

Affine-Projection Recovery of Continuous Angular Power Spectrum: Geometry and Resolution

Shengsong Luo*, Chongbin Xu*, Xin Wang*, Ruilin Wu†, Junjie Ma‡, Xiaojun Yuan§

*Fudan University, Shanghai, China. Email: {ssluo22@m., chbinxu@, xwang11@}fudan.edu.cn

†Peking University, Beijing, China. Email: rlwu22@stu.pku.edu.cn

‡Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China. Email: majunjie@lsec.cc.ac.cn

§University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, China. Email: xjyuan@uestc.edu.cn

Abstract—This paper considers recovering a continuous angular power spectrum (APS) from the channel covariance. Building on the projection-onto-linear-variety (PLV) algorithm, an affine-projection approach introduced by Miretti *et. al.*, we analyze PLV in a well-defined *weighted* Fourier-domain to emphasize its geometric interpretability. This yields an explicit fixed-dimensional trigonometric-polynomial representation and a closed-form solution via a positive-definite matrix, which directly implies uniqueness. We further establish an exact energy identity that yields the APS reconstruction error and leads to a sharp identifiability/resolution characterization: PLV achieves perfect recovery if and only if the ground-truth APS lies in the identified trigonometric-polynomial subspace; otherwise it returns the minimum-energy APS among all covariance-consistent spectra.

Index Terms—Continuous angular power spectrum (APS), projection onto linear variety (PLV), channel covariance, trigonometric polynomials.

I. INTRODUCTION

We consider a directional (angle-domain) channel model as in [1]. Specifically, we study a single-cell uplink where the base station (BS) employs an M -antenna uniform linear array (ULA) and each user has a single antenna. A classical spatial channel covariance $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times M}$ gives [1]–[5].

$$\mathbf{R} = \int_{\Theta} \rho_{\star}(\theta) \mathbf{a}(\theta) \mathbf{a}(\theta)^H d\theta, \quad (1)$$

where $\theta \in \Theta := [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ is the angle of arrival (AoA), $\rho_{\star} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ denotes the angular power spectrum (APS) satisfying Assumption 1, and $\mathbf{a} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^M$ is the frequency dependent antenna array responses:

$$\mathbf{a}(\theta) := [1, e^{i\kappa_1 \sin \theta}, \dots, e^{i\kappa_{M-1} \sin \theta}]^{\top}, \quad (2)$$

where $\kappa_m := \gamma \pi m$, $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}$, with $\gamma = 2d/\lambda_f$. Here, d is the inter-element spacing of the ULA, and λ_f is the wavelength of carrier frequency f .

The APS ρ_{\star} is the primary quantity we aim to estimate. It provides a compact, second-order description of the propagation geometry (e.g., dominant directions, angular spread, and diffuse multipath) and is useful for long-term system design tasks such as beamforming [6], [7], user grouping [4], and channel prediction [8]–[10]. Moreover, ρ_{\star} typically varies on a much slower timescale than instantaneous channel realizations, which makes it well suited for long-term inference [10]–[12].

The covariance in model (1) encodes the underlying continuous angular scattering spectrum ρ_{\star} . This perspective is closely related to covariance-based random access, which considers a discretized counterpart of (1) with random signatures [13]–[15]. In that setting, it is shown that the covariance is a sufficient statistic for estimating large-scale parameters (e.g., user activity and large-scale fading coefficients) [13, Theorem 1], supporting the general principle that second-order statistics can capture the relevant long-term information.

Miretti *et al.* [1] proposed an influential estimator—termed projection onto a linear variety (PLV)—for the inverse problem of recovering a continuous APS from a spatial covariance matrix. Given a target covariance \mathbf{R} , PLV selects, among all spectra consistent with the covariance model (1), the one with minimum L^2 -norm (cf. Definition 1):

$$\rho_{\text{plv}} = \arg \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{V}} \|\rho\|, \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{V} is an affine subset of the Hilbert space $L^2(\Theta)$ defined by the covariance constraints

$$\mathcal{V} := \{\rho \in L^2(\Theta) \mid \mathbf{R} = \int_{\Theta} \rho(\theta) \mathbf{a}(\theta) \mathbf{a}(\theta)^H d\theta\}. \quad (4)$$

Equivalently, ρ_{plv} is the orthogonal projection of the origin onto the affine set \mathcal{V} in $L^2(\Theta)$ [1], which motivates the term “projection onto a linear variety” and our use of “affine projection” in the title.

