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Abstract

The secrecy rate region of wiretap interference channels with a multi-antenna passive eavesdropper is studied under receiver energy harvesting constraints. To stay operational in the network, the legitimate receivers demand energy alongside information, which is fulfilled by power transmission and exploiting a power splitting (PS) receiver. By simultaneous wireless information and power transfer (SWIPT), the amount of leakage to the eavesdropper increases, which in turn reduces the secrecy rates. For this setup, lower-bounds for secure communication rate are derived without imposing any limitation at the eavesdropper processing. These lower-bounds are then compared with the rates achieved by assuming the worst-case linear eavesdropper processing. We show that in certain special cases the worst-case eavesdropper does not enlarge the achievable secure rate region in comparison to the unconstrained eavesdropper case. It turns out that in order to achieve the Pareto boundary of the secrecy rate region, smart tuning of the transmit power and receiver PS coefficient is required. Hence, we propose an efficient algorithm to optimize these parameters jointly in polynomial-time. The secrecy rate region characterization is formulated as a weighted max-min optimization problem. This problem turns out to be a non-convex problem due to the non-convex constrained set. This set is replaced by a convex subset that in consequence leads to an achievable suboptimal solution which is improved iteratively. By solving the problem efficiently, we obtain the amount of rate loss for providing secrecy, meanwhile satisfying the energy demands.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Secrecy is one of the main concerns in future communication networks involving a plethora of communicating nodes. This includes wireless sensor networks (WSNs) and Internet of Things (IoTs) [1]–[3]. Moreover, due to a steadily increasing number of connected devices, the scarce spectrum needs to be shared among multiple communication pairs. These two factors motivate the study of the wiretap interference channel [4]. In this channel, multiple node pairs exchange data simultaneously over a shared spectrum, which in turn induces interference at the receivers. One way to tackle this problem is to treat the undesired signals at the legitimate receivers as noise — popularly known as treating interference as noise (TIN). By using this technique, the complexity of the receiver is kept low. In [5]–[8], for a class of multi-user networks, the authors have shown the information-theoretic optimality of TIN in cases that certain constraints on the level of interference is fulfilled. Despite, the interference is treated as noise for information detection reasons, it can be treated as a energy source for energy harvesting purposes. This way, securing the desired information assuming TIN, the legitimate users demand a particular amount of energy to stay functional during the communication process [9], [10]. For instance, consider a WSN with limited energy supply at the sensors. By deploying energy harvesting receivers, the energy buffer can be charged wirelessly from energy sources, e.g., solar energy, radio frequency (RF) [11], [12]. One aspect of this work is to investigate the concept of RF signal energy harvesting in the context of security. The efficiency of the power conversion from the RF signal to the electrical current can be kept high (up to 70%) by efficient hardware design [13]–[15]. Now, the sensors with scarce energy supply face a trade-off in between information detection (ID) and energy harvesting (EH). Considering a single-antenna receiver, simultaneous ID and
EH can be achieved by power splitting (PS). Hence, one part of received signal power undergoes the ID chain while the other part passes through the EH circuitry. Utilizing PS receivers, the required energy constraint is fulfilled by appropriate power transmission. This concept is known as simultaneous wireless information and power transmission (SWIPT) [16]–[18].

For a class of multi-user networks, the authors in [19]–[23] establish bounds on secure communication region. The secrecy rate region of the model that we study with EH demands is a function of — i) the transmit power, and ii) the receive PS coefficients. Therefore, to establish the secrecy rate region with EH, it is pivotal to study the joint interaction between transmit power, and, receive PS coefficients at the legitimate pairs. Thus, the optimal design of these parameters captures the trade-off between secure communication rates and harvested energies.

A. Contribution

In this paper, we investigate the secrecy rate region of the wiretap interference channel with EH legitimate users. Characterizing the secrecy capacity of this channel is challenging. Thus, we focus our attention to develop secure rate lower-bounds. In particular, we consider two classes of eavesdropper, which we refer to as i) unconstrained, and ii) constrained eavesdroppers. In the unconstrained case, we impose no limitations on the computational complexity of the eavesdropper. For the later case, the eavesdropper is limited to linear processing. We show that in certain special cases the constrained (weak) eavesdropper does not enlarge the achievable secure rate region in comparison to the unconstrained eavesdropper case. For both secure communication and energy harvesting purposes, the transmit power, and receive PS coefficients are optimized jointly in order to capture the trade-off between secure rates and energy demands. This optimization problem is a non-convex problem. Interestingly, this problem turns out to be is a signomial program (SP), which in this work is approximated by a geometric program (GP). We propose a polynomial-time algorithm to solve this problem iteratively, where the approximation gap reduces at each iteration. The efficiency of the proposed algorithm is highlighted by comparing the solution
with exhaustive search. We observe that the optimal secrecy rate tuples (by exhaustive search) are captured by the iterative approach. The optimal solution sheds light on the rate loss due to secrecy constraint, meanwhile harvesting a certain amount of RF energy. This loss is reduced, if the processing capability of the eavesdropper is known.

We structure this paper as follows. We introduce the system model and the related assumptions in section II. In subsections II-A and II-B, we present an achievable secrecy rate region for the unconstrained and constrained eavesdroppers, respectively. In section II-C, we present the analysis and insights for the two-user wiretap interference channel. We present a weighted max-min optimization framework to obtain the achievable secrecy rate region under energy harvesting constrained in section III. In section IV, we study the worst-case linear eavesdropper. We present the numerical results and the insights in section V. Finally, we conclude this paper in section VI.

### B. Notation

Throughout the paper, we denote vectors in boldface lower-case letters while the matrices are expressed in boldface upper-case. The differential entropy of a random variable, \( x \) is denoted by \( h(x) \) and the mutual information between two random variables, \( x \) and \( y \) is denoted by \( I(x; y) \). The operator \( \sqcup \) concatenates two vectors and \( a \leq b \) represents element-wise comparison between vectors \( a \) and \( b \). If \( b = a^k \) or \( b \in \text{Null}(aa^H) \), then \( a^Hb = 0 \), where \( \text{Null}(X) \) represents the null-space of \( X \). Suppose \( x \) is a vector of \( K \) elements, i.e., \( x = [x_1, \ldots, x_K]^T \), then the vector \( x_{k+1}^K = [x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_K]^T \). Moreover, \( x \setminus x_k \) represents vector \( x \) excluding the \( k \)-th element, i.e., \( x \setminus x_k = [x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_K]^T \).

