

Optimal Discrete Constellation Inputs for Aggregated LiFi-WiFi Networks

Shuai Ma, Fan Zhang, Songtao Lu, Hang Li, *Member, IEEE*, Ruixin Yang, Sihua Shao, Jiaheng Wang, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Shiyin Li

Abstract—In this paper, we investigate the performance of a practical aggregated LiFi-WiFi system with the discrete constellation inputs from a practical view. We derive the achievable rate expressions of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system for the first time. Then, we study the rate maximization problem via optimizing the constellation distribution and power allocation jointly. Specifically, a multilevel mercy-filling power allocation scheme is proposed by exploiting the relationship between the mutual information and minimum mean-squared error (MMSE) of discrete inputs. Meanwhile, an inexact gradient descent method is proposed for obtaining the optimal probability distributions. To strike a balance between the computational complexity and the transmission performance, we further develop a framework that maximizes the lower bound of the achievable rate where the optimal power allocation can be obtained in closed forms and the constellation distributions problem can be solved efficiently by Frank-Wolfe method. Extensive numerical results show that the optimized strategies are able to provide significant gains over the state-of-the-art schemes in terms of the achievable rate.

Index Terms—Aggregated LiFi-WiFi system, power allocation, probabilities allocation, discrete constellation inputs.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Motivation and Contributions

The increasing number of Internet of Things (IoT) devices exerts tremendous bandwidth burden continuously on the wireless networks. According to Ericsson' report [1], more than 80% of the wireless data are generated in indoor environments. Visible light communication (VLC) or light fidelity (LiFi), with a vast license-free visible band in 400-790 THz, can support both high speed data transmission and illumination simultaneously. LiFi exploits the off-the-shelf light emitting diodes (LEDs) and photodiodes (PDs) as transceivers, which can be integrated into IoT devices. Although LiFi serves as a competitive candidate for the next generation wireless solution, its vulnerability to the blockage and small its signal coverage still impose many challenges on various indoor applications. Therefore, a more practical solution is to aggregate the LiFi

and WiFi systems and exploit their unique advantages under certain conditions.

In this paper, we consider an aggregated LiFi-WiFi system from a practical communication perspective. First of all, we derive the achievable rate expression of the system with the discrete constellation input signals, rather than the Gaussian inputs adopted in most of the existing works. Then, we further investigate the optimal input distribution and power allocation for the considered system. Our results provide a relatively practical design framework for the aggregated LiFi-WiFi communication system. Specifically, the main contributions of this work are given as follows:

- Generally, the inputs of the practical communications systems follow an finite-set discrete distribution rather than Gaussian distributions. To obtain the performance description of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system with an arbitrary discrete distribution, we derive the achievable rate expressions of LiFi links and WiFi links, respectively. Comparing with the existing rate expressions with equiprobable discrete constellation points, the derived results are more general and practical. Given that such rate expression is not in closed-form, we further derive both the lower and the upper bounds. All these results can be used as the performance metric for the considered system.
- We jointly optimize the discrete constellation input distribution and the power allocation to maximize the derived achievable rate. To handle this non-convex problem, we propose a multi-level mercy-filling method to obtain the suboptimal power allocation scheme, which exploits the relationship between the mutual information and the minimum mean square error (MMSE). The optimal probability distributions of the discrete constellation are calculated by the inexact gradient descent method.
- To reduce the computation complexity in the previous design problem, we further adopt the derived lower bound as the performance metric. Specifically, we jointly optimize the discrete constellation input distribution and the power allocation to maximize the derived lower bound. To overcome the difficulty of the nonconvex problem, we iteratively optimize the power allocation and discrete probability distribution, where the optimal power allocation scheme is derived with closed expression, and the discrete probability distribution sub-problems is optimized via the proposed Frank-Wolfe method.

S. Ma, F. Zhang, R. Yang and S. Li are with the School of Information and Control Engineering, China University of Mining and Technology, Xuzhou 221116, China. (e-mail: {mashuai001;zhangfan; ray.young; lishiyin}@cumt.edu.cn).

S. Lu is with the IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598 USA (e-mail: songtao@ibm.com).

H. Li is with the Shenzhen Research Institute of Big Data, Shenzhen 518172, Guangdong, China. (email: hangdavidli@163.com).

S. Shao is with the Department of Electrical Engineering, New Mexico Tech, Socorro, NM 87801 USA. (email: sihua.shao@nmt.edu).

J. Wang is with the National Mobile Communications Research Laboratory, Southeast University, Nanjing 210096, China, and also with the Purple Mountain Laboratories, Nanjing 211111, China. (e-mail: jhwang@seu.edu.cn).

B. Related Works and Organization

There are two schemes for the LiFi-WiFi transmission: hard-switching (hybrid) [2]–[12] and aggregating [10]–[15]. The former realizes the transmission via LiFi link or WiFi link, while the later uses both links simultaneously. In general, the former scheme usually results in a lower spectral efficiency and may cause frequent link switches. The LiFi-WiFi aggregated systems, on the contrary, can increase the system data rate and provide reliable communication.

The LiFi-WiFi aggregated system receives great attentions in recent years. For example, by leveraging the bonding technique in the Linux operating system, the authors in [10] prove that the aggregated system outperforms the conventional WiFi. Based on the cross-layer analysis of the physical and datalink layers, link selection approaches were proposed in [11] to maximize the average data arrival rate and minimize the non-asymptotic bounds on data buffering delay. In [12], the coverage probability and rate were analyzed for the aggregated RF/VLC networks. It has been shown that selecting the correct intensity of OBSs (optical BSs) plays a crucial role, and the performance of the aggregated scheme outperforms all other schemes (RF-only, VLC-only, and opportunistic RF/VLC). In [13], the access point selection strategies were optimized via the multi-armed bandit scheme. In [14], both subchannel allocation and power control scheme were developed for improving the energy efficiency of the aggregated VLC/RF network.

In most of existing works, e.g. [7]–[15], the achievable rate of the considered system is derived based on the assumption that the input signal follows the Gaussian distribution. However, Gaussian signals may not be an accurate representation of the inputs in practical communication systems. The inputs of the practical RF-only system are always generated based on the discrete constellations, such as pulse amplitude modulation (PAM), quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM), and phase shift keying (PSK), etc., rather than the Gaussian codebook. Thus, those resource allocation strategies based on the Gaussian assumption would lead to serious performance loss. It has been shown that the mutual information maximization strategies can improve performance of the practical communications systems [16]. Meanwhile, it is proved that the optimal inputs of the VLC-only system follow a finite-set discrete distribution [17]. Although some existing works studied the achievable rate based on the discrete constellation points with equal probability [16], [18]–[22], those results cannot be directly extended to the LiFi-WiFi systems with arbitrary discrete inputs. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the optimal transmission scheme with the discrete inputs for the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We provide the model of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system in Section II. The optimal power allocation and optimal probability distributions schemes of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system are presented in Section III. In Section IV, we provide the solutions for the lower bound as the throughput metric. The simulation results are presented in Section V. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper.

Notations: $(\cdot)^T$, $(\cdot)^*$, $\|\cdot\|$, and $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$ represent the transpose, conjugate, Frobenius norm, and trace of a matrix respectively. The Hadamard product of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} is denoted as $\mathbf{A} \odot \mathbf{B}$. $\mathcal{M} \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ and $\mathcal{N} \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$.

II. SYSTEM MODEL




Fig. 1. Schematic diagram of an aggregated LiFi-WiFi system.

As illustrated in Fig. 1, we consider the downlink transmission of an aggregated LiFi-WiFi system, where the transmitter is equipped with single LED and single WiFi antenna, and the receiver is equipped with single PD and single RF antenna. The transmitter simultaneously transmits information via both the LiFi link and the WiFi link, where the bandwidths of LiFi link and WiFi link are B_1 Hz and B_2 Hz, respectively. Let $\mathbf{x} \triangleq [x_1, x_2]^T$ denote the transmitted signal vector, where $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ denote the independently transmitted signals of the LiFi link and WiFi link, respectively.

In a practical LiFi-WiFi communication system, the transmitted signals are distributed in discrete constellation. Suppose that the LiFi link signal is sent via M -pulse-amplitude modulation (M -PAM) and the WiFi link signal is sent via N -quadrature amplitude modulation (N -QAM). To be more specific, the signal x_1 is taken from a non-negative real discrete constellation set Ω_1 with cardinality M , which is given as

$$\Omega_1 \triangleq \left\{ x_1 \left| \begin{array}{l} \Pr(x_1 = x_{1,k}) = p_{1,k}, \\ 0 \leq x_{1,k} \leq A, \\ \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} = 1, \\ \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} x_{1,k} \leq \bar{\mu}, \\ \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} x_{1,k}^2 \leq P_{e,1}, \\ x_{1,k} \in \mathbb{R}, k = 1, \dots, M, \end{array} \right. \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $x_{1,k}$ denotes the constellation point, $p_{1,k}$ represents probability that x_1 equals $x_{1,k}$, and parameters A , $\bar{\mu}$, and $P_{e,1}$ denotes the peak optical power, maximum average optical power, and maximum average electric power of x_1 , respectively. On the other hand, the WiFi signal x_2 is taken from a complex discrete constellation set Ω_2 with cardinality N ,

which is given as

$$\Omega_2 \triangleq \left\{ x_1 \left| \begin{array}{l} \Pr(x_2 = x_{2,l}) = p_{2,l}, \\ \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} = 1, \\ \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} |x_{2,l}|^2 \leq P_{e,2}, \\ x_{2,l} \in \mathbb{C}, l = 1, \dots, N, \end{array} \right. \right\} \quad (2)$$

where $x_{2,l}$ denotes the constellation point, $p_{2,l}$ denotes the probability that the constellation $x_{2,l}$ is chosen, $P_{e,2}$ denotes the maximum average electric power of x_2 , respectively.

