

Optimal Data-based Kernel Estimation of Evolutionary Spectra

Kurt S. Riedel

Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences

New York University

New York, New York 10012

Abstract

Complex demodulation of evolutionary spectra is formulated as a two-dimensional kernel smoother in the time-frequency domain. In the first stage, a tapered Fourier transform, $y_\nu(f, t)$, is calculated. Second, the log-spectral estimate, $\hat{\theta}_\nu(f, t) \equiv \ln(|y_\nu(f, t)|^2)$, is smoothed. As the characteristic widths of the kernel smoother increase, the bias from temporal and frequency averaging increases while the variance decreases. The demodulation parameters, such as the order, length, and bandwidth of spectral taper and the kernel smoother, are determined by minimizing the expected error. For well-resolved evolutionary spectra, the optimal taper length is a small fraction of the optimal kernel halfwidth. The optimal frequency bandwidth, w , for the spectral window scales as $w^2 \sim \lambda_F/\tau$, where τ is the characteristic time, and λ_F is the characteristic frequency scalelength. In contrast, the optimal halfwidths for the second stage kernel smoother scales as $h \sim 1/(\tau\lambda_F)^{\frac{1}{p+2}}$, where p is the order of the kernel smoother. The ratio of the optimal frequency halfwidth to the optimal time halfwidth satisfies $\frac{h_F}{h_T} \sim \left(\frac{|\partial_t^p \theta|}{|\partial_f^p \theta|} \right)$. Since the expected loss depends on the unknown evolutionary spectra, we initially estimate $|\partial_t^p \theta|^2$ and $|\partial_f^p \theta|^2$ using a higher order kernel smoothers, and then substitute the estimated derivatives into the expected loss criteria.

I. Introduction

In this article, we examine nonparametric estimates of evolutionary stochastic processes. We formulate complex demodulation as a two-dimensional kernel smoother in the time-frequency domain. In this and a related article, we consider kernel smoother estimates of time-frequency representations of “slowly” evolving time series. We distinguish three general classes of time-frequency phenomena. First, slowly evolving frequency representations are used when a quasicohherent signal is most simply represented in the frequency domain for intermediate timescales, and the representation evolves temporally. Second, slowly evolving time representations are used when the signal is most simply represented as a sum of a small number of sinusoids with time varying amplitudes. Third, evolutionary spectra are used when the signal is incoherent, and can be modeled as a process which is locally stationary with a slowly evolving spectrum.

Slowly evolving frequency representations have been described in a number of excellent review articles (Cohen (1989), Boashash (1990), Hlawatsch & Boudreaux-Bartels (1992)), and will not be investigated in this article. In a separate article (Riedel (1992b)), we considered the problem of estimating time dependent, deterministic signals in a stationary stochastic background. In the previous case, only one-dimensional functions of time or frequency needed to be determined. In contrast, the amplitude, $A(f, t)$, of an evolutionary process depends on both time and frequency. Thus the estimation problem is two-dimensional.

Complex demodulation estimates the evolutionary spectral density using a two step procedure (Priestley (1965, 1966), Loynes (1968), Melard & Herteleer (1989)). First, $|A(f, t)|^2$ is estimated on a discrete grid in time-frequency space using a moving Fourier transform. Then a kernel smoother is used to reduce the variance of estimate by averaging over a region in the time-frequency domain. We utilize a *two*-dimensional kernel smoother while the standard version of complex demodulation smoothes only in time.

Previous studies (Priestley (1965, 1966), Papanicolaou et al. (1990), Asch et al. (1991), Zurbenko (1991)) of complex demodulation emphasized conditions under which the evolutionary spectral estimates were asymptotically consistent, i.e. converged to a consistent estimate as the time scale separation and the sampling size and rate tend to infinity. Our study extends these results by determining the leading order bias and variance of the demodulation. As the characteristic widths of the kernel smoother increase, the bias from temporal and frequency averaging increases while the variance decreases.

In complex demodulation, both the taper free parameters: taper length, taper

order, and bandwidth; and the kernel smoother free parameters: the order, length, and characteristic width of the kernel in each of the time and frequency variables; need to be determined. We determine the demodulation parameters by minimizing the expected error. Since the expected loss depends on the unknown evolutionary spectra, the evolutionary spectra are estimated, and then substituted into the expected loss criteria. This substitution is known as a “plug-in” estimate.

In the next section, we estimate evolutionary spectrum on a time-frequency lattice using a moving window Fourier transform and estimate the bias and covariance of these point estimates. In Section III, we review kernel smoothers, and determine the bias and variance of the kernel smoother estimates. In Section IV, we give asymptotic expressions for the integrated expected loss and the optimal values of the kernel smoother bandwidths. In Section V, we describe a class of multiple stage kernel estimators, which estimate the optimal bandwidth with a pilot kernel estimate. In Section VI, we briefly discuss the alternatives to two dimensional kernel smoother estimates of the evolutionary spectrum. In the appendix, we examine smoothing kernel estimates of the coherence and phase of two evolving time series. An abbreviated version of this article appeared in Riedel (1992a)

II. Point Estimates of Evolutionary Processes

We consider evolutionary processes which have the representation:

$$x_t = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} A(f, t) e^{2\pi i f t} dZ(f) \quad , \quad (2.1)$$

where $dZ(f)$ is a weakly stationary stochastic process with independent spectral increments and unit variance. For a given stochastic process, there may be a large family of different amplitude functions, $A(f, t)$, which satisfy the representation of Eq. 2.1. Since x_t is real, we require $dZ(-f) = d\bar{Z}(f)$ and $A(-f, t) = \bar{A}(f, t)$. The evolutionary spectrum is defined as $S(f, t) = |A(f, t)|^2$. The values of dZ at different frequencies, f and f' , are uncorrelated:

$$E[dZ(f)d\bar{Z}(f')] = \delta(f - f')dfdf' \quad . \quad (2.2)$$

Equation 2.2 implies that the spectral measure is absolutely continuous with no deterministic spectral lines. The unit variance is simply a normalization, i.e. we have absorbed the spectral density, $S(f)$, into $A(f, t)$. For stationary processes, $A(f, t)$ is independent of t , and $S(f) = |A(f, t)|^2$. The covariance, $R(t, s)$, satisfies

$$R(t, s) \equiv \text{Cov}[x_t, x_s] = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} A(f, t)\bar{A}(f, s)e^{2\pi i(t-s)f}df \quad . \quad (2.3)$$

We restrict our consideration to oscillatory, semistationary processes as defined in Priestley (1965). In this context, oscillatory denotes that $\hat{A}(f, \hat{f})$ has its maximum at $\hat{f} = 0$, where $\hat{A}(f, \hat{f})$ is the Fourier transform of $A(f, t)$ with respect to t at fixed f . This oscillatory requirement enables us to interpret $A(f, t)$ as the time-dependent amplitude for the frequency f . Semistationary means that $\hat{A}(f, \hat{f})$ has a uniformly bounded halfwidth, $\int |\hat{f}||\hat{A}(f, \hat{f})|d\hat{f}$. Thus the amplitude of a semistationary process evolves on a bounded timescale.