## II. System Model

Consider a wiretap interference channel, where the legitimate users are equipped with single antenna and the eavesdropper is equipped with multiple antennas as shown in Fig[1]. The baseband
signal model at the receivers is given by

\[ y_k = h_{kk}x_k + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \atop j \neq k}}^{K} h_{kj}x_j + w_k, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (1) \]

\[ y_E = \sum_{j=1}^{K} h_{Ej}x_j + w_E, \quad (2) \]

where the set of legitimate users is denoted by \( \mathcal{K} = \{1, \cdots, K\} \). The received signal at \( k \)-th legitimate receiver and the eavesdropper is given by \( y_k \in \mathbb{C} \) and \( y_E \in \mathbb{C}^M \), respectively. The transmit signal from the \( k \)-th legitimate transmitter is assumed to be taken from a Gaussian codebook and is denoted by \( x_k \in \mathbb{C} \). We assume that, the transmit signals from the legitimate users follow independent and identical distribution. In this paper, we distinguish between the antenna noise (due to impedance mismatch) and the processing noise (due to analog/digital signal processing tasks) at the receivers. We model these noise entities as zero-mean additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN). Thus, the antenna noise at the \( k \)-th legitimate receiver and the eavesdropper are given by \( w_k \sim \mathcal{C}N(0, \sigma_k^2) \) and \( w_E \sim \mathcal{C}N(0, \sigma_E^2 I_M) \), respectively. Channel realization from the \( j \)-th transmitter to the \( k \)-th receiver is given by \( h_{kj} \in \mathbb{C} \), and the channel from the \( j \)-th user to the eavesdropper is given by \( h_{Ej} \in \mathbb{C}^M \). The channel state information is known globally. The malicious eavesdropper aims at wiretapping the signals from the legitimate users. In the information decoding (ID) chain, the received signal experiences extra noise, which is originated from imperfect A/D conversion and digital processing tasks. Taking this noise term
into account, we obtain

\[ y_E = \sum_{j=1}^{K} h_{Ej}x_j + w_E + n_E, \]  

(3)

where \( n_E \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2_E) \) represents the processing noise at the eavesdropper. As mentioned earlier, the legitimate receivers harvest the energy from the RF signal by PS structure as depicted in Fig. 2. Therefore, a portion of the received signal power undergoes the information detection (ID) chain and the other portion passes through the energy harvesting (EH) circuitry. The signal passed to the ID chain and EH circuitry is given by

\[ y_{\text{ID}k} = \sqrt{\eta_k} \left( h_{kk}x_k + \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^{K} h_{kj}x_j + w_k \right) + n_k, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \]  

(4)

\[ y_{\text{EH}k} = \sqrt{1 - \eta_k} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{K} h_{kj}x_j + w_k \right), \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \]  

(5)

where the processing noise at the \( k \)-th legitimate receiver is denoted by \( n_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2_k) \). The achievable information rate and harvested energy are then given by

\[ R_k = I(x_k; y_{\text{ID}k}) = \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{\eta_k p_k |h_{kk}|^2}{\sigma_k^2 + \eta_k (\sigma_k^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2)} \right), \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \]  

(6)

\[ E_k = (1 - \eta_k) \left( \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 + \sigma_k^2 \right), \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \]  

(7)

respectively, which guarantees reliable communication with arbitrarily small decoding error. Notice that \( \eta_k \) is the PS coefficient at the \( k \)-th legitimate receiver. The transmit power from the
The $k$-th transmitter is denoted by $p_k := \mathbb{E}[|x_k|^2]$.

**Remark 1:** In the interference-limited regime, i.e., for $\sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \gg \sigma^2_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}$, the achievable communication rate reduction by PS is negligible.

For secure communication, the sum rate is given by \cite{24}, \cite{25}

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} R^s_k \leq \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{K} I(x_k; y_{\text{ID}_k}) - I(x_k; y_E) \right]^+, \quad (8)$$

where the secrecy rate for the $k$-th user is denoted by $R^s_k$. The negative term in the RHS in (8) can be written as

$$I(x; y_E) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} I(x_k; y_E|x_{k+1}^{K}) := \sum_{k=1}^{K} R_{E_k}, \quad (9)$$

For Gaussian signaling, the term in (9) is given by \cite{26},

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} R_{E_k} = \log_2 \det \left( I_M + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{p_k h_{Ek} h_{Ek}^H}{\sigma^2_E + \sigma^2_{E_k}} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{K} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{p_k}{\sigma^2_E + \sigma^2_{E_k}} h_{Ek}^H Q_k^{-1} h_{Ek} \right), \quad (10)$$

where

$$Q_k = I_M + \sum_{l=k+1}^{K} \frac{p_l}{\sigma^2_E + \sigma^2_{E_l}} h_{El} h_{El}^H, \quad (11)$$

which shows that the sum rate expression in (10) can be realized by minimum mean-squared alongside successive interference cancellation (MMSE-SIC). Plugging (6) and (9) in (8), we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} R^s_k \leq \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{K} R_k - R_{E_k} \right]^+. \quad (12)$$

Sum secure rate does not necessarily ensure individual secrecy rates. Moreover, assuming MMSE-SIC at the eavesdropper, limits the malicious eavesdropping behavior. This implies that, the eavesdropper may perform a random cancellation order, which is not necessarily known at the legitimate users. In what follows, we elaborate this insight with the help of a simple example.
Example 1: Consider the case of two legitimate users, i.e., $K = 2$. The individual secrecy rates from the secrecy sum rates can be given by,

$$ \sum_{k=1}^{K} R_k^s \leq [R_1 - R_{E_1} + R_2 - R_{E_2}]^+ $$

(13)

where $(R_{E_1}, R_{E_2})$ pairs from the set $\mathcal{R}_E$ are given by

$$ \mathcal{R}_E = \left\{ \frac{R_{E_1}^{(1)}}{\log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{p_1 h_{E_1}^H h_{E_1}}{\sigma_E^2 + \vartheta_E^2} \right)}, \frac{R_{E_2}^{(1)}}{\log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{p_2 h_{E_2}^H h_{E_2}}{\sigma_E^2 + \vartheta_E^2} \right)} \right\}, $$

(14)

for two possible cancellation orders at the eavesdropper. These rates are illustrated in Fig. 3 for the two feasible pairs of the set $\mathcal{R}_E$, for particular channel realizations and given optimal transmit powers. Now, if the eavesdropper decides to cancel the signal of the first user and then performs SIC (the eavesdropper operates at point A in Fig. 3), then the following individual rates are secure

$$ R_k^s = R_k - R_{E_k}^{(1)}, \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2\}, $$

