# Thesis - ADMM method for designing precoders

# List of Abbreviations

 $\mathbf{WSRM}$  weighted-sum-rate-maximization

 $\mathbf{MIMO} \ \ \mathrm{multiple\text{-}input\text{-}multiple\text{-}output}$ 

 ${\bf ADMM} \ \ {\bf alternative-distributed-method-of-multipliers}$ 

**SOCP** second-order-cone-programming

**BS** base-station

 $\mathbf{SINR} \ \ \text{signal-to-noise-ratio}$ 

 $\mathbf{SOC}$  second-order-cone

KKT karush-khun-tucker

#### 1. Introduction

In this report we have formulated a convex optimization problem to maximize the weighted Sum rate maximization (WSRM) by designing the precoders using primal decomposition and alternative distributed method of multipliers (admm).

#### 1.a Problem Formulation

Consider a system of  $\mathcal{B}$  coordinated BSs of N transmit antennas each and K single antenna receivers. The set of all K users is denoted by  $\mathcal{U} = \{1, 2, ..., K\}$ . We assume that data for the  $k^{th}$  user is transmitted only from one BS, which is denoted by  $b_k \in \mathcal{B}$ , where  $\mathcal{B} \triangleq \{1, 2, ..., \mathcal{B}\}$  is the set of all BSs. The set of all users served by BS b is denoted by  $\mathcal{U}_b$ . Under flat fading channel conditions, the signal received by the  $k^{th}$  user is

$$y_k = \mathbf{h}_{b_k,k} \mathbf{w}_k d_k + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^K \mathbf{h}_{b_i,k} \mathbf{w}_i d_i + n_k$$
(1)

where  $\mathbf{h}_{b_i}, k \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N}$  is the channel (row) vector from BS  $b_i$  to user  $k, \mathbf{w}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 1}$  is the beamforming vector (beamformers) from BS  $b_k$  to user  $k, d_k$  is the normalized complex data symbol, and  $n_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$  is complex circularly symmetric zero mean gaussian noise with variance  $\sigma^2$ . The term  $\sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{K} \mathbf{h}_{b_i, k} \mathbf{w}_i d_i$  in (1) includes both intra- and inter-cell interference. The total power transmitted by BS b is  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_k} \|\mathbf{w}_k\|^2$ . The SINR  $\gamma_k$  of user k is

$$\gamma_k = \frac{\|\mathbf{h}_{b_k,k} \mathbf{w}_k\|^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^K \|\mathbf{h}_{b_i,k}\|}$$
(2)

In this report, we are interested in the problem of WSRM under per-BS power constraints, which is formulated as,

$$\max_{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_b} \|\mathbf{w}_k\|^2 \le P_b, \forall b \in \mathcal{B}} \quad \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k \log(1 + \gamma_k)$$
(3)

where  $\alpha_k$ 's are positive weighting factors which are typically introduced to maintain a certain degree of fairness among users.

## 2. Existing Formulation for WSRM

To achieve a tractable solution for the Low-Complexity beamformer design, we note that following monotonicity of logarithmic function, (3) is equivalent to,

$$\max_{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_b} \|\mathbf{w}_k\|^2 \le P_b, \forall b \in \mathcal{B}} \quad \prod_k (1 + \gamma_k)^{\alpha_k}$$
(4)

which can be re-written as,

$$\max_{w_k, t_k} \qquad \prod_k t_k \tag{5a}$$

subject to 
$$\gamma_k \ge t_k^{1/\alpha_k} - 1, \forall k \in \mathcal{U},$$
 (5b)

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_b} \|\mathbf{w}_k\|_2^2 \le P_b, \forall b \in \mathcal{B}.$$
 (5c)

In equation (4) and (5) it can be seen that all constraints are active at the optimum, otherwise, we can obtain a larger objective by increasing  $t_k$  without violating the constraints. We can reformulate (5) by reintroducing additional slack variable  $\beta_k$ ,

$$\underset{w_k, t_k, \beta_k}{\text{maximize}} \qquad \prod_k t_k \tag{6a}$$

subject to 
$$\mathbf{h}_{b_k,k}\mathbf{w}_k \ge \sqrt{t_k^{1/\alpha_k} - 1}\beta_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{U}$$
 (6b)

$$\operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{h}_{b_k,k}\mathbf{w}_k) = 0, \forall k \in \mathcal{U}, \tag{6c}$$

$$(\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^K \|\mathbf{h}_{b_i, k} \mathbf{w}_k\|^2)^{1/2} \le \beta_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{U}, \tag{6d}$$

