

Beyond Dirty Paper Coding for Multi-Antenna Broadcast Channel with Partial CSIT: A Rate-Splitting Approach

Yijie Mao, *Member, IEEE*, Bruno Clerckx, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Imperfect Channel State Information at the Transmitter (CSIT) is inevitable in modern wireless communication networks, and results in severe multi-user interference in multi-antenna Broadcast Channel (BC). While the capacity of multi-antenna (Gaussian) BC with perfect CSIT is known and achieved by Dirty Paper Coding (DPC), the capacity and the capacity-achieving strategy of multi-antenna BC with imperfect CSIT remain unknown. Conventional approaches therefore rely on applying communication strategies designed for perfect CSIT to the imperfect CSIT setting. In this work, we break this conventional routine and make two major contributions. First, we show that linearly precoded Rate-Splitting (RS), relying on the split of messages into common and private parts and linear precoding at the transmitter, and successive interference cancellation at the receivers, can achieve larger rate region than DPC in multi-antenna BC with partial CSIT. Second, we propose a novel scheme, denoted as Dirty Paper Coded Rate-Splitting (DPCRS), that relies on RS to split the user messages into common and private parts, and DPC to encode the private parts. We show that the rate region of DPCRS in Multiple-Input Single-Output (MISO) BC with partial CSIT is enlarged beyond that of conventional DPC and that of linearly precoded RS. Gaining benefits from the capability of RS to partially decode the interference and partially treat interference as noise, DPCRS is less sensitive to CSIT inaccuracies, networks loads and user deployments compared with DPC and other existing transmission strategies.

Index Terms—Dirty Paper Coding (DPC), Multiple-Input Single-Output (MISO), Broadcast Channel (BC), Rate-Splitting Multiple Access (RSMA), partial Channel State Information (CSI) at the Transmitter (CSIT)

I. INTRODUCTION


Current wireless communication networks rely increasingly on multi-antenna/Multiple-Input Multiple Output (MIMO) processing to boost rate performance and manage interference. Although appealing in their concept, multi-antenna networks are nevertheless hampered by several practical factors. Among these, the acquisition of accurate Channel State Information (CSI) knowledge at the Transmitter (CSIT) is a major challenge. The availability of accurate CSIT is crucial for downlink multi-user multi-antenna wireless networks. The beamforming and interference management performance heavily depends on the channel estimation accuracy. Unfortunately, pilot reuse tends to impair channel estimation with inter-cell interference

in Time Division Duplex (TDD) and a significant feedback overhead is required to guarantee sufficient feedback accuracy in Frequency Division Duplex (FDD) due to the potentially large number of antennas. Delay, mobility, Radio Frequency (RF) impairments (e.g. phase noise) and inaccurate calibrations of RF chains also contribute to making the CSIT inaccurate. Moreover, CSI may be known only for a subset of links in the network, may be estimated only at the subband level (and not for each subcarrier) and may not be known instantaneously but only statistically. This CSIT inaccuracy results in a multi-user interference problem that is the primary bottleneck of MIMO wireless networks. As an illustration of the severity of the problem, in 4G Long-Term Evolution (LTE)-Advanced, the CSIT inaccuracy leads to significant losses of Multi-User MIMO (MU-MIMO) of at least 30% in terms of cell average throughput, and 42% in terms of cell edge throughput [1]. Similarly Coordinated Multi-Point (CoMP) transmission based on coordinated scheduling and beamforming across a full network leads to performance even worse than single-cell processing because of the inaccurate CSIT in the presence of subband-based feedback in 4G LTE-Advanced [1].


Looking backward, the problem has been to strive to apply techniques designed for perfect CSIT to scenarios with partial CSIT [2]. Indeed, multi-antenna in 4G and 5G have been fundamentally motivated by the assumption of perfect CSIT and their performance assessed in the presence of partial CSIT. This is reflected by the conventional approach used in the past 20 years that consists in identifying a communication theoretic channel, e.g. Multiple-Input Single-Output (MISO) Broadcast Channel (BC), characterize its fundamental limits, e.g. capacity region, identify the capacity-achieving strategy, e.g. Dirty Paper Coding (DPC), simplify the strategy, e.g. using linear precoding, and then incorporate partial CSIT and design robust precoders. This leads to the classical linear precoding framework where any residual interference is treated as noise at the receivers. This conventional approach is further illustrated in Fig. 1(a).

While the ability to provide highly accurate and up-to-date CSIT remains questionable, considerable effort has been devoted to improving the performance of those strategies in the presence of CSIT uncertainties. Unfortunately, such approaches have been shown partially disappointing (e.g. CoMP in 4G as discussed above) and it is conjectured that following the same path will increase the gap between theory and practice as the density of antennas increases. The caveat of this conventional approach is that the underlying communication

Y. Mao and B. Clerckx are with Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, UK (email: y.mao16@imperial.ac.uk; b.clerckx@imperial.ac.uk). This work has been partially supported by the U.K. Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) under grant EP/N015312/1, EP/R511547/1.



(a) Conventional approach



(b) Approach motivated by CSIT

Fig. 1: Conceptual flow of conventional approach and partial CSIT-motivated approach for rate-splitting in MISO BC.

strategies were motivated by perfect CSIT, and partial CSIT is brought into the picture only at the end of the design. The rationale why such a conventional approach has been extensively used is that, while the capacity of the multi-antenna (Gaussian) BC with perfect CSIT is known and achieved by DPC [3], [4], the capacity and the capacity-achieving strategy of the multi-antenna BC with imperfect CSIT remain unknown. However, such conventional approach may come with non-negligible performance loss. It has been shown in [5], [6] that DPC is very sensitive to imperfect CSIT. As CSIT quality decreases, DPC region becomes much smaller. Below a certain threshold of CSIT quality, DPC region would be outperformed by Beamforming with Joint Decoding (BF-JD) strategy proposed in [5] or even time-sharing [6] under the assumption of perfect Channel State Information at the Receivers (CSIR).

In this paper, we consider another approach and wonder whether it would be wiser to design MIMO wireless networks from scratch accounting for partial CSIT and its resulting multi-user interference [2]. The fundamental question and first motivation for this paper is *can we design and optimize transmission strategies for multi-user multi-antenna communications under the assumption of partial CSIT?* Interestingly, new communication and information theoretic understanding of the fundamental role of partial CSIT on the performance

of MIMO wireless networks has appeared. It is now known that to benefit from partial CSIT and tackle the multi-user interference, the transmitter should take a *Rate-Splitting (RS) approach* that splits the messages into a common and a private parts, encodes the common parts into a common stream, and private parts into private streams and superposes in a non-orthogonal manner the common stream on top of all private streams [2]. The common stream is drawn from a codebook shared by all receivers and is intended to one but is decodable by all receivers, while the private streams are to be decoded by their corresponding receivers only. Such approach is optimal from an information theoretic perspective (Degrees-of-Freedom, DoF) in a K -user MISO BC with partial CSIT [7]–[10], and brings partial CSIT early on in the picture as illustrated in Fig. 1(b).

This proposed approach contrasts with the conventional approach (as used in 4G and 5G) that is entirely designed based on private streams transmission. Importantly, the proposed RS approach is a more general framework that boils down to conventional precoding whenever no power is allocated to the common stream. That has for consequence that RS-based approaches achieve equal or better performance compared to conventional precoding. Over the past few years, the benefits of RS-based network design have been shown in the literature of MIMO wireless networks. The dawn of RS in multi-antenna BC is from an information theoretic analysis. RS is shown to achieve the optimal sum DoF [8] and further proved to achieve the entire DoF region [9], [10] of the K -user underloaded MISO BC with partial CSIT. The DoF benefits of RS are also studied in the underloaded BC with multiple transmitters [11] and multi-antenna receivers [12] in partial CSIT. In the overloaded MISO BC, RS has been shown to achieve the optimal DoF region with heterogeneous CSIT qualities by superimposing degraded symbols on top of linearly precoded RS symbols. The merits of RS discovered from DoF analysis motivate recent studies of precoder design for RS at finite Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) with both perfect and partial CSIT. Specifically, RS linear precoders have been designed in the conventional MISO BC for sum rate maximization with partial CSIT [8] and perfect CSIT [13], max-min fair transmission with partial CSIT [14], energy efficiency maximization with perfect CSIT [15], transmit power control with partial CSIT [16] and minimizing the mean square error with finite feedback [17]. Moreover, it has been shown in [18] that the entire capacity region of two-user MISO BC can be achieved by RS with Minimum Mean Square Error (MMSE) precoding within a constant gap. Besides linearly precoded RS, precoder design of RS with non-linear Tomlinson-Harashima Precoding (THP) in MISO BC has been studied in [19]. Though THP technique does not achieve the performance of DPC, it is less complex and considered as a practical implementation of DPC. The precoders of RS have also been designed in other variants of MISO BC, such as multi-group multicast [20], massive MIMO [21], millimeter-wave systems [22], MISO BC with hardware impairments [23], CoMP joint transmission [24], Cloud Radio Access Networks (C-RAN) [25], Simultaneous Wireless Information and Power Transfer (SWIPT) [26], Non-Orthogonal Unicast and Multicast (NOUM) transmission [27],

cooperative RS in MISO BC with user relaying [28], [29]. The capability of 1-layer RS discovered in the literature to partially decode the interference and partially treat residual interference as noise makes RS the fundamental building block for a more general and powerful transmission framework for downlink BC, namely, *Rate-Splitting Multiple Access (RSMA)* [13]. RSMA uses linearly precoded RS at the transmitter to split each user message into multiple common messages and a private message. The common messages are recombined and encoded into the common streams for the intended users. Successive Interference Cancellation (SIC) is required at each user to sequentially decode the intended common streams. Such linearly precoded generalized RSMA has been demonstrated to be a powerful framework to bridge and generalize Space Division Multiple Access (SDMA) and Non-Orthogonal Multiple Access (NOMA), and further boost system spectral and energy efficiencies for downlink MISO BC with both perfect and partial CSIT. As a summary, the developed framework based on RS is not only optimum from an information theoretic (DoF) perspective, it also provides significant performance benefits over the conventional precoding strategies.

Building upon the progress in the RS literature for multi-antenna BC, this paper studies RS and DPC in MISO BC with partial CSIT, and makes two major and novel contributions:

First, this paper shows that linearly precoded RS outperforms DPC in MISO BC with partial CSIT. The performance benefits come from the inherent robustness of RS to partial CSIT. This is the first paper to explicitly make this observation. This is in sharp contrast with the perfect CSIT case, where DPC is known to be capacity achieving [3] and outperform linearly precoded RS [13]. This has major implications for practical communication system designs. On one extreme, DPC can be seen as a full transmit-side interference cancellation strategy. On the other extreme, power-domain NOMA based on Superposition Coding (SC) and SIC can be seen as a full receive-side interference cancellation strategy. Power-domain NOMA, however, wastes the multiplexing gain of MISO BC and results in poor performance, as explained in [13], [30]. In between, stands RS that can be seen as a smart combination of transmit-side and receive-side interference cancellation strategy where the contribution of the common stream is adjusted according to the level of interference that needs to be canceled by the receiver. What this paper shows is that, in practical deployments subject to partial CSIT, an RS strategy enabling a mix of transmit-side and receive-side interference cancellation outperforms a full transmit-side interference cancellation strategy such as DPC. This further demonstrates the power of the proposed approach in Fig. 1(b) over the conventional approach in Fig. 1(a). Additionally, and importantly, RS also comes at a lower complexity since it only relies on linear precoding. RS is therefore a promising, powerful, and robust non-orthogonal transmission technique for real-world applications.

Second, this paper shows that, in MISO BC with partial CSIT, one can get even better rate region performance than linearly precoded RS (and DPC) by marrying RS and DPC, and using DPC to encode the private parts of the messages. This leads to another transmission strategy, denoted as Dirty

Paper Coded Rate-Splitting (DPCRS). We show that the rate region of DPCRS in MISO BC with partial CSIT is enlarged beyond that of conventional DPC and that of linearly precoded RS. Gaining benefits from the capability of RS to partially decode the interference and partially treat interference as noise, DPCRS is less sensitive to the variation of CSIT inaccuracies, network loads, and user deployments compared with DPC and other existing transmission strategies.

