On Proportional Fairness in Power Allocation for Two-Tone Spectrum-Sharing Networks

Chongtao Guo, *Member, IEEE*, Bin Liao, *Member, IEEE*, Lei Huang, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Peichang Zhang, Min Huang and Jihong Zhang

Abstract—To efficiently trade off system sum-rate and link fairness, power allocation in wireless spectrum-sharing networks often concentrates upon proportional fairness. The corresponding problem has been proved to be convex for a single tone but NP-hard for more than two tones. However, in the two-tone case, the complexity of the problem for achieving proportional fairness has not been addressed yet. In this work, we prove that the issue of proportional fairness optimization for the two-tone situation is NP-hard by reducing the problem of finding the maximum independent set in an undirected graph to it. Besides, a computationally efficient algorithm is proposed to provide an efficient suboptimal solution. Simulation results are presented to illustrate the effectiveness of our proposal.

Index Terms—Difference of two concave functions, interference, NP-hard, power allocation, proportional fairness, spectrumsharing network.

I. Introduction

BROADCAST feature of wireless communications gives rise to serious co-channel interference, which significantly limits the system performance in wireless spectrum-sharing networks [1]. In such kind of networks where many links share a fixed number of frequency bands (tones), power allocation plays an important role in managing interference, increasing network sum-rate as well as enhancing link fairness [2].

As an important resource allocation issue in wireless networks, power allocation for sum-rate maximization has received extensive attentions. It has been shown by Luo and Zhang [3] that this problem is NP-hard for any fixed number of tones. Therefore, one can either design high-complexity algorithms to obtain the global optimality [1], [4] or low-complexity approaches to attain the local optimality [2], [5]–[7]. On the other hand, to achieve a high level of fairness, a common practice is maximizing the minimum-rate of all links,

Copyright (c) 2015 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. However, permission to use this material for any other purposes must be obtained from the IEEE by sending a request to pubs-permissions@ieee.org.

Manuscript received September 2, 2015; revised December 14, 2015; accepted February 2, 2016. The associate editor coordinating the review of this paper and approving it for publication was Prof. R. Jäntti.

This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 61271420, Grant 61401284, Grant 61471365 and Grant U1501253, in part by Guangdong Natural Science Foundation under Grant 2015A030311030, in part by the Foundation of Shenzhen under Grant JCYJ20140418091413566 and Grant JCYJ20150324140036835, and in part by the Natural Science Foundation of SZU under Grant 201414, Grant 201556 and Grant 827-000071.

The authors are with the College of Information Engineering, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen 518060, China (e-mail: ctguo@szu.edu.cn, binliao@szu.edu.cn, lhuang@szu.edu.cn, zpc1029384756@hotmail.com, mhuang@szu.edu.cn, zhangjh@szu.edu.cn). Lei Huang is the corresponding author.

known as max-min fairness. Luo and Zhang [3] have proved that this problem is convex when there is only one tone and turns out to be NP-hard when the number of tones is more than two [3]. For the situation of two tones, the minimum-rate maximization problem can be transformed into a univariate optimization problem and is thus easy to be tackled [3].

Due to the diversity of different channels, the sum-rate maximization often prefers high-quality links and allocates more power to them. In other words, this has the effect of discriminating low-quality links and results in low fairness. On the other hand, to maximize the minimum-rate of all links, more power should be assigned to low-quality links and meanwhile, less should be allocated to high-quality links so that the interference to other links can be maintained at a low level, which considerably limits the sum-rate [8]. To make a tradeoff between the sum-rate and link fairness, numerous works have been dedicated to maximizing the sum-utility of all links, where each link's utility is defined as the logarithm of its rate. This is referred to as proportional fairness [9], [10]. Luo and Zhang [3] have shown that this problem is convex when there is only one tone and is NP-hard when there are more than two tones. However, for the two-tone case, the complexity of this problem is unknown yet.

This paper proves that the power allocation problem for sum-log-utility maximization in the two-tone case is NP-hard. In particular, we establish an equivalence between this problem and the one finding the maximum independent set in an undirected graph which is known to be NP-hard. In general, it is impossible to offer a polynomial-time algorithm to achieve the global optimality unless P = NP. To circumvent this issue, we devise a computationally efficient algorithm in this paper to find suboptimal points.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the system model and formulates the power allocation problem. Section III proves the NP-hardness of the problem. In Section IV, an efficient algorithm is developed to handle the NP-hard problem. Simulation results are presented in Section V. In addition, the applications and the extensions of this work are discussed in Section VI. Finally, Section VII concludes this paper.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider a spectrum-sharing network, in which two frequency tones are available for K transmitter-receiver pairs (links). For achieving high spectrum efficiency, all K links are allowed to access the two tones. Let $h_{k,j}^n$ be the channel

fading coefficient from the transmitter of link j to the receiver of link k at tone n.

Slow-fading Rayleigh channel is assumed. In particular, $h_{k,j}^n$ $(k,j=1,2,\cdots,K;n=1,2)$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) with $h_{k,j}^n \sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$ and remain constant during the period considered. Denote by x_k^n the complex Gaussian signal transmitted from link k at tone n. For an additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel, the received signal of link k at tone n is

$$y_k^n = z_k^n + \sum_{j=1}^K h_{k,j}^n x_j^n, \quad n = 1, 2, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (1)$$

where z_k^n is the complex Gaussian noise of link k at tone n distributed with zero mean and variance N_k^n , i.e., $z_k^n \sim \mathcal{CN}(0,N_k^n)$. The rate of link k at tone n, measured in nats/s/Hz, is given by Shannon formula as

$$R_k^n(\mathbf{p}) = \ln\left(1 + \frac{|h_{k,k}^n|^2 p_k^n}{N_k^n + \sum_{j \neq k} |h_{k,j}^n|^2 p_j^n}\right),$$

$$n = 1, 2, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$
(2)

where $\ln(x)$ is the natural logarithm of x, $p_k^n = \mathbb{E}\{|x_k^n|^2\}$ is the transmit power of link k at tone n, and $\mathbf{p} = (p_1^1, p_2^1, \cdots, p_K^1, p_1^2, p_2^2, \cdots, p_K^2)^T$ is the power allocation vector.