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_b} \|\mathbf{w}_k\|_2^2 \le P_b, \forall b \in \mathcal{B}.$$
 (6e)

The relation between (5) and (6) can be seen as, first, by forcing the imaginary part of  $\mathbf{h}_{b_k,k}\mathbf{w}_k$  to zero in (6c) does not affect the optimality of (5) since phase rotation on  $\mathbf{w}_k$  will result in the same objective while satisfying all constraints. Second we can show that all the constraints in (6d) hold with equality at the optimum.

### 3. Decentralized precoder design using ADMM for WSRM

In the decentralized precoder design, the precoders are designed independently at each base station. This design requires less information exchange. The decentralized approach is explained with the alternating method of multipliers.

#### 3.a Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM)

In contrary with the primal decomposition method, dual composition method reduces the constraint by considering the objective functions in the sub problem. In this method we hold a local and a global copy of the signal interference. At optimality the copies remain equal.

ADMM method can be formulated as following,

$$\frac{\rho}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_{b_k}} \sum_{b \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{b_k}} \|\delta_{b,k}^{b_k} - \delta_{b,k}^G\|_2^2 - \frac{\rho}{2} \sum_{i \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{b_k}} \|\delta_{b_k,i}^{b_k} - \delta_{b_k,i}^G\|_2^2$$
 (7a)

subject to 
$$\mathbf{h}_{b_k,k}\mathbf{w}_k \ge \beta_k \sqrt{(t_k^{1/\alpha_k} - 1)}, \forall k \in \mathcal{U}_{b_k}$$
 (7b)

$$\operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{h}_{b_k,k}\mathbf{w}_k) = 0, \forall k \in \mathcal{U}_{b_k}, \tag{7c}$$

$$\sigma^{2} + \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{U}_{b_{k}} \\ i \neq b}} \|\mathbf{h}_{b_{k},k} \mathbf{w}_{i}\|^{2} + \sum_{\substack{b \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{b_{k}}}} \delta_{b,k}^{(b_{k})} \leq \beta_{k}, \forall k \in \mathcal{U}_{b_{k}}, \tag{7d}$$

$$\delta_{b,j}^{(b_k)} \ge \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}_b} \|\mathbf{h}_{b_k,k} \mathbf{w}_i\|^2, \forall j \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{b_k}$$
 (7e)

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_b} \|\mathbf{w}_k\|_2^2 \le P_b, \forall k \in \mathcal{U}_{b_k}. \tag{7f}$$

In the equation above the objective function of the precoder design is to maximize the sum rate (WSRM)problem. The ADMM method uses the sub gradient update method, where we assume the interference term from the adjascent BS. The  $\delta^{(b_k)}$  is the local interference term taken into account from the adjascent BS, similarly the  $\delta^{(G)}$  is the global interference term taken into account from the adjascent BS.At optimality the local and the global interference terms becomes same. The equation (7b) and the equation (7c) remains the same as the previous formulation. In the equation (7d) we observe that there is the local interference term coming from the adjascent BS adding into the noise plus the interference from the same BS. Similarly equation (7e) shows the sum of all interefrence terms from the adjascent BS.

Let us consider a two base station scenario such that the global interference term can be updated as follows,

$$\delta_{b,k}^G = \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{b,k}^{(b)} + \delta_{b,k}^{(b_k)}) \tag{8}$$

where  $\delta_{b,k}^{(b)}$  refers to the actual interference caused by BS b and  $\delta_{b,k}^{(b_k)}$  refers to the local interference caused by the BS  $b_k$ 

The update for the local interference term is made through iteration of the objective function in each BS. Once the local interference iterations are done then the global interference and the dual variable update are made in the main problem. The dual variable corresponds to the interference terms in the BS  $b_k$  and is updated with the subgradient method. rho gives the dual update step length.

$$\lambda_{b,k}^{(n+1)} = \lambda_{b,k}^{(n)} - \rho(\delta_{b,k}^{(b_k)^*} - \delta_{b,k}^{(G)^*})$$
(9)