

Degrees of Freedom of Time Correlated MISO Broadcast Channel with Delayed CSIT

Sheng Yang, *Member, IEEE*, Mari Kobayashi, *Member, IEEE*,
David Gesbert, *Fellow, IEEE*, Xinping Yi, *Student Member, IEEE*

Abstract—We consider the time correlated multiple-input single-output (MISO) broadcast channel where the transmitter has imperfect knowledge of the current channel state, in addition to delayed channel state information. By representing the quality of the current channel state information as $P^{-\alpha}$ for the signal-to-noise ratio P and some constant $\alpha \geq 0$, we characterize the optimal degree of freedom region for this more general two-user MISO broadcast correlated channel. The essential ingredients of the proposed scheme lie in the quantization and multicast of the overheard interferences, while broadcasting new private messages. Our proposed scheme smoothly bridges between the scheme recently proposed by Maddah-Ali and Tse with no current state information and a simple zero-forcing beamforming with perfect current state information.

I. INTRODUCTION

In most practical scenarios, perfect channel state information at transmitter (CSIT) may not be available due to the time-varying nature of wireless channels as well as the limited resource for channel estimation. However, many wireless applications must guarantee high-data rate and reliable communication in the presence of channel uncertainty. In this paper, we consider such a scenario in the context of the two-user multiple-input single-output (MISO) broadcast channel, where the transmitter equipped with m antennas ($m \geq 2$) wishes to send two private messages to two receivers each with a single antenna. The discrete time signal model is given by

$$y_t = \mathbf{h}_t^H \mathbf{x}_t + \varepsilon_t, \quad (1a)$$

$$z_t = \mathbf{g}_t^H \mathbf{x}_t + \omega_t, \quad (1b)$$

for any time instant t , where $\mathbf{h}_t, \mathbf{g}_t \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times 1}$ are the channel vectors for user 1 and user 2, respectively; $\varepsilon_t, \omega_t \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1)$ are normalized additive white Gaussian noises (AWGN) at the respective receivers; the input signal \mathbf{x}_t is subject to the power constraint $\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2) \leq P, \forall t$.

For the case of perfect CSIT, the optimal degrees of freedom (DoF) of this channel is two and achieved by linear

strategies such as zero-forcing (ZF) beamforming. When the transmitter suffers from constant inaccuracy of channel estimation, it has been shown in [1] that the degrees of freedom per user is upper-bounded by $\frac{2}{3}$, whereas the highest known achievable DoF value, also conjectured to be optimal, is only $\frac{1}{2}$. It is also well known that the full multiplexing gain can be maintained under imperfect CSIT if the error in CSIT decreases as $O(P^{-1})$ as P grows [2]. Moreover, for the case of the temporally correlated fading channel such that the transmitter can predict the current state with error decaying as $O(P^{-\alpha})$ for some constant $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, ZF can only achieve a fraction α of the optimal degrees of freedom [2]. This result somehow reveals the bottleneck of a family of precoding schemes relying only on instantaneous CSIT as the temporal correlation decreases ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$). Recently, a breakthrough has been made in order to overcome this problem. In [3], Maddah-Ali and Tse showed a surprising result that even completely outdated CSIT can be very useful in terms of degrees of freedom, as long as it is accurate. For a system with $m \geq 2$ antennas and two users, the proposed scheme in [3], hereafter called MAT, achieves the multiplexing gain of $\frac{2}{3}$ per user, irrespectively of the temporal correlation. The role of perfect delayed CSIT can be re-interpreted as a feedback of the past signal/interference heard by the receivers. This side information enables the transmitter to perform “retrospective” alignment in the space *and* time domain, as demonstrated in different multiuser network systems (see [4] and the references therein). Despite its DoF optimality, the MAT scheme is designed assuming the worst case scenario where the delayed channel feedback provides no information about the current channel state. This assumption is over pessimistic as most practical channels exhibit some form of temporal correlation. In fact, it readily follows that the selection strategy between ZF and MAT yields the degrees of freedom of $\max\{\alpha, \frac{2}{3}\}$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. For either quasi-static fading channel ($\alpha \geq 1$) or very fast channels ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$), a selection approach is reasonable. However, for intermediate ranges of temporal correlation ($0 < \alpha < 1$), a fundamental question arises as to whether a better way of exploiting both delayed CSIT and current (imperfect) CSIT exists. Studying the DoF under such a CSIT assumption is of practical and theoretical interest.

The main contributions of this work are summarized in the following. First, we establish an outer bound on the DoF region of the two-user broadcast channel with perfect delayed and imperfect current state information. To that end, we use two powerful tools: the genie-aided model and the extremal inequality [5], [6]. Then, we propose a novel scheme that

Manuscript submitted to IEEE Transactions on Information Theory in March 2012, revised in August 2012.

S. Yang and M. Kobayashi are with the Telecommunications department of SUPELEC, 3 rue Joliot-Curie, 91190 Gif-sur-Yvette, France. (e-mail: {sheng.yang, mari.kobayashi}@supelec.fr)

D. Gesbert and X. Yi are with EURECOM, Sophia-Antipolis, France. (e-mail: {david.gesbert, xinpings.yi}@eurecom.fr)

This work was partially supported by HIATUS and the ANR project FIREFLIES (ANR-10-INTB-0302). The project HIATUS acknowledges the financial support of the Future and Emerging Technologies (FET) programme within the Seventh Framework Programme for Research of the European Commission under FET-Open grant number: 265578.

Parts of the results have been presented in IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, Boston, USA, July 2012.

optimally combines the ZF spatial precoding, based on the imperfect current state information, and the MAT space-time alignment, based on the perfect past state information. The key of this scheme is the digital transmission of the overheard interference, which replaces the analog one initially considered in the MAT alignment [3]. The role of spatial precoding, exploiting current CSIT, is two-fold:

- It enables to reduce the power of overheard interferences in the MAT alignment. This power reduction then saves, via source compression/quantization, the resource related to the transmission of the overheard interferences.
- It allows for the parallel transmission of two private messages on top of the multicast of overheard interferences as common message.

It will be shown that the proposed scheme achieves the upper bound of the symmetric DoF

$$d_{\text{sym}} = \frac{2 + \alpha}{3}, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1]$$

given by the converse. To achieve the other corner points of the region, we show that delayed CSIT is not necessary and the optimal strategy is a combination of rate-splitting, spatial precoding with imperfect current CSI, and superposition coding. Specifically, we split one of the users' message into two parts and broadcast one part of it as common message. The other part and the message of the other user are then superimposed over the common message and broadcast with spatial precoding. As an extension to the main result, we derive the optimal DoF region of the same channel with common message. Another extension is the achievable DoF region when only imperfect delayed CSIT is available (e.g., due to limited feedback rates). Finally, in addition to the results on the optimal DoF region, we provide the exact achievable rate regions of the proposed schemes in the appendix.

At the time of submission, a parallel independent work [7] was brought to our attention which also builds on our initial results reported in [8]. In [7], the authors consider an i.i.d. fading model in which the transmitter knows perfectly the past channel states and imperfectly the current channel state. Their achievability proof coincides with our optimal scheme, while the outer bound is derived differently by establishing an equivalent compound channel. It is worth noting that the outer bound technique developed in [7] does not rely on any essential statistical equivalence of the two users' channel vector directions, which is stronger than both the original result of [3] as well as the result in this work (that exploits the isotropic property of the estimation error). On the other hand, our model allows temporal correlations of the channel coefficients and is therefore stronger than both the original result [3] and [7] in that sense. Thus, while both [7] and the current work generalize [3], neither subsumes the other.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, after presenting the assumptions and some basic definitions of our model, we provide our main theorem on the optimal DoF region. The above contributions are then presented in order. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section VI. Detailed proofs are deferred to the appendix.

Throughout the paper, we will use the following notations. Matrix transpose, Hermitian transpose, inverse, and determinant are denoted by \mathbf{A}^\top , \mathbf{A}^H , \mathbf{A}^{-1} , and $\det(\mathbf{A})$, respectively. \mathbf{x}^\perp is any nonzero vector such that $\mathbf{x}^H \mathbf{x}^\perp = 0$. Logarithm is in base 2. Partial ordering of Hermitian matrices is denoted by \succeq and \preceq , i.e., $\mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B}$ means $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$ is positive semidefinite. We use $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}$ to denote a projection matrix on the direction given by \mathbf{x} , i.e., $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}} \triangleq \frac{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^H}{\|\mathbf{x}\|^2}$.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND MAIN RESULTS

The signal model of this paper is defined by (1a) and (1b). For convenience, we provide the following definition.

Definition 1 (channel states): The channel vectors \mathbf{h}_t and \mathbf{g}_t are called the states of the channel at instant t . For simplicity, we also define the state matrix \mathbf{S}_t as $\mathbf{S}_t \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_t^H \\ \mathbf{g}_t^H \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}$ where \mathcal{S} is the set of all possible states.

The assumptions on the knowledge of the channel states and the fading process are summarized as follows.

Assumption 1 (perfect delayed and imperfect current CSI): At each time instant t , the transmitter knows the delayed channel states up to instant $t - 1$. In addition, the transmitter can somehow obtain an estimate $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_t \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}$ of the current channel state \mathbf{S}_t , i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_t$ and $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$ are available to the transmitter with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}_t &= \hat{\mathbf{h}}_t + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t, \\ \mathbf{g}_t &= \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t + \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t \end{aligned}$$

where the estimate $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_t$ (also $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$) and estimation error $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t$ (also $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t$) are uncorrelated and both assumed to be zero mean with covariance $(1 - \sigma^2)\mathbf{I}_m$ and $\sigma^2\mathbf{I}_m$, respectively, with $\sigma^2 \leq 1$. The receivers know perfectly all states $\{\mathbf{S}_t\}$ and $\{\hat{\mathbf{S}}_t\}$.

