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Abstract

Channel estimation is a critical task in multiple-input multiple-output digital communications that has effects on end-to-end system performance. In this work, we introduce a novel approach for channel estimation using deep score-based generative models. These models are trained to estimate the gradient of the log-prior distribution, and can be used to iteratively refine estimates, given observed measurements of a signal. We introduce a framework for training score-based generative models for wireless channels, as well as performing channel estimation using posterior sampling at test time. We derive theoretical robustness guarantees of channel estimation with posterior sampling in single-input single-output scenarios, and show that the observations regarding estimation performance are verified experimentally in MIMO channels. Our results in simulated clustered delay line channels show competitive in-distribution performance without error floors in the high signal-to-noise ratio regime, and robust out-of-distribution performance, outperforming competing deep learning methods by up to 5 dB in end-to-end communication performance, while the complexity analysis reveals how model architecture can efficiently trade performance for estimation latency.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Massive multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) represents a key technology in fifth generation (5G) and envisioned sixth generation (6G) communication systems [1], [2], promising to increase...
communication reliability by orders of magnitude, without increasing bandwidth requirements. With the deployment of millimeter wave (mmWave) band communications, recovering accurate, high-dimensional channel state information (CSI) using reduced pilot overhead has become a major open research problem [3]–[5]. For example, reflective intelligent surfaces – equipped with up to hundreds of antennas – are an active area of research for high-dimensional wireless systems [6], [7], where channel estimation has been recently investigated using either optimization approaches [8] or data-driven methods [9], [10]. Estimating accurate CSI using data-driven methods is envisioned as an important area of research for future communication systems that integrate artificial intelligence in physical layer processing [1], [11], including being taken into consideration for standardization [12].

An important challenge for estimation algorithms is their robustness to test-time distributional shifts [13] that naturally occur when the test environment no longer matches the algorithm design conditions. This is present in wireless communication systems, especially at the user side, where the propagation conditions may change from indoor to outdoor [14], whenever the user is moving. An important open question is whether deep learning-aided channel estimation can retain its performance, both from theoretical, and practical perspectives [15]. To this end, the main motivation of this work is to develop robust, data-driven, deep learning based MIMO channel estimation algorithms for high-dimensional communication scenarios.

In this paper, we use a distribution learning approach for modeling high-dimensional, mmWave MIMO channels in a stochastic environment. We model the distribution of channels by learning its high-dimensional gradient (score), making our method unsupervised in terms of downstream channel estimation. During test time, we perform probabilistic channel estimation by sampling from the posterior distribution with an iterative algorithm. To learn the score of the distribution, we use score-based generative models, originally introduced in [16] and that have been primarily demonstrated on natural image benchmark datasets, such as ImageNet [17].

Inspired by recent results that show the potential of this method for specialized applications such as magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) reconstruction [18]–[20], we introduce a training and inference algorithm for wireless channel estimation using score-based generative models in a single-carrier, point-to-point MIMO communication scenario. For training, a database of known channels is used to train a score-based generative model in an unsupervised manner, that is independent of the pilot symbols. During inference, we tackle the challenges that arise when performing channel estimation in an out-of-distribution setting, to environments not seen during
training, as well as in a very wide (e.g., up to 40 dB) signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) range. Our experiments show that with the proposed approach, estimation performance is retained even when the simulated test channels come from a different distribution than the one during training, and gains of up to 5 dB in energy-per-bit to noise ratio (Eb/N0) are achieved against competing deep learning methods in coded end-to-end communication system simulations. We also investigate the computational complexity of the proposed approach, and identify promising future research directions in developing more compact and efficient deep neural networks to reduce estimation latency.

A. Related Work

Modern statistical wireless channel modeling stems from the well-known Saleh-Valenzuela clustered channel model [21], which characterizes a propagation environment through a sum of impulse responses with stochastic delays and amplitudes. Extensions to this for MIMO models have been made through angles of departure and arrival on both sides of a communication link [22], respectively, as well as including beamforming effects (e.g., specific to millimeter-wave systems [23]) in the modeling. Standardized clustered delay line (CDL) models for cellular communications are extremely flexible and can model wireless channels in four dimensions (time, frequency, transmit antennas, and receive antennas), having been adopted in 5G specifications [24]. In this work, we use the well-established CDL family of stochastic environments to evaluate the performance of MIMO channel estimation algorithms.

Beyond their usage for synthetic channel generation and performance evaluation, statistical channel models have been used to aid compressed sensing for MIMO channel estimation, based on an assumed low rank channel model in the beamspace domain [25]. The Lasso is a fast estimation method [26] that imposes sparsity in the two-dimensional Fourier (2D-DFT) domain through $\ell_1$-regularization in the channel estimation objective. The atomic norm decomposition [27] and its extension to fast, approximate atomic norm decomposition (fsAD) [28] use knowledge of the antenna array shape and the underlying structure of the CDL models (namely, sparsity on a continuum) to achieve competitive channel estimation results. In contrast, our method is data-driven, does not assume a specific channel model, and thus is likely amenable to use in real-world wireless propagation environments where sparsity and low rank assumptions may not always hold [29].
The work in [4] is an application of the compressed sensing with generative models (CSGM) framework [30] to wireless channel estimation. This method trains a deep generative adversarial network (GAN) with a low-dimensional latent space using a training set of channels, and at test-time formulates an optimization problem to recover the channel state information matrix using the received pilot symbols and the pre-trained model. Similar to score-based models, channel estimation represents a downstream task for this approach, and hence is unsupervised as the deep learning model is not trained with an explicit channel estimation objective, which makes for a suitable comparison. In contrast to GANs, score-based generative models do not use adversarial training, and make less restrictive assumptions about the low-dimensional nature of the wireless channels, instead aiming to learn the score of the distribution even in regions with a low probability density.

Conditional generative models have also been used to learn the effects of unknown channels [31]. In this formulation, a conditional generative model is trained to map inputs (transmitted symbols) to observed outputs (received symbols). The goal of this approach is to model transmitter and receiver effects (e.g., nonlinear power amplification or limited-resolution analog-to-digital conversion, respectively) alongside channel effects, which is useful for learning black-box approximations to entire communication chains [32]. In contrast, in this paper we focus on using generative modeling to estimate high-dimensional channel state information from coherent pilots, which is an unsupervised approach, in line with the work in [4].

Supervised end-to-end training of deep learning based methods has been successfully used for wireless MIMO channel estimation. The algorithm proposed in [33] introduces a two-stage deep learning approach for two-dimensional channel estimation: in the first stage, a super-resolution network is used, followed by a denoising stage. While originally introduced for time-frequency channels, this approach is applicable to MIMO channels as well, where an initial estimate of the channel matrix is treated as an image [34]. The work in [3] introduces a powerful and robust deep learning algorithm in the form of the learned denoising approximate message passing (L-DAMP) algorithm [35]. In L-DAMP, differentiable optimization steps are interleaved with forward passes of a deep neural network, and the entire method is trained end-to-end using back-propagation.

Score-based generative models – closely related to diffusion models [36] – are introduced in [16], where the authors also describe annealed Langevin dynamics to efficiently sample from a distribution of interest using a learned model. These models have been recognized to surpass generative adversarial networks (GANs) at modeling complex, real-world distributions, such
as natural images [17]. The work in [37] introduces practical techniques for improving the training of score-based models, which we leverage and adapt for wireless channels. The work in [38] theoretically proves the in-distribution optimality of posterior sampling and links this to their fully-dimensional support. Finally, the work in [18] investigates the robustness of posterior sampling in the setting of MRI reconstruction, where it is shown that these models are competitive with state-of-the-art supervised deep learning methods when used in-distribution and in some cases appreciably more robust when used out-of-distribution.