For ease of expression, we normalize the channel coefficients and denote the rate of link k at tone n as

$$R_k^n(\mathbf{p}) = \ln\left(1 + \frac{p_k^n}{\sigma_k^n + \sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_{k,j}^n p_j^n}\right),$$

$$n = 1, 2, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$
(3)

where $\sigma_k^n=N_k^n/|h_{k,k}^n|^2$ is the normalized power of the background noise and $\alpha_{k,j}^n=|h_{k,j}^n|^2/|h_{k,k}^n|^2$ is the normalized crosstalk coefficient from link j to link k at tone n. Now, we get the overall rate of link k as

$$R_k(\mathbf{p}) = R_k^1(\mathbf{p}) + R_k^2(\mathbf{p}). \tag{4}$$

The power allocation problem with the aim to achieve proportional fairness is formulated as

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{p}} \qquad \sum_{k=1}^{K} \ln \left(R_k(\boldsymbol{p}) \right) \tag{5a}$$

s.t.
$$p_k^1, p_k^2 \ge 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$
 (5b)

$$p_k^1 + p_k^2 \le P_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$
 (5c)

where p is the optimization variable. Here, Constraint (5c) indicates that the total transmit power of link k cannot exceed its budget P_k . It should be pointed out that there is no constraint for guaranteeing links' rates. However, even so, the optimal rate of each link could not be too small, because the objective value approaches negative infinity when the rate tends to zero. This model can be utilized for best-effort traffic such as file transfer.

It can be seen that Problem (5) involves a complex nonconvex objective function that brings about great challenges in solving it. In fact, Problem (5) is NP-hard in general cases as will be shown in the next section.

III. COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS

In this section, we establish the NP-hardness of Problem (5) by constructing a reduction from the maximum independent set (MIS) problem in an undirected graph to Problem (5), where the MIS problem is known NP-hard.

Before the complexity analysis, it is necessary to present some preliminaries in graph theory. Thereafter, we first introduce the MIS problem as well as a special case of Problem (5), and then reduce the former problem to the latter one.

A. Preliminaries

The definitions of graphs and independent sets are given as follows [11].

Definition 1 (Graph): A graph $G=(\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E})$ is composed of a finite set of vertices \mathcal{V} and a finite set of edges \mathcal{E} , where each edge represents an unordered pair of vertices, i.e., $\mathcal{E}\subseteq\{(u,v):u,v\in\mathcal{V},u\neq v\}$.

Note that two nodes $u \in \mathcal{V}$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}$ $(u \neq v)$ are said to be connected if and only if $(u, v) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Definition 2 (Independent Set): An independent set of graph $G=(\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E})$ is a set of vertices $\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{V}$ such that no two nodes in \mathcal{S} are connected: for any $u,v\in\mathcal{S},\,(u,v)\notin\mathcal{E}.$

For graph G, a maximum independent set is an independent set of the largest possible size. The problem of finding such a set is called the MIS problem, which is an NP-hard optimization problem.

B. Problem Constructions

On one hand, let us establish a graph $G=(\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E})$, where the number of nodes $|\mathcal{V}|$ equals K that is the same as the number of links in the considered network. Such a construction of graph implies that the nodes in G can be one-to-one mapped to the links in the network. In particular, node k in the graph corresponds to link k in the network.

On the other hand, with parameter settings $\alpha_{k,j}^2 = 1$, $\sigma_k^1 = 1$, $\sigma_k^2 = 4$ and $P_k = 1$ for k and j, we consider a special case of Problem (5) given as

$$\max_{\mathbf{p}} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \ln \left(\ln \left(1 + \frac{p_k^1}{1 + \sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_{k,j}^1 p_j^1} \right) + \ln \left(1 + \frac{p_k^2}{4 + \sum_{j \neq k} p_j^2} \right) \right)$$
(6a)

s.t.
$$p_k^1, p_k^2 \ge 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, K$$
 (6b)

$$p_k^1 + p_k^2 \le 1, k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$
 (6c)

where $\alpha_{k,j}^1$ for $k \neq i$ is set as

$$\alpha_{k,j}^1 = \alpha_{j,k}^1 = \begin{cases} \infty, & (k,j) \in \mathcal{E} \\ 0, & (k,j) \notin \mathcal{E}. \end{cases}$$
 (7)

Notice that parameters $\alpha_{k,j}^1$ defined in (7) bridges graph G and Problem (6). Particularly, each one of links k and j results in infinite interference to the other if nodes k and j in graph G are connected.

C. Problem Reduction

In this subsection, we shall show that the MIS problem in graph G can be reduced to Problem (6), i.e., a solution to Problem (6) yields a solution to the MIS problem.

For ease of expression, the optimal solution to Problem (6) is denoted by $\mathbf{p}^* = (p_1^{1*}, p_2^{1*}, \cdots, p_K^{1*}, p_1^{2*}, p_2^{2*}, \cdots, p_K^{2*})^T$. Meanwhile, the optimal rate of link k is represented by R_k^* . We have the following proposition.

Proposition 1: The set $\mathcal{I} = \{k|{p_k^1}^*>0\}$ is an independent set in graph G.

Proof: We prove this by contradiction. Suppose that there exist k and i such that $p_k^{1*} > 0$, $p_i^{1*} > 0$ and $(k,i) \in \mathcal{E}$. Since $\alpha_{k,i}^1 = \alpha_{i,k}^1 = \infty$, we have

$$R_k^1 = \ln\left(1 + \frac{p_k^{1*}}{1 + \alpha_{k,i}^1 p_i^{1*} + \sum\limits_{j \neq k, j \neq i} \alpha_{k,j}^1 p_j^{1*}}\right) = 0,$$

$$R_i^1 = \ln \left(1 + \frac{p_i^{1*}}{1 + \alpha_{i,k}^1 p_k^{1*} + \sum_{j \neq i, j \neq k} \alpha_{i,j}^1 p_j^{1*}} \right) = 0.$$

This implies that for all nodes in $\mathcal{I}=\{k|p_k^{1*}>0\}$, only the isolated nodes in graph G get positive rate at tone 1. Let $\mathcal{I}'\subset\mathcal{I}$ be the set composed of all the isolated nodes in G. Then, links in \mathcal{I}' have positive rate at tone 1, while links in $\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{I}'$ have zero rate at tone 1. We arbitrarily select $|\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{I}'|-1$ links in $\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{I}'$ and set their powers as zero. Then, the remainder one link in $\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{I}'$ is not interfered by other links and will get a positive rate at tone 1. Thus, the objective value increases, which means that p^* is not optimal. This is a contradiction and the proof is completed.