Organization: The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The system model is described in Section II. The problem formulation for the proposed strategies is specified in Section III. In Section IV, the proposed algorithm is described followed by the numerical results in Section V. Finally, conclusion is made in Section VI.

Notations: Bold lower and upper case letters denote vectors and matrices, respectively. $\|\cdot\|$ represents Euclidean norm. The notations $(\cdot)^H$, $(\cdot)^T$, $\text{tr}(\cdot)$, $\mathbb{E}\{\cdot\}$ respectively denote the Hermitian, transpose, trace and expectation operators. \mathbf{I} denotes the identity matrix. \sim denotes “distributed as and $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$ ” denotes the Circularly Symmetric Complex Gaussian (CSCG) distribution with zero mean and variance σ^2 . The notations in the system model are summarized in Table I.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

In this work, we consider a MISO BC with one multi-antenna Base Station (BS) simultaneously serving K single-antenna users. The BS is equipped with N_t transmit antennas and the users are indexed by $\mathcal{K} = \{1, \dots, K\}$. The signal received by user- k for a given channel use (time or frequency) is

$$y_k = \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{x} + n_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t}$ is the channel between the BS and user- k . $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t}$ is the signal vector transmitted in a given channel use subject to the transmit power constraint $\mathbb{E}\{\|\mathbf{x}\|^2\} \leq P_t$. $n_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_{n,k}^2)$ is the Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN). Without loss of generality, we assume that $\sigma_{n,k}^2 = \sigma_n^2 = 1, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}$. Hence, the transmit SNR defined as $\text{SNR} \triangleq \frac{P_t}{\sigma_n^2}$ is equal to P_t .

A. Channel Model

Due to the uplink channel estimation error caused by quantized feedback [31], feedback delay [32], [33], etc, CSIT is commonly imperfect. In this work, we assume perfect CSIR and partial CSIT, which is modeled by

$$\mathbf{H} = \widehat{\mathbf{H}} + \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{H} = [\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_K]$ is the actual CSI known at all users. $\widehat{\mathbf{H}} = [\widehat{\mathbf{h}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{h}}_K]$ is the estimated CSI known at the BS. $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}} = [\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_1, \dots, \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_K]$ is the CSIT estimation error matrix with each element of the k -th-column for user- k characterized by an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) zero-mean complex Gaussian distribution variable with $\mathbb{E}\{\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_k \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_k^H\} = \sigma_{e,k}^2 \mathbf{I}$. The variance of the error $\sigma_{e,k}^2$ is assumed to scale exponentially with SNR as $\sigma_{e,k}^2 \sim O(P_t^{-\alpha})$, where $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$ is the quality scaling factor interpreted as the quality of CSIT in the high SNR regime [7], [8], [31]–[33]. $\alpha = 0$ represents

TABLE I: Notations

Notation	Description
N_t	number of transmit antennas
K	number of users
\mathcal{K}	set of users
P_t	transmit power limit
$\sigma_{e,k}^2$	variance of error
α	quality of CSIT in the high SNR regime
π	DPC encoding order
π'	decoding order of partial-common streams
\mathcal{I}_k	index set of all the streams to be decoded at user- k
π'_k	index set of partial-common streams to be decoded at user- k based on decoding order π'
\mathcal{K}_c	index set of all common streams
$\mathcal{K}_{c,k}^i$	index set of all undecoded common streams at user- k when decoding the stream s_i
\mathcal{K}_k	index set of all undecoded streams at user- k when decoding the private stream s_k
\mathcal{K}_i	set of users to decode the common stream s_i
$\overline{R}_{i,k}^x$	ER at user- k to decode stream s_i for strategy "x"
$\overline{R}_{k,tot}^x$	total ER at user- k for strategy "x"
\overline{C}_k	ER of the common stream s_c allocated to user- k for 1-DPCRS
\overline{C}_k^i	ER of the common stream s_i allocated to user- k for M-DPCRS

partial CSIT with finite precision, e.g. a constant number of feedback bits, while $\alpha = \infty$ represents perfect CSIT. The joint distribution of $\{\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}}\}$ is assumed to be stationary and ergodic [8]. \mathbf{H} over the entire transmission is unknown at the BS but the conditional density $f_{\mathbf{H}|\widehat{\mathbf{H}}}(\mathbf{H}|\widehat{\mathbf{H}})$ is assumed to be known at the BS.

B. Conventional Dirty Paper Coding

In the conventional DPC [34]–[37], with a certain encoding order π (where π defined as $\pi \triangleq [\pi(1), \dots, \pi(K)]$ is a permutation of $\{1, \dots, K\}$ such that the message $W_{\pi(i)}$ is encoded before $W_{\pi(j)}$ if $i < j$), the BS starts encoding from message $W_{\pi(1)}$ for user- $\pi(1)$ to message $W_{\pi(K)}$ for user- $\pi(K)$. The messages are encoded into a set of symbol streams $s_{\pi(1)}, \dots, s_{\pi(K)}$ to be transmitted for a given channel use. The stream vector $\mathbf{s} \triangleq [s_{\pi(1)}, \dots, s_{\pi(K)}]^T$ is precoded by $\mathbf{P} \triangleq [\mathbf{p}_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{\pi(K)}]$, where $\mathbf{p}_{\pi(k)} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t}$ is the precoder for user- $\pi(k)$, and the resulting superposed transmit signal is

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{s} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{p}_{\pi(k)} s_{\pi(k)}. \quad (3)$$

Assuming CSCG inputs with $\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{s}\mathbf{s}^H\} = \mathbf{I}$, the transmit power constraint is equivalent to $\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^H) = P_t$. If CSIT is perfect, the encoded data stream $s_{\pi(k)}$ experiences no interference from previously encoded data streams $\{s_{\pi(i)} | i < k\}$ according to the principle of DPC [37]. However, as the BS has no access to the exact channel \mathbf{H} , \mathbf{P} is designed at the BS based on the estimated channel state $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$. Only part of the interference from $\widehat{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(k)}^H \sum_{i < k} \mathbf{p}_{\pi(i)} s_{\pi(i)}$ is removed from the signal received at user- $\pi(k)$. The resulting received signal is given by

$$y_{\pi(k)} = \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(k)}^H \sum_{i < k} \mathbf{p}_{\pi(i)} s_{\pi(i)} + \mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \sum_{j \geq k} \mathbf{p}_{\pi(j)} s_{\pi(j)} + n_{\pi(k)}. \quad (4)$$

Each user directly decodes the intended message by treating any residual interference as noise. As the precoders are designed at the BS based on the channel estimate $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$ and each user decodes the intended stream based on the exact channel

\mathbf{H} , the instantaneous rate of decoding $s_{\pi(k)}$ at user- $\pi(k)$ is determined by one joint fading state $\{\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}}\}$ given as

$$R_{\pi(k)}^{\text{DPC}}(\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}}) = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(k)}|^2}{\sum_{i < k} |\widehat{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(i)}|^2 + \sum_{j > k} |\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(j)}|^2 + 1} \right). \quad (5)$$

As the BS only knows the channel estimate $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$ without any knowledge of the exact channel \mathbf{H} , $R_{\pi(k)}^{\text{DPC}}(\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}})$ may be overestimated and unachievable at user- $\pi(k)$ [8]. A more robust approach is to design the precoders at the BS based on the Ergodic Rate (ER) under the assumption that the transmission is delay-unlimited. The ER characterizes the long-term performance of user- $\pi(k)$ over all possible joint fading states $\{\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}}\}$, which is defined as

$$\overline{R}_{\pi(k),tot}^{\text{DPC}} \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}}\}} \left\{ R_{\pi(k)}^{\text{DPC}}(\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \right\}. \quad (6)$$

C. Dirty Paper Coded Rate-Splitting

1) *Motivation*: The sum DoF achieved by RS in an underloaded ($N_t \geq K$) K -user MISO BC with partial CSIT is given by $1 + (K - 1)\alpha$ [8], where α is the quality scaling factor as defined in Section II-A. This sum DoF matches the upper bound obtained from the Aligned Image Sets in [7]. As a consequence, RS achieves the optimal DoF in this setting. This contrasts with the conventional approach of Fig. 1(a) that achieves a sum DoF of $\max\{1, K\alpha\}$ [8]. Interestingly, $1 + (K - 1)\alpha$ can be equivalently written as $(1 - \alpha) + K\alpha$. Leveraging the weighted-sum interpretation in [11], [38] and the notion of signal-space partitioning in [39], [40], one can interpret $(1 - \alpha) + K\alpha$ as the DoF achieved by the superposition of two sub-networks in the power domain: a first sub-network consisting of a K -user MISO BC with perfect CSIT using a power level α contributing to a sum DoF of $K\alpha$, and a second sub-network consisting of a K -user MISO BC with no CSIT using the remaining power level $1 - \alpha$ contributing to a sum DoF of $1 - \alpha$, as illustrated in Fig. 2. Loading data onto those two sub-networks is achieved by a non-orthogonal transmission in the power domain using RS




Fig. 2: Weighted sum interpretation of an underloaded K -user MISO BC with partial CSIT.

that splits messages into common and private parts, with the private parts loaded onto the first sub-network and the common parts onto the second sub-network. Since the first sub-network can be viewed as a K -user MISO BC with perfect CSIT, and DPC is capacity-achieving for such a scenario, it motivates us to encode the private parts using DPC. This leads to the Dirty Paper Coded RS discussed in the sequel.

2) *One-Layer Dirty Paper Coded Rate-Splitting (1-DPCRS)*: Though DPC achieves the capacity region of MISO BC with perfect CSIT [35]–[37], it is sensitive to the CSIT inaccuracy [5], [6]. Motivated by the DoF interpretation at infinite SNR in Fig. 2 and the recent benefits of RS in multi-antenna BC, in this work, we focus on finite SNR regime where we first marry 1-layer RS with DPC so as to combat performance losses of DPC resulting from partial CSIT and explore a larger rate region in MISO BC with partial CSIT. The proposed “*1-layer Dirty Paper Coded RS (1-DPCRS)*” strategy is illustrated in Fig. 3(a).

In 1-DPCRS, message W_k intended for user- k , $\forall k \in \mathcal{K}$ is first split into one common part $W_{c,k}$ and one private part $W_{p,k}$. The common parts $W_{c,1}, \dots, W_{c,K}$ of all users are combined into the common message W_c and encoded into the common stream s_c to be decoded by all users for a given channel use. Different from the linearly precoded 1-layer RS strategy studied in the literature [2], [8], [13], [41], the private parts $W_{p,1}, \dots, W_{p,K}$ are encoded and precoded by DPC with a certain encoding order π into the private streams $s_{\pi(1)}, \dots, s_{\pi(K)}$ to be decoded by the corresponding users only. The data vector $\mathbf{s} \triangleq [s_c, s_{\pi(1)}, \dots, s_{\pi(K)}]^T$ is precoded by $\mathbf{P} \triangleq [\mathbf{p}_c, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_K]$, the resulting transmit signal is

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{p}_c s_c + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{p}_{\pi(k)} s_{\pi(k)}. \quad (7)$$

The transmit power constraint is $\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^H) = P_t$ and CSCG inputs with $\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{s}\mathbf{s}^H\} = \mathbf{I}$ are assumed.

At user sides, user- $\pi(k)$ first decodes the common stream s_c into \widehat{W}_c by treating the interference from all private streams as noise. With the assist of SIC¹, the decoded common message

¹In this work, we only consider the SIC receiver architecture as widely used in the existing works [8]–[17], [19]–[29]. Other forms of receiver are worth to be investigated in future works to further enhance the rate performance of systems, i.e., beamforming with JD studied in [5] and RS with JD studied in [42]. The receiver architecture of the proposed DPCRS strategy in this work can also be enhanced by using the JD receiver architecture.