Assumption 2 (fading process): The processes $\{\hat{\mathbf{S}}_t\}$, $\{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_t\}$, and thus $\{\mathbf{S}_t\}$ are stationary and ergodic. Moreover, for any time instant t , we assume the following:

- 1) $\text{rank}(\mathbf{S}_t) = 2$ with probability 1 and $\mathbb{E}(\log \det(\mathbf{S}_t \mathbf{S}_t^H)) > -\infty$.
- 2) We have the Markov chain

$$(\hat{\mathbf{S}}^{t-1}, \mathbf{S}^{t-1}) \leftrightarrow \hat{\mathbf{S}}_t \leftrightarrow \mathbf{S}_t. \quad (2)$$

- 3) The estimation error is isotropic, i.e., the distributions of $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t$ conditional on $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_t$ are invariant under unitary transformations. Furthermore, for any $\sigma^2 > 0$, $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{S}}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_t} \left(\log \frac{|\tilde{h}_{t,i}|^2}{\sigma^2} \right)$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{S}}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_t} \left(\log \frac{|\tilde{g}_{t,i}|^2}{\sigma^2} \right)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, are finite.

Note that when $\{\hat{\mathbf{S}}_t\}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_t\}$ are independent Rayleigh fading processes with independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) entries, all the above assumptions are verified. Without loss of generality, we implicitly assume that $\sigma^2 > 0$ in the rest of the paper. The case with $\sigma^2 = 0$ corresponds to the case of perfect CSIT, in which the capacity region is already known. Then, we can introduce a parameter $\alpha_P \geq 0$ as the power exponent of the estimation error

$$\alpha_P \triangleq -\frac{\log(\sigma^2)}{\log P}.$$

The parameter α_P can be regarded as the quality of the current CSIT in the high SNR regime. Note that $\alpha_P = 0$ corresponds

to the case with no current CSIT at all, while $\alpha_P \rightarrow \infty$ corresponds to the case with perfect current CSIT. In addition, we assume that $\lim_{P \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_P$ exists and define

$$\alpha \triangleq \lim_{P \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_P.$$

Hereafter, we use α instead of α_P , whenever no confusion is likely. In addition, since $\alpha > 1$ implies that the estimation noise is negligible as compared to the AWGN and can be regarded as perfect from the DoF perspective, we assume implicitly that the value of $\alpha > 1$ is truncated at 1 wherever applicable. Connections between the above model and practical time correlated models are highlighted in Section V.

Definition 2 (achievable degrees of freedom): A code for the two-user Gaussian MISO broadcast channel with delayed CSIT and imperfect current CSIT is defined as follows:

- A sequence of encoders at time t is given by $F_t : \mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2 \times \mathcal{S}^{t-1} \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}^t \mapsto \mathbb{C}^m$ where the messages W_1 and W_2 are uniformly distributed over the message sets \mathcal{W}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 , respectively.
- A decoder for user k is given by the mapping $\hat{W}_k : \mathbb{C}^{1 \times n} \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}^n \mapsto \mathcal{W}_k$, $k = 1, 2$.

The DoF pair (d_1, d_2) is said to be *achievable* if there exists a code that simultaneously satisfies the reliability condition

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr\{W_k \neq \hat{W}_k\} = 0,$$

and has a pre-log factor of the rate

$$\lim_{P \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_2 |W_k(n, P)|}{n \log_2 P} \geq d_k, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

The union of all achievable DoF pairs is then called the optimal DoF region of the Gaussian MISO broadcast channel.

The main result of this paper is stated below.

Theorem 1: The optimal degrees of freedom region of the two-user Gaussian MISO broadcast channel with perfect delayed and imperfect current CSIT is characterized by

$$d_1 \leq 1, \quad (3a)$$

$$d_2 \leq 1, \quad (3b)$$

$$d_1 + 2d_2 \leq 2 + \alpha, \quad (3c)$$

$$2d_1 + d_2 \leq 2 + \alpha. \quad (3d)$$

As shown in Fig. 1, the DoF region is a polygon characterized by the vertices: $(0, 1)$, $(\alpha, 1)$, $(\frac{2+\alpha}{3}, \frac{2+\alpha}{3})$, $(1, \alpha)$, $(1, 0)$. Note that the region collapses to the MAT region [3] when the quality of current CSIT is poor ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$), whereas it grows smoothly towards the DoF region with perfect CSIT when α increases. In the following sections, we start with the converse proof by establishing outer bounds. Then, we propose schemes that achieve the corner points of the region.

III. CONVERSE

In this section, we establish the converse proof of the main result. Before going into the details, we would like to point out the essential elements of the upcoming proof:

- Genie-aided model: construct a degraded broadcast channel, as in [3].




Fig. 1. DoF region of a two-user MISO channel with perfect delayed and imperfect current CSI at the transmitter. The estimation error of the current state scales as $P^{-\alpha}$.

- Extremal inequality: bound the weighted difference of differential entropies [5].
- Isotropic property of the channel uncertainty: tight upper bound on the pre-log factor.

First, let us consider the genie-aided model where the genie provides the received signal $\{z_i\}$ of user 2 to user 1. This is a degraded broadcast channel $X \leftrightarrow (Y, Z) \leftrightarrow Z$. Therefore, we have the following upper bounds on the rates (R_1, R_2) :

$$\begin{aligned} nR_1 &\leq H(W_1) \\ &= H(W_1 | S^n, \hat{S}^n) \\ &= I(W_1; Y^n, Z^n | S^n, \hat{S}^n) + n\epsilon_n \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq I(W_1; Y^n, Z^n, W_2 | S^n, \hat{S}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &= I(W_1; Y^n, Z^n | S^n, \hat{S}^n, W_2) + n\epsilon_n \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n I(W_1; Y_i, Z_i | Y^{i-1}, Z^{i-1}, S^n, \hat{S}^n, W_2) + n\epsilon_n \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i; Y_i, Z_i | Y^{i-1}, Z^{i-1}, S^n, \hat{S}^n, W_2) + n\epsilon_n \quad (5)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i; Y_i, Z_i | Y^{i-1}, Z^{i-1}, S^i, \hat{S}^i, W_2) + n\epsilon_n \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{i=1}^n (h(Y_i, Z_i | Y^{i-1}, Z^{i-1}, S^i, \hat{S}^i, W_2) \\ &\quad - h(Y_i, Z_i | X_i, Y^{i-1}, Z^{i-1}, S^i, \hat{S}^i, W_2)) + n\epsilon_n \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n (h(Y_i, Z_i | T_i, S_i) - h(E_i, \Omega_i)) + n\epsilon_n$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^n h(Y_i, Z_i | T_i, S_i) + n\epsilon_n \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
nR_2 &\leq H(W_2) \\
&\leq I(W_2; Z^n | S^n, \hat{S}^n) + n\epsilon_n \quad (8) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n I(W_2; Z_i | Z^{i-1}, S^i, \hat{S}^i) + n\epsilon_n \quad (9) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (h(Z_i | Z^{i-1}, S^i, \hat{S}^i) \\
&\quad - h(Z_i | Z^{i-1}, S^i, \hat{S}^i, W_2)) + n\epsilon_n \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n (h(Z_i | S_i) \\
&\quad - h(Z_i | Y^{i-1}, Z^{i-1}, S^i, \hat{S}^i, W_2)) + n\epsilon_n \quad (10) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (h(Z_i | S_i) - h(Z_i | T_i, S_i)) + n\epsilon_n \quad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

where we define $T_i \triangleq (Y^{i-1}, Z^{i-1}, S^{i-1}, \hat{S}^i, W_2)$. Note that the above chains of inequalities follow closely Gallager's proof for the degraded broadcast channel [9] (also see [10]), with the integration of the channel states. In particular, (4) and (8) are from Fano's inequality; (5) is from the data processing inequality; (6) holds because the input X_i and the outputs (Y_i, Z_i) of the channel at instant i do not depend on the future states given the past and current states; (9) results from the same reasoning and the chain rule of mutual information; (7) is from the non-negativity of the differential entropy of unit-variance AWGN, i.e., $h(E_i, \Omega_i) \geq 0$; (10) holds since removing (resp. adding) conditions does not decrease (resp. increase) differential entropy. In the following, we would like to obtain an upper bound on $R_1 + 2R_2$. From (7) and (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
n(R_1 + 2R_2) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n (2h(Z_i | S_i) + h(Y_i, Z_i | T_i, S_i) \\
&\quad - 2h(Z_i | T_i, S_i)) + 3n\epsilon_n. \quad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we can upper-bound each term in the above summation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&2h(Z_i | S_i) + h(Y_i, Z_i | T_i, S_i) - 2h(Z_i | T_i, S_i) \\
&\leq \max_{P_{T_i} P_{X_i | T_i}} (2h(Z_i | S_i) \\
&\quad + h(Y_i, Z_i | T_i, S_i) - 2h(Z_i | T_i, S_i)) \\
&\leq \max_{P_{T_i} P_{X_i | T_i}} 2h(Z_i | S_i) \\
&\quad + \max_{P_{T_i} P_{X_i | T_i}} (h(Y_i, Z_i | T_i, S_i) - 2h(Z_i | T_i, S_i)). \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

The first maximization can be upper-bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{P_{T_i} P_{X_i | T_i}} 2h(Z_i | S_i) &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_{G_i} \left(\max_{P_{X_i | G_i = g_i}} h(\mathbf{g}_i^H X_i + E_i) \right) \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{E}_{G_i} (\log(1 + P\|\mathbf{g}_i\|^2)) \\
&\leq 2\log P + O(1) \quad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

where, to get the first inequality, we put the maximization into the expectation; the second inequality is from the fact that Gaussian distribution maximizes differential entropy under the covariance constraint, that the logarithmic function is monotonically increasing, and that the following partial ordering holds $\text{Cov}(X_i | \mathbf{g}_i) \preceq \text{Cov}(X_i) \preceq P\mathbf{I}$; the last one is from

Jensen's inequality. The second maximization in (13) can also be bounded, but in a slightly more involved way, as shown in (15)-(20) on the top of next page. We get (15) by putting one of the maximizations into the expectation, which does not decrease the value; in (16), we define $N_i \triangleq [E_i \ \Omega_i]^T$; (17) is obtained by splitting one maximization into two, one with the trace constraint and the other with the covariance constraint; (18) is from the fact that with covariance constraint, Gaussian distribution maximizes the weighted difference of two differential entropies, given that i) S_i is independent of X_i conditional on $T_i = (Y^{i-1}, Z^{i-1}, S^{i-1}, \hat{S}^i, W_2)$ due to the Markovian (2) and the fact that X_i is a function of the messages (W_1, W_2) , the past states S^{i-1} , and the estimates up to the current state \hat{S}^i , and that ii) Y_i is a degraded version of (Y_i, Z_i) ; this is an application of the extremal inequality [5], [6]; note that $\mathbf{K}_* \preceq \mathbf{C}$ is defined as the optimal covariance for the inner maximization; (19) holds because any \mathbf{K} such that $0 \preceq \mathbf{K} \preceq \mathbf{C}$ with $\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}) \leq P$ belongs to the set $\{\mathbf{K} : \mathbf{K} \succeq 0, \text{tr}(\mathbf{K}) \leq P\}$, and that the whole term only depends on \hat{S}_i ; the last inequality is from the fact that $\det(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \leq (1 + a_{11})(1 + a_{22})$ for any $\mathbf{A} \triangleq [a_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \succeq \mathbf{0}$.

