

On exact and optimal recovering of a single missing value

Nikolai Dokuchaev

Submitted April 24, 2016. Revised August 16, 2016

Abstract

The paper studies frequency criterions of recoverability of a single missing value from an observed sequence. Stochastic Gaussian stationary processes that are non recoverable in this sense are called minimal processes; they have a degenerate spectral density. The paper considers this problem in a pathwise setting without probabilistic assumptions; recoverability criterions are formulated in the terms of a degeneracy of the Z-transforms. For processes with non-degenerate Z-transform, an optimal recovering algorithm is suggested. This algorithm is based on projections on a closest recoverable sequence; it leads to explicit formulae for the recovered value. Some robustness of the solution with respect to noise contamination and truncation is established.

Key words: data recovery, discrete time, sampling theorem, band-limited interpolation.

1 Introduction

The paper studies optimal recovering of missing values for sequences, or discrete time deterministic processes. This important problem was studied intensively. The classical results for stationary stochastic processes with the spectral density ϕ is that a missing single value is recoverable with zero error if and only if

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \phi(\omega)^{-1} d\omega = -\infty. \quad (1)$$

(Kolmogorov [13], Theorem 24). Stochastic stationary Gaussian processes without this property are called *minimal* [13]. In particular, a process is recoverable if it is “band-limited” meaning that the spectral density is vanishing on an arc of the unit circle $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbf{C} : |z| = 1\}$.

The author is with Department of Mathematics & Statistics, Curtin University, GPO Box U1987, Perth, 6845 Western Australia.

This work was supported by ARC grant of Australia DP120100928 to the author.

This illustrates the relationship of recoverability on the notion of bandlimitiness or its relaxed versions such as (1). In particular, criterion (1) was extended on stable processes [15] and vector Gaussian processes [16].

There are many works devoted to minimization of data recovery errors in different settings; see e.g. [1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 17, 18].

For the forecasting and other applications, it is common to use band-limited approximations of non-bandlimited underlying processes. There are many works devoted to causal smoothing and sampling, oriented on estimation and minimization of norm of the error, especially in stochastic setting; see e.g. [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18].

In theory, a process can be converted into a band-limited and recoverable process with a low-pass filter. However, a ideal low-pass filter cannot be applied if there is a missing value. This lead to optimal selection of an estimate for the missing value. We consider an optimal band-limited process approximating observed trace in ℓ_2 -norm rather than matching the values at selected points. The solution is not error-free; the error can be significant if the underlying process is not band-limited. This is different from a setting in [2, 3, 4, 11, 14], where error-free recovering was considered. Our setting is closer to the setting from [19, 21]. In [19], the problem of minimization of the total energy of the approximating bandlimited process within a given distance from the original process smoothed by an ideal low-pass filter was considered. In [21], extrapolation of a band-limited matching a finite number of points process was considered using special Slepian's type basis in the frequency domain.

We consider solution of a missing value recovery problem in time domain, with the main focus on the minimization of an essential non-vanishing error in a pathwise setting, without using probabilistic assumptions on the ensemble. This setting targets situations where we deal with a sole sequence that is deemed to be unique and such that one cannot rely on statistics collected from observations of other similar samples. An estimate of the missing value has to be done based on the intrinsic properties of this sole sequence and the observed values. In particular, we use a pathwise optimality criterion that does not involve an expectation on a probability space.

The paper consider suggests a criterion of error-free recoverability of sequences (discrete time processes) similar to (1) based on intrinsic properties of sequences, in the pathwise setting, without using probabilistic assumptions on the ensemble. This setting targets situations where we deal with a sole sequence that is deemed to be unique and such that one cannot rely on statistics collected from observations of other similar samples. An estimate of the missing value has to be done based on the intrinsic properties of this sole sequence and the observed values.

