

# Appendix A

## Derivation of the Discrete Wavelet Transform

### A.1 ANALYSIS ALGORITHM

The key to developing an efficient discrete-time implementation of the wavelet decomposition lies in recognizing a useful recursion. Because

$$\phi_0^0(t), \psi_0^0(t) \in \mathbf{V}_0 \subset \mathbf{V}_1,$$

there exists a pair of sequences  $h[n]$  and  $g[n]$  such that we can express these functions in terms of a basis for  $\mathbf{V}_1$ , i.e.,

$$\phi_0^0(t) = \sum_l h[l] \phi_l^1(t) \quad (\text{A.1a})$$

$$\psi_0^0(t) = \sum_l g[l] \phi_l^1(t) \quad (\text{A.1b})$$

where the coefficient  $h[n]$  and  $g[n]$  are given by the appropriate projections, viz., (2.20). Equivalently, we may express (A.1) in the frequency domain as

$$\Phi(\omega) = 2^{-1/2} H(\omega/2) \Phi(\omega/2) \quad (\text{A.2a})$$

$$\Psi(\omega) = 2^{-1/2} G(\omega/2) \Phi(\omega/2). \quad (\text{A.2b})$$

In any case, multiplying both sides of (A.1) by  $2^{m/2}$ , replacing  $t$  with  $2^m t - n$ , and effecting a change of variables we get, more generally,

$$\phi_n^m(t) = \sum_l h[l - 2n] \phi_l^{m+1}(t) \quad (\text{A.3a})$$

$$\psi_n^m(t) = \sum_l g[l - 2n] \phi_l^{m+1}(t) \quad (\text{A.3b})$$

where, in turn, we may rewrite (2.20) as

$$h[l - 2n] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi_n^m(t) \phi_l^{m+1}(t) dt, \quad (\text{A.4a})$$

$$g[l - 2n] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_n^m(t) \phi_l^{m+1}(t) dt. \quad (\text{A.4b})$$

The discrete-time algorithm for the fine-to-coarse decomposition associated with the analysis follows readily. Specifically, substituting (A.3a) into (2.13) and (A.3b) into (2.5b), we get, for each  $m$ , the filter-downsample relations (2.21a) and (2.21b) defining the algorithm.

### A.2 SYNTHESIS ALGORITHM

The coarse-to-fine refinement algorithm associated with the synthesis can be derived in a complementary manner. Since

$$\phi_n^{m+1}(t) \in \{\mathbf{V}_m \oplus \mathbf{O}_m\},$$

we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_n^{m+1}(t) &= A_m \{\phi_n^{m+1}(t)\} + D_m \{\phi_n^{m+1}(t)\} \\ &= \sum_l \{h[n - 2l] \phi_l^m(t) + g[n - 2l] \psi_l^m(t)\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where the last equality follows by recognizing the projections in the respective expansions as (A.4). The upsample-filter-merge relation (2.21c) then follows immediately by substituting (A.5) into

$$a_n^{m+1} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x(t) \phi_n^{m+1}(t) dt.$$

# Appendix B

## Proofs for Chapter 3

### B.1 PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2

Let  $\omega_0$  and  $\omega_1$  be constants from Definition 3.1, and let  $\lambda = \omega_1/\omega_0$ . We first establish the following useful lemma.

**Lemma B.1** *When a  $1/f$  process  $x(t)$  is passed through a filter with frequency response*

$$B_a(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & a\omega_0 < |\omega| \leq a\omega_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

*for any  $a > 0$ , the output  $y_a(t)$  is wide-sense stationary, has finite variance, and has an autocorrelation satisfying*

$$R_{y_a}(\tau) = E[y_a(t)y_a(t-\tau)] = a^{-2H}R_{y_1}(a\tau) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

*for all  $a > 0$ . Furthermore, for any distinct integers  $m$  and  $k$ , the processes  $y_{\lambda^m}(t)$  and  $y_{\lambda^k}(t)$  are jointly wide-sense stationary.*

*Proof:*

First, from Definition 3.1 we have immediately that  $y_1(t)$  is wide-sense stationary. More generally, consider the case  $a > 0$ . Let  $b_a(t)$  be the impulse response of the filter with frequency response (B.1). To establish (B.2), it suffices to note that  $y_a(t)$  has correlation function

$$R_{y_a}(t, s) = E[y_a(t)y_a(s)]$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b_a(t-\alpha)b_a(s-\beta)R_x(\alpha,\beta)d\alpha d\beta \\ &= a^{-2H} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b_1(at-\alpha)b_1(as-\beta)R_x(\alpha,\beta)d\alpha d\beta \\ &= a^{-2H}R_{y_1}(at,as) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where we have exploited the identities (3.2b) and

$$b_a(t) = ab_1(at).$$

However, since  $y_1(t)$  is wide-sense stationary, the right side of (B.3) is a function only of  $t-s$ . Hence,  $y_a(t)$  is wide-sense stationary and (B.2) follows. Furthermore,  $y_a(t)$  has variance

$$R_{y_a}(0,0) = a^{-2H}R_{y_1}(0,0) < \infty$$

where the inequality is a consequence of Definition 3.1. To establish our final result, since  $B_{\lambda^m}(\omega)$  and  $B_{\lambda^k}(\omega)$  occupy disjoint frequency intervals for  $m \neq k$ , the spectra of  $y_{\lambda^m}(t)$  and  $y_{\lambda^k}(t)$  likewise occupy disjoint frequency intervals. Thus,  $y_{\lambda^m}(t)$  and  $y_{\lambda^k}(t)$  are uncorrelated, and, hence, jointly wide-sense stationary as well.

■

Proceeding now to a proof of our main theorem, let us establish that  $y(t)$  is wide-sense stationary. Let  $M_L$  and  $M_U$  be any pair of integers such that

$$\lambda^{M_L}\omega_0 < \omega_L < \omega_U < \lambda^{M_U}\omega_1.$$

and consider preceding the filter (3.25) with a filter whose frequency response is

$$\tilde{B}(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & \lambda^{M_L}\omega_0 < |\omega| \leq \lambda^{M_U}\omega_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

since this will not affect the output  $y(t)$ .

Let  $\tilde{y}(t)$  be the output of the filter (B.4) when driven by  $x(t)$ . Then since

$$\tilde{B}(\omega) = \sum_{m=M_L}^{M_U} B_{\lambda^m}(\omega)$$

where  $B_{\lambda^m}(\omega)$  is as defined in (B.1) of Lemma B.1, we can decompose  $\tilde{y}(t)$  according to

$$\tilde{y}(t) = \sum_{m=M_L}^{M_U} y_{\lambda^m}(t) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where  $y_{\lambda^m}(t)$  is the response of the filter with frequency response  $B_{\lambda^m}(\omega)$  to  $x(t)$ . Since, by Lemma B.1, all the terms comprising the summation (B.5) are jointly wide-sense stationary,  $\tilde{y}(t)$  is wide-sense stationary. Then since  $y(t)$  is obtained from  $\tilde{y}(t)$  through the filter (3.25), the stationarity of  $y(t)$  is an immediate consequence of the stationarity of  $\tilde{y}(t)$  [40].

Let us now derive the form of the spectrum of  $y(t)$ , i.e., (3.26). We begin by rewriting (B.2) of Lemma B.1 in the frequency domain as

$$S_{y_1}(a\omega) = a^{-(2H+1)} S_{y_a}(\omega) \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where  $S_{y_a}(\omega)$  is the power spectrum associated with  $y_a(t)$ . For  $1 < a < \lambda$ , we observe that  $S_{y_1}(\omega)$  and  $S_{y_a}(\omega)$  have spectral overlap in the frequency range  $a\omega_0 < |\omega| < \omega_1$ , and can therefore conclude that the two spectra must be identical in this range. The reasoning is as follows. If we pass either  $y_a(t)$  or  $y_1(t)$  through the bandpass filter with frequency response

$$B^\dagger(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & a\omega_0 < |\omega| \leq \omega_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

whose impulse response is  $b^\dagger(t)$ , the outputs must be identical, i.e.,

$$b^\dagger(t) * y_a(t) = b^\dagger(t) * y_1(t) = b^\dagger(t) * x(t).$$

Since  $y_a(t)$  and  $y_1(t)$  are jointly wide-sense stationary, we then conclude

$$S_{y_a}(\omega) |B^\dagger(\omega)|^2 = S_{y_1}(\omega) |B^\dagger(\omega)|^2$$

whence

$$S_{y_a}(\omega) = S_{y_1}(\omega), \quad a\omega_0 < |\omega| < \omega_1. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Combining (B.7) with (B.6) we get

