On Dynamic Time Division Duplex Transmissions for Small Cell Networks

Ming Ding, *Member, IEEE*, David López-Pérez, *Member, IEEE*, Ruiqi Xue,
Athanasios V. Vasilakos, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Wen Chen, *Senior Member, IEEE*

arXiv:2006.14829v1 [cs.IT] 26 Jun 2020

***Abstract*—Motivated by the promising benefits of dynamic Time Division Duplex (TDD), in this paper, we use a unified framework to investigate both the technical issues of applying dynamic TDD in homogeneous small cell networks (HomSCNs), and the feasibility of introducing dynamic TDD into heterogeneous networks (HetNets). First, HomSCNs are analyzed, and a small cell BS scheduler that dynamically and independently schedules DL and UL subframes is presented, such that load balancing between the DL and the UL traffic can be achieved. Moreover, the effectiveness of various inter-link interference mitigation (ILIM) schemes as well as their combinations, is systematically investigated and compared. Besides, the interesting possibility of partial interference cancellation (IC) is also explored. Second, based on the proposed schemes, the joint operation of dynamic TDD together with cell range expansion (CRE) and almost blank subframe (ABS) in HetNets is studied. In this regard, scheduling polices in small cells and an algorithm to derive the appropriate macrocell traffic off-load and ABS duty cycle under dynamic TDD operation are proposed. Moreover, the full IC and the partial IC schemes are investigated for dynamic TDD in HetNets. The user equipment (UE) packet throughput performance of the proposed/discussed schemes is benchmarked using system-level simulations.**

Keywords: small cell, homogeneous networks, heterogeneous networks, dynamic TDD, interference

I. Introduction

In recent years, the increase of mobile data traffic has been shown to project an exponential trajectory, and this trend is expected to continue through the next decade [1]. In order to meet this formidable traffic demand, the telecommunication networks have marched beyond the 4th generation (4G) realm [2], and begun to explore new advanced technologies [3]. At present, the Third Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) sees exciting activities in the design of Long Term Evolution (LTE) Release 13 networks [4], the scopes of which include advanced interference cancellation receivers [5], LTE operations in unlicensed spectrums [6], [7], device to device (D2D) communications [8], [9], enhanced radio resource management [10]–[14], etc. However, the most promising approach to rapidly increase network capacity is network densification through the deployment of small cells in heterogeneous networks (HetNets), which takes advantage of extensive spatial reuse [3], [15]–[20].

LTE Release 10 HetNets, i.e., LTE Advanced (LTE-A) HetNets, adopted cell range expansion (CRE) to maximize the benefits of small cells [2], [16]. With CRE, the coverage of a small cell can be artificially increased by instructing UEs to add a positive range expansion bias (REB) to the reference signal receiving power (RSRP) of the small cell. However, the better spatial reuse and improved uplink (UL) connection offered by CRE comes at the expense of a reduced downlink (DL) signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) for the expanded-region (ER) UEs, since they no longer connect to the base station (BS) providing the strongest level of signal reception [16]. In order to alleviate this interference problem, LTE-A HetNets implement time-domain enhanced inter-cell interference coordination (eICIC) by introducing almost blank subframes (ABSs) [2], [16]. In more detail, in the DL, macrocells schedule ABSs that are subframes in which only common reference signals (CRSs) and the most important cell-specific broadcast information are transmitted, and small cells typically schedule their ER UEs in those DL subframes overlapping with the macrocell ABSs. In this way, the inter-tier interference from macrocell BSs (MBSs) to ER UEs can be avoided [16].

Besides HetNets, it is also envisaged that future wireless communication networks, e.g., LTE Release 12∼14 networks, will embrace time division duplexing (TDD), which does not require a pair of frequency carriers and holds the possibility of tailoring the amount of DL/UL radio resources to the traffic conditions. In the LTE Release 8∼11 networks, seven TDD configurations [21], each associated with a DL-to-UL subframe ratio in a 10-milisecond transmission frame, are available for semi-static selection at the network side. However, the adopted semi-static selection of TDD configuration in LTE Release 8∼11 networks is not able to adapt DL/UL subframe resources to the fast fluctuations in DL/UL traffic loads. These fluctuations are exacerbated in small cells due to the low number of connected UEs per small cell and the burstiness of their DL and UL traffic demands.

In order to allow small cells to smartly and independently adapt their communication service to the quick variation of DL/UL traffic demands, a new technology, referred to as dynamic TDD, has drawn much attention in the 3GPP

Paper approved by xxx xxx. Manuscript received on xxx xx, 2015; revised on xxx xx, 2015, xxx xx, 2015, and xxx xx, 2015.

Ming Ding is with Data 61, Australia (e-mail: Ming.Ding@nicta.com.au).
David López-Pérez is with Bell Labs Alcatel-Lucent, Ireland (email: dr.david.lopez@ieee.org).
Ruiqi Xue is with Shanghai Jiao Tong University, P. R. China. (e-mail: xrq@sjtu.edu.cn).
Athanasios V. Vasilakos is with Department of Computer Science, Electrical and Space Engineering Lule17University of Technology, Sweden. (e-mail: th.vasilakos@gmail.com).
Wen Chen is with Shanghai Key Lab of Navigation and Location Based Services, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and School of Electronic Engineering and Automation, Guilin University of Electronic Technology, China (e-mail: wenchen@sjtu.edu.cn).

This work is supported by the National 973 Project #2012CB316106, the National 863 Project #2015AA01A710, NSFC #61328101, and SKL on Mobile Communications #2013D11.

recently [4]. In dynamic TDD, the configuration of TDD DL-to-UL subframe ratio can be dynamically changed on a per-frame basis, i.e., once every 10 milliseconds, in each cell or a cluster of cells. Dynamic TDD can thus provide a tailored configuration of DL/UL subframe resources for each cell or a cluster of cells at the expense of allowing inter-link interference, i.e., the DL transmissions of a cell interfere with the UL ones of a neighbouring cell and vice versa. Note that although dynamic TDD is a 4G technology, it serves as the predecessor of the full duplex transmission technology [22], which has been identified as one of the candidate technologies for the 5th generation (5G) networks. In a full duplex system, a BS can transmit to and receive from different UEs simultaneously using the same frequency resource. Hence, aside from the self-interference issue at the transceiver, the full duplex transmission shares a common problem with dynamic TDD, i.e., the inter-link interference.

The application of basic dynamic TDD transmissions in HomSCNs has been investigated in recent works [23], [24]. Gains in terms of wide-band (WB) SINR and UE packet throughput (UPT) have been observed. Faster dynamic TDD configuration time scales have also been shown to outperform slower ones. Besides, in [25] the authors present a preliminary analysis based on stochastic geometry for dynamic TDD in HomSCNs, without the consideration of traffic-adaptive DL/UL schedulers. However, the introduction of dynamic TDD into HetNets is not straightforward, because it will complicate the existing CRE and ABS operations [26]. An initial study on the feasibility of dynamic TDD in HetNets can be found in [27].

In this paper, motivated by the promising benefits of dynamic TDD, we investigate both the technical issues of applying dynamic TDD in HomSCNs and the feasibility of introducing dynamic TDD into HetNets. This paper extends our previous works in [24] and [27] on dynamic TDD by making the following novel contributions:

1) Extensive efforts have been done to construct a coherent framework with the same design objectives, modeling assumptions, simulation scenarios and parameters for both HomSCNs and HetNets. In particular, an ideal genie-aided link adaptation (LA) mechanism is used in this paper, i.e., appropriate modulation and coding schemes are chosen according to the perceived SINRs *after* the DL/UL packets are received. Note that some results in our previous work on dynamic TDD in HetNets [27] were lacking og insights because of the simplistic LA mechanism assumed therein. Hence, as a result of the use of a non-ideal link adapter, the true performance of dynamic TDD was not fully revealed in [24] and [27], especially for dynamic TDD in HetNets [27].
2) This paper opens a new avenue of research by analyzing the concept of partial interference cancellation (IC) and its overhead for dynamic TDD. Two new partial IC schemes are proposed to mitigate the DL-to-UL interference in dynamic TDD, i.e., the BS oriented partial IC scheme and the UE oriented partial IC scheme. Results show that the BS oriented partial IC scheme is much more effective than the UE oriented partial IC scheme and cancelling a few interferers is usually good enough to mitigate inter-link interference.
3) The dynamic TDD algorithms in this paper have been redefined compared to those in our previous works, [24] and [27], such that the algorithms for HomSCNs can be smoothly extended to work in a HetNet scenario. This is important for practical implementation since operators can work with the same hardware/software in different scenarios just with minimal upgrades and no drastic changes.
4) In this paper, unlike [24], MIMO transmissions have also been considered for the UL, which has an impact on the results due to their larger capacity and thus shorter time for file transmission. Moreover, MIMO presents challenges on the appropriated switch between single-stream transmissions and multi-stream transmissions.
5) As a result of the above bulletins, all the experiments have been re-conducted in this paper, so that an intriguing comparison between dynamic TDD in HomSCNs and HetNets can be performed to shed new light on dynamic TDD operations.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the scenarios to analyze the dynamic TDD performance for both HomSCNs and HetNets are introduced. In Sections III and IV, the focus is on dynamic TDD operation in HomSCNs and HetNets, respectively. In Section V, our system-level simulator and the 3GPP simulation parameters in our experiments are presented. In Sections VI and VII, benchmarked network configurations are depicted, and simulation results for a HomSCN and a HetNet are presented and discussed, respectively. Finally, a fair performance comparison between dynamic TDD in HomSCNs and HetNets is conducted in VIII, followed by the concluding remarks drawn in Section IX.


II. Network Scenario

During the study of dynamic TDD in the 3GPP [26], a total of eight deployment scenarios were considered for investigation. The 3GPP prioritised Scenario 3 for further analysis [4], and the study of Scenario 6 was left open for further discussion. The definition of Scenarios 3 and 6 is as follows,


- Scenario 3: Multiple outdoor picocells deployed on the same carrier frequency, where outdoor picocells can dynamically adjust TDD configurations.
- Scenario 6: Multiple outdoor macrocells and multiple picocells deployed on the same carrier frequency, where all macrocells have the same TDD configuration and outdoor picocells can adjust TDD configurations.

In this paper, we focus on Scenario 3 and Scenario 6, which are illustrated in Fig. 1.

With regard to notations, in Fig. 1, the m-th MBS, the n-th small cell BS (SBS), and the q-th UE are denoted as $b(m), m \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$, $c(n), n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, and $u(q), q \in \{1, \ldots, Q\}$, respectively. Moreover, the DL average traffic arriving rate (DATAR), the UL average traffic arriving rate (UATAR), the DL instantaneous data buffer (DIDB) and the



(a) Scenario 3: Homogeneous small cell network.



(b) Scenario 6: Heterogeneous small cell network.

Fig. 1. Dynamic TDD scenarios.

UL instantaneous data buffer (UIDB) of UE $u(q)$ are denoted as $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(q)$, $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(q)$, $\omega^{\mathrm{DL}}(q)$ and $\omega^{\mathrm{UL}}(q)$, respectively.

In order to determine UE cell association, two measures, RSRP and WB DL SINR, have been widely used in practical systems, e.g., LTE-A networks [2]. The RSRP in dBm scale and WB DL SINR in dB scale measured at UE $u(q)$ associated with MBS $b(m)$ are denoted as $\mu^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,q}$ and $\gamma^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,q}$, respectively. The counterpart measures for SBS $c(n)$ are denoted as $\mu^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,q}$ and $\gamma^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,q}$, respectively. Based on the best RSRP criterion of UE association, we assume

- The set of macrocell UEs served by MBS $b(m)$ is denoted by $U^{\mathrm{M}}_m = \left\{u\left(q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,k}\right)\right\}, k \in \{1,\ldots,K_1(m)\}$, where $Q^{\mathrm{M}}_m = \left\{q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,k}\right\}$ is the set of indices of such macrocell UEs and $K_1(m)$ is its cardinality. Note that the original set of macrocell UEs served by MBS $b(m)$ without the CRE operation is denoted by $U^{\mathrm{M}*}_m$ and its cardinality is $K^*_1(m)$.
- Without CRE in the small cells, the set of small cell UEs served by SBS $c(n)$ is denoted by $U^{\mathrm{S}}_n = \left\{u\left(q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right)\right\}, k \in \{1,\ldots,K_2(n)\}$, where $Q^{\mathrm{S}}_n = \left\{q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right\}$ is the set of indices of original small cell UEs and $K_2(n)$ is its cardinality.
- After the CRE operation, some macrocell UEs will migrate to small cells leading to traffic off-loading from the macrocell tier to the small cell tier. Then, the set of off-loaded macrocell UEs to SBS $c(n)$ is denoted as $U^{\mathrm{M2S}}_n = \left\{u\left(r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right)\right\}, k \in \{1,\ldots,K_3(n)\}$, where $R^{\mathrm{M2S}}_n = \left\{r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right\}$ is the set of indices of such ER UEs and $K_3(n)$ is its cardinality.

For clarity, the notation of variables related to UE $u(q)$ is summarized in Table I. In dynamic TDD, the subframes that can be either DL or UL ones are referred to as dynamic TDD subframes. For those dynamic TDD subframes converted to DL ones or UL ones, we refer to them as dynamic DL subframes and dynamic UL subframes, respectively.