Based on Proposition 1, the following proposition can be obtained.

Proposition 2: The set $\mathcal{I}=\{k|{p_k^1}^*>0\}$ is the same as the set $\{k|{p_k^1}^*=1\}$.

Proof: Suppose that $\mathcal{I}=\{k|p_k^{1^*}>0\}$ is given. According to Proposition 1, the rate of link k in \mathcal{I} at tone 1 is $R_k^1=\ln(1+p_k^1)$. Then, the optimal power allocation can be determined by solving the problem given by

$$\max_{\mathbf{p}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \ln \left(\ln(1 + p_k^1) + \ln \left(1 + \frac{p_k^2}{4 + \sum_{j \neq k} p_j^2} \right) \right)$$
$$+ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}} \ln \left(\ln \left(1 + \frac{p_k^2}{4 + \sum_{j \neq k} p_j^2} \right) \right) \tag{8a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad p_k^1, p_k^2 \ge 0, k \in \mathcal{V}, \tag{8b}$$

$$p_k^1 + p_k^2 \le 1, k \in \mathcal{V}, \tag{8c}$$

$$p_k^1 = 0, k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}. \tag{8d}$$

We will prove in the following that, for Problem (8), each link in \mathcal{I} has the optimal power being 1 at tone 1, i.e., $p_k^{1*}=1$ for all $k\in\mathcal{I}$. In particular, for link $k\in\mathcal{I}$, the following two scenarios are considered.

• ${p_k^2}^*=0$. In this case, we can directly get ${p_k^1}^*=1$ because the increment of p_k^1 will monotonically increase link k's rate at tone 1 and induce no interference to other links, as can be seen from the objective function in (8).

• $p_k^{2*} > 0$.

In this situation, we have $p_k^{1*} < 1$ according to (8c). Now, let us consider another power allocation $\mathbf{p}' = (p_1^{1*}, p_2^{1*}, \cdots, p_{k-1}^{1*}, 1, p_{k+1}^{1*}, \cdots, p_K^{1*}, p_1^{2*}, p_2^{2*}, \cdots, p_{k-1}^{2*}, 0, p_{k+1}^{2*}, \cdots, p_K^{2*})$. Accordingly, the rate of link k resulted in by \mathbf{p}' is denoted by R_k' .

For all $i \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}$ we have

$$R_{i}^{*} = \ln\left(1 + \frac{p_{i}^{2*}}{4 + p_{k}^{2*} + \sum_{j \neq i, j \neq k} p_{j}^{2*}}\right)$$

$$< \ln\left(1 + \frac{p_{i}^{2*}}{4 + \sum_{j \neq i, j \neq k} p_{j}^{2*}}\right) = R_{i}'.$$
(9)

For all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ $(i \neq k)$, we obtain

$$R_{i}^{*} = \ln(1 + p_{i}^{1*}) + \ln\left(1 + \frac{p_{i}^{2*}}{4 + p_{k}^{2*} + \sum_{j \neq i, j \neq k} p_{j}^{2*}}\right)$$

$$< \ln(1 + p_{i}^{1*}) + \ln\left(1 + \frac{p_{i}^{2*}}{4 + \sum_{j \neq i, j \neq k} p_{j}^{2*}}\right) = R_{i}'.$$
(10)

For link k, it follows that

$$R_{k}^{*} = \ln(1 + p_{k}^{1*}) + \ln\left(1 + \frac{p_{k}^{2*}}{4 + \sum_{j \neq k} p_{j}^{2*}}\right)$$

$$\leq \ln(1 + p_{k}^{1*}) + \ln\left(1 + \frac{p_{k}^{2*}}{4}\right)$$

$$\stackrel{\text{①}}{\leq} \ln\left(\left(1 + p_{k}^{1*}\right)\left(1 + \frac{1 - p_{k}^{1*}}{4}\right)\right)$$

$$= \ln\left(-\frac{1}{4}\left(p_{k}^{1*}\right)^{2} + p_{k}^{1*} + \frac{5}{4}\right) < \ln 2 = R_{k}',$$
(11)

where inequality \odot comes from the power budget constraint $p_k^{1*} + p_k^{2*} \leq 1$. According to (9)-(11), we can see that the objective function value corresponding to p' is greater than that of p^* . This is a contradiction and the case $p_k^{2*} > 0$ does not exist.

The above analysis shows that $\mathcal{I}=\{k|{p_k^1}^*>0\}=\{k|{p_k^1}^*=1\}.$

According to Proposition 1 and Proposition 2, the optimal power of each link at tone 1 is either 0 or 1 and the set $\mathcal{I} = \{k|p_k^{1*} = 1\}$ is an independent set in graph G. Now, we can get the following proposition.