(15)
where $R_{E_k}^{(1)}$, $\forall k \in \{1, 2\}$ are given in \((14)\). Alternatively, if the eavesdropper decides to cancel the signal from the second user first; and, performs SIC (the eavesdropper operates at point B in Fig. 3), then the individual secure rates are

$$\hat{R}_k^s = R_k - R_{E_k}^{(2)}, \forall k \in \{1, 2\},$$

\((16)\)

where $R_{E_k}^{(2)}$, $\forall k \in \{1, 2\}$ are given in \((14)\). Notice that, the individual secrecy rates depend on the eavesdropper’s freedom in choosing the SIC order. Since, no latency and computational complexity constraints are assumed, the eavesdropper is allowed to process all decoding orders in parallel. Lets assume that the eavesdropper operates at point A. For this point the secrecy communication pair $\left(R_1^s, R_2^s\right)$ is achievable. However, if the eavesdropper switches to point B (changes SIC order), the information transmission at the rate $R_1^s$ is not secure, since $R_1^s > \hat{R}_1^s$. Notice that, the communication at the $R_2^s$ is still secure, since $R_2^s \leq \hat{R}_2^s$. Thus, the communications between all legitimate pairs can not be guaranteed to be secure if no constraint is imposed at the eavesdropper processing order. In the following sections we discuss the achievable individual secrecy rates with constrained and unconstrained eavesdroppers. Table I briefly presents the transmission and reception schemes for these eavesdropper cases.

Next, we establish the individual secrecy rates that guarantee secrecy between all communication pairs independent of the eavesdropper processing.

### TABLE I: Transmission and reception schemes. GC: Gaussian codebooks, RB: random binning, TIN: treating interference as noise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User</th>
<th>Unconstrained eavesdropper</th>
<th>Constrained eavesdropper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate transmitters</td>
<td>GC + RB</td>
<td>GC + RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate receivers</td>
<td>TIN</td>
<td>TIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eavesdropper</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MMSE, MMSE-SIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A. Unconstrained Eavesdropper (lower-bound)

Before providing the achievable secrecy rate region for the unconstrained eavesdropper, we state the following lemma, which will be useful to establish the lower-bound.

**Lemma 1:** Given (3), the following inequalities hold

\[ I(x_k; y_E|x \setminus x_k) \geq I(x_k; y_E|x_{k+1}), \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}. \]  

(17)

**Proof:** The proof of lemma 1 is provided in Appendix A.

Utilizing lemma 1, the individual secrecy rates lower-bound is given by,

\[ R_s^k = \left[ I(x_k; y_{ID_k}) - I(x_k; y_E|x \setminus x_k) \right]^+, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}. \]  

(18)

Exploiting Gaussian codebooks at the legitimate transmitters alongside random binning the first term in RHS in (18) is given by (6), [27]. The second mutual information term in (18) can be readily computed as,

\[ I(x_k; y_E|x \setminus x_k) = \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{p_k \|h_{E_k}\|^2}{\sigma_E^2 + \varrho_E^2} \right), \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}. \]  

(19)

Plugging (6) and (19) into (18), the achievable secrecy rate lower-bound as a function of transmit power and receiver PS coefficients is given by

\[ R_s^k = \log_2 \left( \frac{\left( \sigma_E^2 + \varrho_E^2 \right) \left( \sigma_k^2 + \eta_k \varrho_k^2 + \eta_k \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \right)}{\left( \sigma_E^2 + \varrho_E^2 + p_k \|h_{E_k}\|^2 \right) \left( \sigma_k^2 + \eta_k \varrho_k^2 + \eta_k \sum_{j \neq k}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \right)} \right), \]  

(20)

where the transmit powers and receiver PS coefficients are optimized in section III to provide the achievable secrecy rate region.

B. Constrained Eavesdropper

In this section, we hypothetically limit the eavesdropper to perform linear processing. Zero-forcing (ZF) and maximum-ratio combining (MRC) are two alternatives for eavesdropper linear processing receiver. However, the efficiency of these receivers are functions of the signal-to
interference and noise ratio (SINR). At high SINR, MRC achieves higher secrecy rates compared to ZF. However, if the SINR is sufficiently low, ZF achieves higher secrecy rates. The minimum mean-squared error (MMSE) receiver is the linear-optimal reception scheme independent of the operating SINR regime. In what follows, we study two potential MMSE receivers with parallel and successive decoding functionalities at the eavesdropper. Notice that, successive decoding requires higher implementation complexity. These receive structures are shown in Fig. 4.

1) Parallel reception at the eavesdropper: In this case, following individual secrecy communication rates are achievable

$$R_{k}^{S<PE>} = [I(x_{k}; y_{ID_{k}}) - I(x_{k}; y_{E})]^{+}.$$ (21)

Following the line of proof in lemma 1, we can readily show that

$$I(x_{k}; y_{E}) \leq I(x_{k}; y_{E}|x_{k+1}^{K}), \forall k \in \mathcal{K}.$$ 

Notice that, the second term in RHS in (21) is represented by

$$I(x_{k}; y_{E}) = \log_{2} \left( 1 + \frac{p_{k}h_{E_{k}}^{H}Q_{k}^{-1}h_{E_{k}}}{\sigma_{E}^{2} + \varrho_{E}^{2}} \right), \forall k \in \mathcal{K},$$ (22)

where

$$Q_{k} = I_{M} + \sum_{j=1}^{K} \frac{P_{j}}{\sigma_{E}^{2} + \varrho_{E}^{2}} h_{E_{j}}h_{E_{j}}^{H}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}.$$ (23)
Plugging (6) and (22) into (21), the achievable secrecy rates lower-bound as a function of transmit power and receiver PS coefficients is given by

\[
R_{k}^{SP} = \log_2 \left( \frac{\left( \sigma_E^2 + \varrho_E^2 \right) \left( \sigma_k^2 + \eta_k \varrho_k^2 + \eta_k \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \right)}{\left( \sigma_E^2 + \varrho_E^2 + p_k h_{Ek}^H \mathbf{Q}^{-1} h_{Ek} \right) \left( \sigma_k^2 + \eta_k \varrho_k^2 + \eta_k \sum_{j=1; j \neq k}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \right)} \right).
\]

(24)

Note that, these rates can be achieved by an eavesdropper with the MMSE parallel receiver processing. At any given SINR, the MMSE receiver is the optimal linear receiver for decoding a single information source. However, for decoding multiple information sources (signals from multiple legitimate users) parallel decoding is not optimal.