Let $q_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ denote the power amplification factors for x_1 and x_2 , respectively. Here, q_1 and q_2 need to satisfy the average electrical power constraint, i.e.,

$$\eta_1 \varepsilon_1 q_1^2 + \eta_2 \varepsilon_2 |q_2|^2 \leq P_T, \quad (3)$$

where η_1 and η_2 denote the efficiency of the power amplifier of the LiFi link and WiFi link, respectively; $\varepsilon_1 = \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} x_{1,k}^2$, $\varepsilon_2 = \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} |x_{2,l}|^2$; and P_T denotes the total electrical power threshold. Moreover, for human eye safety considerations, the power control over the LiFi signal also needs to meet the average optical power and peak optical power requirement: $\mathbb{E}\{q_1 x_1\} = q_1 \mu \leq P_o$, and $q_1 A \leq P_{ins}$, where $\mu = \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} x_{1,k}$; P_o and P_{ins} denote the maximum average optical power threshold and the instant optical power threshold, respectively.

Let $\mathbf{g} \triangleq [g_1, g_2]^T$ denotes the channel vector, where g_1 and g_2 are the channel parameters of the LiFi link and WiFi link, respectively. Assume that the channel parameters g_1 and g_2 are quasi-static in the paper. Specifically, g_1 is given by [23]

$$g_1 = \frac{(m+1)A_1}{2\pi d_1^2} \cos^m(\phi) \cos \varphi g_f g_c(\varphi), \quad (4)$$

where m is the order of the Lambertian emission; A_1 is the detector area of PD receiver; d_1 is the distance between the LED and PD; ϕ and φ are the radiance and incidence angle of the LiFi link; g_f denotes the gain of the optical filter; $g_c(\varphi)$ denotes the gain of optical concentrator, which is given as

$$g_c(\varphi) = \begin{cases} \frac{n^2}{\sin^2(\Psi_c)}, & 0 \leq \varphi \leq \Psi_c, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where n is the refractive index, Ψ_c represents the field-of-view (FoV) of the LiFi receiver,

As to the WiFi link, g_2 is modeled by [8]

$$g_2 = \begin{cases} g_r 10^{-(L_F(d_2) + L_\sigma)/20}, & d_2 \leq d_B \\ g_r 10^{-(L_F(d_2) + 35 \log_{10}(\frac{d_2}{d_B}) + L_\sigma)/20}, & d_2 > d_B, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $g_r = \left(\sqrt{\frac{K}{K+1}} e^{j\psi} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{K+1}} a \right)$ denotes the small-scale fading gain, $a \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$; ψ is the angle of arrival/departure of the WiFi link; K denotes the Ricean K -factor; d_2 denotes the distance between user and the RF antenna; d_B is the breakpoint distance; $L_\sigma \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ denotes the shadow fading, $\sigma = 3\text{dB}$ with $d_2 \leq d_B$, $\sigma = 5\text{dB}$ with other conditions; $L_F(d_2)$ is the free space loss at the central carrier

frequency f_c as follows:

$$L_F(d_2) = 20 \log_{10}(d_2) + 20 \log_{10}(f_c) - 147.5. \quad (7)$$

Let y_1 and y_2 denote the received signals from the LiFi link and WiFi link, respectively, which can be written in the vector form as

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} g_1 q_1 x_1 \\ g_2^* q_2 x_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where $z_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_1^2)$ is the received real Gaussian noise from the LiFi link, and $z_2 \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_2^2)$ denotes the received complex Gaussian noise from the WiFi link. Then, the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the LiFi link and WiFi link can be defined as

$$\text{SNR}_1 \triangleq \frac{g_1^2 q_1^2 \varepsilon_1}{B_1 \sigma_1^2}, \quad \text{SNR}_2 \triangleq \frac{|g_2|^2 |q_2|^2 \varepsilon_2}{B_2 \sigma_2^2}. \quad (9)$$

Note that, for the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system with the finite-alphabet inputs, the achievable rate is still unknown. To address this issue, we define the achievable rate $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ as

$$R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}} = I(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2) = R_{\text{LiFi}} + R_{\text{WiFi}}, \quad (10)$$

where $R_{\text{LiFi}} \triangleq I(x_1; y_1)$ and $R_{\text{WiFi}} \triangleq I(x_2; y_2)$ denote the achievable rates of the LiFi link and WiFi link, respectively.

Proof: According to the mutual information, the upper bound of $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ is given as

$$R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}} = I(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2) \quad (11a)$$

$$= h(y_1) + h(y_2|y_1) - h(y_1, y_2|x_1, x_2) \quad (11b)$$

$$\leq I(x_1; y_1) + I(x_2; y_2) \quad (11c)$$

$$= R_{\text{LiFi}} + R_{\text{WiFi}}, \quad (11d)$$

where the equality (11c) holds if and only if x_1 and x_2 are independent. Thus, when x_1 and x_2 are independent, the upper bound (11d) is achievable, i.e., the upper bound (11d) is the channel capacity of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system. In other words, for the considered aggregated LiFi-WiFi system, the optimal inputs of x_1 and x_2 are independent, and the achievable rate is $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}} = I(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2) = R_{\text{LiFi}} + R_{\text{WiFi}}$. \square

Lemma 1: With the finite-alphabet inputs and the given bandwidths B_1 and B_2 , the achievable rates of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system R_{LiFi} and R_{WiFi} are respectively given as

$$R_{\text{LiFi}} = -\frac{B_1}{\ln 2} - 2B_1 \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \mathbb{E}_{z_1} \left\{ \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp(\Lambda_{k,m}) \right\}, \quad (12a)$$

$$R_{\text{WiFi}} = -\frac{B_2}{\ln 2} - B_2 \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \mathbb{E}_{z_2} \left\{ \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp(\Gamma_{l,n}) \right\}, \quad (12b)$$

$$\text{where } \Lambda_{k,m} \triangleq -\frac{(g_1 q_1 (x_{1,k} - x_{1,m}) + \sqrt{B_1} z_1)^2}{2B_1 \sigma_1^2}, \quad \Gamma_{l,n} \triangleq$$

$$-\frac{|g_2^* q_2(x_{2,l}-x_{2,n})+\sqrt{B_2}z_2|^2}{B_2\sigma_2^2}. \quad 1$$

Proof: Please find the proof in Appendix A. \square

With Lemma 1, the achievable rate (10) of the considered system can be obtained.

III. OPTIMAL DISCRETE CONSTELLATION INPUTS OF THE AGGREGATED LiFi-WiFi SYSTEM

Based on the derived expression of $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$, the following question is to optimize the signal distributions and power allocation schemes for the two links to obtain the maximal achievable rate of the aggregated system. The optimization problem is formulated as

$$\max_{q_1, q_2, \{p_{1,k}\}, \{p_{2,l}\}} R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}} \quad (13a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \eta_1 P_{e,1} q_1^2 + \eta_2 P_{e,2} |q_2|^2 \leq P_T, \quad (13b)$$

$$q_1 \leq \min(P_o/\bar{\mu}, P_{\text{ins}}/A), \quad (13c)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} x_{1,k} \leq \bar{\mu}, \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} x_{1,k}^2 \leq P_{e,1}, \quad (13d)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} = 1, p_{1,k} \geq 0, \forall k \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (13e)$$

$$\sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} |x_{2,l}|^2 \leq P_{e,2}, \quad (13f)$$

$$\sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} = 1, p_{2,l} \geq 0, \forall l \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (13g)$$

where (13b) denotes the total average electrical power of two links; (13c) and (13d) denote the maximal optical power constraint, average optical power constraint, and average electrical power constraint on the LiFi link, respectively; (13f) denotes the average electrical power constraint on the WiFi link; (13e) and (13g) denote the probability distribution constraint.

For problem (13), the optimal phase of q_2 is the same as that of g_2 , which can be proved by the counter-evidence method due to the property of the complex multiplication. Thus, the optimal q_2 can be written as

$$q_2 = \sqrt{\hat{q}_2} \frac{g_2}{|g_2|}, \quad (14)$$

where $\hat{q}_2 \triangleq |q_2|^2$. Furthermore, by substituting (14) into (10) and $\hat{q}_1 \triangleq q_1^2$, the achievable rate $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ can be rewrote as (15).

¹ The rate expression (10) is based on the unit bandwidth, while the Lemma 1 is for a given bandwidth. Thus, their units is different, i.e., bits/sec/Hz and bits/sec, respectively.

By defining $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1 \triangleq [x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,M}]^T$ and $\mathbf{p}_1 \triangleq [p_{1,1}, \dots, p_{1,M}]^T$, constraints (13f) and (13d) can be reformulated as

$$\Upsilon_1 \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{p} \mid \mathbf{1}_M^T \mathbf{p} = 1, \mathbf{p} \succeq \mathbf{0}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_1^T \mathbf{p} \leq \bar{\mu}, (\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1 \odot \hat{\mathbf{x}}_1)^T \mathbf{p} \leq P_{e,1} \right\}, \quad \mathbf{p}_1 \in \Upsilon_1. \quad (16)$$

Similarly, by defining $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_2 \triangleq [x_{2,1} \dots x_{2,N}]^T$ and $\mathbf{p}_2 \triangleq [p_{2,1} \dots p_{2,N}]^T$, constraints (13e) and (13g) can be reformulated as

$$\Upsilon_2 \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{p} \mid \mathbf{1}_N^T \mathbf{p} = 1, \mathbf{p} \succeq \mathbf{0}, (\hat{\mathbf{x}}_2 \odot \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2)^T \mathbf{p} \leq P_{e,2} \right\}, \quad \mathbf{p}_2 \in \Upsilon_2. \quad (17)$$

Next, we introduce auxiliary variables, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{w} \triangleq [\log_2 \mathbf{p}_1^T \hat{\mathbf{w}}_1, \dots, \log_2 \mathbf{p}_1^T \hat{\mathbf{w}}_M]^T, \quad (18a)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}_k \triangleq [\hat{w}_{k,1}, \dots, \hat{w}_{k,M}]^T, \quad (18b)$$

$$\hat{w}_{k,m} \triangleq \exp \left(-\frac{(g_1 \sqrt{\hat{q}_1} (x_{1,k} - x_{1,m}) + \sqrt{B_1} z_1)^2}{2B_1 \sigma_1^2} \right), \quad (18c)$$

$$\mathbf{r} \triangleq [\log_2 \mathbf{p}_2^T \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \dots, \log_2 \mathbf{p}_2^T \hat{\mathbf{r}}_N]^T, \quad (18d)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_l \triangleq [\hat{r}_{l,1}, \dots, \hat{r}_{l,N}]^T, \quad (18e)$$

$$\hat{r}_{l,n} \triangleq \exp \left(-\frac{||g_2| \sqrt{\hat{q}_2} (x_{2,l} - x_{2,n}) + \sqrt{B_2} z_2|^2}{B_2 \sigma_2^2} \right), \quad (18f)$$

where k and $m \in \mathcal{M}$, l and $n \in \mathcal{N}$. Then, we rewrite the achievable rate $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ as

$$R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}} = -\frac{B_1 + B_2}{\ln 2} - 2B_1 \mathbb{E}_{z_1} \{ \mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{w} \} - B_2 \mathbb{E}_{z_2} \{ \mathbf{p}_2^T \mathbf{r} \}. \quad (19)$$