TABLE I
NOTATION OF VARIABLES

Items	MBS $b(m)$	SBS $c(n)$ (w/o CRE)	SBS $c(n)$ (w/ CRE)
Serving UEs	$U^{\mathrm{M}}_m = \left\{u\left(q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,k}\right)\right\}$	$U^{\mathrm{S}}_n = \left\{u\left(q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right)\right\}$	/
ER UEs	/	/	$U^{\mathrm{M2S}}_n = \left\{u\left(r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right)\right\}$
UE indices	$Q^{\mathrm{M}}_m = \left\{q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,k}\right\}$	$Q^{\mathrm{S}}_n = \left\{q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right\}$	$R^{\mathrm{M2S}}_n = \left\{r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right\}$
UE number	$K_1(m)$	$K_2(n)$	$K_3(n)$
RSRP	$\mu^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,k}}$	$\mu^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}}$	$\mu^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}}$
WB DL SINR	$\gamma^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,k}}$	$\gamma^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}}$	$\gamma^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}}$
DATAR	$\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,k})$	$\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k})$	$\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k})$
UATAR	$\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,k})$	$\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k})$	$\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k})$
DIDB	$\omega^{\mathrm{DL}}(q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,k})$	$\omega^{\mathrm{DL}}(q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k})$	$\omega^{\mathrm{DL}}(r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k})$
UIDB	$\omega^{\mathrm{UL}}(q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,k})$	$\omega^{\mathrm{UL}}(q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k})$	$\omega^{\mathrm{UL}}(r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k})$

It is important to note that, in the following sections, we propose dynamic TDD schemes based on several coherent optimization objectives, which are summarized here for the sake of clarity:

- **Objective 1:** To minimize the difference between the DL and the UL *average* traffic demand densities in each small cell.
- **Objective 2:** To minimize the difference between the DL and the UL *instantaneous* traffic demand densities in each small cell.
- **Objective 3:** To minimize the *average* traffic demand density for the macrocell and the small cell tiers.

III. Dynamic TDD Operation in HomSCNs

In Scenario 3, as illustrated by Fig. 1(a), multiple outdoor picocells deployed on the same carrier frequency can independently adapt their DL and UL subframe usage to the quick variation of the DL/UL traffic demands. Two design aspects are fundamental to allow such dynamic TDD operation in each small cell, i.e.,

- Algorithms to decide the appropriate TDD configuration. To be more specific, how many subframes should be scheduled as DL or UL subframes in every T subframes.
- Interference mitigation schemes to deal with the new inter-link interference, i.e., the DL transmissions of small cells interfering with the UL transmissions of neighbouring ones and vice versa.

In this section, we present algorithms and schemes to realize these two design aspects.

A. Dynamic DL/UL Subframe Splitting

In the following, we present an algorithm that runs independently in each small cell, and decides the appropriate TDD configuration for each small cell. Two cases are distinguished, whether the small cell has active traffic or not.

First, the case in which there is no instantaneous DL or UL traffic at the small cell is considered. In other words, the small cell $c(n)$ is completely idle, i.e., $\omega^{\mathrm{DL}}\left(q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right) = 0$ and $\omega^{\mathrm{UL}}\left(q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right) = 0$, $\forall q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k} \in Q^{\mathrm{S}}_n$. Then, we propose that the number of dynamic UL subframes should be set to a statistically optimal value that meets the upcoming traffic and achieves **Objective 1**, i.e., to minimize the difference

between the DL and the UL average traffic demand densities in each small cell, where the DL(UL) average traffic demand density is defined as the sum of UEs' DL(UL) average traffic arriving rates over the quantity of the corresponding subframe resources in T subframes.

Formally, the average traffic demand densities in small cell $c(n)$ in the DL and the UL are respectively defined as

$$d_n^{\mathrm{S,DL}}(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K_2(n)} \lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}\left(q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right)}{T-t}, \tag{1}$$

and

$$d_n^{\mathrm{S,UL}}(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K_2(n)} \lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}\left(q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right)}{t}, \tag{2}$$

where the numerator is the sum of the DATARs(UATARs) $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL(UL)}}\left(q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right)$ of all UEs connected to small cell $c(n)$, and the denominator is the number of DL(UL) subframes in every T subframes available to transmit in the DL(UL), such number denoted as $T-t$ for the DL and t for the UL. The definitions proposed in (1) and (2) make sense because the DATAR and the UATAR measure the average traffic influx into the network for the DL and the UL, respectively.

Then, with respect to **Objective 1**, the statistically optimal number of dynamic TDD UL subframes for small cell $c(n)$ is selected from

$$t_n^{\text{STAT_homo}} = \underset{t=g(r),r\in\Upsilon^{\text{homo}}}{\arg\min} \left\{\left|d_n^{\mathrm{S,UL}}(t) - d_n^{\mathrm{S,DL}}(t)\right|\right\}, \tag{3}$$

where Υ^{homo} is the set of all available TDD configurations for the considered HomSCN, r is one specific TDD configuration, and $g(r) \in [1, T-1]$ extracts the number of UL subframes in T subframes from TDD configuration r. In general, $t_n^{\text{STAT_homo}}$ indicates a reasonable stand-by state, which tunes each small cell to be prepared for the upcoming traffic.

It is important to note that:

- $g(r)$ may not be limited to integer values since in practical systems certain special subframes consist of DL symbols, UL symbols and a transition interval between the DL and the UL symbols [21]. The proportion of these three parts depends on the specific TDD configuration r.
- In order to keep the DL/UL control/reference signal channels always open for the TDD system to function properly, we assume that Υ^{homo} only contains reasonable TDD configurations with $g(r) \in [1, T-1]$. In other words, there are at least one DL and one UL subframe available in every T subframes. Note that all the 3GPP TDD configurations satisfy the above constraint [21].

In the following, the case in which there is some active DL and/or UL traffic at the small cell is considered. In this case, the optimization objective is changed to **Objective 2**, i.e., to minimize the difference between the DL and the UL instantaneous traffic demand densities in each small cell, where the DL(UL) instantaneous traffic demand density is defined as the sum of UEs' DIDBs(UIDBs) over the quantity of the corresponding subframe resources in T subframes. This optimization objective ensures that load balancing between the DL and the UL transmissions can be dynamically achieved, since both the DIDB and the UIDB are instantaneous information characterizing the immediate network loads.

Algorithm 1 Selection of the optimal number of instantaneous dynamic TDD UL subframes in a small cell, i.e., $t_n^{\text{INST_homo}}$, for a HomSCN

Compute $d_n^{\mathrm{S,DL}}(t)$, $d_n^{\mathrm{S,UL}}(t)$, $\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{DL}}(t)$ and $\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{UL}}(t)$, using (1) and (2), (4) and (5), respectively.
Select $t_n^{\text{INST_homo}}$ using the following procedure.
if $\omega^{\mathrm{UL}}\left(q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right) = 0, \forall q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}} \in Q_n^{\mathrm{S}}$ **and** $\omega^{\mathrm{DL}}\left(q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right) = 0, \forall q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}} \in Q_n^{\mathrm{S}}$ **then**
  Obtain $t_n^{\text{INST_homo}} = t_n^{\text{STAT_homo}}$ using (3).
else
  Obtain $t_n^{\text{INST_homo}}$ using (6).
end if

Formally and similar to $d_n^{\mathrm{DL}}(t)$ and $d_n^{\mathrm{UL}}(t)$, the instantaneous traffic demand densities of small cell $c(n)$ in the DL and the UL are respectively defined as

$$\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,DL}}(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K_2(n)} \omega^{\mathrm{DL}}\left(q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right)}{T-t}, \tag{4}$$

and

$$\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,UL}}(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K_2(n)} \omega^{\mathrm{UL}}\left(q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right)}{t}, \tag{5}$$

where the numerator is the sum of the DIDBs(UIDBs) $\omega^{\mathrm{DL(UL)}}\left(q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right)$ of all UEs connected to small cell $c(n)$.

Then and similarly as in (3), with respect to **Objective 2**, the instantaneous optimal number of dynamic TDD UL subframes in T subframes for small cell $c(n)$ is selected from

$$t_n^{\text{INST_homo}} = \underset{t=g(r),r\in\Upsilon^{\text{homo}}}{\arg\min} \left\{\left|\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,UL}}(t) - \tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,DL}}(t)\right|\right\}. \tag{6}$$

In Algorithm 1, we summarize the proposed method to compute the dynamic TDD DL/UL subframe splitting for a given small cell according to its traffic condition in a HomSCN.

B. Inter-link Interference Mitigation Schemes

It can be expected that the dynamic TDD DL/UL subframe splitting described in Section III-A enables traffic-adaptive scheduling, i.e., more UL subframes will be diverted to DL transmissions when the DL traffic demand density in a small cell is higher than the UL one and vice versa. However, dynamic TDD DL/UL subframe splitting gives rise to a new type of interference, which is the inter-link interference between DL and UL transmissions resulted from non-uniform TDD subframe configurations among adjacent cells. Such kind of inter-link interference is particularly severe in the DL-to-UL case because *i)* a BS-to-BS path loss is normally much smaller than a UE-to-BS one and *ii)* the DL signal from a high-power BS may easily overwhelm a low-power UE's UL signal intended for another BS.

Various inter-link interference mitigation (ILIM) schemes can be applied to address this DL-to-UL interference problem, such as cell clustering (CC) [26], DL power reduction (DLPR) [28], UL power boosting (ULPB) [29], interference cancellation (IC) [24], as well as their combinations. For brevity, the DLPR scheme will not be considered hereafter, due to its known poor performance, i.e., the DL performance is heavily scarified in exchange of decreasing the DL-to-UL interference and improving the UL performance [24].

More advanced techniques such as the machine-learning techniques [30], [31] can also be applied in dynamic TDD to tackle the DL-to-UL interference problem. For example, the machine-learning techniques could be invoked at BSs to determine the right frequency and power allocation in view of buffer status and inter-link interference conditions. However, the potential performance gains come at the cost of overhead and complexity. We will consider such advanced ILIM schemes in our future work with emphasis on performance improvement and convergence issues.

In the following, we discuss the CC scheme, the ULPB scheme and the IC scheme, whose performance will be compared in later sections. Note that these ILIM schemes can be classified into two strategies to cope with the DL-to-UL interference, i.e., *(i)* to weaken the DL interference or *(ii)* to strengthen the UL signal. The CC scheme and the IC scheme belong to the first strategy, while the ULPB scheme represents the second strategy.

1) Cell Clustering: The CC scheme semi-statically organizes the small cells into cell clusters based on metrics such as coupling loss $\mathrm{PL}^{\mathrm{CC}}$, i.e., the path loss between SBSs [26]. Then, the dynamic TDD configuration is conducted on a per-cluster basis, rather than on a per-cell basis. In other words, the TDD configuration of all the small cells in a cell cluster is the same, thus the inter-link interference is eliminated within the cell cluster. In this case, negotiation and coordination of TDD configurations within cell clusters are required through inter-cell communications over backhaul links or the air interface. A simple method to perform dynamic TDD DL/UL subframe splitting for a given cell cluster is to sum the cell specific $\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,DL}}(t)$ and $\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,UL}}(t)$ as well as $d_n^{\mathrm{S,DL}}(t)$ and $d_n^{\mathrm{S,UL}}(t)$ over the small cells in such cell cluster, and proceed accordingly with Algorithm 1 for each cell cluster. Note that a more dynamic CC scheme considering joint optimization of DL/UL scheduling among multiple small cells might be possible. However, it is out of the scope of our paper. Here, we only consider the semi-static CC scheme that allows distributed operations among small cell clusters [26].

2) Power Control: The power control strategy considered here is based on ULPB [29]. The ULPB scheme increases the amount of transmit power used at the UEs compared to the traditional fractional path loss compensation power control [21]. This UL power boost helps to combat the DL-to-UL interference coming from neighbouring small cells. The implementation of the ULPB scheme is relatively simple, e.g., a fixed power offset ΔP^{UL} can be configured on top of the UL power level.

3) Interference Cancellation: In this paper, the IC scheme refers to the DL-to-UL IC and not to the UL-to-DL IC because it is technically more feasible to assume that BSs are capable of exchanging information and cancelling inter-link interference coming from neighbouring BSs. In contrast, the assumption of UEs performing UL-to-DL IC with regard to other peer UEs would seem to be too farfetched and thus impractical (it is unlikely that UEs can exchange information). In theory, the IC scheme should provide the best ILIM for the UL compared to the CC and the ULPB schemes, but requires good backhaul connections for the exchange of inter-cell information on DL transmission assumptions, such as resource allocation, modulation and coding scheme, etc. Besides, strong signal processing units are required in the BSs to detect, reconstruct and cancel the DL interference for UL.

To reduce the complexity and cost of the IC scheme, partial IC schemes can be further considered. To be more specific, in the following, we propose a UE-oriented IC (UOIC) scheme and a BS-oriented IC (BOIC) scheme.

In the UOIC scheme, only cell-edge UEs will be granted the use of IC to mitigate the DL-to-UL interference. Here, cell-edge UEs can be identified as those UEs, which have at least one RSRP associated with a neighbouring BS that is larger than the RSRP associated with the serving BS by a bias of x_1 dB. Formally, for a UE $u\left(q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right)$, $q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}} \in Q_n^{\mathrm{S}}$, it is a cell-edge UE entitled for IC if the following condition is valid.

$$\exists\ \mu_{m,q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}}}^{\mathrm{S}} > \mu_{n,q_{n,k}^{\mathrm{S}}}^{\mathrm{S}} - x_1, \quad m \neq n\,. \tag{7}$$

In the BOIC scheme, only DL interference from neighbouring BSs, whose path losses to the serving BS are less than x_2 dB are cancelled. Formally, for an SBS $c(n)$, a neighbouring SBS $c(m)$ satisfying the following condition will be treated in the IC process.

$$PL_{m,n}^{\mathrm{S2S}} < x_2, \quad m \neq n\,, \tag{8}$$

where $PL_{m,n}^{\mathrm{S2S}}$ is the path loss from SBS $c(m)$ to SBS $c(n)$ in dB scale.

