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A B S T R A C T

In this paper, we study the Cocentered Orthogonal Loop and Dipole pairs Uniform Linear Array (COLD-ULA) which is sensitive to the source polarization in the context of the localization of time-varying narrow-band far-field sources. We derive and analyze nonmatrix expressions of the deterministic Cramér–Rao Bound (CRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)}) for the direction and the polarization parameters under the assumption that all the sources are lying in the azimuthal plane. We denote this bound by ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)}, where the “A” stands for Asymptotic, meaning that the presented results are derived under the assumption that the number of sensors is sufficiently large. While, to our knowledge, closed-form (nonmatrix) expressions of the CRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)} for multiple time-varying polarized sources signal do not exist in the literature, we show that the ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)} takes a closed-form (nonmatrix) expression in this context and is a good approximation of the CRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)} even if the number of sensor is moderate (about ten), if the source signals are not spatially too close. Our approach has two important advantages: (i) the computational complexity of the proposed closed-form of the bound is very low, compared to the brute force computation of a matrix-based deterministic CRB in case of time-varying model parameters and (ii) useful informations can be deduced from the closed-form expression on the behavior of the bound. In particular, we prove that the ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)} for the direction parameter is not affected by the knowledge or the lack of it concerning the polarization parameters. Another conclusion is that with a COLD-ULA, more model parameters can be estimated than for the uniformly polarized ULA without degrading the estimation accuracy of the localization parameter. Finally, we also study the ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)} for \textit{a priori} known complex amplitudes.

© 2012 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Wireless communication systems, including cellular radio, need to operate in increasingly more crowded signal environments. Antenna arrays provide an important capability for separating multiple superimposed communication signals. In this context, polarization diversity along with the spatial diversity has become an important parameter in a wireless communication system. In the localization of narrowband far-field polarized sources context, we can find plethora of estimation methods. In [1], the Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLE) for diversely polarized source localization was proposed. In [2–5], the ESPRIT algorithm using vector sensors has been investigated. Another scheme based on a shift-invariance property is proposed in [6]. MUSIC-based algorithms for this problem have been applied in [7,8] while another approach, based on the MODE algorithm, was introduced in [9]. In [10], the interest of crossed-dipole array is demonstrated for asynchronous DS-CDMA systems and for seismic processing in [11]. In [12], a MUSIC algorithm based on the Higher-Order Statistics is presented, and in [13,14] hypercomplex algebra is used to deal with vector sensor array data.
Identifiability and uniqueness issues associated with the considered model are analyzed in [15–17]. The resolution limit has been derived and analyzed in Ref. [18]. In [19–21], we can find the matrix-based expression of the Cramér–Rao Bound (CRB) for the considered model and in [22], the authors derive and study closed-form (nonmatrix) expressions of the bound for known polarization state and for a known single source. Remark that the assumption of known model parameters leads to optimistic lower bounds [23]. We can find in the literature (e.g. [24,25]) the deterministic and the stochastic CRB. In the first case, considered in this paper, the sources are assumed to be unknown deterministic while in the stochastic case, they are viewed as unknown Gaussian random variables. The deterministic CRB is important since we know that for sufficient Signal-to-Noise-Ratio the MLE meets this bound [26]. As a consequence, this bound is widely used as a benchmark to evaluate suboptimal estimator (regarding the MLE). However, the difficult point with the deterministic CRB is that the number of source parameters grows with the number of snapshots. This implies the inversion of a large Fisher Information Matrix (FIM) and thus a large computational cost. We can find in [27–29], closed-form expression of the deterministic CRB but to the best of our knowledge, this bound for multiple unknown far-field time-varying2 narrowband polarized sources has not been sufficiently investigated.

In this paper, we derive and analyze nonmatrix (closed-form) expressions of the deterministic CRB for multiple unknown far-field time-varying narrowband polarized sources, impinging a Cocentered Orthogonal Loop and Dipole pairs Uniform Linear Array (COLD-ULA) [9]. For simplification we assume that all the sources are localized in the azimuthal plane (i.e. their elevation angle equals $\pi/2$). This corresponds, for example, to a scenario where all the polarized sources are localized at ground level. In order to obtain a nonmatrix expression of the CRB we use the theoretical assumption that the number of sensors tends to infinity, leading to the “Asymptotic” CRB (ACRB). At first glance, this assumption seems severe but we show numerically that the ACRB closely approximates the CRB, even for small/moderate number of sensors and for sufficiently spaced sources. This has already been noticed in context of training sequence design [30] for instance. Nonmatrix expressions of the CRB [31,32,22] are important for at least two reasons: (i) the computation of these expressions is very cheap while the brute force inversion of the FIM can be a cumbersome task in case of time-varying model parameters and (ii) they provide useful informations on the behavior of the bound since they depend explicitly and clearly on the model parameters.

The paper is organized as follow. Section 2 presents the model of the signal observed on the COLD-ULA. The matrix-based deterministic CRB for the COLD-ULA is introduced in Section 3. Section 4 is dedicated to the definition and the derivation of the closed-form (nonmatrix) Asymptotic CRB for the COLD-ULA regarding the direction and polarization parameters. Next, Section 5 presents the analysis of this bound and introduces some comparisons. Numerical validations and illustrations of the proposed nonmatrix expressions of the bound are given in Section 6. Section 7 provides some concluding remarks.

2. Model of the signal received on a Cocentered Orthogonal Loop and Dipole pairs Uniform Linear Array (COLD-ULA)

Consider a uniform linear array consisting of $L$ COLD pairs, two successive pairs being separated by a distance $d$, as shown in Fig. 1. The array is collinear with the $y$-axis of a $Oxyz$ coordinate system with its origin in the center of the first pair of sensors. For each COLD pair, the dipole is parallel to the $z$-axis and the loop is parallel to the $x$–$y$ plane.

