

On the Realization of Impulse Invariant Bilinear Volterra Kernels

Phillip M. S. Burt and José Henrique de Morais Goulart

Abstract—As previously shown, the direct extension of the impulse invariance principle to Volterra kernels has to be modified in order to provide a condition for the exact modeling of mixed-signal chains. At first sight this would seem to seriously complicate the otherwise simple discrete-time realization of separable kernels (among which bilinear kernels are of particular importance). We show here, however, that this not the case. By defining a cascade operator, the structure of a generalized impulse invariance can be unveiled, leading to a realization without an inordinate increase in computational complexity.

Index Terms—nonlinear systems, bilinear systems, Volterra model, impulse invariance

I. INTRODUCTION

THE impulse invariance [1] between discrete-time and continuous-time linear time-invariant (LTI) systems provides a condition for the exact modeling of mixed-signal chains consisting of discrete-time and continuous-time parts, such as in acoustic echo cancellation (AEC) [2], for instance.

If the signal chain requires a nonlinear model, one might expect that a direct extension of the impulse invariance principle to Volterra kernels [3] would provide the condition for the same kind of modeling. In the case of separable kernels (among which bilinear kernels are of particular importance), this would be very convenient for their discrete-time realization, which would follow directly from their continuous-time realization.

It turns out, however, that when using triangular Volterra kernels (as required to minimize the resulting computational cost), the direct extension of the impulse invariance definition has to be somewhat modified in order to provide a condition for exact modeling, as pointed out in [3], [4]. In this paper, we show that, as a consequence, even if the continuous-time kernels are separable, the resulting discrete-time ones are not. At first sight this would seem to pose a serious problem to their realization. We show, though, that this is not the case, by describing how a separable kernel realization can be modified in order to implement the modified impulse invariance principle. To the best of our knowledge this problem has not been previously addressed. Finally, we quantify the additional cost brought by this modification in number of operations.

This work is organized as follows. In Section II we revise the concept of LTI impulse invariance, its relation to modeling

and realization aspects. In Section III we revise the generalization of impulse invariance to triangular Volterra kernels and reformulate it in terms of regular Volterra kernels. In Section IV we show how impulse invariant separable kernels can be realized. Finally, in Section V we assess the computational complexity of such realization.

II. IMPULSE INVARIANCE OF LTI SYSTEMS

Given an LTI system with impulse response $h_c(t)$ and a sampling period T , the associated impulse-invariant [1] discrete-time system has impulse response

$$h(n) = h_c(nT). \quad (1)$$

A. Invariance and modeling

The relation (1) appears, for instance, when modeling a signal chain as depicted in Fig. 1. The signal chain contains an ideal impulsive D/A providing $u_c(t) = \sum_n u(n)\delta(t-nT)$, a reconstruction filter $h_r(t)$, an LTI system $h_o(t)$, an anti-aliasing filter $h_a(t)$ and an A/D sampler. Its output then reads

$$\begin{aligned} y_c(nT) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_c(nT - \tau)u_c(\tau)d\tau \\ &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_c(nT - \tau)\delta(\tau - kT)d\tau u(k) \\ &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} h_c((n-k)T)u(k), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the overall impulse response is given by the convolutions $h_c(t) = h_r(t)*h_o(t)*h_a(t)$. From (1) and (2), the output of a discrete-time model with impulse response $h(n)$ is then

$$y(n) = y_c(nT), \quad (3)$$

as desired, for instance, in acoustic echo cancellation [2]. We note that (3) is achieved even if there is aliasing due to $h_r(t)$ and $h_a(t)$ not being ideal low-pass filters.

B. Realization

Apart from aspects of numerical precision and computational complexity, the realization of $h(n)$ satisfying (1) is simple. If the overall system with impulse response $h_c(t)$ is described by the state-space equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}'_c(t) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_c(t) + \mathbf{b}u_c(t) \\ y_c(t) &= \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x}_c(t), \end{aligned}$$

P. M. S. Burt is with *Escola Politécnica, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil*. e-mail: pmsburt@usp.br. J. H. de M. Goulart is with *IRIT, Université de Toulouse, Toulouse INP, CNRS, Toulouse, France*. e-mail: henrique.goulart@irit.fr




Fig. 1. Signal chain starting in discrete-time, passing through continuous-time and then returning to discrete-time.

then the discrete-time system realized by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(n+1) &= e^{\mathbf{A}T} \mathbf{x}(n) + e^{\mathbf{A}T} \mathbf{b}u(n) \\ y(n) &= \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x}(n) + \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{b}u(n) \end{aligned}$$

has impulse response $h(n)$ satisfying (1).

