

Rate-Splitting Multiple Access for Multi-Antenna Joint Communication and Radar Transmissions

Chengcheng Xu*, Bruno Clerckx†, Shiwa Chen*, Yijie Mao† and Jianyun Zhang*

*College of Electronic Engineering

National University of Defense Technology, Hefei, China

Email: {xuchengcheng17, chenshiwa17, zhangjianyun17}@nudt.edu.cn

†Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering

Imperial College London, London, U.K.

Email: {b.clerckx, y.mao16}@imperial.ac.uk

Abstract—Rate-Splitting Multiple Access (RSMA), relying on multi-antenna Rate-Splitting (RS) techniques, has emerged as a powerful strategy for multi-user multi-antenna systems. In this paper, RSMA is used as unified multiple access for multi-antenna radar-communication (RadCom) system, where the base station has a dual communication and radar capability to simultaneously communicate with downlink users and probe detection signals to azimuth angles of interests. Using RS, messages are split into common and private parts, then encoded into common and private streams before being precoded and transmitted. We design the message split and the precoders for this RadCom system such that the Weighted Sum Rate (WSR) is maximized and the transmit beampattern is approximated to the desired radar beampattern under an average transmit power constraint at each antenna. We then propose a framework based on Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) to solve the complicated non-convex optimization problem. Results highlight the benefits of RSMA to unify RadCom transmissions and to manage the interference among radar and communications, over the conventional Space-Division Multiple Access (SDMA) technique.

Index Terms—Radar-communication co-design, Rate-Splitting Multiple Access (RSMA), Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM), beampattern design

I. INTRODUCTION

The 4th and 5th generation wireless communication systems are competing with long-range radar applications in the S-band (2-4GHz) and C-band (4-8GHz), which will possibly result in severe spectrum congestion and hamper the higher data rate requirement for the increasing demand in future wireless communication. [1]. Though efforts for new spectrum management regulations and policies are needed, a longer term solution is to enable communication and radar spectrum sharing (CRSS). There are two main research topics in the field of CRSS: 1) coexistence of existing radar and communication devices, 2) co-design for dual-function systems.

For coexistence of existing radar and communication devices, research focuses on designing high-quality wideband radar waveforms that achieve spectrum nulls or even accurate shapes on communication frequency bands [2], [3], as well as jointly designing communication precoders and slow-time radar coding waveforms to meet radar working Signal-to-Interference-plus-Noise (SINR) and communication rate requirements [4]. All the aforementioned works are limited to

single-antenna radar systems. As multi-antenna processing can greatly improve radar performance [5], research has been devoted to the coexistence of existing Multiple-Input Multiple-Output (MIMO) communication systems and MIMO radar systems [6], [7]. However, given the existing infrastructure, a coexistence approach manages interference between radar and communication as much as it can, while a joint design approach makes the best use of the spectrum for the dual purpose of detecting and communicating. As a consequence, a joint radar and communication system design approach would outperform a coexistence approach. Early studies [8], [9] consider single-antenna dual-function platforms without utilizing multi-antenna processing. In [10], [11] the information stream is embedded in radar pulses via a multi-antenna platform, leading to the restriction that the rate is limited by the Pulse Repetition Frequency (PRF), which is far from satisfactory for communication requirements. To overcome this restriction, [12], [13] propose a joint multi-antenna radar-communication (RadCom) system that simultaneously transmits probing signals to radar targets and serves multiple downlink users. The precoders are designed to form a desired radar beampattern and meeting the SINR requirements for communication users.

The main problem in the multi-antenna RadCom system is how to efficiently manage the interference among radar and communication users. In the past few years, a powerful and versatile framework of multi-antenna non-orthogonal transmission and interference management strategy based on Rate-Splitting (RS) has emerged [14]–[19]. The flexibility of RS comes in the potential to partially decode interference and partially treat it as noise, through message splitting and the creation of common and private streams. As a consequence, rate-splitting multiple access (RSMA) brings rate benefits over space-division multiple access (SDMA) and non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) [19].

