

# PHASE RETRIEVAL OF ANALYTIC SIGNALS FROM SHORT-TIME FOURIER TRANSFORM MEASUREMENTS

YOUFA LI, HONGFEI WANG, AND DEGUANG HAN

ABSTRACT. Analytic signals belong to a widely applied class of signals especially for extracting instantaneous frequency (IF) or phase derivative which is very helpful in the characterization of ultrashort laser pulse. In this paper we investigate the phase retrieval (PR) problem for analytic signals in  $\mathbb{C}^N$  by their short-time Fourier transform (STFT) measurements. When the window is bandlimited, it was found that the corresponding STFT of an analytic signal enjoys nice structures. Exploiting such structures, our main results state that the STFT-PR of generic analytic signals can be achieved by their  $(3\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1)$  measurements. Note that the generic analytic signals are  $(\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1)$ -sparse in Fourier domain. Such a number of measurements is lower than  $4N + O(1)$  and  $O(k^3)$  which are required in the literature for STFT-PR of signals in  $\mathbb{C}^N$  and of  $k$ -sparse (in Fourier domain) signals, respectively. Furthermore, if the length  $N$  is even and the windows are also analytic then the number of measurements can be reduced to  $(\frac{3N}{2} - 1)$ . PR approaches are established for different cases of window bandlimit. As an application, the IF of a generic analytic signal can be exactly recovered from the PR results. Several examples are provided to demonstrate the main results and their applications.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Phase retrieval (PR) is a nonlinear sampling problem (c.f. [3, 4]) that asks to recover a signal  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ , *up to the potential ambiguity*, from the magnitude measurements

$$|\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a}_k \rangle|, \quad k \in \Gamma,$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_k \in \mathbb{C}^N$  is referred to as a measurement vector. PR problem is of great interest since it has been widely applied in many applications including coherent diffraction imaging (CDI) ([33, 38]), quantum tomography ([25]), and holography ([29]). The most classical PR problem is to recover a signal by its Fourier transform measurements ([17, 20]). Compared with the Fourier transform, on the other hand, the short-time

---

*Date:* May 17, 2022.

*Key words and phrases.* Phase retrieval, short-time Fourier transform (STFT) measurement, analytic signal, instantaneous frequency.

Youfa Li is partially supported by Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos: 61961003, 61561006, 11501132), Natural Science Foundation of Guangxi (Nos: 2018JJA110110, 2016GXNSFAA380049) and the talent project of Education Department of Guangxi Government for Young-Middle-Aged backbone teachers. Deguang Han is supported by the NSF grant DMS-2105038.

Fourier transform (STFT) or Gabor transform is more effective for time-frequency localization since its associated window function enjoys great flexibility (c.f. [12, 18, 23, 39]). Recently, there have been many interesting results on the STFT-PR (e.g. [1, 5, 8, 9, 24, 30, 32, 37]). Additionally, among others the uniqueness aspect is a fundamental issue for PR and especially for practical applications including quantum tomography ([25]). Our focus here is the uniqueness problem. Particularly, the PR is achieved by as few STFT measurements as possible.

Bojarovska and Flinth [10] proved that  $N^2$  STFT measurements are sufficient for the recovery of signals in  $\mathbb{C}^N$ . With the help of graph theory, Pfander and Salanevich [36] proved that the recovery can be achieved by  $O(N \log N)$  measurements. From the perspective of frame theory (c.f. [24]), the STFT-PR is essentially the PR problem by the frames (measurement vectors) in  $\mathbb{C}^N$ . There exist many phase retrievable frames of  $4N + O(1)$ -length (e.g. [2, 26, 41]). As for the STFT-PR, the recovery can be also achieved by  $4N + O(1)$  measurements (c.f. [2, 6, 27, 28]). Note that such results hold for the signals in  $\mathbb{C}^N$ . Recently, the STFT-PR for structured signals has attracted much attention (e.g. [10, 19, 27]). Among other structured signals, the class of sparse (in the sense of time or Fourier domain) signals are such a typical example. For the priori knowledge on sparsity, it is naturally expected that fewer than  $4N + O(1)$  measurements are sufficient for the recovery. In particular, it was proved in [10] that a  $k$ -sparse (in Fourier domain) signal can be recovered by  $O(k^3)$  STFT measurements.

**1.1. Motivation.** In the present paper our interest is the PR problem for analytic signals. Instantaneous frequency (IF) is an important instantaneous feature of signals, and it has been widely applied in time-frequency analysis (c.f. [13]) and especially in the characterization of ultrashort laser pulse (e.g. [22, 40]). In optics, many signals such as the ultrashort laser pulses are highly oscillatory, or equivalently their IFs are very large. On the other hand, the IF of one's interest is essentially the phase derivative (its definition is postponed to (1.1)) of its associated analytic signal (c.f. [13, 14, 15, 16]). For highly oscillatory signals, it is very difficult or even impossible for electronic measurement devices to measure their phase distributions (actually this is the main reason for PR, see [38]), not to speak of IF. Therefore it is a natural problem to study the PR problem for analytic signals and in this paper we examine this problem in the context of STFT measurements.

**1.2. Main result.** In this paper we work in the space  $\mathbb{C}^N$  consisting of  $N$ -periodic and complex-valued vectors  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_0, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{N-1})$  such that the subscripts are assumed modulo  $N$ . For a real number  $x$ , we will use the notation  $\lceil x \rceil$  (respectively,  $\lfloor x \rfloor$ ) to denote the smallest (respectively, largest) integer that is not smaller (respectively, larger) than  $x$ . Our main results are stated in Theorems 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 which can be summarized in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1.** Suppose that  $\mathbf{w}_l \in \mathbb{C}^N, l = 1, \dots, M$  are the structured  $B$ -bandlimited windows for STFT such that their bandlimits  $2 \leq B \leq \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1$ . Moreover, the STFT

separation (between adjacent short-time sections) parameter  $0 < L < N$  satisfies  $\lceil N/L \rceil \geq 3$ . Then for a generic analytic signal  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ , it can be recovered (up to a sign) by its  $(3\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1)$  STFT measurements. Moreover, if the length  $N$  is even and the windows are analytic then the above number of measurements can be reduced to  $(\frac{3N}{2} - 1)$ .

An immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1 is the exact recovery of instantaneous frequency (IF) for generic signals. Suppose that an analytic signal  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_0, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{N-1})$  such that its element  $\mathbf{z}_k$  is denoted by  $|\mathbf{z}_k|e^{i\arg(\mathbf{z}_k)}$  with  $\arg(\mathbf{z}_k) \in [0, 2\pi)$ . Define

$$(1.1) \quad \varphi^*(k) := (\arg(\mathbf{z}_k) - \arg(\mathbf{z}_{k-1})) \pmod{2\pi}.$$

Then  $\mathbf{z}_\varphi := (\varphi^*(0), \dots, \varphi^*(N-1))$  is referred to as the phase derivative (PD) or IF of  $\mathbf{z}$  (c.f. [15]).

**Proposition 1.2.** Suppose that  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$  is a generic analytic signal. Then its IF can be exactly recovered from the STFT measurements used in Theorem 1.1.

*Proof.* By Theorem 1.1, we get  $\mathbf{z}$  or  $-\mathbf{z}$ . Since the  $k$ th element of  $-\mathbf{z}$  is expressed as  $|\mathbf{z}_k|e^{i((\arg(\mathbf{z}_k) - \pi) \pmod{2\pi})}$ . In the sense of mod,  $[(\arg(\mathbf{z}_k) - \pi) \pmod{2\pi} - (\arg(\mathbf{z}_{k-1}) - \pi) \pmod{2\pi}] \pmod{2\pi} = (\arg(\mathbf{z}_k) - \arg(\mathbf{z}_{k-1})) \pmod{2\pi}$ . That is, the IF of  $-\mathbf{z}$  is identical to that of  $\mathbf{z}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 1.3. Remarks on Theorem 1.1 and some comparisons with the existing results.