B. Contributions

Our contributions in this work are the following:

- We propose a posterior sampling based solution for MIMO channel estimation. Given received pilots, at test (inference) time the algorithm samples from the posterior distribution of channel state information conditioned on the received pilots. In the training phase, a denoising score-matching framework learns the score (the gradient of log-prior distribution) of high-dimensional MIMO channels. During inference, we use the learned score-based model in conjunction with the received pilots to iteratively update the channel estimate and perform posterior sampling (Algorithm 1).

- We derive a closed-form expression that describes robustness guarantees for multi-tap, single-input single-output (SISO) channel estimation with posterior sampling in an out-of-distribution setting, under assumptions of mutual independence between the tap gains and locations. The derived expression bounds the probability of successful recovery using a quantity we describe as the mismatch-to-noise ratio [17]. This predicts the behaviour of the proposed method both as a function of both the SNR, as well as the distributional mismatch between training and testing environments. While the bound is derived for SISO channels, the expression lends insight into generalization to new channel environments and represents a novel theoretical direction concerning provable guarantees of channel estimation with deep learning, in general.

- We perform experimental evaluations of the score-based method and a set of diverse baselines on the CDL family of channel models [24] at mmWave frequencies. Our main findings are that score-based generative methods are near-optimal in-distribution, and consistently outperform competing deep learning methods when generalizing to CDL environments never seen during training or hyper-parameter tuning. We also evaluate the complexity
of the proposed approach, and find that it favourably scales in terms of floating point
operation (FLOP) count and estimation latency when the system size increases, compared
to compressed sensing-based approaches.

C. Notation and Organization

We use boldfaced letters $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{X}$ to denote vectors and matrices, respectively, and $x_{i,j}$ to denote
the $(i,j)$-th element of a matrix. We use italic letters to denote their random variable counterparts.
The notation $p_X(\mathbf{X})$ represents the continuous probability distribution function of the matrix
random variable $X$, evaluated at the matrix $\mathbf{X}$. We use $\mathbf{X}^H$ to denote the Hermitian (conjugate
transpose) of $\mathbf{X}$. The matrix $\mathbf{I}$ denotes the identity matrix of appropriate size. We use $\|\cdot\|_F$ to
denote the Frobenius norm of a matrix, $\|\cdot\|_{1,1}$ to denote the $\ell_1$-norm of the vectorized matrix, $\mathcal{O}$
to denote proportionality up to a multiplicative constant, and $\log$ as the natural logarithm. We
use $\partial f(\mathbf{X})/\partial \mathbf{X}$ to denote the derivative of a function $f(\mathbf{X})$ with respect to $\mathbf{X}$, as the matrix
with the $(i,j)$-th entry given by $\partial f(\mathbf{X})/\partial x_{i,j}$.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section II introduces the MIMO system
model and defines the score of a distribution. Section III introduces the training and inference
(testing) stages of the proposed approach, while Section IV introduces our theoretical derivations
that characterize the probability of successful estimation. Section V presents the experimental
results and discussion, and Section VI concludes the paper.

II. System Model

A. Wireless Communication Model

We consider a narrowband, point-to-point MIMO communication scenario between a trans-
mitter and receiver with $N_t$ and $N_r$ antennas, respectively. Propagation in this scenario is
characterized by channel state information matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_r \times N_t}$. We let $\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t}$ be the $i$-
th pilot symbol chosen from a pre-designed codebook of $N_p$ pilots. Then, the received signal
vector for the $i$-th pilot, $\mathbf{y}_i$, is given by:

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{p}_is + \mathbf{n}_i,$$

(1)

where $\mathbf{n}_i$ is complex additive white Gaussian noise with zero mean and power covariance matrix
$\sigma^2_{\text{pilot}}\mathbf{I}$, and $s$ is a complex-valued scalar.
In practice, the pilot vectors are selected as entries from a beamforming codebook with structural constraints [39]. For the remainder of this work, we make no specific assumptions on the structure of \( p_i \) during training, as they are not required. During testing, we use \( s = 1 \) and \( p_i \) vectors constrained to have unit amplitude and low-resolution phase – each entry of \( P \) is a randomly chosen (fixed for all test samples) quadrature phase shift keying (QPSK) symbol.

Assuming that \( s = 1 \) (without loss of generality) and that the channel state information is constant across \( N_p \) pilot transmissions, we obtain the matrix model:

\[
Y = HP + N, \tag{2}
\]

where the \( i \)-th columns of \( Y, P, \) and \( N \) are given by \( y_i, p_i, \) and \( n_i \) respectively. The inverse problem of channel estimation consists of estimating the channel state information matrix \( H \), using the received pilot matrix \( Y \), and having knowledge of the transmitted pilot matrix \( P \). The latter part is ubiquitous in communication standards, where pilot sequences are pre-specified [39].

Let \( \alpha = \frac{N_p}{N_t} \) denote the undersampling ratio of the pilot matrix. When \( \alpha < 1 \), then there are a number of received pilots equal to \( N_rN_p < N_rN_t \) and channel estimation is an under-determined inverse problem, hence accurate recovery using classical algorithms [40] is not possible.

### B. The Score of a Distribution

An important assumption of this paper is that wireless channels are assumed stochastic. This is a realistic assumption for real-world wireless environments, that has been extensively used in both theoretical [41], [42] and practical works [31]. We let \( p_H \) denote the distribution of high-dimensional wireless channels for an arbitrary environment. The score of \( p_H \) at a point \( H \) is defined as [43]:

\[
\psi_H(H) = \frac{\partial \log p_H(H)}{\partial H}, \tag{3}
\]

where \( \psi_H(H) \in \mathbb{C}^{N_r \times N_t} \).

The score function can be used to draw samples from \( p_H \), though it is generally intractable for non-trivial distributions including wireless channels. Remarkably, the result in [43] shows that it is possible to learn an approximation to arbitrary distributions using an unsupervised formulation. This is detailed in Section III-A. For the remainder of this work, we do not make any explicit assumptions about \( p_H \) or \( \psi_H \). That is, we do not assume the existence of a low-dimensional
(sparse) representation of MIMO channels, and the proposed recovery approach does not use explicit information about $p_H$ (the channel statistics in a given environment) or $\psi_H$, instead relying completely on a data-driven approach.

C. Score-Based Generative Modeling

The goal of score-based generative models is to learn the score function $\psi_H$ at all input points, for a channel distribution $p_H$. That is, when a database of training samples $H_i$ and their associated scores $\psi_H(H_i)$ are available, explicit score matching learns a model $s_\theta$ using the following loss function [44]:

$$L_{ESM,p_H}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{H_i \sim p_H} \left[ \| s_\theta(H_i) - \psi_H(H_i) \|^2 \right]. \quad (4)$$

The above can be minimized using any gradient descent method. However, in general, $\psi_H$ is intractable, and thus the loss objective in (4) cannot be used to learn a model $s_\theta$. Furthermore, if $\psi_H$ were tractable and computationally feasible to evaluate, a deep learning model that approximates it would have limited practical use. To circumvent this problem, the work in [43] proposes to use denoising score matching by synthesizing corrupted data samples $\tilde{H}_i$ and learning the score of the conditional distribution $p_{\tilde{H}|H}$, using the following objective:

$$L_{DSM}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{H_i \sim p_H, \tilde{H}_i \sim p_{\tilde{H}}} \left[ \left\| s_\theta(\tilde{H}_i) - \frac{\partial \log p_{\tilde{H}|H}(\tilde{H}_i|H_i)}{\partial H_i} \right\|^2 \right]. \quad (5)$$

The work in [43] proves the following theorem:

**Theorem 1** (Appendix from [43]). Assuming that $\log p_{\tilde{H}|H}(\tilde{H}|H)$ is differentiable with respect to $\tilde{H}$, then the losses $L_{ESM,H}$ and $L_{DSM}$ are equivalent.