Based on the above definitions, problem (13) can be equivalent to a compact form as

$$\min_{\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2, \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2} 2B_1 \mathbb{E}_{z_1} \{ \mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{w} \} + B_2 \mathbb{E}_{z_2} \{ \mathbf{p}_2^T \mathbf{r} \} \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \eta_1 P_{e,1} \hat{q}_1 + \eta_2 P_{e,2} \hat{q}_2 \leq P_T, \quad (20b)$$

$$\hat{q}_1 \leq \tau^2, \quad (20c)$$

$$\mathbf{p}_1 \in \Upsilon_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in \Upsilon_2, \quad (20d)$$

where $\tau \triangleq \min(P_o/\bar{\mu}, P_{\text{ins}}/A)$. Note that in problem (20), the power allocation variables \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 are only contained in constraints (20b) and (20c), while the distribution variables \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 are only contained in the constraint (20d). Therefore, the optimization problem (18) can be decomposed into two sub-problems solved alternately until the objective function converges : *power allocation sub-problem 1*: optimizing \hat{q}_1

$$R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}} = -2B_1 \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \mathbb{E}_{z_1} \left\{ \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp \left(-\frac{(g_1 \sqrt{\hat{q}_1} (x_{1,k} - x_{1,m}) + \sqrt{B_1} z_1)^2}{2B_1 \sigma_1^2} \right) \right\} \\ - B_2 \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \mathbb{E}_{z_2} \left\{ \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp \left(-\frac{||g_2| \sqrt{\hat{q}_2} (x_{2,l} - x_{2,n}) + \sqrt{B_2} z_2|^2}{B_2 \sigma_2^2} \right) \right\} - \frac{B_1 + B_2}{\ln 2}. \quad (15)$$

and \hat{q}_2 with given \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 , and *probability distribution sub-problem 2*: optimizing \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 with given \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 . Next, we will present the solutions to these two sub-problems.

A. Power Allocation Sub-Problem

With given \mathbf{p}_1 , \mathbf{p}_2 , problem (20) can be simplified to an optimal power allocation problem as

$$\min_{\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2} h(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2) \quad (21a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \eta_1 P_{e,1} \hat{q}_1 + \eta_2 P_{e,2} \hat{q}_2 \leq P_T, \quad (21b)$$

$$\hat{q}_1 \leq \tau^2, \quad (21c)$$

where $h(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2) \triangleq 2B_1 \mathbb{E}_{z_1} \{\mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{w}\} + B_2 \mathbb{E}_{z_2} \{\mathbf{p}_2^T \mathbf{r}\}$.

Note that $-\frac{(g_1 \sqrt{\hat{q}_1} (x_{1,k} - x_{1,m}) + \sqrt{B_1} z_1)^2}{2B_1 \sigma_1^2}$ and $-\frac{|g_2| \sqrt{\hat{q}_2} (x_{2,\ell} - x_{2,n}) + \sqrt{B_2} z_2}{B_2 \sigma_2^2}$ are convex over \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 , respectively. Furthermore, since $\log \sum_i e^{f_i(x)}$ is convex as long as $f_i(x)$ is convex [24], problem (21) is convex over \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 . To obtain the optimal power allocation \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 , we write the Lagrangian function of problem (21) as

$$\mathcal{L}(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2, \gamma, \nu) = h(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2) + \gamma (\eta_1 P_{e,1} \hat{q}_1 + \eta_2 P_{e,2} \hat{q}_2 - P_T) + \nu (\hat{q}_1 - \tau^2), \quad (22)$$

where $\gamma \geq 0$ and $\nu \geq 0$ are the Lagrangian multipliers associated with constraints (21b) and (21c), respectively. Then, the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions of problem (21) are

$$\frac{\partial h(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2)}{\partial \hat{q}_1} + \gamma \eta_1 P_{e,1} + \nu = 0, \quad (23a)$$

$$\frac{\partial h(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2)}{\partial \hat{q}_2} + \gamma \eta_2 P_{e,2} = 0, \quad (23b)$$

$$\gamma (\eta_1 P_{e,1} \hat{q}_1 + \eta_2 P_{e,2} \hat{q}_2 - P_T) = 0, \quad \gamma \geq 0, \quad (23c)$$

$$\nu (\hat{q}_1 - \tau^2) = 0, \quad \nu \geq 0. \quad (23d)$$

Furthermore, based on the definition of $h(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial h(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2)}{\partial \hat{q}_1} &= -\frac{g_1^2 \varepsilon_1}{B_1 \sigma_1^2} \frac{\partial I(x_1; y_1)}{\partial \text{SNR}_1}, \\ \frac{\partial h(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2)}{\partial \hat{q}_2} &= -\frac{|g_2|^2 \varepsilon_2}{B_2 \sigma_2^2} \frac{\partial I(x_2; y_2)}{\partial \text{SNR}_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Moreover, according to relationship between the mutual information and the MMSE [22], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial I(x_1; y_1)}{\partial \text{SNR}_1} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{MMSE}_1(\text{SNR}_1), \\ \frac{\partial I(x_2; y_2)}{\partial \text{SNR}_2} &= \text{MMSE}_2(\text{SNR}_2), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $\text{MMSE}_i(\text{SNR}_i) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{|x_i - \hat{x}_i|\}$ denotes the MMSE between x_i and \hat{x}_i , $i = 1, 2$, and \hat{x}_i is the conditional mean of the MMSE estimate of x_i , i.e. $\hat{x}_1 \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{x_1 | y_1 = g_1 q_1 x_1 + z_1\}$ and $\hat{x}_2 \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{x_2 | y_2 = g_2^* q_2 x_2 + z_2\}$. Note that the calculation of the above MMSE involves non-holonomic function, i.e., it is non-trivial to compute the exact MMSE for an arbitrary input distribution. Meanwhile, it is an opening problem to find the lower and upper bounds of the MMSE for the discrete inputs

[25]. Thus, most of existing works adopt numerical methods such as Monte Carlo integral to obtain the results, which may lead to sub-optimality and high complexity. To overcome this issue, we approximate the MMSEs by a scaled linear MMSE upper bound [25], i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MMSE}_1(\text{SNR}_1) &\approx \text{LMMSE}_{\varepsilon_1}(\text{SNR}_1), \\ \text{MMSE}_2(\text{SNR}_2) &\approx \text{LMMSE}_{\varepsilon_2}(\text{SNR}_2), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $\text{LMMSE}_t(x) = \frac{t}{1+tx}$. Although the approximation based on LMMSE, like a continuous Gaussian MMSE, would lead to the optimality loss, it can provide a fast acceptable closed-form method. Then, (25) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial I(x_1; y_1)}{\partial \text{SNR}_1} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{LMMSE}_{\varepsilon_1}(\text{SNR}_1), \\ \frac{\partial I(x_2; y_2)}{\partial \text{SNR}_2} &= \text{LMMSE}_{\varepsilon_2}(\text{SNR}_2). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

With (9) and (27), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial h(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2)}{\partial \hat{q}_1} &= -\frac{g_1^2 \varepsilon_1}{2B_1 \sigma_1^2} \text{LMMSE}_{\varepsilon_1} \left(\frac{g_1^2 \hat{q}_1 \varepsilon_1}{B_1 \sigma_1^2} \right), \\ \frac{\partial h(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2)}{\partial \hat{q}_2} &= -\frac{|g_2|^2 \varepsilon_2}{B_2 \sigma_2^2} \text{LMMSE}_{\varepsilon_2} \left(\frac{|g_2|^2 \hat{q}_2 \varepsilon_2}{B_2 \sigma_2^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Substituting equation (28) into equation (23), we have

$$\frac{g_1^2 \varepsilon_1}{2B_1 \sigma_1^2} \text{LMMSE}_{\varepsilon_1} \left(\frac{g_1^2 \hat{q}_1 \varepsilon_1}{B_1 \sigma_1^2} \right) - \gamma \eta_1 P_{e,1} - \nu = 0, \quad (29a)$$

$$\frac{|g_2|^2 \varepsilon_2}{B_2 \sigma_2^2} \text{LMMSE}_{\varepsilon_2} \left(\frac{|g_2|^2 \hat{q}_2 \varepsilon_2}{B_2 \sigma_2^2} \right) - \gamma \eta_2 P_{e,2} = 0. \quad (29b)$$

Then, \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 can be derived through solving the equation (29) as

$$\hat{q}_1 = \frac{B_1 \sigma_1^2}{g_1^2 \varepsilon_1} \text{LMMSE}_{\varepsilon_1}^{-1} \left(\frac{2B_1 \sigma_1^2 (\gamma \eta_1 P_{e,1} + \nu)}{g_1^2 \varepsilon_1} \right), \quad (30a)$$

$$\hat{q}_2 = \frac{B_2 \sigma_2^2}{|g_2|^2 \varepsilon_2} \text{LMMSE}_{\varepsilon_2}^{-1} \left(\frac{B_2 \sigma_2^2 \gamma \eta_2 P_{e,2}}{|g_2|^2 \varepsilon_2} \right), \quad (30b)$$

where $\text{LMMSE}_t^{-1}(x) = \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{t}$. The Lagrangian multipliers γ and ν can be solved by the Water-filling (WF) Method. The detailed algorithm is given in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Water-filling (WF) Method for Power Allocation Sub-Problem (21).