III. GENERALIZATION OF IMPULSE INVARIANCE TO VOLTERRA KERNELS

We assume now that the input/output relation of the analog portion of the chain in Fig. 1 is given by the Volterra series $y_c(t) = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} y_{c,p}(t)$, with homogeneous outputs given by

$$y_{c,p}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} h_p^{\text{tri}}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p) \prod_{i=1}^p u_c(t - \tau_i) d\tau_1 \dots d\tau_p, \quad (4)$$

where $h_p^{\text{tri}}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p)$ is the triangular Volterra kernel¹ of order p , which is null outside the domain $\tau_1 \leq \dots \leq \tau_p$. The nonlinearity can arise, for instance, from a loudspeaker in acoustic echo cancellation. Likewise, we assume now that $y(n) = \sum_{p=1}^P y_p(n)$, where

$$y_p(n) = \sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_p=0}^{\infty} v_p^{\text{tri}}(n_1, \dots, n_p) \prod_{i=1}^p u(n - n_i), \quad (5)$$

with $v_p^{\text{tri}}(n_1, \dots, n_p) = 0$ outside the domain $n_1 \leq \dots \leq n_p$.

A. Generalization of impulse invariance

Let $y_{c,p}(t)$ and $y_p(n)$ be given by (4) and (5), respectively, and, as previously, $u_c(t) = \sum_n u(n)\delta(t - nT)$. As follows from [4], in order that $y_p(n) = y_{c,p}(nT)$ the impulse invariance relation (1) has to be generalized to

$$v_p^{\text{tri}}(n_1, \dots, n_p) = \frac{h_p^{\text{tri}}(n_1T, \dots, n_pT)}{m_1! \dots m_q!}, \quad (6)$$

$n_1 \leq \dots \leq n_p$, where q is the number of distinct values among n_1, \dots, n_p and m_1, \dots, m_q are their corresponding number of occurrences.² This modified relation is due to the possible discontinuity of the triangular continuous-time kernel on the border of the triangular domain $\tau_1 \leq \dots \leq \tau_p$. In particular, in the interior of that domain we retrieve a direct extension of the invariance condition (1), that is, we have $v_p^{\text{tri}}(n_1, \dots, n_p) = h_p^{\text{tri}}(n_1T, \dots, n_pT)$ for $n_1 < \dots < n_p$.

¹For simplicity, we omit the subscript c for the continuous-time kernels.

²This result is stated without proof in [3].

B. Formulation for regular kernels

For the analysis ahead, it will be more convenient to express $y_{c,p}(t)$ in terms of the regular kernels [3]

$$h_p(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) = h_p^{\text{tri}}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p), \quad (7)$$

where

$$\theta_1 = \tau_p - \tau_{p-1}, \dots, \theta_{p-1} = \tau_2 - \tau_1, \theta_p = \tau_1. \quad (8)$$

With them we can write

$$y_{c,p}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} h_p(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \prod_{i=1}^p u(t - \bar{\theta}_i) d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_p, \quad (9)$$

where $\bar{\theta}_i = \sum_{j=1}^p \theta_j$. Likewise, in the discrete-time case,

$$y_p(n) = \sum_{n_p=0}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} v_p(n_1, \dots, n_p) \prod_{i=1}^p u(n - \bar{n}_i), \quad (10)$$

where $\bar{n}_i = \sum_{j=1}^p n_j$.