2) Successive cancellation at the eavesdropper: The eavesdropper can further perform SIC at the cost of additional complexity. Assuming that the eavesdropper exploits MMSE with SIC, the following secrecy rates are achievable

\[
R_{k}^{SIC} = \left[ I(x_k; y_{ID_k}) - I(x_k; y_{E_k} | x_{k+1}^K) \right]^+,
\]

(25)

where the cancellation order that is used by the eavesdropper is known at the legitimate users. Recall that, as mentioned before in example 1, if this information is not known at the legitimate users, the communication between the legitimate users with the rates (25) can not be guaranteed to be secure. It is important to note that, interference cancellation order at the eavesdropper is of crucial importance for obtaining achievable secrecy rates. For the \( K \) legitimate user wiretap interference channel, there exists \( K! \) combinations for the interference cancellation order. Hence, the worst-case linear eavesdropper considers the secrecy worst-case cancellation order. Given \( l \)-th cancellation order at the eavesdropper and by plugging (6) and (10) in (8), we obtain

\[
R_{kl}^{SIC} = \log_2 \left( \frac{\left( \sigma_E^2 + \varrho_E^2 \right) \left( \sigma_k^2 + \eta_k \varrho_k^2 + \eta_k \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \right)}{\left( \sigma_E^2 + \varrho_E^2 + p_k h_{Ek}^H \mathbf{Q}^{-1} h_{Ek} \right) \left( \sigma_k^2 + \eta_k \varrho_k^2 + \eta_k \sum_{j=1; j \neq k}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \right)} \right),
\]

(26)

where \( \mathbf{Q}_{kl} \) follows (11) for the \( l \)-th cancellation order. Notice that the worst-case secrecy rate is the minimum rate among all cancellation orders, i.e., \( R_{k}^{SIC} = \min_l R_{kl}^{SIC} \). Given that
Fig. 5: Convergence of the secrecy rate region obtained by assuming MMSE-SIC eavesdropper to the lower-bound (LB).

MMSE-SIC processing at the eavesdropper is employed, the lowest secrecy rates among any linear reception at the eavesdropper can be achieved. We refer to the eavesdropper with MMSE-SIC processing as the worst-case linear eavesdropper and the respective secrecy rates as the worst-case linear secrecy rates.

**Lemma 2:** Let \( H_E = [h_{E1}, \ldots, h_{EK}] \), then the worst-case linear secrecy rates approach the lower-bound if \(|h_{Ek}^H h_{Ej}| \rightarrow 0, \forall k \in K, \forall j \neq k\). Further, the worst-case linear secrecy rates equal the lower-bounds if \( M \geq K \), and \(|h_{Ek}^H h_{Ej}| = 0, \forall j \neq k\).

**Proof:** The proof of lemma 2 appears in Appendix B. \( \blacksquare \)

**Example 2:** The region of secrecy rates lower-bound (unconstrained eavesdropper) and worst-case linear secrecy rates are depicted in Fig. 5 given \( K = M = 2 \), and for the following channels

\[
\begin{align*}
\{h_{11}, h_{22}\} & = \{e^{i0.2613}, e^{-i2.2784}\}, \\
\{h_{12}, h_{21}\} & = \{0.4e^{-i1.3928}, 0.4e^{i0.8640}\}, \\
\mathbf{h}_{E1} & = [0.4628e^{i2.5586}, 0.1894e^{-i0.8067}]^T, \quad \|\mathbf{h}_{E2}\| = \|\mathbf{h}_{E1}\|. 
\end{align*}
\]

The angle between \( \mathbf{h}_{E1} \) and \( \mathbf{h}_{E2} \) is given by \( \theta = \frac{|\mathbf{h}_{E1}^H \mathbf{h}_{E2}|}{\|\mathbf{h}_{E1}\|\|\mathbf{h}_{E2}\|} \). We consider \( p_{k_{\text{max}}} = 1, \forall k, \sigma_E^2 = \sigma_k^2 = 0.25, \forall k, \sigma_E^2 = \sigma_k^2 = 0.25, \forall k \) and \( \eta_k = 1, \forall k \). The depicted regions are obtained by power
allocation. Also, note that, the single user decodable reliable communication rates are 1.58 bit (equality is due to the symmetry in the channel strength).

**Lemma 3:** The secrecy rate region established by the linear eavesdropper coincides with the lower-bounds if the eavesdropper is equipped with a massive antenna array, i.e., $K \ll M$, $M \to \infty$, and $\text{rank}(H_E) = K$.

**Proof:** The proof of lemma 3 appears in Appendix C.

![Proof](image)

**C. Analysis**

In this section, we present the analytical insights for the case of the two-user wiretap interference channel.

**Lemma 4:** Consider a two-user Gaussian wiretap interference channel with PS at the legitimate users. Employing Gaussian codebooks at the transmitters, the achievable secrecy rates are secure and positive if

\[
\eta_k \geq \frac{\|h_E_k\|^2 \sigma_k^2}{|h_{kk}|^2 (\sigma_k^2 + \sigma_E^2) - \|h_{kk}\|^2 (\sigma_k^2 + p_j |h_{kj}|^2)}, \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2\}, j \neq k,
\]

\[
p_j \leq \frac{|h_{kk}|^2 (\sigma_k^2 + \sigma_E^2) - \|h_{kk}\|^2 (\sigma_k^2 + \sigma_E^2)}{\|h_{kk}\|^2 |h_{kj}|^2}, \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2\}, j \neq k,
\]

and are feasible if the following channel condition holds

\[
\frac{|h_{kk}|^2}{\|h_{kk}\|^2} \geq \frac{\sigma_k^2 + \max (\sigma_k^2, p_j |h_{kj}|^2)}{\sigma_k^2 + \sigma_E^2}, \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2\}, j \neq k.
\]

**Proof:** The proof of lemma 4 appears in Appendix D.
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The legitimate users need to acquire efficient strategies for obtaining sufficiently high positive secrecy rates, meanwhile satisfying the energy harvesting demands.

**Theorem 1:** Consider a vector of transmit powers $p = [p_1, p_2]$ and receiver PS coefficients $\eta = [\eta_1, \eta_2]$ that achieve sets of positive secrecy rate pairs $R^{<s>} = \{R_1^{<s>}, R_2^{<s>}\}$ and feasible

\[
1R_1 = \log_2 (1 + \frac{\eta_1 p_1 |h_{11}|^2}{\sigma_1^2 + \eta_1 |h_{11}|^2 + \eta_2 |h_{12}|^2}) = \log_2 (1 + \frac{1}{0.25 + 0.25}) = 1.58 \text{ bit}
\]
harvested energy pairs, \( \mathcal{E} = \{\psi_1, \psi_2\} \). Let one user requires a higher energy, e.g., \( \psi_1' \geq \psi_1 \). Then, the set of harvested energies \( \mathcal{E} = [\psi_1', \psi_2] \) is feasible by the following strategies,

(I) \( \eta' \) and \( p' = [p_1', p_2] \) with \( p_1' \geq p_1 \Rightarrow R_2^{<s>}' \leq R_2^{<s>} \),

(II) \( \eta \) and \( p' = [p_1, p_2'] \) with \( p_2' \geq p_2 \Rightarrow R_1^{<s>}' \leq R_1^{<s>} \),

(III) \( p \) and \( \eta' = [\eta_1', \eta_2] \) with \( \eta_1' \leq \eta_1 \Rightarrow R_1^{<s>}' \leq R_1^{<s>} \).

