowly as $M$ varies.

Second, we study the case that all source waveforms are in selective range with $\text{SNR} = 12 \text{ dB}$ and 100 Monte carlo runs are performed. Three closely-spaced uncorrelated sources at $42^\circ$, $44^\circ$ and $46^\circ$ are considered. It is seen in Figure 5 that all estimates of the IAA and SIAA I and SIAA II locate in $(42^\circ, 46^\circ)$, and they can resolve three clusters around $42^\circ$, $44^\circ$ and $46^\circ$ clearly. While for the other three conventional estimators, they fail to provide a reliable and high-resolution estimation. This demonstrates that our proposed methods have higher resolvability.

Thirdly, the scenario that not all sources are in the selective range is considered. Here five uncorrelated sources at $16^\circ$, $42^\circ$, $44^\circ$, $68^\circ$ and $70^\circ$ are investigated, where only sources at $42^\circ$ and $44^\circ$ are our interested signals. The SNR is set to $12 \text{ dB}$ and the experiment is based on 1000 independent trials. Figure 6 shows the DOA spectrum of all estimators. It is seen that only IAA can resolve five peaks in the full range while Capon, APES and MUSIC estimators fails to recognize all peaks. Since signals at $42^\circ$ and $44^\circ$ are the interested ones, our proposed methods can provide a reliable estimation of them. This result shows that although our
method is developed under the assumption that all sources in the selective range, they can still work on the interested range.

To conclude, the proposed methods, SIAA I and SIAA II, have the same resolution with IAA, while they are more flexible since it can work in any interested azimuth range with one snapshot. On the other hand, they are superior to the APES, Capon and MUSIC, indicating that the SIAA I and SIAA II have higher applicability.

V. CONCLUSION
In this paper, two non-parametric DOA estimators are devised, which have high-resolution with one snapshot observations. With the use of the DOA estimates in any selective azimuth range, two implementation approaches of the covariance matrix are developed, which guarantee the flexibility of the proposed schemes. Simulation results demonstrate the superiority of our estimators over the IAA, APES, Capon and MUSIC methods, in terms of higher resolution and lower computational cost.

APPENDIX
DERIVATION OF $E\{v_Sv_S^H\}$
Consider only IID noise term $q = [q_1 \; q_2 \; \cdots \; q_M]^T$ exist in the observations. According to (2), the noise can be expressed as

$$q = A_M x_1 z,$$

where $z = [z_1 \; z_2 \; \cdots \; z_L]^T$ can be regarded as the spectrum of the noise and also contains IID random variables following the Gaussian distribution [33]. With the use of definition for variance $\sigma^2$ as well as (30), we have

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{M}E\{|q|^2\} = \frac{1}{M}E\{|z|^2 (A^HA) z\}.$$  

(31)

Employing the trace [34] property, (31) can be rewritten as

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{M} \text{trace}\left\{E\{|z|^2 (A^HA) z\}\right\} = \frac{1}{M} \text{trace}\left\{(A^HA) E\{|z|^2 z\}\right\},$$  

(32)

where trace($X$) denotes the trace of $X$. Since $z$ are IID Gaussian random variables, according to the definition of trace, (32) is

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{M} \text{trace}\left\{(A^HA) \sigma_z^2\right\},$$

$$= \frac{1}{M} M L \sigma_z^2 = L \sigma_z^2,$$

(33)

where $\sigma_z^2$ is the variance of $z$.

Similarly, since $v_S$ are also IID random variables outside the interested selective range, we have

$$E\{|v_S|^2\} = \sigma_z^2 I_S.$$  

(34)
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