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Abstract—Perfect channel state information (CSI) is challenging to obtain due to the limited signal processing capability at the intelligent reflection surface (IRS). In this paper, we study the worst-case robust beamforming design for an IRS-aided multiuser multiple-input single-output (MU-MISO) system under the assumption of imperfect CSI. We aim for minimizing the transmit power while ensuring that the achievable rate of each user meets the quality of service (QoS) requirement for all possible channel error realizations. With unit-modulus and rate constraints, this problem is non-convex. The imperfect CSI further increases the difficulty of solving this problem. By using approximation and transformation techniques, we convert this problem into a sequence of semidefinite programming (SDP) subproblems that can be efficiently solved. Numerical results show that the proposed robust beamforming design can guarantee the required QoS targets for all the users.

I. INTRODUCTION

Intelligent reflecting surface (IRS) has recently been proposed as a cost-effective and energy-efficient high data rate communication technology due to the rapid development of radio frequency (RF) micro-electro-mechanical systems (MEMS) as well as the abundant applications of the programmable and reconfigurable metasurfaces [1]. It consists of an artificial passive radio array structure that is capable of adjusting the phase of each passive antenna element on the surface continuously or discretely with low power consumption [2]. The benefits of IRS in enhancing the spectral and energy efficiency have been demonstrated in various schemes (e.g., [3]–[9]) by the joint design of active precoder at the base station (BS) and passive reflection beamforming at the IRS.

However, all the existing contributions on IRS are based on the assumption of perfect channel state information (CSI) at the BS, which is too idealistic in IRS communications. There are three types of channels in an IRS-aided communication system: the direct channel from the BS to the IRS, the indirect channel from the BS to the IRS and the reflection channel from the IRS to the user. The first one can be obtained with high accuracy by using the conventional channel estimation method. The accurate CSI of the latter two, however, are challenging to obtain in practice due to the fact that the reflective elements at the IRS are passive and have limited signal processing capability. Fortunately, the location of the IRS is fixed and is usually installed in the building facades, ceilings, walls, etc. In this case, the indirect channel can be accurately estimated through calculating the angles of arrival and departure, which vary slowly. In contrast, the reflection channel is more challenging to acquire as the locations of users are changing and their environmental conditions are varying.

Against the above background, this paper investigates the robust active precoder and passive reflection beamforming design for an IRS-aided downlink multiple-user multiple-input single-output (MU-MISO) system based on the assumption of imperfect reflection channel. An ellipsoid model of the reflection channel uncertainties are adopted. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to study the worst-case robust beamforming design problem in IRS-aided wireless systems, the contributions of which are listed as follows: 1) We aim to minimize the transmit power of the BS through the joint design of active precoder at the BS and the passive beamforming at the IRS while ensuring that each user’s QoS target can be achieved for all possible channel error realizations. This problem is non-convex and difficult to solve due to the unit-modulus constraints and the imperfect CSI. 2) To address this problem, we propose an iterative algorithm based on approximation transformations and convex–concave procedure (CCP). Specifically, to handle the non-convex rate expression and CSI uncertainties, we first approximately linearize the rates by using the first-order Taylor expansion, and then transform the resultant semi-infinite constraints into linear matrix inequalities (LMIs). The non-convex unit-modulus constraints of the reflection beamforming are handled by the penalized CCP [10]. 3) Numerical results confirm the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms in guaranteeing the QoS targets of all users.