The result is based on the approach developed for pathwise predicting [5, 6, 8], where some predictors were derived to establish error-free predicability. An estimate of the missing value has to be done based on the intrinsic properties of this sole sequence and the observed values. In particular, we use a pathwise optimality criterion that does not involve an expectation on a probability space. For these criterions, we obtain explicit optimal estimates for single missing values of a general type processes (Theorems 1 and 2). In addition, we described some classes of processes with vanishing Z-transforms allowing error-free recoverability (Corollary 1 and 2). In particular, we found a condition of error-free recoverability of sequences (discrete time processes) reminding classical criterion (1) but based on intrinsic properties of sequences, in the pathwise setting (Corollary 2). In addition, we established numerical stability and robustness of the method with respect to the input errors and data truncation.

2 Some definitions and background

Let \mathbb{Z} be the set of all integers. For a set $G \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \in [1, \infty)$, we denote by $\ell_r(G)$ a Banach space of real valued sequences $\{x(t)\}_{t \in G}$ such that $\|x\|_{\ell_r(G)} = (\sum_{t \in G} |x(t)|^r)^{1/r} < +\infty$ for $r \in [1, +\infty)$, and $\|x\|_{r(G)} = \sup_{t \in G} |x(t)| < +\infty$ for $r = \infty$. Let $\ell_r = \ell_r(\mathbb{Z})$.

For $x \in \ell_2$, we denote by $X = \mathcal{Z}x$ the Z-transform

$$X(z) = \sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} x(t)z^{-t},$$

defined for $z \in \mathbf{C}$ such that the series converge. For $x \in \ell_2$, the function $X(e^{i\omega})|_{\omega \in (-\pi, \pi]}$ is defined as an element of $L_2(-\pi, \pi)$. For $x \in \ell_1$, the function $X(e^{i\omega})$ is defined for all $\omega \in (-\pi, \pi]$ and is continuous in ω .

Let $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_r$ be the set of all real sequences $\widehat{k} \in \ell_q$ such that $\widehat{k}(0) = 0$, where $q = (1 - 1/r)^{-1}$.

We will study data recovery for problem for a special case of a missing single value.

Definition 1. Let $\mathcal{Y} \subset \ell_r$ be a class of sequences. We say that this class is recoverable if, for any $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a mapping $F : \ell_r(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $x(s) = F(x|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}})$ for all $x \in \mathcal{Y}$.

For a sequence that does not belong to a recoverable class, it is natural to accept as an approximate solution the value recovered for a closest process from a preselected recoverable class. More precisely, given observations $x|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ and a recoverable class $\mathcal{Y} \subset \ell_r$, we suggest to find an optimal solution $\widehat{x} \in \mathcal{Y}$ of the minimization problem

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} |\widehat{x}(t) - x(t)|^2$$

$$\text{over } \hat{x} \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (2)$$

and accept the value $\hat{x}(s)$ as the result of the recovery the missing value $x(s)$.

3 Recovering based on band-limited smoothing

Let $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ be given.

We consider below input processes $x \in \ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ and their band-limited approximations. The sequences $\{x(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ represent the observations available; the value at $t = s$ is missing.

We assume that we are given $\Omega \in (0, \pi)$. Let $\ell_2^{BL, \Omega}$ be the set of all processes from ℓ_2 such that $X(e^{i\omega}) = 0$ for $|\omega| > \Omega$ for $X = Zx$. We will call these corresponding processes x *band-limited*. Let $\ell_2^{BL, \Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ be the subset of $\ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ consisting of traces $\{\hat{x}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ for all sequences $\hat{x} \in \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}$.

We will use the notation $\text{sinc}(x) = \sin(x)/x$, and we will use notation \circ for the convolution in ℓ_2 .

Proposition 1. *For any $x \in \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$, there exists a unique $\hat{x} \in \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}$ such that $\hat{x}(t) = x(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}$.*

In a general case, the sequence of observations $x|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ does not represent a snapshot of a band-limited process. In addition, this sequence $x|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ cannot be converted into a snapshot of band-limited process using some ideal low-pass filter since this would require the value for $t = s$ that is unavailable. We will be using approximation described in the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *There exists a unique optimal solution $\hat{x} \in \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}$ of the minimization problem (2) with $r = 2$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}$.*

Under the assumptions of Lemma 1, there exists a unique band-limited process \hat{x} such that the trace $\hat{x}|_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ provides an optimal approximation of its observable trace $\{x(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$. The corresponding value $\hat{x}(s)$ is uniquely defined and can be interpreted as the solution of the problem of optimal recovering of the missing value $x(s)$ (optimal in the sense of problem (2) given Ω). In this setting, the process \hat{x} is considered to be a smoothed version of x , and the process $\eta = x - \hat{x}$ is presumed to be an irregular noise that is removed from the recovered value. It can be noted that the choice of Ω will have an impact on the recovered value; the selection of Ω should be based on the presumptions about cut-off frequencies suitable for particular applications.