$$S_{y_1}(a\omega) = a^{-(2H+1)} S_{y_1}(\omega), \quad a\omega_0 < |\omega| < \omega_1 \quad (\text{B.8})$$

for any  $1 < a < \lambda$ . Differentiating (B.8) with respect to  $a$  and letting  $a \rightarrow 1+$ , we find that

$$\omega S'_{y_1}(\omega) = -(2H+1) S_{y_1}(\omega), \quad \omega_0 < \omega < \omega_1.$$

and note that all positive, even, regular solutions to this equation are of the form

$$S_{y_1}(\omega) = \sigma_x^2 / |\omega|^\gamma, \quad \omega_0 < |\omega| \leq \omega_1 \quad (\text{B.9})$$

for some  $\sigma_x^2 > 0$  and  $\gamma = 2H + 1$ . Using (B.9) with (B.6) we find, further, that

$$S_{y_{\lambda^m}}(\omega) = \begin{cases} \sigma_x^2 / |\omega|^\gamma & \lambda^m \omega_0 < |\omega| \leq \lambda^m \omega_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Via Lemma B.1, the  $y_{\lambda^m}(t)$  are uncorrelated, so we deduce that  $\tilde{y}(t)$  has spectrum

$$S_{\tilde{y}}(\omega) = \sum_{m=M_L}^{M_U} S_{y_{\lambda^m}}(\omega) = \begin{cases} \sigma_x^2 / |\omega|^\gamma & \lambda^{M_L} \omega_0 < |\omega| \leq \lambda^{M_U} \omega_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Finally, since

$$S_y(\omega) = |B(\omega)|^2 S_{\tilde{y}}(\omega)$$

our desired result (3.26) follows. ■

## B.2 PROOF OF THEOREM 3.3

To show that a fractional Brownian motion  $x(t)$ , for  $0 < H < 1$ , is a  $1/f$  process according to Definition 3.1, it suffices to consider the effect on  $x(t)$  of any LTI filter with a regular finite-energy impulse response  $b(t)$  and frequency response  $B(\omega)$  satisfying  $B(\omega) = 0$ . In particular, since  $x(t)$  has correlation given by (3.16), the output of the filter

$$y(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b(t-\tau) x(\tau) d\tau \quad (\text{B.10})$$

has autocorrelation

$$\begin{aligned} R_y(t, s) &= E[y(t)y(s)] \\ &= \frac{\sigma_x^2}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b(v) dv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |t-s+u-v|^{2H} b(u) du \end{aligned}$$

as first shown by Flandrin [44]. Since  $R_y(t, s)$  is a function only of  $t-s$ , the process is stationary, and has spectrum

$$S_y(\omega) = |B(\omega)|^2 \cdot \frac{1}{|\omega|^{2H+1}}.$$

When we restrict our attention to the case in which  $B(\omega)$  is the ideal bandpass filter (3.24), we see that  $y(t)$  is not only stationary, but has finite variance. This establishes that any fractional Brownian motion  $x(t)$  satisfies the definition of a  $1/f$  process.

That the generalized derivative, fractional Gaussian noise  $x'(t)$ , is also a  $1/f$  process follows almost immediately. Indeed, when  $x'(t)$  is processed by the LTI filter with impulse response  $b(t)$  described above, the output is  $y'(t)$ , the derivative of (B.10). Since  $y(t)$  is stationary, so is  $y'(t)$ . Moreover,  $y'(t)$  has spectrum

$$S_{y'}(\omega) = |B(\omega)|^2 \cdot \frac{1}{|\omega|^{2H'+1}},$$

where  $H'$  is as given by (3.20). Again, when  $B(\omega)$  is given by (3.24),  $y'(t)$  is not only stationary, but has finite variance, which is our desired result. ■

## B.3 PROOF OF THEOREM 3.4

Without loss of generality, let us assume  $\sigma^2 = 1$ . Next, we define

$$x_M(t) = \sum_{m=-M}^M \sum_n x_n^m \psi_n^m(t) \quad (\text{B.11})$$

as a resolution-limited approximation to  $x(t)$  in which information at resolutions coarser than  $2^{-M}$  and finer than  $2^M$  is discarded, so

$$x(t) = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} x_M(t) = \sum_m \sum_n x_n^m \psi_n^m(t).$$

Since for each  $m$  the wavelet coefficient sequence  $x_n^m$  is wide-sense stationary with spectrum  $2^{-\gamma m}$ , the approximation  $x_M(t)$  is cyclostationary [40] with period  $2^M$ , has finite variance, and has the associated time-averaged spectrum

$$S_M(\omega) = \sum_{m=-M}^M 2^{-\gamma m} |\Psi(2^{-m}\omega)|^2. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

The limiting time-averaged spectrum

$$S_x(\omega) = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} S_M(\omega)$$

gives the desired spectrum expression (3.36), and corresponds to the time-averaged spectrum of  $x(t)$  as measured at the output of a bandpass filter for each frequency  $\omega$  in the passband. The desired octave-spaced ripple relation (3.38) for arbitrary integer  $k$  follows immediately from (3.36).

To establish (3.37), we begin by noting that, given  $\omega$ , we can choose  $m_0$  and  $\omega_0$  such that  $\omega = 2^{m_0}\omega_0$  and  $1 \leq |\omega_0| < 2$ . Hence, using (3.38) we see

$$S_x(\omega) = 2^{-m_0\gamma} S_x(\omega_0)$$

from which it follows that

$$\left[ \inf_{1 \leq |\omega_0| < 2} S_x(\omega_0) \right] \frac{1}{|\omega|^\gamma} \leq S_x(\omega) \leq \left[ \sup_{1 \leq |\omega_0| < 2} S_x(\omega_0) \right] \frac{2^\gamma}{|\omega|^\gamma}.$$

It suffices, therefore, to find upper and lower bounds for  $S_x(\omega_0)$  on  $1 \leq |\omega_0| < 2$ .

Since  $\psi(t)$  is  $R$ th-order regular,  $\Psi(\omega)$  decays at least as fast as  $1/\omega^R$  as  $\omega \rightarrow \infty$ . This, together with the fact that  $\Psi(\omega)$  is bounded according to (2.8a), implies that

$$|\Psi(\omega)| \leq \frac{C}{1 + |\omega|^R}.$$

for some  $C \geq 1$ . Using this with (2.14a) in (3.36) leads to the upper bound

$$S_x(\omega_0) \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} 2^{-\gamma m} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 2^{\gamma m} C^2 2^{-2Rm} < \infty.$$

To establish the lower bound it suffices to show  $S_x(\omega) > 0$  for every  $1 \leq \omega \leq 2$ , which we establish by contradiction.

Suppose for some  $1 \leq \omega_0 \leq 2$ ,

$$S_x(\omega_0) = \sum_m 2^{-\gamma m} |\Psi(2^{-m}\omega_0)|^2 = 0$$

Then since all the terms in the sum are non-negative, this would imply that each term is zero, from which we could conclude

$$\sum_m |\Psi(2^{-m}\omega_0)|^2 = 0.$$

However, this contradicts the wavelet basis identity (2.9). Hence, we must have that  $S(\omega) > 0$  for every  $\pi \leq \omega_0 \leq 2\pi$ . The complete theorem follows. ■

#### B.4 PROOF OF THEOREM 3.5

We begin by defining the process  $x_K(t)$  as the result of filtering  $x(t)$  with the ideal bandpass filter whose frequency response is given by

$$B_K(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & 2^{-K} < |\omega| \leq 2^K \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

so that

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} x_K(t) = x(t).$$

Then by Theorem 3.2,  $x_K(t)$  is wide-sense stationary and has power spectrum

$$S_K(\omega) = \begin{cases} \sigma_x^2/|\omega|^\gamma & 2^{-K} < |\omega| \leq 2^K \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

If we denote its corresponding autocorrelation by

$$R_K(\tau) = E[x_K(t)x_K(t-\tau)]$$

and its wavelet coefficients by

$$x_n^m(K) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x_K(t) \psi_n^m(t) dt,$$

the correlation between wavelet coefficients may be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} E[x_n^m(K)x_{n'}^{m'}(K)] &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_n^m(t) R_K(t-\tau) \psi_{n'}^{m'}(\tau) dt d\tau \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_n^m(t) \cdot [R_K(t) * \psi_{n'}^{m'}(t)] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