Assume $M$ narrowband far-field plane waves impinge on the array from directions described by the elevation angle $\varphi$ and azimuth angle $\theta$. In this paper we suppose that all the sources are contained in the $x$–$y$ azimuthal plane, i.e. $\varphi = \frac{\pi}{2}$, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Furthermore, suppose each signal is a completely polarized transverse electromagnetic wave, with an elliptical polarization of ellipticity $\alpha (-\frac{\pi}{4} \leq \alpha \leq \frac{\pi}{4})$ and orientation $\beta$ ($0 \leq \beta < \pi$) (see Fig. 2). For a given signal polarization, the vertical and the horizontal components ($E_v$ and $E_h$) of the incoming signal electric field $E$ can be specified by polarization constants $\rho$ and $\psi$ [33,9] as

$$E_v = E \cos \rho,$$  

(1)

$$E_h = E \sin \rho \exp(i\psi).$$  

(2)

The values of $\rho$ ($0 \leq \rho \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$) and $\psi$ ($-\pi \leq \psi < \pi$) can be used to compute the polarization ellipse parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$. Fig. 2. Polarization ellipse.
and β [34,35]. For example, ψ = 0 implies α = 0, which means (see Fig. 2) that the source is linearly polarized. A zero value of ρ implies α = 0 and β = 0 meaning that the source polarization is linear horizontal, while if ρ = $\frac{\pi}{2}$, then β = $\frac{\pi}{2}$ and α = 0, i.e. the polarization is linear vertical. These remarks will be used in the following sections to facilitate the interpretation of the CRB results.

2.1. The model of the polarized source mixture recorded on a single COLD pair

Under the given assumptions, the output of the ℓ-th pair of the COLD-ULA represented in Fig. 1 can be expressed by [9,35]

$$\tilde{x}_\ell(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_{\ell}(t) \\ y_{\ell}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} a_m(t) u_m \tilde{z}_m^\ell$$

(3)

in which $x_{\ell}(t)$ and $y_{\ell}(t)$ are the signals recorded on the small loop and short dipole, respectively. In (3), $\tilde{z}_m(t)$ is the phase factor for the mth source, with $\lambda$ the wavelength. The time-varying sources are modeled by $a_m(t) = a_m e^{i(2\pi f_0 + \phi_m(t))}$, where $a_m$ is the non-zero real amplitude, $\phi_m(t)$ is the time-varying modulating phase and $f_0$ is the carrier frequency of the incident wave. $u_m$ is the 2 × 1 polarization state vector given by

$$u_m = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2\pi \lambda A_d}{\lambda} \cos(\rho_m) \\ -L_d \sin(\rho_m) e^{i\phi_m} \end{bmatrix}$$

(4)

where $L_d$ and $A_d$ represent the length of the short dipole and the area of the small loop. In (4) we used the fact that for short dipoles and small loops the output voltages are proportional to the electric field components parallel to dipole and loop, respectively. Note that, from a modeling point of view, we can assume $L_d = \frac{2\pi \lambda A_d}{\lambda} = 1$.

The COLD polarization state vector presents several interesting properties listed below:

P1. $\partial u_m / \partial \theta_m = 0$, i.e. the polarization state vector of a COLD array is not a function of the direction parameter.

P2. $\|u_m\|^2 = 1$, i.e. the norm of the polarization state vector is one.

P3. $\partial u_m / \partial \rho_m = 1$, i.e. the norm of the differentiation of the polarization state vector with respect to parameter $\rho_m$ is one.

P4. $u_m$ and $\partial u_m / \partial \rho_m$ are orthogonal, i.e. $(u_m, \partial u_m / \partial \rho_m) = 0$ where $(.,.)$ stands for the Hermitian inner product.

P5. $\|\partial u_m / \partial \psi_m\|^2 = \sin^2(\rho_m)$, i.e. the norm of the differentiation of the polarization state vector with respect to parameter $\psi_m$ is simply a trigonometric function of parameter $\rho_m$. We have $\|\partial u_m / \partial \psi_m\|^2 \leq 1$.

P6. $(u_m, \partial u_m / \partial \psi_m) = i \|\partial u_m / \partial \psi_m\|^2$, meaning that the Hermitian inner product between the polarization state vector and its differentiation with respect to parameter $\psi_m$ is a pure imaginary quantity, linked to the norm of the differentiation of the polarization state vector with respect to parameter $\psi_m$.

2.2. The space-time model of the data recorded on a COLD-ULA

Let us now define the 2L × 1 vector collecting the observation over the L sensor pairs of the array, according to

$$\tilde{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_0(t) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{x}_{L-1}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} A_m(t) d_m$$

(5)

where $A_m(t) = I_L \otimes (a_m(t) u_m)$ is of size $(2L) \times L$. Operator $\otimes$ stands for the Kronecker product and the steering vector is defined by

$$d_m = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ e^{i\frac{2\pi}{L} d\sin(\theta_m)} & \ldots & e^{i(l-1)\frac{2\pi}{L} d\sin(\theta_m)} \end{bmatrix}^T$$

where the superscript $(.,.)^T$ denotes the transposition operator. Collecting the above observation for T snapshots, the final noise corrupted $(2LT) \times 1$ vector model is

$$y = \tilde{x} + \sigma e$$

(6)

and $e$ is an additive white circular complex centered (zero-mean) Gaussian noise of covariance $I_{2LT}$.

3. Deterministic Cramér–Rao Bound for the COLD-ULA

The noisy observation $y$ in expression (6) is constituted by the deterministic signal of interest corrupted by a complex Gaussian noise. So, the observation $y$ follows a Gaussian distribution such as $y \sim CN(\tilde{x}, \sigma^2 I_{2LT})$ and is a function of the real deterministic unknown parameter vector $\xi$ given by $\xi = [\xi^T, \sigma^2 I_{2LT}]^T$ in which the noise power $\sigma^2$ is an unknown and unwanted (nuisance) parameter and

$$\xi' = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}^T \\ \phi^T \\ \rho^T \\ \sigma^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

(7)

where $\tilde{x} = [a_1 \ldots a_M]^T$, $\rho = [\rho_1 \ldots \rho_M]^T$, $\phi = [\phi(1)^T \ldots \phi(T)^T]^T$ with $\phi(t) = [\phi_1(t) \ldots \phi_M(t)]^T$, $\psi = [\psi_1 \ldots \psi_M]^T$, $\sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sigma_i^2$, $\tilde{x}_i = \theta_i - \tilde{\theta}_i$, are the parameters of interest.

