

# UNIPOL: Unimodular sequence design via a separable iterative quartic polynomial optimization for active sensing systems

Surya Prakash Sankuru, Prabhu Babu, Mohammad Alae-Kerahroodi

## Abstract

Sequences having better autocorrelation properties play a crucial role in enhancing the performance of active sensing systems. Hence, sequences with good autocorrelation properties are very much in demand. In this paper, we addressed the problem of designing a unimodular sequence having better side-lobe levels. We formulated it as a constrained optimization problem comprising the Integrated Side-lobe Level (ISL) metric and then proposed an effective algorithm (named UNIPOL - UNImodular sequence design via a separable iterative POLynomial optimization) where we perform the polynomial optimization at every iteration. The novelty of the paper comes from deriving a quartic majorization function that is separable in the sequence variables and that can be minimized parallelly. To evaluate the performance of our proposed algorithm we perform the numerical experiments for different sequence lengths and confirm that our proposed algorithm is the fastest algorithm to attain an actual optimum minimizer of the ISL metric. Our proposed algorithm is also computationally efficient due to its ease of implementation using the FFT, IFFT operations in a parallel fashion.

Index Terms– radar, sonar, Integrated Side-lobe Level, sequence design, majorization-minimization.

## I. INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

One of the major challenges in active sensing systems (RADAR/SONAR) is to estimate the underlying target parameters which result in the avoidance of false targets as well as able to discriminate the detected targets. But, the accuracy of estimated parameters will depend purely upon the autocorrelation properties of transmit sequences. Hence, transmit sequences with better autocorrelation properties are always in demand [1]. Apart from the active sensing systems, some other applications where sequences with good autocorrelation properties are usually preferred are cryptography and CDMA communication systems [2]. In practice along with the correlation property, the aforementioned applications also pose different constraints like the power (due to its limited quantity available in the system) and spectral (to avoid the already reserved frequencies) constraints. Hence, we consider the problem of designing unimodular (constant modulus) sequences with better autocorrelation properties.

Let  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^N$  be the  $N$  length unimodular sequence having aperiodic auto-correlations  $\{r_k\}_{k=-N+1}^{N-1}$  defined as:

$$r_k = \sum_{n=1}^{N-k} x_{n+k}x_n^* = r_{-k}^*, k = -N + 1, \dots, N - 1. \quad (1)$$

Thus the design of a sequence having better side-lobe levels (*i.e.*  $\{r_k\}_{k=1}^{N-1}$ ) can be formulated as:

$$\underset{|x_n|=1, \forall n}{\text{minimum}} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} |r_k|^2 \quad (2)$$

Some of the existing methods which are capable of generating the unimodular sequences are given as follows. Earlier, there exist only the analytical approaches which are able to design the sequences of specific lengths (for instance, power of 2). Some of the well known analytical approach based sequences are the Barker [3], [4], Frank [5], Golomb [6], Chu [6], [7] and P4 [8], [9] sequences. To overcome the demarcation of analytical approaches, in the last decade or so, the computational approaches came into the existence. The authors in [10] proposed the CAN algorithm which can solve (2) by using the alternating minimization technique. However, instead of solving the problem in (2) directly, they solved its approximation. To solve the same ISL minimization problem in (2) the authors in [11], [12] proposed the MISL and ISL-NEW algorithms, respectively. Both of them are majorization minimization (MM) technique based algorithms comprising the linear (in  $x_n$ ) majorization functions which results in slower convergence issues. The authors in [13] used the ADMM technique to solve an approximation of the problem in (2). In [14] the authors proposed the CPM algorithm based on the coordinate descent technique. But, when the length of the sequence increases the CPM would take a considerable amount of time to converge. Hence, we decided to propose an efficient technique to solve the problem in (2). The major contributions of this letter are: We formulate the problem of designing a unimodular sequence as a constrained ISL minimization problem and then proposed a quartic polynomial optimization based iterative algorithm. In particular, unlike the state-of-the-art MM based approaches which employ a loose linear upper bound, here we derive a tighter quartic upper bound for the ISL objective function. It makes the resultant surrogate minimization problem separable in the sequence variables which in turn can be solved in a parallel fashion - this would be an attractive feature if one intends to design sequences of very large lengths. Later, through computer simulations, we show the efficacy of our proposed algorithm by comparing it with the state-of-the-art methods. The rest of the paper is formulated as follows: a brief introduction of the majorization minimization technique and the proposed algorithm is given in section II. The numerical simulation results are given in section III and finally section IV concludes the paper.

