A QUASI-SYMMETRIC MODEL FOR THE TWO-WAY MIMO COMMUNICATION CHANNEL

Lang P. Withers, Jr.

The MITRE Corporation 7515 Colshire Drive, McLean, Virginia USA 22102-7508 email: lpwithers@mitre.org

ABSTRACT

It is well-known that the wireless MIMO fading channel at any moment in time and at any frequency is not exactly reciprocal or symmetric. This raises the question of how the forward and reverse channel response matrices are related. Clearly we do not want to forfeit all symmetry and merely consider them as two independent instances of a stochastic fading model. Here a more general relation, called **quasisymmetry**, is proposed to relate the incoming and outgoing channel response matrices. We also find that quasi-symmetry is equivalent to simple relations between the complex symmetric singular value decompositions (SVDs) of the two channel matrices. Appropriate background is included on the two kinds of complex linear algebra that originate from the usual conjugate-symmetric scalar product, and the symmetric scalar product, respectively.

Index Terms— MIMO wireless channel, reciprocity, quasi-symmetry, complex symmetric matrices

1. INTRODUCTION

Transceivers with multiple antennas introduce spatial diversity to constructively combine multiple reflections of signalcarrying waves and to combat fading in the physical RF communication channel. Recent signal processing methods for multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) transceivers, such as spacetime block coding and DBLAST, make use of current knowledge of the incoming channel at the receiver [1]. The best performance comes from methods that rely on knowledge of the outgoing channel at the transmitter as well [1][2]. Stochastic models for the one-way MIMO channel, based on those of Rayleigh, Rice, Clarke-Gans-Jakes, Suzuki, and others, have been studied in depth [1][3]. But to date little attention has been paid to the instantaneous two-way MIMO channel, in the sense of defining how the forward and reverse channels are related.

A first answer to the question of how they are related is to say that the channels are reciprocal or symmetric. This





Fig. 1. Symmetric or reciprocal channel: $H_{BA} = (H_{AB})^T$.

is true for electromagnetic waves sent and received between two antennas A and B in empty space, free of any scattering materials. We model the path response from A to B as $h_{AB} = g \cdot e^{i\omega_c \tau}$, an end-to-end gain coefficient times a complex phasor for carrier frequency ω_c and path delay τ between a pair of antennas. The path delay, path loss, and gain at each antenna are the same in either direction, so $h_{BA} = h_{AB}$. This is a **reciprocal** or symmetric relation for the outgoing and incoming paths with respect to A. This reciprocal relation is still true when ideal reflectors are put into the space, which may create multiple paths between A and B or block the direct line-of-sight path, causing interference and fading. The reflectors and A and B can be moving, causing Doppler shifts, but reciprocity holds true.

Next consider a two-way communication channel between two MIMO transceivers A and B, with m_A and m_B antenna elements, resp. This MIMO channel is said to be reciprocal when the incoming and outgoing channel matrices H_{BA} and H_{AB} are such that

$$H_{BA} = H_{AB}^T \tag{1}$$

at each moment in time and for each narrow subband of the frequency band being used. This is true since for each pair of antennas, antenna j at A, antenna k at B, the response entry h_{kj}^{AB} in the matrix H_{AB} (to send from j at A to k at B) equals the entry h_{jk}^{BA} in the matrix H_{BA} (to send from k at B to j at A). Figure 1 illustrates this equality.

However, this symmetry may be broken for actual physical channels. The measured fading coefficients for the incoming and outgoing wireless channel are usually not the same



Fig. 2. Quasi-symmetric channel: $H_{BA}H_{AB} = (H_{BA}H_{AB})^T$ (pictured for elements 1 and 3 of array A) and $H_{AB}H_{BA} = (H_{AB}H_{BA})^T$.

[1]. One reason for this is that the transceivers and antennas may be different at A and B [4]. Physical effects that produce channel asymmetry or non-reciprocity include carrier wave diffraction around barriers, doppler shifts for scatterers with frequency-dependent absorption, and path variation due to motion of A and B or the media during long propagation delays.

