

# Stationarity of Time-Series on Graph: A Generalized Approach via Transition Invariance

Amin Jalili, *Student Member, IEEE* and Chong-Yung Chi, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—Stationarity is a cornerstone in classical signal processing (CSP) for modeling and characterizing various stochastic signals for the ensuing analysis. However, in many complex real world scenarios, where the stochastic process lies over an irregular graph structure, the CSP is incapable of handling such signals. It is essential to establish a new framework to analyze the high-dimensional graph structured stochastic signals by taking the underlying structure into account. To this end, looking through the lens of operator theory, we first propose a new bivariate joint transition operator (JTO) consistent with the abstract form of translation operators in other signal domains. Moreover, we characterize time-vertex filtering based on the proposed JTO. Thereupon, we put forth a new definition of stationarity in time-vertex domain using the proposed JTO together with its spectral characterization. Then a new joint power spectral density (JPSD) estimator, called generalized Welch method (GWM), is presented. Simulation results are provided to show the efficacy of this JPSD estimator. Then, by modeling the brain Electroencephalography (EEG) signals as time-varying graph signals, we use JPSD as the feature for the challenging task of emotion recognition. Experimental results demonstrate that JPSD yields superior emotion recognition accuracy in comparison with the classical power spectral density (PSD) as the feature set. Eventually, we provide some concluding remarks.

**Index Terms**—Graph signal processing, graph transition operator, joint transition operator, harmonic analysis, joint time-vertex stationarity, joint power spectral density estimation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**B**EYOND doubt, we are in the era of big data in which massive amount of information are generated at a fast pace and this poses new challenges for the data science. Often, the *big structured data* lies over an irregular structure, but classical signal processing (CSP) disregards the underlying *topological structure*. Connecting the concepts from algebraic graph theory to the CSP gave birth to the field of graph signal processing (GSP) [2]–[9] as a theoretical discipline for analyzing the data lying over irregular graph structures.

©2020 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.

A. Jalili and C.-Y. Chi are with the Wireless Communication and Signal Processing Laboratory, College of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Institute of Communications Engineering, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 30013, Taiwan (e-mail: amin.jalili@ieee.org and cychi@ee.nthu.edu.tw).

This work was supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology, R.O.C., under Grant MOST 107-2221-E-007-021, MOST 108-2634-F-007-004 and MOST 108-2221-E-007-024. It is noted that part of this paper is posted on arXiv.org [1]. (*Corresponding author: Amin Jalili.*)

**Code.** The source code of our simulations will be publicly available at: [www.github.com/amin-jalili/mfdssp/projects/1](http://www.github.com/amin-jalili/mfdssp/projects/1).

There have been two main streams in GSP. One of which exploits the *graph Laplacian matrix* as the cornerstone for developing the theories [2], [4]. However, the second direction is rooted in the algebraic signal processing theory and uses the *weighted adjacency matrix* as the graph shift operator [5], [10], [11]. In the recent few years, GSP emerged via numerous theoretical research works for tackling challenging problems in modern signal processing and data science [12]–[18]. In particular, Grassi *et al.* [18] proposed a new framework for analyzing time-varying graph signals through a meaningful representations of time-series on graph. Stationarity and its important subclass wide-sense stationarity play an essential role in statistical signal processing and time-series analysis. By the classical definition, a signal is temporal wide sense stationary (TWSS) if *its mean and autocorrelation functions are translation invariant*. Likewise, this concept is of paramount significance on irregular graph structure for analyzing stochastic (time-varying) graph signals.

**Quick Review.** Stationarity on graph — correspondingly, vertex wide-sense stationary (VWSS) — is first defined by Girault [19], [20] via isometric graph shift operator. Afterwards, using the notion of *localization on graph*, Perraudin *et al.* [21] proposed a localization operator to define the notion of stationarity on graph. Moreover, Marques *et al.* [22] defined weak stationarity of random graph signals using the adjacency matrix (or graph Laplacian matrix) as the graph shift operator. It is emphasized that these approaches lead to almost the same definition of stationarity on graph in spite of their different initial ideas [23]. Segarra *et al.* [24] defined joint stationarity based on the weighted adjacency matrix corresponding to the joint graph. However, this indeed reduces the stationarity in joint time-vertex domain to stationarity on joint graph. Due to the ambiguity behind notion of translation time-vertex domain, by generalizing a classic “*filtering interpretation*” of stationarity from Euclidean space, Loukas and Perraudin [25] defined joint time-vertex wide-sense stationarity (JWSS) signals via *time-vertex filtering*. Moreover, Isufi *et al.* [26] extended the classical vector autoregressive and vector autoregressive moving average recursions for modeling and predicting time-varying stochastic processes on graph.

**Main Contributions.** In this paper, a novel approach, beyond [24]–[26], is proposed for characterizing the stationarity of time-series on graph via bivariate transition operator in time-vertex domain. First of all, the generic/abstract representation of transition operator on graph is characterized via generalization from classical signal domains which leads to design a bivariate isometric joint transition operator (JTO) in

time-vertex domain. Then we put forth a new definition of stationarity of time-series on graph based on the proposed JTO followed by its spectral characterization. Then the joint power spectral density (JPSD) estimation of JWSS processes is proposed using a generalized Welch method (GWM) followed by some simulation results to demonstrate its effectiveness. Finally, we provide experimental results using real Electroencephalography (EEG) signals to show the applicability of the proposed framework.

**Notations.** Matrices and vectors are denoted by uppercase and lowercase boldface letters,  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{x}$ , respectively. The  $n$ -th element of a vector is indexed by  $\mathbf{x}[n]$ , and the entry in  $n$ -th row and  $m$ -th column of a matrix is denoted by  $\mathbf{X}[n, m]$ .  $\mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{R}_{(m,n)}]$  is a block matrix where  $\mathbf{R}_{(m,n)}$  is its submatrix in the  $m$ -th row and  $n$ -th column partition. Other notations are as follows:  $\mathbf{X}^\top$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ , and  $\mathbf{X}^* = (\bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top$  stand for the transpose, conjugate, and adjoint of the matrix  $\mathbf{X}$ , respectively. Moreover,  $\text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$  stands for the column vector by stacking all the columns of  $\mathbf{X}$  sequentially,  $\text{Diag}(\mathbf{x})$  represents a diagonal matrix by placing the elements of vector  $\mathbf{x}$  on the main diagonal, and  $\text{Diag}(\mathbf{X})$  is equivalent to  $\text{Diag}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}))$ . Also,  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{X})$  represents the column vector containing the diagonal elements of matrix  $\mathbf{X}$ . We use  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$  and  $|x|$  as the 2-norm of  $\mathbf{x}$  and absolute of  $x$ , respectively. On the other hand,  $|\mathbf{X}|$  is a matrix with  $(n, m)$ -th element equal to  $|\mathbf{X}[n, m]|$ .  $\text{row}_k(\mathbf{X})$  stands for the  $k$ -th row of matrix  $\mathbf{X}$ . Also,  $\mathbf{I}$ ,  $\mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{1}$  denote the identity matrix, matrix/column vector of all zeros, and matrix/column vector of all ones (their dimensions may be indicated by their subscript for some emphasized cases), respectively. Symbols  $\star$ ,  $\otimes$ ,  $\oplus$ , and  $\odot$  represent the convolution operator, Kronecker product, Kronecker sum, and Hadamard (element-wise) product, respectively. Then  $\mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$  ( $\mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ ) is the set of  $N \times N$  complex (real) matrices.  $\mathbb{C}^N$  ( $\mathbb{R}^N$ ) is the set of  $N \times 1$  complex (real) vectors.  $\mathbb{R}_+$  ( $\mathbb{Z}_+$ ) accounts for the set of nonnegative real (integer) numbers. Moreover, C, D, G, J, and M represent the continuous-time, discrete-time, graph, joint time-vertex domains, and Riemannian manifold, respectively. Finally,  $i = \sqrt{-1}$  and  $\llbracket a, b \rrbracket$  represents the integers between  $a$  and  $b$  inclusive.

**Note 1.** In this paper, we replace the terminology “translation” with “transition” since the it is more sensible terminology for the purpose of addressing translation on graph.

**Note 2.** Let  $\mathbf{L}$  be an  $N \times N$  self-adjoint matrix with eigenvalue decomposition  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{\Phi} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{\Phi}^*$  where  $\mathbf{\Phi}$  is a unitary eigenbasis matrix  $\mathbf{\Phi} \mathbf{\Phi}^* = \mathbf{\Phi}^* \mathbf{\Phi} = \mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{Diag}([\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{N-1}])$  is the eigenvalue matrix. Then, the univariate matrix function is defined as  $h(\mathbf{L}) := \mathbf{\Phi} h(\mathbf{\Lambda}) \mathbf{\Phi}^*$  where  $h(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \text{Diag}([h(\lambda_0), \dots, h(\lambda_{N-1})])$  in which  $h: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  [27]. Note that  $h$  can also be a multivariate matrix function.

## II. BACKGROUND

**Vertex Harmonic Analysis.** Let  $G := (V, E, W)$  denote a fixed graph with finite vertex set  $V$  with the cardinality  $|V| = N$ ,  $E = \{(n_1, n_2) | n_1, n_2 \in V, n_2 \sim n_1\} \subseteq V \times V$  is the edge set and  $W_G: V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a weight function. This function yields the weighted adjacency matrix

as  $\mathbf{W}_G = [w_{n_1, n_2}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  where  $w_{n_1, n_2}$  represents the strength of the connection between nodes  $n_1$  and  $n_2$ . Throughout this paper, we assume that the graph is finite, weighted, connected, and undirected. A graph signal, represented in a compact form by the vector  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ , is defined by the function  $f_G: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where  $\mathbf{f}[n]$  is the function value at the vertex  $n$ . Then the graph Laplacian matrix is defined as  $\mathbf{L}_G := \text{Diag}(\mathbf{W}_G \mathbf{1}) - \mathbf{W}_G$ . Since  $\mathbf{L}_G$  is a symmetric positive semi-definite matrix, it can be written as  $\mathbf{L}_G = \mathbf{\Phi}_G \mathbf{\Lambda}_G \mathbf{\Phi}_G^*$ , eigenvalue decomposition (EVD) of  $\mathbf{L}_G$ , where  $\mathbf{\Phi}_G = [\varphi_{G,0}, \dots, \varphi_{G,N-1}] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$  consists of a complete set of orthonormal eigenvectors  $\mathcal{B}_G := \{\varphi_{G,\ell}, \forall \ell \in \llbracket 0, N-1 \rrbracket\}$ , such that  $\varphi_{G,\ell}$  is equal to the  $\ell$ -th graph Fourier mode,  $\mathbf{\Phi}_G$  is a unitary matrix, and  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_G = \text{Diag}([\lambda_{G,0}, \dots, \lambda_{G,N-1}])$  contains the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{L}_G$ . Without loss of generality, one may assume:  $0 = \lambda_{G,0} < \lambda_{G,1} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{G,N-1} = \lambda_{G,\max}$ . The graph Fourier transform (GFT) and its inverse can be expressed as [2]

$$\text{GFT: } \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{F}_G \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{\Phi}_G^* \mathbf{x} \longleftrightarrow \text{IGFT: } \mathbf{x} = \mathcal{F}_G^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{\Phi}_G \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_G$  and  $\mathcal{F}_G^{-1}$  account for the GFT and inverse GFT (IGFT) operator, respectively.

