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Abstract—In this work we study the secrecy energy efficiency (SEE) of a multiple-input-multiple-output multiple-antenna eavesdropper (MIMOME) wiretap channel, in terms of the securely communicated bits-per-Joule, where the legitimate receiver is enabled with full-duplex (FD) capability. Hence, the transmitter and the legitimate receiver are capable of transmitting artificial noise (AN) to the eavesdropper, while exchanging information. In particular, we seek answer to the question: if and how the application of an FD jammer can enhance the system SEE, considering the additional power consumption used for jamming and self-interference cancellation, as well as the degrading effect of residual self-interference. In this regard, an SEE maximization problem is formulated assuming the availability of the exact, or statistical channel state information (CSI). Due to the intractable problem structure, an iterative solution is provided in each case with a guaranteed convergence to a local optimum. Numerical simulations indicate a marginal SEE gain, via the utilization of FD jamming, for a wide range of system conditions. However, a significant gain is observed for the scenarios with a small distance between the FD node and the eavesdropper, a high signal-to-noise (SNR) condition or for a bidirectional FD communication setup, under the condition that the self-interference can be effectively and efficiently mitigated.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The information security of wireless communication systems is currently addressed via cryptographic approaches, at the upper layers of the protocol stack. However, these approaches are prone to attack due to the ever-increasing computational capability of the digital processors, and suffer due to the issues regarding management and distribution of secret keys [1], [2]. Alternatively, physical layer security takes advantage of physical characteristics of the communication medium in order to provide a secure data exchange between the information transmitter (Alice) and the legitimate receiver (Bob). In the seminal work by Wyner [3] the concept of secrecy capacity is introduced for a three-node degraded wiretap channel, as the maximum information rate that can be exchanged under perfect secrecy condition. It is shown that a positive secrecy capacity is achievable when the physical channel to the eavesdropper has a weaker condition compared to the channel to the legitimate receiver. The arguments of [3] have since been extended in the directions of secrecy rate region analysis for various wiretap channel models [4]–[6], construction of capacity achieving channel codes [7]–[9], as well as signal processing techniques for enhancing the secrecy capacity of wireless communication systems, see [10]–[14] and references therein.

As a promising method to enhance the secrecy capacity of wireless systems, Goel and Negi [10] have introduced the idea of friendly jamming, i.e., the transmission of artificial noise (AN) with the intention of degrading the decoding capability of the Eavesdropper. This can be implemented via i) the joint transmission of information and AN from Alice, however, requiring an effective beamforming capability at Alice and sharing the communication and jamming resources [10], [11], ii) utilization of external (cooperative) jammers, however, resulting in the issues of jammer mobility, synchronization, and trustworthiness [5], [12]–[14], and iii) via the application of full-duplex (FD) nodes [3]. An FD transceiver is capable of transmission and reception at the same time and frequency, however, suffering from the strong self-interference from its own transmitter. The recently developed methods for self-interference cancellation (SIC) [15]–[18], have demonstrated functioning realizations of FD transceivers in the last few years and motivated a wide range of related studies, see [19], [20] and the references therein. In this regard, an FD Bob can act as a friendly jammer, while simultaneously receiving information from Alice. Note that an FD jammer does not occupy the communication resources from Alice, nor does it rely on the external helpers, resolving the related drawbacks. The problems regarding secrecy rate region analysis and resource optimization has hence been addressed in [2], [21]–[24]. It is observed that a significant gain is achievable, in terms of the resulting secrecy capacity, via the utilization of an FD jamming strategy under the condition that the self-interference signal can be attenuated effectively.

Although the available literature introduces a gainful utilization of FD transceivers for enhancing the system secrecy capacity, the aforementioned gain comes at the expense of a higher power consumption due to i) the degrading impact of residual self-interference on the desired communication link ii) the implementation of an SIC scheme at the FD transceiver, incurring additional digital processing and analog circuitry, as well as iii) the power consumed for the transmission of
AN. As a result, it is not clear how the FD jamming-enabled systems perform in terms of the secrecy energy efficiency (SEE). Note that the issue of energy efficiency is recently raised as a key criteria in the design of wireless communication systems. This is justified due to the exponential increase of the information and communication technology (ICT) services, currently generating around 5% of global CO₂ emissions and with 75% expected share of wireless systems in 2020, which calls for novel energy efficient ICT solutions\cite{25},\cite{26}. Hence, it is the main purpose of this paper to investigate if and how the application of FD jammers can enhance the system’s SEE, in terms of the securely communicated bits per Joule (SBPJ).

A. Related works on SEE maximization

The SEE of a downlink cellular network with single antenna users is studied in\cite{27},\cite{28}, where SBPJ is introduced as the evaluation metric. These studies have then been extended with the consideration of a general multiple-input-multiple-output multiple-antenna eavesdropper (MIMOME) setup\cite{29},\cite{30}, and availability of partial channel state information (CSI) regarding the channels to eavesdropper\cite{31}–\cite{33}. The impact of utilizing AN on SEE is studied as a potentially beneficial factor, where Alice is transmitting AN together with the information containing signal\cite{29},\cite{32},\cite{33}, with later extension to multi-hop relaying setups\cite{34},\cite{35}. The work in\cite{33} jointly considers the transmission of AN by Alice and the availability of statistical CSI, however, assuming a single antenna eavesdropper and restricting the setup to a fast-fading scenario. Moreover, an investigation on SEE performance of an FD-enabled system is not available in the literature.

B. Contribution and paper organization

In this work we study a set of SEE maximization problems for a MIMOME wiretap channel, assuming the availability of perfect or statistical CSI, where Alice and an FD Bob are jointly capable of transmitting AN. Our main contributions are as following:

- In contrast to the available designs\cite{21}–\cite{24}, utilizing FD transceivers for secrecy capacity enhancement, in Section [IV] an SEE [SBPJ] maximization problem is formulated. Due to the intractable structure, a successive general inner approximation algorithm (SUIAP) is proposed, with a guaranteed convergence to a point satisfying Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions of optimality. The joint utilization of FD capability, both on Alice and Bob for jamming and bi-directional information exchange, shows additional potentials for the improvement of SEE. This is grounded on the fact that i) the FD jamming power is reused for both communication directions, resulting in a power-efficient jamming, and ii) the coexistence of two communication directions on the same channel may degrade Eve’s decoding capability. Motivated by this, the proposed SUIAP algorithm is extended in Section [V] for an FD bidirectional setup.

- In order to account for the channel uncertainties, the consideration of statistical CSI regarding the channels to Eve has been introduced in\cite{36} for maximizing system secrecy and in\cite{33} for enhancing the system SEE, considering HD nodes. However, the aforementioned works limit the studied setups to a single antenna Eve, where CSI statistics follow a fast-fading nature. In this work an SEE maximization problem is studied for an FD-enabled MIMOME setup, where the channels to Eve follow an arbitrary statistical distribution. Note that unlike the fast-fading conditions, which assumes the CSI is not available due to mobility, the consideration of an arbitrary statistical distribution also accounts for the scenarios where Eve’s condition is stationary, but the CSI cannot be obtained due to the lack of collaboration from Eve. Hence, in Section [V] a successive selection and statistical lower bound maximization (SSSLM) algorithm is proposed, utilizing a combination of ensemble average approximation\cite{37}, together with the successive lower bound approximation method\cite{38}, with the goal of maximizing the statistical average of SEE. The algorithm is proven to converge to a point satisfying KKT conditions. It is worth mentioning that the studied problem also subsumes the problem for the maximization of secrecy capacity under the same assumption set.

The numerical results show that the utilization of FD transceivers is able to provide a significant SEE gain for a system with a small distance between the FD node and the eavesdropper, a high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) or for a bidirectional FD communication setup, under the condition that the self-interference can be effectively and efficiently mitigated.

C. Mathematical notation

Throughout this paper, column vectors and matrices are denoted as lower-case and upper-case bold letters, respectively. Mathematical expectation, trace, determinant, and Hermitian transpose are denoted by $E(\cdot)$, $\text{tr}(\cdot)$, $|\cdot|$, and $(\cdot)^H$, respectively. The Kronecker product is denoted by $\otimes$. The identity matrix with dimension $K$ is denoted as $I_K$ and vec$(\cdot)$ operator stacks the elements of a matrix into a vector. Moreover, $(\cdot)^{-1}$ represents the inverse of a matrix and $||\cdot||_2, ||\cdot||_F$ respectively represent the Euclidean and Frobenius norms. diag$(\cdot)$ returns a diagonal matrix by putting the off-diagonal elements to zero. $\perp$ denotes statistical independence. The set $\mathbb{F}_K$ is defined as $\{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$, and $|\mathcal{X}|$ denotes the size of the set $\mathcal{X}$. The set of positive real numbers, the set of complex numbers, and the set of all positive semi-definite matrices with Hermitian symmetry are denoted by $\mathbb{R}^+$, $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathcal{H}$, respectively. $a^i$ indicates the value of $a$ for which optimality holds. The value of $\{x\}^+$ is equal to $x$, if positive, and zero otherwise. Furthermore, $\mathcal{CN}(x, \Sigma)$ denotes the complex normal distribution with mean $x$ and covariance $\Sigma$.