The statements (I) and (II) correspond to the reduction in the achievable secrecy rate of the second and first user, respectively, only if \( R_k^{<s>} \geq 0 \), \( \forall k \in \{1, 2\} \). The statement (III) corresponds to the reduction in the achievable secrecy rate of the first user.

**Proof:** The proof is provided in Appendix E.

A higher EH demand by the \( k \)-th legitimate user coincides with either a lower \( \eta_k \) or higher power transmission by the legitimate users \( p_j, \forall j \in \mathcal{K} \). Thus, smart and joint tuning of the transmit powers and receiver PS coefficients is required in order to capture the optimal secrecy communication rates. From the secrecy rate perspective, satisfying the energy demands of the \( k \)-th legitimate receiver by its corresponding transmitter is a selfish strategy. As stated above in the statement of Theorem \[\text{(I)}\], increasing the power of the \( k \)-th transmitter coincides with the reduction in the secrecy rate of the all other users. The selfish strategy yields analytical solutions for the transmit powers and receiver PS coefficients. However, this strategy only delivers \( K \) Pareto-optimal solutions, which are the edges of the Pareto boundary (single-user decodable). The Pareto boundary represents the outermost boundary of the achievable secrecy rate tuples, where by increasing the secrecy rate of one user, the secrecy rate of at least one other user is inevitably decreased. Notice that, this is only feasible if the transmit power budget at the \( k \)-th legitimate transmitter supports the energy demands of the \( k \)-th legitimate receiver.

**Proposition 1:** Suppose that, the EH demands are not feasible by the selfish strategy. Then, allowing cooperation in fulfilling the energy demands eventually reduces the single-user decodable secrecy rates.

**Proof:** The proof of proposition 1 follows along similar lines as shown in Theorem \[\text{II}(\text{II})\].
The single-user secrecy rates do not characterize the Pareto boundary of the secrecy rate region completely. In the next section we present an optimization procedure to obtain the secrecy rate region Pareto boundary.

III. ACHIEVABLE SECRECY RATE REGION—UNCONSTRAINED CASE

In this section, we develop the secrecy rate region for the unconstrained eavesdropper case. Having the $k$-th user achievable secrecy rate in (20), the secrecy rate region can be obtained by formulating the following weighted max-min optimization problem

$$\max_{\eta, \mathbf{p}} \min_{k \in K} \frac{R^s_k}{\alpha_k}$$

subject to

$$E_k \geq \psi_k,$$

$$\mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{p}_{\text{max}},$$

$$0 \leq \eta \leq 1,$$

where $\mathbf{p} = [p_1, ..., p_K]$ and $\eta = [\eta_1, ..., \eta_K]$. Moreover, $\mathbf{p}_{\text{max}} = [p_{1\text{max}}, ..., p_{K\text{max}}]$ is the power budget available at the users. The energy harvesting constraint is given by (27a), where the energy demand of the $k$-th user is represented by $\psi_k$. The weight vector $\alpha = [\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_K]$ is determined apriori with $0 \leq \alpha_k \leq 1$, $\forall k$ and $\|\alpha\|_1 = 1$. Notice that, with each realization of $\alpha$ we obtain a secure achievable rate on the Pareto boundary of the secrecy rate region. Hence, solving problem (27) for each realization of $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^K$ with a predefined resolution, delivers the secrecy rate region [28]. Problem (27) is a non-convex problem. This is due to the non-convexity of the objective function, which is the division of non-convex functions. By defining an auxiliary variable $\beta = \min_k \frac{R^s_k}{\alpha_k}$, we transfer the objective function into the constraint set. Then we obtain,
\[
\max_{\beta, \eta, p} \beta \quad \text{(28)}
\]
subject to \[\beta \alpha_k \leq R^s, \quad \forall k \in K, \quad (28a)\]
\[\text{(27a), (27b), (27c).} \quad (28b)\]

We can reformulate constraints (28a) as
\[
\lambda \alpha_k \left( \sigma^2 + \eta \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \right) \left( \sigma^2 + \eta \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \right) \leq 1, \quad (29)
\]
where \( \lambda = 2^\beta \). Since \( \lambda \) is monotonically increasing as a function of \( \beta \) in optimization problem (28), we replace \( \beta \) with \( \lambda \). The energy harvesting constraints in (27a) are reformulated as
\[
\psi_k - \sigma^2 + \eta \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \leq 1. \quad (30)
\]

Hence, we obtain
\[
\max_{\lambda, \eta, p} \lambda \quad \text{subject to} \quad (29), (30), (27b), (27c). \quad (31)
\]
The constraints (29) and (30) are divisions of posynomials, which are not necessarily convex functions. This renders the weighted max-min optimization problem into a signomial program which is a NP-hard problem [29]. Next, we propose a polynomial-time algorithm to obtain a sub-optimal solution. We approximate the denominator of the functions in (29) and (30) with a monomial function based on the single condensation method [29]. This approximation is based on the relation between arithmetic and geometric means [30]. For instance, the denominator of constraint (30) can be approximated as
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \geq \prod_{j=1}^{K} \left( \frac{p_j |h_{kj}|^2}{c_{kj}} \right)^{c_{kj}}, \quad (32)
\]
where $c_{kj}$, $\forall j$, controls the approximation gap given by

$$B = \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 - \prod_{j=1}^{K} \left( \frac{p_j |h_{kj}|^2}{c_{kj}} \right)^{c_{kj}}.$$  

(33)

Inequality (32) holds with equality with the optimal value of $c_{kj}$, $\forall j$, which is

$$c_{kj}^* = \frac{p_j |h_{kj}|^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2}.$$  

(34)

Similar approximation is applied for the denominator of (29). Notice that, $c_{kj}^*$ is a function of the optimization parameters $p$. Here, we tighten the approximation gap by optimizing over $p_j$ and $\eta_j$, $\forall j$ and using the solutions to obtain $c_{kj}^*$. Notice that this $c_{kj}^*$ is optimal only for the current iteration and suboptimal for the next iteration. The convergence of this joint optimization procedure is depicted in Fig. 6. It can be easily seen from the figure that, it takes less than 10 iterations for $\lambda$ to converge.