**Discrete-Time Harmonic Analysis.** Let  $x(n)$ ,  $n \in \llbracket 1, M \rrbracket$  be a discrete-time signal of finite length  $M$ . The discrete Fourier transform (DFT) operator  $\mathcal{F}_D$  and its inverse  $\mathcal{F}_D^{-1}$  can be represented in a matrix form as

$$\text{DFT: } \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{F}_D \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{\Phi}_D^* \mathbf{x} \longleftrightarrow \text{IDFT: } \mathbf{x} = \mathcal{F}_D^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{\Phi}_D \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \quad (2)$$

where the signal in vector form is denoted as  $\mathbf{x} := [x(1), x(2), \dots, x(M)]^\top$  and  $\mathbf{\Phi}_D = [\varphi_{D,0}, \dots, \varphi_{D,M-1}] \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times M}$  is a unitary matrix comprising of a complete set of orthonormal eigenvectors  $\mathcal{B}_D := \{\varphi_{D,k}, \forall k \in \llbracket 0, M-1 \rrbracket\}$ , such that  $\varphi_{D,k}$  is equivalent to the  $k$ -th discrete Fourier mode. Moreover, the set of angular frequencies is defined as  $\mathcal{W}_D := \{\omega_k := 2\pi(k-1)/M, k \in \llbracket 1, M \rrbracket\}$ . Then  $\mathbf{\Phi}_D[n, k] = \exp(i\omega_k(n-1))/\sqrt{M}$ ,  $n, k \in \llbracket 1, M \rrbracket$ . By a classic interpretation, discrete-time domain can be modeled as a  $M$ -Cycle graph  $D$  with all edge weights equal to unity. Moreover, the symmetric time Laplacian matrix  $\mathbf{L}_D$  — corresponding to the graph  $D$  — is defined as the second-order derivative in discrete-time domain up to a negative sign and, as a circulant matrix, it can be diagonalized as

$$\mathbf{L}_D = \mathbf{\Phi}_D \mathbf{\Lambda}_D \mathbf{\Phi}_D^*, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_D = \text{Diag}([\lambda_{D,0}, \dots, \lambda_{D,M-1}])$  contains the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{L}_D$  such that  $\lambda_{D,k} = \omega_k$  [18]. Without loss of generality, one may assume that  $0 = \lambda_{D,0} < \lambda_{D,1} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{D,M-1} = \lambda_{D,\max} = 2\pi(M-1)/M$ .

**Joint Time-Vertex Harmonic Analysis.** A time-varying graph signal is represented in a compact form by the matrix  $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$  where  $\mathbf{x}_k$  denotes the graph signal at discrete-time  $k \in \llbracket 1, M \rrbracket$  with a fixed sampling interval. Then the joint time-vertex Fourier transform (JFT) is defined as  $\hat{\mathbf{X}} := \mathbf{\Phi}_G^* \mathbf{X} \mathbf{\Phi}_D$ , where  $\mathbf{\Phi}_G$  and  $\mathbf{\Phi}_D$  are the GFT and DFT matrices, respectively [18], [28]. Clearly, the JFT coefficient of  $\mathbf{X}$  corresponding to the

frequency pairs  $(\lambda_{G,\ell}, \lambda_{D,k})$  is denoted by  $\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell, k]$  where  $\lambda_{G,\ell}$  and  $\lambda_{D,k}$  are the  $\ell$ -th and  $k$ -th eigenvalues (frequencies) on graphs  $G$  and  $D$ , respectively. In a compact form, JFT and its inverse can be rewritten as [28]

$$\text{JFT: } \widehat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{F}_J \mathbf{x} = \Phi_J^* \mathbf{x} \longleftrightarrow \text{IJFT: } \mathbf{x} = \mathcal{F}_J^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{x}} = \Phi_J \widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{x} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$  is the vectorized form of the time-varying graph signal and

$$\Phi_J := \Phi_D \otimes \Phi_G \in \mathbb{C}^{NM \times NM}, \quad (5)$$

is a unitary matrix. This consists of a complete set of orthonormal eigenvectors  $\mathcal{B}_J := \{\varphi_{J,\ell}, \forall \ell \in [0, NM-1]\}$ , such that  $\varphi_{J,\ell}$  is equivalent to the  $\ell$ -th joint Fourier mode. One can easily see that  $\varphi_{J,0} = \mathbf{1}_{NM}/\sqrt{NM}$ . Likewise the graph setting and discrete-time domain, joint time-vertex domain can also be modeled by a multilayer graph — in brief, *joint graph*  $J$  — which is equal to the Cartesian product of undirected graph  $G$  and  $M$ -Cycle graph  $D$  (see [28, Figure 2]). Moreover, the joint Laplacian matrix  $\mathbf{L}_J$ , corresponding to the graph  $J$ , can be described as  $\mathbf{L}_J = \mathbf{L}_G \oplus \mathbf{L}_D = \Phi_J \mathbf{\Lambda}_J \Phi_J^*$  where  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_J = \mathbf{\Lambda}_D \oplus \mathbf{\Lambda}_G = \text{Diag}([\lambda_{J,0}, \dots, \lambda_{J,NM-1}])$  contains the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{L}_J$  (corresponding to the sum of all eigenvalue pairs of  $\mathbf{L}_G$  and  $\mathbf{L}_D$ ) [18].

### III. JOINT TIME-VERTEX TRANSITION OPERATOR

Girault *et al.* [20], [29] are the first who introduced the isometric graph translation operator. To be specific, they *designed* their operator based on the properties of isometry and convolutionity which led to the general form  $\mathbf{T}_G = \exp(i\mathbf{\Omega})$  where the matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  has to be specified (cf. [20, Eq. (6)])<sup>1</sup>. Since the translation operators in continuous-time and discrete-time domains (cf. (6) and (8)) are both *isometric* and *convolutive*, there is no need for such design and one can directly generalize classical translation operators to the graph domain. Basically, operators can be considered as abstract mathematical objects with concrete manifestations in different domains. In the ensuing part, we aim at discussing the abstract representations of translation operators in various signal domains followed by generalizing to the time-vertex domain.

**Graph Transition Operator (GTO).** Let us begin with characterizing the abstract form of translation operators in continuous-time and discrete-time domains.

**Remark 1.** Let  $x(t)$  be a continuous-time signal and  $\widehat{x}(\xi) = (\mathcal{F}_C x)(t)$  be its Fourier transform where  $\mathcal{F}_C$  is the Fourier transform operator. The continuous translation operator is defined as  $(\mathcal{T}_C^\tau x)(t) = x(t-\tau)$  where with  $\tau$  is the translation value. This operator can be formulated in the abstract form as

$$\mathcal{T}_C^\tau = \mathcal{F}_C^{-1} \mathcal{P}_C^\tau \mathcal{F}_C, \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_C^\tau = \exp(-2\pi i \tau \xi)$  is the phase multiplication operator in the continuous-time domain.

*Proof:* See Appendix A. ■ □

<sup>1</sup>It is noted that, recently, Dees *et al.* [30] introduced a new unitary shift operator on graph for finding the closest unitary matrix to the adjacency matrix of a directed graph by solving an optimization problem.

Moreover, the Laplace operator can be expressed as:  $\Delta_C = -\mathcal{F}_C^{-1} \mathcal{M}_C^2 \mathcal{F}_C$  where  $\mathcal{M}_C$  is defined by (65). This identity interestingly shows that the Fourier transform operator diagonalizes the Laplace operator.

**Definition 1.** Let  $x(n)$  where  $n \in [1, M]$  be a discrete-time signal and  $\mathcal{T}_D^v$  be the right-circular translation operator in discrete-time domain with the translation value  $v$  defined as  $(\mathcal{T}_D^v x)(n) := x(n-v)$ . Let  $\mathbf{x} := [x(1), x(2), \dots, x(M)]^T$  be the signal in vector form. Then  $\mathcal{T}_D \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{T}_D \mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3, \dots, \mathbf{e}_M, \mathbf{e}_1] \mathbf{x}$  where  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is the  $M \times 1$  unit vector with the  $i$ -th entry equal to 1.

**Remark 2.** The discrete-time translation operator can be unitarily diagonalized by the DFT matrix as

$$\mathbf{T}_D^v = \Phi_D \mathbf{P}_D^v \Phi_D^* = \sum_{\ell=0}^{M-1} \exp(-iv\omega_\ell) \varphi_{D,\ell} \varphi_{D,\ell}^*, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_D := \exp(-i\mathbf{M}_D)$  and the angular discrete-frequency matrix is  $\mathbf{M}_D := \text{Diag}([\omega_0, \dots, \omega_{M-1}])$ . On the other hand, we can write  $\mathbf{T}_D^v = \exp(-iv\mathbf{L}_D)$  (cf. Section II). This puts forth a compact representation of the discrete isometric translation operator based on the discrete Laplacian matrix  $\mathbf{L}_D$ . Then this operator with  $v$ -translation can be written as

$$\mathcal{T}_D^v = \mathcal{F}_D^{-1} \mathcal{P}_D^v \mathcal{F}_D, \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_D$  is the DFT operator and  $\mathcal{P}_D^v = \exp(-iv\mathbf{M}_D)$ . □

One can characterize the abstract form of graph transition operator  $\mathcal{T}_G$  by directly generalizing the characteristic of translation operators in continuous-time and discrete-time domains (cf. (6) and (8)) as follows.

**Definition 2.** (Graph Transition Operator) Let  $\mathcal{T}_G : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$  denote the GTO defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_G^\vartheta := \mathcal{F}_G^{-1} \mathcal{P}_G^\vartheta \mathcal{F}_G, \quad (9)$$

where  $\vartheta$  is the translation value,  $\mathcal{P}_G^\vartheta := \mathbf{P}_G^\vartheta = \exp(-i\vartheta \mathbf{M}_G)$ , and  $\mathbf{M}_G$  is a diagonal matrix containing the angular frequencies in the graph setting and  $\mathcal{F}_G$  accounts for the GFT operator which can be represented by any GFT matrix<sup>2</sup>.

As the matrix  $\mathbf{M}_G$  is assigned, the operator  $\mathcal{T}_G$  is then well-defined. The notion of graph frequency is defined in an analogous manner to the frequency in the continuous domain. Let  $\Delta_M$  be the Laplace-Beltrami operator defined on a Riemannian manifold and  $g(x) := \exp(2\pi i \xi x)$  be the plane wave function. Then one can simply obtain the following identity as:  $(\Delta_M g)(x) = -(2\pi \xi)^2 g(x)$  where  $g(x)$  is an eigenfunction of  $\Delta_M$  with eigenvalue  $-(2\pi \xi)^2$ . Moreover, the (combinatorial) graph Laplacian can be considered as an approximation of the Laplace-Beltrami operator up to a negative sign (i.e.,  $-\Delta_M$ ) [4]. Following these observations from the continuous space, Shuman *et al.* [2] specified that  $\lambda_\ell$  for

<sup>2</sup>The abstract representation (2) allows us either to use weighted adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{W}_G$  or graph Laplacian  $\mathbf{L}_G$  to define the translation operator on graph. Some state-of-the-art translation operators (Girault's isometric shift operator [20], Gavili's graph shift operators  $\mathbf{A}_e$  and  $\mathbf{A}_\phi$  [31]) turn out to be the special cases of (9). We refer the reader to [1, Discussion 1] for a detailed discussion about various matrix realizations of this abstract form.