Theorem 1 implies that the score of the perturbed distribution $p_{\tilde{H}}$ can be learned by using the objective in (5), using any perturbation, as long as its probability distribution is differentiable. When the perturbation $Z$ is additive, Gaussian, with zero mean, covariance matrix $\sigma_z^2 I$, and independent of $H$, then we obtain that [43]:

$$\frac{\partial \log p_{\tilde{H}|H}(\tilde{H}|H)}{\partial H} = -\frac{Z}{\sigma_z^2}. \quad (6)$$
Finally, the work in [16] proposes to train a single score-based model using a weighted version of the loss in (5) at multiple noise levels, as well as a learnable model (in practice, a deep neural network) \( s_\theta \). The loss is [16]:

\[
L_{\text{score}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{H_i \sim p_H, Z_j \sim p_{Z_j}} \left[ \sigma_{z_j}^2 \left\| s_\theta (H_i + Z_j) + \frac{Z_j}{\sigma_{z_j}^2} \right\|_2^2 \right]. 
\]

(7)

The decision to weigh the predicted score at each noise level comes from formulating denoising score-matching as a variance-exploding (VE) diffusion process [36]. As the score \(-Z/\sigma^2\) tends towards infinity magnitude (hence the term exploding variance) at very low values of \( \sigma \), weighting with \( \sigma^2 \) compensates for this and stabilizes the objective.

D. Sampling Using Score Functions

Given a score function \( \psi_H \), it is possible to use it for sampling from the distribution of \( H \), hence the name of score-based generative modeling. Sampling from \( H \) can be achieved using several methods, but here we focus on annealed Langevin dynamics [16], which applies the following high-level iterative procedure:

\[
H \leftarrow H + \alpha \cdot \psi_H (H) + \beta \cdot \zeta, 
\]

(8)

where \( \zeta \) is i.i.d. Gaussian noise and \( \alpha, \beta \) are hyper-parameters that are exponentially decreasing over iterations. The above applies two additive update terms to the current sample \( H \):

- The term \( \alpha \cdot \psi_H (H) \) increases the likelihood of the current sample. Recall that since \( \psi_H \) is the gradient of \( \log p_H \), and that the definition of a gradient is the local direction of steepest ascent [45], this update thus ”guides” \( H \) to a more plausible sample under the distribution \( H \), i.e., a region of the distribution with higher probability density.

- The term \( \beta \cdot \zeta \) represents a perturbation to the above process. If the hyper-parameter \( \beta \) is chosen correctly, this perturbation allows for sample diversity and prevents always sampling the mode of the distribution [38].

Notice that the above does not require any knowledge about \( P, Y \) or \( \sigma_{\text{pilot}} \), which is what makes score-based models unsupervised with respect to channel estimation. To actually perform channel estimation with score-based models, we resort to posterior sampling, using the same annealed Langevin dynamics with the update given by:

\[
H \leftarrow H + \alpha \cdot \psi_{H|Y} (H|Y) + \beta \cdot \zeta, 
\]

(9)
where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are decaying step sizes, potentially different than the ones in (8). A key observation here is that the term $\psi_{H|Y} = \log p_{H|Y}$ can be expanded using Bayes’ rule to yield the update step:

$$
H \leftarrow H + \alpha \cdot \psi_{Y|H}(Y|H) + \alpha \cdot \psi_{H}(H) + \beta \cdot \zeta,
$$

where the term $\psi_{Y}$ is omitted since it does not depend on the current $H$. Finally, notice that there is now an additional term when compared to (8): $\alpha \cdot \psi_{Y|H}$ updates the current estimate in a direction that makes it more consistent with the received pilots $Y$. Taken together, the three updates in (10) represent the core routine of the proposed channel estimation algorithm.

### III. Proposed Method

There are two optimization problems that must be solved in order to perform channel estimation with a score-based generative model:

1) During the training stage, a score-based deep generative model $s_\theta$ is trained by minimizing the loss function described in Section [III-A]. In this work, this stage only takes place once in the lifetime of a wireless device, e.g., offline, using powerful computational clusters and either an acquired database of channel matrices, or using simulated environments. This stage is illustrated in Figure [I]a).
2) During the testing (inference) stage, channel estimation is formulated as an optimization problem and the iterative algorithm in Section III-B is used to solve it. This stage makes uses of the pretrained score-based model in conjunction with the received pilots to robustly recover channel state information. A single step of the iterative procedure is illustrated in Figure 1(b).

A. Training a Score-Based Model for Wireless Channels

In practice, a deep neural network with weights $\theta$ is used to learn a model $s_\theta$. We use the RefineNet architecture [46], an extension of the U-Net [47] architecture, that operates at multiple resolution levels in parallel, and consists of an encoder and decoder, with residual skips between them and a number of down- and up-sampling operations, respectively. This allows the model to learn structural relations in the CSI at multiple resolution levels, and to efficiently predict the score function. Furthermore, as the model is fully convolutional, it can handle channel matrices of dynamic input size, both during training and testing. Further details about the architectural details of RefineNet are available in the original paper [46], as well as in our source code repository. The mini-batch loss used to train $s_\theta$ with a batch size of $B$ samples is given by the
finite-sample version of (7) as:

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\text{train}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^{B} \sigma_{z_i}^2 \left\| s_\theta(H_i + Z_i) + \frac{Z_i}{\sigma_{z_i}^2} \right\|^2_2,
$$

(11)

where, at each training step, and for each sample in the mini-batch, $Z_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_{z_i}^2 I)$, and $\sigma_{z_i}$ is a noise level selected uniformly at random from a set of values $\{\sigma_{z_l}\}_{l=1,\ldots,L}$. That is, inside each mini-batch, noise at a randomly chosen noise level is added to each sample, and the model is trained to predict from the noisy sample $\tilde{H}$ towards the clean sample $H$ – this represents the score of the distribution of perturbed wireless channels.

Figure 2(a) illustrates this effect for two perturbed samples, starting from the same clean channel matrix $H$. A perturbed sample $\tilde{H}_1$ ($\tilde{H}_2$) is used as input to the deep neural network, and the output aims to predict $-Z_1/\sigma_{z_1}^2$ ($-Z_2/\sigma_{z_2}^2$). Finally, note that in (11) we have not used any information about (2), the noise power $\sigma_{\text{pilot}}$ of the noise affecting the received pilots, or the pilot matrix $P$ itself. This information is not required to train the score-based generative model, as these models are not trained stand-alone to perform channel estimation, making them robust and usable across a wide range of SNR values, as well as with different pilot matrices $P$.