Even with these restrictions, the amplitude and spectrum may not be uniquely defined. We also assume $A(f, t)$ is a smooth function in $C^{\bar{p}}$, where $\bar{p} \geq 2$. For higher order convergence results, we need to assume $A(f, t)$ is real.

We denote the characteristic time scale of the amplitude evolution by τ , where we normalize the time interval between measurements, τ_s , to unity. We make the stronger assumption that $A(f, t)$ evolves slowly in time and frequency relative to the sampling rate. We denote the characteristic frequency scalelength of the evolutionary spectrum by λ_f , where $\lambda_f^{-2} \simeq \partial_f^2 S(f, t)/S(f, t)$. In our asymptotic analysis, we will rescale time and frequency to the slow scale: $\bar{t} \equiv t/\tau$ and $\bar{f} \equiv f/\lambda_f$.

$2\tau\lambda_f$ is the number of measurements taken on the timescale of the spectral evolution divided by the number of degrees of freedom which are necessary to adequately

represent the spectrum. $\tau\lambda_F$ is the fundamental expansion parameter for complex demodulation. Both the optimal spectral window bandwidth and the optimal kernel halfwidth are expressed in terms of $\tau\lambda_F$.

The measured time series is N_D discrete measurements, $\{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{N_D-1}\}$, of a realization of the stochastic process. The Nyquist frequency is $1/2$, and the Raleigh resolution frequency is $1/N_D$.

Our goal is to estimate the local spectral density, $S(f, t) \equiv |A(f, t)|^2$, given the measure time series, $\{x_j\}$. In complex demodulation, we begin the estimate of $|A(f, t)|^2$, by taking a windowed Fourier transform. For a given taper length, N , and taper, ν ,¹ we define the windowed transform, $y_\nu(f, t)$ by

$$y_\nu(f, t) = \sum_{j=[\frac{N}{2}]}^{[\frac{N}{2}]} x_{t+j} \nu_j e^{-2\pi i f(t+j)}. \quad (2.4)$$

For convenience, we assume that the taper length is an odd integer, and define $[\frac{N}{2}] \equiv (\frac{N-1}{2})$. The point estimate of the evolutionary spectrum is $\hat{S}_\nu(f, t) = |\hat{y}_\nu(f, t)|^2$. Equation 2.1 implies that $y_\nu(f, t)$ satisfies the statistical model

$$y_\nu(f, t) = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \sum_{j=[\frac{N}{2}]}^{[\frac{N}{2}]} A(f', t+j) \nu_j e^{2\pi i(f'-f)(t+j)} dZ(f'). \quad (2.5)$$

Since we assume that $A(f, t)$ is a smooth, slowly varying function, we make a Taylor series expansion of $A(f, t+j)$ about (f, t) : $A(f, t+j) = A(f, t) + \partial_t A(f, t)j + O(|A|j^2/\tau^2)$. With this expansion, Eq. 2.5 reduces to

$$y_\nu(f, t) = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \sum_{j=[\frac{N}{2}]}^{[\frac{N}{2}]} [A(f', t) + \partial_t A(f', t)j] \nu_j e^{2\pi i(f'-f)(t+j)} dZ(f'). \quad (2.6)$$

To simplify Eq. 2.6, we define the spectral window, $V(f)$, to be the Fourier transform of ν_j :

$$V(f) = \sum_{j=-[\frac{N}{2}]}^{[\frac{N}{2}]} \nu_j e^{-2\pi i j f}, \quad \nu_j = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} V(f) e^{2\pi i j f} df. \quad (2.7)$$

The uniform taper, $\nu_j \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$, generates the spectral window, $V(f) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=-[\frac{N}{2}]}^{[\frac{N}{2}]} e^{-2\pi i j f} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} e^{\pi i(N-1)f} D_N(f)$, where D_N is the Diriclet kernel. In the frequency domain, Eq.

¹In this article, we denote tapers by ν and kernels by μ . We normalize tapers to $\sum_j \nu_j^2 = 1$, and normalize kernels of zeroth order to $\sum_j \mu_j = 1$.

2.6 becomes a convolution equation:

$$y_\nu(f, t) = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \left[A(f', t) V(f - f') - \frac{\partial_t A(f', t) \partial_f V(f - f')}{2\pi i} \right] e^{2\pi i(f' - f)t} dZ(f'). \quad (2.8)$$

Thus the discrete Fourier transform of the measured process is related to the realization of the stochastic process by an integral equation of the first kind. The purpose of the taper is to reduce the bias from the sidelobes of the kernel, $V(f - f')$, relative to those of the Diriclet kernel. We denote the characteristic bandwidth of the spectral kernel by w . Typically, the taper is chosen with $w \simeq c/N\tau_s$, where $c \geq 1$.

The expectation of the quadratic tapered estimator is

$$\mathbf{E} [(y_\nu(f_1, t) \bar{y}_\nu(f_2, t'))] = e^{2\pi i(f_2 t' - f_1 t)} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \left[M(f', t, f_1) \bar{M}(f', t', f_2) e^{2\pi i f' (t - t')} \right] df', \quad (2.9)$$

where $M(f', t, f) \equiv A(f', t) V(f - f') - \frac{\partial_t A(f', t) \partial_f V(f - f')}{2\pi i}$. Thus $y_\nu(f_1, t)$ and $\bar{y}_\nu(f_2, t')$ become nearly independent when $|f_1 - f_2| > w$ or $|t - t'| > \frac{1}{w}$, where w is the spectral bandwidth. When $f_1 = f_2$ and $t = t'$, Eq. 2.9 reduces to

$$\mathbf{E} [(y_\nu(f_1, t) \bar{y}_\nu(f_1, t))] = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \left[|A(f', t)|^2 |V(f' - f_1)|^2 + \frac{|\partial_t A(f', t)|^2 |\partial_f V(f' - f_1)|^2}{4\pi^2} \right] df'. \quad (2.10)$$

The second term in Eq. 2.10 constitutes the bias in the spectral estimate due to the temporal variation in the amplitude $A(f, t)$. This bias is always positive. The bias from the frequency variation in $S(f, t)$ is estimated by making a Taylor series expansion of $S(f, t)$. The total bias of the tapered spectral estimate, $\hat{S}_\nu(f, t) \equiv |y_\nu(f, t)|^2$ is approximately

$$\text{Bias} [\hat{S}_\nu(f, t)] \simeq \partial_f^2 S(f, t) \bar{B}_\nu \left(\frac{w}{\lambda_F} \right)^2 + |\partial_t A(f', t)|^2 \bar{D}_\nu \left(\frac{1}{\tau w} \right)^2, \quad (2.11)$$

where

$$\bar{B}_\nu \equiv \frac{1}{w^2} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} |f|^2 |V(f)|^2 df, \text{ and } \bar{D}_\nu \equiv \frac{w^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} |\partial_f V(f)|^2 df. \quad (2.12)$$

We note that $B[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f, t)]$ contains a term which is proportional to $|\partial_t A(f, t)|^2$. We estimate only $S(f, t)$, so $|\partial_t A(f, t)|^2$ is undetermined unless we assume that $|\partial_t A(f, t)|^2 \sim |\partial_t S(f, t)|^2 / 4S(f, t)$. *The bias of the point estimate of $S(f, t)$ is minimized by choosing the taper bandwidth to minimize Eq. 2.11, i.e. $w^2 \sim \lambda_F / \tau$ and the taper length, N , satisfies $N^2 \sim \frac{\tau}{\lambda_F \tau_s^2}$.* Due to symmetry, this expression is valid to to fourth order in the small parameters, $\frac{w}{\lambda_F}$ and $\frac{1}{\tau w}$.