## II. UNIPOL - THE PROPOSED ALGORITHM

Before introducing our algorithm, we will discuss the basic principle of the MM method as follows. The MM method [15] is a numerical technique that involves calculating the upper bound (majorization) function  $u(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{z}^k)$  to the original objective function  $g(\mathbf{z})$  at any point  $\mathbf{z}^k$  and then minimizing the upper bound to arrive at the next iterate point. The constructed majorization function has to satisfy the following properties.

$$u(\mathbf{z}^k|\mathbf{z}^k) = g(\mathbf{z}^k) \text{ and } u(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{z}^k) \geq g(\mathbf{z}), \forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{Z}. \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{Z}$  is a feasible set. As the MM technique is an iterative process, it will generate the sequence of points  $\{\mathbf{z}\} = \mathbf{z}^1, \mathbf{z}^2, \mathbf{z}^3, \dots, \mathbf{z}^m$  according to the following update rule:

$$\mathbf{z}^{k+1} \triangleq \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{Z}} u(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{z}^k). \quad (4)$$

The value of the objective function computed at every iterate point (4) will satisfy the monotonic decreasing property, i.e.

$$g(\mathbf{z}^{k+1}) \leq u(\mathbf{z}^{k+1}|\mathbf{z}^k) \leq u(\mathbf{z}^k|\mathbf{z}^k) = g(\mathbf{z}^k). \quad (5)$$

Now, we will start with our problem of interest in (2). Here, the cost function is expressed in terms of the autocorrelation values, but by re-expressing it in frequency domain (using the Parseval's theorem), we arrive at the following equivalent form (a short proof of the same can be found in the appendix of [10]):

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} |r_k|^2 \triangleq \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{p=1}^{2N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N x_n e^{-j\omega_p n} \right|^2 - N \quad (6)$$

where  $\omega_p = \frac{2\pi}{2N}p$ .

By expanding the square in the equivalent objective function and using the fact that the energy of the signal is constant (i.e.  $\sum_{p=1}^{2N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N x_n e^{-j\omega_p n} \right|^2 = 2N^2$ ), the ISL minimization problem can be expressed as:

$$\text{minimum}_{|x_n|=1, \forall n} \sum_{p=1}^{2N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N x_n e^{-j\omega_p n} \right|^4 \quad (7)$$

Now by using the Jensen's inequality (see example-11 in [15]), at any given  $x_n^t$ , the cost function in the above problem can be majorized (or) upper bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{p=1}^{2N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N x_n e^{-j\omega_p n} \right|^4 \\ & \leq \sum_{p=1}^{2N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{N} \left( x_n e^{-j\omega_p n} - x_n^t e^{-j\omega_p n} \right) + \sum_{n'=1}^N x_{n'}^t e^{-j\omega_p n'} \right|^4 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

One can observe that both the upper bound and exact functions are quartic in nature. Hence, it confirms that by using Jensen's inequality we are able to construct a quartic majorization function to the original quartic objective function and itself is the novelty of our paper. After pulling out the factor  $N$  and the complex exponential in the first and second terms we arrive at the following equivalent upper bound function:

$$u(x_n|x_n^t) = \sum_{p=1}^{2N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left| x_n - x_n^t + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n'=1}^N x_{n'}^t e^{-j\omega_p(n'-n)} \right|^4 \quad (9)$$

It's worth pointing out that the above surrogate function is separable in  $x_n$  and a generic function (independent of  $n$ ) will be given by:

$$u(x|x^t) = \sum_{p=1}^{2N} \left| x - x^t + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n'=1}^N x_{n'}^t e^{-j\omega_p(n'-q)} \right|^4 \quad (10)$$

where  $q$  denotes the corresponding variable index of  $x$ . The surrogate in (10) can be rewritten more compactly as:

$$u(x|x^t) = \sum_{p=1}^{2N} |x - \alpha_p|^4 \quad (11)$$

where  $\alpha_p = x^t - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n'=1}^N x_{n'}^t e^{-j\omega_p(n'-q)}$ .