- 1: Given $\zeta \geq 0$, $\gamma \in [0, \hat{\gamma}]$;
 - 2: **Initialization:** $\gamma_{\min} = 0$, $\gamma_{\max} = \hat{\gamma}$;
 - 3: **repeat.**
 - 4: Set $\gamma \leftarrow (\gamma_{\min} + \gamma_{\max}) / 2$;
 - 5: Obtain \hat{q}_2 by (30b);
 - 6: Find the minimum ν satisfying the constraint $\hat{q}_1 \leq \tau^2$;
 - 7: Obtain \hat{q}_1 by (30a);
 - 8: If $\eta_1 P_{e,1} \hat{q}_1 + \eta_2 P_{e,2} \hat{q}_2 \leq P_T$, set $\gamma_{\max} \leftarrow \gamma$; otherwise, $\gamma_{\min} \leftarrow \gamma$;
 - 9: **until** $|\nu_{\max} - \nu_{\min}| \leq \zeta$.
 - 10: **return** \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 ;
-

B. Probability Distribution Sub-Problem

When \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 are given, problem (20) can be reformulated as

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2} 2B_1 \mathbb{E}_{z_1} \{\mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{w}\} + B_2 \mathbb{E}_{z_2} \{\mathbf{p}_2^T \mathbf{r}\} \quad (31a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{p}_1 \in \Upsilon_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in \Upsilon_2, \quad (31b)$$

which is a convex optimization problem with two variables \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 . However, there is no analytical expression of the objective function, which prevents us from calculating the optimal probability distributions.

To overcome this bottleneck, we adopt the inexact gradient descent method [17] to calculate the optimal probability distribution. Besides, the Blahut-Arimoto algorithm [26]–[28] can also solve this problem. Let $\phi_1(\mathbf{p}_1) \triangleq 2B_1 \mathbb{E}_{z_1} \{\mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{w}\}$ and $\nabla \phi_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$ denote the its gradient as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \phi_1(\mathbf{p}_1) &= 2B_1 \mathbb{E}_{z_1} \{\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}_1\} \\ &= 2B_1 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{z_1}(z_1) (\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}_1) dz_1, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $\mathbf{W} \triangleq [W_{i,j}]$, $W_{i,j} \triangleq \frac{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_j^T \mathbf{e}_i}{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_j^T \mathbf{p}_1 \ln 2}$, \mathbf{e}_i denotes the unit vector in which the i th element is 1 and the other elements are zeros, and $f_{z_1}(z_1) \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_1} \exp\left(-\frac{z_1^2}{\sigma_1^2}\right)$ denotes the probability density function of z_1 .

Since neither $\phi_j(\mathbf{p}_j)$ nor $\nabla \phi_j(\mathbf{p}_j)$ has a closed-form expression, we perform the truncation of the integration from infinity to an finite interval. More specifically, let $[-\tau_1, \tau_1]$ and $[-\tau_2, \tau_2]$ denote the integration intervals of $\phi_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$ and $\nabla \phi_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$. Then, let $\hat{\phi}_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$ and $\nabla \hat{\phi}_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$ denote the approximation of $\phi_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$ and $\nabla \phi_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$ respectively, which are given by

$$\hat{\phi}_1(\mathbf{p}_1) \triangleq 2B_1 \int_{-\tau_1}^{\tau_1} f_{z_1}(z_1) \mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{w} dz, \quad (33a)$$

$$\nabla \hat{\phi}_1(\mathbf{p}_1) \triangleq 2B_1 \int_{-\tau_2}^{\tau_2} f_{z_1}(z_1) (\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}_1) dz, \quad (33b)$$

where $\tau_1 > 0$ and $\tau_2 > 0$.

With the approximated objective function and its gradient, i.e., $\hat{\phi}_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$ and $\nabla \hat{\phi}_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$, we adopt the gradient projections method to solve problem (31). Specifically, let $\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]}$ denote the n th iteration feasible point. With inexact gradient $\nabla \hat{\phi}_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$, the gradient projection iteration between $\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]}$ and $\mathbf{p}_1^{[i+1]}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{p}_1^{[i+1]} = \text{Proj}_{\Upsilon_1} \left(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]} - \alpha_1^{[i]} \nabla \hat{\phi}_1(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]}) \right), \quad (34)$$

where $\alpha_1^{[i]}$ denotes the i th-iteration step size, $\text{Proj}_{\Upsilon_1}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ denotes the projection of $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ onto Υ_1 :

$$\text{Proj}_{\Upsilon_1}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \Upsilon_1, \\ \arg \min_{\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \Upsilon_1} \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|^2, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

The details of the inexact gradient descent method are listed in Algorithm 2, and the distribution of LiFi link \mathbf{p}_1 can be obtained. The optimal distribution of WiFi link \mathbf{p}_2 can be obtained analogously. Thus, we omit the detailed derivations for brevity. The optimal probability distribution $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2$ can

be achieved by the distribution matching (DM) [29]–[31].

In summary, the achievable rate maximization problem (13) can be solved by Algorithm 3, therefore the maximal achievable rate $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ can be achieved.

Algorithm 2 Inexact Gradient Descent Method for Probability Distribution Sub-Problem(31)

- 1: **Initialization:** Given $\delta \geq 0$, set $i = 1$, and choose $\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]} \in \Upsilon_1$.
 - 2: **repeat**
 - 3: $i \leftarrow i + 1$.
 - 4: Update $\hat{\phi}_1(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i-1]})$ and $\nabla \hat{\phi}_1(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i-1]})$ by (33).
 - 5: Compute the step size $\alpha_1^{[i-1]}$ by Armijo rule [24].
 - 6: Update $\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]} = \text{Proj}_{\Upsilon_1}(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i-1]} - \alpha_1^{[i-1]} \nabla \hat{\phi}_1(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i-1]}))$.
 - 7: **until** $\|\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]} - \mathbf{p}_1^{[i-1]}\| \leq \delta$.
 - 8: **return** $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_1^{[i]}$.
-

Algorithm 3 Optimal discrete constellation inputs of problem (20)

- 1: **Initialization:** Given $\xi \geq 0$, set $k = 1$, and choose $\mathbf{p}_1^{[1]} \in \Upsilon_1, \mathbf{p}_2^{[1]} \in \Upsilon_2$.
 - 2: Update $\hat{q}_1^{[1]}$ and $\hat{q}_2^{[1]}$ by Algorithm 1.
 - 3: Obtain $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^{[1]}$ by substituting $\hat{q}_1^{[1]}, \hat{q}_2^{[1]}, \mathbf{p}_1^{[1]}$ and $\mathbf{p}_2^{[1]}$ into formulation (19).
 - 4: **repeat**
 - 5: $k \leftarrow k + 1$.
 - 6: Update $\mathbf{p}_1^{[k]}$ and $\mathbf{p}_2^{[k]}$ based on Algorithm 2 with given $\hat{q}_1^{[k-1]}$ and $\hat{q}_2^{[k-1]}$.
 - 7: Update $\hat{q}_1^{[k]}$ and $\hat{q}_2^{[k]}$ by Algorithm 1 with given $\mathbf{p}_1^{[k]}$ and $\mathbf{p}_2^{[k]}$.
 - 8: Obtain $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^{[k]}$ by substituting $\hat{q}_1^{[k]}, \hat{q}_2^{[k]}, \mathbf{p}_1^{[k]}$ and $\mathbf{p}_2^{[k]}$ into formulation (19).
 - 9: **until** $|R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^{[k]} - R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^{[k-1]}| \leq \xi$.
 - 10: **return** $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_1^{[k]}, \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_2^{[k]}, \hat{q}_1 = \hat{q}_1^{[k]}$ and $\hat{q}_2 = \hat{q}_2^{[k]}, R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}} = R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^{[k]}$.
-

IV. OPTIMAL DISCRETE CONSTELLATION INPUT DISTRIBUTIONS BASED ON LOWER BOUNDS AND UPPER BOUNDS

Recall that, neither the achievable rate (12a) nor (12b) is in a closed-form expression, and thus the calculation of (10) is computationally inefficient. To reduce the computational complexity, we may replace the objective function with an explicit expression. Thus, we turn to the capacity bound of LiFi link and WiFi link.

Lemma 2: *With the finite-alphabet inputs, the closed-form upper bound R_{LiFi}^U and lower bound R_{LiFi}^L of the LiFi link achievable rate are respectively given as*

$$R_{\text{LiFi}}^U = -2B_1 \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp(2\hat{\Lambda}_{k,m}), \quad (36a)$$

$$R_{\text{LiFi}}^L = B_1 - \frac{B_1}{\ln 2} - 2B_1 \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp(\hat{\Lambda}_{k,m}), \quad a_{k,m}(\hat{q}_1) \triangleq \exp\left(-\frac{(x_{1,k} - x_{1,m})^2 g_1^2 \hat{q}_1}{4B_1 \sigma_1^2}\right), \quad \forall k, m \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (36b)$$

where $\hat{\Lambda}_{k,m} \triangleq -\frac{(x_{1,k} - x_{1,m})^2 (g_1 q_1)^2}{4B_1 \sigma_1^2}$.

Proof: Please find the proof in Appendix B. \square

Furthermore, we develop the closed-form upper bound and lower bound of the achievable rate for WiFi link R_{WiFi} .

Lemma 3: The upper bound R_{WiFi}^U and lower bound R_{WiFi}^L of the achievable rate for the WiFi link are respectively given as

$$R_{\text{WiFi}}^U = -B_2 \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp(2\hat{\Gamma}_{l,n}), \quad (37a)$$

$$R_{\text{WiFi}}^L = B_2 - \frac{B_2}{\ln 2} - B_2 \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp(\hat{\Gamma}_{l,n}), \quad (37b)$$

where $\hat{\Gamma}_{l,n} \triangleq -\frac{|x_{2,l} - x_{2,n}|^2 |g_2^* q_2|^2}{2B_2 \sigma_2^2}$.

Proof: Please see the proof in the Appendix C. \square

Then, let $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$ respectively denote the lower bound and upper bound of $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$, which are given by

$$R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L \triangleq R_{\text{LiFi}}^L + R_{\text{WiFi}}^L. \quad (38a)$$

$$R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U \triangleq R_{\text{LiFi}}^U + R_{\text{WiFi}}^U. \quad (38b)$$

The lower bound R_{LiFi}^L , R_{WiFi}^L , $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ are not tight, and might be negative [32]. When $P_T \rightarrow 0$ and $P_T \rightarrow +\infty$, there is a constant gap, i.e., $B_1 (\frac{1}{\ln 2} - 1)$, between the R_{LiFi}^L (12a) and R_{LiFi}^L (36b). There also is a constant gap, i.e., $B_2 (\frac{1}{\ln 2} - 1)$, between the R_{WiFi}^L (12b) and R_{WiFi}^L (37b). Thus, when $P_T \rightarrow 0$ and $P_T \rightarrow +\infty$, there is a constant gap, i.e., $(\frac{1}{\ln 2} - 1) (B_1 + B_2)$, between the $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ (10) and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ (38a). If the constant gap is directly added to $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$, there might be intersections between $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$ as similar as Fig. 1-3 in [32].