Proposition 3: Given the independent set $\mathcal{I} = \{k|p_k^{1*} = 1\}$ in graph G, the optimal value of Problem (5) is

$$|\mathcal{I}|\ln(\ln(2)) + (K - |\mathcal{I}|)\ln\left(\ln\left(\frac{K - |\mathcal{I}| + 4}{K - |\mathcal{I}| + 3}\right)\right).$$
 (12)

Proof: According to the property of set \mathcal{I} , we have $p_k^{1\,*}=1,\,p_k^{2\,*}=0$ for $k\in\mathcal{I}$ and $p_k^{1\,*}=0$ for $k\in\mathcal{V}-\mathcal{I}$. Therefore, we only need to determine $p_k^{2\,*}$ for $k\in\mathcal{V}-\mathcal{I}$. The optimization

of ${p_k^2}^*$ for $k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}$ can be formulated as

$$\max_{p_k^2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}} \ln \left(\ln \left(1 + \frac{p_k^2}{4 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}, j \neq k} p_j^2} \right) \right)$$
(13a)

s.t.
$$0 \le p_k^2 \le 1, k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}$$
 (13b)

Although the above problem has a non-concave objective function, it can be transformed into a convex optimization problem [3]. In order to get the explicit expression of the optimal solution, we decompose this problem as

$$\max_{c} \qquad f(c) \tag{14a}$$

$$\max_{c} \qquad f(c) \tag{14a}$$
 s.t.
$$0 \le c \le K - |\mathcal{I}|, \tag{14b}$$

where f(c) is given by

$$f(c) = \max_{p_k^2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}} \ln \left(\ln \left(1 + \frac{p_k^2}{4 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}, j \neq k} p_j^2} \right) \right)$$
(15a)

s.t.
$$0 \le p_k^2 \le 1, k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I},$$
 (15b)

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{T}} p_k^2 = c. \tag{15c}$$

For Problem (15), we can transform the objective function into

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}} \ln \left(\ln \left(\frac{4 + c}{4 + c - p_k^2} \right) \right). \tag{16}$$

The function in (16) is concave over the optimization variable because the second-order derivative of $\ln \left(\ln \left(\frac{4+c}{4+c-n^2} \right) \right)$ with respect to p_k^2 is

$$\left(\ln\left(\frac{4+c}{4+c-p_k^2}\right) - 1\right) \left(\left(4+c-p_k^2\right) \ln\left(\frac{4+c}{4+c-p_k^2}\right)\right)^{-2}$$
(17)

which is less than zero for $0 \le c \le K - |I|$ and $0 \le p_k^2 \le 1$. Therefore, Problem (15) has a convex form and we can utilize Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions to obtain its global optimality. That is, λ_k, μ_k, ν and p_k^2 , for all $k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}$, satisfy the KKT conditions given in (18)-(21), (15b) and (15c).

$$\lambda_k, \mu_k \ge 0 \tag{18}$$

$$\lambda_k p_k^2 = 0 \tag{19}$$

$$\mu_k(1 - p_k^2) = 0 (20)$$

$$(4+c-p_k^2)^{-1} \ln^{-1} \left(\frac{4+c}{4+c-p_k^2} \right) + \lambda_k - \mu_k + \nu = 0$$
 (21)

As a result, ${p_k^2}^* = c/(K-|\mathcal{I}|)$ for all $k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}$ is the primal optimal point and $(\lambda_k^*, \mu_k^*, \nu^*)$ for all $k \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{I}$ is the dual optimal point, where $\lambda_k^* = \mu_k^* = 0$ and ν^* is given by

$$\nu^* = -\left(4 + \frac{K - |\mathcal{I}| - 1}{K - |\mathcal{I}|}c\right)^{-1} \times \ln^{-1}\left(\frac{(K - |\mathcal{I}|)(4 + c)}{4(K - |\mathcal{I}|) + (K - |\mathcal{I}| - 1)c}\right). \tag{22}$$

Then, we get

$$f(c) = (K - |\mathcal{I}|) \ln \left(\ln \left(\frac{(K - |\mathcal{I}|)c + 4(K - |\mathcal{I}|)}{(K - |\mathcal{I}| - 1)c + 4(K - |\mathcal{I}|)} \right) \right).$$
(23)

Since f(c) is a monotonically increasing function of c, the optimal solution and the maximum value of Problem (14) are $c^* = K - |\mathcal{I}|$ and $(K - |\mathcal{I}|) \ln \left(\ln \left(\frac{K - |\mathcal{I}| + 4}{K - |\mathcal{I}| + 3} \right) \right)$, respectively. In addition, as the rate of each link in \mathcal{I} is $\ln 2$, the proof is finished.

Utilizing Proposition 3, we characterize the complexity of Problem (5) in the following Theorem.

Theorem 1: Problem (6) is NP-hard.

Proof: According to Proposition 3, the optimization of Problem (6) is equivalent to

$$\max_{\mathcal{I}} \quad |\mathcal{I}| \ln(\ln(2)) + (K - |\mathcal{I}|) \ln \left(\ln \left(\frac{K - |\mathcal{I}| + 4}{K - |\mathcal{I}| + 3} \right) \right)$$

(24a)

 \mathcal{I} is an independent set in graph G. (24b)

Notice that the derivative of the objective function with respect to $|\mathcal{I}|$ is

$$\ln^{-1}\left(\frac{K-|\mathcal{I}|+4}{K-|\mathcal{I}|+3}\right) \cdot \frac{K-|\mathcal{I}|}{(K-|\mathcal{I}|+4)(K-|\mathcal{I}|+3)} + \ln\left(\ln 2 \cdot \ln^{-1}\left(\frac{K-|\mathcal{I}|+4}{K-|\mathcal{I}|+3}\right)\right),\tag{25}$$

which is greater than zero due to the fact that $1 < \frac{K - |\mathcal{I}| + 4}{K - |\mathcal{I}| + 3} \le$ $\frac{4}{3}$ for $1 \leq |\mathcal{I}| < K$. This indicates that the objective function of Problem (24) is increasing in $|\mathcal{I}|$ for $1 \leq |\mathcal{I}| \leq K$. As a result, the optimal solution to Problem (24) turns out to be the size of the MIS in graph G. Since the MIS problem in a graph is NP-hard, so is Problem (6).

According to Theorem 1, a special case of Problem (5) is NP-hard, which gives rise to the NP-hardness of its general cases. Therefore, we cannot globally solve Problem (5) in polynomial time in the global optimal sense unless P = NP. To this end, we shall devise a computationally efficient algorithm which is able to provide a suboptimal but efficient solution to this problem in the following section.