So, any individual surrogate minimization problem would be as follows:

$$\min_{|x|=1} \sum_{p=1}^{2N} |x - \alpha_p|^4 \quad (12)$$

where  $\alpha_p$  is a complex variable with  $|\alpha_p| \neq 1$ . The cost function in the above problem (12) can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p=1}^{2N} |x - \alpha_p|^4 &= \sum_{p=1}^{2N} (|x - \alpha_p|^2)^2 = \sum_{p=1}^{2N} (1 - 2\text{Re}(\alpha_p^* x) + |\alpha_p|^2)^2 \\ &= \sum_{p=1}^{2N} (4(\text{Re}(\alpha_p^* x))^2 - 4\text{Re}(\alpha_p^* x)(1 + |\alpha_p|^2) + \text{const}) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

By neglecting the constant terms, (13) simplifies as:

$$= \sum_{p=1}^{2N} ((\alpha_p^* x + x^* \alpha_p)^2 - 4\text{Re}(\alpha_p^* x)(1 + |\alpha_p|^2)) \quad (14)$$

$$= \sum_{p=1}^{2N} ([(\alpha_p^*)^2 x^2 + (x^*)^2 \alpha_p^2] - 4\text{Re}(\alpha_p^* x)(1 + |\alpha_p|^2) + \text{const}) \quad (15)$$

By neglecting the constant terms, (15) can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{p=1}^{2N} (2\text{Re}((\alpha_p^*)^2 x^2) - 4\text{Re}(\alpha_p^* x)(1 + |\alpha_p|^2)) \\ &= \text{Re}(ax^2) - \text{Re}(bx) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where  $a = \sum_{p=1}^{2N} 2(\alpha_p^*)^2$  and  $b = \sum_{p=1}^{2N} 4\alpha_p^*(1 + |\alpha_p|^2)$ .

So, the final surrogate minimization problem came to be:

$$\min_{|x|=1} \text{Re}(ax^2 - bx) \quad (17)$$

Although the above problem looks like a simple univariable optimization problem, it doesn't have any closed form solution. So, to compute its minimizer we express the constraint  $|x| = 1$  as  $x = e^{j\theta}$  and then the first order KKT condition of the above problem is given as:

$$\frac{d}{d\theta} (\text{Re}(ae^{2j\theta} - be^{j\theta})) = \text{Re}(2aje^{2j\theta} - jbe^{j\theta}) = 0. \quad (18)$$

By defining  $2ja = -2a_I + j2a_R$  and  $jb = -b_I + jb_R$ , where  $a_R, b_R, a_I, b_I$  are the real and imaginary parts of  $a$  and  $b$ , respectively, then the KKT condition becomes as:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Re}(2aje^{2j\theta} - jbe^{j\theta}) \\ &= -2a_I \cos(2\theta) - 2a_R \sin(2\theta) + b_I \cos(\theta) + b_R \sin(\theta) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

which further simplifies as:

$$2a_I \cos(2\theta) + 2a_R \sin(2\theta) - b_I \cos(\theta) - b_R \sin(\theta) = 0 \quad (20)$$

Now, if we let  $\beta = \tan\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)$ , then  $\sin(\theta) = \frac{2\beta}{1+\beta^2}$ ,  $\cos(\theta) = \frac{1-\beta^2}{1+\beta^2}$ ,  $\sin(2\theta) = \frac{4\beta(1-\beta^2)}{(1+\beta^2)^2}$ ,  $\cos(2\theta) = \frac{1+\beta^4-6\beta^2}{(1+\beta^2)^2}$ , then the KKT condition can be rewritten as:

$$\frac{2a_I(1+\beta^4-6\beta^2)}{(1+\beta^2)^2} + \frac{2a_R(4\beta(1-\beta^2))}{(1+\beta^2)^2} - \frac{b_I(1-\beta^2)}{1+\beta^2} - \frac{b_R 2\beta}{1+\beta^2} = 0 \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{2a_I(1+\beta^4) - 12a_I\beta^2 + 8a_R(\beta - \beta^3) - b_I(1-\beta^4) - 2b_R(\beta + \beta^3)}{(1+\beta^2)^2} = 0 \quad (22)$$

which can be rewritten as:

$$\frac{p_4\beta^4 + p_3\beta^3 + p_2\beta^2 + p_1\beta + p_0}{(1+\beta^2)^2} = 0 \quad (23)$$