Notations: Most of the notations in this paper are standard. The symbol $|·|$ denotes the modulus of a complex scalar. $\diag(\mathbf{x})$ is a diagonal matrix with the entries of $\mathbf{x}$ on its main diagonal. $\mathbf{X} \succeq \mathbf{Y}$ means that $\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Y}$ is positive semidefinite.
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Additionally, the symbol $\mathbb{C}$ denotes complex field and $\mathbb{R}$ represents real field.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

A. Signal Transmission Model

We consider an IRS-aided MISO broadcast (BC) communication system shown in Fig. 1 in which there is a BS equipped with $N$ transmit antennas serving $K$ single-antenna users. Denote by $s = [s_1, \ldots, s_K]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times 1}$ the Gaussian data symbols, in which each element is an independent random variable with zero mean and unit variance, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[ss^H] = I$. Denote by $F = [f_1, \ldots, f_K] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K}$ the corresponding precoding vectors for the users. Then, the transmit signal at the BS is $x = Fs$, the transmit power of which is $\mathbb{E}\{\text{Tr}[xx^H]\} = ||F||_F^2$.

In the MISO BC system, we propose to employ an IRS with the goal of enhancing the received signal strength of users by reflecting signals from the BS to the users. It is assumed that the IRS has $M$ passive reflection elements $e = [e_1, \ldots, e_M]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times 1}$, the modulus of each element is $|e_m|^2 = 1$, $1 \leq m \leq M$. Then, the reflection beamforming at the IRS is modeled as a diagonal matrix $E = \text{diag}(e) \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times M}$. The channels spanning from the BS to user $k$, from the BS to the IRS, and from the IRS to user $k$ are denoted by $h_{d,k} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 1}$, $H_{d,r} \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$, and $h_{r,k} \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times 1}$, respectively.

The BS is responsible for designing the reflection beamforming at the IRS and sends it to the IRS controller [4]. Let us define the set of all users as $\mathcal{K} = \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$, then the received signal of users are

$$y_k = (h_{d,k}^H + h_{r,k}^H E H_{d,r}) F s + n_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (1)$$

where $n_k$ is the received noise at user $k$, which is an additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) following circularly symmetric complex Gaussian (CSCG) distribution with zero mean and variance $\sigma_k^2$. The achievable data rate (bit/s/Hz) at user $k$ is given by

$$R_k(F, e) = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|(h_{d,k}^H + h_{r,k}^H E H_{d,r}) F s + n_k|^2}{\beta_k}\right) \quad (2)$$

where $\beta_k = ||(h_{d,k}^H + h_{r,k}^H E H_{d,r}) F s + n_k||_2^2 + \sigma_k^2, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}$ represent the interference-plus-noises (INs) with $F_{-k} = [f_1, \ldots, f_{k-1}, f_{k+1}, \ldots, f_K]$.

In the IRS-aided communication system, there are three types of channels: the direct channel from the BS to the user of $h_{d,k}$, the indirect channel from the BS to the IRS of $H_{d,r}$, and the reflection channel from the IRS to the user of $h_{r,k}$. As mentioned in the introduction section, the reflection channel is much more challenging to obtain than the other two types. Hence, in this paper, we assume that the third type of channels are imperfect. The reflection channel $\{h_{r,k}\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ can be modeled as $\{h_{r,k} = h_{r,k} + \Delta_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$, where $\{\Delta_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ denote the contaminated channel vectors and $\{\Delta_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ denote the corresponding channel error vectors. In this paper, we adopt the channel error bounded model [11], i.e., $||\Delta_k||_2 \leq \epsilon_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}$, where $\epsilon_k$ is the radius of the uncertainty region known by the BS.

B. Problem Formulation

With imperfect CSI, we aim to minimize the total transmit power by jointly designing the precoding matrix $F$ and reflection vector $e$ under the worst-case QoS constraints, i.e., ensuring the achievable rate of each user above a threshold for all possible channel error realizations. Mathematically, the worst-case robust design problem is formulated as

$$\min_{F, e} ||F||_F^2 \quad (3a)$$

s.t. $R_k(F, e) \geq r_k, \forall 1 \leq m \leq M.$ \quad (3b)

Constraints (3b) are the minimum QoS targets for each user, while constraints (3c) correspond to the unit-modulus requirements of the reflection elements at the IRS.