As a more realistic property of the two-way channel, we propose a kind of roundtrip symmetry. An asymmetric channel is said to be **quasi-symmetric** when the roundtrip channel matrices are both transpose symmetric:

$$\left(H_{BA}H_{AB}\right)^T = H_{BA}H_{AB} \tag{2}$$

$$\left(H_{AB}H_{BA}\right)^{T} = H_{AB}H_{BA}.$$
(3)

It is clear that any reciprocal channel is quasi-reciprocal. Figure 2 illustrates the meaning of (2) in terms of the roundtrip paths between any two antennas k, ℓ of A: the linear superposition of roundtrip channel coefficients for all paths from k to ℓ equals that for all paths from ℓ to k. (The coefficient h for each one-way path, e.g. from an antenna of A to an antenna of B, represents the total transfer of radiation between the two antennas, e.g. actual multipath.) Let $G_{ABA} = (H_{BA}H_{AB}) = [g_{k\ell}]$. Then (2) means that $g_{k\ell} = g_{\ell k}$, or $\sum_{j} h_{kj}^{BA} h_{j\ell}^{AB} = \sum_{j} h_{\ell j}^{BA} h_{jk}^{AB}$, as shown in Figure 2 for antennas $k, \ell = 1, 3$. The meaning of (3) is of course similar, but for roundtrip paths that begin and end on any two of B's antennas.

1.1. Example of a quasi-symmetric channel

We can show that a MIMO system with asymmetric transceivers has a quasi-symmetric two-way channel. Let us factor the forward channel matrix as $H_{AB} = R_B P_{AB} T_A$, where the complex diagonal matrices $T_A = t_A I_{m_A}$ and $R_B = r_B I_{m_B}$ represent the transmit and receive chains up to the antennas, resp. This assumes that the synchronized transmit chains and receive chains have uniform values within the array on each side A or B, but different values for the two arrays: $t_A \neq t_B$, $r_A \neq r_B$. (If the chain values within an array are nonuniform, digital compensation may be possible since it is a local effect.) Here P_{AB} represents the wireless propagation channel, including antenna gains for all paths. We assume it is

reciprocal: $P_{AB}^T = P_{BA}$. We model the reverse channel matrix similarly as $H_{BA} = R_A P_{BA} T_B$.

Then the two-way channel is not reciprocal $(H_{BA} \neq H_{AB}^T)$, but it is quasi-symmetric. For we have $(H_{BA}H_{AB}) =$ $R_A [P_{BA}T_BR_BP_{AB}]T_A$. The factor $Q = [P_{BA}T_BR_BP_{AB}]$ is symmetric since $T_BR_B = R_BT_B$; that is, $Q = [q_{jk}] =$ $Q^T = [q_{kj}]$. Then $R_AQT_A = [r_{jj}^Aq_{jk}t_{kk}^A]$ is also symmetric, since $r_{jj}^At_{kk}^A = r_{kk}^At_{jj}^A = r_At_A$, for uniform transceiver chains on side A. The same reasoning shows that $(H_{AB}H_{BA})$ is also symmetric. Therefore, by our twofold definition (2,3), H_{AB} and H_{BA} have a quasi-symmetric relation.

The outline for the rest of this paper is as follows. Section 2 gives an overview of the two kinds of linear algebra that we will be using for complex vectors and matrices. In Section 3, we present an equivalent version of quasi-symmetry in terms of SVDs. In Section 4, we discuss how to apply quasi-symmetry in SVD form to two-way channel estimation. We conclude in Section 5.

2. TWO TYPES OF LINEAR ALGEBRA

There are two ways to transpose a complex matrix $A = [a_{jk}] \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$: with or without complex conjugation of its elements. Without, its transpose is $A^T = [a_{kj}]$. With, its transpose is $A^H = \bar{A}^T = [\bar{a}_{kj}]$. What is perhaps surprising is that both transposes (or adjoints) are found together in complex signal processing.

The *n*-dimensional linear space \mathbb{C}^n of complex vectors has two scalar products. With the inner product $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_H = \mathbf{x}^H \mathbf{y} = \sum_i \bar{x}_i y_i$, \mathbb{C}^n is called a Hilbert space. (For *A* not positive definite and $A^H = A$, $\langle \mathbf{x}, A\mathbf{y} \rangle_H$ is an indefinite scalar product [5].) The other scalar product is $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_T = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y} = \sum_i x_i y_i$. Of course they are the same for real vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Both scalar products are non-degenerate, in the sense that if for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle = 0$, then $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$. Both induce a vector 2-norm in the usual way: we define $|\mathbf{x}|_H^2 = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_H$, $|\mathbf{x}|_T^2 = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_T$. But only the first norm squared is positive and 0 only when $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$. The second can be negative, and can be 0 for non-zero vectors called null (or isotropic) vectors (e.g., $|(1, i)|_T^2 = 1^2 + i^2 = 0)$ [6]. Only the inner product obeys the Schwarz inequality. Linear independence and rank do not depend on which scalar product we use, but orthogonality does.

To provide perspective (and remind us that sometimes we must venture outside of Hilbert space), consider some examples involving both types of transpose:

Example 1: The discrete Fourier transform (DFT) matrix is symmetric and unitary: $F^T = F$ and $F^H F = I$, where $F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} [\omega_n^{jk}], \omega_n = e^{i2\pi/n}$. (Also $F^4 = I$.)