IV. WORST-CASE SECRECY RATES—CONSTRAINED CASE

In this section, we assume that the eavesdropper is capable of performing MMSE-SIC at the signal combining stage with the optimal cancellation order. Furthermore, we assume that this cancellation order is known at the legitimate users. Having the worst-case secrecy rate
Algorithm 1 Worst-case linear secrecy rates

1: for \( m = 1 : K \) do
2: \hspace{1em} choose \( m \)-th element of the set \( \mathcal{L} \), i.e., \( l = \mathcal{L}(m) \).
3: \hspace{1em} Set \( \alpha \), s.t. \( \|\alpha\|_1 = 1 \), \( \alpha \geq 0 \),
4: \hspace{1em} Set \( \eta^{(1)} = 1 \), \( p^{(1)} = p_{\text{max}} \)
5: \hspace{1em} Outer-iteration index \( t = 1 \)
6: \hspace{1em} while \( |A^{(t)} - A^{(t-1)}| \) large do
7: \hspace{2em} Set \( Q_{kl}^{(t)} = \mathbf{I}_M + \sum_{j=k+1}^{K} \frac{p_j}{\sigma_{E_j}^2 + \sigma_{E}^2} \mathbf{h}_{E_j} \mathbf{h}_{E_j}^H \), \( \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \)
8: \hspace{2em} Inner-iteration index \( q = 1 \)
9: \hspace{2em} Define \( B^{(q)} \) as posynomial to monomial approximation gap.
10: \hspace{2em} while \( |B^{(q)} - B^{(q-1)}| \) large do
11: \hspace{3em} Formulate weighted max-min optimization problem alike (36)
12: \hspace{3em} Utilize the approximation in (32)
13: \hspace{3em} Solve the weighted max-min problem (geometric program) and obtain \( (p^{*(q)}, \eta^{*(q)}, \zeta^{*(q)}) \)
14: \hspace{3em} \( q = q + 1 \)
15: \hspace{3em} Calculate \( B^{(q)} = \text{func}(p^{*(q)}, \eta^{*(q)}, \zeta^{*(q)}) \)
16: \hspace{2em} end while
17: \hspace{1em} \( t = t + 1 \),
18: \hspace{1em} \( A^{(t)} = \zeta^{*(q)} \), \( p^{(t)} = p^{*(q)} \), \( \eta^{(t)} = \eta^{*(q)} \)
19: \hspace{1em} end while
20: \hspace{1em} Calculate \( R_{kl}^{<\text{SIC}>^{(m)}}(p^{(t)}, \eta^{(t)}) \), \( \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \) from (26).
21: \hspace{1em} \( A^{(m)} = A^{(t)} \)
22: end for
23: \( m^* = \arg \max_m A^{(m)} \): Optimal cancellation order
24: \( R_{k}^{<\text{SIC}>} = R_{kl}^{<\text{SIC}>^{(m^*)}} \), \( \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \)
from (26) the worst-case linear secrecy rate region can be obtained by the following min-max-min optimization problem

\[
\min_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \max_{\eta, p} \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} R_{kl}^{\text{SIC}} \alpha_k
\]

subject to

\[
E_k \geq \psi_k, \tag{35a}
\]

\[
P \leq P_{\text{max}}, \tag{35b}
\]

\[
0 \leq \eta \leq 1. \tag{35c}
\]

Notice that the set \( \mathcal{L} \) has the cardinality \( K! \), which includes all decoding orders at the eavesdropper. By further reformulation we obtain

\[
\min_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \max_{\zeta, \eta, p} \zeta_l \tag{36}
\]

subject to

\[
f(\zeta, \eta, p) \leq 1, \tag{36a}
\]

\[
(30), (35b), (35c). \tag{36b}
\]

Notice that \( f(\zeta, \eta, p) \) is given as

\[
f(\zeta, \eta, p) := \frac{\zeta^\alpha_k \left( \sigma_E^2 + \varrho_E^2 + p_k h_k^H Q_{kl}^{-1} h_k \right) \left( \sigma_k^2 + \eta_k \varrho_k^2 + \eta_k \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \right)}{\left( \sigma_E^2 + \varrho_E^2 \right) \left( \sigma_k^2 + \eta_k \varrho_k^2 + \eta_k \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j |h_{kj}|^2 \right)}, \tag{37}
\]

where \( \zeta_l = 2^{\min_k \frac{R_{kl}^{\text{SIC}}}{\alpha_k}} \) is treated as an auxiliary variable. In (37), the parameter \( Q_{kl}^{-1} \) corresponds to the \( k \)-th interference-plus-noise covariance matrix of the \( l \)-th interference cancellation order.

Problem (36) is non-convex in the optimization variables, \( \zeta, l, p, \eta \). Next, we propose an approach with inner and outer iterations to obtain a suboptimal solution, which is improved iteratively. In this approach, for all feasible interference cancellation orders \( l \in \mathcal{L} \), the transmit power \( p \), the receiver PS coefficients \( \eta \) and the auxiliary variable \( \zeta \) is optimized in an inner iteration loop for given \( Q_{kl}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \forall l \in \mathcal{L} \) matrices. Furthermore, \( Q_{kl}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \forall l \in \mathcal{L} \) matrices are optimized in an outer iteration loop. Then, among all feasible orders, the one that minimizes \( \max \zeta \) is picked. This procedure in elaborated in Algorithm I in details.
We consider two legitimate users that are wiretapped by an eavesdropper equipped with two antennas, i.e., $K = M = 2$. We assume that the antenna noise and the processing noises at the legitimate receivers and at the eavesdropper have the variances, $\sigma_k^2 = \sigma^2_k = 0.25$, $\forall k \in \{1, 2\}$, $\sigma_E = \sigma_E^2 = 0.25$. Transmit power budget is $p_{\text{max}} = 1$. The achievable secrecy rate region Pareto-boundary of the wiretap interference channel is characterized numerically based on the proposed algorithm. Moreover, the worst-case linear secrecy rate region is obtained iteratively according to algorithm (31). Notice that, these optimization problems need to be solved for $\alpha \in A = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^2 | \alpha \geq 0, \|\alpha\|_1 = 1\}$. In Fig. 7, the Pareto-boundary of the reliable and the secure communication rates are depicted. In this figure, we highlight the efficiency of the proposed polynomial-time algorithm by comparing its solution with the one obtained by exhaustive search. As can be seen, the algorithm captures the outermost points of the exhaustive search. Interestingly, for weak interference channels Fig. 7(a).
Fig. 8: Comparison between the secure communication rates assuming linear eavesdropper and the lower-bound. Antenna and processing noise variance are set to $\sigma_k = \sigma_k = 0.25$, $\forall k \in \{1, 2\}$, $\sigma_E = \sigma_E = 0.25$. Transmit power budget is $p_{\text{max}} = 1$. Strong interference regime, $|h_{kk}| = 1$, $|h_{kj}| = 1$, $\forall k \in \{1, 2\}$, $j \neq k$, $\|h_E\| = 0.5$, $\forall k \in \{1, 2\}$.