### B. MIMO Channel Estimation via Posterior Sampling

To perform channel estimation using score-based models, we resort to posterior sampling: our solution comes in the form of a single sample from the posterior distribution $p_H(\cdot|Y)$. To sample from the posterior, we use annealed Langevin dynamics [16], [48]. This is an iterative algorithm, that takes the following form at the $i$-th step:

$$
H_{\text{est},i+1} = H_{\text{est},i} + \alpha_i \cdot \frac{\partial \log p_{H|Y} (H|Y)}{\partial H} \bigg|_{H_{\text{est},i}} + \sqrt{2\beta \cdot \alpha_i \cdot \sigma_{z_i} \cdot \zeta},
$$

(12)

where $\zeta \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, I)$ is randomly sampled at every update step, and $\alpha_i = \alpha_0 \cdot r^i$. The scalars $\alpha_0$, $\beta$ and $r$ serve as hyper-parameters for the algorithm and are discussed in Section IV. Using Bayes’ rule and the linearity of the gradient, we can expand the middle term:

$$
H_{\text{est},i+1} = H_{\text{est},i} + \alpha_i \cdot \frac{\partial \log p_{Y|H} (Y|H)}{\partial H} \bigg|_{H_{\text{est},i}} + \alpha_i \cdot \frac{\partial \log p_{H} (H)}{\partial H} \bigg|_{H_{\text{est},i}} + \sqrt{2\beta \cdot \alpha_i \cdot \sigma_{z_i} \cdot \zeta},
$$

(13)

where the term involving $\log p_{Y} (Y)$ does not depend on the current $H_{\text{est}}$, and thus has zero gradient.
Using (2) and the fact that the pilot noise $N$ is Gaussian, we obtain that the conditional distribution of $Y|H$ is Gaussian with mean $H_{est,i}^*P$ and covariance matrix $\sigma^2_{\text{pilot}} I$, and its score can be derived in closed-form as:

$$\frac{\partial \log p_{Y|H}(Y|H)}{\partial H} \bigg|_{H_{est,i}} = \frac{(H_{est,i}^*P - Y)^IP^H}{\sigma^2_{\text{pilot}} + 2\beta \cdot \alpha_i \cdot \sigma^2_{z_i}},$$

(14)

where the above also accounts for the variance of the added annealing noise. Finally, observe that the only unknown component in (13) is now the score of $p_{H}(H)$, evaluated at the current estimate. While this does not have a closed-form expression, we can leverage the score-based model $s_{\theta}$ trained using the procedure described in Section III-A. This leads to the final channel estimation procedure in Algorithm 1 and illustrated in Figure 2(b), where, additionally, at each noise level we perform $M = 3$ updates [37].

**Algorithm 1** MIMO Channel Estimation with Score-Based Generative Models.

**Inputs:** Pilot matrix $P$, received pilots $Y$, pretrained score-based model $s_{\theta}$, received noise power $\sigma^2_{\text{pilot}}$, inference noise levels $\sigma^2_{z_i}$ (same as what $s_{\theta}$ was trained with), hyper-parameters $\alpha_0$, $\beta$ and $r < 1$.

**Generate random initial estimate:** $H_{est} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, I)$

for $i = 1, \ldots, L$

Set annealed noise level $\sigma \leftarrow \sigma_{z_i}$.

for $m = 1, \ldots, M$

Generate annealing noise $\zeta \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, I)$.

$H_{est} \leftarrow H_{est} + \alpha_0 \cdot r^i \cdot \frac{(H_{est}^*P - Y)^IP^H}{\sigma^2_{\text{pilot}} + 2\beta \cdot \alpha_i \cdot \sigma^2_{z_i}} + \alpha_0 \cdot r^i \cdot s_{\theta}(H_{est}) + \sqrt{2\beta \cdot \alpha_0 \cdot r^i} \cdot \sigma \cdot \zeta$.

**Output:** Estimated channel matrix $H_{est}$.

**IV. THEORETICAL RESULTS**

An important aspect of using posterior sampling is that previous work has derived theoretical guarantees for recovering the correct estimate (up to the ambient noise level), assuming that a sufficient number of measurements are available [18], [38], even when posterior sampling is performed with respect to a mismatched distribution in terms of 2-Wasserstein (Earth mover’s) distance [49]. In this section we derive an expression for the effects of train-test distributional mismatch for a simplified class of tapped delay line SISO channels.
**Definition 1.** Let $p$ and $r$ be two probability distributions of random vectors. If $\mathcal{W}_2^2 (p, r) > 0$, then the two distributions are mismatched.

We define the following family of sparse channels with complex-valued gains $\{h_i\}_{i=1...K}$ and real-valued delays $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1...K}$, and the channel gain at an arbitrary delay $t$ given by:

$$h(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{K} h_i \cdot \delta(t - \tau_i). \quad (15)$$

To obtain a vector channel, we sample $h(t)$ along the delay dimension, using a pre-determined, fixed waveform $g(t)$ at $N$ equally spaced points as $h[i] = (g(t) * h(t)) \cdot (iT)$, where $1/T$ is the sampling resolution. In practice, this corresponds to the sampled impulse response of a SISO channel. We make the following additional assumptions:

- $\tau_i = -\alpha_i \log x_i$, where $\alpha_i$ is a constant and $x_i \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$, $\forall i$. This is a realistic model for tap delays, and is used in the standardized CDL models [24].
- $h_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_i^2)$, $\forall i$, where $\sigma_i$ is a constant.
- $\sum_{i=1}^{K} \sigma_i^2 = 1$, i.e., the taps are normalized to unit average total power.
- $h_i$ and $\tau_i$ are mutually independent. In other words, the location of a tap is independent of its gain, and all tap locations and gains are mutually independent.

The above assumptions imply that a distribution of normalized channels $p_H$ is parameterized by the $2K$ real-valued degrees of freedom $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1...K}$ and $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1...K}$. For example, a line-of-sight family of channels could exhibit $\alpha_1 < \alpha_i, \forall i > 1$, as well as $\sigma_1 \gg \sigma_i, \forall i > 1$, meaning that the channel profile contains a large magnitude path with a small delay, followed by delayed rays with much lower gains.

Let $h_1$ and $h_2$ be two mismatched distributions from the family of channels previously defined, with degrees of freedom $\{\sigma_i^{(1)}, \alpha_i^{(1)}\}_{i=1...K}$ and $\{\sigma_i^{(2)}, \alpha_i^{(2)}\}_{i=1...K}$, respectively. Our main theorem is given below.

**Theorem 2.** Let $h^*$ be a vector channel sampled from $h_2$. Then, posterior sampling with respect to $p_{h_1}$, using a number of $\mathcal{O}(1/\delta_{\text{MNR}})$ linear, Gaussian pilot measurements, at a noise level $\sigma_{\text{pilot}}$, recovers $h_{\text{est}}$ such that:

$$\|h^* - h_{\text{est}}\|_2 \leq C\sigma_{\text{pilot}} \quad \text{w.p.} \quad 1 - \mathcal{O}(\delta_{\text{MNR}}), \quad (16)$$

where:

$$\delta_{\text{MNR}}^2 = \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2 (h_1, h_2)}{\sigma_{\text{pilot}}^2} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{pilot}}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{K} \left( \sigma_i^{(1)} - \sigma_i^{(2)} \right)^2 + 2 \left( \alpha_i^{(1)} - \alpha_i^{(2)} \right)^2, \quad (17)$$
and $C$ is a constant.

Proof. For the complete proof, see the Appendix. At a high-level, it involves two stages, in which the main novelty lies in the second stage: applying Theorem 1.1 from [38] for the 2-Wasserstein distance, followed by deriving a closed-form expression for $\mathcal{W}_2^2(h_1, h_2)$ under the considered assumptions.

We call $\delta_{\text{MNR}}^2$ the mismatch-to-noise ratio, i.e., the ratio between the distributional mismatch and the pilot noise power. Note that this ratio is inversely proportional to the probability of successful recovery: a smaller $\delta_{\text{MNR}}$ leads to a higher probability of correct channel estimation. In general, this happens in two conditions: a very small mismatch $\mathcal{W}_2^2(H_1, H_2)$ exists between the train and test distributions, or the noise power $\sigma_{\text{pilot}}^2$ is very large.