Lemma 1: For any given $\mathbf{K} \succeq 0$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{S_i | \hat{S}_i} (\log(1 + \mathbf{h}_i^H \mathbf{K} \mathbf{h}_i)) \leq \log(1 + \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i\|^2 \lambda_1) + O(1), \quad (21)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{S_i | \hat{S}_i} (\log(1 + \mathbf{g}_i^H \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g}_i)) \geq \log(1 + 2^\gamma \sigma^2 \lambda_1) + O(1), \quad (22)$$

with

$$\gamma \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{S}_i | S_i} \left(\log \frac{|\tilde{g}_{i,1}|^2}{\sigma^2} \right).$$

Proof: See Appendix A. ■

It is worth noting that γ is finite according to Assumption 2. Therefore, 2^γ is a strictly positive and bounded value that can be regarded as constant as far as the DoF is concerned. From Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{S_i | \hat{S}_i} (\log(1 + \mathbf{h}_i^H \mathbf{K} \mathbf{h}_i) - \log(1 + \mathbf{g}_i^H \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g}_i)) \\
&\leq \log \frac{1 + \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i\|^2 \lambda_1}{1 + 2^\gamma \sigma^2 \lambda_1} + O(1) \\
&\leq \log \left(1 + \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i\|^2}{2^\gamma \sigma^2} \right) + O(1) \quad (23) \\
&\leq -\log(\sigma^2) + \log(2^\gamma \sigma^2 + \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i\|^2) + O(1) \quad (24)
\end{aligned}$$

where (23) is from the fact that $\log \frac{1+ax}{1+bx} \leq \log(1+\frac{a}{b})$, $\forall a, x \geq 0, b > 0$. Note that the above upper bound does not depend on \mathbf{K} . From (20) and (24) and by noticing that $\sigma^2 \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{P_{T_i} P_{X_i | T_i}} (h(Y_i, Z_i | T_i, S_i) - 2h(Z_i | T_i, S_i)) \\
&\leq \alpha \log P + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{S}_i} (\log(2^\gamma + \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i\|^2)) + O(1) \\
&= \alpha \log P + O(1). \quad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

From (12), (14), (25), and by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$R_1 + 2R_2 \leq (2 + \alpha) \log P + O(1),$$

from which we obtain (3c) by dividing both sides of the above inequality by $\log P$ and tending $P \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, from (11)

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{P_{T_i} P_{X_i|T_i}} (h(Y_i, Z_i | T_i, S_i) - 2h(Z_i | T_i, S_i)) \\ & \leq \max_{P_{T_i}} \mathbb{E}_{T_i} \left(\max_{P_{X_i|T_i}} (h(Y_i, Z_i | T_i = T, S_i) - 2h(Z_i | T_i = T, S_i)) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \max_{P_{T_i}} \mathbb{E}_{T_i} \left(\max_{P_{X_i|T_i}} \mathbb{E}_{S_i|T_i} (h(Y_i, Z_i | T_i = T, S_i = \mathbf{S}_i) - 2h(Z_i | T_i = T, S_i = \mathbf{S}_i)) \right) \\ & = \max_{P_{T_i}} \mathbb{E}_{T_i} \left(\max_{P_{X_i|T_i}} \mathbb{E}_{S_i|\hat{S}_i} (h(\mathbf{S}_i X_i + N_i | T_i = T) - 2h(\mathbf{g}_i^H X_i + E_i | T_i = T)) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

$$= \max_{P_{T_i}} \mathbb{E}_{T_i} \left(\max_{\mathbf{C}: \mathbf{C} \succeq 0, \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}) \leq P} \max_{\substack{P_{X_i|T_i}: \\ \text{Cov}(X_i|T_i) \preceq \mathbf{C}}} \mathbb{E}_{S_i|\hat{S}_i} (h(\mathbf{S}_i X_i + N_i | T_i = T) - 2h(\mathbf{g}_i^H X_i + E_i | T_i = T)) \right) \quad (17)$$

$$= \max_{P_{T_i}} \mathbb{E}_{T_i} \left(\max_{\mathbf{C}: \mathbf{C} \succeq 0, \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}) \leq P} \mathbb{E}_{S_i|\hat{S}_i} (\log \det(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S}_i^H) - 2 \log(1 + \mathbf{g}_i^H \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g}_i)) \right) \quad (18)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{S}_i} \left(\max_{\mathbf{K}: \mathbf{K} \succeq 0, \text{tr}(\mathbf{K}) \leq P} \mathbb{E}_{S_i|\hat{S}_i} (\log \det(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S}_i^H) - 2 \log(1 + \mathbf{g}_i^H \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g}_i)) \right) \quad (19)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{S}_i} \left(\max_{\mathbf{K}: \mathbf{K} \succeq 0, \text{tr}(\mathbf{K}) \leq P} \mathbb{E}_{S_i|\hat{S}_i} (\log(1 + \mathbf{h}_i^H \mathbf{K} \mathbf{h}_i) - \log(1 + \mathbf{g}_i^H \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g}_i)) \right) \quad (20)$$

and (14), and by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$R_2 \leq \log P + O(1),$$

from which the single user bound (3b) follows immediately. To obtain (3a) and (3d), we can use the genie-aided model in which receiver 2 is helped by the genie and has perfect knowledge of y_t . Due to the symmetry, the same reasoning as above can be applied by swapping the roles of receiver 1 and receiver 2. The converse part is thus completed.

Remark 3.1: In a nutshell, the converse proof can be summarized as follows, in terms of the essential elements mentioned at the beginning of this section. First, the ‘‘degraded’’ property enables the use of the extremal inequality (cf. (17) and (18)). Then, the latter provides a closed-form upper bound given by the Gaussian distribution (cf. (20)). Finally, the isotropic property of the channel uncertainty is exploited only at the end of the proof, to bound the expectation of the logarithmic function (cf. (22)).

IV. ACHIEVABILITY

To show the achievability of the whole region, it is enough to show that all corner points in Fig. 1 are achievable. Note that the extreme points (1, 0) and (0, 1) can be trivially achieved by serving only one of the users. The rest of the section is devoted to proving the achievability of $(1, \alpha)$, $(\alpha, 1)$, and $(\frac{2+\alpha}{3}, \frac{2+\alpha}{3})$. Since the DoF region does not depend on the number of transmit antennas m , $\forall m \geq 2$, it is enough to prove the achievability for the case $m = 2$ which is assumed implicitly in this section. The exact achievable rate region from which the DoF can be derived in a more rigorous way is provided in the appendix.

A. Achieving $(1, \alpha)$ and $(\alpha, 1)$

One of the key elements to achieve the three corner points is broadcasting with common message in the presence of

imperfect current CSIT. The following result is crucial and will be repeatedly used in the proofs.

Lemma 2 (broadcast channel with common message):

Let (R_c, R_{p1}, R_{p2}) be the rate of common message, private message for user 1, and private message for user 2, respectively. Furthermore, we let (d_c, d_{p1}, d_{p2}) be the corresponding DoF. Then, there exists a family of codes $\{\mathcal{X}_c(P), \mathcal{X}_{p1}(P), \mathcal{X}_{p2}(P)\}$, such that

$$d_c = 1 - \alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad d_{p1} = d_{p2} = \alpha$$

are achievable simultaneously.

A sketch of proof is as follows, with more details given in Appendix B. Let us consider a single channel use with a superposition scheme: $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_c + \mathbf{x}_{p1} + \mathbf{x}_{p2}$ with precoding such that $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_{p1} \mathbf{x}_{p1}^H) = \frac{P_p}{2} \mathbf{\Psi}_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}^\perp}$ and $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_{p2} \mathbf{x}_{p2}^H) = \frac{P_p}{2} \mathbf{\Psi}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}^\perp}$. We set the power $P_p \sim P^\alpha$ such that the private signals are drowned by the AWGN at the unintended receivers while remaining the level P^α at the intended receivers. The power of the common signal is $P_c = \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{x}_c\|^2) \sim P$. The decoding is performed as follows. At each receiver, the common message is decoded first by treating the private signals as noise. The signal-to-interference-and-noise ratio (SINR) is approximately $P_c/P_p \sim P^{1-\alpha}$, from which the achievability of $d_c = 1 - \alpha$ is shown. Then, each receiver decodes their own private messages, after removing the decoded common message. The SINR for the private message being approximately P^α , $d_{pk} = \alpha$ is thus achievable for user k , $k = 1, 2$.

From the above lemma, the achievability of $(1, \alpha)$ is straightforward. Let W_1 and W_2 be the messages for user 1 and user 2, respectively. Assuming that the DoF are respectively d_1 and d_2 , we can split user 1’s message as $W_1 = (W_{10}, W_{11})$ with the corresponding rate-splitting $d_1 = d_{10} + d_{11}$. Then, (W_{10}, W_{11}, W_2) are broadcast to both users with W_{10} as common message. According to Lemma 2, (W_{10}, W_{11}) and (W_{10}, W_2) can be recovered by user 1 and user 2, respectively,

as long as

$$d_{10} \leq 1 - \alpha, \quad d_{11} \leq \alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad d_2 \leq \alpha$$

which implies $d_1 = d_{10} + d_{11} \leq 1$ and $d_2 \leq \alpha$ are achievable simultaneously. Similarly, $(\alpha, 1)$ can also be achieved by the same scheme with rate-splitting over user 2's message.

