Massive MIMO Unsourced Random Access

Alexander Fengler, Giuseppe Caire, Peter Jung, and Saeid Haghighatshoar
Communication and Information Theory Chair, Technische Universität Berlin

arXiv:1901.00828v1 [cs.IT] 3 Jan 2019

***Abstract*—We consider an extension of the massive unsourced random access originally proposed in [1] to the case where the receiver has a very large number of antennas (a massive MIMO base station) and no channel state information is given to the receiver (fully non-coherent detection). Our coding approach borrows the concatenated coding idea from [2], combined with a novel non-Bayesian "activity detection" algorithm for massive MIMO random access channels, that outperforms currently proposed Bayesian vector AMP (VAMP) schemes currently proposed for activity detection, and does not suffer from the numerical instabilities and requirement for accurate a priori statistics as VAMP. We show that the required transmit E_b/N_0 for reliable communication can be made arbitrarily small as the number of receiver antennas M grows sufficiently large.**

***Index Terms*—Unsourced Massive Random Access, Massive MIMO, Activity Detection.**

I. Introduction

In some Internet of Things applications, it is envisaged that a very large number of objects send sporadic data via a wireless channel to a central collector. Such objects may be sensing-enabled appliances, that are mass-produced and disseminated into the environment without any specific centralized control. For massive scalability and production costs reasons, the transmission protocol (including signaling and channel coding) shall be hard-wired and identical to all devices. This poses a new random access problem known as "unsourced massive random access", where the goal of the receiver (data collector) consists of decoding the messages transmitted by a small number of active nodes on each transmission slot, whose identity is not known a priori, and such that these nodes make use of exactly the same channel codebook (or, more in general, the same transmission protocol). In this context, if senders want to identify themselves, they can include their ID into the information message itself. Therefore, the goal of the receiver is to decode the *list* of active user messages up to permutations.

This new information theoretic problem has been posed by Polyanskiy in [1]. In Polyanskiy's formulation, the number of users is comparable to the channel block length (e.g., imagine a city-wide IoT network with $\sim 10^6$ sensors, each of which sends sporadic data using a codebook of block length $\sim 10^4$). In this regime, under the classical notion of probability of error used in the information theoretic multiple access channel [3], no reliable communication is possible. Hence, Polyanskiy proposes the Per-User Probability of Error (PUPE), i.e., the average fraction of mis-decoded messages over the number of active users, as a more practically meaningful performance metric. In [1] the channel is modeled as a real adder with additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN), where the discrete-time baseband signal received at the decoder is given by

$$y_t = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}_a} x_t(m_k) + z_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, n, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{K}_a$ is the set of $|\mathcal{K}_a| = K_a$ active users in a population $\mathcal{K}_{\rm tot}$ of $|\mathcal{K}_{\rm tot}| = K_{\rm tot}$ total users, $x_t(m)$ is the t-th symbol of the m-th codeword of a common codebook $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of cardinality 2^{nR}, $m_k \in [1 : 2^{nR}]$ is the message transmitted by active user $k \in \mathcal{K}_a$, and $z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, N_0/2)$ is the real AWGN. For this channel, [1] established quite tight achievability and converse bounds to the minimum energy per bit over N_0 (E_b/N_0) necessary for reliable communication.

The sporadic communication patterns and the very large number of potential users $K_{\rm tot}$ rule out most of the current network solutions, which are essentially "grant-based" random access. In such schemes, when a user wishes to send a data packet, it must first access a dedicated Random Access Control Channel (RACCH), identify itself, and ask for a transmission resource. After being granted access, the user sends its message on the allocated dedicated resource (e.g., a combination of time-frequency slot and space beam, in modern MIMO-enabled space-division multiple access). During the granting process, each user makes use of some unique feature in its signaling scheme (e.g., a unique combination of pilot/signature signal and time-frequency slot) such that the base station is aware of the identity of the user requesting access. Furthermore, during this hand-shaking procedure, pilot signals are used to estimate the channel state (e.g., channel vectors in fading MIMO communications), such that channel-state based precoding/beamforming is made possible.

In contrast, it is becoming more and more apparent that radically new grant-free strategies must be developed for for the unsourced massive random access scenario described before, since in this scenario the protocol overhead cost (in rate and energy) for grant-based communication and the inconvenience of individually distinct codebooks at the user devices would be simply too large. Hence, in this scenario the active users have to be simultaneously detected and decoded within a single communication phase.

Providing *explicit* coding schemes to approach the random coding achievability results is an interesting and relevant challenge for the design of practical IoT systems. In fact, for the unsourced massive random access setting described above, the gap in E_b/N_0 between random coding achievability and the state of the art random access schemes known to date is very large. Therefore, a large gain in energy efficiency can be achieved through an improved coding design.