Based on the lower bound of the achievable rate $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$, we aim to obtain the optimal distribution of the signal magnitudes and power allocation jointly, which can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{q_1, q_2, \{p_{1,k}\}, \{p_{2,l}\}} \quad & R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (13b), (13c), (13e), (13d), (13f), (13g). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Furthermore, by defining $\hat{q}_1 \triangleq q_1^2$ and $\hat{q}_2 \triangleq |q_2|^2$, the lower bound of the achievable rate $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ can be rewritten as

$$R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\ln 2}\right) (B_1 + B_2) - 2B_1 \mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{u}(\hat{q}_1) - B_2 \mathbf{p}_2^T \mathbf{v}(\hat{q}_2), \quad (40)$$

where

$$\mathbf{u}(\hat{q}_1) \triangleq [\log_2 \mathbf{a}_1^T(\hat{q}_1) \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \log_2 \mathbf{a}_M^T(\hat{q}_1) \mathbf{p}_1]^T, \quad (41a)$$

$$\mathbf{a}_k(\hat{q}_1) \triangleq [a_{k,1}(\hat{q}_1), \dots, a_{k,M}(\hat{q}_1)]^T, \quad (41b)$$

$$\mathbf{v}(\hat{q}_2) \triangleq [\log_2 \mathbf{b}_1^T(\hat{q}_2) \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \log_2 \mathbf{b}_N^T(\hat{q}_2) \mathbf{p}_2]^T, \quad (41d)$$

$$\mathbf{b}_l(\hat{q}_2) \triangleq [b_{l,1}(\hat{q}_2), \dots, b_{l,N}(\hat{q}_2)]^T, \quad (41e)$$

$$b_{l,n}(\hat{q}_2) \triangleq \exp\left(-\frac{|x_{2,l} - x_{2,n}|^2 |g_2|^2 \hat{q}_2}{2B_2 \sigma_2^2}\right), \quad \forall l, n \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (41f)$$

Then, problem (39) can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2, \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2} \quad & 2B_1 \mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{u}(\hat{q}_1) + B_2 \mathbf{p}_2^T \mathbf{v}(\hat{q}_2) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (20b), (20c), (20d). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

It can be easily checked that the objection function (42) is convex with respect to \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 , and constraints (20b), (20c), and (20d) are linear in terms of \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 . Therefore, problem (42) is convex with respect to (w.r.t.) \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 . While, the problem (42) is nonconvex w.r.t. \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 . To solve problem (42), we by solving the following two sub-problems iteratively, and until the objective function converges.

A. Power Allocation Sub-problem

Firstly, we solve the power allocation sub-problem: optimizing the LiFi and the WiFi links power allocation, i.e., \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 , with fixed \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 . Then, problem (42) is reformulated as

$$\min_{\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2} \quad 2B_1 \mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{u}(\hat{q}_1) + B_2 \mathbf{p}_2^T \mathbf{v}(\hat{q}_2) \quad (43a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \eta_1 P_{e,1} \hat{q}_1 + \eta_2 P_{e,2} \hat{q}_2 \leq P_T, \quad (43b)$$

$$\hat{q}_1 \leq \tau^2, \quad (43c)$$

$$\hat{q}_1 \geq 0, \hat{q}_2 \geq 0. \quad (43d)$$

Since $\log_2 x$ is a concave function, at least one of constraint (43b) and constraint (43c) is active for the optimal power allocation, i.e., $\eta_1 P_{e,1} \hat{q}_1 + \eta_2 P_{e,2} \hat{q}_2 = P_T$ or $\hat{q}_1 = \tau^2$. When $\hat{q}_1 = \tau^2$, constraint (43b) is also active. Therefore, constraint (43b) is always active, i.e., $\eta_1 P_{e,1} \hat{q}_1 + \eta_2 P_{e,2} \hat{q}_2 = P_T$. In the following, we will discuss the optimal power allocation of problem (43) based on whether constraint (43c) is active or not.

1) $\eta_1 \varepsilon_1 \tau^2 > P_T$: In this case, constraint (43c) is inactive, i.e., $\hat{q}_1 < \tau^2$. Problem (43) can be reformulated as

$$\min_{\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2} \quad 2B_1 \mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{u}(\hat{q}_1) + B_2 \mathbf{p}_2^T \mathbf{v}(\hat{q}_2) \quad (44a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \eta_1 P_{e,1} \hat{q}_1 + \eta_2 P_{e,1} \hat{q}_2 = P_T, \quad (44b)$$

$$\hat{q}_1 \geq 0, \hat{q}_2 \geq 0. \quad (44c)$$

Substituting $\hat{q}_2 = \frac{P_T - \eta_1 \varepsilon_1 \hat{q}_1}{\eta_2 \varepsilon_2}$ into problem (44), the objective function (44a) is reformulated as

$$\Phi(\hat{q}_1) \triangleq 2B_1 \mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{u}(\hat{q}_1) + B_2 \mathbf{p}_2^T \hat{\mathbf{v}}(\hat{q}_1), \quad (45)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{v}}(\hat{q}_1) \triangleq [\log_2 \hat{\mathbf{b}}_1^T(\hat{q}_1) \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \log_2 \hat{\mathbf{b}}_N^T(\hat{q}_1) \mathbf{p}_1]^T$, $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_l(\hat{q}_1) \triangleq [\hat{b}_{l,1}(\hat{q}_1), \dots, \hat{b}_{l,N}(\hat{q}_1)]^T, \forall l \in \mathcal{N}$, and $\hat{b}_{l,n}(\hat{q}_1) \triangleq$

$$\exp\left(-\frac{|x_{2,l}-x_{2,n}|^2|g_2|^2(P_T-\eta_1\varepsilon_1\hat{q}_1)}{2B_2\sigma_2^2\eta_2\varepsilon_2}\right), \forall l, n \in \mathcal{N}.$$

Thus, problem (43) can be reformulated as

$$\min_{\hat{q}_1} \Phi(\hat{q}_1) \quad (46a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } 0 \leq \hat{q}_1 \leq \frac{P_T}{\eta_1\varepsilon_1}. \quad (46b)$$

Let \hat{q}_1^{opt} denote the optimal solution of problem (46), and Φ^{opt} denote the maximum rate of the aggregated LiFi - WiFi system. Then, we can obtain a stationary point \hat{q}_1^{sta} by setting $\frac{\partial \Phi(\hat{q}_1)}{\partial \hat{q}_1} = 0$ so that the optimal solution \hat{q}_1^{sta} satisfies the following equation

$$2B_1\mathbf{p}_1^T \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{q}_1) = B_2\mathbf{p}_2^T \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\hat{q}_1), \quad (47)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{q}_1) = [\tilde{a}_1(\hat{q}_1), \dots, \tilde{a}_M(\hat{q}_1)]^T, \quad (48a)$$

$$\tilde{a}_k(\hat{q}_1) = \frac{\mathbf{c}_k^T \odot \mathbf{a}_k^T(\hat{q}_1)\mathbf{p}_1}{\mathbf{a}_k^T(\hat{q}_1)\mathbf{p}_1}, \quad (48b)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_k \triangleq \frac{g_1^2}{4B_1\sigma_1^2} [(x_{1,k} - x_{1,1})^2, \dots, (x_{1,k} - x_{1,M})^2]^T, \forall k \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (48c)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\hat{q}_1) = [\tilde{b}_1(\hat{q}_1), \dots, \tilde{b}_N(\hat{q}_1)]^T, \quad (48d)$$

$$\tilde{b}_l(\hat{q}_1) = \frac{\mathbf{d}_l^T \odot \hat{\mathbf{b}}_l^T(\hat{q}_1)\mathbf{p}_2}{\hat{\mathbf{b}}_l^T(\hat{q}_1)\mathbf{p}_2}, \quad (48e)$$

$$\mathbf{d}_l \triangleq \frac{\eta_1\varepsilon_1|g_2|^2}{2B_2\sigma_2^2\eta_2\varepsilon_2} [|x_{2,l} - x_{2,1}|^2, \dots, |x_{2,l} - x_{2,N}|^2]^T, \forall l \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (48f)$$

Let $\Phi^{\text{opt},1}$ and $\hat{q}_1^{\text{opt},1}$ respectively denote the minimal objective function and the optimal power allocation \hat{q}_1 of problem (43). Thus, if $0 \leq \hat{q}_1 \leq \frac{P_T}{\eta_1\varepsilon_1}$, we have

$$\Phi^{\text{opt},1} = \min \left\{ \Phi(\hat{q}_1^{\text{sta}}), \Phi(0), \Phi\left(\frac{P_T}{\eta_1\varepsilon_1}\right) \right\}, \quad (49a)$$

$$\hat{q}_1^{\text{opt},1} = \arg \min_{\hat{q}_1} \left\{ \Phi(\hat{q}_1^{\text{sta}}), \Phi(0), \Phi\left(\frac{P_T}{\eta_1\varepsilon_1}\right) \right\}. \quad (49b)$$

Otherwise, we have

$$\Phi^{\text{opt},1} = \min \left\{ \Phi(0), \Phi\left(\frac{P_T}{\eta_1\varepsilon_1}\right) \right\}, \quad (50a)$$

$$\hat{q}_1^{\text{opt},1} = \arg \min_{\hat{q}_1} \left\{ \Phi(0), \Phi\left(\frac{P_T}{\eta_1\varepsilon_1}\right) \right\}. \quad (50b)$$

2) $\eta_1 P_{e,1} \tau^2 \leq P_T$: When $\eta_1 P_{e,1} \tau^2 \leq P_T$, constraint (43c) could be either active or inactive, i.e., $\hat{q}_1 = \tau^2$ or $\hat{q}_1 < \tau^2$. When constraint (43c) is inactive, the minimal objective function of problem (43) is the same as the case $\eta_1 P_{e,1} \tau^2 < P_T$. Otherwise, the optimal allocated power of problem (43) are $\hat{q}_1 = \tau^2$, and $\hat{q}_2 = \frac{P_T - \eta_1 P_{e,1} \tau^2}{\eta_2 P_{e,2}}$. Here, the corresponding minimal objective function of problem (43) is $\Phi(\tau^2)$. Let $\Phi^{\text{opt},2}$ and $\hat{q}_1^{\text{opt},2}$ respectively denote the minimal objective function and the optimal power allocation \hat{q}_1 of problem (43), which are given by

$$\Phi^{\text{opt},2} = \min \{ \Phi^{\text{opt},1}, \Phi(\tau^2) \}, \quad (51a)$$

$$\hat{q}_1^{\text{opt},2} = \arg \min_{\hat{q}_1} \{ \Phi^{\text{opt},1}, \Phi(\tau^2) \}. \quad (51b)$$

By solving the power allocation sub-problem, we can obtain the optimal power of LiFi and WiFi links q_1 and q_2 .