$\ell \in \llbracket 0, N-1 \rrbracket$  carries the *frequency notion* in graph setting. Then the equivalent of angular frequencies in graph setting can be defined as  $\mathcal{W}_G := \{\omega_{G,\ell} := \sqrt{\lambda_{G,\ell}}, \ell \in \llbracket 0, N-1 \rrbracket\}$  as a natural generalization from the continuous space to graph setting. Hence, we define the angular frequency multiplication matrix as follows:  $\mathbf{M}_G := \text{Diag}([\omega_{G,0}, \dots, \omega_{G,N-1}])$ . Then the isometric JTO can be expressed as follows

$$\mathbf{T}_G^\vartheta = \Phi_G \mathbf{P}_G^\vartheta \Phi_G^* = \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \exp(-i\vartheta\omega_{G,\ell}) \varphi_{G,\ell} \varphi_{G,\ell}^*. \quad (10)$$

**Remark 3.** Consider a dynamic  $N$ -state system defined on the connected graph  $G$  where the state in *evolution-time*  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  is described by a column vector  $\mathbf{u}(t)$ . The *Schrödinger equation* is expressed as:  $(i\alpha\partial_t - \mathbf{H}_G)\mathbf{u}(t) = 0$ , where  $\partial_t$  is the partial derivative with respect to the evolution-time,  $\alpha$  is a constant — in the original equation, it is the *Plank's reduced constant*, and  $\mathbf{u}(0)$  is the initial state. In the context of GSP,  $\mathbf{u}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  corresponds to the given graph signal. Here,  $\mathbf{H}_G$  is any self-adjoint matrix representing the characteristic of graph  $G$  called *Hamiltonian*. Suppose  $\mathbf{H}_G = \Phi_G \mathbf{P}_G \Phi_G^*$ . Then one can obtain the solution of *Schrödinger equation* as

$$\mathbf{u}(t) = e^{-it\mathbf{H}_G/\alpha} \mathbf{u}(0) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} e^{-it\beta_k/\alpha} \langle \mathbf{u}(0), \varphi_{G,k} \rangle \varphi_{G,k},$$

where  $\beta_k := \mathbf{P}_G[k, k]$ ,  $\varphi_{G,k}$  is the  $k$ -th column of  $\Phi_G$  and  $\mathbf{P}_G[k, k]$  corresponds to the  $k$ -th angular frequency on graph. Then the *transition function* [32] on graph  $G$  is defined as follows

$$H_G(t) := \exp(-it\mathbf{H}_G/\alpha) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-it/\alpha)^r}{r!} \mathbf{H}_G^r, \quad (11)$$

which is a matrix function presenting the evolution of continuous time quantum walk over  $G$ . In fact, it describes the state transfer between particles in a network of quantum particles defined over graph  $G$ . It is interesting to observe that, for integer values of  $t$ , the isometric GTO is equivalent to the transition function (where the translated graph signal is equivalent to the evolutionized form of the graph signal).  $\square$

**Joint Transition Operator.** Now, we are ready to design a general form of an isometric transition operator in joint time-vertex domain as follows.

**Definition 3.** The transition of time-vertex signal is defined as  $\mathbf{X}^{(v,\vartheta)} := \mathbf{T}_G^\vartheta \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{T}_D^v)^v$  where  $\vartheta, v \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  account for the transition values in graph and discrete-time domains, respectively. Then the time-vertex transition operator  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  can be defined as  $\mathbf{x}^{(v,\vartheta)} = \mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{x}$  where  $\mathbf{x}^{(v,\vartheta)} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}^{(v,\vartheta)})$  and  $\mathbf{x} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$ . Moreover, the matrix representation of  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  can be obtained as  $\mathbf{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} = \mathbf{T}_D^v \otimes \mathbf{T}_G^\vartheta$ . The reader is referred to [1, Figure 1] where we depicted the idea behind our definition of transition in time-vertex domain.

**Proposition 1.** The joint time-vertex transition operator  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  (cf. Definition 3) is a unitary operator, and hence isometric.

*Proof:* It is sufficient to prove it for the unit joint time-vertex transition simply denoted by  $\mathbf{T}_J$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T}_J \mathbf{T}_J^* &= (\mathbf{T}_D \otimes \mathbf{T}_G) (\mathbf{T}_D \otimes \mathbf{T}_G)^* = (\mathbf{T}_D \mathbf{T}_D^*) \otimes (\mathbf{T}_G \mathbf{T}_G^*) \\ &= \mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{I}_N = \mathbf{I}_{NM}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality holds since  $\mathbf{T}_G$  and  $\mathbf{T}_D$  are unitary matrices<sup>3</sup>. Similarly, it can be shown that  $\mathbf{T}_J^* \mathbf{T}_J = \mathbf{I}_{NM}$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 1.** The proposed joint time-vertex transition operator  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  can be written as

$$\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} = \mathcal{F}_J^{-1} \mathcal{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathcal{F}_J, \quad \forall v, \vartheta \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad (12)$$

where the bivariate phase multiplication operator is  $\mathcal{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} := \exp(-i\mathbf{M}_J^{(v,\vartheta)})$ , and the multiplier matrix is given by  $\mathbf{M}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} := \text{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(v,\vartheta)})$  such that the joint angular frequency vector is

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(v,\vartheta)} := \text{vec} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{0,0}^{(v,\vartheta)} & \xi_{0,1}^{(v,\vartheta)} & \cdots & \xi_{0,M-1}^{(v,\vartheta)} \\ \xi_{1,0}^{(v,\vartheta)} & \xi_{1,1}^{(v,\vartheta)} & \cdots & \xi_{1,M-1}^{(v,\vartheta)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \xi_{N-1,0}^{(v,\vartheta)} & \xi_{N-1,1}^{(v,\vartheta)} & \cdots & \xi_{N-1,M-1}^{(v,\vartheta)} \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad (13)$$

which consists of all the combinations of frequencies in discrete-time and graph domains as

$$\xi_{k,j}^{(v,\vartheta)} := \vartheta\omega_{G,k} + v\omega_{D,j}, \quad k \in \llbracket 0, N-1 \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket 0, M-1 \rrbracket. \quad (14)$$

*Proof:* From Definition 3, one can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} &= \mathbf{T}_D^v \otimes \mathbf{T}_G^\vartheta = (\Phi_D \mathbf{P}_D^v \Phi_D^*) \otimes (\Phi_G \mathbf{P}_G^\vartheta \Phi_G^*) \\ &= (\Phi_D \otimes \Phi_G) (\mathbf{P}_D^v \otimes \mathbf{P}_G^\vartheta) (\Phi_D \otimes \Phi_G)^* \\ &= \Phi_J \mathbf{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \Phi_J^*, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where the phase multiplication matrix is defined as

$$\mathbf{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} := \mathbf{P}_D^v \otimes \mathbf{P}_G^\vartheta = \exp(-i\mathbf{M}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}) \quad (16)$$

and  $\mathbf{M}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} := v\mathbf{M}_D \oplus \vartheta\mathbf{M}_G$ . Then (15) can be written in the abstract form as (12) with  $\Phi_J^*$  and  $\mathbf{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  to be the matrix representations of  $\mathcal{F}_J$  and  $\mathcal{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$ , respectively.  $\blacksquare$

Then the isometric JTO given by (15) can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{NM-1} \gamma_{J,\ell}^{(v,\vartheta)} \varphi_{J,\ell} \varphi_{J,\ell}^*, \quad (17)$$

where  $\ell = k + jN$ ,  $k \in \llbracket 0, N-1 \rrbracket$  and  $j \in \llbracket 0, M-1 \rrbracket$  (cf. (13), (14)), and

$$\gamma_{J,\ell}^{(v,\vartheta)} = \mathbf{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}[\ell, \ell] = \exp(-i\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(v,\vartheta)}[\ell]), \quad (18)$$

which depends on  $\mathbf{P}_D$  and  $\mathbf{P}_G$  due to (16). This implies that the isometric JTO  $\mathcal{T}_J$  is a bivariate operator.

**Discussion 1.** Due to our design, the JTO is a bivariate operator with angular frequencies in discrete-time and graph domains as of its variables (i.e.,  $(\omega_{G,k}, \omega_{D,j})$  for all  $k \in$

<sup>3</sup>Here, we used the properties  $(\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B})^* = \mathbf{A}^* \otimes \mathbf{B}^*$  and  $(\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B})(\mathbf{C} \otimes \mathbf{D}) = (\mathbf{AC}) \otimes (\mathbf{BD})$ .

TABLE I  
TRANSLATION/TRANSITION OPERATORS IN VARIOUS SIGNAL DOMAINS

Domain	Abstract form	Description
Continuous-time (cf. (6))	$\mathcal{T}_C^\tau = \mathcal{F}_C^{-1} \mathcal{P}_C^\tau \mathcal{F}_C$	$\mathcal{F}_C$ : Continuous-time Fourier transform operator, $\mathcal{P}_C^\tau = \exp(-i2\pi\xi\tau)$ , $\mathcal{M}_C$ : Angular frequency multiplication operator — $(\mathcal{M}_C\hat{x})(\xi) := (2\pi\xi\hat{x})(\xi)$
Discrete-time (cf. (8))	$\mathcal{T}_D^v = \mathcal{F}_D^{-1} \mathcal{P}_D^v \mathcal{F}_D$	$\mathcal{F}_D$ : DFT operator, $\mathcal{P}_D^v := \exp(-iv\mathbf{M}_D)$ , $\mathbf{M}_D$ : Diagonal matrix of discrete angular frequencies
Graph (cf. (9))	$\mathcal{T}_G^\vartheta := \mathcal{F}_G^{-1} \mathcal{P}_G^\vartheta \mathcal{F}_G$	$\mathcal{F}_G$ : GFT operator, $\mathcal{P}_G^\vartheta := \exp(-i\vartheta\mathbf{M}_G)$ , $\mathbf{M}_G$ : Diagonal matrix of angular frequencies in graph setting
Joint time-vertex (cf. (12))	$\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} = \mathcal{F}_J^{-1} \mathcal{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathcal{F}_J$	$\mathcal{F}_J$ : JFT operator, $\mathcal{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} := \exp(-i\mathbf{M}_J^{(v,\vartheta)})$ , $\mathbf{M}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$ : Diagonal matrix of joint angular frequencies

$\llbracket 0, N-1 \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket 0, M-1 \rrbracket$ ). In a special framework, the time-vertex domain is modeled as the multilayer graph  $\mathbf{J}$  (namely, *joint graph*) resulting from the Cartesian product of  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$  [18]. Then, for  $\vartheta = v$ , this operator reduces to a special case of isometric GTO on graph  $\mathbf{J}$  using the joint Laplacian matrix. Thus, the proposed isometric JTO (cf. Definition 3) is *more general than defining GTO on joint graph*  $\mathbf{J}$  and empowers us to define a *more general notion of stationarity* in time-vertex domain than stationarity on  $\mathbf{J}^4$ . Moreover, Segarra *et al.* [24] defined the univariate shift operator as the weighted adjacency matrix of  $\mathbf{J}$  as

$$\mathcal{S}_J := \mathbf{W}_D \oplus \mathbf{W}_G, \quad (19)$$

where  $\mathbf{W}_D$  and  $\mathbf{W}_G$  are the weighted adjacency matrices of graph  $\mathbf{D}$  (with unity weights) and  $\mathbf{G}$ , respectively. Clearly, this is not an isometric operator. This definition treats discrete-time and graph domains *equally* and it does not include the feasible shifts with different values in the two domains. Note that the obtained stationarity [24, Eq. (12.7)] via the operator (19) is actually a special case of stationarity in time-vertex domain defined in this paper (cf. Definition 7 below). Letting  $\mathbf{W}_D = \Psi_D \Gamma_D \Psi_D^*$  and  $\mathbf{W}_G = \Psi_G \Gamma_G \Psi_G^*$  be the EVDs of  $\mathbf{W}_D$  and  $\mathbf{W}_G$ , respectively, we suggest the following non-isometric bivariate shift operator instead

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} &:= \mathbf{W}_D^v \oplus \mathbf{W}_G^\vartheta \\ &= (\Psi_D \otimes \Psi_G) (\Gamma_D^v \oplus \Gamma_G^\vartheta) (\Psi_D \otimes \Psi_G)^*. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

However, we focus on filtering and stationarity based on the proposed *isometric bivariate JTO* (cf. Definition 3) instead of the one defined by (20).  $\square$

**Proposition 2.** The properties of JTO, given by (12), are:

- (i) It yields a family of isometric transition operators with two parameters  $\mathcal{F}_J, \mathcal{P}_J$ , and consequently it results in different matrix representations of JTO.
- (ii) It is linear, convolutive (since  $\mathbf{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  is a diagonal matrix) and isometric (because it is a unitary operator).
- (iii)  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$ s commute with each other as  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v_1,\vartheta_1)} \mathcal{T}_J^{(v_2,\vartheta_2)} = \mathcal{T}_J^{(v_1+\vartheta_1, v_2+\vartheta_2)} \mathcal{T}_J^{(v_1,\vartheta_1)}$ .