Motivates by Polyanskiy's results, [2] proposed a coding

scheme for the real-adder AWGN channel (1), based on partitioning the transmission slot into subslots, and letting each active user send a codeword from a common codebook across the subslots. The common codebook is obtained by concatenating an outer tree code with an inner "compressed sensing code". The inner encoder maps each submessage into one column of a given (real) coding matrix. The inner decoder must identify which columns of the matrix have been transmitted from the received noisy superposition. This is a classical "sparse support identification" problem, well investigated in the compressed sensing (CS) literature. In particular, due to the fact that the support is a 0-1 sparse signal, [2] makes use of the Non-Negative Least-Squares (NNLS) approach, which is known to be computationally very efficient and well-suited for the sparse support identification problem [4, 5]. The inner decoder produces a sequence of active submessages lists across the subblocks. The task of the outer tree decoder is to "stitch together" the submessages such that each sequence of submessages is a valid path in the tree.

For the simple real-adder AWGN channel model (1), the aspect of channel estimation is absent since the channel coefficients are all fixed to 1. Hence, detection is (implicitly) coherent by default. In practice, through, wireless communication is affected by channel pathloss attenuation, phase shifts, and fading. In particular, when extending the model (1) to the case of a multiple-antenna base station receiver, it is completely unreasonable to assume that the channel matrix between the $K_a$to active users and the M receiver antennas is known a priory, and often even that the channel pathloss coefficients (i.e., the active user signal strengths) are known a priori. In standard multiuser MIMO communications it is usually assumed that the uplink data transmission comes with some dedicated pilot field, where each user is given an individual pilot sequence, such that the base station receiver can estimate the corresponding column of the channel matrix and use a "coherent" approach for detection. Pilot-based coherent detection is widely studied and ubiquitously used in the massive MIMO literature [6]. It is obvious that, in the unsourced massive random access context, assigning a dedicated pilot to each user violates the "single common codebook" paradigm.

In parallel to the line of work on unsourced massive random access, another line of work has focused on activity detection with massive MIMO reception [7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. In this context, users are given individual pilot sequences and the superposition of the active users' pilot sequences is observed at the output (M antenna ports) of a massive MIMO receiver. The goal of the receiver consists of identifying the set of active users and, in certain applications, also estimate their large-scale channel pathloss coefficients (i.e., their signal strength). Activity detection is similar to widely studied problems in many other fields such as network tomography and neuron activation in brain imaging. In the context of wireless communications it has been intensively investigated for grant-free random access [7] and it is obviously a prototypical application of CS. In [7, 8] it is assumed that a slot is divided into two subslots, one for channel estimation, and the other for data detection. Activity detection takes place on the channel estimation subslot, where users send individual (unique) pilot sequences. It follows that the above mentioned works on activity detection do not apply immediately to the unsourced massive random access paradigm.

An interesting approach that moves activity detection in the direction of unsourced massive random access is taken in [12, 13], where the same activity detection approach of [8, 9] is used to send information in a piggybacking mode: if each user is given a set of possible pilot sequences instead of just a single one, using the CS-based activity detection scheme it is possible not only to identify the active users, but also which codeword (pilot sequence) each active user has sent. Thus, each active user can send information together with its activity. In addition, the CS scheme of [8, 9] is used in [12, 13] as a non-coherent decoder, i.e., there is no need of explicit MIMO channel matrix estimation before detection. Nevertheless, the piggybacking scheme of [12, 13] is still based on the fact that each user has a unique individual codebook, and therefore it is not compliant with the unsourced massive random access paradigm. Furthermore, in order to send a B bit message each user needs a codebook of 2^B pilot sequences. Therefore, the scheme of [12, 13] can only work for messages of very small size (e.g., for B as small as 100 bits, the scheme would be completely impractical).

A. Our Contribution

In this work we consider the unsourced massive random access problem for the case where the base station has a massive number of antennas. We refer to this scenario as the *Massive MIMO Unsourced Random Access* channel. We combine the concatenated approach of [2] with a novel non-coherent massive MIMO activity detection scheme first proposed by the authors in [11]. The novel activity detection algorithm is non-Bayesian, and treats the activity detection pattern including the users' large-scale pathloss coefficients as a deterministic unknown sparse non-negative vector. This is different from the Bayesian Vector Approximated Message Passing (VAMP) approach taken in [8, 9, 12, 13], where the pathloss coefficients are considered either fully known or statistically fully known. Both such assumptions are highly unrealistic in the context of massive random access. The knowledge of the channel pathlosses for all $K_{\rm tot}$ users implies that at the time of deployment (imagine millions of sensors!) each channel is calibrated and the attenuation due to the propagation pathloss is stored in memory. Furthermore, such calibration procedure must be repeated over time since the propagation conditions change. Now, for large-scale effects such as shadowing, statistical fluctuations of the channel pathloss of up to 6-8 dB are possible, with over a time scale (coherence time) from tens of seconds to tens of minutes (imagine traffic sensors in the presence of moving large objects such as trucks and buses, motion of tree foliage and other large-scale effects of this sort). It is easy to figure out that maintaining calibration for a very large network would be very

hard and impractical. Furthermore, even the statistical knowledge of such coefficients is difficult to acquire in practice. In fact, distance dependent pathloss laws are somehow hard simplifications of reality, and are maybe useful for validating performances via simulation, but definitely not accurate and reliable enough to be exploited as statistical information in a Bayesian detection context. In practice, extracting such statistical information is tantamount collecting a large sample of the receive signal energy from each node in the network, and forming a combined histogram for all K_{tot} users. Again, this requires a lot of data exchange which eventually is similar to the calibration said before.