III. ROBUST BEAMFORMING DESIGN

Problem (3) is a non-convex problem and the most difficulties lie in the non-convex QoS constraints (3b) over the CSI uncertainty regions and the non-convex unit-modulus constraints (3c). Since variables $F$ and $e$ are coupled, we propose an alternate optimization (AO) method to solve Problem (3) as follows.

A. Problem Transformation

To start with, the non-convexity of constraints (3b) can be addressed by firstly treating the INs $\beta = [\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_K]^T$ as auxiliary variables. Hence, constraints (3b) are reformulated as

$$||(h_{d,k}^H + h_{r,k}^H E H_{d,r}) F s + n_k||_2^2 \geq \beta_k, \forall 1 \leq m \leq M.$$ \quad (4a)

$$||(h_{d,k}^H + h_{r,k}^H E H_{d,r}) F s + n_k||_2^2 \leq \beta_k, \forall 1 \leq m \leq M.$$ \quad (4b)
We first handle the infinite inequalities in (4a), which are non-convex. Specifically, the left hand side (LHS) of (4a) is approximated as its lower bound which is shown in the following lemma.

**Lemma 1** Let \( f_k^{(n)} \) and \( E^{(n)} \) be the optimal solutions obtained at iteration \( n \), then the linear lower bound of \( |(h_{d,k}^H + h_{r,k}^H \mathcal{E} h_{r,k})f_k| \) in \( f_k^{(n)} \) at \( f_k^{(n)} \) is

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{h}_{r,k}^T \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{h}_{r,k} + \mathbf{h}_{r,k}^T \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{x}_k^T \mathbf{h}_{r,k} + c_k,
\end{align*}
\]

(5)

where

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{X}_k &= \mathcal{E} \mathbf{h}_{d,r} f_k^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} + E^{(n)} \mathbf{h}_{d,r} f_k^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} - E^{(n)} \mathbf{h}_{d,r} f_k^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} - E^{(n)} \mathbf{h}_{d,r} f_k^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} H_n^{(n)},
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{x}_k &= \mathcal{E} \mathbf{h}_{d,r} f_k^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} - E^{(n)} \mathbf{h}_{d,r} f_k^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} - E^{(n)} \mathbf{h}_{d,r} f_k^{(n)} H_n^{(n)} H_n^{(n)},
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
c_k &= \mathbf{h}_{d,k}^T \left( f_k^{(n)} + f_k^{(n)} + f_k^{(n)} \right) \mathbf{h}_{d,k}.
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof:** Let \( a \) be a complex scalar variable. By applying Appendix B of [12], we have the inequality

\[
|a|^2 \geq a^{*}(a) a - a^{*}(a) a
\]

for any fixed point \( a^{(n)} \). Then, \( \mathbf{h}_{d,k}^T \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{h}_{d,k} + \mathbf{h}_{d,k}^T \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{x}_k^T \mathbf{h}_{d,k} + c_k \geq \beta_k(2r_k - 1),
\]

\[\forall k \in \mathcal{K},\]

(7)

By substituting \( \mathbf{h}_{d,k}^T \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{h}_{d,k} + \mathbf{h}_{d,k}^T \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{x}_k^T \mathbf{h}_{d,k} + c_k \) into the LHS of (7), the inequality in (7) is reformulated as

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{h}_{r,k}^T \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{h}_{r,k} + \mathbf{h}_{r,k}^T \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{x}_k^T \mathbf{h}_{r,k} + c_k &\geq \beta_k(2r_k - 1),
\end{align*}
\]

\[\forall k \in \mathcal{K},\]

(8)

where \( \mathbf{d}_k = \mathbf{h}_{d,k}^T \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{h}_{r,k} + \mathbf{h}_{d,k}^T \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{x}_k^T \mathbf{h}_{r,k} + c_k \).