The above analysis gives rise to the following three performance regimes that characterize how channel estimation with posterior sampling performs when evaluated on samples from the test distribution $H_2$, and using a score-based generative model trained on samples from $H_1$:

- When there is a train-test match, we have that $\mathcal{W}_2^2(H_1, H_2) = 0$ and channel recovery with posterior sampling is optimal – up to the noise level – when using a sufficient number of measurements.
- The probability of successful channel estimation decreases as the distributional distance of the tap delays (or angles of arrival/departure, as discussed below) and gains between the training and test conditions increases, at a fixed noise level $\sigma_{\text{pilot}}^2$.
- Conversely, assuming a fixed distributional distance given by $\mathcal{W}_2^2(H_1, H_2)$, the probability of successful channel estimation increases as the ambient noise level $\sigma_{\text{pilot}}^2$ increases. Note that while this shows favourable scaling in very low SNR, the quality of the estimated channel in this regime is still limited by the large noise power, since recovery is only guaranteed up to the noise level.

**Applicability to MIMO Channels**

As an alternative to delay-domain SISO channels, it is possible to interpret a vector channel as either a single-input multiple-output (SIMO) or multiple-input single-output (MISO) channel sampled along the spatial angular direction, using an array with a finite number of elements. As long as the distributions of the angles of arrival and departure allow for tractable computation of the 2-Wasserstein distance, a similar result can be derived in that case. Finally, extending
the result to MIMO channels would require mutual independence assumptions between the set of vector channels. In practice, this can be achieved with large antenna spacings, but may be difficult to obtain in practice due to physical array sizes.

While the theory is only derived for vector channels, the three implications of Theorem 2 are verified in Section V for MIMO channels, and are extremely powerful in predicting the performance of the proposed approach in varying test-time environments. In particular, we verify that channel estimation with posterior sampling, under moderate distributional shifts and with realistic, non-Gaussian pilots, surpasses all baselines in a broad SNR range (between $-5$ and $30$ dB), which allows for reduced power consumption when sending pilots, or, conversely, a higher quality channel estimate.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The goal of this section is to evaluate Algorithm 1 in simulated settings, across a wide range of SNR values, both from a raw estimation performance, as well as end-to-end performance in a coded system, and complexity considerations. To emulate deployment in a novel wireless propagation environment, Sections V-B and V-C consider scenarios where models are tested on different distributions than the training one, without any prior knowledge about the test distribution or adaptation.

We evaluate the proposed method against the following diverse set of baselines, that we have reproduced and implemented using the PyTorch [50] and SigPy [51] Python packages, and are available in the source code repository:

- **L-DAMP [3], [35]**: This represents a powerful deep learning algorithm that performs model unrolling. We use a denoising convolutional neural network (DnCNN) [52] backbone, which is interleaved with gradient descent steps, for a number of 3 million total parameters and ten unrolled steps. We train a separate L-DAMP model for each value of $\alpha$ to further boost performance. We compare with this method as it is a representative and highly competitive supervised approach for MIMO channel estimation using deep learning.

- **WGAN [4]**: This represents a framework for using generative adversarial networks in channel estimation. This is achieved with a two-stage setting similar to our proposed approach:
  1) In the first stage, a generative model $g_{\theta}$ is trained to map low-dimensional vectors $z$ to channel matrices $H$, using an adversarial loss and regularization [53]. We use the
same deep convolutional GAN as in [4], and validate correct training by sampling from the distribution of channels.

2) In the second stage, given a pretrained generative model \( g_\theta \), channel estimation is solved by first recovering the solution to the optimization problem:

\[
\argmin_z \frac{1}{2} \| Y - g_\theta (z) P \|^2_F + \lambda \| z \|^2_F. \tag{18}
\]

Given a solution \( z^* \) to the above, the final channel estimate is output as \( g_\theta (z^*) \). In practice, we use the Adam algorithm to solve (18), with a learning rate and number of steps determined using a validation set of 100 samples from the same channel distribution as the training data. Additionally, we search for the optimal value of \( \lambda \) using the same validation set.

- **Lasso** [25], [26]: This is a compressed sensing-based approach that uses \( \ell_1 \)-norm element-wise regularization in the two-dimensional Fourier (beamspace) domain. That is, channel estimation is formulated as the solution to the following optimization problem:

\[
\argmin_H \frac{1}{2} \| Y - HP \|^2_F + \lambda \| F_{\text{left}} H F_{\text{right}}^H \|_{1,1}, \tag{19}
\]

where \( F_{\text{left}} \) and \( F_{\text{right}} \) are square, discrete Fourier matrices of size \( N_r \times N_r \) and \( N_t \times N_t \), respectively. In practice, we use gradient descent with momentum to solve the above optimization problem, and we tune the step size, number of optimization steps, and the value of \( \lambda \) chosen via grid-search on set of 100 samples from a specific channel distribution. As different environments have different statistics of their scattering structure, different values of \( \lambda \) may be optimal.

- **Fast, approximate atomic norm decomposition (fsAD)** [27], [28]: This represents a provably optimal, compressed sensing-based approach for recovering channel matrices that are exactly sparse in the continuum of spatial frequencies. Channel estimation is formulated as the solution to the optimization problem:

\[
\argmin_H \frac{1}{2} \| Y - HP \|^2_F + \lambda \| H \|_A, \tag{20}
\]

where \( \| H \|_A \) represents the atomic norm of \( H \) with respect to the basis set \( A \). While this is an optimal approach, evaluating \( \| H \|_A \) itself involves an optimization problem [27], which can quickly become computationally prohibitive in high-dimensional settings. In practice,
### TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel Model</th>
<th>Carrier Frequency</th>
<th>Antenna Arrays</th>
<th>Antenna Spacing</th>
<th>$(N_r, N_t)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training: CDL-B, C</td>
<td>40 GHz</td>
<td>ULA, UPA</td>
<td>$\lambda/2$ - ULA</td>
<td>(16, 64), (32, 128) - ULA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing: CDL-A, B, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(\lambda/4, \lambda/4)$ - UPA</td>
<td>(64, 256) - UPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in scenarios with uniform linear arrays (ULA) at both the receiver and transmitter, we use the following approximation to (20):

$$\underset{H}{\text{argmin}} \frac{1}{2} \| Y - HP \|_F^2 + \lambda \| W_{\text{left}} HW_{\text{right}}^H \|_{1,1},$$

where $W_{\text{left}}$ and $W_{\text{right}}$ represent over-sampled Fourier matrices, with a lifting factor $L$. In other words, this method leverages knowledge about the antenna array shape and imposes sparsity in the over-sampled beamspace representation of the channel, which approximates the continuum of frequencies as $L \to \infty$, with the cost of increased computational complexity. In our experiments, we use $L = 4$, and tune the parameter $\lambda$, step size and number of steps using 100 validation samples from the training distribution. We discuss the practical limitations of this method in detail in Section V-B.

### A. Data and Training

We use the CDL family of channel models to generate training, validation and test data. CDL-D channels are LOS, and generally the easiest to estimate due to their very sparse structure in the beamspace representation. CDL-B and -C channels are NLOS, while CDL-A channels have both components. While a database of complex-valued measurements and channel state information represents the ideal setting, there is a lack of publicly available datasets of complex-valued channel state information measurements for high-dimensional mmWave scenarios. This is partially offset by the recent release of the DeepSense6G [54] dataset, but scenarios with channel estimation information were still not available at the time of submission.

For training the deep learning methods (ours, L-DAMP, and WGAN), we use a set of 10000 channel realization from either the CDL-B or -C model. To generate training samples, we increment the seed of the CDL models, and pick the first subcarrier of the first symbol in each generated channel, as these models are designed to output 4-D channel tensors. Details
about the used parameters are given in Table I. For tuning methods that have additional hyperparameters (ours, WGAN, Lasso, and fsAD) we use an additional set of 100 channel realization from the training distribution for tuning. Exact details on the training parameters (optimizer, learning rate, batch size) are available in our source code repository.