Applying Parseval's theorem and exploiting (B.13), we may rewrite (B.14) in the frequency domain as

$$\begin{aligned} E[x_n^m(K)x_{n'}^{m'}(K)] &= \frac{2^{-(m+m')/2}}{2\pi} \left\{ \int_{-2^K}^{-2^{-K}} \frac{\sigma_x^2}{|\omega|^\gamma} \Psi(2^{-m}\omega) \Psi^*(2^{-m'}\omega) d\omega \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{2^{-K}}^{2^K} \frac{\sigma_x^2}{|\omega|^\gamma} \Psi(2^{-m}\omega) \Psi^*(2^{-m'}\omega) d\omega \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Interchanging limits, we get

$$x_n^m = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} x_n^m(K)$$

and, in turn,

$$E[x_n^m x_{n'}^{m'}] = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} E[x_n^m(K) x_{n'}^{m'}(K)]. \quad (\text{B.16})$$

Substituting (B.15) into (B.16) yields (3.40). Since

$$|E[x_n^m x_{n'}^{m'}]|^2 \leq \text{var } x_n^m \cdot \text{var } x_{n'}^{m'},$$

and since

$$\text{var } x_n^m = \frac{\sigma_x^2 \sigma_x^2 2^{-\gamma m}}{\pi} J$$

where

$$J = \int_0^\infty \omega^{-\gamma} |\Psi(\omega)|^2 d\omega, \quad (\text{B.17})$$

it suffices to show that (B.17) converges. Because  $\psi(t)$  has  $R$  vanishing moments, there exist constants  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  such that

$$|\Psi(\omega)| < C_0 |\omega|^R \quad (\text{B.18a})$$

$$|\Psi(\omega)| < C_1 |\omega|^{-R}. \quad (\text{B.18b})$$

Using (B.18) in (B.17), we obtain, for  $0 < \gamma < 2R$  and  $R \geq 1$ ,

$$J = \int_0^1 C_0^2 \omega^{2R-\gamma} d\omega + \int_1^\infty C_1^2 \omega^{-2R-\gamma} d\omega < \infty$$

as required. ■

## B.5 PROOF OF THEOREM 3.6

Let us define

$$\Delta = 2^{-m} n - 2^{-m'} n'$$

and

$$\Xi(\omega) = \omega^{-\gamma} \Psi(2^{-m}\omega) \Psi^*(2^{-m'}\omega)$$

for  $\omega > 0$ , so that (3.41) may be expressed, via (3.40), as

$$\rho_{n,n'}^{m,m'} = \frac{\sigma_x^2}{\pi \sigma^2} \text{Re } I(\Delta) \quad (\text{B.19})$$

where

$$I(\Delta) = \int_0^\infty \Xi(\omega) e^{-j\Delta\omega} d\omega. \quad (\text{B.20})$$

Thus, to establish the desired result, it suffices to show that  $I(\Delta)$  has the appropriate decay.

We first note that if  $\gamma \geq 2R + 1$ , then we cannot even guarantee that  $I(\Delta)$  converges for any  $\Delta$ . Indeed, since

$$\Xi(\omega) \sim \mathcal{O}(\omega^{2R-\gamma}), \quad \omega \rightarrow 0$$

we see that  $I(\Delta)$  is not absolutely integrable. However, provided  $\gamma \leq 2R$ ,  $I(\Delta)$  is absolutely integrable, i.e.,

$$\int_0^\infty |\Xi^{(Q)}(\omega)| d\omega < \infty.$$

In this case, we have, by the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma [50], that

$$I(\Delta) \rightarrow 0, \quad \Delta \rightarrow \infty.$$

When  $0 < \gamma < 2R$ , we may integrate (B.20) by parts  $Q$  times, for some positive integer  $Q$ , to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I(\Delta) &= \frac{1}{(j\Delta)^Q} \int_0^\infty \Xi^{(Q)}(\omega) e^{-j\Delta\omega} d\omega \\ &+ \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} \frac{1}{(j\Delta)^q} \left\{ \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} [\Xi^{(q)}(\omega) e^{-j\Delta\omega}] - \lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} [\Xi^{(q)}(\omega) e^{-j\Delta\omega}] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.21})$$

Due to the vanishing moments of the wavelet we have

$$\Xi^{(q)}(\omega) \sim \mathcal{O}(\omega^{2R-\gamma-q}), \quad \omega \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{B.22})$$

while due to the regularity of the wavelet,  $\Psi(\omega)$  decays at least as fast as  $1/\omega^R$  as  $\omega \rightarrow \infty$ , whence

$$\Xi^{(q)}(\omega) \sim \mathcal{O}(\omega^{-2R-\gamma-q}), \quad \omega \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.23})$$

Hence, the limit terms in (B.21) for which  $-2R - \gamma < q < 2R - \gamma$  all vanish.

Moreover, when we substitute  $q = Q$ , (B.22) and (B.23) imply that  $\Xi^{(Q)}(\omega)$  is absolutely integrable, i.e.,

$$\int_0^\infty |\Xi^{(Q)}(\omega)| d\omega < \infty, \quad (\text{B.24})$$

whenever  $-2R - \gamma + 1 < Q < 2R - \gamma + 1$ , which implies, again via the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma, that the integral in (B.21) vanishes asymptotically, i.e.,

$$\int_0^\infty \Xi^{(Q)}(\omega) e^{-j\Delta\omega} d\omega \rightarrow 0, \quad \Delta \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.25})$$

Hence, choosing  $Q = \lceil 2R - \gamma \rceil$  in (B.21) (so  $2R - \gamma \leq Q < 2R - \gamma + 1$ ) allows us to conclude

$$I \sim \mathcal{O}(\Delta^{-\lceil 2R - \gamma \rceil}), \quad \Delta \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.26})$$

Substituting (B.26) into (B.19) then yields the desired result. ■

# Appendix C

## The EM Parameter Estimation Algorithm

In this appendix, we derive the EM algorithm for the estimation of the signal and noise parameters  $\Theta = \{\beta, \sigma^2, \sigma_w^2\}$  for the scenario described in Section 4.3.

We begin by defining our observed (incomplete) data to be

$$\mathbf{r} = \{r_n^m, m, n \in \mathcal{R}\},$$

and our complete data to be  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$  where

$$\mathbf{x} = \{x_n^m, m, n \in \mathcal{R}\}.$$

Consequently, the EM algorithm for the problem is defined as [80]

*E step:* Compute

$$U(\Theta, \hat{\Theta}^{[l]}).$$

*M step:*

$$\max_{\Theta} U(\Theta, \hat{\Theta}^{[l]}) \rightarrow \hat{\Theta}^{[l+1]}$$

where

$$U(\Theta, \tilde{\Theta}) \triangleq E \left[ \ln p_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}; \Theta) | \mathbf{r}; \tilde{\Theta} \right].$$

For our case,  $U$  is obtained conveniently via

$$U(\Theta, \tilde{\Theta}) = E \left[ \ln p_{\mathbf{r}|\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{r}|\mathbf{x}; \Theta) + \ln p_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}; \Theta) | \mathbf{r}; \tilde{\Theta} \right]$$

with

$$p_{\mathbf{r}|\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{r}|\mathbf{x}; \Theta) = \prod_{m, n \in \mathcal{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_w^2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(r_n^m - x_n^m)^2}{2\sigma_w^2} \right\}$$

and

$$p_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}; \Theta) = \prod_{m, n \in \mathcal{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\beta^{-m}}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(x_n^m)^2}{2\sigma^2\beta^{-m}} \right\}.$$

Then

$$U(\Theta, \tilde{\Theta}) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} N(m) \left\{ \frac{1}{\sigma_w^2} S_m^w(\tilde{\Theta}) + \ln 2\pi\sigma_w^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2\beta^{-m}} S_m^x(\tilde{\Theta}) + \ln 2\pi\sigma^2\beta^{-m} \right\} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where

$$S_m^w(\Theta) = \frac{1}{N(m)} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}(m)} E \left[ (w_n^m)^2 | r_n^m; \Theta \right]$$

$$S_m^x(\Theta) = \frac{1}{N(m)} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}(m)} E \left[ (x_n^m)^2 | r_n^m; \Theta \right]$$

are (quasi) conditional sample-variance estimates from the data based upon the model parameters  $\Theta$ . Evaluating the expectations we get

$$S_m^w(\Theta) = A_m(\Theta) + B_m^w(\Theta)\hat{\sigma}_m^2$$

$$S_m^x(\Theta) = A_m(\Theta) + B_m^x(\Theta)\hat{\sigma}_m^2$$

where

$$A_m(\Theta) = \frac{\sigma_w^2 \cdot \sigma^2 \beta^{-m}}{\sigma_w^2 + \sigma^2 \beta^{-m}}$$

$$B_m^w(\Theta) = \left( \frac{\sigma_w^2}{\sigma_w^2 + \sigma^2 \beta^{-m}} \right)^2$$

$$B_m^x(\Theta) = \left( \frac{\sigma^2 \beta^{-m}}{\sigma_w^2 + \sigma^2 \beta^{-m}} \right)^2,$$

which completes our derivation of the *E* step.