Note that in both partial IC schemes, the selected UE set and the selected BS set for the IC operations are cell-specific.

IV. Small Cell Dynamic TDD Operation in HetNets

In Scenario 6 illustrated by Fig. 1(b), it is assumed that multiple outdoor macrocells and multiple picocells are deployed on the same carrier frequency, and that all macrocells have the same TDD configuration while outdoor picocells can adjust their TDD configurations. This is a logical assumption since macrocell traffic dynamics are usually averaged out due to the fairly large number of macrocell UEs per macrocell site. Moreover, with a quasi-static configuration of DL/UL subframe splitting, the detrimental DL-to-UL interference in the macrocell tier can be avoided. In contrast, the traffic behaviour is completely different in the small cell tier, mostly because of the low number of connected UEs per small cell and the burstiness of their DL and UL traffic demands. This leads to drastic DL/UL traffic fluctuations, which are particularly suitable for dynamic TDD operations. Here, we propose that the macrocell tier uses a quasi-static configuration of DL/UL subframe splitting, which matches its statistical DL/UL traffic ratio, and consider dynamic TDD only for the small cell tier.

Moreover, in a HetNet, dynamic TDD operation at small cells cannot ignore CRE and ABS operations that have already been adopted at the macrocells, and these technologies need to be designed together. Hence, the following design aspects have to be considered:

- Scheduling policy in small cells, i.e., what is the behaviour of small cells in macrocell DL, UL and ABS subframes.

- UE cell association after CRE and optimal macrocell ABS duty cycle.
- Dynamic TDD scheduling at small cells.

In the following subsections, we examine these issues one by one in detail.

A. Scheduling Policy in Small Cells

For small cell UEs, any UL transmission attempt to SBSs will find itself in an extremely adverse situation in the subframes aligned with macrocell DL subframes, since DL signals emitted from MBSs are of high power and thus can easily jam small cell UEs' UL signals. Macrocell DL to small cell UL IC techniques based on full or partial prior information of macrocell DL transmissions may solve this problem. However, the involved complexity in this kind of inter-tier IC is extremely high, considering the dominant role of the DL interference coming from macrocells and the heavy traffic flow in macrocells. Thus, it may not be wise to abuse the IC technique to cancel the DL-to-UL interference from the macrocell tier to the small cell tier. Thus, we propose that small cells only conduct DL transmissions in the subframes aligned with macrocell DL subframes.

As for the subframes aligned with macrocell UL and ABS subframes, since the interference suffered by SBSs and small cell UEs will probably be low because strong interfering macrocell UEs are very likely to have been off-loaded to small cells as ER UEs, we propose that small cells can perform dynamic TDD when macrocells transmit UL or ABS subframes.

As a result of these scheduling policies, not all subframes in the small cell tier are dynamic TDD subframes, and the number of dynamic TDD subframes is denoted as $f^{\mathrm{S,dynTDD}}$.

Having decided which subframe type should be scheduled at each time at small cells, it is important to define which small cell UEs should be scheduled in the subframes overlapping with macrocell DL subframes and in the dynamic TDD subframes. A widely adopted assumption in LTE-A DL HetNets is that DL packets of ER UEs should be scheduled with a high priority in subframes overlapping with the macrocell ABSs, and that they should not be scheduled in subframes overlapping with the macrocell DL subframes due to the strong inter-tier interference [32]. Taking into account the previous scheduling policy and extending these ideas to the HetNet dynamic TDD scenario, we propose the following:

1) Small cell DL packets of ER UEs, i.e., U_n^{M2S}, are transmitted in small cell dynamic TDD DL subframes.
2) Small cell DL packets of non-ER UEs, i.e., U_n^{S}, are transmitted in subframes overlapping with the macrocell DL subframes. If the small cell dynamic TDD DL subframes are not occupied, DL packets of non-ER UEs can also be carried by these subframes.
3) Small cell UL packets of all connected UEs, i.e., $U_n^{\mathrm{S}} \bigcup U_n^{\mathrm{M2S}}$, are transmitted in small cell dynamic TDD UL subframes.

B. UE Cell Association and Macrocell ABS Duty Cycle

In light of the CRE and ABS operations, and given the proposed scheduling policy in small cells, next important questions to be answered are: To which small cell should each off-loaded macrocell UE go? Which is the optimal ABS duty cycle for the macrocell tier? In order to answer these questions, in this paper, a new semi-dynamic algorithm is proposed to jointly determine UE cell association and macrocell ABS duty cycle, with the consideration of dynamic TDD operation at small cells.

The proposed semi-dynamic scheme considers a subframe splitting algorithm that is consistent with that presented in Section III-A, targeted at providing load balancing between the DL and the UL average traffic demand densities, i.e., **Objective 1**. Considering the multiple cell tiers in HetNets, the proposed semi-dynamic scheme also tries to find the optimal macrocell ABS duty cycle, which achieves **Objective 3**, i.e., to minimize the average cell traffic demand density for the macrocell and the small cell tiers, proving load balancing between tiers.

The proposed algorithm to jointly determine UE cell association and macrocell ABS duty cycle is summarized in Algorithm 2, where A is the number of ABSs given up by the macrocells every T subframes with $A \in \{0, 1, \ldots, T-1\}$, $\alpha^{\mathrm{M,DL}}$ and $\alpha^{\mathrm{M,UL}}$ are the ratios of DL-to-total subframes and UL-to-total subframes for macrocells, respectively, with $\alpha^{\mathrm{M,DL}}+\alpha^{\mathrm{M,UL}} = 1$, and round$\{x\}$ is an operator that maps x to its closest integer. Moreover, and similar to the DL/UL average traffic demand densities defined in (1) and (2) for small cell $c\,(n)$, the average traffic demand densities for macrocell $b\,(m)$ in the DL and the UL are respectively defined as

$$d_m^{\mathrm{M,DL}} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K_1(m)} \lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(q_{m,k}^{\mathrm{M}})}{f^{\mathrm{M,DL}}}, \tag{9}$$

and

$$d_m^{\mathrm{M,UL}} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K_1(m)} \lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(q_{m,k}^{\mathrm{M}})}{f^{\mathrm{M,UL}}}, \tag{10}$$

where the numerator is the sum of DATARs/UATARs $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL(UL)}}\left(q_{m,k}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)$ of all UEs connected to macrocell $b(m)$, and the denominator is the number of DL(UL) subframes in every T subframes available to transmit it, such number denoted as $f^{\mathrm{M,DL}}(f^{\mathrm{M,UL}})$.

It is important to note that due to the static TDD configuration in the macrocell tier, $f^{\mathrm{M,DL}}$ and $f^{\mathrm{M,UL}}$ take network-wide values for all macrocells, and that $f^{\mathrm{M,DL}} + f^{\mathrm{M,UL}} + A = T$.

Due to the limited solution space of A, Algorithm 2 performs an exhaustive search on A and its objective is to find the optimal A^{opt}, which achieves **Objective 3**, i.e., to minimize the average cell traffic demand density for the macrocell and the small cell tiers. Note that in practice, different operators may have different objectives and could select different optimization targets, but in those there is always a trade-off between the macrocell and small cell UPTs [33], i.e., increasing macrocell UPT reduces small cell UPT and vice versa. Intuitively, A^{opt} tends to be larger if some operator wants to put more emphasis on the performance of the small cell tier and vice versa.

The procedure of Algorithm 2 is explained as follows, where for each possible A the following operations are performed.

For each macrocell $b(m)$, all connected UEs in U_m^{M} are sorted according to their ascending order of wideband SINR $\gamma_{m,k}^{\mathrm{M}}$, and the following sorted set is obtained $\bar{U}_m^{\mathrm{M}} =$

Algorithm 2 Joint selection of UE cell association and macrocell ABS duty cycle in a HetNet

for $A = 0 : T-1$ **do**
  Compute $f^{\mathrm{M,DL}} = \mathrm{round}\left\{(T-A)\times\alpha^{\mathrm{M,DL}}\right\}$, $f^{\mathrm{M,UL}} = T - A - f^{\mathrm{M,DL}}$, and $f^{\mathrm{S,dynTDD}} = f^{\mathrm{M,UL}} + A$.
  for $m = 1 : M$ **do**
    Initialization: $U_m^{\mathrm{M}} = U_m^{\mathrm{M}*}$, $K_1(m) = K_1^*(m)$.
    Obtain $\bar{U}_m^{\mathrm{M}}$ by sorting $u\left(q_{m,k}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)$ according to the ascending order of $\gamma_{m,k}^{\mathrm{M}}$.
    for $j = 1 : K_1(m)$ **do**
      Regarding the candidate ER UE $u\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)$, calculate $d_m'^{\mathrm{M,DL}}$ and $d_m'^{\mathrm{M,UL}}$ using (11) and (12).
      Obtain $C(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}})$ by sorting all small cells according to the descending order of $\mu^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,\pi(j)}}$.
      for $l = 1 : N$ **do**
        Compute $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,DL,M_DL_sf}}$ using (13).
        Obtain $t_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{STAT_het}}$, $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,DL,dynTDD_sf}}\left(t_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{STAT_het}}\right)$ and $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,UL,dynTDD_sf}}\left(t_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{STAT_het}}\right)$ for the candidate outsourcing small cell $c(\zeta(l))$ using Algorithm 3.
        Update $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,DL}}$ and $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,UL}}$ using (17) and (18).
        if $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,DL}} < d_m'^{\mathrm{M,DL}}$ **and** $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,UL}} < d_m'^{\mathrm{M,UL}}$ **and** $\mu^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,\pi(j)}} - \mu^{\mathrm{S}}_{\zeta(l),q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,\pi(j)}} < y$ **then**
          UE $u\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)$ is outsourced to $c(\zeta(l))$.
          Update the UE cell association as
          $K_3(\zeta(l)) = K_3(\zeta(l)) + 1$;
          $R_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{M2S}} = R_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{M2S}} + \left\{u\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)\right\}$;
          $K_1(m) = K_1(m) - 1$;
          $U_m^{M} = U_m^{\mathrm{M}} - \left\{u\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)\right\}$.
          Record the average traffic demand density of macrocell $b(m)$ as $d_m^{\mathrm{M}}(A) = \frac{d_m^{\mathrm{M,DL}} + d_m^{\mathrm{M,UL}}}{2}$.
          Obtain the average traffic demand density for small cell $c(\zeta(l))$ as $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S}}(A) = \frac{d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,DL}} + d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,UL}}}{2}$.
          break;
        end if {judgement of a successful outsourcing}
      end for {loop of candidate small cells}
    end for {loop of candidate ER UEs}
  end for {loop of macrocells}
end for {loop of candidate macrocell ABS duty cycles}
Choose the appropriate macrocell ABS duty cycle using (19). And UE cell association is eventually determined based on A^{opt}.

$\left\{u\left(q_{m,\pi(1)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right),\ldots,u\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right),\ldots,u\left(q_{m,\pi(K_1(m))}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)\right\}$. The first UE in the sorted set is the first candidate UE to be off-loaded to a small cell, and candidate UEs are examined sequentially.

For an examined candidate UE $u\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)$ to be off-loaded, the average DL and UL traffic demand densities for macrocell $b(m)$ in (9) and (10) are updated as follows:

$$d_m'^{\mathrm{M,DL}} = d_m^{\mathrm{M,DL}} - \frac{\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)}{f^{\mathrm{M,DL}}}, \tag{11}$$

and

$$d_m'^{\mathrm{M,UL}} = d_m^{\mathrm{M,UL}} - \frac{\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)}{f^{\mathrm{M,UL}}}. \tag{12}$$

Then, in order to determine the new serving cell of candidate UE $u\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)$, all small cells $c(n)$ are sorted according to their descending order of RSRP, i.e., $\mu^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,\pi(j)}}$. The sorted small cell set is UE-specific, and is denoted as $C\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right) = \{c(\zeta(1)),\ldots,c(\zeta(l)),\ldots,c(\zeta(N))\}$. Because of its highest signal strength, the first small cell in the sorted set is the first candidate small cell to host the candidate UE, and candidate small cells are examined sequentially.

Algorithm 3 Selection of the optimal number of average dynamic TDD UL subframes, i.e., $t_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{STAT_het}}$ in a HetNet

for each $t = g(r), r \in \Upsilon^{\mathrm{het}}$ **do**
  Compute $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,DL,dynTDD_sf}}(t)$ and $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,UL,dynTDD_sf}}(t)$ using (14) and (15), respectively.
end for
Select $t_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{STAT_het}}$ using (16).

For each candidate small cell $c(\zeta(l))$, its average DL traffic demand density in the subframes overlapping with macrocell DL subframes, denoted by $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,DL,M_DL_sf}}$ is defined as

$$d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,DL,M_DL_sf}} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K_2(\zeta(l))}\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}\left(q_{\zeta(l),k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right)}{f^{\mathrm{M,DL}}}, \tag{13}$$

where the numerator is the sum of DATARs $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}\left(q_{\zeta(l),k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right)$ of all non-ER UEs in small cell $c(\zeta(l))$. The proposed definition is predicated on the fact that according to our scheduling policy, small cell DL packets of non-ER UEs should be typically transmitted in subframes overlapping with the macrocell DL subframes, which number is $f^{\mathrm{M,DL}}$.