For testing the methods, we generate a new set of 1000 channel realizations from each target distribution, using different random seeding than training or validation. For pilots $P$, we use matrices of size $N_t \times N_p$ with randomly chosen QPSK elements – this corresponds to unit-power, 2-bit phase quantized random beamforming. We normalize all channels using the average, element-wise channel power from the training set, to obtain $\mathbb{E}[|h_{i,j}|^2] = 1$, and define the SNR as $N_t/\sigma_{\text{pilot}}^2$.

Unless specified otherwise, we use a RefineNet model – as discussed in Section III-A – with a depth of four layers in the encoder and decoder paths, a number of 32 channels in the first layer, and ReLU activations. This leads to the network having a number of five million learnable weights. The impact of using a smaller network is investigated in detail in Section V-D.

B. Robust Estimation Performance

In this section, we train the sets of methods (score-based model and all baselines) twice, once for CDL-B and once for CDL-D channels, and test them in CDL-{A, B, C, D} environments, without fine-tuning or adapting them. As a reference, we also train a Mixed score-based model, which uses 10000 training samples from all four CDL-{A, B, C, D}, for a total of 40000 training channels. The purpose of this model is to more broadly verify the claim in Section IV that score-based models can successfully recover channels in an in-distribution setting, since all models are in-distribution when using the Mixed approach. We measure estimation quality using the normalized mean squared error (NMSE), defined as:

$$\text{NMSE [dB]} = 10 \log_{10} \frac{\|H_{\text{est}} - H\|_F^2}{\|H\|_F^2}. \quad (22)$$

Figure 3 shows estimation results when using models trained only on CDL-B channels, and tested on all four CDL models. Figure 3(b) represents the in-distribution setting, where the score-based model approach recovers channels up to the noise level, and surpasses prior work by at least 10 dB in NMSE for SNR values between $-5$ and 30 dB. In all four test conditions, the Mixed model scales favourably with high SNR. Note that there is a slight drop in performance between the Mixed model and the score-based model trained only on CDL-B channels, when evaluating
on CDL-B channels: this is owed to the fact that, in practice, the deep network we use has a finite learning capacity, and will generalize slightly poorer on a specific distribution when data from other distributions is included in training.

We find that the WGAN approach can competitively estimate channels in the very low SNR regime, but, in general, suffers from saturation of the performance at SNR values greater than $-5$ dB. This is owed to the optimization problem in (18) overfitting (in practice, in the first tens of steps of the optimization), regardless of the learning rate or value of $\lambda$ used, and is a phenomenon that has been previously observed in prior machine learning work [30]. This highlights the difficulty that GANs face when applied to channel estimation, and potential ways to overcome this effect include using advanced optimization approaches, that adapt the
generative prior itself during inference [55]. In contrast, estimation using score-based generative models scales linearly with increasing SNR. However, estimating CDL-A channels at a pilot density \( \alpha = 0.6 \) using a score-based model trained on CDL-B remains a difficult task, as shown in Figure 3(a). We posit this is due to the fact that CDL-A channels include both LOS and NLOS components, making them distributionally different from all other considered CDL environments. Figure 4 plots estimation performance with models trained only on CDL-C channels, and tested on all four CDL models. This generally corroborates the findings from Figure 3: score-based models recover channels up to the noise floor in-distribution (Figure 4(c)), and outperform all baselines for SNR values between \(-5\) and \(30\) dB. A notable difference here is the much better generalization capability of score-based models from CDL-C to CDL-D.
environments, as observed in Figure 4(d). This is explained by the fact that CDL-C channels contain the least amount of scattering, and are most similar to CDL-D channels, that is, we hypothesize that \( \mathcal{W}_2^2 (H_{\text{CDL-C}}, H_{\text{CDL-D}}) < \mathcal{W}_2^2 (H_{\text{CDL-B}}, H_{\text{CDL-D}}) \), leading to a lower \( \delta_{\text{MNR}} \), in line with the Theorem 2. Another difference that occurs when training on CDL-C channels, is that generalization to CDL-A models is also improved, matching the performance of the Lasso algorithm, as shown in Figure 4(a).

In both settings of Figure 3 and Figure 4, we also find that score-based models outperform the L-DAMP approach on the evaluated channels, but that L-DAMP has a similar scaling in terms of SNR, thus is a reliable approach, in general, especially for the simpler CDL-C and CDL-D models, as highlighted in Figures 3(c) and 3(d). The Lasso approach is also competitive, in general, and surpasses score-based models (trained only on CDL-B), WGAN, and L-DAMP when evaluated on CDL-A channels, as shown in Figure 3(a).

The findings in this section support the conclusions of Theorem 2 through the following:

1) Channel estimation with posterior sampling (through score-based models) can recover channels up to the noise floor when the test distribution matches the training (Figures 3(b) and 4(c), as well as the Mixed model in all figures).

2) Channel estimation with posterior sampling outperforms the baselines in the low SNR regime (−5 to 0 dB), under test-time distributional shift, and approaches the Mixed model (Figures 3 and 4).

3) Test channel distributions that are significantly more different than the training distributions lead to error floors in the high SNR regime (Figures 3(a) and 4(a)).

Finally, it is worth highlighting that, overall, the fsAD approach is the most robust estimation method and retains a significant portion of its performance in all scenarios, regardless of what environment the hyper-parameters are tuned on. While this is a very useful algorithm for idealized settings, it has the following limitations:

- When deriving the approximation in (21), we have explicitly used knowledge about the shape of the antenna arrays (ULA, and spacing) at both the receiver and transmitter. In general settings, this information may not be available, or the array response may be intractable (e.g., for non-uniform arrays). In contrast, score-based generative models learn the distribution of the channels while *implicitly* learning the array configuration, with no external knowledge required.
A key assumption required for the fsAD algorithm is that channels are exactly sparse on the continuum of spatial frequencies. While this holds for simulated channel using the CDL models, it is generally not true in practice, e.g., as revealed by sounding experiments at mmWave frequencies [56]. This represents a situation when using a data-driven approach can prove beneficial, since no assumptions are required.

C. End-to-End Coded Performance

While the NMSE indicates the raw performance of the channel estimation module, wireless communication systems use error correcting codes that can absorb a portion of the channel estimation errors, when the estimated channel is used in downstream tasks, such as MIMO precoding and equalization. To consider a more realistic performance metric, in this section we evaluate end-to-end coded bit error rates in a simulated system that attempts to capture the downlink physical layer of cellular communication systems.

A block diagram of the simulated system is shown in Figure 5. The transmitter (base station) sends a pilot matrix $P$ with multiple uses, which is received by the user as $Y$, using the model in (2). Channel estimation is used to obtain $H_{est}$. For the data transmission, a payload of 324 bits is encoded using a rate 1/2 low-density parity-check (LDPC) code, followed by digital modulation. Then, digital symbols are split in groups of $N_s = 4$ data streams, followed by adaptive digital beamforming with the unit-power $V_{est}$ matrix to obtain a matrix of 64-dimensional column vectors. We assume that the scenario is based on time-division duplex (TDD), that the channel
is symmetric, and that the transmitter obtains noiseless feedback about the estimated channel. The adaptive beamforming block at the transmitter uses the first four columns of $V$ from the singular value decomposition of $H_{\text{est}}$ as beamforming weights. The data symbols are observed at the receiver as:

$$Y_d = HV_{\text{est}}X_d + N_d,$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

and they are followed by linear minimum mean square error (LMMSE) equalization to yield the equalized data symbols:

$$X_{d,\text{eq}} = \left(H_{\text{est}}^H H_{\text{est}} + \sigma_{\text{pilot}}^2 I\right)^{-1} H_{\text{est}}^H Y_d.$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