A fundamental result (e.g. [36,37,24]) is the following. Let $E\{[(\tilde{\epsilon} - \epsilon)(\tilde{\epsilon} - \epsilon)^T]\}$ be the covariance matrix of an (locally) unbiased estimate of $\epsilon$, denoted by $\tilde{\epsilon}$ and define the deterministic Cramér–Rao Bound (CRB) dedicated to the COLD-ULA, denoted by CRB(COLD). The covariance inequality principle states that under quite general/weak conditions, we have

$$\text{MSE}[(\tilde{\epsilon}_i)] = E\{(\tilde{\epsilon}_i - [\epsilon_i])^2\} \geq \text{CRB}^{\text{COLD}}(\{[\epsilon_i]\})$$

for $i \in [1 : (T+4)M+1]$. More specifically, the deterministic CRB wrt. the signal parameters, $\epsilon'$, is given by

$$\text{CRB}^{\text{COLD}}(\{[\epsilon_i]\}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \left[F^{-1}_{\epsilon'}\right]_{ii}, \quad \text{for } i \in [1 : (T+4)M]$$

(8)
and
\[
F_{\varepsilon \varepsilon} = \begin{bmatrix}
J_{\theta \theta} & J_{\theta \psi} & J_{\theta \phi} & J_{\theta \varphi} & J_{\theta \alpha} \\
J_{\theta \psi} & J_{\psi \psi} & J_{\psi \phi} & J_{\psi \varphi} & J_{\psi \alpha} \\
J_{\theta \phi} & J_{\phi \psi} & J_{\phi \phi} & J_{\phi \varphi} & J_{\phi \alpha} \\
J_{\theta \varphi} & J_{\varphi \psi} & J_{\varphi \phi} & J_{\varphi \varphi} & J_{\varphi \alpha} \\
J_{\theta \alpha} & J_{\alpha \psi} & J_{\alpha \phi} & J_{\alpha \varphi} & J_{\alpha \alpha}
\end{bmatrix}
\]  
(9)

is the \((M(T+4)) \times (M(T+4))\) Fisher Information Matrix (FIM) wrt. the signal parameter \(\varepsilon^r\). In addition, in (9) we have defined each block of the FIM by

\[
U_{pq} = \mathbb{R} \left\{ \left( \frac{\partial \hat{\varepsilon}}{\partial [p]} \right)^H \left( \frac{\partial \hat{\varepsilon}}{\partial [q]} \right) \right\}
\]  
(10)

with \((\cdot)^H\) being the conjugate-transpose operator, \(\mathbb{R}\{\cdot\}\) being the real part of a complex number and \(\hat{x}\) is the noise-free model introduced in expression (5). Note that to obtain (8), we have exploited the well-known property that the signal and the noise variance (noise variance) parameters are decoupled. So, the CRB for the \(i\)-th signal parameter, denoted by \([\varepsilon^i]\), is given by the \((i, i)\)-th term of the inverse of the FIM weighed by \(\sigma^2/2\). Note that in the case of the deterministic CRB, we need to inverse a FIM of size growing with \(T\). So for large \(T\), this operation may have a high computational cost.

4. Closed-form expressions of the Asymptotic CRB (ACRB) for the COLD-ULA

4.1. Definition of the Asymptotic CRB (ACRB)

In this paper, term “asymptotic” refers to the deterministic CRB considered for a large number of sensors,\(^3\) i.e., \(L \gg 1\). In this case, we define the Asymptotic CRB for a COLD-ULA according to

\[
\text{ACRB}^{\text{COLD}}(\varepsilon) \triangleq \{ \text{CRB}^{\text{COLD}}(\varepsilon') \text{ subject to } L \gg 1 \}
\]

where CRB\(^{\text{COLD}}(\varepsilon')\) is the CRB defined in (8)-(10). As the ACRB\(^{\text{COLD}}\) is essentially a CRB, this bound also satisfies the covariance inequality principle subject to \(L \gg 1\). Note that this assumption seems severe but we will show in the simulation part that this constraint can be relaxed in practice.

4.2. Derivation of the lower bound

In Appendix A, we have reported the partial derivatives wrt. the model parameters of the vectorized noise-free model.

4.2.1. Example of the derivation of two blocks of the FIM

We first derive the \(M \times M\) block of the FIM regarding the direction parameter defined by

\[
J_{\theta m \theta k} = \begin{bmatrix}
J_{\theta m \theta_1} & \cdots & J_{\theta M \theta_m}
\end{bmatrix}
\]  
(11)

where the \((m, k)\)-th entry of the above matrix is

\[
J_{\theta m \theta k} = \frac{4\pi^2 d^2}{\lambda^2} \cos(\theta_m) \cos(\theta_k) \times \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{R}\{ (d_m^H (I_t \otimes (\alpha_m^H(t) u_m^H)) (I_t \otimes (\alpha_m(t) u_m^H)) d_m') \} \\
+ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{R}\{ \frac{2\pi d}{\lambda} \cos(\theta_m) (d_m^H (I_t \otimes (\alpha_m^H(t) u_m^H)) \times \left( I_t \otimes \left( \frac{\partial u_m^H}{\partial \theta_m} \right) \right) d_m') \} \\
+ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{R}\{ \frac{2\pi d}{\lambda} \cos(\theta_k) (I_t \otimes (\alpha_m(t) \frac{\partial u_m^H}{\partial \theta_m})) \} \\
\times \left( I_t \otimes (\alpha_k(t) u_k) \right) d_k' \} \\
+ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{R}\{ (d_m^H (I_t \otimes (\alpha_m^H(t) \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial \theta_m})) \} \\
\times \left( I_t \otimes (\alpha_k(t) \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial \theta_k}) \right) d_k' \} \\
= \frac{4T \pi^2 d^2 \cos(\theta_m) \cos(\theta_k)}{\lambda^2} \mathbb{R}\{ \{ d_m, d_k' \} \hat{r}_{mk} (u_m, u_k) \}
\]

in which \((\cdot)^*\) stands for the conjugate,

\[
d_m' = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & e^{\frac{2\pi i (\alpha_m')}{\sin(\theta_m)}} & \cdots & e^{\frac{2\pi i (\alpha_m')}{\sin(\theta_m)} (L-1)} & e^{\frac{2\pi i (\alpha_m')}{\sin(\theta_m)} (L-1)}
\end{bmatrix}^T
\]

and \(\hat{r}_{mk} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \alpha_m^H(t) \alpha_k(t) = \frac{\delta_{mk}}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} e^{i(\theta(t) - \phi(t))} \) is the sample correlation coefficient of the sources. In the above expression, we used \(P_1 \cdot \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial \theta_m} = 0\). Now, consider that we dispose of a large number of sensors i.e., \(L \gg 1\), we have [24,38]:

\[
\frac{1}{L^2} \mathbb{E}\{ d_m, d_m' \} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} \frac{1}{3} \delta_{k-m}, \quad \frac{1}{L^2} \mathbb{E}\{ d_k, d_m \} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} \frac{1}{2} \delta_{k-m}, \quad \frac{1}{L} \mathbb{E}\{ d_k, d_m \} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} \delta_{k-m}
\]

where \(\delta_{k-m}\) is the Kronecker symbol defined by \(\delta_{k-m} = 1\) for \(k = m\) and zero otherwise. In this scenario, expression (13) can be simplified to

\[
J_{\theta m \theta k} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} \frac{4T \pi^2 d^2 \cos(\theta_m)}{\lambda^2} \mathbb{R}\{ \{ \hat{r}_{mk} (u_m, u_k) \} \delta_{k-m} \}
\]  
(14)
We can see that $\mathbf{J}_{\phi\phi}$ is a diagonal matrix. So, for $m = k$, the sample correlation coefficient is $\hat{r}_{mm} = a_m^2$ and $\|u_m\|^2 = 1$ (see P2.). As a consequence, (14) becomes

$$J_{\phi\phi} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} \frac{4\pi^2 T d^2 L^3}{3\lambda^2} \Delta^2 \Theta^2$$

(15)

where $\Theta = \text{diag}(\cos(\theta_1), \ldots, \cos(\theta_M))$ and $\Delta = \text{diag}(a_1, \ldots, a_M)$. Remark that the sources can be correlated and the number of snapshots does not need to be large. Next we derive the block expressions of the FIM for the time-varying phase of the source. First, we have

$$J_{\phi_m(t)\phi_k(t')} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } t \neq t', \text{ and } m = k, \\ a_m a_k \Re \{ e^{i \phi_k(t) - \phi_m(t')} \} \langle d_m, d_k \rangle \langle u_m, u_k \rangle & \text{for } t = t' \text{ and } k \neq m, \\ 0 & \text{for } t \neq t', \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that, the time-diversity of the model implies that $J_{\phi\phi}$ is block-diagonal. This property is true for any $L$ in the asymptotic regime ($L \gg 1$), each of these blocks becomes diagonal since

$$J_{\phi_m(t)\phi_k(t')} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} L a_m^2 & \text{for } t = t' \text{ and } m = k, \\ 0 & \text{for } t = t' \text{ and } k \neq m, \\ 0 & \text{for } t \neq t', \text{ otherwise.} \end{array} \right.$$ 

and thus

$$J_{\phi(t)\phi(t')} = \begin{bmatrix} J_{\phi_1(t)\phi_1(t')} & \cdots & J_{\phi_1(t)\phi_M(t')} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ J_{\phi_M(t)\phi_1(t')} & \cdots & J_{\phi_M(t)\phi_M(t')} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} \left( L L \Delta^2 \right)_{M \times M}.$$

Using the above expressions, we obtain

$$J_{\phi\phi} = \begin{bmatrix} J_{\phi(1)\phi(1)} & \cdots & J_{\phi(1)\phi(T)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ J_{\phi(T)\phi(1)} & \cdots & J_{\phi(T)\phi(T)} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} L (I_T \otimes \Delta^2).$$

4.2.2. Final expressions of the other blocks of the FIM

Using a similar method as in the previous section and after some tedious derivations, we obtain

$$J_{\phi\psi} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} \left( \frac{-i\pi d_l^2}{\lambda} \right) \Delta^2 \Theta \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi,$$

(16)

$$J_{\phi\phi} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} \left( \frac{\pi d_l^2}{\lambda} \right) \Delta^2 \Theta \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi,$$

(17)

$$J_{\phi\psi} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} \left( \lambda \right) \Delta^2 \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi,$$

(18)

To obtain the above expressions, we used P2. and P3. ($\|u_m\|^2 = \|\partial u_m/\partial \rho_m\|^2 = 1$) and introduced the two block-diagonal matrices: $\mathbf{D} = \text{Bdiag}(\mathbf{u}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_M)$ and $\mathbf{D}_\psi = \text{Bdiag}(\partial \mathbf{u}_1/\partial \rho_1, \ldots, \partial \mathbf{u}_M/\partial \rho_M)$. In addition, we have $J_{\phi\phi} = J_{\phi\phi} = 0_{M \times M}$ and $J_{\phi\psi} = 0_{(TM) \times M}$. Using P4., i.e., $\langle u_m, \partial u_m/\partial \rho_m \rangle = 0$ and $J_{\phi\psi} J_{\phi\psi} J_{\phi\psi} J_{\phi\psi} L \gg 1 \rightarrow 0_{M \times M}$ and $J_{\phi\psi} L \gg 1 \rightarrow 0_{(TM) \times M}$. Since all these quantities are asymptotically pure imaginary complex, they vanish by considering the real part in definition (10).

4.2.3. Block-diagonal FIM

Finally, using the results given in the two previous paragraphs, the FIM is asymptotically block-diagonal and has the following particular structure

$$\mathbf{F}_{\nu'\nu} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} L \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \end{bmatrix}$$

(19)

where the north-west block of size $(M(T + 2)) \times (M(T + 2))$ is given by the sparse band matrix given in Box I.

The south-west block of size $(2M) \times (2M)$ is the following diagonal matrix:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta^2 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & I_M \end{bmatrix}.$$

Box I.

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{V} \Pi \mathbf{V}$$

(20)

where

$$\Pi = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{4\pi^2 T d^2 l^2}{3\lambda^2} \Theta^2 & \left( \frac{-i\pi d_l^2}{\lambda} \right) \Theta \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi & \left( \frac{\pi d_l^2}{\lambda} \right) \Theta & \cdots & \left( \frac{\pi d_l^2}{\lambda} \right) \Theta \\ \left( \frac{i\pi d_l^2}{\lambda} \right) \Theta \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi & T \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi & i \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi & \cdots & i \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi \\ \left( \frac{\pi d_l^2}{\lambda} \right) \Theta & -i \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi & I_M & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots \\ \left( \frac{\pi d_l^2}{\lambda} \right) \Theta & -i \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi & \mathbf{0} & I_M \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathbf{V} = I_{T + 2} \otimes \Delta.$$
It is worth noting that considering large \( L \) implies a strongly structured FIM.

