# Optimal Transmit Power and Channel-Information Bit Allocation With Zeroforcing Beamforming in MIMO-NOMA and MIMO-OMA Downlinks

Kritsada Mamat and Wiroonsak Santipach, Senior Member, IEEE

Abstract—In downlink, a base station (BS) with multiple transmit antennas applies zeroforcing beamforming to transmit to single-antenna mobile users in a cell. We propose the schemes that optimize transmit power and the number of bits for channel direction information (CDI) for all users to achieve the max-min signal-to-interference plus noise ratio (SINR) fairness. The optimal allocation can be obtained by a geometric program for both non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) and orthogonal multiple access (OMA). For NOMA, 2 users with highly correlated channels are paired and share the same transmit beamforming. In some small total-CDI rate regimes, we show that NOMA can outperform OMA by as much as 3 dB. The performance gain over OMA increases when the correlation-coefficient threshold for user pairing is set higher. To reduce computational complexity, we propose to allocate transmit power and CDI rate to groups of multiple users instead of individual users. The user grouping scheme is based on K-means over the user SINR. We also propose a progressive filling scheme that performs close to the optimum, but can reduce the computation time by almost 3 orders of magnitude in some numerical examples.

*Index Terms*—MIMO, NOMA, OMA, zeroforcing beamforming, transmit power allocation, CSI quantization, downlink, maxmin fairness, geometric program.

# I. INTRODUCTION

Combining multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) with non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) can support more users and achieve higher spectral efficiency in wireless networks than that with orthogonal multiple access (OMA) [1]– [4, and references therein]. Users in power-domain NOMA may share the same time/frequency/spatial resource, but are distinguished by proper transmit-power allocation and successive interference cancellation (SIC) [1]. However, the gain from NOMA is traded with additional complexity from superposition coding, power allocation, user clustering, and SIC [5]–[7].

In downlink, a base station (BS) with multiple transmit antennas employs zeroforcing beamforming to transmit message signals to all users in a cell. Zeroforcing beamforming from the

This work was supported by the Program Management Unit for Human Resources and Institutional Development, Research and Innovation through the Office of National Higher Education Science Research and Innovation Policy Council (NXPO) under Grant B05F630035. (*Corresponding author: Wiroonsak Santipach.*)

K. Mamat is with the Department of Electronic Engineering Technology; College of Industrial Technology; King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok, Bangkok, 10800, Thailand (email: kritsada.m@cit.kmutnb.ac.th).

W. Santipach is with the Department of Electrical Engineering; Faculty of Engineering; Kasetsart University, Bangkok, 10900, Thailand (email: wiroonsak.s@ku.ac.th).

BS nulls out all multi-user interference when the signal reaches mobile users. However, the BS requires current channel state information (CSI) to determine transmit beamforming vectors and user clustering. Users with highly correlated channel direction information (CDI) are assigned to be in the same cluster and share the same transmit beamforming [8]–[10]. Assuming perfect CSI, several existing works [11]–[18, and references therein] studied beamforming design, power allocation, and user clustering for MIMO-NOMA. However, CSI errors incurred by quantizing with a finite number of bits or by estimating the channels can have an adverse effect on the system performance [8], [19]–[24].

1

For power-domain MIMO-NOMA, recent works focused on imperfect CSI or finite CSI quantization rate in conjunction with transmit power allocation [19]–[22], [24]–[29]. Several studies [19]–[21], [27]–[30] proposed the transmission schemes that maximize the sum rate of all users. In [21], power allocation for users sharing the same transmit beam, was optimized for given imperfect CSI. Both power and CSI feedback allocations were optimized in [19], [20]. An imperfect CSI robust beamforming design and power allocation for millimeter wave MIMO-NOMA was proposed in [28]. In [29], power allocation and user clustering were proposed. A beamforming design with power allocation was studied in [30] for satellite transmission. A low complexity power allocation scheme that maximizes the sum rate while ensuring user's fairness was proposed in [27].

Other studies examined different objectives besides maximizing the sum rate. In our previous work [24], the allocation of CDI rates between 2 groups of users was optimized for a given total CDI rate to attain max-min fairness on either achievable rate or outage probability. In [22], power allocation and beamforming vectors were jointly optimized under some outage constraints to maximize the sum of user's utility, which is a function of the rate. Eigen beamforming technique was proposed in [25] to improve the physical layer security for MIMO-NOMA-based cognitive radio networks where the power allocation was also optimized. In [26], a closed-form optimal power allocation was derived with the objective function being energy efficiency of the system in bitper-joule. The work [31] applied deep reinforcement learning to allocate power for each vehicular user in MIMO-NOMA vehicular edge computing system for which the objective was to minimize long-term power consumption and latency.

For MIMO-NOMA, the number of users sharing a single beamforming vector can be greater than 2. However, as the number of users increases, the complexity of SIC at the receivers increases while the sum rate decreases [32]. Thus, for this work, we assume that 2 users with highly correlated spatial channels are paired, and only the user with higher channel power in the pair, quantizes and feeds CDI back to the BS. This can reduce the total CDI rate over all users and is in contrast with [19], [20] in which all users must quantize and send back their CDI. To achieve max-min rate fairness among all users, the BS must optimize the allocation of CDI rate and transmit power for users. To reduce the number of optimizing variables, grouping of user pairs is proposed for the allocation. The proposed user-grouping scheme can support any number of user groups and hence, generalizes our previous scheme [24] in which only 2 groups of users were considered and only the CDI rate was optimized.

Given the total CDI rate and total transmit power, we develop a max-min SINR problem optimizing the CDI rate and transmit power for each user group, and user grouping. For given grouping of users, we can find the optimal CDI rate and transmit power for all users by solving a geometric program (GP). To reduce the complexity of finding solutions, we propose a progressive-filling scheme that gradually allocates the CDI rate and transmit power for each group of users. Numerical results show that the progressive filling performs close to the optimum with much less computational complexity. To further increase the system performance, we optimize user grouping by applying K-means to cluster user pairs with similar performance into the same group.

For MIMO-OMA, there is no user pairing and thus, all users are assigned different transmit beamforming. Since all users must send back CDI to the BS, the total CDI rate for OMA can be higher than that for NOMA. However, the receiver in OMA is simpler since SIC at the receivers is not needed. Similar to MIMO-NOMA, we develop an allocation problem that maximizes the minimum SINR. To accommodate an arbitrary number of users, regularized zeroforcing is applied to find transmit beamforming for all users. For systems with a full load<sup>1</sup>, we can find the optimal CDI rate and transmit power for each user group, and the optimal regularizing constant from GP. Comparing NOMA and OMA, we find that the NOMA scheme can outperform the OMA scheme by up to 4 dB when the total CDI rate is small or moderate. As the total CDI rate increases, the performance gap between the 2 multiple access schemes decreases and for a lighter load, OMA can perform better than NOMA.

Our contribution in this work can be summarized as follows.

• We derive asymptotic SINR for all users when the number of BS transmit antennas tends to infinity. The derived SINR is shown to approximate the actual SINR well when the system size is large. For MIMO-NOMA downlink, we found the optimal CDI rate and transmit power for all users that maximize the minimum of the approximate SINR. Optimal solutions can be obtained by GP for which there are many efficient and fast solvers. We propose a suboptimal progressive filling scheme that performs close to the optimum and can reduce the computation time by

<sup>1</sup>The number of users is equal to the number of transmit antennas.

almost 3 orders of magnitude in some cases. To better the allocation and increase the system SINR, we propose to group user pairs with an iterative scheme based on K-means over all pairs' SINR.

• For MIMO-OMA, we employ regularized zeroforcing instead of conventional zeroforcing to accommodate systems with the number of users greater than that of transmit antennas. For systems with a full load, we can solve for the optimal CDI rate, transmit power, and regularizing constant. For systems with arbitrary load, we propose a suboptimal scheme that alternately solves subproblems. We compare the performance of OMA and NOMA with the number of users larger than the number of BS transmit antennas and find that with a higher threshold for user pairing, NOMA can outperform OMA in all total-CDI rate regimes.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the channel model, zeroforcing beamforming, CDI quantization, and transmit power allocation. In Section III, we derive the SINR in a large system limit and develop a joint power CDIrate allocation problem that maximizes the minimum largesystem SINR. In Section IV, we propose the optimal solution and the suboptimal solutions obtained from progressive-filling scheme. User grouping, which improves the system performance, is proposed in Section V. In Section VI, we propose the allocation schemes for MIMO-OMA. Numerical results are presented in Section VII. Finally, we conclude this work in Section VIII.

#### **II. SYSTEM MODEL**

We consider a discrete-time downlink channel in which a BS with  $N_t$  transmit antennas transmits message signals to Ksingle-antenna users. For a link from each transmit antenna to a user's antenna, we assume that the signal propagates through a rich-scattering environment with no line of sight, and that the signal's delay spread is much smaller than the symbol period. Thus, a channel impulse response of each link can be modeled by a single complex Gaussian random variable with zero mean and unit variance. We assume that transmit antennas at the BS are placed sufficiently far apart that they are independent from one another. Hence, the channel gains from all transmit antennas to a user are independent.

For power-domain NOMA, a user near the cell center should be paired with another user toward the cell edge with a similar channel direction. Thus, both users can share a transmit beamforming, but can be distinguished in the power domain at a receiver. For pair k, let  $h_{k;s}$  denote an  $N_t \times 1$  channel vector for the user with a stronger channel or the cell-center user while  $h_{k;w}$  denotes the channel vector for the weaker user or the cell-edge user. Each entry in a channel vector corresponds to a channel gain from each transmit antenna to the user. The correlation between 2 channels follows the Gauss-Markov model given by [11], [21]

$$\boldsymbol{h}_{k;w} = c_k(\rho_k \boldsymbol{h}_{k;s} + \sqrt{1 - \rho_k^2} \boldsymbol{e}_k) \tag{1}$$

where  $0 < c_k \leq 1$  is the degradation factor for pair  $k, 0 \leq \rho_k \leq 1$  is the correlation coefficient for pair k, and  $e_k$  is an

 $N_t \times 1$  error vector with independent complex Gaussian entries with zero mean and unit variance. Note that the degradation factor  $c_k$  is a ratio between the average channel power of the cell-edge and the cell-center users of pair k. The value of  $c_k$  close to zero indicates that 2 users are far apart from each other. Otherwise, the 2 users are close to each other. The correlation coefficient  $\rho_k$  is close to 1 if the channels of the 2 users are highly correlated.<sup>2</sup> Those users could lie in the same signal direction and hence, their CDI's are similar. For better performance, 2 users should be paired if  $c_k$  is small and  $\rho_k$  is close to 1. The design of user pairing is important, but is out of the scope of this work. Some users are not in pairs since their channels may not be sufficiently correlated with others. These users are referred to as singletons. Let  $h_l$  denote an  $N_t \times 1$  channel vector for singleton or unpaired user l.