The above is followed by reshaping to a vector of symbols, soft de-mapping, and LDPC decoding, to obtain the estimated bit stream $b_{\text{est}}$. This is repeated for two million codewords, each with a different CDL-D channel realization from a randomly generated test set, while using models trained on CDL-C channels, matching the setting of Figure 4(d). Figure 6 plots the performance results for four methods, as well as communication using ideal channels – this allows us to evaluate performance against a well-defined upper bound. This is expressed in terms of the energy per bit to noise ratio (Eb/N0), whereas channel estimation quality still depends on the pilot SNR. The difference between Figure 6(a) and Figure 6(b) consists in the modulation scheme used: 16-QAM or 64-QAM, respectively. We omit WGAN from this investigation due to its early estimation error floor, leading to severe end-to-end bit error floors occurring (similar to Lasso).
Figure 6(a) uses 16-QAM modulation, and can thus tolerate more errors in the channel estimation than Figure 6(b), which uses 64-QAM. Even in the case of 16-QAM, channel estimation errors lead to an error floor for the Lasso algorithm, while score-based models, fsAD, and L-DAMP manage to overcome this and sharply decrease the bit error rate at high pilot SNR. In this case, an NMSE between $-20$ dB and $-15$ dB is required to avoid this error floor, which Lasso does not manage to achieve, as can be seen in Figure 4(d). Figure 6(a) also shows that score-based models and the fsAD approach are competitive when compared to L-DAMP: the same coded bit error rate can be achieved using an Eb/N0 that is 5 dB lower compared to L-DAMP.

On the other hand, Figure 6(b) shows a case where L-DAMP also exhibits an error floor. Since the modulation is now 64-QAM, accurate channel estimation is required for equalization and precoding, and the L-DAMP approach is not sufficient to avoid an early error floor. In contrast, score-based models and fsAD overcome this error floor and decay the bit error rate at approximately the same rate as ideal channel knowledge. Finally, the benefits of extremely accurate channel estimation at high SNR values (e.g., errors lower than $-30$ dB NMSE at pilot SNR larger than 25 dB) are also illustrated in Figure 6(b), where it can be seen that both methods depart from optimal performance, but score-based models improve performance by up to 2 dB in terms of Eb/N0. Overall, these results highlight the importance of evaluating end-to-end performance in various scenarios, since error floors may depend on the modulation order and pilot SNR conditions.

D. Complexity Analysis and Ablation

All score-based models up to this point have used a RefineNet with 24 hidden channels in the first layer, and a depth of six residual blocks in both the encoder and decoder path, where each residual blocks is made of four convolutional layers. In Table II, we investigate validation performance at SNR 28 dB for nine model sizes that vary in depth and width. We look at the high SNR regime, since this is indicative of any error floors occurring. Our findings indicate that model performance is much more sensitive to depth rather than width, but even a shallow model (four blocks), only causes a loss of performance of at most 1.5 dB. Furthermore, shallower models improve performance in an out-of-distribution setting, indicating that they overfit less. Table II also measures per-step latency on a machine with an NVIDIA A100 GPU and Intel Xeon Gold 6230 CPU, as well as the number of inference steps at specific SNR points and a
TABLE II
NETWORK SIZE ABLATION RESULTS. D REPRESENTS THE NETWORK DEPTH (SAME NUMBER OF BLOCKS FOR ENCODER AND DECODER), WHILE W IS THE NUMBER OF HIDDEN CHANNELS IN THE FIRST ENCODER LAYER. THE SCORE-BASED MODELS IN THIS EXPERIMENT ARE TRAINED ON CDL-C CHANNELS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$D = 4$</th>
<th>$D = 5$</th>
<th>$D = 6$</th>
<th>$D = 4$</th>
<th>$D = 5$</th>
<th>$D = 6$</th>
<th>$D = 4$</th>
<th>$D = 5$</th>
<th>$D = 6$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDL-C NMSE [dB] (28 dB, $\alpha = 0.6$)</td>
<td>$-37.8$</td>
<td>$-38.6$</td>
<td>$-38.7$</td>
<td>$-37.3$</td>
<td>$-38.5$</td>
<td>$-38.8$</td>
<td>$-37.8$</td>
<td>$-38.5$</td>
<td>$-38.7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL-D NMSE [dB] (28 dB, $\alpha = 0.6$)</td>
<td>$-36.3$</td>
<td>$-34.8$</td>
<td>$-34.8$</td>
<td>$-36.3$</td>
<td>$-35.3$</td>
<td>$-35.2$</td>
<td>$-36.0$</td>
<td>$-35.2$</td>
<td>$-35.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. weights</td>
<td>64k</td>
<td>184k</td>
<td>208k</td>
<td>263k</td>
<td>734k</td>
<td>828k</td>
<td>1046k</td>
<td>2938k</td>
<td>3314k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latency/step [ms]</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. steps (8 dB, $\alpha = 0.6$)</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. steps (28 dB, $\alpha = 0.6$)</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>2121</td>
<td>2119</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

value $\alpha = 0.6$, which are a result of tuning the hyper-parameters. We find that depth is a main contributor to latency, whereas width is negligible, due to the powerful parallelization capabilities of the GPU.

Table III evaluates the computational complexity of score-based generative models, as well as the fsAD algorithm. For the score-based generative models, we use an architecture with twelve hidden channels and a depth of six hidden layers, leading to an estimation performance loss of at 0.3 dB in the high SNR regime out-of-distribution (for CDL-D channels), according to Table II. It can be seen that the total latency is slightly reduced when compared to fsAD, while the FLOP count scales much more favourably, due to the score-based model being purely convolutional, unlike fsAD which requires matrix-matrix multiplications.

E. Scaling to Large Channel Sizes

While Section V-D shows that the FLOP count is competitive with fsAD in the case of larger channels, in this section we verify that channels can be estimated without error floors using a small network, even for large channel sizes. Figure 7(a) shows the results of this experiment when training and testing score-based models for three channel sizes, where for each size we
### TABLE III

**Complexity and latency analysis for different MIMO scenarios.** For score-based models, the same network is analyzed, with the performance in Figure 7. Values for both algorithms are evaluated using the number of inference steps for SNR = 8 dB, 16 × 64 CDL-C channels, and $\alpha = 0.6$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(N_r, N_t)$</th>
<th>FLOP Count</th>
<th>Latency</th>
<th>Memory Consumption</th>
<th>Model Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score-based</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16, 64)</td>
<td>18.9 GFlops</td>
<td>2.18 s</td>
<td>1.12 MB</td>
<td>828 kB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32, 128)</td>
<td>75.9 GFlops</td>
<td>2.21 s</td>
<td>4.46 MB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64, 256)</td>
<td>303.5 GFlops</td>
<td>2.21 s</td>
<td>17.84 MB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fast approximate atomic norm (fsAD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16, 64)</td>
<td>6.86 GFlops</td>
<td>2.59 s</td>
<td>73 kB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32, 128)</td>
<td>54.9 GFlops</td>
<td>2.6 s</td>
<td>294 kB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64, 256)</td>
<td>439.4 GFlops</td>
<td>2.7 s</td>
<td>1.18 MB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Train a separate model. It can be seen that given a fixed pilot overhead $\alpha$, there is a slight drop in performance at larger channel sizes – we attribute this to the fact that we use a score-based model of the same size ($D = 6$, $W = 12$), regardless of channel size. To compare performance under a resource-limited scenario, we also simulate the larger sizes in cases where only 38 pilot vectors are allowed, leading to smaller values of $\alpha$. In this case, estimation for $32 \times 128$ channels is still competitive, but fails for $64 \times 256$, where $\alpha = 0.15$.