It appears that the solution for the case of a single missing value allows a convenient explicit formula.

Theorem 1. *Let $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ be given. The problem of optimal recovering a single missing value $x(s)$ for $x \in \ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$, where $\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\} = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}$, has an unique solution*

$$\hat{x}(s) = \frac{\Omega}{\pi - \Omega} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} x(t) \text{sinc}[\Omega(s - t)]. \quad (3)$$

This solution is optimal in the sense of problem (2) with $\mathcal{Y} = \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ given $\Omega \in (0, \pi)$. In addition,

$$|\hat{x}(s)| \leq \frac{\Omega}{\pi - \Omega} \|x\|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})}.$$

Corollary 1. *For any $\Omega \in (0, \Omega)$, the class $\ell_2^{BL, \Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ is recoverable in the sense of Definition 1.*

Remark 1. *Theorem 1 applied to a band-limited process $x_{BL} \in \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}$ gives a well-known formula*

$$x_{BL}(s) = \frac{\Omega}{\pi - \Omega} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} x_{BL}(t) \text{sinc}[\Omega(s - t)]$$

that is implied by the Shannon sampling theorem; see e.g. [12]. The difference with Theorem 1 is that x in (3) is not necessarily band-limited.

4 Recovering without smoothing

Theorem 1 suggests to recover a missing value as a value of a smoothed band-limited process. This process is actually different from the underlying input process; this could lead to a loss of some information that could be contained in high-frequency component. Besides, it could be difficult to justify a particular choice of Ω in (3) that defines the degree of smoothing. To overcome this, we consider below the limit case where $\Omega \rightarrow \pi - 0$.

Again, we consider input sequences $\{x(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ representing the observations available; the value at $t = s$ is missing, for a given $s \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Let $\omega_0 \in (0, \pi]$ be given.

For $\sigma \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{X}_\sigma = \{x \in \ell_1 : |X(e^{i\omega_0})| = \sigma, X = \mathcal{Z}x\}$.

We will call processes $x \in \mathcal{X}_0$ degenerate. Clearly, $\cup_{\Omega \in (0, \pi)} \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}) \cap \ell_1 \subset \mathcal{X}_0$.

Lemma 2. *For any $x \in \ell_1(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$, there exists a unique $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}_0$ such that $\hat{x}(t) = x(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}$. This process is a unique optimal solution of the minimization problem (2) with $r = 1$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}_0$.*

Under the assumptions of Lemma 2, there exists a unique recoverable process $\widehat{x} \in \mathcal{X}_0$ such that $\widehat{x}|_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} = x|_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$. The corresponding value $\widehat{x}(s)$ is uniquely defined and can be interpreted as the solution of the problem of optimal recovering of the missing value $x(s)$ (optimal in the sense of problem (2) for $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}_0$). It appears that the solution for the case of a single missing value allows a convenient explicit formula.

Theorem 2. *Let $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ be given. Consider the problem of recovering a single missing value $x(s)$ for $x \in \ell_1(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$.*

(i) *The problem has an unique optimal solution*

$$\widehat{x}(s) = - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} e^{i\omega_0(s-t)} x(t), \quad (4)$$

where the optimality is understood in the sense of problem (2) with $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}_0$.

(ii) *Solution (4) is also optimal in the following sense:*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}_\sigma} |\widehat{x}(s) - x(s)| = \sigma \leq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}_\sigma} |\widetilde{x}(s) - x(s)| \quad (5)$$

for any estimator $\widetilde{x}(s) = F(x|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}})$, where $F : \ell_1(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is some mapping.

