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Abstract—The downlink channel covariance matrix (CCM) acquisition is the key step for the practical performance of massive multiple-input and multiple-output (MIMO) systems, including beamforming, channel tracking, and user scheduling. However, this task is challenging in the popular frequency division duplex massive MIMO systems with Type I codebook due to the limited channel information feedback. In this paper, we propose a novel formulation that leverages the structure of the codebook and feedback values for an accurate estimation of the downlink CCM. Then, we design a cutting plane algorithm to consecutively shrink the feasible set containing the downlink CCM, enabled by the careful design of pilot weighting matrices. Theoretical analysis shows that as the number of communication rounds increases, the proposed cutting plane algorithm can recover the ground-truth CCM. Numerical results are presented to demonstrate the superior performance of the proposed algorithm over the existing benchmark in CCM reconstruction.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background and Challenge

In the fifth generation (5G) cellular systems and beyond (e.g., 5G and 6G [1]), massive multiple-input and multiple-output (MIMO) has become a key enabling technology [2]. By harnessing a large number of antennas at the base station (BS), the efficient use of spectral resources [3] and the mitigation of inter-cell interference [4] can be performed via simple algorithms, thus facilitating the implementations on hardware. Other prominent functionalities of massive MIMO include joint spatial division and multiplexing [5], optimal user scheduling [6], channel tracking [7], and so forth.

To realize the potential merits of massive MIMO for aforementioned tasks [3]–[7], downlink channel covariance matrix (CCM) is often required at BS as indispensable prior knowledge. It measures how downlink channels are correlated across different antennas, and varies quite slowly compared to the instantaneous channel realizations [8]. Therefore, downlink CCM is essential for the design of long-term statistically adaptive algorithms in practical wireless systems [1], and thus demands accurate acquisition.

Downlink CCM acquisition in frequency-division duplex (FDD) wireless systems is much more challenging than the counterpart in time-division duplex (TDD) systems, due to the lack of channel reciprocity property [9]. To tackle this difficulty in a communication-efficient manner, existing practical FDD 5G systems adopt codebook based limited feedback schemes [10]. Particularly, the BS and the user equipment (UE) share a judiciously designed codebook (e.g., Type I codebook in the 3GPP standard [11]), which is a set of vectors (a.k.a. codewords) that approximate instantaneous channels. At the UE, after acquiring the CCM via the downlink training process, it utilizes the codebook to “encode” CCM into a few scalars, and then feeds these scalars, rather than the whole CCM matrix, back to the BS. Although with light overhead, this scheme results in a challenging task at the BS: how to reconstruct the CCM, possibly with a large number of entries, from only a few feedback values?

B. Related Works

Several previous works investigated downlink CCM estimation at the UE using pilot signals [12]–[17]. For example, in [12], based on the orthogonal assumption of channels, it was shown that each channel vector can be characterized by an eigenvector of the sample covariance matrix computed by the received data at the UE. Then, with the aid of pilot signals, channel vectors and their corresponding downlink CCM can be acquired via eigen-vector decomposition (EVD). However, since the pilot signals are contaminated by the inter-cell interference, the channel vectors are only approximately orthogonal in practice. To mitigate pilot contamination, research work [13] proposed a Bayesian channel estimation method assuming that the BS coordination among cells is viable. In addition, after taking the transceiver’s hardware impairment into account, recent work [14] proposed a robust CCM estimation algorithm.

Note that the algorithms mentioned above are performed at the UE using the received data and pilot signals, and thus cannot address the CCM reconstruction challenge at the BS, in which only a few feedback values are available. Several early attempts have been made for different limited feedback
schemes [18]–[23]. For instance, in [18], the received pilot signal at the UE is fed back to the BS. By assuming the sparsity of massive MIMO channels, a compressed sensing based method was proposed to estimate downlink CCM. Adopting the same feedback scheme as that in [18], the work [19] proposed a two-stage weighted block \( l_1 \) minimization based CCM reconstruction algorithm. In [24], the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) measure is fed back to the BS, based on which a cutting plane method was utilized for CCM reconstruction and subsequent beamforming. More recently, the deep learning model was employed to realize both the CCM compression at the UE and the CCM reconstruction at the BS [25]. For various limited feedback schemes mentioned above, they are not as widely adopted as the codebook based scheme (introduced in Section I.A) in real-world 5G systems, see, e.g., the 3GPP standard [11].

Using the codebook based feedback mechanism, there are few works on downlink CCM reconstruction. The most closely related work [26] approximated the CCM via the codewords that the feedback values indicate, which can be viewed as the approximation of the principal eigenvectors of the downlink CCM. Therefore, its performance heavily relies on the selected codebook, which however is not frequently altered in practical 5G systems. So far, given a pre-defined codebook and limited feedback values, the downlink CCM reconstruction problem has not been well formulated nor solved in a principled fashion, especially in view of the 3GPP standard [11].

C. Contributions

To fill in this gap, we propose a novel algorithm that reconstructs the downlink CCM for the Type I codebook (in the 3GPP standard [11]) based limited feedback FDD massive MIMO systems. The major contributions of this paper are summarized as follows.

- **Principled Problem Formulation.** To the best knowledge of the authors, it is the first time that the downlink CCM reconstruction problem in the context of Type I codebook based FDD wireless systems has been formulated in a principled way, by leveraging the structures of codebook and feedback values. The resulting problem aims at consecutively squeezing the size of the feasible set, which is characterized by equality/inequality constraints.

- **Effective Algorithm Design.** Due to a large number of constraints, evaluating the size of the feasible set is challenging (and even intractable). To get over this hurdle, this paper proposes an effective algorithm to optimize the pilot weighting matrix such that the feasible set can be consecutively reduced. It is the first time that these pilot weighting matrices have been judiciously optimized for accurate CCM reconstruction. Numerical experiments based on channel samples from QUAsi Deterministic Ra dio channel GenerAtor (QuaDRIGa)\(^1\) have confirmed the excellent performance of the proposed algorithm.

- **Convergence Analysis.** We provide the convergence characterization of the proposed algorithm. It is shown that the algorithm can exactly recover the ground-truth CCM if the communication round goes to infinity. This indicates that in practice, given adequate feedback values, the proposed algorithm can reconstruct CCM with a relatively high accuracy.

Part of the work has appeared in IEEE ICASSP 2021 [27]. The current paper contains convergence analysis and more extensive experiment results that were missing in the conference version [27].

D. The Structure of This Paper and Notations

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the system model and problem formulation are introduced, based on which the CCM reconstruction algorithm is developed and analyzed in Section III. In Section IV, numerical results using channel samples from QuaDRIGa are presented to show the excellent performance of the proposed algorithm. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section V.

Throughout the paper, we use boldface uppercase letters to denote matrices and boldface lowercase letters to denote column vectors. The superscript \( (\cdot)^H \) is adopted to denote the Hermitian (conjugate) transpose matrix operator. The set containing \( n \) elements is denoted by \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \), where \( n \) is the index of the element. The intersection of \( N \) sets is denoted by \( \bigcap_{n=1}^{N} \{\cdot\}_{n} \), where \( n \) is the index of the set. The symbol \( \subseteq \) denotes the subset relationship. In addition, \( \text{Tr}(\cdot) \), \( \text{rank}(\cdot) \), \( \mathbb{E}[\cdot] \), and \( \text{diag}(\cdot) \) denote the trace, rank, expectation, and diagonalization operators respectively. Particularly, \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_F \) denotes matrix inner product operator, which is equivalent to the trace of the product of two matrices, that is, \( \langle A, B \rangle_F = \text{Tr}(AB) \).

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

As shown in Fig. 1, a point-to-point MIMO link consists of a BS with \( N_A \) antennas and a UE with \( N_U \) antennas. In the \( t \)-th communication round, the downlink channel matrix between the BS and the UE is denoted by \( \mathbf{H}(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{N_U \times N_A} \). Moreover, within \( T \) consecutive communication rounds, the downlink channel covariance (CCM) matrix \( \mathbf{C} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}(t)^H \mathbf{H}(t)] \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A} \) is assumed to remain unchanged.

Following the 5G new radio (NR) standard [11], the channel state information reference signal (CSI-RS), denoted by \( s(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{N_U \times 1} \), is adopted to assist the UE to acquire the CSI in

\(^1\)https://quadriga-channel-model.de.
the $t$-th communication round. On the other hand, since the number of CSI-RS ports $N_p$ might be smaller than the number of antennas $N_A$ at the BS (i.e., $N_p \leq N_A$), the CSI-RS $s(t)$ needs to be reshaped to match the dimension of antennas at the BS. Particularly, by using the pilot weighting matrix $Q_t \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_p}$ (also known as virtual antenna matrix), BS transmits the signal $Q_t(s(t))^t$ to the UE through channel $H_t$. At the UE, the received data takes the following form:

$$y(t) = H(t)Q_t(s(t) + z(t), \quad t = 1, \ldots, T,$$ (1)

where $z(t) \sim \mathcal{C}\mathcal{N}(z(t)|0, \sigma^2 I_{N_U})$ is the additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN). In (1),

$$H_t \triangleq H(t)Q_t, \quad t = 1, \ldots, T,$$ (2)

is viewed as the effective channel for UE. Using CSI-RS $s(t)$, the UE can estimate the effective CCM

$$R(t) \triangleq E[H_c(t)^H H_c(t)] = Q(t)^H CQ(t), \quad t = 1, \ldots, T,$$ (3)

via various algorithms [12]–[16], as introduced in Section I-B.