In order to tackle the CSI uncertainties, S-Procedure in [13] is used to transform (8) into the following equivalent LMI as

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{I}_M + \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{X}_k^T + \mathbf{x}_k^T \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{x}_k^T &\geq \mathbf{0},
\end{align*}
\]

\[\forall k \in \mathcal{K},\]

(9)

where \( \mathbf{w}_k = \mathbf{w}_1^T, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_K^T \), \( \mathbf{w}_k \) is slack variables.

Now, we consider the uncertainties in \( \{\mathbf{d}_k\} \) of (4b). To this end, we firstly adopt Schur’s complement [14] to equivalently recast (4b) as

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{t}_k^T \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{X}_k^T + \mathbf{x}_k^T \mathbf{X}_k \mathbf{x}_k^T &\geq \mathbf{0},
\end{align*}
\]

\[\forall k \in \mathcal{K},\]

(10)

where \( \mathbf{t}_k = ((h_{d,k}^H + h_{r,k}^H \mathcal{E} h_{r,k}) \mathbf{F}_{-k})^T \).

Then, by using Nemirovski Lemma [15] and introducing slack variables \( \mathbf{z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_K]^T \), \( \mathbf{1} \) is rewritten as

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{z} - \frac{\mathbf{t}_k^T}{\mathbf{1}} & \mathbf{I} \mathbf{k}_{(K-1)} \\
\mathbf{0}_{M \times 1} & \varepsilon_k \mathcal{E} \mathbf{h}_{d,r} \mathbf{F}_{-k} \mathbf{h}_k^H
\end{bmatrix} \geq 0,
\end{align*}
\]

\[\forall k \in \mathcal{K},\]

(11)

where \( \mathbf{t}_k = ((h_{d,k}^H + \mathbf{h}_{d,r} \mathcal{E} h_{r,k}) \mathbf{F}_{-k})^H \).

With (9) and (11), we obtain the following approximated reformulation of Problem (3) as

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{z}} \|\mathbf{F}\|^2_2,
\end{align*}
\]

s.t. \( [9] \cup [11], [3c], \)

\[\mathbf{w} \geq 0, \mathbf{z} \geq 0.\]

(12a)

(12b)

(12c)

It is difficult to optimize variables \( \mathbf{F} \) and \( \mathbf{e} \) simultaneously as they are coupled in the LMI constraints. Therefore, AO method is adopted to solve the subproblems corresponding to different sets of variables iteratively. Specifically, for given reflection beamforming \( \mathbf{e} \), the subproblem of Problem (12) corresponding to the precoder \( \mathbf{F} \) is formulated as

\[
\begin{align*}
\max_{\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{e}} \|\mathbf{a}\|_1,
\end{align*}
\]

s.t. \( [0] \cup [11], [3c], [12c], \)

\[\mathbf{a} \preceq 0, \]

(13a)

(13b)

where \( [0] \) are LMI constraints obtained from (9) by replacing \( \beta_k(2r_k - 1) \) with \( \beta_k(2r_k - 1) + \mathbf{a}_k \) for \( \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \).

However, the above problem cannot be solved directly due to the non-convex unit-modulus constraint (3c). Instead, the semidefinite relaxation (SDR) method used in [16] cannot always guarantee a feasible solution due to the fact that the QoS constraints are generally violated when the SDR solution is not rank one. To handle this issue, we apply the penalty CCP (10) which is capable of finding a feasible solution that meets the unit-modulus constraint as well as the QoS constraints. In particular, the constraints \( |c_m|^2 = 1, 1 \leq m \leq M \) in (3c) can be equivalently rewritten as \( 1 \leq |c_m|^2 \leq 1 \leq m \leq M \). Following the penalty CCP framework, we impose the use of slack variables \( \mathbf{b} = [b_1, \ldots, b_{2M}]^T \) over the equivalent constraints...
of the unit-modulus constraints, the resultant problem is given by

\[
\max_{\alpha,\beta,\nu,\xi} \|a\|_1 - \lambda^{(t)} \|b\|_1 \tag{15a}
\]

