Temporal Analysis of Stationary Markov \( \alpha \)-sub-Gaussian Noise
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Abstract—In warm shallow waters, snapping shrimp noise is the dominant source of ambient noise at medium-to-high frequencies. The noise process is impulsive and exhibits memory. The latter property causes outliers to cluster together, thus resulting in bursty impulsive noise. When tuned to snapping shrimp data, the stationary \( \alpha \)-sub-Gaussian noise with memory order \( m \) \( (\alpha\text{SGN}(m)) \) model tracks the former’s temporal amplitude statistics very well. In comparison to contemporary impulsive noise models, \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) offers a far more realistic model for snapping shrimp noise. To develop a more deeper understanding of \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \), we perform an impulsive event analysis on its realizations. This is accomplished by initially mapping impulsive data to a point process in time. The resulting time-series is then analyzed via first-order interval and counting analysis. We compare our results with those of snapping shrimp noise and highlight the pros and cons of adopting the \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) model. Moreover, our results also offer us a reliable way to tune the order \( m \) of \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \).

I. INTRODUCTION

Ambient noise in the sea is known to vary considerably in different environments [1]. In warm shallow waters, the sea bed is typically littered with colonies of snapping shrimp. These crustaceans are known to create snaps (surges in acoustic pressure) by cavitating bubbles. Practical measurements have shown peak-to-peak levels of a single snap to be as high as 190 dB re 1\( \mu \)Pa at 1 m from the source [2], [3]. The collective snaps create an impulsive soundscape in warm shallow waters [3], [4]. If not accounted for, snapping shrimp noise is detrimental to the performance of acoustic systems operating nearby [5]–[7]. Though it is known that snapping shrimp noise is impulsive, few studies have been devoted to understanding the dependence between its samples [3], [8], [9]. In fact, the contemporary literature typically adopts white impulsive noise models to design schemes that mitigate the detrimental impact of snapping shrimp noise on underwater systems [5], [10], [11]. In reality, snapping shrimp noise exhibits memory and is thus bursty as well as impulsive.

In [9], the authors observe that closely-spaced snapping shrimp noise samples exhibit near-elliptic distributions. This was highlighted by plotting delay scatter plots of recorded samples. Noting that the empirical amplitude distribution is characterized well by univariate heavy-tailed symmetric \( \alpha \)-stable (\( \alpha \)-SaS) distributions, [9] based the \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) model on the multivariate \( \alpha \)-sub-Gaussian (\( \alpha \)-SG) distribution. The latter is essentially a multivariate heavy-tailed \( \alpha \)-SaS distribution with the additional constraint of being elliptic as well [12]. The \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) model employs a sliding window framework and effectively constrains any adjacent \( m+1 \) samples to an \( \alpha \)-SG distribution. Moreover, the model does not allow the underlying \( \alpha \)-SG distribution to vary with time. Consequently, the \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) is a stationary Markov process. As marginal distributions of a multivariate \( \alpha \)-SaS distribution are \( \alpha \)-SaS as well [12], [13], the \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) model is able to characterize the empirical amplitude distribution of snapping shrimp noise, i.e., each sample is essentially an \( \alpha \)-SaS random variable. However, due to its memory, it also tracks the amplitude statistics as a function of time and thus the temporal amplitude statistics of the noise process [9].

In this paper, we try to further our understanding of the \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) model by conducting interval and counting analysis of impulsive events on its samples. As a realization of \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) is a time-series, our study is essentially a temporal analysis of \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) data. Note, that this is not to be confused with the aforementioned temporal amplitude statistics of \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \). While the latter highlights how amplitude statistics varies in time due to dependence between the samples, this work discards the sample values by converting \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) to a random point process in time. By doing so, each noise sample is mapped onto a binary value within \( \{0, 1\} \), where \( 0 \) and \( 1 \) imply the absence and presence of an impulsive event, respectively. Subsequent temporal analysis offers insight into the arrival and counts of impulsive events on the real-number line. We compare our results with those of snapping shrimp noise and highlight the suitability of \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) in modeling the former. Moreover, we show that temporal analysis of impulsive events offers a clear way to estimate the order \( m \) from practical data. The latter is essential for tuning the model appropriately [9].