both reliable and secure communication regions are convex by optimal power allocation. Hence, there is no need for time sharing between the single-user decodable operating points. Similar observations are made, with the energy harvesting demands at the legitimate users. In the strong interference regime, power allocation does not always provide an optimal solution. According to Fig. 7(b) power allocation is the optimal strategy for the reliable communication with EH demands. It turns out that, time-sharing achieves a larger secrecy rate region for both cases, i.e., with and without EH demands. Evidently, stronger interference results in a lower achievable secrecy rates. Interestingly in weak interference scenarios high EH demands are not feasible. This can be observed in Fig. 7(a) where unity EH demands are not feasible, however these demands are feasible for stronger interference scenarios as can be seen in Fig. 7(b). The secrecy rate region gap between various linear reception at the eavesdropper and the unconstrained eavesdropper is depicted in Fig. 8 and Fig. 9 for strong and weak interference scenarios, respectively. We have considered three linear reception schemes at the eavesdropper. ZF, MMSE and MMSE-SIC with increasing complexity order at the eavesdropper. Interestingly, we observe a relatively small gap
between the achievable lower-bound with the rates achieved by MMSE-SIC at the eavesdropper.

Moreover, in a sufficiently strong interference regime, the lower-bound stays close to the worst-case secrecy rates. As expected, ZF at the eavesdropper yields a larger secrecy rates region. However, recall that this region coincides with the lower-bound in special cases (discussed in lemma 3). Assuming legitimate users without EH demands, in the strong interference regime, SIC at the eavesdropper does not reduce the secrecy rates as can be seen in Fig. 8(a). However, in the weak interference regime lower secrecy rates can be obtained by SIC, Fig. 9(a). Interestingly, by having EH constraints at the legitimate users, SIC at the eavesdropper has more impact of the secrecy rate region compared to other linear schemes. This is due to the fact that, EH constraints are not necessarily satisfied through the desired channels, hence neighboring legitimate users help fulfilling these demands. This casts undesired interference at the legitimate users, which can be partially suppressed by SIC.

Fig. 9: Comparison between the secure communication rates assuming linear eavesdropper and the lower-bound. Antenna and processing noise variance are set to $\sigma_k = \varrho_k = 0.25, \forall k \in \{1, 2\}$, $\sigma_E = \varrho_E = 0.25$. Transmit power budget is $p_{\text{max}} = 1$. Weak interference regime, $|h_{kk}| = 1, |h_{kj}| = 0.5, \forall k \in \{1, 2\}, j \neq k$, $\|H_E\| = 0.5, \forall k \in \{1, 2\}$.
VI. Conclusion

We investigated the secrecy rate region of the wiretap interference channel with energy harvesting constraints at the legitimate users. The achievable secrecy rates are derived for unconstrained and constrained eavesdroppers. The secrecy rates in case of constrained eavesdropper match the lower-bound (by unconstrained eavesdropper) if the eavesdropper channel has special structure, or the eavesdropper deploys a massive antenna array. The achievable secrecy rate regions for the case of unconstrained and constrained eavesdroppers are functions of power allocation and receiver PS coefficients. Hence, optimal resource allocation is required to characterize the secrecy rate region. We formulated the secrecy rate region Pareto-boundary characterization problem as a weighted max-min optimization problem. This turns out to be a non-convex problem, for which we proposed a polynomial-time algorithm to obtain a reliable sub-optimal solution. We stressed the efficiency of the proposed algorithm by comparing the solution with exhaustive search. Finally, we observed that the secrecy rates gap between the unconstrained and the constrained eavesdroppers is low, if the eavesdropper exploits MMSE-SIC. The higher the energy demands are, the more detrimental is the SIC at the eavesdropper in lowering the secrecy rates.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF L EMMA 1

We begin the proof as follows. We show that $I(x_k; y_E|x_k) - I(x_k; y_E|x_{k+1}^K) \geq 0$.

$$\begin{align*}
I(x_k; y_E|x_k) - I(x_k; y_E|x_{k+1}^K) &= h(x_k|x_k) - h(x_k|y_E,x_k) - h(x_k|x_{k+1}^K) + h(x_k|y_E,x_{k+1}^K) \\
&= h(x_k) - h(x_k|y_E,x_k) - h(x_k) + h(x_k|y_E,x_{k+1}^K) \\
&= h(x_k|y_E, x_{k+1}^K) - h(x_k|y_E, x_{k+1}^K) \geq 0,
\end{align*}$$

(38)

where (a) follows due to independence of $x_k$, $\forall k \in K$, and (b) holds due to the fact that conditioning does not increase the entropy, since $x \setminus x_k = [x_1, \cdots, x_{k-1}]^T \sqcup x_{k+1}^K$. 
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APPENDIX B

PROOF OF LEMMA 2

For the $k$-th communication pair, having $|h_{Ek}^H h_{Ej}| \to 0$, $\forall j \neq k$, the following statement holds

$$\lim_{|h_{Ek}^H h_{Ej}| \to 0} (I(x_k; y_E|x_k) - I(x_k; y_E)) = 0,$$

which is due to the fact that, at $y_E$ the projection of the side information subspace on the subspace spanned by $x_k$ approaches zero for $|h_{Ek}^H h_{Ej}| \to 0$, $\forall j \neq k$. For particular channels $|h_{Ek}^H h_{Ej}| = 0$, $\forall k \in K$, $\forall j \neq k$, we obtain $I(x_k; y_E) = I(x_k; y_E|x_k)$, since at $y_E$ all $x_k \forall k \in K$ lie at each other’s null-space. Hence, side information subspace has zero projection on the subspace spanned by $x_k$. This can happen only if the number of observations at the eavesdropper is more than the number of legitimate users, i.e., $M \geq K$. This, provides sufficient dimensions for the probability that the channels are orthogonal to each other. However, the occurrence of these orthogonal channels is of measure zero (almost never happens) assuming limited number of antennas at the eavesdropper. Notice that, having $|h_{Ek}^H h_{Ej}| = 0$, $\forall k \in K$, $\forall j \neq k$, maximum ratio combining (MRC) at the eavesdropper serves as the worst-case eavesdropper processing. This is due to the fact that, having these channels, MRC maximizes the SNR and forces the interference to zero simultaneously.