In this paper, we introduce a novel way to design RadCom and show the potential and versatility of RS in multi-antenna RadCom system to manage jointly multi-user interference and communication-radar interference. Uniquely, the benefit of RS originates from the presence of the common stream that is not only used to manage interference between communication users but also better approximate the desired radar beampat-




Fig. 1: Schematic diagram for the proposed multi-antenna RadCom system.

tern. Specifically, we are motivated to design a multi-antenna RadCom system that functions as both a communication BS and a collocated MIMO radar, so as to maximize the Weighted Sum Rate (WSR) of users and to detect targets following a desired radar beampattern. Firstly, we build the RSMA-based multi-antenna RadCom system model, which is the first work that combines RS and RadCom system design to the best of our knowledge. Secondly, we formulate the problem of maximizing the WSR of all users and approximating the transmit beampattern to the desired one with an average transmit power constraint at each antenna. Thirdly, to solve the complicated non-convex problem, we propose an ADMM-based iterative method. Finally, we compare the performance of our RSMA-based RadCom with the SDMA-based RadCom system. Numerical results show that the proposed RSMA-based RadCom system enables a better tradeoff between WSR and beampattern approximation compared with the SDMA-based RadCom system.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this work, we consider a downlink multi-antenna RadCom system, which is equipped with a uniform linear array (ULA) of N_t antennas and serves K single-antenna communication users and one radar target. The communication users are indexed by $\mathcal{K} = \{1, \dots, K\}$. The schematic diagram of the proposed system is shown in Fig. 1.

A. Rate-Splitting Preliminaries

Rate-splitting is a promising transmission technique to tackle numerous problems faced by modern MIMO wireless networks [18]. The message W_k of the k th user is split into a common part $W_{c,k}$ and a private part $W_{p,k}$, $\forall k \in \mathcal{K}$. The common parts of all users $\{W_{c,1}, \dots, W_{c,K}\}$ are jointly encoded into the common stream s_c , while the private parts $\{W_{p,1}, \dots, W_{p,K}\}$ are respectively encoded into

private streams $\{s_1, \dots, s_K\}$. Then the data stream vector $\mathbf{s} = [s_c, s_1, \dots, s_K]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{K+1}$ is linearly precoded using the precoder $\mathbf{P} = [\mathbf{p}_c, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_K]$, where $\mathbf{p}_c \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times 1}$ is the precoder of the common stream.

B. MIMO Radar Beampattern Design

MIMO radar can transmit multiple probing signals that may be chosen freely via its antennas. Such waveform diversity enables superior capabilities compared with standard phased-array radar [5]. To achieve higher signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) for target tracking or narrow-beam scanning scenarios, and to avoid wasting probing power on either jammer locations or locations of uninteresting targets, a specially desired rather than a nominally omnidirectional MIMO radar beampattern should be achieved via correlated waveform design [20]–[22]. According to [21], [22], the beampattern design problem can be formulated in a more explicit way

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\alpha, \mathbf{R}} \quad & \sum_{m=1}^M |\alpha P_d(\theta_m) - \mathbf{a}^H(\theta_m) \mathbf{R} \mathbf{a}(\theta_m)|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \text{diag}(\mathbf{R}) = \frac{P_0 \mathbf{1}}{N_t} \\ & \mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{S}_+^{N_t} \\ & \alpha > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where θ_m is the m th azimuth angle grid among all M grids, $P_d(\theta_m)$ is the desired beampattern level at θ_m , \mathbf{R} is the covariance matrix of transmit waveforms, $\mathbf{a}(\theta_m) = [1, e^{j2\pi\delta \sin(\theta_m)}, \dots, e^{j2\pi(N_t-1)\delta \sin(\theta_m)}]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times 1}$ is the transmit steering vector, δ is the normalized distance (relative to wavelength) between adjacent array elements and $\text{diag}(\cdot)$ refers to the vector constructed from the diagonal entries of the matrix. The objective function is to approximate the beampattern to the desired one via least squares, the first constraint ensures that every radar transmit antenna has the same average power with total power budget P_0 , the second constraint ensures that \mathbf{R} is a semi-positive definite matrix.