We obtain now the condition corresponding to (6) for the regular kernels. Consider initially $p = 4$ and some particular cases:

- $n_1, n_2, n_3 > 0$: with $\theta_i = n_iT$ and (8) follows $\tau_1 < \dots < \tau_4$, so that from (6) and (7) follows $v_p(n_1, \dots, n_4) = h_p(n_1, \dots, n_4)$
- $n_1 = 0; n_2, n_3 > 0 \Rightarrow \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \tau_3 = \tau_4 \Rightarrow v_p(0, n_2, n_3, n_4) = \frac{1}{2!} h_p(0, n_2, n_3, n_4)$
- $n_1, n_2 = 0; n_3 > 0 \Rightarrow \tau_1 < \tau_2 = \tau_3 = \tau_4 \Rightarrow v_p(0, 0, n_3, n_4) = \frac{1}{3!} h_p(0, 0, n_3, n_4)$
- $n_1, n_3 = 0; n_2 > 0 \Rightarrow \tau_1 = \tau_2 < \tau_3 = \tau_4 \Rightarrow v_p(0, n_2, 0, n_4) = \frac{1}{2!2!} h_p(0, n_2, 0, n_4)$

The sought impulse invariance condition for regular kernels can then be seen to be

$$v_p(n_1, \dots, n_p) = \frac{h_p(n_1T, \dots, n_pT)}{m_1! \dots m_q!}, \quad (11)$$

where q is the number of groups of consecutive null indices among n_1, \dots, n_{p-1} and $m_1 - 1, \dots, m_q - 1$ are the numbers of indices in each group.

IV. REALIZATION

We consider here regular kernels given by the sum of separable factors

$$h_p(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p) = \sum_{r=1}^{R_p} \mathbf{H}_r^{(p)}(\tau_p) \mathbf{H}_r^{(p-1)}(\tau_{p-1}) \dots \mathbf{H}_r^{(1)}(\tau_1), \quad (12)$$

for any set of matrix functions $\mathbf{H}_r^{(i)}(\tau_i)$ of compatible dimensions. For simplicity, we refer to such kernels as separable kernels. A particular case of (12) of great interest are the kernels of a bilinear system

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}'_c(t) &= \mathbf{F} \mathbf{x}_c(t) + \mathbf{G} \mathbf{x}_c(t) u_c(t) + \mathbf{b} u_c(t) \\ y_c(t) &= \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x}_c(t), \end{aligned}$$

which are given by [3]

$$h_p(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p) = \mathbf{c}^\top e^{\mathbf{F}\tau_p} \mathbf{G} e^{\mathbf{F}\tau_{p-1}} \mathbf{G} \dots \mathbf{G} e^{\mathbf{F}\tau_1} \mathbf{b}, \quad \tau_i \geq 0.$$




Fig. 2. Cascade realization of a separable kernel, $p = 3$.

For $p > 2$ we can assign then $\mathbf{H}^{(1)}(\tau_1) = e^{\mathbf{F}\tau_1} \mathbf{b}$, $\mathbf{H}^{(i)}(\tau_i) = e^{\mathbf{F}\tau_i} \mathbf{G}$, $1 < i < p$, and $\mathbf{H}^{(p)}(\tau_p) = \mathbf{c}^\top e^{\mathbf{F}\tau_p} \mathbf{G}$. In this case, $R_p = 1$ so the subscripts in $\mathbf{H}_r^{(i)}(\tau_i)$ were omitted. Without loss of generality, we consider $R_p = 1$ from here onward.

A. Cascade structure

From (12) and (9) it follows that separable kernels can be realized quite simply by a cascade of linear blocks and multipliers, as depicted in Fig. 2 for $p = 3$, where

$$\begin{aligned} z_1(t) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbf{H}^{(1)}(\tau_1) u_c(t - \tau_1) d\tau_1, \\ z_2(t) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbf{H}^{(2)}(\tau_2) z_1(t - \tau_2) u_c(t - \tau_2) d\tau_2, \\ y_{c,p}(t) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbf{H}^{(3)}(\tau_3) z_2(t - \tau_3) u_c(t - \tau_3) d\tau_3. \end{aligned}$$

It should be noted that this also would be a realization of any kernel equivalent to the regular separable kernel $h_p(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p)$, such as for instance the triangular kernel $h_p^{\text{tri}}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p) = h_p(\tau_p - \tau_{p-1}, \dots, \tau_2 - \tau_1, \tau_1)$, which in general is not separable.