Once the average DL traffic demand density in the subframes overlapping with macrocell DL subframes has been calculated, the algorithm looks for the statistically optimal splitting of dynamic TDD subframes in the DL and the UL for the candidate small cell $c(\zeta(l))$. For future use in Section IV-D, the presentation of the proposed statistically optimal splitting of dynamic TDD DL/UL subframes in the DL and the UL for a small cell is isolated from Algorithm 2 and presented in Algorithm 3. In this case, and following the same approach as in Section III-A, we propose that the statistically optimal number of dynamic TDD UL subframes for the candidate small cell $c(\zeta(l))$ should be derived with **Objective 1**, i.e., to minimize the difference between the average DL and UL traffic demand densities. In this way, a balanced DL/UL UPT performance in such small cell can be achieved.

In Algorithm 3, Υ^{het} is the set of all available TDD configurations for the considered HetNet. For a candidate number of dynamic TDD UL subframes t, based on our proposed scheduling policy, ER UE DL traffic and all UE UL traffic should be served by dynamic TDD subframes aligned with macrocell UL and ABS subframes. Considering the candidate ER UE $u\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)$, the average DL and UL traffic demand density in dynamic TDD subframes for the candidate host small cell $c(\zeta(l))$ can be respectively computed as

$$d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,DL,dynTDD_sf}}(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K_3(\zeta(l))}\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}\left(r_{\zeta(l),k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right) + \lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)}{f^{\mathrm{S,dynTDD}} - t}, \tag{14}$$

and

$$d_{\zeta(l)}^{\mathrm{S,UL,dynTDD_sf}}(t) = \frac{1}{t}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{K_2(\zeta(l))}\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}\left(q_{\zeta(l),k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right) + \sum_{k=1}^{K_3(\zeta(l))}\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}\left(r_{\zeta(l),k}^{\mathrm{S}}\right) + \lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\mathrm{M}}\right)\right]. \tag{15}$$

Then, based on such computations and similar to (3) considering **Objective 1**, the statistically optimal number of dynamic TDD UL subframes for small cell $c(\zeta(l))$ becomes

$$t_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{STAT_het}} = \arg\min_{t=g(r),r\in\Upsilon^{\text{het}}} \left\{ \left| d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S,UL,dynTDD_sf}}(t) - d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S,DL,dynTDD_sf}}(t) \right| \right\}. \quad (16)$$

Having obtained $t_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{STAT_het}}$, we propose that the average DL traffic demand density for the candidate small cell $c(\zeta(l))$, used in the following step, should be the larger one of the average DL traffic demand density associated with ER UEs and with non-ER UEs, which is expressed as

$$d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S,DL}} = \max\left\{ d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S,DL,dynTDD_sf}}\left(t_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{STAT_het}}\right), d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S,DL,M_DL_sf}} \right\}, \quad (17)$$

while the average UL traffic demand density for the candidate small cell $c(\zeta(l))$ is

$$d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S,UL}} = d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S,UL,dynTDD_sf}}\left(t_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{STAT_het}}\right). \quad (18)$$

Now, before executing the offloading of candidate UE $u\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\text{M}}\right)$, we propose that two constraints should be checked. First, the average traffic demand density of the candidate small cell after offloading should not be larger than that of the source macrocell to avoid small cells taking upon too much burden and becoming new traffic bottlenecks. This is a necessary condition in the load balanced state, and is mathematically formulated as $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S,DL}} < d_m^{\prime\text{M,DL}}$ and $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S,UL}} < d_m^{\prime\text{M,UL}}$. Second, the link quality between the candidate ER UE and the candidate small cell should be good enough, i.e., $\mu_{m,q_{m,k}^{\text{M}}}^{\text{M}} - \mu_{\zeta(l),q_{m,k}^{\text{M}}}^{\text{S}} < y$, where y is the REB parameter in dB scale for the CRE operation. Intuitively, the proposed two constraints require that a candidate macrocell UE should be offloaded to a small cell that is neither overloaded nor far away from the concerned macrocell UE. Otherwise, the off-loading will not be performed.

Once these constraints are met, the candidate UE $u\left(q_{m,\pi(j)}^{\text{M}}\right)$ is offloaded to the candidate small cell $c(\zeta(l))$, and all related parameters are updated as described in Algorithm 2. The average traffic demand density of the offloaded macrocell $b(m)$ is updated as $d_m^{\text{M}}(A) = \frac{d_m^{\text{M,DL}} + d_m^{\text{M,UL}}}{2}$, and that of the candidate small cell $c(\zeta(l))$ is updated as $d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S}}(A) = \frac{d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S,DL}} + d_{\zeta(l)}^{\text{S,UL}}}{2}$.

Finally, after iterating over all macrocells, all candidate UEs and all candidate small cells, we select the macrocell ABS duty cycle A^{opt} using (19) with respect to **Objective 3**, i.e., to minimize the average traffic demand density for the macrocell and the small cell tiers.

$$A^{\text{opt}} = \arg\min_{A} \left\{ \frac{1}{M+N} \left[\sum_{m=1}^{M} d_m^{\text{M}}(A) + \sum_{n=1}^{N} d_n^{\text{S}}(A) \right] \right\}. \quad (19)$$

The final UE cell association is established according to the selected A^{opt}.

In the proposed Algorithm 2, two parameters need to be chosen for its operation. The first parameter is T, which can be set to 10 according to the 3GPP specifications [21], because each transmission frame consists of 10 subframes in the current LTE networks. The other parameter is y, which is the REB parameter in dB. As suggested in some previous work on CRE [32], a reasonable value of y can be $y = 9\,\text{dB}$.

C. Discussion on the Convergence and the Complexity of Algorithm 2

Before we delve deeper into the problem of DL/UL subframe splitting in the small cell tier, it is beneficial to have a full assessment on the convergence and the complexity of the proposed Algorithm 2, which jointly optimizes UE cell association and macrocell ABS duty cycle. Note that Algorithm 2 is a one-shot exhaustive searching algorithm with no iterative steps, and thus convergence is not an issue for Algorithm 2.

The complexity of Algorithm 2, on the other hand, could be a serious issue that may prevent its implementation in practice. In more detail, the complexity of Algorithm 2 is in the order of $TN\sum_{m=1}^{M} K_1^*(m)$ because T candidate values of A and N candidate outsourcing small cells need to be tested for *each and every* macrocell UE. One way to reduce the complexity of the algorithm without compromising its performance is to adopt a macrocell-UE-specific number of candidate outsourcing small cells based on the value of y, which should be much smaller than N, because the small cells that are too far away from the considered macrocell UE do not need to go through the off-loading test due to poor signal strength. Another way to reduce the complexity is to perform Algorithm 2 inside a macrocell cluster, the size of which can be adjusted based on the implementation feasibility.

Having said that, the real challenge to implement Algorithm 2 comes from the *time-variant* network, where UEs can come and go, and thus the UE cell association and the macrocell ABS duty cycle need to be updated on the fly. In more detail, it is generally feasible to execute Algorithm 2 only once for a *time-invariant* network scenario. However, when the network becomes *time-variant* due to UE mobility and bursty traffic, etc., we need to frequently recall Algorithm 2, which is not practical due to its high complexity. Note that it is not necessary to consider fast time-variant networks caused by high UE mobility in the framework of HetNets dynamic TDD, since UEs with high mobility will be connected to the macrocell tier only, thus avoiding handover failure issues [2]. Here, the considered time-variant network changes in the order of seconds or hundreds of milliseconds, since a UE with a speed of 10 km/h will only move about 2.78 m in one second, and it may take seconds or tens of seconds for a UE to finish reading a web page before requesting a new DL/UL transmission [35]. Even so, it is still infeasible to conduct the entire Algorithm 2 every time when a UE arrives at a cell or a UE leaves a cell. Therefore, we need to design new algorithms for the time-variant networks, and use Algorithm 2 in the initialization stage only. Based on the best RSRP criterion of UE association discussed in Section II, we propose to classify the events of network changing into four cases:

- Case 1: A new macrocell UE $u(z)$ arrives at macrocell $b(m_0)$. Then we have $U_{m_0}^{\text{M}*} = U_{m_0}^{\text{M}*} \cup u(z)$ and $K_1^*(m_0) = K_1^*(m_0) + 1$. There are two alternatives for algorithm design.
  - 17 Alt. 1: For macrocell $b(m_0)$, we perform Algorithm 2 for macrocell $b(m_0)$ only, the complexity of which is in the order of $TNK_1^*(m_0)$.

  - 17Alt. 2: For UE $u(z)$, we can design a new algorithm, denoted by Algorithm 2-A, to check the N candidate outsourcing small cells and decide whether UE $u(z)$ should stay in macrocell $b(m_0)$, or it should be off-loaded to a small cell $c(n_0)$. The complexity of Algorithm 2-A is in the order of TN.
- Case 2: A macrocell UE $u\left(q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m_0,k_0}\right)$ leaves from macrocell $b(m_0)$. Then, we have $U^{\mathrm{M}*}_{m_0} = U^{\mathrm{M}*}_{m_0} \setminus u\left(q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m_0,k_0}\right)$ and $K^*_1(m_0) = K^*_1(m_0) - 1$. Also, there are two alternatives for algorithm design.
  - 17Alt. 1: For macrocell $b(m_0)$, we perform Algorithm 2 for macrocell $b(m_0)$ only, the complexity of which is in the order of $TNK^*_1(m_0)$.
  - 17Alt. 2: Since a UE leaves from macrocell $b(m_0)$, the traffic load of macrocell $b(m_0)$ should be reduced. Therefore, we should design a new algorithm, denoted by Algorithm 2-B, to examine the $K^*_1(m_0) - K_1(m_0)$ UEs that have been outsourced to small cells and check whether some of them should come back to macrocell $b(m_0)$. The complexity of Algorithm 2-B is in the order of $T[K^*_1(m_0) - K_1(m_0)]$.
- Case 3: A new small cell UE $u(z)$ arrives at small cell $c(n_0)$. Note that such UE cannot be an ER UE because we consider the best RSRP criterion of UE association and all the potential ER UEs should go through Case 1 first. Due to the arrival of UE $u(z)$, the traffic load of small cell $c(n_0)$ should be increased. Therefore, we should design a new algorithm, denoted by Algorithm 2-C, to check the $K_3(n_0)$ UEs that have been outsourced to small cell $c(n_0)$ and check whether some of them should come back to their original macrocells. The complexity of Algorithm 2-C is in the order of $TK_3(n_0)$.
- Case 4: A small cell UE $u\left(q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n_0,k_0}\right)$ leaves from small cell $c(n_0)$. Note that such UE can be an ER UE or a non-ER UE. Either way, the traffic load of small cell $c(n_0)$ should be reduced. Therefore, we should design a new algorithm, denoted by Algorithm 2-D, to examine all the macrocell UEs, the number of which is $\sum_{m=1}^{M} K_1(m)$, and check whether some of them are eligible to be outsourced by small cell $c(n_0)$. The complexity of Algorithm 2-D is in the order of $T\sum_{m=1}^{M} K_1(m)$.

In this paper, we would like to focus on *time-invariant* networks, both in algorithm design and simulation, to show the full potential of dynamic TDD in HetNets. In our future work, we will study Case 1∼4 as well as Algorithm 2-A∼D for *time-variant* networks.

D. Dynamic DL/UL Subframe Splitting in the Small Cell Tier

Following the dynamic DL/UL subframe splitting algorithm (see Algorithm 1) proposed for the HomSCNs, we also propose a dynamic algorithm to compute the instantaneous small cell dynamic TDD DL/UL subframe splitting for a given small cell according to its instantaneous traffic conditions in a HetNet. Similar to Algorithm 1, the proposed algorithm is performed every T subframes and is based on the criterion of

Algorithm 4 Selection of the optimal number of instantaneous dynamic TDD UL subframes in a small cell, i.e., $t_n^{\text{INST_het}}$, for a HetNet

Obtain $f^{\mathrm{S,dynTDD}} = f^{\mathrm{M,UL}} + A^{\mathrm{opt}}$ via Algorithm 2.
Compute $\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,DL,dynTDD_sf}}(t)$ and $\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,UL,dynTDD_sf}}(t)$ using (20) and (21), respectively.
Select $t_n^{\text{INST_het}}$ using the following procedure.
if $\omega^{\mathrm{UL}}(q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}) = 0, \forall q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k} \in Q^{\mathrm{S}}_n$ **and** $\omega^{\mathrm{UL}}(r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}) = 0, \forall r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k} \in R^{\mathrm{M2S}}_n$ **and** $\omega^{\mathrm{DL}}(r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}) = 0, \forall r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k} \in R^{\mathrm{M2S}}_n$ **then**
  Obtain $t_n^{\text{INST_het}} = t_n^{\text{STAT_het}}$, which is computed using Algorithm 3 with $u\left(q^{\mathrm{M}}_{m,\pi(j)}\right) = \emptyset$.
else
  Obtain $t_n^{\text{INST_het}}$ using (22).
end if

Objective 2, i.e., to minimize the difference between the instantaneous DL and UL traffic demand densities in each small cell. Considering our previous discussion in Section IV-B, the instantaneous DL and UL traffic demand densities of $c(n)$ for given number of dynamic UL subframes t are defined in a similar way as in (14) and (15) with ω instead of λ, i.e.,

$$\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,DL,dynTDD_sf}}(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K_3(n)} \omega^{\mathrm{DL}}\left(r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right)}{f^{\mathrm{S,dynTDD}} - t}, \tag{20}$$

and

$$\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,UL,dynTDD_sf}}(t) = \frac{1}{t}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{K_2(n)} \omega^{\mathrm{UL}}\left(q^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right) + \sum_{k=1}^{K_3(n)} \omega^{\mathrm{UL}}\left(r^{\mathrm{S}}_{n,k}\right)\right]. \tag{21}$$

Then, similar to (16) considering **Objective 2**, the optimal number of instantaneous dynamic TDD UL subframes for small cell $c(n)$ can be selected as

$$t_n^{\text{INST_het}} = \underset{t=g(r), r\in\Upsilon^{\text{het}}}{\arg\min} \left\{\left|\tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,UL,dynTDD_sf}}(t) - \tilde{d}_n^{\mathrm{S,DL,dynTDD_sf}}(t)\right|\right\}. \tag{22}$$

The proposed algorithm to split the dynamic TDD DL/UL subframes for small cell $c(n)$ in a HetNet is summarized in Algorithm 4. Note that Algorithm 4 is built on the same principle as that of Algorithm 1 so that our design of dynamic TDD for small cells is coherent for both HomSCNs and HetNets. Similar to the consideration on the range of t for Algorithm 1, here we also impose constraints on t so that the DL/UL control/reference signal channels are always available for the small cell TDD system to function properly. Since $f^{\mathrm{M,DL}} \geq 1$ (the macrocell DL should never be completely deactivated), which indicates the availability of DL subframes for the small cell tier in every T subframes, we assume that Υ^{het} contains TDD configurations with $g(r) \in \left[1, f^{\mathrm{S,dynTDD}}\right]$. Moreover, as indicated in Algorithm 1, when a small cell is completely idle with neither DL nor UL traffic demand, we propose that $t_n^{\text{INST_het}}$ should be set to $t_n^{\text{STAT_het}}$ so that the DL/UL subframe splitting in the small cell matches its statistical traffic pattern.