APPENDIX C

PROOF OF LEMMA 3

The secrecy rates achieved by linear ZF processing at the eavesdropper approaches any optimal processing scheme at the eavesdropper if $K \ll M$ and $M \to \infty$. This claim is proved in the following. Let the channel matrix from the legitimate transmitters to the eavesdropper be $H_E = [h_{E1}, \ldots, h_{EK}]$. Then, the output at the eavesdropper is given by

$$y_E = H_E x + n_E + w_E,$$
where $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, \cdots, x_K]^T$. Assuming ZF at the eavesdropper, the eavesdropper obtains

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_E = \mathbf{U}^H (\mathbf{H}_E \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n}_E + \mathbf{w}_E),$$

(41)

where $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{H}_E (\mathbf{H}_E^H \mathbf{H}_E)^{-1}$, which is feasible if $\text{rank} (\mathbf{H}_E) = K$. The ZF output is then given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_E = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{U}^H (\mathbf{n}_E + \mathbf{w}_E).$$

(42)

Using the law of large numbers, for the second and third terms in (42), and we obtain

$$\mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{n}_E \to 0, \text{ as } M \to \infty,$$

(44)

$$\mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{w}_E \to 0, \text{ as } M \to \infty.$$

(45)

This way ZF serves as the worst-case eavesdropper processing as $M \to \infty$. Therefore, by ZF processing at the eavesdropper the following statement holds

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_E - \mathbf{x} = 0.$$

(46)

Zero-forcing at the eavesdropper renders the system to parallel channels. Notice that in parallel channels, side information from other streams does not enhance the individual mutual information terms. Now, we can claim that

$$I(x_k; y_E | \mathbf{x} \setminus x_k) \to I(x_k; y_E), \text{ as } M \to \infty.$$

(47)

Therefore, the secrecy rates by assuming linear eavesdropper approaches the lower-bound as $M \to \infty$.

---

Assume that $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ are two mutually independent $m \times 1$ vectors. Moreover, assume that the elements of $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ are i.i.d. zero-mean random variables with variances $\sigma_a^2$ and $\sigma_b^2$, respectively. The law of large number states that

$$\frac{1}{m} \mathbf{a}^H \mathbf{a} \to \sigma_a^2, \quad \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{a}^H \mathbf{b} \to 0, \text{ as } m \to \infty.$$  

(43)
To obtain a positive achievable secrecy rate for the $k$-th legitimate user with Gaussian transmission, we have

$$R_k^s = I(x_k; y_{ID_k}) - I(x_k; y_E|x_k) \geq 0,$$  \hfill (48) \]

where $I(x_k; y_{ID_k})$ and $I(x_k; y_E|x_k)$ are given in (6) and (19), respectively. (48) is formulated as

$$\frac{p_k|h_{kk}|^2}{\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \sigma_k^2 + p_j|h_{kj}|^2} \geq \frac{p_k\|h_{E_k}\|^2}{\sigma_E^2 + \sigma_k^2},$$

$$\Rightarrow \eta_k \geq \left| \frac{\|h_{E_k}\|^2\sigma_k^2}{|h_{kk}|^2(\sigma_k^2 + \sigma_E^2) - \|h_{E_k}\|^2(\sigma_k^2 + p_j|h_{kj}|^2)} \right|,$$  \hfill (49) \]

which can be feasible if the denominator is bigger than zero. This results in

$$\frac{|h_{kk}|^2}{\|h_{E_k}\|^2} \geq \frac{\sigma_k^2 + \sigma_E^2}{\sigma_k^2 + \sigma_E^2}, \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2\}. \hfill (50) \]

However, having $0 \leq \eta_k \leq 1$, the right hand side in (49) should always be less than or equal to 1, which yields

$$p_j \leq \frac{|h_{kk}|^2(\sigma_k^2 + \sigma_E^2) - \|h_{E_k}\|^2(\sigma_k^2 + \sigma_E^2)}{\|h_{E_k}\|^2|h_{kj}|^2}.$$  \hfill (51) \]

This is feasible if the numerator in bigger than zero, which results in

$$\frac{|h_{kk}|^2}{\|h_{E_k}\|^2} \geq \frac{\sigma_k^2 + p_j|h_{kj}|^2}{\sigma_k^2 + \sigma_E^2}, \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2\}, j \neq k. \hfill (52) \]

Having (50) and (52), we obtain

$$\frac{|h_{kk}|^2}{\|h_{E_k}\|^2} \geq \frac{\sigma_k^2 + \max(\sigma_k^2, p_j|h_{kj}|^2)}{\sigma_k^2 + \sigma_E^2}, \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2\}, j \neq k.$$

Subject to 
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APPENDIX E

PROOF OF THEOREM 1

(I) An increment in $p_1$ inevitably coincides with a decrement in $R_2^{<s>}$. This is due to the fact that $R_2^{<s>}$ is monotonically decreasing in $p_1$. However, by increasing $p_1$, $R_1^{<s>}$ is monotonically increasing if

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial p_1} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{\eta_1 p_1 |h_{11}|^2}{\sigma_1^2 + \eta_1 \varrho_1^2 + \eta_1 p_2 |h_{12}|^2} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial p_1} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{p_1 \|\mathbf{h}_E_1\|^2}{\sigma_E^2 + \varrho_E^2} \right) \geq 0.
$$

This derivative inequality results in the following conditions

$$
\eta_1 \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{h}_E_1\|^2 \sigma_E^2}{|h_{11}|^2 (\sigma_1^2 + \varrho_1^2) - \|\mathbf{h}_E_1\|^2 (\sigma_2^2 + \varrho_2^2)}
$$

(54)

and

$$
p_2 \leq \frac{|h_{11}|^2 (\sigma_1^2 + \varrho_1^2) - \|\mathbf{h}_E_1\|^2 (\sigma_2^2 + \varrho_2^2)}{\|\mathbf{h}_E_1\|^2 |h_{12}|^2},
$$

(55)

which are interestingly the necessary conditions to achieve positive secrecy rate for the first user (according to lemma 4). The proof of (II) is similar to (I).

(III) A decrement in $\eta_1$ associates with a reduction in $R_1^{<s>}$. Since, $R_1^{<s>}$ is a monotonically increasing function in $\eta_1$, due to $\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_1} R_1^{<s>} \geq 0$. However, $R_2^{<s>}$ is independent of $\eta_1$.

REFERENCES