At the UE, instead of directly transmitting the CCM $R(t)$ back to the BS via the reverse link, Type I codebook $V \triangleq \{v_m \in \mathbb{C}^{N_p \times 1} ||v_m||_2 = 1\}_{m=1}^M$ was introduced by 3GPP to enable limited feedback schemes in FDD massive MIMO wireless systems. Specifically, based on the codebook $V$, two scalar values, the precoder matrix indicator (PMI)

$$m_0(t) = \arg \max_{m=1,\ldots,M} v_m^H R(t) v_m$$

and the channel qualification indicator (CQI)

$$\eta(t) = v_{m_0(t)}^H Q(t)^H CQ(t) v_{m_0(t)}, \quad t = 1, \ldots, T,$$ (4)

are computed by the UE and then fed back to the BS.

In the context of system model introduced above, the CCM reconstruction challenge mentioned in Section I-A can be concretely stated as: how can the BS reconstruct the downlink CCM $\hat{C} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A}$ from PMI values $\{m_0(t)\}_{t=1}^T$ and CQI values $\{\eta(t)\}_{t=1}^T$, by exploiting the structure of Type I codebook $V$ and the pilot weighting matrices $\{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T$? This problem is highly under-determined and thus non-trivial. To effectively solve such a problem, the underlying principle is to embed all the prior information we have about the CCM $\hat{C}$ (to be estimated) into the problem formulation, see, e.g., (4) and (5). Specifically, we model the feasible set of CCM estimate $\hat{C}$ as follows:

$$B(\hat{C} ; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T)$$

which comprises four groups of inequality/equality constraints (C1)-(C4). The geometries of these constraints are introduced as follows. First, the inequalities in (C1) come from the definition of PMI (see (4)), and indicate that the CCM estimate $\hat{C}$ should lie in the following polyhedron:

$$\bigcap_{t=1}^T \{ \hat{C} | v_{m_0(t)}^H Q(t)^H \hat{C} Q(t) v_{m_0(t)} \leq \eta(t), \quad t = 1, \ldots, T, \hat{C} \succeq 0_{N_A}, \text{Tr} (\hat{C}) \leq b \}.$$

The constraint (C3) encodes the positive semi-definiteness of $\hat{C}$, which is a convex cone and denoted by $\mathcal{H}_0$. Finally, without loss of generality, we introduce a trace upper bound $b$ in (C4) to eliminate the scaling ambiguity of estimation\(^2\), and thus the constraint (C4) is a convex set and denoted by $\mathcal{H}_0$.

It can be shown (see Appendix B) that

$$B(\hat{C} ; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T) \subseteq B(\hat{C} ; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T), \quad 1 \leq \kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2 \leq T,$$ (9)

which suggests that incorporating additional pairs of feedback values (i.e., PMIs and CQIs) would tend to shrink the feasible set. If the feasible set is small enough (and even contains one matrix), then any element in such a set will be a good CCM estimate. This observation motivates the following problem formulation:

$$\min_{\{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T} \text{Vol}(B(\hat{C} ; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T)).$$ (10)

In (10), $\text{Vol}()$ measures the volume of the set $B(\hat{C} ; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T)$. In practice, the pilot weighting matrices $\{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T$ are allowed to be devised. Note that in the $t+1$-th communication round, the feedback values (PMI $m_0(t+1)$ and CQI $\eta(t+1)$) are determined by the pilot weighting matrix $Q(t)$, as seen in (4) and (5). Therefore, the underlying rationale of solving problem (10) is that matrices $\{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T$ should be designed such that the feedback values are the most informative ones that make the feasible set as small as possible.

### III. CCM Reconstruction Algorithm: Development and Analysis

Computing the analytical expression for the volume of $B(\hat{C} ; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T)$ is difficult (and even not tractable), thus making the associated optimization problem (10) not straightforward and challenging. In this paper, we generalize the idea of cutting plane method [28]–[30] from seeking a feasible vector to estimating a positive semi-definite CCM, in the context of limited feedback FDD wireless systems. The

\(^2\)The determination of $b$ will be introduced in the next section.
generalization is non-trivial, especially when optimizing the weighting matrices \( \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T \) to consecutively shrink the feasible set \( \mathcal{B}(\hat{C};\{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T) \), due to a large number of inequality constraints involved. Particularly, in (C1) of (6), there are \( MT \) (e.g., \( 256 \times 10 = 2560 \)) inequality constraints. To the best knowledge of the authors, there is still no work discussing the effective design of these weighting matrices, and we propose one viable algorithm with convergence guarantee in this section.

A. Weighting Matrix Design

From (6)-(9), the feasible set \( \mathcal{B}(\hat{C};\{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T) \) can be expressed as:

\[
\mathcal{B}(\hat{C};\{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T) = P_0 \cap P_1 \cap \cdots \cap P_T \cap H_0 \cap H_1 \cdots \cap H_T. \tag{11}
\]

In order to minimize the volume of set \( \mathcal{B}(\hat{C};\{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T) \), weighting matrices \( \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T \) are supposed to make the intersections in (11) small. Since each \( H_t \) defines a hyper-plane, \( \{Q(t)\}_t \) should vary in different communication rounds in order to make the intersections among the hyper-planes \( \{H_t\}_t \), small, which is easy to achieve. On the other hand, since each set \( P_t \) defines a polyhedron that is composed of \( M \) (e.g., 256) hyper-planes, \( \{Q(t)\}_t \) should be carefully designed such that the intersections among the polyhedrons \( \{P_t\}_t \) is small, which is non-trivial. In other words, polyhedron \( P_{t+1} \) should significantly cut the intersections of previous polyhedrons \( \{P_t\}_t \). This coincides with the idea of “neutral/ deep cut” in the literature of cutting plane methods [28]. Particularly, suppose that \( \hat{C}(t) \) is the analytical center [29], [30] of the feasible set \( \mathcal{B}(\hat{C};\{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T) \), it should be excluded from (or on the supporting faces of) polyhedron \( P_{t+1} \), which is determined by \( Q(t + 1) \) (as defined in (7)). To achieve this goal, we formulate the following problem:

Find \( Q(t + 1) \)
s.t. \[
\begin{align*}
&v_{m't(t+1)}^H Q(t + 1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t + 1) v_{m't(t+1)} \\
&\geq v_{m_0(t+1)}^H Q(t + 1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t + 1) v_{m_0(t+1)} \\
&\forall m'(t+1) \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M\}.
\end{align*}
\]

The challenge of solving problem (12) lies in that the value of \( m_0(t + 1) \) has not been fed back when optimizing \( Q(t + 1) \). Therefore, we need to design \( Q(t + 1) \) such that the inequality in problem (12) holds for all the possible values of \( m_0(t + 1) \), making the solution of problem (12) irrelevant to \( m_0(t + 1) \). The basic idea of designing such \( Q(t + 1) \) is to make the vector \( v_{m'(t+1)} \) as the first principal eigenvector of matrix \( Q(t + 1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t + 1) \) (corresponding to the largest eigenvalue), that is

\[
v_{m'(t+1)} = \arg \max_{\|x\|=1} x^H Q(t + 1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t + 1) x. \tag{13}
\]

To achieve this, we first devise an auxiliary matrix \( R_{t+1} \) for different ranks of \( \hat{C}(t) \), and show that the solution of problem (12) can be given by the following equation:

\[
Q(t + 1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t + 1) = R_{t+1}. \tag{14}
\]

The key results are summarized in Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 as follows.

**Proposition 1.** If \( \text{rank}(\hat{C}(t)) = N_A \), construct a matrix

\[
R_{t+1} = \sigma_1 v_{m'(t+1)} v_{m'(t+1)}^H + \sigma_2 u_1 u_1^H + \cdots + \sigma_{N_P} u_{N_P} u_{N_P}^H, \tag{15}
\]

where \( m'(t+1) \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M\} \) : hyper-parameters \( \{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P} \) and \( \{u_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P} \) are pre-selected such that \( \sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_{N_P} \) and columns \( \{v_{m'(t+1)}, u_1, \ldots, u_{N_P}\} \) are all orthonormal. The solution of problem (12) can be provided by solving equation (14), with the closed-form expression:

\[
(1 + \frac{1}{\mu}) X_{t+1} \Sigma_{t+1} Y_{t+1}, \tag{16}
\]

where

\[
Y_{t+1} = [v_{m'(t+1)}, u_1, \ldots, u_{N_P}], \tag{17}
\]

\[
\Sigma_{t+1} = \text{diag} \left( \sqrt{\sigma_1}, \sqrt{\sigma_2}, \ldots, \sqrt{\sigma_{N_P}}, 0, \ldots, 0 \right) \tag{18}
\]

and matrix \( X_{t+1} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A} \) is a random unitary matrix, i.e., \( X_{t+1}^H X_{t+1} = I_{N_A} \).