Building upon the PLV framework of [1], we revisit PLV in a *weighted* Fourier-domain and sharpen its geometric structure. In particular, we make the following three aspects explicit (*our main contributions*):

- **Appearance of trigonometric polynomials.** We introduce a weighted Fourier-domain perspective that reveals a clean geometric decomposition of the covariance-consistency set: The feasible spectra form an affine set, and its orthogonal complement is a fixed-dimensional subspace, in terms of *trigonometric polynomials*, determined by the array size. This turns an infinite-dimensional recovery problem into an explicit finite-dimensional characterization.
- **Equivalent PLV interpretations and its uniqueness.** We show that the PLV estimator admits several equivalent interpretations, and we derive a simple closed-form

procedure to compute the solution. This also yields a clear uniqueness guarantee and makes the dependence on the observed covariance lags transparent.

• **Exact error decomposition and resolution.** We establish an exact energy/error decomposition that directly quantifies the reconstruction error of PLV. This leads to a sharp identifiability (resolution) statement: Perfect recovery holds precisely for spectra that lie in the identified subspace; otherwise PLV returns the minimum-energy spectrum among all covariance-consistent candidates, clarifying the fundamental aperture-limited resolution.

A. Preliminaries and Notation

Let $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be a Lebesgue-measurable set and dx be the Lebesgue measure. We introduce the following preliminaries.

Definition 1. (*Weighted L^2 space*). Let $w : I \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a Lebesgue-measurable weight function with $w > 0$ almost everywhere. For measurable functions $f, g : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define the weighted inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle_w := \int_I f(x) g(x) w(x) dx,$$

whenever it is well-defined. Define the weighted L^2 space

$$L_w^2(I) := \{ f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \langle f, f \rangle_w < \infty \},$$

with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_w$ and norm $\|f\|_w := \sqrt{\langle f, f \rangle_w}$. If $w(x) = 1$ on I , then $L_w^2(I)$ reduces to the standard space $L^2(I)$ with the usual inner product and norm $\|f\| := \sqrt{\langle f, f \rangle}$.

Definition 2. (*Projection Operator*). Let $\mathcal{S} \subset L_w^2$ be a nonempty closed convex set. The *projection* of $f \in L_w^2$ onto \mathcal{S} is the (unique) element $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{S}}(f) \in \mathcal{S}$ that solves

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{S}}(f) := \arg \min_{z \in \mathcal{S}} \|f - z\|_w^2. \quad (5)$$

The mapping $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{S}} : L_w^2 \rightarrow L_w^2$ is called the *projection operator* onto \mathcal{S} . In particular, if \mathcal{S} is a closed subspace, then $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the orthogonal projection onto \mathcal{S} .

Assumption 1. The APS $\rho_{\star} \in L^2(\Theta)$.

Organization. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II presents the transformed (weighted Fourier) domain formulation and the associated weighted L_2 geometric setup. Section III develops the main geometric results and Section IV concludes the paper.

Notation. Throughout the paper, we use the typefaces $a, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{A}$ and \mathcal{A} to denote scalar/function, vector, matrix and set, respectively. For a vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{a}(j_1 : j_2)$ denotes the subvector of \mathbf{a} consisting of its j_1 -th to j_2 -th entries, where $0 \leq j_1 \leq j_2 \leq n-1$; in particular, $\mathbf{a}[j]$ denotes the j -th entry of \mathbf{a} , and we also write a_j when no ambiguity can arise. For a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $[\mathbf{A}]_{i,j}$ denotes its (i, j) -th entry, and $\mathbf{A}(i_1 : i_2, j_1 : j_2)$ denotes the submatrix formed by rows i_1 to i_2 and columns j_1 to j_2 , where $0 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq m-1$ and $0 \leq j_1 \leq j_2 \leq n-1$.

II. WEIGHTED FOURIER-DOMAIN FORMULATION

In this section, we reformulate the continuous APS recovery problem in a *weighted* Fourier-domain that is more amenable to geometric analysis. For a ULA, the covariance matrix \mathbf{R} is Hermitian Toeplitz and positive semidefinite, and is therefore fully specified by its first column $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{C}^M$:

$$\mathbf{r} := [\mathbf{R}]_{:,1} = \int_{\Theta} \rho_{\star}(\theta) \mathbf{a}(\theta) d\theta. \quad (6)$$

Let $\mathbf{r} = [r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{M-1}]^T$. Then, the m -th covariance lag admits the integral form

$$r_m = \int_{\Theta} \rho_{\star}(\theta) e^{i\kappa_m \sin \theta} d\theta, \quad m = 0, \dots, M-1, \quad (7)$$

where κ_m is defined in (2) (with $r_0 = \int_{\Theta} \rho_{\star}(\theta) d\theta$).