C. Joint RadCom Transmission System Design

In our system, the transmit signal at the RS-assisted BS is

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_c s_c + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{p}_k s_k. \quad (2)$$

The received signal at the k th user is

$$\begin{aligned} y_k &= \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{x} + n_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \\ &= \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{p}_c s_c + \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{p}_k s_k + \mathbf{h}_k^H \sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}, j \neq k} \mathbf{p}_j s_j + n_k \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times 1}$ is the channel vector between the RadCom system and the k th user. It is assumed to be perfectly known at both the transmitter and receivers. The received noise n_k at the k th user is modelled as a complex Gaussian random variable with zero mean and variance $\sigma_{n,k}^2$. Without loss of generality, we assume the noise variances all equal to 1, i.e., $\sigma_{n,k}^2 = 1, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}$.

Following the decoding order in the literature of RS [15], each user first decodes the common stream by treating all private streams as interference. Therefore, the SINR for decoding s_c at the k th user is

$$\gamma_{c,k}(\mathbf{P}) = \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{p}_c|^2}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}} |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{p}_j|^2 + 1}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (4)$$

After successfully decoding s_c and subtracting it from y_k , user- k decodes the intended private stream s_k by treating other private streams as interference. The SINR of decoding s_k at user- k is

$$\gamma_k(\mathbf{P}) = \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{p}_k|^2}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}, j \neq k} |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{p}_j|^2 + 1}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (5)$$

The corresponding achievable rates of s_c and s_k at the k th user are $R_{c,k}(\mathbf{P}) = \log_2(1 + \gamma_{c,k}(\mathbf{P}))$ and $R_k(\mathbf{P}) = \log_2(1 + \gamma_k(\mathbf{P}))$. The common stream s_c is decoded by all users. To ensure that all the K users can successfully decode the common stream s_c , the corresponding rate should not exceed

$$R_c(\mathbf{P}) = \min\{R_{c,1}(\mathbf{P}), \dots, R_{c,K}(\mathbf{P})\}. \quad (6)$$

As $R_c(\mathbf{P})$ is shared by K users, we have $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} C_k = R_c(\mathbf{P})$, where C_k is the portion of common rate at user- k transmitting $W_{c,k}$. The total achievable rate of user- k contains the portion of common rate transmitting $W_{c,k}$ and the private rate transmitting $W_{p,k}$.

In this work, we aim at designing communication precoder \mathbf{P} and message splits to maximize the WSR of downlink users and approximate the desired radar beampattern. Denote the weight allocated to user- k as μ_k , the formulated optimization problem can be

$$\max_{\alpha, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{P}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mu_k (C_k + R_k(\mathbf{P})) \quad (7a)$$

$$- \lambda \sum_{m=1}^M \left| \alpha P_d(\theta_m) - \mathbf{a}^H(\theta_m) (\mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^H) \mathbf{a}(\theta_m) \right|^2 \quad (7b)$$

$$s.t. \quad \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}} C_{k'} \leq R_{c,k}(\mathbf{P}), \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (7c)$$

$$\mathbf{c} \geq 0 \quad (7d)$$

$$\text{diag}(\mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^H) = \frac{P_t \mathbf{1}}{N_t} \quad (7e)$$

$$\alpha > 0 \quad (7f)$$

where P_t is the total transmit power budget of the whole RadCom system, $\mathbf{c} = [C_1, \dots, C_K]^T$ is the common rate vector, (7a) maximizes the WSR from a communication perspective, (7b) ensures the probing beampattern approximates the desired pattern from a radar perspective, λ is the regularization parameter that balances the communication WSR and radar beampattern approximation, (7c) ensures each user can decode the common stream in RS, (7e) ensures the transmit average power of each antenna to be the same.