with

$$p_4 = 2a_I + b_I, \quad p_3 = -8a_R - 2b_R \quad (24)$$

$$p_2 = -12a_I, \quad p_1 = 8a_R - 2b_R, \quad p_0 = 2a_I - b_I$$

Since  $(1+\beta^2) \neq 0$ , (23) is equivalent to:

$$p_4\beta^4 + p_3\beta^3 + p_2\beta^2 + p_1\beta + p_0 = 0 \quad (25)$$

which is a quartic polynomial. So, we calculate the roots of this quartic polynomial and choose the root which gives the least value of objective in (17) as the minimizer of surrogate minimization problem. The pseudocode of the proposed algorithm is given in Algorithm-1.

Some remarks on the proposed algorithm are given below:

- The major chunk of the computational complexity comes from the calculation of  $\alpha_p$ 's, which can be done easily via the FFT operations (*i.e.*, the second term in  $\alpha_p$  can be written as  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n'=1}^N x_{n'}^t e^{-j\omega_p n'} e^{j\omega_p q}$  where  $\sum_{n'=1}^N x_{n'}^t e^{-j\omega_p n'}$  is FFT of  $\mathbf{x}$ ). Hence, the computational complexity of UNIPOL came to be  $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$  and the space complexity as  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ . The computational complexity of state-of-the-art methods (which we compare in the numerical section) is given as: CAN- $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ , MISL- $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ , ISL-NEW- $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ , ADMM- $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$ , CPM- $\mathcal{O}(K \log N)$ , where  $K$  denotes the number of iterations incurred to implement the bisection method. We noticed that our proposed algorithm is having either same or better computational complexity than the state-of-the-art algorithms.
- It's worth pointing that the original ISL objective function is quartic in  $x_n$  and the upper bounds employed by the methods like MISL and ISL-NEW are linear in  $x_n$ , on the other hand, the surrogate function derived in our algorithm (see eq (12)) is quartic in  $x_n$ . Thus, our surrogate function would be tighter upper bound for ISL function than the surrogates of MISL and ISL-NEW algorithms. As we know that the convergence of MM algorithms will depend mostly on the tightness of surrogate function, we expect the convergence of our algorithm would be much better than the MISL and ISL-NEW algorithms. Indeed, we will show in the numerical simulations section that our proposed algorithm is faster than the MISL and ISL-NEW algorithms.

---

**Algorithm 1** :UNIPOL
 

---

**Require:** sequence length ‘ $N$ ’
 

---

```

1: set  $t = 0$ , initialize  $x^0$ 
2: repeat
3:   set  $n = 1$ 
4:   repeat
5:     compute  $\alpha_p, \forall p$ .
6:     compute  $a, b$ .
7:     compute  $p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4$  using (24).
8:     compute optimal  $\beta_n$  by solving the KKT condition.
9:      $n \leftarrow n + 1$ 
10:  until  $n = N$ 
11:   $x_n^{t+1} = e^{j2 \arctan(\beta_n)}$ ,  $\forall n$ .
12:   $t \leftarrow t + 1$ 
13: until convergence

```

---

- In the development of our algorithm, we derive a surrogate function which is separable in the sequence variables and shows the minimization of it only over a generic variable which is identical for all the variables. So, our algorithm can be implemented parallelly when we solve the  $N$  surrogate minimization problems (the steps 3 – 10 in the UNIPOL algorithm can be implemented parallelly). This is an attractive feature that would be handy when we design sequences of larger lengths  $N \approx 10^6$ .
- Since our algorithm is derived based on the MM principle, it enjoys the monotonic descent property and the standard convergence proofs would be applicable to establish the convergence of our algorithm, please see section IIc in [15] for more details on convergence of MM steps.

### III. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section, we numerically evaluate the performance of our proposed algorithm. The numerical simulations are conducted for different sequence lengths like  $N = 50, 100, 225, 400, 625, 900, 1000, 1300$ . For each length, the evolution of ISL value with respect to the iterations and convergence time, autocorrelation properties of the converged sequences are computed. The algorithms chosen for comparison are CAN, MISL, ISL-NEW, ADMM,







(a) ISL vs iterations for  $N = 100$ (b) ISL vs iterations for  $N = 1000$ (c) ISL vs time for  $N = 100$ (d) ISL vs time for  $N = 1000$ (e)  $20 \log_{10} (|r_k|/N)$  vs  $k$  for  $N = 100$ (f)  $20 \log_{10} (|r_k|/N)$  vs  $k$  for  $N = 1000$ 

Figure 1: UNIPOL simulations using the random initialization

CPM. We also implemented the SQUAREM accelerated MISL and ISL-NEW algorithms. For better comparisons, all algorithms are initialized using the same random sequence *i.e.*,  $e^{j\theta_a}$ ,  $a = 1, \dots, N$ , where  $\theta_a$  follows the uniform distribution between  $[0, 1]$ . The convergence criteria is selected as 1000 iterations.