This paper is organized as follows: In Section II we briefly introduce the \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) model. This is followed by discussions on interval and counting analysis for \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) and snapping shrimp noise in Section III. The impact of dead-time filtering on the temporal statistics is investigated in Section IV. We wrap up by presenting our conclusions in Section V.

II. THE \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) MODEL

The \( \alpha\text{SGN}(m) \) model was initially introduced in [9] to model the near-elliptic dependency between immediately adjacent snapping shrimp noise samples. The model is based on the multivariate \( \alpha \)-SG distribution, which besides being heavy-tailed \( \alpha \)-SaS, is elliptic as well [14]. Mathematically, an \( \alpha \)-SG
A right skewed \( \mu \) location in (1) is \( S \) by \( S \) work and constrains any adjacent \( \alpha \in \beta \) on \( SG \) (and thus \( S \)).

The PDF of a stable random variable is completely defined by four parameters, namely, the characteristic exponent \( \alpha \in (0,2] \), skew \( \beta \in [-1,1] \), scale \( \delta \in (0,\infty) \) and location \( \mu \in (-\infty,\infty) \) [14], [15]. The distribution can be denoted succinctly by \( S(\alpha,\beta,\delta,\mu) \). An \( \alpha S \) random variable is stable but with the additional constraint of \( \beta = \mu = 0 \) [14], [15]. Consequently, an \( \alpha S \) distribution may be represented by \( S(\alpha,\delta) \). Of all parameters, \( \alpha \) completely determines the tail-heaviness of a stable distribution [14], [15]. In fact, the heaviness decreases monotonically with increasing \( \alpha \). Moreover, for \( \alpha = 2 \), the distribution ceases to depend on \( \beta \) and is Gaussian with mean \( \mu \) and variance \( 2\delta^2 \), i.e., \( S(2,\beta,\delta,\mu) \doteq N(\mu,2\delta^2) \) [14], [15]. On a final note, we see that all marginal distributions of an \( \alpha S \) random vector are \( \alpha S \) (and thus \( \alpha S \)) as well [14]. Consequently, by setting \( A \sim S(\frac{\alpha}{2}, 1, 2((\frac{\pi\alpha}{4}))^{2/\alpha}, 0) \), the \( i \)th univariate marginal of \( \bar{X} \) in (1) is \( \alpha S \) distributed with \( S(\alpha,\sqrt{\alpha}) \) [12].

The \( \alpha S(m) \) model is based on a sliding-window framework and constrains any adjacent \( m + 1 \) samples to an \( \alpha S \) distribution [9]. Mathematically, let \( X_n \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \) denote samples of \( \alpha S(m) \) at time index \( n \) and \( \bar{X}_{n,m} = [X_{n-m}, \ldots, X_{n-1}, X_n]^T \) a random vector in \( \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \) consisting of \( X_n \) and \( m \) immediately previous samples. Then, from (1), the following expression completely defines the process [9]:

\[
\bar{X}_{n,m} \doteq A^{1/2} \bar{G}_{n,m},
\]

where \( \doteq \) signifies equality in distribution, \( A \) is a totally-right skewed stable random variable and \( \bar{G} \) is a multivariate zero-mean Gaussian random vector with covariance matrix \( \mathbf{R} = [r_{ij}] \), i.e., \( \bar{G} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{R}) \). Both \( A \) and \( \bar{G} \) are statistically independent of one another [12], [15].