The proposed scheme, hereafter referred to as rate-splitting (RS), achieves both corner points $(1, \alpha)$ and $(\alpha, 1)$ with only current CSIT and without delayed CSIT at all. A sum DoF of $1 + \alpha$ is thus attained. The idea is closely related to the Han-Kobayashi scheme [11] for the two-user interference channel where each receiver can decode and then eliminate the common part of the interfering signal to achieve a higher rate. Therefore, the common message in our RS scheme is desirable for only one of the users but is decodable by both users.

B. Achieving the symmetric corner point $(\frac{2+\alpha}{3}, \frac{2+\alpha}{3})$

In the following, we show that exploiting both current and delayed CSIT, the symmetric corner point $(\frac{2+\alpha}{3}, \frac{2+\alpha}{3})$ can be achieved. It provides a sum DoF of $\frac{2(2+\alpha)}{3}$ that is strictly larger than $1 + \alpha$ for $\alpha < 1$. Since this scheme builds on the MAT scheme, we briefly review it first.

1) *MAT alignment revisited*: In the two-user MISO case, the original MAT is a three-slot scheme, described by the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_1 &= \mathbf{u} & \mathbf{x}_2 &= \mathbf{v} & \mathbf{x}_3 &= [\mathbf{g}_1^H \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{h}_2^H \mathbf{v} \quad 0]^T \\ y_1 &= \mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{u} & y_2 &= \mathbf{h}_2^H \mathbf{v} & y_3 &= h_{31}^* (\mathbf{g}_1^H \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{h}_2^H \mathbf{v}) \\ z_1 &= \mathbf{g}_1^H \mathbf{u} & z_2 &= \mathbf{g}_2^H \mathbf{v} & z_3 &= g_{31}^* (\mathbf{g}_1^H \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{h}_2^H \mathbf{v}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times 1}$, $y_t, z_t \in \mathbb{C}$ are the transmitted signal, received signals at user 1 and user 2, respectively, at time slot t ; $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times 1}$ are useful signals to user 1 and user 2, respectively; for simplicity, we omit the noise in the received signals. The idea of the MAT scheme is to use delayed CSIT to align the mutual interference into a one-dimensional subspace ($\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{v}$ for user 1 and $\mathbf{g}_1^H \mathbf{u}$ for user 2). And importantly, the interference is reduced without sacrificing the dimension of the useful signals. Specifically, a two-dimensional interference-free observation of \mathbf{u} (resp. \mathbf{v}) is obtained at receiver 1 (resp. receiver 2).

Interestingly, the alignment can be done in a different manner.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_1 &= \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v} & \mathbf{x}_2 &= [\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{v} \quad 0]^T & \mathbf{x}_3 &= [\mathbf{g}_1^H \mathbf{u} \quad 0]^T \\ y_1 &= \mathbf{h}_1^H (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) & y_2 &= h_{21}^* \mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{v} & y_3 &= h_{31}^* \mathbf{g}_1^H \mathbf{u} \\ z_1 &= \mathbf{g}_1^H (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) & z_2 &= g_{21}^* \mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{v} & z_3 &= g_{31}^* \mathbf{g}_1^H \mathbf{u} \end{aligned}$$

In the first slot, the transmitter sends the private signals to both users by simply superposing them. In the second slot, the transmitter sends the interference overheard by receiver 1 in the first slot. The role of this stage is two-fold: *resolving interference for user 1 and reinforcing signal for user 2*. In the third slot, the transmitter sends the interference overheard by user 2 to help both users the other way around. In summary, this variant of the MAT scheme consists of two phases: i) broadcast of the private signals, and ii) multicast of the overheard interferences. At the end of three time slots, the observations

at the receivers are given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ y_3 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_1^H \\ 0 \\ h_{31}^* \mathbf{g}_1^H \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{rank}=2} \mathbf{u} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_1^H \\ h_{21}^* \mathbf{h}_1^H \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{rank}=1} \mathbf{v},$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ z_3 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{g}_1^H \\ g_{21}^* \mathbf{h}_1^H \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{rank}=2} \mathbf{v} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{g}_1^H \\ 0 \\ g_{31}^* \mathbf{g}_1^H \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{rank}=1} \mathbf{u}.$$

For each user, the useful signal lies in a two-dimensional subspace while the interference is aligned in a one-dimensional subspace. It readily follows that this variant enables each user to achieve two degrees of freedom in the three-dimensional time space as for the original MAT scheme. Although the original and variant schemes are equivalent from the point of the space-time alignment, they differ conceptually in the way how the ‘‘order-two’’ symbols are delivered. More precisely, the variant spends two slots to deliver two separate symbols: the interferences overheard by user 1 and user 2, denoted by

$$\eta_1 \triangleq \mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{v} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_2 \triangleq \mathbf{g}_1^H \mathbf{u},$$

while the original MAT spends a single slot to deliver one symbol $\mathbf{h}_2^H \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{g}_1^H \mathbf{u}$.

2) *Proposed scheme*: Based on the above variant of the MAT alignment, we propose a new scheme that exploits optimally both the perfect delayed and imperfect current CSIT. Before proceeding further, we would like to highlight the main ideas as compared to the MAT alignment (Fig. 2):

- Spatial precoding and power allocation in the first slot: $1 + (1 - \alpha) = 2 - \alpha$ instead of two streams are broadcast.
- Digitizing the overheard interferences (η_1, η_2) in approximately $2(1 - \alpha) \log P$ bits.
- Broadcasting the digitized interferences $(\hat{\eta}_1, \hat{\eta}_2)$ as common message *and* two new private messages of $\alpha \log P$ bits each, in the second and third slots.

These ideas will be explored in the rest of the section whereafter the interpretation of Fig. 2 will become clear. Since only \mathbf{h}_1 and \mathbf{g}_1 are involved below, we drop the time indices for convenience.

Spatial precoding and power allocation: As in the MAT alignment, we first superpose the two private signals as $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}$, except that \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are precoded beforehand. The precoding is specified by the covariance matrices

$$\mathbf{Q}_u \triangleq \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^H) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Q}_v \triangleq \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^H)$$

that may depend on the estimates of the current channel. The power constraint is respected by choosing \mathbf{Q}_u and \mathbf{Q}_v such that $\text{tr}(\mathbf{Q}_u) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{Q}_v) \leq P$. In particular, we choose \mathbf{Q}_u and \mathbf{Q}_v in such a way that the power of the interferences η_1 and η_2 is reduced and scales as $O(P^{1-\alpha})$. To this end,

- for user k , $k = 1, 2$, we send two streams of messages $(W_{k,1}, W_{k,2})$ in two orthogonal directions: one perpendicular to the estimated channel of the unintended user,




Fig. 2. Overview of the main differences between the Maddah-Ali Tse alignment and the proposed scheme.

while the other one aligned with it, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_u &= P_1 \Psi_{\hat{g}^\perp} + P_2 \Psi_{\hat{g}}, \\ \mathbf{Q}_v &= P_1 \Psi_{\hat{h}^\perp} + P_2 \Psi_{\hat{h}}; \end{aligned}$$

- the transmit power in the estimated channel direction is such that $P_2 \sim P^{1-\alpha}$, whereas the transmit power in the orthogonal direction is $P_1 = P - P_2 \sim P$ for any $\alpha < 1$.

With \mathbf{Q}_u and \mathbf{Q}_v chosen as such, it is readily shown that, for a given channel realization \mathbf{h} , the power of the interference seen by user 1 is

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\eta_1}^2 &\triangleq \mathbb{E}_v(|\mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{v}|^2) \\ &= \mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{Q}_v \mathbf{h} \\ &= \mathbf{h}^H (P_1 \Psi_{\hat{h}^\perp} + P_2 \Psi_{\hat{h}}) \mathbf{h} \\ &= P_1 \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^H \Psi_{\hat{h}^\perp} \tilde{\mathbf{h}} + P_2 \mathbf{h}^H \Psi_{\hat{h}} \mathbf{h} \\ &\leq P_1 \|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^2 + P_2 \|\mathbf{h}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By averaging $\sigma_{\eta_1}^2$ over \mathbf{h} , we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\sigma_{\eta_1}^2) = O(P^{1-\alpha}). \quad (26)$$

Due to the symmetry, defining $\sigma_{\eta_2}^2 \triangleq \mathbb{E}_u(|\mathbf{g}^H \mathbf{u}|^2)$, we also have $\mathbb{E}(\sigma_{\eta_2}^2) = O(P^{1-\alpha})$.

Digitizing the overheard interferences : As in the second phase of the MAT variant, we would like to convey the overheard interferences ($\mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{v}$, $\mathbf{g}^H \mathbf{u}$) to both receivers. However, unlike the original MAT scheme where these symbols are transmitted in an analog fashion, we quantize them and then transmit the digital version. The rationale behind this choice is as follows. With the precoding and power allocation as described above, the overheard interferences have a reduced power $O(P^{1-\alpha})$, without sacrificing *too much* received signal power.¹ As a result, we should be able to compress the interferences, which in turn makes room for transmission of new symbols. The benefit can be significant when the current CSIT is nearly perfect. In this case, the analog transmission is

¹With no CSIT on the current channel, the only way to reduce the interference power is to reduce the transmit power, therefore the received signal power.

no longer suitable, due to the mismatch between the source (interference) power and available transmit power. Therefore, a good alternative is to quantize the interferences and to transmit the encoded symbols. The number of quantization bits depends naturally on the interference power that is related to the quality of the current channel state information.