To show the advantage of RSMA in joint RadCom transmission, we consider the conventional multi-access SDMA based on multi-user linear precoding (MU-LP) in our RadCom system as a baseline. According to [19], the SDMA-based RadCom design problem can be formulated by replacing (7a) with $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mu_k R_k(\mathbf{P})$, and (7c) with $R_k(\mathbf{P}) \geq R_k^{th}$, $\forall k \in \mathcal{K}$ where R_k^{th} is the quality of service (QoS) threshold for each user.

III. ADMM-BASED METHOD FOR SOLVING THE PROBLEM

Since (7) combines both communication and radar metrics, it is intuitive to think about alternately solving the communication and radar counterparts to find the optimal solution. In this section, we propose an iterative method based on ADMM to solve the nonconvex problem (7).

To give an explicit expression of the approach, we first denote a new vector that contains all variables $\mathbf{v} = [\alpha, \mathbf{c}^T, \text{vec}(\mathbf{P})^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_+^K \times \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times (K+1)}$, with $\mathbf{p}_{\text{vec}} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{P})$. We then define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}_k &= \text{Diag}(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_k, 1, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(K+1)N_t + K - k}), k \in \mathcal{K} \\ \mathbf{D}_p &= \text{Diag}(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{K+1}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{(K+1)N_t}) \\ \mathbf{D}_c &= \text{Diag}(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{K+1}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{N_t}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{KN_t}) \\ \mathbf{D}_k &= \text{Diag}(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{K+1+kN_t}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{N_t}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{(K-k)N_t}), k \in \mathcal{K} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\text{Diag}(\cdot)$ is the diagonal matrix built from the entries within the bracket. We then further denote

$$\begin{aligned} R_{c,k}(\mathbf{P}) &= \eta_{c,k}(\mathbf{p}_{\text{vec}}) = \eta_{c,k}(\mathbf{D}_p \mathbf{v}), \\ R_k(\mathbf{P}) &= \eta_k(\mathbf{p}_{\text{vec}}) = \eta_k(\mathbf{D}_p \mathbf{v}), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and rewrite (7) in a tractable formulation to ADMM

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}} \quad & f_c(\mathbf{v}) + g_c(\mathbf{v}) + f_r(\mathbf{u}) + g_r(\mathbf{u}) \\ s.t. \quad & \mathbf{D}_p(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_+^K \times \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times (K+1)}$ is introduced as a new variable,

$$f_c(\mathbf{v}) = - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mu_k (\mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{v} + \eta_k(\mathbf{D}_p \mathbf{v})), \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_r(\mathbf{u}) &= \lambda \sum_{m=1}^M \left| \alpha P_d(\theta_m) - \mathbf{a}^H(\theta_m) (\mathbf{D}_c \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^H \mathbf{D}_c^H + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^H \mathbf{D}_k^H) \mathbf{a}(\theta_m) \right|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$g_c(\mathbf{v})$ is the indicator function of the communication feasible set $\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \mid \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{v} \leq \eta_{c,k}(\mathbf{D}_p \mathbf{v}) \right\}$, $g_r(\mathbf{u})$ is the indicator function of radar feasible set $\mathcal{R} = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \mid \text{diag}(\mathbf{D}_c \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^H \mathbf{D}_c^H + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^H \mathbf{D}_k^H) = \frac{P_t \mathbf{1}}{N_t} \right\}$.