We next apply the change of variables $x = \sin \theta$ and define the transformed APS

$$g_{\star}(x) := \rho_{\star}(\arcsin x), \quad x \in I := [-1, 1]. \quad (8)$$

Then (7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} r_m &= \int_{-1}^1 g_{\star}(x) e^{i\kappa_m x} w(x) dx \\ &= \langle g_{\star}, e^{i\kappa_m (\cdot)} \rangle_w, \quad m = 0, \dots, M-1, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the Jacobian weight is

$$w(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}, \quad (10)$$

and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_w$ is the weighted inner product in Definition 1.

Remark 1. Under Assumption 1, $\rho_{\star} \in L^2(\Theta)$ implies $g_{\star} \in L_w^2(I)$ via the mapping (8).

Since ρ_{\star} and g_{\star} are in one-to-one correspondence, we will refer to either function as the APS when no confusion arises. In the remainder of the paper, we work with the *weighted* Fourier-domain representation (9). This viewpoint reveals that the available covariance lags $\{r_m\}_{m=0}^{M-1}$ are weighted Fourier measurements of g_{\star} , and it will lead to a cleaner geometric characterization of the PLV estimator.

III. GEOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF PLV IN THE WEIGHTED FOURIER-DOMAIN REPRESENTATION

We next revisit the PLV scheme and place it in the *weighted* Fourier-domain representation. This leads to a arguably simple geometric interpretation of PLV and shows that PLV reconstructs the APS within a fixed-order trigonometric polynomial model.

A. Geometry and Trigonometric-Polynomial Subspace

In order to facilitate geometric analysis, we introduce the following Lemma.

Lemma 1 (Affine structure and orthogonal decomposition). *Let $\mathbf{r} = [r_0, \dots, r_{M-1}]^T \in \mathbb{C}^M$ be a given covariance vector,*

and define $r_{-m} := r_m^*$ for $m = 1, \dots, M-1$. Consider the L_w^2 space in Definition 1 and define the affine set

$$\mathcal{V}_w := \{f \mid \langle f, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = r_m, -M < m < M\}, \quad (11)$$

together with the closed subspace (i.e., null space)

$$\mathcal{N} := \{f \mid \langle f, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = 0, -M < m < M\}, \quad (12)$$

and its orthogonal complement

$$\mathcal{N}_\perp := \{f \mid \langle f, h \rangle_w = 0, \forall h \in \mathcal{N}\}. \quad (13)$$

Then the following two statements hold true:

1) \mathcal{V}_w is an affine subset of $L_w^2(I)$ with direction \mathcal{N} , i.e., for any $f_1 \in \mathcal{V}_w$ and $f_2 \in \mathcal{N}$ we have $f_1 + f_2 \in \mathcal{V}_w$, and hence $\mathcal{V}_w + \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{V}_w$.

2) The orthogonal complement \mathcal{N}_\perp is a finite-dimensional subspace spanned by trigonometric polynomials, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N}_\perp = \{f(\cdot; \mathbf{b}) \mid \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{2M-1}\}, \quad (14)$$

in which

$$f(x; \mathbf{b}) = b_0 + \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} b_m \cos(\kappa_m x) + b_{M-1+m} \sin(\kappa_m x)$$

with κ_m denoting the spatial-frequency samples associated with the covariance lags (cf. (2)). \square

Proof. See Appendix A. \square

Lemma 1 shows that the set of functions $g \in L_w^2(I)$ that satisfy the covariance constraints is an affine set \mathcal{V}_w with direction \mathcal{N} , and that \mathcal{N}_\perp is a finite-dimensional subspace spanned by trigonometric polynomials. The PLV can thus be viewed as selecting the unique element in $\mathcal{V}_w \cap \mathcal{N}_\perp$ (see Fig. 1). Building on this geometric picture, the following Theorem summarizes several equivalent characterizations of PLV.

Theorem 1. Recall the sets \mathcal{V}_w , \mathcal{N}_\perp defined in Lemma 1. Let $g_{\text{plv}} \in L_w^2(I)$ denote the solution of the PLV [1]. Then the following four statements are equivalent and uniquely characterize g_{plv} .

1) **Minimum-norm formulation:**

$$g_{\text{plv}} = \arg \min_{\hat{g} \in \mathcal{V}_w} \|\hat{g}\|_w = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{V}_w}(0). \quad (15)$$

i.e., the minimum-norm element in \mathcal{V}_w .

2) **Geometric feasibility formulation:**

$$g_{\text{plv}} = \mathcal{V}_w \cap \mathcal{N}_\perp, \quad (16)$$

i.e., g_{plv} is the unique element in the intersection set $\mathcal{V}_w \cap \mathcal{N}_\perp$.