<sup>4</sup>Note that for further derivations and without loss of generality, we use the generalized GTO defined in (10). However, any manifestation of the abstract representation (10) can be exploited to define the JTO.

- (iv) The power spectrum of time-vertex signal  $\mathbf{X}$  is invariant under the operator  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  as  $|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(v,\vartheta)}[\ell, k]|^2 = |\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell, k]|^2$  for all  $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$  and  $k \in \llbracket 1, M \rrbracket$ .
- (v) The set of  $\mathcal{Z} := \{\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} : v, \vartheta \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ , with the operation of multiplication, forms a mathematical transition abelian group ( $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is the set of nonnegative integers).

Table I summarizes the abstract representations of isometric translation/transition operators in different signal spaces including continuous-time, discrete-time, graph, and time-vertex domains where they share similar structural characteristics.

#### IV. JOINT FILTERING VIA JOINT TRANSITION OPERATOR

In discrete-time domain, a linear translation invariant (LTI) filter is equivalent to the circular convolution operator [33]. Then the filtering operation in this domain can be represented in a compact form as  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{H}_D \mathbf{x}$  where  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  are the input and output signal vectors, respectively, and the filter matrix can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{H}_D = \sum_{p=0}^{L_1-1} h_{D,p} \mathbf{T}_D^p, \quad (21)$$

where  $h_{D,0}, \dots, h_{D,L_1-1}$  are the  $L_1$  filter coefficients and  $L_1 \leq M$ . In the spectral domain, the dual of  $\mathbf{H}_D$  can be expressed as

$$\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_D = \Phi_D^* \mathbf{H}_D \Phi_D = \sum_{p=0}^{L_1-1} h_{D,p} \mathbf{P}_D^p, \quad (\text{cf. (7)}). \quad (22)$$

Sandryhaila and Moura [5], [34], defined graph filtering as  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{H}_G \mathbf{x}$  where  $\mathbf{H}_G \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$  is the complex valued graph filter matrix. Furthermore, they showed that any LTI graph filter can be written as a polynomial of  $\mathbf{W}_G$  [5, Theorem 1]. Afterward, Marques *et al.* [22] used the notion of graph filtering for power spectral density (PSD) estimation. Moreover, Gavili and Zhang [31] defined graph filtering based on their devised energy preserving graph shift operators. The generic form of graph filter, in the same spirit as in discrete-time, is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_G = \sum_{q=0}^{L_2-1} h_{G,q} \mathcal{T}_G^q, \quad (23)$$

where  $h_{G,q} \in \mathbb{C}$  is the  $q$ -th tap of the filter. In the graph spectral domain, the dual of  $\mathbf{H}_G$  can be written as

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_G = \Phi_G^* \mathbf{H}_G \Phi_G = \sum_{q=0}^{L_2-1} h_{G,q} \mathbf{P}_G^q, \quad (\text{cf. (10)}). \quad (24)$$

Now, we elaborate on joint filtering defined based upon the proposed isometric JTO as follows.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose that the graph Laplacian matrix has distinct eigenvalues<sup>5</sup> and  $\mathcal{T}_J$  is the JTO. A joint filter  $\mathcal{H}_J$  is bivariate LTI (i.e.,  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathcal{H}_J = \mathcal{H}_J \mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$ ) if and only if

$$\mathcal{H}_J = \sum_{q=0}^{L_2-1} \sum_{p=0}^{L_1-1} h_{J,(p,q)} \mathcal{T}_J^{(p,q)}, \quad (25)$$

where  $h_{J,(p,q)} \in \mathbb{C}$  is the  $(p,q)$ -th tap of the filter and  $L_1 - 1$ ,  $L_2 - 1$  are the degrees of polynomial in discrete-time and graph domains, respectively, such that  $L_1 \leq M$  and  $L_2 \leq N$ .

*Proof:* ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Let  $\mathbf{H}_J$  stands for joint LTI filter with respect to (w.r.t.) the bivariate JTO,  $\mathbf{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} = \Phi_J \mathbf{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \Phi_J^*$  (cf. (15)), where  $\mathbf{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  is a diagonal matrix (cf. (16)). Without loss of generality, assume  $v = \vartheta = 1$ . Since  $\mathbf{H}_J \mathbf{T}_J = \mathbf{T}_J \mathbf{H}_J$  and graph Laplacian has distinct eigenvalues,  $\mathbf{H}_J$  is diagonalizable by the eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{T}_J$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{H}_J = \Phi_J \mathbf{O}_J \Phi_J^*$  (i.e., EVD of  $\mathbf{H}_J$ ). By (18) we have

$$\gamma_{J,\ell} := \mathbf{P}_J[\ell, \ell] = \exp(-i\xi[\ell]). \quad (26)$$

Suppose  $h(x)$ , with  $x := (x_1, x_2)$ , is the bivariate polynomial of degrees  $L_1 - 1$  and  $L_2 - 1$  such that  $h(\gamma_{J,\ell}) = \mathbf{O}_J[\ell, \ell]$  (recall that  $\gamma_{J,\ell}$  depends on  $\mathbf{P}_D$  and  $\mathbf{P}_G$ ). In other words,

$$h(\gamma_{J,\ell}) = \sum_{q=0}^{L_2-1} \sum_{p=0}^{L_1-1} h_{J,(p,q)} \gamma_{J,\ell}^{(p,q)}, \quad \forall \ell \in \llbracket 0, NM - 1 \rrbracket, \quad (27)$$

where  $h_{J,(p,q)}$  for all  $p, q$  are the polynomial coefficients and  $\gamma_{J,\ell}^{(p,q)}$  is given by (18). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{T}_J) &= \Phi_J h(\mathbf{P}_J) \Phi_J^* \quad (\text{cf. Note 2}) \\ &= \sum_{q=0}^{L_2-1} \sum_{p=0}^{L_1-1} h_{J,(p,q)} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^{NM-1} \gamma_{J,\ell}^{(p,q)} \varphi_{J,\ell} \varphi_{J,\ell}^* \right), \end{aligned}$$

which clearly reduces to (25) by (17).

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Now, since (25) holds true, we have

$$\mathbf{H}_J = \sum_{q=0}^{L_2-1} \sum_{p=0}^{L_1-1} h_{J,(p,q)} \mathbf{T}_J^{(p,q)} = \Phi_J h(\mathbf{P}_J) \Phi_J^*. \quad (28)$$

Then, one can further deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_J \mathbf{T}_J &= \Phi_J \mathbf{O}_J \Phi_J^* \Phi_J \mathbf{P}_J \Phi_J^* \\ &= \Phi_J \mathbf{P}_J \Phi_J^* \Phi_J \mathbf{O}_J \Phi_J^* = \mathbf{T}_J \mathbf{H}_J, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

since  $\mathbf{O}_J$  and  $\mathbf{P}_J$  are diagonal, implying that the joint filter  $\mathcal{H}_J$  is LTI. Thereby, the proof is completed. ■

<sup>5</sup>It is worth noting that this assumption is realistic as it is specified by Girault [19] that the eigenvalue uniqueness can be obtained via a small random perturbation of the edge weights.

Let  $\mathbf{h}_J := [h_{J,(0,0)}, h_{J,(1,0)}, \dots, h_{J,(L_1-1, L_2-1)}]$  be vector containing the coefficients of joint finite impulse response (JFIR) filter. Then it can be written as

$$\mathbf{H}_J = \Phi_J \hat{\mathbf{H}}_J \Phi_J^*, \quad (30)$$

which together with (25) leads to its dual in joint spectral domain as

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_J = \sum_{q=0}^{L_2-1} \sum_{p=0}^{L_1-1} h_{J,(p,q)} \mathbf{P}_J^{(p,q)}. \quad (31)$$

On the other hand, a fundamental subset of joint time-vertex filters, called *separable filters*, for which their frequency response can be written as the product of frequency response of filters in graph and discrete-time domains [18]. We can write the dual of separable filter  $\mathbf{H}_J$  in spectral domain as

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_J = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_D \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_G, \quad (32)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_D$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_G$  are the dual of discrete-time and graph filters in corresponding spectral domains, respectively (cf. (22), (24)). Then, the joint separable filter is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_J &= \Phi_J \hat{\mathbf{H}}_J \Phi_J^* = (\Phi_D \otimes \Phi_G)(\hat{\mathbf{H}}_D \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_G)(\Phi_D^* \otimes \Phi_G^*) \\ &= (\Phi_D \hat{\mathbf{H}}_D \Phi_D^*) \otimes (\Phi_G \hat{\mathbf{H}}_G \Phi_G^*) = \mathbf{H}_D \otimes \mathbf{H}_G. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

## V. STAIONARITY IN JOINT TIME-VERTEX DOMAIN

Let  $\mathbf{m}_x = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}]$  and  $\mathbf{R}_x = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*]$  denote the mean vector and autocorrelation matrix of the process  $\mathbf{x}$ , respectively, where  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  accounts for statistical expectation. First we need to elaborate on the multivariate TWSS (MTWSS) as follows.

**Definition 4.** (MTWSS via Translation Invariance) Suppose that  $\mathbf{x}_m \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is a vector random process. Let  $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$  be the collection of such random vectors. It is called MTWSS if and only if

- (i)  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_m] = c\mathbf{1}_N$ ,  $\forall m$ .
- (ii) The autocorrelation matrix of  $\mathbf{X}$  can be described as the block circulant matrix  $\mathbf{R}_X = [\mathbf{R}_{D,(m,n)}]$  where  $\mathbf{R}_{D,(m,n)} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_m \mathbf{x}_n^*] = \Psi_{(m-n) \bmod M}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a stochastic graph signal where  $\mathbf{x}[n]$  is the random variable corresponding to the vertex  $n$ . The mean vector and autocorrelation matrix are denoted by  $\mathbf{m}_x = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}]$  and  $\mathbf{R}_x = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*]$ , respectively.

**Definition 5.** ([19, Definition 3]) The stochastic graph signal  $\mathbf{x}$  defined on graph  $G$  is called vertex WSS (VWSS) w.r.t. the GTO  $\mathcal{T}_G^\vartheta$  if and only if for all  $\vartheta$  the following conditions hold:

- (i)  $\mathbf{m}_x = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}_G^\vartheta \mathbf{x}] = c\mathbf{1}_N$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathbf{R}_x = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*] = \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{T}_G^\vartheta \mathbf{x})(\mathcal{T}_G^\vartheta \mathbf{x})^*]$ .

Note that, by Definition (5),  $\mathbf{R}_x = \Phi_G \mathbf{S}_x \Phi_G^*$  where  $\mathbf{S}_x$  is a diagonal matrix known as the graph PSD matrix. It is necessary to define the multivariate VWSS (MVWSS) via graph transition invariance as follows<sup>6</sup>.

**Definition 6.** (MVWSS via Graph Transition Invariance) Suppose that  $\mathbf{x}_m \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is a vector random process on graph.

<sup>6</sup>It is worth noting that, throughout this paper, we use MTWSS and MVWSS to differentiate from the classical multivariate TWSS and VWSS.

Let  $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$  be the collection of such random vectors. It is called MVWSS if and only if

- (i) The mean vector is constant as:  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_m] = c_m \mathbf{1}_N, \forall m$ .
- (ii) The autocorrelation matrix is a block matrix  $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{X}} = [\mathbf{R}_{G,(m,n)}]$  where

$$\mathbf{R}_{G,(m,n)} = \Phi_G \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{G,(m,n)} \Phi_G^*, \quad m, n \in [1, M], \quad (34)$$

and  $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{G,(m,n)}$  is a diagonal matrix.