**Proof.** See Appendix C.

**Proposition 2.** If \( \text{rank}(\hat{C}(t)) = K < N_A \), construct a matrix:

\[
R_{t+1} = \sigma_1 v_{m'(t+1)} v_{m'(t+1)}^H + \sigma_2 u_1 u_1^H + \cdots + \sigma_{N_P} u_{N_P} u_{N_P}^H, \tag{19}
\]

where \( m'(t+1) \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M\} \) : \( \{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P} \) are pre-selected such that columns \( \{v_{m'(t+1)}, u_1, \ldots, u_{N_P}\} \) are all orthonormal. When \( K < N_P \), the hyper-parameters \( \{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P} \) follows

\[
\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_K > \sigma_{K+1} = \sigma_{K+2} = \cdots = \sigma_{N_P} = 0. \tag{20}
\]

Otherwise, when \( N_P \leq K < N_A \), the values of \( \{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P} \) need to satisfy

\[
\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_{N_P} > 0. \tag{21}
\]

Then, the solution of problem (12) is

\[
Q(t + 1) = \begin{bmatrix} U_{t+1}^H \text{diag}(s_t) \cdot U_{t+1} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} R_{t+1} \begin{bmatrix} F_{t+1} \end{bmatrix} + O_t, \tag{22}
\]
Table I
DIFFERENT STRATEGIES OF SETTING HYPER-PARAMETERS FOR PROBLEM (12).

| $m'(t + 1) \in \{1, 2, \cdots, M\}$ | Strategy 1 | Randomly selected from $\{1, 2, \cdots, M\}$. |
| $m'(t + 1) = \arg\max_{m'} v_m^H Q(t) C(t) v_m, \forall v_m \in V.$ | Strategy 2 | |
| Define $\gamma_t = \sqrt{\frac{||C'(t)-C(t)||^2}{N^2}}$. If $\gamma_t \geq \epsilon$, Strategy 1; otherwise Strategy 2. | Strategy 3 | |
| $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P}$ | Strategy 1 | $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \cdots = \sigma_{N_P} = 1$. |
| Sample each $\sigma_n \sim U(0, 1)$ and then sort these values. | Strategy 2 | |
| $X_{t+1}$ | Strategy 1 | Let $B(t) = \sum_{i=1}^t Q(t) \exp\{10(i-t)\}. \quad X_{t+1} = \arg\min_{X(t+1)|Y(t)} \text{Tr}(Q(t+1)|B(t)^H B(t) Q(t+1))$ (see Appendix E). |
| Randomly generated. | Strategy 2 | |

where

$$F_{t+1} = R_{t+1}^\frac{1}{2} = X_{t+1} \Sigma_{t+1} Y_{t+1};$$

$$Y_{t+1} = \left[ v_{m'(t+1)}, u_1, \cdots, u_{N_P-1} \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{N_P \times N_P};$$

$$\Sigma_{t+1} = \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{diag}\left\{ \sqrt{\sigma_1^2}, \sqrt{\sigma_2^2}, \cdots, \sqrt{\sigma_{N_P}^2} \right\} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_P \times N_P} \\
0 \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_A-N_P) \times N_P}
\end{array} \right];$$

$$X_{t+1} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A} \quad \text{and} \quad X_{t+1}^H X_{t+1} = \left[ \begin{array}{c}
I_{K \times K} \quad 0 \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_A-K) \times (N_A-K)} \\
0 \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_A-K) \times (N_A-K)}
\end{array} \right];$$

$$U_t = \left[ \begin{array}{c}
U_{t,1} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times K} \\
U_{t,2} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times (N_A-K)}
\end{array} \right];$$

$$s_t = [\sigma_{t,1}^F, \cdots, \sigma_{t,K}^F];$$

contains all nonzero singular values of $\hat{C}(t)$; (23)

$$O_t \in \text{Null}(U_{t,1}^H).$$ (24)

Proof. See Appendix D.

In Proposition 1 and Proposition 2, when constructing $R_{t+1}$, there are a number of hyper-parameters that need to be pre-defined, including $m'(t + 1) \in \{1, 2, \cdots, M\}$, $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P}$, $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P-1}$ and unitary matrix $X_{t+1}$. Different strategies of setting those hyper-parameters result in different $Q(t+1)$, which further result in different number of communication rounds for the algorithm to converge\(^5\). In Table I, we list some strategies, and use the “check” symbol to mark those with the best performance in terms of both reconstruction accuracy and convergence speed in extensive simulation studies.

B. Analytic Center Acquisition

In problem (12), the analytical center matrix $\hat{C}(t)$ of the feasible set $B(C; \{Q(i)\}_{i=1}^t)$ is required. Inspired by the analytical center optimization in the framework of cutting plane method [29], [30], given the weighting matrices $\{Q(i)\}_{i=1}^t$, we propose to find the center matrix $\hat{C}(t)$ via solving the following problem:

$$\max_{\mathbb{C}} \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{1}{\eta(i)} \log(v_{m(i)}^H Q(i)^H C Q(i) v_{m(i)})$$

$$- v_{m(i)}^H Q(i)^H C Q(i) v_{m(i)} + \log \det(C) - \lambda \|C\|_\ast$$

s.t. $a \leq \text{Tr}(C) \leq b,$

$$v_{m(i)}^H Q(i)^H C Q(i) v_{m(i)} = \eta(i),$$

$$i = 1, \cdots, t,$$ (31)

where $\| \cdot \|_\ast$ denotes the nuclear norm of the argument, and $\lambda \geq 0$ is the regularization parameter. In addition, $a$ and $b$ (see (C4) in (6)) are the lower bound value and the upper bound value of the trace of the ground-truth CCM $C$, respectively.

Note that problem (31) is different from the standard formulation of analytic center acquisition problem [29], [30], due to the incorporation of the system model information (see Section II) for more accurate CCM estimation. Specifically, the low-rank structure of $\hat{C}(t)$ is promoted by the added nuclear norm based regularization term. The inequality constraint $\text{Tr}(C) \geq a$ is introduced to further reduce the feasible region. CQI values $\{\eta(i)\}_{i=1}^t$ are employed to re-weight each log-barrier term to make $\hat{C}(t)$ closer to the ground-truth $C$. Even with these differences, problem (31) is still convex and can be well solved by the CVX solver\(^5\).

For the hyper-parameters of problem (31), the regularization parameter $\lambda$ needs to be tuned, while the upper/lower bound values $\{a, b\}$ can be analytically obtained. As the upper bound of Tr$(C)$, the value of $b$ depends on the normalization scheme adopted for the ground-truth $C$ at the UE side. If trace normalization is utilized, then $b = 1$ is an appropriate choice. If Frobenius normalization is used, then $b$ should take value $N_U$. If the normalization scheme is unknown at the BS, we provide one heuristic scheme to estimate $b$ (See Appendix F). For the lower bound $a$, it can be given by the following proposition.

\(^4\)The convergence analysis will be provided in Section III-D.

\(^5\)http://cvxr.com/cvx/.
Algorithm 1: The Proposed Channel Covariance Matrix Reconstruction Algorithm

Initialization: Set initial value of $Q(0)$.

For the $t$-th communication round ($t \geq 1$):

- Update center matrix $C(t)$ via solving (31);
- If $\text{rank}(C(t)) = N_A$, update $Q(t+1)$ using (16);
- If $\text{rank}(C(t)) < N_A$, update $Q(t+1)$ using (22);

Until the communication round $T$.

Output: Channel covariance matrix estimate $\hat{C}_T$.

Proposition 3. Given CQI $\{\eta(t)\}_{t=1}^T$, the trace of the ground-truth CCM $C$ satisfies

$$\text{Tr}(C) \geq \max_{t=1,\ldots,T} \frac{\eta(t)}{\text{Tr}(Q(t)\mathbf{v}_{m_0(t)}^H\mathbf{v}_{m_0(t)}^H(t))}. \quad (32)$$

Proof. See Appendix G.

C. Algorithm Summary

From previous subsections, it can be seen that the design of weighting matrix $Q(t+1)$ requires the analytical center $\hat{C}(t)$, while the computation of $\hat{C}(t)$ needs a set of weighting matrices $\{Q(i)\}_{i=1}^t$. This motivates the alternating updates of center CCM matrix $\hat{C}(t)$ and weighting matrix $Q(t+1)$, as summarized in Algorithm 1. The algorithm is composed of two steps: weighting matrix design (see Section III-A) and analytic center acquisition (see Section III-B). In the $t$-th communication round ($t \geq 1$), the analytic center acquisition provides a feasible CCM estimate $C(t) \in B(C; \{Q(i)\}_{i=1}^t)$, based on which weighting matrix $Q(t+1)$ is designed to achieve a “neutral/deep” cut for the set $B(\hat{C}; \{Q(i)\}_{i=1}^t)$. As shown in the next subsection, when $T$ is large enough, the set $B(\hat{C}; \{Q(i)\}_{i=1}^t)$ will be very small such that any element in such a set provides a good CCM estimate.

D. Convergence Analysis

In this section, we theoretically show that the CCM estimate sequence $\{C(t)\}_{t=1}^T$, in which $C(t)$ is the solution of problem (31) in the $t$-th communication round, will converge to the ground-truth CCM $C^*$ when $t$ goes to infinity. To show this, we first present the following property that characterizes the feasible set of problem (31).