To derive the structure of the *M* step, we maximize  $U(\Theta, \tilde{\Theta})$  as given by (C.1). This maximization is always well defined as  $U(\Theta, \tilde{\Theta}) \leq L(\Theta)$  for any  $\Theta, \tilde{\Theta}$ .

The local extrema are obtained by differentiating  $U(\Theta, \tilde{\Theta})$  with respect to each of the parameters of  $\Theta$ . Since (C.1) expresses  $U(\Theta, \tilde{\Theta})$  as the sum of two terms, one of which depends only on  $\sigma_w^2$  and the other of which depends only on  $\beta$  and  $\sigma^2$ , the maximization can be broken down into two independent parts.

Considering first our maximization over  $\sigma_w^2$ , we readily obtain the maximizing  $\hat{\sigma}_w^2$  as the sample-average

$$\hat{\sigma}_w^2 = \frac{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} N(m) S_m^w(\hat{\Theta})}{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} N(m)}.$$

Turning next to  $\beta$  and  $\sigma^2$ , we find that the maximizing parameters  $\hat{\beta}$  and  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  satisfy

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} N(m) S_m^x(\hat{\Theta}) \beta^m = \sigma^2 \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} N(m) \quad (\text{C.2a})$$

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} m N(m) S_m^x(\hat{\Theta}) \beta^m = \sigma^2 \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} m N(m). \quad (\text{C.2b})$$

Eliminating  $\sigma^2$  we obtain that  $\hat{\beta}$  is the solution of the polynomial equation

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} C_m N(m) S_m^x(\hat{\Theta}) \beta^m = 0, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

where  $C_m$  is as defined in (4.16). The eliminated variable  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  is trivially obtained by back-substitution:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} N(m) S_m^x(\hat{\Theta}) \hat{\beta}^m}{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} N(m)}.$$

Finally, to show that the maximizing parameters are the only solution to (C.2) it suffices to show that the solution to (C.3) is unique, which we establish via the following lemma.

**Lemma C.1** Any polynomial equation of the form

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} C_m K_m \beta^m = 0 \quad (\text{C.4})$$

where  $C_m$  is given by (4.16) and  $K_m \geq 0$  has a unique positive real solution provided  $M \geq 2$  and not all  $K_m$  are zero.

*Proof:* Let

$$m_* = \frac{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} m N(m)}{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} N(m)}$$

be a weighted average of the  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ , so  $m_1 < m_* < m_M$ . Then, from (4.16), for  $m > m_*$ ,  $C_m > 0$ , while for  $m < m_*$ ,  $C_m < 0$ . Hence,  $C_m(m - m_*) \geq 0$  with

strict inequality for at least two values of  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  from our hypothesis. Now let  $f(\beta)$  be the left-hand side of (C.4), and observe that

$$\tilde{f}(\beta) \triangleq f(\beta) \beta^{-m_*}$$

is increasing for  $\beta > 0$ , i.e.,

$$\tilde{f}'(\beta) = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} C_m (m - m_*) N(m) \hat{\sigma}_m^2 \beta^{m-m_*-1} > 0.$$

Then, since  $\tilde{f}(0) = -\infty$  and  $\tilde{f}(\infty) = \infty$ , we see  $\tilde{f}(\beta)$  has a single real root on  $\beta > 0$ . Since  $f(\beta)$  shares the same roots on  $\beta > 0$ , we have the desired result. ■

This completes our derivation for the  $M$  step. The complete algorithm follows directly.

# Appendix D

## Proofs for Chapter 5

### D.1 PROOF OF THEOREM 5.2

To show that  $y(t)$  has finite energy, we exploit an equivalent synthesis for  $y(t)$  as the output of a cascade of filters driven by  $x(t)$ , the first of which is an ideal bandpass filter whose passband includes  $\omega_L < |\omega| < \omega_U$ , and the second of which is the filter given by (5.4).

Let  $b_m(t)$  be the impulse response of a filter whose frequency response is given by

$$B_m(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & 2^m\pi < |\omega| \leq 2^{m+1}\pi \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (\text{D.1})$$

and let  $b(t)$  be the impulse response corresponding to (5.4). Furthermore, choose finite integers  $M_L$  and  $M_U$  such that  $2^{M_L}\pi < \omega_L$  and  $\omega_U < 2^{M_U+1}\pi$ . Then, using  $*$  to denote convolution,

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= b(t) * \left[ \sum_{m=M_L}^{M_U} b_m(t) \right] * x(t) \\ &= b(t) * \sum_{m=M_L}^{M_U} \tilde{x}_m(t) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

where

$$\tilde{x}_m(t) = x(t) * b_m(t) = 2^{-mH} \tilde{x}_0(2^m t), \quad (\text{D.3})$$

and where the last equality in (D.3) results from an application of the self-similarity relation (5.2) and the identity

$$b_m(t) = 2^m b_0(2^m t).$$

Because  $x(t)$  is energy-dominated,  $\tilde{x}_0(t)$  has finite energy. Hence, (D.3) implies that every  $\tilde{x}_m(t)$  has finite energy. Exploiting this fact in (D.2) allows us to conclude that  $y(t)$  must have finite energy as well.

To verify the spectrum relation (5.5), we express (D.2) in the Fourier domain. Exploiting the fact that we may arbitrarily extend the limits in the summation in (D.2), we get

$$Y(\omega) = B(\omega) \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{X}_m(\omega) = \begin{cases} X(\omega) & \omega_L < |\omega| < \omega_U \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $\tilde{X}_m(\omega)$  denotes the Fourier transform of  $\tilde{x}_m(t)$ , and where

$$X(\omega) \triangleq \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{X}_m(\omega). \quad (\text{D.4})$$

The right-hand side of (D.4) is, of course, pointwise convergent because for each  $\omega$  at most one term in the sum is non-zero. Finally, exploiting (D.3) in (D.4) gives

$$X(\omega) = \sum_m 2^{-m(H+1)} \tilde{X}_0(2^{-m}\omega),$$

which, as one can readily verify, satisfies (5.6). ■

### D.2 PROOF OF THEOREM 5.3

To prove the “only if” statement, we suppose  $x(t) \in E^H$  and begin by expressing  $x(t)$  in terms of the ideal bandpass wavelet basis. In particular, we let

$$x(t) = \sum_m \tilde{x}_m(t)$$

where

$$\tilde{x}_m(t) = \beta^{-m/2} \sum_n \tilde{q}[n] \tilde{\psi}_n^m(t)$$

and where  $\tilde{q}[n]$ , the generating sequence in this basis, has energy  $\tilde{E} < \infty$ . The new generating sequence  $q[n]$  can then be expressed as

$$q[n] = \sum_m q_m[n] \quad (\text{D.5})$$

where

$$q_m[n] = y_m(t)|_{t=n}$$



and

$$y_m(t) = \tilde{x}_m(t) * \psi(-t).$$

For each  $m$ , since  $\tilde{x}_m(t)$  is bandlimited,  $y_m(t)$  and  $q_m[n]$  each have finite energy and Fourier transforms  $Y_m(\omega)$  and  $Q_m(\omega)$  respectively. Hence,

$$Q_m(\omega) = \sum_k Y_m(\omega - 2\pi k) \quad (\text{D.6})$$

where

$$Y_m(\omega) = \begin{cases} (2\beta)^{-m/2} \Psi^*(\omega) \tilde{Q}(2^{-m}\omega) & 2^m\pi < |\omega| \leq 2^{m+1}\pi \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

with  $\tilde{Q}(\omega)$  denoting the Fourier transform of  $\tilde{q}[n]$ , and  $\Psi^*(\omega)$  the complex conjugate of  $\Psi(\omega)$ .

In deriving bounds on the energy  $E_m$  in each sequence  $q_m[n]$  for a fixed  $m$ , it is convenient to consider the cases  $m \leq -1$  and  $m \geq 0$  separately. When  $m \leq -1$ , the sampling by which  $q_m[n]$  is obtained involves no aliasing. Since on  $|\omega| \leq \pi$  we then have

$$Q_m(\omega) = Y_m(\omega),$$

we may deduce that  $q_m[n]$  has energy

$$E_m = \sum_n |q_m[n]|^2 = \frac{(2\beta)^{-m}}{\pi} \int_{2^m\pi}^{2^{m+1}\pi} |\Psi(\omega)|^2 |\tilde{Q}(2^{-m}\omega)|^2 d\omega. \quad (\text{D.7})$$

Because  $\psi(t)$  has  $R$  vanishing moments, there exists a  $0 < \epsilon_0 < \infty$  such that

$$|\Psi(\omega)| \leq \epsilon_0 |\omega|^R \quad (\text{D.8})$$

for all  $\omega$ . Exploiting this in (D.7) we obtain

$$E_m \leq C_0 2^{(2R-\gamma)m} \tilde{E} \quad (\text{D.9})$$

for some  $0 \leq C_0 < \infty$ .