IV. PROPOSED ALGORITHM TO SOLVE PROBLEM (5)

Due to the negative infinite value of logarithm function at zero, it is known that each link has a positive rate under the optimal power allocation of Problem (5). Given that the optimal rate of link k is at least T_k ($T_k > 0$), we define a utility function $U_{T_k}(x)$ as

$$U_{T_k}(x) = \begin{cases} \ln(x), & x \ge T_k, \\ \frac{1}{T_k}x + (\ln(T_k) - 1), & 0 \le x < T_k. \end{cases}$$
 (26)

As shown in Fig.1, $U_{T_k}(x)$ has the same concave curve with ln(x) when $x \ge T_k$ and corresponds to a line tangent to ln(x)at $(T_k, \ln(T_k))$ when $0 \le x < T_k$. Apparently, $U_{T_k}(x)$ is concave for $x \geq 0$.

Then, the following problem

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{p}} \qquad \sum_{k=1}^{K} U_{T_k} \left(R_k(\boldsymbol{p}) \right) \tag{27a}$$

s.t.
$$p_k^1, p_k^2 \ge 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$
 (27b)

$$p_k^1 + p_k^2 \le P_k, k = 1, 2, \cdots, K,$$
 (27c)




Fig. 1. The curves of $U_{T_k}(x)$ and $\ln(x)$.

is equivalent to Problem (5) in the sense that the solutions of these two problems are identical. The reason is as follows. The slater's condition is satisfied for both problems in (27) and (5), i.e., there exists a feasible point in the relative interior of the feasible set for these two problems. Therefore, the optimal solutions to each of these two problems must satisfy its own KKT conditions [12]. Since the KKT equations of Problem (5) are the same as those of Problem (27) when the optimal rate of link k is greater than T_k , the optimal solution to Problem (5) is also the solution to Problem (27).

Now, with the definitions of $\alpha_{k,k}^n = 1$ for all $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ and n = 1, 2, we rewrite the rate of link k as

$$R_{k}(\mathbf{p}) = \ln \left(\frac{\sigma_{k}^{1} + \sum_{j} \alpha_{k,j}^{1} p_{j}^{1}}{\sigma_{k}^{1} + \sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_{k,j}^{1} p_{j}^{1}} \right) + \ln \left(\frac{\sigma_{k}^{2} + \sum_{j} \alpha_{k,j}^{2} p_{j}^{2}}{\sigma_{k}^{2} + \sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_{k,j}^{2} p_{j}^{2}} \right)$$
$$= g_{k}(\mathbf{p}) - h_{k}(\mathbf{p}), \tag{28}$$

where $g_k(\mathbf{p})$ and $h_k(\mathbf{p})$ are concave functions with respect to \mathbf{p} and defined as

$$g_k(\mathbf{p}) = \ln \left(\sigma_k^1 + \sum_j \alpha_{k,j}^1 p_j^1 \right) + \ln \left(\sigma_k^2 + \sum_j \alpha_{k,j}^2 p_j^2 \right)$$

and

$$h_k(\mathbf{p}) = \ln \left(\sigma_k^1 + \sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_{k,j}^1 p_j^1 \right) + \ln \left(\sigma_k^2 + \sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_{k,j}^2 p_j^2 \right),$$
(30)

respectively.

Theorem 2: Function $f_k(\mathbf{p})$ given by

$$f_k(\mathbf{p}) = U_{T_k}(R_k) + T_k^{-1} h_k(\mathbf{p})$$
 (31)

is concave.

Proof: Since $U_{T_k}(R_k)$ is concave, we have

$$U_{T_k}(R_k) = \inf_{\theta \ge 0} \left\{ U_{T_k}(\theta) + U'_{T_k}(\theta)(R_k - \theta) \right\}$$

=
$$\inf_{\theta \ge 0} \left\{ U_{T_k}(\theta) - \theta U'_{T_k}(\theta) + U'_{T_k}(\theta)(g_k(\boldsymbol{p}) - h_k(\boldsymbol{p})) \right\}.$$
(32)

Substituting this into (31), we get

$$f_{k}(\mathbf{p})$$

$$=\inf_{\theta\geq0}\left\{U_{T_{k}}(\theta)-\theta U_{T_{k}}'(\theta) + U_{T_{k}}'(\theta)(g_{k}(\mathbf{p})-h_{k}(\mathbf{p}))\right\} + T_{k}^{-1}h_{k}(\mathbf{p})$$

$$=\inf_{\theta\geq0}\left\{U_{T_{k}}(\theta)-\theta U_{T_{k}}'(\theta) + U_{T_{k}}'(\theta)(g_{k}(\mathbf{p})+T_{k}^{-1}-T_{k}^{-1}(\theta))h_{k}(\mathbf{p})\right\}.$$
(33)

According to the definition of $U_{T_k}(x)$ in (26), we obtain $U'_{T_k}(\theta) > 0$ and $T_k^{-1} - U'_{T_k}(\theta) \ge 0$ for all $\theta \ge 0$. Therefore, $f_k(\mathbf{p})$ is the infimum of a set of concave functions, which indicates that $f_k(\mathbf{p})$ is concave [12], [13].

Based on Theorem 2, we express the objective function of Problem (27) as

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} U_{T_k} \left(R_k(\boldsymbol{p}) \right) = g(\boldsymbol{p}) - h(\boldsymbol{p}), \tag{34}$$

where $g(\mathbf{p})$ and $h(\mathbf{p})$ are both concave functions given, respectively, by

$$g(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} f_k(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} U_{T_k}(R_k) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} T_k^{-1} h_k(\mathbf{p})$$
 (35)

and

$$h(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} T_k^{-1} h_k(\mathbf{p}).$$
 (36)

The objective function of Problem (27) is now the difference of two concave (D.C.) functions. As a result, for a given T_k , we can utilize an iterative algorithm to obtain a suboptimal solution to Problem (27). Specifically, given the power allocation vector \mathbf{p}^{ζ} in the ζ th iteration, we approximate $h(\mathbf{p})$ by utilizing its first-order Taylor expansion, i.e., $h(\mathbf{p}^{\zeta}) + \nabla h^T(\mathbf{p}^{\zeta}) (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^{\zeta})$, and optimize \mathbf{p} in the $(\zeta + 1)$ th iteration. In particular, $\mathbf{p}^{\zeta+1}$ can be achieved by solving the following problem

$$\max_{\mathbf{p}} \quad g(\mathbf{p}) - \left(h\left(\mathbf{p}^{\zeta}\right) + \nabla h^{T}\left(\mathbf{p}^{\zeta}\right)\left(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^{\zeta}\right) \right)$$
 (37a)

s.t.
$$p_k^1, p_k^2 \ge 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$
 (37b)

$$p_k^1 + p_k^2 \le P_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K.$$
 (37c)

Note that Problem (37) is convex and thus can be efficiently solved by mature tools such as the interior-point methods.

