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Abstract—Signal reconstruction from magnitude-only measurements presents a long-standing problem in signal processing. In this contribution, we propose a phase reconstruction method for filter banks with uniform decimation and controlled frequency variation. The suggested procedure extends the recently introduced phase-gradient heap integration and relies on a phase-magnitude relationship for filter bank coefficients obtained from Gaussian filters. Admissible filter banks are modeled as specialized methods have been presented [10]–[13]. Here, we introduce an extension of phase gradient heap integration (PGHI), see [13], where a more exhaustive overview and comparison of previous phase reconstruction schemes is given. PGHI uses the phase-magnitude relationship of the STFT with a Gaussian window [14] to compute the phase gradient from the magnitude coefficients and generate a phase estimate by integration.

We derive a generalization of the essential equations provided in [13], valid for certain generalized translation-invariant (GTI) systems [15]. Although we are not able to exactly determine the phase gradient solely from known information, our evaluation shows that the resulting approximation achieves excellent results.

Notation: In this manuscript, we consider continuous or discrete signals of finite energy, i.e., \( s \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \) or \( s \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \). By \( T_x, M_\gamma \) and \( D_\gamma \) we denote the translation, modulation and dilation operators given by \( T_x s = s(\cdot - x) \), \( M_\gamma s = e^{\pi i \gamma \langle \cdot \rangle} s \) and \( D_\gamma s = \gamma^{-1/2} s(\cdot / \gamma) \) and their analogue on \( \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \). Without subscript, \( T \) denotes the time-weighting operator \( T s = (\cdot s) \).

II. GTI SYSTEMS WITH CONTROLLED FREQUENCY VARIATION AND THE DERIVED FILTER BANKS

A generalized translation-invariant (GTI) system on \( L^2(\mathbb{R}) \) is a collection of functions \( \{g_\xi\}_{\xi \in I} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}) \), for some index set \( I \), together with all their translations on the real line, i.e. \( \{T_x g_\xi\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in I} \). Here, we only consider \( I = \mathbb{R} \), identified with frequency, and \( g_\xi := M_\gamma D_\gamma(\xi) g \), where \( g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \) is the prototype function and \( \gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \) is a continuous function of the frequency variable \( \xi \) determining the frequency-bandwidth relationship. We define

\[
G(\gamma, g) := \{g_{x,\xi}\}_{x,\xi \in \mathbb{R}}, \quad \text{where } g_{x,\xi} := T_x M_\xi D_\gamma(\xi) g.
\]

The analysis coefficients of a function \( s \) with respect to \( G(\gamma, g) \) are defined through the inner products

\[
c_s(x, \xi) := V_{G(\gamma, g)} s(x, \xi) := \langle s, g_{x,\xi} \rangle = s * g_{x,\xi}(\cdot)(x),
\]

for all \( x, \xi \in \mathbb{R} \). The final equality shows that \( c_s(\cdot, \xi) \) is a filtering of \( s \) with the filter \( g_{x,\xi}(\cdot) \). The complex-valued function \( V_{G(\gamma, g)} s \) can be described by its magnitude and phase as

\[
V_{G(\gamma, g)} s(x, \xi) = M_{G(\gamma, g)} s(x, \xi) e^{2\pi i \phi_{G(\gamma, g)}(x, \xi)},
\]
for all \( x, \xi \in \mathbb{R} \), where \( M_{G(\gamma,g)}s := |V_{G(\gamma,g)}s| \) is the magnitude and \( \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}^s \) is the phase of \( V_{G(\gamma,g)}s \).

Let \( \{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}) \) be a collection of functions and \( a \in \mathbb{R}^+ \) a decimation factor. The system \( \{g_n,k\}_{n,k \in \mathbb{Z}} \) with \( g_{n,k} := T_{na}g_k \) is a filter bank (FB). The analysis coefficients of \( s \) with respect to \( \{g_{n,k}\}_{n,k \in \mathbb{Z}} \) are

\[
c_n[n,k] = (s, g_{n,k}).
\]

A FB is said to form a frame, if there are constants \( 0 < A \leq B < \infty \), such that \( A\|s\|^2 \leq \|c_n\|^2 \leq B\|s\|^2 \), for all \( s \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \). The frame property guarantees the stable invertibility of the coefficient mapping by means of a dual frame \( \{\tilde{g}_{n,k}\}_{n,k \in \mathbb{Z}} \), i.e.