**Remark 1.1.** If the bandlimit of the window is less than  $(\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1)$ , then the PR can be achieved by only one window function (Theorem 3.4). However, for the case that windows being  $(\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1)$ -bandlimited, it will be explained in Remark 3.2 and Example 3.1 that the PR may not be achieved by single-window measurements. Therefore, the multiple-window measurements are required in Theorem 3.5 for windows being  $(\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1)$ -bandlimited. Note that the multiple-window measurements were also used for STFT-PR in [30]. Essentially, such measurements belong to coded diffraction patterns (c.f. [11]).

**Remark 1.2.** There is a correlation between the required number of measurements and the bandlimits of windows. (1) Since a generic analytic signal is  $(\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1)$ -sparse (in Fourier domain), by the discrete uncertainty principle (c.f. [10, section 3.2]) it is generally not sparse in the time domain. Therefore, the existing PR results for sparse (in time domain) signals do not hold for analytic signals. (2) If an analytic signal is  $(\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1)$ -sparse (in Fourier domain) or equivalently has bandlimit  $\mathring{B} = \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1$ , then Theorem 1.1 implies that it can be determined (up to a sign) by its  $(3\mathring{B} - 2)$  STFT measurements. When the windows are analytic, such a required number of measurements can be reduced to  $(3\mathring{B} - 4)$ . (3) As for the case of windows of larger bandlimit, it will be addressed in subsection 4.1 that more measurements may be

required to do the PR. Moreover, the numerical examples in section 4 will imply that Approach 3.1 (using the narrow bandlimited windows) outperforms Approaches 3.2 and 3.3 (using the wide bandlimited windows).

In what follows, we comment on the comparisons of Theorem 1.1 with the results in [10] and [31].

**Note 1.3.** As previously mentioned, it was proved by [10] that the STFT-PR of a  $k$ -sparse (in the sense of Fourier domain) signal in  $\mathbb{C}^N$  can be achieved by  $O(k^3)$  measurements. Note that a generic analytic signal is  $(\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1)$ -sparse. Theorem 1.1 implies that its STFT-PR can be achieved by  $3\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + O(1)$  measurements.

**Note 1.4.** Frequency-resolved optical gating (FROG) trace is essentially an adaptive STFT since the corresponding window is the delay of the signal itself (c.f. [7]). The FROG-PR for analytic signals was addressed in [31]. The STFT-PR in this paper is different from FROG-PR since the window here is known and independent of the signal. The following tells us some other essential differences between Theorem 1.1 and the results in [31]. (1) The main result in [31] only applies to the case when  $N$  is even and the separation parameter  $0 < L < N$  is odd with the property that  $\lceil N/L \rceil \geq 5$ . However, Theorem 1.1 only requires  $\lceil N/L \rceil \geq 3$  in this case. (2) Similarly,  $(\frac{3N}{2} + 1)$  FROG measurements are required in [31] for the even length case. The number of measurement is reduced to  $(\frac{3N}{2} - 1)$  in Theorem 1.1. (3) The ambiguity for FROG-PR in [31] is different from that in Theorem 1.1 since it additionally contains shift and reflection. Consequently, the IFs of only a few analytic signals can be extracted from FROG-PR ([31, section 4]). However, Proposition 1.2 applies to every generic analytic signal.

**1.4. Outline of the paper.** Three main results together with corresponding recovering algorithms are established and discussed in subsections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 with proofs presented in subsections 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4, respectively. More precisely, the STFT-PR is addressed in subsections 3.2 and 3.3 for the two cases of window bandlimit: (i)  $B \leq \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil$  and (ii)  $B = \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1$ , respectively. To establish the uniqueness of STFT-PR for such two cases, in (3.5) and (3.14) we first examine the structures of their corresponding STFTs. It was found that such two structures are quite different from each other, and consequently the PR problems are addressed in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 for such two cases, respectively. The recovery in Theorem 3.4 is achieved by the single-window STFT measurements while that in Theorem 3.5 is done by multiple-window ones (c.f. [30]). The common thing shared by the two recoveries is that the PR of a generic analytic signal in  $\mathbb{C}^N$  can be recovered by its  $(3\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1)$  STFT measurements. If  $N$  is even and the windows are analytic then Theorem 3.6 states that  $(\frac{3N}{2} - 1)$  measurements are sufficient for STFT-PR. Approaches 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 provide the PR procedures for Theorems 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6, respectively. Several examples are provided in subsection 4.1 to check the main results. Moreover, as an application of the results, the IF of the example signal is exactly recovered in subsection 4.2.

## 2. PRELIMINARY

A complex number  $0 \neq z \in \mathbb{C}$  is traditionally denoted by  $|z|e^{i\arg(z)}$ , where  $\mathbf{i}$ ,  $|z|$  and  $\arg(z)$  are the imaginary unit, modulus and phase, respectively. The real and imaginary parts, and conjugation of  $z$  are denoted by  $\Re(z)$ ,  $\Im(z)$  and  $\bar{z}$ , respectively. The discrete Fourier transform (DFT) of  $\mathbf{z}$  is defined by  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}} := (\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{N-1})$  such that  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_k = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{z}_n e^{-2\pi i k n / N}$ . The inverse discrete Fourier transform (IDFT) admits the recovery

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbf{z}_k = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_n e^{2\pi i k n / N}.$$

We say that  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$  is  $B$ -bandlimited if its DFT contains  $N - B$  consecutive zeros. Associated with a window  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ , the short-time Fourier transform (STFT, c.f. [8, 30]) of  $\mathbf{z}$  at  $(k, m)$  is defined as

$$(2.2) \quad \widehat{y}_{k,m}^{\mathbf{w}} = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{z}_n \mathbf{w}_{mL-n} e^{-2\pi i k n / N},$$

where  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$  and  $m = 0, 1, \dots, \lceil N/L \rceil - 1$  with  $0 < L < N$  the separation parameter. By (2.1) one can check that

$$(2.3) \quad \widehat{y}_{k,m}^{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k+l} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_l \omega^{lm},$$

where  $\omega = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{\lceil N/L \rceil}}$ . The following definition of an analytic signal was given by Marple [34]. For a real-valued signal  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , its analytic signal  $A(\mathbf{x}) = (A(\mathbf{x})_0, \dots, A(\mathbf{x})_{N-1})$  is defined through its DFT  $\widehat{A(\mathbf{x})} = ((\widehat{A(\mathbf{x})})_0, \dots, (\widehat{A(\mathbf{x})})_{N-1})$ , where for even length  $N$ ,

$$(2.4) \quad (\widehat{A(\mathbf{x})})_k = \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_0, & k = 0, \\ 2\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_k, & 1 \leq k \leq \frac{N}{2} - 1, \\ \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{\frac{N}{2}}, & k = \frac{N}{2}, \\ 0, & \frac{N}{2} + 1 \leq k \leq N - 1, \end{cases}$$

and for odd length  $N$ ,

$$(2.5) \quad (\widehat{A(\mathbf{x})})_k = \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_0, & k = 0, \\ 2\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_k, & 1 \leq k \leq \frac{N-1}{2}, \\ 0, & \frac{N+1}{2} \leq k \leq N - 1. \end{cases}$$

By [34], the real part  $\Re(A(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{x}$  and the imaginary part  $\Im(A(\mathbf{x}))$  is the discrete Hilbert transform of  $\mathbf{x}$ . The following is a characterization of DFT structure for an analytic signal.

**Proposition 2.1.** (c.f. [31]) Suppose that  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ . Denote the Cartesian product of sets by  $\times$ . Then  $\mathbf{z}$  is analytic if and only if the following two items holds:

- (i) for even length  $N$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}^{\frac{N}{2}-1} \times \mathbb{R} \times \overbrace{\{0\} \times \dots \times \{0\}}^{(\frac{N}{2}-1)\text{copies}}$ ;
- (ii) for odd length  $N$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}^{\frac{N-1}{2}} \times \overbrace{\{0\} \times \dots \times \{0\}}^{\frac{N-1}{2}\text{copies}}$ .