Perhaps even most surprisingly, our proposed non-Bayesian activity detection algorithm outperforms the Bayesian VAMP even under the very favorable assumption (for VAMP) of fully known pathloss coefficients (let alone the case of statistically known). Furthermore, VAMP shows a very critical "unstable" behavior when the number of base station antennas is very large with respect to the pilot dimension. In contrast, our algorithm uniformly improves as the number of antennas grows large for any fixed pilot dimension, and shows no numerical instabilities. Also from a computational complexity viewpoint, our scheme is only slightly more complex than VAMP. Therefore, it is definitely the algorithm of choice for this application, requiring much less a priori knowledge, and offering significantly better performance in the relevant regime of large number of antennas, and similar complexity.

To our knowledge, the scheme proposed in this work is the first practical coding solution to the unsourced massive random access problem as posed in [1] for a massive MIMO block-fading channel with noncoherent decoding. In our scheme, the inner code essentially reduces the MIMO random access to a random "OR-channel" to the outer code, where each signal dimension at the output of the outer code is associated with "activity" or "non-activity", whether one or more messages are active or no message is active on that dimension. This is repeated for each subslot, such that the sequence of lists of active messages over the subslots is passed to the outer tree code as in [2].

Our numerical simulations suggest that the proposed scheme performs substantially better then previous approaches. Furthermore, we show that theoretically that the required transmit E_b/N_0 for reliable communication can be made arbitrarily small as the number of receiver antennas M grows sufficiently large.

The structure of the papers is follows: we will introduce in Section II the system model on more detail. Then, in Section III a inner and outer encoding is proposed and efficient decoding algorithm is presented. We will discuss our setup further in Section V and show first numerical experiments in Section VI.

II. System Model

We consider the block fading Gaussian MAC with M receive antennas and K_a out of K_{tot} active users, where each user is employing the same codebook $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. The received t-th signal sample at the i-th antenna is given by:

$$y_{t,i} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_a} \sqrt{g_k} h_{k,i} x_t(m_k) + z_{t,i}, \tag{2}$$

for $t = 1, \dots, n$ and $i = 1, \dots, M$. As before, $x_t(m)$ denotes the t-th symbol of the m-th codeword of a common codebook $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{x}(m) : m \in [1 : 2^{nR}]\}$, m_k is the message transmitted by active user $k \in \mathcal{K}_a$, $g_k \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the large-scale channel gain coefficient of user k and $h_{k,i} \in \mathbb{C}$ is the small-scale channel coefficient from user k's transmitter to the base station antenna i. In this complex baseband model the noise $z_{t,i}$ is i.i.d. $\sim \mathcal{CN}(0, N_0)$ (circular symmetric Gaussian), independent across time and antennas. The codebook $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies the per-message power constraint $(1/n)\sum_{t=1}^{n} |x_t(m)|^2 \leq P$ for all m.

We also assume that the MIMO channel is spatially white, zero-mean Rayleigh fading, such that the coefficients $h_{k,i}$'s are also i.i.d. $\sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$. Furthermore, we assume a block-fading model for which the coefficients $h_{k,i}$ are random but fixed for all coding dimensions $t = 1, \dots, n$. Notice that such dimensions can be obtained in the time-frequency domain. Therefore, the model (2) applies to both narrow-band frequency-flat fading and to wideband frequency-selective fading with OFDM modulation. Furthermore, the assumption of constant small-scale fading over the whole transmission duration can be relaxed to constant over much smaller subblocks, as explained in the following.

Given that each user uses the same codebook, it is inherently impossible for the receiver to identify users and assign messages to users. Instead, the receiver produces a list of decoded messages $\mathcal{L}$ and the performance is expressed in terms of the *Per-User Probability of Misdetection*, defined as the average fraction of transmitted messages not contained in the list, i.e.,

$$p_{md} = \frac{1}{K_a} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_a} \mathbb{P}(m_k \notin \mathcal{L}), \tag{3}$$

and the *Per-User Probability of False-Alarm*, defined as the average fraction of decoded messages that were indeed not sent, i.e.,

$$p_{fa} = \frac{|\mathcal{L} \setminus \{m_k : k \in \mathcal{K}_a\}|}{|\mathcal{L}|}. \tag{4}$$

Notice that the error probabilities are independent of the total number of users K_{tot} and depend only on the cardinality of the (random) active set. The power efficiency of the decoding scheme is measured in terms of $E_b/N_0 := \frac{P}{RN_0}$.

III. Proposed Coding Scheme

As anticipated before, we follow the concatenated coding scheme approach of [2], suitably adapted to our case. Let $b = nR$ denote the number of bits per user message. For some suitable integers $L \geq 1$ and $J > 0$, we divide the b-bit message into blocks of size $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_L$ such that $\sum_\ell b_\ell = b$ and such that $b_1 = J$ and $b_\ell < J$ for all $\ell = 2, \dots, L$. Each subblock $\ell = 2, 3, \dots, L$ is augmented to size J by appending $p_\ell = J - b_\ell$ parity bits, obtained using pseudo-random linear combinations of the information bits of the previous blocks $\ell' < \ell$. Therefore, the sequence of coded blocks forms a tree

of depth L. The pseudo-random parity-check equations are identical for all users, i.e., each user makes use exactly of the same outer code. For more details on the outer coding scheme, please refer to [2].