B. Probability Distribution Sub-problem

Next, we solve the probability distribution sub-problem: optimizing the LiFi and the WiFi links probability distribution, i.e., \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 , with given \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 . Then, the maximization problem of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system (43) can be formulated as

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2} 2B_1\mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{p}_1) + B_2\mathbf{p}_2^T \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_2) \quad (52a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{p}_1 \in \Upsilon_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in \Upsilon_2, \quad (52b)$$

where $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{p}_1) = [\log_2 \mathbf{a}_1^T(\hat{q}_1)\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \log_2 \mathbf{a}_M^T(\hat{q}_1)\mathbf{p}_1]^T$, and $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_2) = [\log_2 \mathbf{b}_1^T(\hat{q}_2)\mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \log_2 \mathbf{b}_N^T(\hat{q}_2)\mathbf{p}_2]^T$. Then, problem (52) can be divided into two independent subproblems as

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}_1} f_1(\mathbf{p}_1) \quad (53a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{p}_1 \in \Upsilon_1, \quad (53b)$$

and

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}_2} f_2(\mathbf{p}_2) \quad (54a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{p}_2 \in \Upsilon_2. \quad (54b)$$

where $f_1(\mathbf{p}_1) \triangleq 2B_1\mathbf{p}_1^T \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{p}_1)$, and $f_2(\mathbf{p}_2) \triangleq B_2\mathbf{p}_2^T \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_2)$. We can adopt the Frank-Wolfe method [33] to solve problem (53) and (54). Specifically, let $\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]}$ denote a feasible point at the i th iteration. The first-order Taylor expansion of $f_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$ is given by

$$f_1(\mathbf{p}_1) \approx f_1(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]}) + \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_1} f_1^T(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]}) (\mathbf{p}_1 - \mathbf{p}_1^{[i]}), \quad (55)$$

where $\nabla_{\mathbf{p}_1} f_1^T(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]})$ denotes the gradient of the objective function $f_1(\mathbf{p}_1)$. Since $\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]}$ is obtained, problem (53) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}_1} \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_1} f_1^T(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]}) \mathbf{p}_1 \quad (56a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{p}_1 \in \Upsilon_1. \quad (56b)$$

Then, the $i+1$ th iteration point $\mathbf{p}_1^{[i+1]}$ is updated by

$$\mathbf{p}_1^{[i+1]} = \mathbf{p}_1^{[i]} + \lambda_1^{[i]} \mathbf{d}_1^{[i]}, \quad (57)$$

where $\lambda_1^{[i]}$ denotes the stepsize of the i th iteration, and $\mathbf{d}_1^{[i]}$ denotes the feasible descending direction of the i th iteration. The details of the Frank-Wolfe method are summarized in Algorithm 4, which outputs the probability distribution of the LiFi link, i.e., \mathbf{p}_1 . Similar as problem (53), we can obtain the optimal probability distribution of the WiFi link, i.e., \mathbf{p}_2 , by solving problem (54) through Frank-Wolfe method. We omit the detailed derivations for brevity. The optimal probability distribution $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2$ can be achieved by the distribution matching (DM) [29]–[31].

In summary, the achievable rate maximization of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system (42) can be solved by Algorithm 5. The optimal power allocation of LiFi and WiFi links \hat{q}_1 and \hat{q}_2 , the probability distribution of LiFi and WiFi links \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 , and the maximal lower bound of the achievable rate $\hat{R}_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ can be obtained by Algorithm 3. Note that, based on the upper bound of the achievable rate $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$, we can also find the optimal distribution of the signal magnitudes and power allocation to maximize the achievable rate of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system, which is similar to the lower bound case.

Algorithm 4 Frank-Wolfe Method for the Probability Distribution Sub-Problem (52).

- 1: **Initialization:** Given $\varsigma \geq 0$, set $i = 1$, and choose $\mathbf{p}_1^{[1]} \in \Upsilon_1$.
- 2: **repeat**
- 3: $i \leftarrow i + 1$.
- 4: Obtain $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1^{[i-1]}$ by solving problem (56).
- 5: Construct feasible descending direction $\mathbf{d}_1^{[i-1]} = \hat{\mathbf{p}}_1^{[i-1]} - \mathbf{p}_1^{[i-1]}$.
- 6: Use the bisection search to obtain the optimal $\lambda_1^{[i-1]} = \arg \min_{\lambda_1} f_1(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i-1]} + \lambda_1 \mathbf{d}_1^{[i-1]})$.
- 7: Update $\mathbf{p}_1^{[i]} = \mathbf{p}_1^{[i-1]} + \lambda_1^{[i-1]} \mathbf{d}_1^{[i-1]}$.
- 8: **until** $|\nabla_{\mathbf{p}_1} f_1(\mathbf{p}_1^{[i-1]}) \mathbf{d}_1^{[i-1]}| \leq \varsigma$.
- 9: **return** $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_1^{[i+1]}$.

Algorithm 5 Optimal discrete constellation input distributions based on lower bounds

- 1: **Initialization:** Given $\xi \geq 0$, set $k = 1$, and choose $\mathbf{p}_1^{[1]} \in \Upsilon_1$, $\mathbf{p}_2^{[1]} \in \Upsilon_2$.
- 2: Update $\hat{q}_1^{[1]}$ and $\hat{q}_2^{[1]}$ by solving problem (43).
- 3: Obtain $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^{L[1]}$ by substituting $\hat{q}_1^{[1]}$, $\hat{q}_2^{[1]}$, $\mathbf{p}_1^{[1]}$ and $\mathbf{p}_2^{[1]}$ into formulation (40).
- 4: **repeat.**
- 5: $k \leftarrow k + 1$.
- 6: Update $\hat{q}_1^{[k]}$ and $\hat{q}_2^{[k]}$ by solving problem (43).
- 7: Update $\mathbf{p}_1^{[k]}$ and $\mathbf{p}_2^{[k]}$ by Frank-Wolfe method (in Algorithm 4).
- 8: Obtain $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^{L[k]}$ by substituting $\hat{q}_1^{[k]}$, $\hat{q}_2^{[k]}$, $\mathbf{p}_1^{[k]}$ and $\mathbf{p}_2^{[k]}$ into formulation (40).
- 9: **until** $|R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^{L[k]} - R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^{L[k-1]}| \leq \xi$.
- 10: **return** $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_1^{[k]}$, $\mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_2^{[k]}$, $\hat{q}_1 = \hat{q}_1^{[k]}$ and $\hat{q}_2 = \hat{q}_2^{[k]}$, $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L = R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^{L[k]}$.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section, we illustrate the performance of the proposed schemes for the considered aggregated LiFi-WiFi system. Moreover, the simulation results also demonstrate the impact of key parameters on both the achievable rate and energy efficiency of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system, such as total power threshold, bandwidths, etc. In the simulations, we

consider the locations of the LED and PD as (0, 0, 5.7)m and (0, 0, 1.7)m, respectively. More detailed system parameters of the LiFi and WiFi links are given in Table I.

TABLE I
BASIC PARAMETERS

LiFi Link		WiFi Link	
Parameters	Value	Parameters	Value
σ_1^2	$10^{-21} \text{ A}^2/\text{Hz}$	σ_2^2	-57dBm/MHz
FoV Ψ_c	90°	d_B	5 m
A_{PD}	1cm ²	d_2	4 m
I_H	8 A	f_c	2.4 GHz
$\theta_{1/2}$	60°	ψ	45°
B_1	40MHz	B_2	20MHz

A. Performance of the Aggregated LiFi-WiFi System based on $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ (10)

In the following, we evaluate the performance of the proposed transmission schemes in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3.

Fig. 2 (a) illustrates the optimal probability distribution of input $\{x_{1,k}, p_{1,k}\}$ versus SNR₁ (SNR) of the LiFi link, where $K_1 = 8$. It shows that in the low SNR region, the optimal input positions include two discrete points with an equal probability. While in the high SNR region, the optimal input positions have more than two discrete points. As the increase of SNR, the optimal probability distribution is closer to the equiprobable distribution. Fig. 2 (c) illustrates the achievable rate of LiFi link R_{LiFi} versus SNR. We can observe that the achievable rate of LiFi link R_{LiFi} with the proposed method is higher than that equiprobable distribution. Moreover, with the increase of the SNR, the gap between the proposed method and the equiprobable distribution shrinks.

Fig. 2 (b) shows the optimal probability distribution of input $\{x_{2,l}, p_{2,l}\}$ with SNR₂ = 4dB of the WiFi link, where $K_2 = 16$. It shows that for SNR₂=4dB, the optimal input positions include sixteen discrete points, and the optimal probability distribution is equiprobable. Fig. 2(d) illustrates the achievable rate of WiFi link R_{WiFi} versus SNR₂. We can observe that the achievable rate of WiFi link R_{WiFi} with the proposed method is higher than that obtained by the equiprobable distribution. Moreover, with the increase of the SNR₂, the gap between the proposed method and the equiprobable distribution decreases.

Fig. 3 (a) shows the achievable rate $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ and link transmit power of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system versus total power threshold P_T , respectively. We observe that the achievable rates $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ with both the proposed method and equiprobable distribution increase as total power threshold P_T increases.