In the discrete-time case, we note initially that, for the cascade structure in particular, replacing $\mathbf{H}^{(i)}(\tau_i)$ with $\mathbf{H}^{(i)}(n_i T)$ is a realization³ of $v_p(n_1, \dots, n_p) = h_p(n_1 T, \dots, n_p T)$. This, in general, does not satisfy (11), so the goal $y_p(n) = y_{c,p}(nT)$ for $u_c(t) = \sum_n u(n) \delta(t - nT)$ would not be achieved. Another way of viewing the problem follows from rewriting (11) as

$$v_p(n_1, \dots, n_p) = m(n_1, \dots, n_{p-1}) h_p(n_1 T, \dots, n_p T), \quad (13)$$

where $m(n_1, \dots, n_{p-1})$ implements the described rule for the factor $1/m_1! \dots m_p!$. This emphasizes the fact that the discrete-time kernels are not separable and, therefore, their realization is not simply a discrete-time version of the cascade structure type depicted in Fig. 2. Nevertheless, as shown in the following their realization is less complicated than may seem initially.

B. Cascade operator

In order that the following analysis be more compact, we define, given $u(n)$, the *cascade operation* on a signal $x(n)$ as

$$v_p \circ x(n) = \sum_{n_p=0}^\infty \dots \sum_{n_1=0}^\infty v_p(n_1, \dots, n_p) x(n - \bar{n}_i) \prod_{i=2}^p u(n - \bar{n}_i),$$

which for $p = 1$ is the convolution operation $v_p * x(n) = \sum_k v_p(k) x(n - k)$. We can rewrite (10) then as $y_p(n) = v_p \circ u(n)$. The properties below follow directly from the definition

³This is not true in general. For instance, the series connection of discrete-time linear systems $f(n) = f_c(nT)$ and $g(n) = g_c(nT)$ has impulse response $\sum_k f(k)g(n-k) \neq \int f_c(\tau)g_c(nT - \tau) d\tau$.




Fig. 3. Realization of impulse invariant kernel of order $p = 2$.

and will be useful. The first two mean that the operation is bilinear.

- $v_p(n_1, \dots, n_p) = r(n_1, \dots, n_p) + s(n_1, \dots, n_p) \Rightarrow v_p \circ x(n) = r \circ x(n) + s \circ x(n)$
- $v_p \circ [x(n) + y(n)] = v_p \circ x(n) + v_p \circ y(n)$
- $v_p(n_1, \dots, n_p) = v^{(1)}(n_1) v^{(2)}(n_2, \dots, n_p) \Rightarrow v_p \circ x(n) = v^{(2)} \circ x_1(n)$, where $x_1(n) = [v^{(1)} * x(n)] u(n)$

C. Corrections for impulse invariance

Without loss of generality, we consider, for notational simplicity, the case of kernels separable into scalar (instead of matrix) factors, $h_p(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p) = h^{(1)}(\tau_1) \dots h^{(p)}(\tau_p)$. We also omit the sampling period T in (13) and write

$$v_p(n_1, \dots, n_p) = m(n_1, \dots, n_{p-1}) h^{(1)}(n_1) \dots h^{(p)}(n_p). \quad (14)$$

Finally, we will make use of $m(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$, with $\ell < p - 1$, for which the same definitions apply.

In the following, we progressively expand the analysis to cover the cases $p = 2, 3$ and 4, after which the realization of impulse invariant separable kernels for any p will become clear.

1) *Case $p = 2$* : Placing a null sample at the origin of an impulse response, we define

$$\bar{h}^{(i)}(n_i) = [1 - \delta(n_i)] h^{(i)}(n_i)$$

From (14) we can always write then $v_p(n_1, n_2) = r(n_1, n_2) + s(n_1, n_2)$, where

$$r(n_1, n_2) = \bar{h}^{(1)}(n_1) r^{(2)}(n_2) \quad (15)$$

$$s(n_1, n_2) = h^{(1)}(0) \delta(n_1) s^{(2)}(n_2), \quad (16)$$

with $r^{(2)}(n_2) = h^{(2)}(n_2)$ and $s^{(2)}(n_2) = m(0) h^{(2)}(n_2)$. It follows then that

$$y_p(n) = h^{(2)} * z_{1,1}(n) + h^{(2)} * [m(0) z_{1,2}(n)] \quad (17)$$

$$= h^{(2)} * [z_{1,1}(n) + m(0) z_{1,2}(n)], \quad (18)$$

where $m(0) = 1/2$ and

$$z_{1,1}(n) = [\bar{h}^{(1)} * u(n)] u(n) \quad (19)$$

$$z_{1,2}(n) = h^{(1)}(0) u(n) u(n) \quad (20)$$

This realization is depicted in Fig. 3.