A. Inner Code

In this section we focus on the inner code. Given J and the subslot length $n_0 = n/L$, the inner code is used to transmit in sequence the L (outer-encoded) blocks. Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_0 \times 2^J} = [\mathbf{a}_1, ..., \mathbf{a}_{2^J}]$, be a matrix with columns normalized such that $\|\mathbf{a}_i\|^2 \leq n_0 P$. Each column of $\mathbf{A}$ represents one *inner* codeword. Each active user $k \in \mathcal{K}_a$, let $i_k(1), \ldots, i_k(L)$ denote the sequence of L (outer-)encoded J-bit messages produced by the outer encoder, represented as integers in $[1 : 2^J]$. Then, each user $k \in \mathcal{K}_a$ simply sends in sequence, over consecutive subblocks of length n_0, the columns $\mathbf{a}_{i_k(1)}, \mathbf{a}_{i_k(2)}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{i_k(L)}$ of the coding matrix $\mathbf{A}$. From (2), collecting the n_0 channel uses forming subslot ℓ and the outputs of all M antennas into a $n_0 \times M$ matrix $\mathbf{Y}_\ell$, the received signal is given by

$$\mathbf{Y}_\ell = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}_\ell \mathbf{G}^{1/2}\mathbf{H} + \mathbf{Z}_\ell, \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, L, \tag{5}$$

where $\mathbf{G} = \text{diag}(g_1, \ldots, g_{K_{\text{tot}}})$, $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{C}^{K_{\text{tot}} \times M}$ with Gaussian i.i.d. entries $\sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$, $\mathbf{Z}_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^{n_0 \times M}$ has Gaussian i.i.d. entries $\sim \mathcal{CN}(0, N_0)$, and $\mathbf{B}_\ell \in \{0,1\}^{2^J \times K_{\text{tot}}}$ is a binary activity matrix with columns $\mathbf{b}_k^{(\ell)}$ such that: i) if $k \notin \mathcal{K}_a$, then $\mathbf{b}_k = \mathbf{0}$, and ii) if $k \in \mathcal{K}_a$, then $\mathbf{b}_k^{(\ell)} = \mathbf{e}_{i_k(\ell)}$, the standard basis vector in dimension 2^J, with all-zeros and a single 1 in position $i_k(\ell)$. Notice also that, for what follows, we may equivalently assume that $\mathbf{H}$ changes at each subslot ℓ, i.e., replace $\mathbf{H}$ in (5) with $\mathbf{H}_\ell$ was dependent on ℓ. The results will remain the same provided that the marginal statistics of the matrices $\mathbf{H}_\ell$ is Gaussian i.i.d. as said above (independently of their correlation across the subslots).

Let's focus on the matrix $\mathbf{X}_\ell = \mathbf{B}_\ell \mathbf{G}^{1/2}\mathbf{H}$ of dimension $2^J \times M$. The r-th row of such matrix,[1] denoted by $\underline{\mathbf{x}}_r^{(\ell)}$, is given by

$$\underline{\mathbf{x}}_r^{(\ell)} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_a} \sqrt{g_k} b_{r,k}^{(\ell)} \underline{\mathbf{h}}_k, \tag{6}$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{h}}_k$ is the k-th row of $\mathbf{H}$, and where $b_{r,k}^{(\ell)}$ is the (r,k)-th element of $\mathbf{B}_\ell$, equal to 1 if the active user k sends subblock number r (i.e., if $i_k(\ell) = r$) and zero otherwise. It follows that $\mathbf{X}$ is Gaussian with independent entries $\sim \mathcal{CN}\left(0, \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_a} g_k b_{r,k}^{(\ell)}\right)$. Since the submessages are independently and uniformly distributed over $[1 : 2^J]$, the probability that the r-th row is identically zero is given by $(1 - 1/2^J)^{K_a}$. Hence, for 2^J significantly larger than K_a, the matrix $\mathbf{X}$ is row-sparse.

Let $\gamma_r^{(\ell)} := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_a} g_k b_{r,k}^{(\ell)}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}_\ell = \text{diag}(\gamma_1^{(\ell)}, ..., \gamma_{2^J}^{(\ell)})$. Then, (5) can be written as

$$\mathbf{Y}_\ell = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Gamma}_\ell^{1/2}\tilde{\mathbf{H}} + \mathbf{Z}_\ell, \tag{7}$$

[1]We use underline to denote row vectors, while simple bold-face small-case letters denote standard column vectors.

where $\tilde{\mathbf{H}} \in \mathbb{C}^{2^J \times M}$ with i.i.d. elements $\sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$. Notice that in (7) the number of total users K_{tot} plays no role. In fact, none of the matrices involved in (7) depends on K_{tot}.