For our proposed NOMA schemes in Sections III-V, we assume  $M \leq N_t$  transmit beamforming vectors.<sup>3</sup> If there exist  $M_1 < M$  singletons,  $M_1$  beams are assigned for singletons and the remaining  $M - M_1$  beams are for  $M - M_1$  user pairs. Hence, the total number of served users denoted by  $K = M_1 + 2(M - M_1) = 2M - M_1$ . To compute zeroforcing beamforming vectors and allocate proper transmit power, the BS requires current CSI from all singletons and user pairs. We assume that singletons and pairs feed back their channel quality information (CQI) referring to  $\|\boldsymbol{h}_l\|$ ,  $\|\boldsymbol{h}_{k:s}\|$ , and  $c_k$ ,  $\forall l, k$ , to the BS *perfectly*. For CDI, which requires significantly more quantization bits, each singleton or pair quantizes and feeds back its normalized channel vector  $\bar{\boldsymbol{h}}_l = \boldsymbol{h}_l / \|\boldsymbol{h}_l\|$  or  $\bar{h}_{k;s} = h_{k;s} / \|h_{k;s}\|$  with a finite number of bits. Let  $b_l$  and  $b_k$  be the number of bits to quantize  $\bar{h}_l$  for singleton l and  $\bar{h}_{k:s}$ for pair k, respectively. We assume channels are independent block fading and the block length is sufficiently long that feeding back CDI is meaningful.

With the quantized CDI, the BS forms the  $M \times N_t$  matrix  $\hat{H}$  whose rows are transpose of the quantized channel vectors  $\hat{h}_m$ . Zeroforcing beamforming vector for singleton or pair m is denoted by  $w_m$ , which is the normalized mth column of the  $N_t \times M$  matrix given by  $W = \hat{H}^{\dagger} (\hat{H} \hat{H}^{\dagger})^{-1}$ . With the set of transmit beamforming vectors, the BS transmits message symbol  $s_l$  for singleton l and applies superposition coding to convey symbols  $s_{k;s}$  and  $s_{k,w}$  for strong and weak users of pair k, respectively. The transmitted symbol

$$x = \sqrt{p_l} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{w}_l s_l + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}} \boldsymbol{w}_k (\sqrt{p_{k;s}} s_{k;s} + \sqrt{p_{k;w}} s_{k;w}) \quad (2)$$

where  $s_l$ ,  $s_{k;s}$ , and  $s_{k;w}$  are zero-mean unit-variance random variables,  $p_l$  is transmit power for singleton l with beam  $w_l$ ,  $p_{k;s}$  and  $p_{k;w}$  are transmit power for strong and weak users in pair k sharing beam  $w_k$ , S and U are sets of beam indices for singletons and user pairs, respectively. Note that  $|S| = M_1$ and  $|U| = M - M_1$ , and  $S \cap U = \emptyset$ . In any frequencytime resource block, 2 users in each pair will interfere with each other in time, frequency, and spatial domains, but will be distinguished in the power domain. For transmit power allocation between 2 users in a pair, we apply the fractionaltransmit power allocation (FTPA) proposed by [33] as follows

$$p_{k;s} = \frac{c_k^{2\alpha_k}}{1 + c_k^{2\alpha_k}} p_k,$$
(3)

$$p_{k;w} = \frac{1}{1 + c_k^{2\alpha_k}} p_k,$$
(4)

where  $p_k = p_{k;s} + p_{k;w}$ ,  $\forall k \in \mathcal{U}$  is the total transmit power for beam  $w_k$  and  $\alpha_k \ge 0$  is the power decay factor for pair k. If  $\alpha_k = 0$ , both users in pair k are allocated equal transmit power  $p_{k;s} = p_{k;w} = p_k/2$ . By increasing the decay factor  $\alpha_k$ , more power is allocated to the weaker user. This allocation scheme also enforces the constraint  $p_{k;w} \ge p_{k;s}$  of ensuring stability of SIC at the receiver for the stronger user.

The instantaneous signal-to-interference plus noise ratio (SINR) for singleton l is given by

$$\gamma_l = \frac{p_l |\boldsymbol{h}_l^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{w}_l|^2}{\sum_{k \neq l} p_k |\boldsymbol{h}_l^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{w}_k|^2 + \sigma_n^2}$$
(5)

where  $\sigma_n^2$  denotes the power of zero-mean additive white Gaussian noise. Since the zeroforcing solutions are computed from quantized CDI, singleton *l* will suffer from some residual interference due to quantization error. The interference can be reduced if the CDI quantization error is decreased or the number of bits to quantize the CDI for singleton *l* is increased. For the stronger user of pair *k*, the signal of the weaker user is decoded first, and then that signal is reconstructed and subtracted from the received signal. With perfect SIC, the stronger user can decode its signal without any interference from the weaker user. Hence, an expression for the SINR for the stronger user of pair *k* is similar to that for a singleton and is given by

$$\gamma_{k;s} = \frac{p_{k;s} |\boldsymbol{h}_{k;s}^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{w}_{k}|^{2}}{\sum_{m \neq k} p_{m} |\boldsymbol{h}_{k;s}^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{w}_{m}|^{2} + \sigma_{n}^{2}}.$$
(6)

For the weaker user with larger transmit power, its signal is decoded directly by treating all interfering signals as noise and its SINR is given by

$$\gamma_{k;w} = \frac{p_{k;w} |\boldsymbol{h}_{k;w}^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{w}_{k}|^{2}}{\sum_{m \neq k} p_{m} |\boldsymbol{h}_{k;w}^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{w}_{m}|^{2} + p_{k;s} |\boldsymbol{h}_{k;w}^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{w}_{k}|^{2} + \sigma_{n}^{2}}.$$
 (7)

From (7), we see the additional interference in the denominator, which accounts for intra-pair interference from the stronger user in the pair.

We would like to maximize the minimum achievable rate for all users in the cell to achieve max-min fairness. The objective can be obtained by optimizing the transmit power and CDI-quantization bit allocation with a total transmit-power constraint given by

$$\sum_{l \in \mathcal{S}} p_l + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}} p_k = P_{\text{tot}}$$
(8)

where  $P_{\text{tot}}$  is the total transmit power, and a total CDIquantization bit constraint is given by

$$\sum_{l \in \mathcal{S}} b_l + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}} b_k = B_{\text{tot}}$$
(9)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Our previous work [24] strictly assumed a perfect channel alignment between 2 users for all pairs ( $\rho_k = 1, \forall k$ ).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>In Section VI, we apply *regularized* zeroforcing beamforming. In that case, the number of transmit beams M can be greater than  $N_t$ .

where  $B_{\text{tot}}$  is the total number of quantization bits for CDI or the number of CDI feedback bits from users to the BS. From (8) and (9), there are 2M optimizing variables. Optimizing the power decay factor  $\alpha_k$  in (3) and (4) will add another  $M - M_1$  variables. For systems with a larger number of BS transmit antennas, the number of optimizing variables totaling  $3M - M_1$  can be large. To lessen the computational complexity, we propose to approximate the problem and present suboptimal solutions that perform well in the subsequent sections.

#### **III. APPROXIMATE ALLOCATION PROBLEMS**

To reduce the number of variables to be optimized, we group all singletons into the first user group since their SINR expressions (5) are similar. We assign all singletons with the same transmit power  $p_l = P_1$  and the same number of CDI quantization bits  $b_l = B_1$ ,  $\forall l \in S$ . For a user pair, its performance will be dominated by the SINR of the weaker user in (7), which largely depends on the degradation factor  $c_k$  and the channel correlation coefficient  $\rho_k$ . We will later in Section V propose to group user pairs by theirs SINR. Assume that there are G groups of users, where the first group is for all singletons and the other G-1 groups are for user pairs, and  $2 \leq G \leq M$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$  be a grouping function whose input is either an index of a pair or that of a singleton and output is a group index  $g, 1 \leq g \leq G$ . We allocate the same resource to all pairs in the same group. Thus, user pair k in group  $g = \mathcal{G}(k)$ , will be allocated with transmit power  $p_k = P_g$  and a number of bits  $b_k = B_g$ . After pair grouping, group g is assumed to consist of  $M_g$  user pairs. Hence,  $\sum_{g=1}^G M_g = M$ where  $M_1$  is the number of singletons.

For the min-max rate fairness, we must allocate transmit power and CDI bits based on the ergodic rates for all 3 types of users, which depend on the distribution functions of the SINR in (5), (6), and (7). Due to the intractability of the distribution functions of those SINR for any finite  $N_t$  and M, we approximate the rate by its large-system limit, which is shown to be a good approximation when the system size is sufficiently large [24], [34], [35]. To analyze the rate or the SINR in a large-system limit, we let  $N_t$ , M, and K tend to infinity with fixed ratios  $\bar{K} = K/N_t$  and  $\bar{M} = M/N_t$ . By constraining the total transmit power  $P_{\text{tot}}$  to be finite, as the number of users  $K \to \infty$ , we assume that the transmit power for group q decreases as follows

$$P_g K \to \zeta_g P_{\text{tot}} \quad \text{for } g = 1, 2, \dots, G,$$
 (10)

where  $0 < \zeta_g < 1$  denotes the limiting power fraction of the total power assigned to each pair of group g. Hence, in a large-system limit, the total-power constraint (8) converges to

$$\sum_{g=1}^{G} \zeta_g \bar{M}_g = \bar{K} \tag{11}$$

where  $M_g = M_g/N_t$  is the normalized number of user pairs in group g. For meaningful CDI quantizing, the number of bits  $B_g$  must increase with the dimension of the CDI, which is  $N_t$ . We denote the normalized number of CDI quantization bits per transmit antenna by  $\bar{B}_g = B_g/N_t$ . Hence, the total-bit constraint (9) converges to

$$\sum_{g=1}^{G} \bar{B}_g \bar{M}_g = \hat{B}_{\text{tot}} \tag{12}$$

where  $\hat{B}_{tot} = B_{tot}/N_t^2$ . We note that  $B_{tot}$  increases quadratically with  $N_t$  since both  $\bar{B}_g$  and  $\bar{M}_g$  increase linearly with  $N_t$ .

With the above assumptions and the limits derived by [35], we can obtain the limiting SINR for all 3 types of users as follows. For singleton l, as  $N_t \to \infty$ ,

$$\gamma_l \to \gamma_l^{\infty} = \frac{\zeta_1 (1 - \bar{M}) (1 - 2^{-B_1})}{\bar{K} \left(2^{-\bar{B}_1} + \frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}}\right)}.$$
 (13)

Since this expression holds for all singletons, this is why the BS should group all singletons together and assign them with the same transmit power and CDI bits. The limiting SINR (13) increases with larger power factor  $\zeta_1$  or the normalized bits  $\overline{B}_1$ , and with smaller load  $\overline{M}$  or  $\overline{K}$ . The SINR will converge to 0 when CDI is not available at the BS ( $\overline{B}_1 = 0$ ), or the cell is at a full load ( $\overline{M} = 1$ ).