\[
s = \sum_{n,k} c_n[n,k] \tilde{g}_{n,k}, \quad \text{for all } s \in L^2(\mathbb{R}). \tag{4}
\]

For FBs with uniform decimation, various efficient methods exist for computing the dual frame or at least the synthesis operation \( (4) \), see [16]–[18]. Clearly, if \( \xi : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) is an increasing function, the filter bank

\[
G(\gamma \circ \xi, g, a) := \{T_{na}M_{\xi(k)}D_{\gamma(\xi(k))}g\}_{n,k \in \mathbb{Z}}
\]

is a sampling of \( G(\gamma, g) \) and

\[
c_n[n,k] = V_{G(\gamma,g)}s(na, \xi(k)) = M_{G(\gamma,g)}s(na, \xi(k))e^{2\pi i \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}s(na, \xi(k))}.
\]

### III. Phase-Magnitude Relationships for Gaussian GTI Systems

Assume that \( g \in C^1 \) and \( \gamma \in C^1 \). A straightforward calculation using

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \log \left( V_{G(\gamma,g)}s(x, \xi) \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \log \left( M_{G(\gamma,g)}s(x, \xi) \right) + i \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}^s(x, \xi),
\]

and analogous for \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \log \left( V_{G(\gamma,g)}s \right) \), show that the equalities provided in \((7)\) hold for all \( g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}) \). The derivation steps here are analogous to [19]. Now, if we set \( g = g_0 := 2^{1/4}e^{-\pi(\xi)^2} \), then the equality \( g_0 = -2\pi T_{na}g_0 \) yields \((8)\) and if \( \gamma \) is constant, we obtain the phase-magnitude relationship for the STFT \([14]\).

### IV. Application to Filter Bank Phase (Re)Construction

Given a FB \( G(\gamma \circ \xi, g_0, a) \) as per \((5)\), the results of the previous section can be used to obtain a phase estimate \( \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}^s \) from the magnitude measurements \( |c_n[n,k]| = M_{G(\gamma,g)}s(na, \xi(k)) \). To that end, PGHI \([13]\) is adapted to cope with the more general filter bank structure. Before a phase estimate can be constructed, we have to compute an estimate of the phase derivative from the given magnitude. Assuming that only \( |c_n|, \xi(\cdot) \) and \( \gamma(\xi(\cdot)) \) are known, we have

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}^s(na, \xi(k)) \approx \Delta \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}^s(na, \xi(k)) = 2\pi \xi(\xi(k)) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}^s(na, \xi(k)) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}^s(na, \xi(k)) \approx \Delta \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}^s(na, \xi(k))
\]

\[
:= 2\pi \xi(k) + \frac{\Delta_\xi(\gamma \circ \xi)(k) + \Delta_k (\log(|c_n|))(n,k)}{2\gamma(\xi(k))^2},
\]

\[
\Delta_n(c)(n) := \frac{c(n+1) - c(n-1)}{2a}.
\]

The sampling step in frequency is variable, depending on \( \xi(\cdot) \). Hence, weighted centered differences are used:

\[
\Delta_k(c)(k) := \frac{c(k+1) - c(k-1)}{2(\Delta_\xi(\gamma \circ \xi)(k) + \Delta_k (\log(|c_n|))(n,k))}.
\]

Note that we omit the terms depending on \( V_{G(\gamma,T^2\gamma g)}s \). Although this integration algorithm, described in the next section, is the initialization of the integration and the adaptive selection of the integration path, i.e. when to use \((9)\) or \((10)\).

### V. Implementation and Analysis

In practice, we work with sampled signals and digital filters in \( \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \). The signal \( s \) and the prototype filter \( g \) are assumed to be samples of smooth and localized functions, such that the procedure described above still provides a valid estimate of the phase of \( c_n \). Moreover, we only have to consider a limited number of frequency channels \( k \in K := \{0, \ldots, K - 1\} \), and, if \( s \) is finitely supported, time positions \( n \in N := \{0, \ldots, N - 1\} \), for which to compute \( \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}^s(na, \xi(k)) \). Algorithm 1 (FBPGHI), a modified version of PGHI, is used to compute the phase estimate \( \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}^s \). If \( N \) is very large, or \( s \) has infinite support, RTPGHI \([20]\) can be similarly adapted.