\widehat{W}_c then goes through the process of re-encoding, precoding, and subtracting from the received signal. After decoding the common stream, user- $\pi(k)$ then decodes the intended private stream $s_{\pi(k)}$ into $\widehat{W}_{p,\pi(k)}$ by treating the interference from the private streams encoded after $s_{\pi(k)}$ as noise. Once \widehat{W}_c and $\widehat{W}_{p,\pi(k)}$ are decoded, user- $\pi(k)$ reconstructs the original message by extracting $\widehat{W}_{c,\pi(k)}$ from \widehat{W}_c , and then combines $\widehat{W}_{c,\pi(k)}$ with $\widehat{W}_{p,\pi(k)}$ into $\widehat{W}_{\pi(k)}$. The instantaneous rates of decoding the common stream s_c and the private stream $s_{\pi(k)}$ at user- $\pi(k)$ are

$$R_{c,\pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}}) = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_c|^2}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}} |\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(j)}|^2 + 1} \right), \quad (8a)$$

$$R_{\pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}}) = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(k)}|^2}{\sum_{i < k} |\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(i)}|^2 + \sum_{j > k} |\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(j)}|^2 + 1} \right). \quad (8b)$$

The respective ERs of decoding s_c and $s_{\pi(k)}$ at user- $\pi(k)$ using 1-DPCRS are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{R}_{c,\pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}} &\triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}}\}} \{R_{c,\pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}})\}, \\ \overline{R}_{\pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}} &\triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}}\}} \{R_{\pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$


To ensure s_c is successfully decoded by all users, the ER of the common stream s_c should not exceed

$$\overline{R}_c^{1\text{-DPCRS}} \triangleq \min \left\{ \overline{R}_{c,\pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}} \mid k \in \mathcal{K} \right\}. \quad (10)$$


As the common stream is shared by all users, by denoting the ER of the common stream allocated to user- $\pi(k)$ as $\overline{C}_{\pi(k)}$, we have $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \overline{C}_{\pi(k)} = \overline{R}_c^{1\text{-DPCRS}}$. Therefore, the total ER of each user using 1-DPCRS is $\overline{R}_{\pi(k),tot}^{1\text{-DPCRS}} = \overline{C}_{\pi(k)} + \overline{R}_{\pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}$.

3) *Multi-Layer Dirty Paper Coded Rate-Splitting (M-DPCRS)*: To further exploit a larger rate region for MISO BC with partial CSIT, we incorporate the generalized RSMA framework proposed in [13] with DPC and propose a novel transmission scheme, namely, “*Multi-layer Dirty Paper Coded RS (M-DPCRS)*”. We claim that the proposed M-DPCRS has a larger rate region than DPC and other linearly precoded schemes in MISO BC with partial CSIT.

Compared with the linearly precoded RSMA framework proposed in [13], the main difference of the proposed strategy comes from the non-linear DPC encoding and precoding for the private streams. How the user messages are split and combined follows the framework in [13]. To simplify the explanation, we introduce a three-user M-DPCRS, where the users are indexed as $\mathcal{K} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. It can be easily generalized to the K -user case if readers understand the three-user M-DPCRS as well as the two-user 1-DPCRS. As illustrated in Fig. 3(b), user message W_k of user- k is split into four parts at the BS as $\{W_k^i \mid i \in \mathcal{I}_k\}$, where $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{123, 12, 13, 1\}$, $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{123, 12, 23, 2\}$, $\mathcal{I}_3 = \{123, 13, 23, 3\}$. This is different from 1-DPCRS described in Section II-C2 where the message of each user is only split into two parts as $\{W_{c,k}, W_{p,k}\}$. The intention of splitting user messages into more different parts is to form more layers of common streams for different



(a) K -user 1-DPCRS.



(b) 3-user M-DPCRS, $\pi' = 12 \rightarrow 13 \rightarrow 23$.

Fig. 3: System architecture of Dirty Paper Coded RS for MISO BC.

users, so as to manage interference and disparity of channel strengths more flexibly. The sub-messages $\{W_k^{123} | k \in \mathcal{K}\}$ are jointly encoded into the common stream s_{123} , which is decoded by all the three users. The sub-messages $\{W_1^{12}, W_2^{12}\}$ and $\{W_1^{13}, W_3^{13}\}$ and $\{W_2^{23}, W_3^{23}\}$ are respectively encoded into the partial-common streams s_{12}, s_{13}, s_{23} to be decoded by the intended two users. The private messages $W_k^k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}$ are encoded via DPC with encoding order π into the private streams $s_{\pi(1)}, s_{\pi(2)}, s_{\pi(3)}$ for the respective user only. We assume the private stream of user- $\pi(k)$ is encoded after user- $\pi(i)$ if $k > i$. Define the common stream index set as $\mathcal{K}_c \triangleq \{123, 12, 13, 23\}$. The encoded stream vector $\mathbf{s} \triangleq \{s_k | k \in \mathcal{K}_c \cup \mathcal{K}\}$ is precoded by $\mathbf{P} \triangleq \{\mathbf{p}_k | k \in \mathcal{K}_c \cup \mathcal{K}\}$. The resulting transmit signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t}$ is

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{s} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_c} \mathbf{p}_i s_i + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{p}_{\pi(k)} s_{\pi(k)}. \quad (11)$$

In the three-user M-DPCRS strategy, each user requires three layers of SIC to sequentially decode and remove the intended common streams before decoding the intended private stream. The decoding order of the common streams follows the rule that the data streams intended for a larger number of users have higher decoding priorities. Such rule is commonly adopted in the literature of RS [13], [21], [27], and is motivated by the DoF results and analysis [8], [9]. Therefore, s_{123} is decoded first at all users, followed by the intended partial-common streams s_{12}, s_{13}, s_{23} . The private streams s_1, s_2, s_3 are decoded at the end. As each of the partial-common streams s_{12}, s_{13}, s_{23} are to be decoded by two users, their decoding order is considered to be jointly optimized with the precoders in this work. We define $\pi' \triangleq [\pi'(1), \pi'(2), \pi'(3)]$ as one permutation of $\{12, 13, 23\}$ such that $s_{\pi'(i)}$ is decoded

before $s_{\pi'(j)}$ if $i < j$ at all users². As each user only decodes two of the partial-common streams, we further define $\pi'_k \triangleq [\pi'_k(1), \pi'_k(2)]$ as the two partial-common streams to be decoded at user- k based on the decoding order π' . For example, when $\pi' = [12, 13, 23]$ as illustrated in Fig. 3(b), the decoding order at user-1 is $\pi'_1 = [12, 13]$. $s_{\pi'_1(1)} = s_{12}$ is decoded first followed by $s_{\pi'_1(2)} = s_{13}$. Hence, user- $\pi(k)$ sequentially decodes the streams $\{s_i | i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)}\}$ for a given DPC encoding order π of the private streams and a given decoding order π' of the partial-common streams. The instantaneous rates of decoding the common streams $s_i, i \in \{123, \pi'(k)\}$ and the private stream $s_{\pi(k)}$ at user- $\pi(k)$ are

$$R_{i, \pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) = \quad (12a)$$

$$\log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_i|^2}{\sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}_{c, \pi(k)}^i \cup \mathcal{K}} |\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_j|^2 + 1} \right), \forall i \in \{123, \pi'(k)\}, \quad (12b)$$

$$R_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(k)}|^2}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_{\pi(k)}} |\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_j|^2 + \sum_{j < k} |\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(j)}|^2 + 1} \right), \quad (12c)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{K}}_{c, \pi(k)}^i$ is the set of remaining undecoded common streams when user- $\pi(k)$ decodes the common stream s_i , i.e., $\bar{\mathcal{K}}_{c, \pi(k)}^{123} = \mathcal{K}_c \setminus \{123\}$. $\bar{\mathcal{K}}_{\pi(k)} = \mathcal{K}_c \setminus \{123, \pi'(k)\} \cup \{\pi(j) | j > k\}$ is the set of undecoded common and private streams at user- $\pi(k)$ when decoding the intended private stream $s_{\pi(k)}$.

In the three-user M-DPCRS, the ERs of decoding the intended common and private streams $\{s_i | i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)}\}$ at user- $\pi(k)$ are defined as

$$\bar{R}_{i, \pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}} \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}\}} \{R_{i, \pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})\}, \quad (13)$$

where $R_{i, \pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) = R_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})$ and $\bar{R}_{i, \pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}$ is simplified to $\bar{R}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}$ when $i = \pi(k)$. To ensure the common streams $\{s_i | i \in \mathcal{K}_c\}$ are successfully decoded by the intended users, the ERs of the common streams should not exceed $\bar{R}_i^{\text{M-DPCRS}} \triangleq \min\{\bar{R}_{i, \pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}} | \pi(k) \in \mathcal{K}_i\}$, where \mathcal{K}_i denotes the group of users decoding the common stream s_i . For instance, $\mathcal{K}_i = \{1, 2\}$ when $i = 12$ and $\mathcal{K}_i = \mathcal{K}$ when $i = 123$. By introducing scalar variable \bar{C}_k^i to denote the ER of common stream s_i allocated to user- k , we have $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \bar{C}_k^i = \bar{R}_i^{\text{M-DPCRS}}$. As the message of each user is split into four parts, the ER of user- $\pi(k)$ is the sum of the rate allocated to user- $\pi(k)$ in the intended common streams, i.e., $\bar{R}_{\pi(k), \text{tot}}^{\text{M-DPCRS}} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)} \setminus \{\pi(k)\}} \bar{C}_{\pi(k)}^i + \bar{R}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}$.

Remark 1. As the common streams of RS are linearly precoded, the achievability of ERs for the common streams based on (8a) and (12b) is guaranteed. In contrast, the achievability of the ERs for the private streams calculated by (8b), (12c) and (5) is unknown since the private streams are encoded based on DPC and there is no prior work that rigorously show the achievability of the ERs of DPC for multi-antenna BC with

²Notice that π' is different from π . π' is the decoding order of the linearly precoded common streams at all users while π is the encoding order of the DPC-coded private streams at the BS.

partial CSIT to the best of our knowledge. If the ER based on (5) is achievable, ERs based on (8b) and (12c) are achievable, and vice versa. This is due to the fact that DPC is only applied to the encoding and precoding of the private streams in both 1-DPCRS and M-DPCRS. In the following, we explain the achievability issue in detail and discuss its potential influence to the study of DPCRS in this work.

DPC based on the Gel'fand-Pinsker coding applied on the additive channel is given as $Y = GX + S + Z$, where X is the channel input, G is the effective channel gain, S is the interference, and Z is AWGN [34], [43, Section 1.4.2]. When CSIT is perfect, G and S are known at the transmitter and Z is independent on S . S is successfully pre-cancelled at the transmitter. User rates of DPC with perfect CSIT are therefore achievable. However, when CSIT is imperfect, G is not known at the transmitter and Z is dependent on S . Whether S can be pre-cancelled is unknown and the achievability issue arises.

In equation (5), G, X, S, Z are respectively equivalent to $\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(k)} \rightarrow G$, $s_{\pi(k)} \rightarrow X$, $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(k)}^H \sum_{i < k} \mathbf{p}_{\pi(i)} s_{\pi(i)} \rightarrow S$, $\sum_{i < k} |\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(i)}|^2 + \sum_{j > k} |\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(j)}|^2 + 1 \rightarrow Z$ and we assume that S can be pre-cancelled at the transmitter. One standpoint for the ER based on (5) to be achievable is that the dependency between S and Z should increase the capacity according to footnote 2 of [6]. By treating S and Z as independent as if Z is AWGN, we should be getting an achievable performance which ignores (or does not exploit) the dependency. The channel gain G can be obtained at the transmitter by assuming that once the precoders are selected and synchronized at the transmitter and receivers, each receiver feeds back the composite channel $\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{p}_k$, which provides G .