(10) can be solved by iterating the following updates

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_r^{t+1} := & \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}_r} (f_c(\mathbf{v}_r) + g_c(\mathbf{v}_r) \\ & + (\rho/2) \|\mathbf{D}_{pr}(\mathbf{v}_r - \mathbf{u}_r^t) + \mathbf{d}_r^t\|_2^2) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_r^{t+1} := & \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}_r} (f_r(\mathbf{u}_r) + g_r(\mathbf{u}_r) \\ & + (\rho/2) \|\mathbf{D}_{pr}(\mathbf{v}_r^{t+1} - \mathbf{u}_r) + \mathbf{d}_r^t\|_2^2) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbf{d}_r^{t+1} := \mathbf{d}_r^t + \mathbf{D}_{pr}(\mathbf{v}_r^{t+1} - \mathbf{u}_r^{t+1}) \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbf{d}_r = [\Re\{\mathbf{d}\}; \Im\{\mathbf{d}\}]^T$ with $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times (K+1)}$ as the scaled dual variable. Here we write the ADMM expression in a real-valued way according to [23] to avoid confusions, letting $\mathbf{v}_r = [\Re\{\mathbf{v}\}; \Im\{\mathbf{v}\}]^T$, $\mathbf{u}_r = [\Re\{\mathbf{u}\}; \Im\{\mathbf{u}\}]^T$, $\mathbf{D}_{pr} = [\Re\{\mathbf{D}_p\}, -\Im\{\mathbf{D}_p\}; \Im\{\mathbf{D}_p\}, \Re\{\mathbf{D}_p\}]$, where $\Re\{\cdot\}$, $\Im\{\cdot\}$ respectively mean extracting real and imaginary parts. It's worth noting that this is just a different expression for the same problem to rigorously meet the definition of ADMM [24].

We then solve the updates in the framework respectively. The \mathbf{v} -update (13) is first equivalently rewritten in a tractable manner

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{P}} \quad & - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mu_k (C_k + \eta_k(\mathbf{p}_{\text{vec}})) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|\mathbf{p}_{\text{vec}} - \mathbf{D}_p \mathbf{u}^t + \mathbf{d}^t\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}} C_{k'} \leq \eta_{c,k}(\mathbf{p}_{\text{vec}}), \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \\ & \mathbf{c} \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

This problem can be reformulated with Weighted Minimized Mean Square Errors (WMMSE) approach and solved through the WMMSE-based Alternating Optimization (AO) algorithm following [25].

The \mathbf{u} -update (14) is fully formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\alpha_u, \mathbf{p}_u} \quad & \lambda \sum_{m=1}^M |P_d(\theta_m) \alpha_u - \mathbf{a}^H(\theta_m) (\sum_{k=1}^{K+1} \mathbf{D}_{p,k} \mathbf{p}_u \mathbf{p}_u^H \mathbf{D}_{p,k}^H)| \\ & \mathbf{a}(\theta_m)|^2 + \frac{\rho}{2} \|\mathbf{D}_p \mathbf{v}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}_u + \mathbf{d}^t\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \text{diag}(\sum_{k=1}^{K+1} \mathbf{D}_{p,k} \mathbf{p}_u \mathbf{p}_u^H \mathbf{D}_{p,k}^H) = \frac{P_t \mathbf{1}}{N_t} \\ & \alpha_u \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Here $\alpha_u = u_1$, $\mathbf{p}_u = [u_{K+2}, u_{K+3}, \dots, u_{(N_t+1) \times (K+1)}]^T$, where u_i is the i th element in \mathbf{u} , and the selection matrix is defined as

$$\mathbf{D}_{p,k} = \text{Diag}(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(k-1) \times N_t}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{N_t}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(K+1-k) \times N_t}) \quad (18)$$

(17) is apparently non-convex, but can be solved by general Semidefinite Relaxation (SDR) method referring to [23], [26]. We summarize the ADMM-based method to solve problem (7) in Algorithm 1, where \mathbf{r}^{t+1} and \mathbf{q}^{t+1} are the primal and dual residuals. Similarly, the SDMA-based RadCom problem can be solved via the proposed ADMM-based algorithm in this section. In the simulations, we see that the proposed solving

method always converges within tens of iterations toward a modest accuracy.