The algorithm introduces several possible sources of inaccuracy. In addition to the errors present in PGHI, we (a) approximate \( \gamma(\xi(k)) \) by a weighted centered difference only involving \( \gamma(\xi(k)) \), \( \gamma(\xi(k) \pm 1) \), where available, (b) disregard the real or imaginary part of \( 2\pi |c_n| \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \phi_{G(\gamma,g)}^s(na, \xi(k)) \) in \((8)\), since there is no straightforward way to obtain them from known information. Therefore, the accuracy of the algorithm rests on \( \gamma \) not to vary too quickly. In this case, the derivative of \( \gamma \) is approximated well by the finite difference scheme and
have proposed to use the spectral difference $E$ original and reconstructed signals. In [7], Griffin and Lim be easily judged by simply comparing the waveforms of the 

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \phi^\phi_{\gamma,g}(x,\xi) = 2\pi \xi - \gamma(\xi)^{-1} \text{Im}\left( \frac{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g') s(x,\xi)}{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \phi^\phi_{\gamma,g}(x,\xi) = -\gamma(\xi)^{-1} \text{Im}\left( \frac{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g') s(x,\xi)}{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \log(M\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)) = -\gamma(\xi)^{-1} \text{Re}\left( \frac{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g') s(x,\xi)}{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \log(M\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)) = -\gamma(\xi)^{-1} \text{Re}\left( \frac{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g') s(x,\xi)}{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)} \right) + 2\pi \gamma(\xi) \text{Im}\left( \frac{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g') s(x,\xi)}{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \phi^\phi_{\gamma,g}(x,\xi) = 2\pi \xi + \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \log(M\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)) + \gamma(\xi)^{-1} \text{Im}\left( \frac{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g') s(x,\xi)}{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \phi^\phi_{\gamma,g}(x,\xi) = -2\pi \gamma(\xi)^{-1} \text{Re}\left( \frac{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g') s(x,\xi)}{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)} \right) + \gamma(\xi)^{-1} \text{Re}\left( \frac{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g') s(x,\xi)}{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)} \right) + 2\pi \gamma(\xi) \text{Im}\left( \frac{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g') s(x,\xi)}{V\hat{g}(\gamma,g) s(x,\xi)} \right)$$

$$\bar{\phi}^\phi_{\gamma,g}(n+1,k) := \bar{\phi}^\phi_{\gamma,g}(n,k) + \frac{\Delta \phi^\phi_{g}(\gamma,g)[n+1,k]}{2} + \frac{\Delta \phi^\phi_{g}(\gamma,g)[n+1,k]}{2}$$

$$\bar{\phi}^\phi_{\gamma,g}(n,k+1) := \bar{\phi}^\phi_{\gamma,g}(n,k) + \frac{\Delta \phi^\phi_{g}(\gamma,g)[n,k+1]}{2} + \frac{\Delta \phi^\phi_{g}(\gamma,g)[n,k+1]}{2}$$

moreover, the factor $\gamma'\gamma - \gamma'\xi$ is expected to be small, such that the missing term has little influence on the result.

VI. EVALUATION

To demonstrate the performance of the proposed algorithm, we applied it to a number of real and synthetic audio signals, using several different filter bank configurations. Moreover, we compare our results to the results provided by the established, iterative fast Griffin-Lim algorithm (fGLA). Phase reconstruction algorithms are usually not expected to recover the original phase exactly and, typically, the reconstruction quality cannot be easily judged by simply comparing the waveforms of the original and reconstructed signals. In [7], Griffin and Lim have proposed to use the spectral difference $E_{\text{spec}}(s,\xi) = 20 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\|c_{\gamma,s} - c_{\gamma,s^*}\|_2}{\|c_{\gamma,s^*}\|_2} \right)$, to measure the distortion of the phase-restored signal $s$. Despite some flaws, $E_{\text{spec}}$ usually provides a useful indicator of the restoration quality. Figure 1(r) shows a typical example of the phase difference between the original representation phase and the phase obtained with FBPGHI. See [13] for more details.