(iii) *The following holds for all $x \in \ell_1(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$:*

$$|\widehat{x}(s)| \leq \|x\|_{\ell_1(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})}.$$

Corollary 2. *The class \mathcal{X}_0 is recoverable in the sense of Definition 1.*

Remark 2. *By Corollary 2, a process $x \in \ell_1$ is recoverable if $X(e^{\omega_0}) = 0$ for $X = \mathcal{Z}x$; this remind condition (1) for spectral density of minimal Gaussian processes [13].*

Remark 3. *Formula (4) with $\omega_0 = \pi$ has the form*

$$\widehat{x}(s) = - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} (-1)^{t-s} x(t). \quad (6)$$

This represents the limit case of formula (3), since

$$\frac{\Omega}{\pi - \Omega} \text{sinc}[\Omega(s - t)] \rightarrow -(-1)^{t-s} \quad \text{as } \Omega \rightarrow \pi - 0$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}$.

5 Robustness with respect to noise contamination and data truncation

Let us consider a situation where an input process $x|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ is observed with an error. In other words, assume that we observe a process $x_\eta|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} = x|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} + \eta|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$, where η is a noise.

Let $\hat{x}_\eta(s)$ be the corresponding value (3) or (4) with $x_\eta|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ as an input, and let $\hat{x}(s)$ be the corresponding value (3) or (4) with $x|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ as an input.

By Theorem 1, it follows immediately that

$$|\hat{x}(s) - \hat{x}_\eta(s)| \leq \frac{\Omega}{\pi - \Omega} \|\eta\|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})} \quad (7)$$

for all $\eta|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} \in \ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$, under the assumptions of this theorem.

Similarly, by Theorem 2, it follows immediately that

$$|\hat{x}(s) - \hat{x}_\eta(s)| \leq \|\eta\|_{\ell_1(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})} \quad (8)$$

for all $\eta|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} \in \ell_1(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$, under the assumptions of this theorem.

This demonstrates some robustness of the method with respect to the noise in the observations.

In particular, this ensures robustness of the estimate with respect to truncation of the input processes, such that infinite sequences $x \in \ell_r(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$, $r \in \{1, 2\}$, are replaced by truncated sequences $x_\eta(t) = x(t)\mathbb{I}_{\{|t| \leq q\}}$ for $q > 0$; in this case $\eta(t) = \mathbb{I}_{|t| > q}x(t)$. Clearly, $\|\eta\|_{\ell_r(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})} \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow +\infty$. This overcomes principal impossibility to access infinite sequences of observations.

The experiments with sequences generated by Monte-Carlo simulation demonstrated a good numerical stability of the method; the results were quite robust with respect to deviations of input processes and truncation.

On a choice between recovering formulae (3) and (4)

It can be seen from (7) and (8) that recovering formula (4) is less robust with respect to data truncation and the noise contamination than recovering formula (3). In addition, recovering formula (4) is not applicable to $x \in \ell_2 \setminus \ell_1$. On the other hand, application of (4) does not require to select Ω ; moreover, it follows from the definition that $\cup_{\Omega \in (0, \pi)} \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}) \cap \ell_1 \subset \mathcal{X}_\sigma$. In practice, numerical implementation requires to replace a sequence $\{x(t)\}$ by a truncated sequence $x\mathbb{I}_{\{|t| \leq q\}}$; technically, this means that both formulas could be applied. The choice between (3) and (4) and of a particular Ω for (3) should be done based on the purpose of the model. In general, a more numerically robust result can be achieved with choice of a smaller Ω .

This can be illustrated with the following example. Consider a band-limited input $x \in \ell_2^{BL,\Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ with a missing value $x(s)$. In theory, application of (3) with Ω replaced by $\Omega_1 \in (\Omega, \pi]$ produces error-free recovering, i.e. $\hat{x}(s) = x(s)$. However, application of (3) with Ω replaced by $\Omega_2 \in (0, \Omega_1)$ will be not be error-free, i.e. one can expect a large error $|\hat{x}(s) - x(s)|$. In practice, replacement of $x|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ by a truncated series $x\mathbb{I}_{\{t: |t| \leq q, t \neq s\}}$ gives a satisfactory approximation $\hat{x}(s) \approx x(s)$ for large $q > 0$ given of (3) with Ω replaced by $\Omega_1 \geq \pi$ only.