V. System-Level Simulation

In order to verify the effectiveness of the proposed dynamic TDD schemes, system-level simulations are used. As

TABLE II
KEY SIMULATION PARAMETERS

Parameters	Assumptions
Scenario	Scenario 3 or Scenario 6 [26]
Network layout	7 cell sites, 3 macrocells per cell site, wrap-around
Inter-site distance	500 m [35]
# small cells per macrocell	4 (84 small cells in total) [26]
Small cell deployment	Random deployment, 40 m radius of coverage [26]
# UEs per macrocell	0 (Scenario 3), 10 (Scenario 6) [26]
# UEs per small cell	10 (Scenario 3), 5 (Scenario 6) [26]
System bandwidth	10 MHz [35]
UE deployment	Uniform and random deployment in cell coverage
# macro/small cell antenna	4 (for both transmission and reception)
# UE antenna	2 (for both transmission and reception)
Receiver type	Basic MMSE Rx for both the DL and the UL [26]
Codebook for PMI feedback	LTE Release 11 codebook with WB rank adaptation
UE scheduling in each cell	Proportional fairness (PF)
Packet scheduling for each UE	Round Robin (RR)
Modulation & coding schemes	QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM, 256 QAM
Ideal genie-aided LA	Target BLER being 0.1 for both the DL and the UL
IC capability	For DL: none For UL: with or without perfect DL-to-UL IC
Non-data overhead	3 out of 14 OFDM symbols per subframe
HARQ modelling	Retransmission in the first available subframe
Small-scale fading channel	Explicitly modelled (EPA channel [36])

indicated in Section II, we concentrate our analysis on the 3GPP dynamic TDD Scenario 3 and Scenario 6, illustrated in Fig. 1(a) and Fig. 1(b), respectively. Detailed information on our system-level simulator used for this analysis can be found in [34]. The full list of system parameters and traffic modelling methodology can be found in [26] and [35], respectively. Some key parameters in our simulations are presented in Table II.

In our simulations, the traffic model is assumed to be Poisson distributed with $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q))$ taking a uniform value for all UEs [26]. Different values of $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q))$ correspond to different traffic load conditions, i.e., low, medium, and high traffic loads. Besides, $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q))$ is assumed to be half of $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q))$, i.e., $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q))$ [26]. The packet size is 0.5 Mbytes. Packets are independently generated for the DL and the UL in each small cell, and they are randomly assigned to small cell UEs. Finally, we assume that $T = 10$ [21].

Due to the inherently different topology of HomSCNs and HetNets as well as the CRE and eICIC operations in HetNets, it is generally very difficult to accurately compare the performance of two networks respectively associated with Scenario 3 and Scenario 6. Nevertheless, in the following sections we will try to draw some useful conclusions regarding the comparison of dynamic TDD in HomSCNs and that in HetNets. To that end, in our simulations, as suggested in [26], we deploy 10 UEs per small cell in Scenario 3, while we deploy 10 UEs per macrocell as well as 5 UEs per small cell in Scenario 6. So the simulated Scenario 3 network is slightly more crowded with UEs than the simulated Scenario 6 network. As a result, for Scenario 3, the values of $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q))$ are set to $\{0.05, 0.25, 0.45\}$ packets per UE per second to represent the low, medium and high traffic loads, respectively. In contrast, for Scenario 6 to achieve a similar load, the values of $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q))$ are slightly increased to $\{0.1, 0.3, 0.5\}$ packets per UE per second due to its relatively lower UE density. Note that here we assume $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q))$ is independent of the UE index q, because we want to focus on a case with the same $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q))$ for all UEs. This facilitates the extraction of conclusions on the functioning of dynamic TDD and interference mitigation techniques that are not biased by the traffic model. However, it should be clarified that no restriction is imposed on the values of $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q))$ in the proposed algorithms, which ensures their feasibility in general cases. Also note that the aggregate traffic load for each cell should be the product of $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q))$ and the number of served UEs, which roughly injects more than 4 packets into each small per second in case of high traffic load, i.e., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$.

With regard to key performance indicators, UPT is adopted in this paper. According to [35], UPT is defined as the ratio of successfully transmitted bits over the time consumed to transmit the said data bits, where the consumed time starts when the DL/UL packet arrives at the UE DL/UL buffer and ends when the last bit of the DL/UL packet is correctly decoded.

It is important to note that an ideal genie-aided LA mechanism is adopted for both HomSCNs and HetNets in this study. In more detail, appropriate modulation and coding schemes are chosen according to the perceived SINRs *after* the DL/UL transmissions. We make such assumption due to the following reasons:

- Some results in our previous work on dynamic TDD [24] [27] were lacking insights and seemed counter-intuitively small because a simple LA mechanism was assumed therein, and hence the true value of dynamic TDD was not fully revealed, as a result of using such a non-ideal practical link adapter.
- To make a fair performance comparison between dynamic TDD in HomSCNs and in HetNets, a common LA algorithm should be assumed and the ideal genie-aided LA mechanism is a good choice since it provides the performance upper bounds for the considered networks.
- As can be well imagined, the fluctuation of interference in dynamic TDD transmissions should be significantly larger than that in static TDD ones. How to harness such interference fluctuation and perform a good LA function in practical networks are far from trivial, and are out of the scope of this paper. Therefore, considering an ideal genie-aided LA mechanism becomes the logical choice.

It is also important to note that in both our algorithm design and our simulation evaluation, we adopt some ideal assumptions such as the ideal genie-aided LA mechanism, the perfect inter-cell IC function (if considered), the perfect knowledge of $\omega^{\mathrm{DL}}(q)$ and $\omega^{\mathrm{UL}}(q)$ for the instantaneous splitting of dynamic TDD subframes, etc. Our intention is to conduct a performance evaluation to show the *potentials* of dynamic TDD in current and future networks, and it will be our future work to consider more practical assumptions in our study. For example, although it is feasible for a UE to report its UL buffer size to its serving BS in the LTE networks, some mismatch between the reported buffer size and the actual one still exists due to the quantization error and the feedback error [2]. S uch errors should be considered properly in a more detailed study.

VI. HOMSCN RESULTS

In this section, we present numerical results to compare the performance of the existing static TDD scheme in LTE

Release 11 with that of dynamic TDD transmissions in LTE Release 12 and an enhanced version with full flexibility of dynamic TDD configuration, which probably falls into the scope of LTE future releases. We also investigate the performance gains of dynamic TDD with the basic ILIM schemes presented in Section III-B and their combinations. The study is performed for $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = \{0.05, 0.25, 0.45\}$, as explained in Section V.

For LTE future releases, apart from the existing 7 TDD configurations defined for Υ^{homo} in LTE Release 12, another 3 TDD configurations favouring the UL transmissions with DL/UL subframe ratios being 1/9, 2/8, and 3/7, respectively, are added into Υ^{homo}. It should be noted that the DL/UL subframe ratio in LTE Release 12 cannot go below 2/3 [21], while in the hypothetical LTE future release network, the ratio now ranges freely from 1/9 to 9/1, and hence the system can achieve full flexibility of dynamic TDD configuration. The purpose of investigating a hypothetical Υ^{homo} of LTE future releases is to check the performance limit.

Considering the ILIM schemes addressed in Section III-B, the corresponding parameters are explained in the following. For the CC scheme, the coupling loss threshold PL^{CC} for small cells within a cell cluster is chosen as 90 dB [26]. For the ULPB scheme, ΔP^{UL} is set to 10 dB [29]. For the UOIC scheme, the parameter x_1 is set to $x_1 = 9$ dB so that about half of the UEs are labelled as cell-edge UEs and treated in IC in our simulations, reducing the complexity by approximately 50 % compared with the full IC scheme. Besides, for the BOIC scheme, the parameter x_2 is chosen as $x_2 = 120$ dB, leading to around 2.3 BSs treated in IC on average in our simulations. As a result, the complexity of the BOIC scheme is slashed to approximately 2.3/83≈2.77 % compared with the full IC scheme (83 neighbouring BSs in our simulations). Note that an additional parametric study for the proposed UOIC and BOIC schemes could be useful. However, the basic conclusion should be obvious: different x_1 and x_2 parameters can achieve difference balances between complexity and performance, i.e., the proposed UOIC(BOIC) scheme will become the full IC scheme with the highest complexity when $x_1(x_2)$ approaches infinity, and the proposed UOIC(BOIC) scheme will degenerate to the non-IC scheme with the lowest complexity when $x_1(x_2)$ approaches zero. In order to keep our discussion concise and concentrate on the complexity reduction of the proposed partial IC schemes, we omit the parametric study and directly show the efficiency of the proposed UOIC/BOIC scheme using the parameters that achieve comparable performance with the full IC scheme.

A. Performance of DL/UL UPTs with Basic ILIM

In this subsection, we investigate the performance of DL/UL UPTs for dynamic TDD with various basic ILIM schemes:

- Scheme 1: LTE Release 12 baseline static TDD with TDD configuration 3 as in [21], where the DL/UL subframe ratio is 7:3. Note that the assumed TDD DL/UL subframe splitting optimally matches the ratio of $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q))$ over $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q))$ when $T = 10$.
- Scheme 2: LTE Release 12 dynamic TDD (T_0) with no ILIM.
- Scheme 3: LTE Release 12 dynamic TDD (T_1) with no ILIM.
- Scheme 4: Scheme 3 with CC.
- Scheme 5: Scheme 3 with ULPB.
- Scheme 6: Scheme 3 with full IC.
- Scheme 6(a): Scheme 3 with UOIC.
- Scheme 6(b): Scheme 3 with BOIC.
- Scheme 7: Hypothetical LTE future release dynamic TDD (T_1) with full IC.

Here, the periodicities of dynamic TDD reconfiguration are $T_0 = 200$ ms and $T_1 = 10$ ms for comparison purposes. Schemes 6(a) and 6(b) are the proposed partial IC schemes previously discussed in Section III-B.

Table III shows the relative performance gains of dynamic TDD with basic ILIM compared with the static TDD scheme (Scheme 1) in terms of 95-, 50-, and 5-percentile DL/UL UPTs, respectively. The absolute results for Scheme 1 are also provided in Table III so that the absolute results for other schemes can be easily derived.

Compared with the baseline static TDD scheme (Scheme 1), the straightforward dynamic TDD scheme with T_1 (Scheme 3) shows solid gains in most performance categories. However, it shows no gain in terms of the 5-percentile UL UPT when the traffic load is high, i.e.., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$. This is due to the lack of ILIM to mitigate the DL-to-UL interference. Moreover, a faster dynamic TDD configuration time scale (Scheme 3) is shown to outperform a slower one (Scheme 2) in almost every performance category, as previously reported in [23] and [24].

In order to improve performance in terms of the 5-percentile UL UPT, the CC scheme (Scheme 4) can be adopted. Note that the efficiency of the CC scheme degrades when the traffic grows, since the flexibility of dynamic TDD is reduced as all the small cells in a cluster adapt their TDD configuration according to the aggregated traffic in the cluster rather than to their individual traffic conditions. Still, CC brings a considerable improvement of 42.26 % in the 5-percentile UL UPT when the traffic load is high, i.e., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$ at the expense of 10∼20 % sacrifice in DL UPTs compared with the straightforward dynamic TDD scheme (Scheme 3).

The ULPB scheme (Scheme 5) is also quite useful to boost the UL UPTs by 225.14 %∼275.59 % when the traffic load is low to medium, i.e., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) \leq 0.25$, indicating that the UL network is generally power limited. However, when the traffic load is high i.e., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$, the performance gain in terms of the 5-percentile UL UPT, albeit considerable, decreases by 48.28 %, since the power headroom of a cell-edge UE tends to be quickly drained up and increasing UL power leads to more serious UL interference. Overall, ULPB follows a similar trend as CC.