II. System Model

We consider a MIMOME wiretap channel consists of a legitimate transmitter, i.e., Alice, a legitimate receiver, i.e., Bob, and an eavesdropper, i.e., Eve, see Fig. [I] Alice and
Eve are equipped with $N_A$ transmit and $M_B$ receive antennas, respectively. Bob is respectively equipped with $N_B$ and $M_B$ transmit and receive antennas, and is capable of FD operation. Channels are assumed to follow a quasi-stationary and flat-fading model. In this regard, channel from Alice to Bob, Alice to Eve, and Bob to Eve (jamming channel) are respectively denoted as $H_{ab} \in \mathbb{C}^{M_B \times N_A}$, $H_{ae} \in \mathbb{C}^{M_E \times N_A}$, $H_{be} \in \mathbb{C}^{M_E \times N_B}$. The channel from Bob to Bob, i.e., self-interference channel, is denoted as $H_{bb} \in \mathbb{C}^{M_B \times N_B}$.

### A. Signal model

The transmission from Alice includes the information-containing signal, intended for Bob, and a AN, intended to degrade the reception by Eve. This is expressed as

$$x_a = q_a + w_a + e_{tx,a},$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $q_a \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A}$ is the intended transmit signal, $w_a \sim \mathcal{C}\mathcal{N} \left(0, N_A Q_a \right)$ and $e_{tx,a} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A}$ represents the information-containing and AN signal, and $x_a \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A}$ is the combined transmitted signal from Alice. The transmit distortion, denoted as $e_{tx,a} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A}$ models collective impacts of transmit chain inaccuracies, e.g., analog-to-digital converters (ADC) noise, power amplifier (PA) noise, oscillator phase noise, and automatic gain control (DAC) noise, see Subsection II-B. Note that the role of hardware inaccuracies becomes important in a system with FD transceivers, due to the impact of a strong self-interference channel. Similar to the transmission from Alice, the transmission of AN by Bob is expressed as

$$x_b = w_b + e_{tx,b},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $w_b \sim \mathcal{C}\mathcal{N} \left(0, N_B W_b \right)$ is the transmitted artificial noise and $e_{tx,b} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_B}$ represents the transmitted distortions from Bob. Via the application of (1) and (2) the received signal at Eve is expressed as

$$y_e = H_{ae} x_a + H_{be} x_b + n_e,$$

$$= H_{ae} q_a + c_e,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $n_e \sim \mathcal{C}\mathcal{N} \left(0, M_B \sigma_{n,e}^2 I_{M_B} \right)$ is the additive thermal noise and

$$c_e := H_{ae} w_a + H_{ae} w_b + H_{ae} e_{tx,a} + H_{be} e_{tx,b} + n_e$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

is the collective interference-plus-noise at Eve.

Similarly, the received signal at Bob is formulated as

$$y_b = H_{ab} x_a + H_{bb} x_b + n_b + e_{rx,b},$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

$$= y_{bb}$$

where $n_b \sim \mathcal{C}\mathcal{N} \left(0, M_B \sigma_{n,b}^2 I_{M_B} \right)$ is the additive thermal noise, and $y_{bb}$ is the received signal, assuming perfect hardware operation. Similar to the transmit side, the receiver side, the distortion, denoted as $e_{rx,b} \in \mathbb{C}^{M_B}$, models the collective impact of receiver chain inaccuracies, e.g., digital-to-analog converter (DAC) noise, oscillator phase noise, and automatic gain control error, see Subsection II-B. Note that $y_{bb}$ includes the received self-interference signal at Bob, originating from the same transceiver. Hence, the known, i.e., distortion-free, part of the self-interference can be subtracted applying a SIC method \cite{15, 17}. The received signal at Bob, after the application of SIC is hence written as

$$\hat{y}_b = y_b - H_{bb} w_b$$

$$= H_{ab} x_a + H_{ab} e_{tx,b} + e_{rx,b} + n_b$$

$$= H_{ab} q_a + c_b,$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where

$$c_b := H_{ab} w_a + H_{ab} e_{tx,a} + H_{bb} e_{tx,b} + e_{rx,b} + n_b,$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

is the collective interference-plus-noise at Bob.

### B. Distortion signal statistics

Similar to \cite{39}, we model the impact of transmit (receive) chain inaccuracies by injecting Gaussian-distributed and independent distortion terms at each antenna. Moreover, the variance of the distortion signals are proportional to the power of the intended transmit (receive) signal at the corresponding channel. This model is elaborated in \cite{39} Subsections C], [40], [41] regarding the characterization of hardware impairments in transmit chains, and in \cite{39} Subsections D], [42] for the receiver chains. This is expressed in our system as

$$e_{tx,a} \sim \mathcal{C}\mathcal{N} \left(0, N_A, \kappa_a \text{diag} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |u_a|^2 \right] \right) \right),$$

$$e_{tx,b} \sim \mathcal{C}\mathcal{N} \left(0, N_B, \kappa_b \text{diag} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |u_b|^2 \right] \right) \right),$$

$$e_{rx,b} \sim \mathcal{C}\mathcal{N} \left(0, M_B, \kappa_b \text{diag} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |u_b|^2 \right] \right) \right),$$

where $\kappa_a, \kappa_b, \beta_b \in \mathbb{R}^+$ are distortion coefficients, relating the variance of the distortion terms to the intended signal power, and $u_a$ and $u_b$ are defined in (1) and (5), respectively. For further elaborations on the used distortion model please see \cite{39, 43, 45}, and the references therein.

### C. Power consumption model

The consumed power of a wireless transceiver can be segmented into three parts. First, the power consumed at the PA, which is related to the effective transmit power via PA efficiency, see \cite{46} Eq. (2)]. Secondly, the zero-state power, i.e., the power consumed by other circuit blocks, independent from transmission status $x^T$ see \cite{46} Eq. (3)]. And finally, the power consumed for the implementation of a SIC scheme, for enabling FD operation. The aforementioned power varies for different SIC methods, and by definition, is not relevant for HD transceivers.

The consumed power for Alice and Bob can hence be expressed as

$$P_A = \frac{1}{\mu_A} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \| x_a \|^2 \right\} + P_{A,0}, \quad P_A \leq P_{A,\text{max}} \hspace{1cm} (11)$$

and

$$P_B = \frac{1}{\mu_B} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \| x_b \|^2 \right\} + P_{B,0} + P_{\text{FD}}, \quad P_B \leq P_{B,\text{max}}. \hspace{1cm} (14)$$

This includes, e.g., the power consumed at receiver chain, and for base band processing.
\( \Sigma_b = \mathbb{E}\{c_b c_b^H\} = H_{ab} W_b H_{ab}^H + \kappa_a H_{ab} \text{diag} (Q_a + W_a) H_{ab}^H + \kappa_b H_{bb} \text{diag} (W_b) H_{bb}^H \)

\[ + \beta_{\text{diag}} (H_{ab} (Q_a + W_a) H_{ab}^H + H_{ab} W_b H_{bb}^H + \sigma_{a,b}^2 I_{M_a}) + \sigma_{a,b}^2 I_{M_b}, \]  

(12)

\( \Sigma_e = \mathbb{E}\{c_e c_e^H\} = H_{ae} W_a H_{ae}^H + H_{ae} W_b H_{be}^H + \kappa_e H_{ae} \text{diag} (Q_a + W_a) H_{ae}^H + \kappa_b H_{be} \text{diag} (W_b) H_{be}^H + \sigma_{a,e}^2 I_{M_e}. \)  

(13)

Figure 1. The studied wiretap channel. Alice, and the FD-Bob are jointly enabled with jamming capability.

In the above arguments, \( P_X, P_{X,i}, \mu_X, P_{X,max} \), where \( X \in \{A, B\} \), respectively represent the consumed power, the zero-state power, PA efficiency, and the maximum allowed power consumption for each node. The additional required power for the implementation of an SIC scheme is denoted by \( P_{\text{FD}} \). From (11), (14), the total system power consumption is obtained as

\[ P_{\text{tot}} = P_A + P_B. \]  

(15)

D. Secrecy energy efficiency

Following [2, 6, 10], the achievable secrecy rate\(^3\) for Alice-Bob communication is expressed as

\[ C_{ab} = \left\{ C_{ab} \right\}^+, \]  

such that

\[ \tilde{C}_{ab} = \log |I + H_{ab} Q_a H_{ab}^H \Sigma_b^{-1}| - \log |I + H_{ae} Q_a H_{ae}^H \Sigma_e^{-1}|, \]  

(16)

where \( \Sigma_b, \Sigma_e \) are given in (12), (13), and represent the covariance of the interference-plus-noise terms at Bob and Eve, respectively. The secrecy energy efficiency (SEE), as a measure of securely communicated information per energy unit, is consequentially expressed as

\[ \text{SEE} = \frac{C_{ab}}{P_{\text{tot}}}. \]  

(17)

It is the intention of the remaining parts of this paper to improve the efficiency of the defined wiretap channel, in terms of the SEE, and provide comparison to the usual HD strategies.

E. Remarks

- In this part we have assumed the availability of the perfect CSI for all channels. However, it may be difficult to estimate the channels associated to Eve, due to mobility, or the lack of collaboration from Eve. The scenario with the availability of partial CSI is discussed in Section [V].
- Unlike the data symbols, which follow a known constellation, the AN is generated from a pseudo-random

sequence which is not known to the receivers, see [10, Section III]. This is to prevent Eve from decoding the AN.