Property 1. In the $t$-th communication round, denote the feasible set of problem (31) as $\mathcal{F}_t$, $t = 1, 2, \ldots, T$, we have:

$$\mathcal{F}_T \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{T-1} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1. \quad (33)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_t$$

$$C^* \in \mathcal{F}_t, \ \forall t. \quad (34)$$

Proof. see Appendix H.

Property 1 points out that the feasible set $\mathcal{F}_t$ will tend to shrink as the communication round $t$ increases, and always contain the ground-truth CCM $C^*$. Therefore, when $t$ goes to infinity, if the set $\mathcal{F}_t$ only contains one feasible CCM $C_t$, this CCM must be the ground-truth $C^*$. In the following, we show the statement above indeed holds.

To facilitate the analysis, we introduce a relaxed version of problem (31) as follows:

$$\max_C \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{1}{\eta(i)} \log \left( \mathbf{v}_{m_0(t)}^H Q(i)^H C Q(i) \mathbf{v}_{m_0(t)} + \mathbf{v}_m^H Q(i)^H C Q(i) \mathbf{v}_m \right) + \log \det(C) - \lambda ||C||_*$$

s.t. $\text{Tr}(C) \leq b.$ \quad (35)

By noticing that several constraints in problem (31) have been eliminated, it is easy to see that the feasible set $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ of problem (35) contains the feasible set $\mathcal{F}_t$ of problem (31), i.e., $\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$. Therefore, if set $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ can be shown to monotonically shrink as $t$ goes larger, and always contains the ground-truth CCM $C^*$, so does the subset $\mathcal{F}_t$. To show this, we first present the property that characterizes the set $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$.

Property 2. In the $t$-th ($t > 0$) communication round, for the feasible set $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ of problem (35), we have

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t = \mathcal{F}_0 \cap \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t, \quad (36)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \{C | \text{Tr}(C) \leq b\} \cap \{C | C \in \mathbb{S}_+\}, \quad (37)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t = \bigcap_{i=1}^t \left\{C | \mathbf{v}_m^H Q(i)^H C Q(i) \mathbf{v}_m \leq \mathbf{v}_{m_0(t)}^H Q(i)^H C Q(i) \mathbf{v}_{m_0(t)}, m = 1, \ldots, M\right\}; \quad (38)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t; \quad (39)$$

$$C^* \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t. \quad (40)$$

Property 2 indicates that the volume of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ is up to that of $\mathcal{F}_t$. Then inspired by [31], we introduce a measure to assess its volume.

Definition 1. Given the interior point $\tilde{C}_t$ of set $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ obtained via solving problem (35), we define the volume measure of set $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ as follows:

$$\max_{C \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t} \mu_t(C), \quad (41)$$

where

$$\mu_t(C) = \frac{1}{S_t} \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{m=1}^M \omega_{i,m,t} \langle G_{m,i}, C \rangle_F; \quad (42)$$

$$G_{m,i} = Q(i) \mathbf{v}_{m_0(i)} \mathbf{v}_{m_0(i)}^H Q(i) - Q(i) \mathbf{v}_m \mathbf{v}_m^H Q(i); \quad (43)$$

$$\langle G_{m,i}, C \rangle_F = \text{Tr}(G_{m,i} C); \quad (44)$$

$$\omega_{i,m,t} = \frac{1}{\eta(i)} \langle G_{m,i}, \tilde{C}_t \rangle_F; \quad (45)$$

$$S_t = \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{m=1}^M \omega_{i,m,t}. \quad (46)$$
This definition extends the notion of volume measure from a set containing all vectors [31] to a set involving CCMs. The physical meaning of (42) can be interpreted as follows. First, equations (43) and (44) compute the following term:

\[ v_{m(i)}^H Q(i)^H C Q(i) v_{m(i)} - v_m^H Q(i)^H C Q(i) v_m, \]  

(47)

which measures the distance between the CCM \( C \) to the \( m \)-th hyper-planes in the \( t \)-th communication round. Second, \( \omega_{t,m,t} \) is the weighting coefficient, which is adopted to eliminate the scaling difference of \( \{C_{m,i,t} F\}_{m=1,i=1}^{M,t} \) induced by the different \( Q(i) \) and \( v_{m(i)} \). Finally, \( S_t \) is used for normalization.

Using Definition 1, we can show the following lemma:

**Lemma 1.** For all \( C \in \{C | \text{Tr}(C) \leq b\} \), it holds

\[ \mu_t(C) \leq \frac{\lambda(I,C)^F}{S_t}, \]  

(48)

where \( S_t \to \infty \) as \( t \to \infty \).

**Proof.** see Appendix I. \( \square \)

**Lemma 1** shows that the volume measure \( \mu_t \) is upper-bounded. Since \( S_t \) is a monotonically increasing function of \( t \), as \( t \) goes to infinity, the right-hand side of (48) will become zero. In addition, we have **Lemma 2** stated as follows:

**Lemma 2.** For any feasible CCM \( C \neq C^* \in \bar{F}_t \), it will be excluded from the feasible set after the \( \tau \)-th (\( \tau > t \)) communication round, i.e., \( C \notin \bar{F}_t, \forall \tau \geq \tau \).

**Proof.** see Appendix J. \( \square \)

**Lemma 2** guarantees that the feasible set \( \bar{F}_t \) will shrink to the set that only contains one feasible CCM \( C^* \). Using these two lemma, we can show the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** As \( t \to \infty \), the feasible set \( F_t \) of problem (31) only contains one feasible CCM \( C^* \).

**Proof.** see Appendix K. \( \square \)

From **Theorem 1**, it can be concluded that the proposed algorithm will converge to the ground-truth \( C^* \) when \( t \) goes to infinity.

**Remark 1 (Complexity Analysis):** The complexity of **Algorithm 1** is dominated by the cost of primal-dual interior method that solves the convex optimization problem (31). In [32], it shows the iteration complexity of primal-dual interior method is \( O(\sqrt{nL}) \) in the worst case, where \( n \) is the number of variables and \( L \) is the number of constraints. Therefore, it can be concluded that the proposed algorithm is with complexity order \( O(\sqrt{nL}) \).

**IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

In this section, numerical results are presented to showcase the effectiveness of the proposed CCM reconstruction algorithm. (i.e., **Algorithm 1**). Consider a BS with \( N_A = 32 \) antennas and \( N_P = 8 \) ports, serving a UE with \( N_U = 2 \) antennas. The ground-truth CCMs are provided by the channel samples generated from QuaDRiGa. Particularly, we set the center frequency of the downlink channel and the uplink channel to 1.275 GHz and 1.25 GHz respectively, and assume that the speed of the UE terminal is 3 km/h. Type I codebook is generated according to the 5G NR standard [1], [11]. Each point in the following figures is an average of 100 Monte-Carlo trials.

The CCM reconstruction performance is measured by the root mean square error (RMSE)

\[ \sqrt{\frac{\|C^* - \hat{C}\|^2}{N_A}}, \]  

where \( \hat{C} \) is the reconstructed CCM and \( C^* \) is the ground-truth CCM. In addition, consider that beamforming vector \( w \) can be acquired via computing the first principal eigenvector of \( C \), we also use the beam precision, which is defined as \( \frac{w^H C^* w}{d} \) (where \( d \) is the largest eigenvalue of \( C^* \)), to see how the CCM reconstruction helps the beamforming.

In Appendix I, the RMSEs and beam precision of the proposed algorithm under different hyper-parameter setting strategies (see Table I) are presented, from which we can identify the practically useful strategies of hyper-parameter setting. Particularly, in weighting matrix design, \( m'(t + 1) \) is randomly selected from \{1, 2, · · · , M\} if the RMSE

\[ \sqrt{\frac{\|C(t+1) - C^*\|^2}{N_A}} \geq \epsilon \quad \text{(e.g., 0.01)}, \]  

otherwise, \( m'(t + 1) \) is obtained via solving

\[ m'(t + 1) = \underset{m}{\arg \max} \quad v_m^H Q^H(t) C(t) Q(t) v_m, \forall v_m \in \mathcal{V}. \]  

(49)

Moreover, \( X_{t+1} \) is acquired via solving

\[ X_{t+1} = \arg \min_b \quad (Q^H(t + 1) B(t) + B^H(t) Q(t + 1)), \]  

(50)

where \( B(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{t} Q(i) \exp\{10(i - t)\}; \) and \( \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \cdots = \sigma_{N_P} = 1 \). In analytic center acquisition problem (31), the upper bound \( b \) follows the strategy in Appendix F, and the lower bound \( a \) follows the update equation in **Proposition 3**.

The RMSEs of the proposed algorithm versus different communication rounds are presented in Fig. 2, with the algorithm in [26] serving as the benchmark (labeled as baseline), which has been adopted in real-world 5G systems. In particular, the algorithm in [26] looks at the system information to reconstruct the CCM. In contrast, the proposed principled problem formulation, which utilizes all the CCM reconstruction helps the beamforming.