B. Inner decoding as a massive MIMO activity detection problem

At this point, the inner decoder must simply identify which of the columns of $\mathbf{A}$ is "active" in each subslot ℓ. The set of detected active columns forms the list of submessages at subslot time ℓ. The sequence of such lists is then passed to the outer decoder, which works as described in [2] (see also Section III-C). Next, we discuss the detection of the active columns of $\mathbf{A}$ in a given subslot ℓ, and drop the subslot index for simplicity of notation since such detection operation proceeds identically in each subslot and it is independent of the subslot index.

Identifying the active columns of $\mathbf{A}$ is tantamount estimating the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, and identifying which ones are non-zero. This problem is completely analogous to the activity detection problem studied in [8, 9, 12, 13]. A difference here is that the elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ are random sums of the individual user channel gains $\{g_k\}$. Hence, even if the g_k's were exactly individually known, or their statistics was known, these random sums would have unknown values and unknown statistics (unless averaging over all possible active subsets, which would involve an exponential complexity in K_{tot} which is clearly infeasible in our context). Hence, the Bayesian VAMP-based approaches advocated in [8, 9, 12, 13] do not find a straightforward application here. In contrast, we shall use our new non-Bayesian detection approach, that treats $\boldsymbol{\gamma} := \text{diag}(\mathbf{\Gamma}) = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{2^J})^{\mathsf{T}}$ as a deterministically unknown vector. Interestingly, as already anticipated before, our algorithm is not only more robust and more generally applicable than Bayesian VAMP, but yields also better results for the estimation of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ even under the assumption that the individual elements γ_r are Bernoulli variables taking on the value zero with probability $(1 - 1/2^J)^{K_a}$ or a *known positive value* with probability $1 - (1 - 1/2^J)^{K_a}$. The reason is that, despite the nice features of Bayesian VAMP, such as the fact that their performance in the large dimensional limit, can be predicted in closed form by the *State Evolution* equation [14, 15, 7] when the coding matrix of $\mathbf{A}$ has sub-Gaussian i.i.d. elements, for the case where n_0 is small with respect to M, VAMP becomes numerically unstable and sometimes produces completely wring estimates of the activity vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. Notice that in a practical application, the subslot dimension n_0 may be of the order of 100 to 400 symbols, while for a city-wide IoT data collector it is not unreasonable to have M of the order of 500 to 1000 antennas (especially when considering narrowband signals such as in LoRA-type applications [16, 17]. This is precisely the regime where we have observed a critical behavior of VAMP, while our algorithm uniformly improves as M increases, for any slot dimension n_0. In Section IV, we give the details of the proposed inner decoding algorithm.

C. Outer Code

For each subslot ℓ, let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(\ell)} = (\widehat{\gamma}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\gamma}_{2^J})^{\mathsf{T}}$ denote the ML estimate of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell$ obtained by the inner decoder. Then, the list of active messages at subslot ℓ is defined as

$$\mathcal{S}_\ell = \left\{ r \in [1 : 2^J] : \widehat{\gamma}_r^{(\ell)} \geq \tau_\ell \right\}, \tag{8}$$

where $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_L$ are suitable pre-defined thresholds. Let $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_L$ the sequence of lists of active subblock messages. Since the subblock (coded) messages contain parity bits with parity profile $\{0, p_2, \ldots, p_L\}$, not all all message sequences in $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{S}_L$ are possible. The role of the outer decoder is to identify all possible subblock message sequences. The output list $\mathcal{L}$ is initialized as an empty list. Starting from $\ell = 1$ and proceeding in order, the decoder converts the integer indices $\mathcal{S}_\ell$ back to their binary representation, separates data and parity bits, computes the parity checks for all the combinations with messages from the list $\mathcal{L}$ and extends only the paths in the tree which fulfill the parity checks. A precise analysis of the error probability of such decoder and its complexity in terms of surviving paths in the list is given in [2].

IV. Maximum Likelihood Activity Detection

In [11] we have addressed the estimation of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ from the $n_0 \times M$ received signal matrix of the form (7) using the Maximum Likelihood (ML) approach. Given $\mathbf{A}$ (known to the decoder), and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ (deterministic unknown), the columns $\mathbf{y}_i$ of $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{y}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_M]$ in (7) are i.i.d. Gaussian vectors $\mathbf{y}_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\mathbf{y})$ with (conditional) covariance matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{H}} + N_0\mathbf{I}_{n_0} = \sum_{r=1}^{2^J} \gamma_r \mathbf{a}_r \mathbf{a}_r^{\mathsf{H}} + N_0\mathbf{I}_{n_0}. \tag{9}$$

We also define the empirical covariance matrix of the columns of $\mathbf{Y}$ as

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\mathbf{y} = \frac{1}{M}\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}^{\mathsf{H}} = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{i=1}^{M} \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^{\mathsf{H}}. \tag{10}$$

The log-likelihood function is the logarithm of the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{Y}$ given $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ (up to multiplicative and additive irrelevant factors). This takes on the form

$$f(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) := -\frac{1}{M}\log p(\mathbf{Y}|\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = -\frac{1}{M}\sum_{i=1}^{M} \log p(\mathbf{y}_i|\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \tag{11}$$

$$= \log|\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{H}} + N_0\mathbf{I}_{n_0}| + \mathrm{tr}\left(\left(\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{H}} + N_0\mathbf{I}_{n_0} \right)^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\mathbf{y} \right). \tag{12}$$