The IC schemes (Schemes 6 & 7) are shown to bring substantial gains in every performance category compared with the baseline static TDD scheme (Schemes 1), for all the considered traffic loads. In particular, among the considered ILIM schemes, the IC schemes (Schemes 6 & 7) provide the largest performance gain of 114.41 %∼125.52 % in terms of

TABLE III
RELATIVE PERFORMANCE GAINS OF DL AND UL UPTS (HOMSCN, BASIC ILIM)

95-percentile UPTs	Sch. 1 (Mbps)	Sch. 2	Sch. 3	Sch. 4	Sch. 5	Sch. 6	Sch. 6(a)	Sch. 6(b)	Sch. 7
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.05$	62.50 (-)	4.92%	25.49%	25.49%	25.49%	25.49%	25.49%	25.49%	25.49%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.25$	57.97 (-)	1.47%	25.45%	23.21%	27.78%	25.45%	25.45%	25.45%	27.78%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$	47.06 (-)	-4.49%	23.19%	11.70%	34.92%	28.40%	23.19%	25.00%	32.81%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.05/2$	13.75 (-)	78.53%	100.69%	102.08%	246.43%	106.38%	102.08%	103.50%	212.90%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.25/2$	12.66 (-)	70.81%	88.10%	89.22%	232.63%	106.54%	97.50%	100.00%	219.19%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.45/2$	10.84 (-)	57.69%	80.88%	74.06%	229.46%	108.42%	88.27%	93.19%	229.46%
50-percentile UPTs	Sch. 1 (Mbps)	Sch. 2	Sch. 3	Sch. 4	Sch. 5	Sch. 6	Sch. 6(a)	Sch. 6(b)	Sch. 7
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.05$	38.83 (-)	-7.21%	24.10%	19.77%	27.16%	24.10%	23.03%	22.62%	24.10%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.25$	23.12 (-)	-4.42%	16.11%	-0.29%	30.08%	22.26%	20.56%	20.98%	21.00%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$	7.18 (-)	14.61%	21.24%	-1.07%	52.39%	48.14%	28.34%	41.01%	53.02%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.05/2$	11.46 (-)	63.85%	92.82%	92.82%	245.54%	98.86%	96.07%	94.97%	195.76%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.25/2$	6.98 (-)	74.43%	91.64%	94.90%	239.05%	143.83%	119.54%	131.98%	258.13%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.45/2$	3.18 (-)	61.70%	69.77%	77.68%	191.88%	156.73%	95.65%	135.36%	209.09%
5-percentile UPTs	Sch. 1 (Mbps)	Sch. 2	Sch. 3	Sch. 4	Sch. 5	Sch. 6	Sch. 6(a)	Sch. 6(b)	Sch. 7
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.05$	17.32 (-)	1.03%	21.80%	13.99%	26.92%	22.87%	20.06%	19.93%	20.27%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.25$	2.76 (-)	65.84%	65.83%	21.91%	91.71%	113.02%	113.64%	98.14%	114.52%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$	0.50 (-)	35.11%	26.84%	6.16%	69.19%	90.02%	70.66%	90.03%	99.06%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.05/2$	6.26 (-)	90.03%	125.42%	116.44%	275.59%	133.67%	129.68%	124.82%	224.94%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.25/2$	2.31 (-)	84.91%	120.20%	141.03%	225.14%	212.25%	181.79%	202.44%	285.11%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.45/2$	0.71 (-)	6.19%	3.60%	42.26%	48.28%	114.41%	65.98%	103.73%	125.52%

the 5-percentile UL UPT with no loss in the DL UPTs when the traffic load is relatively high, e.g., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$.

As for the proposed partial IC schemes, it is interesting to find that the BOIC scheme (Schemes 6(b)) achieves similar results with small losses in every performance category compared with the full IC scheme (Schemes 6). This is because in current networks where small cells are not ultra-densely deployed, only a few BSs are the dominant interferers. Thus, cancelling the DL-to-UL interference from those BSs is already good enough to achieve satisfactory performances [21]. In contrast, the UOIC scheme (Schemes 6(a)) turns out to be much less effective than the BOIC scheme (Schemes 6(b)), especially in improving UL UPTs when the traffic load is medium to high. This is because in realistic scenarios cell-center UEs are also vulnerable to dominant DL-to-UL interference in dynamic TDD, since BS-to-BS path loss could be orders of magnitude smaller than UE-to-BS path loss [21]. As a result, even a cell-center UE with good link quality cannot combat such a large difference in signal reception levels. Thus, we conclude that if partial IC should be used to reduce the complexity/cost of full IC, the BOIC scheme is a much more preferable choice than the UOIC scheme.

Another important note is that compared with our previous work on dynamic TDD in HomSCNs [24], the performance gains of dynamic TDD are considerably larger in this study. In particular, unlike that in [24], the straightforward dynamic TDD scheme (Scheme 3) is shown to be able to work on its own with positive gains in all performance categories over the baseline Scheme 1. This is because an ideal genie-aided LA mechanism is used, as discussed in Section V, so that the full potential of dynamic TDD in HomSCNs can be exposed. This shows the importance of LA and the need for designing a practical LA algorithm in dynamic TDD networks, which will be part of our future work.

As a summary, dynamic TDD provides substantial UTP gains compared to the static TDD, the gains depending on the quality of the considered ILIM scheme. The (partial) IC schemes have been shown to provide the most significant gains at the expense of a higher complexity, and such performance gain in terms of the 5-percentile UL UPT becomes much more obvious when the traffic load is medium to heavy, where the DL-to-UL interference occurs frequently.

B. Performance of DL/UL UPTs with Combined ILIM

In the following, the following combined ILIM schemes are considered:

- Scheme 8: Combined Schemes 4 and 5.
- Scheme 9: Combined Schemes 4 and 6.
- Scheme 10: Combined Schemes 5 and 6.
- Scheme 10(b): Combined Schemes 5 and 6(b).
- Scheme 11: Combined Schemes 4, 5 and 6.
- Scheme 12: Combined Schemes 5 and 7.

Table IV shows the relative performance gains of dynamic TDD with combined ILIM compared with the static TDD scheme (Scheme 1) in terms of 95-, 50-, and 5-percentile DL/UL UPTs. Note that the absolute results for Scheme 1 are also provided in Table IV so that the absolute results for other schemes can be easily obtained.

As can be observed from Table IV, the combined CC and ULPB scheme (Scheme 8) is strictly superior to the combined CC and IC scheme (Scheme 9). This is because the CC scheme and IC scheme are somehow redundant, i.e., the CC scheme already eliminates dominant interfering small cells for the UL by coordination, rendering the IC process less effective. When the traffic load is relatively heavy, e.g., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$, Scheme 8 greatly outperforms the static TDD scheme (Scheme 1) by 25.00 %∼62.68 % and 162.55 %∼250.42 % in terms of the DL and the UL UPTs, respectively.

The combined ULPB and IC scheme (Schemes 10) is the most powerful combination, which substantially increases the UL performance due to the larger transmit power at UEs and

TABLE IV
RELATIVE PERFORMANCE GAINS OF DL AND UL UPTS (HOMSCN, COMBINED ILIM)

95-percentile UPTs	Sch. 1 (Mbps)	Sch. 8	Sch. 9	Sch. 10	Sch. 10(b)	Sch. 11	Sch. 12
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.05$	62.50 (-)	25.49%	25.49%	25.49%	25.49%	25.49%	25.49%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.25$	57.97 (-)	25.45%	23.21%	27.78%	27.78%	25.45%	27.78%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$	47.06 (-)	25.00%	13.33%	34.92%	34.92%	25.00%	37.10%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.05/2$	13.75 (-)	246.43%	104.93%	250.60%	246.43%	250.60%	429.09%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.25/2$	12.66 (-)	243.48%	100.00%	263.22%	255.06%	255.06%	454.39%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.45/2$	10.84 (-)	241.67%	91.19%	288.42%	272.73%	258.25%	495.16%
50-percentile UPTs	Sch. 1 (Mbps)	Sch. 8	Sch. 9	Sch. 10	Sch. 10(b)	Sch. 11	Sch. 12
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.05$	38.83 (-)	24.10%	19.77%	27.16%	24.10%	22.62%	28.75%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.25$	23.12 (-)	20.14%	1.17%	36.45%	36.22%	18.49%	35.69%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$	7.18 (-)	40.83%	4.14%	85.67%	83.83%	45.81%	84.44%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.05/2$	11.46 (-)	252.53%	96.07%	259.79%	252.53%	254.01%	428.79%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.25/2$	6.98 (-)	276.97%	104.64%	381.51%	369.67%	292.47%	653.95%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.45/2$	3.18 (-)	250.42%	92.94%	437.61%	419.71%	267.84%	580.00%
5-percentile UPTs	Sch. 1 (Mbps)	Sch. 8	Sch. 9	Sch. 10	Sch. 10(b)	Sch. 11	Sch. 12
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.05$	17.32 (-)	23.53%	16.29%	29.05%	25.34%	23.76%	26.07%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.25$	2.76 (-)	79.97%	52.70%	136.06%	126.26%	59.93%	151.90%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.45$	0.50 (-)	62.68%	17.99%	153.39%	137.10%	56.98%	171.25%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.05/2$	6.26 (-)	291.72%	117.18%	331.42%	317.32%	291.72%	480.45%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.25/2$	2.31 (-)	353.66%	162.18%	539.48%	518.94%	369.65%	597.27%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.45/2$	0.71 (-)	162.55%	53.74%	303.12%	287.03%	183.24%	366.93%

the IC capabilities at BSs. Some of the tremendous performance gain in the UL is also shown to be transferred to the DL by means of the traffic-adaptive dynamic TDD scheduling. To be more specific, since the performance in the UL is enhanced, some UL subframes can be transformed into DL subframes, thus improving the DL performance. When the traffic load is medium to high, e.g., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) \geq 0.25$, Scheme 10 is shown to significantly outperform the static TDD scheme (Scheme 1) by 27.78 %∼153.39 % and 263.22 %∼539.48 % in terms of the DL and the UL UPTs, respectively. In order to reduce the complexity of IC, the combination of the ULPB and the BOIC schemes (Scheme 10(b)) is proposed here. As can be seen from Table IV, Schemes 10(b) achieves a similar UPT performance compared with Schemes 10, but with a much lower complexity of the IC operations.

Finally, the combination of all three ILIM schemes (Scheme 11) only gives similar performance as that of the combination of CC and ULPB (Scheme 8), which does not justify the employment of IC on top of the joint operation of CC and ULPB. This is again because the CC scheme and IC scheme are somehow redundant. Moreover, the combined ULPB and IC scheme with full flexibility of dynamic TDD configuration (Schemes 12) is investigated to show the performance upper bound. As can be seen from Table IV, Scheme 12 significantly outperforms the static TDD scheme (Scheme 1) by 25.49 %∼171.25 % and 366.93 %∼653.95 % in terms of the DL and the UL UPTs, respectively.

To sum up, if it is preferable to find an easy-to-implement scheme with reasonable performance gains, Scheme 8 should be called upon. But if complexity issue is a minor concern, Scheme 10(b) should be engaged to realize the full potential of dynamic TDD.

VII. HETNET RESULTS

In this section, we present numerical results to benchmark the performance of static/dynamic TDD in HetNets.

We assume that the range expansion bias is $y = 9\,\mathrm{dB}$, as suggested in some previous work on CRE [32]. Moreover, the study is performed for $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = \{0.1, 0.3, 0.5\}$, as explained in Section V. For the considered HetNet, after running Algorithm 2, we found that $f^{\mathrm{M,DL}} = 5$, $f^{\mathrm{M,UL}} = 3$, $A^{\mathrm{opt}} = 2$, and that approximately 1/3 of macrocell UEs are offloaded to small cells. Thus, 5 subframes in every 10 subframes are used as dynamic TDD subframes in small cells, i.e., $f^{\mathrm{S,dynTDD}} = 5$.

In this light, the following schemes are considered for benchmarking,

- Scheme A (Static TDD scheme without CRE and ABS): LTE Release 12 TDD configuration 3 for both macrocells and small cells (DL/UL subframe ratio = 7:3 [21]).
- Scheme B (Straightforward dynamic TDD scheme without CRE and ABS): macrocell (DL/UL subframe ratio = 7:3), small cell (dynamic TDD without CRE and ABS). Note that Algorithm 2 is used to determine the dynamic TDD DL/UL subframe splitting for the small cells.
- Scheme C (Static TDD scheme with CRE and ABS): macrocell (DL/ABS/UL subframe ratio = 5:2:3), small cell (DL/UL subframe ratio = 7:3). Note that the scheduling policy in [32] is adopted where DL packets of ER UEs should be scheduled with a high priority in subframes overlapping with the macrocell ABSs and that they should not be scheduled in subframes overlapping with the macrocell DL subframes.
- Scheme D (Proposed scheme without IC): macrocell (DL/ABS/UL subframe ratio = 5:2:3), small cell (DL/dynamic TDD subframe ratio = 5:5), dynamic TDD reconfiguration per 10 ms, and no IC.
- Scheme E: Scheme D plus small cell DL to macrocell UL IC.
- Scheme F: Scheme E plus small cell DL to small cell UL full IC, i.e., Scheme 6 in Section VI.
- Scheme F(b): Scheme E plus the BS oriented small cell DL to small cell UL partial IC, i.e., Scheme 6(b) in

Section VI.

Table V shows the relative performance gains of the considered schemes compared with the baseline static TDD scheme (Scheme A) in terms of 95-, 50-, and 5-percentile DL/UL UPTs. Note that the absolute results for Scheme A are also provided in Table V so that the absolute results for other schemes can be easily obtained. Moreover, in Table V, apart from the overall performances, the UPT results are broken down to show the contributions from the macrocell and the small cell tiers, respectively.

