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Abstract—In most existing robust array beam pattern synthesis studies, the bounded-sphere model is used to describe the steering vector (SV) uncertainties. In this letter, instead of bounding the norm of SV perturbations as a whole, we explore the amplitude and phase perturbations of each SV element separately, thereby obtaining a tighter SV uncertainty model. Based on this model, we formulate the robust array pattern synthesis problem from the perspective of the min-max optimization, which aims to minimize the maximum side lobe response, while preserving the main lobe response. However, this problem is difficult due to the infinitely many non-convex constraints. As a remedy, we employ the worst-case criterion and recast the problem as a convex second-order cone program (SOCP). To solve the SOCP, we further develop an alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM)-based algorithm, which is computationally efficient with each step being computed in closed form. Numerical simulations demonstrate the efficacy and efficiency of the proposed algorithm.
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Let $\mathbf{w} = [w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_N]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 1}$ be the beamformer, and the array pattern with angle $\theta$ is given by $|\mathbf{w}^a\hat{a}_0|$, where $\mathbf{w}^a$ denotes the Hermitian of $\mathbf{w}$. In this paper, we aim to maintain the unit main lobe response in direction $\theta_0$, while suppressing the response in the side lobe region, denoted by $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots, \theta_M\}$, as small as possible. Given the perfect knowledge of SV, such an array pattern can be synthesized by solving the following min-max problem \[ \text{(2)} \]

**Proposition 1.**

**Proof.**

**Remark 1** Although \ref{prob:convex} is the same as the $\ell_1$-regularization problem in \cite{16}, our formulation is derived under a different SV uncertainty model. Originally, our robust problem \ref{prob:convex} is formulated based on $C_\theta$. Compared with $\tilde{C}_\theta$, \ref{prob:convex} gives a more intuitive form of the SV element uncertainty which essentially consists of the perturbations in amplitude and phase. These two types of perturbations are usually measurable in practice. Problem \ref{prob:convex} is a convex restriction of problem \ref{prob:convex}. Proposition \ref{prop:convex} establishes a connection between them by revealing the relation between the total SV element uncertainty, i.e., $\Delta a_{\theta,n}$, and the individual amplitude and phase uncertainties, i.e., $U_n$ and $\Phi_n$.

**Remark 2** As shown in Fig. \ref{fig:convex}, $\tilde{C}_\theta$ gives a tighter SV uncertainty set than the well-known bounded-sphere model, i.e.,
where \( \lambda_m \) denotes the conjugate of \( \lambda, m = 0, 1, \ldots, M \), and \( \Re\{\cdot\} \) denotes the real part of a complex number.

By dividing the variables \( \{w, v, x, t\} \) into two blocks of \( w \) and \( \{v, x, t\} \), problem (11) fits into the framework of ADMM, and hence can be solved by updating \( w \), \( \{v, x, t\} \), and \( \{\lambda, \gamma\} \) alternately. Specifically, the ADMM iterates are given as

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{w}^{i+1} &= \arg\min_w \mathcal{L}_\rho(w, v^i, x^i, t^i, \lambda^i, \gamma^i) \quad (14a) \\
\{v^{i+1}, x^{i+1}, t^{i+1}\} &= \arg\min_{\{v, x, t\}} \mathcal{L}_\rho(w^{i+1}, v, x, t^i, \lambda^i, \gamma^i) \quad (14b) \\
& \quad \text{s.t. } (11b) \text{ and } (11c),
\end{align*}
\]

where \( i \) is the iteration index.

With the help of ADMM, problem (11) is separated into two subproblems, i.e., (14a) and (14b). These two subproblems are very simple and can be solved in closed form, thus generating a computationally efficient algorithm. In the rest of this section, we will elaborate more on the step-by-step computation of the ADMM subproblems.