The ML estimate of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}^* = \underset{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2^J}}{\arg\min}\, f(\boldsymbol{\gamma}). \tag{13}$$

It is shown in [11], that $f(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ has only global minima if $K_a \gtrsim \mathcal{O}(n_0^2)$. In the same work, the low complexity coordinate descent Algorithm 1 is derived. Compared to 1, we used the matrix-inversion lemma

$$(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} + d(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^{\mathsf{H}}))^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} + \frac{d\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^{\mathsf{H}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}}{1 + d\,\mathbf{a}^{\mathsf{H}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{a}} \tag{14}$$

to reformulate the algorithm in order to avoid explicit matrix inversion. Note that the log-likelihood function (12) depends on $\mathbf{Y}$ only through the $n_0 \times n_0$ empirical covariance matrix $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\mathbf{y}$. The calculation of the covariance matrix itself scales with M, but the minimization of (12) is independent of M. For large M, this gives a crucial advantage in complexity compared to other algorithms like VAMP [9], whose complexity scales at least linear in M.

Algorithm 1 Activity Detection via Coordinate Descend

1: **Input:** The sample covariance matrix $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\mathbf{y} = \frac{1}{M}\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}^{\mathsf{H}}$ of the $n_0 \times M$ received signal matrix $\mathbf{Y}$.
2: **Initialize:** $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} = \frac{1}{N_0}\mathbf{I}_{n_0}$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \mathbf{0}$.
3: **for** $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
4: Select an index $r \in [2^J]$ corresponding to the r-th component of $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{2^J})^\top$ randomly or according to a specific schedule.
5: **ML:** Set

$$d^* = \max\left\{ \frac{\mathbf{a}_r^{\mathsf{H}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\mathbf{y}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_r - \mathbf{a}_r^{\mathsf{H}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_r}{(\mathbf{a}_r^{\mathsf{H}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_r)^2}, -\gamma_r \right\} \tag{15}$$

6: Update $\gamma_r \leftarrow \gamma_r + d^*$.
7: Update

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} + \frac{d^*\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_r\mathbf{a}_r^{\mathsf{H}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}}{1 + d^*\,\mathbf{a}_r^{\mathsf{H}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_r} \tag{16}$$

8: **end for**
9: **Output:** The resulting estimate $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$.

V. Discussion and Analysis




Figure 1: Proposed Coding Scheme

A. Inner Code

The results of [11] suggest that the probability of an error in the estimation of the support of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ vanishes in the limit $M \to \infty$ for any SNR $\frac{P}{N_0} > 0$ as long as $K_a = \mathcal{O}(n_0^2) = \mathcal{O}(\frac{n^2}{L^2})$.

This is shown to hold also for $(M, K_a, \frac{P}{N_0}) \to (\infty, \infty, 0)$ as long as

$$\frac{M}{\max((\frac{N_0}{P})^2, K_a)} = o(1). \tag{17}$$

More precisely [11] gives the following bound for the reconstruction error of

$$\|\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}^*\|_2 \leq \kappa \left(\frac{(P/N_0)^{-1}}{\sqrt{M}} + \sqrt{\frac{K_a}{M}} \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_2 \right) \tag{18}$$

where κ is some universal constant and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*$ denotes the estimate of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ by Non-Negative Least-Squares (NNLS) as proposed in [10]. We omit here the details of the NNLS scheme for the sake of brevity and since this is identical to what was proposed in [10] and analyzed in [11]. The numerical results in [11] suggest that the reconstruction error of the ML algorithm is at least as good as that of NNLS (in practice it is typically *much better*). Work in progress by the authors aims to shown that, under certain conditions, the reconstruction error bound (18) applies also to ML. This bound is indeed very conservative and in addition it is difficult if not impossible to sharply quantify the constant κ. Nevertheless, this is enough to give achievable scaling laws for the probability of error of the inner decoder.

B. Outer Code

In the case of error-free support recovery, the support $\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}$ of the estimated $\widehat{\gamma}^{(\ell)}$ can be interpreted as the output of a vector "OR" multiple access channel (OR-MAC) where the inputs are the binary columns of the activity matrix $\mathbf{B}_\ell$, namely, $\mathbf{b}_k^{(\ell)} : k \in \mathcal{K}_a$, and the output is given by

$$\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)} = \bigvee_{k \in \mathcal{K}_a} \mathbf{b}_k^{(\ell)}, \tag{19}$$

where $\bigvee$ denotes the component-wise binary OR operation. The output entropy of the vector OR-MAC of dimension 2^J is bounded by the entropy of 2^J scalar OR-MACs. The marginal distribution of the entries of $\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}$ is Bernoulli with $\mathbb{P}(s_r^{(\ell)} = 0) = (1 - 1/2^J)^{K_a}$. Hence, we have

$$H(\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}) \leq 2^J \mathcal{H}_2((1 - 1/2^J)^{K_a}). \tag{20}$$