In Fig. 2, we can observe that the proposed algorithm is rather heuristic. It did not take the system information to reconstruct the CCM. In contrast, the proposed principled problem formulation, which utilizes all the system information to reconstruct the CCM. It is clear that in each communication round, the proposed algorithm gives a much lower RMSE than that of the benchmarking algorithm. This shows the effectiveness of the proposed principled problem formulation, which utilizes all the system information to reconstruct the CCM. In contrast, the algorithm in [26] is rather heuristic. It did not take the CCM reconstruction as an explicit optimization objective.
algorithm [26], the beam precision using Type I codebook and Type II codebook (see the 3GPP standard [11]) also are employed as the benchmark. It can be observed that the proposed algorithm did not offer satisfactory beamforming performance unless the communication round is larger than 35. This is because the proposed algorithm aims at reconstructing the CCM, while not its first principal eigenvector. Therefore, even though the RMSE of CCM reconstruction continues to decrease as shown in Fig. 2, the first principal eigenvector of the ground-truth CCM did not get well recovered.

However, if $N_U = 1$ (the UE is equipped with a single antenna), the CCM reconstruction is equivalent to the first principal eigenvector estimation of CCM. Under this setting, we present the RMSEs and beam precision of different algorithms in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 respectively. It is clear the proposed algorithm still offers much lower RMSEs than those of the baseline algorithm [26], see Fig. 4. On the other hand, under the rank-1 CCM setting, the proposed CCM reconstruction algorithm equivalently seeks the optimal first principal eigenvector of $C$. As a result, in Fig. 5, the beam precisions of the proposed algorithm continue to increase and exceeds those of baseline algorithm [26] after the 26-th communication round. Meanwhile, it touches the 95% of the Type II codebook based beam precision at the 32-th communication round. This shows the excellent performance of the proposed algorithm for the UE with $N_U = 1$ antenna.

Finally, in Fig. 6, the convergence of the proposed algorithm is verified under the setting: $N_U = 2$, $N_A = 8$ and $N_P = 2$, for the ease of illustration. As shown in Fig. 6, the RMSE of the proposed algorithm keeps decreasing as the communication round increases. In particular, after the 60-th communication round, the RMSE is less than $5 \times 10^{-4}$, which shows the nearly exact recovery of the ground-truth CCM.
find that through incorporating more constraints. Therefore, any addition, when the UE is with a single antenna, a notable the proposed algorithm in terms of CCM reconstruction. In simulation results have shown the excellent performance of a principled way by leveraging the structure of codebook and Figure 6. The RMSEs of CCM reconstruction versus communication rounds \((N_A = 8, N_F = 2, N_U = 1)\).

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the reconstruction of CCM from a few feedback values at BS was investigated in 5G NR FDD massive MIMO wireless systems. Particularly, using Type I codebook, the downlink CCM reconstruction problem was formulated in a principled way by leveraging the structure of codebook and feedback values. The proposed effective algorithm extend the idea of cutting plane method to tackle the complicated feasible set of CCMs, and consists of two alternating steps. One is to optimize pilot weighting matrix such that the feasible set can be consecutively reduced, and the another is to obtain the analytical center of the feasible set. The convergence of the proposed algorithm was theoretically analyzed. Extensive simulation results have shown the excellent performance of the proposed algorithm in terms of CCM reconstruction. In addition, when the UE is with a single antenna, a notable beamforming performance of the proposed algorithm was observed.

APPENDIX

A. The Convex Cone Property of (7)

See Section A of the supplementary document.

B. The Shrinkage of \(B(\hat{C}; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^T)\)

According to the definition of subset, it holds that

\[
B(\hat{C}; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^{\kappa_2}) \subseteq B(\hat{C}; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^{\kappa_1}), \quad 1 \leq \kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2 \leq T, \tag{52}
\]

if and only if any \(\hat{C} \in B(\hat{C}; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^{\kappa_2})\) must be in \(B(\hat{C}; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^{\kappa_1})\).

From the definition of \(B(\hat{C}; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^{\kappa_2})\), it is easy to find that \(B(\hat{C}; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^{\kappa_2})\) extends from \(B(\hat{C}; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^{\kappa_1})\) through incorporating more constraints. Therefore, any \(\hat{C}\) in \(B(\hat{C}; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^{\kappa_2})\) is also in \(B(\hat{C}; \{Q(t)\}_{t=1}^{\kappa_1})\).

C. The Proof of Proposition 1

In problem (12), assuming \(Q(t+1)\) and \(m'(t+1)\) are given\(^6\), the sufficient condition of the constraint in (12), i.e.,

\[
\mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)}^H Q(t+1) \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1) \mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)}^H \geq \mathbf{v}_{m(t+1)}^H Q(t+1) \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1) \mathbf{v}_{m(t+1)}^H \tag{53}
\]

is that the unit-norm vector \(\mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)}\) is the first principal eigenvector of \(Q(t+1) \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1)\), since all codewords \(\{\mathbf{v}_{m(t+1)}\}_{t=1}^{M}\) are unit-norm. This condition reveals one property of \(Q(t+1)\), that is

\[
\mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)} = \arg \max_{||\mathbf{w}||=1} \mathbf{w}^H Q(t+1) \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1) \mathbf{w}. \tag{54}
\]

Guided by this property, the finding of \(Q(t+1)\) consists of two steps. First, an auxiliary positive semi-definite (PSD) matrix \(R_{t+1}\) is constructed, of which the first principal eigenvector is \(\mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)}\). In other words, such \(R_{t+1}\) guarantees

\[
\mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)} = \arg \max_{||\mathbf{w}||=1} \mathbf{w}^H R_{t+1} \mathbf{w} \tag{55}
\]

holds. Then, the matrix \(Q(t+1)\) can be acquired by solving

\[
Q(t+1) \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1) = R_{t+1}, \tag{56}
\]

and the resulting \(Q(t+1)\) is a solution of problem (12).

Let us show the first step. Inspired by (55), we devise the PSD matrix \(R_{t+1}\) as follows

\[
R_{t+1} = \sigma_1 \mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)}^H \mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)}^H + \sigma_2 \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_1^H + \ldots + \sigma_{N_F} \mathbf{u}_{N_F-1} \mathbf{u}_{N_F-1}^H \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A}, \tag{57}
\]

where hyper-parameters \(\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{N_F}\) and \(\{\mathbf{u}_n\}_{n=1}^{N_F-1}\) are all orthonormal. \(^{59}\)

Now, we will show that \(R_{t+1}\) in (57) guarantees (55) holds. In particular, since \(\mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)}, \mathbf{u}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{N_F-1}\) are a set of basis vectors of space \(\mathbb{C}^{N_F \times 1}\), any unit-norm vector \(\mathbf{w}\) in \(\mathbb{C}^{N_F \times 1}\) can be represented as

\[
\mathbf{w} = \alpha_1 \mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)} + \alpha_2 \mathbf{u}_1 + \ldots + \alpha_{N_F} \mathbf{u}_{N_F-1}, \tag{60}
\]

where \(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_{N_F} \in \mathbb{R}\) satisfy \(\sum_{n=1}^{N_F} \alpha_n^2 = 1\). From (60), it can be concluded that for any given unit-norm vector \(\mathbf{w}\), we have

\[
\mathbf{w}^H R_{t+1} \mathbf{w} = (\alpha_1 \mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)} + \alpha_2 \mathbf{u}_1 + \ldots + \alpha_{N_F} \mathbf{u}_{N_F-1})^H \times (\sigma_1 \mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)}^H \mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)}^H + \sigma_2 \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_1^H + \ldots + \sigma_{N_F} \mathbf{u}_{N_F-1} \mathbf{u}_{N_F-1}^H) \times (\alpha_1 \mathbf{v}_{m'(t+1)} + \alpha_2 \mathbf{u}_1 + \ldots + \alpha_{N_F} \mathbf{u}_{N_F-1})
\]

\[
= \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 \alpha_2^2 + \ldots + \sigma_{N_F}^2 \alpha_{N_F}^2 \tag{61}
\]

\[
\leq \alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \ldots + \alpha_{N_F}^2 \tag{62}
\]

\[
= \alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \ldots + \alpha_{N_F}^2 \sigma_{N_F} \sigma_{N_F} \tag{63}
\]

\[
= \alpha_1. \tag{64}
\]

\(^6\)In particular, the choice of \(m'(t+1)\) is independent with problem (12) and thus \(m'(t+1)\) can be selected from \([1, 2, \ldots, M]\) following any given scheme in Table I.
Notice that term (62) equals to term (63) if and only if \( \alpha = \alpha_3 = \cdots = \alpha_{N_P} = 0 \). In other words, the unit-norm vector which maximizes the value of \( w^H R_{t+1} w \) is \( v_{m'(t+1)} \), that is the equation (55).