Showing the achievability of the ERs of DPC for multi-antenna BC with partial CSIT rigorously is beyond the scope of this work and would deserve a thorough study afterwards. To complete our discussion, we summarize the possible cases of the achievability of ERs based on (5), (8b) and (12c), and discuss the merits of DPCRS to be explored in this work for each case:

- 1) The first case is when the ER of DPC based on (5) and the ERs of the private streams for DPCRS based on (8b) and (12c) are achievable, then we are able to draw the conclusion that the proposed DPCRS boosts the achievable rate region and becomes a new benchmark for assessing the achievable rate region in multi-antenna BC with partial CSIT.
- 2) The second case is when ERs based on (5), (8b) and (12c) are not achievable, which are then the respective outer bounds of the achievable rate regions of DPC and DPCRS in MISO BC with partial CSIT. In such case, the performance benefits of linearly precoded RS are further exploited since we show throughout the paper that the achievable rate region of linearly precoded RS outperforms the outer bound of DPC rate region and is almost overlapped with the outer bound of DPCRS rate region in MISO BC with partial CSIT.

The rate achievability issue discussed above was the motivation in [6] to derive an achievable lower bound on the rate for DPC with imperfect CSIT. To further show the superiority

of RS and DPCRS over DPC in imperfect CSIT, following [6], we obtain lower bounds of (5) and (8b) in the Appendix, and also confirm the superiority of RS and DPCRS over DPC using achievable lower bounds on the rate.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

An intuitive method of precoder design at the BS is to optimize the instantaneous precoder \mathbf{P} based on the knowledge of the estimated channel state $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ by maximizing the instantaneous Weighted Sum Rate (WSR) subject to instantaneous power constraint $\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^H) \leq P_t$. However, the partial CSIT may lead to an undecodable rate [8]. In this work, we aim at optimizing precoders so as to maximize the Weighted Ergodic Sum Rate (WESR) which captures the long-term (ergodic) weighted sum rate performance of all users. WESR for a given strategy $x \in \{\text{"DPC"}, \text{"1-DPCRS"}, \text{"M-DPCRS"}\}$ is defined as

$$\text{WESR}^x \triangleq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k \bar{R}_{k, \text{tot}}^x. \quad (14)$$

In this section, the precoder and message-split design problems for WESR maximization in MISO BC with partial CSIT are formulated. Before specifying the formulated problems, we start by answering the question: *how to maximize WESR at the BS with instantaneous imperfect CSIT?*

Though BS is not able to estimate the instantaneous rates, the Average Rates (ARs) of users are predictable at the BS [8]. The ARs are defined in Definition 1.

Definition 1. *The AR of decoding the stream s_i at user- $k, k \in \mathcal{K}$ for a given channel estimate $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ and precoder $\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ is given by*

$$\hat{R}_{i,k}^x(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{H}|\hat{\mathbf{H}}\}} \left\{ R_{i,k}^x(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) \mid \hat{\mathbf{H}} \right\}, \quad (15)$$

where $R_{i,k}^x(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) = R_k^x(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})$ and $\hat{R}_{i,k}^x(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ is simplified to $\hat{R}_k^x(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ when $i = k$. $x \in \{\text{"DPC"}, \text{"1-DPCRS"}, \text{"M-DPCRS"}\}$.

Notice that AR is a short-term measure for an instantaneous channel estimate $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ at the BS. It captures the expected rate over the CSIT uncertainty for a given $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ and conditional density $f_{\mathbf{H}|\hat{\mathbf{H}}}(\mathbf{H} \mid \hat{\mathbf{H}})$. This is different from ER that captures the long-term performance over a long sequence of channel uses $\{\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}\}$ spanning almost all possible joint channel states. We could then obtain the relation between ER and AR [8] as provided in Proposition 1:

Proposition 1. *The ER and AR of decoding the stream s_i at user- $k, k \in \mathcal{K}$ for a given strategy $x \in \{\text{"DPC"}, \text{"1-DPCRS"}, \text{"M-DPCRS"}\}$ follows the relation:*

$$\bar{R}_{i,k}^x = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{H}}} \left\{ \hat{R}_{i,k}^x(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \right\}. \quad (16)$$

Proof: Relation (16) is obtained by the law of total expectation and definition of AR in (15), $\mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}\}} \left\{ R_{i,k}^x(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) \right\} = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{H}}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{H}|\hat{\mathbf{H}}\}} \left\{ R_{i,k}^x(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) \mid \hat{\mathbf{H}} \right\} \right\} = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{H}}} \left\{ \hat{R}_{i,k}^x(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \right\}$. \square

Based on Proposition 1, the problem of designing the precoder \mathbf{P} to maximize the WESR subject to the short-term rate and power constraints³ is equivalently transformed to the

³Note that the long-term power constraint, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}\}} \left\{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^H) \right\} \leq P_t$ results in allocating power across different channel states, which is intractable. Therefore, it is common to replace the long-term power constraint with short-term power constraints for each channel state.

problem of maximizing Weighted Average Sum Rate (WASR) defined by $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_{\pi(k)} \widehat{R}_{\pi(k), tot}^x(\widehat{\mathbf{H}})$ for each $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$ due to the fact that there is no dependencies in the objective function and the constraints of the WESR optimization problem among the channel instances. Hence, the WESR maximization problem is decomposed into the WASR subproblem for each $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$ [8]. In the following, we specify the formulated WASR maximization problem for all the considered strategies.

A. DPC

For a given weight vector $\mathbf{u} = [u_1, \dots, u_K]$ and a fixed DPC encoding order π , the WASR problem for each $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$ is:

$$\max_{\mathbf{P}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_{\pi(k)} \widehat{R}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{DPC}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \quad (17a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \widehat{R}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{DPC}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \geq R_{\pi(k)}^{th}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (17b)$$

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^H) \leq P_t, \quad (17c)$$

where $\widehat{R}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{DPC}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}})$ is defined in Definition 1 and $R_{\pi(k)}^{th}$ is the QoS rate constraint of user- $\pi(k)$. An extra optimization over DPC encoding order π is required in order to maximize WESR for a given \mathbf{u} .

Remark 2. When CSIT is perfect, the capacity region of MISO BC is achieved by solving problem (17) with $R_{\pi(k)}^{th} = 0$ for all possible π and a set of \mathbf{u} . Though it is typical to optimize covariance matrix $\mathbf{Q}_k = \mathbf{p}_k \mathbf{p}_k^H$ in the literature of DPC [37], [44], the optimal covariance matrix of DPC when each user has a single antenna is rank one due to the uplink-downlink duality [35], [36]. The dual MISO MAC channel has a single transmit antenna at each user and thus a rank one covariance matrix. The transformation to the corresponding covariance matrix in MISO BC preserves this rank. Hence, the capacity region can be achieved by optimizing the precoder.

B. 1-DPCRS

Note that the overall ER of the common stream $\widehat{R}_c^{1\text{-DPCRS}}$ specified in (10) with minimization outside the ER of each user is intractable since the precoders of all fading states are required to be jointly designed. To remove dependency among the channel instances, we consider its lower bound by moving minimization inside of the ER based on the inequality [8]:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{R}_c^{1\text{-DPCRS}} &= \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\mathbf{H}}} \left\{ \widehat{R}_{c, \pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \right\} \right\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\mathbf{H}}} \left\{ \min \left\{ \widehat{R}_{c, \pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \mid k \in \mathcal{K} \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

By defining $\widehat{R}_c^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \triangleq \min \{ \widehat{R}_{c, \pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \mid k \in \mathcal{K} \}$ as the overall AR of the common stream s_c and $\widehat{C}_{\pi(k)}$ as the AR of the common stream allocated to user- $\pi(k)$, we have $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \widehat{C}_{\pi(k)} = \widehat{R}_c^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}})$ and the total AR of user- $\pi(k)$ is $\widehat{R}_{\pi(k), tot}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \triangleq \widehat{C}_{\pi(k)} + \widehat{R}_{\pi(k)}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}})$. The WASR

maximization problem of 1-DPCRS for each $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$ with a given weight vector \mathbf{u} and DPC encoding order π is:

$$\max_{\widehat{\mathbf{c}}, \mathbf{P}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_{\pi(k)} \widehat{R}_{\pi(k), tot}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \quad (19a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \widehat{C}_k \leq \widehat{R}_c^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \quad (19b)$$

$$\widehat{R}_{\pi(k), tot}^{1\text{-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \geq R_{\pi(k)}^{th}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (19c)$$

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^H) \leq P_t \quad (19d)$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{c}} \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad (19e)$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{c}} = [\widehat{C}_1, \dots, \widehat{C}_K]$ is the AR allocation for the common stream s_c for each $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$. It is required to be jointly optimized with the precoder so as to maximize the WASR. Similarly to (17), the WASR of all possible DPC encoding orders are required to be considered in order to maximize the WESR over all channels.

C. M-DPCRS

Following the methods adopted by DPC and 1-DPCRS, we could also obtain the decomposed WASR maximization problem of the three-user M-DPCRS to be solved with a given weight vector \mathbf{u} and DPC encoding order π for each $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$, which is given by

$$\max_{\pi', \widehat{\mathbf{c}}, \mathbf{P}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_{\pi(k)} \widehat{R}_{\pi(k), tot}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \widehat{C}_k^i \leq \widehat{R}_i^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}), \forall i \in \mathcal{K}_c \quad (20b)$$

$$\widehat{R}_{\pi(k), tot}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \geq R_{\pi(k)}^{th}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (20c)$$

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^H) \leq P_t \quad (20d)$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{c}} \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad (20e)$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{c}} = \{ \widehat{C}_k^i \mid k \in \mathcal{K}_i, i \in \mathcal{K}_c \}$ is the AR allocation for all the common streams for each $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$. $\widehat{R}_{\pi(k), tot}^{\text{M-DPCRS}} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)} \setminus \{ \pi(k) \}} \widehat{C}_k^i + \widehat{R}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}$ is the total AR at user- $\pi(k)$ to decode $W_{\pi(k)}$ and $\widehat{R}_i^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) = \min \{ \widehat{R}_{i, \pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}) \mid \pi(k) \in \mathcal{K}_i \}$ is the AR of s_i . Notice that the decoding order π' of the partial-common streams s_{12}, s_{13}, s_{23} is required to be jointly optimized with precoders for each $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$ so as to maximize the system WASR for a given weight vector \mathbf{u} and DPC encoding order π . To further maximize the WESR for a given set of user weights \mathbf{u} , an extra optimization over the DPC encoding order π has to be carried out. Therefore, both the decoding order π' of the partial-common streams and the DPC encoding order of the private streams π are jointly optimized at the BS. This can be done by evaluating the performance for all possible decoding and encoding orders π, π' and choosing the one with the highest WASR.

IV. PROPOSED OPTIMIZATION FRAMEWORK

The formulated problem (17), (19) and (20) are stochastic non-convex optimization problems since the ARs specified in Definition 1 are expectations with respect to the random variable $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$. To tackle the stochastic nature and the non-convexity of the problems, we extend the algorithm proposed

in [8] to solve the problem. Specifically, there are three steps of the proposed optimization framework:

- *Step 1. Sample Average Approximation Approach:* We first employ the Sample Average Approximation (SAA) approach to transform the original stochastic problems into the corresponding deterministic problems.
- *Step 2. Weighted Minimum Mean Square Error Approach:* The non-convexity of each transformed deterministic problem is further tackled by the Weighted Minimum Mean Square Error (WMMSE) approach and transformed into a block-wise convex problem.
- *Step 3. Alternating Optimization Algorithm:* The transformed block-wise convex problem is finally solved by using Alternating Optimization (AO) algorithm.

In this section, the above optimization framework of solving M-DPCRS problem (20) is specified followed by the guidance of solving other problems.