2) *Case* $p = 3$: From $v_p(n_1, n_2, n_3) = r(n_1, n_2, n_3) + s(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ now, (15) and (16) become

$$\begin{aligned} r(n_1, n_2, n_3) &= \bar{h}^{(1)}(n_1)r^{(2)}(n_2, n_3) \\ s(n_1, n_2, n_3) &= h^{(1)}(0)\delta(n_1)s^{(2)}(n_2, n_3), \end{aligned}$$

where $r^{(2)}(n_2, n_3) = m(n_2)h^{(2)}(n_2)h^{(3)}(n_3)$ and $s^{(2)}(n_2, n_3) = m(0, n_2)\bar{h}^{(2)}(n_2)h^{(3)}(n_3)$. We see that $m(n_2)$ and $m(0, n_2)$ don't decouple from $h^{(2)}(n_2)$, so (17) has to be written now as

$$y_p(n) = r^{(2)} \circ z_{1,1}(n) + s^{(2)} \circ z_{1,2}(n), \quad (21)$$

where, nevertheless, (19) and (20) still apply.

Noting that $m(n_2) = 1$ and $m(0, n_2) = m(0)$ if $n_2 > 0$, we can then rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} r^{(2)}(n_2, n_3) &= \bar{h}^{(2)}(n_2)h^{(3)}(n_3) \\ &\quad + m(0)h^{(2)}(0)\delta(n_2)h^{(3)}(n_3), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} s^{(2)}(n_2, n_3) &= m(0)\bar{h}^{(2)}(n_2)h^{(3)}(n_3) \\ &\quad + m(0, 0)h^{(2)}(0)\delta(n_2)h^{(3)}(n_3). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting these expressions into (21), we get

$$\begin{aligned} y_p(n) &= h^{(3)} * z_{2,1}(n) + h^{(3)} * [m(0)z_{2,2}(n)] + \\ &\quad h^{(3)} * [m(0, 0)z_{2,3}(n)] \\ &= h^{(3)} * [z_{2,1}(n) + m(0)z_{2,2}(n) + m(0, 0)z_{2,3}(n)], \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

where $m(0, 0) = 1/3!$ and

$$z_{2,1}(n) = \left[\bar{h}^{(2)} * [z_{1,1}(n) + m(0)z_{1,2}(n)] \right] u(n), \quad (23)$$

$$z_{2,2}(n) = h^{(2)}(0)z_{1,1}(n)u(n), \quad (24)$$

$$z_{2,3}(n) = h^{(2)}(0)z_{1,2}(n)u(n). \quad (25)$$

This realization is depicted in Fig. 4.

3) *Case* $p = 4$: We can start from (21), which still applies, but now with

$$\begin{aligned} r^{(2)}(n_2, n_3, n_4) &= m(n_2, n_3)h^{(2)}(n_2)t(n_3, n_4) \\ s^{(2)}(n_2, n_3, n_4) &= m(0, n_2, n_3)h^{(2)}(n_2)t(n_3, n_4), \end{aligned}$$

where $t^{(3)}(n_3, n_4) \triangleq h^{(3)}(n_3)h^{(4)}(n_4)$. Since $m(n_2, n_3)$ and $m(0, n_2, n_3)$ do not decouple from $t^{(3)}(n_3, n_4)$, (22) becomes, with a slight abuse of notation in favor of expediency,

$$\begin{aligned} y_p(n) &= \left[m(n_3)t^{(3)} \right] \circ z_{2,1}(n) + \left[m(0, n_3)t^{(3)} \right] \circ z_{2,2}(n) \\ &\quad + \left[m(0, 0, n_3)t^{(3)} \right] \circ z_{2,3}(n), \end{aligned}$$