subject to

\[
|e_m^{(n)}|^2 - 2\Re(e_m^{H} e_m^{(n)}) \leq b_m - 1, 1 \leq m \leq M \tag{15b}
\]

\[
|e_m|^2 \leq 1 + b_{M+m}, 1 \leq m \leq M \tag{15c}
\]

\[
b \geq 0 \tag{15d}
\]

\[
\lambda^{(t)} \geq 0 \tag{15e}
\]

where \(\lambda^{(t)}\) is the regularization factor to scale the impact of the penalty term \(\|b\|_1\) and control the feasibility of the constraints. At low value of \(\lambda\), Problem 15 targets to maximize the “SINR residual”, while Problem 15 seeks for a feasible point rather than optimization the “SINR residual” at high value of \(\lambda\).

Problem 15 is always feasible and is a convex semidefinite programming (SDP). The algorithm for finding a feasible solution of \(e\) is summarized in Algorithm 1. Some points are emphasized as follows: a) The maximum value \(\lambda_{\text{max}}\) is imposed to avoid a numerical problem, that is, a feasible solution may not be found when the iteration converges under the increasing large \(\lambda^{(t)}\); b) Stopping criteria \(\|b\|_1 \leq \chi\) guarantees the unit-modulus constraints in the original Problem 14 to be met for a sufficiently low \(\chi\); c) Stopping criteria \(\|e - e^{(t-1)}\|_1 \leq \nu\) controls the convergence of Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: Penalty CCP optimization for reflection beamforming optimization

**Initialize:** Initialize \(e^{(0)}\), \(\gamma > 1\), and set \(t = 0\).

1: repeat

2: Update \(e^{(t+1)}\) from Problem 15;

3: \(\lambda^{(t+1)} = \max\{\gamma \lambda^{(t)}, \lambda_{\text{max}}\}\);

4: \(t = t + 1\);

5: until \(\|b\|_1 \leq \chi\) and \(\|e - e^{(t-1)}\|_1 \leq \nu\).

B. Algorithm Description

Problem (12) is solved by solving Problems (13) and (14) in an iterative manner, the details of which are summarized in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: AO algorithm for Problem (3)

**Initialize:** Initialize \(e^{(0)}\) and \(F^{(0)}\), and set \(n = 0\).

1: repeat

2: Update \(F^{(n+1)}\) from Problem (13) with given \(e^{(n)}\);

3: Update \(e^{(n+1)}\) from Problem (14) with given \(F^{(n+1)}\);

4: \(n \leftarrow n + 1\);

5: until The objective value \(\|F^{(n+1)}\|_F^2\) converges.

\(a)\) Convergence analysis: The convergence of Algorithm 2 can be guaranteed. In particular, denoting the objective value of Problem (13) as \(F(F, e)\), it follows that

\[
F(F^{(n)}, e^{(n)}) = F(F^{(n)}, e^{(n+1)}) \geq F(F^{(n+1)}, e^{(n+1)}).
\]

The above equality holds due to the fact that the objective value of Problem (13) is independent of \(e\), and also \(e^{(n+1)}\) is feasible for Problem (13) if it is a feasible solution to Problem (14). The above inequality follows from the optimal solution \(F^{(n+1)}\) of Problem (13) for given \(e^{(n+1)}\). Hence, the sequence \(\{F(F^{(n)}, e^{(n)})\}\) is non-increasing and the algorithm is guaranteed to converge.

\(b)\) Complexity analysis: Note that all considered sub-problems are SDP problems and can be solved by interior point method whose worst-case computational complexity is \(O((1 + \sum_{j=1}^{J} b_j)^{1/2} (n^{3 + n^2 \sum_{j=1}^{J} b_j^n} + n^{2 \sum_{j=1}^{J} b_j^n}))\) (17), where \(n\) is the number of variables and \(J\) is the number of LMI’s of size \(b_j\). Therefore, the approximate complexity of Problem (13) is \(O((K(2M + 1) + K^2)^{1/2} ((NtK + K)^3 + (NtK + K)^2 (K(M + 1)^2 + K) + (NtK + K)^3 (K(M + 1)^3 + K)), \text{ and that of Problem (14) is } o_{2} = O((K(2M + 1) + K^2)^{1/2} ((M + K)^3 + (M + K)^2 (K(M + 1)^2) + (M + K)(K(M + 1)^3)). Finally, the approximate complexity of Algorithm 2 per iteration is \(o_{1} + o_{2}\).