A. Sample Average Approximation Approach

The first step is to use SAA to approximate the stochastic ARs into the corresponding deterministic expressions. As the conditional density $f_{\mathbf{H}|\hat{\mathbf{H}}}(\mathbf{H} | \hat{\mathbf{H}})$ is known at the BS, for a given channel estimate $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$, BS is able to generate a sample of M user channels, indexed by $\mathcal{M} = \{1, \dots, M\}$ as

$$\mathbb{H}^{(M)} \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{H}^{(m)} = \hat{\mathbf{H}} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{(m)} \mid \hat{\mathbf{H}}, m \in \mathcal{M} \right\}. \quad (21)$$

Following the strong Law of Large Number (LLN), the ARs $\hat{R}_{i,k}^x(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ specified in equation (15) for decoding stream s_i at user- k , $k \in \mathcal{K}$ with a given channel estimate $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ is equivalent to

$$\hat{R}_{i,k}^x(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \hat{R}_{i,k}^{x(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}), \quad (22)$$

where

$$\hat{R}_{i,k}^{x(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \triangleq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M R_{i,k}^x(\mathbf{H}^{(m)}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) \quad (23)$$

is the sampled AR. It approximates AR, i.e., $\hat{R}_{i,k}^x(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \approx \hat{R}_{i,k}^{x(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ if M is sufficiently large. $x \in \{\text{"DPC"}, \text{"1-DPCRS"}, \text{"M-DPCRS"}\}$. $R_{i,k}^x(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) = R_k^x(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})$ and $\hat{R}_{i,k}^{x(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ is simplified as $\hat{R}_k^{x(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ when $i = k$. Note that the precoder \mathbf{P} in (22) is unaltered over all the M channel samples. Considering M-DPCRS strategy, as π' and π are discrete variables, they are optimized at the BS by evaluating the WASR performance for a given pair of π, π' and choosing the one with the highest WASR. Hence, $\hat{\mathbf{c}}, \mathbf{P}$ are designed by solving problem (20) for each π' and π with the average common and private rates approximated by (23), which is given by

$$\max_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}, \mathbf{P}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_{\pi(k)} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)} \setminus \{\pi(k)\}} \hat{C}_{\pi(k)}^i + \hat{R}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \right) \quad (24a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \hat{C}_k^i \leq \hat{R}_i^{\text{M-DPCRS}(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}), \forall i \in \mathcal{K}_c \quad (24b)$$

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)} \setminus \{\pi(k)\}} \hat{C}_{\pi(k)}^i + \hat{R}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \geq R_{\pi(k)}^{th}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (24c)$$

$$(20d), (20e),$$

where $\hat{R}_i^{\text{M-DPCRS}(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) = \min \left\{ \hat{R}_{i,\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \mid \pi(k) \in \mathcal{K}_i \right\}$. Following the LLN, problem (24) approximates to the stochastic problem (20) for a given π' as $M \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, our target is transformed to design precoder \mathbf{P} and the common stream allocation vector $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ by solving (24).

B. Weighted Minimum Mean Square Error Approach

Problem (24) is still non-convex due to the non-convex approximated rate expressions of the common stream and the private streams. To solve the problem, we further extend the WMMSE algorithm proposed in [8], [45]. At user sides, user- $\pi(k)$ decodes data streams $\{s_i \mid i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)}\}$ sequentially based on the decoding order π' by employing the equalizer $g_{\pi(k)}^i, i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)}$. The signal received at user- $\pi(k)$ is $y_{\pi(k)} = \mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{x} + n_{\pi(k)}$, where \mathbf{x} is specified in equation (11). s_{123} is decoded first and the estimated common stream \hat{s}_{123} is $\hat{s}_{123} = g_{123}^{123} y_{\pi(k)}$. Once s_{123} is successfully decoded and removed from the received signal, user- $\pi(k)$ then decodes the partial-common streams $s_{\pi'(k)(1)}, s_{\pi'(k)(2)}$ by employing the equalizer $g_{\pi(k)}^i, i \in \{\pi'(k)\}$ followed by the private stream $s_{\pi(k)}$ via equalizer $g_{\pi(k)}^{\pi(k)}$. The Mean Square Error (MSE) of each stream $s_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)}$ at user- $\pi(k)$ is

$$\varepsilon_{\pi(k)}^i \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{| \hat{s}_i - s_i |^2\} = |g_{\pi(k)}^i|^2 T_{\pi(k)}^i - 2\Re\{g_{\pi(k)}^i \mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_i\} + 1, \quad (25)$$

where $T_{\pi(k)}^i$ is the remaining received power at user- $\pi(k)$ when decoding s_i . Mathematically, it is defined as $T_{\pi(k)}^i \triangleq \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}_i \cup \mathcal{K} \setminus \{i\}} |\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_j|^2 + 1, \forall i \in \{123, \pi'(k)\}$ and $T_{\pi(k)}^i \triangleq \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}_{\pi(k)} \cup \{i\}} |\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_j|^2 + \sum_{j < k} |\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(j)}|^2 + 1, \text{ if } i = \pi(k)$.

Define the Weighted MSE (WMSE) of decoding s_i at user- $\pi(k)$ as

$$\xi_{\pi(k)}^i(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) \triangleq w_{\pi(k)}^i \varepsilon_{\pi(k)}^i - \log_2(w_{\pi(k)}^i), \quad (26)$$

where $w_{\pi(k)}^i$ is the introduced weight for MSE of user- $\pi(k)$. The corresponding Weighted Minimum MSE (WMMSE) metrics of the common and private streams are

$$\xi_{i,\pi(k)}^{\text{M-MSE}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) \triangleq \min_{w_{\pi(k)}^i, g_{\pi(k)}^i} \xi_{\pi(k)}^i(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}). \quad (27)$$

With the introduced WMMSEs, we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 2. *The instantaneous rate and the WMMSE of decoding stream s_i at user- $\pi(k), k \in \mathcal{K}$ has the following relationship:*

$$\xi_{i,\pi(k)}^{\text{M-MSE}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) = 1 - R_{i,\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}), \quad (28)$$

where $R_{i,\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) = R_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})$ when $i = \pi(k)$.

Proof: Following (27), the WMSE weights $(w_{\pi(k)}^{i,*})$ and equalizers $(g_{\pi(k)}^{i,*})$ of minimizing $\xi_{\pi(k)}^i(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})$ satisfy that $\left. \frac{\partial \xi_{\pi(k)}^i(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})}{\partial w_{\pi(k)}^i} \right|_{(w_{\pi(k)}^i, g_{\pi(k)}^i) = (w_{\pi(k)}^{i,*}, g_{\pi(k)}^{i,*})} = 0$ and

$$\left. \frac{\partial \xi_{\pi(k)}^i(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})}{\partial g_{\pi(k)}^i} \right|_{(w_{\pi(k)}^i, g_{\pi(k)}^i) = (w_{\pi(k)}^{i,*}, g_{\pi(k)}^{i,*})} = 0. \text{ We first solve } \left. \frac{\partial \xi_{\pi(k)}^i(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})}{\partial w_{\pi(k)}^i} \right|_{g_{\pi(k)}^i = g_{\pi(k)}^{i,*}} = 0 \text{ and obtain the equalizer as}$$

$$g_{\pi(k)}^{i,*} = \mathbf{P}_i^H \mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)} (T_{\pi(k)}^i)^{-1}. \quad (29)$$

By further solving $\left. \frac{\partial \xi_{\pi(k)}^i(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})}{\partial w_{\pi(k)}^i} \right|_{g_{\pi(k)}^i = g_{\pi(k)}^{i,*}} = 0$, we obtain that

$$w_{\pi(k)}^{i,*} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\pi(k)}(g_{\pi(k)}^{i,*})} = \frac{T_{\pi(k)}^i}{T_{\pi(k)}^i - |\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^H \mathbf{P}_i|^2}. \quad (30)$$

Substituting $(w_{\pi(k)}^{i,*}, g_{\pi(k)}^{i,*})$ back to $\xi_{\pi(k)}^i(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})$, $\xi_{\pi(k)}^{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}})$ is derived as

$$\xi_{\pi(k)}^{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) = \log_2(w_{\pi(k)}^{i,*}) = 1 - R_{i,\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\mathbf{H}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}). \quad (31)$$

The proof is completed. \square

The Rate-WMMSE relationships in (28) is established for instantaneous channel realizations. We can also extend it to the average Rate-WMMSE relationships over a sample of M user channels as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\xi}_{i,\pi(k)}^{(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) &\triangleq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\min_{w_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)}, g_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)}} \xi_{\pi(k)}^i(\mathbf{H}^{(m)}, \hat{\mathbf{H}}) \right) \\ &= 1 - \hat{R}_{i,\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $w_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)}, g_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)}$ are the weights and equalizers associated with the m th channel realization in $\mathbb{H}^{(M)}$. $\hat{\xi}_{i,\pi(k)}^{(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) = \hat{\xi}_{\pi(k)}^{(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ when $i = \pi(k)$. With the average Rate-WMMSE relationships in (32), problem (24) is equivalently transformed into the WMMSE problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{P}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{g}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_{\pi(k)} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)} \setminus \{\pi(k)\}} \hat{X}_{\pi(k)}^i + \hat{\xi}_{\pi(k)}^{(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \right) \quad (33a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \hat{X}_k^i + 1 \geq \hat{\xi}_i^{(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}), \forall i \in \mathcal{K}_c \quad (33b)$$

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)} \setminus \{\pi(k)\}} \hat{X}_{\pi(k)}^i + \hat{\xi}_{\pi(k)}^{(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \leq 1 - R_{\pi(k)}^{\text{th}}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (33c)$$

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^H) \leq P_t \quad (33d)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} \leq \mathbf{0}, \quad (33e)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \{\hat{X}_k^i | k \in \mathcal{K}_i, i \in \mathcal{K}_c\}$ is the transformation of the common rate $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ with $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = -\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ holds. $\mathbf{w} = \{w_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} | i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)}, k \in \mathcal{K}, m \in \mathcal{M}\}$ and $\mathbf{g} = \{g_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} | i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)}, k \in \mathcal{K}, m \in \mathcal{M}\}$ are the MSE weights and equalizers, respectively. $\hat{\xi}_i^{(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) = \max\{\hat{\xi}_{i,\pi(k)}^{(M)}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) | \pi(k) \in \mathcal{K}_i\}$.

C. Alternating Optimization Algorithm

Though problem (33) that jointly optimizes $(\mathbf{P}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{g})$ is still non-convex, it is block-wise convex with respect to each block of \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{g} and $(\mathbf{P}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ by fixing other two blocks⁴. This

⁴The block-wise convexity of problem (33) can be observed by treating one block among \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{g} and $(\mathbf{P}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ as optimization variables and other two blocks as constants according to the concept of convex optimization problems specified in [46, Section 4].

motivates us to use AO algorithm to solve the problem. At each iteration $[n]$, for given $\mathbf{w}^{[n-1]}$ and $(\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{[n-1]})$, the solution \mathbf{g}^* of (33) is

$$\mathbf{g}^{[n]} \triangleq \mathbf{g}^*(\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]}) = \{g_{\pi(k)}^{i,*(m)} | i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)}, k \in \mathcal{K}, m \in \mathcal{M}\} \quad (34)$$

with each element calculated by equation (29) and precoder $\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]}$ for the m th channel realization in $\mathbb{H}^{(M)}$. For given $\mathbf{g}^{[n-1]}$ and $(\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{[n-1]})$, the solution \mathbf{w}^* of (33) is

$$\mathbf{w}^{[n]} \triangleq \mathbf{w}^*(\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]}) = \{w_{\pi(k)}^{i,*(m)} | i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)}, k \in \mathcal{K}, m \in \mathcal{M}\} \quad (35)$$

with each element calculated by equation (30) and precoder $\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]}$. The solutions of weights and equalizers can be verified through showing that $(\mathbf{w}^{[n]}, \mathbf{g}^{[n]})$ satisfy the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions of (33). Substituting $(\mathbf{w}^{[n]}, \mathbf{g}^{[n]})$ back to (33), the optimization problem is equivalently transformed as:

$$\min_{\mathbf{P}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_{\pi(k)} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)} \setminus \{\pi(k)\}} \hat{X}_{\pi(k)}^i + \hat{\xi}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \right) \quad (36a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \hat{X}_k^i + 1 \geq \hat{\xi}_i^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}), \forall i \in \mathcal{K}_c \quad (36b)$$