The delay scatter plots of \( \alpha S(m) \) are shown in Figs. 3 & 4, respectively. The scatter plots are immediately previous samples. Then, from (1), the following expression completely defines the process [9]:

\[
\bar{X}_{n,m} \doteq A^{1/2} \bar{G}_{n,m},
\]

where \( \bar{G}_{n,m} = [G_{n-m}, \ldots, G_{n-1}, G_n]^T \) is a multivariate zero-mean Gaussian random vector with covariance matrix \( \mathbf{R}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1)\times (m+1)} \), i.e., \( \bar{G}_{n,m} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{R}_m) \) and \( A_n \sim S(\frac{2}{m}, 1, 2((\frac{\pi\alpha}{4}))^{2/\alpha}, 0) \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \). From (2), one notes that \( \alpha S(m) \) is a Markov process of order \( m \) [9]. Moreover, as \( \mathbf{R}_m \) does not vary with time, \( \alpha S(m) \) is a stationary Markov process. The sliding-window framework and stationarity of the process also ensure that \( \mathbf{R}_m = [r_{ij}] \) is a symmetric Toeplitz matrix [9]. Consequently, it takes on the block form

\[
\mathbf{R}_m = \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{R}_{m-1} & \mathbf{r}_m \\
\mathbf{r}_m^T & r_{(m+1)(m+1)}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( \mathbf{r}_m = [r_{1(m+1)}, r_{2(m+1)}, \ldots, r_{m(m+1)}]^T \). Due to its structure, \( \mathbf{R}_m \) can be completely constructed from a single row or column. Further still, its main diagonal elements are equivalent. Therefore, by setting \( r_{ii} = \delta^2 \forall i \in \{1,2,\ldots,m+1\} \), we note that \( X_n \sim S(\alpha,\mu) \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \).

We plot a realization \( x(t) \) of snapping shrimp noise (sampled at 180kHz) in Fig. 1 and of \( \alpha S(m) \) in Fig. 2. The latter’s parameters are tuned to that of the snapping shrimp noise dataset via the methodology outlined in [9]. One can see the similarities between both realizations. Moreover, denoting the samples as \( x_n \), we present delay scatter plots of either realization in Figs. 3 & 4, respectively. The scatter plots are generated for delays of 1 and 100. For snapping shrimp noise, one can clearly see an elliptic geometry associated with the
TABLE I
\( \hat{r}_{1k} \) TUNED TO SNAPING SHRIMP NOISE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k )</th>
<th>( \hat{r}_{1k} )</th>
<th>( \hat{\delta}^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

scatter plot in Fig. 3. With increasing delay, the samples are expected to be decreasingly dependent. When the delay is large enough, the samples are effectively independent and the scatter plot converges to a four-tailed structure akin to that observed at a delay of 100 in Fig. 3 [7]. From visual judgment, on comparing Figs. 3 & 4, we clearly see that the tuned αSGN(4) model characterizes the temporal amplitude statistics of snapping shrimp noise sampled at 180 kHz very well. We analyze temporal statistics of impulsive events for both processes next.

III. TEMPORAL ANALYSIS OF αSGN(\( m \)) AND SNAPING SHRIMP NOISE

Though αSGN(\( m \)) effectively models the temporal amplitude statistics of the snapping shrimp noise process, the temporal characteristics of its impulsive events are yet to be understood. This can be accomplished by doing away with the sample values and modeling αSGN(\( m \)) as a random point process. The latter is roughly defined as a collection of highly localized events or random points that occur in some space [16]. For the case of snapping shrimp noise, related numerical studies were carried out in [3], [8], [17] and a number of observations were made. The primary objective of this paper is to model αSGN(\( m \)) as a point process in time and compare its results to those observed in snapping shrimp noise. Moreover, we conduct a similar analysis on white SoS noise (WSoS). The latter essentially is an αSGN(0) process, i.e., it has no memory and its samples are IID SoS random variables [9]. The WSoS model has been used extensively in the literature to model the amplitude distribution of snapping shrimp noise but fails to address the burstiness associated with the noise process [9].