Let  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$  be a time-series on graph  $G$ . Then  $\mathbf{x} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$  is the stochastic time-vertex signal in vector form. The proposed bivariate JTO (Definition 3) enables us to generalize wide-sense stationarity in Euclidean space to the time-vertex domain as follows.

**Definition 7.** (JWSS via Joint Transition Invariance) A joint time-vertex stochastic signal  $\mathbf{x}$  on graph  $G$  is called JWSS under the JTO  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  (cf. Definition 3) if and only if for all  $\vartheta$  and  $v$  we have

- (i)  $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{x}] = c \mathbf{1}_{NM}$ ,
- (ii)  $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*] = \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{x})(\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{x})^*]$ .

This is a mathematically tractable definition due to the isometric nature of the JTO. However, one can also define JWSS by the non-isometric bivariate shift operator  $\mathcal{S}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  given by (20). The following theorem provides the representation of joint wide-sense stationarity in the spectral domain.

**Theorem 3.** A stochastic time-vertex signal  $\mathbf{X}$  over the graph  $G$  is JWSS w.r.t. the JTO  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  if and only if

- (i)  $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell, k]] = 0$  for all  $\omega_{G,\ell} \neq 0$  or  $\omega_{D,k} \neq 0$ .
- (ii)  $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_1, k_1] \widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_2, k_2]] = 0$  for  $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$  or  $k_1 \neq k_2$ .

*Proof:* Let  $\mathbf{x} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$ . By the first-order moment condition of joint wide-sense stationarity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}} &= \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{x}}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_J \mathbf{x}] = \mathcal{F}_J \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{F}_J \mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{x}} \\ &= (\mathcal{F}_J \mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathcal{F}_J^{-1}) (\mathcal{F}_J \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{x}}) = \mathcal{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}} \\ &= \mathbf{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{x}}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

which can alternatively be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell, k]] = \exp(-i(\vartheta \omega_{G,\ell-1} + v \omega_{D,k-1})) \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell, k]].$$

This equation holds if  $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell, k]] = 0$  for all  $\omega_{G,\ell} \neq 0$  or  $\omega_{D,k} \neq 0$ . Since the graph  $G$  is connected (i.e.,  $\omega_{G,0} = 0$ ), the only nonzero component is  $\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[1, 1]$  which accounts for the DC value of the time-vertex signal corresponding to the joint frequency  $(\omega_{G,0}, \omega_{D,0})$ . Therefore, the condition (i) is true. On the other hand, for the second-order moment we have

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{x}}\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^*] = \mathcal{F}_J \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*] \mathcal{F}_J^{-1} = \mathcal{F}_J \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{F}_J^{-1}, \quad (36)$$

and hence

$$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{F}_J^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{F}_J = \Phi_J \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} \Phi_J^*. \quad (37)$$

Via the condition (ii) in Definition 7, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}} &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*] = \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{x})(\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{x})^*] \\ &= \mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*] \mathcal{T}_J^{(-v,-\vartheta)} = \mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{T}_J^{(-v,-\vartheta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Setting (37) equal to (38) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} &= (\mathcal{F}_J \mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathcal{F}_J^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} (\mathcal{F}_J \mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathcal{F}_J^{-1})^{-1} \\ &= \mathcal{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{P}_J^{(-v,-\vartheta)} = \mathbf{P}_J^{(v,\vartheta)} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{P}_J^{(-v,-\vartheta)}, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

from which it can be inferred that

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}[k, j] = e^{-i(\vartheta \omega_{G,k} + v \omega_{D,k} - \vartheta \omega_{G,j} - v \omega_{D,j})} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}[k, j]. \quad (40)$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_1, k_1] \widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_2, k_2]] \\ &= e^{-i(\vartheta(\omega_{G,\ell_1} - \omega_{G,\ell_2}) + \frac{2\pi v(k_1 - k_2)}{M})} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_1, k_1] \widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_2, k_2]], \end{aligned}$$

which holds true if  $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_1, k_1] \widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_2, k_2]] = 0$  for all  $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$  or  $k_1 \neq k_2$ , i.e., the condition (ii) is true. ■

The following lemma presents the conditions for a joint random process to be JWSS based on its spectral characterization.

**Lemma 1.** A stochastic time-vertex signal  $\mathbf{x} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$  over a connected graph  $G$  is JWSS based on the JTO if:

- (i) The mean vector is  $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}[1] \mathbf{1}_{NM} / \sqrt{NM}$ .
- (ii) The autocorrelation matrix is unitarily diagonalizable by the JFT matrix as follows

$$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}} = \Phi_J \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} \Phi_J^*, \quad (41)$$

where  $\Phi_J^*$  is the JFT matrix and  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}$  is a diagonal matrix with nonnegative real entries on its main diagonal.

*Proof:* One can deduce from (35) that  $\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}} = \mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}[1] \mathbf{e}_1$  which is equivalent to condition (i) in Definition 7. This together with the facts that  $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{F}_J^{-1} \mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}$  and  $\varphi_{J,0} = \mathbf{1}_{NM} / \sqrt{NM}$  implies the result for the mean vector. For the second-order moment, due to  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}[k, j] = 0$  for all  $k \neq j$  in (40),  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}$  is a diagonal matrix. Moreover, since the autocorrelation matrix  $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}}$  must be a positive semidefinite matrix, also self-adjoint, it consists of real nonnegative eigenvalues. Clearly, by (37), we have  $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}} = \Phi_J \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} \Phi_J^*$  where  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}$  is diagonal with nonnegative entries. ■

A widely known fact is that the response of an LTI filter to a WSS process input is WSS. The following theorem gives an equivalent relation in time-vertex domain by generalizing [22, Theorem 2], [21, Property 1].

**Theorem 4.** (See also [23, Property 2]) Let  $\mathbf{H}_J$  be a linear JFIR filter defined over the connected graph  $G$  and  $\mathbf{x}$  be the JWSS process under the JTO  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$ . Then the output of this filter is a JWSS process under the JTO as well.

*Proof:* Let the output of joint filter  $\mathbf{H}_J$  be  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{H}_J \mathbf{x}$ . Then

$$\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_J \mathbf{x}] = \Phi_J \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_J \Phi_J^* \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}] = \frac{\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}[1] \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_J[1, 1]}{\sqrt{NM}} \mathbf{1}_{NM},$$

by Lemma 1 (i). Clearly,  $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{y}}$  is constant over all time-vertex domain. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{y}} &= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{H}_J \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{H}_J \mathbf{x})^*] = \mathbf{H}_J \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*] \mathbf{H}_J^* \\ &= \Phi_J \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_J \Phi_J^* \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}} \Phi_J \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_J^* \Phi_J^* = \Phi_J \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_J \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_J^* \Phi_J^* \\ &= \Phi_J \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_J \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_J^* \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} \Phi_J^* = \Phi_J \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{y}} \Phi_J^*, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

TABLE II  
COMPARISON OF WIDE-SENSE STATIONARITY IN JOINT TIME-VERTEX DOMAIN VIA JOINT FILTERING AND THE PROPOSED PERSPECTIVES

Characteristic	via Joint Filtering [23]		via Joint Transition Invariance (Proposed)	
	Time-Vertex Domain	Joint Spectral Domain	Time-Vertex Domain	Joint Spectral Domain
1st moment	$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}] = c\mathbf{1}_{NM}$	$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell, k]] = 0$ $\forall \lambda_{G,\ell} \neq 0$ or $\lambda_{D,k} \neq 0$	$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}_J^{(\kappa,v)} \mathbf{x}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}]$	$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell, k]] = 0$ , $\forall \omega_{G,\ell} \neq 0$ or $\omega_{D,k} \neq 0$ .
2nd moment	$\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}} = h(\mathbf{L}_G, \mathbf{L}_D)$ where: $h(\cdot, \cdot) \geq 0$ .	(i) $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_1, k_1] \widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_2, k_2]] = 0$ $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$ or $k_1 \neq k_2$ .	$\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{T}_J^{(\kappa,v)} \mathbf{x})(\mathcal{T}_J^{(\kappa,v)} \mathbf{x})^*]$ $= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^*]$	$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_1, k_1] \widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell_2, k_2]] = 0$ $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$ or $k_1 \neq k_2$ .
	Block circulant matrix	(ii) $\exists h(\cdot, \cdot) \geq 0$ such that:	Block circulant matrix	
	Diagonalizable by	$\mathbb{E}[ \widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell, k] ^2] -  \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathbf{X}}[\ell, k]] ^2$	Diagonalizable by	
	JFT matrix	$= h(\lambda_{G,\ell}, \lambda_{D,k})$ .	JFT matrix	

since  $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_J$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}$  are diagonal, where

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{y}} = |\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_J|^2 \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}, \quad (43)$$

is the key equation relating JPSDs of input and output of the joint filter<sup>7</sup>. Obviously, both conditions in Lemma 1 are satisfied. Hence,  $\mathbf{y}$  is a JWSS process. ■

One interesting question arises here: “What is the relation between JWSS and classical multivariate WSS (MWSS) processes in time and vertex domains?” Loukas and Perraudin [23, Theorem 2] showed that a JWSS process, defined via joint filtering, is both MTWSS and MVWSS. In the following theorem, we elaborate on the relation between JWSS and classical MWSS processes via transition invariance.

**Theorem 5.** A joint time-vertex process  $\mathbf{x} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$  over a connected graph  $G$  is JWSS under the JTO  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\theta)}$  if and only if it is simultaneously MTWSS and MVWSS based upon Definition 4 and Definition 6.

*Proof:* Let us first prove the necessity of this theorem. It can be readily seen that the first-moment condition (i) in Definition 7 implies condition (i) in Definition 4 and that in Definition 6. For the second-order moment, by (41), we have  $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}} = \Phi_J \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} \Phi_J^*$ , where the JPSD matrix can be written as

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}} = \text{Diag}([\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2, \dots, \mathbf{S}_M]), \quad (44)$$

which is an  $NM \times NM$  diagonal matrix with nonnegative entries and  $\mathbf{S}_j$ , for all  $j \in [1, M]$ , are its diagonal submatrices with nonnegative elements. On the other hand, by (5),  $\Phi_J$  can be described as a block matrix  $\Phi_J = [\Phi_{(m,n)}]$  where

$$\Phi_{(m,n)} = \exp(i2\pi(m-1)(n-1)/M) \Phi_G \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}, \quad (45)$$

is its submatrix in  $m$ -th row and  $n$ -th column partition, and  $m, n \in [1, M]$ . Then  $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}}$  can be re-expressed as the following

<sup>7</sup>Interestingly, this equation in joint time-vertex domain is in the same spirit as the key identity in time domain where the PSD of the output of LTI filter, in response to a WSS random process, is equal to the squared magnitude of the frequency response of the filter multiplied by PSD of the input random process.

block matrix

$$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{(1,1)} & \Xi_{(1,2)} & \cdots & \Xi_{(1,M)} \\ \Xi_{(2,1)} & \Xi_{(2,2)} & \cdots & \Xi_{(2,M)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Xi_{(M,1)} & \Xi_{(M,2)} & \cdots & \Xi_{(M,M)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

where

$$\Xi_{(m,n)} = \Phi_G \widehat{\Xi}_{(m,n)} \Phi_G^*, \quad m, n \in [1, M], \quad (47)$$

and

$$\widehat{\Xi}_{(m,n)} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbf{S}_j \exp\left(\frac{i2\pi(m-n)}{M}\right), \quad (48)$$

implying that  $\Xi_{(m,n)}$  depends on the discrete time difference  $m - n$ . Clearly,  $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}}$  is a block circulant matrix and hence  $\mathbf{x}$  is a MTWSS process (cf. (ii) in Definition 4). Furthermore, by (47), the submatrices of  $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x}}$ , namely  $\Xi_{(m,n)}$  for all  $m, n$  are simultaneously diagonalizable with the graph Laplacian. Therefore, it is MVWSS (cf. (ii) in Definition 6). On the other hand, for the proof of sufficiency, assuming that the process  $\mathbf{x}$  is simultaneously MTWSS and MVWSS, by the reverse implications above, it can be easily shown that  $\mathbf{x}$  is JWSS. ■

**Discussion 2.** (Comparison with the Loukas and Perraudin’s Approach [23]) Loukas and Perraudin built their theory for defining JWSS based upon filtering interpretation of stationarity from classical WSS as the building block: the covariance matrix of a WSS process  $\mathbf{x}$  can be expressed as  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}} = h(\mathbf{L}_D)$  where  $h(\cdot)$  refers to a linear filter in discrete-time domain [23] (cf. Note 2 and (3)). A time-vertex process is JWSS if and only if [23, Definition 1]

- (i)  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}] = c\mathbf{1}_{NM}$ ;
- (ii) The covariance matrix is defined as  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}} = h(\mathbf{L}_G, \mathbf{L}_D)$  where  $h(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a bivariate nonnegative real function denoting the JPSD.