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\pi(k)} \setminus \{\pi(k)\}} \hat{X}_{\pi(k)}^i + \hat{\xi}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \leq 1 - R_{\pi(k)}^{\text{th}}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (36c)$$

$$(33d), (33e),$$

where

$$\hat{\xi}_{i,\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \triangleq \Omega_{\pi(k)}^i + \bar{t}_{\pi(k)}^i - 2\Re\{\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{\pi(k)}^i H \mathbf{P}_i\} + \bar{w}_{\pi(k)}^i - \bar{\nu}_{\pi(k)}^i \quad (37)$$

and $\hat{\xi}_{i,\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ is simplified to $\hat{\xi}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ when $i = \pi(k)$. $\Omega_{\pi(k)}^i$ in (37) is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\pi(k)}^i &\triangleq \\ &\begin{cases} \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}_{\pi(k)} \cup \mathcal{K} \cup \{i\}} \mathbf{P}_j^H \bar{\Psi}_{\pi(k)}^i \mathbf{P}_j, & \forall i \in \{123, \pi'_{\pi(k)}\} \\ \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}_{\pi(k)} \cup \{i\}} \mathbf{P}_j^H \bar{\Psi}_{\pi(k)}^i \mathbf{P}_j + \sum_{j < k} \mathbf{P}_{\pi(j)}^H \bar{\Phi}_{\pi(k)}^i \mathbf{P}_{\pi(j)}, & i = \pi(k), \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

and $\bar{\Psi}_{\pi(k)}^i, \bar{\Phi}_{\pi(k)}^i, \bar{t}_{\pi(k)}^i, \bar{\mathbf{f}}_{\pi(k)}^i, \bar{w}_{\pi(k)}^i, \bar{\nu}_{\pi(k)}^i$ are constants (or constant vectors/matrices) averaged over a sample of M user channels, i.e., $\bar{w}_{\pi(k)}^i = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M w_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)}$. Their corresponding values in each channel instance (m) are updated as

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} &= w_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} \left| g_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} \right|^2, \\ \Psi_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} &= t_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} \mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^{(m)} (\mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^{(m)})^H, \\ \Phi_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} &= t_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(k)}^{(m)} (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(k)}^{(m)})^H, \\ \mathbf{f}_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} &= w_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} \mathbf{h}_{\pi(k)}^{(m)} (g_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)})^H, \\ \nu_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)} &= \log_2(w_{\pi(k)}^{i,(m)}). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

As $\hat{\xi}_{\pi(k)}^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}), \hat{\xi}_i^{\text{M-DPCRS}}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ are quadratic according to (37), problem (36) is a convex Quadratically Constrained Quadratic Program (QCQP), which can be solved via interior-point methods [46]. Therefore, $(\mathbf{P}^{[n]}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{[n]})$ can be updated by using the optimal solution of (36). The details to the proposed AO algorithm is specified in Algorithm 1. The weights \mathbf{w} , equalizers \mathbf{g} , precoders and common rate vectors $(\mathbf{P}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ are updated iteratively until the WASR of the system WASR^[n]

(calculated by (24a) based on the solution $\mathbf{P}^{[n]}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}^{[n]} = -\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{[n]}$) converges.

Algorithm 1: WMMSE-based AO algorithm

1 **Initialize:** $n \leftarrow 0, \mathbf{P}, \text{WASR}^{[n]}$;
2 **repeat**
3 $n \leftarrow n + 1$;
4 $\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]} \leftarrow \mathbf{P}$;
5 update \mathbf{g} and \mathbf{w} by $\mathbf{g}^*(\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]})$ and $\mathbf{w}^*(\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]})$
 specified in (34) and (35), respectively;
6 update $(\mathbf{P}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ by solving (36) using the updated \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{g} ;
7 **until** $|\text{WASR}^{[n]} - \text{WASR}^{[n-1]}| \leq \epsilon$;

D. Convergence

The convergence of Algorithm 1 is guaranteed according to Proposition 3.

Proposition 3. *Denote any stationary point of problem (20) for a given common stream decoding order π' as $(\mathbf{P}^\circ, \hat{\mathbf{c}}^\circ)$. With a feasible initial point, the proposed Algorithm 1 is guaranteed to converge. As $M \rightarrow \infty$, the convergent solution $(\mathbf{P}', \hat{\mathbf{x}}')$ of Algorithm 1 is a stationary point of problem (20) with $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}^\circ$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}' = -\hat{\mathbf{c}}^\circ$ holds.*

Proof: The proof in [8] for the AO algorithm of linearly precoded 1-layer RS is extended here for that of M-DPCRS. We first show that the proposed algorithm is guaranteed to converge followed by showing the convergent point is a stationary point of problem (24) and problem (20) as $M \rightarrow \infty$.

As the solution $\mathbf{P}^{[n]}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{[n]}, \mathbf{w}^{[n]}, \mathbf{g}^{[n]}$ of problem (36) at iteration $[n]$ is also a feasible solution of (36) at iteration $[n + 1]$, the corresponding objective function of problem (36) is guaranteed to decrease monotonically. Due to the transmit power constraint (33d), the objective function of (36) is bounded below. Therefore, the AO algorithm proposed to solve problem (36) is guaranteed to converge.

Next, we show that the solution sequence $\{\mathbf{P}^{[n]}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{[n]}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of problem (36) converges to a stationary point $(\mathbf{P}^\circ, \hat{\mathbf{c}}^\circ)$ of problem (20) with $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}^\circ$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}' = -\hat{\mathbf{c}}^\circ$ holds. Following Proposition 2, we obtain that problem (36) is a convex approximation of problem (24) around the point $(\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{[n-1]})$. As the AO algorithm is also a special instance of the Successive Convex Approximation (SCA) method [8], the KKT conditions of the original problem at the point $(\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{[n-1]})$ is maintained. Hence, we obtain that problem (24) and problem (36) share the same sets of KKT points (stationary points) when the solution point $(\mathbf{P}^{[n]}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{[n]})$ is the same as the solution of the previous iteration $(\mathbf{P}^{[n-1]}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{[n-1]})$, which is the convergent point $(\mathbf{P}', \hat{\mathbf{x}}')$. Since Problem (24) is equivalent to problem (20) for a given π' as $M \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that the convergent point $(\mathbf{P}', \hat{\mathbf{x}}')$ of the proposed AO algorithm is one stationary point $(\mathbf{P}^\circ, \hat{\mathbf{c}}^\circ)$ of problem (20) with $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}^\circ$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}' = -\hat{\mathbf{c}}^\circ$ holds. \square

TABLE II: Computational complexity of Algorithm 1 for different strategies

Strategy	Computational complexity of Algorithm 1
DPC	$\mathcal{O}([KN_t]^{3.5} + K^2 N_t M) K! \log(\epsilon^{-1})$
1-DPCRS	$\mathcal{O}([KN_t]^{3.5} + K^2 N_t M) K! \log(\epsilon^{-1})$
M-DPCRS	$\mathcal{O}([2^K N_t]^{3.5} + 2^{2K} K N_t M) K! \prod_{k=2}^{K-1} \binom{K-1}{k}! \log(\epsilon^{-1})$

E. Complexity

The computational complexity of using Algorithm 1 to solve the problems of DPC and DPCRS-based strategies are summarized in Table II under the assumption that $N_t \geq K$.

At each iteration of Algorithm 1, the MMSE equalizers and weights (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{g}) are updated with complexity $\mathcal{O}(K^2 N_t M)$ for DPC and 1-DPCRS, or $\mathcal{O}(2^{2K} K N_t M)$ for M-DPCRS. The precoders and common rate vector (\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{x}) are then updated by using interior-point method with computational complexity $\mathcal{O}([KN_t]^{3.5})$ for DPC and 1-DPCRS, or $\mathcal{O}([2^K N_t]^{3.5})$ for M-DPCRS [47]. The AO algorithm with convergence tolerance ϵ requires $\mathcal{O}(\log(\epsilon^{-1}))$ iterations to converge. Note that the optimal DPC encoding order in MISO BC with partial CSIT is unknown. Therefore, Algorithm 1 is required to be repeated for all possible DPC encoding orders. The number of possible DPC encoding orders is $K!$ in the K -user case. For M-DPCRS, Algorithm 1 is also required to be repeated for all possible decoding orders of the common streams. In the K -user case, the number of possible decoding order of the common streams is $\prod_{k=2}^{K-1} \binom{K-1}{k}!$ [27].

Compared with DPC and 1-DPCRS, the computational complexity of M-DPCRS is much higher due to the exponentially increasing number of common streams as well as the joint optimization of the precoders and the decoding order of common streams. As discussed in [27], the generalized RS has a number of common streams (and therefore complexity) that increases exponentially with K , which suggests that the generalized RS is applicable to only relatively small K scenarios. M-DPCRS proposed here incurs the same complexity issue. Moreover, M-DPCRS is considered as a novel technique to exploit larger ergodic rate region in MISO BC with partial CSIT. We show in Section V that linearly precoded RS has a much lower complexity and is able to achieve very close performance to M-DPCRS.

Remark 3. Similarly, problem (17) and (19) are solved respectively by approximating each stochastic optimization problem using the SAA approach. The equivalently transformed problems are then reformulated into the WMMSE problems and solved by the corresponding AO algorithm.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, the WSR performance of the proposed 1-DPCRS and M-DPCRS strategies in MISO BC with partial CSIT is evaluated. In the following numerical results, all the optimization problems to be solved by using interior-point methods are solved using the CVX toolbox [48]. User channels are randomly generated as specified in [8], [14], [27]. The actual user channel \mathbf{h}_k experienced at user- k has i.i.d. complex Gaussian entries drawn from the distribution $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_k^2)$ and the channel estimation error $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k$ has i.i.d. complex Gaussian entries drawn from distribution $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_{e,k}^2)$. The variance of

$\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k$ is defined as $\sigma_{e,k}^2 \triangleq \sigma_k^2 P_t^{-\alpha}$. As user channels with heterogeneous variances are considered, the corresponding CSIT qualities also scale with the channel variance σ_k^2 . $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ represents SNR scaling as described in Section II-A. We obtain that $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k = \mathbf{h}_k - \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k$ also follows Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_k^2 - \sigma_{e,k}^2)$. The WESR is obtained by averaging the WASR over 100 channel realizations. For each $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$, the AR of each user is approximated using SAA method over $M = 1000$ samples of user channels $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{(M)}$. For a given $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$, the m th channel estimation error $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{(m)}$ is randomly generated from the error distribution. Hence, the m th conditional channel is calculated by $\mathbf{H}^{(m)} = \hat{\mathbf{H}} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{(m)}$. The initialization of the precoders \mathbf{P} for Algorithm 1 is designed by the Maximum Ratio Transmission (MRT) and Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) method proposed in [8]. The precoders for the private streams of RS-assisted or other non-RS-assisted transmission strategies are initialized by MRT, i.e., $\mathbf{p}_k = \sqrt{p_k} \frac{\mathbf{h}_k}{\|\mathbf{h}_k\|}$. The precoders for the common streams of RS-assisted strategies are initialized by SVD, i.e., for 1-DPCRS and 1-layer RS, $\mathbf{p}_c = \sqrt{p_c} \hat{\mathbf{p}}_c$, where $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_c$ is the largest left singular vector of the channel estimate $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$. p_c and p_k are the power allocated to each precoder, it follows that $p_c + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} p_k = P_t$. The precoders of the common streams $s_i, i \in \mathcal{K}_c$ for M-DPCRS and the generalized RS are initialized in the same way as \mathbf{p}_c but $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i$ is chosen based on $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_i$ formed by the channel estimate of users in \mathcal{K}_i .

The following eight transmission strategies are compared:

- **M-DPCRS**: the M-DPCRS strategy proposed in Section II-C. In the K -user case, there are $2^K - 1$ linearly precoded common streams and K DPC-coded private streams to be transmitted from the BS.
- **1-DPCRS**: the 1-DPCRS strategy proposed in Section II-C. One linearly precoded common stream and K DPC-coded private streams are transmitted in the K -user case.
- **DPC**: the conventional DPC strategy specified in Section II-B. There are K DPC-coded data streams to be transmitted in the K -user case.
- **generalized RS**: the multi-layer RS strategy proposed in [13]. User messages are split in the same way as M-DPCRS discussed in Section II-C. The main difference compared with M-DPCRS is the private streams of the generalized RS are linearly precoded. In the K -user case, there are $2^K - 1$ linearly precoded common streams and K linearly precoded private streams to be transmitted from the BS.
- **1-layer RS**: the 1-layer RS strategy specified in [2], [8], [13], [49]. The message of each user is split into a common part and a private part. There is one linearly precoded common stream and K linearly precoded private streams to be transmitted jointly from the BS. Each user is required to decode the common stream first and uses one layer of SIC to remove the common stream before decoding the intended private stream.
- **SC-SIC**: the power-domain NOMA widely studied in the literature [50]. In the K -user case, the streams are linearly precoded and superimposed at the BS before transmission. Users are ordered based on their effective

scalar channel strength after precoding. Each user is required to decode and remove the interference from users with weaker effective channel strength sequentially using SIC.