4.2.4. Analytic inverse of the FIM and closed-form expressions of the ACRB

Considering the remarkable block-structure of the FIM in (19), finding an analytic inverse of the FIM is equivalent to finding the analytic expressions of \( A^{-1} \) and \( A^{-1} \). An analytic inverse of the factorized matrix (20) can be easily obtained. Indeed, we have \( A^{-1} = V^{-1} \Pi^{-1} V^{-1} \) where \( V^{-1} = I_{12} + \mathbf{a} \mathbf{a}^H \mathbf{a} \). Before calculating the inverse of FIM, it is necessary to analyze the non-singularity of \( A \) by calculating its determinant. Applying in expression (20) the fact that the determinant of the product is the product of the determinants, we must verify that

\[
\det(A) = \det(\Pi) \det(V)^2 = \det(\Pi) \prod_{m=1}^M a_m^{2(T+2)} \neq 0. \tag{21}
\]

As we assumed that \( a_m \neq 0 \), we have to show that \( \Pi \) is nonsingular. Let define the following partition \( \Pi = \begin{bmatrix} \Pi_{11} & \Pi_{12} \\ \Pi_{12}^T & \Pi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \) where \( \Pi_{22} = I_M \). The definition of the other blocks can be easily deduced. Using a well-known expression of the determinant of a block matrix, we obtain

\[
\det(\Pi) = \det(\Pi_{22}) \det(\mathbf{Q}) \tag{22}
\]

where \( \mathbf{Q} \) is the \((2M) \times (2M)\) Schur complement \([39,40]\) defined by

\[
\mathbf{Q} = \Pi_{11} - \Pi_{12} \Pi_{22}^{-1} \Pi_{12}^T
\]

such that \( \Pi^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \). Note that matrix \( \Pi_{22}^{-1} \) is a nonsingular matrix (\( \det(\Pi_{22}) = 1 \)), so relation (23) is well defined. Consequently, relation (22) becomes

\[
\det(\Pi) = \det(\mathbf{Q}). \tag{24}
\]

Following definition (23), a simple derivation of the Schur complement leads to the following diagonal matrix:

\[
\mathbf{Q} = T \begin{bmatrix}
\pi^2 I_2 d^2 & 0 \\
0 & \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi \\
0 & \mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi^T \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( \mathbf{D}_\psi = \text{diag}(\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_M) \), with \( \phi_m = I_2 - \mathbf{u}_m \mathbf{u}_m^H \) a rank-1 orthogonal projector onto the linear subspace \( \langle \mathbf{u}_m \rangle \) and \( \mathbf{D}_\psi = \text{diag}(\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_M) \) provides a direct link to the largest canonical principal angle [41,42], \( \psi_m \), between the two one-dimensional linear spaces \( \langle \mathbf{u}_m \rangle \) and \( \langle \frac{\mathbf{u}_m}{\|\mathbf{u}_m\|} \rangle \) defined by

\[
\sin^2(\psi_m) = 1 - \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_m, \mathbf{u}_m \rangle}{\|\mathbf{u}_m\|^2}. \tag{26}
\]

Using P5. and P6., we have \( \langle \frac{\mathbf{u}_m}{\|\mathbf{u}_m\|}, \mathbf{u}_m \rangle = \|\mathbf{u}_m\|^2 = \sin^2(\psi_m) \). Thus, an interesting characterization of the largest canonical angle can be obtained by rewriting expression (26) according to

\[
\sin^2(\psi_m) = 1 - \frac{\sin^4(\rho_m)}{\sin^4(\rho_m)} = \cos^2(\rho_m). \tag{27}
\]

As \( \psi_m, \rho_m \in [0, \pi/2] \) and based on the above relation, we have

\[
\psi_m = \pi/2 - \rho_m. \tag{28}
\]

Thus, the largest canonical angle is completely characterized by the polarization parameter \( \rho_m \). Finally, we have

\[
\mathbf{D}_\psi^H \mathbf{D}_\psi^T \mathbf{D}_\psi \mathbf{D}_\psi = R^2 \Psi \tag{29}
\]

where \( R = \text{diag}(\sin(\rho_1), \ldots, \sin(\rho_M)) \) and \( \Psi = \text{diag}(\sin(\psi_1), \ldots, \sin(\psi_M)) = \text{diag}(\cos(\rho_1), \ldots, \cos(\rho_M)) \). Using the diagonal structure of the Schur complement, the determinant of matrix \( \Pi \) using expression (24) is given by

\[
\det(\mathbf{Q}) \propto \det(\Theta^3) \det(R^2 \Psi^2) \tag{30}
\]

where symbol \( \propto \) means proportional to. Thus, to verify \( \det(\mathbf{Q}) \neq 0 \), the following three conditions must be satisfied:

1. \( \theta_m \neq \pi/2 \). This means (see Fig. 1) that the sources must not have DOAs perpendicular to the array. Such a source would produce a zero phase-shift between any two COLD pairs, its DOA being thus unobservable by the array.

2. \( \rho_m \neq 0 \) (i.e., \( \psi_m \neq \pi/2 \)). This means (see Section 2 and Fig. 2) that linear horizontal polarizations are not allowed. Such a polarization would excite only the loops of the COLD array, and would be impossible to observe by the dipoles.

3. \( \rho_m \neq \pi/2 \) (i.e., \( \psi_m \neq 0 \)). This means (see Section 2 and Fig. 2) that linear vertical polarizations are not allowed, either. Such a polarization would excite only the dipoles of the COLD array, and would be impossible to observe by the loops.