**Evaluation setup:** For the evaluation, we selected seven signals, sampled at $\xi_s = 44.1$ kHz each:

- $s_1[l] = \sum_{k=0}^{2^7} \sin(220\pi \cdot 2^k l/\xi_s), l \in \xi_s$.  
- $s_2[l] = \sum_{k=0}^{2^4} \sin(220\pi \cdot 2^k l/\xi_s) + \sum_{k=1}^{2^4} \delta_{5000k}[l] + \text{echirp}_1[l] + \text{echirp}_2[l], l \in \xi_s$, where echirp$_1$ and echirp$_2$ are real-valued, constant amplitude chirps with exponential frequency modulation and center frequency increasing from 500 Hz to 15 kHz, resp. decreasing from 18 kHz to 3 kHz.
- $s_3$ is $\xi_s$ samples of white noise.
- $s_4$ to $s_7$ comprise 4 second excerpts of a jazz recording (brass and percussion), signal number 54 from the SQAM database [22] (male German speech), Ophelia’s Song by Musetta and a classical Indian melody (both female singing voice).

For each signal, we applied the proposed algorithm and fGLA in five different FB configurations. All FB choices have in common that the filter center frequencies and bandwidths are chosen with respect to a given frequency scale, i.e. we have bins filters per scale unit with a bandwidth of bw scale units.

The tested configurations are as follows:

1) Adapted to the ERB scale [23], bins = 1 and bw = 2, for the full frequency range, see also [18].
2) Adapted to the ERB scale, but bins = 4, bw = 1/2.
3) Adapted to the scale $10 \log(\xi), i.e. constant-Q, bins = 4$ and bw = 1/2, with minimum frequency 30 Hz and maximum frequency $\xi_s/2$, see [24].
4) Adapted to the scale $\text{sgn}(\xi) \cdot (1 + |\xi/4|^{1/2} - 1)$, with parameters identical to the constant-Q FB.
5) Adapted to the scale $8 \text{sgn}(\xi) \cdot (1 + |\xi|^{1/4} - 1)$, with parameters identical to the constant-Q FB.

The latter 2 scales have no particular perceptual relevance and were chosen merely for demonstration purposes. For now, our method only considers uniform decimation by $a$. The chosen decimation factors and resulting redundancies are shown in Table 1.

**Quantitative evaluation:** Table II lists the spectral difference in dB of the solution provided by the proposed algorithm for all combinations of signals and filter banks. It can be seen that, despite considerably different redundancies, the algorithm...
Algorithm 1: Phase Gradient Heap Integration - FBPGHI

Input: Magnitude $|c_s|$ of FB coefficients, estimates $\Delta \hat{\phi}^{s,x}_G(n,k)$ and $\Delta \hat{\phi}^{s,y}_G(n,k)$ of the time and frequency phase derivative, relative tolerance $tol$.

Output: Phase estimate $\hat{\phi}^{s}_{G(\gamma,go)}$:

1. $\text{abstol} \leftarrow tol \cdot \max \{c_s[n,k]\}$;
2. Create set $\mathcal{I} = \{(n,k) \in K \times N : c_s[n,k] > \text{abstol}\}$;
3. Assign random values to $\phi_s(n,k)$ for $k \notin \mathcal{I}$;
4. Construct a self-sorting max heap [21] for $(n,k)$ pairs;
5. while $\mathcal{I}$ is not $\emptyset$ do
   6. if heap is empty then
      7. Move $(k_m,n_m) = \arg \max \{|c_s[n,k]|\}$ from $\mathcal{I}$ into the heap;
      8. $\hat{\phi}^{s}_{G(\gamma,go)}(k_m,n_m) \leftarrow 0$;
   end
   10. while heap is not empty do
       11. $(n,k) \leftarrow$ remove the top of the heap;
       12. if $(n,k+1) \in \mathcal{I}$ then
           13. Apply Eq. (9)(+);
           14. Move $(n,k+1)$ from $\mathcal{I}$ into the heap;
       end
       16. if $(n,k-1) \in \mathcal{I}$ then
           17. Apply Eq. (9)(-);
           18. Move $(n,k-1)$ from $\mathcal{I}$ into the heap;
       end
       19. if $(k+1,n) \in \mathcal{I}$ then
           20. Apply Eq. (10)(+);
           21. Move $(k+1,n)$ from $\mathcal{I}$ into the heap;
       end
       23. if $(k-1,n) \in \mathcal{I}$ then
           24. Apply Eq. (10)(-);
           25. Move $(k-1,n)$ from $\mathcal{I}$ into the heap;
       end
   end
29 end

performs similar for all considered FBs in terms of spectral difference. The possible exception to this rule is the ERB-scale FB(1) with only 1 filter per ERB, which performs worse in almost all cases. Also of note are the large values of $E_{\text{spec}}$ for the noise $s_3$, which is consistent with the evaluations in [13].