- **SC-SIC per group**: the method of combining SDMA and NOMA in MIMO transmission networks [51]. The K users are clustered into multiple groups. The inner-group interference is coordinated by SC-SIC while the inter-group interference is coordinated by SDMA. At the BS, the K -user messages are linearly precoded. Users within the same group are ordered by the corresponding effective channel strength such that each user is able to sequentially decode and remove the interference from weaker users within the same group. The interference from users in different groups is fully treated as noise at each user.
- **MU-LP**: Multi-User Linear Precoding (MU-LP) is a practical transmission strategy that has been widely studied in MIMO networks and it is the common implementation of SDMA. User messages are linearly precoded and superimposed at the BS and each user directly decodes its intended data stream by fully treating any residual interference as noise.

Readers are referred to [13] for more details of “generalized RS”, “1-layer RS”, “SC-SIC”, “SC-SIC per group” and “MU-LP” transmission strategies, where the corresponding WSR maximization problems are studied. In the sequel, we evaluate the WESR performance of all the eight strategies in a wide range of user deployments considering a diverse range of CSIT qualities, QoS rate requirements and channel strength disparities among users⁵. In the following, we first illustrate the results in the two-user MISO BC with partial CSIT followed by the three-user case.

A. Two-user case

When $K = 2$, M-DPCRS, generalized RS and SC-SIC per group respectively reduces to 1-DPCRS, 1-layer RS and SC-SIC. We use the term “DPCRS” to represent both M-DPCRS and 1-DPCRS and the term “RS” to represent both generalized RS and 1-layer RS in the two-user case. We first illustrate the system Ergodic Sum Rate (ESR) ($u_1 = 1, u_2 = 1$) versus SNR comparison of different strategies considering diverse CSIT inaccuracies and channel strength disparities in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5. The individual QoS rate constraint of each user is set to 0, i.e., $R_k^{th} = 0, \forall k \in \{1, 2\}$. Without QoS rate constraint and unequal user weights, the WESR problem for 1-layer RS reduces to the ESR maximization problem studied in [8]. It has been discovered in [8] the sum DoF achieved by solving the ESR problem of 1-layer RS is

$$d_{\text{RS}}^* = 1 + (K - 1)\alpha, \quad (40)$$

and d_{RS}^* has been shown to be the sum DoF limit that could be achieved in MISO BC with partial CSIT. In comparison, the DoF achieved by optimally solving the ESR problem of MU-LP is $d_{\text{MU-LP}}^* = \max\{1, K\alpha\}$. As DoF captures the

⁵As we use random channel realizations, the channel strength disparities are manifested by tuning the channel variance σ_k^2 of each user. It is termed “channel variance disparities” in the following.




Fig. 4: Sum rate versus SNR comparison of different strategies with different partial CSIT inaccuracies, averaged over 100 random channel realizations, $K = 2$, $N_t = 4$, $\sigma_1^2 = 1$, $\sigma_2^2 = 1$.




Fig. 5: Sum rate versus SNR comparison of different strategies with different partial CSIT inaccuracies, averaged over 100 random channel realizations, $K = 2$, $N_t = 4$, $\sigma_1^2 = 1$, $\sigma_2^2 = 0.09$.

rate's asymptotic slope with respect to $\log_2(P_t)$, it is easy to identify the DoF according to the slope of the sum rate at high SNR from both Fig. 4 and Fig. 5. The values are calculated by scaling the high-SNR slopes to $\log_2(P_t)$. The DoF achieved by RS and DPCRS from both figures are close to the theoretically anticipated values calculated by (40), i.e., $d_{RS}^* = 1.3, 1.6, 1.9$ when $\alpha = 0.3, 0.6, 0.9$, respectively. By using the same method, we obtain the DoF of MU-LP and DPC, which also coincides with the theoretical DoF results, i.e.: $d_{MU-LP}^* = 1, 1.2, 1.8$ when $\alpha = 0.3, 0.6, 0.9$, respectively. As the DoF of RS is optimal, the DoF of DPCRS is the same as RS. Though DPC is capacity-achieving in perfect CSIT, it is very sensitive to the CSIT inaccuracy. Its DoF is the same as MU-LP. As α decreases, the rate of DPC drops rapidly as MU-LP. In contrast, RS-assisted transmission strategies are more robust to the CSIT inaccuracy. Linearly precoded RS is not only more practical and low complex compared with DPC but also achieves non-negligible rate gain over DPC when CSIT is imperfect. The rate gain of DPCRS and RS over all other strategies grows with SNR. Specifically, both DPCRS and RS achieves 16.12% rate improvement over DPC and MU-LP when $\alpha = 0.3$, SNR is 30 dB and users have equal channel variance as illustrated in Fig. 4. When there is a 10 dB average channel variance disparities as in Fig. 5, the rate gain of RS decreases since there is a higher probability that the transmission reduces to single-user transmission by switching off the weaker user. In both figures, SC-SIC has the worst performance due to the fact that it does not exploit efficiently the spatial domain for interference management. The DoF of SC-SIC is the worst and is limited to 1 (same as OMA) [30].

We further investigate the ER region in the two-user case.

Denote the optimized rate vector of problem (17) and (19) for the two users as $\hat{R}_{\pi, \mathbf{u}}^{x*} = \{\hat{R}_{\pi(1)}^{x*}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}), \hat{R}_{\pi(2)}^{x*}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})\}$, where $x \in \{\text{"DPC"}, \text{"DPCRS"}\}$. The boundary points of the ER region \mathcal{R}_{π}^x for a certain encoding order π are first calculated over a set of different pairs of weights assigned to users and averaging AR $\hat{R}_{\pi, \mathbf{u}}^{x*}$ over all channel uses for each pair of weights. The entire ER region of DPC/DPCRS is the convex hull of the rate regions of all encoding orders, i.e., $\mathcal{R}_{DPC} = \text{Conv}(\bigcup_{\pi} \mathcal{R}_{\pi}^x)$. Following [8], the weight of user-1 is fixed as $u_1 = 1$ for each pair of user weights while the weight of user-2 changes as $u_2 \in 10^{-3, -1, -0.95, \dots, 0.95, 1, 3}$. As we study the largest rate region comparison, the QoS rate constraint of each user is set to 0. Fig. 6 illustrates the rate region comparison of different strategies considering different number of transmit antennas and channel strength disparities. SNR is equal to 20 dB. In all subfigures, DPCRS achieves the largest rate region among all strategies. Comparing subfigure (a) and (c) in Fig. 6, we observe that SC-SIC achieves the worst rate region. As there is no channel variance disparities among users, SC-SIC cannot properly utilize the power domain to manage interference. As the number of transmit antennas decreases (from subfigure (a)/(b) to (c)/(d)), the rate region gap between DPCRS and DPC/MU-LP becomes larger. Each user in DPC and MU-LP directly decodes its intended stream, and the pressure of interference management is at the transmitter. In comparison, both DPCRS and RS utilize the common stream to enable each user the capability of partially decoding the interference and partially treating the interference as noise. Both of them are more robust to various number of transmit antennas and user deployments.

B. Three-user case

When $K = 3$, the ESR of all the eight strategies versus CSIT inaccuracy are compared in Fig. 7 with different QoS rate constraints, network loads and user deployments. SNR is 20 dB. In subfigure (a), the individual QoS rate constraint increases with CSIT accuracy. For $\alpha = [0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1]$, the corresponding rate constraint for user- k ($k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$) changes as $\mathbf{r}_k^{th} = [0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5]$ bit/s/Hz. In all subfigures, the ESR of DPC, MU-LP, and SC-SIC-assisted strategies decrease dramatically as α decreases from 1 to 0.2 due to the drop-off of CSIT accuracy. The ESR gap between M-DPCRS/1-DPCRS and DPC is more obvious in the region with strong CSIT inaccuracy. Thanks to their ability to partially decode interference and partially treat interference as noise, all RS-assisted transmission strategies are more robust to the CSIT inaccuracy. In Fig. 7(a) and Fig. 7(b) with underloaded network loads, generalized RS and 1-layer RS, using linear precoder for all streams, achieve explicit ESR improvement over DPC when α is less than 0.6. This observation further confirms the powerful interference management capability of RS in the multi-antenna BC. In Fig. 7(c) and Fig. 7(d) where network loads are overloaded and users suffer from stronger inter-user interference, we observe that M-DPCRS (generalized RS) has higher rate than 1-DPCRS (1-layer RS). By increasing the number of layers of common streams in RS, inter-user interference is better managed and ESR is further improved even though there is no DoF increase.




Fig. 6: Ergodic rate region comparison of different strategies with partial CSIT, averaged over 100 random channel realizations, SNR = 20 dB, $K = 2$, $\alpha = 0.6$, $\sigma_1^2 = 1$.

VI. CONCLUSION

To conclude, we propose a novel strategy, namely, DPCRS in this work for assessing the rate region of multi-antenna BC with partial CSIT by incorporating RS with DPC. By splitting the user messages at the transmitter into common and private parts, and use DPC to encode the private parts, DPCRS not only enables the ability to partially decode the interference and partially treat interference as noise, but also further restrains the multi-user interference among private messages. Numerical results first show that the existing linearly precoded RS, benefiting from its robustness in partial CSIT, outperforms DPC if CSIT is sufficiently inaccurate in MISO BC. Most importantly, the rate region improvement of linearly precoded RS over DPC comes with much lower hardware and computational complexities. This is sharply different from the observations in perfect CSIT where DPC outperforms all linearly precoded strategies. Moreover, we show that the proposed DPCRS not only enlarges the rate region of MISO BC with partial CSIT but is more robust to CSIT inaccuracies, network loads and user deployments compared with DPC and other existing transmission strategies.




Fig. 7: Ergodic sum rate versus CSIT inaccuracy α comparison of different strategies, averaged over 100 random channel realizations, $K = 3$, SNR = 20 dB.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are deeply indebted to Dr. Hamdi Joudeh for his useful insights and suggestions.

APPENDIX

We follow Theorem 1 in [6] and obtain the following Lower Bound (LB) of the achievable rates of DPC and DPCRS, which is given as:

$$R_{\pi(1)}^x = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_{\pi(1)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(1)}|^2}{|\mathbf{h}_{\pi(1)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(2)}|^2 + 1} \right),$$

$$R_{\pi(2)}^x = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_{\pi(2)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(2)}|^2}{\sigma_{e,2}^2 \|\mathbf{p}_{\pi(1)}\|^2 + 1} \right),$$
(41)

where $x \in \{\text{“DPC”}, \text{“DPCRS”}\}$. The procedure of deriving (41) follows [6]. $R_{\pi(1)}^x$ is trivial. For user- $\pi(2)$, its corresponding received signal is:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{\pi(2)} &= \mathbf{h}_{\pi(2)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(1)} s_{\pi(1)} + \mathbf{h}_{\pi(2)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(2)} s_{\pi(2)} + n_{\pi(2)} \\ &= \mathbf{h}_{\pi(2)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(2)} s_{\pi(2)} + \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(2)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(1)} s_{\pi(1)} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(2)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(1)} s_{\pi(1)} + n_{\pi(2)} \\ &= h_{\pi(2)} s_{\pi(2)} + \hat{h}_{\pi(2)} s_{\pi(1)} - w_{\pi(2)} s_{\pi(1)} + n_{\pi(2)}, \end{aligned}$$
(42)

where $h_{\pi(2)} = \mathbf{h}_{\pi(2)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(2)}$, $\hat{h}_{\pi(2)} = \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(2)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(1)}$ and $w_{\pi(2)} = -\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(2)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(1)}$ and we have $\gamma_k = |h_k|^2 = |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{p}_k|^2$ and $\mathbb{E}\{|w_{\pi(2)}|^2\} \leq \sigma_{e,k}^2 \|\mathbf{p}_{\pi(1)}\|^2$. Following Lemma 1 of [6], we obtain that LB (41) is achievable.