For pair k in group g, the stronger user achieves the following limiting SINR

$$\gamma_{k;s} \to \gamma_{k;s}^{\infty} = \frac{\zeta_g c_k^{2\alpha_k} (1 - \bar{M})(1 - 2^{-\bar{B}_g})}{\bar{K}(1 + c_k^{2\alpha_k}) \left(2^{-\bar{B}_g} + \frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}}\right)}.$$
 (14)

Similar to (13), we apply the limits derived by [35] to obtain (14). In addition to  $\zeta_g$  and  $\bar{B}_g$ , the SINR for the stronger user in pair k depends on the intra-pair power allocation via the power decay factor  $\alpha_k$ . Same as (13), the term  $2^{-\bar{B}_g}$  in the denominator of (14) accounts for the residual interference due to CDI quantization error. As the CDI becomes more accurate, both the singleton or the stronger user in a pair will suffer less interference from other users.

For the weaker user in a pair, interference will be relatively larger due to additional interference from the stronger user and larger interference from other beams. The latter is caused by the difference between the CDI of the weaker user and that of the stronger. The CDI difference is dictated by the correlation coefficient  $\rho_k$  in (1), which plays a major role in the performance of the weaker user. The limiting SINR of the weaker user in pair k can also be derived with the limits in [35] and is given by (15).

Similar to that for the stronger user, the SINR for the weaker user increases with a larger CDI rate  $\bar{B}_g$ . The SINR also increases with better channel alignment between 2 users in a

$$\gamma_{k;w} \to \gamma_{k;w}^{\infty} = \frac{\zeta_g (1 - \bar{M})(1 - 2^{-\bar{B}_g})}{\bar{K}(1 + c_k^{2\alpha_k})(c_k^2 - c_k^2 \rho_k^2 (1 - 2^{-\bar{B}_g})) + \frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}}) + \zeta_g c_k^{4\alpha_k} (1 - \bar{M})(1 - 2^{-\bar{B}_g})}$$
(15)

pair (a larger  $\rho_k$ ). We note that the last term in the denominator in (15) can be attributed to the interference from the stronger user's signal, which can be reduced by a smaller degradation factor  $c_k$ . Hence, the performance of a pair that shares the same beam can be increased by pairing users with a large channel correlation coefficient ( $\rho_k$  close to 1) and a significant difference in CQI ( $c_k$  close to 0).

In a large-system limit, an achievable rate for each user converges to  $\log_2(1 + \gamma^{\infty})$  where  $\gamma^{\infty}$  is obtained from either (13), (14), or (15). We would like to maximize the minimum rate of all users in the cell given the total CDI-rate constraint and the total transmit-power constraint. Since the rate increases monotonically with SINR, we optimize SINR directly over power fractions  $\{\zeta_g\}$ , normalized CDI bits  $\{\overline{B}_g\}$ , power decay factors  $\{\alpha_k\}$ , and grouping function  $\mathcal{G}$ . The optimization problem is stated as follows.

$$\max_{\{\zeta_g\},\{\bar{B}_g\},\{\alpha_k\},\mathcal{G}} \quad \min_{l\in\mathcal{S},k\in\mathcal{U}}\{\gamma_l^{\infty},\gamma_{k;s}^{\infty},\gamma_{k;w}^{\infty}\}$$
(16a)

subject to 
$$\sum_{g=1}^{G} \zeta_g \bar{M}_g \le \bar{K},$$
 (16b)

$$\sum_{g=1}^{G} \bar{M}_g \bar{B}_g \le \hat{B}_{\text{tot}},\tag{16c}$$

$$\zeta_g \ge 0, \bar{B}_g \ge 0, \quad g = 1, 2, \dots, G, \quad (16d)$$

$$\alpha_k \ge 0, \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{U}, \tag{10c}$$

$$\mathcal{G}(m) = \begin{cases} 1 & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 2, 3, \dots, G & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ m \in \mathcal{U}. \end{cases}$$
(16f)

This generalizes the problem considered in our previous work [24] in which there were only 2 groups, i.e., a group of all singletons and a group of all pairs, and only  $\overline{B}_1$  and  $\overline{B}_2$  were optimized. Also, the work in [24] only assumed perfect channel alignment between the 2 users in any pair or  $\rho_k = 1, \forall k \in \mathcal{U}$ . Finding optimal solutions for the clustering nonlinear problem in (16) is exceedingly complex. Hence, we will propose a suboptimal solution by dividing the problem into 2 subproblems. The first subproblem is to optimize the transmit power and the CDI rate with a fixed pair grouping and the second subproblem is to optimize the grouping of user pairs with fixed transmit power and CDI rate. We will consider the first subproblem in Section IV and the second one in Section V.

# IV. JOINT TRANSMIT POWER AND CDI-RATE OPTIMIZATION

In this section, we assume that the group assignment for all user pairs is fixed or the grouping function G is provided. Hence, problem (16) is simplified and transformed as follows.

$$\max_{\{\zeta_g\},\{\bar{B}_g\},\{\alpha_k\}} \gamma_{\text{th}}$$
(17a)  
subject to (16b), (16c), (16d), (16e),

$$\gamma_l^{\infty} \ge \gamma_{\text{th}}, \qquad \forall l \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (17b)$$

$$\gamma_{k;s}^{\infty} \ge \gamma_{\text{th}}, \quad \gamma_{k;w}^{\infty} \ge \gamma_{\text{th}}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{U}.$$
 (17c)

Note that the objective function for problem (17) is the minimum attainable SINR for all users denoted by  $\gamma_{\text{th}}$ . With

the additional SINR constraints (17b) and (17c), the objective functions in (17) and (16) are equivalent.

#### A. Geometric Program

Problem (17) can be converted to a geometric program (GP) [36], which requires the objective and inequality constraints to be posynomial. We substitute (13) into inequality (17b) and rearrange the inequality to obtain

$$\zeta_1^{-1} \frac{\beta_1}{1 - \beta_1} + \frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}} \zeta_1^{-1} \frac{1}{1 - \beta_1} \le Z$$
(18)

where  $\beta_1 \triangleq 2^{-\bar{B}_1}$  and  $Z \triangleq \frac{1-\bar{M}}{\bar{K}\gamma_{\text{th}}}$ . For  $\bar{B}_1 > 0$  ( $\beta_1 < 1$ ), we can expand  $\frac{1}{1-\beta_1} = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \beta_i^i$ . With the expansion of  $\frac{1}{1-\beta_1}$ , (18) can be expressed as a posynomial inequality given by

$$\frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}}\zeta_1^{-1}Z^{-1} + \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}}\right)\zeta_1^{-1}Z^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\beta_1^i \le 1.$$
(19)

Similarly, we can substitute (14) and (15) into (17c) and obtain 2 posynomial constraints on SINR for stronger and weaker users of pair k in group g given by

$$\zeta_g^{-1} Z^{-1} (1 + a_k^{-1}) \left[ \frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}} + \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \beta_g^i \right] \le 1 \quad (20)$$

(16e) where  $\beta_g \triangleq 2^{-\bar{B}_g}$  and  $a_k \triangleq c_k^{2\alpha_k}$ , and

$$\left(\frac{1-\bar{M}}{\bar{K}}\right)c_{k}^{2}a_{k}Z^{-1} \\
+ \left(c_{k}^{2}(1-\rho_{k}^{2}) + \frac{\sigma_{n}^{2}}{P_{\text{tot}}}\right)\zeta_{g}^{-1}Z^{-1}(1+a_{k}) \\
+ \left(c_{k}^{2} + \frac{\sigma_{n}^{2}}{P_{\text{tot}}}\right)\zeta_{g}^{-1}Z^{-1}(1+a_{k})\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\beta_{g}^{i} \leq 1, \quad (21)$$

respectively. The constraints on total transmit power (16b) and total CDI rate (16c) can also be converted to posynomial inequalities given by

$$\sum_{g=1}^{G} \frac{\bar{M}_g}{\bar{K}} \zeta_g \le 1, \tag{22}$$

$$2^{-\hat{B}_{\text{tot}}} \prod_{g=1}^{G} \beta_g^{-\bar{M}_g} \le 1.$$
(23)

With the equivalent posynomial constraints, we can rewrite problem (17) as

$$\min_{\{\zeta_g\},\{a_k\},\{\beta_g\},Z} Z$$
(24a)
subject to (19) (22) (23)

subject to (19), (22), (23),  
(20), (21), 
$$\forall k \in \mathcal{U},$$
  
 $0 < a_k \le 1, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{U},$  (24b)  
 $\zeta_g > 0, \quad 0 < \beta_g < 1, \quad g = 1, 2, \dots, G,$   
(24c)  
 $Z > 0.$  (24d)

Problem (24) is not convex due to its posynomial constraints. However, it is a GP and can be solved efficiently by many readily available software packages, such as MOSEK, CVXOPT, and GGPLAB. One efficient method to solve a GP is to convert it to a convex problem by logarithmic transformations of variables and constraint functions [36]. We use MOSEK to solve (24) and will show the results in Section VII. Let us denote the optimal solutions for (24) by  $\{\zeta_g^*\}$ ,  $\{a_k^*\}$ ,  $\{\beta_g^*\}$ , and  $Z^*$ . Hence, the optimal normalized CDI quantization rate is  $\bar{B}_g^* = -\log_2(\beta_g^*)$  and the optimal power decay factor for pair k is  $\alpha_k^* = -\ln(a_k^*)/\ln(c_k^2)$ , and the minimum SINR for all users is  $\gamma_{\rm th}^* = (1 - \bar{M})/(Z^*\bar{K})$ .

Since explicit complexity in polynomial form does not exist for solving GP [37], we determine the complexity of problem (24) by the number of optimizing variables and constraints. There are  $2G + M - M_1 + 1$  variables, 2K + 3inequality constraints, and another  $2G + M - M_1 + 1$  boundary constraints on the variables. The complexity of solving (24) increases with the system size and the number of user groups. To compare the computational complexity of different schemes, we will compare the computation time in Section VII.

## B. Progressive-Filling Allocation

To further reduce the complexity of finding the optimal resource allocation, we propose to first optimize the power decay factor  $\alpha_k$  for all user pairs for a given power factor  $\zeta_g$  and normalized CDI rate  $\bar{B}_g$ , and then allocate  $\zeta_g$  and  $\bar{B}_g$  for all user groups by a progressive-filling scheme. Progressive filling has been previously applied to allocate limited resource to nodes in a network to achieve max-min fairness [38].

For pair k, we first find the power decay factor  $\alpha_k \geq 0$  that maximizes the SINR minimum of the 2 users,  $\min\{\gamma_{k;s}^{\infty}, \gamma_{k;w}^{\infty}\}$ .