Example 2: Given only the complex inner product $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_H$, we can not recover the four real inner products of the real and imaginary parts of the two complex vectors. Write $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{a} + i\mathbf{b}$, $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + i\mathbf{d}$, for $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If we have *both* scalar products, $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_H = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{d} + i(\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{d})$,

and $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_T = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{d} + i (-\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{d})$, it is clear we can recover the individual real inner products $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \rangle$, $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{d} \rangle$, $\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \rangle$, $\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{d} \rangle$, by taking sums and differences. This is essentially why, to specify all auto-correlation statistics of a complex stationary process (e.g., circular complex Gaussian noise) we must use both scalar products [7]. The same is true for complex cross-correlations, and higher-order correlations.

Example 3: Suppose $A = A^T$, with SVD $A = \sum \sigma \mathbf{uv}^H$, with all singular values σ distinct. Since the SVD is unique up to a phasor multiple ρ of each pair \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} , for $|\rho| = 1$, $A = A^T$ implies $\mathbf{u} = \rho \bar{\mathbf{v}}$. Then $\rho = \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \rangle_T$. To balance the SVD, replace \mathbf{u} by $\mathbf{w} = \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{u}$. Then $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \rangle_H = \delta_{\mathbf{ww}'}$, and $A = \sum \sigma \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^T$. This is the Takagi form of the SVD, unique up to a multiple ± 1 of each \mathbf{w} . (For a repeated singular value, ρ becomes a unitary rotation applied to the subspace of singular vectors for that value.)

Example 4: The real and imaginary parts of a unitary matrix U are quasi-symmetric. Let U = A + iB, with Re(U) = A, Im(U) = B, such that $U^H U = UU^H = I$. Then $(A - iB)^T (A + iB) = A^T A + B^T B + i(A^T B - B^T A) = I$, $(A - iB)(A + iB)^T = AA^T + BB^T + i(AB^T - BA^T) = I$. Equivalently, $A^T A = I - B^T B$, $AA^T = I - BB^T$, and $A^T B = B^T A$, $AB^T = BA^T$. From the two imaginary conditions, A^T and B are quasi-symmetric.

The two scalar products generate two parallel versions of complex linear algebra. An orthonormal basis exists for \mathbb{C}^n with either scalar product, and any vector can be expanded uniquely in terms of the basis [6]. The decompositions for $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$ (Gram-Schmidt, EVD, SVD, polar) have analogs for $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_T$, even with null vectors present [8][9][10]. It is always true that rank($A^H A$) = rank(A), but due to null column vectors of A, rank($A^T A$) may be less than rank(A) for a complex matrix A [11]. For simplicity and brevity, in this paper we assume all matrices A are well-behaved, i.e., are diagonizable and have rank($A^T A$) = rank(A).

2.1. Two SVDs of a Complex Matrix

We give a short account of two SVDs (HSVD and TSVD) that result from the two scalar products. We will need the TSVD in the next section, to characterize quasi-symmetry. (Two hybrid SVDs, for H- and T-orthogonal left and right vectors, also exist [14], but are not needed here.) The theorems and proofs in the sequel are presented in a parallel manner: we let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ stand for $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$ or $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_T$; for a matrix A, A^* stands for A^H or A^T ; for a scalar α , α^* stands for its conjugate $\bar{\alpha}$ or α ; resp. We say A is symmetric if $A^* = A$, and define A and B to be quasi-symmetric if AB and BA are symmetric.

A basic principle is that a matrix with either kind of symmetry has eigenvectors that are orthogonal in kind. In the case $A^H = A$, the eigenvalues are easily shown to be real.

Lemma 1. Let A be an $n \times n$ complex matrix. Suppose $A^* = A$. Then eigenvectors of distinct eigenvalues of A are orthogonal.

Proof: Suppose $A\mathbf{v} = \alpha \mathbf{v}$, and $A\mathbf{v}' = \beta \mathbf{v}'$, for $\alpha \neq \beta$. Then $\langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} \rangle = \alpha \langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{v} \rangle$, and $\langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{A}^*\mathbf{v}', \mathbf{v} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}', \mathbf{v} \rangle = \beta^* \langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{v} \rangle = \beta \langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{v} \rangle$. Since $\alpha \neq \beta$, and there are no zero-divisors in \mathbb{C} , it follows that $\langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$. \Box

The two kinds of SVD of a matrix A, denoted by TSVD and HSVD, can both be derived from Lemma 1. In a nutshell, since A^*A is symmetric, with eigenvalues $\alpha \ge 0$, its orthogonal eigenvectors \mathbf{v} are taken as right singular vectors, and orthogonal vectors $\mathbf{u} = A\mathbf{v}/\sqrt{\alpha}$ as left singular vectors. Then the SVD is $A = \sum \sqrt{\alpha}\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^*$ [12][11]. For a full account of the TSVD, see [8].