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section, numerical results are provided to evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithm. We consider the system setup in Fig. 2, where the BS is equipped with \(N = 8\) transmit antennas serving \(K = 4\) users with the assistance of an IRS. The number of the reflection elements is \(M = 8\). We assume that the locations of the BS and IRS are (0 m, 0 m) and (100 m, 50 m), respectively. Users are distributed randomly in a circle centered at (150 m, 0 m) with radius 10 m.

The large-scale path loss is \(PL = -30 - 10\alpha \log_{10}(d)\) dB, where \(\alpha\) is the path loss exponent and \(d\) is the link length in meters. The path loss exponents for the BS-IRS link, BS-user link, and the IRS-user link are set as \(\alpha_{\text{BS}} = 3.6\), \(\alpha_{\text{BU}} = 3.5\) and \(\alpha_{\text{UI}} = 2.2\), respectively. The small-scale fading in \((H_{dr}, \{h_{kd,k}, \tilde{h}_{kd,k}\}_{k=1}^{K})\) follows Rayleigh distribution. For each realization \(\{h_{kd,k}, \tilde{h}_{kd,k}\}_{k=1}^{K}\) of 500 sets of CSI errors \(\{\Delta_k\}_{k=1}^{K}\) satisfying \(\|\Delta_k\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_k\) are randomly generated. The CSI error bounds are defined by \(\varepsilon_k = \delta \|\tilde{h}_{kd,k}\|_2, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}\), in which \(\delta \in [0, 1]\) evaluates the relative amount of CSI uncertainties. The power of the AWGN at all users is set to \(\sigma_k^2 = \ldots = \sigma_{K}^2 = -60\) dBm and the target rates of all users are the same, i.e., \(r_1 = \ldots = r_K = r\). For comparison, benchmark “Non-robust” scheme, in which the estimated reflection channel vectors are naively regarded as perfect channels, is considered. Benchmark “Perfect CSI” scheme, in which there is no channel estimation error, is considered as the performance upper bound.

![Fig. 2: The simulated system setup.](image-url)
Firstly, Fig. 3 shows the total transmit power versus the target rate $r$, where different channel uncertainty levels are evaluated, i.e., $\delta = \{0.02, 0.04\}$. From this figure, one can observe that the robust beamforming requires more transmit power than the other algorithms due to the price of robust design. In addition, the total transmit power required by the “Perfect IRS” and “Non-robust IRS” are almost the same. The reason is that the non-robust beamforming is designed based on the estimated channels, which have similar distribution properties of perfect CSI.

Finally, we evaluate the effectiveness of our robust algorithm in Fig. 4. The value of the y-axis in Fig. 4 is the difference between the smallest achievable rate among users and the target rate. We note that the achievable rates in “Perfect IRS” are nearly equal to the target data rate due to the fact that the inequalities in the QoS constraints hold with equalities when the problem is optimal. However, the minimal rates achieved by “Non-robust IRS” cannot always meet the QoS requirements, especially when target rate is high. In contrast, when target rate increases, the proposed robust beamforming can achieve the target data rates, especially under large CSI uncertainties.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we considered the robust beamforming design for the IRS-aided MU-MISO system when the CSI is imperfect. The CSI uncertainties were addressed by using approximation and transformation techniques, and the non-convex unit-modulus constraints were solved under the penalty CCP framework. Numerical results demonstrated the robustness of our proposed algorithm.
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