Proposition 1: For a given  $\zeta_g$  and  $\overline{B}_g$ , if

$$2^{-\bar{B}_{g}} \left( 1 - c_{k}^{2} + \frac{\zeta_{g} c_{k}^{2} (1 - \bar{M})}{2\rho_{k}^{2} \bar{K}} \right) \\ \geq (\rho_{k}^{-2} - 1)(c_{k}^{2} + \frac{\sigma_{n}^{2}}{P_{\text{tot}}}) + \frac{\zeta_{g} c_{k}^{2} (1 - \bar{M})}{2\rho_{k}^{2} \bar{K}}, \quad (25)$$

the optimal power decay factor that maximizes the minimum SINR between the stronger and weaker users of pair k is  $\alpha_k^* = 0$  and the minimum SINR for pair k is given by

$$\gamma_k^{\infty} = \frac{\zeta_g (1 - \bar{M})(1 - 2^{-B_g})}{2\bar{K} \left(2^{-\bar{B}_g} + \frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}}\right)}.$$
 (26)

Otherwise, the optimal power decay factor is

$$\alpha_k^* = \frac{\ln\left(\sqrt{\mathbb{B}_k^2 - 4\mathbb{A}_k\mathbb{C}_k} - \mathbb{B}_k\right) - \ln(2\mathbb{A}_k)}{\ln(c_k^2)}$$
(27)

and the resulting minimum SINR for pair k is given by (28) where

$$\mathbb{A}_{k} = c_{k}^{2} + c_{k}^{2} \left( \frac{\zeta_{g}(1-\bar{M})}{\bar{K}} - \rho_{k}^{2} \right) (1 - 2^{-\bar{B}_{g}}) + \frac{\sigma_{n}^{2}}{P_{\text{tot}}}, \quad (29)$$

$$\mathbb{B}_{k} = (1 - \rho_{k}^{2}) \left( c_{k}^{2} + \frac{\sigma_{n}^{2}}{P_{\text{tot}}} \right) - \rho_{k}^{2} (1 - c_{k}^{2}) 2^{-\bar{B}_{g}}, \tag{30}$$

$$\mathbb{C}_k = -\rho_k^2 \left( 2^{-\bar{B}_g} + \frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}} \right). \tag{31}$$

A proof of the proposition is in Appendix A.

From the above proposition, if the allocated CDI rate per user pair  $\bar{B}_g$  is so low that (25) is true, the optimal power allocation among the 2 users is uniform ( $\alpha_k^* = 0$ ). The resulting SINR for the stronger user will be smaller than that for the weaker user, and will dictate the performance of the pair. If  $\bar{B}_g$  is sufficiently large such that (25) is false, the optimal decay factor is given by (27) and both users achieve the same SINR given by (28). Also, (27) is likely false for user pairs with good channel alignment ( $\rho_k^2 \approx 1$ ) or with a large CQI gap ( $c_k^2 \approx 0$ ). For user pairs with those properties, the optimal power allocation will most likely be nonuniform ( $\alpha_k^* > 0$ ).

Before progressively allocating the transmit power and CDI bits for each group, we divide the total power and total bits into small chunks. Let  $N_{\zeta}^{(0)}$  and  $N_B^{(0)}$  be the initial number of chunks for power and CDI-bit allocations, respectively. Both  $N_{\zeta}^{(0)}$  and  $N_B^{(0)}$  must be greater than the number of user groups G. First, each group will be allocated with the same cumulative power factor of  $\bar{K}/N_{\zeta}^{(0)}$  and the same cumulative normalized bits of  $\hat{B}_{\rm tot}/N_B^{(0)}$ . For group g, the power factor per beam and normalized bits per beam are set to  $\zeta_g = \bar{K}/(N_{\zeta}^{(0)}\bar{M}_g)$  and  $\bar{B}_g = \hat{B}_{\rm tot}/(N_B^{(0)}\bar{M}_g)$ , respectively.

With this initial allocation, we compute the SINR for a singleton (13) and the SINR for pair k from Proposition 1. The group with the minimum SINR will be allocated an additional power factor of  $\bar{K}/(N_{\zeta}^{(0)}\bar{M}_g)$ . We then recalculate the SINR of the group with the additional power factor and find the group with the minimum SINR, which will be assigned an additional chunk of CDI bits. Unlike the power factor, we propose to allocate the remaining  $\hat{B}_{tot}(1 - G/N_B^{(0)})$  bits as a geometric sequence of  $N_B^{(0)} - G$  chunks with decay factor  $0 < \delta < 1$ . Therefore, the chunk size of the normalized bits in the initial iterations is much larger than that in the final iterations. This is due to the small rate of change of the SINR for each user with respect to the normalized bits  $\bar{B}_g$  when  $\bar{B}_g$  is close to zero. With too small CDI-bit allocation, the SINR increase will be tiny and the algorithm will take a larger number of iterations to converge. Thus, we allocate larger chunks first followed by smaller chunks. With a sum of

$$\gamma_k^{\infty} = \frac{2\zeta_g \rho_k^2 (1 - \bar{M})(1 - 2^{-\bar{B}_g})}{\sqrt{\bar{K}^2 (\mathbb{B}_k - 2\mathbb{C}_k)^2 + 4\zeta_g c_k^2 \rho_k^2 \bar{K}(1 - \bar{M})(1 - 2^{-\bar{B}_g})(2^{-\bar{B}_g} + \frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}}) + \bar{K}(\mathbb{B}_k - 2\mathbb{C}_k)}$$
(28)

the geometric sequence, we can derive the chunk size of the normalized CDI bits for the *i*th iteration given by

$$\Delta \bar{B}_i = \hat{B}_{\text{tot}} \left( 1 - \frac{G}{N_B^{(0)}} \right) \frac{(1-\delta)\delta^{i-1}}{1 - \delta^{N_B^{(0)} - G}}$$
(32)

where  $i = 1, 2, ..., N_B^{(0)} - G$ . After allocating additional CDI bits, the SINR for the group is re-computed. We then find the group with the minimum SINR to allocate the additional power factor. Power factors and normalized bits are alternately allocated to the group with the minimum SINR. In other words, user groups are progressively filled with both resources until both are exhausted. The allocation at the end is the solution. We summarize the scheme in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 The proposed progressive-filling power and CDI bit allocation.

1: Set  $N_{\zeta}^{(0)} > G$ ,  $N_B^{(0)} > G$ ,  $0 < \delta < 1$ , and i = 0. 2: Initialize  $\bar{B}_g = \frac{\hat{B}_{\text{tot}}}{N_B^{(0)}\bar{M}_g}$  and  $\zeta_g = \frac{\bar{K}}{N_c^{(0)}\bar{M}_g}$  for g = $1, 2, \ldots, G.$ 3: Compute  $\gamma_l^{\infty}(\zeta_1, \bar{B}_1), \forall l \in \mathcal{S}$  from (13) and  $\gamma_k^{\infty}(\zeta_g, \bar{B}_g), \forall k \in \mathcal{U}$  from Proposition 1 where  $g = \mathcal{G}(k)$ . 4:  $N_{\zeta} = N_{\zeta}^{(0)} - G$ 5:  $N_B = N_B^{(0)} - G$ 6: Find  $a^* = \mathcal{C}(m^*)$  where  $a^*$ 6: Find  $g^* = \mathcal{G}(m^*)$  where  $m^* = \arg \min_{m \in \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{U}} \gamma_m^{\infty}$ . 7: while  $N_{\zeta} > 0$  or  $N_B > 0$  do 8:  $i \leftarrow i + 1$ if  $N_{\zeta} > 0$  then  $\zeta_{g^*} \leftarrow \zeta_{g^*} + \frac{\bar{K}}{N_{\zeta}^{(0)}\bar{M}_{g^*}}$   $N_{\zeta} \leftarrow N_{\zeta} - 1$ 9: 10: 11: Re-compute  $\gamma_{q^*}^{\infty}(\zeta_{g^*}, \bar{B}_{g^*})$  from either (13) or Propo-12: Find  $g^+ = \mathcal{G}(m^+)$  where  $m^+ = \arg \min_{m \in \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{U}} \gamma_m^\infty$ . 13: else 14:  $g^+ \leftarrow g^*$ 15: end if 16: if  $N_B > 0$  then  $\bar{B}_{g^+} \leftarrow \bar{B}_{g^+} + \hat{B}_{\text{tot}} \left( \frac{(1 - G/N_B^{(0)})(1 - \delta)}{1 - \delta^{N_B^{(0)} - G}} \right) \delta^{i-1}$ 17: 18:  $N_B \leftarrow N_B - 1$ 19: Re-compute  $\gamma_{g^+}^{\infty}(\zeta_{g^+}, \bar{B}_{g^+})$  from either (13) or 20: Proposition 1. Find  $q^* = \mathcal{G}(m^*)$  where  $m^* = \arg\min_{m \in S \cup \mathcal{U}} \gamma_m^\infty$ . 21: 22: else  $g^* \leftarrow g^+$ 23: end if 24: 25: end while 26: **return**  $\bar{B}_g$  and  $\zeta_g$  for  $g = 1, 2, \ldots, G$ .

Generally,  $N_{\zeta}^{(0)}$  and  $N_{B}^{(0)}$  should be sufficiently large that the achieved minimum SINR is close to the optimum obtained by GP from Section IV-A. However, as we discussed earlier, we do not set  $N_{B}^{(0)}$  too large to avoid tiny CDI-rate chunks. From the numerical results in Section VII,  $N_{B}^{(0)}$  can be set to be much smaller than  $N_{\zeta}^{(0)}$ .

The complexity of this progressive-filling scheme depends on the number of iterations, which is  $\max\{N_{\zeta}^{(0)}, N_{B}^{(0)}\}$ , and

the number of SINR computations, which is  $N_{\zeta}^{(0)} + N_B^{(0)} - G$ , and hence, increases with  $N_{\zeta}^{(0)}$  and  $N_B^{(0)}$ .

# V. GROUPING OF USER PAIRS

In addition to jointly optimizing the power factor and CDIbit allocation in Section IV, the minimum SINR can be further increased by optimizing grouping function  $\mathcal{G}$ . To improve maxmin fairness, user pairs with similar channel quality should be grouped together. The optimized grouping can significantly increase the system performance, especially when the number of groups is large. This motivated us to propose a grouping scheme shown in Algorithm 2. The scheme applies when the number of groups  $G \geq 3$ . For G = 2, we simply group all user pairs together.

For our proposed scheme, we first cluster all pairs into G-1 groups with K-means, which is a well-known method of vector quantization. Here, we apply one-dimensional K-means over the SINR of each pair. In each subsequent iteration, we move the pair with the worst SINR, which is also the system SINR, from the current group to the group with a lower SINR mean. We expect the pair will perform better in the next iteration since it is in a group with a lower SINR mean and will likely be allocated larger power factor and bit allocation. The scheme terminates when there is no pair to move or the SINR increase  $\Delta_{\gamma}$  is less than threshold  $\epsilon_{\gamma}$ . Beyond the initial grouping by K-means, at the most one pair will be moved at each iteration. Thus, the scheme reduces the likelihood that the grouping oscillates and does not converge. From the numerical results, Algorithm 2 converges within a few iterations.

The complexity of Algorithm 2 depends largely on the joint power and bit allocation scheme used in line 10 and the number of iterations, which depends on the threshold  $\epsilon_{\gamma}$ . The computational complexity increases greatly if GP is applied instead of the progressive filling.