Consider, next, the case corresponding to  $m \geq 0$ . Since  $\psi(t)$  has  $R$  vanishing moments, there also exists a  $0 < \epsilon_1 < \infty$  such that

$$|\Psi(\omega)| \leq \epsilon_1 |\omega|^{-R} \quad (\text{D.10})$$

for all  $\omega$ . Hence, on  $2^m\pi < |\omega| \leq 2^{m+1}\pi$ ,

$$|Y_m(\omega)| \leq \epsilon_1 \pi^{-R} 2^{-(\gamma+1+2R)m/2} |\tilde{Q}(2^{-m}\omega)|. \quad (\text{D.11})$$

From (D.6), we obtain

$$|Q_m(\omega)| \leq \epsilon_1 \pi^{-R} 2^{-(\gamma+1+2R)m/2} \sum_{k=0}^{2^m-1} |\tilde{Q}(2^{-m}\omega + 2\pi k 2^{-m})| \quad (\text{D.12})$$

by exploiting, in order, the triangle inequality, the bound (D.11), the fact that only  $2^m$  terms in the summation in (D.6) are non-zero since  $y_m(t)$  is

bandlimited, and the fact that  $\tilde{Q}(\omega)$  is  $2\pi$ -periodic. In turn, we may use, in order, (D.12), the Schwarz inequality, and again the periodicity of  $\tilde{Q}(\omega)$  to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} E_m &\leq \epsilon_1^2 \pi^{-2R} 2^{-(\gamma+1+2R)m} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{2^m-1} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |\tilde{Q}(2^{-m}\omega + 2\pi k 2^{-m})|^2 d\omega} \right]^2 \\ &\leq C_1 2^{-(\gamma-2+\omega R)m} \tilde{E} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.13})$$

for some  $0 \leq C_1 < \infty$ .

Using (D.5), the triangle inequality, and the Schwarz inequality, we obtain the following bound on the energy in  $q[n]$

$$E = \sum_n |q[n]|^2 \leq \left[ \sum_m \sqrt{E_m} \right]^2$$

which from (D.13) and (D.9) is finite provided  $0 < \gamma < 2R$  and  $R \geq 1$ .

Let us now show the converse. Suppose  $q[n]$  has energy  $E < \infty$ , and express  $x(t)$  as

$$x(t) = \sum_m x_m(t)$$

where

$$x_m(t) = \beta^{-m/2} \sum_n q[n] \psi_n^m(t).$$

If we let

$$\tilde{y}_m(t) = b_0(t) * x_m(t)$$

where  $b_0(t)$  is the impulse response of the ideal bandpass filter in Definition 5.1, it suffices to show that

$$\tilde{y}(t) = \sum_m \tilde{y}_m(t) \quad (\text{D.14})$$

has finite energy.

For each  $m$ , we begin by bounding the energy in  $\tilde{y}_m(t)$ , which is finite because  $x_m(t)$  has finite energy. Since  $\tilde{y}_m(t)$  has Fourier transform

$$\tilde{Y}_m(\omega) = \begin{cases} (2\beta)^{-m/2} Q(2^{-m}\omega) \Psi(2^{-m}\omega) & \pi < |\omega| \leq 2\pi \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $Q(\omega)$  is the discrete-time Fourier transform of  $q[n]$ , we get

$$\tilde{E}_m = \frac{2^{-\gamma m}}{\pi} \int_{2^{-m}\pi}^{2^{-m+1}\pi} |Q(\omega)|^2 |\Psi(2^{-m}\omega)|^2 d\omega.$$

Again, it is convenient to consider the cases corresponding to  $m \leq -1$  and  $m \geq 0$  separately. For  $m \leq -1$ , most of the energy in  $x_m(t)$  is at frequencies

below the passband of the bandpass filter. Hence, using the bound (D.10) and exploiting the periodicity of  $Q(\omega)$  we obtain

$$\tilde{E}_m \leq \tilde{C}_0 2^{(2R-1-\gamma)m} E. \quad (\text{D.15})$$

for some  $0 \leq \tilde{C}_0 < \infty$ . For  $m \geq 0$ , most of the energy in  $x_m(t)$  is at frequencies higher than the passband of the bandpass filter. Hence, using the bound (D.8) we obtain

$$\tilde{E}_m \leq \tilde{C}_1 2^{-(\gamma+2R+1)m} E. \quad (\text{D.16})$$

for some  $0 \leq \tilde{C}_1 < \infty$ .

Finally, using (D.14), the triangle inequality, and the Schwarz inequality, we obtain the following bound on the energy in  $\tilde{y}(t)$

$$\tilde{E} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\tilde{y}(t)|^2 dt \leq \left[ \sum_m \sqrt{\tilde{E}_m} \right]^2$$

which, from (D.16) and (D.15) is finite provided  $0 < \gamma < 2R - 1$  since  $R \geq 1$ .

■

### D.3 PROOF OF THEOREM 5.5

Following an approach analogous to the proof of Theorem 5.2, let  $b_m(t)$  be the impulse response of a filter whose frequency response is given by (D.1), and let  $b(t)$  be the impulse response corresponding to (5.4). By choosing finite integers  $M_L$  and  $M_U$  such that  $2^{M_L}\pi < \omega_L$  and  $\omega_U < 2^{M_U+1}\pi$ , we can again express  $y(t)$  in the form of eq. (D.2). Because  $x(t)$  is power-dominated,  $\tilde{x}_0(t)$  has finite power. Hence, (D.3) implies that every  $\tilde{x}_m(t)$  has finite power. Exploiting this fact in (D.2) allows us to conclude that  $y(t)$  must have finite power as well.

To verify the spectrum relation (5.23), we use (D.2) together with the fact that the  $\tilde{x}_m(t)$  are uncorrelated for different  $m$  to obtain

$$S_y(\omega) = |B(\omega)|^2 \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} S_{\tilde{x}_m}(\omega) = \begin{cases} S_x(\omega) & \omega_L < |\omega| < \omega_U \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $S_{\tilde{x}_m}(\omega)$  denotes the power spectrum of  $\tilde{x}_m(t)$ , and where

$$S_x(\omega) \triangleq \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} S_{\tilde{x}_m}(\omega). \quad (\text{D.17})$$

Again we have exploited the fact that the upper and lower limits on the summation in (D.2) may be extended to  $\infty$  and  $-\infty$ , respectively. The right-hand side of (D.17) is, again, pointwise convergent because for each  $\omega$  at most one term in the sum is non-zero. Finally, exploiting (D.3) in (D.17) gives

$$S_x(\omega) = \sum_m 2^{-\gamma m} S_{\tilde{x}_0}(2^{-m}\omega)$$

which, as one can readily verify, satisfies (5.24).

■

### D.4 PROOF OF THEOREM 5.6

We first establish some notation. Let us denote the cross-correlation between two finite-power signals  $f(t)$  and  $g(t)$  by

$$R_{f,g}(\tau) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T f(t) g(t - \tau) dt.$$

Its Fourier transform is the corresponding cross-spectrum  $S_{f,g}(\omega)$ . Similarly

$$R_{a,b}[k] = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2L+1} \sum_{n=-L}^L a[n] b[n-k]$$

will denote the cross-correlation between two finite-power sequences  $a[n]$  and  $b[n]$ .

We begin by expressing  $x(t)$  as

$$x(t) = \sum_m x_m(t)$$

where

$$x_m(t) = \beta^{-m/2} \sum_n q[n] \psi_n^m(t).$$

Then the deterministic power spectrum of  $x(t)$  is given by

$$S_x(\omega) = \sum_m \sum_{m'} S_{x_m, x_{m'}}(\omega). \quad (\text{D.18})$$

We will proceed to evaluate these various terms. Because of the dilational relationships among the  $x_m(t)$ , viz.,

$$x_m(t) = 2^{m/2} \beta^{-m/2} x_0(2^m t),$$

it will suffice to consider a single term of the form  $S_{x_0, x_m}(t)$ , for some  $m \geq 0$ .