3. QUASI-SYMMETRY AS AN SVD RELATION

We are now prepared to characterize quasi-symmetric matrices, in terms of their SVDs.

There are two special cases when A and B are quasisymmetric. First, if $B = A^*$, it is clear that AB and BA are symmetric. Second, if A and B themselves are symmetric, quasi-symmetry immediately reduces to usual commutativity of A and B.

As motivation, we begin with a well-known way (key to quantum mechanics) to characterize commuting symmetric matrices in terms of their eigenvalue decompositions (EVDs). **Theorem 2.** Let $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ each be symmetric. Then AB = BA if and only if A and B have the same eigenvectors (not the same eigenvalues).

Proof: Suppose $A = \sum \alpha \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}^*$, $B = \sum \beta \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}^*$. Then it is clear that AB = BA. Conversely, suppose AB = BA. Assume that A and B each have a distinct eigenvalue for every eigenvector. Let A have EVD $A = \sum \alpha \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}^*$. Then for any eigenvector \mathbf{v}_0 of A,

$$A(B\mathbf{v}_0) = BA\mathbf{v}_0 = \alpha_0(B\mathbf{v}_0),\tag{4}$$

Since $B\mathbf{v}_0$ is an eigenvector of A with the same eigenvalue α_0 as \mathbf{v}_0 , the two vectors must be equal, up to some scalar β_0 : $B\mathbf{v}_0 = \beta_0\mathbf{v}_0$. Thus \mathbf{v}_0 is also an eigenvector of B, but with eigenvalue β_0 . The proof when the eigenvalues of A or B are not distinct is too long to include here. \Box

We can generalize Theorem 2 and its proof for quasisymmetric rectangular matrices A and B, using their SVDs: **Theorem 3.** Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$. AB and BA are symmetric if and only if the left and right singular vectors of A are the same as the right and left singular vectors of B, resp. (the singular values of A and B need not be the same). *Proof:* Suppose $A = \sum \alpha u \mathbf{v}^*$, $B = \sum \beta \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u}^*$. Then it is clear that $AB = \sum \alpha \beta u \mathbf{u}^*$ and $BA = \sum \alpha \beta v \mathbf{v}^*$, so that AB and BA are symmetric. Conversely, suppose AB = $\sum \rho u \mathbf{u}^*$ and $BA = \sum \sigma v \mathbf{v}^*$. Assume that A and B each have a distinct (unique) singular value for every pair of singular vectors. Then for any eigenvector \mathbf{u}_0 of AB,

$$BA(B\mathbf{u}_0) = B(AB\mathbf{u}_0) = \rho_0(B\mathbf{u}_0).$$
(5)

Since $B\mathbf{u}_0$ is an eigenvector of BA, it must equal one of its eigenvectors, \mathbf{v}_0 , up to some scalar β_0 : $B\mathbf{u}_0 = \beta_0\mathbf{v}_0$, so that \mathbf{u}_0 , \mathbf{v}_0 are a unique pair of right and left singular vectors of B. Since $\langle \mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_0 \rangle = 1$, $\beta_0 = \langle \mathbf{v}_0, B\mathbf{u}_0 \rangle$. Similarly, for any eigenvector \mathbf{v}_0 of BA, we find $A\mathbf{v}_0 = \alpha_0\mathbf{u}_0$, where $\alpha_0 = \langle \mathbf{u}_0, A\mathbf{v}_0 \rangle$. Thus \mathbf{v}_0 , \mathbf{u}_0 are a unique pair of right and left singular vectors of A. Our space is again too short to prove the case for non-distinct eigenvalues of AB or BA. \Box

Theorem 3 was first found by Eckart and Young, in their paper introducing the general HSVD [13] [11]. **Corollary 4.** A matrix U is unitary iff it has the form $U = \sum \rho \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y}^T$ for real orthonormal vectors \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , and $|\rho| = 1$. *Proof:* Let U = A + iB as in Example 4, where we saw that A^T and B are quasi-symmetric. Their SVDs are real, and by Theorem 3 are related as $A = \sum \alpha \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y}^T$ and $B = \sum \beta \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y}^T$. Therefore, $U = \sum (\alpha + i\beta)\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}^T$ for real orthonormal vectors \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} . Substituting this sum into $U^H U = I$, on the diagonal we have $|\alpha + i\beta|^2 = 1$. This is the TSVD of U. \Box