As it can be seen from Table V, it is easy to conclude that the straightforward dynamic TDD in the small cell tier (Scheme B) leads to substantial performance degradation in the UL of a HetNet, particularly for the macrocell tier, i.e., macrocell UL UPTs degradation of up to 88.27 %. This is due to the significant inter-tier DL-to-UL interference, which indicates the great difficulties in introducing dynamic TDD into HetNets, if inter-link interference is not properly managed. Similar observations were drawn for HomSCNs in Section VI. In contrast, Scheme B leads to performance gains in the DL of a HetNet, especially for the small cell tier, because the scheduler favours the UL in the small cell tier to combat the above mentioned strong inter-tier DL-to-UL interference, and thus the interference experienced by the DL transmissions in the small cell tier is significantly reduced. However, the observed gains in the DL UPTs do not justify the use of Scheme B in a HetNet, because the UL UPT reductions are enormous.

Let us now compare the baseline scheme (Scheme A) with the static TDD scheme with CRE and ABS operations (Scheme C). When the traffic load is low, e.g., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$, the performance gains of Scheme C are low. This is because interference is not a severe problem, and thus the gain of eICIC is small or even negative. The 95-percentile macrocell DL UPT suffers from a loss of 10.79 % because 2 subframes have been converted from DL to ABS, resulting in a moderate resource shortage. In contrast, when the traffic load is medium to high, e.g., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) \geq 0.3$, in other words, when the interference is high, it can be seen that the performance gains of Scheme C are significant in almost all categories. The only exception is that the 50-percentile and the 5-percentile UL UPTs of small cell UEs suffer from a slight performance loss of 6.66 %$\sim$ 16.87 %. This negative impact is mostly caused due to the larger number of small cell UEs to share the small cell resources, as a result of macrocell offloading through range expansion. Having said that, it is important to notice that the 50-percentile and the 5-percentile UL UPTs of all UEs together still rise by 121.28 %$\sim$380.98 %, indicating that CRE and eICIC benefit UL performance in general. This is because the RAN has been brought closer to small cell ER UEs, thus greatly improving the qualities of ULs.

Regarding Scheme F, when the traffic load is low, e.g., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$, the 95-percentile small cell DL UPT and the 95-percentile small cell UL UPT are basically contributed by cell-interior UEs. This is because these UEs suffer from low inter-cell interference and the IC function is engaged to mitigate inter-link interference. Besides, when the traffic load is low, the coupling of DL scheduling and UL scheduling is quite weak. Hence, the UPT gains are mainly determined by the amount of additional transmission subframes in the DL or in the UL. Considering that in dynamic TDD the numbers of the available DL and UL subframes per 10 subframes respectively increase from 7 to 9 and from 3 to 5, the UPT gains of Scheme F compared with Scheme C in terms of the 95-percentile small cell DL UPT and the 95-percentile small cell UL UPT should be around 2/7 and 3/5, respectively. The corresponding numerical results Table V confirm this observation, indicating 95-percentile small cell DL UPT and the 95-percentile small cell UL UPT gains around 26 %((1.7467-1.3884)/1.3884) and 63 %((1.8519-1.1381)/1.1381), respectively. Note that such insightful observation cannot be obtained in our previous work [27] because of the non-ideal link adaptor.

As can be further observed from Table V, compared with Scheme C, the proposed schemes (Schemes D, E and F) achieve superior performances in all DL UPT categories. The additional gains on top of those of Scheme C over Scheme A are particularly significant for the small cell tier. To be more specific, additional gains of 35.83 %(74.67 %-38.84 %)$\sim$55.55 %(122.22 %-66.67 %), 34.72 %(60.28 %-25.56 %)$\sim$89.93 %(201.15 %-111.22 %), and 56.96 %(44.60 %-(-12.36 %))$\sim$162.56 %(209.30 %-46.74 %) can be observed in terms of 95-, 50- and 5-percentile small cell DL UPTs, respectively. The reason for these extra gains is that dynamic TDD is able to divert idle UL subframes for DL usage, thus boosting DL capacity. In the proposed scheduling policy, an ER UE may occupy as many as 5 dynamic TDD subframes for its DL transmission, thus greatly improving the 5-percentile small cell DL UPT.

As for the UL UPT, gains or losses maybe observed depending on the tier and the used scheme. When the traffic load is low to medium, e.g., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) \leq$0.3, the small cell UL UPT performance of the proposed schemes (Schemes D, E and F) improves. In more detail, extra performance gains of 52.70 %(68.57 %-15.87 %)$\sim$75.35 %(91.22 %-15.87 %), 36.95 %(29.56 %-(-7.39 %))$\sim$66.28 %(65.71 %-(-0.57 %)) and 43.80 %(37.14 %-(-6.66 %))$\sim$60.34 %(48.40 %-(-11.94 %)) are observed for the proposed schemes on top of those for Scheme C in terms of 95-, 50- and 5-percentile small cell UL UPTs, respectively. The story is different for the macrocell tier, when using Scheme D. In this case, macrocell UL UPTs suffer from a severe performance degradation as high as 79.87 %, indicating that the inter-tier inter-link interference from the small cell DL is overwhelming for the macrocell UL. Thus, the inter-tier small cell DL to macrocell UL IC is necessary for the macrocell UL to efficiently function, if small cell dynamic TDD operation is introduced into HetNets. When the traffic load is relatively high, e.g., $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.5$, the small cell UL UPT performance of the proposed schemes (Schemes D, E) improves but not as much as with low to medium traffic loads. In more detail, extra performance gains of 40.74 %(49.09 %-8.35 %), 21.68 %(4.81 %-(-16.87 %)) and 7.66 %(-3.71 %-(-11.37 %)) are observed for the proposed

TABLE V
RELATIVE PERFORMANCE GAINS OF DL AND UL UPTS (HETNETS)

95-percentile UPTs (overall)	Sch. A (Mbps)	Sch. B	Sch. C	Sch. D	Sch. E	Sch. F	Sch. F(b)
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$	42.55 (-)	11.90%	9.30%	38.24%	40.30%	38.24%	38.24%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.3$	15.81 (-)	54.75%	91.88%	155.56%	155.56%	158.16%	158.16%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.5$	11.20 (-)	63.76%	97.40%	166.42%	162.50%	166.42%	164.44%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.1/2$	13.58 (-)	-25.99%	17.81%	79.59%	79.92%	83.28%	82.94%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.3/2$	12.16 (-)	-30.00%	14.46%	71.35%	72.25%	95.83%	84.83%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.5/2$	11.50 (-)	-32.21%	10.05%	50.54%	47.63%	75.63%	65.28%
50-percentile UPTs (overall)	Sch. A (Mbps)	Sch. B	Sch. C	Sch. D	Sch. E	Sch. F	Sch. F(b)
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$	17.62 (-)	21.39%	18.23%	36.75%	36.75%	36.75%	36.75%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.3$	2.19 (-)	41.86%	285.02%	432.07%	425.94%	435.19%	422.92%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.5$	0.88 (-)	27.83%	299.10%	476.37%	468.79%	488.31%	478.20%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.1/2$	9.96 (-)	-36.77%	7.07%	45.47%	56.84%	59.33%	57.05%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.3/2$	3.20 (-)	-84.26%	121.28%	176.60%	188.07%	215.71%	201.26%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.5/2$	1.29 (-)	-80.67%	267.63%	317.01%	326.45%	399.47%	368.58%
5-percentile UPTs (overall)	Sch. A (Mbps)	Sch. B	Sch. C	Sch. D	Sch. E	Sch. F	Sch. F(b)
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$	6.13 (-)	7.95%	4.34%	37.84%	37.84%	38.72%	38.72%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.3$	0.16 (-)	21.51%	439.40%	492.22%	493.72%	494.22%	493.72%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.5$	0.09 (-)	3.71%	153.15%	172.46%	170.47%	171.55%	170.28%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.1/2$	3.43 (-)	-61.65%	51.94%	-25.50%	78.90%	79.34%	79.34%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.3/2$	0.30 (-)	-84.21%	380.98%	-74.29%	413.76%	417.71%	412.59%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.5/2$	0.13 (-)	-72.09%	165.06%	-57.66%	193.40%	210.47%	205.88%
95-percentile UPTs (macrocells)	Sch. A (Mbps)	Sch. B	Sch. C	Sch. D	Sch. E	Sch. F	Sch. F(b)
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$	47.20 (-)	0.47%	-10.79%	-10.79%	-11.58%	-10.79%	-10.79%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.3$	6.04 (-)	18.61%	209.90%	215.82%	215.82%	215.97%	212.83%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.5$	2.92 (-)	9.59%	159.20%	174.26%	170.47%	174.26%	174.26%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.1/2$	13.08 (-)	-33.71%	24.69%	-20.20%	26.38%	29.00%	27.33%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.3/2$	5.12 (-)	-87.22%	70.14%	-76.66%	89.80%	89.80%	89.71%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.5/2$	2.08 (-)	-86.27%	152.76%	-79.34%	184.90%	185.24%	177.72%
50-percentile UPTs (macrocells)	Sch. A (Mbps)	Sch. B	Sch. C	Sch. D	Sch. E	Sch. F	Sch. F(b)
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$	17.47 (-)	0.00%	8.53%	9.05%	9.05%	9.57%	9.31%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.3$	0.89 (-)	4.73%	295.75%	308.74%	309.48%	309.11%	306.51%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.5$	0.29 (-)	5.66%	265.23%	282.56%	282.06%	285.02%	283.83%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.1/2$	8.02 (-)	-51.97%	23.51%	-36.07%	26.01%	26.33%	25.69%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.3/2$	1.03 (-)	-88.27%	247.12%	-79.87%	272.84%	280.16%	275.01%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.5/2$	0.44 (-)	-80.54%	171.67%	-73.01%	209.91%	220.84%	214.40%
5-percentile UPTs (macrocells)	Sch. A (Mbps)	Sch. B	Sch. C	Sch. D	Sch. E	Sch. F	Sch. F(b)
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$	5.72 (-)	-4.45%	13.88%	20.41%	20.24%	21.01%	21.07%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.3$	0.12 (-)	14.05%	298.88%	305.64%	307.90%	309.19%	308.71%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.5$	0.08 (-)	0.31%	91.85%	95.06%	94.94%	96.29%	95.36%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.1/2$	2.87 (-)	-65.84%	53.68%	-41.92%	62.30%	62.99%	61.79%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.3/2$	0.23 (-)	-82.38%	249.81%	-76.62%	268.03%	274.18%	268.29%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.5/2$	0.11 (-)	-74.12%	58.54%	-68.27%	73.05%	82.26%	76.25%
95-percentile UPTs (small cells)	Sch. A (Mbps)	Sch. B	Sch. C	Sch. D	Sch. E	Sch. F	Sch. F(b)
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$	36.94 (-)	29.39%	38.84%	74.67%	74.67%	74.67%	74.67%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.3$	20.00 (-)	53.61%	66.67%	122.22%	117.39%	122.22%	117.39%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.5$	15.29 (-)	51.56%	61.63%	112.68%	111.22%	115.14%	114.50%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.1/2$	13.85 (-)	-23.40%	13.81%	80.56%	80.56%	85.19%	82.85%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.3/2$	12.83 (-)	-31.52%	15.87%	70.37%	68.57%	91.22%	86.70%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.5/2$	12.38 (-)	-32.14%	8.35%	50.93%	49.09%	72.73%	61.14%
50-percentile UPTs (small cells)	Sch. A (Mbps)	Sch. B	Sch. C	Sch. D	Sch. E	Sch. F	Sch. F(b)
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$	17.70 (-)	45.81%	25.56%	60.28%	60.28%	60.28%	59.15%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.3$	6.62 (-)	64.27%	86.00%	158.89%	157.23%	160.56%	157.23%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.5$	3.17 (-)	63.06%	111.22%	195.31%	187.80%	201.15%	195.32%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.1/2$	11.49 (-)	-23.01%	-0.57%	59.63%	61.11%	65.71%	60.37%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.3/2$	9.98 (-)	-40.19%	-7.39%	29.56%	30.62%	43.47%	35.93%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.5/2$	7.84 (-)	-54.34%	-16.87%	4.81%	4.38%	20.39%	12.55%
5-percentile UPTs (small cells)	Sch. A (Mbps)	Sch. B	Sch. C	Sch. D	Sch. E	Sch. F	Sch. F(b)
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$	7.28 (-)	58.61%	-12.36%	44.60%	45.31%	45.49%	44.28%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.3$	1.10 (-)	56.61%	46.74%	208.88%	196.80%	209.30%	189.65%
DL $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.5$	0.49 (-)	53.18%	66.79%	187.80%	176.36%	222.03%	215.88%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.1/2$	6.76 (-)	-26.98%	-11.94%	44.27%	45.41%	48.40%	43.71%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.3/2$	3.78 (-)	-38.84%	-6.66%	37.14%	38.71%	51.25%	34.63%
UL $\lambda^{\mathrm{UL}}(u(q)) = 0.5/2$	2.05 (-)	-68.04%	-11.37%	-3.71%	-4.40%	31.14%	26.56%

schemes (Schemes D and E) on top of those for Scheme C in terms of 95-, 50- and 5-percentile UL UPTs, respectively. This shows that inter-tier IC is helpless in dealing with inter-link interference inside the small cell tier. In contrast, the proposed Scheme F with the required double IC, i.e., inter-tier small cell DL to macrocell UL IC and DL-to-UL IC in the small cell tier, considerably outperforms Scheme C, providing additional gains of 64.38 %(72.73 %-8.35 %), 37.26 %(20.39 %-(-16.87 %) and 42.51 %(31.14 %-(-11.37 %)) in terms of 95-, 50- and 5-percentile UL UPTs, respectively. Double IC is thus necessary to aid the UL at high traffic loads.