For simplicity, we suppose that η_1 and η_2 are quantized separately. Furthermore, let us assume that an R_{η_k} -bits quantizer is used for η_k , $k = 1, 2$. Hence, we have

$$\eta_k = \hat{\eta}_k + \Delta_k$$

where $\hat{\eta}_k$ and Δ_k are respectively the quantized value and the quantization noise with average distortion $\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^2) = D_k$, $k = 1, 2$. The index corresponding to $\hat{\eta} \triangleq (\hat{\eta}_1, \hat{\eta}_2)$, represented in $R_{\hat{\eta}} \triangleq R_{\eta_1} + R_{\eta_2}$ bits, is then multicast to both users. In order not to incur a DoF loss with the quantization, we set the distortion to the noise level, i.e., $D_1 = D_2 = 1$. With the above choices, we can upper-bound the quantization rate $R_{\hat{\eta}}$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\hat{\eta}} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\log \left(\frac{\sigma_{\eta_1}^2}{D_1} \right) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\log \left(\frac{\sigma_{\eta_2}^2}{D_2} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \log \left(\mathbb{E}(\sigma_{\eta_1}^2) \right) + \log \left(\mathbb{E}(\sigma_{\eta_2}^2) \right) \\ &\leq 2(1 - \alpha) \log P + O(1) \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is from the rate-distortion theorem and the fact that Gaussian source is the hardest to compress [10]; the second inequality is from the concavity of the log function and Jensen's inequality; the last one is from (26).

Multicasting digitized interferences and broadcasting new private messages: The next step is to communicate the digitized interferences ($\hat{\eta}_1, \hat{\eta}_2$), represented approximately in $2(1 - \alpha) \log P$ bits, to both users. This information is broadcast as common message in two slots. Meanwhile, new private messages ($W_{1,3}, W_{2,3}$) and ($W_{1,4}, W_{2,4}$) are sent to both users simultaneously in the second and third slots, respectively. The superposition is illustrated in Fig. 2. In the following, we let (d_c, d_{p1}, d_{p2}) denote the corresponding DoF per slot for the common message, private messages for user 1 and user 2, respectively. It is readily shown that $d_c = 1 - \alpha$.

Decoding: Each user first decodes the second and third slots, i.e., receiver k recovers $(\hat{\eta}_1, \hat{\eta}_2, W_{k,3}, W_{k,4})$, $k = 1, 2$. According to Lemma 2, and given that $d_c = 1 - \alpha$, these messages can be decoded reliably as long as

$$d_{pk} \leq \alpha, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

Then, receiver 1 has the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} y &= \mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{u} + \eta_1 + \varepsilon, \\ \hat{\eta}_1 &= \eta_1 - \Delta_1, \\ \hat{\eta}_2 &= \eta_2 - \Delta_2 = \mathbf{g}^H \mathbf{u} - \Delta_2, \end{aligned}$$

from which an equivalent 2×2 MIMO channel is obtained

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} y - \hat{\eta}_1 \\ \hat{\eta}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u} + \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon + \Delta_1 \\ -\Delta_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (27)$$

where the noise $\mathbf{b} \triangleq [\varepsilon + \Delta_1 \quad -\Delta_2]^T$ depends on the input signals in general. Similarly, receiver 2 has

$$\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\eta}_1 \\ z - \hat{\eta}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{S} \mathbf{v} + \begin{bmatrix} -\Delta_1 \\ \omega + \Delta_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In order to recover the messages $W_{\text{mimo},1} \triangleq (W_{1,1}, W_{1,2})$ encoded in \mathbf{u} or $W_{\text{mimo},2} \triangleq (W_{2,1}, W_{2,2})$ encoded in \mathbf{v} , each user performs conventional MIMO decoding of the above equivalent channel. Let R_{mimo} denote the achievable rate of the equivalent channel (27) in bits per channel use and d_{mimo} the corresponding DoF. We can lower-bound R_{mimo} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{mimo}} &= \mathbb{E}(I(U; \tilde{Y} | S = \mathbf{S})) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(I(\mathbf{S}U; \tilde{Y})) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{S}U) - h(\mathbf{S}U | \tilde{Y})) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{S}U) - h(E + \Delta_1, -\Delta_2 | \tilde{Y})) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{S}U) - h(E + \Delta_1, -\Delta_2)) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \mathbb{E}(\log \det(\mathbf{S} \mathbf{Q}_u \mathbf{S}^H)) - \log(1 + D_1) \\ &\quad - \log(D_2) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E}(\log \det(\mathbf{Q}_u)) + \mathbb{E}(\log \det(\mathbf{S} \mathbf{S}^H)) \\ &\quad - \log(1 + D_1) - \log(D_2) \\ &= \log(P_1 P_2) + O(1) \\ &= (2 - \alpha) \log(P) + O(1) \end{aligned}$$

where (28) is from the fact that \mathbf{S} is invertible almost surely and therefore the linear transformation is information-lossless; (29) holds since conditioning does not increase differential entropy; (30) follows because \mathbf{u} is Gaussian, then by noticing that $E + \Delta_1$ and Δ_2 are independent with the corresponding differential entropies maximized by Gaussian distribution. Finally, in three slots, user k , $k = 1, 2$, can recover the messages $(W_{k,1}, W_{k,2})$ sent in the equivalent MIMO channel corresponding to the MAT alignment as well as two fresh messages $(W_{k,3}, W_{k,4})$, from which the average DoF per user per channel use is

$$d_{\text{sym}} = \frac{d_{\text{mimo}} + 2d_{pk}}{3} = \frac{2 - \alpha + 2\alpha}{3} = \frac{2 + \alpha}{3}.$$

This concludes the achievability of the whole region given by (3) and Fig. 1.

Remark 4.1: By removing the private messages, one can send the common message in a higher rate (corresponding




Fig. 3. Comparison of the achievable DoF between the proposed scheme and the zero-forcing and MAT alignment as a function of α .

to $d_c = 1$ instead of $d_c = 1 - \alpha$) and thus shorten the communication $(1 + 2(1 - \alpha))$ slots instead of 3 slots). This is the original idea reported in [8] that provides an achievable DoF of $\frac{2-\alpha}{3-2\alpha}$. Inspired by the gap between this DoF and the upper bound given by the converse

$$\frac{2 - \alpha}{3 - 2\alpha} \quad \text{versus} \quad \frac{2 + \alpha}{3} = \frac{2 - \alpha + 2\alpha}{3 - 2\alpha + 2\alpha},$$

a natural question arose: *Can we convey 2α more symbols per user by extending the transmission by 2α channel uses, i.e., in total over three channel uses?* It turned out that it is possible by exploiting the current CSI, according to Lemma 2.

In Fig. 3, we compare the achievable DoF of different schemes. The TDMA (time sharing between single-user communications) requires neither the current nor the delayed CSIT and achieves a DoF of $\frac{1}{2}$. The ZF precoding only exploits the current CSIT with a DoF of α , while the MAT scheme only exploits the delayed CSIT with a DoF of $\frac{2}{3}$. The scheme “RS+ZF” (Rate-Splitting and ZF precoding) is from equally time sharing between the corner points $(1, \alpha)$ and $(\alpha, 1)$. It only exploits the current CSIT with a DoF of $\frac{1+\alpha}{2}$. Note that when α is close to 0, the estimation of current CSIT is bad and therefore useless. In this case, the optimal scheme is the MAT alignment. On the other hand, when $\alpha \geq 1$, the estimation is good and the interference at the receivers due to the imperfect estimation is below the noise level and thus can be neglected as far as the DoF is concerned. In this case, delayed CSIT is useless and even ZF with the estimated current CSIT is asymptotically optimal, achieving a DoF of 1 per user. Our result reveals that strictly larger DoF than $\max\{\frac{2}{3}, \alpha\}$ can be obtained by exploiting both the imperfect current CSIT and the perfect delayed CSIT in an intermediate regime $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

In the appendix, we provide the exact achievable rate region. Some examples of the achievable sum rates with Rayleigh fading are shown in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5.² In Fig. 4, we plot the sum rate performance of our sum-DoF optimal scheme for different values of α . We observe that as the quality of

²Note that the parameters are fixed according to the choices given in the appendix without optimization.




Fig. 4. The achievable ergodic sum-rate of the proposed scheme with Rayleigh fading, for $\alpha = 0, 0.2, \dots, 1$.




Fig. 5. The achievable ergodic sum-rate of the proposed sum-DoF optimal scheme, rate-splitting scheme, TDMA, zero-forcing, and MAT alignment. We set $\alpha = 0.5$.

channel knowledge increases ($\alpha \rightarrow 1$), the sum rate improves significantly with the sharper slope promised by the DoF result. Note that the performance with $\alpha = 0$ nearly corresponds to the sum rate achieved by MAT (cf. Fig. 5). In Fig. 5, we compare our sum-DoF optimal scheme with different strategies: MAT, ZF, TDMA, as well as “RS+ZF” in terms of the ergodic sum rate for $\alpha = 0.5$. For this quality of the current CSIT, ZF performs substantially worse than the others, achieving the pre-log of one. With the same value of DoF as ZF, the TDMA scheme performs much better than the ZF scheme, since full transmit power can be used without causing interference. Note that the current CSIT is exploited in the TDMA scheme in such a way that the signal is beamformed in the direction of the estimated channel. The sum rate with MAT, RS+ZF, and the proposed scheme increases with a slope of $\frac{4}{3}$, $\frac{3}{2}$, and $\frac{5}{3}$, respectively, as expected from the DoF results.

V. DISCUSSIONS

A. DoF with common message

The main result of this paper can be extended trivially to the case with common message.

Corollary 1: Let (d_0, d_1, d_2) be the degrees of freedom related to the common message, private message for user 1,

and private message for user 2, respectively. Then, the optimal DoF region is characterized by

$$d_0 + d_1 \leq 1, \quad (31a)$$

$$d_0 + d_2 \leq 1, \quad (31b)$$

$$2d_0 + d_1 + 2d_2 \leq 2 + \alpha, \quad (31c)$$

$$2d_0 + 2d_1 + d_2 \leq 2 + \alpha. \quad (31d)$$

Proof: The converse follows the same lines as in the case without common message, presented in Section III. To obtain (31b) and (31c), we replace W_2 by $W'_2 \triangleq (W_0, W_2)$ and R_2 by $R'_2 \triangleq R_0 + R_2$ throughout Section III and carry out exactly the same steps. Then, (31a) and (31d) follow straightforwardly by interchanging the roles of user 1 and user 2 as well as the symmetry between the two users.