A. Data Setup & Processing

To allow fair comparison, we tune the parameters of the αSGN(\( m \)) model to empirical snapping shrimp data. In our work, we consider an 1800 s recording of snapping shrimp noise sampled at 180 kHz. The data was recorded in Singapore waters by personnel of the Acoustic Research Laboratory at the National University of Singapore. We divide the dataset into blocks of \( 10^6 \) samples (\( \sim 5.56 \) s) and estimate the model’s parameters for each block for a maximum predetermined order of \( m = 8 \) using the method outlined in [9]. More precisely, for each block, \( \alpha \) and \( \delta \) are evaluated via maximum-likelihood estimation. These are then used to get the remaining elements of \( R_8 \) via a covariance based method [9], [18]. The final values of \( \alpha \), \( \delta \) and \( R_8 \) are acquired by averaging the corresponding estimates over all blocks. These estimated values (with obvious notation) are \( \hat{\alpha} = 1.577 \), \( \hat{\delta} = 14.63 \) and \( \hat{r}_{1k} \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 9\} \) in Table I. We have listed only the first row of the normalized covariance matrix \( R_8/\hat{\delta}^2 \) in Table I, as \( R_8 \) can be completely constructed from it. Finally, we note that the employed estimation method for \( \alpha \) and \( \delta \) is independent of \( m \). Moreover, from (3), \( R_m \) for \( m < 8 \) is essentially the \( (m+1) \times (m+1) \) top-left block matrix of \( R_8 \). Therefore, by estimating parameters for αSGN(8), we already have estimates of the model’s parameters for \( m < 8 \).

To accomplish our goals, we need to employ a suitable event detector to convert αSGN(\( m \)) realizations to that of a point process [3], [8]. From Fig. 2, one can intuitively see that an impulsive event can be adequately detected if the amplitude of a noise sample is observed to exceed a suitable threshold.

In our work we employ a threshold detector with threshold \( 20\hat{\delta} \). A sample outcome \( X_n = x_n \) is mapped on to 0 or 1 if \( x_n < 20\hat{\delta} \) or \( x_n \geq 20\hat{\delta} \), respectively. Mathematically,

\[
p_n = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } x_n \geq 20\hat{\delta} \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases},
\]

where \( p_n \) is the observation of the point process at index \( n \). Note that we do not define a negative impulse, i.e., \( x_n \leq -20\hat{\delta} \), as an impulsive event. This is due to the fact that negative surges in pressure for snapping shrimp noise are attributed to surface reflections of snaps [3]. Nevertheless, there is no loss in generality as considering negative snaps just increases the number of impulsive arrivals by a factor of two. The latter stems from the fact that an αSGN(\( m \)) sample has a zero-centered symmetric PDF, i.e., \( X_n \sim S(\alpha, \delta) \).

Event analysis techniques can be broadly divided into two different categories, namely, interval and counting analysis [3]. In either case, the point process data is divided into blocks before processing. The former characterizes time delay (or number of samples) between ordered events, while the latter counts the number of events in a certain time block. Both approaches are covered in our work. For the first case, we employ an inter-event interval (II) technique which counts the time delay \( T_L \) between immediately adjacent (first-order) events and computes an empirical PDF. When plotted on a log scale, the resulting curve is linear if it is an exponential distribution [3], [8]. This in turn shows that the point process belongs to the general Poisson family. Secondly, for counting analysis, we compute the Fano-factor (FF) time curves. These are evaluated from the variance to mean ratio of the time samples and are plotted against the time duration \( T_N \) of the employed block [3], [8]. If the point process is homogeneous Poisson, the FF plot is a straight line of amplitude one.
B. Results and Discussion

In the literature, II and FF analysis for snapping shrimp noise have clearly shown the latter not to be a homogeneous Poisson process [3], [8]. We highlight this by presenting II results in Fig. 5. The red markers highlight the empirical PDF of first-order IIs plotted against $T_D$ (measured in milliseconds) of the snapping shrimp noise dataset, while the blue curves correspond to $\alpha SGN(m)$ for $m \in \{0, 4, 8\}$. Note that the curve corresponding to WSoS$N$ is essentially that of a homogeneous Poisson process as its samples are IID random variables. We also note that the remaining curves become linear as $T_D$ increases. This is because the first-order II probability density at $T_D$ is conditional on observing an event at $T_D = 0$ ms and none in between. With increasing $T_D$, the PDF ceases to be influenced by events located far in the past and depends on nearby samples only, which in turn do not observe impulsive events. Therefore, for large $T_D$, event arrivals are independent of that at $T_D = 0$ ms and can be approximated by an exponential distribution. This results in the linear regions when plotted on a log-scaled axis.