On the other hand, application of (4), where Ω is not used, also gives a close approximation $\hat{x}(s) \approx x(s)$ for a truncated sequence, performing better than (3) with too small miscalculated $\Omega = \Omega_2$. This is illustrated by Figure 1 that shows an example of a process $x(t) \in \ell_2^{BL,\Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ with $\Omega = 0.1\pi$ and recovered values $\hat{x}(s)$ corresponding to band-limited extensions obtained from (3) with $\Omega = 0.1\pi$ and $\Omega = 0.05\pi$. In addition, this figure shows $\hat{x}(s)$ calculated by (4). On the hand, the presence of a noise in processes that are nor recoverable without error may lead to a larger error for estimate (4). This is illustrated by Figure 2 that shows an example of a noisy process $x(t)$ and recovered values $\hat{x}(s)$ corresponding to band-limited extensions obtained from (3) with $\Omega = 0.1\pi$ and $\Omega = 0.05\pi$. In addition, this figure shows $\hat{x}(s)$ calculated by (4). In these experiments, we used $s = 0$ and truncated sums (3) and (4) with 100 members.

6 Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1. It is known that a bandlimited function can be recovered without error from a sample if a finite number of sample values is unknown [11]. Hence if $x(\cdot) \in \ell_2^{BL,\Omega}$ is such that $x(t) = 0$ for $t \neq s$, then $x(s) = 0$. Then the proof of Proposition 1 follows. \square

Proof of Lemma 1. It suffices to prove that $\ell_2^{BL,\Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ is a closed linear subspace of $\ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$. In this case, there exists a unique projection \hat{x} of $\{x(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ on $\ell_2^{BL,\Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$, and the proof will be completed.

Let \mathbb{B} be the set of all mappings $X : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $X(e^{i\omega}) \in L_2(-\pi, \pi)$ and such that $X(e^{i\omega}) = 0$ for $|\omega| > \Omega$ for $X = Zx$.

Consider the mapping $\zeta : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \ell_2^{BL,\Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ such that

$$x(t) = (\zeta(X))(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} X(e^{i\omega}) e^{i\omega t} d\omega, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}.$$

It is a linear continuous operator. By Proposition 1, it is a bijection.

Since the mapping $\zeta : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \ell_2^{BL,\Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ is continuous, it follows that the inverse mapping $\zeta^{-1} : \ell_2^{BL,\Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ is also continuous; see e.g. Corollary in Ch.II.5 [20], p. 77. Since the set \mathbb{B} is a closed linear subspace of $L_2(-\pi, \pi)$, it follows that $\ell_2^{BL,\Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ is a closed linear subspace of $\ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$. This completes the proof of Lemma 1. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Assume that the input sequences $\{x(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}}$ are extended on $t = s$ such that $x(s) = \hat{x}(s)$. Then \hat{x} is a unique solution of the minimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} |x_{BL}(t) - x(t)|^2 \\ & \text{over} \quad x_{BL} \in \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Consider a mapping $\nu : \ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}) \rightarrow \ell_2$ such that $\nu(x)(t) = x(t)$ for $t \neq s$ and $\nu(x)(s) = 0$.

Let $H(z)$ be the transfer function for an ideal low-pass filter such that $H(e^{i\omega}) = \mathbb{I}_{[-\Omega, \Omega]}(\omega)$, where \mathbb{I} denotes the indicator function. Let $h = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}H$; it is known that $h(t) = \Omega \text{sinc}(\Omega t)/\pi$. The definitions imply that $h \circ x \in \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}$ for any $x \in \ell_2$.