Since $|y_\nu(f, t)|^2$ is a narrow bandpass process, it is approximately distributed as a χ_2^2 distribution for a wide class of distributions, $dZ(f)$ (Mallows (1967)). When $dZ(f)$ are *Gaussian* variables, we estimate the covariance of $\hat{S}(f, t)$ by applying Isserlis' fourth moment identity for complex Gaussian variables:

$$E[X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4] = E[X_1 X_2] E[X_3 X_4] + E[X_1 X_3] E[X_2 X_4] + E[X_2 X_3] E[X_1 X_4].$$

For incremental Gaussian processes, $dZ(f)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Cov} [|y_\nu(f_1, t)|^2, |y_\nu(f_2, t')|^2] &= \mathbf{E}[|y_\nu(f_1, t)|^2 |y_\nu(f_2, t')|^2] - \mathbf{E}[|y_\nu(f_1, t)|^2] \mathbf{E}[|y_\nu(f_2, t')|^2] = \\ &= |\mathbf{E}[y_\nu(f_1, t) \bar{y}_\nu(f_2, t')]|^2 + |\mathbf{E}[y_\nu(f_1, t') \bar{y}_\nu(-f_2, t')]|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

where $\mathbf{E}[y_\nu(f_1, t) \bar{y}_\nu(f_2, t')]$ is given by Eq. 2.9. The second term is only important when both f_1 and f_2 are within a bandwidth of zero frequency. Thus the variance of the estimated spectrum is

$$\mathbf{Var} [\hat{S}_\nu(f_1, t)] \simeq (1 + \delta_{f,0}) \left| S(f, t) + \partial_f^2 S(f, t) \bar{B}_\nu \left(\frac{w}{\lambda_F} \right)^2 + |\partial_t A(f', t)|^2 \bar{D}_\nu \left(\frac{1}{\tau w} \right)^2 \right|^2. \quad (2.14)$$

Thus $\hat{S}_\nu(f, t)$ has a variance almost exactly equal to the square of its expectation away from $f = 0$.

Although the windowed transform of Eq. 2.4 is defined on all points (f, t) , $|f| \leq 1/2$, we only evaluate $y_\nu(f, t)$ on a discrete lattice, $t = j\delta t$, $f = m\delta f$, where $j = 0, \dots, N_t$, $m = 0, N_f$, where $N_t \equiv N_D/\delta t$, $\delta t \equiv N p_t \tau_s$, $N_f \equiv N/p_f$ and $\delta f \equiv \frac{p_f}{N \tau_s}$. This time-frequency lattice is precisely the Gabor transform of the discrete process. $(1 - p_t)$ and $(1 - p_f)$ are the grid overlap fractions for time and frequency. Equation 2.7 shows that the lattice point estimates become nearly independent as p_t or p_f approach one. As the overlap fraction decreases, the additional lattice points contain less new information and more redundant information.

III. Bias and Variance of Smoothed Kernel Estimates

The point estimate for the spectral density, $\hat{S}(f, t) = |y_\nu(f, t)|^2$, is inconsistent, i.e. the variance of the estimate does not tend to zero as the number of datapoints, N_D , increases. Statistical consistency is normally achieved by smoothing the point spectral estimate over a region. Smoothing estimators may broadly be distinguished by three main characteristics: dependent variable, smoothing method, and data-based parameter selection technique. Prior to smoothing, it is usually desirable to transform the spectrum to the logarithmic scale: $\hat{\theta}(f, t) \equiv \ln(\hat{S}(f, t))$, and then transform back both the smoothed estimate and the confidence interval. The logarithmic transformation is advantageous, because $\hat{\theta}$ has approximately a $\log(\chi_2^2)$ distribution, which is closer to a Gaussian than χ_2^2 is. Also the variance of $\hat{\theta}$ is independent of θ , while the variance of $\hat{S}(f, t)$ is equal to $(E[\hat{S}(f, t)])^2$. When \hat{y} has a Gaussian distribution, $\hat{\theta}(f, t)$ has expectation and variance:

$$E[\hat{\theta}(f, t)] = \theta(f, t) + \psi(1) \simeq \theta(f, t) - .5772, \quad \text{Var}[\hat{\theta}(f, t)] = \psi'(1) \simeq 1.645, \quad (3.0)$$

where ψ is the digamma function. More detailed discussions of variance stabilizing transformations can be found in Thomson and Chave (1990). We bias correct the tapered log-periodogram prior to smoothing: $\hat{\theta}_{new}(f, t) = \hat{\theta}_{raw}(f, t) + .5772$.

The standard smoothing methods are kernel smoothers and smoothing splines. We concentrate on kernel smoothers because both the error analysis and the implementation are easier. In Section VI, we discuss the smoothing spline alternative.

A data-based method to determine the smoothing free parameters needs to be selected. In Wahba (1980), generalized cross-validation, a statistical resampling technique, is advocated to determine the level of smoothing. However, data-based parameter selection methods which minimize an estimate of the expected loss converge more rapidly than generalized cross-validation. Thus we will estimate the bias and variance of the kernel smoother, and then select the smoother parameters to minimize this estimate of the expected loss.

We consider two-dimensional kernel smoothers which are the crossproduct of a kernel smoother in frequency, μ_F , and a kernel smoother in time, μ_T . Before examining two-dimensional kernels, we review the basic definitions and properties of one-dimensional kernels. We index the one-dimensional kernel by the index j , where $|j| \leq M$. We call M the index bound. We say that a one-dimensional kernel, μ , has halfwidth, H , and is of type (q, p) if

$$\mu \cdot \mathbf{r}_m = q! H^q \delta_{m,q}, \quad m = 0, \dots, p-1, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{m,j} \equiv j^m$, $-M \leq j \leq M$. We denote the p th moment by $\mu \cdot \mathbf{r}_p = p! C(q, p) H^p$, and the $(p + \tilde{p})$ th moment by $\mu \cdot \mathbf{r}_{p+\tilde{p}} = (p + \tilde{p})! C_{\tilde{p}}(q, p) H^{p+\tilde{p}}$, where \tilde{p} is a positive

integer. Kernels of type (q, p) are used to estimate the q th derivative of a function, $g(\frac{j\delta t}{\tau})$, to order $O((\frac{H\tau_s}{\tau})^{p-q})$. Typically, the index bound will be a multiple of the halfwidth. Most widespread kernels are scale parameter kernels, which have the form $\mu_j = \frac{1}{H}K(\frac{j}{H})$.