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

**3.1. Several lemmas.** This section starts with an auxiliary result from [7, Lemma 3.2].

**Lemma 3.1.** Consider the equation system w.r.t  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ :

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} |z + v_1| = n_1, \\ |z + v_2| = n_2, \\ |z + v_3| = n_3, \end{cases}$$

where  $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \mathbb{C}$  are distinct. If there exists a solution  $\tilde{z} = a + \mathbf{i}b$  to the above system and  $\Im\left(\frac{v_1 - v_2}{v_1 - v_3}\right) \neq 0$ , then it is the unique one. Moreover, it is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} c & d \\ e & f \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} n_1^2 - n_2^2 + |v_2|^2 - |v_1|^2 \\ n_1^2 - n_3^2 + |v_3|^2 - |v_1|^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $c = \Re(v_1 - v_2)$ ,  $d = \Im(v_1 - v_2)$ ,  $e = \Re(v_1 - v_3)$  and  $f = \Im(v_1 - v_3)$ .

The following lemma will be used in the proofs of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.

**Lemma 3.2.** Suppose that the rational function  $f(z) = \frac{az + b}{cz + d}$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , such that  $ad - bc \neq 0$ ,  $ac \neq 0$ ,  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{C}$ . Then for a generic  $z$ , it holds that  $\Im(f(z)) \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $z = x + \mathbf{i}y$ . One can check that

$$(3.2) \quad \Im(f(z)) = \frac{\Im(a\bar{c})(x^2 + y^2) + (\Im(a\bar{d}) + \Im(b\bar{c}))x + (\Re(a\bar{d}) - \Re(b\bar{c}))y + \Im(b\bar{d})}{|cz + d|^2}.$$

Now the proof can be completed by (3.2).  $\square$

The following lemma will be helpful in the proofs of both Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.

**Lemma 3.3.** As in (2.2), let  $L, N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $L < N$  and  $\lceil N/L \rceil \geq 3$ . If  $0 \leq m_1, m_2, m_3 \leq \lceil N/L \rceil - 1$  are distinct then  $\Im\left(\frac{\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_2}}{\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_3}}\right) \neq 0$  where  $\omega = e^{\mathbf{i}\frac{2\pi}{\lceil N/L \rceil}}$ .

*Proof.* Since

$$\frac{\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_2}}{\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_3}} = \frac{(\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_2})(\overline{\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_3}})}{|\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_3}|^2} = \frac{1 - \omega^{m_1-m_3} - \omega^{m_2-m_1} + \omega^{m_2-m_3}}{|\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_3}|^2},$$

it follows that  $\Im\left(\frac{\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_2}}{\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_3}}\right) \neq 0$  is equivalent to

$$-\sin\left(\frac{2\pi(m_1 - m_3)}{\lceil N/L \rceil}\right) - \sin\left(\frac{2\pi(m_2 - m_1)}{\lceil N/L \rceil}\right) + \sin\left(\frac{2\pi(m_2 - m_3)}{\lceil N/L \rceil}\right) \neq 0.$$

If the above does not hold, then one can check that

$$\sin\left(\frac{\pi(m_2 - m_3)}{\lceil N/L \rceil}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\pi(m_2 - m_3)}{\lceil N/L \rceil}\right) = \sin\left(\frac{\pi(m_2 - m_3)}{\lceil N/L \rceil}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\pi(2m_1 - m_3 - m_2)}{\lceil N/L \rceil}\right).$$

Since  $m_2 \neq m_3$  and  $0 \leq m_2, m_3 \leq \lceil N/L \rceil - 1$ , we get that

$$\sin\left(\frac{\pi(m_2 - m_3)}{\lceil N/L \rceil}\right) \neq 0, \quad \cos\left(\frac{\pi(m_2 - m_3)}{r}\right) = \cos\left(\frac{\pi(2m_1 - m_3 - m_2)}{\lceil N/L \rceil}\right).$$

Therefore,  $\frac{\pi(m_2 - m_3)}{\lceil N/L \rceil} = \frac{\pi(2m_1 - m_3 - m_2)}{\lceil N/L \rceil}$  or  $\frac{\pi(m_2 - m_3)}{\lceil N/L \rceil} = -\frac{\pi(2m_1 - m_3 - m_2)}{\lceil N/L \rceil}$  which implies that  $m_1 = m_2$  or  $m_1 = m_3$ . This is a contradiction. The proof is completed.  $\square$

**3.2. The first main result: window bandlimit**  $2 \leq B \leq \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil$ . Suppose that the window  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^N$  is  $B$ -bandlimited such that  $2 \leq B \leq \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil$ . Consequently, there exists  $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$  such that

$$(3.3) \quad \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_i = \dots = \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B-1} = 0.$$

For such a subscript  $i$ , we consider the following measurements

$$(3.4) \quad \left| \widehat{y}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - (i+N-B) - n + 1, m}^{\mathbf{w}} \right| = \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - (i+N-B) - n + 1 + l} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_l \omega^{lm} \right|,$$

where  $n = 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1$ . Now it follows from  $2 \leq B \leq \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil$ , (3.3) and Proposition 2.1 that the summation on the right-hand side of (3.4) enjoys the following structure:

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B} & \\ & & & & & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B} & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B+1} \\ & & & & & \dots & \vdots \\ & & & & & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1 - B} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B} & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 2 - B} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B+1} & \dots & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-1} \\ & \dots & & & & \dots & & & \\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B} & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_1 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B+1} & \dots & & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{B-1} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-1} & & & & \end{array}$$

For  $n = 1$ , as implied on the first row of (3.5) the corresponding measurement  $\left| \widehat{y}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - (i+N-B), m}^{\mathbf{w}} \right|$  is involved with only the term  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B}$ . Motivated by such

a structure, we will use the measurements in (3.4) to do the phase retrieval of  $\mathbf{z}$  through the following approach.

**Approach 3.1. Input:** a window  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ , STFT measurements

(3.6)

$$\{|\widehat{y}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - (i+N-B), 0}^{\mathbf{w}}|, |\widehat{y}_{k-(i+N-B), m_j}^{\mathbf{w}}| : k = \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, 0, 0 \leq m_j \leq \lceil N/L \rceil - 1, j = 1, 2, 3\}.$$

**Step 1:**  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \leftarrow \frac{N|\widehat{y}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - (i+N-B), 0}^{\mathbf{w}}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B}|}$ .

**Step 2:** The component  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}$  is determined by the equation system

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{N|\widehat{y}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1 - (i+N-B), m_j}^{\mathbf{w}}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B} \omega^{(i+N-B)m_j}|} = |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} + v_{j, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}|, j = 1, 2, 3,$$

which is solved by Lemma 3.1. Here

$$(3.8) \quad v_{j, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} := \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B+1} \omega^{(i+N-B+1)m_j}}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B} \omega^{(i+N-B)m_j}}.$$

**Step 3:** Suppose that  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_k$  has been determined for any  $k \in \{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, k_0\}$  with  $k_0 \in \{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, 1\}$ . Then  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1}$  is determined by the system

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{N|\widehat{y}_{k_0-1-(i+N-B), m_j}^{\mathbf{w}}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B} \omega^{(i+N-B)m_j}|} = |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1} + v_{j, k_0-1}|, j = 1, 2, 3,$$

which is also solved by Lemma 3.1. Here

$$(3.10) \quad v_{j, k_0-1} := \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - k_0 + 1} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1+l} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B+l} \omega^{(i+N-B+l)m_j}}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B} \omega^{(i+N-B)m_j}}.$$

**Step 4:** If  $N$  is odd, then  $e^{i\widehat{\theta}_0} \leftarrow \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 / |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0|$  and for any  $l \in \{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, 0\}$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_l \leftarrow \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_l e^{-i\widehat{\theta}_0}$ .