Figure 7(b) investigates in more detail how performance scales with $\alpha$ for all three sizes in the high SNR regime, and the same model size as in Figure 7(a): here, we find that for all three scenarios there is a breaking point of $\alpha \approx 0.4$, below which the estimation error increases rapidly. This is indicative of not having sufficient measurements to meet the conditions of Theorem 2.

### VI. Conclusion

In this paper, we have introduced an unsupervised, probabilistic approach for MIMO channel estimation using a reduced number of pilot symbols. The approach leverages score-based generative models to perform posterior sampling, and represents a new research direction for MIMO channel estimation. Our results on simulated mmWave channels show that performance is favourable in-distribution, as well as in out-of-distribution settings, where channel distributions not seen during training are tested. Additionally, compared to prior work, estimation with
posterior sampling has the advantage of avoiding error floors in the high SNR regime, which leads to improved end-to-end performance.

A current limitation and direction of future research is related to the complexity of posterior sampling. In Section V-D we have performed an initial investigation into improvements achievable through architectural modifications (depth and width of the deep score-based model) which was able to reduce inference latency to as low as 2.2 seconds for channels of size $16 \times 64$. This is usable in scenarios with low mobility, but where long-term distributional shifts may still occur, such as communication with urban pedestrians. Very recent work [57] has investigated algorithmic improvements to posterior sampling: how to reduce the number of inference steps, by more appropriately choosing the hyper-parameters during inference. This a promising direction of future research that we aim to explore. In conclusion, we hope that the method described in this paper inspires researchers to consider novel uses of deep learning for channel estimation, beyond supervised approaches.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Theorem [2]

From [38], we have the following theorem.
**Theorem 3** (Theorem 1.1 from [38], adapted). Let $h_1$ be a high-dimensional arbitrary distribution over an $\ell_2$ ball of radius $r$, and let $h^*$ be drawn from $h_1$. Let $h_2$ be any distribution on the same probability space as $h_1$, such that

$$\mathcal{W}_2(h_1, h_2) \leq \sigma \delta^{1/2},$$

(25)

where $\mathcal{W}_2(h_1, h_2)$ represents the 2-Wasserstein distance between two distributions $h_1$ and $h_2$. Suppose there exists an algorithm that recovers an estimate $\hat{h}$ of $h^*$ using an arbitrary measurement matrix $A$ that gives $m$ measurements, and noise power $\sigma^2$, such that $\|h^* - \hat{h}\|_2 \lesssim \sigma$ with probability $1 - O(\delta)$. Then, posterior sampling with respect to $h_2$ using number of $m' \geq O\left(m \log \left(1 + \frac{m \sigma^2 \|A\|_\infty^2}{\sigma^2} \right) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ noisy, Gaussian measurements at noise level $\sigma$ will output $h_{\text{est}}$ such that:

$$\|h^* - h_{\text{est}}\|_2 \lesssim \sigma \quad \text{w.p.} \quad 1 - O(\delta).$$

(26)

**Proof.** We refer readers to [38] for a complete proof, omitted here due to lack of space. At a high level, this is achieved through upper and lower bounding the number of required measurements to achieve the desired probability of error. □

For the rest of the proof, we assume that the two distributions $h_1$ and $h_2$ are fixed, and given. This also implies that $\mathcal{W}_2(h_1, h_2)$ has a fixed value. Further assuming that we operate at a fixed noise power $\sigma = \sigma_{\text{pilot}}$, it follows from (25) that there exists a unique value $\delta_{\text{min}}$ such that:

$$\delta_{\text{min}}^2(h_1, h_2) = \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(h_2, h_2)}{\sigma_{\text{pilot}}^2}.$$

(27)

We let $\delta_{\text{min}} = \delta_{\text{MNR}}$. The last step that remains is to explicitly calculate $\delta_{\text{MNR}}$ under the assumptions of Theorem 2. We use the following Lemmas.

**Lemma 1** (Section 1.2, Page 7 from [58]). The squared 2-Wasserstein distance between two continuous, scalar random variables $a$ and $b$ with cumulative distribution functions $F_a$ and $F_b$, respectively, is given by:

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(a, b) = \int_0^1 |F_a^{-1}(u) - F_b^{-1}(u)|^2 du.$$

**Proof.** Proven in [58]. □

**Lemma 2** (Lemma 1 from [59]). The squared 2-Wasserstein distance between two random vectors $x$ and $y$, each with independent entries $x_i$ and $y_i$, respectively, satisfies:

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(x, y) = \sum_i \mathcal{W}_2^2(x_i, y_i).$$
Proof. Proven in [59].

Lemma 1 allows us to compute the closed-form 2-Wasserstein distance between two scalar random variables, which leads to the following two corollaries.

**Corollary 1.** The squared 2-Wasserstein distance between two independent, complex, zero-mean and circularly symmetric Gaussian random variables $h_1$ and $h_2$ with probability distribution functions $\mathcal{CN}(0,\sigma_1^2)$ and $\mathcal{CN}(0,\sigma_2^2)$, respectively, is given by:

$$W_2^2(h_1, h_2) = (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2.$$  

**Proof.** Let $h = x + jy$. Using Lemma 1 we have that:

$$W_2^2(h_1, h_2) = \inf_{\psi_1 \sim h_1, \psi_2 \sim h_2} \mathbb{E} \left( \| \psi_1 - \psi_2 \|^2 \right)$$

$$= \inf_{\psi_1 \sim h_1, \psi_2 \sim h_2} \mathbb{E} \left( \| \text{Re}\{\psi_1\} - \text{Re}\{\psi_2\} \|^2 \right) + \mathbb{E} \left( \| \text{Im}\{\psi_1\} - \text{Im}\{\psi_2\} \|^2 \right)$$

$$= W_2^2(x_1, x_2) + W_2^2(y_1, y_2) = \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2}{2} + \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2}{2} = (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2.$$  

**Corollary 2.** The squared 2-Wasserstein distance between two random variables $\tau_1 = -\alpha_1 \log x_1$ and $\tau_2 = -\alpha_2 \log x_2$, where $x_1$ and $x_2$ are i.i.d. and distributed as $\mathcal{U}(0,1)$ is given by:

$$W_2^2(\tau_1, \tau_2) = 2(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2.$$  

**Proof.** Using the definition of the cumulative distribution function, we have:

$$F_\tau(u) = P(\tau \leq u) = P(-\alpha \log X \leq u)$$

$$= P(\log X \geq -\frac{u}{\alpha}) = P(X \geq \exp\left(-\frac{u}{\alpha}\right)) = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{u}{\alpha}\right),$$

where we use that $x \sim \mathcal{U}(0,1)$ satisfies $F_x(x) = x$ for all $x \in [0,1]$. We further obtain that $F^{-1}_\tau(v) = -\alpha \log (1 - v)$. Given random variables $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$, and using Lemma 1,

$$W_2^2(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int_0^1 |F^{-1}_\tau(v) - F^{-1}_\tau(v)|^2 dv$$

$$= \int_0^1 | - \alpha_1 \log (1 - v) + \alpha_2 \log (1 - v) |^2 dv$$

$$= (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \int_0^1 \log^2 (1 - v) dv = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)^2 \int_0^1 \log^2 (t) dt,$$
where the last line follows through the change of variable $t = 1 - v$. Finally, using that $\int_{0}^{1} \log^2(t) \, dt = (t \log |t|)^2 - 2t \log |t| + 2t \bigg|_{0}^{1} = 2$, the proof is completed. $\square$

Combining Corollary 1, Corollary 2, and Lemma 2 the proof of Theorem 2 is completed.
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