Now, the detailed algorithm to solve Problem (27) for a given T_k is presented in Algorithm 1, in which ζ is the iteration index, \mathbf{p}^{ζ} is the power allocation after the ζ th iteration and ε is the maximum tolerance for terminating the algorithm. It is worth emphasizing that this iterative algorithm converges to a local optimal solution to Problem (27) that is no worse than the starting point \mathbf{p}^0 , which can be proved by the similar approaches in [14] and [15].

As mentioned above, Problem (27) is equivalent to Problem (5) only if T_k is smaller than the rate of link k under the optimal power allocation. Therefore, for guaranteeing the

Algorithm 1 Solving Problem (27) for a given T_k

```
1: Input: p^0, \varepsilon, T_k for all k

2: Output: p^{\zeta}

3: Initialization: Set \zeta = 0

4: repeat

5: Solve Problem (37) and get its optimal solution p^*;

6: \zeta = \zeta + 1;

7: p^{\zeta} = p^*;

8: until |p^{\zeta} - p^{\zeta - 1}| \le \varepsilon
```

equivalence between the two problems, T_k should not be too large. On the other hand, a too small value of T_k will result in a slow convergence of Algorithm 1. Let us go back to the definitions of $g(\mathbf{p})$ in (35) and $h(\mathbf{p})$ in (36). A pretty small T_k makes $T_k^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K h_k(\mathbf{p})$ be the dominant part of $g(\mathbf{p})$, and therefore $g(\mathbf{p})$ is quite close to $h(\mathbf{p})$. Then, Problem (37) can be approximated as

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{p}} \quad h(\boldsymbol{p}) - \left(h\left(\boldsymbol{p}^{\zeta}\right) + \nabla h^{T}\left(\boldsymbol{p}^{\zeta}\right)\left(\boldsymbol{p} - \boldsymbol{p}^{\zeta}\right)\right) \tag{38a}$$

s.t.
$$p_k^1, p_k^2 \ge 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$
 (38b)

$$p_k^1 + p_k^2 \le P_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K.$$
 (38c)

Since h(p) is concave, the optimal solution to Problem (38) is p^{ζ} . This indicates that the step-size of the update of p^{ζ} is very small. As a result, T_k should be appropriately initialized, and carefully updated when it gets too large and too small.

The overall iterative algorithm for solving Problem (5) is provided in Algorithm 2, where ϖ is the number of times for calling Algorithm 1. In practice, T_k is initialized as the rate of link k under a given feasible power allocation. Notice that in the 9th line, T_k is divided in half if R_k is less than or equal to T_k . Moreover, for preventing T_k from getting too small, T_k is increasing according to $T_k = (1 - \mu^\varpi)T_k + \mu^\varpi R_k$ if T_k is less than a half of R_k , where $\mu \in (0,1)$ is a small positive scalar for the stability of the algorithm.

Algorithm 2 Proposed power allocation algorithm

```
1: Initialization: Set p^0, \varepsilon, \mu and T_k for all k
2: Set \varpi = 0;
3: repeat
       Set Flag=1 and \varpi = \varpi + 1;
4:
       Get power allocation p by calling Algorithm 1;
 5:
       Calculate R_k under power allocation \boldsymbol{p} for all k;
6:
       for k = 1 : K do
7:
         if T_k \geq R_k then
8:
             T_k = T_k/2;
9:
            Flag=0;
10:
          else if T_k < R_k/2 then
11:
             T_k = (1 - \mu^{\varpi})T_k + \mu^{\varpi}R_k;
12:
13:
       end for
14:
       p^0 = p;
16: until Flag=1
```

Based on the above discussions, Algorithm 2 will finally locate a local optimal power allocation of Problem (27)

guaranteeing $R_k > T_k$ for all k, which is thus also local optimal to Problem (5).

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we present the performance of our proposed algorithm, where, without loss of generality, the noise power is set to be $N_k^n = 0.1 \mu W$ and the power budget is $P_k = 1 m W$ for all links. Let $\mathbf{p}^E = (0.5, 0.5, \cdots, 0.5)^T \ mW$ be the equal power allocation, i.e., the power of each link at each tone is 0.5mW. Parameters ε and μ are set as $\varepsilon = 10^{-3}$ and $\mu = 0.6$ in the proposed algorithm. For evaluating the influences of different initializations of p^0 and T_k , we simulate the proposed algorithm by three different initializations: (1) $\mathbf{p}^0 = \mathbf{p}^{\bar{E}}$ and $T_k = R_k(\mathbf{p}^E)$, where $R_k(\mathbf{p}^E)$ is the rate of link k under the power allocation p^E ; (2) p^0 is randomly initialized and $T_k =$ $R_k(\mathbf{p}^E)$; and (3) \mathbf{p}^0 is randomly initialized and $T_k = R_k(\mathbf{p}^0)$. For the purpose of comparison, we also present simulation results of the classical water-filling power allocation for each link under an assumption that the power of each other link at each tone is 0.5mW. Besides, we consider the special case that only one tone can be utilized, which corresponds to a convex optimization problem as shown in [3].

For different numbers of links, we randomly pick up 100 channel realizations and give the averaged objective function values of Problem (5) under different power allocation approaches in Fig.2. It can be observed that, as the number of links increases, the co-channel interference become serious and thus the objective function value decreases for all approaches. Specifically, the proposed algorithm outperforms the other power allocation approaches for any number of links. In addition, different initializations of p^0 and T_k in the proposed algorithm are not critical to the performance. Moreover, the result indicates that the utilization of two tones can significantly improve the overall network utility compared with the utilization of only one tone.