where (23), (24) and (25) still apply. Substituting now in the expression above

$$\begin{aligned} m(n_3)t^{(3)}(n_3, n_4) &= \bar{h}^{(3)}(n_3)h^{(4)}(n_4) \\ &\quad + m(0)h^{(3)}(0)\delta(n_3)h^{(4)}(n_4) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} m(0, n_3)t^{(3)}(n_3, n_4) &= m(0)\bar{h}^{(3)}(n_3)h^{(4)}(n_4) \\ &\quad + m(0, 0)h^{(3)}(0)\delta(n_3)h^{(4)}(n_4) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} m(0, 0, n_3)t^{(3)}(n_2, n_3) &= m(0, 0)\bar{h}^{(3)}(n_3)h^{(4)}(n_4) \\ &\quad + m(0, 0, 0)h^{(3)}(0)\delta(n_3)h^{(4)}(n_4), \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} y_p(n) &= h^{(4)} * [z_{3,1}(n) + m(0)z_{3,2}(n) + m(0, 0)z_{3,3}(n) \\ &\quad + m(0, 0, 0)z_{3,4}(n)], \end{aligned}$$

where $m(0, 0, 0) = 1/4!$,

$$\begin{aligned} z_{3,1}(n) &= [\bar{h}^{(3)} * [z_{2,1}(n) + m(0)z_{2,2}(n) \\ &\quad + m(0, 0)z_{2,3}]]u(n) \end{aligned}$$

$$z_{3,2}(n) = h^{(3)}(0)z_{2,1}(n)u(n)$$

$$z_{3,3}(n) = h^{(3)}(0)z_{2,2}(n)u(n)$$

$$z_{3,4}(n) = h^{(3)}(0)z_{2,3}(n)u(n)$$

This realization is also depicted in Fig. 4.

4) *Generalization*: From the above, we can see that the proposed realization of an impulse invariant Volterra kernel of order $p > 1$,

$$v_p(n_1, \dots, n_p) = h_p(n_1T_c, \dots, n_pT_c)/(m_1!, \dots, m_q!),$$

where $h_p(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p)$ is separable, consists of the following steps:

- For $i = 1, \dots, p-1$ and with $z_{0,1}(n) \triangleq u(n)$, compute

$$z_{i,1}(n) = \left[\bar{h}^{(i)} * \sum_{j=1}^i \frac{1}{j!} z_{i-1,j}(n) \right] u(n),$$

$$z_{i,j}(n) = h^{(i)}(0)z_{i-1,j-1}(n)u(n), \quad j = 2, \dots, i+1.$$

- Compute $y_p(n) = h^{(p)} * \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{j!} z_{p-1,j}(n)$.

V. COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY

In the following, for a separable kernel $h_p(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p) = \mathbf{H}^{(p)}(\tau_p) \dots \mathbf{H}^{(1)}(\tau_1)$, we calculate the additional multiplications required to realize the impulse invariant discrete-time kernel $v_p(n_1, \dots, n_p) = h_p(n_1T, \dots, n_pT)/(m_1!, \dots, m_q!)$ as opposed to simply realizing $v_p(n_1, \dots, n_p) = h_p(n_1T, \dots, n_pT)$ with the structure in Fig. 2.

A. Scalar case

We consider initially that $\mathbf{H}^{(i)}(\tau_i) = h^{(i)}(\tau_i)$ are scalar impulse responses. We assume also that the product $h^{(i)}(0)u(n) \triangleq w_i(n)$ in each stage does not add to complexity, since it is compensated by the direct, series or parallel realization of the rational system $\bar{h}^{(i)}$ requiring one multiplication less than that of $h^{(i)}$. So at the i th stage, $i < p-1$, there are the $2i$ additional multiplications required by the operations $w_i(n)z_{i-1,j-1}(n)(1/j!)$, $j = 2, \dots, i+1$, totaling $2 \sum_{i=1}^{p-2} i = (p-1)(p-2)$ multiplications. At the $(p-1)$ th stage, one can first perform $\sum_{j=2}^p z_{p-1,j}(n)(1/j!)$ and then multiply this by $w_i(n)$, so only p additional multiplications are performed, instead of $2(p-1)$. The overall number A_S of additional multiplications is, therefore, $(p-1)(p-2) + p = p(p-2) + 2$:

$$A_S = p(p-2) + 2 \quad (26)$$




Fig. 4. Realization of impulse invariant separable kernels of orders $p = 3$ and $p = 4$.