**Output:**  $\mathbf{z} = \text{IDFT}(\widehat{\mathbf{z}})$ .

Based on Approach 3.1 we establish the first main theorem as follows.

**Theorem 3.4.** Suppose that the window  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^N$  is  $B$ -bandlimited such that  $2 \leq B \leq \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil$  and there exists  $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$  such that (3.3) holds and  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B+1} \neq 0$ . Moreover, we assume that the STFT separation parameter  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfies the condition  $\lceil N/L \rceil \geq 3$ . Then any generic analytic signal  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$  can be determined, up to a global sign, by its  $(3\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1)$  STFT measurements in (3.6).

*Proof.* The proof is provided in subsection 6.1.  $\square$



**Remark 3.1.** In Theorem 3.4 it is required that  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B+1} \neq 0$ . Such a requirement is crucial for the determination of  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}$ . If it is not satisfied, then (3.7) degenerates to

$$(3.11) \quad \frac{N |\widehat{y}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1 - (i+N-B), m_j}^{\mathbf{w}}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B} \omega^{(i+N-B)m_j}|} = |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}|, j = 1, 2, 3.$$

Clearly, the above system is underdetermined and  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}$  can not be determined.

**3.3. The second main result: window bandlimit  $B = \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1$ .** Suppose that the window  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^N$  is  $(\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1)$ -bandlimited. Consequently, there exists  $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$  such that

$$(3.12) \quad \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_i = \dots = \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i + \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 2} = 0.$$

We are interested in the STFT measurement at  $(2-i+N-n, m)$ :

$$(3.13) \quad |\widehat{y}_{2-i+N-n, m}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{2-i+N-n+l} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_l \omega^{lm} \right|,$$

where  $n \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor\}$ . It follows from (3.12),  $B = \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1$  and Proposition 2.1 that the summation on the right-hand side of (3.13) enjoys the following structure:

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i-1+N} & & & & & & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i + \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} \\ & & & & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i + \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} & & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i + \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \\ & & & \dots & & & \vdots \\ & & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_1 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i + \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_2 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i + \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} & \dots & & \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i + 2 \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 2} \end{array}$$

Motivated by such a structure, we next use the (multi-window) measurements  $|\widehat{y}_{2-i+N-n, m}^{\mathbf{w}(s)}|$  to do the PR of  $\mathbf{z}$  through the following approach, where  $s = 1, 2, 3, 4$ .

**Approach 3.2. Input:** four windows  $\mathbf{w}^{(s)} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ ,  $s = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , STFT measurements

$$(3.15) \quad \left\{ |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N, 0}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|, |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N, 0}^{\mathbf{w}(2)}|, |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N, 0}^{\mathbf{w}(3)}|, |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N, 0}^{\mathbf{w}(4)}|, |\widehat{y}_{k-(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1), m_j}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}| : k = \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, 1, \right. \\ \left. 0 \leq m_j \leq \lceil N/L \rceil - 1, j = 1, 2, 3 \right\}.$$

**Step 1:** Compute

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{pmatrix} |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor}|^2 \\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0^2 \end{pmatrix} := \mathcal{A}_0^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} N^2 |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N, 0}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|^2 \\ N^2 |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N, 0}^{\mathbf{w}(2)}|^2 \\ N^2 |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N, 0}^{\mathbf{w}(3)}|^2 \\ N^2 |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N, 0}^{\mathbf{w}(4)}|^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

from which we obtain  $(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor})$ , up to a sign. Here

$$(3.17) \quad \mathcal{A}_0 := \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}^{(1)} & a_{12}^{(1)} & a_{21}^{(1)} & a_{22}^{(1)} \\ a_{11}^{(2)} & a_{12}^{(2)} & a_{21}^{(2)} & a_{22}^{(2)} \\ a_{11}^{(3)} & a_{12}^{(3)} & a_{21}^{(3)} & a_{22}^{(3)} \\ a_{11}^{(4)} & a_{12}^{(4)} & a_{21}^{(4)} & a_{22}^{(4)} \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{cases} a_{11}^{(s)} = |\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}^{(s)}|^2, & a_{12}^{(s)} = \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}^{(s)} \overline{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i-1+N}^{(s)}}, \\ a_{21}^{(s)} = \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i-1+N}^{(s)} \overline{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}^{(s)}}, & a_{22}^{(s)} = |\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i-1+N}^{(s)}|^2. \end{cases}$$

**Step 2:** The component  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}$  is determined by the equation system

$$(3.19) \quad \frac{N|\widehat{y}_{N-i,m_j}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1)m_j}|} = |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1} + v_{j,\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}|, j = 1, 2, 3,$$

which is solved by Lemma 3.1. Here

$$(3.20) \quad v_{j,\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1} := \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor)m_j}}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1)m_j}}.$$

**Step 3:** Suppose that  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_k$  has been determined for any  $k \in \{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, k_0, 0\}$  with  $k_0 \in \{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, 2\}$ . Then  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1}$  is determined by the system

$$(3.21) \quad \frac{N|\widehat{y}_{k_0-1-(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1),m_j}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1)m_j}|} = |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1} + v_{j,k_0-1}|, j = 1, 2, 3,$$

which is also solved by Lemma 3.1. Here

$$(3.22) \quad v_{j,k_0-1} := \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - k_0 + 1} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1+l} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1+l}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1+l)m_j}}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1)m_j}}.$$

**Output:**  $\mathbf{z} = \text{IDFT}(\widehat{\mathbf{z}})$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** Let the STFT separation parameter  $L$  satisfy  $\lceil N/L \rceil \geq 3$ . Suppose that the four windows  $\mathbf{w}^{(s)} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ ,  $s = 1, \dots, 4$  are  $(\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1)$ -bandlimited such that they satisfy (3.12) for  $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ . Moreover,  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor}^{(1)} \neq 0$  and the matrix  $\mathcal{A}_0$  in (3.17) is invertible. Then, through Approach 3.2, any generic analytic signal  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$

can be determined (up to a global sign) by its  $(3\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1)$  STFT measurements in (3.15).

*Proof.* The proof is provided in subsection 6.2.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** For the case that windows being  $(\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1)$ -bandlimited, the corresponding Approach 3.2 is conducted by multiple-window measurements. The following example implies that for such a window bandlimit case, the PR may not be achieved from the single-window STFT measurements. As such, the multiple-window STFT measurements in (3.15) are used to do the PR.

**Example 3.1.** Let  $N = 4$ ,  $B = 3$  and  $L = 1$ . Then for an analytic signal  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^4$  its DFT  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}} = (\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_1, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_2, 0)$ . Choose a 3-bandlimited window  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^4$  such that  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}} = (\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0, 0, \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_2, 0)$ , it is easy to check that  $|\widehat{y}_{0,0}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{4}|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_2\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_2| = |\widehat{y}_{0,2}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{4}|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_2\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_2\omega^4|$ ,  $|\widehat{y}_{0,1}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{4}|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_2\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_2\omega^2| = |\widehat{y}_{0,3}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{4}|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_2\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_2\omega^6|$ ,  $|\widehat{y}_{1,0}^{\mathbf{w}}| = |\widehat{y}_{1,1}^{\mathbf{w}}| = |\widehat{y}_{1,2}^{\mathbf{w}}| = |\widehat{y}_{1,3}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{4}|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_1\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0|$ ,  $|\widehat{y}_{2,0}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{4}|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_2\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_2| = |\widehat{y}_{2,2}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{4}|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_2\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_2\omega^4|$ ,  $|\widehat{y}_{2,1}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{4}|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_2\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_2\omega^2| = |\widehat{y}_{2,3}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{4}|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_2\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_2\omega^6|$ , and  $|\widehat{y}_{3,0}^{\mathbf{w}}| = |\widehat{y}_{3,1}^{\mathbf{w}}| = |\widehat{y}_{3,2}^{\mathbf{w}}| = |\widehat{y}_{3,3}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{4}|\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_1\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_2|$ . That is, the total number of available STFT measurements of  $\mathbf{z}$  is 6. Since  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_3 = 0$ , the recovery of  $\mathbf{z}$  is essentially the PR problem in  $\mathbb{C}^3$ . By [41, section 1.2.1], the minimum number of measurements for PR of  $\mathbb{C}^3$  is 8. Then the above single-window STFT measurements do not provide redundant information. Consequently, multiple-window STFT measurements are necessary.