III. Secrecy Energy Efficiency Maximization

In this part we intend to enhance the system SEE, assuming the availability of CSI for all channels. The corresponding optimization problem is defined as

\[ \max_{Q_a, W_a, W_b} \text{SEE} (Q_a, W_a, W_b) \]  

(16a)

s.t. \[ \frac{1 + \kappa_a}{\mu_a} \text{tr} (Q_a + W_a) + P_{A,0} \leq P_{A,max}, \]  

(16b)

\[ \frac{1 + \kappa_b}{\mu_b} \text{tr} (W_b) + P_{B,0} + P_{\text{FD}} \leq P_{B,max}, \]  

(16c)

\[ Q_a, W_a, W_b \in \mathcal{H}, \]  

(16d)

where (16b) and (16c) represent the power constraints at Alice and Bob, see (11), (14). The defined problem in (16) is not tractable in the current form, due to the non-convex and non-smooth objective. In order to obtain a tractable structure, without loss of optimality, we remove the non-linear operator \( \{}^+ \) from the definition of \( \text{SEE} \). The modified SEE, named \( \text{SEE}_p \), hereinafter, can hence be formulated as

\[ \text{SEE}_p (Q_a, W_a, W_b) = \frac{\sum_{X \in \{a,b\}} \alpha_X \log |\Sigma_X + H_{aa} Q_a H_{aa}^H| - \log |\Sigma_X|}{P_{\text{tot}} (Q_a, W_a, W_b)}, \]  

(17)

where \( \alpha_a = 1 \) and \( \alpha_e = -1 \). It is observed that \( \text{SEE}_p \) is a difference of concave (DC) over affine fractional function which is intractable in the current form. In the following we propose a successive general inner approximation algorithm (SUIAP) to obtain an optimal solution to (16).

A. SUIAP

The proposed SUIAP algorithm consists of two nested loops. In each outer iteration, an effective lower bound to \( \text{SEE}_p \) is computed following the successive inner approximation (SIA) method [47], applying the inequality

\[ -\log |X| \geq -\log |Y| + \text{tr} \left( Y^{-1} (Y - X) \right) \]  

(19)

as the first-order Taylor approximation of the convex terms \( -\log |\cdot| \) in (17) at the point \( Y \). Please note that via the elimination of the convex terms from the nominator, the proposed lower bound holds a concave over affine fractional structure, which is a pseudo-concave function [48]. Hence, in the inner loop, the well-known Dinkelbach’s algorithm [49].

\(^3\)Note that at the optimality of (16), the resulting \( C_{ab} \), and consequently the SEE is non-negative. This is since a non-negative SEE is immediately obtained by setting \( Q_a = 0 \), see [2], [3] for similar arguments.
The update of $\lambda$ stable point is obtained, see Algorithm 1 for more details. Outer and inner loop iterations are continued until a jointly updated by solving the identity (13) at the iteration instance represented by $p$. Moreover, it shares the same slope as the $\text{SEE}_p$ function at the point of approximation. The aforementioned properties, and the fact that inner iterations are solved to optimality, results in the convergence of the outer loop iterations to a point satisfying the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions of the original problem, see [47] Theorem 1. However, the converging KKT point of the original problem is not necessarily the global optimum. This optimality gap is numerically analyzed in Subsection VI-A by examining multiple initializations.

C. Initialization

In this section we briefly discuss the initialization of Algorithm [1]. We separate the choice of spatial beams and power allocation for different transmissions, in order to obtain a fast solution.

1) Spatial adjustment: The role of the transmit spatial adjustment is to direct the transmit signal to the desired receiver, while preventing leakage to the undesired directions. This is written as the following maximization

$$\max_{\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{W}_a, \mathbf{W}_b} \text{tr} (\mathbf{FQ}^H) + \nu_f, \quad \text{s.t. } \text{tr} (\mathbf{Q}) = 1,$$

where $\mathbf{Q}$ represents the normalized covariance matrix, $\mathbf{F}$ and $\mathbf{G}$ are the desired and undesired channels, and $\nu_f, \nu_g$ are the noise variances at the desired and undesired receivers, respectively. An optimal solution to (22) can be obtained as

$$\text{vec} \left( \mathbf{Q}^\frac{1}{2} \right) = \mathcal{P}_{\text{max}} \left( (\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{G}^H \mathbf{G} + \nu_g \mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{F}^H \mathbf{F} + \nu_f \mathbf{I}) \right),$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\text{max}} (\cdot)$ calculates the dominant eigenvector. Note that the above approach is applied separately for the spatial adjustment of $\mathbf{Q}_a, \mathbf{W}_a$ and $\mathbf{W}_b$. The corresponding desired and undesired channels are defined in Appendix A-A.

2) Power allocation: The transmit power adjustment for $\mathbf{Q}_a, \mathbf{W}_a$ and $\mathbf{W}_b$ is obtained by applying the normalized covariance in the previous part as the basis. Afterwards, the power for each transmission is optimized to maximize $\text{SEE}_p$, see Appendix A-B.

D. Computational complexity

Each outer iteration consists of the calculation of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_b^{[0,t]}$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}_b^{[0,t]} + \mathbf{H}_{ae} \mathbf{Q}_a^{[0,t]} \mathbf{H}_{ae}^H$ via (12), [13], and the inverse terms via Cholesky decomposition incurring in total

$$\mathcal{O} \left( \gamma_{\text{out}} \left( M^3 + M^3 + N_A M_B (4 M_B + N_A) + 5 N_A M_E (N_A + M_E) + N_B M_B (2 N_B + 4 M_B) + 4 N_B M_E (M_E + N_B) \right) \right)$$

arithmetic operations [52], where $\gamma_{\text{in}} (\gamma_{\text{out}})$ is the total number of the required inner (outer) iterations until convergence. However, the computational complexity of the algorithm is dominated by the steps of the determinant maximization in the inner loop, see Algorithm [1] Step 10. A general form of a MAX-DET problem is defined as

$$\min_{\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{W}_a, \mathbf{W}_b} \text{tr} (\mathbf{Y} (\mathbf{z})^{-1}), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{Y} (\mathbf{z}) > 0, \mathbf{F} (\mathbf{z}) \geq 0,$$

where $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\mathbf{Y} (\mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} := \mathbf{Y}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \mathbf{Y}_i$ and $\mathbf{F} (\mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} := \mathbf{F}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \mathbf{F}_i$. An upper bound to the computational complexity of the above problem is given as

$$\mathcal{O} \left( \gamma_n \sqrt{n} (n^2 + n^2) n_F^2 \right),$$

where $n = n_1 + n_2$. This is written as the following maximization

$$\max_{\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{W}_a, \mathbf{W}_b} \text{tr} (\mathbf{FQ}^H) + \nu_f, \quad \text{s.t. } \text{tr} (\mathbf{Q}) = 1,$$

where $\mathbf{Q}$ represents the normalized covariance matrix, $\mathbf{F}$ and $\mathbf{G}$ are the desired and undesired channels, and $\nu_f, \nu_g$ are the noise variances at the desired and undesired receivers, respectively. An optimal solution to (22) can be obtained as

$$\text{vec} \left( \mathbf{Q}^\frac{1}{2} \right) = \mathcal{P}_{\text{max}} \left( (\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{G}^H \mathbf{G} + \nu_g \mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{F}^H \mathbf{F} + \nu_f \mathbf{I}) \right),$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\text{max}} (\cdot)$ calculates the dominant eigenvector. Note that the above approach is applied separately for the spatial adjustment of $\mathbf{Q}_a, \mathbf{W}_a$ and $\mathbf{W}_b$. The corresponding desired and undesired channels are defined in Appendix A-A.

2) Power allocation: The transmit power adjustment for $\mathbf{Q}_a, \mathbf{W}_a$ and $\mathbf{W}_b$ is obtained by applying the normalized covariance in the previous part as the basis. Afterwards, the power for each transmission is optimized to maximize $\text{SEE}_p$, see Appendix A-B.

D. Computational complexity

Each outer iteration consists of the calculation of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_b^{[0,t]}$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}_b^{[0,t]} + \mathbf{H}_{ae} \mathbf{Q}_a^{[0,t]} \mathbf{H}_{ae}^H$ via (12), [13], and the inverse terms via Cholesky decomposition incurring in total

$$\mathcal{O} \left( \gamma_{\text{out}} \left( M^3 + M^3 + N_A M_B (4 M_B + N_A) + 5 N_A M_E (N_A + M_E) + N_B M_B (2 N_B + 4 M_B) + 4 N_B M_E (M_E + N_B) \right) \right)$$

arithmetic operations [52], where $\gamma_{\text{in}} (\gamma_{\text{out}})$ is the total number of the required inner (outer) iterations until convergence. However, the computational complexity of the algorithm is dominated by the steps of the determinant maximization in the inner loop, see Algorithm [1] Step 10. A general form of a MAX-DET problem is defined as

$$\min_{\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{W}_a, \mathbf{W}_b} \text{tr} (\mathbf{Y} (\mathbf{z})^{-1}), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{Y} (\mathbf{z}) > 0, \mathbf{F} (\mathbf{z}) \geq 0,$$

where $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\mathbf{Y} (\mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} := \mathbf{Y}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \mathbf{Y}_i$ and $\mathbf{F} (\mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} := \mathbf{F}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \mathbf{F}_i$. An upper bound to the computational complexity of the above problem is given as

$$\mathcal{O} \left( \gamma_n \sqrt{n} (n^2 + n^2) n_F^2 \right),$$

where $n = n_1 + n_2$. This is written as the following maximization

$$\max_{\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{W}_a, \mathbf{W}_b} \text{tr} (\mathbf{FQ}^H) + \nu_f, \quad \text{s.t. } \text{tr} (\mathbf{Q}) = 1,$$
In our problem $n = 2N_A^2 - 2N_A + N_B^2 - N_B$ representing the dimension of real valued scalar variable space, and $n_{k_v} = M_B + M_F$ and $n_{k_e} = N_B + 2N_A + 2$, representing the dimension of the determinant operation and the constraints space, respectively.

1) Remark: The above analysis intends to show how the bounds on computational complexity are related to different problem dimensions. Nevertheless, the computational load may vary in practice, depending on the implementation and the used numerical solver. Furthermore, the overall algorithm complexity also depends on the number of optimization iterations required to obtain convergence. Please see Subsection VI-A for a numerical analysis on the convergence behavior, as well as the algorithm computational complexity.