To compare RS with DPC and DPCRS, we follow the same method and obtain the LB of the achievable rate of RS, which is given as:

$$R_{\pi(1)}^{\text{RS}} = R_{\pi(1)}^x,$$

$$R_{\pi(2)}^{\text{RS}} = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_{\pi(2)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(2)}|^2}{|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\pi(2)}^H \mathbf{p}_{\pi(1)}|^2 + \sigma_{e,2}^2 \|\mathbf{p}_{\pi(1)}\|^2 + 1} \right).$$
(43)

Note that the encoding order π specified in equation (43) decides which user to approximate the rate to its LB.

We follow the method adopted in Section V-A to illustrate the Ergodic Rate (ER) regions of DPC, DPCRS, RS as well as their corresponding LBs based on (41) and (43) in Fig. 8. The ER regions of LBs of DPC, DPCRS, RS are denoted by “DPC_{LB}”, “DPCRS_{LB}”, “RS_{LB}”, respectively. We first observe from Fig. 8 that the ER region obtained based on the LB (41) is indeed smaller than that obtained based on (5) and (8b). We also find from Fig. 8 that the ER region of the LB of DPCRS is always larger than that of RS or DPC. RS achieves an obvious LB improvement over DPC and it is closer to the LB of DPCRS. Moreover, when $N_t = 2$, the ER region of the LB of RS is even larger than the ER region of DPC (which might be the outer bound of DPC), but with a much lower complexity. Therefore, we draw the conclusion that RS strategies with linear or non-linear precoding are promising strategies for future wireless communication networks since they outperform conventional DPC and are able to come with lower complexity.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Clerckx and C. Oestges, *MIMO wireless networks: Channels, techniques and standards for multi-antenna, multi-user and multi-cell systems*. Academic Press, 2013.

[2] B. Clerckx, H. Joudeh, C. Hao, M. Dai, and B. Rassouli, “Rate splitting for MIMO wireless networks: A promising PHY-layer strategy for LTE evolution,” *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 98–105, May 2016.




Fig. 8: Ergodic rate region comparison of different strategies and their corresponding lower bounds with partial CSIT, averaged over 100 random channel realizations, SNR = 20 dB, $K = 2$, $\alpha = 0.6$, $\sigma_1^2 = 1$.

[3] G. Caire and S. Shamai, “On the achievable throughput of a multiantenna Gaussian broadcast channel,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 1691–1706, July 2003.

[4] H. Weingarten, Y. Steinberg, and S. S. Shamai, “The capacity region of the Gaussian multiple-input multiple-output broadcast channel,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 3936–3964, Sept 2006.

[5] N. Lee, O. Simeone, and J. Kang, “The effect of imperfect channel knowledge on a MIMO system with interference,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 2221–2229, Aug 2012.

[6] S. Yang and J.-C. Belfiore, “The impact of channel estimation error on the DPC region of the two-user Gaussian broadcast channel,” in *Proceedings of Allerton Conf. on Commun., Control, and Comput.*, 2005.

[7] A. G. Davoodi and S. A. Jafar, “Aligned image sets under channel uncertainty: Settling conjectures on the collapse of degrees of freedom under finite precision CSIT,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 10, pp. 5603–5618, Oct 2016.

[8] H. Joudeh and B. Clerckx, “Sum-rate maximization for linearly precoded downlink multiuser MISO systems with partial CSIT: A rate-splitting approach,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 4847–4861, Nov 2016.

[9] E. Piovano and B. Clerckx, “Optimal DoF region of the K-user MISO BC with partial CSIT,” *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 2368–2371, Nov 2017.

[10] H. Joudeh and B. Clerckx, “DoF region of the MISO BC with partial CSIT: Proof by inductive Fourier-Motzkin elimination,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Workshop Signal Process. Adv. Wireless Commun. (SPAWC)*, July 2019, pp. 1–5.

[11] C. Hao and B. Clerckx, “MISO networks with imperfect CSIT: A topological rate-splitting approach,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 2164–2179, May 2017.

[12] C. Hao, B. Rassouli, and B. Clerckx, “Achievable DoF regions of MIMO networks with imperfect CSIT,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 6587–6606, Oct 2017.

[13] Y. Mao, B. Clerckx, and V. O. K. Li, “Rate-splitting multiple access for downlink communication systems: bridging, generalizing, and outperforming SDMA and NOMA,” *EURASIP J. Wireless Commun. Netw.*, vol. 2018, no. 1, p. 133, May 2018.

[14] H. Joudeh and B. Clerckx, “Robust transmission in downlink multiuser MISO systems: A rate-splitting approach,” *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 64, no. 23, pp. 6227–6242, Dec 2016.

[15] Y. Mao, B. Clerckx, and V. O. K. Li, “Energy efficiency of rate-splitting multiple access, and performance benefits over SDMA and NOMA,” in

- Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Wireless Commun. Syst. (ISWCS)*, Aug 2018, pp. 1–5.
- [16] M. Medra and T. N. Davidson, “Robust downlink transmission: An offset-based single-rate-splitting approach,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Workshop Signal Process. Adv. Wireless Commun. (SPAWC)*, June 2018, pp. 1–5.
- [17] G. Lu, L. Li, H. Tian, and F. Qian, “MMSE-based precoding for rate splitting systems with finite feedback,” *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 642–645, Mar 2018.
- [18] Z. Li and S. Yang, “A linearly precoded rate splitting approach and its optimality for MIMO broadcast channels,” in *Proc. IEEE Inform. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2018, pp. 1–5.
- [19] A. R. Flores, B. Clerckx, and R. C. de Lamare, “Tomlinson-Harashima precoded rate-splitting for multiuser multiple-antenna systems,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Wireless Commun. Syst. (ISWCS)*, Aug 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [20] H. Joudeh and B. Clerckx, “Rate-splitting for max-min fair multigroup multicast beamforming in overloaded systems,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 11, pp. 7276–7289, Nov 2017.
- [21] M. Dai, B. Clerckx, D. Gesbert, and G. Caire, “A rate splitting strategy for massive MIMO with imperfect CSIT,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 15, no. 7, pp. 4611–4624, July 2016.
- [22] M. Dai and B. Clerckx, “Multiuser millimeter wave beamforming strategies with quantized and statistical CSIT,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 11, pp. 7025–7038, Nov 2017.
- [23] A. Papazafeiropoulos, B. Clerckx, and T. Ratnarajah, “Rate-splitting to mitigate residual transceiver hardware impairments in massive MIMO systems,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 66, no. 9, pp. 8196–8211, Sept 2017.
- [24] Y. Mao, B. Clerckx, and V. O. K. Li, “Rate-splitting multiple access for coordinated multi-point joint transmission,” *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. (ICC) Workshop*, 2019.
- [25] A. Alameer Ahmad, H. Dahrouj, A. Chaaban, A. Sezgin, and M. Alouini, “Interference mitigation via rate-splitting and common message decoding in cloud radio access networks,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 80 350–80 365, 2019.
- [26] Y. Mao, B. Clerckx, and V. O. K. Li, “Rate-splitting for multi-user multi-antenna wireless information and power transfer,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Workshop Signal Process. Adv. Wireless Commun. (SPAWC)*, July 2019, pp. 1–5.
- [27] —, “Rate-splitting for multi-antenna non-orthogonal unicast and multicast transmission: Spectral and energy efficiency analysis,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 67, no. 12, pp. 8754–8770, Dec 2019.
- [28] J. Zhang, B. Clerckx, J. Ge, and Y. Mao, “Cooperative rate splitting for MISO broadcast channel with user relaying, and performance benefits over cooperative NOMA,” *IEEE Signal. Proc. Lett.*, vol. 26, no. 11, pp. 1678–1682, Nov 2019.
- [29] Y. Mao, B. Clerckx, J. Zhang, V. O. K. Li, and M. Arafah, “Max-min fairness of K-user cooperative rate-splitting in MISO broadcast channel with user relaying,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, pp. 1–1, 2020.
- [30] B. Clerckx, Y. Mao, R. Schober, and H. V. Poor, “Rate-splitting unifying SDMA, OMA, NOMA, and multicasting in MISO broadcast channel: A simple two-user rate analysis,” *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, 2019.
- [31] N. Jindal, “MIMO broadcast channels with finite-rate feedback,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 11, pp. 5045–5060, Nov 2006.
- [32] G. Caire, N. Jindal, M. Kobayashi, and N. Ravindran, “Multiuser MIMO achievable rates with downlink training and channel state feedback,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 2845–2866, June 2010.
- [33] S. Yang, M. Kobayashi, D. Gesbert, and X. Yi, “Degrees of freedom of time correlated MISO broadcast channel with delayed CSIT,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 315–328, Jan 2013.
- [34] M. Costa, “Writing on dirty paper (corresp.),” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 439–441, May 1983.
- [35] N. Jindal, S. Vishwanath, and A. Goldsmith, “Duality, dirty paper coding, and capacity for multiuser wireless channels,” in *Information, Coding and Mathematics*. Springer, 2002, pp. 239–256.
- [36] S. Vishwanath, N. Jindal, and A. Goldsmith, “Duality, achievable rates, and sum-rate capacity of gaussian mimo broadcast channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 10, pp. 2658–2668, Oct 2003.
- [37] A. Goldsmith, S. A. Jafar, N. Jindal, and S. Vishwanath, “Capacity limits of MIMO channels,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 684–702, June 2003.
- [38] C. Hao, B. Rassouli, and B. Clerckx, “Degrees-of-freedom region of MISO-OFDMA broadcast channel with imperfect CSIT,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1310.6669*, 2013.
- [39] A. Gholami Davoodi, B. Yuan, and S. A. Jafar, “GDoF region of the MISO BC: Bridging the gap between finite precision and perfect CSIT,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 7208–7217, Nov 2018.
- [40] B. Yuan and S. A. Jafar, “Elevated multiplexing and signal space partitioning in the 2 user MIMO IC with partial CSIT,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Workshop Signal Process. Adv. Wireless Commun. (SPAWC)*, July 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [41] Y. Mao, B. Clerckx, and V. O. K. Li, “Rate-splitting for multi-antenna non-orthogonal unicast and multicast transmission,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Workshop Signal Process. Adv. Wireless Commun. (SPAWC)*, June 2018, pp. 1–5.
- [42] Z. Li, C. Ye, Y. Cui, S. Yang, and S. Shamai, “Rate splitting for multi-antenna downlink: Precoder design and practical implementation,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, pp. 1–1, 2020.
- [43] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network information theory*. Cambridge university press, 2011.
- [44] H. Viswanathan, S. Venkatesan, and H. Huang, “Downlink capacity evaluation of cellular networks with known-interference cancellation,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 802–811, June 2003.
- [45] S. S. Christensen, R. Agarwal, E. D. Carvalho, and J. M. Cioffi, “Weighted sum-rate maximization using weighted MMSE for MIMO-BC beamforming design,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 12, pp. 4792–4799, Dec 2008.
- [46] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [47] Y. Ye, *Interior point algorithms: theory and analysis*. Springer, 1997.
- [48] M. Grant, S. Boyd, and Y. Ye, “CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming,” 2008.
- [49] C. Hao, Y. Wu, and B. Clerckx, “Rate analysis of two-receiver MISO broadcast channel with finite rate feedback: A rate-splitting approach,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 63, no. 9, pp. 3232–3246, Sept 2015.
- [50] M. F. Hanif, Z. Ding, T. Ratnarajah, and G. K. Karagiannidis, “A minorization-maximization method for optimizing sum rate in the downlink of non-orthogonal multiple access systems,” *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 76–88, Jan 2016.
- [51] J. Choi, “On generalized downlink beamforming with NOMA,” *J. Commun. Networks*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 319–328, Aug 2017.