# VI. ORTHOGONAL MULTIPLE ACCESS

In this section, we assume that the system does not pair users whose spatial channels are highly correlated and hence, the system only consists of singletons. To accommodate an arbitrary number of users, K, the BS with  $N_t$  transmit antennas applies regularized zeroforcing beamforming to construct for each user its transmit beamforming vector [39]. Assuming flat Rayleigh fading, the channel vector for user n is given by  $c_n h_n$  where  $h_n$  is an  $N_t \times 1$  vector whose entries are complex Gaussian with zero mean and unit variance,  $0 < c_n \le 1$  is the degradation factor, and n = 1, 2, ..., K. For a cell-center user,  $c_n$  is close to or equal to 1. For a cell-edge user,  $c_n$ is small and closer to 0. Since there is no user pairing, the BS randomly selects K users and hence, the channel vectors corresponding to those users are independent.

Inspired by the proposed scheme in Section V, we group users with similar degradation factor  $c_n$  into a group and allocate resources to each group based on its performance. We propose that user l in group g is assigned  $B_g$  bits to quantize its CDI, which will be fed back to the BS. Similar to NOMA transmission, the BS forms the  $K \times N_t$  quantized channel matrix  $\hat{H}_{oma}$  whose *n*th row is a transpose of quantized CDI

# Algorithm 2 The proposed user-pair grouping

1: Set  $G \geq 3$ .

- 2: Initialize  $\bar{B}_g = (\hat{B}_{tot} \bar{M}_1 \bar{B}_1)/(\bar{M} \bar{M}_1), g =$  $2, 3, \ldots, G.$
- 3: Initialize  $\zeta_g = (\bar{K} \bar{M}_1 \zeta_1)/(\bar{M} \bar{M}_1), g = 2, 3, \dots, G.$ 4: Compute  $\gamma_k^{\infty}, \forall k \in \mathcal{U}$  with Proposition 1.
- 5: Apply K-means to cluster  $\{\gamma_k^\infty\}$  into G-1 groups and obtain the SINR mean for each group.
- 6: Label the groups with index  $g = 2, 3, \ldots, G$  by ascending SINR mean. (The group with label g = 2 has the smallest SINR mean.)
- 7: Define function  $\mathcal{G}$  with input pair index  $k \in \mathcal{U}$  and output group index  $g \in \{2, 3, \dots, G\}$ , based on the clustering in line 5 and labeling in line 6.
- 8: Set  $\gamma_{\text{th-old}} = 0$ ,  $0 < \epsilon_{\gamma} \ll 1$ , and  $\Delta_{\gamma} = \epsilon_{\gamma} + 1$ .

9: while 
$$\Delta_{\gamma} > \epsilon_{\gamma}$$
 do

- Given  $\hat{B}_{tot}$ ,  $\bar{K}$ , and  $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ , solve for  $\zeta_g$ , and  $\bar{B}_g$ ,  $\forall g$  by 10: either GP or Algorithm 1.
- Compute  $\gamma_l^{\infty}, \forall l \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \gamma_k^{\infty}, \forall k \in \mathcal{U}.$ 11:
- $\gamma_{\rm th} = \min_{l \in \mathcal{S}, k \in \mathcal{U}} \{ \gamma_l^{\infty}, \gamma_k^{\infty} \}.$ 12:
- if  $\exists k : \gamma_k^{\infty} = \gamma_{\text{th}}$  and  $\mathcal{G}(k) = g > 2$  then 13:
- Revise function  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $\mathcal{G}(k) = g 1$ . 14:
- end if 15:
- 16:  $\Delta_{\gamma} = \gamma_{\rm th} - \gamma_{\rm th-old}$
- 17:  $\gamma_{\text{th-old}} \leftarrow \gamma_{\text{th}}$
- 18: end while
- 19: return G.

for user n denoted by  $\hat{h}_n$ . For the same CDI accuracy, this scheme will require a much higher total quantization rate than the NOMA scheme presented in previous sections since the number of CDI vectors is generally higher. The BS computes a regularized zeroforcing beamforming for user n given by  $v_n = V \hat{h}_n$  where  $V = (\hat{H}_{oma}^{\dagger} \hat{H}_{oma} + \varphi N_t I)^{-1}$  and  $\varphi$  is a regularizing constant. The regularized zeroforcing vectors obtained are semi-orthogonal with one another and hence, induce less interference. As the CDI becomes more accurate (as  $B_q$  increases), the beamforming vectors become more orthogonal. Thus, this is an OMA scheme.

We can derive an expression for the SINR for user l as follows

$$\gamma_n = \frac{p_n c_n^2 |\boldsymbol{h}_n^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{v}_n|^2 / \|\boldsymbol{v}_n\|^2}{\sum_{j \neq n} p_j c_n^2 |\boldsymbol{h}_n^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{v}_j|^2 / \|\boldsymbol{v}_j\|^2 + \sigma_n^2}$$
(33)

where  $p_n$  is the transmit power for user n and  $p_i$  is the interfering power from user j. If user n belongs in group g, the base station allocates power  $p_n = \zeta_g P_{\text{tot}}/K$  where  $P_{\text{tot}}$  is the total transmit power and  $\zeta_q$  is the power factor for group g. With the results in [39], we can show that as  $N_t \to \infty$ ,

$$\gamma_n - \gamma_n^\infty \to 0 \tag{34}$$

where

$$\gamma_n^{\infty} = \frac{\zeta_g (1 - 2^{-B_g}) (m^{\circ})^2 a^{\circ}}{1 - m^{\circ} (m^{\circ} + 2) 2^{-\bar{B}_g} + (1 + m^{\circ})^2 \sigma_n^2 / (c_n^2 P_{\text{tot}})},$$
(35)

$$m^{\circ} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{\bar{K} - 1}{\varphi}\right)^{2} + \frac{4}{\varphi} - \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\bar{K} - 1}{\varphi}\right)}, \quad (36)$$

$$a^{\circ} = \left(\sqrt{\bar{K}} + \frac{\varphi(1+m^{\circ})}{\sqrt{\bar{K}}}\right)^2 - 1.$$
(37)

The asymptotic SINR in (35) clearly increases with  $\zeta_q$ ,  $\bar{B}_q$ , and signal-to-noise ratio (SNR)  $c_n^2 P_{\text{tot}} / \sigma_n^2$ . For moderate to large  $N_t$ , the asymptotic SINR  $\gamma_n^{\infty}$  is shown to be close to the actual SINR  $\gamma_n$  [39]. For tractability, we will use the asymptotic SINR to find the optimal sets of power factors  $\{\zeta_q\}$  and the normalized CDI bits  $\{\overline{B}_q\}$ . To achieve max-min fairness for this OMA scheme, we would like to solve the following problem

$$\max_{\{\zeta_g\},\{\bar{B}_g\},\varphi,\mathcal{F}} \quad \min_{n=1,2,\dots,K} \gamma_n^{\infty}$$
(38a)

subject to 
$$\sum_{g=1}^{G} \zeta_g \bar{M}_g \le \bar{K},$$
 (38b)

$$\sum_{g=1}^{6} \bar{M}_g \bar{B}_g \le \hat{B}_{\text{tot}}, \qquad (38c)$$

$$\zeta_g \ge 0, \bar{B}_g \ge 0, \quad g = 1, 2, \dots, G,$$
 (38d)

$$> 0,$$
 (38e)

$$\mathcal{F}: \{1, 2, \dots, K\} \to \{1, 2, \dots, G\}$$
 (38f)

where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a user-grouping function. Since  $\gamma_n^{\infty}$  monotonically decreases with degradation factor  $c_n$ , the minimum SINR for group g is from the user with the minimum  $c_n^2$  in the group denoted by

 $\varphi$  >

$$n_g^* = \arg\min_{n:\mathcal{F}(n)=g} c_n^2.$$
(39)

This set of users,  $\{n_a^*\}$ , will determine the resource allocation for all groups. In this study, we do not directly solve problem (38), but focus on subproblems that optimize  $\{\zeta_q\}, \{B_q\}, \{B_q\},$ and  $\varphi$ , with a given user grouping  $\mathcal{F}$ . The subproblems are discussed next.

# A. Optimizing $\zeta_g$ , $\overline{B}_g$ , and $\varphi$

The first subproblem of (38) is to jointly optimize  $\zeta_q$  and  $\bar{B}_g$  for given regularizing constant  $\varphi$  and grouping function  $\mathcal{F}$ . This subproblem can also be solved by GP. Similar to problem (17), SINR for all users must exceed a threshold  $\gamma_{\text{th}}$ . Equivalently, the minimum SINR for each group  $\gamma_{n_a}^{\infty} \geq \gamma_{\text{th}}$ . With (35), we can rewrite the inequality as follows

$$\frac{1 + (1 + m^{\circ})^2 \sigma_n^2 / (c_{n_g^*}^2 P_{\text{tot}})}{\zeta_g (1 - 2^{-\bar{B}_g}) a^{\circ}} + \frac{m^{\circ} (m^{\circ} + 2) 2^{-\bar{B}_g}}{\zeta_g (1 - 2^{-\bar{B}_g}) a^{\circ}} \le \frac{(m^{\circ})^2}{\gamma_{\text{th}}}.$$
(40)

Defining  $\beta_g \triangleq 2^{-\bar{B}_g}$  and  $Y \triangleq \frac{(m^{\circ})^2}{\gamma_{\text{th}}}$ , we can rewrite (40) with posynomials of  $\zeta_g$ ,  $\beta_g$ , and Y given by

$$\left(1 + \frac{(1+m^{\circ})^{2}\sigma_{n}^{2}}{c_{n_{g}}^{2}P_{\text{tot}}}\right)(a^{\circ})^{-1}\zeta_{g}^{-1}(1+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\beta_{g}^{i})Y^{-1} + m^{\circ}(m^{\circ}+2)(a^{\circ})^{-1}\zeta^{-1}(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\beta_{g}^{i})Y^{-1} \le 1.$$
(41)

Similar to problem (24), we can describe this problem so that the objective and constraints are composed of posynomials of the variables to be optimized as shown

$$\min_{\{\zeta_g\}, \{\beta_g\}, Y} \quad Y \quad (42a)$$
subject to (41),  $g = 1, 2, \dots, G,$ 
(22) and (23),
$$\zeta_g > 0, \ 0 < \beta_g < 1, \ g = 1, 2, \dots, G, \quad (42b)$$

$$Y > 0 \quad (42c)$$

where (22) and (23) are the constraints on the total power factor and the total normalized CDI bits, respectively. Hence, problem (42) can be solved by a GP solver.

To further improve the performance, we can optimize regularizing constant  $\varphi$ . The optimal  $\varphi$  was derived from [39]. With the optimized  $\varphi$ , we re-solve problem (42) to obtain the new power factor and bit allocations. The 2 subproblems are alternately solved until the minimum SINR converges. The steps are summarized in Algorithm 3. We note that the initial value for  $\varphi$  in line 1 is the optimal value when CDI is perfect or  $\overline{B}_g \to \infty$  while that in line 7 is the optimal value with quantized CDI [39]. Algorithm 3 terminates when the SINR difference from the previous iteration is less than threshold  $\epsilon_{\gamma}$ .