All the cases enumerated above would induce a FIM matrix that is singular. Adding the assumption that \( a_m \neq 0 \), we can conclude that under the above four conditions, the inverse of matrix \( \mathbf{A} \) is given by Eq. (31) in Box II, thanks to the well-known geometric equality \( \sin(2\rho_m) = 2 \sin(\rho_m) \cos(\rho_m) \). Considering the diagonal terms of the above matrix up to \( \sigma^2/(2L) \), we obtain:

\[
\text{ACRB}_{\text{COLD}}(\rho_m) = \frac{3\sigma^2}{2LT^2 a_m^2 \pi^2 d^2 \cos^2(\theta_m)} \tag{32}
\]

\[
\text{ACRB}_{\text{COLD}}(\psi_m) = \frac{2\sigma^2}{TL a_m^2 \sin^2(2\rho_m)}. \tag{33}
\]

It remains to derive the ACRB\(_{\text{COLD}} \) for the polarization parameters \( \{\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_M\} \). Firstly remark that \( \mathbf{A} \) is nonsingular if \( \det(\mathbf{A}) = \prod_{m=1}^M a_m^2 \neq 0 \). As, we have assumed
that the real amplitudes are non-zeros, this condition is always verified. The inverse the north-west block of $\tilde{A}$ is simply $\frac{1}{\Delta} A^{-2}$. Considering the diagonal terms up to $\sigma^2/(2L)$ (see (8) and (19)), we finally find:

$$\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\rho_m) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2TLa_m^2}. \quad (34)$$

5. Analysis of the ACRB for COLD-ULA

5.1. Remarks and properties

1. The $\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}$ regarding the direction parameter is anisotropic since the $\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\theta_m)$ depends of $\theta_m$. This is also true and well-known for the uniformly polarized ULA [43].

2. The $\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\theta_m)$ is not a function of the polarization parameters. The intuitive reason for that is the fact that the magnetic loops are insensitive to the source azimuth angles. As the sources are all localized in the azimuthal plane, the polarization vector $u_m$ in (3) and the localization parameter $\theta_m$ are fully decoupled.

However, for elevation angles different from $\pi/2$, this result does not hold anymore. A formal proof for that is not straightforward since the analytic CRB for all elevation-DOAs is arduous to derive.

3. The $\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\psi_m)$ is a function of the polarization parameter $\rho_m$. The inverse is not true.

4. The $\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\psi_m)$ is sensitive to the geometry of the polarization state vector and its derivative with respect to parameter $\psi_m$. The lowest value that the bound $\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\psi_m)$ can reach is $\frac{2\sigma^2}{\pi a_m^2}$ for $\rho_m = \pi/4$. This means [33] that the polarization ellipse orientation angle $\beta = \frac{\pi}{4}$ or the ellipticity $\alpha = \frac{\pi}{4}$ (circular polarization). Both cases imply that the dipoles and the loops are equally excited by the impinging source. The worst performance scenario corresponds to $\rho_m = 0$ (linear horizontal polarization) or $\rho_m = \frac{\pi}{2}$ (linear vertical polarization), in which cases only the loops or only the dipoles, respectively, are excited by the impinging wave.

However, even in the favorable case, the polarization parameter $\rho_m$ is better estimated than the polarization parameter $\psi_m$ as $\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\psi_m) > \text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\rho_m)$, regardless of the parameter values (see (33) and (34)).

5. All the bounds are function of the inverse of the local Signal to Noise Ratio ($\frac{a_m^2}{\sigma^2}$).

6. The $\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}$ for the localization parameter is in $O(1/L^3)$ while the $\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}$ for the polarization parameters are simply in $O(1/L)$. This means that the estimation of the DOAs is much more sensitive to the number of sensors than the estimation of the polarization parameters.

5.2. The known polarization state vector case

Consider the bound, denoted by $\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\theta_m|\psi, \rho)$, where we assume that the polarization state is known. Considering a known polarization state implies that the polarization parameters in vector $e'$ are removed according to $e' = Pe'$ with $P$ a convenient $(M(T + 2)) \times (M(T + 4))$ selection matrix. This produces a reduced-size FIM, $F_{e'e'e'}$, which shares the same block-structure as $F_{e'e}$. Focusing only on block $A$, there exists a selection matrix $P_0$ of size $(M(T + 1)) \times (M(T + 2))$, extracted from the larger matrix $P$, such as

$$A_0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} P_0AP_0^T = (I_{T+1} \otimes \Delta) \Pi_0 (I_{T+1} \otimes \Delta)$$

where $\Pi_0$ can be easily deduced. The key point is that the $(2M) \times (2M)$ Schur complement derived for matrix $\Pi$ in expression (25) can be linked to the $M \times M$ Schur complement of $\Pi_0$ according to $Q^{-1} = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} Q_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \infty \end{array} \right]$. Thus, compared to expression (25), we have $Q^{-1} = \frac{3\sigma^2}{\pi a_m^2} \Theta^{-2}$ and thus

$$\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\theta_m|\psi, \rho) = \text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\theta_m).$$

The result is somewhat unexpected and means that the estimation accuracy of the localization parameter is the same, regardless the knowledge of the polarization state.

5.3. Localization with a COLD-ULA compared to the uniformly polarized ULA

Denote by $\text{ACRB}(\theta_m)$ the ACRB for a uniformly polarized ULA, derived in Appendix B. The number of unknown model parameters (direction parameter, amplitude and phase of the source) in the $\text{ACRB}(\theta_m)$ is $M(T + 2)$ while the number of the unknown model parameters in the $\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\theta_m)$ is higher (equal to $M(T + 4)$). Therefore, a direct comparison between these two bounds is unfair. However, if we consider the case (studied in the previous subsection) of a COLD-ULA where the polarization parameters are known, then the two bounds, $\text{ACRB}(\theta_m)$...
and ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)}(θ|m|ψ, ρ), have the same number of unknown parameters. Comparing expressions (32) and (B.4), we can readily check that

$$\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\theta_m) = \text{ACRB}(\theta_m).$$

This means that with a COLD-ULA, more model parameters can be estimated than with a uniformly polarized ULA, without degrading the estimation accuracy of the localization parameter.