3) **Trigonometric polynomial parameterization:** There is a unique vector $\mathbf{b} = [b_0, \dots, b_{2M-2}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2M-1}$ such that

$$g_{\text{plv}}(x; \mathbf{b}) := b_0 + \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} b_m \cos(\kappa_m x) + b_{M-1+m} \sin(\kappa_m x), \quad (17)$$

with the vector being solved by: letting $r_{-m} := r_m^*$ for $m = -(M-1), \dots, M-1$,

$$\text{find } \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{2M-1} \text{ s.t. } \langle g_{\text{plv}}(\cdot; \mathbf{b}), e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = r_m. \quad (18)$$




Fig. 1. Geometric interpretation of the PLV. The affine set \mathcal{V}_w collects all functions consistent with the covariance constraints, \mathcal{N} denotes the associated null space, and \mathcal{N}_\perp is its orthogonal complement.

4) **Closed-form coefficient representation:** The vector \mathbf{b} in (17) admits the closed form

$$\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{G}^{-1} \mathbf{y}, \quad (19)$$

where \mathbf{y} is defined by¹

$$\mathbf{y} := \begin{bmatrix} \Re r_{0:M-1} \\ \Im r_{1:M-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2M-1} \quad (20)$$

and \mathbf{G} satisfies²

$$\mathbf{G} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{\Re} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{G}_{\Im} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2M-1) \times (2M-1)}, \quad (21)$$

with $\mathbf{G}_{\Re} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ and $\mathbf{G}_{\Im} \in \mathbb{R}^{(M-1) \times (M-1)}$ given by

$$[\mathbf{G}_{\Re}]_{m,n} = \frac{\pi}{2} (J_0(\kappa_{m-n}) + J_0(\kappa_{m+n})),$$

$$[\mathbf{G}_{\Im}]_{m'-1,n'-1} = \frac{\pi}{2} (J_0(\kappa_{m'-n'}) - J_0(\kappa_{m'+n'})),$$

for $0 \leq m, n \leq M-1$ and $1 \leq m', n' \leq M-1$, respectively, and $J_0(\cdot)$ denotes the Bessel function of the first kind of order zero. In particular, $\mathbf{G} \succ \mathbf{0}$ and hence invertible.

Proof. See Appendix B. \square

Remark 2 (Additional insight into the PLV formulation). Building upon the original PLV method in [1], Theorem 1 makes two aspects of the method more explicit.

- **Appearance of trigonometric polynomials.** The explicit description of \mathcal{N}_\perp shows that PLV reconstructs the APS within a fixed-order trigonometric polynomial model in the transformed domain $g_* \in L_w^2(I)$. In particular, PLV selects the basis $\{1, \cos(\kappa_m x), \sin(\kappa_m x)\}$ for representing APS, which clarifies the underlying modeling assumptions on angular resolution and on the level of detail that can be captured in the reconstructed APS.
- **Uniqueness.** The closed-form relation (19) reveals that the PLV estimate is linear to the covariance, with a matrix \mathbf{G} that depends only on the array geometry and frequencies. Since $\mathbf{G} \succ \mathbf{0}$, the coefficients \mathbf{b} , and hence g_{plv} , are uniquely determined by the covariance constraints. This makes the uniqueness of the PLV solution explicit.

¹We note that the imaginary of r_0 is trivial, i.e., $\Im r_0 = 0$ (refer to (2)).

²Note that matrix \mathbf{G} slightly differs from the one in [1, Proposition 1]; in particular, the latter is rank-deficient, whereas \mathbf{G} is full-rank in our setting.

Discussion. Theorem 1 shows that PLV recovers the APS by projecting onto a fixed dimensional trigonometric polynomial subspace in the transformed domain $g \in L_w^2(I)$, yielding a unique solution that depends linearly on the covariance vector.

B. Error Decomposition and Resolution

Proposition 1 (Energy identity and reconstruction error). *Let g_{plv} be the PLV solution as in (17). Then*

$$\|g_{\text{plv}}\|_w^2 = \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{G} \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{G}^{-1} \mathbf{y}, \quad (22)$$

where $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{G}^{-1} \mathbf{y}$ is given in (19). Moreover, for any $g \in \mathcal{V}_w$,

$$\|g\|_w^2 = \|g_{\text{plv}}\|_w^2 + \|g - g_{\text{plv}}\|_w^2. \quad (23)$$

In particular,

$$\|g_{\text{plv}} - g_\star\|_w^2 = \|g_\star\|_w^2 - \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{G}^{-1} \mathbf{y} \geq 0, \quad (24)$$

with equality if and only if $g_\star \in \mathcal{N}_\perp$.