4. THE QUASI-SYMMETRIC CHANNEL

If a wireless channel is quasi-symmetric in the sense of (2, 3), then by Theorem 3, the TSVDs of the forward and reverse channel matrices have the form

$$H_{AB} = \sum_{k} \sigma_k \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{v}_k^T \tag{6}$$

$$H_{BA} = \sum_{k} \rho_k \mathbf{v}_k \mathbf{u}_k^T.$$
⁽⁷⁾

Quasi-symmetry could be used to constrain H_{AB} and H_{BA} when estimating both of them at one station from training data exchanged between stations A and B. For example, quasisymmetry might be used in the echo-MIMO method, which estimates H_{AB} from $(H_{BA}H_{AB})$ and H_{BA} [2].

The usual HSVD of H_{AB} also plays a role, since optimum matched beamforming at arrays A and B depends on it. By the Schwarz inequality, the principal left and right singular vectors y and x of the HSVD of H_{AB} are the beamformers for A and B, resp., that give maximum link gain $\gamma = \langle \mathbf{y}, H_{AB}\mathbf{x} \rangle_H$ to send a single signal stream [1]. How the HSVDs of H_{AB} and H_{BA} are related when they are T-quasisymmetric as in (6,7) remains an open question.

5. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

A new quasi-symmetric model to relate the incoming and outgoing channel response at one end of a MIMO wireless communication link has been proposed. The relation is more general and flexible than simple reciprocity, but preserves roundtrip symmetry on both sides of the link. As background, we briefly considered two parallel types of linear algebra that occur in processing complex signals, based on taking transposes with and without conjugation. Then we showed that quasisymmetry has an equivalent expression in terms of the TSVDs of the forward and reverse channel matrices. We demonstrated that quasi-symmetry holds for a twoway MIMO channel consisting of a symmetric propagation channel with asymmetric transmit and receive chains on the two ends of the link. Experimental validation of the quasisymmetric relation for real propagation channels and transceiver arrays remains to be carried out in field tests in various urban and rural environments. The TSVD form of quasisymmetry should be a useful way to test forward and reverse channel data from measurements for quasi-symmetry.

Acknowledgement. My thanks go to Robert Taylor for helpful discussions on this topic, and for ref. [4]; and to David Colella for simplifying my proofs of Theorems 2 and 3.

6. REFERENCES

- A. Paulraj, R. Nabar, D. Gore, *Intro. to Space-Time Wire-less Communications*, Cambridge Univ.Press 2003.
- [2] R. Taylor, L. Withers, "Echo-MIMO: a Two-Way Channel Training Method for Matched Cooperative Beamforming," 39th Asilomar Conf. on Sig., Syst., Nov. 2005.
- [3] M. Pätzhold, Mobile Fading Channels, J. Wiley 2002.
- [4] G. Jiann-Ching, L. Larsson, "Modeling and evaluation of MIMO systems exploiting channel reciprocity in TDD mode," IEEE Veh. Tech. Conf., Sept. 2004.
- [5] I. Gohberg, P. Lancaster, L. Rodman, *Matrices and Indefinite Scalar Products*, Birkhäuser 1983.
- [6] B. O'Neill, Semi-Riemannian Geometry, Acad. Press 1983.
- [7] J. Barry, E. Lee, D. Messerschmidt, *Digital Communications*, Kluwer 2003.
- [8] D. Choudhury, R. Horn, "An Analog of the Singular Value Decomposition for Complex Orthogonal Equivalence," Linear and Multilinear Algebra, vol.21, 1987.
- [9] D. Choudhury, R. Horn, "An Analog of the Gram-Schmidt Algorithm for Complex Bilinear Forms," Bull.Inst.Math.Acad.Sinica, vol.26, no.1, 1998.
- [10] D. Choudhury, R. Horn, "A Complex Orthogonal-Symmetric Analog of the Polar Decomposition," SIAM J. on Algebraic and Discrete Mathematics, April 1987, vol.8, No.2.
- [11] R. Horn, C. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge Univ. Press 1991.
- [12] G. Strang, *Introduction to Linear Algebra*, 3rd ed., Wellesley-Cambridge Press 2003.
- [13] C. Eckart, R. Young, "A principal axis transformation for non-Hermitian matrices," Bull. Amer. Math. Society 45, pp118-121, 1939.
- [14] L. De Lathauwer, B. De Moor, "On the Blind Separation of Non-Circular Sources," Proc. EUSIPCO-2002.