### A. Solution to Subproblem (14a)

Subproblem (14a) is an unconstrained quadratic program (QP) with respect to \( w \), and can be optimally solved in closed form. To simplify the notation, we define

\[
\mathbf{A} \triangleq \sum_{m=0}^{M} \rho \hat{a}_{\theta_m} \hat{a}_{\theta_m}^\dagger + \rho \mathbf{I},
\]

and then the subproblem (14a) can be expressed as

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_w & \quad \frac{1}{2} w^\dagger \mathbf{A} w - \Re\{w^\dagger \mathbf{b}\} \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad \mathbf{w}^\dagger \mathbf{w} = 1
\end{align*}
\]

Since \( \mathbf{A} \) is positive definite, the optimal \( w \) can be calculated uniquely in closed form, i.e.,

\[
\mathbf{w}^* = \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{b}.
\]

Notice that since \( \{\hat{a}_{\theta_m}\}_{m=0}^{M} \) are given, \( \mathbf{A}^{-1} \) can be computed in advance. The complexities of updating \( \mathbf{b} \) and computing \( \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{b} \) are \( O(MN) \) and \( O(N^2) \), respectively. Therefore, the complexity of updating \( w \) in each ADMM iteration is only \( O(MN + N^2) \).
B. Solution to Subproblem (14b)

The subproblem related to \( \{v, x, t\} \) can be expressed as

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\{v, x, t\}} & \quad t + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left( \delta_n |v_n| + \frac{\rho}{2} |v_n + \frac{1}{\rho} \gamma_n - w_n| \right) \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad |x_{\theta_m}| \leq t, \quad \forall m = 1, 2, \cdots, M, \\
& \quad x_{\theta_0} \geq \sum_{n=1}^{N} \delta_n |v_n| + 1, \quad \Im \{x_{\theta_0}\} = 0.
\end{align*}
\] (19)

It can be easily observed that problem (19) is separable among \( \{t, \{x_{\theta_m}\}_{m=1}^{M}\} \) and \( \{x_{\theta_0}, \{v_n\}_{n=1}^{N}\} \). Therefore, we can update them independently.

1) Update \( \{t, \{x_{\theta_m}\}_{m=1}^{M}\} \): To simplify the notation, let us denote \( c_{\theta_m} = \frac{1}{\rho} \lambda_m - \text{w}^T a_{\theta_m} \), \( m = 1, 2, \cdots, M \). The subproblem related to \( \{t, \{x_{\theta_m}\}_{m=1}^{M}\} \) is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\{t, \{x_{\theta_m}\}_{m=1}^{M}\}} & \quad t + \frac{\rho}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M} |x_{\theta_m} + c_{\theta_m}|^2 \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad |x_{\theta_m}| \leq t, \quad \forall m = 1, 2, \cdots, M.
\end{align*}
\] (20)

Notice that the constraint \( |x_{\theta_m}| \leq t \) does not restrict the phase of \( x_{\theta_m} \). To minimize the objective of problem (20), \( x_{\theta_m} \) must take the following form

\[
x_{\theta_m} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{c_{\theta_m}}{|c_{\theta_m}|}, & |c_{\theta_m}| \neq 0, \\
0, & c_{\theta_m} = 0.
\end{cases}
\] (21)

Consequently, problem (20) can be simplified as (22), which tries to find the optimal \( t \) and \( z_{\theta_m} = |x_{\theta_m}|, m = 1, 2, \cdots, M \),

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\{t, \{z_{\theta_m}\}_{m=1}^{M}\}} & \quad t + \frac{\rho}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M} (z_{\theta_m} - |c_{\theta_m}|)^2 \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad 0 \leq z_{\theta_m} \leq t, \quad \forall m = 1, 2, \cdots, M.
\end{align*}
\] (22a)

Due to the instinct structure, problem (22) can be optimally solved in closed form (24). First, when \( t \) is given in problem (22), the optimal solution to \( z_{\theta_m} \) can be easily obtained as

\[
z_{\theta_m} = \text{proj}_{[0, t]} \{|c_{\theta_m}|\}, \quad \forall m = 1, 2, \cdots, M,
\] (23)