Algorithm 3 The proposed suboptimal scheme to find  $\{\zeta_g\}$ ,  $\{\bar{B}_q\}$ , and  $\varphi$ .

1: Initialize 
$$\varphi = \frac{\bar{K}\sigma_n^2}{P_{\text{tot}}}$$
.  
2: Set  $\gamma_{\text{th-old}} = 0$ ,  $0 < \epsilon_{\gamma} \ll 1$ , and  $\Delta_{\gamma} = \epsilon_{\gamma} + 1$ .  
3: while  $\Delta_{\gamma} > \epsilon_{\gamma}$  do  
4: Solve (42) to obtain  $\{\zeta_g\}$  and  $\{\bar{B}_g\}$ .  
5: Compute  $\gamma_{n_g^*}^{\infty}$  for  $g = 1, 2, ..., G$  where  $n_g^*$  is obtained  
by (39).  
6:  $\gamma_{\text{th}} = \min_{g=1,2,...,G} \gamma_{n_g^*}^{\infty}$  and  $g_{\min} = \arg\min_{g=1,2,...,G} \gamma_{n_g^*}^{\infty}$   
7:  $\varphi = \frac{c_{n_g^*\min}^2 P_{\text{tot}}/\sigma_n^2 + 2^{-\bar{B}g_{\min}}}{1 - 2^{-\bar{B}g_{\min}}}$ .  
8:  $\Delta_{\gamma} = |\gamma_{\text{th}} - \gamma_{\text{th-old}}|$ .  
9: end while  
10: return  $\{\zeta_g\}, \{\bar{B}_g\}$ , and  $\varphi$ .

B. Full Load ( $\overline{K} = 1$ )

Next, we consider a system with a full load or with the number of users equal to the number of transmit antennas at the BS. Substitute  $\bar{K} = 1$  into (36) and (37) to obtain

$$m^{\circ} = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{\varphi}} - \frac{1}{2},$$
(43)

$$a^{\circ} = \frac{2m^{\circ} + 1}{(m^{\circ})^2}.$$
(44)

We let

$$d = 2m^{\circ} + 1 = \sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{\varphi}},\tag{45}$$

$$S = \frac{1}{\gamma_{\rm th}}.\tag{46}$$

Substituting (43)-(46) into (40), we can express inequality (40) in terms of posynomials of  $\zeta_q$ ,  $\beta_q$ , d, and S as follows

$$\begin{split} \zeta_g^{-1} S^{-1}(2+d+d^{-1}) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \beta_g^i + \frac{(1+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \beta_g^i)\sigma_n^2}{4c_{n_g^*}^2 P_{\text{tot}}} \right) \\ + \zeta_g^{-1} S^{-1} d^{-1} \leq 1. \end{split} \tag{47}$$

For  $\bar{K} = 1$ , we can describe a problem that solves for max-min fairness as follows :

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{\{\zeta_g\},\{\beta_g\},d,S} & S & (48a) \\ \text{subject to} & (47), & g = 1, 2, \dots, G, \\ & (22) \text{ and } (23), \\ & \zeta_g > 0, \ 0 < \beta_g < 1, \quad g = 1, 2, \dots, G, \ (48b) \\ & S > 0, \ d > 1. & (48c) \end{array}$$

After solving (48) with GP, the optimized regularizing constant  $\varphi^* = 4/((d^*)^2 - 1)$  is obtained along with the optimized power factors and bit allocations. Thus,  $\varphi$  does not need to be solved separately.

#### VII. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In Fig. 1, we compare the large-system SINR for a singleton (13), and the stronger user (14) and the weaker user (15)in a pair with the corresponding SINR for finite-size systems obtained by simulation. We consider a system with G = 3,  $\bar{M}_1 = 0.125, \ \bar{M}_2 = \bar{M}_2 = 0.0625, \ \bar{K} = 0.375, \ {
m and}$  $P_{\rm tot}/\sigma_n^2 = 20$  dB. The number of transmit antennas at the BS is either  $N_t = 32$  or 64. For the user pair, degradation factor  $c_k = 0.8$ , channel correlation coefficient  $\rho_k = 0.95$ , and the decay factor  $\alpha_k = 5$ . As expected, SINR for all 3 users increases with the normalized CDI bit rate per antenna  $(\overline{B}_1 \text{ for a singleton and } \overline{B}_2 \text{ for a user pair})$ . We see that a singleton achieves larger SINR  $\gamma_l$  when the CDI rate is high since it does not share the transmit beam with other users and therefore, does not suffer additional interference. With a large power decay factor  $\alpha_k = 5$ , more power is allocated for the weak user in the pair and hence, in the small CDIrate regimes, SINR for the weak user is larger than that for the strong user. As the CDI rate increases and the channel information becomes more accurate, the strong user with SIC performs better due to more accurate transmit beamforming and less interference from other users.

As the system size increases from  $N_t = 32$  to 64, the SINR obtained by simulation approaches the large-system SINR in (13), (14), and (15). In addition to the simulation for Rayleigh fading channels, we also obtain the simulation results for millimeter wave (mmWave) channels utilized in many mobile networks including long-term evolution (LTE) networks. For this figure with moderate load ( $\bar{K} = 0.375$ ), SINR for all 3 users in mmWave channels is a bit smaller than that in Rayleigh fading, but follows the same trend as the CDI rate increases. The model for mmWave channels in this work is from [28] with 20 signal paths and an exponential power-delay profile. From our numerical study, we find that for a lighter-to-moderate load or a high CDI rate, our large-system analysis can reasonably approximate the performance

of mmWave channels. Thus, the optimized allocation derived in this work is expected to also work well for systems operated in mmWave bands in those applicable regimes.



Fig. 1: SINR for singleton,  $\gamma_l$ , and that for the stronger user in pair k,  $\gamma_{k;s}$  and the weaker user,  $\gamma_{k;w}$  for finite-size systems are compared with the large-system results.

In Fig. 2, we show a plot of  $\gamma_k^{\infty}$  obtained from Proposition 1 with varying  $c_k^2$  and  $\rho_k^2$  for a system with  $\overline{M} = 0.45$ ,  $\overline{K} = 0.8$ , and  $P_{\text{tot}}/\sigma_n^2 = 25$  dB. If condition (25) applies, the expression for the SINR for pair k (26) does not depend on  $c_k^2$  and  $\rho_k^2$ . Thus, we see a flat SINR surface. Otherwise, the SINR expression (28) applies and the SINR decreases with larger  $c_k^2$  and smaller  $\rho_k^2$ .



Fig. 2: A surface plot of  $\gamma_k^{\infty}$  obtained from Proposition 1 with varying  $c_k^2$  and  $\rho_k^2$  for a system with  $\bar{M} = 0.45$ ,  $\bar{K} = 0.8$ , and  $P_{\text{tot}}/\sigma_n^2 = 25$  dB.

In Fig. 3, we track the minimum SINR obtained from Algorithm 1 with the number of iterations for systems with 2 groups with  $M_1 = M_2 = 4$ , and 4 groups with  $M_1 = M_2 = M_3 = M_3 = 4$ . In the figure,  $N_{\zeta}^{(0)} = 500$  while  $N_B^{(0)}$  is set to either 50, 300, or 600. The minimum SINR of all users increases with the number of iterations. The maximum of the minimum SINR is attained when all bit and power chunks are allocated to the user pairs. The system with 4 groups

achieves lower SINR due to heavier load. From the results shown, setting  $N_B^{(0)} = 50$  results in the fastest convergence with about 650 iterations.



Fig. 3: The minimum SINR from Algorithm 1 is plotted with the number of iterations for systems with either G = 2 or G = 4,  $N_t = 32$ ,  $\hat{B}_{tot} = 4$ ,  $P_{tot}/\sigma_n^2 = 25$  dB, and  $\delta = 0.6$ .

For Fig. 4, we solve problem (24) with GP solver MOSEK for a system with 4 user groups and  $N_t = 32$ , and obtain the optimal  $\{\alpha_k^*\}, \{\zeta_g^*\}, \text{ and } \{\bar{B}_g^*\}$ . For one user pair, the ratio between the optimal power for strong and weak users,  $p_{k;s}/p_{k;w}$  is plotted with varying squared degradation factor  $c_k^2$ . As expected, the weak or the cell-edge user must be allocated with higher power than the strong or the cell-center user. As the weak user moves toward the cell center  $(c_k^2$ increases to 1), the power assigned to both users becomes more uniform. We also vary the channel correlation between 2 users and note that the weaker user is allocated with a higher power fraction as  $\rho_k^2$  increases. This is due to stronger intra-pair interference from the stronger user as both channels become more aligned.



Fig. 4: For a given pair, ratio  $p_{k;s}/p_{k;w}$  is plotted with  $c_k^2$  for various values of  $\rho_k^2$ .  $N_t = 32$ , G = 4,  $\{M_g\} = \{4, 3, 4, 5\}$ , K = 32,  $\hat{B}_{tot} = 3$ , and  $P_{tot}/\sigma_n^2 = 25$  dB.

For Fig. 5, we consider a system with 2 groups (G = 2),

 $N_t = 32, M = 20$ , and vary the number of transmit beams for group 1 or  $M_1$  ( $M_2 = M - M_1$ ). A GP in (24) is solved. The ratio between the optimized CDI rates for the 2 groups is shown with varying  $M_1/M_2$  in Fig. 5a and the ratio between the optimized power factors is shown in Fig. 5b. Since both ratios are less than 1 for all settings shown, we conclude that more resources should be allocated to user pairs instead of singletons. User pairs must combat the intra-pair interference in addition to the interference from other users. From Fig. 5a, even larger fraction of the total CDI rate should be assigned to user pairs when the total CDI rate is high or when the channel alignment between the 2 users in a pair is better ( $\rho_k^2$ close to 1). Since intra-beam interference is strong when  $\rho_k^2$ is high, a user pair will require a higher CDI rate to better suppress inter-beam interference. Hence, with fixed  $B_{tot} = 1$ ,  $\bar{B}_1^*/\bar{B}_2^*$  decreases with increasing  $\rho_k^2$ . For Fig. 5b, we fix the normalized total CDI rate  $\hat{B}_{tot} = 3$ . When the total SNR is lowered to 10 dB,  $\zeta_1^*/\zeta_2^*$  is smaller. Therefore, an even higher fraction of the total power should be devoted to user pairs. As  $M_1/M_2$  increases with fixed M = 20, the total number of users K decreases. Due to a lighter load, the interference among users is reduced. Hence, more resource can be devoted to user pairs. As a result, the ratio between the resource for singleton and that for user pair decreases in both Figs. 5a and 5b.



Fig. 5:  $N_t = 32$ , G = 2, and M = 20. For group 2,  $0.2 \le c_k^2 \le 0.6$  and  $\rho_k^2 \ge 0.8$ .