Proof. See Appendix C. \square

Compared with prior set-theoretic analyses in [16], our error study differs in two main aspects: (i) [16] primarily bounds errors of specific linear functionals of the APS (task-dependent performance), whereas we bound the *APS reconstruction error* itself in a *weighted L^2* geometry; (ii) We leverage the explicit PLV geometry in the *weighted* Fourier-domain to expose a *resolution/identifiability* limit, while their bounds do not aim to characterize this resolution behavior. The following Corollary is a direct consequence of Proposition 1.

Corollary 1 (Resolution/Identifiability). *The APS becomes perfectly recoverable via the PLV approach if and only if the ground-truth APS $g_\star \in \mathcal{N}_\perp$, i.e., is represented by the trigonometric polynomials in (17) with order up to $2M-2$ (a total of $2M-1$ degrees).*

Corollary 1 yields an explicit identifiability (resolution) condition for *continuous* APS recovery, thereby clarifying the fundamental *resolution* limit induced by the finite aperture. To the best of our knowledge, explicit results for such resolution have not appeared in the literature.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We studied the recovery of a continuous APS from spatial covariance and revisited the PLV approach through a *weighted* Fourier-domain Hilbert-space viewpoint. This geometric reformulation reveals that PLV operates over an explicit finite-dimensional trigonometric-polynomial model and leads to a closed-form solution characterized by a geometry-dependent, positive-definite matrix, making uniqueness transparent. Moreover, the resulting orthogonal decomposition provides an exact energy/error relation and yields a sharp identifiability (resolution) statement: PLV achieves exact recovery precisely when the true spectrum lies in the identified subspace; otherwise, it returns the minimum-energy spectrum among all covariance-consistent candidates. Future work includes extending the analysis to noisy or finite-sample covariance estimates and to more general array geometries (e.g., planar arrays).

APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA 1

1) *Affine structure.* Let $f_1 \in \mathcal{V}_w$ and $f_2 \in \mathcal{N}$. For every $-M < m < M$, by linearity of the inner product in the first argument,

$$\langle f_1 + f_2, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = \langle f_1, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w + \langle f_2, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = r_m,$$

so $f_1 + f_2 \in \mathcal{V}_w$. Hence $\mathcal{V}_w + \mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_w$. Conversely, fix any $f_1 \in \mathcal{V}_w$ and take any $f \in \mathcal{V}_w$. Then for each $-M < m < M$,

$$\langle f - f_1, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = \langle f, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w - \langle f_1, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = 0,$$

so $f - f_1 \in \mathcal{N}$, i.e., $f \in f_1 + \mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_w + \mathcal{N}$. Therefore $\mathcal{V}_w \subseteq \mathcal{V}_w + \mathcal{N}$, and we conclude $\mathcal{V}_w + \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{V}_w$, so \mathcal{V}_w is an affine subset of $L_w^2(I)$ with direction \mathcal{N} .

2) *Characterization of \mathcal{N}_\perp .* Define the finite-dimensional subspace

$$\mathcal{S} := \text{span}(1, \{\cos(\kappa_m \cdot)\}_{m=1}^{M-1}, \{\sin(\kappa_m \cdot)\}_{m=1}^{M-1}) \subset L_w^2(I).$$

We claim that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{S}^\perp$. Indeed, if $f \in \mathcal{N}$, then in particular

$$\langle f, 1 \rangle_w = \langle f, e^{i\kappa_0(\cdot)} \rangle_w = 0,$$

and for each $m = 1, \dots, M-1$ we have $\langle f, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = 0$ and $\langle f, e^{-i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = 0$ (since the constraints hold for all $-M < m < M$). Using the identities

$$\cos(\kappa_m x) = \frac{e^{i\kappa_m x} + e^{-i\kappa_m x}}{2}, \quad \sin(\kappa_m x) = \frac{e^{i\kappa_m x} - e^{-i\kappa_m x}}{2i},$$

and linearity of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_w$ in the second argument, we obtain

$$\langle f, \cos(\kappa_m(\cdot)) \rangle_w = \frac{1}{2}(\langle f, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w + \langle f, e^{-i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w) = 0,$$

$$\langle f, \sin(\kappa_m(\cdot)) \rangle_w = \frac{1}{2i}(\langle f, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w - \langle f, e^{-i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w) = 0.$$

Hence f is orthogonal to each generator of \mathcal{S} , i.e., $f \in \mathcal{S}^\perp$, so $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^\perp$. Conversely, if $f \in \mathcal{S}^\perp$, then $\langle f, 1 \rangle_w = 0$ and for each $m = 1, \dots, M-1$, $\langle f, \cos(\kappa_m(\cdot)) \rangle_w = 0$ and $\langle f, \sin(\kappa_m(\cdot)) \rangle_w = 0$; therefore

$$\langle f, e^{\pm i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = \langle f, \cos(\kappa_m(\cdot)) \rangle_w \pm i \langle f, \sin(\kappa_m(\cdot)) \rangle_w = 0,$$

and also $\langle f, e^{i\kappa_0(\cdot)} \rangle_w = \langle f, 1 \rangle_w = 0$. This is exactly the defining condition of \mathcal{N} , so $\mathcal{S}^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{N}$. Hence $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{S}^\perp$.