where \( \text{proj}_{[0, t]} \{|c_{\theta_m}|\} \) denotes the projection onto the range of \([0, t]\). That is, when \( |c_{\theta_m}| < t \), \( z_{\theta_m} = |c_{\theta_m}| \); otherwise, \( z_{\theta_m} = t \). Without loss of generality, we assume \( |c_{\theta_1}| \leq |c_{\theta_2}| \leq \cdots \leq |c_{\theta_M}| \). We further assume that there exists some \( K \) such that the optimal \( t^* \in \{|c_{\theta_{K-1}}|, |c_{\theta_K}|\} \), i.e., \( z_{\theta_m} = |c_{\theta_m}| \) for \( \theta_1 \leq \theta_m < \theta_K \) and \( x_{\theta_m} = t^* \) for \( \theta_K \leq \theta_m \leq \theta_M \). Then, the optimal \( t^* \) can be achieved by

\[
t^* = \arg \min_{t \geq 0} t + \frac{\rho}{2} \sum_{m=K}^{M} (t - |c_{\theta_m}|)^2 = \left[ \frac{\rho \sum_{m=K}^{M} |c_{\theta_m}| - 1}{\rho (M - K + 1)} \right]^{+} \triangleq \Gamma(K).
\] (24)

where \([.]^{+} = \max\{0, \cdot\}\). Therefore, solving problem (23) is equivalent to finding the unique \( 1 \leq K^* \leq M \) so that \( |c_{\theta_{K^*}}| \geq \Gamma(K^*) > |c_{\theta_{K+1}}| \). Then, the optimal solution to problem (14b) is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
t^* & = \Gamma(K^*), \\
x_{\theta_m}^* & = \begin{cases} 
-c_{\theta_m}, & 1 \leq m \leq K^* - 1, \\
c_{\theta_m} - t^*, & K^* \leq m \leq M.
\end{cases}
\] (25a, b)

2) Update \( \{x_{\theta_0}, \{v_n\}_{n=1}^{N}\} \): Again, to simplify the notation, we denote \( c_{\theta_0} = \frac{1}{\rho} \lambda_0 - \text{w}^T a_{\theta_0} \), and \( d_n = \frac{1}{\rho} \gamma_n - w_n \), \( \forall n = 1, 2, \cdots, N \). Then, the problem of \( \{x_{\theta_0}, \{v_n\}_{n=1}^{N}\} \) is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\{x_{\theta_0}, \{v_n\}_{n=1}^{N}\}} & \quad \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left( \delta_n |v_n| + \frac{\rho}{2} |v_n + d_n|^2 \right) + \frac{\rho}{2} |x_{\theta_0} + c_{\theta_0}|^2 \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad x_{\theta_0} \geq \sum_{n=1}^{N} \delta_n |v_n| + 1, \quad \Im \{x_{\theta_0}\} = 0.
\end{align*}
\] (26)

It can be easily observed that the constraint in problem (26) does not restrict the phase of \( v_n \), \( n = 1, 2, \cdots, N \). Similar as the analysis in Sec. III-B1, we denote \( e_n = |d_n| - \frac{1}{\rho} \delta_n \) and \( y_n = |v_n| \), and then recast problem (26) equivalently as

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\{x_{\theta_0}, \{y_n\}_{n=1}^{N}\}} & \quad \left( x_{\theta_0} + \Re \{c_{\theta_0}\} \right)^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{N} (y_n - e_n)^2 \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad x_{\theta_0} \geq \sum_{n=1}^{N} \delta_n y_n + 1, \\
& \quad y_n \geq 0, \quad \forall n = 1, 2, \cdots, N.
\end{align*}
\] (27a, b)

By applying the first-order optimality condition, the optimal \( x_{\theta_0}^* \) and \( y_n^* \) are given as

\[
\begin{align*}
x_{\theta_0}^* & = -\Re \{c_{\theta_0}\} + \frac{\xi}{2}, \\
y_n^* & = \left[ e_n - \frac{\delta_n^2 \xi}{2} \right]^+, \quad \forall n = 1, 2, \cdots, N.
\end{align*}
\] (28a, b)

where \( \xi \) is Lagrangian multiplier associated with (27b), which should be carefully chosen such that the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions (25) are satisfied.