5.4. The case of known complex sources

In this section, we study the ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)} when the complex sources in model (3) are \textit{a priori} known. This scenario is relevant for some particular applications. For instance, in wireless communications the complex sources are perfectly known at the receiver in case of using a set of training sequences (see [44,45] for instance). Thus, the complex sources are no longer desired parameters and we define the unknown model parameters by

$$\epsilon'' \equiv [\hat{\rho}^T, \psi, \hat{\rho}^T]^T.$$

We denote by ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)}(ε''|φ, g) the ACRB for a COLD-ULA array when vectors \(\hat{\epsilon}''\) of initial phases and \(\hat{g}\) of real amplitudes are \textit{a priori} known. We have

$$\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\epsilon''|\phi, g) = \frac{\pi^2}{2} F_{\epsilon''}^{-1}$$

where \(F_{\epsilon''}^{-1}\) is the new FIM with respect to vector \(\epsilon''\). There exists a \((3M) \times (M(T + 4))\) selection matrix \(W\) such that \(\epsilon'' = W\epsilon\), where \(\epsilon\) was defined in (7). Thus, matrix \(W\) removes from \(\epsilon''\) the known parameters (real amplitudes and initial phases). In this case, we have

$$F_{\epsilon''}^{-1} = WF_{\epsilon}W^T$$

$$= LT \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{4\pi^2}{2\lambda^2} \Delta^2 \Theta^2 & (\frac{\pi k}{\lambda}) \Delta^2 \Theta R^2 & 0 \\
(\frac{\pi k}{\lambda}) \Delta^2 \Theta R^2 & \Delta^2 R^2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \Delta^2
\end{bmatrix}$$

since \(D^H D_\phi = iR^2\) and \(D^H_\psi D_\phi = R^2\).

5.4.1. The direction parameter

The Schur complement of the above matrix is given by

$$Q = \frac{4\pi^2}{2\lambda^2} \Delta^2 \Theta^2 (I + 3\Psi^2).$$

A simple derivation yields

$$\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\psi_m|\phi, g) = G_m \text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\theta_m)$$

where \(G_m = \frac{1}{1 + 3 \cos^2(\rho_m)}\). As \(\rho_m \in (0, \pi/2)\), we have \(G_m \leq 1\) (see Fig. 3) and therefore

$$\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\psi_m|\phi, g) \leq \text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\theta_m).$$

As intuitively expected, integrating prior-knowledge on the sources can decrease the ACRB(\text{COLD})(θ_m). We can say that according to Fig. 3, if parameter \(\rho_m\) is close to \(\pi/2\) (the polarization is close to linear vertical), the ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)}(θ_m) is close to the ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)}(θ_m|ψ, ρ) and thus the accuracy estimation for the direction parameter is weakly improved in the case of known sources. Inversely, for polarizations close to linear horizontal, \(\rho_m\) close to zero, the accuracy estimation for the DOA parameter can be considerably improved by taking into account information on the source signals.

5.4.2. The polarization parameters

The \((2, 2)\)-th block of the inverse of the FIM provides the bound for the parameter \(\psi\) according to

$$\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\psi_m|\phi, g) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2T} \left( \Delta^{-2} R^{-2} + 3(I + \Delta^{-2} (I + 3\Psi)^{-1}) \right)$$

or equivalently for the \(m\)-th parameter,

$$\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\psi_m|\phi, g) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2TLa_m^2 \sin^2(\rho_m)} \left( 1 + \frac{3 \sin^2(\rho_m)}{1 + 3 \cos^2(\rho_m)} \right)$$

$$= 2\sigma^2 G_m \frac{a_m^2 \sin^2(\rho_m)}{TL}.\tag{37}$$

It comes the following interesting relation

$$\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\psi_m|\phi, g) \leq 4 \cos^2(\rho_m) G_m.\tag{38}$$

According to Fig. 3, we have

$$\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\psi_m|\phi, g) \leq \text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\psi_m).$$

Here again, integrating the prior-knowledge of the sources can decrease the ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)}(\psi_m). We can say that according to Fig. 3, if the polarization is close to linear horizontal (\(\rho_m\) is close to zero), the ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)}(\psi_m) is close to the ACRB\textsuperscript{(COLD)}(\psi_m|\phi, g). On the contrary, for values of \(\rho_m\) close to \(\pi/2\) (polarization close to linear vertical), the prior-knowledge of the sources allows to better estimate parameter \(\psi_m\).

Regarding the polarization parameter \(\rho_m\), we have

$$\text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\rho_m|\phi, g) = \text{ACRB}^{(\text{COLD})}(\rho_m).$$
6. Numerical analysis of the bound

We consider a COLD-ULA with $L = 13$ sensors with half-wavelength inter-spacing sensors. Two narrowband far-field sources ($M = 2$) are located according to $\theta_1 = -70^\circ$ and $\theta_2 = 10^\circ$ with unit real amplitudes ($a_1 = a_2 = 1$). The polarization state is parametrized by $\rho_1 = 60^\circ$, $\rho_2 = 15^\circ$, $\psi_1 = 5^\circ$ and $\psi_2 = 15^\circ$.

6.1. Relative Squared Error

The CRB$^{\text{COLD}}$ is computed for the direction and polarization parameters by a numerical evaluation and inversion of the FIM and compared to the proposed ACRB$^{\text{COLD}}$. On Fig. 4(a), we have drawn the Relative Squared Error (RSE) defined by

$$\text{RSE}(\theta_1) = \frac{|\text{CRB}^{\text{COLD}}(\theta_1) - \text{ACRB}^{\text{COLD}}(\theta_1)|^2}{|\text{CRB}^{\text{COLD}}(\theta_1)|^2}$$

for the direction parameter $\theta_1$, for $T = 100$ snapshots and for a fixed noise variance ($\sigma^2 = 1$). The RSE($\psi_1$) and RSE($\rho_1$) are accordingly introduced and drawn in Fig. 4(b) and (c), respectively. The RSE has a nice property given by $0 < \text{RSE}(\cdot) < 1$.

This can be shown by noting that ACRB$^{\text{COLD}}$($\cdot$) > 0, thus CRB$^{\text{COLD}}$($\cdot$) - ACRB$^{\text{COLD}}$($\cdot$) < CRB$^{\text{COLD}}$($\cdot$). Considering the squared absolute value, one gets

$$|\text{CRB}^{\text{COLD}}(\cdot) - \text{ACRB}^{\text{COLD}}(\cdot)|^2 < |\text{CRB}^{\text{COLD}}(\cdot)|^2.$$

This means that the approximation error by considering the ACRB$^{\text{COLD}}$ wrt. the CRB$^{\text{COLD}}$ itself. It is well-known that at high SNR and for not too closely-spaced sources, the CRB$^{\text{COLD}}$ takes a small value. This means that the approximation error is small.

According to Fig. 4(b) and (c), we can see that the decrease of the RSE with respect to the number of sensors for the direction and polarization parameters is given by RSE($\theta_1$), RSE($\psi_1$), RSE($\rho_1$) ~ $O(1/L^5)$.