The frequency interpretation of this definition is given by [23, Proposition 1]. This states three conditions for JWSS leading to the spectral covariance matrix (or JPSD matrix) as  $\Sigma_{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}} = h(\Lambda_G, \Lambda_D)$  — which is a diagonal matrix. Indeed, with completely different initial ideas — joint filtering and joint transition invariance — the resulting notion of joint



stationarity is similar. Table II summarizes the characteristics of JWSS from the perspective of [23] and ours.  $\square$

**Separable JWSS Processes.** Joint stationarity and separable processes have been defined on joint graph  $\mathcal{J}$  based on the *joint weighted adjacency matrix* (cf. (19), [35, Definition 12.5]). However, this approach is a special case of joint stationarity defining over joint graph. Next, we define separable JWSS under the proposed isometric JTO  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$  through the notion of *separable filters* (cf. (33)).

**Definition 8.** Let  $\mathbf{x} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$  be a JWSS process under the JTO  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$ . It is called separable if it can be written as the output of a separable joint time-vertex filter  $\mathbf{H}_J$  (cf. (33)) to a white noise  $\mathbf{z}$  with zero-mean and autocorrelation matrix  $\mathbf{R}_z = \mathbf{I}_{NM}$  such that

$$\mathbf{H}_J \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{H}_D \otimes \mathbf{H}_G) \mathbf{z}, \quad (49)$$

where  $\mathbf{H}_D$  and  $\mathbf{H}_G$  are the filters in discrete-time and graph domains, respectively.

**Remark 4.** Let  $\mathbf{x} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$  be a separable JWSS process under the transition operator  $\mathcal{T}_J^{(v,\vartheta)}$ . Using (42) and (32), we can write  $\mathbf{R}_x = \Phi_J \mathbf{S}_x \Phi_J^*$  where

$$\mathbf{S}_x = |\hat{\mathbf{H}}_J|^2 \mathbf{S}_z = (|\hat{\mathbf{H}}_D|^2 \otimes |\hat{\mathbf{H}}_G|^2) \mathbf{S}_z. \quad (50)$$

Since  $\mathbf{z}$  is a JWSS white noise, it has a flat spectrum as  $\mathbf{S}_z = \mathbf{I}_{NM}$ . One can deduce that  $\mathbf{S}_z = \mathbf{S}_{z_D} \otimes \mathbf{S}_{z_G}$  where  $\mathbf{S}_{z_D} = \mathbf{I}_M$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{z_G} = \mathbf{I}_N$  are the JPSD matrices of  $z_D$  and  $z_G$ , as the white noise processes in the discrete-time and graph domains. Then, from (50), we have

$$\mathbf{S}_x = (|\hat{\mathbf{H}}_D|^2 \otimes |\hat{\mathbf{H}}_G|^2) (\mathbf{S}_{z_D} \otimes \mathbf{S}_{z_G}) = \mathbf{S}_{x_D} \otimes \mathbf{S}_{x_G}, \quad (51)$$

It is straightforward to see that  $\mathbf{R}_x = \mathbf{R}_{x_D} \otimes \mathbf{R}_{x_G}$ . This characterization implies that the separable JWSS process on the connected graph  $\mathcal{G}$  can be modeled as the response of two separate finite length filters,  $\mathbf{H}_D$  and  $\mathbf{H}_G$ , to the two separate white noise processes in discrete-time and graph domains, respectively.  $\square$

## VI. JOINT POWER SPECTRAL DENSITY ESTIMATION

Analogous to the stochastic processes in Euclidean space, a reliable JPSD estimator is important for analyzing time-series on graph. In this section, given a data  $\mathbf{X} := \{\mathbf{x}_q, q \in [1, Q]\}$  where  $Q$  is the number of realizations, we present the estimation of JPSD vector denoted by  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_x := \text{diag}(\mathbf{S}_x)$  of a JWSS process  $\mathbf{x} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$ . Prior to the presentation of our proposed JPSD estimator, let us have a short review of the generalized Bartlett estimator.

**Generalized Bartlett Method (GBM).** It is a non-parametric technique, also called *sample estimator*, that estimates the JPSD by averaging over  $Q$  computed periodograms. Let  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{x,\text{GBM}}$  be the generalized Bartlett estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_x$  which is known to be [23]

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{x,\text{GBM}}[k] = \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q |(\Phi_J^* \mathbf{x}_q)[k]|^2, \quad (52)$$

and unbiased with the variance of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{x,\text{GBM}}[k]$  given by

$$\sigma_{\text{GBM},k}^2 = \frac{1}{Q} \rho_{\text{GBM}}[k], \quad (53)$$

where  $\rho_{\text{GBM}}[k] := \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathbf{x}}[k]|^4] - \boldsymbol{\theta}_x[k]^2$ .

**Generalized Welch Method (GWM).** This method obtains the JPSD estimate by averaging the windowed periodograms (cf. (56) below). So, we begin with the definition of windowing in joint time-vertex domain.

**Definition 9.** (Joint Windowing) Let  $\mathbf{x} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$  be the given time-varying graph signal. Let  $\mathbf{A}_D = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{a}_D)$  and  $\mathbf{A}_G = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{a}_G)$  be the windowing matrices corresponding to the windows  $\mathbf{a}_D$  and  $\mathbf{a}_G$  in discrete-time and graph domains, respectively. The time-vertex windowing is defined as  $\mathbf{X}_w := \mathbf{A}_G \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{A}_D^T)$ . In the vector form,  $\mathbf{x}_w := \mathbf{a}_J \odot \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{A}_J \mathbf{x}$  where

$$\mathbf{A}_J = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{a}_J) = \mathbf{A}_D \otimes \mathbf{A}_G, \quad (54)$$

is the joint window matrix and  $\mathbf{x}_w = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_w)$ .

By this definition, we have  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_w = \hat{\mathbf{A}}_J \hat{\mathbf{x}}$  where

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}}_J = \Phi_J^* \mathbf{A}_J \Phi_J = \Phi_J^* \text{Diag}(\mathbf{a}_J) \Phi_J \quad (55)$$

is the dual joint windowing matrix in spectral domain.

Following this definition, the generalized Welch JPSD estimator  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{x,\text{GWM}}$  is defined as:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{x,\text{GWM}}[k] := \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q |(\Phi_J^* \mathbf{A}_J \mathbf{x}_q)[k]|^2. \quad (56)$$

The next theorem provides the bias and variance of generalized Welch JPSD estimator.

**Theorem 6.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be the set of  $Q$  independent realizations of JWSS process  $\mathbf{x}$  under the isometric JTO and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{x,\text{GWM}}$  be the proposed JPSD estimator given by (56). Then

(i) The bias of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{x,\text{GWM}}$  is

$$\mathbf{b}_{\text{GWM}}[k] = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k - \mathbf{e}_k)^T \boldsymbol{\theta}_x, \quad (57)$$

for all  $k \in [1, NM]$  where  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^T := \text{row}_k(\hat{\mathbf{A}}_J \odot \bar{\hat{\mathbf{A}}}_J)$ .

(ii) The variance of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{x,\text{GWM}}[k]$  is

$$\sigma_{\text{GWM},k}^2 = \frac{1}{Q} \rho_{\text{GWM}}[k], \quad (58)$$

where  $\rho_{\text{GWM}}[k] := \beta_k^T \rho_{\text{GBM}}$ ,

$$\beta_k^T = \text{row}_k(\hat{\mathbf{A}}_J \odot \bar{\hat{\mathbf{A}}}_J \odot \hat{\mathbf{A}}_J \odot \bar{\hat{\mathbf{A}}}_J),$$

and  $\rho_{\text{GBM}}[k] = \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathbf{x}}[k]|^4] - \boldsymbol{\theta}_x[k]^2$  (cf. (53)). In particular, if  $\mathbf{x}$  is a Gaussian JWSS process, then (58) reduces to

$$\sigma_{\text{GWM},k}^2 = \frac{2}{Q} \beta_k^T [|\boldsymbol{\theta}_x[1]|^2, \dots, |\boldsymbol{\theta}_x[NM]|^2]. \quad (59)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix B.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 5.** Practically, for a given single realization of a JWSS process denoted by  $\mathbf{x} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{C}^{NM}$ , we exploit

a bank of joint windows for JPSD estimation. In discrete-time domain, the time-series data of length  $M$  is split up into overlapping segments of length  $L$  where

$$K_1 := \left\lfloor \frac{M-L}{\Delta\tau} \right\rfloor + 1, \quad (60)$$

is the number of windows and  $\Delta\tau$  is the length of overlap. By this, we have a set of discrete-time windows  $\mathcal{A}_D := \{\mathbf{A}_{D,k_1} : k_1 \in \llbracket 1, K_1 \rrbracket\}$ . Moreover, following the same concept of local windowing [22], we obtain a set of graph windows  $\mathcal{A}_G := \{\mathbf{A}_{G,k_2} : k_2 \in \llbracket 1, K_2 \rrbracket\}$ . Then we come up with a bank of joint windows as follows

$$\mathcal{A}_J := \{\mathbf{A}_{J,k} = \mathbf{A}_{D,k_1} \otimes \mathbf{A}_{G,k_2} : k \in \llbracket 1, K \rrbracket\}, \quad (61)$$

where  $K = K_1 K_2$  is the number of joint windows. Then, we calculate

$$\hat{\theta}_{x,\text{GWM}}[\ell] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K |(\Phi_J^* \mathbf{A}_{J,k} \mathbf{x})[\ell]|^2, \quad (62)$$

where  $\ell \in \llbracket 1, NM \rrbracket$ . It is worth noting that Theorem 6 provides an analysis for the case with single joint window. However, for the case of multiple joint windows — likewise the classical Welch estimator [36] — giving a rigorous analysis over the trade-off between bias and the variance is quite difficult, and so the effectiveness of  $\hat{\theta}_{x,\text{GWM}}$  (62) can only be shown experimentally.  $\square$

## VII. SIMULATIONS AND EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

This section presents some simulation results to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed JPSD estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{x,\text{GWM}}$  given by (56). In the simulation, each data realization is generated by passing the white Gaussian noise through a chosen joint filter of degrees  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  in discrete-time and graph domains, respectively. The generated time-series is of length  $M = 128$  over Watts-Strogatz small-world graph<sup>8</sup> [37] with  $N \in \{100, 200\}$  nodes. In discrete-time window, we use the Hamming window with 50% overlapping (cf. (60), (61)). Then, with the obtained bank of joint windows stated in Remark 5, we calculate  $\hat{\theta}_{x,\text{GWM}}$  (cf. (62)). Then, for the estimated JPSD  $\hat{\theta}_x$  (via GBM or GWM), we compute the normalized mean-squared error (NMSE), bias, and variance as follows:

$$\text{NMSE} = \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\theta}_x - \theta_x\|_2^2] / \|\theta_x\|_2^2,$$

$$\text{Bias} = \|\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_x] - \theta_x\|_2 / \|\theta_x\|_2,$$

$$\text{Std} = \left( \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\theta}_x - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_x]\|_2^2] \right)^{1/2} / \|\theta_x\|_2,$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  is the average over all the realizations.