Fig. 3 (b) illustrates the achievable rate of aggregated LiFi-WiFi system $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ versus instant optical power threshold P_{ins} . We observe that the achievable rates $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ with the proposed method increase as the instant optical power threshold P_{ins} first increases, and remains constant. Moreover, as instant optical power threshold P_{ins} increases, the transmit power of LiFi link \hat{q}_1 first increases, and then




Fig. 2. (a) The optimal probability distribution of input $\{x_{1,k}, p_{1,k}\}$ versus SNR₁ of LiFi link; (b) The optimal probability distribution of input $\{x_{2,l}, p_{2,l}\}$ with SNR₂=4dB of WiFi link. (c) Achievable rate of LiFi link R_{LiFi} versus SNR₁; (d) Achievable rate of WiFi link R_{WiFi} versus SNR₂.




Fig. 3. Achievable rate of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system $R_{LiFi-WiFi}$: (a) versus the total power threshold P_T ; (b) versus the instant optical power threshold P_{ins} .

keeps as a constant. The transmit power of WiFi link \hat{q}_2 first decreases, and then keeps as a constant. This is due to $\tau \triangleq \min(P_o/\bar{\mu}, P_{ins}/A)$, and we assume that $P_o = 0.8P_{ins}$, and $\bar{\mu} = 0.5A$. For a lower P_{ins} , \hat{q}_1 is constrained by τ , while for a high P_{ins} , \hat{q}_1 is constrained by the total electrical power threshold P_T .

B. Optimal Discrete Constellation Input Distributions Based on $R_{LiFi-WiFi}^L$ (38a)

In the following, the performance of the proposed aggregated LiFi-WiFi system based on the lower bound of achievable rate is investigated in Fig. 4 (a) and (b).

Fig. 4 (a) demonstrates the lower bound of achievable rate $R_{LiFi-WiFi}^L$ and link transmit power of aggregated LiFi-WiFi system versus total power threshold P_T , respectively. We observe that the lower bound of achievable rates $R_{LiFi-WiFi}^L$ with both the proposed method and equiprobable distribution increase as total power threshold P_T increases. Moreover, as total power threshold P_T increases, the transmit power of the LiFi link, i.e., \hat{q}_1 , first increases, and remains as a




Fig. 4. Lower bound of the achievable rates of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$: (a) versus the total electrical power threshold P_T ; (b) versus the instant optical power threshold P_{ins} .

constant, and the transmit power of the WiFi link, i.e., \hat{q}_2 , increases. The reason is that \hat{q}_1 is also limited by the optical power constraint.²

Fig. 4 (b) describes the lower bound of achievable rate of aggregated LiFi-WiFi system $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ versus instant optical power threshold P_{ins} , and we assume that $P_o = 0.8P_{\text{ins}}$, and $\bar{\mu} = 0.5A$. We observe that the lower bound of achievable rates $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ with the proposed method increases as instant optical power threshold P_{ins} first increases, and remains as a constant. Moreover, as instant optical power threshold P_{ins} increases, the transmit power of the LiFi link, i.e., \hat{q}_1 , first increases, and then keeps as a constant. The transmit power of WiFi link \hat{q}_2 first decreases, and then keeps as a constant. This is due to $\tau \triangleq \min(P_o/\bar{\mu}, P_{\text{ins}}/A)$. For a lower P_{ins} , \hat{q}_1 is constrained by τ , while for high P_{ins} , \hat{q}_1 is constrained by the total electrical power threshold P_T .

²Due to adding the constant gap, $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ might be less than $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ in Fig. 4-6 as similar as Fig. 1-3 of [32].

C. The Rate Performance

In the following, we investigate the comparison between the achievable rate $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ (10), its lower bound $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ (38a) and the upper bound $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$ (38b) of the proposed aggregated LiFi-WiFi system in Fig. 5 (a) and (b), Fig. 6 (a) and (b).




Fig. 5. $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$, $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$ versus the total power threshold P_T : (a) with the optimal solutions of problem (13); (b) with the optimal solutions of problem (39).

Fig. 5 (a) shows the achievable rate $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ (10), its lower bound $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ (38a) and the upper bound $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$ (38b) of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system versus total power threshold P_T with the optimal solutions of problem (13), respectively. And Fig. 5 (b) illustrates the achievable rate $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ (10), its lower bound $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ (38a) and the upper bound $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$ (38b) of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system versus total power threshold P_T with the optimal solutions of problem (39), respectively. Both Fig. 5 (a) and (b) show that for a low P_T , the gap between $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ is larger than the one of between $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$, and for a high P_T , the gap between $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ is lower than the one of between $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$. Moreover, the $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$, $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$

$R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$ in Fig. 5 (a) are lower than those in Fig. 5 (b). This is because that solutions of Algorithm 3 are suboptimal.




Fig. 6. $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$, $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$ versus the LiFi link bandwidth B_1 with the WiFi link bandwidth $B_2 = 20\text{MHz}$: (a) with the optimal solutions of problem (13); (b) with the optimal solutions of problem (39).

Fig. 6 (a) and (b) shows that the achievable rate versus the LiFi link bandwidth B_1 with the WiFi link bandwidth $B_2 = 20\text{MHz}$ and the two solutions. Fig. 5 (a) based on the solutions of problem (13), and Fig. 5 (b) is with the solutions of problem (39). Both Fig. 6 (a) and (b) show that for a low B_1 , the gap between $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ is larger than the one of between $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$, and for a high B_1 , the gap between $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^L$ is lower than the one of between $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}$ and $R_{\text{LiFi-WiFi}}^U$.

D. The Average Executing Time

To evaluate the computational complexity, Table II shows the average executing times versus modulation order ($M = N$) of Algorithm 3 and Algorithm 5, respectively.

For the given modulation order, the average executing time is calculated over 200 independent trials, which are performed by MATLAB (2021a) with Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-9500 3.00 GHz CPU and 8 GB RAM. As showed in Table II, the CPU

TABLE II
THE AVERAGE EXECUTING TIME OF DIFFERENT SCHEME VERSUS MODULATION ORDER ($M = N$).

Time(s) \ Scheme	Algorithm 3	Algorithm 5
$M = N$		
4	5.47	0.2466
8	30.16	4.60
16	79.01	7.68
32	311.44	29.75
64	4217.26	264.95

time of the two algorithms increases as the modulation order increases, and the CPU time of Algorithm 5 is significantly less than that of Algorithm 3.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we investigated the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system, which simultaneously used both the LiFi link and WiFi link to transmit information. First of all, with both LiFi link and WiFi link bandwidths consideration, we derived the achievable rate expression of the system with the discrete constellation input signals. Then, we further investigated the optimal input distribution and power allocation for the considered system. Moreover, we derived the upper and lower bounds of the achievable rate expression of the system with the discrete constellation input signals, and we investigated the optimal input distribution and power allocation for the considered system. At last, the effects of critical parameters of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system on the maximum achievable rate, such as total threshold, optical power, and bandwidth, etc., are numerically analyzed. In the future, we would further investigate both imperfect CSI and interference management for multi-user LiFi-WiFi networks.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF THE FORMULATION LEMMA 1

The achievable rates of the LiFi link R_{LiFi} are given as follows

$$R_{\text{LiFi}} = h(y_1) - h(y_1 | x_1) \quad (58a)$$

$$= - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \exp\left(-\frac{z_1^2}{2\sigma_1^2}\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_1} \log_2 \frac{\sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp(\bar{\Lambda}_{k,m})}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_1} dz_1 - \frac{1}{2} \log_2 2\pi e \sigma_1^2 \quad (58b)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2 \ln 2} - \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \mathbb{E}_{z_1} \left\{ \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp(\bar{\Lambda}_{k,m}) \right\}, \quad (58c)$$

where $\bar{\Lambda}_{k,m} \triangleq -\frac{(g_1 q_1 (x_{1,k} - x_{1,m}) + z_1)^2}{2\sigma_1^2}$.

Suppose that the bandwidth of the LiFi link is B_1 (Hz). Then, both the input and output can be represented by samples taken by $\frac{1}{2B_1}$ seconds apart [34]. The power spectral density of

the noise is $\frac{\sigma_1^2}{2}$ watts/Hz, which leads to the noise power $\sigma_1^2 B_1$. For the time interval $[0, T]$, there are $2BT$ noise samples, and the variance of each sample is $\frac{\sigma_1^2 B_1 T}{2B_1 T} = \frac{\sigma_1^2}{2}$. Moreover, if the power of signal is P_1 , the energy of signal per sample is $\frac{P_1 T}{2B_1 T} = \frac{P_1}{2B_1}$. Therefore, we obtain the achievable rate expression of the LiFi link with the bandwidth of B_1 as given in (12a).

Then, the achievable rates of the WiFi link and $R_{\text{Wi-Fi}}$ are given as follows

$$R_{\text{Wi-Fi}} = - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \exp\left(-\frac{|z_2|^2}{\sigma_2^2}\right)}{\pi \sigma_2^2} \log_2 \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp(\bar{\Gamma}_{l,n})}{\pi \sigma_2^2} d\mathbf{z}_2 - \log_2 \pi e \sigma_2^2 \quad (59a)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{\ln 2} - \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \mathbb{E}_{z_2} \left\{ \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp(\bar{\Gamma}_{l,n}) \right\}, \quad (59b)$$

where $\bar{\Gamma}_{l,n} \triangleq -\frac{|g_2^* q_2 (x_{2,l} - x_{2,n}) + z_2|^2}{\sigma_2^2}$.

Suppose that the bandwidth of the WiFi link is B_2 (Hz). Then, both the input and output can be represented by complex samples taken by $\frac{1}{B_2}$ seconds apart. Note that since the noise is independent in the I and Q components, each use of the complex channel can be thought of as two independent uses of a real AWGN channel. If the power of signal is P_2 , the noise variance and the power constraint per real symbol are $\frac{\sigma_2^2}{2}$ and $\frac{P_2}{2B_2}$, respectively. Thus, we have the achievable rate expression of the WiFi link with the bandwidth of B_1 as given in (12b).

Hence, the achievable rates of the aggregated LiFi-WiFi system $R_{\text{Li-Fi-Wi-Fi}}$ is given in (14).