Algorithm 1: ADMM-based method

Input: $t \leftarrow 0, \mathbf{v}_r^t, \mathbf{u}_r^t, \mathbf{d}_r^t$

- 1 **repeat**
- 2 Update $\mathbf{v}_r^{t+1} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}_r} (f_c(\mathbf{v}_r) + g_c(\mathbf{v}_r) + (\rho/2) \|\mathbf{D}_{pr}(\mathbf{v}_r - \mathbf{u}_r^t) + \mathbf{d}_r^t\|_2^2)$ via WMMSE-based AO algorithm;
- 3 Update $\mathbf{u}_r^{t+1} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}_r} (f_r(\mathbf{u}_r) + g_r(\mathbf{u}_r) + (\rho/2) \|\mathbf{D}_{pr}(\mathbf{v}_r^{t+1} - \mathbf{u}_r) + \mathbf{d}_r^t\|_2^2)$ via SDR-based algorithm;
- 4 Update $\mathbf{d}_r^{t+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{d}_r^t + \mathbf{D}_{pr}(\mathbf{v}_r^{t+1} - \mathbf{u}_r^{t+1})$;
- 5 $\mathbf{r}^{t+1} = \mathbf{D}_{pr}(\mathbf{v}_r^{t+1} - \mathbf{u}_r^{t+1})$;
- 6 $\mathbf{q}^{t+1} = \mathbf{D}_{pr}(\mathbf{u}_r^{t+1} - \mathbf{u}_r^t)$;
- 7 $k++$;
- 8 **until** $\|\mathbf{r}^{t+1}\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ and $\|\mathbf{q}^{t+1}\|_2 \leq \epsilon$;

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this part, numerical results are provided for validating the performance of the proposed RadCom transmission design. We assume $P_t = 20\text{dBm}$, the noise power at each user is 0dBm , $K = 2$, $N_t = 8$, $\mu_k = 1/K, k \in \mathcal{K}$. The RadCom system employs a ULA with half-wavelength spacing, i.e., $\delta = 0.5$. We assume that the channel vectors between the multi-antenna transmission system and users obey the i.i.d. standard complex Gaussian distribution. We initialize \mathbf{d} randomly obeying standard complex Gaussian distribution, $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u} = [\alpha, \mathbf{c}^T, \text{vec}(\mathbf{P})^T]^T$, where $\alpha = 1$, $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{1}^{K \times 1}$, and \mathbf{P} is designed through Maximum Ratio Combining (MRC) method following [15]. Then the initialization \mathbf{v}_r , \mathbf{d}_r and \mathbf{u}_r can be obtained according to Section III. The stopping criterion in Algorithm 1 is $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$. We denote the jointly designed RadCom transmission based on RSMA and SDMA strategies respectively as RSMA-RadCom and SDMA-RadCom. We set the same channel vectors, desired beampattern and regularization parameter $\lambda = 10^{-3}$ in Fig. 2-Fig. 4 to compare both methods explicitly.

In Fig. 2, we first show the equivalent amplitude of each channel vector corresponding to each steering vector at θ_m in the beampattern. The amplitude is defined as $\phi_k(\theta_m) = |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{a}(\theta_m)| / (\|\mathbf{h}_k\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{a}(\theta_m)\|_2)$. Fig. 2 equivalently reflects each user's desired beampattern. It demonstrates that both users desire little power at 0° , which appears as valleys on the beampattern. Since the radar desires high peak level at 0° , there exists a conflict between the purposes of radar and communication.

We then compare the transmit beampattern of RSMA-RadCom and SDMA-RadCom in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4. In both figures, we assume the azimuth angle of interest is 0° . The beampatterns of the precoded common stream and private streams are respectively displayed so as to show the contributions of all streams to the RadCom transmit beampattern. We




Fig. 2: Equivalent amplitude of channel vectors.




Fig. 3: Transmit beampattern of SDMA-RadCom.




Fig. 4: Transmit beampattern of RSMA-RadCom.