Figure 1 (top plot) shows the true JPSD versus joint frequency indices. This JPSD is obtained via the dual of a JFIR filter of degrees  $L_1 = 6$  and  $L_2 = 2$  (cf. (31), (43)) for a Watts-Strogatz small-world graph with  $N = 100$  and

<sup>8</sup>The Watts-Strogatz model is a random graph generation model that produces graphs with small-world network properties such as clustering and short average path lengths. This model lies between two extreme cases of completely *regular* and *random* graph topology such that many biological and social networks can be modeled via this model.




Fig. 1. True JPSD for the first 100 joint frequencies (top plot) and two JPSD estimates  $\hat{\theta}_{x,\text{GBM}}$  and  $\hat{\theta}_{x,\text{GWM}}$  (bottom plot), obtained from a typical realization, where the Watts-Strogatz small-world graph with  $N = 100$  is used, along with  $M = 128$ ,  $L_1 = 6$ , and  $L_2 = 2$ .




Fig. 2. NMSE performance of JPSD estimators  $\hat{\theta}_{x,\text{GBM}}$  for  $(L_1, L_2) \in \{(6, 2), (10, 5)\}$  where the Watts-Strogatz small-world graph with  $N \in \{100, 200\}$  vertices is used.

rewiring probability  $q = 0.05$ . Moreover, in Figure 1 (bottom plot), for better observation, we only display the obtained JPSD estimates  $\hat{\theta}_{x,\text{GBM}}$  and  $\hat{\theta}_{x,\text{GWM}}$  with  $K_1 = 17$  (number of discrete-time windows) and  $K_2 = 15$  (number of graph windows) for the first 20 joint frequencies from a typical realization. It can be easily seen from this figure, that despite the rapid fluctuations of the true JPSD, the latter works effectively providing superior estimation accuracy over the former as expected.

Figure 2 exhibits the NMSE performance of JPSD estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{x,\text{GBM}}$  of  $Q \in \llbracket 1, 10 \rrbracket$  independent realizations of JWSS process. Here, the Watts-Strogatz small-world graph of  $N \in \{100, 200\}$  nodes is used, and meanwhile two different true JPSDs are considered, each obtained from a JFIR filter of degree pair  $(L_1, L_2) \in \{(6, 2), (20, 15)\}$ . For all the considered scenarios shown in this figure, NMSE performance of GBM is better for larger number of realizations. However, this estimator suffers from high NMSE when only a limited small realizations of the process are available. Next, we will focus on the case where there exists only a single realization of the process.

Figure 3 shows the NMSE performance of  $\hat{\theta}_{x,\text{GWM}}$  versus the degree pairs of JFIR filters. Here, there is only a single realization of JWSS process available and the Watts-Strogatz




Fig. 3. NMSE performance of JPSD estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}, \text{GWM}}^{\circ}$  for  $K_1 = 7, K_2 = 5$  where the Watts-Strogatz small-world graph with (a)  $N = 100$  and (b)  $N = 200$  is used.

small-world graph with  $N \in \{100, 200\}$  nodes. The simulation is performed for window number pair as  $(K_1, K_2) = (7, 5)$ . It can be seen that, for both cases, GWM performs significantly better than GBM for  $Q = 1$  as shown in Figure 2. The trend of NMSE linearly and mildly increases with  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  for both  $N = 100$  and  $N = 200$ , while the level and variation of NMSE are similar for both  $N = 100$  and  $N = 200$ , indicating the low sensitivity of NMSE performance to the size of graph.

Figure 4 illustrates the performance of GWM w.r.t. the length of discrete-time window  $L$  and number of windows in graph setting  $K_2$ . In this simulation, there is only a single realization of JWSS process and the Watts-Strogatz small-world graph with  $N = 200$  nodes is used. Overall, from Figure 4(a), 4(b) and 4(c), one can observe that the larger the  $L$ , the better the NMSE performance along with lower bias and higher standard deviation, whereas the variation of NMSE versus  $K_2$  is mild indicating its low sensitivity to  $K_2$ , although a peak naturally happens to  $L = 64$  (corresponding to  $K_1 = 2$ ) and  $K_2 = 1$  (i.e., very few number of joint windows). Furthermore, it can be observed from Figure 4(d), that computation time exponentially increases with  $K_2$  but decreases with  $L$ . Nevertheless, the generalized Welch estimator is computationally efficient with accurate JPSD estimate for medium  $L$  (e.g., 16 and 32) and  $K_2$  (e.g., 6 and 7).

**Real Data Experiment.** Recent attempts for emotion recognition using Electroencephalography (EEG) signals have demonstrated its effectiveness in human-machine interactions [38]. In this section, we apply the concept of joint wide-sense stationarity for the challenging task of emotion recognition from brain EEG signals. It is emphasized that our objective here is to show the effectiveness of modeling EEG signals as JWSS processes for emotion recognition rather than using an advanced techniques for feature reduction and classification for increasing the recognition accuracy. For that, we model the EEG signals as time-series on graph as realizations of JWSS processes.

The SEED-IV [39] is a publicly available EEG signal dataset obtained from 15 subjects each participating in 3 sessions, each session including 24 trials. In each trial, every participant watched one out of 72 movie clips while his/her EEG signals are collected via the 62-channel ESI NeuroScan System. The corresponding EEG channels are illustrated in Figure 5. The samples are categorized into four emotions as fear, happy, sad, and neutral. Our experiments are based on all the 1080 available samples in this dataset.




Fig. 4. Effect of the window length in discrete-time domain  $L$  and number of graph windows  $K_2$  on JPSD estimation using GWM: (a) NMSE; (b) Bias; (c) Standard deviation; and (d) Computation time, where a JFIR filter of degrees  $L_1 = 7, L_2 = 4$  and a Watts-Strogatz small-world graph with  $N = 200$  vertices is used.

Some studies have shown that the asymmetry in neuronal activities between the left and right hemispheres is useful for emotion recognition [40]–[42]. Zhong *et al.* [38] exploited this differential asymmetry information to initialize the adjacency matrix for developing the graph convolution network for emotion recognition. It is shown experimentally that the following set of channel pairs, denoted by  $E_{glb}$ , balances the wiring cost and global efficiency [38], [43]: (FP1, FP2), (AF3, AF4), (F5, F6), (FC5, FC6), (C5, C6), (CP5, CP6), (P5, P6), (PO5, PO6), and (O1, O2) depicted by red dash lines in Figure 5. We build the brain graph based on the concept of *local and global inter-channel relations* across all the EEG channels. Let  $E$  be set of all the edges connecting nodes in brain network. Then we define weighted adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{W}_G = [w_{i,j}]$  based on the locations of EEG channels via a Gaussian kernel as follows:

$$w_{i,j} := \kappa \exp(-\text{dist}(i,j)/2\gamma^2), \quad (63)$$

where  $\gamma = 5.2$  is a scaling parameter,  $\kappa = 2$  if  $(i,j) \in E_{glb}$  and  $\kappa = 1$  if  $(i,j) \in E \setminus E_{glb}$ ,  $\text{dist}(i,j) := \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j\|_1$  is the Manhattan distance between two EEG channels  $i$  and  $j$  with coordinate vectors  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and  $\mathbf{v}_j$ , respectively. Note that the values for  $\gamma$  and  $\kappa$  are chosen empirically. In this modeling, we set  $\kappa = 1$  for the local inter-channel relations, however, for the global connections we employ  $\kappa = 2$  due to above-mentioned differential asymmetry information between right and left brain hemispheres in emotion recognition.

To reduce the challenges of curse of dimensionality for the ensuing classification task [45], we use the cross validated principal component analysis (PCA) as the feature reduction method (maintaining the simplicity of our procedure). The EEG signals provided by SEED-IV database are quite long in length and we use GBM for the JPSD estimation — as the special case of GWM by assuming the  $\mathbf{A}_J = \mathbf{I}_{NM}$  — since it has superior estimation where there are quite amount of realizations of the JWSS process (cf. Figure 2).




Fig. 5. The EEG layout of 62-electrode exploited in the collection of SEED-IV dataset [39], [44]. The global inter-channel relations are shown by red dash lines connecting the associated channels from right to left hemispheres.

Table III presents the correct classification rate (CCR) of the JPSD features per emotion comparing with the classical PSD features, where the latter assumes the given data following a multichannel WSS process but ignoring the graph structure. Clearly, PSD reaches up to 53.1% accuracy whereas JPSD reaches up to 56.4% accuracy both using cross-validated PCA with 500 selected features. Because the training and testing sets can be different in each run for the purpose of randomized cross validation, performing Monte Carlo runs is necessary. The obtained average of weighted recognition accuracy of our scheme over 50 Monte Carlo simulation runs is  $54.2 \pm 0.8$  which is superior to the achievable accuracy of classical PSD method. Clearly, JPSD significantly performs better than the classical PSD in terms of recognition accuracy.

### VIII. CONCLUSION

We have presented a generalized framework for modeling the stochastic time-varying graph signal as a JWSS process via a bivariate joint transition operator. Specifically, this can be applied to the JPSD estimation of time-varying graph signals, from which one can use the resulting JPSD as the features for machine learning based applications. To this end, we also presented the generalized Welch estimator for JPSD estimation, supported by some simulation results. Finally, this framework was applied to emotion recognition by modeling the EEG data as a JWSS process where the JPSD was used as the features yielding superior results over the classical PSD as features. Though we exploited a simple approach to model the brain graph, in the future work, we will strive for devising an effective brain graph learning method to further upgrade emotion recognition in the GSP framework, in addition to other applications where JWSS is suitable for the data.

### APPENDIX A PROOF OF REMARK 1

Let  $\mathcal{D}_C := \partial_t$  denote the derivative w.r.t.  $t$  and  $\hat{x}(f)$  be the Fourier transform of  $x(t)$ . Using the Taylor series expansion

$$(\mathcal{T}_C^\tau x)(t) = x(t - \tau) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (-\tau \mathcal{D}_C)^k x(t). \quad (64)$$

TABLE III  
CORRECT CLASSIFICATION RATE OF EMOTION RECOGNITION FROM EEG SIGNALS FOR SEED-IV DATASET

	CCR (%)				Accuracy (%)	
	Neutral	Sad	Fear	Happy	Ach <sup>†</sup>	Ave <sup>‡</sup>
PSD	56.3	43.7	54.1	58.5	53.1	$51.9 \pm 0.9$
JPSD	58.5	45.2	58.5	65.9	<b>57.0</b>	<b><math>54.7 \pm 0.9</math></b>

<sup>†</sup>Achievable; <sup>‡</sup>Average.