Hence, let

$$v_m(t) = \beta^{-m/2} \sum_n q[n] \delta(t - 2^{-m}n)$$

and note that

$$v_0(t) = \sum_n \tilde{q}[n] \delta(t - 2^{-m}n)$$

where  $\tilde{q}[n]$  is an upsampled version of  $q[n]$ , i.e.,

$$\tilde{q}[n] = \begin{cases} q[2^{-m}n] & n = 2^m l, \quad l = \dots, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Hence,

$$R_{v_0, v_m}(\tau) = \sum_k R_{\tilde{q}, q}[k] \delta(t - 2^{-m}k)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\tilde{q},\tilde{q}}[k] &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2L+1} \sum_{|n| \leq L, n=2^m l} q[2^{-m}n] q[n-k] \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2L+1} \sum_{|l| \leq 2^{-m}L} q[l] q[2^m l - k]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $q[n]$  is correlation-ergodic, we may replace this correlation with its expected value:

$$R_{\tilde{q},\tilde{q}}[k] = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2L+1} \sum_{|l| \leq 2^{-m}L} \delta[(2^m - 1)l - k] = \begin{cases} \delta[k] & m = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Hence,

$$S_{v_0, v_m}(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & m = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where, without loss of generality, we have set  $\sigma^2 = 1$ . Then, using

$$S_{x_0, x_m}(\omega) = (2\beta)^{-m/2} \Psi(\omega) \Psi^*(2^{-m}\omega) S_{v_0, v_m}(\omega)$$

we get that

$$S_{x_0, x_m}(\omega) = \begin{cases} |\Psi(\omega)|^2 & m = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (\text{D.19})$$

Finally, we note that

$$S_{x_m, x_{m'}}(\omega) = S_{x_{m'}, x_m}^*(\omega)$$

and that

$$S_{x_m, x_{m'}}(\omega) = \beta^{-m'} S_{x_0, x_{m-m'}}(2^{-m'}\omega).$$

Using these identities together with (D.19) in (D.18) yields

$$S_x(\omega) = \sum_m \beta^{-m} |\Psi(2^{-m}\omega)|^2$$

as desired. ■

## References

- [1] Oppenheim, A. V., and Willsky, A. S. with Young, I. T., *Signals and Systems*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1983.
- [2] Siebert, W. M., *Circuits, Signals and Systems*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1986.
- [3] Oppenheim, A. V., and Schaffer, R. W., *Discrete-Time Signal Processing*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1989.
- [4] Mandelbrot, B. B., *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*, San Francisco, CA, Freeman, 1982.
- [5] Grossmann, A., and Morlet, J., "Decompositions of Hardy Functions into Square Integrable Wavelets of Constant Shape," *SIAM J. Math.*, Vol. 15, pp. 723-736, Jan. 1984.
- [6] Goupillaud, P., Grossmann, A., and Morlet, J., "Cycle-Octave and Related Transforms in Seismic Signal Analysis," *Geoexploration*, Vol. 23, pp. 85-102, 1985.
- [7] Daubechies, I., "The Wavelet Transform, Time-Frequency Localization and Signal Analysis," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-36, pp. 961-1005, Sep. 1990.
- [8] Daubechies, I., *Ten Lectures on Wavelets*, Philadelphia, PA, SIAM, 1992.
- [9] Meyer, Y., "Ondelettes et fonctions splines," in *Sem. Equations aux Dérivées Partielles*, Ecole Polytechnique, Paris, France, Dec. 1986.
- [10] Mallat, S., "Multiresolution approximations and wavelet orthonormal bases of  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ ," *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, Vol. 315, pp. 69-87, Sep. 1989.

- [11] Mallat, S. G., "A Theory for Multiresolution Signal Decomposition: The Wavelet Representation," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, Vol. PAMI-11, pp. 674–693, July 1989.
- [12] Daubechies, I., "Orthonormal Bases of Compactly Supported Wavelets," *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, Vol. 41, pp. 909–996, Nov. 1988.
- [13] Burt, P. J., and Adelson, E. H., "The Laplacian Pyramid as a Compact Image Code," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, Vol. COM-31, pp. 532–540, Apr. 1983.
- [14] McCormick, S. F., ed., *Multigrid Methods*, Philadelphia, PA, SIAM, 1987.
- [15] Rabiner, L. R., and Shafer, R. W., *Digital Processing of Speech Signals*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1978.
- [16] Shapiro, J. M., "Embedded Image Coding Using Zerotrees of Wavelet Coefficients," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol. 41, pp. 3445–3462, Dec. 1993.
- [17] Jayant, N. S., and Noll, P., *Digital Coding of Waveforms*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1984.
- [18] Equitz, W. H. R., and Cover, T. M., "Successive Refinement of Information," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-37, pp. 269–275, March 1991.
- [19] Noll, P., "Wideband Speech and Audio Coding," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, Vol. 31, pp. 34–44, Nov. 1993.
- [20] Vaidyanathan, P. P., *Multirate Systems and Filter Banks*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1993.
- [21] Simoncelli, E. P., and Adelson, E. H., "Subband Transforms," in *Subband Image Coding* (Woods, J. W., ed.), Norwell, MA, Kluwer Academic Press, 1990.
- [22] Vetterli, M., and Kovačević, J., *Wavelets and Subband Coding*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1995.
- [23] Vaidyanathan, P., "Multirate Digital Filters, Filter Banks, Polyphase Networks, and Applications: A Tutorial," *Proc. IEEE*, Vol. 78, pp. 56–93, Jan. 1990.
- [24] Bingham, J. A. C., "Multicarrier Modulation for Data Transmission: An Idea Whose Time Has Come," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, pp. 5–14, May 1990.
- [25] Crochiere, R. E., and Rabiner, L. R., *Multirate Digital Signal Processing*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1983.
- [26] Strang, G., "Wavelets and Dilation Equations: A Brief Introduction," *SIAM Rev.*, Vol. 31, pp. 614–627, Dec. 1989.
- [27] Rioul, O., and Vetterli, M., "Wavelets and Signal Processing," *IEEE Signal Proc. Mag.*, Vol. 8, pp. 14–38, Oct. 1991.
- [28] Naylor, A. W., and Sell, G. R., *Linear Operator Theory in Engineering and Science*, New York, NY, Springer-Verlag, 1982.
- [29] Reed, M., and Simon, B., *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics: Functional Analysis*, Vol. I, New York, NY, Academic Press, 1980.

- [30] Mallat, S. G., *Multiresolution Representations and Wavelets*, PhD thesis, Univ. Penn., Philadelphia, PA, Aug. 1988.
- [31] Ballard, D. H., and Brown, C. M., *Computer Vision*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1982.
- [32] Jerri, A. J., "The Shannon Sampling Theorem—Its Various Extensions and Applications: A Tutorial Review," *Proc. IEEE*, Vol. 65, pp. 1565–1596, Nov. 1977.
- [33] Vetterli, M., and Herley, C., "Wavelets and Filter Banks: Theory and Design," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol. 40, pp. 2207–2232, Sep. 1992.
- [34] Lawton, W. M., "Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Constructing Orthonormal Wavelet Bases," *J. Math. Phys.*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 57–61, 1991.
- [35] Malvar, H. S., *Signal Processing with Lapped Transforms*, Norwood, MA, Artech House, 1992.
- [36] Auscher, P., "Wavelet Bases for  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$  with Rational Dilation Factors," in *Wavelets and Their Applications* (Ruskai, B. et al., eds.), Boston, MA, Jones and Bartlett, 1992.
- [37] Blu, T., "Iterated Filter Banks with Rational Sampling Factors: Links with Discrete Wavelet Transforms," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol. 41, pp. 3232–3244, Dec. 1993.
- [38] Kovačević, J., and Vetterli, M., "Perfect Reconstruction Filter Banks with Rational Sampling Factors," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol. 41, pp. 2047–2066, June 1993.
- [39] Mandelbrot, B. B., and Van Ness, H. W., "Fractional Brownian Motions, Fractional Noises and Applications," *SIAM Rev.*, Vol. 10, pp. 422–436, Oct. 1968.
- [40] Papoulis, A., *Probability, Random Variables, and Stochastic Processes*, New York, NY, McGraw-Hill, 2nd ed., 1984.
- [41] Stark, H., and Woods, J. W., *Probability, Random Processes, and Estimation Theory for Engineers*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 2nd ed., 1994.
- [42] Mandelbrot, B., "Some Noises with  $1/f$  Spectrum: A Bridge Between Direct Current and White Noise," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-13, pp. 289–298, Apr. 1967.
- [43] Keshner, M. S., *Renewal Process and Diffusion Models of  $1/f$  Noise*, PhD thesis, M. I. T., Cambridge, MA, May 1979.
- [44] Flandrin, P., "On the Spectrum of Fractional Brownian Motions," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-35, pp. 197–199, Jan. 1989.
- [45] Falconer, K., *Fractal Geometry: Mathematical Foundations and Applications*, New York, NY, John Wiley and Sons, 1990.
- [46] Keshner, M. S., " $1/f$  Noise," *Proc. IEEE*, Vol. 70, pp. 212–218, March 1982.