In addition, we can also note that even for a small of number of sensors, as for instance 13 sensors, the RSE is small since RSE($\theta_1$) ~ $10^{-3}$, RSE($\psi_1$) ~ $10^{-4}$ and RSE($\rho_1$) ~ $10^{-4}$. From a practical point of view, this means that the asymptotic assumption is not severe and the asymptotic regime is rapidly reached for sufficiently spaced sources. Remark that a similar observation has been done in [30]. According to Fig. 5, we can see that even for a moderate number of sensors, all the ACRB$^{\text{COLD}}$ are very close to their corresponding CRB$^{\text{COLD}}$, for sufficiently spaced sources. We can verify that the ACRB$^{\text{COLD}}$ for the direction parameter is identical to the CRB$^{\text{COLD}}$ for the same parameter with known polarization state (see Section 5.2). We also verify the result derived in Section 5.4 for the case where the complex sources are known.

It is also interesting to plot (see Fig. 6(a)) the RSE wrt. the proximity of the sources. We can see that the RSE is maximal (close to one) if the sources are very close. In this scenario, the ACRB$^{\text{COLD}}$ is not a consistent approximation of the CRB$^{\text{COLD}}$. Nevertheless, if the constraint of proximity of the sources is relaxed, the ACRB$^{\text{COLD}}$ becomes a valid approximation of the CRB$^{\text{COLD}}$ (see Fig. 6(b)).

6.2. Asymptotic numerical diagonality of the block of the FIM regarding the direction parameter

Consider on Fig. 7, an error metric relatively to the diagonal term of $J_{\theta\theta}$ defined by

$$E_{mk}(L) = (J_{m\theta_k} - J_{m\theta_k}^2)/|J_{m\theta_k}|^2$$

where $J_{m\theta_k} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} J_{m\theta_k}$. For $m \neq k$ (resp. $m = k$), we consider the error on the off-diagonal (resp. diagonal) terms relatively to the diagonal ones for matrix $J_{\theta\theta}$. Thus, this metric characterizes the “asymptotic numerical diagonality” of $J_{\theta\theta}$. This metric decreases in $O(1/L^4)$ and is small even for a small/moderate number of sensors (see Fig. 7). For instance, consider 13 sensors, $E_{mk}(L) = |J_{m\theta_k}|^2/|J_{m\theta_k}|^2 \approx 6 \cdot 10^{-3}$ meaning that the off-diagonal terms are strongly dominated by the diagonal ones. For the
same number of sensors, we have $E_{mm}(L) \approx 10^{-2}$ which is also relatively small. From a practical point of view, this means that the asymptotic assumption can be relaxed.

7. Conclusion

In this work, we have studied the performance of the estimation of the direction and polarization parameters for a COLD-ULA in the case where the sources are all localized in the azimuthal plane. Toward this end, we have derived closed-form (nonmatrix) expressions of the deterministic CRB under the assumption that the number of sensors is sufficiently large. We show that this assumption is not severe in practice and the closed-form expressions are accurate for a number of sensors slightly higher than ten when the sources are widely-spaced. As a by product, it...
results a very cheap way to compute the deterministic CRB while the brute force computation of this lower bound needs to inverse a large FIM for \( T \gg 1 \). The main contribution of this work is the analysis of the proposed bound. More precisely, we prove that the accuracy of the direction parameter estimation is not affected whether the polarization state vector is known or not. This allows a fair comparison between the ACRB for a COLD-ULA and for an uniformly polarized ULA, since these two bounds have the same number of unknown model parameters. Finally, we show that with a COLD-ULA, more model parameters can be estimated than with the uniformly polarized ULA, without degrading the estimation accuracy of localization parameter. We also quantify precisely the interest of considering known complex sources, as it is sometimes the case in some applications as for instance in wireless communications.

**Appendix A. Partial derivative vectors of the model wrt. the model parameters**

We use intensively the first partial derivative of the model wrt. the model parameters. We provide these expressions in this Appendix:

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \theta_m} = \frac{2i\pi d}{\lambda} \cos(\theta_m) \begin{pmatrix} (I_T \otimes (\alpha_m(1)u_m)) d_m' \\ \vdots \\ (I_T \otimes (\alpha_m(T)u_m)) d_m' \end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \psi_m} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial \psi_m} d_m \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial \psi_m} d_m \end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \phi_m} = i \begin{pmatrix} (I_T \otimes \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial \phi_m}) d_m \\ \vdots \\ (I_T \otimes \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial \phi_m}) d_m \end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \rho_m} = (I_T \otimes \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial \rho_m}) d_m,
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \psi_m} = \begin{pmatrix} (I_T \otimes \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial \psi_m}) d_m \\ \vdots \\ (I_T \otimes \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial \psi_m}) d_m \end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial m} = \begin{pmatrix} (I_T \otimes (e^{(2\pi f_0 + \phi_m(1))}u_m)) d_m \\ \vdots \\ (I_T \otimes (e^{(2\pi f_0 + \phi_m(T))}u_m)) d_m \end{pmatrix}.
\]

**Appendix B. Derivation of the ACRB for an uniformly polarized ULA with multiple snapshots**

The model parameters are collected in the following \((T + 2)M \times 1\) vector:

\[
\epsilon_m' = [\theta' \quad \phi' \quad \alpha' ]^T.
\]

The FIM for an ULA is given by

\[
\tilde{F}\epsilon'\epsilon' \xrightarrow{\L} L \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & TI_{M} \end{bmatrix}
\]

where

\[
B = \begin{bmatrix} \pi \Delta^2 \Theta & \pi \Delta^2 \Theta & \ldots & \pi \Delta^2 \Theta \\ \pi \Delta^2 \Theta & \Delta^2 & 0 & \ldots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \pi \Delta^2 \Theta & 0 & \ldots & \Delta^2 \end{bmatrix}.
\]

The inverse of the Schur complement [40,39] associated with matrix \( B \) is given by

\[
\tilde{Q}^{-1} = \frac{3\lambda^2}{\pi^2 d^2 L^2} \Theta^{-2} \Delta^{-2}
\]

with \( B^{-1} = [\tilde{Q}^{-1} \times \times \times] \). Considering the diagonal terms of the above expression up to \( \sigma^2/(2L) \), we obtain

\[
\text{ACRB}(\theta_m) = \frac{3\sigma^2}{2TI d_m^2 \pi^2 d^2 \cos^2(\theta_m)}.
\]
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