Then, let us show the second step, i.e., how to obtain \( Q(t+1) \) via solving

\[
Q(t+1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1) = R_{t+1}.
\]

(65)

Notice that when \( \text{rank}(\hat{C}(t)) = N_A > N_P \), there must exist a \( Q(t+1) \) such that

\[
\text{rank}(Q(t+1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1)) = \text{rank}(R_{t+1}) = N_P,
\]

(66)

which means the equation (65) is solvable. Since equation (65) is a quadratic form of variable \( Q(t+1) \), it can be solved by completing the square. More specifically, due to the positive semi-definiteness of both \( \hat{C}(t) \) and \( R_{t+1} \), it can be shown

\[
Q(t+1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1) = Q(t+1)^H \hat{C}(t) \frac{1}{2} Q(t+1) + R_{t+1},
\]

(67)

\[
R_{t+1} = Y_{t+1} H^H \Sigma_{t+1}^H X_{t+1} X_{t+1} \Sigma_{t+1} Y_{t+1},
\]

(68)

where

\[
\Sigma_{t+1} = \text{diag} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\sigma_1}, \sqrt{\sigma_2}, \ldots, \sqrt{\sigma_{N_P}}, 0, \ldots, 0}{N_A-N_P} \right) \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A},
\]

(69)

\[
Y_{t+1} = [v_{m'(t+1)}, u_1, \ldots, u_{N_P-1}] \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_P},
\]

(70)

and \( X_{t+1} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A} \) is a random unitary matrix. From (67) and (68), equation (65) holds if

\[
\hat{C}(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} Q(t+1) = X_{t+1} \Sigma_{t+1} Y_{t+1},
\]

(71)

from which \( Q(t+1) \) can be obtained via

\[
Q(t+1) = \hat{C}(t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} X_{t+1} \Sigma_{t+1} Y_{t+1}.
\]

(72)

\[\text{D. The Proof of Proposition 2}\]

In this proposition, the rank of \( \hat{C}(t) \) is \( K < N_A \) instead of \( N_A \) which is assumed in \textbf{Proposition 1} This subtle difference suggests that the proofs of these two propositions follow the same proof logic, in which the only difference is the construction of \( R_{t+1} \).

Similarly, given \( m'(t+1) \), the auxiliary PSD matrix \( R_{t+1} \) is constructed as follows:

\[
R_{t+1} = \sigma_1 v_{m'(t+1)} v_{m'(t+1)}^H + \sigma_2 u_1 u_1^H + \cdots + \sigma_{N_P} u_{N_P-1} u_{N_P-1}^H \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A},
\]

(73)

where \( \{u_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P-1} \) are preselected such that columns \( \{v_{m'(t+1)}, u_1, \ldots, u_{N_P-1} \} \) are all orthonormal. When \( K < N_P \), the hyper-parameters \( \{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P} \) follow

\[
\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_K > \sigma_{K+1} = \cdots = \sigma_{N_P} = 0.
\]

(74)

Otherwise, when \( N_P \leq K < N_A \), the values of \( \{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P} \) need to satisfy

\[
\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_{N_P} > 0.
\]

(75)

Notice that such construction of \( R_{t+1} \) guarantees the equation

\[
Q(t+1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1) = R_{t+1}.
\]

(76)

is solvable. Using such \( R_{t+1} \), there exists a \( Q(t+1) \) such that

\[
K \geq \text{rank}(Q(t+1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1)) = \text{rank}(R_{t+1}) = N_P,
\]

(77)

when \( N_P \leq K < N_A \) or

\[
\text{rank}(Q(t+1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1)) = \text{rank}(R_{t+1}) = K,
\]

(78)

when \( K < N_P \), which means the equation (76) is solvable. Likewise, \( Q(t+1) \) can be obtained by solving (76). In order to solve (76), we construct the completing square form via the following steps. Due to the positive semi-definiteness of both \( \hat{C}(t) \) and \( R_{t+1} \), it can be shown

\[
Q(t+1)^H \hat{C}(t) \frac{1}{2} Q(t+1) = Q(t+1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1),
\]

(79)

\[
Y_{t+1}^H \Sigma_{t+1}^H X_{t+1} X_{t+1} \Sigma_{t+1} Y_{t+1} = R_{t+1},
\]

(80)

where \( X_{t+1} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A} \), \( \Sigma_{t+1} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A} \) and \( Y_{t+1} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A} \) with form

\[
Y_{t+1} = [v_{m'(t+1)}, u_1, \ldots, u_{N_P-1}],
\]

(81)

\[
\Sigma_{t+1} = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} \text{diag} \left( \sqrt{\sigma_1}, \sqrt{\sigma_2}, \ldots, \sqrt{\sigma_{N_P}} \right) & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A} \end{array} \right],
\]

(82)

\[
X_{t+1} = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} I_{K \times K} & \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times K} \\ \hline 0 & \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_A-K) \times (N_A-K)} \end{array} \right].
\]

(83)

Notice that \( X_{t+1} \) is designed carefully such that

\[
\text{rank}(Q(t+1)^H \hat{C}(t) Q(t+1)) = \text{rank}(R_{t+1}) = \min(K, N_P)
\]

(84)

holds. Then, from (76), (79), and (80), the equation

\[
\hat{C}(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_{t+1} = X_{t+1} \Sigma_{t+1} Y_{t+1}
\]

(85)

can be straightforwardly obtained. By replacing \( \hat{C}(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \) in equation (85) with its eigenvalue decomposition

\[
\hat{C}(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} U_{t,1} & \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{diag}(s_1) \\ 0 \end{array} \right] \\ \hline 0 & \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A} \end{array} \right],
\]

(86)

where \( s_k = [\sigma_{K+1}^2, \ldots, \sigma_{K}^2] \) contains all nonzero singular values of \( \hat{C}(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \) and the semi-unitaries matrices \( U_{t,1}^H \) and \( U_{t,2}^H \) are orthogonal (i.e., \( U_{t,1} U_{t,2} = 0 \), we have

\[
\left[ \begin{array}{c|c} U_{t,1} & 0 \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{diag}(s_k) \\ 0 \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c c} U_{t,1}^H & U_{t,2}^H \end{array} \right] Q(t+1) = X_{t+1} \Sigma_{t+1} Y_{t+1},
\]

(87)
Furthermore, due to $U_{t,2}^H U_{t,2} = 0$, equation (87) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{diag}(s_t) & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
U_{t,1}^H \\
U_{t,2}^H
\end{bmatrix}
Q(t + 1)
= \begin{bmatrix}
U_{t,1}^H X_{t+1}^t \Sigma_{t+1}^t Y_{t+1}^t \\
U_{t,2}^H X_{t+1}^t \Sigma_{t+1}^t Y_{t+1}^t
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(88)

Following this, it holds that

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{diag}(s_t) U_{t,1}^H Q(t + 1) \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
U_{t,1}^H X_{t+1}^t \Sigma_{t+1}^t Y_{t+1}^t \\
U_{t,2}^H X_{t+1}^t \Sigma_{t+1}^t Y_{t+1}^t
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(89)

where

$$
\begin{align*}
U_{t,1}^H &= \begin{bmatrix}
U_{t,1}^H & U_{t,12}^H 
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times (N_A - K)}, \\
Q(t + 1) &= \begin{bmatrix}
Q_1(t + 1) & Q_2(t + 1)
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times (K - N_A)}.
\end{align*}
$$

(90)

(91)

Therefore, according to (89), equation (85) has solutions if and only if

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{diag}(s_t) &= (U_{t,1}^H Q_1(t + 1) + U_{t,12}^H Q_2(t + 1)) \\
&= U_{t,1}^H X_{t+1}^t \Sigma_{t+1}^t Y_{t+1}^t \\
&= U_{t,1}^H F_{t+1},
\end{align*}
$$

(92)

and

$$
0 = U_{t,2}^H X_{t+1}^t \Sigma_{t+1}^t Y_{t+1}^t.
$$

(93)

In order to make equation (93) hold, we construct $X_{t+1}$ as following:

$$
X_{t+1} = X_{t+1,1} X_{t+1,2},
$$

(94)

where

$$
X_{t+1,1} = \begin{bmatrix}
U_{t,1,1} & 0
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_A \times N_A},
$$

(95)

and

$$
X_{t+1,2} = \begin{bmatrix}
V_{t+1} & 0
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times (N_A - K)},
$$

(96)

$$
V_{t+1} = \mathbf{I}.
$$

(97)

In particular, $X_{t+1,1}$ is designed carefully such that

$$
U_{t,2}^H X_{t+1}^t = U_{t,2}^H X_{t+1,1} X_{t+1,2} = 0.
$$

(98)

Then, using the specially designed $X_{t+1}$, we can construct a special $Q(t + 1)$ to make equation (92) hold, that is,

$$
Q(t + 1) = \begin{bmatrix}
Q_1(t + 1) \\
Q_2(t + 1)
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times (K - N_A)},
$$

(99)

Finally, together with the null space of $U_{t,1}^H$, we obtain the solution set of equation (85) based on (99) with the following form:

$$
Q(t + 1) = \begin{bmatrix}
U_{t,1}^H \text{diag}(s_t)^{-1} U_{t,1}^H F_{t+1} \\
0
\end{bmatrix} + O_t,
$$

(100)

where $O_t \in \text{Null}(U_{t,1}^H)$.

**E. The Strategy I of $X_{t+1}$ in Proposition 1 and Proposition 2**

See Section B of the supplementary document.