Fig. 5 offers us great insight into how $m$ influences the effectiveness of the $\alpha SGN(m)$ model. Clearly, in our case, $\alpha SGN(8)$ adequately models inter-arrival events for the considered snapping shrimp noise data set. Moreover, as expected, WSoS$N$ is ineffective in modeling memory and thus the intervals between adjacent snaps. The PDF corresponding to $\alpha SGN(4)$ offers a better fit than that of WSoS$N$, but offers a higher rate of impulsive events (lower gradient) with respect to the snapping shrimp case. These results are also supported by their corresponding FF plots presented in Fig. 6. Following [17], the latter are plotted on a log-log scale against $T_N$ (measured in seconds). As samples of WSoS$N$ are IID random variables, its FF curve is flat. Clearly, this deviates sharply from the FF plot of snapping shrimp noise. In comparison, the $\alpha SGN(8)$ curve tracks the latter much more effectively. The short-time rise and plateau regions in Fig. 6 arise mainly due to surface reflections of a snapping shrimp snap [3], [8]. We note the $\alpha SGN(8)$ curve approximates the plateau region $10^{-2} < T_N \leq 10^0$ (seconds) of its snapping shrimp counterpart very well. However, it also deviates in the short-time rise region $10^{-4} < T_N \leq 10^{-2}$ (seconds). Moreover, we also observe a slight deviation between the curves for $T_N > 10^0$ s. The latter is due to the non-stationarity of ambient noise in warm shallow waters, which mainly includes snapping shrimp noise but also other biological/man-made noise as well.

In Fig. 5, on closer inspection, we note that the snapping shrimp noise and $\alpha SGN(m)$ curves for $m \neq 0$ sharply decrease near the origin. It is insightful to see how they vary when $T_D$ is small. To highlight this we plot the same II curves, but for $T_D \in [0, 5]$ ms in Fig. 7. Though $\alpha SGN(8)$ clearly tracks the rate of impulsive arrivals in the snapping shrimp noise dataset for large $T_D$ (observed in Fig. 5), it does not exhibit the same II characteristics for $0.2 < T_D \leq 2$ (milliseconds) in Fig. 7. This may be because the considered dataset also consists of samples from other sources of noise with lingering dependencies. We also note, that for $T_D \sim 0$ ms,
us a very clear method of choosing differentiates between what actually might be. The II curves on the other hand clearly offer us a way to select m for \( \alpha \text{SGN}(m) \) and \( \alpha \text{SGN}(8) \) offer good approximates to the snapping shrimp curve. This is expected as both models share similar parameter estimates (\( R_8 \) consists of \( R_4 \)) and they are designed to characterize \( m + 1 \) immediately adjacent samples. Finally, to highlight II characteristics for both small and large \( T_D \), we also present the II results on the log-log scale in Fig. 8. The latter we believe, is a better visualization than traditional log-scale plots such as those in Figs. 5 & 7.

IV. TEMPORAL ANALYSIS WITH DEAD-TIME FILTERING

Till now we have investigated impulsive events in \( \alpha \text{SGN}(m) \) tuned to snapping shrimp noise and compared it to the latter. However, we note that a burst in \( \alpha \text{SGN}(m) \) effectively models the collective response of two different phenomenon originating from a single snapping shrimp snap. The first is the temporal response of the snap and the second is the multipath component due to surface reflection \([3], [8]\). Therefore, a burst arises from a single snap. Section III offers useful insights in to scenarios involving signal transmission in warm shallow waters. In such settings, receivers need to ideally compensate for noise bursts that accompany the signal. Therefore, temporal characteristics within small ranges of \( T_D \) and \( T_N \) are of interest. In underwater acoustic communication, this typically amounts to sub-millisecond values.