Algorithm 1 Successive inner approximation algorithm (SUIAP) for SEE maximization. $C_{th_b} (\lambda_{th_b})$ represents the convergence threshold for the outer (inner) iterations.

1: $l \leftarrow 0$;
2: $\lambda^{(0,0)} \leftarrow 0, Q^{(0,0)} \leftarrow $ Subsection III-C
3: repeat
4: $l \leftarrow l + 1$
5: $\lambda^{(l+1)} \leftarrow \lambda^{(l)}$;
6: $\lambda^{(l+1)} \leftarrow \lambda^{(l)}$;
7: $k \leftarrow 0$;
8: repeat
9: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
10: $Q^{(l,k)} \leftarrow \text{MAX-DET}$ [52], see [20];
11: $C \leftarrow \text{SEE}_{eq} \left( Q^{(l,k)}; \lambda^{(l+1)} \right)$;
12: $\lambda^{(l)} \leftarrow \lambda^{(l)}$
13: until $C \leq C_{th_b}$;
14: until $\lambda^{(l)} \leq \lambda_{th_b}$
15: return $\{ Q^{(l,k)}, \lambda^{(l+1)} \}$

IV. SECURE BIDIRECTIONAL COMMUNICATION: JOINT FULL-DUPLEX OPERATION AT ALICE AND BOB

In this part we study the case that a bidirectional communication is established between Alice and Bob, where both Alice and Bob are enabled with FD capability. An FD bidirectional setup is interesting as it enables the usage of the same channel for both communication directions, and leads to a higher spectral efficiency [59]. Moreover, the jamming power at both Alice and Bob can be reused to improve security at both directions [59] and potentially improve the resulting SEE. However, the coexistence of all signal transmissions on a single channel results in a higher number of interference paths, which calls for a smart design regarding the signal and jamming transmit strategies at Alice and Bob.

In order to update the defined setup to a bidirectional one, we denote the number of receive antennas, and the self-interference channel at Alice as $M_A$, $H_{ba}$, respectively. Moreover, we denote that the data transmission from Bob as $q_b \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, N_b)$. Following the same signal model for the transmission of data and jamming signals as in (11) - (10), the received interference-plus-noise covariance matrix at Bob and Eve are updated respectively as

\[
\begin{align*}
\Sigma_b^{BD} &= \Sigma_b + \kappa_b H_{ba} \text{diag}(Q_b) H_{ba}^H + \beta_b \text{diag}(H_{ba} Q_b H_{ba}^H), \\
\Sigma_e^{BD} &= \Sigma_e + \kappa_b H_{ba} \text{diag}(Q_b) H_{ba}^H,
\end{align*}
\]

where $\beta_b \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the distortion coefficient for the reception at Alice. Please note that in the formulation of (27) we consider a worst-case scenario where the interference on Eve, due to the transmission of data signals, i.e., $q_a$ and $q_b$, can be decoded [53]. Similarly, the received interference-plus-noise signal covariance at Alice is written as

\[
\begin{align*}
\Sigma_a^{BD} &= H_{ba} W_a H_{ba}^H + \sigma_{n,a}^2 \mathbf{I}_{M_A} + \kappa_a H_{aa} \text{diag}(Q_b + W_b) H_{ba}^H \\
&+ \kappa_a \text{diag}(W_a + Q_a) H_{aa}^H + \beta_a \text{diag}(H_{ba} (Q_b + W_b) H_{ba}^H) + H_{aa} (W_a + Q_a) H_{aa}^H + \sigma_{n,a}^2 \mathbf{I}_{M_A},
\end{align*}
\]

where $\sigma_{n,a}^2$ represents the thermal noise variance at Alice. The SEE for the defined BD system is then obtained as

\[
\text{SEE}^{BD} = \left\{ \tilde{C}_{ab} \right\}^+ + \left\{ \tilde{C}_{ba} \right\}^+ - \log \left| I + H_{ba} Q_b H_{ba}^H (\Sigma_{a}^{BD})^{-1} \right| - \log \left| I + H_{aa} Q_a H_{aa}^H (\Sigma_{e}^{BD})^{-1} \right|,
\]

where $\tilde{C}_{ab}$ is obtained by applying (26), (27) into (17), and

\[
\tilde{C}_{ba} = \log \left| I + H_{ba} Q_b H_{ba}^H (\Sigma_{a}^{BD})^{-1} \right| - \log \left| I + H_{aa} Q_a H_{aa}^H (\Sigma_{e}^{BD})^{-1} \right|.
\]

is defined similar to (10) but for the opposite direction.

Lemma IV.1. The values $\tilde{C}_{ab}$ and $\tilde{C}_{ba}$ in the nominator of (29) are non-negative for an optimal choice of $Q_a, Q_b$ under some mild practical assumptions.

Proof: The proof is obtained via contradiction, assuming that an optimal choice of $Q_a$ results in a negative $\tilde{C}_{ab}$. A feasible, non-negative value of $\tilde{C}_{ab}$ can be obtained by setting $Q_a = 0$. Note that this choice reduces the residual self-interference terms, i.e., $\kappa_a H_{aa} \text{diag}(Q_a) H_{aa}^H + \beta_a \text{diag}(H_{aa} Q_a H_{aa}^H)$, which impacts $\tilde{C}_{ba}$ positively. Conversely, it eliminates the received distortion terms at Eve, i.e., $\kappa_a H_{aa} \text{diag}(Q_a) H_{aa}^H$, hence impacting $\tilde{C}_{ba}$ in the degrading direction. However, this degradation is negligible considering $\kappa_a \ll 1$, and $\|H_{aa}\|_F \ll \|H_{aa}\|_F$ which are common assumptions for any practical implementation of an FD transceiver. This concludes that a non-negative value of $\tilde{C}_{ba}$ holds at the optimality, under some mild practical assumptions.

A. Extended SUIAP for bidirectional-SEE maximization

In the first step we remove the nonlinear operator $\{ \}^+$ from the nominator of (29), following the result of Lemma IV.1.

5This is since the jamming sent to Eve from each single node degrades Eves reception quality from both communication directions.

6The proof for $Q_b$, $\tilde{C}_{ba}$ for the opposite direction can be obtained similarly and is eliminated due to space limitations.

7This is since the self-interference channel is much stronger than the communication channels, up to 100 dB, due to the proximity of the transmit and receiver chains on the same device [59]. Moreover, the power of the transmit noise is much smaller than the actually transmitted signal, in the margin of 40 – 60 dB, see [17].
hence turning the BD-SEE objective into a DC over affine fraction. Moreover, it is observed that the SEE_{BD} maximization holds a similar mathematical structure in relation to the transmit covariance matrices, i.e., $Q_{ae}, W_{XY}, \mathcal{X} \in \{a, b\}$ as addressed for (16). Hence, a similar procedure as in the SUAIP algorithm is employed to obtain an optimal solution, with a guaranteed convergence to a point satisfying KKT conditions. The computational complexity of each Dinkelbach step is obtained similar to (25), where $n = 2N_A^2 - 2N_A + 2N_B - 2N_B, n_Y = M_B + M_A + M_E$ and $n_F = 2N_B + 2N_A + 2$.

V. Secrecy Energy Efficiency Maximization with Statistical CSI

It is usually challenging to obtain an accurate estimate of $H_{ae}$ and $H_{be}$, due to the lack of collaboration from Eve. In this part, we consider the case where the channel matrices are known only partially, i.e., only a statistical knowledge of $H_{ae}, H_{be}$ is available. An optimization problem for maximizing the statistical expectation of SEE is written as

$$\max Q \mathbb{E}_{H_{ae}, H_{be}} \{\text{SEE}\} \quad (31a)$$

s.t. \quad (16b), (16c), (16d). \quad (31b)

It is worth mentioning that the consideration of statistical CSI on secrecy capacity with single antenna receivers is studied in [33], considering a fast-fading channel case and extended for SEE maximization in [33], assuming HD operation of the nodes. In this work, we consider a more general case, where the channel to Eve may be stationary, however not known accurately due to the lack of collaboration from Eve. In order to turn (31) into a tractable form we write

$$\mathbb{E}_{H_{ae}, H_{be}} \{\text{SEE}\} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{H_{ae}, H_{be}} \left\{ \left\{ \hat{C}_s (Q) \right\}^+ \right\}}{P_{\text{tot}} (Q)} \approx \frac{1}{|F_C|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_C} \left\{ \hat{C}_{s,i} (Q) \right\}^+ P_{\text{tot}} (Q) =: \text{SAA} (Q), \quad (32)$$

where the latter is obtained via sample average approximation (SAA) [32], such that the equality holds for $|F_C| \to \infty$, $F_C$ being the index set of the sampled channel realizations. Moreover, $\hat{C}_{s,i} (Q) := \hat{C}_s (Q, H_{ae,i}, H_{be,i})$ where $H_{ae,i}, H_{be,i}$ represent the $i$-th realization of the channel matrices drawn from the given distributions. The approximated problem is hence expressed as

$$\max Q \quad \text{SAA} (Q) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad (16b), (16c), (16d). \quad (33)$$

Note that the above formulation is still challenging due to three reasons. Firstly, while the application of SAA turns the statistical expectation into a linear sum for any arbitrary channel distribution, it results in a high computational complexity as $|F_C|$ increases. This calls for a smart choice of $|F_C|$, compromising accuracy with algorithm complexity. Secondly, unlike the scenario with perfect CSI and also the case presented in [33], [36] considering a fast fading channel situation, the $\{\}$-operation may not be ignored. This is since some of the channel realizations may result in a negative $\hat{C}_s$, while the statistical expectation remains effectively positive. And third, similar to the studied problem in [16], the above objective presents a non-concave over affine fractional program which is not tractable in general.