Taking orthogonal complements yields

$$\mathcal{N}_\perp = \mathcal{N}^\perp = (\mathcal{S}^\perp)^\perp = \overline{\mathcal{S}}.$$

As \mathcal{S} is finite-dimensional, it is closed in $L_w^2(I)$, so $\overline{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S}$ and thus $\mathcal{N}_\perp = \mathcal{S}$. Equivalently, every $f \in \mathcal{N}_\perp$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= b_0 + \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} b_m \cos(\kappa_m x) + b_{M-1+m} \sin(\kappa_m x) \\ &:= f(x; b), \end{aligned}$$

for some $b \in \mathbb{R}^{2M-1}$, and conversely every such trigonometric polynomial belongs to \mathcal{N}_\perp . This proves Lemma 1 and the finite-dimensionality claim.

APPENDIX B PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We show the equivalence of the four statements in Theorem 1 by linking them pairwise. Throughout the proof, we use the sets $\mathcal{V}_w, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}_\perp$ defined in Lemma 1.

1) \Leftrightarrow 2): *minimum norm vs. affine intersection.* By Lemma 1, the feasible set \mathcal{V}_w is an affine subset of $L_w^2(I)$ with direction \mathcal{N} , i.e., $\mathcal{V}_w + \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{V}_w$. In particular, if $g_0 \in \mathcal{V}_w$ is any fixed feasible point, then every $\dot{g} \in \mathcal{V}_w$ can be written uniquely as

$$\dot{g} = g_0 + h, \quad h \in \mathcal{N}.$$

Assume first that statement 2) holds, i.e., $\mathcal{V}_w \cap \mathcal{N}_\perp = \{g_{\text{plv}}\}$. For any $g \in \mathcal{V}_w$, write $\dot{g} = g_{\text{plv}} + h$ with $h \in \mathcal{N}$. Since $g_{\text{plv}} \in \mathcal{N}_\perp$ and $h \in \mathcal{N}$, we have $\langle g_{\text{plv}}, h \rangle_w = 0$ and hence

$$\|\dot{g}\|_w^2 = \|g_{\text{plv}} + h\|_w^2 = \|g_{\text{plv}}\|_w^2 + \|h\|_w^2 \geq \|g_{\text{plv}}\|_w^2,$$

with equality only if $h = 0$, i.e., $\dot{g} = g_{\text{plv}}$. Thus g_{plv} is the unique minimum-norm element in \mathcal{V}_w , which proves statement 1).

Conversely, suppose g_{plv} is the unique solution of the minimum-norm problem (15). Decompose g_{plv} orthogonally with respect to \mathcal{N} as

$$g_{\text{plv}} = g_\perp + h, \quad g_\perp \in \mathcal{N}_\perp, \quad h \in \mathcal{N}.$$

Since \mathcal{V}_w is an affine set with direction \mathcal{N} , we have $g_\perp = g_{\text{plv}} - h \in \mathcal{V}_w$. Moreover,

$$\|g_\perp\|_w^2 = \|g_{\text{plv}} - h\|_w^2 = \|g_{\text{plv}}\|_w^2 - \|h\|_w^2 \leq \|g_{\text{plv}}\|_w^2,$$

with strict inequality whenever $h \neq 0$. By the optimality of g_{plv} , it must hold that $h = 0$, and hence $g_{\text{plv}} = g_\perp \in \mathcal{N}_\perp$. Combined with $g_{\text{plv}} \in \mathcal{V}_w$, this implies $g_{\text{plv}} \in \mathcal{V}_w \cap \mathcal{N}_\perp$. Finally, if there were two distinct elements $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{V}_w \cap \mathcal{N}_\perp$, then $g_1 - g_2 \in \mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{N}_\perp = \{0\}$, so $g_1 = g_2$. Hence $\mathcal{V}_w \cap \mathcal{N}_\perp$ is a singleton, and statement 2) holds. This proves 1) \Leftrightarrow 2).