**Remark 3.3.** In Theorem 3.5 it is required that  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor}^{(1)} \neq 0$ . Or else, the system in (3.19) degenerates to

$$(3.23) \quad \frac{N|\widehat{y}_{N-i,m_j}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}^{(1)}\omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1)m_j}|} = |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}|.$$

Clearly, the above system is underdetermined and  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}$  can not be recovered exactly.

**3.4. The third main result: windows are analytic.** In what follows we provide a PR approach for the case that  $N$  is even and the windows are analytic such that it requires fewer measurements than Approaches 3.1 and 3.2.

**Approach 3.3. Input:** two analytic windows  $\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \mathbf{w}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ , STFT measurements

$$(3.24) \quad \{|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|, |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}(2)}|, |\widehat{y}_{k,m_j}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|, k = \frac{N}{2} - 1, \dots, 1, 0 \leq m_j \leq \lceil N/L \rceil - 1, j = 1, 2, 3\}.$$

**Step 1:**

$$(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}) \leftarrow \left( \frac{N(-|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} + |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}(2)}|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}}, \frac{N(|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}(2)}|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}} \right).$$

**Step 2:** If the following three circles w.r.t the variable  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}$ :

$$\frac{N|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2}-1,m_j}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)}|} = \left| \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1} + \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1^{(1)} \omega^{m_j}}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)}} \right|, j = 1, 2, 3$$

does not have only one intersection point then

$$(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}) \leftarrow \left( \frac{N(-|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} - |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}}, \frac{N(|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} + |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}} \right).$$

**Step 3:** Through the similar procedures in **step 2** and **step 3** of Approach 3.2, other components of  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$  can be determined by  $\{|\widehat{y}_{k,m_j}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| : k = \frac{N}{2} - 1, \dots, 1, 0 \leq m_j \leq \lceil N/L \rceil - 1, j = 1, 2, 3\}$ .

**Output:**  $\mathbf{z} = \text{IDFT}(\widehat{\mathbf{z}})$ .

Based on Approach 3.3, we establish the third main result.

**Theorem 3.6.** Suppose that  $N$  is even and the STFT separation parameter  $L$  satisfies  $\lceil N/L \rceil \geq 3$ . Moreover, both the two windows  $\mathbf{w}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathbf{w}^{(2)}$  are analytic such that  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1^{(1)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} \neq 0$  and the matrix

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} & \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} & \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$$

is invertible. Then any generic analytic signal  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ , through Approach 3.3, can be determined (up to a sign) by its  $(\frac{3N}{2} - 1)$  STFT measurements in (3.24).

*Proof.* The proof is provided in section 6.4.  $\square$

**3.5. A final remark: windows of large bandlimit lead to large number of measurements.** Recall that the bandlimits of windows in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 are required to be shorter than  $\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil$  and to be  $\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1$ , respectively. Since the windows in Theorem 3.6 are analytic, naturally their bandlimits  $\leq (\frac{N}{2} + 1)$ . The following states that if the bandlimit  $B \gg \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1$  then far more measurements than those in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 are required to do the PR. Suppose that the windows  $\mathbf{w}^{(s)} \in \mathbb{C}^N, s = 1, \dots, M$  are  $B$ -bandlimited such that  $B \gg \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1$ . For such a bandlimit case, it is easy to check that

$$(3.26) \quad \begin{aligned} |\widehat{y}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - (i+N-B), m}^{\mathbf{w}^{(s)}}| &= \frac{1}{N} \left| \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B}^{(s)} \omega^{(i+N-B)m} + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B+\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil}^{(s)} \omega^{(i+N-B+\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil)m} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \dots + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{B-\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil - 1} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-1}^{(s)} \omega^{(i+N-1)m} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The summation on the right-hand side of (3.26) enjoys the similar structure as that in (3.14), but it is involved with  $(B - \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1)$  components  $\{\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{B - \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil - 1}, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil}\}$ . What is more, among other measurements one can check that  $|\widehat{y}_{\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil - (i + N - B), m}^{\mathbf{w}^{(s)}}|$  is involved with the minimum number of components. To recover the above  $(B - \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1)$  components, by [41] it is commonly required  $4(B - \lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1) + O(1)$  measurements. After this recovery, by the similar procedures in the proof of Theorem 3.5,  $3(N - B)$  additional measurements are required to recover the other components. Then the total number of required measurements is  $3N - 4\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + B + 4 + O(1)$ . For large  $N$  and  $\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1 \ll B < N$ , it is clear that the required number  $\gg 3\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1$ . Therefore, for the case that windows with large bandlimits, large number of measurements are required to do the PR.

#### 4. EXAMPLES TO DEMONSTRATE THEOREMS 3.4, 3.5 AND 3.6, AND THEIR APPLICATIONS

**4.1. Examples to demonstrate Theorems 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6.** Choose the real-valued signal  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{47})$  from [35, Page 163] such that  $\mathbf{x}_n = \frac{\sin(\frac{n\pi}{3})}{n\pi}$ . Its analytic signal is denoted by  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_0, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{47})$ . The real and imaginary parts of  $\mathbf{z}$  are plotted in Figure 4.1 (a-b). Approaches 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 will be applied to do the PR of  $\mathbf{z}$ . Moreover, the separation parameter  $L = 16$  such that  $\lceil N/L \rceil = 3$ . The recovery error is defined as  $\min\{\frac{\|\mathbf{z} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{z}\|_2}, \frac{\|\mathbf{z} + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{z}\|_2}\}$  where  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$  is the recovery result. Denote

$$(4.1) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\pm := \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, -\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\}} \frac{\|\mathbf{z} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{z}\|_2}.$$

We first choose a window  $\mathbf{w}$  such that its bandlimit is 2, and its real and imaginary parts are plotted in Figure 4.1 (c-d). Approach 3.1 is applied to recover  $\mathbf{z}$  by its STFT measurements in (3.6) associated with  $\mathbf{w}$ . Its recovery error is  $8.7684 \times 10^{-16}$ . The graph of  $|\mathbf{z} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\pm|$  is plotted in Figure 4.3 (a). Additionally, we choose four windows  $\mathbf{w}^{(s)}$ ,  $s = 1, \dots, 4$  such that their bandlimits are  $\lceil 48/2 \rceil + 1 = 25$ . They are plotted in Figure 4.2 (a-h). Approach 3.2 is applied to recover  $\mathbf{z}$  by its STFT measurements in (3.15) associated with the four windows. Its recovery error is  $4.9823 \times 10^{-13}$ . Correspondingly, the graph of  $|\mathbf{z} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\pm|$  is plotted in Figure 4.3 (b). Next Approach 3.3 is conducted to check Theorem 3.6. For this, we choose two analytic windows  $\mathring{\mathbf{w}}^{(s)}$ ,  $s = 1, 2$  such that they are plotted in Figure 4.2 (i-l). The corresponding recovery error is  $3.9023 \times 10^{-12}$ . The graph of  $|\mathbf{z} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\pm|$  is plotted in Figure 4.3 (c). The three errors are mainly derived from the roundoff error of computation. They imply that Approach 3.1 using windows of narrow bandlimits outperforms Approaches 3.2 and 3.3 using windows of wide bandlimits.