**F. Strategy for Setting the Upper Bound $b$**

Given the weight matrix $Q$ and any codeword $v$ in codebook $\mathcal{V}$, its beam precision with respect to the ground-truth channel covariance $C$ is defined as

$$
\frac{v^H C Q v}{d \|Qv\|^2}.
$$

(101)

where $d$ is the largest eigenvalue of $C$. By randomly generating numerous weight matrices $Q$ and using these matrices to compute the beam precision of $v$ in $\mathcal{V}$, the beam precision of Type I codebook, denoted by $\alpha$, is obtained by taking an average of all the collected beam precisions. Then, the following equation

$$
\frac{v_{m_0(t)}^H C Q(t) v_{m_0(t)}}{d \|Q(t)v_{m_0(t)}\|^2} = \alpha,
$$

(102)

is very likely to hold [11]. Furthermore, using the definition of CQI, i.e., $v_{m_0(t)}^H C Q(t) v_{m_0(t)} = \eta(t)$, the equation can be rewritten as

$$
d = \frac{\eta(t)}{\alpha \|Q(t)v_{m_0(t)}\|^2}.
$$

(103)

Since $\text{rank}(C) = N_U$, we have $\text{Tr}(C) \leq N_U d$. Then, the upper bound can be obtained by

$$
b = N_U d = \frac{N_U \eta(t)}{\alpha \|Q(t)v_{m_0(t)}\|^2}.
$$

(104)

**G. Proof of Proposition 3**

According to the definition of CQI (see (5)), in each communication round $t$, we have

$$
\eta(t) = v_{m_0(t)}^H C Q(t) v_{m_0(t)}
= \text{Tr} \left( v_{m_0(t)}^H Q(t) C Q(t) v_{m_0(t)} \right)
= \text{Tr} \left( C Q(t) v_{m_0(t)} v_{m_0(t)}^H Q(t) \right).
$$

(105)

Denote $A_t \triangleq Q(t) v_{m_0(t)} v_{m_0(t)}^H Q(t)$ which is a positive semi-definite matrix. The CCM $C$ and $A_t$ have the corresponding positive semi-definite square root matrix $C^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $A_t^{\frac{1}{2}}$, respectively. Therefore, from equation (105), we have

$$
\eta(t) = \text{Tr}(C A_t)
= \text{Tr} \left( C^{\frac{1}{2}} A_t C^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)
= \text{Tr} \left( C^{\frac{1}{2}} A_t^{\frac{1}{2}} C^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)
= \left\| C^{\frac{1}{2}} A_t^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F^2
\leq \left\| C^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F^2 \left\| A_t^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F^2
= \text{Tr}(C) \text{Tr}(A_t).
$$

(106)

Following this inequality (106), there is

$$
\text{Tr}(C) \geq \frac{\eta(t)}{\text{Tr}(A_t)} = \frac{\text{Tr}(C)}{\text{Tr}(Q(t) v_{m_0(t)} v_{m_0(t)}^H Q(t))}.
$$

(107)

Since the inequality (107) holds for $\forall t \in \{1, 2, \cdots, T\}$, we can conclude that

$$
\text{Tr}(C) \geq \max_{t=1,\cdots,T} \frac{\eta(t)}{\text{Tr}(Q(t) v_{m_0(t)} v_{m_0(t)}^H Q(t))}.
$$

(108)
\textbf{H. The Proof of Property 1}

According to the problem formulation (31), its feasible set, denoted by \( \mathcal{F}_t \), can be formulated as
\[
\mathcal{F}_t = S_0 \cap S_1^t \cap S_2^t, \tag{109}
\]
where
\[
S_0 = \{C|\text{Tr}(C) \leq b\} \cap \{C|C \in S_+\}, \tag{110}
\]
\[
S_1^t = \bigcap_{i=1}^{t} \{C|v_{m}^{H}(i)CQ(i)v_{m(i)} \leq v_{m(i)}^{H}(i)Q(i)^{H}CQ(i)v_{m(i)}, m = 1, \cdots, M\} \tag{111}
\]
\[
S_2^t = \bigcap_{i=1}^{t} \{C|\eta(i) = v_{m(i)}^{H}(i)Q(i)^{H}CQ(i)v_{m(i)}\}. \tag{112}
\]
From the formulation (109), it holds for any \( t_1 > t_2 \) that
\[
S_1^{t_1} \subseteq S_2^{t_2}, \tag{113}
\]
\[
S_2^{t_1} \subseteq S_2^{t_2}. \tag{114}
\]
Therefore, it can be concluded
\[
\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1. \tag{115}
\]
In addition, according to the feedback scheme aforementioned, it is easy to check that \( C^* \in S_0, C^* \in S_1^t, \) and \( C^* \in S_2^t \) hold such that
\[
C^* \in \mathcal{F}_t, \forall t. \tag{116}
\]

\textbf{I. The Proof of Lemma 1}

Consider the problem (35), its corresponding Lagrangian function is
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{t} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{1}{\eta(i)} \log \left( v_{m(i)}^{H}(i)CQ(i)v_{m(i)} - v_{m}^{H}(i)Q(i)^{H}CQ(i)v_{m} \right) + \log \det(C) - \lambda\|C\|_s + \lambda_1^t(\text{Tr}(C) - b),
\]
where \( \lambda_1^t \geq 0 \) is the dual variable. Therefore, the optimal solution \( \hat{C}_t \) of the problem (35) satisfies the following KKT condition
\[
0 = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{1}{\eta(i)} Q(i) \left( v_{m(i)}^{H}(i)C_{m(i)} - v_{m}^{H}(i)Q(i)_{m(i)} \right) Q^{H}(i)
+ \hat{C}_t^{H} - \lambda I + \lambda_1^t I; \tag{117}
\]
\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{t} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{1}{\eta(i)} G_{m,i}^{H}(C_{m,i}^{H})_t + \hat{C}_t^{H} - \lambda I + \lambda_1^t I, \tag{118}
\]
where \( \lambda_1^t \) is the optimal value of dual variable. Based on \textbf{Definition 1}, by multiplying \( C \in \{C|\text{Tr}(C) \leq b\} \) to both sides of equation (118), there is
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{t} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{1}{\eta(i)} (G_{m,i}^{H}(C_{m,i}^{H})_t + \hat{C}_t^{H} - \lambda I + \lambda_1^t I) C = 0, \tag{119}
\]
which is equal to
\[
S_t \mu_t(C) + \langle \hat{C}_t^{H}, C \rangle_F - \lambda(\|I\|_F + \lambda_1^t(\|I\|_F) = 0, \tag{120}
\]
Since \( C, \hat{C}_t \) are positive semi-definite matrix and \( \lambda_1^t \geq 0 \), the term \( \langle \hat{C}_t^{H}, C \rangle_F \) and \( \lambda_1^t(\|I\|_F) \) in equation (120) are positive such that
\[
S_t \mu_t(C) \leq \lambda(\|I\|_F). \tag{121}
\]
According to the definition of \( S_t \), the \( S_t \) is positive such that
\[
\mu_t(C) \leq \frac{\lambda(\|I\|_F)}{S_t} \tag{122}
\]
holds for all \( C \in \{C|\text{Tr}(C) \leq b\} \). In particular, since \( S_t \) is monotonically increasing with respect to \( t \), the upper bound of \( \mu_t(C) \) tends to 0 when \( t \) goes to infinity.

\textbf{J. The Proof of Lemma 2}

At the communication round \( \tau > t \), the proposed algorithm obtains a feasible CCM \( \hat{C}_\tau \in \mathcal{F}_\tau \) to generate \( Q(\tau) \) according to \textbf{Proposition 1} and \textbf{Proposition 2}. Based on such \( Q(\tau) \), the cutting planes are constructed to cut \( \mathcal{F}_\tau \) (see Section III).

Based on the design rule of weighting matrix \( Q \) (see Section III-A), it is easy to show that the generated cutting planes can cut \( \mathcal{F}_\tau \) such that some feasible CCMs (at least one feasible CCM \( \hat{C}_\tau \)) are excluded from \( \mathcal{F}_\tau \). Then, these CCMs are excluded from \( \mathcal{F}_\tau \) after the \( \tau + 1 \)-th communication round.

In particular, the eliminated CCM could be any feasible CCM \( C \neq C^* \in \mathcal{F}_\tau \). Therefore, as \( \tau \) increases, \( \mathcal{F}_\tau \) will converge to the set only contains \( C^* \).

\textbf{K. The Proof of Theorem 1}

Since it holds that the ground-truth CCM \( C^* \in \mathcal{F}_t \) (see \textbf{Property 2}), the value of \( \langle G_{m,i}, C^* \rangle_F, \forall m, i \) is always non-negative according to the definition of \( G_{m,i} \), which gives \( \mu_t(C^*) \geq 0 \). Then, from \textbf{Lemma 1}, the upper bound of \( \mu_t(C^*) \) tends to 0 when \( t \) is large enough due to \( C^* \in \{C|\text{Tr}(C) \leq b\} \), thus it holds that
\[
0 \leq \mu_t(C^*) \leq 0. \tag{123}
\]
For such \( \mathcal{F}_t \) with zeros size measure, \textbf{Lemma 2} guarantees it shrinks to a singleton. In other words, such \( \mathcal{F}_t \) only contains one element, that is \( C^* \). Based on the relationship \( \mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{F}_t \) and \( C^* \in \mathcal{F}_t \) (from \textbf{Property 1}), it can be concluded that \( \mathcal{F}_t \) also only contains one feasible CCM \( C^* \).