Fig. 5: Average power of each antenna.

can see from Fig. 3 that SDMA-RadCom handles the conflict between radar and communication by making the private stream to user-2 contribute more to the radar's desired beam at 0° , as user-2 desires more power than user-1 at this angle according to Fig. 2. Although this strategy could somewhat mitigate the conflict, the high power of user-2's stream at 0° would cause strong interference to user-1. However, from Fig. 4, we can see that the common stream shares the task of forming a beam at 0° with the private stream to user-2. This is reasonable as the common stream is useful to both users at 0° , which avoids the strong interference imposed by user-2's stream upon user-1 in SDMA-RadCom. This indicates that introducing the common stream can better mitigate the conflicts between communication and radar, which explains why the beam peak at 0° and WSR of RSMA-RadCom are both higher than SDMA-RadCom. It is also worth noting that the common stream not only decreases the conflict of dual-function but also works properly on its basic task, i.e., mitigating interference between downlink communication users. This can be seen by comparing the beampatterns of RSMA-RadCom and SDMA-RadCom at around -30° and 40° . It is clear that both users desire high power at these two angles according to Fig. 2. Then, we take the beampattern at 40° as an example, since user-1 desires more power at this angle than user-2, SDMA-RadCom has to allocate more power to the stream intended for user-1 to achieve higher WSR, which would introduce additional interference to user-2. In contrast, RSMA-RadCom allocates more power to the common stream at this angle in Fig. 4, which serves both users' desires and mitigates the interference in SDMA-RadCom. By this means, RSMA-RadCom manages the interference between users better, and thus further improves WSR compared with SDMA-RadCom.

Fig. 5 shows the average power of each antenna, which verifies that the ADMM-based method reaches a high-quality solution to meet the average power constraint (7e) with a full use of the power budget P_t . Table. I analyses the rates achieved by RSMA-RadCom and SDMA-RadCom in this scenario. It displays that RSMA-RadCom has higher WSR and the common stream makes considerable contributions.

TABLE I: Rate analysis for the scenario in Fig. 4 and Fig. 3

	R_1	C_1	R_2	C_2	WSR
RSMA-RadCom	6.7268	0.8001	7.3828	0.8001	7.8549
SDMA-RadCom	6.4632	-	7.2740	-	6.8686

Fig. 6 is the tradeoff of both RSMA-RadCom and SDMA-RadCom, which is obtained by varying λ while keeping other settings the same. Obviously, Fig. 6 further shows that RSMA-RadCom achieves a considerably better tradeoff than SDMA-RadCom.

V. CONCLUSION

To conclude, we propose a multi-antenna RSMA-RadCom system that functions both as a BS communicating with users and a radar detecting targets in specific azimuth angles of




Fig. 6: Tradeoff comparison between WSR and MSE of beampattern approximation.