A. Successive selection and statistical lower bound maximization (SSSLM)

In order to address the aforementioned challenges, we propose a successive selection and statistical lower bound maximization (SSSLM) algorithm, which converges to a stationary point of (33). Please note that in contrast to Subsection III-A, the operating objective in this part is not a differentiable one, hence invalidating the arguments given by SIA [47]. In this regard we follow a variation of SIA, i.e., the successive upper-bound minimization (SUM) method [38], generalizing the convergence arguments in SIA-based methods for non-smooth problems. The proposed SSSLM algorithm is composed of three nested loops; separation of the SAA into smooth and non-smooth parts at the outer loop, construction of an effective lower bound to SAA as the intermediate loop, and maximization of the constructed bound in the inner loop. A detailed description of the algorithm steps is given in the following.

1) Initialization: The algorithm starts by generating the channel instances $H_{ae,i}, H_{be,i}, \forall i \in \mathcal{F}_C$, drawn from the known statistical distribution of the channels. The number of channel realizations, i.e., $|F_C|$, should be chosen large enough to capture the channel statistics in SAA with adequate accuracy, however, should be kept small to reduce computational complexity. The analytical expression for the choice of $|F_C|$ is given in [54, Theorem 5.18], depending on the required statistical accuracy and the given probability distribution. For the initialization of $Q$, we follow the approximation

$$\mathbb{E}_{H_{ae}, H_{be}} \{\text{SEE} (Q, H_{ae}, H_{be})\} \approx \text{SEE} (Q, \mathbb{E} \{H_{ae}\}, \mathbb{E} \{H_{be}\}), \quad (34)$$

where the expectations $\mathbb{E} \{H_{ae}\}, \mathbb{E} \{H_{be}\}$ are obtained from the statistical distribution of the channels. Note that the right side of the approximation corresponds to the objective addressed in Subsection III-A, where SUAIP algorithm is applied to obtain an optimal solution. The obtained solution from SUAIP is then used as an initialization to the SSSLM algorithm.

2) Outer loop: In each outer iteration, the objective is decomposed as

$$\text{SAA} (Q) = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{C_1}} \left\{ \hat{C}_{s,i} (Q) \right\}^+ + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{C_2}} \left\{ \hat{C}_{s,i} (Q) \right\}^+}{|F_C|P_{\text{tot}} (Q)} \quad (35)$$

by separating the set of channel realizations into the disjoint sets $F_{C_1}$ and $F_{C_2}$, such that $F_C = F_{C_1} \cup F_{C_2}$. In particular, the set $F_{C_1}$ is updated in each outer iteration as

$$\mathcal{F}_{C_1}^{(\text{new})} = \left\{ i \mid i \in \mathcal{F}_{C_1} \quad \text{or} \quad \hat{C}_{s,i} (Q) = 0 \right\}, \quad (36)$$

where $Q$ is given from the last intermediate loop, and results in the separation of smooth and non-smooth parts of the objective in (35). The algorithm converges when the constructed set $F_{C_1}$ does not change. As it will be elaborated, the set members in
\( F_{C_i} \) incur a high computational complexity, but are capable of resolving the non-smooth points by maintaining the same directional derivative as to SAA. On the other hand, the set members in \( F_{C_i} \) are resolved with lower computational complexity, however, they are not capable of handling non-smooth situations.

3) Intermediate loop: In each intermediate iteration a lower bound is constructed from the original objective SAA, namely SAA_{LB}, using the value of \( Q \) from the last inner loop, i.e., \( Q_0 \). In order to construct SAA_{LB} we undertake three steps. Firstly, the operator \( \{ \}^+ \) is removed from SAA for \( i \in F_{C_2} \), which results in a global lower bound. Secondly, concave and tight lower bounds of the functions \( \hat{C}_{s,i} \) are constructed at the point \( Q_0 \), denoted as \( C_{s,i}(Q,Q_0) \), by applying the inequality (19) on the convex parts. Please note that the value of \( \hat{C}_{s,i} \) functions may be negative at \( Q_0 \) for some \( i \in F_{C_2} \), resulting in a bias to the original objective. In order to obtain a tight lower bound, we define the set

\[
F_{C_2}^+ := \{ \forall i \mid i \in F_{C_2}, \hat{C}_{s,i}(Q,Q_0) \geq 0 \}, \quad (37)
\]

representing the subset of channel realizations resulting in a non-negative \( \hat{C}_{s,i} \) at \( Q_0 \). The corresponding lower bound function is then obtained as

\[
\text{SAA}_{LB}(Q,Q_0) := \sum_{i \in F_{C_2}} \{ \hat{C}_{s,i}(Q,Q_0) \}^+ + \sum_{i \in F_{C_2}^+} \hat{C}_{s,i}(Q,Q_0) \left| \frac{F_{C_2}}{P_{tot}}(Q) \right|. \quad (38)
\]

It can be verified that the constructed lower bound is tight at the point of approximation, i.e., SAA\((Q_0) = \text{SAA}_{LB}(Q_0,Q_0)\), see Appendix B. The obtained lower bound is then optimally maximized in the inner loop. The iterations of the intermediate loop converge when \( Q_0 \), and hence SAA_{LB}, (almost) does not change in subsequent intermediate iterations.

4) Inner loop: The inner loop is dedicated to optimally maximize SAA_{LB}, under the original problem constrains (33). Note that the SAA_{LB} is not tractable in the current form, due to the \( \{ \}^+ \) operation. In order to obtain the optimum solution we equivalently write the maximization problem in the inner loop as

\[
\max_{a_i \in \{0,1\}, s \in F_{C_1}} \max_Q \text{SAA}_{LB}, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad (16b), (16c), (16d), \quad (39)
\]

where \( \text{SAA}_{LB} \) is obtained by replacing the terms \( \{ \hat{C}_{s,i} \}^+ \) in (38) by \( a_i \hat{C}_{s,i} \). Please note that for fixed values of \( a_i, i \in F_{C_1} \), the function \( \text{SAA}_{LB} \) is a concave over affine fraction, and can be maximized to optimality via the application of the Dinkelbach algorithm. Hence (39) can be solved by repeating the Dinkelbach algorithm for all \( 2^{\|F_{C_1}\|} \) possible combinations of \( a_i, i \in F_{C_1} \), however, requiring a large number of Dinkelbach iterations. The optimization problem corresponding to the \( k \)-th inner iteration is expressed as

\[
\max_{a_i \in \{0,1\}, s \in F_{C_1}} \max_Q \text{SAA}_{LB}, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad (16b), (16c), (16d), \quad (40a)
\]

where \( \text{SAA}_{LB} \) is the nominator in \( \text{SAA}_{LB} \), and \( Q_0 \) is the point for the construction of SAA_{LB}, given from the intermediate loop. Moreover, the vector \( a \in \{0,1\}^{\|F_{C_1}\|} \) stacks the values of \( a_i, \forall i \in F_{C_1} \), and \( A[k] \subset \{0,1\}^{\|F_{C_1}\|} \). It is observed that for a given \( a[k] \), \( \lambda[k-1] \), (40) is a jointly convex optimization problem, and is solved to optimality via MAX-DET algorithm [50]. Hence, the optimum \( a[k], Q[k] \) are obtained by repeating the MAX-DET algorithm for all combinations \( a[k] \in A[k] \). The value of \( \lambda \) is then updated by applying the obtained \( Q[k], a[k] \)

\[
\lambda[k] = \text{SAA}_{LB} \left( Q[k], Q_0[0], a[k] \right) / P_{tot} (Q[k]). \quad (41)
\]

Please note that the set \( A[k] \) is initialized as \( \{0,1\}^{\|F_{C_1}\|} \) but is reduced in each iteration. The following lemma clarifies this reduction.

Lemma VI.1 Let \( g_k(a_0) \) be the optimal value of the objective (40) at inner iteration \( k \), for the given combination \( a[k] = a_0 \). Then, if \( g_k(a_0) \) is negative, then the combination \( a_0 \) will not be an optimum combination.

Proof: Due to the monotonic improvement of \( \lambda \) in every iteration, and the fact that \( P_{tot} \geq 0 \), the value of \( g_k(a_0) \) will never improve after further iterations. This also results in a negative value of \( g_k(a_0) \) at the optimality. Since at least one of the combinations \( a \in \{0,1\}^{\|F_{C_1}\|} \) equalizes the objective to zero at the optimality, the combination \( a_0 \) will never be optimal.

As a result of Lemma VI.1 once a combination \( a_0 \) results in a negative value of the objective, then it is safely removed from \( A \) for the next iteration, see Algorithm 2. Note that the above process reduces the required computational complexity, compared to the separately applying the Dinkelbach method on all combinations, in two ways. Firstly, the parameter \( \lambda \) is only updated jointly, for all combinations \( a \in A \). Secondly, the monotonic reduction in \( |A| \) in each iteration, results in a smaller computational demand in finding the solution to (40).

5) Convergence: The proposed SSSLM algorithm converges to a stationary point of the original optimization problem (33). In order to observe this, we first verify the convergence of the algorithm. Afterwards, we show that the converging point is also a stationary point of (33).