Since all users make use of the same code, letting R_{out} denote the rate of the outer code, we have that the number of information bits sent by the K_a active users over a subslot is $b_{\text{sum}} = K_a J R_{\text{out}}$. Therefore, in order to hope for small probability of error a necessary condition is

$$K_a J R_{\text{out}} \leq 2^J \mathcal{H}_2((1 - 1/2^J)^{K_a}). \tag{21}$$

For large 2^J, we can approximate

$$\mathcal{H}_2((1 - 1/2^J)^{K_a}) \approx K_a(1 + J - \log K_a). \tag{22}$$

Inserting this into (21) and solving for K_a we get

$$K_a \leq 2^{J(1-R_{\text{out}})+1}. \tag{23}$$

Together with the limitation of the inner ML decoder we get:

$$K_a \leq \min\left(c\frac{n^2}{L^2}, 2^{J(1-R_{\text{out}})+1} \right) \tag{24}$$

for some constant c.

Based on this analysis, we can identify two operational regimes. For large enough block length, the number of active users is limited by the outer code, while for small block lengths it is limited by the detection capabilities of the inner decoder.

Together with the considerations of the previous section we can estimate the order of the number of antennas needed to achieve a certain value of E_b/N_0. Let the number of active users K_a be fixed and let the blocklength n be large enough such that the limiting factor in (24) is the outer code, i.e.,

$$c\frac{n^2}{L^2} \geq 2^{J(1-R_{\text{out}})+1}. \tag{25}$$

Then, we can write

$$\frac{E_b}{N_0} = \frac{P}{N_0}\frac{n}{b} \tag{26}$$

$$= \frac{P}{N_0}\frac{n}{LJR_{\text{out}}} \tag{27}$$

$$\geq \frac{P}{N_0}\frac{2^{J(1-R_{\text{out}})/2+1/2}}{\sqrt{c}JR_{\text{out}}} \tag{28}$$

which is equivalent to $\frac{P}{N_0} \leq \frac{E_b}{N_0}\phi(J, R_{\text{out}})$ with $\phi(J, R_{\text{out}}) = \frac{\sqrt{c}JR_{\text{out}}}{2^{J(1-R_{\text{out}})/2+1/2}}$. The bound (18) gives that M should be of order

$$M = \Omega\left(\max\left(\left(\frac{E_b}{N_0}\phi(J, R_{\text{out}}) \right)^{-2}, K_a \right) \right). \tag{29}$$

It is therefore apparent that for any $E_b/N_0 > 0$, J, and R_{out}, if (25) holds and $K_a \leq 2^{J(1-R_{\text{out}})+1}$, we can find a sufficiently large value of M such that a desired level of reliability (in terms of the PUPE) is achieved.

VI. Simulations

A. Thresholding and Power Allocation

The outer decoder requires a hard decision on the support of the estimated $\widehat{\gamma}^{(\ell)}$. One approach consists of selecting the $K_a + \Delta$ largest entries in each section, where $\Delta \geq 0$ can be adjusted to balance between false alarm and misdetection in the outer channel. However, this approach requires the the knowledge of K_a, which is generally unknown and a random variable itself. An alternative approach, which does not require this knowledge, consists of fixing a sequence of thresholds $\{\tau_\ell : \ell \in [1 : L]\}$ and let $\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}$ to be the binary vector of dimension 2^J with elements equal to 1 for all components $r \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$, where $\mathcal{S}_\ell$ is given in (8). By choosing the thresholds, we can balance between missed detections and false alarms. The outer decoder has the property that any missed detection will necessarily result in a missing message in the final output list $\mathcal{L}$, while a relatively large number of false alarms can be corrected. The concrete number of correctable errors depends on the distribution of parity bits and is mainly limited by the

runtime of the decoder, since many false alarms in the early subslots may let the runtime grow exponentially. It is found in [2], that the best performance of the outer tree decoder is achieved by choosing all of the parity bits in the last sections, but this increases the complexity of the outer decoder to an unfeasible level. Therefore, a compromise has to be found between rate and complexity. We have found that it is advantageous to use a non-uniform power allocation to reduce the complexity, i.e., instead of allocating the same power to the inner codewords of each subslot, we choose a sequence $P_1, \dots, P_L$ such that $\sum_{\ell=1}^{L} P_\ell = LP$. A decaying power allocation can reduce the number of false alarms in the early subslots at the cost of an increased number of false alarms more of them in the later sections. In this way, we can choose more parity bits in the later subslots, i.e., an increasing parity profile $p_2 \leq p_3 \leq \cdots \leq p_L$, while keeping the complexity manageable.

B. Results

For the simulations in Figure 2 we choose $b = 96$ bits as payload size for each user and $n = 3200$ complex channel uses. We choose $L = 32$, yielding $n_0 = 100$ and $J = 12$, yielding an inner coding rate $R_{\text{in}} = 12/100$ bits per channel use. Notice that the coding matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in this case has dimension 100×4096 and therefore is still quite manageable. Notice also that if one wishes to send the same payload message using the piggybacking scheme of [12, 13], each user should make use of 2^{96} columns, which is totally impractical.