Comparison with iterative methods: In [8], [13], it was shown that, for Gabor transforms, gGLA performs comparably or better than other iterative schemes in terms of spectral difference. Since we have no reason to assume that the situation changes in the filter bank setting, we consider fGLA as reference algorithm. In Figure 2, we provide some examples as to how FBPGHI compares to fGLA iterations for the signals $s_4$ to $s_7$ and FB(2). Between 30 and 80 fGLA steps are necessary to achieve the same $E_{\text{spec}}$ as FBPGHI and any meaningful improvement requires a large number of additional steps.

Table I: Decimation factor and redundancy for the considered filter banks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FB</th>
<th>$s_1$</th>
<th>$s_2$</th>
<th>$s_3$</th>
<th>$s_4$</th>
<th>$s_5$</th>
<th>$s_6$</th>
<th>$s_7$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-32.62</td>
<td>-28.76</td>
<td>-12.89</td>
<td>-23.24</td>
<td>-26.96</td>
<td>-31.44</td>
<td>-28.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-34.75</td>
<td>-29.21</td>
<td>-14.30</td>
<td>-23.96</td>
<td>-27.65</td>
<td>-30.28</td>
<td>-28.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>-34.52</td>
<td>-30.76</td>
<td>-14.39</td>
<td>-23.08</td>
<td>-25.70</td>
<td>-32.59</td>
<td>-29.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>-35.72</td>
<td>-31.32</td>
<td>-15.93</td>
<td>-23.41</td>
<td>-28.03</td>
<td>-33.15</td>
<td>-29.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: FBPGHI - Spectral difference values $E_{\text{spec}}$ in dB.

fGLA steps\(^1\). Note that every step of fGLA requires 1 application each of FB synthesis and analysis. Therefore, every iteration has considerable computational cost, while FBPGHI is very efficient, see also [13] for more details. In the same contribution, it was shown that the initialization of fGLA with PGHI provided a significant quality boost over both methods. We expect the same for FBPGHI.

Perceptual performance: Informal listening of the signals restored by the proposed FBPGHI algorithm or 80 fGLA iterations, for signals $s_1$ through $s_7$ and FBs (1) to (5) led to the conclusion that both methods performed comparably and without significant artifacts on all signals\(^2\). No clear performance gap between the algorithms could be detected, with the exception of FB(1) which produced clearly audible artifacts for both FBPGHI and fGLA, albeit on different signals. We attribute these artifacts to the poor frequency resolution of FB(1).

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

We have provided an extension of the recent PGHI algorithm for phase reconstruction to filter banks with controlled frequency variation and uniform decimation. Experiments have shown that the algorithm performs competitively in terms of an established objective error measure and also perceptually. A significant drawback of the proposed method is the required redundancy, in particular for filter banks with highly

\(^1\)For the full set of comparisons, audio examples and extended experiments, please refer to the supplementary material at http://ltfat.github.io/notes/051/.
Figure 2: Comparison of fGLA convergence and FBPGHI. Results were obtained with FB(2).

varying filter bandwidths, see Table I FBs (3),(5). Therefore, a logical next step will be the combination of the heap integration method with nonuniform decimation. Such a scheme will enable the selection of an appropriate sampling step for each frequency channel. Therefore, it can be expected that redundancy is significantly reduced without meaningful impact to the restoration quality. However, the adaptation of the heap integration method to a truly nonuniform sampling grid requires significant work.

In [25], the authors propose an improved phase vocoder based on PGHI for time-stretching and pitch-shifting. A similar application of FBPGHI is conceivable and might possibly further improve the quality of the achieved effect. Future theoretical work could be concerned with finding an appropriate estimate including the neglected terms in (8) as well as estimates for the error if the used filters differ from the Gaussian. Preliminary results\(^1\) have shown promising results for Blackman filters.
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