It is important to note that the proposed partial IC scheme, i.e., Scheme F(b), turns out to be very efficient, resulting in small performance losses and low complexity compared with Scheme F (full IC). Therefore, we conclude that for the used of dynamic TDD in HetNets, Scheme F(b) is a good choice, which strikes a beneficial balance between performance and complexity. Its nearly perfect score sheet is due to two reasons, i.e., *(i)* the CRE, ABS and small cell DL to macrocell UL IC operations handle the inter-tier interference that paves the way for efficient dynamic TDD transmissions in the small cell tier, and *(ii)* the adaptive dynamic TDD transmission, the IC operation to mitigate the small cell DL to small cell UL interference together with the proposed scheduling policy in the small cell tier make the best of the transmission opportunities created by macrocell ABS and UL subframes. The only downside of Scheme F(b) is that the 95-percentile macrocell DL UPT suffers from a loss of 10.79 % when $\lambda^{\mathrm{DL}}(u(q)) = 0.1$. As explained earlier for Scheme D, this is because macrocells experience resource shortage when the traffic load is low due to the ABS operation of muting 2 subframes per 10 subframes.

VIII. Comparison of Dynamic TDD Operations in HomSCNs and HetNets

Our study is coherent for both HomSCNs and HetNets, because *(i)* the optimization objectives are same for both network scenarios, *(ii)* the additional complication of scheduler in HetNets compared with that in HomSCNs is removed by the ideal genie-aided LA mechanism, and *(iii)* LTE-compliant DL/UL MIMO operations are considered for both network scenarios. Therefore, the performance results of HomSCNs and those of HetNets can be compared head to head, and thus we can draw some useful insights on the application of dynamic TDD in future networks as follows.

Remark 1. *A higher flexibility of TDD configurations promises higher potential performance gains of dynamic TDD.*

From Table III and Table V, it can be observed that the performance gain of dynamic TDD is smaller in HetNets than that in HomSCNs, especially in the UL. This is mainly because only limited flexibility of dynamic TDD can be achieved in HetNets due to the existence of ABSs and the restrictions it imposes on dynamic TDD transmissions. In more detail, in the HomSCNs, all subframes can be dynamic TDD subframes, and the DL-to-UL subframe ratio ranges from 2:3 (LTE Release 12) or 1:9 (LTE future releases) to 9:1, as discussed in Section VI. In contrast, in the HetNet small cell tier, the DL-to-UL subframe ratio ranges from 5:5 to 9:1, since not all subframes can be dynamic TDD subframes, as discussed in Section VII. Hence, compared with dynamic TDD in HetNets, it's counterpart in HomSCNs benefits form a much wider range of DL-to-UL subframe ratios, leading to larger performance gains due to the traffic-adaptive scheduling.

Remark 2. *Interference mitigation is more crucial for the successful dynamic TDD operation in HetNets than in HomSCNs.*

As can be seen from Table III and Table V, we can conclude that interference mitigation is more crucial for the successful dynamic TDD operation in HetNets than that in HomSCNs. In more detail, the straightforward dynamic TDD operation is able to stand on its own with positive performance gains in HomSCNs (see Scheme 1 vs. Scheme 3 in Table III), while the straightforward dynamic TDD operation suffers from huge performance losses in HetNets (see Scheme A vs. Scheme B or Scheme C vs. Scheme D in Table V), particularly in terms of the macrocell UL UPTs due to the devastating interference from small cell DL to macrocell UL. Hence, proper interference mitigation must be in place to handle the inter-tier inter-link interference for dynamic TDD in HetNets.

Remark 3. *Proper LA algorithms are essential for both HomSCNs and HetNets to reap the performance gains offered by dynamic TDD.*

Comparing the results of a given dynamic TDD scheme in this study and those in our previous work [24] and [27], we can find that some results in [24] and [27] were lack of insights and seemed counter-intuitively small because a simple LA mechanism was assumed in our previous work, and hence the potential gains of dynamic TDD were not fully reaped. Such examples include Scheme 3 for the HomSCNs as discussed in VI, Scheme B for the HetNets as discussed in VII, etc. Therefore, it is very important for dynamic TDD networks, both HomSCNs and HetNets, to have proper LA algorithms to predict the drastic interference fluctuation due to the dynamic and non-uniform TDD configurations in neighbouring cells.

IX. Conclusion

In this paper, using a unified framework, we present new results on dynamic TDD transmissions in both HomSCNs and HetNets, and we draw the following conclusion,

- The dynamic TDD with (partial) IC is shown to provide large gains, especially in terms of the 5-percentile UL UPT, when the traffic load is medium to relatively high.
- The combination of CC and IC, with or without ULPB, is not an efficient strategy because the CC scheme and IC scheme are somehow redundant.
- The combination of CC and ULPB is recommended for low-complexity implementation, while that of ULPB and IC can bring much more performance gains at the expense of higher complexity.

In our study on dynamic TDD in HetNets, we show that in order to make dynamic TDD operate properly in HetNets,

- Small cell DL to macrocell UL IC is indispensable for the macrocells to achieve reasonable UL UPTs.
- Another DL-to-UL IC in the small cell tier is required to mitigate the inter-link interference among small cells, especially when the traffic load is medium or high.
- The proposed BOIC scheme results in small performance losses and low complexity compared with the full IC scheme, making it a good choice for practical use.

To improve the feasibility and the generality of the proposed algorithms, as future work, we will consider more practical assumptions in our study such as errors in buffer size, investigate practical LA algorithms and more practical non-IC receivers, as well as use theories such as machine learning techniques, game theory, distributed optimization, etc., to design low-complexity algorithms, particularly for dynamic TDD in HetNets.

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank all the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and constructive suggestions to improve early drafts of this paper.

REFERENCES

[1] Cisco, Cisco Visual Networking Index: Global Mobile Data Traffic Forecast Update, 2011−2016. Feb. 2012.
[2] S. Sesia, I. Toufik, M. Baker, LTE: The UMTS Long Term Evolution (2nd Edition). John Wiley and Sons, USA, 2011.
[3] D. López-Pérez, M. Ding, H. Claussen, and A. Jafari, "Towards 1 Gbps/UE in Cellular Systems: Understanding Ultra-Dense Small Cell Deployments," *IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 2078-2101, Jun. 2015.
[4] ETSI MCC, Draft Report of 3GPP TSG RAN meeting #66. Dec. 2014.
[5] H. Zhang, C. Jiang, J. Cheng, V. C. M. Leung, "Cooperative interference mitigation and handover management for heterogeneous cloud small cell networks," *IEEE Mag. on Wireless Commun.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 92-99, Jun. 2015.
[6] H. Zhang, X. Chu, W. Guo, S. Wang, "Coexistence of Wi-Fi and heterogeneous small cell networks sharing unlicensed spectrum," *IEEE Comm. Mag.*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 158-164, Mar. 2015.
[7] Z. Luo, M. Ding, H. Luo, "CC On/Off Scheduling Using Learning-Based Prediction for LTE in the Unlicensed Spectrum," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 19, no. 12, pp. 2158-2161, Dec. 2015.
[8] Y. Qin, M. Ding, M. Zhang, H. Yu, H. Luo, "Relaying Robust Beamforming for Device-to-Device Communication with Channel Uncertainty," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 18, no. 10, pp. 1859-1862, Oct. 2014.
[9] Y. Niu, C. Gao, Y. Li, L. Su, D. Jin, A. V. Vasilakos, "Exploiting Device-to-Device Communications in Joint Scheduling of Access and Backhaul for mmWave Small Cells," IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, vol. 33, no. 10, pp. 2052-2069, Oct. 2015.
[10] H. Zhang, C. Jiang, N. C. Beaulieu, X. Chu, X. Wang, T. Q. S. Quek, "Resource allocation for cognitive small cell networks: A cooperative bargaining game theoretic approach," *IEEE Trans. on Wireless Commun.*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 3481-3493, Jun. 2015.
[11] H. Zhang, C. Jiang, X. Mao, H. Chen, "Interference-limited resource optimization in cognitive femtocells with fairness and imperfect spectrum sensing," to appear in *IEEE Trans. on Vehicular Technology*.
[12] H. Zhang, C. Jiang, N. C. Beaulieu, X. Chu, X. Wen, M. Tao, "Resource allocation in spectrum-sharing OFDMA femtocells with heterogeneous services," *IEEE Trans. on Commun.*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 2366-2377, July 2014.
[13] D. López-Pérez, X. Chu, A.V. Vasilakos, H. Claussen, "On Distributed and Coordinated Resource Allocation for Interference Mitigation in Self-Organizing LTE Networks," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 1145-1158, Aug. 2013.
[14] D. López-Pérez, X. Chu, A.V. Vasilakos, H. Claussen, "Power Minimization Based Resource Allocation for Interference Mitigation in OFDMA Femtocell Networks," IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 333-344, Feb. 2014.
[15] J. G. Andrews, "Seven ways that HetNets are a cellular paradigm shift," *IEEE Comm. Mag.*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp.136-144, Mar. 2013.
[16] D. López-Pérez, I. Guvenc, Guillaume de la Roche, M. Kountouris, T. Q. S. Quek and J. Zhang, "Enhanced Inter-cell Interference Coordination Challenges in Heterogeneous Networks," *IEEE Wireless Comm. Mag.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 22-30, Jun., 2011.
[17] D. López-Pérez, C. Xiaoli, I. Guvenc, "On the expanded region of picocells in heterogeneous networks," *IEEE Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 281-294, Jun. 2012.
[18] M. Ding, D. López-Pérez, G. Mao, P. Wang, and Z. Lin, Will the Area Spectral Efficiency Monotonically Grow as Small Cells Go Dense?,17to appear in IEEE Globecom 2015, arXiv: 1505.01920 [cs.NI], Dec. 2015.
[19] M. Ding, P. Wang, D. López-Pérez, G. Mao, and Z. Lin, Performance Impact of LoS and NLoS Transmissions in Dense Cellular Networks,17to appear in *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, arXiv:1503.04251 [cs.IT], Dec. 2015.
[20] M. Ding, D. López-Pérez, G. Mao, and Z. Lin, DNA-GA: A New Approach of Network Performance Analysis,17submitted to IEEE ICC 2016, arXiv:1512.05429 [cs.IT], Dec. 2015.
[21] 3GPP, "TS 36.213 (V11.3.0): Physical layer procedures (Release 11)," Jun. 2013.
[22] C. I, C. Rowell, S. Han, Z. Xu, G. Li, Z. Pan, "Toward green and soft: a 5G perspective," *IEEE Comm. Mag.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 66-73, Feb. 2014.
[23] Z. Shen, A. Khoryaev, E. Eriksson, X. Pan, "Dynamic uplink-downlink configuration and interference management in TD-LTE," *IEEE Comm. Mag.*, vol. 50, no. 11, pp. 51-59, Nov. 2012.
[24] M. Ding, D. López-Pérez, A. V. Vasilakos, and W. Chen, "Dynamic TDD transmissions in homogeneous small cell networks," *IEEE ICC 2014*, pp. 616-621, Jun. 2014.
[25] S. Song, Y. Chang, H. Xu, D. Zheng, and D. Yang, "Energy efficiency model based on stochastic geometry in dynamic TDD cellular networks," *IEEE ICC 2014*, pp. 889-894, Jun. 2014.
[26] 3GPP, "TR 36.828 (V11.0.0): Further enhancements to LTE Time Division Duplex (TDD) for Downlink-Uplink (DL-UL) interference management and traffic adaptation (Release 11)," Jun. 2012.
[27] M. Ding, D. López-Pérez, R. Xue, A. V. Vasilakos, and W. Chen, "Small Cell Dynamic TDD Transmissions in Heterogeneous Networks," *IEEE ICC 2014*, pp. 4881-4887, Jun. 2014.
[28] Sharp, "R1-132350: DL power control based interference mitigation for eIMTA," 3GPP RAN1 Meeting #73, Fukuoka, Japan, May, 2013.
[29] Sharp, "R1-132351: UL power control based interference mitigation for eIMTA," 3GPP RAN1 Meeting #73, Fukuoka, Japan, May, 2013.
[30] A. Galindo-Serrano, L. Giupponi, "Distributed Q-Learning for Aggregated Interference Control in Cognitive Radio Networks," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 1823-1834, May 2010.
[31] L. Giupponi, A. Galindo-Serrano, P. Blasco, M. Dohler, "Docitive networks: an emerging paradigm for dynamic spectrum management [Dynamic Spectrum Management]," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 47-54, Aug. 2010.
[32] Nokia Siemens Networks, Nokia, "R1-132304: Enhanced fast ABS adaptation for Rel-12 small cell scenario 1," 3GPP RAN1 Meeting #73, Fukuoka, Japan, May, 2013.
[33] D. López-Pérez and H.Claussen, "Duty cycles and load balancing in HetNets with eICIC almost blank subframes," *IEEE PIMRC*, London, UK, pp. 1-6, Sep. 2013.
[34] http://wnt.sjtu.edu.cn/flint/html/index.html
[35] 3GPP, "TR 36.814 (V9.0.0): Further advancements for E-UTRA physical layer aspects (Release 9)," Mar. 2010.
[36] 3GPP, "TS 36.104 (V11.4.0): Base Station (BS) radio transmission and reception," Mar. 2013.