Figure-1 consists of the ISL vs iterations, ISL vs time, and the autocorrelations vs lag plots for two different sequence lengths ( $N = 100, 1000$ ). From the simulation plots, we observe that all the algorithms has started at the same initial point but converged to different minimum values with different convergence rates. We noticed that in comparison to the existing algorithms the UNIPOL has converged to a better minimum in the least number of iterations (also in terms of CPU time). In terms of the autocorrelation side-lobe levels, except the ADMM method, all other methods have better sidelobe levels compared to initialization sequences.

Figure-2 shows the comparison plots of different algorithms in terms of average running time vs different sequence lengths. Here we didn't consider the CAN and ADMM methods for comparisons because they both are not actual ISL minimizers and to calculate the average running time, for each length the experiment is repeated over 30 Monte Carlo runs. All the algorithms are run till they converge to a local minima. From the simulation plots we observe that irrespective of the sequence length the UNIPOL has taken the least time to design sequences with better correlation properties.




Figure 2: Average running time vs  $N$

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we formulated the unimodular sequence design problem as a constrained ISL minimization problem and proposed a majorization minimization technique based algorithm named as UNIPOL where we solve the series of polynomial optimization problems at every iteration. The performance of the proposed algorithm is evaluated through the numerical experiments and shows that it will perform well in terms of the average convergence time.



## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Skolnik, "Radar handbook," *McGraw-Hill*, 1990.
- [2] J. Khalife, K. Shamaei, and Z. M. Kassas, "Navigation with cellular cdma signals part i: Signal modeling and software-defined receiver design," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 8, pp. 2191–2203, 2018.
- [3] R. H. Barker, "Group synchronizing of binary digital systems," *Communication theory*, pp. 273–287, 1953.
- [4] S. E. Kocabas and A. Atalar, "Binary sequences with low aperiodic autocorrelation for synchronization purposes," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 36–38, Jan 2003.
- [5] R. Frank, "Polyphase codes with good nonperiodic correlation properties," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 43–45, January 1963.
- [6] N. Zhang and S. W. Golomb, "Polyphase sequence with low autocorrelations," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 1085–1089, May 1993.
- [7] N. Levanon and E. Mozeson, "Basic radar signals," *John Wiley and Sons*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 53–73, 2004.
- [8] P. Stoica, H. He, and J. Li, "On designing sequences with impulse-like periodic correlation," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 703–706, Aug 2009.
- [9] H. He, D. Vu, P. Stoica, and J. Li, "Construction of unimodular sequence sets for periodic correlations," in *2009 Conference Record of the Forty-Third Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, Nov 2009, pp. 136–140.
- [10] P. Stoica, H. He, and J. Li, "New algorithms for designing unimodular sequences with good correlation properties," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 1415–1425, April 2009.
- [11] J. Song, P. Babu, and D. P. Palomar, "Optimization methods for designing sequences with low autocorrelation sidelobes," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 15, pp. 3998–4009, Aug 2015.
- [12] Y. Li and S. A. Vorobyov, "Fast algorithms for designing unimodular waveform(s) with good correlation properties," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 1197–1212, March 2018.
- [13] J. Liang, H. C. So, J. Li, and A. Farina, "Unimodular sequence design based on alternating direction method of multipliers," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 20, pp. 5367–5381, Oct 2016.
- [14] M. A. Kerahroodi, A. Aubry, A. De Maio, M. M. Naghsh, and M. Modarres-Hashemi, "A coordinate-descent framework to design low psl/lisl sequences," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 22, pp. 5942–5956, 2017.
- [15] Y. Sun, P. Babu, and D. P. Palomar, "Majorization-minimization algorithms in signal processing, communications, and machine learning," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 794–816, Feb 2017.