- [47] Pentland, A. P., "Fractal-Based Description of Natural Scenes," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, Vol. PAMI-6, pp. 661-674, Nov. 1984.
- [48] Voss, R. F., "1/f (Flicker) Noise: A Brief Review," *Proc. Ann. Symp. Freq. Contr.*, pp. 40-46, 1979.
- [49] van der Ziel, A., "Unified Presentation of 1/f Noise in Electronic Devices: Fundamental 1/f Noise Sources," *Proc. IEEE*, pp. 233-258, March 1988.
- [50] Champeney, D. C., *A Handbook of Fourier Theorems*, Cambridge, England, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987.
- [51] Zolotarev, V. M., *One-Dimensional Stable Distributions*, Providence, RI, Am. Math. Soc., 1986.
- [52] Taqqu, M. S., "Self-Similar Processes and Related Ultraviolet and Infrared Catastrophes," in *Random Fields: Rigorous Results in Statistical Mechanics and Quantum Field Theory* (Fritz, J., Lebowitz, J. L., and Szasz, D., eds.), pp. 1057-1096, Amsterdam, North-Holland, 1981.
- [53] Taqqu, M. S., "A Bibliographic Guide to Self-Similar Processes and Long-Range Dependence," in *Dependence in Probability and Statistics* (Eberlein, E., and Taqqu, M. S., eds.), Boston, MA, Birkhauser, 1986.
- [54] Abramowitz, M., and Stegun, I. A., eds., *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, New York, NY, Dover, 1965.
- [55] Barnes, J. A., and Allan, D. W., "A Statistical Model of Flicker Noise," *Proc. IEEE*, Vol. 54, pp. 176-178, Feb. 1966.
- [56] Oldham, K. B., and Spanier, J., *The Fractional Calculus*, New York, Academic Press, 1974.
- [57] Barton, R. J., and Poor, V. H., "Signal Detection in Fractional Gaussian Noise," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-34, pp. 943-959, Sep. 1988.
- [58] Lundahl, T., Ohley, W. J., Kay, S. M., and Siffert, R., "Fractional Brownian Motion: A Maximum Likelihood Estimator and Its Application to Image Texture," *IEEE Trans. on Medical Imaging*, Vol. MI-5, pp. 152-161, Sep. 1986.
- [59] Wornell, G. W., "Wavelet-Based Representations for the 1/f Family of Fractal Processes," *Proc. IEEE*, Vol. 81, pp. 1428-1450, Oct. 1993.
- [60] Wornell, G. W., *Synthesis, Analysis, and Processing of Fractal Signals*, PhD thesis, M. I. T., Cambridge, MA, Sep. 1991. Also RLE Tech. Rep. No. 566, Oct. 1991.
- [61] Ramanathan, J., and Zeitouni, O., "On the Wavelet Transform of Fractional Brownian Motion," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-37, No. 4, pp. 1156-1158, 1991.
- [62] Bernamont, J., "Fluctuations in the Resistance of Thin Films," *Proc. Phys. Soc.*, Vol. 49, pp. 138-139, 1937.
- [63] van der Ziel, A., "On the Noise Spectra of Semi-Conductor Noise and of Flicker Effect," *Physica*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 359-372, 1950.

- [64] Machlup, S., "Earthquakes, Thunderstorms and Other 1/f Noises," in *Noise in Physical Systems* (Meijer, P. H. E., Mountain, R. D., and Soulen, Jr., R. J., eds.), pp. 157-160, Washington, DC, National Bureau of Standards, 1981. Special publ. no. 614.
- [65] West, B. J., and Shlesinger, M. F., "On the Ubiquity of 1/f Noise," *Int. J. Mod. Phys.*, Vol. 3, No. 6, pp. 795-819, 1989.
- [66] Montroll, E. W., and Shlesinger, M. F., "On 1/f Noise and Other Distributions with Long Tails," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, Vol. 79, pp. 3380-3383, May 1982.
- [67] Saletti, R., "A Comparison Between Two Methods to Generate 1/f<sup>γ</sup> Noise," *Proc. IEEE*, Vol. 74, pp. 1595-1596, Nov. 1986.
- [68] Pellegrini, B., Saletti, R., Neri, B., and Terreni, P., "1/f<sup>γ</sup> Noise Generators," in *Noise in Physical Systems and 1/f Noise* (D'Amico, A., and Mazzetti, P., eds.), pp. 425-428, Amsterdam, North-Holland, 1986.
- [69] Corsini, G., and Saletti, R., "Design of a Digital 1/f<sup>γ</sup> Noise Simulator," in *Noise in Physical Systems and 1/f Noise* (Van Vliet, C. M., ed.), pp. 82-86, Singapore, World Scientific, 1987.
- [70] Wornell, G. W., "A Karhunen-Loève-like Expansion for 1/f Processes via Wavelets," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-36, pp. 859-861, July 1990.
- [71] Flandrin, P., "Wavelet Analysis and Synthesis of Fractional Brownian Motion," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-38, pp. 910-917, March 1992.
- [72] Vergassola, M., and Frisch, U., "Wavelet Transforms of Self-Similar Processes," *Physica D*, Vol. 54, No. 1-2, pp. 58-64, 1991.
- [73] Tewfik, A. H., and Kim, M., "Correlation Structure of the Discrete Wavelet Coefficients of Fractional Brownian Motion," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-38, pp. 904-909, March 1992.
- [74] Beylkin, G., Coifman, R., and Rokhlin, V., "Fast Wavelet Transforms and Numerical Algorithms I," *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, Vol. 44, pp. 141-183, Dec. 1989.
- [75] Senturia, S. D., and Wedlock, B. D., *Electronic Circuits and Applications*, New York, NY, John Wiley and Sons, 1975.
- [76] Van Trees, H. L., *Detection, Estimation, and Modulation Theory, Part I*, New York, NY, John Wiley and Sons, 1968.
- [77] Wornell, G. W., and Oppenheim, A. V., "Estimation of Fractal Signals from Noisy Measurements Using Wavelets," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol. 40, pp. 611-623, March 1992.
- [78] Yajima, Y., "On Estimation of Long-Memory Time-Series Models," *Austral. J. Statist.*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 321-325, 1985.
- [79] Fox, R., and Taqqu, M. S., "Large-Sample Properties of Parameter Estimates for Strongly Dependent Stationary Gaussian Time Series," *Ann. Stat.*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 517-532, 1986.

- [80] Laird, N. M., Dempster, A. P., and Rubin, D. B., "Maximum Likelihood from Incomplete Data via the EM Algorithm," *Ann. Roy. Stat. Soc.*, pp. 1-38, Dec. 1977.
- [81] Luenberger, D. G., *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*, New York, NY, John Wiley and Sons, 1968.
- [82] Ninness, B. M., "Estimation of  $1/f$  Processes," *Proc. IEEE Workshop on Nonlinear Signal and Image Processing*, pp. 831-834, 1995.
- [83] Wornell, G. W., "Communication over Fractal Channels," *Proc. Int. Conf. Acoust. Speech, Signal Processing*, May 1991.
- [84] Basseville, M., Benveniste, A., Chou, K. C., Golden, S. A., Nikoukhah, R., and Willsky, A. S., "Modeling and Estimation of Multiresolution Stochastic Processes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-38, pp. 766-784, March 1992.
- [85] Chou, K. C., *A Stochastic Modeling Approach to Multiscale Signal Processing*, PhD thesis, M. I. T., Cambridge, MA, June 1991.
- [86] Deriche, M., and Tewfik, A. H., "Maximum Likelihood Estimation of the Parameters of Discrete Fractionally Differenced Gaussian Noise Process," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol. 41, pp. 2977-2989, Oct. 1993.
- [87] Deriche, M., and Tewfik, A. H., "Signal Modeling with Filtered Discrete Fractional Noise Processes," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol. 41, pp. 2839-2849, Sep. 1993.
- [88] Kaplan, L. M., and Kuo, C.-C. J., "Fractal Estimation from Noisy Measurements via Discrete Fractional Gaussian Noise (DFGN) and the Haar Basis," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol. 41, pp. 3554-3561, Dec. 1993.
- [89] Lam, W. M., *Modeling Algorithms for a Class of Fractal Signals*, Master's thesis, M. I. T., Cambridge, MA, Sep. 1992.
- [90] Gel'fand, I. M., Shilov, G. E., Vilenkin, N. Y., and Graev, M. I., *Generalized Functions*, New York, NY, Academic Press, 1964.
- [91] Wornell, G. W., and Oppenheim, A. V., "Wavelet-Based Representations for a Class of Self-Similar Signals with Application to Fractal Modulation," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. 38, pp. 785-800, March 1992.
- [92] Barnsley, M. F., *Fractals Everywhere*, New York, NY, Academic Press, 1988.
- [93] Malassenet, F. J., and Mersereau, R. M., "Wavelet Representations and Coding of Self-Affine Signals," *Proc. Int. Conf. Acoust. Speech, Signal Processing*, 1991.
- [94] Kalet, I., "The Multitone Channel," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, Vol. COM-37, pp. 119-124, Feb. 1989.
- [95] Gallager, R. G., *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*, New York, NY, John Wiley and Sons, 1968.
- [96] Forney, Jr., G. D., Gallager, R. G., Lang, G. R., Longstaff, F. M., and Qureshi, S. U., "Efficient Modulation for Band-Limited Channels," *IEEE J. Select. Areas Commun.*, Vol. SAC-2, pp. 632-647, Sep. 1984.