We assume that the crossproduct kernel smoother has the same order p in time and in frequency. We let H_T and H_F denote the halfwidths, and M_T and M_F denote the index bounds of the kernel smoothers, μ_T and μ_F . We also define the normalized halfwidths, h_F and h_T , by $h_T = \frac{H_T\delta t}{\tau} = \frac{H_T p_t N \tau_s}{\tau}$ and $h_F = \frac{H_F\delta f}{\lambda_F} = \frac{H_F p_F}{\lambda_F N \tau_s}$. If μ_T has type (q, p) and μ_F has type (q', p') , the corresponding results can be derived by replacing all occurrences of h_F^p and h_T^q by $h_F^{p'}$ and $h_T^{q'}$.

The two-dimensional crossproduct kernel estimators have the form:

$$\hat{\theta}_\mu(f, t) = \sum_{k=-M_F}^{M_F} \sum_{j=-M_T}^{M_T} \mu_{F,k} \mu_{T,j} \hat{\theta}_\nu(f + k\delta f, t + j\delta t). \quad (3.2)$$

We also need to estimate time and frequency derivatives of $\theta(f, t)$. To estimate the q th time derivative of $\theta(f, t)$, we use a crossproduct kernel where μ_T is of type (q, p) and μ_F is of type $(0, p)$. We denote the estimate of $\partial_t^q \theta(f, t)$ by $\widehat{\partial_t^q \theta}(f, t)$.

We divide the expectation of the point estimate, $\hat{\theta}_\nu(f, t)$, into $\theta(f, t)$ and the bias, $B[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f, t)]$: $E[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f, t)] = \theta(f, t) + B[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f, t)]$, where $B[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f, t)] \simeq \frac{d\theta}{dS}(\hat{\theta}_\nu(f, t))B[\hat{S}_\nu(f, t)] \simeq [\partial_f^2 \theta(f, t) + (\partial_f \theta(f, t))^2] \bar{B}_\nu(\frac{w}{\lambda_F})^2 + |\partial_t \theta(f, t)|^2 \bar{D}_\nu(\frac{1}{2\tau w})^2$. We order the bias of the point estimate to be smaller than the bias of the kernel smoother. We can then approximate the bias of $\hat{\theta}_\mu(f, t)$ to high order accuracy by:

$$\begin{aligned} B[\hat{\theta}_\mu(f, t)] \simeq & C(0, p) \partial_f^p \theta(f, t) h_F^p + C(0, p) \partial_t^p \theta(f, t) h_T^p + B[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f, t)] + \\ & C_2(0, p) \partial_f^{p+2} \theta(f, t) h_F^{p+2} + C_2(0, p) \partial_t^{p+2} \theta(f, t) h_T^{p+2} + C(0, p)^2 \partial_f^p \partial_t^p \theta(f, t) h_F^p h_T^p. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

The last term is important only when p equals two.

To estimate the q th time derivative of $\theta(f, t)$, we use a crossproduct of a kernel smoother in time of type (q, p) , and a kernel smoother in frequency of type $(0, p)$. For a kernel smoother of type (q, p) , the bias of the estimate of $\partial_t^q \widehat{\theta}(f, t)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} B[\widehat{\partial_t^q \theta}(f, t)] \simeq & C(0, p) \partial_f^p \theta(f, t) \frac{h_F^p}{h_T^q} + C(q, p) \partial_t^q \theta(f, t) h_T^{p-q} + \partial_t^q B[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f, t)] + \\ & C_2(0, p) \partial_f^{p+2} \theta(f, t) \frac{h_F^{p+2}}{h_T^q} + C_2(q, p) \partial_t^{p+2} \theta(f, t) h_T^{p+2-q} + C(q, p) C(0, p) \partial_f^p \partial_t^p \theta(f, t) h_F^p h_T^{p-q}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

which includes Eq. 3.3 as the special case $q = 0$. Reversing the time and frequency indices yields the corresponding results for frequency derivatives.

We let $R_\nu^\theta(f_1, t_1, f_2, t_2)$ denote the covariance of the transformed spectral density:

$$R_\nu^\theta(f_1, t_1, f_2, t_2) \equiv \text{Cov}[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f_1, t_1), \hat{\theta}_\nu(f_2, t_2)] . \quad (3.5)$$

Eqs. 2.9 & 2.13 give the covariance of $\hat{S}_\nu(f_1, t_1), \hat{S}_\nu(f_2, t_2)$ in terms of $A(f, t)$. When $A(f, t)$ is unknown, the covariance of $\theta_\nu(f_1, t_1)$ and $\theta_\nu(f_2, t_2)$ may be estimated with the plug-in approximation.

We would like to be able to replace $\text{Cov}[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f_1, t_1), \hat{\theta}_\nu(f_2, t_2)]$ by its Taylor series approximation:

$$\text{Cov}[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f_1, t_1), \hat{\theta}_\nu(f_2, t_2)] \simeq C \frac{d\theta}{dS}(\hat{\theta}_\nu(f_1, t_1)) \frac{d\theta}{dS}(\hat{\theta}_\nu(f_2, t_2)) \text{Cov}[\hat{S}_\nu(f_1, t_1), \hat{S}_\nu(f_2, t_2)] . \quad (3.6)$$

We choose the constant C in Eq. 3.6 to match known results at $(f_2, t_2) = (f_1, t_1)$. Although Eq. 3.6 is not strictly valid, this simplification is widespread due to the severe complications of calculating $\text{Cov}[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f_1, t_1), \hat{\theta}_\nu(f_2, t_2)]$ exactly. If the multiple taper spectral estimates of Thomson (1982, 1990) are used, the expansion parameter scales as the inverse of the number of tapers.

To further simplify the evaluation of $\text{Cov}[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f_1, t_1), \hat{\theta}_\nu(f_2, t_2)]$, we expand $M(f', t_\ell, f_\ell)$ in Eq. 2.9 by $A(f_\ell, t_\ell)V(f_\ell - f') - \frac{\partial_t A(f_\ell, t_\ell) \partial_{f'} V(f_\ell - f')}{2\pi i}$, where the subscript ℓ equals one or two. Thus for the *log* transformation, we have

$$\text{Cov}[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f_1, t_1), \hat{\theta}_\nu(f_2, t_2)] \simeq C \left| \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} [V(f_1 - f')V(f_2 - f')e^{2\pi i f'(t-t')}] df' \right|^2 , \quad (3.7)$$

to the second order in the small parameters, $\frac{w}{\lambda_F}$ and $\frac{1}{\tau w}$. From Eq. 3.0, we choose $C = \psi'(1) \simeq 1.645$. When the grid overlap parameters, p_T and p_F , are greater than one, $\text{Cov}[\hat{\theta}_\nu(f_1, t_1), \hat{\theta}_\nu(f_2, t_2)]$ is approximately equal to a multiple of the identity matrix. When p_T and p_F are less than one, the coupling matrix needs to be calculated.