Specifically, if

\[
\begin{align*}
-\Re \{c_{\theta_0}\} & \geq \sum_{n=1}^{N} \delta_n [e_n]^+ + 1, \\
\text{then } \xi & = 0. \quad \text{Otherwise, we find some } \xi > 0 \text{ such that } \\
\frac{\xi}{2} - \Re \{c_{\theta_0}\} & = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \delta_n^2 \left( \frac{e_n}{\delta_n} - \frac{\xi}{2} \right) + 1.
\end{align*}
\] (30)

Without loss of generality, we assume \( \frac{\delta_n}{\delta_1} \leq \frac{\delta_n}{\delta_2} \leq \cdots \leq \frac{\delta_n}{\delta_N} \). Then there exists some \( L \) such that \( y_n = 0 \) for \( 1 \leq n < L \), and \( y_n > 0 \) for \( L \leq n \leq N \). In this case, (30) turns to

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\xi}{2} - \Re \{c_{\theta_0}\} & = \sum_{n=L}^{N} \delta_n^2 \left( \frac{e_n}{\delta_n} - \frac{\xi}{2} \right) + 1, \\
\text{and } \xi & \text{ is solved as } \\
\xi & = 2 \left[ \sum_{n=L}^{N} \delta_n e_n + 1 + \Re \{c_{\theta_0}\} \right] \triangleq \Omega(L).
\] (32)
Therefore, to determine $\xi$, we only need to find some $1 \leq L^* \leq N$ such that $\frac{\varepsilon x}{\delta x} \leq \frac{\Omega(L^*)}{2} < \frac{\varepsilon x}{\delta x}$. Then, we have
\[
x_{\theta_0}^* = -\mathcal{R}(c_{\theta_0}) + \frac{\Omega(L^*)}{2}, \\
v_n^* = \begin{cases} 0, & 1 \leq n \leq L^* - 1, \\
-\frac{d_n}{|d_n|}, & e_n - \frac{\Omega(L^*)\delta}{2}, \ L^* \leq n \leq N.
\end{cases}
\]
In the special case of $\frac{\Omega(N)}{2} \geq \frac{\varepsilon x}{\delta x}$, we directly have $x_{\theta_0}^* = 1$, and $v_n^* = 0, \forall n = 1, 2, \ldots, N$.

C. Summary of the ADMM-Based Algorithm

At the end of this section, we summarize the ADMM-based algorithm for the robust pattern synthesis problem. The main steps of the algorithm are listed in Table I where the stopping criterion is satisfied as the difference between the iterates of two adjacent iterations falls below some given threshold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF THE ADMM-BASED ALGORITHM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Initialize ${a_{\theta_m}, x_{\theta_m}}<em>{m=0}^M$, ${\delta_n}</em>{n=1}^N$, $\nu$, $\lambda$, $\rho$, and $A^{-1}$;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. repeat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $w \leftarrow A^{-1}b$;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $t \leftarrow \Gamma(K)$;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| $x_{\theta_m} \leftarrow \begin{cases} -c_{\theta_m}, & 1 \leq m \leq K - 1, \\
-\frac{d_m}{|d_m|}, & K \leq m \leq M; \end{cases}$ |
| $x_{\theta_0} \leftarrow -\mathcal{R}(c_{\theta_0}) + \frac{\Omega(t)}{2}$; |
| $v_n \leftarrow -\frac{d_n}{|d_n|}, |d_n| - \frac{\Omega(t)\delta}{2}, \ L \leq n \leq N;$ |
| $\lambda_m \leftarrow \lambda_m + \rho(x_{\theta_m} - w^*a_{\theta_m}), 0 \leq m \leq M,$ |
| $\gamma_n \leftarrow \gamma_n + \rho(v_n - w_n), 1 \leq n \leq N; |
| 7. until some stopping criterion is satisfied; |

Remark 3 As shown in [26], if the problem is feasible, and the subproblems in each ADMM iteration can be uniquely solved, then every accumulation point of the iterates generated by the ADMM algorithm is an optimal solution of the problem. Since problem (10) is always feasible, and the subproblems of $w$ and $\{v, x, t\}$ are uniquely solved by (18), (25) and (33), we claim that the proposed ADMM algorithm solves problem (10) optimally.