Note that the region is a polyhedron and completely characterized by the vertices in terms of (d_0, d_1, d_2) :

- extreme points: $(1, 0, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0)$, $(0, 0, 1)$,
- private points: $(0, 1, \alpha)$, $(0, \alpha, 1)$, $(0, \frac{2+\alpha}{3}, \frac{2+\alpha}{3})$, and
- mixed point: $(1 - \alpha, \alpha, \alpha)$

which are all achievable with the proposed scheme. Thus, the entire region is achievable by time sharing between the vertices. ■

B. Imperfect delayed CSI: Limited feedback

In most practical scenarios, delayed CSIT is obtained through feedback channel and the current state is then predicted based on the delayed CSIT. Due to various reasons, perfect delayed CSIT may not be available. For instance, the limited feedback rate may incur a distortion on the channel coefficients. In the following, we take a look at the impact of the imperfect delayed CSIT on the achievable DoF of the proposed scheme.

First, let us assume that the channel state \mathcal{S}_{t-1} is quantized before being sent back to the transmitter (and to the other receiver). The quantization model is

$$\mathcal{S}_{t-1} = \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{t-1} + \check{\mathcal{S}}_{t-1}$$

where each entry of the quantization noise $\check{\mathcal{S}}_{t-1}$ has the same variance σ_{FB}^2 . We introduce a parameter β to characterize the precision of the quantization. As the definition of α , we define β as the power exponent of the quantization noise³, i.e.,

$$\beta \triangleq \min \left\{ -\frac{\log \sigma_{\text{FB}}^2}{\log P}, 1 \right\}.$$

Due to the lack of perfect delayed CSIT, instead of using \mathcal{S}^{t-1} to predict \mathcal{S}_t for the precoding and using \mathcal{S}_{t-1} to perform the MAT alignment, the transmitter now predicts the quantized state $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_t$ with the past quantized state $\bar{\mathcal{S}}^{t-1}$ and uses $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{t-1}$ for the alignment. Therefore, although the actual interference seen by the receivers is $(\mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{g}^H \mathbf{u})$, the transmitter only has access to a noisy version of it $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\bar{\mathbf{h}}^H \mathbf{v}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}^H \mathbf{u})$. Receiver 1 has the following equations

$$y = \mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{v} + \varepsilon = \mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{u} + \eta_1 + (\mathbf{h} - \bar{\mathbf{h}})^H \mathbf{v} + \varepsilon, \quad (32)$$

$$\hat{\eta}_1 = \eta_1 - \Delta_1,$$

$$\hat{\eta}_2 = \eta_2 - \Delta_2 = \bar{\mathbf{g}}^H \mathbf{u} - \Delta_2.$$

³From the rate-distortion function, it is not difficult to relate β to the resource required for the CSI feedback, i.e., the feedback DoF.




Fig. 6. Impact of imperfect delayed CSIT on the achievable DoF with the proposed scheme. We fix $\alpha = 0.5$ and vary β from 1 to 0.

The power of η is $\bar{\mathbf{h}}^H \mathbf{Q}_v \bar{\mathbf{h}} + \bar{\mathbf{g}}^H \mathbf{Q}_u \bar{\mathbf{g}}$ that depends on the “precision” of the prediction from $\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{t-1}$ to $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_t$. It can be shown⁴ that the power exponent of this prediction error is $\alpha' \triangleq \min\{\alpha, \beta\}$ where α is the power exponent of the prediction error when perfect delayed CSIT is present, i.e., predicting \mathbf{S}_t from \mathbf{S}^{t-1} . Therefore, the achievable DoF of the proposed scheme would be $\frac{2+\alpha'}{3}$ without taking into account the “residual interference” $(\mathbf{h} - \bar{\mathbf{h}})^H \mathbf{v}$ in (32). In fact, this interference costs a DoF loss of $1 - \beta$ over three slots, yielding the new DoF per user

$$\begin{aligned} d(\alpha, \beta) &= \frac{2 + \alpha' - (1 - \beta)}{3} \\ &= \frac{1 + \min\{\alpha, \beta\} + \beta}{3}, \quad \alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

As in the case with perfect delayed CSIT, the DoF pairs $(1, \alpha')$ and $(\alpha', 1)$ are achievable without the MAT alignment. An example of the DoF region is shown in Fig. 6, where we fix the value α and vary β from 1 to 0. As shown in the figure, when $\beta = 1$, the DoF region is unchanged. When β is reduced to $\frac{1+\alpha}{2}$, the symmetric DoF point can be achieved by time sharing between the two corner points $(1, \alpha)$ and $(\alpha, 1)$. Delayed CSIT is not beneficial any more with our scheme. As β continues to diminish to α , the symmetric DoF keeps dropping while the corner points remain still. At this point, using MAT alignment creates more interference than resolving it. When β goes below α , it becomes the dominating source of interference. The corner points become $(1, \beta)$ and $(\beta, 1)$. The above analysis reveals that even imperfect delayed CSIT can be beneficial with our scheme, as long as the feedback accuracy β is larger than $\frac{1+\alpha}{2}$. However, it is unclear whether this

⁴Without going into the details, we can see that the following Markov chain holds $\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{t-1} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{S}^{t-1} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{S}_t \leftrightarrow \bar{\mathbf{S}}_t$. The prediction error from $\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{t-1}$ to $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_t$ is now the aggregation of two effects: the channel variation, characterized by $P^{-\alpha}$, and the quantization error due to limited feedback rate, characterized by $P^{-\beta}$. Hence, we have the power exponent of the aggregated error $\alpha' = \min\{\alpha, \beta\}$.

naive extension to the imperfect delayed CSIT case is optimal. Finding optimal schemes with imperfect delayed CSIT remains an open problem and is out of the scope of this paper.

C. Bandwidth-limited Doppler process

The main result on the achievable DoF has been presented in terms of an artificial parameter α , denoting the speed of decay of the estimation error $\sigma^2 \sim P^{-\alpha}$ in the current CSIT. In this section, we provide an example showing the practical interpretation of this parameter. Focusing on receiver 1 due to symmetry, we describe the fading process, channel estimation, and feedback scheme as follows:

- The channel fading \mathbf{h}_t follows a Doppler process with power spectral density $S_h(w)$. The channel coefficients are strictly band-limited to $[-F, F]$ with $F = \frac{v f_c T_f}{c} < \frac{1}{2}$ where v, f_c, T_f , and c denote the mobile speed in m/sec, the carrier frequency in Hz, the slot duration in sec, the light speed in m/sec, respectively.
- The channel estimation is done at the receivers side with pilot-based downlink training. At slot t , receiver 1 estimates \mathbf{h}_t based on a sequence of noisy observations $\{\mathbf{s}_\tau = \sqrt{P}\mathbf{h}_\tau + \nu_\tau\}$ up to t , where $\nu_\tau \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \mathbf{I})$ is the AWGN. The estimate is denoted by $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_t$ with

$$\mathbf{h}_t = \bar{\mathbf{h}}_t + \check{\mathbf{h}}_t.$$

Under this model, the estimation error vanishes as $\mathbb{E}(\|\check{\mathbf{h}}_t\|^2) \sim P^{-1}$.

- At the end of slot t , the noisy observation \mathbf{s}_t is sent to the transmitter and receiver 2 over a noise-free channel. At slot $t+1$, based on the noisy observation $\{\mathbf{s}_\tau\}$ up to t , the transmitter and receiver 2 acquire the prediction $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{t+1}$ of \mathbf{h}_{t+1} and estimation $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t$ of \mathbf{h}_t . The corresponding prediction model is

$$\mathbf{h}_t = \hat{\mathbf{h}}_t + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t.$$

From [2, Lemma 1], we have $\mathbb{E}(\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t\|^2) \sim P^{-(1-2F)}$.

In this channel with imperfect delayed CSIT, we can still apply the proposed scheme and analysis in exactly the same way as in the previous section with $\alpha = 1 - 2F$ and $\beta = 1$.

D. Non-ergodic fading (delay-limited communications)

The DoF results have been derived based on the ergodic rates. For non-ergodic fading processes, the DoF can be redefined in the same manner as the definition of multiplexing gain in [12]. This approach has been reported in [8]. Following the footsteps in [8], it can be shown that the non-ergodic DoF coincides with the ergodic DoF.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

A scheme achieving the optimal degrees of freedom region in a two-user MISO broadcast channel has been presented. The approach optimally exploits the combination of delayed channel feedback together with imperfect current CSIT. In practical scenarios, the current CSIT may be obtained from a prediction based on the delayed CSIT samples. When the quality of current CSIT is poor, the proposed scheme coincides with

the previously reported MAT space-time alignment, whereas as the current CSIT prediction quality becomes ideal, the scheme relies on standard linear precoding. In between these extremal regimes, the proposed strategy advocates interference quantization followed by feedback. Generalizations of the proposed study to the MIMO case, multi-user case, and imperfect delayed CSIT case remain challenging yet interesting open problems.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Lemma 1

First, we show (21) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{S_i|\hat{S}_i}(\log(1 + \mathbf{h}_i^H \mathbf{K} \mathbf{h}_i)) \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_{S_i|\hat{S}_i}(\log(1 + \lambda_1 \|\mathbf{h}_i\|^2)) \\
& \leq \log(1 + \lambda_1 \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i\|^2 + m\sigma^2 \lambda_1) \\
& = \log(1 + \lambda_1 \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i\|^2) + \log\left(1 + \frac{m\sigma^2 \lambda_1}{1 + \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i\|^2 \lambda_1}\right) \\
& \leq \log(1 + \lambda_1 \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i\|^2) + \log\left(1 + \frac{m\sigma^2}{\|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i\|^2}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where (33) is from the concavity of the log function.