Given the covariance of the point estimate, $R_\nu^\theta(f_1, t_1, f_2, t_2)$, the variance of the smoothed kernel estimator of Eq. 3.2 is

$$\text{Var} [\widehat{\partial_t^q \theta}_\mu(f, t)] = \frac{1}{h_T^{2q}} \sum_{j, j'=-M_T}^{M_T} \sum_{k, k'=-M_F}^{M_F} \mu_j^T \mu_k^F R_\nu^\theta(f+k, t+j, f+k', t+j') \mu_{j'}^T \mu_{k'}^F . \quad (3.8)$$

The righthand side of Eq. 3.6 scales as $(\tau \lambda_F h_F h_T^{2q+1})^{-1}$ times the variance of $\hat{\theta}_\nu(f, t)$. To simplify later formulas, we denote the righthand side of Eq. 3.8 by $\rho(\mathbf{R}^\theta, \mu)/(h_F h_T^{2q+1})$. $\tau \lambda_F$ (or more precisely, $(\tau \lambda_F)^{\frac{1}{2p+2}}$) is the ratio of the sampling rate to the number of degrees of freedom which are necessary to adequately represent the spectral evolution. As such, $\tau \lambda_F$ is the fundamental expansion parameter for complex demodulation.

IV. Optimization of Expected Loss for Complex Demodulation

The local expected loss of the smoothed estimate of the q th derivative is the sum of the squared bias and the variance:

$$L(\widehat{\partial_t^q \theta_\mu}(f, t), \mu) = |B[\widehat{\partial_t^q \theta_\mu}(f, t)]|^2 + \frac{\rho(\mathbf{R}^\theta, \mu)}{h_F h_T^{(2q+1)}}, \quad (4.1)$$

where the bias is given by Eq. (3.4) and $\rho(\mathbf{R}^\theta, \mu) = O(\frac{1}{\tau \lambda_F})$. Equation 4.1 shows that as the characteristic widths of the kernel smoother increase, the bias from temporal and frequency averaging increases while the variance decreases. The bias versus variance tradeoff is well known in smoothing kernel estimates of stationary spectra (Grenander and Rosenblatt (1957), Wahba (1980)). For evolutionary spectra, a similar expression for kernel smoothing only in time is given by Priestley (1966).

To simplify the expected loss, we expand Eq. 4.1 in powers of h_T and h_F . The leading order expected loss is

$$L_W^o(\widehat{\partial_t^q \theta_\mu}(f, t), \mu) = \left[C(0, p) \partial_t^p \theta_\mu(f, t) \bar{h}_F^p \bar{h}_T^{-q} + C(q, p) \partial_f^p \theta_\mu(f, t) \bar{h}_T^{p-q} \right]^2 + \frac{\rho(\mathbf{R}^\theta, \mu)}{h_F h_T^{(2q+1)}}. \quad (4.2)$$

To the leading order, only $\partial_t^p \theta_\mu(f, t)$ and $\partial_f^p \theta_\mu(f, t)$ appear in the loss criterion, and the mixed partial derivatives are not required. To determine the leading order optimal values of the kernel scale parameters, we minimize Eq. 4.1 with respect to the h_T and h_F . We begin by changing variables to $h \equiv \sqrt{h_T h_F}$ and $r \equiv \sqrt{\frac{h_F}{h_T}}$. The minimizing value of r is order one, and satisfies:

$$\left[C(0, p) \partial_t^p \theta_\mu r^p + C(q, p) \partial_f^p \theta_\mu r^{-p} \right] \left[(2pq + p + q) C(0, p) \partial_t^p \theta_\mu r^p - (p - q) C(q, p) \partial_f^p \theta_\mu r^{-p} \right]. \quad (4.3)$$

The optimal value of h , denoted by h_o , satisfies

$$h_o(\mu)^{2p+2} = \frac{q+1}{(p-q)} \frac{\rho(\mathbf{R}^\theta, \mu)}{K(r)}, \quad \text{where } K(r) \equiv \left[C(0, p) \partial_t^p \theta_\mu r^p + C(q, p) \partial_f^p \theta_\mu r^{-p} \right]^2. \quad (4.4)$$

Equation 4.4 has two roots; when $C(0, p)C(q, p)\partial_t^p \theta_\mu r^p \partial_f^p \theta_\mu > 0$, we have

$$r = \left[\frac{(p-q)}{(2pq+p+q)} \frac{C(q, p) \partial_f^p \theta_\mu r^{-p}}{C(0, p) \partial_t^p \theta_\mu} \right]^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \quad (4.5)$$

When $C(0, p)C(q, p)\partial_t^p \theta_\mu r^p \partial_f^p \theta_\mu < 0$, the ‘optimal’ halfwidth satisfies $K(r) = 0$, $h = \infty$! This pathological result occurs because we have neglected the higher order bias terms, and thus $K(r) = 0$ eliminates our approximate bias. In some, but not all cases,

including the next order terms from Eq. 3.4 will remove the singularity and result in a finite value of h . Including these higher order terms increases the computational cost and algorithmic complexity and often causes ill-conditioning. *Therefore we regularize the Eq. 4.1-3 by replacing $K(r)$ with a function, $K_b(r)$, which is bounded from below by a positive constant.* Remark B gives one possible regularization. In the future, we plan to explore the effect of different regularization schemes on the evolutionary spectral estimate.

In general, the optimal value of h is proportional to $(\tau\lambda_F)^{-1/(2p+2)}$, and the total error, $L^2(\hat{\theta}_t^q; \mu)$, is proportional to $(\tau\lambda_F)^{-2(p-q)/(2p+2)}$. If $\theta(f, t)$ has precisely \bar{p} continuous derivatives, then kernels of type (q, \bar{p}) yield the highest possible rate of convergence asymptotically as $\tau\lambda_F$ increases (Stone (1982)). For given time and frequency scalelengths, and a given sampling rate, higher order kernels may produce worse estimates, because higher order kernels require larger values of $\tau\lambda_F$ and N_D to be in the asymptotic limit. When $C(0, p)C(q, p)\partial_t^p\theta_\mu r^p\partial_f^p\theta_\mu < 0$ and $K(r) = 0$, the kernel estimator is effectively higher order. By regularizing $K(r)$, we maintain a kernel of \bar{p} order.

Remarks:

A) *Edge kernels*

When the domain of the kernel smoother intersects the ends of the dataset, the kernel needs to be modified to continue to be of type (q, p) . The appropriate edge kernels are given in Riedel & Sidorenko (1993). Although the edge kernels noticeably increase the computation cost and implementation complexity, they yield significantly better results in practice.