In Fig. 6, we compare the performance of 2 allocation

schemes from Section IV. The GP solutions are shown with blue lines and circular markers and solutions from the progressive-filling scheme with Algorithm 1 in conjunction with Proposition 1 are shown with orange lines and diamond markers. In Fig 6a, the system SINR increases with a larger total CDI rate and smaller load as expected. For a lighter load  $M = M_1 + M_2 = 8$ , the normalized total CDI rate  $\hat{B}_{tot}$  of approximately 2 is sufficient to achieve close to the maximum performance. For a larger load, much higher  $B_{tot}$  is required. Although the progressive-filling scheme is suboptimal, it can perform close to the optimal solutions obtained by GP. The computational complexity measured by the computation time is shown in Fig 6b. For the same set of parameters, the progressive filling in Algorithm 1 is less complex than MOSEK, which is the GP solver employed, by more than 2 orders of magnitude. As the number of users increases, the computation time required for MOSEK steadily increases while that for Algorithm 1 remains approximately constant.



(b) Computation time.

Fig. 6: The SINR comparison between solving (42) with GP solver MOSEK and Algorithm 1 in conjunction with Proposition 1 for a system with  $N_t = 32$  and  $P_{\text{tot}}/\sigma_n^2 = 25$  dB.

Fig. 7 illustrates the performance gain from user grouping by applying Algorithm 2 in conjunction with Algorithm 1. For the figure, the number of singletons is 8 and that of user pairs is 28 with  $N_t = 64$ . We vary the number of groups G from 5 (4 groups of user pairs) to 29 (each beam gets its own optimized power and CDI rate). With increasing G, the system SINR increases as expected. We see a larger gain when the total CDI rate is moderate ( $\hat{B}_{tot} \approx 2.5$ ). The system gains about 2 dB when G is increased from 5 to 15 and a fraction of a dB when G is increased further to 29. However, the complexity of finding these solutions will also increase with G. Thus, there is a trade-off between the SINR and the computational complexity.



Fig. 7: The system SINR obtained by Algorithm 2 in conjunction with Algorithm 1 is shown with varying the number of groups, G.

In Fig. 8, we compare the SINR obtained from the largesystem analysis (35) with that from numerical simulation with  $N_t = 100$ ,  $\bar{B} = 3$ ,  $c_n^2 P_{\text{tot}} / \sigma_n^2 = 20$  dB, and various values of  $\varphi$ . As the load  $\bar{K}$  increases, SINR decreases, as expected. For a lighter load (small  $\bar{K}$ ), SINR also decreases substantially with larger  $\varphi$ . We remark that the large-system result gives an accurate approximation of the simulation result with large  $N_t$ .



Fig. 8: The asymptotic SINR (35) is compared with the SINR from numerical simulation with  $N_t = 100$ ,  $\bar{B} = 3$ ,  $P_{\text{tot}}/\sigma_n^2 = 20$  dB, and varying  $\varphi$  and  $\bar{K}$ .

The performance of OMA schemes described in Section VI is shown in Fig. 9. For the figure, we set  $N_t = K = 32$  $(\bar{K} = 1)$ , and G = 4. Since  $\bar{K} = 1$ , we can directly solve for both the allocation  $\{\zeta_g\}$  and  $\{\bar{B}_g\}$ , and regularizing constant  $\varphi$  from problem (48) with a GP solver. User grouping is based on the degradation factor  $c_k$ . The resulting SINR is indicated by the green line in the figure. We also apply the suboptimal scheme from Algorithm 3 and obtain the purple curve with triangle markers. The SINR from Algorithm 3 is very close to the optimum. Unlike problem (48), Algorithm 3 can be applied to systems with arbitrary  $\overline{K}$ . If  $\varphi$  is fixed while { $\zeta_g$ } and { $\overline{B}_g$ } are optimized, the performance loss (the blue curve with circular markers) is noticeable with a larger total CDI rate  $\hat{B}_{tot}$ . Finally, the orange curve with diamond markers indicates the system SINR with uniform power and CDI rate with fixed  $\varphi = K \sigma_n^2 / P_{tot}$ . The SINR with uniform allocation performs the worst across all values of  $\hat{B}_{tot}$ .



Fig. 9: The SINR performance with different OMA schemes for a system with  $N_t = K = 32$ , G = 4 with  $M_1 = 8$  and  $P_{\text{tot}}/\sigma_n^2 = 25$  dB.

Fig. 10 compares the performance of the proposed NOMA scheme from Algorithm 2 with that of the OMA from Algorithm 3 with user grouping based on  $c_k^2$ . To generate the degradation factor  $c_k$  for this figure, we assume a cell with radius of 100 meters and path-loss exponent of 2. The strong user for pair k is uniformly placed within 50 meters from the BS while the weak user is uniformly placed at least 60 meters away from the BS. Both NOMA and OMA schemes are operated with the same system parameters. For Fig. 10a, K = 142, which is larger than  $N_t = 128$  while for Fig. 10b, K = 112. For the NOMA scheme, we assume a correlation coefficient between the channels of the strong and weak users is uniform. We consider user pairing with 2 different thresholds on the channel correlation. For the first setting, users are paired only if  $\rho_k^2 \ge 0.7$ . For the second setting,  $\rho_k^2 \ge 0.9$ . From both Figs. 10a and 10b, we see a possible SINR gain of 3 dB when the threshold for  $\rho_k^2$  is higher. With higher correlation between the channels of strong and weak users in a pair, there is less interference from weaker users due to more accurate transmit beamforming. Thus, user pairing is crucial for NOMA. Compared with NOMA, OMA performs much worse when the total CDI rate is not large. This can be attributed to more CDI vectors that need to be quantized for OMA. Thus, with limited CDI rate, the accuracy of the quantized CDI for OMA is worse than that for NOMA, especially when the user load is high (Fig. 10a). However, as  $\hat{B}_{tot}$  increases, the SINR gap between OMA and NOMA is closing.

With fewer number of users in Fig. 10b, OMA can outperform NOMA when the total CDI rate is large or when channel information is highly accurate. In those regimes, the transmit beams can more precisely cancel interference. Additionally, there is no intra-beam interference for OMA users to contend with. In Fig. 10b with  $K < N_t$ , we are able to add the performance of a system with conventional zeroforcing beamforming (regularizing constant  $\varphi = 0$ ). The optimized power and bit allocations for that system are also obtained from Algorithm 3. We note that with the optimized regularizing constant, the regularized zeroforcing performs much better than the conventional zeroforcing does, especially when the CDI rate is small or moderate.

From the numerical results shown in Figs. 10a and 10b, we remark that the optimized NOMA scheme outperforms the optimized OMA scheme when the number of CDI bits per the number of transmit antennas squared ( $\hat{B}_{tot}$ ) is between 1 and 4. The SINR gain of NOMA over OMA increases when users in the NOMA scheme are paired with a higher threshold on the channel correlation between the strong and weak users.



Fig. 10: Performance for NOMA scheme from Algorithm 2 and OMA from Algorithm 3.

#### VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We have developed a joint transmit-power, CDI-rate, usergrouping problem for MIMO-NOMA and MIMO-OMA downlinks that maximizes the minimum large-system SINR over all users. For some joint power and CDI-rate optimization, the optimal solutions can be obtained by a GP solver. A suboptimal progressive-filling scheme was shown to perform close to the optimum with the computation time cut by almost 3 orders of magnitude. The allocation complexity can be further decreased by decreasing the number of user groups. Although the system SINR increases with the number of user groups, the SINR gain is diminishing. For larger system SINR, users should be paired if the correlation coefficient is sufficiently high. Additionally, a larger fraction of the transmit power should be allocated to user pairs. If the total CDI rate is low to moderate ( $\hat{B}_{tot}$  is approximately between 1 and 4), NOMA generally achieves a larger SINR than OMA does. The performance gain over OMA increases when users are paired with a high correlation threshold. On the other hand, OMA can outperform NOMA when the total CDI-rate is very high and the correlation threshold for user pairing is low.

In this work, the channel inaccuracy at the BS is attributed to limited CDI from mobile users in a frequency-division duplex. Our results can also be applied to a time-division duplex (TDD) in which the channel inaccuracy is caused by limited training from mobile users. For TDD, the number of pilots for each user pair and singleton must be optimized instead of CDI bits. However, if the channel reciprocity between uplink and downlink is imperfect, the system performance will degrade. Taking into account imperfect channel reciprocity could be explored in the future work. Other possible topics include a distributed joint power and CDI-rate allocation scheme for uplink and learning-based allocation schemes for uplink and downlink.

# APPENDIX

#### A. Proof of Proposition 1

From (14) and (15), we see that as  $\alpha_k$  increases from 0,  $\gamma_{k;s}^{\infty}$  decreases, but  $\gamma_{k;w}^{\infty}$  increases. Larger  $\alpha_k$  will lead to allocating more transmit power to the weaker user, and less power to the stronger user. Hence, the optimal decay factor that maximizes the minimum SINR of the 2 users, is at the intersection between  $\gamma_{k;s}^{\infty}$  and  $\gamma_{k;w}^{\infty}$  obtained by setting  $\gamma_{k;s}^{\infty} = \gamma_{k;w}^{\infty}$ . By substituting (14) and (15) into  $\gamma_{k;s}^{\infty} = \gamma_{k;w}^{\infty}$  and rearranging the equation, we obtain the following quadratic equation

$$\mathbb{A}_k (c_k^{2\alpha_k})^2 + \mathbb{B}_k c_k^{2\alpha_k} + \mathbb{C}_k = 0 \tag{49}$$

where coefficients  $\mathbb{A}_k$ ,  $\mathbb{B}_k$ , and  $\mathbb{C}_k$  are given by (29)–(31), respectively. Since  $c_k^{2\alpha_k}$  must be greater than 0, the only solution for (49) is

$$c_k^{2\alpha_k^*} = \frac{-\mathbb{B}_k + \sqrt{\mathbb{B}_k^2 - 4\mathbb{A}_k\mathbb{C}_k}}{2\mathbb{A}_k}.$$
 (50)

Note that  $\mathbb{A}_k \mathbb{C}_k < 0$ . Solving for  $\alpha_k^*$  in (50) gives (27). To obtain the minimum SINR in (28), we substitute  $c_k^{2\alpha_k^*}$  shown above into (14).

There is no intersection between  $\gamma_{k;s}^{\infty}$  and  $\gamma_{k;w}^{\infty}$  for all  $\alpha_k > 0$  or the intersection occurs at  $\alpha_k = 0$  if for  $\alpha_k = 0$ ,

$$\gamma_{k;w}^{\infty}\big|_{\alpha_k=0} \ge \gamma_{k;s}^{\infty}\big|_{\alpha_k=0} \,. \tag{51}$$

Here,  $\gamma_{k;w}^{\infty} > \gamma_{k;s}^{\infty}$ ,  $\forall \alpha_k > 0$ . Hence, the optimal  $\alpha_k^* = 0$ . Evaluating  $\gamma_{k;s}^{\infty}$  and  $\gamma_{k;w}^{\infty}$  with (14) and (15), respectively at  $\alpha_k = 0$ , we obtain

$$\gamma_{k;s}^{\infty}\big|_{\alpha_{k}=0} = \frac{\zeta_{g}(1-\bar{M})(1-2^{-B_{g}})}{2\bar{K}\left(2^{-\bar{B}_{g}}+\frac{\sigma_{n}^{2}}{P_{\text{tot}}}\right)}$$
(52)

and (53).