B. General case

We consider now the more general case $h_p(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p) = \mathbf{H}^{(p)}(\tau_p) \dots \mathbf{H}^{(1)}(\tau_1)$, with matrices $\mathbf{H}^{(i)}(\tau_i)$ having dimensions $M_i \times M_{i-1}$, where $M_p = M_0 = 1$. Here, a state space-space realization of a rational system $\bar{\mathbf{H}}^{(i)}$ may have, in some cases, the same complexity of that of $\mathbf{H}^{(i)}$. So we take into account the product $\mathbf{H}^{(i)}(0)u(n) \triangleq \mathbf{W}_i(n)$, which requires $M_i M_{i-1}$ multiplications. In turn, for $i < p - 1$, the products $\mathbf{W}_i(n)\mathbf{z}_{i-1,j-1}(n) = \mathbf{z}_{i,j}(n)$ and $\mathbf{z}_{i,j}(n)(1/j!)$, $j = 2, \dots, i + 1$ require, respectively, $M_i M_{i-1}$ and M_i multiplications for each value of j . If $\mathbf{H}^{(i)}(0)$ has a known structure (such as when the bilinear system is obtained from Carleman bilinearization [3] of a linear-analytic system) then the first product (and also $\mathbf{H}^{(i)}(0)u(n)$) require μ_i multiplications, where $\mu_i \leq M_i M_{i-1}$ is the number of non-null elements of $\bar{\mathbf{H}}^{(i)}$. Up to stage $p - 2$ then, a total of $\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} \mu_i + i(\mu_i + M_i)$ multiplications is required. Similarly to the scalar case, at the $(p - 1)$ th stage, $p > 2$, one can first perform $\sum_{j=2}^p \mathbf{z}_{p-1,j}(n)(1/j!)$, then multiply this by $\mathbf{H}^{(p-1)}(0)$ and finally by $u(n)$, so only $\mu_{p-1} + pM_{p-1}$ multiplications are performed, instead of $\mu_{p-1} + (p - 1)(\mu_{p-1} + M_{p-1})$. The overall number A_M of additional multiplications is therefore $\mu_{p-1} + pM_{p-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p-2} \mu_i + i(\mu_i + M_i)$, $p > 2$. For $p = 2$, $\mathbf{H}^{(1)}(0)$ can absorb the factor $1/2$, so the overall number of additional multiplications is $\mu_1 + M_1$. So, in synthesis,

$$A_M = \begin{cases} \mu_1 + M_1, & p = 2 \\ \mu_{p-1} + pM_{p-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p-2} \mu_i + i(\mu_i + M_i), & p > 2 \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

VI. CONCLUSION

We have shown how the generalized impulse invariance condition for triangular Volterra kernels translates to regular kernels. Such kernels, if separable, have simple continuous-time realizations with a cascade structure. By defining a cascade operator, we have shown how such structures should be modified for the discrete-time realization of impulse invariant separable kernels. Finally, we assessed the additional computational complexity incurred by that modification.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. V. Oppenheim and R. W. Schaffer, *Discrete-time Signal Processing*. Prentice-Hall, 1989.
- [2] L. A. Azpicueta-Ruiz, M. Zeller, A. R. Figueiras-Vidal, J. Arenas-García, and W. Kellermann, "Adaptive Combination of Volterra Kernels and its Application to Nonlinear Acoustic Echo Cancellation," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 97–110, Jan. 2011.
- [3] W. J. Rugh, *Nonlinear System Theory: The Volterra/Wiener Approach*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- [4] P. M. S. Burt and J. H. de Morais Goulart, "Efficient computation of bilinear approximations and volterra models of nonlinear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 804–816, Feb 2018.