B) *Regularization of the optimal halfwidths*

A desirable regularization is to integrate Eq. 4.1 over a small region in (f, t) space. To model this effect, we replace Eq. 4.2 by

$$(2pq+p+q)C(0, p)^2 I_{F,F}^{p,p} r^{2p} + 2q(p+1)C(0, p)C(q, p) I_{T,F}^{p,p} - (p-q)C(q, p)^2 I_{T,T}^{p,p} r^{-2p} = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$I_{T,T}^p \equiv |\partial_t^p \theta(f, t)|^2, \quad I_{F,T}^p \equiv b \partial_f^p \theta(f, t) \partial_t^{p'} \theta(f, t), \quad I_{F,F}^p \equiv |\partial_f^p \theta(f, t)|^2, \quad (4.7)$$

with $0 < b < 1$. If we were to integrate Eq. 4.1 over a small region, the regularization parameter, b , would be

$$b \simeq I_{F,T}^{p,p'}(\theta, W) \equiv \frac{\int df \int dt \partial_f^p \theta(f, t) \partial_t^{p'} \theta(f, t)}{\left[\int df \int dt |\partial_t^p \theta(f, t)|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int df \int dt |\partial_f^p \theta(f, t)|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (4.8)$$

Equation 4.8 is used only heuristically for scalelength adjustment and is not actually applied.

C) Global halfwidth kernels

In this article, we consider variable, locally adaptive halfwidths. If instead the halfwidth is fixed globally, the convergence rate will be suboptimal, and the difference in the expected losses is given by a Holder inequality. The more rapidly $\partial_t^p \theta(f, t)$ and $\partial_f^p \theta(f, t)$ vary, the larger the difference will be (Mueller & Stadtmueller (1987)).

D) Selection of the grid overlap parameters, p_T and p_F

Decreasing the grid overlap parameters, p_T and p_F , will decrease the expected loss because no information is lost and a small amount is gained. However, the decrease in the loss becomes very weak when p_T and p_F are decreased below one third. Minimizing the loss function with respect to the grid overlap parameters will result in the trivial and unachievable minimum at $p_T = 0$ and $p_F = 0$. Thus the tradeoff in overlap parameter selection is expected loss versus computational effort.

V. Pilot parameter determination for complex demodulation

To optimize the final estimate of $\theta(f, t)$, we consider multiple stage estimators. We classify the multiple stage kernel estimators by: A) the kernel order, p , of the final stage estimate; B) the number of stages, where each earlier stage estimates the optimal halfwidths for the next stage; C) the type of initialization.

The combined scheme is constrained to not estimate derivatives of order greater than the number of continuous derivatives, \bar{p} , of $\theta(f, t)$. Higher order kernels can yield poor results when $\theta(f, t)$ is less smooth than the order of the kernel. Therefore, we check *a posteriori* that the estimated derivatives have no discontinuities. For each of these multiple stage estimates, *we evaluate the expected loss using Eq. 4.2 with the plug-in approximation. We then select the scheme with the smallest expected error.* Multiple stage kernel estimators with variable kernel halfwidths are discussed for one dimensional problems in Mueller & Stadtmueller (1987) and Riedel (1992b).

Given estimates of $\partial_t^p \theta_\mu(f, t)$ and $\partial_f^p \theta_\mu(f, t)$, we construct an estimate of the optimal halfwidths, h_T and h_F , by substituting the estimates, $\widehat{\partial_t^p \theta}(f, t)$ and $\widehat{\partial_f^p \theta}(f, t)$, into a regularized version of Eqs. 4.2-3. Provided that $\partial_t^p \theta(f, t)$ and $\partial_f^p \theta(f, t)$ are continuous, the empirical halfwidth estimate of $\partial_f^q \theta(f, t)$ is accurate to $(\tau \lambda_F)^{-(p-q)/(2p+2)}$, i.e. $L^2(\widehat{\partial_t^q \theta}) \simeq O((\tau \lambda_F)^{-2(p-q)/(2p+2)})$. Thus the rate of convergence is optimal. However, the constant of proportionality is suboptimal. More precisely,

$$\text{E} \left[|\widehat{\partial_t^q \theta}(\hat{h}_{q,p}) - \partial_t^q \theta|^2 \right] \sim c(\tau \lambda_F) \text{E} \left[|\widehat{\partial_t^q \theta}(h_{q,p}) - \partial_t^q \theta|^2 \right], \quad (5.1)$$

where $h_{q,p}$ is given by Eqs. 4.3-4 and $\hat{h}_{q,p}$ is the empirical estimate. If $c(\tau \lambda_F) \rightarrow 1$ as

$\tau\lambda_F \rightarrow \infty$, the empirical estimate, $\widehat{\partial_t^q \theta}(\hat{h}_{q,p})$, of $\partial_t^q \theta$ is asymptotically efficient. The relative convergence rate is the rate which $c(\tau\lambda_F) - 1$ tends to zero. Since $L^2(\widehat{\partial_t^q \theta})$ is a smooth function of h_T and h_F , we have

$$c(\tau\lambda_F) \simeq 1 + O\left(\left|\frac{|\widehat{\partial_t^p \theta}|^2}{|\partial_t^p \theta|^2} - 1\right|\right) + O\left(\left|\frac{|\widehat{\partial_f^p \theta}|^2}{|\partial_f^p \theta|^2} - 1\right|\right). \quad (5.2)$$

Thus to optimize the relative rate of convergence in our estimate of $\partial_t^q \theta$, we begin by estimating $\partial_t^p \theta$ and $\partial_f^p \theta$ in an earlier stage.

To optimize the final estimate of $\theta(f, t)$, we consider multiple stage estimators. In two stage schemes, we begin by estimating $\partial_t^p \theta(f, t)$ and $\partial_f^p \theta(f, t)$ using crossproduct kernels of type $(0, p+2) \times (p, p+2)$ and $(p, p+2) \times (0, p+2)$ respectively. The kernel halfwidths for the first stage are determined by substituting into Eq. 4.2-3 the *scalelength ansatz*: $\widehat{\partial_t^{p+2} \theta}(f, t) \sim \tau^{-p-2} \bar{\theta}$ and $\widehat{\partial_f^{p+2} \theta} \sim \lambda_F^{-p-2} \bar{\theta}$ where $\bar{\theta}$, τ and λ_F are given *a priori*. In the second stage, we estimate $\theta(f, t)$ using a $(0, p) \times (0, p)$ kernel with the halfwidths specified by $\widehat{\partial_t^p \theta}(f, t)$ and $\widehat{\partial_f^p \theta}(f, t)$.

The final two stages of three stage estimators are the kernel estimates of $\partial_t^p \theta(f, t)$, $\partial_f^p \theta(f, t)$, and $\theta(f, t)$ as in two stage estimates. There are three types of initializations for three stage estimators, scalelength ansatz estimators, goodness of fit/ factor method estimators, and parametric estimators. Each type estimates the optimal halfwidths for the second stage. Scale length ansatz estimators begin by applying $(0, p+4) \times (p+2, p+4)$ and $(p+2, p+4) \times (0, p+4)$ kernels with the halfwidths specified by Eqs. 4.2-3 and using the scalelength ansatz for the $(p+4)$ th partial derivatives. In three and four stage estimators, considerable error can be tolerated in the initial stages without noticeably impacting the final estimates.