By the property of the low-pass filters, $\hat{x} = h \circ x$. Hence the optimal process $\hat{x} \in \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}$ from Lemma 1 is such that

$$\hat{x} = h \circ (\nu(x) + \hat{x} \mathbb{I}_{\{t=s\}}).$$

For $\hat{y} = \mathbb{I}_{\{t=s\}} \hat{x}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{y} &= \mathbb{I}_{\{t=s\}} (h \circ (\nu(x) + \hat{x} \mathbb{I}_{\{t=s\}})) \\ &= \mathbb{I}_{\{t=s\}} (h \circ \nu(x)) + \mathbb{I}_{\{t=s\}} (h \circ (\hat{x} \mathbb{I}_{\{t=s\}})). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

This gives that

$$\hat{x}(s) = \frac{\Omega}{\pi} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} x(t) \text{sinc}[\Omega(s-t)] + \frac{\Omega}{\pi} \hat{x}(s)$$

or $\hat{x}(s) = (1 - \Omega/\pi)^{-1} y = \pi(\pi - \Omega)^{-1} y$, where

$$\begin{aligned} y &= \frac{\Omega}{\pi} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} x(t) \text{sinc}[\Omega(s-t)] = (h \circ \tilde{x})(s), \\ \tilde{x}(t) &= x(t) \mathbb{I}_{\{t \neq s\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Further,

$$\begin{aligned} |y| &= \|\mathbb{I}_{\{t=s\}}(h \circ \tilde{x})\|_{\ell_2} \leq \|h \circ \tilde{x}\|_{\ell_2} \leq \|\tilde{x}\|_{\ell_2} \\ &= \|x\|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})}. \end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof of Theorem 1, it suffices to observe that a unique solution of the corresponding problem (2) with $\mathcal{Y} = \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$. \square

Proof of Corollary 1. If $x \in \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$, then $\hat{x} = x$, since it is a solution of (2). By Theorem 1, \hat{x} is obtained as is required in Definition 1 with $r = 2$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \ell_2^{BL, \Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $y \in \ell_1$ be selected such that $y(t) = x(t)$ for $t \neq s$ and $y(s) = 0$. Let $Y = \mathcal{Z}y$, and let $\hat{x} \in \ell_1$ be selected such that $\hat{x}(t) = x(t)$ for $t \neq s$, with some choice of $\hat{x}(s)$. Let $\hat{X} = \mathcal{Z}\hat{x}$. It follows from the definitions that $\hat{X}(e^{i\omega}) = Y(e^{i\omega}) + e^{-i\omega s}\hat{x}(s)$. For $\omega = \omega_0$, this gives $\hat{X}(e^{\omega_0}) = Y(e^{\omega_0}) + e^{-i\omega_0 s}\hat{x}(s)$. Hence there is a unique choice that ensures that $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}_0$ i.e. that $\hat{X}(e^{\omega_0}) = 0$. This choice is defined by equations

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x}(s) &= -e^{i\omega_0 s}Y(e^{\omega_0}) = -e^{i\omega_0 s} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} e^{-i\omega_0 t}x(t) \\ &= - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} e^{i\omega_0(s-t)}x(t).\end{aligned}$$

This defines an unique choice of $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}_\sigma$ with the desired properties. This completes the proof of Lemma 2. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Let us prove statement (i). We have that $\hat{x}(s) = -e^{i\omega_0 s}Y(e^{\omega_0})$ in the notations of the proof of Lemma 2. Then (4) follows. In addition, it suffices to observe that \hat{x} is a unique solution of the corresponding problem (2) with $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}_\sigma$. This completes the proof of statement (i).

Let us prove statement (ii). Let $x \in \mathcal{X}_\sigma$ for some $\sigma \geq 0$, and let $Y(e^{i\omega}) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}} e^{-i\omega k}x(k)$, $\omega \in (-\pi, \pi]$; this function is observable. By the definitions, it follows that

$$X(e^{i\omega}) = Y(e^{i\omega}) + e^{-i\omega s}x(s).$$

It follows that

$$x(s) = -e^{i\omega_0 s}[Y(e^{\omega_0}) - X(e^{\omega_0})] = -e^{i\omega_0 m}Y(e^{\omega_0}) + \xi,$$

where $\xi = e^{i\omega_0 m}X(e^{\omega_0})$. Hence

$$|x(s) + e^{i\omega_0 s}Y(e^{\omega_0})| = |\xi| = \sigma.$$

Let us accept the value $\hat{x}(s) = -e^{i\omega_0 s}Y(e^{\omega_0})$ as the estimate of the missing value $x(s)$. For this estimator, the first equality in (5) holds, i.e. the size of the recovery error is σ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}_\sigma$. If $\sigma = 0$ then the estimator is error-free.