Substitute (52) and (53) into (51) to obtain condition (25). The minimum SINR is that of the stronger user in (52).

#### REFERENCES

- L. Dai, B. Wang, Z. Ding, Z. Wang, S. Chen, and L. Hanzo, "A survey of non-orthogonal multiple access for 5G," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 2294–2323, 2018.
- [2] M. Zeng, A. Yadav, O. A. Dobre, G. I. Tsiropoulos, and H. V. Poor, "On the sum rate of MIMO-NOMA and MIMO-OMA systems," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 534–537, Aug. 2017.
- [3] D. Zhang, Y. Liu, Z. Ding, Z. Zhou, A. Nallanathan, and T. Sato, "Performance analysis of non-regenerative massive-MIMO-NOMA relay systems for 5G," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 65, no. 11, pp. 4777– 4790, Nov. 2017.
- [4] Y. Liu, G. Pan, H. Zhang, and M. Song, "On the capacity comparison between MIMO-NOMA and MIMO-OMA," *IEEE Access*, vol. 4, pp. 2123–2129, 2016.
- [5] G. Nain, S. S. Das, and A. Chatterjee, "Low complexity user selection with optimal power allocation in downlink NOMA," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 158–161, Apr. 2018.
- [6] G. Im and J. H. Lee, "Outage probability for cooperative NOMA systems with imperfect SIC in cognitive radio networks," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 692–695, Apr. 2019.
- [7] S. Bisen, P. Shaik, and V. Bhatia, "On performance of energy harvested cooperative NOMA under imperfect CSI and imperfect SIC," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 70, no. 9, pp. 8993–9005, Sep. 2021.
- [8] Q. Yang, H. M. Wang, D. W. K. Ng, and M. H. Lee, "NOMA in downlink SDMA with limited feedback: Performance analysis and optimization," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 35, no. 10, pp. 2281– 2294, Oct. 2017.
- [9] H. He, Y. Liang, and S. Li, "Clustering algorithm based on azimuth in mmwave massive MIMO-NOMA system," in *IEEE/CIC Int. Conf. on Commun. in China (ICCC Workshops)*, Xiamen, China, Jul. 2021, pp. 118–122.
- [10] Z. Ding, Y. Liu, J. Choi, Q. Sun, M. Elkashlan, C.-L. I, and H. V. Poor, "Application of non-orthogonal multiple access in LTE and 5G networks," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 185–191, Feb. 2017.
- [11] S. Dhakal, P. A. Martin, and P. J. Smith, "NOMA with guaranteed weak user QoS: Design and analysis," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 32 884–32 896, 2019.
- [12] J. Ding, J. Cai, and C. Yi, "An improved coalition game approach for MIMO-NOMA clustering integrating beamforming and power allocation," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 1672–1687, Feb. 2019.
- [13] Z. Xiao, L. Zhu, J. Choi, P. Xia, and X. Xia, "Joint power allocation and beamforming for non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) in 5G millimeter wave communications," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 2961–2974, May 2018.
- [14] Z. Ding, X. Lei, G. K. Karagiannidis, R. Schober, J. Yuan, and V. K. Bhargava, "A survey on non-orthogonal multiple access for 5G networks: Research challenges and future trends," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 35, no. 10, pp. 2181–2195, Oct. 2017.

- [15] S. Ali, E. Hossain, and D. I. Kim, "Non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) for downlink multiuser MIMO systems: User clustering, beamforming, and power allocation," *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, pp. 565–577, 2017.
- [16] Q. Wang and Z. Wu, "Beamforming optimization and power allocation for user-centric MIMO-NOMA IoT networks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 339–348, 2021.
- [17] J. Ding and J. Cai, "Two-side coalitional matching approach for joint MIMO-NOMA clustering and BS selection in multi-cell MIMO-NOMA systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 2006–2021, Mar. 2020.
- [18] H.-R. Kim, J. Chen, and J. Yoon, "Joint user clustering and beamforming in non-orthogonal multiple access networks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 111 355–111 367, 2020.
- [19] X. Chen, Z. Zhang, C. Zhong, and D. W. K. Ng, "Exploiting multipleantenna techniques for non-orthogonal multiple access," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 35, no. 10, pp. 2207–2220, Oct. 2017.
- [20] Z. Tang, L. Sun, L. Cao, S. Qi, and Y. Feng, "Reconsidering design of multi-antenna NOMA systems with limited feedback," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 1519–1534, Mar. 2020.
- [21] J. Zhang, Y. Zhu, S. Ma, X. Li, and K. K. Wong, "Large system analysis of downlink MISO-NOMA system via regularized zero-forcing precoding with imperfect CSIT," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 2454–2458, Nov. 2020.
- [22] J. Cui, Z. Ding, and P. Fan, "Outage probability constrained MIMO-NOMA designs under imperfect CSI," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 17, no. 12, pp. 8239–8255, Dec. 2018.
- [23] T. M. Hoang, B. C. Nguyen, X. N. Tran, and L. T. Dung, "Outage probability and ergodic capacity of user clustering and beamforming MIMO-NOMA relay system with imperfect CSI over Nakagami-m fading channels," *IEEE Systems Journal*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 2398–2409, Jun. 2021.
- [24] K. Mamat and W. Santipach, "On optimizing feedback-rate allocation for downlink MIMO-NOMA with quantized CSIT," *IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 1, pp. 1551–1570, 2020.
- [25] N. Nandan, S. Majhi, and H.-C. Wu, "Beamforming and power optimization for physical layer security of MIMO-NOMA based CRN over imperfect CSI," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 70, no. 6, pp. 5990– 6001, Jun. 2021.
- [26] X. Wan, E. Li, Z. Wang, and Z. Fan, "Energy-efficient resource allocation for multicarrier NOMA systems with imperfect CSI," in *IEEE Int. Conf. on Electron. Info. and Commun. Technol. (ICEICT)*, Xi'an, China, Aug. 2021, pp. 823–827.
- [27] X. Liu, J. Zhang, and S. Cai, "An optimal power allocation scheme in downlink multi-user NOMA beamforming system with imperfect CSI," in *IEEE Int. Conf. on Commun. Syst. (ICCS)*, Chengdu, China, Dec. 2018, pp. 99–103.
- [28] K. K. Kota and P. Ubaidulla, "Sum-rate maximization in NOMA-based mmwave analog beamforming under imperfect CSI," in *IEEE Veh. Technol. Conf. (VTC2021-Spring)*, Helsinki, Finland, Apr. 2021, pp. 1–7.
- [29] M.-y. Gong and Z. Yang, "The application of antenna diversity to NOMA with statistical channel state information," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 3755–3765, Apr. 2019.
- [30] Z. Gao, A. Liu, C. Han, and X. Liang, "Sum rate maximization of massive MIMO NOMA in LEO satellite communication system," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 1667–1671, Aug. 2021.
- [31] H. Zhu, Q. Wu, X.-J. Wu, Q. Fan, P. Fan, and J. Wang, "Decentralized power allocation for MIMO-NOMA vehicular edge computing based on deep reinforcement learning," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 14, pp. 12770–12782, Jul. 2022.
- [32] M. Zeng, A. Yadav, O. A. Dobre, G. I. Tsiropoulos, and H. V. Poor, "Capacity comparison between MIMO-NOMA and MIMO-OMA with multiple users in a cluster," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 35, no. 10, pp. 2413–2424, Oct. 2017.
- [33] Y. Saito, A. Benjebbour, Y. Kishiyama, and T. Nakamura, "System-level performance evaluation of downlink non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA)," in *Proc. Int. Symp. on Personal, Indoor, and Mobile Radio Commun. (PIMRC)*, London, UK, Sep. 2013, pp. 611–615.

(53)

$$\gamma_{k;w}^{\infty}\big|_{\alpha_k=0} = \frac{\zeta_g(1-\bar{M})(1-2^{-B_g})}{2\bar{K}(c_k^2 - c_k^2\rho_k^2(1-2^{-\bar{B}_g})) + \frac{\sigma_n^2}{P_{\rm tot}}) + \zeta_g(1-\bar{M})(1-2^{-\bar{B}_g})}$$

15

- [34] W. Santipach and M. L. Honig, "Capacity of a multiple-antenna fading channel with a quantized precoding matrix," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 1218–1234, Mar. 2009.
- [35] W. Dai, Y. Liu, B. C. Rider, and W. Gao, "How many users should be turned on in a multi-antenna broadcast channel?" *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 26, no. 8, pp. 1526–1535, Oct. 2008.
- [36] S. Boyd, S. Kim, L. Vandenberghe, and A. Hassibi, "A tutorial on geometric programming," *Optimization and Engineering*, vol. 8, no. 67, pp. 67–127, Apr. 2007.
- [37] A. Chassein and M. Goerigk, "Robust geometric programming is co-NP hard," Dec. 2014, unpublished. [Online]. Available: http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:hbz:386-kluedo-39380
- [38] M. A. Mollah, X. Yuan, S. Pakin, and M. Lang, "Rapid calculation of max-min fair rates for multi-commodity flows in fat-tree networks," *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distrib. Syst.*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 156–168, Jan. 2018.
- [39] S. Wagner, R. Couillet, M. Debbah, and D. T. M. Slock, "Large system analysis of linear precoding in correlated MISO broadcast channels under limited feedback," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 4509–4537, Jul. 2012.



Kritsada Mamat was born in Suphanburi, Thailand in 1984. He received the B.Eng. degree in electrical engineering from Burapha University, Chonburi, Thailand, in 2007, and the M.Eng. and D.Eng. degrees in electrical engineering from Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand, in 2010 and 2016, respectively. After graduation, he joined the Department of Electrical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Kasetsart University as a Post-Doctoral Researcher for one year. He is currently an Assistant Professor with the Department of Electronic

Engineering Technology, College of Industrial Technology, King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok, Bangkok, Thailand. His research interest is in optimization techniques for wireless communication channels.



Wiroonsak Santipach (Senior Member, IEEE) received the B.S. (summa cum laude), M.S., and Ph.D. degrees all in electrical engineering from Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, USA, in 2000, 2001, and 2006, respectively. In 2006, he joined the Department of Electrical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand, as a Lecturer and since 2019, he has been a Professor. In 2013 and 2019, he was a visiting scholar at the Institute of Telecommunications, Technische Universität Wien, Austria. He has authored 2 books

titled Introduction to Telecommunication Engineering (Kasetsart University Press, 2016) and Wireless Communications With Limited Feedback (Kasetsart University Press, 2020), and coauthored more than 40 technical papers. His current interest includes limited feedback in NOMA and MIMO channels, and deep learning in wireless channels.