

Backscatter Modulation Design for Symbiotic Radio Networks




Fig. 1. For a passive tag, the rectifier and demodulator rely on the incident electromagnetic wave for energy harvesting and downlink information decoding, while the load-switcher manipulate the reradiated signal for backscatter modulation.

I. BACKSCATTER MODEL

A. Backscatter Principles

Consider a bistatic backscatter system that consists of an excitation source, a dedicated reader, and a passive tag. The excitation source generates a carrier wave signal, the dedicated reader decodes the tag message, and the tag simultaneously harvests energy, backscatters its own message, and demodulates the downlink information if necessary. As shown in Fig. 1(a), a typical passive tag consists of a scattering antenna, an energy harvester, a integrated receiver¹, a load-switching modulator, and on-chip components (e.g., micro-controller, memory, and sensors). A portion of the impinging signal is absorbed by the tag while the remaining is backscattered to the space, as illustrated in Fig. 1(b). According to Green's decomposition [2], the backscattered signal can be decomposed into the *structural mode* component and the *antenna mode* component. The former is fixed and depends on the antenna geometry and material properties², while the latter is adjustable and depends on the mismatch of the antenna and load impedance. Hence, the equivalent reflection coefficient at tag state i is defined as³

$$\Gamma_i = \frac{Z_i - Z_A^*}{Z_i + Z_A}, \quad (1)$$

where Z_i is the load impedance at state i and Z_A is the antenna input impedance.

Remark 1. The reflection coefficient plays an important role in various network designs. For example, $\Gamma_i = 0$ (perfect matching) achieves maximum power transfer that is optimal for Wireless Power Transfer (WPT), $|\Gamma_i| = 1$ (perfect mismatching) achieves fully signal reflection that is optimal for Intelligent

¹For example, [1] prototyped a compact-size pulse position demodulator based on an envelope detector, which brings great potential to coordination, synchronization, and reflection pattern control.

²We assume the structural mode reflection can be modeled as part of the environment multipath and covered by channel estimation [3].

³We assume the linear backscatter model where Γ_i is irrelevant to the incident electromagnetic field at the tag [4].




Fig. 2. A single-user single-tag symbiotic radio system.

Reflecting Surface (IRS), and $\Gamma_i \neq \Gamma_j$ (adjustable matching) enables backscatter modulation.

B. Backscatter Modulation

Tags perform backscatter modulation by switching the load impedance between different states. For M -ary Phase Shift Keying (PSK), the reflection coefficient Γ_i maps to the desired signal constellation point c_i as [5]

$$\Gamma_i = \alpha c_i = \alpha e^{j(\frac{2\pi i}{M} + \phi)}, \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ is the reflection efficiency at a given direction, and ϕ is a fixed phase offset.

Remark 2. For passive tags, the reflection efficiency α controls the tradeoff between the backscatter strength and harvestable power. Interestingly, when $\alpha = 1$, the reflection coefficient set $\{\Gamma_i\}$ of the M -PSK backscatter coincides with that of an ideal discrete M -state uniform IRS. The optimal strategy for the IRS is to choose one reflection state with probability 1 to boost the equivalent channel, while the optimal strategy for the modulator is to utilize all constellation points with equal probability. It inspires one to adaptively design the p.m.f. of tag symbols to jointly benefit the backscatter modulation and passive beamforming.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

As shown in Fig. 2, we propose a single-user (UE) single-tag (TG) symbiotic radio network where the RF signal generated by the single-antenna Access Point (AP) is shared by two coexisting systems. In the primary AP-UE downlink system, the AP transmits to the single-antenna user. In the secondary AP-TG-UE backscatter system, the AP acts as the carrier emitter, the user serves as the backscatter reader, and the single-antenna tag modulates its information over the reradiated RF signal by varying the reflection coefficient. Denote the AP-UE direct channel as h_D , the AP-TG forward channel as h_F , and the TG-UE backward channel as h_B . We consider the quasi-static block fading model and assume the CSI of the direct channel and the cascaded forward-backward channel

$h_C \triangleq h_B h_F$ are known at the AP.⁴ It is assumed that the primary symbol s follows standard CSCG distribution $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ and the secondary symbol c employs M -PSK modulation by (2). To provide a preliminary insight, we consider a parasitic symbiotic radio [9] where the primary and secondary symbol periods are equal.⁵ The user simultaneously captures the signal from both primary and secondary links as⁶

$$y = \sqrt{P}h_D s + \sqrt{\alpha P}h_C s c + n, \quad (3)$$

where P is the average transmit power of the AP and $n \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ is the additive white Gaussian noise.