The goodness of fit/factor method (Mueller & Stadtmueller (1987)) initializes by estimating the optimal global halfwidth for a $(0, p+2) \times (0, p+2)$ kernel using the Rice goodness of fit criterion (Hardle et al. (1988)). The Rice criterion selects the halfwidths to minimize

$$C_R(h_F, h_T) \equiv \hat{\sigma}(h_{0,p'})^2 \left(1 - \frac{2\mu_0}{N_D}\right), \quad (5.3)$$

$$\text{where } \hat{\sigma}(h_{0,p'})^2 \equiv \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{N_t} \sum_{k=0}^{N_f} \left[\ln(|y_\nu(m\delta f, j\delta t)|^2) - \hat{\theta}_\mu(m\delta f, j\delta t) \right]^2}{N_t N_f}. \quad (5.4)$$

In Equation 5.3, $\hat{\sigma}(h_{0,p'})^2$ is the mean squared residual error and $(1 - \frac{2\mu_0}{N_D})$ corrects for the number of degrees of freedom. The Rice goodness of fit criterion is an asymptotically efficient estimator of the optimal halfwidth, but it has a slow relative rate of convergence (in comparison with the multiple stage kernel estimators).

After the minimum of Eq. 5.3, $\hat{h}_{0,p'}$, is found, the factor method selects halfwidths for derivatives, $h_{q',p'}$, in terms of the optimal halfwidth for a $(0, p')$ kernel:

$$h_{q',p'} = H(\mu_{q',p'}, \mu_{0,p'}) \hat{h}_{0,p'}, \quad \text{where } H(\mu_{q,p}, \mu_{0,p}) \equiv \left(\frac{(4pq + 2p)C(0, p)^2 m_2(\mu_{q,p})}{2(p - q)C(q, p)^2 m_2(\mu_{0,p})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2p+1}}. \quad (5.5)$$

The factor method only requires that $\theta(f, t)$ have $p + 2$ continuous derivatives, while the scaling ansatz initialization requires $p + 4$ derivatives. The disadvantage of the factor method is that the pilot estimator requires repeated evaluations of Eq. 5.4 to determine the minimum, and therefore is more computationally intensive than the scalelength initialization.

A third possibility to initialize the multi-stage estimator is to fit the data to a low order parametric model. If the evolutionary spectrum and its derivatives are well described by the parametric model, this initialization can yield good, stable results. The evolving autoregressive models are of particular interest. Several semiparametric (one dimensional) models for fitting the evolutionary spectrum are described in Sec. VI.

VI. Discussion

The windowed Fourier transform gives estimates of $S(f, t)$ on a grid in time-frequency space. Smoothing the gridpoint values result in a smooth estimate of the evolutionary spectrum. Our work generalizes Priestley's original calculation (1966) of the expected loss in kernel estimation of evolutionary spectra in several ways. First, we smooth in both time and frequency while Priestley smoothes only in time. Second, we explicitly evaluate the optimal kernel halfwidths and filter bandwidths. Third, we give data-based methods which estimate the optimal kernel halfwidths with the optimal relative convergence rates. Finally, we include two effects which do not occur in standard kernel estimation problems. We include the bias of the gridpoint spectral estimates as a second order bias correction. Second, as the gridpoint overlap parameters, p_T and p_F , decrease, the correlation in the gridpoint estimates is included via $\rho(\mathbf{R}^\theta, \mu)$.

In this article, we have assumed that the signal has no coherent part: $E[x_j] = 0$. If unknown coherent components are present, the resulting model satisfies an evolutionary Cramer's representation:

$$x_t = \sum_{\ell=1}^L A_\ell(t) \cos(\omega_\ell t + \phi_\ell) + \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} A(f, t) e^{2\pi i f t} dZ(f) \quad , \quad (6.1)$$

The coherent components, $A_\ell(t) \cos(\omega_\ell t + \phi_\ell)$, may be iteratively estimated and removed using a kernel smoother (Riedel (1992b)). The error in removing the coherent component should be included in the the expected loss criteria for the evolutionary spectrum. However, these additional terms are so complicated that the residual error from the coherent component removal is neglected in practice.

The other popular method for smoothing noisy data is smoothing splines. The simplest smoothing spline approach is to use crossproduct splines with a knot at every gridpoint, and with imposed symmetry at $f = 0$. Convergence results for crossproduct splines are given in Utreras (1988) and Cox (1984). In this formulation, the penalty function is applied uniformly, and often tends to penalize the mean spectrum too much and the spectral variation too little. To remedy this situation, Gu and Wahba (1991) propose a nonparametric analysis of variation. In complex demodulation, this corresponds to the model: $\theta(f, t) = \theta_T(t) + \theta_F(f) + \tilde{\theta}(f, t)$, where $\theta_T(t)$ and $\theta_F(f)$ have smaller penalty functions. A similar, but different expansion is given in Riedel & Imre (1993), which corresponds to the model: $\theta(f, t) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L g_\ell(t) \theta_\ell(f)$, where the $\{g_\ell(t)\}$ are a small number of known basis functions such as low order polynomials or complex exponentials. This representation is parametric in time and nonparametric in frequency.

A third alternative is to perform a singular value decomposition on the matrix, whose entries are the point estimates of θ evaluated on the gridpoint locations: $\Theta_{k,j} \equiv \hat{\theta}(f_k, t_j)$. The low order left and right eigenvectors are then smoothed to create the representation: $\theta(f, t) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \theta_{T,\ell}(t) \theta_{F,\ell}(f)$. $\theta_{T,\ell}(t)$ and $\theta_{F,\ell}(f)$ are both nonparametric.

When the spline model is chosen, the strength of the smoothness penalty function needs to be selected. The data-based parameter selection method which is traditionally used is generalized cross-validation (Wahba (1990)). Instead, we recommend that the smoothness parameter be chosen to minimize the expected loss. Expected loss parameter selection for smoothing splines with an arbitrary covariance are discussed in detail in Riedel & Imre (1993).

The uncertainty principle implies that the time resolution, δt_R , and the frequency resolution, δf_R , satisfy $\delta t_R \delta f_R > \frac{1}{4\pi}$. When the time grid spacing, δt , and the frequency grid spacing, δf , are chosen with $\delta t \delta f < \frac{1}{4\pi}$, the point spectral estimates at the grid locations are significantly correlated and the effective time-frequency resolution continues to satisfy $\delta t_R \delta f_R > \frac{1}{4\pi}$. Lower values of the grid spacing parameter, $\delta t \delta f$, are useful, because the additional estimates of the spectrum contain some small amount of information about the spectrum at (f, t) . This additional information does not result in estimates with resolution which exceeds the limit $\delta t_R \delta f_R = \frac{1}{4\pi}$.

In complex demodulation, we fix the time grid spacing, δt , and the frequency grid spacing, δf , and then evaluate the point spectral measurements on an equally spaced grid. By using a single value of $(\delta t, \delta f)$, we do not use the information from other possible combinations of δt and δf . As δt and δf are varied, we receive estimates with high frequency resolution and low time resolution as well as estimates with high time resolution and low frequency resolution. An improvement on the fixed δt and δf approach would be to combine the estimates from various combinations of $(\delta t, \delta f)$ in a multiresolution estimate of the evolutionary spectrum. The Wavelet transform (Daubechies (1990)) yields high time resolution for low frequencies and poorer time resolution for high frequencies. In a future publication, we plan to examine the wavelet alternative to windowed Fourier transform estimation of evolutionary spectra.

