


Figure 1: Block diagram of a complex-valued MISO system.

and its structure heavily depends on the application at hand. Likewise, the physical interpretation of the parameter vectors $\mathbf{h}$ and $\mathbf{g}$ is very application-dependent. As an introductory toy example, the input–output relation of the complex-valued MISO system in Figure 1 can be written in the form of (3). This model is valid when each channel impulse response is a scaled copy of a common impulse response $\mathbf{h}$. With M input signals $x_{m,k}$ in combination with M linear channels $g_m\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{C}^L$, for $m = 1, \ldots, M$, the input signal matrix is defined as

$$\mathbf{X}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{1,k} & \cdots & \mathbf{x}_{M,k} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

where the mth column $\mathbf{x}_{m,k}$ consists of the past L input samples of the input signal $x_{m,k}$. The scalar $g_m \in \mathbb{C}$ is the mth entry of $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{C}^M$, and it may represent an amplitude and phase difference among the M different channels.

In a second example, consider a complex-valued Hammerstein system, as can be seen in Figure 2. Such systems arise, for example, in communication or radar transmitters affected by in-phase and quadrature-phase (IQ) imbalance and/or a nonlinear power amplifier (PA). Assuming the nonlinearity is memory-free and linear in the parameters as

$$u_k = \sum_{m=1}^{M} g_m \varphi_m(x_k), \tag{5}$$

with the input signal x_k, nonlinear functions $\varphi_m(x_k)$, and parameters g_m, the input–output relation of this complex-valued Hammerstein system again can be written in the form of (3). The corresponding input signal matrix results in

$$\mathbf{X}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1(x_k) & \cdots & \varphi_M(x_k) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \varphi_1(x_{k-L+1}) & \cdots & \varphi_M(x_{k-L+1}) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

In both applications, the vectors $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{C}^L$ and $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{C}^M$ can be interpreted as coefficient vectors.

By analyzing (3), it is easy to see that every bilinear model can be rewritten as a linear model as

$$y_k = \mathbf{f}^T \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k + n_k, \tag{7}$$

where we denote $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{g} \otimes \mathbf{h}^* \in \mathbb{C}^{LM}$ as the corresponding linear coefficient vector and $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k = \mathrm{vec}[\mathbf{X}_k] \in \mathbb{C}^{LM}$ as the corresponding input vector.




Figure 2: Block diagram of a complex-valued Hammerstein system.




Figure 3: Block diagram of a system identification task using optimum or adaptive filters.

Using optimum or adaptive filters, with their key structure illustrated in Figure 3, the goal is to find filter parameters $\hat{\mathbf{h}} \in \mathbb{C}^L$ and $\hat{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathbb{C}^M$ or $\hat{\mathbf{f}} \in \mathbb{C}^{LM}$ that minimize a cost function based on the error signal e_k. While a bilinear system has $L + M$ unknown parameters, finding $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_k$ directly requires LM parameters to be found. Note that it is only possible to estimate $\mathbf{h}$ and $\mathbf{g}$ up to a complex-valued constant $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$, since

$$\mathbf{h}^H\mathbf{X}_k\mathbf{g} = (\nu\mathbf{h})^H \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{g}\frac{1}{\nu^*}, \tag{8}$$

while $\mathbf{f}$ is unaffected by this scaling factor.

3. COMPLEX-VALUED BILINEAR FILTERS

In the following chapter, several complex-valued bilinear filters are derived. To approximate the output of a system as in (3), we investigate four different methods. First, this can be achieved by using either $2\mathbb{R}$ or $4\mathbb{R}$ bilinear filter structures. Second, a fully complex-valued bilinear filter structure is applied to estimate $\mathbf{h}$ and $\mathbf{g}$. The fourth method is based on the corresponding linear system shown in (7), thus a complex-valued linear filter may be used [37, 38, 42, 43]. However, this may result in slow convergence speeds because LM coefficients have to be estimated instead of $L + M$ in the bilinear case.

It should be noted that $2\mathbb{R}$ bilinear filters and $4\mathbb{R}$ bilinear filters may be interpreted as simple extensions from the vast literature on real-valued bilinear filters [13–24]. Thus, in this work only the derivations of the $2\mathbb{R}$ bilinear LMS ($2\mathbb{R}$-BLMS) filter and the $4\mathbb{R}$ bilinear LMS ($4\mathbb{R}$-BLMS) filter are shown. The derivations of further $2\mathbb{R}$ and $4\mathbb{R}$ optimum and adaptive bilinear filters can be carried out similarly.