Remark 3. *The symbiotic radio network can be regarded as a special case of Multiple Access Channel (MAC) because the AP and the tag simultaneously transmit to the user. It is known that Superposition Coding-Successive Interference Cancellation (SC-SIC) with different decoding orders can achieve different vertices of the MAC capacity region [12]. Therefore, most relevant papers proposed the user to decode the primary message first (by treating the tag interference as noise), cancel out its contribution from the received signal, then decode the secondary message. Since the direct channel is typically much stronger than the cascaded channel [13], the primary decoding is expected to enjoy a high Signal-to-Interference-and-Noise Ratio (SINR) and the secondary decoding is ideally interference-free.*

To investigate how backscatter modulation potentially benefits the primary transmission, we instead start decoding from the secondary link. Once the tag message is successfully recovered, by combining the backscattered symbol with the cascaded channel, the uncertainty of the AP-TG-UE path can be eliminated, and its contribution to primary transmission can be modeled within the equivalent AP-UE channel. This is reminiscent of IRS-aided point-to-point transmission. Overall, the passive tag not only embeds its own message in the reflection pattern, but also influences the legacy transmission.

Remark 4. *The main difference between symbiotic radio and conventional MAC is that the primary message also reaches the user from the backscatter link. This characteristic inspires one to decode the tag message first and model its contribution within the equivalent channel (i.e., unify backscatter decoding and channel training), instead of performing SIC. In such case, the primary transmission is able to achieve ergodic capacity with artificial channel variation created by the backscatter modulation.*

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Kim and B. Clerckx, "Wireless information and power transfer for iot: Pulse position modulation, integrated receiver, and experimental validation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08404*, pp. 1–15, 2021.

⁴Due to the lack of RF chains at the passive tag, accurate and efficient CSI acquisition at the AP can be challenging. One possible approach is that the AP sends known pilots, the tag responds in a pre-defined manner, and the user performs least-square estimation then feeds back to the AP [6]–[8].

⁵However, parasitic symbiotic radio requires fast tag-state switching and frequent synchronization, which can be challenging for passive tags.

⁶We assume the time difference of arrival from the AP-UE path and the AP-TG-UE path are negligible compared to the symbol period [9]–[11].

- [2] R. Hansen, "Relationships between antennas as scatterers and as radiators," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 77, no. 5, pp. 659–662, May 1989.
- [3] C. Boyer and S. Roy, "Backscatter communication and rfid: Coding, energy, and mimo analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 770–785, Mar. 2014.
- [4] D. M. Dobkin, *The RF in RFID: UHF RFID in Practice*. Newnes, 2012.
- [5] S. J. Thomas, E. Wheeler, J. Teizer, and M. S. Reynolds, "Quadrature amplitude modulated backscatter in passive and semipassive uhf rfid systems," *IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 1175–1182, Apr. 2012.
- [6] D. Bharadia, K. R. Joshi, M. Kotaru, and S. Katti, "Backfi: High throughput wifi backscatter," in *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Conference on Special Interest Group on Data Communication*, vol. 45, no. 4. New York, NY, USA: ACM, Aug. 2015, pp. 283–296.
- [7] G. Yang, C. K. Ho, and Y. L. Guan, "Multi-antenna wireless energy transfer for backscatter communication systems," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 33, no. 12, pp. 2974–2987, Dec. 2015.
- [8] H. Guo, Q. Zhang, S. Xiao, and Y.-C. Liang, "Exploiting multiple antennas for cognitive ambient backscatter communication," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 765–775, Feb. 2019.
- [9] R. Long, Y.-C. Liang, H. Guo, G. Yang, and R. Zhang, "Symbiotic radio: A new communication paradigm for passive internet of things," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 1350–1363, Feb. 2020.
- [10] H. Guo, Y. C. Liang, R. Long, and Q. Zhang, "Cooperative ambient backscatter system: A symbiotic radio paradigm for passive iot," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 1191–1194, 2019.
- [11] Y.-C. Liang, Q. Zhang, E. G. Larsson, and G. Y. Li, "Symbiotic radio: Cognitive backscattering communications for future wireless networks," *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 1242–1255, Dec. 2020.
- [12] A. Goldsmith, *Wireless Communications*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [13] O. Ozdogan, E. Bjornson, and E. G. Larsson, "Intelligent reflecting surfaces: Physics, propagation, and pathloss modeling," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 581–585, May 2020.