It is observed that the constructed lower bound in each step of the intermediate loop is maximized to the optimality via the application of the modified Dinkelbach algorithm. On the other hand, the value of SAA_{LB}(Q) after the construction of the new lower bound in each intermediate iteration experiences an improvement. This is grounded on the re-calculation of \( \hat{C}_{s,i} \) at the point of approximation, and elimination of the channel instances from \( F_{C_2} \) which result in a negative \( \hat{C}_{s,i} \). Since the both aforementioned updates result in a monotonic improvement of SAA_{LB}(Q) and as the SAA is bounded from above, the iterations of inner and intermediate loop
will result in a necessary convergence. The convergence of the intermediate loop subsequently results in the necessary convergence of the outer loop, due to the monotonic increase of $|F_{C_i}|$ after each outer iteration, and the fact that $|F_{C_i}| \leq |F_C|$.

In order to argue the properties of the converging point on the original objective, we observe that neither the SAA nor SAA${}_{LB}(Q)$ are necessarily differentiable at the point of convergence, hence invalidating the convergence arguments used for SUAIP algorithm from [47]. In this regard, we follow the guidelines given by SUM method [38], generalizing the convergence arguments in SIA-based methods for non-smooth problems.

**Lemma V.2.** Let $Q^*$ be a solution of SSSLM. Then the function SAA, i.e., original problem objective, and SAA${}_{LB}$, i.e., the constructed lower bound at the last intermediate iteration, are tight and share the same directional derivatives at $Q^*$.

**Proof:** See Appendix B.

The results of Lemma V.2 together with the fact that SAA${}_{LB}(Q) \leq$ SAA$(Q)$ for any feasible $Q$, jointly satisfy the required assumption set [38] Assumption 1, and guarantee that the obtained converging point is indeed a stationary point of the original problem.

6) **Computational complexity:** The computational complexity of the algorithm is dominated by the maximization defined in (40), solved via the MAX-DET algorithm in each inner iteration. The associated arithmetic complexity is hence upper-bounded similar to (35), where $\gamma_{in} \propto 2^{[P_{C1}]}$, $n = 2N_A+2N_B+N_B-N_B$, $n_{\gamma} = [F_C](M_B+M_E)$, $n_F = 2N_A+N_B+2$. The performance of the proposed SSSLM algorithm, in terms of the computational complexity and convergence behavior is further studied in Subsection VI-A via numerical simulations.

**Algorithm 2** SEE maximization using statistical CSI via successive selection and statistical lower bound maximization (SSSLM). $C_{min}$ ($\lambda_{min}$) represents the convergence threshold for the intermediate (inner) iterations.

1: $k, l, m, \lambda^{[0,0,0]} \leftarrow 0; F_{C1} \leftarrow 0; F_C, C^{[0,0,0]} \leftarrow $ Subsection VI-A \(\triangleright \) initialize
2: repeat
3: $m \leftarrow m + 1$
4: $\lambda^{[0,m]} \leftarrow \lambda^{[k,l,m-1]}; C^{[0,m]} \leftarrow C^{[k,l,m-1]}$
5: $F_{C1} \leftarrow C^{[0,m]}$
6: $l \leftarrow 0$
7: repeat \(\triangleright \) intermediate loop
8: $l \leftarrow l + 1$
9: $F_{C2} \leftarrow C^{[0,m]}$
10: $SAA_{LB} \leftarrow \ $ Subsection VI-A
11: repeat \(\triangleright \) inner loop
12: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
13: $\{Q^{[k,l,m]}|\lambda^{[k,l,m]} \leq C_{min}\} \leftarrow$ Dinkelbach’s alg. \((\triangleright \) 10, 11)\n14: until $|\lambda^{[k,l,m]}| \leq C_{min}$
15: until $\lambda^{[0,m]} \leq \lambda^{[0,1,m]} \lambda_{min}$
16: until $F_{C1} \leq F_{C2}$
17: return $\{Q^{[k,l,m]}|\lambda^{[k,l,m]} \}$

VI. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section the performance of the studied MIMOME system is evaluated in terms of the resulting SEE, via numerical simulations. In particular, we are interested in a comparison between the performance of an FD-enabled setup, compared to the case where all nodes operate in HD mode. Moreover, the evaluation of the proposed SEE-specific designs is of interest, in comparison to the available designs which target the maximization of the system’s secrecy capacity. We assume that all communication channels follow an uncorrelated Rayleigh flat-fading model with variance $\rho_X = \rho/B$, where $B$ is the link distance and depends on the simulated geometry, $X \in \{ab, ba, ae, be\}$. Moreover, in case that only a statistical CSI is available for the channels to Eve, we assume that $H_X = \sqrt{\rho_B D X H X}$, where $\sqrt{\rho_B}H_X$ is the known channel estimate following similar statistics as for the exact CSI case, and $\sqrt{\rho_B} DX H X$ is the estimation error where $D$ enforces the receive-side spatial correlation, and $H_X$ includes i.i.d Gaussian elements with unit variance. For the self-interference channels we follow the characterization reported in [55]. In this respect we have $H_{bb} \sim \mathcal{CN}(\sqrt{\rho_B K_B}H_0, \rho_B I_{MB} \otimes I_{NB})$, where $\rho_B$ represents the self-interference channel strength, $H_0$ is a deterministic term, and $K_B$ is the Rician coefficient. The statistics of the self-interference channel on Alice, i.e., $H_{aa}$, is defined similarly. The resulting system SEE is evaluated by employing different design strategies, and averaged over 100 channel realizations. Unless otherwise is stated, the default simulated setup is defined as follows: $P_{\text{max}} := P_{X_{\text{max}}} = 0$dB, $P_0 := P_{X_{0}} = -20$dB, $\mu := \mu_X = 0.9$, $\kappa := \kappa_X = \beta_X = 40$dB, $N := N_X = M_X = 4$, $X \in \{A, B\}$. Moreover we set $P_{FD} = 0$, $\rho_a = 0$dB, $K_B = 10$, $\rho = -20$dB, and $\sigma_a^2 := \sigma_{ae}^2 = \sigma_{ae} = -40$dB. Three nodes are equidistantly positioned, with the distance equal to one.

A. Algorithm analysis

Due to the iterative structure of the proposed algorithms and the possibility of local optimum points, the convergence behavior of the algorithms are of high interest, both as a verification for algorithm operation as well as an indication of the required computational effort. In this part, the performance of the SUAIP and SSSLM algorithms are studied in terms of the average convergence behavior and computational complexity. Moreover, the impact of the choice of the algorithm initialization is evaluated.

In Fig. 4 (a) the average convergence behavior of the SUAIP algorithm is depicted. As expected, a monotonic objective improvement is observed, with convergence in 5-20 total outer iterations.

In Fig. 4 (b) and (c) the average required CPU time is depicted. It is observed that a higher power budget or antenna array size results in a higher required computational complexity, associated with slower convergence and larger problems.

---

9For simplicity, we choose $H_0$ as a matrix of all-1 elements.
10We consider unit-less parameters to preserve a general framework. However, the obtained SEE values can be interpreted as the number of securely communicated bits per-Hz per-Joule, assuming the power values are in Watt.
11The reported CPU time is obtained using an Intel Core i5 3320M processor with the clock rate of 2.6 GHz and 8 GB of random-access memory (RAM). As software platform we have used CVX [50], together with MATLAB 2013a on a 64-bit operating system.
problem dimensions. Moreover, a design with an FD-enabled jamming results in a higher CPU time, due to the additional problem complexity associated with the choice of jamming strategy and residual self-interference.

In Figs. 2 (d)-(e), the impact of the proposed initializations for the SUAIP and SSSLM algorithms are depicted. In Fig. 2 (d) it is observed that for the SUAIP algorithm, the proposed initialization in Subsection III-C reaches close to the benchmark performance. For the SSSLM algorithm, the situation is prone to more randomness. This is since, in addition to the choice of the algorithm initialization, the solution is dependent on the used channel realizations used in the construction of SAA, see (32). In this regard, the resulting cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the resulting SEE values is depicted in Fig. 2 (e), by examining 100 instances of the SSSLM algorithm. It is observed that the resulting average SEE differs for different solution instances, however, within 2 – 3% of the relative difference. This value is smaller for a system with HD nodes, due to the absence of FD jamming and the impact of residual self-interference which result in a simpler problem structure.

B. Performance comparison

In this part the SEE performance of the FD-enabled system is evaluated via the application of the proposed SUAIP and SSSLM algorithms, and under different system conditions. In particular, we are interested in a comparison between the performance of an FD-enabled setup, compared to the case where all nodes operate in HD mode. Moreover, the evaluation of the proposed SEE-specific designs is of interest, in comparison to the available designs which target the maximization of the system’s secrecy capacity. The following benchmarks are hence implemented to provide a meaningful comparison.

- **SEE-FD**: The proposed SUAIP (SSSLM) algorithm is implemented using the exact (statistical) CSI, where Bob is capable of FD operation.
- **SEE-HD**: Similar to **SEE-FD**, but with restricting the operation of the nodes to the HD mode.
- **CS-HD**: Similar to **CS-FD**, but with restricting the operation of the nodes to the HD mode.
- **FD-enabled jamming with exact CSI**: In Figs. 3 (a)-(h) the average SEE performance of the defined benchmarks are evaluated, assuming availability of perfect CSI and FD operation at Bob. Hence, both Alice and Bob are simultaneously capable of transmitting AN, see Fig. 1.

In Fig. 3 (a) the impact of thermal noise variance is depicted. It is observed that a higher \( \sigma_n^2 \) results in a smaller SEE both for FD and HD setups. Moreover, a marginal gain for FD setup is obtained compared to the HD setup, if the noise variance is low. This is expected, since FD jamming becomes less effective when Eve is already distorted with high thermal noise power.