Then, to derive (22), let us define $\tilde{\psi} \triangleq \mathbf{V}^H \hat{\mathbf{g}}_i$ and $\tilde{\psi} \triangleq \mathbf{V}^H \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_i$ with \mathbf{V} being the unitary matrix containing the eigenvectors of \mathbf{K} , i.e., $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{V} \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m) \mathbf{V}^H$. From the isotropic assumption, $\tilde{\psi}$ has the same distribution as $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_i$ and is also isotropic. Since the distribution of the vector $\tilde{\psi}$ is invariant under unitary transformations, it follows that the distribution of each scalar $\tilde{\psi}_l$ in $\tilde{\psi}$ is invariant under complex scalar rotations. Thus, $\tilde{\psi}_l$, $l = 1, \dots, m$, can be represented by $A_l e^{j\theta_l}$ where $A_l \triangleq |\tilde{\psi}_l|$ is independent of θ_l that is uniformly distributed in $[0, 2\pi)$. We need the following lemma for the proof.

Lemma 3: Let θ be a random variable uniformly distributed in $[0, 2\pi)$. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta(\log(|B + Ae^{j\theta}|^2)) = \log(\max\{|A|^2, |B|^2\}).$$

Proof: Without loss of generality, we assume that both A and B have non-negative real values, since θ is uniformly distributed in $[0, 2\pi)$. The expectation $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\log(|B + Ae^{j\theta}|^2))$ can be directly calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_\theta(\log(|B + Ae^{j\theta}|^2)) \\
& = \mathbb{E}_\theta(\log(A^2 + B^2 + 2AB \cos(\theta))) \\
& = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log(A^2 + B^2 + 2AB \cos(\theta)) d\theta \\
& = \log \frac{A^2 + B^2 + \sqrt{(A^2 + B^2)^2 - (2AB)^2}}{2} \\
& = \log(\max\{|A|^2, |B|^2\})
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where (34) is from the identity

$$\int_0^1 \log(a + b \cos(2\pi t)) dt = \log \frac{a + \sqrt{a^2 - b^2}}{2}, \quad \forall a \geq b > 0.$$

Now, we can finish the proof of (22) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{S_i|\hat{S}_i}(\log(1 + \mathbf{g}_i^H \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g}_i)) \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\psi}_1|\hat{S}_i} \left(\log \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j |\hat{\psi}_j + \tilde{\psi}_j|^2 \right) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\psi}_1|\hat{S}_i}(\log(\lambda_1 |\hat{\psi}_1 + \tilde{\psi}_1|^2))^+ \tag{36}$$

$$\geq \left(\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\psi}_1|\hat{S}_i}(\log(\lambda_1 |\hat{\psi}_1 + \tilde{\psi}_1|^2)) \right)^+ \tag{37}$$

$$\geq \left(\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\psi}_1|\hat{S}_i}(\log(\lambda_1 |\tilde{\psi}_1|^2)) \right)^+ \tag{38}$$

$$= (\log(2^\gamma \sigma^2 \lambda_1))^+ \tag{39}$$

$$\geq \log(1 + 2^\gamma \sigma^2 \lambda_1) - 1 \tag{39}$$

where in (35), $(x)^+$ means $\max\{x, 0\}$; (36) is from the fact that moving the maximization outside of the expectation does not increase the value; (37) is obtained by using the fact that $\tilde{\psi}_1$ is invariant under complex scalar rotations and by applying Lemma 3 (averaging over the phase of $\tilde{\psi}_1$); in (38), we define $\gamma \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\psi}_1|\hat{S}_i} \left(\log \frac{|\tilde{\psi}_1|^2}{\sigma^2} \right) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{S}_i|\hat{S}_i} \left(\log \frac{|\tilde{g}_{i,1}|^2}{\sigma^2} \right)$ with $\gamma > -\infty$ according to Assumption 2; in (39), we apply the inequality $(\log(x))^+ \geq \log(1+x) - 1$.

B. Proof of Lemma 2

We describe the coding scheme in Lemma 2 as follows.

- Channel codebooks $\mathcal{X}_c, \mathcal{X}_{p1}, \mathcal{X}_{p2}$ of length n and sizes $2^{nR_c}, 2^{nR_{p1}},$ and $2^{nR_{p2}}$, respectively. Entries of these codebooks are generated i.i.d. according to $\mathcal{N}_C(0, \mathbf{\Lambda}_c), \mathcal{N}_C(0, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{p1}),$ and $\mathcal{N}_C(0, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{p2}),$ respectively, with $\mathbf{\Lambda}_c, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{p1}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{p2} \geq 0$ being $m \times m$ matrices that can be assumed to be diagonal without loss of generality.
- Time-varying linear precoders that only depend on the estimate of the current state:

$$\Xi_t, \Gamma_t, \Omega_t : \hat{S}_t \mapsto \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}.$$

- Coding: The common message denoted by W_c is coded in $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{c,t}\}_{t=1}^n \in \mathcal{X}_c$, precoded, and then multicast to both users. Meanwhile, two private messages W_{p1} and W_{p2} for user 1 and user 2, respectively, are coded in $\{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{p,t}\}_{t=1}^n \in \mathcal{X}_{p1}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{p,t}\}_{t=1}^n \in \mathcal{X}_{p2}$, respectively, precoded, and sent. The transmitted signal is

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \Omega_t \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{c,t} + \Xi_t \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{p,t} + \Gamma_t \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{p,t}, \quad t = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then, we can get the following achievable rate region.

Proposition 1: The achievable rate region of the two-user MISO broadcast channel with common message is the union of the rate triples (R_c, R_{p1}, R_{p2}) with

$$R_c \triangleq \min \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\log \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{Q}_c \mathbf{h}}{1 + \mathbf{h}^H (\mathbf{Q}_{p1} + \mathbf{Q}_{p2}) \mathbf{h}} \right) \right), \mathbb{E} \left(\log \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{g}^H \mathbf{Q}_c \mathbf{g}}{1 + \mathbf{g}^H (\mathbf{Q}_{p1} + \mathbf{Q}_{p2}) \mathbf{g}} \right) \right) \right\},$$

$$R_{p1} \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left(\log \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{Q}_{p1} \mathbf{h}}{1 + \mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{Q}_{p2} \mathbf{h}} \right) \right),$$

$$R_{p2} \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left(\log \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{g}^H \mathbf{Q}_{p2} \mathbf{g}}{1 + \mathbf{g}^H \mathbf{Q}_{p1} \mathbf{g}} \right) \right),$$

over all policies

$$Q(\hat{S}) \triangleq \{Q_c, Q_{p1}, Q_{p2} \succeq 0 : \text{tr}(Q_c + Q_{p1} + Q_{p2}) \leq P\}$$

that only depend on the estimate of the channels \hat{S} .

Proof: The proof is straightforward. First, the common message is decoded by treating the private signals as noise. Then, after removing the decoded common signal, the private message is obtained by treating the interference as noises. The covariance matrices are such that $Q_c = \Omega \Lambda_c \Omega^H$, $Q_{p1} = \Xi \Lambda_{p1} \Xi^H$, $Q_{p2} = \Gamma \Lambda_{p2} \Gamma^H$. Further details are omitted. ■

Setting $Q_c \sim P\mathbf{I}$, $Q_{p1} \sim P^\alpha \Psi_{\hat{g}^\perp}$, and $Q_{p2} \sim P^\alpha \Psi_{\hat{h}^\perp}$, Lemma 2 follows immediately.

C. Achievable rate region of the sum-DoF optimal scheme

Let us recall that the proposed scheme consists of two phases. In the following, we let n_1 and n_2 denote the length of Phase 1 and Phase 2, in channel uses, respectively. The main ingredients in Phase 1 are:

- Codebook generation:
 - Channel codebooks $\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{u}}$ of length n_1 and size $2^{n_1 R_{\text{mimo},1}}$, $\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{v}}$ of length n_1 and size $2^{n_1 R_{\text{mimo},2}}$. Entries of $\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{u}}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{v}}$ are generated i.i.d. according to $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \Lambda_u)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \Lambda_v)$, respectively. $\Lambda_u, \Lambda_v \succeq 0$ are $m \times m$ diagonal matrices.
 - Source codebooks \mathcal{C}_k of length n_1 and size $2^{n_1 R_{\eta_k}}$, $k = 1, 2$. Entries of \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 are generated i.i.d. according to $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1 - \tilde{D}_k)$, $\tilde{D}_k \leq 1$, $k = 1, 2$.
- Time-varying linear precoders that only depend on the estimate of the current state:

$$\Theta_t, \Phi_t : \hat{S}_t \mapsto \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}.$$

- Coding in Phase 1: The codewords $\{\tilde{u}_t\}_{t=1}^{n_1}$ and $\{\tilde{v}_t\}_{t=1}^{n_1}$ are selected from $\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{u}}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{v}}$, according to $W_{\text{mimo},1}$ and $W_{\text{mimo},2}$, respectively. The transmitted signal is

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \Theta_t \tilde{u}_t + \Phi_t \tilde{v}_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, n_1.$$

- Quantization of the interferences η_1 and η_2 : At the end of Phase 1, the transmitter knows $\{(\eta_{1,t}, \eta_{2,t})\}_{t=1}^{n_1}$ with $\eta_{1,t} \triangleq \mathbf{h}_t^H \mathbf{v}_t \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \sigma_{\eta_{1,t}}^2)$ and $\eta_{2,t} \triangleq \mathbf{g}_t^H \mathbf{u}_t \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \sigma_{\eta_{2,t}}^2)$, for a given channel realization $\{\mathbf{h}_t, \mathbf{g}_t\}_{t=1}^{n_1}$. The codebook \mathcal{C}_k , $k = 1, 2$, is used to quantize the *normalized* source $\left\{ \frac{\eta_{k,t}}{\sigma_{\eta_{k,t}}} \right\}_{t=1}^{n_1}$ that is i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1)$. The quantized outputs are represented in $n_1(R_{\eta_1} + R_{\eta_2})$ bits.