**4.2. Application: exact recovery of instantaneous frequency.** The IF  $\mathbf{z}_\varphi = (\varphi^*(0), \dots, \varphi^*(47))$  of  $\mathbf{z}$  in subsection 4.1 is defined by (1.1). It is referred to as the

analytic IF of  $\mathbf{x}$  (c.f.[15]). The IF of  $\mathbf{z}$  is plotted in Figure 4.3 (d). The IF error is defined as  $|\mathbf{z}_\varphi - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\varphi^\pm|$  where  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\pm$  is as in (4.1). Correspondingly, the three IF recovery errors are plotted in Figures 4.3 (e-g). They are derived from the STFT-PR error addressed in subsection 4.1. Naturally, as in subsection 4.1 the IF recovery error from Approach 3.1 is much smaller than those from Approaches 3.2 and 3.3.




FIGURE 4.1. (a) The graph of the real part of  $\mathbf{z}$ ; (b) The graph of the imaginary part of  $\mathbf{z}$ ; (c) The graph of the real part of the window  $\mathbf{w}$ ; (d) The graph of the imaginary part of the window  $\mathbf{w}$ .

## 5. CONCLUSION

This paper concerns on the phase retrieval of analytic signals in  $\mathbb{C}^N$  by STFT measurements. For the window of STFT being bandlimited, we examine the structure of STFT. In particular, if the windows are  $B$ -bandlimited our main results state that a generic analytic signal can be determined up to a sign by  $(3\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor + 1)$  measurements. What is more, if  $N$  is even and the windows are also analytic then the above number of measurements can be reduced to  $(3\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1)$ . Several approaches are provided to do STFT-PR for difference cases of bandlimit. As an application, the main results are applied to exactly recover the instantaneous frequency.

## 6. APPENDIX

### 6.1. Proof of Theorem 3.4.

#### 6.1.1. An auxiliary result.

**Lemma 6.1.** Suppose that the window  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^N$  is  $B$ -bandlimited such that  $2 \leq B \leq \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$ . Consequently, there exists  $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$  such that  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_i = \dots = \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B-1} = 0$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B} \neq 0$ . Then for any analytic signal  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$  such that its DFT  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}} = (\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor}, 0, \dots, 0)$ , we have the followings:

**Case I:  $N$  is even.** The component  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor}$  can be determined (up to a sign) by the measurement  $|\widehat{y}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - (i+N-B), 0}^{\mathbf{w}}|$ .




FIGURE 4.2. (a-h) The real and imaginary parts of the four windows  $\mathbf{w}^{(s)}$  used in Approach 3.2; (i-l) The real and imaginary parts of the two windows  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}^{(1)}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}^{(2)}$  used in Approach 3.2.

**Case II:  $N$  is odd.** The component  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor}$  can be determined (up to a unimodular scalar) by  $|\hat{y}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - (i+N-B), 0}^{\mathbf{w}}|$ .

*Proof.* One can check that  $|\hat{y}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - (i+N-B), 0}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{N} |\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B}|$ . Then  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} = \frac{N |\hat{y}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - (i+N-B), 0}^{\mathbf{w}}|}{|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B}|} e^{i\theta_0}$ . By Proposition 2.1 for  $N$  being even we have  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \in \mathbb{R}$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

6.1.2. *Proof of Theorem 3.4.* We just need to complete the proof for  $N$  being even. It can be similarly completed for the odd case. The proof will be completed by induction. By Lemma 6.1 or Step 1 of Approach 3.1, the component  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}$  can be determined up




FIGURE 4.3. (a) The recovery error of Approach 3.1; (b) The recovery error of Approach 3.2; (c) The recovery error of Approach 3.3; (d) The instantaneous frequency of  $\mathbf{z}$ ; (e) The instantaneous frequency error of Approach 3.1; (f) The instantaneous frequency error of Approach 3.2; (g) The instantaneous frequency error of Approach 3.3.

to a sign by the measurement  $|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2}-(i+N-B),0}^{\mathbf{w}}|$ . Denote such a determination result by  $\epsilon \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}$  with  $\epsilon \in \{1, -1\}$ . In what follows, we discuss how to recover other components.

We first address the recovery of  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}$  by Step 2 of Approach 3.1. One can check that (3.7) holds, namely

$$(6.1) \quad \frac{N|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2}-1-(i+N-B),m_j}^{\mathbf{w}}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B}\omega^{(i+N-B)m_j}|} = |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1} + v_{j,\frac{N}{2}-1}|,$$

where  $v_{j,\frac{N}{2}-1}$  is expressed in (3.8) and  $j = 1, 2, 3$ . For the generic analytic signal  $\mathbf{z}$ , we have  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \neq 0$ . Therefore, for  $v_{j,\frac{N}{2}-1}$  in (3.8) we have

$$\frac{v_{1,\frac{N}{2}-1} - v_{2,\frac{N}{2}-1}}{v_{1,\frac{N}{2}-1} - v_{3,\frac{N}{2}-1}} = \frac{\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_2}}{\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_3}}.$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have  $\Im\left(\frac{v_{1,\frac{N}{2}-1} - v_{2,\frac{N}{2}-1}}{v_{1,\frac{N}{2}-1} - v_{3,\frac{N}{2}-1}}\right) \neq 0$ . Then it follows from Lemma 3.1 that there exists a unique solution to the equation system (6.1) w.r.t  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}$ . Clearly,  $\epsilon \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}$  is a solution. Then it is the unique one. In what follows, we address how to recover other components  $\{\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-2}, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0\}$ . As in Step 3 of Approach 3.1, based on



the measurements

$$\{|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2}-(i+N-B),0}^{\mathbf{w}}|, |\widehat{y}_{\ell-(i+N-B),m_j}^{\mathbf{w}}| : \ell = \frac{N}{2} - 1, \dots, k_0, 0 \leq m_j \leq \lceil N/L \rceil - 1, j = 1, 2, 3\},$$

suppose that  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_k$  has been obtained for any  $k \in \{\frac{N}{2}, \frac{N}{2} - 1, \dots, k_0\}$  with  $k_0 \in \{\frac{N}{2}, \frac{N}{2} - 1, \dots, 1\}$ . Then one can check that (3.9) holds, namely,

$$(6.2) \quad \frac{N|\widehat{y}_{k_0-1-(i+N-B),m_j}^{\mathbf{w}}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B}\omega^{(i+N-B)m_j}|} = |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1} + v_{j,k_0-1}|, j = 1, 2, 3.$$

The quantity  $v_{j,k_0-1}$  is as in (3.10), namely,

$$(6.3) \quad v_{j,k_0-1} := \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{\frac{N}{2}-k_0+1} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1+l} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B+l}\omega^{(i+N-B+l)m_j}}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B}\omega^{(i+N-B)m_j}}.$$

Define

$$f(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0}) := \frac{v_{1,k_0-1} - v_{2,k_0-1}}{v_{1,k_0-1} - v_{3,k_0-1}}.$$

Recall that  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+N-B+1} \neq 0$ . Then one can check that  $f(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0})$  meets the requirements in Lemma 3.2 for the generic analytic signal  $\mathbf{z}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 3.1 the component  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1}$  can be determined by the equation system (6.2). By the induction, the proof can be completed.

**6.2. Proof of Theorem 3.5.** It follows from the first row of (3.14) that

$$(6.4) \quad |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N,0}^{\mathbf{w}(s)}| = \frac{1}{N} |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}^{(s)} + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i-1+N}^{(s)}|,$$

where  $s = 1, \dots, 4$ . Then

$$(6.5) \quad (\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}^{(s)} + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i-1+N}^{(s)}) \overline{(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor-1}^{(s)} + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i-1+N}^{(s)})} = N^2 |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N,0}^{\mathbf{w}(s)}|^2.$$

One can check that (6.5) can be reexpressed as

$$(6.6) \quad \mathcal{A}_0 \begin{pmatrix} |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor}|^2 \\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0^2 \\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} N^2 |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N,0}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|^2 \\ N^2 |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N,0}^{\mathbf{w}(2)}|^2 \\ N^2 |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N,0}^{\mathbf{w}(3)}|^2 \\ N^2 |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N,0}^{\mathbf{w}(4)}|^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is defined in Approach 3.2 (3.17). Since  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is invertible and  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  then  $(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor})$  can be determined up to a sign by the four measurements in (6.4). We denote such a recovery result by  $\epsilon(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor})$  with  $\epsilon \in \{1, -1\}$ . In what follows, we discuss how to determine other components of  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$ .