In Fig. 3 (b) the impact of the available transmit power budget \( P_{\text{max}} \) for each transceiver is depicted. It is observed that for small values of \( P_{\text{max}} \), the resulting SEE is monotonically increasing with an increase in \( P_{\text{max}} \). Moreover, the performance of the benchmark algorithms essentially converge for small values of \( P_{\text{max}} \). This is grounded in the fact that for a system with low SNR condition, the positive impact of FD jamming disappears as observed from Fig. 3 (a). Conversely, for large values of \( P_{\text{max}} \), the traditional designs result in a rapid decrease of SEE, where the proposed SUAIP method converges to a constant value. This is expected, since the designs with the target of maximizing the secrecy rate utilize the maximum available power budget, resulting in a severe degradation of SEE. Moreover, a visible gain is observed with the application of an FD jammer for a high \( P_{\text{max}} \) region. Due to a high \( P_{\text{max}} \), the link from Alice to Eve also enjoys a better SNR condition, which justifies the application of an FD jammer.

In Fig. 3 (c) the impact of transceiver accuracy is depicted. As expected, a higher value of \( \kappa \) results in a smaller achievable SEE, both in HD and FD setups. Moreover, it is observed that FD jamming can be beneficial only for a system with an accurate hardware operation, due to the impact of residual self-interference. However, results show that targeting SEE as the design objective results in a significant energy efficiency gain, compared to the traditional designs which target the maximization of secrecy rate.

In Fig. 3 (d) the impact of Eve’s distance to Alice (\( d_E \)) is depicted. It is assumed that three nodes are positioned in a line with a total Alice-Bob distance of 100, where Eve is positioned in between. It is observed that the system SEE increases as \( d_E \) increase, and Eve gets closer to Bob. Moreover, the application

---

11 The benchmark performance is obtained by repeating the algorithm with several random initializations, and choosing the highest obtained SEE.
of FD jamming becomes beneficial only when Eve is located in a close distance to Bob, and hence the channel between Bob and Eve, i.e., the jamming channel, is strong.

In Figs. 3 (e) the impact of the number of antenna elements at Eve ($M_E$) on SEE is depicted. As expected, a larger $M_E$ results in a reduced SEE as it results in a stronger Alice-Eve channel. Moreover, the application of an FD jammer becomes gainful for a higher values of $M_E$, in order to counteract the improved Eve reception capability.

In Figs. 3 (f)-(h) the impact of the transceiver’s power efficiency is evaluated on the resulting system SEE. In particular, the impact of the zero-state power consumption ($P_0$), PA efficiency ($\mu$) and the additional power consumption for SIC ($P_{FD}$) are depicted respectively in Fig. 3 (f), (g) and (h). It is observed that higher (lower) values of $\mu$ ($P_0$, $P_{FD}$) result in a smaller SEE. Moreover, it is observed that a marginal gain with the application of an FD jammer is obtained for a high $\mu$, and a small $P_{FD}$ conditions. This is expected, since a small (large) value of $\mu$ ($P_{FD}$) results in a bigger waste of power when using an FD jamming strategy.

2) Secure bidirectional communication: In Fig. 4 a system with a bidirectional secure communication between Alice and Bob is studied. In particular, a joint FD operation at Alice and Bob is considered which enables jamming and communication simultaneously at both directions. Two scenarios are considered regarding the decoding capability at Eve: i) Eve treats interference from the non-intended information path as noise, and ii) Eve is capable of decoding, and hence reducing, the received signal from the non-intended information link. Moreover, a setup with HD Bob and HD Alice is also evaluated, where time-division-duplexing (TDD) or frequency-division-duplexing (FDD) is employed in order to facilitate a bidirectional communication.

It is observed that the resulting SEE increases with $P_{\text{max}}$, however, saturates for high values of maximum transmit power. Moreover, it is observed that a joint FD operation is capable of enhancing the system SEE, with a considerable margin, in the
studied bidirectional setup. This is since, due to the coexistence of both communication directions on the same channel the jamming power is re-used for both communication directions, leading to a higher SEE compared to the HD setup. Moreover, the Eve’s decoding capability is further decreased in the FD setup considering the scenario (i), due to the existence of two information links at the same channel.

3) **FD-enabled jamming with statistical CSI:** In Fig. 5 the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the resulting SEE is evaluated via the application of SSSLM algorithm on 100 problem instances\(^{12}\) where only a statistical CSI is available for the channels to Eve. We choose \(|\mathbb{C}_C| = 75\) in the construction of SAA, see Section V, in order to limit the required computational effort. The CDF of the resulting SEE is then evaluated via the utilization of 10000 channel realizations for each problem instance, following the statistical distribution defined in the beginning of the current section and choosing \(D_X\) as a matrix of all-1 elements.

In Fig. 5 (a) the performance of the SSSLM algorithm with the consideration of the statistical CSI, is compared to the case where the SUIAP algorithm is applied directly on the channel estimate matrices \(\tilde{H}_X\). It is observed that a significant gain is obtained by taking into account the full channel statistics, however, at the expense of a higher computational complexity. Moreover, the superior SEE performance of the SEE specific design, compared to the secrecy rate maximizing designs is observable.

In Figs. 5 (b)-(d) the CDF of the resulting SEE is evaluated for different levels of thermal noise (\(\sigma_n^2\)), hardware inaccuracy (\(\kappa\)), and the PA efficiency (\(\mu\)). Similar to the observed trends for the scenario where exact CSI is available, a marginal gain is observed in the resulting SEE with the application of an optimized FD jamming strategy. In particular, the gain of the FD-enabled system is improved for a system with a high SNR, i.e., a high transmit power budget or a low noise level, and as hardware accuracy increases.

\(^{12}\)Each problem instance includes a realization of \(H_{ab}, H_{bb}\).
VII. CONCLUSION

The utilization of FD jamming transceivers is known to significantly enhance the secrecy capacity of wireless communication systems, by transmitting AN while exchanging information. However, this results in a higher power consumption in the system due to i) the degrading impact of residual self-interference on the desired communication channel, ii) the implementation of an SIC scheme at the FD transceiver, as well as iii) the power consumed for the transmission of AN. In this work, we have observed that the application of FD transceivers results only in a marginal gain in terms of secrecy energy efficiency, for a wide range of system conditions. However, the aforementioned SEE gain becomes significant for a system with a small distance between the FD node to the eavesdropper, or a system operating in high SNR regimes, under the condition that the self-interference can be effectively and efficiently mitigated. Moreover, a promising SEE gain is observed for an FD bidirectional communication, where jamming power can be reused for both directions. It is observed that for almost all system conditions, the application of an SEE-aware design is essential, compared to the available designs which target the maximization of secrecy capacity.

APPENDIX A
SUIAP INITIALIZATION

A. The choice of $F$ and $G$

As mentioned, the role of $F$ (G) is to direct (suppress) the transmission into the desired (undesired) direction. Hence, for the design of $Q_a$, i.e., data transmission from Alice, we choose $F \leftarrow H_{ab}$, and $G \leftarrow H_{ae}$. Conversely, for the design of $W_a$ we choose $F \leftarrow H_{ae}$, and $G \leftarrow H_{ab}$. For the design of $W_b$ we set $F \leftarrow H_{be}$. However, the choice of $G$ should include the impact of distortion terms on Bob, reflecting the effect of residual self-interference. The distortion power at Bob can be written as

$$\text{tr}(\kappa H_{bb} \text{diag}(W_b) H_{bb}^H) + \text{tr}(\beta \text{diag}(H_{bb} W_b H_{bb}^H))$$

which consequently results in the choice of $G \leftarrow (H_{bb})^{-1}$.

B. Power adjustment

Via the utilization of the obtained spatial beams, i.e., normalized covariance matrices, the optimal power adjustment on each transmission is sought to maximize the resulting SEE. In each case, by fixing the power of the other transmission, the resulting $\text{SEE}_p$ is written as

$$\text{SEE}_p(p_X) = \log \left( \frac{\alpha_{11}^{X} p_X^{2} + \alpha_{12}^{X} p_X + \alpha_{22}^{X} p_X + \alpha_{21}^{X}}{\gamma_1^{X} p_X + \gamma_2^{X}} \right),$$

where $p_X, X \in \{Q_a, W_a, W_b\}$, represent the power associated with different transmissions. It is observed from (42) that $\text{SEE}_p \to 0$ for $p_X \to \infty$ and $\text{SEE}_p(0)$ is a finite and non-negative value. Moreover, $\text{SEE}_p(p_X)$ is a continuous and differentiable function in the region $p_X \in [0, \infty)$. This concludes the location of the optimal $p_X$ at the problem boundaries, or at the points equalizing the derivative if $\text{SEE}_p(p_X) \to 0$, see section A-C for an efficient numerical solution.