We also evaluate the complexity of the proposed algorithm in terms of the number of iterations required to solve Problem (37). Fig.3 presents the averaged number of iterations for different numbers of links. It can be seen that the devised approach may converge to a local optimal point within 270 iterations. This complexity is relatively low because even solving a one-tone sum-rate maximization problem requires around 150 similar iterations for a ten-link case [5], [16]. Since the problem considered in this paper has double optimization variables and a more complex objective function, this slight increase of complexity is affordable. It can also been observed that the required number of iterations is not much sensitive to different initializations of p^0 and T_k .

Now, we focus on the influence of different initial points on the performance in the proposed algorithm. In particular, considering a five-link case, we randomly pick up 100 channel realizations and carry out ten experiments, where in each experiment we randomly generate an initial point p^0 and set T_k as $T_k = R_k(p^0)$ to implement the proposed algorithm in the 100 realizations. Then, the averaged objective function value of Problem (5) and the number of iterations are given in Fig.4. It can be seen that the maximum difference of objective




Fig. 2. Comparison of the objective function values under different methods.




Fig. 3. Average number of iterations in the proposed method versus number of links.

function values in different experiments is about 0.15 and the maximum difference of the iteration number is around 40. This implies that the proposed algorithm is insensitive to the initialization of p^0 in terms of both the objective value and the number of iterations.

VI. APPLICATIONS AND EXTENSIONS

In this section, we discuss the practical applications of this work and the extensions of the proposed algorithm.

A. Applications

The proposed power allocation method under a two-tone spectrum-sharing model has numerous applications. Here, we take a scenario of heterogeneous cellular networks (HetNets) as a representative to illustrate the applications.

Consider a downlink HetNet consisting of one macro cell and K-1 pico cells, where each cell involves a base station (BS) located at the center of the cell. As such, 'cell' and 'BS' are used interchangeably here. Without loss of generality, we




Fig. 4. Objective function values and numbers of iterations under different initial power allocations.

denote cell 1 the macro cell and cells $2, 3, \cdots, K$ the pico cells. We assume that each BS serves only one user and specifically, user k is served by cell k. Let us concentrate upon a unit duration of time, in which the first fraction of time with length τ_1 is the muting period and the remainder part with length τ_2 is the normal period $(\tau_1 + \tau_2 = 1)$. Notice that the macro cell is muting for protecting small cell users in the muting period, while all BSs are transmitting data to their users in the normal period. For simplicity, the muting period and the normal period are referred to as period 1 and period 2, respectively. The achievable rate of user k in period n n n n n n n is given by

$$R_k^n(\mathbf{p}) = \tau_n \ln \left(1 + \frac{p_k^n}{\sigma_k^n + \sum_{i=1, j \neq k}^K \alpha_{k,i}^n p_i^n} \right)$$
(39)

where p_k^n is the transmit power of BS k in period n, $\boldsymbol{p}=(p_1^1,p_2^1,\cdots,p_K^1,p_1^2,p_2^2,\cdots,p_K^2)^T$ is the power vector, σ_k^n is the normalized noise power of user k in period n and $\alpha_{k,j}^n$ is the normalized interference factor from BS j to user k in period n. Now, we get the mean rate of user k in the considered unit duration given by

$$R_k(\mathbf{p}) = \tau_1 R_k^1(\mathbf{p}) + \tau_2 R_k^2(\mathbf{p}).$$
 (40)

In this scenario, when τ_n are fixed for n=1,2, the power allocation issue for achieving proportional fairness can be formulated by the programming:

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{p}} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{K} \ln \left(\tau_1 R_k^1(\boldsymbol{p}) + \tau_2 R_k^2(\boldsymbol{p}) \right) \tag{41a}$$

s.t.
$$p_k^1, p_k^2 \ge 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, K$$
 (41b)

$$p_1^1 = 0$$
 (41c)

$$p_1 = 0$$
 (41c)
 $\tau_1 p_k^1 + \tau_2 p_k^2 \le Q_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$ (41d)

where Q_k is the power budget of BS k. It can be seen that Problem (41) is the same as Problem (5), only except the coefficients involved in users' rates in two periods, and the linearly transformed constraints (41c) and (41d). As a result, the complexity analysis and the proposed algorithm are valid in this situation.

B. Extensions

The proposed power allocation algorithm can be easily extended to a general N-tone case¹. Particularly, in an N-tone scenario, the achievable rate of link k can be expressed as

$$R_{k}(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \ln \left(1 + \frac{p_{k}^{n}}{\sigma_{k}^{n} + \sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_{k,j}^{n} p_{j}^{n}} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{N} \ln \left(\frac{\sigma_{k}^{n} + \sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_{k,j}^{n} p_{j}^{n}}{\sigma_{k}^{n} + \sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_{k,j}^{n} p_{j}^{n}} \right)$$

$$= g_{k}(\mathbf{p}) - h_{k}(\mathbf{p}),$$

$$(42)$$

where $g_k(\mathbf{p})$ and $h_k(\mathbf{p})$ are given by

$$g_k(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \ln \left(\sigma_k^n + \sum_j \alpha_{k,j}^n p_j^n \right)$$
 (43)

and

$$h_k(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \ln \left(\sigma_k^n + \sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_{k,j}^n p_j^n \right), \tag{44}$$

respectively. Apparently, both $g_k(\mathbf{p})$ and $h_k(\mathbf{p})$ are concave functions. As a result, only with replacements of $g_k(\mathbf{p})$ defined in (29) by (43) and $h_k(\mathbf{p})$ defined in (30) by (44), the proposed method can be applied directly.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this work, we proved that the power allocation problem, which is modeled as the sum-log-utility maximization in two-tone spectrum-sharing networks, is NP-hard. As a consequence, it is difficult to solve this problem in polynomial time. By formulating the objective function in a D.C. form, we devised a fast converging iterative algorithm that suboptimally solves the problem. An application of this work in HetNets and the extension of the proposed power allocation algorithm to general *N*-tone cases are also presented. Simulation results show that the proposed algorithm can efficiently lead to a satisfactory suboptimal solution.