interest. We first study maximizing WSR and approximating desired radar beampattern under the average power constraint of each antenna in the multi-antenna RadCom system. An ADMM-based method with WMMSE-based AO algorithm and SDR algorithm is proposed to solve the non-convex problem. Numerical results show that RSMA-RadCom achieves a better tradeoff compared with SDMA-RadCom. This results from the creation of the common stream, which effectively mitigates interference especially at the beampattern angles where we desire peaks. We can thus conclude that RSMA is a more powerful strategy when applied to multi-antenna RadCom design.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Griffiths, L. Cohen, S. Watts, E. Mokole, C. Baker, M. Wicks, and S. Blunt, "Radar spectrum engineering and management: Technical and regulatory issues," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 103, no. 1, pp. 85–102, Jan 2015.
- [2] A. Aubry, V. Carotenuto, A. De Maio, A. Farina, and L. Pallotta, "Optimization theory-based radar waveform design for spectrally dense environments," *IEEE Aerospace and Electronic Systems Magazine*, vol. 31, no. 12, pp. 14–25, 2016.
- [3] B. Tang and J. Liang, "Efficient algorithms for synthesizing probing waveforms with desired spectral shapes," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 1174–1189, June 2019.
- [4] L. Zheng, M. Lops, X. Wang, and E. Grossi, "Joint design of overlaid communication systems and pulsed radars," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 139–154, 2018.
- [5] J. Li and P. Stoica, "MIMO radar with colocated antennas," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 106–114, 2007.
- [6] J. A. Mahal, A. Khawar, A. Abdelhadi, and T. C. Clancy, "Spectral coexistence of MIMO radar and MIMO cellular system," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 655–668, April 2017.
- [7] J. Qian, M. Lops, L. Zheng, X. Wang, and Z. He, "Joint system design for coexistence of MIMO radar and MIMO communication," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 13, pp. 3504–3519, 2018.
- [8] G. N. Saddik, R. S. Singh, and E. R. Brown, "Ultra-wideband multifunctional communications/radar system," *IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 1431–1437, 2007.
- [9] C. Sturm and W. Wiesbeck, "Waveform design and signal processing aspects for fusion of wireless communications and radar sensing," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 99, no. 7, pp. 1236–1259, 2011.
- [10] A. Hassanien, M. G. Amin, Y. D. Zhang, and F. Ahmad, "Dual-function radar-communications: Information embedding using sidelobe control and waveform diversity," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 2168–2181, 2015.
- [11] —, "Phase-modulation based dual-function radar-communications," *IET Radar, Sonar & Navigation*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 1411–1421, 2016.
- [12] F. Liu, C. Masouros, A. Li, H. Sun, and L. Hanzo, "MU-MIMO communications with MIMO radar: From co-existence to joint transmission," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 2755–2770, 2018.
- [13] F. Liu, L. Zhou, C. Masouros, A. Li, W. Luo, and A. Petropulu, "Toward dual-functional radar-communication systems: Optimal waveform design," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 16, pp. 4264–4279, 2018.
- [14] B. Clerckx, H. Joudeh, C. Hao, M. Dai, and B. Rassouli, "Rate splitting for MIMO wireless networks: a promising PHY-layer strategy for LTE evolution," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 98–105, May 2016.
- [15] H. Joudeh and B. Clerckx, "Sum-rate maximization for linearly precoded downlink multiuser MISO systems with partial CSIT: A rate-splitting approach," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 4847–4861, 2016.
- [16] M. Dai, B. Clerckx, D. Gesbert, and G. Caire, "A rate splitting strategy for massive MIMO with imperfect CSIT," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 15, no. 7, pp. 4611–4624, 2016.
- [17] H. Joudeh and B. Clerckx, "Rate-splitting for max-min fair multigroup multicast beamforming in overloaded systems," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 16, no. 11, pp. 7276–7289, 2017.
- [18] Y. Mao, B. Clerckx, and V. O. K. Li, "Rate-splitting for multi-antenna non-orthogonal unicast and multicast transmission: Spectral and energy efficiency analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 67, no. 12, pp. 8754–8770, Dec 2019.
- [19] Y. Mao, B. Clerckx, and V. O. Li, "Rate-splitting multiple access for downlink communication systems: bridging, generalizing, and outperforming SDMA and NOMA," *EURASIP journal on wireless communications and networking*, vol. 2018, no. 1, p. 133, 2018.
- [20] J. Li, L. Xu, P. Stoica, K. W. Forsythe, and D. W. Bliss, "Range compression and waveform optimization for MIMO radar: a Cramer-Rao bound based study," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 218–232, 2007.
- [21] D. R. Fuhrmann and G. San Antonio, "Transmit beamforming for MIMO radar systems using signal cross-correlation," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 171–186, 2008.
- [22] P. Stoica, J. Li, and Y. Xie, "On probing signal design for MIMO radar," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 55, no. 8, pp. 4151–4161, 2007.
- [23] W.-K. Ma, "Semidefinite relaxation of quadratic optimization problems and applications," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 1053, no. 5888/10, 2010.
- [24] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein, "Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers," *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/22000000016>
- [25] Y. Mao, B. Clerckx, and V. O. K. Li, "Rate-splitting for multi-user multi-antenna wireless information and power transfer," in *2019 IEEE 20th International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*, July 2019, pp. 1–5.
- [26] S. Boyd, L. El Ghaoui, E. Feron, and V. Balakrishnan, *Linear matrix inequalities in system and control theory*. Siam, 1994, vol. 15.