We first address the recovery of  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}$  by Step 2 of Approach 3.2. One can check that

$$(6.7) \quad \frac{N|\widehat{y}_{N-i, m_j}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1)m_j}|} = |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} + v_{j, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}|, j = 1, 2, 3,$$

where

$$(6.8) \quad v_{j, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} := \frac{\epsilon \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor)m_j}}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1)m_j}}.$$

For the generic analytic signal  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ , we have  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor} \neq 0$ . Therefore,

$$\frac{v_{1, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} - v_{2, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}}{v_{1, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} - v_{3, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}} = \frac{\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_2}}{\omega^{m_1} - \omega^{m_3}}.$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\Im \left( \frac{v_{1, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} - v_{2, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}}{v_{1, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1} - v_{3, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}} \right) \neq 0.$$

Now it follows from Lemma 3.1 that there exists a unique solution to the equation system (6.7) w.r.t  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}$ . Clearly,  $\epsilon \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}$  is a solution. Then it is the unique solution. In what follows, we address how to recover other components  $\{\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 2}, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_1\}$ .

As in Step 3 of Approach 3.2, based on the measurements

$$(6.9) \quad \left\{ |\widehat{y}_{1-i+N, 0}^{\mathbf{w}(s)}|, |\widehat{y}_{\ell-(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1), m_j}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}| : \ell = \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, k_0, \right. \\ \left. s = 1, 2, 3, 4, 0 \leq m_j \leq \lceil N/L \rceil - 1, j = 1, 2, 3 \right\},$$

suppose that  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_k$  has been determined for any  $k \in \{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, k_0, 0\}$  with  $k_0 \in \{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, 2\}$ . We next recover  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1}$ . One can check that

$$(6.10) \quad \frac{N|\widehat{y}_{k_0-1-(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1), m_j}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}|}{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1)m_j}|} = |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1} + v_{j, k_0-1}|, j = 1, 2, 3,$$

where

$$(6.11) \quad v_{j, k_0-1} := \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - k_0 + 1} \epsilon \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1+l} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1+l}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1+l)m_j}}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1}^{(1)} \omega^{(i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor - 1)m_j}}.$$

Define

$$(6.12) \quad g(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0}) := \frac{v_{1,k_0-1} - v_{2,k_0-1}}{v_{1,k_0-1} - v_{3,k_0-1}}$$

Recall that  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{i+\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor}^{(1)} \neq 0$ . For the generic analytic signal  $\mathbf{z}$ , it holds that  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0} \neq 0$ . Now it follows from Lemma 3.2 that  $\Im(g(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0})) \neq 0$ . By Lemma 3.1,  $\epsilon \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k_0-1}$  can be determined. This completes the proof.

### 6.3. A lemma for proving Theorem 3.6.

**Lemma 6.2.** Suppose that  $N$  is even, and  $\mathbf{z}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{C}^N$  are both generic analytic signals such that their DFTs  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}} = (\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}, 0, \dots, 0)$  and  $\widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} = (\widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_0, \widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_{\frac{N}{2}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ . Moreover, the STFT separation parameter  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\lceil N/L \rceil \geq 3$ , and  $\mathbf{w}$  is an analytic window such that  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 \neq 0$ . If  $|\widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_{\frac{N}{2}}| \neq |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}|$  then their STFT (w.r.t  $\mathbf{w}$ ) magnitudes are different from each other.

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.1, both  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}$  and  $\widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_{\frac{N}{2}}$  are real-valued. Suppose that  $\widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_{\frac{N}{2}} = \lambda \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}$  such that  $\pm 1 \neq \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . We just need to prove that there exists  $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lceil N/L \rceil - 1\}$  such that the STFT magnitudes at  $(\frac{N}{2} - 1, m)$  of  $\mathbf{z}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$  are different to each other. If not, we arbitrarily choose distinctive  $m_1, m_2, m_3 \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lceil N/L \rceil - 1\}$ . Then we have

$$(6.13) \quad \frac{1}{N} |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1 \omega^{m_j}| = |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2}-1, m_j}^{\mathbf{w}}| = \frac{1}{N} |\widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1 \omega^{m_j}|, j = 1, 2, 3.$$

Since  $\widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_{\frac{N}{2}} = \lambda \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}$  then

$$(6.14) \quad |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1 \omega^{m_j}|^2 = |\widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \lambda \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1 \omega^{m_j}|^2.$$

Using Proposition 2.1 again,  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0$  is real-valued. Then one can check that (6.14) is equivalent to

$$(6.15) \quad (\lambda^2 - 1) \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^2 |\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1|^2 + (|\widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}|^2 - |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}|^2) \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^2 + 2 \Re\{\overline{\omega^{m_j} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} (\lambda \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1} - \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1})\} = 0.$$

Multiplying  $\omega^{m_j}$  on both sides of (6.15) leads to

$$(6.16) \quad [(\lambda^2 - 1) \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^2 |\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1|^2 + (|\widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}|^2 - |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}|^2) \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^2] \omega^{m_j} + (\lambda - 1) \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \overline{\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 \omega^{2m_j} + (\lambda - 1) \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 \overline{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1} = 0.$$

Consider the following equation w.r.t  $x$ :

$$(6.17) \quad [(\lambda^2 - 1) \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^2 |\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1|^2 + (|\widehat{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}|^2 - |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}|^2) \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^2] x + (\lambda - 1) \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \overline{\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 x^2 + (\lambda - 1) \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 \overline{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1} = 0.$$

If the polynomial on the left-hand side of (6.17) is a non-zero polynomial, then there are at most two solutions to the above equation. By (6.16),  $\omega^{m_j}, 0 \leq m_j \leq \lceil N/L \rceil -$

1,  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , are the three solutions to (6.17). Therefore, all the coefficients in (6.17) are zero. Then

$$(6.18) \quad (\lambda - 1) \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \overline{\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0 = 0.$$

For  $\mathbf{z}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$  being generic analytic signals, neither of  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}$  is zero. Now it follows from (6.18) that  $\lambda = 1$ . This contradicts with the previous assumption. The proof is concluded.  $\square$

**6.4. Proof of Theorem 3.6.** Recalling  $\mathbf{z}$ ,  $\mathbf{w}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathbf{w}^{(2)}$  are all analytic, it follows from Proposition 2.1 (i) that  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}, \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)}, \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)}, \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)}$  are all real-valued. We first consider the equation system w.r.t the real-valued variables  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$(6.19) \quad \begin{cases} |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| = \frac{1}{N} |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}|, \\ |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| = \frac{1}{N} |\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} + \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0 \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)}|. \end{cases}$$

For the matrix in (3.25) being invertible, one can check that the solutions (up to a global sign) to (6.19) are

$$(6.20) \quad (\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}) = \left( \frac{N(-|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} + |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}}, \frac{N(|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}} \right)$$

and

$$(6.21) \quad (\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}}) = \left( \frac{N(-|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} - |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}}, \frac{N(|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} + |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}} \right).$$

Moreover, one can check that

$$(6.22) \quad \left| \frac{N(|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}} \right| = \left| \frac{N(|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} + |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}} \right|$$

if and only if

$$(6.23) \quad |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} = 0 \text{ or } |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)} = 0.$$