2) \Leftrightarrow 3): *geometric formulation vs. trigonometric parameterization.* Lemma 1 further shows that \mathcal{N}_\perp is a $(2M-1)$ -dimensional subspace spanned by the trigonometric basis

$$\{1, \cos(\kappa_m x), \sin(\kappa_m x) \mid m = 1, \dots, M-1\},$$

so every $g \in \mathcal{N}_\perp$ admits a unique representation of the form (17) with some $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{2M-1}$. In particular, any $g_{\text{plv}} \in \mathcal{V}_w \cap \mathcal{N}_\perp$ must be representable as in (17), and the constraints defining \mathcal{V}_w translate exactly into the feasibility conditions (18). This yields statement 3).

Conversely, if g_{plv} admits the representation (17) with a vector \mathbf{b} that satisfies (18), then by construction $g_{\text{plv}} \in \mathcal{N}_\perp$ and $\langle g_{\text{plv}}, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = r_m$ for all $-M < m < M$, i.e., $g_{\text{plv}} \in \mathcal{V}_w$. Uniqueness of \mathbf{b} (and hence of g_{plv}) follows from the linear independence of the trigonometric basis. Therefore $\mathcal{V}_w \cap \mathcal{N}_\perp = \{g_{\text{plv}}\}$, and statement 2) holds. This proves 2) \Leftrightarrow 3).

3) \Leftrightarrow 4): *trigonometric form vs. closed-form coefficients.* Substituting the expansion (17) into the covariance constraints

$\langle g_{\text{plv}}, e^{i\kappa_m(\cdot)} \rangle_w = r_m$, $-M < m < M$, and separating real and imaginary parts yield a linear system of the form

$$\mathbf{G} \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{y}, \quad (25)$$

where \mathbf{y} is defined in (20) and \mathbf{G} is the block-diagonal matrix in (21). The entries of \mathbf{G}_\Re and \mathbf{G}_\Im can be written as

$$[\mathbf{G}_\Re]_{m,n} = \langle \cos(\kappa_m \cdot), \cos(\kappa_n \cdot) \rangle_w, \\ [\mathbf{G}_\Im]_{m-1,n-1} = \langle \sin(\kappa_m \cdot), \sin(\kappa_n \cdot) \rangle_w.$$

with (via the identity $\int_0^\pi \cos(z \cos \theta) d\theta = \pi J_0(z)$)

$$\langle \cos(\kappa_m \cdot), \cos(\kappa_n \cdot) \rangle_w = \frac{\pi}{2} (J_0(\kappa_{m-n}) + J_0(\kappa_{m+n})), \\ \langle \sin(\kappa_m \cdot), \sin(\kappa_n \cdot) \rangle_w = \frac{\pi}{2} (J_0(\kappa_{m'-n'}) - J_0(\kappa_{m'+n'})).$$

For any $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^M$, we have

$$\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{G}_\Re \mathbf{c} = \left\| \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} c_m \cos(\kappa_m \cdot) \right\|_w^2 \geq 0,$$

with equality if and only if $\sum_{m=0}^{M-1} c_m \cos(\kappa_m x) = 0$ for all $x \in I$, which by linear independence of the cosine functions implies $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0}$. Hence \mathbf{G}_\Re is symmetric positive definite. An analogous argument shows that \mathbf{G}_\Im is symmetric positive definite as well. Thus \mathbf{G} is positive definite and invertible, and (25) has the unique solution $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{G}^{-1} \mathbf{y}$, which gives the closed-form expression (19). This proves statement 4) given statement 3).

Conversely, if $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{G}^{-1} \mathbf{y}$, then (25) holds, and thus $g_{\text{plv}}(\cdot; \mathbf{b})$ of the form (17) satisfies covariance constraints in \mathcal{V}_w and belongs to \mathcal{N}_\perp . This recovers statement 3), and hence 3) \Leftrightarrow 4).

Combining the implications 1) \Leftrightarrow 2), 2) \Leftrightarrow 3), and 3) \Leftrightarrow 4) yields the equivalence of all four characterizations.

APPENDIX C PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

For any $x \in I = [-1, 1]$, denote by

$$\phi(x) := [1, \dots, \cos(\kappa_m x), \dots, \sin(\kappa_m x), \dots]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2M-1},$$

and recall Theorem 1 that $g_{\text{plv}}(x) = \mathbf{b}^\top \phi(x)$ with $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{G}^{-1} \mathbf{y}$, where the matrix is $\mathbf{G} = \int_I \phi(x) \phi(x)^\top w(x) dx$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_{\text{plv}}\|_w^2 &= \langle g_{\text{plv}}, g_{\text{plv}} \rangle_w \\ &= \mathbf{b}^\top \left(\int_I \phi(x) \phi(x)^\top w(x) dx \right) \mathbf{b} \\ &= \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{G} \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{G}^{-1} \mathbf{y}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{G}^{-1} \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}^\top \succ \mathbf{0}$.