APPENDIX B

DERIVATION OF THE FORMULATION LEMMA 2

Since $\log_2(\sum \exp(x))$ is a convex function with respect to x , we can obtain the upper bound of $R_{\text{Li-Fi}}$ by Jensen's inequality.

$$R_{\text{Li-Fi}} \leq -\frac{1}{2 \ln 2} - \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp(\mathbb{E}_{z_1} \{\bar{\Lambda}_{k,m}\}) \quad (60a)$$

$$= -\sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp\left(2B_1 \hat{\Lambda}_{k,m} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_{z_1} \{z_1^2\}}{2\sigma_1^2}\right) - \frac{1}{2 \ln 2} \quad (60b)$$

$$= -\sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp(2B_1 \hat{\Lambda}_{k,m}). \quad (60c)$$

The upper bound of the LiFi link $R_{\text{Li-Fi}}$ with the bandwidth of B_1 is given by

$$R_{\text{Li-Fi}} \leq -2B_1 \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp(2B_1 \hat{\Lambda}_{k,m}). \quad (61)$$

Since $\log_2(x)$ is a concave function, we can obtain the lower bound of $R_{\text{Li-Fi}}$ by Jensen's inequality as follows

$$R_{\text{Li-Fi}} \geq -\frac{1}{2 \ln 2} - \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \mathbb{E}_{z_1} \{\exp(\bar{\Lambda}_{k,m})\} \quad (62a)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2 \ln 2} + \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp(B_1 \hat{\Lambda}_{k,m}). \quad (62b)$$

The lower bound of the LiFi link $R_{\text{Li-Fi}}$ with the bandwidth of B_1 is given by

$$R_{\text{Li-Fi}} \geq B_1 - \frac{B_1}{\ln 2} - 2B_1 \sum_{k=1}^M p_{1,k} \log_2 \sum_{m=1}^M p_{1,m} \exp(\hat{\Lambda}_{k,m}). \quad (63)$$

APPENDIX C

DERIVATION OF THE FORMULATION LEMMA 3

The upper bound of $R_{\text{Wi-Fi}}$ is given as

$$R_{\text{Wi-Fi}} \leq -\frac{1}{\ln 2} - \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp(\mathbb{E}_{z_2} \{\bar{\Gamma}_{l,n}\}) \quad (64a)$$

$$= -\sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp\left(2B_2 \hat{\Gamma}_{l,n} - \mathbb{E}_{z_2} \left\{ \frac{|z_2|^2}{\sigma_2^2} \right\}\right) \quad (64b)$$

$$= -\sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp(2B_2 \hat{\Gamma}_{l,n}). \quad (64c)$$

Then, the upper bound of the WiFi link $R_{\text{Wi-Fi}}$ with the bandwidth of B_2 is given by

$$R_{\text{Wi-Fi}} \leq -B_2 \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp(2\hat{\Gamma}_{l,n}). \quad (65)$$

Since $\log_2(x)$ is a concave function, the lower bound of $R_{\text{Wi-Fi}}$ can be obtained by Jensen's inequality as well

$$R_{\text{Wi-Fi}} \geq -\frac{1}{\ln 2} - \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \frac{1}{\sigma_2^2 \pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{(c_R + z_{2,R})^2 + z_{2,R}^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{(c_I + z_{2,I})^2 + z_{2,I}^2}{\sigma^2}\right) dz_{2,R} dz_{2,I} \quad (66a)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{\ln 2} + 1 - \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp(B_2 \hat{\Gamma}_{l,n}), \quad (66b)$$

where $z_{2,R} \triangleq \text{Re}(z_2)$, $z_{2,I} \triangleq \text{Im}(z_2)$, $c_R \triangleq \text{Re}(g_2^* q_2 (x_{2,l} - x_{2,n}))$ and $c_I \triangleq \text{Im}(g_2^* q_2 (x_{2,l} - x_{2,n}))$; (66a) is true due to $\mathbb{E}_{z_2} \{f(z_2)\} = \int p_{z_2} f(z_2) dz_{z_2}$, and z_2 follows the complex Gaussian distribution.

Finally, the lower bound of the WiFi link R_{WiFi} with the bandwidth of B_2 is given by

$$R_{\text{WiFi}} \geq B_2 - \frac{B_2}{\ln 2} - B_2 \sum_{l=1}^N p_{2,l} \log_2 \sum_{n=1}^N p_{2,n} \exp(\hat{\Gamma}_{l,n}). \quad (67)$$

REFERENCES

- [1] Ericsson, "Mobility report: On the pulse of the networked society," 2015.
- [2] Y. Wang, X. Wu, and H. Haas, "Load balancing game with shadowing effect for indoor hybrid LiFi/RF networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 2366–2378, Apr. 2017.
- [3] Y. Wang, D. A. Basnayaka, X. Wu, and H. Haas, "Optimization of load balancing in hybrid LiFi/RF networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 1708–1720, Apr. 2017.
- [4] V. K. Papanikolaou, P. D. Diamantoulakis, P. C. Sofotasios, S. Muhaidat, and G. K. Karagiannidis, "On optimal resource allocation for hybrid VLC/RF networks with common backhaul," *IEEE Trans. on Cogn. Commun. Netw.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 352–365, Mar. 2020.
- [5] X. Li, R. Zhang, and L. Hanzo, "Cooperative load balancing in hybrid visible light communications and WiFi," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 1319–1329, Apr. 2015.
- [6] F. Jin, R. Zhang, and L. Hanzo, "Resource allocation under delay-guarantee constraints for heterogeneous visible-light and RF femtocell," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 1020–1034, Feb. 2015.
- [7] Y. Wang and H. Haas, "Dynamic load balancing with handover in hybrid Li-Fi and Wi-Fi networks," *J. Lightw. Technol.*, vol. 33, no. 22, pp. 4671–4682, Nov. 2015.
- [8] X. Wu, M. Safari, and H. Haas, "Access point selection for hybrid Li-Fi and Wi-Fi networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 5375–5385, Dec. 2017.
- [9] D. A. Basnayaka and H. Haas, "Design and analysis of a hybrid radio frequency and visible light communication system," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 65, no. 10, pp. 4334–4347, Oct. 2017.
- [10] S. Shao, A. Khreishah, M. Ayyash, M. B. Rahaim, H. Elgala, V. Jungnickel, D. Schulz, T. D. C. Little, J. Hilt, and R. Freund, "Design and analysis of a visible-light-communication enhanced WiFi system," *IEEE/OSA J. Opt. Commun. Networking*, vol. 7, no. 10, pp. 960–973, Oct. 2015.
- [11] M. Hammouda, S. Akin, A. M. Vegni, H. Haas, and J. Peissig, "Link selection in hybrid RF/VLC systems under statistical queueing constraints," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, Apr. 2018.
- [12] H. Tabassum and E. Hossain, "Coverage and rate analysis for co-existing RF/VLC downlink cellular networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 2588–2601, 2018.
- [13] J. Wang, C. Jiang, H. Zhang, X. Zhang, V. C. M. Leung, and L. Hanzo, "Learning-aided network association for hybrid indoor LiFi-WiFi systems," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 3561–3574, Apr. 2018.
- [14] H. Zhang, N. Liu, K. Long, J. Cheng, V. C. M. Leung, and L. Hanzo, "Energy efficient subchannel and power allocation for software-defined heterogeneous VLC and RF networks," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 658–670, Mar. 2018.
- [15] S. Ma, F. Zhang, H. Li, F. Zhou, M. S. Alouini, and S. Li, "Aggregated VLC-RF systems: Achievable rates, optimal power allocation, and energy efficiency," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 7265–7278, Nov. 2020.
- [16] C. Xiao, Y. R. Zheng, and Z. Ding, "Globally optimal linear precoders for finite alphabet signals over complex vector gaussian channels," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 59, no. 7, pp. 3301–3314, Jul. 2011.
- [17] S. Ma, R. Yang, Y. He, S. Lu, F. Zhou, N. Al-Dhahir, and S. Li, "Achieving channel capacity of visible light communication," *IEEE Syst. J.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 1652–1663, Jun. 2021.
- [18] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed., New York: Wiley, 2006.
- [19] A. E. Gamal and Y. H. Kim, *Network Information Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011.
- [20] D. N. C. Tse and P. Viswanath, *Fundamentals of Wireless Communications*, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011.
- [21] W. Zeng, C. Xiao, and J. Lu, "A low-complexity design of linear precoding for mimo channels with finite-alphabet inputs," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 38–41, Feb. 2012.
- [22] Dongning Guo, S. Shamai, and S. Verdú, "Mutual information and minimum mean-square error in gaussian channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 1261–1282, Apr. 2005.
- [23] R. Ahmad and A. Srivastava, "Optimized user association for indoor hybrid Li-Fi Wi-Fi network," in *2019 the 21st International Conference on Transparent Optical Networks (ICTON)*, pp. 1–5, 2019.
- [24] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004.
- [25] W. Cao, A. Dytso, M. Fauß, G. Feng, and H. V. Poor, "Robust power allocation for parallel gaussian channels with approximately gaussian input distributions," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 3685–3699, Jun. 2020.
- [26] A. Favano, M. Ferrari, M. Magarini, and L. Barletta, "The capacity of the amplitude-constrained vector gaussian channel," *arXiv:2101.08643*.
- [27] A. Dytso, L. Barletta, and S. Shamai, "Bounds on the number of mass points of the capacity achieving distribution of the amplitude constraint poisson noise channel," *arXiv:2104.14431*.
- [28] J. H. Dauwels, *On graphical models for communications and machine learning: algorithms, bounds, and analog implementation*, Ph.D. thesis, 2006.
- [29] P. Schulte and G. Bocherer, "Constant composition distribution matching," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 430–434, Jan. 2016.
- [30] X. Chen, Z. Feng, M. Tang, S. Fu, and D. Liu, "Performance enhanced DDO-OFDM system with adaptively partitioned precoding and single sideband modulation," *Opt. Express*, vol. 25, no. 19, pp. 23093, Sept. 2017.
- [31] F. Buchali, F. Steiner, G. Bocherer, L. Schmalen, P. Schulte, and W. Idler, "Rate adaptation and reach increase by probabilistically shaped 64-QAM: An experimental demonstration," *J. Light. Technol.*, vol. 34, no. 7, pp. 1599–1609, Apr. 2016.
- [32] W. Zeng, C. Xiao, and J. Lu, "A low-complexity design of linear precoding for MIMO channels with finite-alphabet inputs," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 38–41, Feb. 2012.
- [33] D. P. Bertsekas and D. P. Bertsekas, *Nonlinear Programming*, Athena Scientific, 1999.
- [34] S. Hranilovic, "Minimum-bandwidth optical intensity nyquist pulses," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 574–583, Mar. 2007.