REFERENCES

- L. P. Qian, Y. J. Zhang, and J. Huang, "MAPEL: Achieving global optimality for a non-convex wireless power control problem," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 1553–1563, Mar. 2009.
- [2] A. Gjendemsjø, D. Gesbert, G. Øien, and S. Kiani, "Binary power control for sum rate maximization over multiple interfering links," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 8, pp. 3164–3173, Aug. 2008.
- [3] Z.-Q. Luo and S. Zhang, "Dynamic spectrum management: Complexity and duality," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 57– 73. Feb. 2008.
- [4] K. Eriksson, S. Shi, N. Vucic, M. Schubert, and E. Larsson, "Globally optimal resource allocation for achieving maximum weighted sum rate," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM*, Dec. 2010, pp. 1–6.
- [5] H. Kha, H. Tuan, and H. Nguyen, "Fast global optimal power allocation in wireless networks by local D.C. programming," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 510–515, Feb. 2012.

¹Notice that the corresponding problem is convex when N=1, which has been proved by Luo and Zhang in [3].

- [6] J. Huang, R. Berry, and M. Honig, "Distributed interference compensation for wireless networks," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 1074–1084, May 2006.
- [7] M. Chiang, C.-W. Tan, D. Palomar, D. O'Neill, and D. Julian, "Power control by geometric programming," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 6, no. 7, pp. 2640–2651, Jul. 2007.
- [8] C. Guo, M. Sheng, X. Wang, and Y. Zhang, "Throughput maximization with short-term and long-term Jain's index constraints in downlink OFDMA systems," *IEEE Tran. Commun.*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 1503–1517, May 2014.
- [9] F. P. Kelly, A. K. Maulloo, and D. K. H. Tan, "Rate control for communication networks: shadow prices, proportional fairness and stability," *Journal of the Operational Research society*, pp. 237–252, 1998.
- [10] C. Guo, B. Liao, L. Huang, Q. Li, and X. Lin, "Convexity of fairness-aware resource allocation in wireless powered communication networks," *IEEE Commn. Lett.*, 2016, doi:10.1109/LCOMM.2016.2519344, to be published.
- [11] O. Goldreich, Computational complexity: A conceptual perspective. Cambridge University Press., 2008.
- [12] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, Convex Optimization. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [13] H. Tuy, Convex analysis and global optimization. Boston, MA: Kluwer, 1998.
- [14] Y. Li, M. Sheng, C. Yang, and X. Wang, "Energy efficiency and spectral efficiency tradeoff in interference-limited wireless networks," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 17, no. 10, pp. 1924–1927, Oct. 2013.
- [15] N. Vucic, S. Shi, and M. Schubert, "DC programming approach for resource allocation in wireless networks," in *Proc. WiOpt*, May 2010, pp. 380–386.
- [16] C. Guo, Y. Zhang, M. Sheng, X. Wang, and Y. Li, "α-fair power allocation in spectrum-sharing networks," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, 2015, doi: 10.1109/TVT.2015.2436068, to be published.



Chongtao Guo (S'13-M'14) received the B.S. degree in Electronic and Information Engineering in 2009 and the Ph.D. degree in Communication and Information Systems in 2014, both from Xidian University, Xi'an, China. Since 2014, he has been with the College of Information Engineering, Shenzhen University, where he is currently an Assistant Professor.

His currently research interests include resource allocation and interference management in spectrumsharing networks, heterogeneous cellular networks

and wireless powered communication networks.



and Signal Processing.

Bin Liao received the B.Eng. and M.Eng degrees from Xidian University, Xian, China, in 2006 and 2009, respectively, and received his Ph.D degree from The University of Hong Kong in 2013. From Sept. 2013 to Jan. 2014, he was a research assistant at The University of Hong Kong. He is now an assistant professor at Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, China. His main research interests are sensor array processing, adaptive filtering, convex optimization, with applications to radar and communications. He is an associate editor of Multidimensional Systems



Lei Huang (M'07-SM'14) was born in Guangdong, China. He received the B.Sc., M.Sc., and Ph.D. degrees in electronic engineering from Xidian University, Xian, China, in 2000, 2003, and 2005, respectively.

From 2005 to 2006, he was a Research Associate with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Duke University, Durham, NC. From 2009 to 2010, he was a Research Fellow with the Department of Electronic Engineering, City University of Hong Kong and a Research Associate with the

Department of Electronic Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. From 2011 to 2014, he was a Professor with the Department of Electronic and Information Engineering, Harbin Institute of Technology Shenzhen Graduate School. Since November 2014, he has joined the Department of Information Engineering, Shenzhen University, where he is currently a Chair Professor. His research interests include spectral estimation, array signal processing, statistical signal processing, and their applications in radar and wireless communication systems.

He is currently serving as an Associate Editor for IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing and Digital Signal Processing.



Peichang Zhang received his B.Eng. degree with first class honour in electronic engineering from the University of Central Lancashire, UK, in 2009 and his M.Sc degree with distinction in wireless communications from the University of Southampton, UK, in 2010. He received his Ph.D. degree with the Communications Research Group, Electronics and Computer Science, the University of Southampton, UK. He is now with the College of Information and Engineering, Shenzhen University. His research interests include massive MIMO, cooperative com-

munications, coherent and non-coherent detection, iterative detection, as well as channel estimation.



Min Huang received the B.S. and Ph.D degree in Electrical Communication from Xidian University, China, in 2008 and 2015, respectively. Now, he is working as a postdoctoral fellow in the Shenzhen Key Lab of Advanced Navigation Techniques, Shenzhen University. His research interest includes channel estimation, OFDM signal detection and compressive sensing algorithms.



Jihong Zhang received his B.Eng., M.Eng. and Ph.D. degrees from Southeast University, Nanjing, China in 1986, 1989 and 1992, respectively. From Nov. 1995 to Feb. 1996, he was a cooperative researcher in the University of Central Lancashire, UK. From Apr. 1997 to Nov. 1997, he was a cooperative researcher in Soka University, Japan. From May 2000 to Jun. 2000, he was a cooperative researcher in the University of Liverpool, UK. His research interests include artificial neural network, fuzzy logic, ant colony optimization and their appli-

cations in wireless communications and video image processing.