The $w$-minimization step requires the computational cost of $O(MN + N^2)$ to complete the multiplication of $A^{-1}b$. The complexity of the $\{t, (x_{\theta_m})_{m=1}^N\}$-minimization step is $O(MN + M \log_2 M)$, which is mainly coming from computing $c_{\theta_m} = w^*a_{\theta_m}, m = 1, 2, \ldots, M$, and the partition-exchange sort. Similarly, the computational cost of the $\{x_{\theta_0}, (v_n)_{n=1}^N\}$-minimization step is $O(N \log_2 N)$. The complexity of the Lagrangian multipliers update is $O(M + N)$. Therefore, the per-iteration complexity of the proposed algorithm is $O(N^2 + M \log_2 M + M N)$. By contrast, solving problem (10) via the interior-point (IP) method [28] requires a complexity of $O((M + N)^{1.5} N^2)$.

IV. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section, we evaluate the performance of the proposed ADMM-based algorithm on a uniform linear array (ULA) with half-wavelength spacing. The desired main lobe direction $\theta_0$ is $90^\circ$ and the side lobe region $\Theta$ is specified as $[0^\circ, 89^\circ] \cup [91^\circ, 180^\circ]$. The presumed SV for angle $\theta$ is defined as $a_n = \exp(j \pi \cos \theta(n - 1)), \ \forall n = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. All simulations are run on a computer with i5 CPU. The penalty parameter of the ADMM algorithm is set as $\rho = 1$.

In Fig. 2, we compare the worst-case side lobe levels of the following three approaches: (1) the proposed approach, (2) the $\ell_2$-regularization approach based on the bounded-sphere SV uncertainty model [16], where the penalty parameter is set as $\epsilon = \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^N a_n^2}^2/2$, and (3) the nominal beamformer approach which assumes that the perfect SVs are available. The number of array elements is set as $N = 30$. The side lobe region $\Theta$ is sampled every $1^\circ$, i.e., $M = 180$. We set $\Phi_{\max} = 5^\circ$ and sample $U_{\max}$ uniformly from 0.12 to 0.41, which correspond to 1dB and 3dB amplitude perturbations, respectively. Consequently, $\delta_{\max}$ varies from 0.018 to 0.18. We randomly choose $\{U_n, \Phi_n\}_{n=1}^N$ in the range of $[0, U_{\max}] \times [0, \Phi_{\max}]$. It can be observed from Fig. 2 that the proposed approach outperforms the $\ell_2$-regularization approach. This is expected since the SV uncertainty model considered in this paper provides a tighter uncertainty set than the bounded-sphere model, and thus yields a lower worst-case side lobe level.

Next, we confirm the efficiency advantage of the proposed ADMM-based algorithm. To this end, we solve problem (10) as compared to CVX, which employs the IP method. The CPU running times of the two approaches with different numbers of array elements $N$ and angle samples $M$ are listed in Table II where the numerical precision of CVX is $10^{-8}$ and all $\delta_{\max}$ are fixed at 0.15. It can be observed that the proposed algorithm runs much faster than the CVX solver, regardless of the problem dimension.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we consider the classic robust array pattern synthesis problem, which aims to minimize the maximum side lobe response while preserving the unit main lobe response in the presence of SV imperfections. Departing from most existing studies based on the the bounded-sphere SV uncertainty
model, we employ a different uncertainty model by exploring the amplitude and phase perturbations of each SV element separately. One advantage of our strategy lies in that this model provides a tighter SV uncertainty set than the bounded-sphere model. To tackle the infinitely many non-convex constraints within the uncertainty set, we apply the worst-case criterion and recast the min-max problem as a convex SOCP. Then, an ADMM-based algorithm is developed to solve the SOCP problem. The proposed algorithm is computationally efficient since each step can be computed in closed form. Its efficiency and efficacy have been validated by numerical simulations.
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## Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(M, N)$</th>
<th>CPU Running Time (Sec.)</th>
<th>ADMM CPU Time</th>
<th>CVX CPU Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30, 16)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60, 30)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90, 30)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(180, 80)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(360, 200)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(720, 500)</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>259.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1440, 1120)</td>
<td>92.54</td>
<td>2497.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>