Clearly, for the generic analytic signal  $\mathbf{z}$  and windows  $\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \mathbf{w}^{(2)}$ , the condition in (6.23) does not hold. Stated another way, for the generic signal  $\mathbf{z}$  we have

$$(6.24) \quad \left| \frac{N(|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}} \right| \neq \left| \frac{N(|\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(1)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} + |\widehat{y}_{\frac{N}{2},0}^{\mathbf{w}^{(2)}}| \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)})}{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(2)} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(2)} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\frac{N}{2}}^{(1)}} \right|.$$

Now combining (6.24) and Lemma 6.2,  $(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}})$  is given by either (6.20) or (6.21). That is, from the two measurements in (6.19) the vector  $\epsilon(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}})$  can be obtained with  $\epsilon \in \{1, -1\}$ . Having  $\epsilon(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}})$  at hand, through the similar procedures in the proof of Theorem 3.5, other components  $\{\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\frac{N}{2}-1}\}$  can be determined (up to the sign  $\epsilon$ ) by the  $(\frac{3N}{2} - 3)$  measurements

$$(6.25) \quad \left\{ |\widehat{y}_{k,m_j}^{\mathbf{w}(1)}| = \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{k+l} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_l^{(1)} \omega^{lm_j} \right|, k = \frac{N}{2} - 1, \dots, 1, 0 \leq m_j \leq \lceil N/L \rceil - 1, j = 1, 2, 3 \right\}.$$

This completes the proof.

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. Alaifari, M. Wellershoff, Uniqueness of STFT phase retrieval for bandlimited functions, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 2021, 50, 34-48.
- [2] R. Balan, Reconstruction of Signals from Magnitudes of Redundant Representations: The Complex Case, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 2016, 16, 677-721.
- [3] R. Balan, Y. Wang, Invertibility and robustness of phaseless reconstruction, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 38(3), 469-488, 2015.
- [4] R. Balan, D. Zou, On Lipschitz analysis and Lipschitz synthesis for the phase retrieval problem, *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 496, 152-181, 2016.
- [5] T. Bendory, Y. C. Eldar, A least squares approach for stable phase retrieval from short-time Fourier transform magnitude, *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:1510.00920, 2015.
- [6] T. Bendory, C. Cheng, D. Edidin, Near-optimal bounds for signal recovery from blind phaseless periodic short-time Fourier transform, *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2112.02836, 2021.
- [7] T. Bendory, D. Edidin, Y. C. Eldar, On signal reconstruction from FROG measurements, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 2020, 48(3), 1030-1044.
- [8] T. Bendory, D. Edidin, Y. C. Eldar, Blind phaseless short-time Fourier transform recovery, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2019, 66(5), 3232-3241.
- [9] T. Bendory, Y. C. Eldar, N. Boumal, Non-convex phase retrieval from STFT measurements, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2017, 64(1), 467-484.
- [10] I. Bojarovska, A. Flinth, Phase retrieval from Gabor measurements, *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 2016, 22, 542-567.
- [11] E. J. Candès, X. Li, M. Soltanolkotabi, Phase retrieval from coded diffraction patterns, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 2015, 39, 277-299.
- [12] C. K. Chui, An Introduction to Wavelets, *Academic Press*, 1992.
- [13] L. Cohen, Time-Frequency Analysis, *Prentice Hall*, 1995.
- [14] P. Dang, T. Qian, Z. You, Hardy-Sobolev spaces decomposition in signal analysis, *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 2011, 17, 36-64.
- [15] P. Dang, T. Qian, Y. Yang, Hardy-Sobolev derivatives of phase and amplitude, and their applications, *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 2012, 35(17), 2017-2030.
- [16] P. Dang, T. Qian, Analytic Phase Derivatives, All-pass filters and signals of minimum phase, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 2011, 59(10), 4708-4718.
- [17] J. C. Dainty, J. R. Fienup, Phase retrieval and image reconstruction for astronomy, *Image Recovery: Theory and Application*, 1987, 231: 275.

- [18] I. Daubechies, Ten Lectures on Wavelets. *CBMS-NSF Series in Applied Mathematics*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1992.
- [19] Y. C. Eldar, P. Sidorenko, D. G. Mixon, S. Barel, O. Cohen, Sparse phase retrieval from short-time Fourier measurements, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 2014, 22(5), 638-642.
- [20] J. R. Fienup, Reconstruction of an object from the modulus of its Fourier transform, *Optics letters*, 1978, 3(1), 27-29.
- [21] R. A. Gonsalves, Small-phase solution to the phase-retrieval problem, *Optics Letters*, 2001, 26(10), 684-685.
- [22] J. R. Gulley, T. E. Lanier, Model for ultrashort laser pulse-induced ionization dynamics in transparent solids, *Physical Review B*, 2014, 90: 155119.
- [23] B. Han, Framelets and wavelets: Algorithms, analysis, and applications, *Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis*, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017. xxxiii +724 pp.
- [24] D. Han, D. R. Larson, Frames, Bases and Group Representations, *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, 2000, 147.
- [25] T. Heinosaari, L. Mazzarella and M. M. Wolf, Quantum tomography under prior information, *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 2013, 318, 355-374.
- [26] M. Huang, Y. Rong, Y. Wang and Z. Xu, Almost everywhere generalized phase retrieval, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 2021, 50, 16-33.
- [27] K. Jaganathan, Y. C. Eldar, B. Hassibi, STFT phase retrieval: Uniqueness guarantees and recovery algorithms, *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 2016, 10(4), 770-781.
- [28] K. Jaganathan, Y. Eldar, B. Hassibi, Phase retrieval with masks using convex optimization, *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2015, 15506782.
- [29] M. K. Kim, Principles and techniques of digital holographic microscopy, *SPIE Reviews*, 2010, 1, 018005.
- [30] L. Li, C. Cheng, D. Han, Q. Sun, G. Shi, Phase retrieval from multiple-window short-time Fourier measurements, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 2017, 24(4), 372-376.
- [31] Y. Li, Y. Ma, D. Han, FROG-measurement based phase retrieval for analytic signals, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 2021, 55, 199-222.
- [32] L. Li, T. Juste, J. Brennan, C. Cheng, D. Han, Phase retrievable projective representation frames for finite Abelian groups, *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 2019, 25, 86-100.
- [33] J. Miao, T. Ishikawa, I.K. Robinson and M.M. Murnane, Beyond crystallography: Diffractive imaging using coherent x-ray light sources, *Science*, 2015, 348(6234), 530-535.
- [34] L. Marple, Computing the discrete-time analytic signal via FFT, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 1999, 47(9), 2600-2603.
- [35] S. K. Mitra, Digital Signal Processing: A Computer-Based Approach, 3rd ed., *McGraw Hill*, 2006.
- [36] G. E. Pfander, P. Salanevich, Robust phase retrieval algorithm for time-frequency structured measurements, *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 2019, 12(2), 736-761.
- [37] Y. Shechtman, A. Beck, Y. C. Eldar, GESPAR: Efficient Phase Retrieval of Sparse Signals, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 2014, 62(4), 928-938.
- [38] Y. Shechtman, Y. C. Eldar, O. Cohen, H. N. Chapman, J. Miao, M. Segev, Phase Retrieval with Application to Optical Imaging: A contemporary overview, *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 2015, 32(3), 87-109.
- [39] M. Stéphanie, A Wavelet Tour of Signal Processing, *Elsevier Inc*, 2009.
- [40] A. B. Shvartsburg, G. Petite, Instantaneous optics of ultrashort broadband pulses and rapidly varying media, *Progress in Optics*, 2002, 44, 143-214.

- [41] Y. Wang, Z. Xu, Generalized phase retrieval: Measurement number, matrix recovery and beyond, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 2019, 47(2), 423-446.

COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, GUANGXI UNIVERSITY, NANNING, 530004, CHINA

*Email address:* youfalee@hotmail.com

COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, GUANGXI UNIVERSITY, NANNING, 530004, CHINA

*Email address:* whf254679@163.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA, ORLANDO, FL 32816

*Email address:* Deguang.Han@ucf.edu