In the literature, various works on snapping shrimp noise also define an impulsive event as individual snap arrivals, i.e., a burst is counted as a single event \([3], [8]\). This is useful in scenarios where one is interested in determining the position/density of snapping shrimp populations or mapping objects within the vicinity of such a populace. Thus, to avoid counting clustered impulses as different events, further processing of \( p_n \) is necessary before employing II and FF analysis. Following \([3], [8]\), we investigate the temporal characteristics of our data with dead-time filtering. The latter is easily implemented and does not search for potential events within a certain interval of a detected impulse \([3]\). We define our dead-time filter to negate all impulsive events within \( T_D < 2 \text{ ms} \). The motivation for this arises from Figs. 7 & 8, where one can clearly see the snapping shrimp curve at the end of its clustering phase.

In Figs. 9 & 10, we present first-order II PDFs for snapping shrimp and \( \alpha \text{SGN}(m) \) realizations on log and log-log scales, respectively. As expected, our setting of the dead-time zone to 2 ms effectively nullifies dependence of impulsive events (for \( T_D \geq 2 \text{ ms} \)) on the event observed at \( T_D = 0 \text{ ms} \). This results in linear curves in Fig. 9 which are similar to what one observes for homogeneous Poisson data with dead-time filtering \([3]\). The corresponding FF curves presented in Fig. 11 exhibit some interesting properties. Introducing dead-time filtering essentially regularizes the data for \( T_N \ll 2 \text{ ms} \), which results in it behaving like a homogeneous Poisson process, i.e., FF \( \sim 1 \) as \( T_N \rightarrow 0 \text{ ms} \) \([3]\). On comparison with Fig. 6, we see that the short-time rise is non-existent and is re-labeled in Fig. 11 as a short-time plateau. The \( \alpha \text{SGN}(8) \) process is able to track this and the plateau region very well. More significant though is the deviation observed at \( T_N \approx 0.3 \text{ s} \), labeled as medium-time rise. This is attributed to the non-stationarity of the snapping shrimp noise data set and is not as pronounced in Fig. 6.

As a final result, we investigate the impact of changing the threshold in (4) to \( 30\delta \) in addition to dead-time filtering. Increasing the threshold reduces the number of impulsive
model’s parameters to practical snapping shrimp data. Noise for various those in Fig. 11 but with slightly scaled down FFs. FF curves are presented in Fig. 14 and offer similar trends to the snapping shrimp data set very well. The corresponding α increased. Moreover, the expected, the gradients of all curves in Fig. 12 are relatively the log and log-log scales in Figs. 12 & 13, respectively. As with respect to Fig. 9. We plot the corresponding II results on events, which results in larger TD and thus increased gradients with respect to Fig. 9. We plot the corresponding II results on the log and log-log scales in Figs. 12 & 13, respectively. As expected, the gradients of all curves in Fig. 12 are relatively increased. Moreover, the αSGN(8) curve still tracks that of the snapping shrimp data set very well. The corresponding FF curves are presented in Fig. 14 and offer similar trends to those in Fig. 11 but with slightly scaled down FFs.

V. CONCLUSION

We investigated the temporal characteristics of αSGN(m) for various m. This was accomplished by first tuning the model’s parameters to practical snapping shrimp data. Noise realizations were then generated and converted to a point process in time via a threshold detector. The resulting time-series was investigated by employing first-order II arrival and FF analysis on raw and dead-time filtered data. These were then compared to results generated from the original snapping shrimp dataset. The pros and cons of modeling the latter with αSGN(m) was commented on. Overall, αSGN(m) was found to characterize the temporal statistics of snapping shrimp noise very well. Moreover, II analysis was found to be an effective tool in evaluating the order m of the model. This is necessary for characterizing snapping shrimp noise adequately.
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