From the theory of Fourier transform, it is easy to verify the following property as  $\mathcal{F}_C \mathcal{D}_C x(t) = i2\pi\xi \hat{x}(\xi)$ . In a compact notation one can write  $\mathcal{F}_C \mathcal{D}_C = i\mathcal{M}_C \mathcal{F}_C$  where

$$(\mathcal{M}_C \hat{x})(\xi) := 2\pi\xi \hat{x}(\xi), \quad (65)$$

is an explicit multiplier called *angular frequency multiplication operator*. Then one can obtain the following identity as

$$\mathcal{D}_C = i\mathcal{F}_C^{-1} \mathcal{M}_C \mathcal{F}_C. \quad (66)$$

Equation (64) together with (66) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_C^\tau &= 1 - \frac{\tau}{1!} \mathcal{D}_C + \frac{\tau^2}{2!} \mathcal{D}_C^2 - \dots \\ &= \mathcal{F}_C^{-1} \left( 1 - i\frac{\tau}{1!} (2\pi\xi) + i^2 \frac{\tau^2}{2!} (2\pi\xi)^2 - \dots \right) \mathcal{F}_C, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

which clearly reduces to (6). ■

### APPENDIX B PROOF OF THEOREM 6

By (56), the  $k$ -th entry of  $\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}, \text{GWM}}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}, \text{GWM}}[k]] &= \frac{1}{Q} \varphi_{J,k}^* \left( \sum_{q=1}^Q \mathbf{A}_J \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_q \mathbf{x}_q^*] \mathbf{A}_J^* \right) \varphi_{J,k} \\ &= \underbrace{\varphi_{J,k}^* \Phi_J}_{\mathbf{e}_k^*} (\hat{\mathbf{A}}_J \text{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}}) \hat{\mathbf{A}}_J^*) \underbrace{\Phi_J^* \varphi_{J,k}}_{\mathbf{e}_k} \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

$$= \text{row}_k(\hat{\mathbf{A}}_J \odot \overline{\hat{\mathbf{A}}_J}) \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^T \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}}. \quad (69)$$

Then the bias simply can be written as (57). To derive (58), we need to show

$$\sigma_{\text{GWM},k}^2 = \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}, \text{GWM}}[k]|^2] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}, \text{GWM}}[k]]^2 \quad (70)$$

satisfies that equation. Then, by (56), one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}, \text{GWM}}[k]|^2] &= \frac{1}{Q^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{e}_k^* \sum_{q=1}^Q \hat{\mathbf{A}}_J \hat{\mathbf{x}}_q \hat{\mathbf{x}}_q^* \hat{\mathbf{A}}_J^* \mathbf{e}_k \sum_{q'=1}^Q \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{q'} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{q'}^* \mathbf{e}_k \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{Q^2} \left( \sum_{q,q'=1}^Q \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k^T \text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_q \hat{\mathbf{x}}_q^*) \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k \text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{q'} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{q'}^*)] \right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{NM} \frac{\beta_k^T[\ell]}{Q^2} \left( \sum_{q=q'} \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_q[\ell]|^4] + \sum_{q \neq q'} \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_q[\ell]|^2] \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{q'}[\ell]|^2] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{\ell=1}^{NM} \beta_k^T[\ell] (\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathbf{x}}[\ell]|^4] + (Q-1) \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}}[\ell]^2), \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where the third equality holds due to the fact that  $\mathcal{X} := \{\mathbf{x}_q : \forall q \in [1, Q]\}$  are independent realizations derived from JWSS process  $\mathbf{x}$  and therefore  $|\mathbf{x}_q[\ell]|^2$  and  $|\mathbf{x}_{q'}[\ell]|^2$  for all  $q \neq q'$  are pairwise independent. Note that the last equality is obtained through some straightforward derivations where we used the fact that  $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_x[k] = \mathbf{S}_x[k, k] = \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_j^* \mathbf{x})[k](\boldsymbol{\Phi}_j^* \mathbf{x})^*[k]] = \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathbf{x}}[k]|^2]$ . Then by inserting (71) into (70), the result (58) follows immediately. For the case of  $\mathbf{x}$  to be a Gaussian JWSS process, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathbf{x}}[\ell]|^4] = 3\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathbf{x}}[\ell]|^2] = 3\boldsymbol{\Theta}_x[\ell]^2. \quad (72)$$

thanks to the *Isserlis' theorem* [46, Eq. (39)]. Clearly, (58) reduces to (59) and the proof is completed. ■

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Jalili, S. Sahami, and C.-Y. Chi, "Translation Operator in Joint Time-Vertex Domain: A Generalized Approach," *arXiv e-prints:1909.04178*, Sep. 2019.
- [2] D. I. Shuman, S. K. Narang, P. Frossard, A. Ortega, and P. Vandergheynst, "The emerging field of signal processing on graphs: Extending high-dimensional data analysis to networks and other irregular domains," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 30, pp. 83–98, May 2013.
- [3] F. R. K. Chung, *Spectral Graph Theory*, vol. 92 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, 1997.
- [4] D. K. Hammond, P. Vandergheynst, and R. Gribonval, "Wavelets on graphs via spectral graph theory," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 129–150, 2011.
- [5] A. Sandryhaila and J. M. F. Moura, "Discrete signal processing on graphs," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 61, pp. 1644–1656, April 2013.
- [6] A. Ortega, P. Frossard, J. Kovaei, J. M. F. Moura, and P. Vandergheynst, "Graph signal processing: Overview, challenges, and applications," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 106, pp. 808–828, May 2018.
- [7] L. Stankovi, D. P. Mandic, M. Dakovi, M. Brajovic, B. S. Dees, and T. Constantinides, "Graph signal processing - Part I: Graphs, graph spectra, and spectral clustering," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1907.03467, Jul. 2019.
- [8] L. Stankovi, D. P. Mandic, M. Dakovic, B. Scalzo, M. Brajovic, E. Sejdic, and A. G. Constantinides, "Vertex-frequency graph signal processing: A review," *arXiv e-prints:1907.03471*, Jul. 2019.
- [9] L. Stankovi, D. Mandic, M. Dakovi, M. Brajovi, B. Scalzo, S. Li, and A. G. Constantinides, "Graph signal processing - Part III: Machine learning on graphs, from graph topology to applications," *arXiv e-prints:2001.00426*, Jan. 2020.
- [10] M. Pschel and J. M. F. Moura, "Algebraic signal processing theory: Foundation and 1-d time," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 56, pp. 3572–3585, Aug. 2008.
- [11] M. Pschel and J. M. F. Moura, "Algebraic signal processing theory: 1-d space," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 56, pp. 3586–3599, Aug. 2008.
- [12] D. I. Shuman, B. Ricaud, and P. Vandergheynst, "Vertex-frequency analysis on graphs," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 260–291, 2016.
- [13] N. Perraudin, *Graph-based Structures in Data Science: Fundamental Limits and Applications to Machine Learning*. PhD thesis, Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland, 2018.
- [14] M. M. Bronstein, J. Bruna, Y. LeCun, A. Szlam, and P. Vandergheynst, "Geometric deep learning: Going beyond Euclidean data," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 34, pp. 18–42, July 2017.
- [15] N. Perraudin, B. Ricaud, D. I. Shuman, and P. Vandergheynst, "Global and local uncertainty principles for signals on graphs," *APSIPA Trans. Signal and Information Processing*, vol. 7, e3, 2018.
- [16] X. Dong, D. Thanou, M. Rabbat, and P. Frossard, "Learning graphs from data: A signal representation perspective," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 36(3):44–63, 2019.
- [17] G. B. Giannakis, Y. Shen, and G. V. Karanikolas, "Topology identification and learning over graphs: Accounting for nonlinearities and dynamics," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 106, pp. 787–807, May 2018.
- [18] F. Grassi, A. Loukas, N. Perraudin, and B. Ricaud, "A time-vertex signal processing framework: Scalable processing and meaningful representations for time-series on graphs," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 66, pp. 817–829, Feb. 2018.
- [19] B. Girault, "Stationary graph signals using an isometric graph translation," in *23rd European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, pp. 1516–1520, Aug. 2015.
- [20] B. Girault, P. Goncalves, and É. Fleury, "Translation on graphs: An isometric shift operator," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 22, pp. 2416–2420, Dec. 2015.
- [21] N. Perraudin and P. Vandergheynst, "Stationary signal processing on graphs," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 65, pp. 3462–3477, July 2017.
- [22] A. G. Marques, S. Segarra, G. Leus, and A. Ribeiro, "Stationary graph processes and spectral estimation," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 65, pp. 5911–5926, Nov. 2017.
- [23] A. Loukas and N. Perraudin, "Stationary time-vertex signal processing," *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing*, vol. 2019, 11 2016.
- [24] S. Segarra, S. P. Chepuri, A. G. Marques, and G. Leus, "Chapter 12 - Statistical Graph Signal Processing: Stationarity and spectral estimation," in *Cooperative and Graph Signal Processing* (P. M. Djuri and C. Richard, eds.), pp. 325 – 347, Academic Press, 2018.
- [25] N. Perraudin, A. Loukas, F. Grassi, and P. Vandergheynst, "Towards stationary time-vertex signal processing," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 3914–3918, March 2017.
- [26] E. Isufi, A. Loukas, N. Perraudin, and G. Leus, "Forecasting time series with VARMA recursions on graphs," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 67, pp. 4870–4885, Sep. 2019.
- [27] N. J. Higham, *Functions of Matrices: Theory and Computation*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2008.
- [28] A. Loukas and D. Foucard, "Frequency analysis of time-varying graph signals," in *Proc. 2016 IEEE Global Conference on Signal and Information Processing (GlobalSIP)*, pp. 346–350, Dec. 2016.
- [29] B. Girault, *Signal Processing on Graphs - Contributions to an Emerging Field*. PhD thesis, Ecole normale supérieure de lyon - ENS LYON, France, 2015.
- [30] B. S. Dees, L. Stankovi, M. Dakovi, A. G. Constantinides, and D. P. Mandic, "Unitary shift operators on a graph," *arXiv e-prints:1909.05767*, 2019.
- [31] A. Gavili and X. Zhang, "On the shift operator, graph frequency, and optimal filtering in graph signal processing," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 65, pp. 6303–6318, Dec. 2017.
- [32] G. Coutinho, *Quantum State Transfer in Graphs*. PhD thesis, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2014.
- [33] M. Vetterli, J. Kovaei, and V. K. Goyal, *Foundations of Signal Processing*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [34] A. Sandryhaila and J. M. F. Moura, "Discrete signal processing on graphs: Frequency analysis," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 62, pp. 3042–3054, June 2014.
- [35] P. Djuric and C. Richard, *Cooperative and Graph Signal Processing: Principles and Applications*. Elsevier Science, 2018.
- [36] P. Stoica and R. Moses, *Spectral Analysis of Signals*. Upper Saddle River, N.J., Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2005.
- [37] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, "Collective dynamics of small-world networks," *Nature*, vol. 393, pp. 440–442, June 1998.
- [38] P. Zhong, D. Wang, and C. Miao, "EEG-based emotion recognition using regularized graph neural networks," *arXiv e-prints:1907.07835*, vol. abs/1907.07835, Jul. 2019.
- [39] W. Zheng, W. Liu, Y. Lu, B. Lu, and A. Cichocki, "Emotionmeter: A multimodal framework for recognizing human emotions," *IEEE Trans. Cybernetics*, vol. 49, pp. 1110–1122, March 2019.
- [40] S. J. Dimond, L. Farrington, and P. Johnson, "Differing emotional response from right and left hemispheres," *Nature*, vol. 261, no. 5562, pp. 690–692, 1976.
- [41] L. A. Schmidt and L. J. Trainor, "Frontal brain electrical activity (EEG) distinguishes valence and intensity of musical emotions," *Cognition and Emotion*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 487–500, 2001.
- [42] G. Zhao, Y. Zhang, and Y. Ge, "Frontal EEG asymmetry and middle line power difference in discrete emotions," *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, vol. 12, p. 225, 2018.
- [43] E. Bullmore and O. Sporns, "The economy of brain network organization," *Nature reviews. Neuroscience*, vol. 13, pp. 336–49, Apr. 2012.
- [44] W. Zheng and B. Lu, "Investigating critical frequency bands and channels for EEG-based emotion recognition with deep neural networks," *IEEE Trans. Autonomous Mental Development*, vol. 7, pp. 162–175, Sep. 2015.
- [45] M. B. Christopher, *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2016.
- [46] L. Isserlis, "On certain probable errors and correlation coefficients of multiple frequency distributions with skew regression," *Biometrika*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 185–190, 1916.
- [47] S. Janson, *Gaussian Hilbert Spaces*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 1997.