Let us show that the inequality in (5) holds. Suppose that we use another estimator $\tilde{x}(s) = \tilde{F}(x|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}})$, where $\tilde{F} : \ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is some mapping. Let $X_\pm(e^{i\omega}) = \pm\sigma e^{-i\omega s}$, $x_\pm = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}X_\pm$, i.e. $x_\pm(t) = \pm\sigma \mathbb{I}_{\{t=s\}}$. Clearly, $x_\pm \in \mathcal{X}_\sigma$. Moreover, we have that $\tilde{x}_- = \tilde{x}_+$ for $\tilde{x}_\pm = \tilde{F}(x|_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\}})$, for any choice of \tilde{F} . Hence

$$\max(|\tilde{x}_-(s) - x_-(s)|, |\tilde{x}_+(s) - x_+(s)|) \geq \sigma.$$

Then statement (ii) follows. Statement (iii) follows immediately from (4). This completes the proof of Theorem 2. \square

Proof of Corollary 2. If $x \in \mathcal{X}_0$, then $\hat{x} = x$ since it is a solution of (2). By Theorem 2, \hat{x} is obtained as is required in Definition 1 with $r = 1$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}_0$. \square

7 Discussion and possible modifications

The paper suggests a frequency criterion of error-free recoverability of a single missing value in pathwise deterministic setting in the spirit of the Kolmogorov's criterion of minimality for stochastic Gaussian stationary processes [13] formulated in the terms of spectral density. Corollaries 1 and 2 give recoverability criterions that reminds the classical Kolmogorov's criterion (1) for the spectral densities [13]. However, the degree of similarity is quite limited. For instance, if a stationary Gaussian process has the spectral density $\phi(\omega) \geq \text{const} \cdot (\pi^2 - \omega^2)^\nu$ for $\nu \in (0, 1)$, then, according to criterion (1), this process is not minimal [13], i.e. this process is non-recoverable. On the other hand, Corollary 2 imply that, processes $x \in \ell_1$ are recoverable if $X(-1) = 0$ for $X = \mathcal{Z}x$. In particular, this class includes sequences x such that $|X(e^{i\omega})| \leq \text{const} \cdot (\pi^2 - \omega^2)^\nu$ for $\nu \in (0, 1)$. Nevertheless, this similarity still could be used for analysis of the properties of pathwise Z-transforms for stochastic Gaussian processes. In particular, assume that $y = \{y(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a stochastic stationary Gaussian process with spectral density ϕ such that (1) does not hold. It follows that adjusted paths $\{(1 + \delta t^2)^{-1}y(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$, where $\delta > 0$, cannot have Z-transforms satisfying the definitions of $\ell_2^{BL, \Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ or \mathcal{X}_σ . We leave this analysis for the future research.

There are other open questions. In particular, it is unclear if it is possible to obtain pathwise necessary conditions of error-free recoverability based on Z-transform.

There are some possible straightforward modifications. Similarly to Theorem 2 with $\omega_0 \neq \pi$, Our approach can be extended on the setting where $x(t)$ is approximated by a "high frequency" band-limited processes $\hat{x}(t)$ such that the process $\hat{X}(e^{i\omega})$ is supported on $[-\pi, -\pi + \Omega] \cup [\pi - \Omega, \pi]$. The solution follows immediately from the solution given above with $x(t)$ replaced by $(-1)^t x(t)$.

The present paper is focused on theoretical aspects of possibility to recover a missing single value. For practical applications, it is important to extend these results on multiple missing values. Currently, Theorem 1 is extended on a more general case of multiple missed values (Theorem 1 in working paper [9]; this paper was focused on predicting). It is possible to extend Theorem 2 on multiple values as well; this would require a setting closed to [3] with multiple restrictions for Z-transform, instead of the single restriction $\mathcal{X}(-1) = 1$ imposed for

the class \mathcal{K}_σ in Theorem 2. We leave it for the future research.