C. Efficient implementation

For ease of notation, the objective [43] is denoted as $f(p_X)$ and its numerator is defined as $g(p_X)$:

$$f(p_X) = \frac{g(p_X)}{\gamma_1^{X} p_X + \gamma_2^{X}}$$

$$g(p_X) = \log \left( \frac{\alpha_{11}^{X} p_X^{2} + \alpha_{12}^{X} p_X + \alpha_{22}^{X} p_X + \alpha_{21}^{X}}{\alpha_{21}^{X} p_X^{2} + \alpha_{22}^{X} p_X + \alpha_{23}^{X}} \right).$$

The goal is to find the maximum feasible value $\lambda^*$ of the objective function $f(p_X)$ as well as $p_X^*$ for which $\lambda^*$ is...
achieved. \( \lambda^* \) is defined as follows:

\[
\lambda^* = \max_{0 \leq p_X \leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma_1 X^* + \gamma_2 X^*} g(p_X). \tag{45}
\]

It can be seen that the objective \( f(p_X) \) is continuous and differentiable. Because \( p_X \) is bounded on the closed interval \([0, c]\), it follows from the extreme value theorem that the objective has a maximum \( \lambda^* \) on this interval. The optimum \( p_X \), i.e., \( x^\star \), is located either on the boundaries of the closed interval or on a point satisfying

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial p_X} g(p_X) \gamma_1^2 p_X + \gamma_2^2 = 0.
\tag{46}
\]

Using the quotient rule, \( \gamma_1^2 p_X^2 + \gamma_2^2 \) can be rewritten as

\[
\lambda^* = \gamma_1^X p_X^* + \gamma_2^X = g(p_X^*) \gamma_1^X = 0.
\tag{47}
\]

\[
\lambda^* = \gamma_1^X p_X^* + \gamma_2^X = g(p_X^*) \gamma_1^X = 0.
\tag{48}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial p_X} g(p_X) = \gamma_1^X p_X^* + \gamma_2^X = \lambda,
\tag{49}
\]

where \( g'(p_X) \) denotes the derivative of \( g(p_X) \) with respect to \( p_X \), given by

\[
g'(p_X) = \frac{2 \alpha_1 X^* p_X + \alpha_2 X^*}{\alpha_1 X^* + \alpha_2 X^*} + \frac{2 \alpha_1 X^* p_X + \alpha_2 X^*}{\alpha_1 X^* + \alpha_2 X^*}.
\tag{50}
\]

Our goal is to convert the maximization problem into a simpler feasibility problem. For a given value of the objective function, denoted as \( \lambda \), check if a feasible \( p_X \) exists. Therefore, equation \( \lambda^* \) is rewritten to

\[
\lambda^* = \frac{2 \alpha_1 X^* p_X + \alpha_2 X^*}{\alpha_1 X^* + \alpha_2 X^*} + \frac{2 \alpha_1 X^* p_X + \alpha_2 X^*}{\alpha_1 X^* + \alpha_2 X^*} = 0.
\tag{51}
\]

Equation \( 51 \) is a fourth-order polynomial and hence, it can be written as

\[
c_4 p_X^4 + c_3 p_X^3 + c_2 p_X^2 + c_1 p_X + c_0 = 0,
\tag{52}
\]

with

\[
c_4 = \alpha_1 X^* \alpha_1 X^* \gamma_1 X^* \lambda
c_3 = (\alpha_1 X^* \alpha_1 X^* \alpha_2 X^* \gamma_1 X^* \lambda)
c_2 = (\alpha_2 X^* \alpha_1 X^* \alpha_2 X^* \alpha_2 X^* \gamma_1 X^* \lambda)
c_1 = (\alpha_1 X^* \alpha_1 X^* \alpha_2 X^* \alpha_2 X^* \gamma_1 X^* \lambda)
c_0 = \alpha_1 X^* \alpha_1 X^* \alpha_1 X^* \gamma_1 X^* \lambda.
\]

Let the roots of \( 52 \) be denoted as \( p_X^i, i \in \{1, \ldots, 4\} \). If there is any real \( p_X^i \in [0, c] \) for which

\[
f(p_X^i) \geq \lambda
\tag{53}
\]

holds, then \( \lambda \) is feasible. As a result, it is possible to construct the following bi-section algorithm to find the maximum \( \lambda^* \), denoted as \( \lambda^* \).

Firstly, a closed interval for \( \lambda^* \) is defined, i.e., \( \lambda^* \in [\lambda_{\min}, \lambda_{\max}] \), where \( \lambda_{\min} \) can usually be defined as

\[
\lambda_{\min} = \min \{ f(0), f(c) \}.
\tag{54}
\]

Moreover, \( \lambda_{\max} \) can be chosen as an upper bound on \( \lambda \):

\[
\lambda_{\max} = \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \max \left\{ \alpha_1 X^*/\alpha_2 X^*, \alpha_1 X^*/\alpha_2 X^*, \alpha_1 X^*/\alpha_2 X^* \right\} \right).
\tag{55}
\]

The algorithm finds \( \lambda^* \) up to some tolerance \( \epsilon > 0 \). In the first iteration it is verified if \( \lambda^1 = \lambda_{\max} - \lambda_{\min} \) is feasible. Therefore, the roots \( p_X^i, i \in \{1, \ldots, 4\} \) of \( 52 \) are calculated for \( \lambda = \lambda^1 \). If any \( p_X^i \) is real, lies in the interval \([0, c]\) and \( f(p_X^i) \geq \lambda^i \) holds, then \( \lambda^1 \) is feasible and the procedure is repeated for \( \lambda^2 = \lambda_{\max} - \lambda^1 \). Otherwise \( \lambda^1 \) is infeasible and the procedure is repeated for \( \lambda^2 = \lambda_{\max} - \lambda_{\min} \). By construction this algorithm numerically approximates the maximum feasible objective value \( \lambda^* \) to arbitrary precision \( \epsilon \). This algorithm is formally given by algorithm 3.

**Algorithm 3 Bi-Section Power Allocation**

1: Input: \( \lambda_{\min}, \lambda_{\max}, c \)
2: \( \epsilon > 0, \ell = 0, a = \lambda_{\min}, b = \lambda_{\max} \)
3: repeat
4: \( \ell = \ell + 1 \)
5: isFeasible = false
6: \( \lambda = \frac{a + b}{2} \)
7: Calculate roots \( p_X^i, i \in \{1, \ldots, 4\} \) of \( 52 \)
8: for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, 4\} \) do
9: if \( f(p_X^i) \geq \lambda \) and \( p_X^i \in [0, c] \) and \( f(p_X^i) \geq \lambda^i \) then
10: isFeasible = true
11: \( p_X = p_X^i \)
12: break
13: end if
14: end for
15: if isFeasible then
16: \( a = \lambda \)
17: else
18: \( b = \lambda \)
19: end if
20: end if
21: return \( p_X^* = p_X, \lambda^* = \lambda \)

**APPENDIX B**

**PROOF TO LEMMA V.2**

**A. Proof of tightness:**

Tightness is obtained by observing the equivalence

\[
|\mathcal{F}_C| P_{tot}(Q^*) SAA(Q^*) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_C} \left( \hat{C}_{s,i}(Q^*) \right)^+
\]

\[
= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_C^1} \left( \hat{C}_{s,i}(Q^*) \right)^+ + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_C^2} \left( \hat{C}_{s,i}(Q^*) \right)^+
\tag{56a}
\]

\[
= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_C^1} \left( \hat{C}_{s,i}(Q^*, Q^*) \right)^+ + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_C^2} \left( \hat{C}_{s,i}(Q^*, Q^*) \right)^+
\tag{56b}
\]

where \( 56a \) is obtained by applying the definition \( 37 \), and \( 56b \) from \( \hat{C}_{s,i}(Q^*) = \hat{C}_{s,i}(Q^*, Q^*) \), see \( 19 \).

**B. Proof of equal directional derivative:**

Let \( \hat{C}_{s,i} := \hat{C}_{s,i}^+ \), and \( f'(x; d) \) represents the directional derivative of a function \( f \) at point \( x \) and for the direction \( d \).
The directional derivative of $SAA$ at $Q^*$ is then expressed as
\[
P_{\text{tot}}(Q^*) \cdot \text{SAA}'(Q^*;d) = \left( \sum_{i \in F_{C_1}} C'_{s, i}(Q^*;d) + \sum_{i \in F_{C_2}} \tilde{C}'_{s, i}(Q^*;d) \right) / |F_C| - P_{\text{tot}}(Q^*;d) \cdot \text{SAA}(Q^*)
\]
(57a)
\[
= \left( \sum_{i \in F_{C_1}} \tilde{C}'_{s, i}(Q^*, Q^*;d) + \sum_{i \in F_{C_2}} \tilde{C}'_{s, i}(Q^*, Q^*;d) \right) / |F_C| - P_{\text{tot}}(Q^*;d) \cdot \text{SAA}_{\text{LB}}(Q^*, Q^*)
\]
(57b)
\[
P_{\text{tot}}(Q^*) \cdot \text{SAA}_{\text{LB}}(Q^*, Q^*;d)
\]
(57c)
where the set $F_{C_i}(d)$ is defined as
\[
F_{C_i}(d) := \{ i \in F_{C_1} \text{ and } C'_{s, i}(Q^*;d) ≠ 0 \}.
\]
(58)
In the above arguments, (57a) is obtained by recalling (32), and the fact that $C_{s, i}(Q^*)$ is positive and differentiable for any $i \in F_{C_2}$. The identity (57b) is obtained by considering the possible situations for $C_{s, i}(Q^*)$:
- $C_{s, i}(Q^*) < 0$. Then, $C_{s, i}$ is differentiable and $C'_{s, i}(Q^*;d) = 0$ for any direction $d$.
- $C_{s, i}(Q^*) > 0$. Then, $C_{s, i}$ is differentiable and $C'_{s, i}(Q^*;d) = \tilde{C}'_{s, i}(Q^*;d)$ for any direction $d$.
- $C_{s, i}(Q^*) = 0$ and $\tilde{C}'_{s, i}(Q^*;d) > 0$. Then, $C_{s, i}$ is not differentiable and $C'_{s, i}(Q^*;d) = \tilde{C}'_{s, i}(Q^*;d)$.
- $C_{s, i}(Q^*) = 0$ and $\tilde{C}'_{s, i}(Q^*;d) ≤ 0$. Then, $C_{s, i}$ is not differentiable and $C'_{s, i}(Q^*;d) = 0$.

Finally, the identity (57c) is obtained by recalling (38), and the tightness property from (56).
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