Acknowledgements

We thank C. Hurvich, A. Sidorenko, and D.J. Thomson for useful discussions. This work was funded by the U.S. Department of Energy.

Bibliography

1. Asch, M., Kohler, W., Papanicolaou, G. et al. (1991). Frequency content of randomly scattered signals. *S.I.A.M. Review* **33**, 519-625.
2. Boashash, B. (1990), Time-frequency signal analysis. In *Advances in spectrum analysis*, S. Haykin, ed. Prentice-Hall, New York.
3. Cohen, L. (1989). Time-frequency distributions - a review. *Proc. I.E.E.E.* **77**, 941-981.
4. Cox, D.D. (1984). Multivariate smoothing spline functions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **21**. 789-813.
5. Daubechies, I. (1990). The wavelet transform, time-frequency localization and signal analysis. *I.E.E.E. Trans. on Information Th.* **36**, 961-1005.
6. Grenander, U. and Rosenblatt, M. (1957). *Statistical analysis of stationary time series*. Wiley, New York.
7. Gu, C. and Wahba, G. (1991). Smoothing spline ANOVA with componentwise Bayesian “confidence intervals”. Technical Report 881, Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
8. Hardle, W. (1990). *Applied nonparametric regression*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York.
9. Hardle, W., Hall, P., and Marron, S. (1988). How far are automatically chosen smoothing parameters from their optimum? *J. Amer. Stat. Assoc.* **83**, 86-95.
10. Hlawatsch, F. and Boudreaux-Bartels G.F. (1992). Linear and quadratic time-frequency representations. *I.E.E.E. Signal Processing Mag.* **9**, 21-67.
11. Loynes, R.M. (1968). On the concept of spectrum for nonstationary processes. *J. Roy. Stat. Soc. Ser. B* **30**, 1-30.
12. Mallows, C.L. (1967). Linear processes are nearly Gaussian. *J. Applied Probability* **4**, 313-329.
13. Melard, G. & Herteleer-de Schutter, A. (1989). Contributions to evolutionary spectral theory. *J. Roy. Stat. Soc. Ser. B* **10**, 41-63.

14. Mueller, H.G. (1980). *Nonparametric regression analysis of longitudinal data*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, New York.
15. Mueller, H.G. and Stadtmueller, U. (1987). Variable bandwidth kernel estimators of regression curves. *Annals of Statistics* **15**, 182-201.
16. Papanicolaou, G., Postel, M., Sheng, P. et al. (1990). Frequency content of randomly scattered signals. Part II: Inversion. *Wave Motion* **12**, 527-549.
17. Priestley, M.B. (1965). Evolutionary spectra and nonstationary processes. *J. Roy. Stat. Soc. Ser. B* **27**, 204-237.
18. Priestley, M.B. (1966). Design relations for nonstationary processes. *J. Roy. Stat. Soc. Ser. B* **28**, 228-240.
19. Riedel, K.S. (1992a). Time-frequency tradeoff in data-based parameter determination for complex demodulation. *Proc. I.E.E.E.-S.P. Int. Symp. on Time-Freq. & Time-Scale Anal.*
20. Riedel, K.S. (1992b). Time-frequency tradeoff in data-based parameter determination for complex demodulation. Submitted for publication.
21. Riedel, K.S. and Imre, K. (1993). Smoothing spline growth curves with covariates. *Comm. in Statistics*, **22** , No. 6.
22. Riedel, K.S. and Sidorenko, A. (1993). Optimal edge kernels. Submitted for publication.
23. Slepian, D. (1978). Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis, and uncertainty-V: the discrete case. *Bell System Tech. J.* **57**, 1371-1429.
24. Stone, C.J. (1982). Optimal global rates of convergence for nonparametric regression. *Annals of Stat.* **10**, 1040-1053.
25. Thomson, D.J. (1982). Spectrum estimation and harmonic analysis. *Proc. I.E.E.E.* **70**, 1055-1096.
26. Thomson, D.J. (1990). Quadratic inverse spectrum estimates: applications to paleoclimatology. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A* **332**, 539-597.
27. Thomson, D.J. and Chave, A.D. (1990). Jackknife error estimates for spectra, coherences and transfer functions in *Advances in spectrum analysis*, (S. Haykin ed.) Ch. 2, p. 70, Prentice-Hall, New York.

28. Utreras, F. (1988). On generalized cross-validation for multivariate smoothing spline functions. *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comp.* **8**, 630-643.
29. Wahba, G. (1980). Automatic smoothing of the log periodogram. *J. Amer. Stat. Assoc.* **75**, 122-132.
30. Wahba, G. (1990). *Spline Models for Observational Data*, S.I.A.M., Philadelphia.
31. Zurbenko, I.G. (1991). Spectral analysis of nonstationary time series. *Int. Stat. Rev.* **59**, 163-173.

Appendix A: Coherence and phase estimates

We analyze the cross-coherence and phase two separate time series, $\{x_j^1\}$ and $\{x_j^2\}$. The tapered Fourier transforms, $y_1^{(k)}(f, t)$ and $y_2^{(k)}(f, t)$, are computed from Eq. 2.3. The point estimates of the the covariance are computed in the usual way. We decompose the cross-coherence into a magnitude and phase:

$$\hat{C}_{12}(f, t) \exp(2\pi i \hat{\phi}_\mu(f, t)) = \frac{\hat{S}_{12}(f)}{\sqrt{\hat{S}_{11}(f) \hat{S}_{22}(f)}} \quad (A1)$$

The cross-coherence estimate is stabilized with the inverse hyperbolic tangent transformation (Thomson and Chave (1990)):

$$Q(f, t) \equiv \sqrt{4K - 2} \tanh^{-1}(|C_{12}(f, t)|) , \quad (A2)$$

where K is the number of tapers of different tapers. In our single taper point estimates, $K = 1$. The \tanh^{-1} transform accelerates the convergence of the residual errors to a Gaussian. When $\{y^1\}$ and $\{y^2\}$ are jointly Gaussian, the bias and variance of Q are explicitly known: Q has a small bias, $E\hat{Q} = Q + \frac{1}{\sqrt{4K-2}}$, and unit variance. After smoothing, $Q(f, t)$ and its confidence interval are then transformed back to the coherence.

To compute the phase estimates, we smooth the real and imaginary parts of $\hat{\gamma}(f, t) \equiv \exp(2\pi i \hat{\phi}(f, t))$. The smoothed estimate of $\gamma(f, t)$ has a modulus less than one. Therefore, our smoothed estimate of the phase is defined by $\exp(2\pi i \hat{\phi}_\mu(f, t)) \equiv \hat{\gamma}_\mu(f, t) / |\hat{\gamma}_\mu(f, t)|$.