- [97] Lee, E. A., and Messerschmitt, D. G., *Digital Communication*, Boston, MA, Kluwer Academic, 2nd ed., 1994.
- [98] Blahut, R. E., *Theory and Practice of Error Control Codes*, Reading, MA, Addison Wesley, 1983.
- [99] Dillard, R. A., and Dillard, G. M., *Detectability of Spread-Spectrum Signals*, Norwood, MA, Artech House, 1989.
- [100] Kailath, T., *Linear Systems*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1980.
- [101] Gerardi, F. R., "Application of Mellin and Hankel Transforms to Networks with Time-Varying Parameters," *IRE Trans. Circuit Theory*, Vol. CT-6, pp. 197-208, 1959.
- [102] Casasent, D., "Coherent Optical Pattern Recognition," *Proc. IEEE*, Vol. 67, pp. 813-825, May 1979.
- [103] Rooney, P. G., "A Survey of Mellin Multipliers," in *Fractional Calculus* (McBride, A. C., and Roach, G. F., eds.), London, England, Pitman, 1989.
- [104] McBride, A. C., "A Mellin Transform Approach to Fractional Calculus on  $(0, \infty)$ ," in *Fractional Calculus* (McBride, A. C., and Roach, G. F., eds.), London, England, Pitman, 1985.
- [105] Oberhettinger, F., *Tables of Mellin Transforms*, Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 1974.
- [106] Bracewell, R. N., *The Fourier Transform and Its Applications*, New York, NY, McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- [107] Erdélyi, A., ed., *Tables of Integral Transforms*, Vol. I, New York, NY, McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- [108] Benveniste, A., Nikoukhah, R., and Willsky, A. S., "Multiscale System Theory," *IEEE Trans. Circuits and Systems I*, Vol. 41, pp. 2-15, Jan. 1994.

# Index

- $1/f$  noise, 59  
 $1/f$  process, 30–32  
   Barnes-Allan model, 37, 42  
   correlation function, 45  
   Corsini-Saletti synthesis, 46  
   Cramér-Rao bounds, 69  
   distribution of time-constants model, 43  
   examples, 33  
   fractal dimension, 33  
   fractal dimension estimation, 64  
   frequency-domain characterization, 41  
   Karhunen-Loève-type expansions, 46, 50  
   Keshner model, 44  
   mathematical definition, 41  
   maximum likelihood parameter estimation, 63  
   measured power spectra, 32  
   parameter estimation, 120  
   pole-zero behavior, 45  
   RC transmission line model, 44  
   sample paths, 32  
   smoothing (noise reduction), 72  
   spectrum, 41
- spectrum estimation, 64  
 state variables, 45  
 synthesis filter, 62  
 Van der Ziel model, 43  
 wavelet coefficient correlation, 50–51  
 wavelet coefficient stationarity properties, 50  
 wavelet coefficient variances, 51  
 wavelet coefficients, ideal bandpass basis, 52  
 wavelet-based analysis, 50  
 wavelet-based models, 46  
 wavelet-based synthesis, 47  
 wavelet-based synthesis, regularity issues, 49  
 whitening filter, 61–62
- A**  
 autoregressive moving-average (ARMA) models, 35, 43
- B**  
 bandpass filter  
   ideal, continuous-time, 11  
 Barnes-Allan process, 37, 42, 45  
 bihomogeneous signal, 95
- Brownian motion, 31, 36, 38
- C**  
 characteristic sequence, 108  
   synthesis, 110  
 communication channel models, 113  
 conjugate quadrature filter (CQF), 25–27
- D**  
 differentiation in scale, 135  
 discrete wavelet transform, 21  
   analysis algorithm, 22  
   complexity, 22  
   data length and resolution effects, 23  
   synthesis algorithm, 22
- E**  
 Euler-Cauchy equations, 136
- F**  
 filter bank  
   octave band, 13  
 Fourier transform  
   definition, continuous-time, 10  
   definition, discrete-time, 21  
 fractal dimension, 33  
   estimation, 64  
   estimator performance, 71  
   estimator performance bounds, 69  
 fractal modulation  
   analog data, 124  
   choice of fractal dimension, 118  
   digital data, 121  
   discrete-time implementation, 117, 122–124  
   finite-length messages, 118  
   performance, 122, 126  
   power efficiency, 123  
   receiver, 120  
   requirements, 114  
   spectral efficiency, 116
- spectral matching, 120  
 transmitter, 115  
 fractional Brownian motion, 30, 36  
   correlation function, 38  
   definition, 38  
   derivative, 39  
   increments, 38  
   limitations, 40  
   self-similarity parameter, 38  
   synthesis, 39, 139  
   uniqueness, 40  
   variance, 40  
 fractional calculus, 45  
 fractional Gaussian noise, 36  
   correlation structure, 39
- G**  
 generating sequence, 99
- H**  
 highpass filter  
   ideal, discrete-time, 22  
 homogeneous signal, 95  
   bihomogeneous signal, 95  
   characteristic sequence, 108  
   discrete-time, 109  
   energy-dominated, 96, 97  
   equivalence class, 98  
   examples, 97, 105  
   Fourier transform, 97, 103  
   fractal dimension, 104  
   generating sequence, 99  
   Hilbert space, 100  
   input to LTSI( $\lambda$ ) system, 138  
   periodicity-dominated, 107, 118  
   power spectrum, 103–105  
   power-dominated, 96, 103  
   randomly-generated, 105  
   regularity, 104  
   time-frequency portrait, 107  
   wavelet expansion, 98
- I**  
 infrared catastrophe, 35  
 iterated function system, 110

## J

Johnson noise, 60

## L

Laplace transform, 130–132  
 linear scale-invariant system, 132  
   convolution property, 133  
   eigenfunctions, 133  
   generalized class, 136  
   lagged-impulse response, 132  
   system function, 134  
 linear system, 131  
 linear time- and scale-invariant system, 137  
   dyadic approximation, 143  
   wavelet representation, 140  
 linear time-invariant system, 131  
   impulse response, 131  
 long-term dependence, 39  
 Lorentzian spectra, 43  
 lowpass filter  
   ideal, continuous-time, 19  
   ideal, discrete-time, 22

## M

Mellin transform, 130, 134  
   inverse formula, 134  
 multiresolution signal analysis, 16  
   characterization, 17  
   detail signal, 20  
   perfectly bandlimited, 19

## N

nearly- $1/f$  process  
   spectrum, 47  
   wavelet-based synthesis, 47  
 nearly- $1/f$  processes, 30, 43

## P

Poisson formula, 12

## R

regularity, 12

## S

scale-differential equations, 135  
 scaling function, 18  
   ideal lowpass, 19  
 self-similar basis, 96, 99  
   example, 101  
 self-similar system, 130  
 shot noise, 60  
 spectral efficiency, 114  
 stable distributions, 35  
 statistical self-similarity, 31

## T

thermal noise, 60  
 time-frequency analysis, 14

## U

ultraviolet catastrophe, 35

## W

wavelet  
   basic, 11  
   basic (or “mother”), 20  
   Battle-Lemarie, 27  
   Daubechies, 27  
   father, 18  
   frame, 10  
   Haar, 26  
   ideal bandpass, 11, 13, 15, 20,  
     26, 28  
   mother, 11  
   scaling function, 18  
 wavelet bases, 9  
   Battle-Lemarie, 27  
   construction of, 25  
   dyadic, 11  
   example lacking multiresolution  
     analysis, 12  
   examples, 26  
   filter bank interpretation, 13  
   multiresolution analysis inter-  
     pretation, 16  
   nondyadic, 27  
   orthonormal, 11

  synthesis/analysis equations, 11  
   useful identity, 15  
   vanishing moments, 26–27  
   wavelet, 11  
 wavelet-based modeling  
   Dow Jones Industrial Average,  
     54  
   heartbeat interarrival data, 55  
 white Gaussian noise, 31, 35  
 Wiener process, 31, 35, 38