\textbf{L. Numerical Results of Trying Different Strategies in Table I}

See Section C of the supplementary document.
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A. The Convex Cone Property of (7)

According to the definition of convex cone [33], it can be concluded that \( \cap_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{P}_t \) is a convex cone if and only if each \( \mathcal{P}_t \) is a convex cone.

Given \( \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}_t \) and \( \theta \geq 0 \), the inequalities

\[
v_m^H Q(i)^H \hat{C} Q(i) v_m \leq v_{m_0}^H Q(i)^H \hat{C} Q(i) v_{m_0}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, t, \quad \forall v_m \in V \quad (124)
\]

is equivalent to

\[
\theta v_m^H Q(i)^H \hat{C} Q(i) v_m \leq \theta v_{m_0}^H Q(i)^H \hat{C} Q(i) v_{m_0}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, t, \quad \forall v_m \in V \quad (125)
\]

by multiplying \( \theta \) on both sides of (124). Hence, it can be concluded that \( \theta \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}_t \), which means \( \mathcal{P}_t \) is a cone.

In addition, given \( \mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \in \mathcal{P}_t \) and \( \theta \in [0, 1] \), it holds that

\[
v_m^H Q(i)^H \left( \theta \mathcal{C}_1 + (1 - \theta) \mathcal{C}_2 \right) Q(i) v_m = v_m^H Q(i)^H \left( \theta \mathcal{C}_1 \right) Q(i) v_m + v_m^H Q(i)^H \left( (1 - \theta) \mathcal{C}_2 \right) Q(i) v_m \\
\leq v_{m_0}^H Q(i)^H \left( \theta \mathcal{C}_1 \right) Q(i) v_{m_0} + v_{m_0}^H Q(i)^H \left( (1 - \theta) \mathcal{C}_2 \right) Q(i) v_{m_0}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, t, \quad \forall v_m \in V \quad (126)
\]

In other words, from (126), we have \( \theta \mathcal{C}_1 + (1 - \theta) \mathcal{C}_2 \in \mathcal{P}_t \) which means \( \mathcal{P}_t \) is a convex cone.

Therefore, each \( \mathcal{P}_t \) is a convex cone, and the union of these cones, i.e., \( \bigcup_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{P}_t \), is also a convex cone.

B. The Strategy 1 of \( X_{t+1} \) in Proposition 1 and Proposition 2

In this strategy, the history information \( \{Q(i)\}_{i=1}^{t} \) is used to design \( Q(t+1) \). The key idea is to require that \( Q(t+1) \) and \( \{Q(i)\}_{i=1}^{t} \) are as different as possible. Based on this idea, the problem is formulated as follows

\[
\min_{Q(t+1)} \text{Tr} \left( Q^H(t+1) B(t) + B^H(t) Q(t+1) \right), \quad (127)
\]

where \( B(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{t} Q(i) \exp \{10(i-t) \} \). In particular, since the construction of \( Q(t+1) \) involves \( X_{t+1} \) which is a random matrix, this strategy is to determine \( X_{t+1} \) in essence. According to different proposition, the matrix \( X_{t+1} \) is computed as follows.

1) Proposition 1: By replacing \( Q(t+1) \) with (16), the problem (127) can be reformulated as

\[
\min_{X_{t+1}} \text{Tr} \left( Y_{t+1} H \Sigma_{t+1}^H X_{t+1} \hat{C}(t) - \frac{1}{2} B(t) \right) + B^H(t) \hat{C}(t) \left( \mathcal{C}_{t+1}^H \Sigma_{t+1} Y_{t+1} \right) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad X_{t+1}^H X_{t+1} = I \quad (128)
\]

Based on the property of trace operation, the problem (128) can be reformulated as

\[
\max_{X_{t+1}} \text{Tr} \left( X_{t+1}^H D(t+1) + D^H(t+1) X_{t+1} \right) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad X_{t+1}^H X_{t+1} = I \quad (129)
\]

where

\[
D(t+1) = -\hat{C}(t) - \frac{1}{2} B(t) Y_{t+1}^H \Sigma_{t+1}^H \quad (130)
\]

Then, from [34], the closed-form solution of (129) is

\[
X_{t+1}^* = \hat{U}(t+1) \hat{V}^H(t+1) \quad (131)
\]

where \( \hat{U}(t+1) \) and \( \hat{V}(t+1) \) are the left-orthonormal matrix and right-orthonormal matrix of \( D(t+1) \) respectively, which are from the singular value decomposition of \( D(t+1) \), i.e., \( \hat{D}(t+1) = \hat{U}(t+1) \hat{\Phi}(t+1) \hat{V}^H(t+1) \).

2) Proposition 2: Similarly, by replacing \( Q(t+1) \) with solution (22), the problem (127) can be reformulated as

\[
\max_{X_{t+1}} \text{Tr} \left( X_{t+1}^H D(t+1) + D^H(t+1) X_{t+1} \right) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad X_{t+1}^H X_{t+1} = I \quad (132)
\]

where

\[
D(t+1) = -\left[ U_{t,1}^{-1} \text{diag}(s_t)^{-1} U_{t,1}^{-1} \right]^H B(t) Y_{t+1}^H \Sigma_{t+1}^H \quad (133)
\]

In particular, according to (95)-(97), \( X_{t+1} \) is decided by \( V_{t+1} \). Therefore, the problem (132) is further reformulated as

\[
\max_{V_{t+1}} \text{Tr} \left( V_{t+1}^H D(t+1) + D^H(t+1) V_{t+1} \right) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad V_{t+1}^H V_{t+1} = I \quad (134)
\]

where

\[
\hat{D}(t+1) = -\text{diag}(s_t)^{-1} U_{t,1}^{-1} \left[ B(t) Y_{t+1}^H \Sigma_{t+1}^H \right]_{(1;K,1;K)} \quad (135)
\]

and \( \left[ B(t) Y_{t+1}^H \Sigma_{t+1}^H \right]_{(1;K,1;K)} \) is the \( k \)-th leading principle submatrix of matrix \( B(t) Y_{t+1}^H \Sigma_{t+1}^H \).

Then, from [34], the closed-form solution of (134) is

\[
V_{t+1}^* = \hat{U}(t+1) \hat{W}^H(t+1) \quad (136)
\]

where \( \hat{U}(t+1) \) and \( \hat{W}(t+1) \) are the left-orthonormal matrix and right-orthonormal matrix of \( \hat{D}(t+1) \) respectively, which are from the singular value decomposition of \( \hat{D}(t+1) \), i.e., \( \hat{D}(t+1) = \hat{U}(t+1) \hat{\Phi}(t+1) \hat{W}^H(t+1) \). Using \( V_{t+1}^* \), \( X_{t+1} \) can be computed directly from (95)-(97).

C. Numerical Results of Trying Different Strategies in Table I

The BS is with antenna number \( N_A = 32 \) and port number \( N_P = 8 \) while the antenna number of the UE is \( N_U = 2 \). The ground-truth channel covariance matrices are sampled from QuaDRiGa with the speed of the UE is 3 km/h. The center frequency of the downlink channel and the uplink channel are set as 1.275 GHZ and 1.25 GHZ respectively. In addition, the
Type-I codebook is built according to 5G NR standards [11]. In these experiments, the RMSE and beam precision are all chosen as the performance measure.

Fig. 7 shows the comparison between the performances of three different $m'(t+1)$ strategies (labeled as “Strategy 1, 2, 3” following the Table I), given $\sigma_n = 1, n = 1, \cdots, N_P$ and $X$ generated from the corresponding strategy 1. In Fig. 7, The adoptions of these three strategies have similar performances in terms of both RMSE and beam precision, while the adoption of strategy 3 can outperform others in most of cases. Especially, after the 10-th communication round, strategy 3 is the best among another the three strategies in terms of RMSE. In terms of beam precision, the same result can be obtained, that is, the strategy 3 can surpass others after the 9-th communication round. Hence, it is a good choice that $m'(t+1)$ is acquired by adopting strategy 3.

Then, given $m'$ chosen from $[1, 2, \cdots, M]$, according to the corresponding strategy 3 and $X$ generated from the corresponding strategy 1, the performance of different strategies (labeled as “Strategy 1, 2” following the Table I) of setting $\sigma_n = 1, n = 1, \cdots, N_P$ are examined in Fig. 8. It can be observed that the adoption of strategy 1 surpasses that of the strategy 2 in terms of both RMSE and beam precision. Therefore, the best setting of $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{N_P}$ is $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \cdots = \sigma_{N_P} = 1$, i.e., the strategy 1.

Finally, given $m'$ chosen from the corresponding strategy 3 and $\sigma_n = 1, n = 1, \cdots, N_P$ selected to all 1. The different strategies (labeled as “Strategy 1, 2” following the Table I) of designing $X$ is compared in Fig. 9. In terms of both RMSE or beam precision, the adoption of strategy 1 surpasses another strategies. Hence, we prefer to acquire $X$ according to the strategy 1.

In conclusion, the adoption of “checked” strategies listed in Table I is the best choice in terms of both reconstruction accuracy and convergence speed.