For the outer code, we choose the following parity profile $p = [0, 9, 9, \dots, 9, 12, 12, 12]$, yielding an outer coding rate $R_{out} = 0.25$ information bits per binary symbol. We fix $N_0 = 1$ and choose the transmit power, such that $E_b/N_0 = 0$dB. All large scale fading coefficients are fixed to $g_k \equiv 1$. Figure 2 shows the total PUPE $P_e = p_{md} + p_{fa}$ as a function of the number of active users for different numbers of receive antennas M. We find that with $M = 400$ the error probability drops below 10^{-2} for 300 active users. Notice that this corresponds to a total spectral efficiency $\mu = \frac{12}{100} \times 0.25 \times 300 = 9$ bit per channel use, which is significantly larger than today's LTE cellular systems (in terms of bit/s/Hz per sector) and definitely much larger than IoT-driven schemes such as LoRA [16, 17]. According to the random coding bound of [1] this is impossible to achieve for the scalar Gaussian channel (1) (only one receive antenna), even with coherent detection and roughly five times smaller spectral efficiency then here.




Figure 2: Error probability ($P_e = p_{md} + p_{fa}$) as a function of the number of active users for different numbers of receive antennas. $L = 32, J = 12$.

References

[1] Yury Polyanskiy. "A perspective on massive random-access". In: *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 2523–2527. ISBN: 978-1-5090-4096-4.

[2] Vamsi K. Amalladinne et al. "A Coupled Compressive Sensing Scheme for Uncoordinated Multiple Access". In: (Sept. 12, 2018). arXiv: 1809.04745.

[3] T M Cover and Joy Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. 2nd. Wiley, 2006.

[4] Richard Kueng and Peter Jung. "Robust Nonnegative Sparse Recovery and the Nullspace Property of 0/1 Measurements". In: *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* 64 (2018), pp. 689–703. arXiv: 1603.07997.

[5] Martin Slawski and Matthias Hein. "Non-Negative Least Squares for High-Dimensional Linear Models: Consistency and Sparse Recovery without Regularization". In: *Electron. J. Stat.* 7 (2013), pp. 3004–3056. arXiv: 1205.0953.

[6] Thomas L. Marzetta et al. *Fundamentals of Massive MIMO*. Cambridge University Press, 2016. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781316799895.

[7] Liang Liu et al. "Sparse Signal Processing for Grant-Free Massive IoT Connectivity". In: (Apr. 10, 2018). arXiv: 1804.03475.

[8] Liang Liu and Wei Yu. "Massive Connectivity with Massive MIMO-Part I: Device Activity Detection and Channel Estimation". In: *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* 66.11 (June 1, 2018), pp. 2933–2946. DOI: 10.1109/TSP.2018.2818082. arXiv: 1706.06438.

[9] Zhilin Chen, Foad Sohrabi, and Wei Yu. "Sparse Activity Detection for Massive Connectivity". In: *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* 66.7 (Apr. 1, 2018), pp. 1890–1904. DOI: 10.1109/TSP.2018.2795540. arXiv: 1801.05873.

[10] C. Wang et al. “On-the-Fly Large-Scale Channel-Gain Estimation for Massive Antenna-Array Base Stations”. In: *2018 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. 2018 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC). May 2018, pp. 1–6. DOI: 10.1109/ICC.2018.8422419.

[11] Saeid Haghighatshoar, Peter Jung, and Giuseppe Caire. “Improved Scaling Law for Activity Detection in Massive MIMO Systems”. In: (Mar. 6, 2018). arXiv: 1803.02288.

[12] E. G. Larsson and R. Moosavi. “Piggybacking an Additional Lonely Bit on Linearly Coded Payload Data”. In: *IEEE Wirel. Commun. Lett.* 1.4 (Aug. 2012), pp. 292–295. DOI: 10.1109/WCL.2012.041612.120093.

[13] K. Senel and E. G. Larsson. “Device Activity and Embedded Information Bit Detection Using AMP in Massive MIMO”. In: *2017 IEEE Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps)*. 2017 IEEE Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps). Dec. 2017, pp. 1–6. DOI: 10.1109/GLOCOMW.2017.8269163.

[14] Mohsen Bayati and Andrea Montanari. “The Dynamics of Message Passing on Dense Graphs, with Applications to Compressed Sensing”. In: *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* 57.2 (2011), pp. 764–785. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2010.2094817.

[15] Jongmin Kim et al. “Belief Propagation for Joint Sparse Recovery”. In: (Feb. 16, 2011). arXiv: 1102.3289.

[16] M. Centenaro et al. “Long-Range Communications in Unlicensed Bands: The Rising Stars in the IoT and Smart City Scenarios”. In: *IEEE Wirel. Commun.* 23.5 (Oct. 2016), pp. 60–67. DOI: 10.1109/MWC.2016.7721743.

[17] D. Bankov, E. Khorov, and A. Lyakhov. “On the Limits of LoRaWAN Channel Access”. In: *2016 International Conference on Engineering and Telecommunication (EnT)*. 2016 International Conference on Engineering and Telecommunication (EnT). Nov. 2016, pp. 10–14. DOI: 10.1109/EnT.2016.011.