References

- [1] Y. Alem, Z. Khalid, R.A. Kennedy. (2014). Band-limited extrapolation on the sphere for signal reconstruction in the presence of noise, *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. ICASSP'2014*, pp. 4141-4145.
- [2] T. Cai, G. Xu, and J. Zhang. (2009), On recovery of sparse signals via ℓ_1 minimization, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3388-3397.
- [3] E. Candés, T. Tao. (2006), Near optimal signal recovery from random projections: Universal encoding strategies? *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 52(12) (2006), 5406-5425.
- [4] E.J. Candes, J. Romberg, T. Tao. (2006). Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **52** (2), 489–509.
- [5] N. Dokuchaev. (2012). On predictors for band-limited and high-frequency time series. *Signal Processing* **92**, iss. 10, 2571-2575.
- [6] N. Dokuchaev. (2012). Predictors for discrete time processes with energy decay on higher frequencies. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **60**, No. 11, 6027-6030.
- [7] N. Dokuchaev. (2015). A closed equation in time domain for band-limited extensions of one-sided sequences. Working paper: ArXiv 1504.02298.
- [8] N. Dokuchaev. (2016). Near-ideal causal smoothing filters for the real sequences. *Signal Processing* **118**, iss. 1, pp. 285-293.
- [9] N. Dokuchaev. (2015). Optimal data recovery and forecasting with dummy long-horizon forecasts. Working paper: ArXiv 1604.08692.
- [10] D. L. Donoho and P. B. Stark. (1989). Uncertainty principles and signal recovery. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 906–931.
- [11] P. G. S. G. Ferreira (1994). Interpolation and the discrete Papoulis-Gerchberg algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **42** (10), 2596–2606.

- [12] A. Jerri. (1977). The Shannon sampling theorem - its various extensions and applications: A tutorial review. *Proc. IEEE* **65**, 11, 1565–1596.
- [13] A.N. Kolmogorov. (1941). Interpolation and extrapolation of stationary stochastic series. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 5:1, 3–14.
- [14] D.G. Lee, P.J.S.G. Ferreira. (2014). Direct construction of superoscillations. *IEEE Transactions on Signal processing*, V. 62, No. 12, 3125–3134.
- [15] V. V. Peller (2000). Regularity conditions for vectorial stationary processes. *In: Complex Analysis, Operators, and Related Topics. The S.A. Vinogradov Memorial Volume*. Ed. V. P. Khavin and N. K. Nikol'skii. Birkhauser Verlag, pp 287–301.
- [16] M. Pourahmadi (1984). On minimality and interpolation of harmonizable stable processes. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, Vol. 44, No. 5, pp. 1023–1030.
- [17] M. Pourahmadi. Estimation and interpolation of missing values of a stationary time series. *J. Time Ser. Anal.*, 10 (1989), pp. 149–169
- [18] J. Tropp and A. Gilbert. (2007). Signal recovery from partial information via orthogonal matching pursuit, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 12, pp. 4655–4666.
- [19] R. Tzschoppe, J.B. Huber. (2009). Causal discrete-time system approximation of non-bandlimited continuous-time systems by means of discrete prolate spheroidal wave functions. *Eur. Trans. Telecomm.* **20**, 604–616.
- [20] K. Yosida. (1965). *Functional Analysis*. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York.
- [21] H. Zhao, R. Wang, D. Song, T. Zhang, D. Wu. (2014). Extrapolation of discrete bandlimited signals in linear canonical transform domain *Signal Processing* **94**, 212–218.




Figure 1: Example of a path $x \in \ell_2^{BL,\Omega}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ with $\Omega = 0.1\pi$ and the recovered values $\hat{x}(0)$ calculated using 100 observations: (i) calculated by (3) for $\Omega = 0.1\pi$ (top); (ii) calculated by (3) with $\Omega = 0.05\pi$ (middle); (iii) calculated by (4) (bottom).




Figure 2: Example of a path $x \in \ell_2(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{s\})$ and the recovered values $\hat{x}(0)$ calculated using 100 observations: (i) calculated by (3) for $\Omega = 0.1\pi$ (top); (ii) calculated by (3) with $\Omega = 0.05\pi$ (middle); (iii) calculated by (4) (bottom).