Next, by Theorem 1, $g_{\text{plv}} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{V}_w}(0)$, i.e., it minimizes $\|g\|_w$ over the affine set $\mathcal{V}_w = g_{\text{plv}} + \mathcal{N}$. Hence for any $h \in \mathcal{N}$, the function $f(t) := \|g_{\text{plv}} + th\|_w^2$ is minimized at $t = 0$, which implies $0 = f'(0) = 2 \langle g_{\text{plv}}, h \rangle_w$ for all $h \in \mathcal{N}$, i.e., $g_{\text{plv}} \perp \mathcal{N}$. Therefore, for any $g \in \mathcal{V}_w$ we can write $g = g_{\text{plv}} + h$ with $h \in \mathcal{N}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_w^2 &= \|g_{\text{plv}} + h\|_w^2 = \|g_{\text{plv}}\|_w^2 + \|h\|_w^2 \\ &= \|g_{\text{plv}}\|_w^2 + \|g - g_{\text{plv}}\|_w^2. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for $g_* \in V_r$, $\|g_{\text{plv}} - g_*\|_w^2 = \|g_*\|_w^2 - \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{G}^{-1} \mathbf{y}$. This completes the proof.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Miretti, R. L. G. Cavalcante, and S. Stańczak, "Channel covariance conversion and modelling using infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 69, pp. 3145–3159, 2021.
- [2] E. Björnson, E. G. Larsson, and T. L. Marzetta, "Massive MIMO: Ten myths and one critical question," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 114–123, 2016.
- [3] H. Yin, D. Gesbert, and L. Cottatellucci, "Dealing with interference in distributed large-scale MIMO systems: A statistical approach," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 942–953, 2014.
- [4] S. Haghigatshoar and G. Caire, "Massive MIMO channel subspace estimation from low-dimensional projections," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 303–318, 2016.
- [5] O. Besson, L. L. Scharf, and F. Vincent, "Matched direction detectors and estimators for array processing with subspace steering vector uncertainties," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 53, no. 12, pp. 4453–4463, 2005.
- [6] S. Mohammadzadeh, V. H. Nascimento, R. C. de Lamare, and O. Kukrer, "Covariance matrix reconstruction based on power spectral estimation and uncertainty region for robust adaptive beamforming," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 3848–3858, 2022.
- [7] D. Shakya, M. Ying, and T. S. Rappaport, "Angular spread statistics for 6.75 GHz FR1 (C) and 16.95 GHz FR3 mid-band frequencies in an indoor hotspot environment," in *Proc. IEEE WCNC*, 2025, pp. 1–6.
- [8] D. Fan, F. Gao, Y. Liu, Y. Deng, G. Wang, Z. Zhong, and A. Nallanathan, "Angle domain channel estimation in hybrid millimeter wave massive MIMO systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 17, no. 12, pp. 8165–8179, 2018.
- [9] X. Wang, Y. Shi, T. Wang, Y. Huang, Z. Hu, L. Chen, and Z. Jiang, "Channel knowledge map aided channel prediction with measurements-based evaluation," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, 2024.
- [10] S. Bameri, K. A. Almahrog, R. H. Gohary, A. El-Keyi, and Y. A. E. Ahmed, "Uplink to downlink channel covariance transformation in FDD systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 71, pp. 3196–3212, 2023.
- [11] S. Haghigatshoar, M. B. Khalilsarai, and G. Caire, "Multi-band covariance interpolation with applications in massive MIMO," in *Proc. IEEE ISIT*, 2018, pp. 386–390.
- [12] M. B. Khalilsarai, S. Haghigatshoar, X. Yi, and G. Caire, "FDD massive MIMO via UL/DL channel covariance extrapolation and active channel sparsification," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 121–135, 2019.
- [13] S. Haghigatshoar, P. Jung, and G. Caire, "Improved scaling law for activity detection in massive MIMO systems," in *Proc. IEEE ISIT*, 2018, pp. 381–385.
- [14] Z. Chen, F. Sohrabi, Y.-F. Liu, and W. Yu, "Phase transition analysis for covariance-based massive random access with massive MIMO," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 1696–1715, 2021.
- [15] A. Fengler, S. Haghigatshoar, P. Jung, and G. Caire, "Non-Bayesian activity detection, large-scale fading coefficient estimation, and unsourced random access with a massive MIMO receiver," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2925–2951, 2021.
- [16] R. L. G. Cavalcante, L. Miretti, and S. Stańczak, "Error bounds for FDD massive MIMO channel covariance conversion with set-theoretic methods," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2018, pp. 1–7.