In Phase 2, exactly the same codebooks and precoders as in Appendix B are used, except that the length of the codewords is n_2 instead of n . The quantized interferences, represented in $n_1(R_{\eta_1} + R_{\eta_2})$ bits and denoted by W_c , is coded in $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{c,t}\}_{t=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \in \mathcal{X}_c$, precoded, and then multicast to both users. Meanwhile, two private messages W_{p1} and W_{p2} for user 1 and 2 are coded in $\{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{p,t}\}_{t=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \in \mathcal{X}_{p1}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{p,t}\}_{t=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \in \mathcal{X}_{p2}$, respectively, precoded, and sent. The transmitted signal is

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \Omega_t \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{c,t} + \Xi_t \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{p,t} + \Gamma_t \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{p,t}, \quad t = n_1 + 1, \dots, n_1 + n_2.$$

For user k to recover its original messages $(W_{\text{mimo},k}, W_{pk})$ correctly⁵, when $n_1, n_2 \rightarrow \infty$, it is enough to

- recover the message (W_c, W_{pk}) , which is possible if

$$n_1(R_{\eta_1} + R_{\eta_2}) \leq n_2 R_c, \quad (40)$$

and if the triple (R_c, R_{p1}, R_{p2}) lies in the region defined in Proposition 1;

- reconstruct $\{\hat{\eta}_{k,t}\}_{t=1}^{n_1}$, $k = 1, 2$, with

$$\eta_{k,t} = \hat{\eta}_{k,t} + \Delta_{k,t}, \quad \Delta_{k,t} \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \sigma_{\eta_{k,t}}^2 \tilde{D}_k),$$

which is possible if

$$R_{\eta_k} > \log \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{D}_k} \right), \quad k = 1, 2;$$

- then decode the message $W_{\text{mimo},k}$, which is possible if

$$R_{\text{mimo},1} < I(\tilde{U}; Y, \hat{\eta}_1, \hat{\eta}_2 | S, \hat{S}), \quad (41)$$

$$R_{\text{mimo},2} < I(\tilde{V}; Z, \hat{\eta}_1, \hat{\eta}_2 | S, \hat{S}).$$

Putting all pieces together, we obtain the rate region of the proposed scheme in the following.

Proposition 2: Let (R_c, R_{p1}, R_{p2}) be defined as in Proposition 1 and let us define the compression rate R_{η_k} and MIMO rate as

$$R_{\eta_k} \triangleq \log \frac{1}{\tilde{D}_k}, \quad k = 1, 2,$$

$$R_{\text{mimo},1} \triangleq \mathbb{E}(\log \det(\mathbf{I} + D_1 S Q_u S^H)), \quad (42)$$

$$R_{\text{mimo},2} \triangleq \mathbb{E}(\log \det(\mathbf{I} + D_2 S Q_v S^H)), \quad (43)$$

with

$$D_1 \triangleq \text{diag} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{h}^H Q_u \mathbf{h} \tilde{D}_1}, \frac{1 - \tilde{D}_2}{\mathbf{g}^H Q_u \mathbf{g} \tilde{D}_2} \right),$$

$$D_2 \triangleq \text{diag} \left(\frac{1 - \tilde{D}_1}{\mathbf{h}^H Q_v \mathbf{h} \tilde{D}_1}, \frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{g}^H Q_v \mathbf{g} \tilde{D}_2} \right).$$

Then, the achievable rate region of the proposed scheme is the union of the rate pairs (R_1, R_2) with

$$R_k = \frac{R_c R_{\text{mimo},k} + (R_{\eta,1} + R_{\eta,2}) R_{pk}}{R_c + R_{\eta,1} + R_{\eta,2}}, \quad k = 1, 2, \quad (44)$$

over all policies $D(\hat{S}) \triangleq \{\tilde{D}_1, \tilde{D}_2 : 0 \leq \tilde{D}_k \leq 1\}$ and

$$Q'(\hat{S}) \triangleq \{Q_u, Q_v, Q_c, Q_{p1}, Q_{p2} \succeq 0 : \text{tr}(Q_u + Q_v) \leq P, \text{tr}(Q_c + Q_{p1} + Q_{p2}) \leq P\}$$

that only depend on the estimate of the channels.

Proof: The average achievable rate for user k is

$$\begin{aligned} R_k &= \frac{n_1 R_{\text{mimo},k} + n_2 R_{pk}}{n_1 + n_2} \\ &= \frac{R_{\text{mimo},k} + \frac{n_2}{n_1} R_{pk}}{1 + \frac{n_2}{n_1}} \\ &= \frac{R_c R_{\text{mimo},k} + (R_{\eta,1} + R_{\eta,2}) R_{pk}}{R_c + R_{\eta,1} + R_{\eta,2}} \end{aligned}$$

⁵Note that the assumption on the ergodicity and the Markov chain (2) makes the single-letter representation of the rates possible.

where the last equality holds by choosing n_1 and n_2 that equalize (40). To see (42), we write

$$\begin{aligned} I(\tilde{U}; Y, \hat{\eta}_1, \hat{\eta}_2 | S = \mathbf{S}, \hat{S} = \hat{\mathbf{S}}) \\ = I(\tilde{U}; \hat{\eta}_1) + I(\tilde{U}; Y, \hat{\eta}_2 | \hat{\eta}_1) \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

$$= I(\tilde{U}; Y, \hat{\eta}_2 | \hat{\eta}_1) \quad (46)$$

$$\begin{aligned} = I(\tilde{U}; Y - \hat{\eta}_1, \hat{\eta}_2 | \hat{\eta}_1) \\ = I(\tilde{U}; \mathbf{h}^H \tilde{U} + \Delta_1 + E, \hat{\eta}_2) \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

$$\begin{aligned} = I(\tilde{U}; \mathbf{h}^H \tilde{U} + \Delta_1 + E, a_{\text{mmse}} \mathbf{g}^H \tilde{U} + E_{\text{mmse}}) \\ = \log \det(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{D}_1 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{Q}_u \mathbf{S}^H) \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where (45) is from the chain rule of mutual information; (46) is from the fact that \tilde{U} is independent of η_1 ; (47) holds because $\hat{\eta}_1$ is independent of all the other terms. Since $\eta_2 = \hat{\eta}_2 + \Delta_2$ with $\hat{\eta}_2 \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \mathbf{g}^H \mathbf{Q}_u \mathbf{g} (1 - \tilde{D}_2))$ and $\Delta_2 \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \mathbf{g}^H \mathbf{Q}_u \mathbf{g} \tilde{D}_2)$ being additive Gaussian noise, we can optimally “estimate” $\hat{\eta}_2$ from η_2 with a linear MMSE estimator and get the “backward channel” model

$$\hat{\eta}_2 = a_{\text{mmse}} \eta_2 + e_{\text{mmse}}$$

where $a_{\text{mmse}} \triangleq 1 - \tilde{D}_2$ corresponds to the scaling of the linear MMSE estimation and the additive estimation noise $e_{\text{mmse}} \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, a_{\text{mmse}} \mathbf{g}^H \mathbf{Q}_u \mathbf{g} \tilde{D}_2)$ is independent of the “input” η_2 of the estimator. Thus, (48) follows as the mutual information of an equivalent Gaussian MIMO channel with Gaussian input, where $\mathbf{Q}_u = \Theta \Lambda_u \Theta^H$ and $\mathbf{Q}_v = \Phi \Lambda_v \Phi^H$. Note that in the right hand sides of the above equalities, we have omitted the conditioning on $\{S = \mathbf{S}, \hat{S} = \hat{\mathbf{S}}\}$ for convenience of presentation. Finally, (42) follows from (41) and (48). Due to the symmetry, (43) is straightforward. ■

Note that the optimization in (44) is not trivial and is out of the scope of this paper. Instead of finding the exact rate, we focus on the symmetric degrees of freedom of the scheme with $m = 2$, by fixing the following parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_u &= \frac{P_1}{2} \Psi_{\hat{g}^\perp} + \frac{P_2}{2} \Psi_{\hat{g}}, & \mathbf{Q}_v &= \frac{P_1}{2} \Psi_{\hat{h}^\perp} + \frac{P_2}{2} \Psi_{\hat{h}}, \\ \mathbf{Q}_c &= \frac{P_c}{2} \mathbf{I}, & \mathbf{Q}_{p1} &= \frac{P_p}{2} \Psi_{\hat{g}^\perp}, & \mathbf{Q}_{p2} &= \frac{P_p}{2} \Psi_{\hat{h}^\perp}, \\ \tilde{D}_1 &= \tilde{D}_2 = (P\sigma^2)^{-1} = P^{-(1-\alpha)} \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where we recall that $\Psi_{\hat{g}} \triangleq \frac{\hat{g} \hat{g}^H}{\|\hat{g}\|^2}$ and $\Psi_{\hat{g}^\perp}$, $\Psi_{\hat{h}}$, and $\Psi_{\hat{h}^\perp}$ are similarly defined; the power allocations (P_c, P_p) and (P_1, P_2) are specified by

$$\begin{aligned} P_p &= \hat{\alpha} \hat{\sigma}^{-2}, & P_c &= P - P_p, \\ P_2 &= (1 - \hat{\alpha}) \frac{P}{2} \hat{\sigma}^2, & P_1 &= P - P_2, \end{aligned}$$

with $\hat{\sigma}^2 \triangleq \max\{P^{-1}, \sigma^2\}$ and $\hat{\alpha} \triangleq \frac{\log \hat{\sigma}^2}{\log P}$. The interpretation of the choices on the covariance matrices has already been given in Section IV-B2. For the choices of the distortions (49) and the power allocations, the intuitions are as follows:

- The distortions \tilde{D}_1 and \tilde{D}_2 are such that the errors $\{\Delta_{k,t}\}$ after the reconstruction of η_1 and η_2 are at the noise level.
- The transmit power of the private signals scales as $P_p \sim P^\alpha$, while the received power at the unintended receiver

scales as P^0 , i.e., the noise level. Thus, the private signal does not incur any DoF loss for the unintended receiver.

- The scaling factor $\hat{\alpha}$ ensures that $P_p = P$ and $P_c = 0$ when the estimation error is small, i.e., $\sigma^2 \leq P^{-1}$ while leading to $P_p = 0$ and $P_c = P$ when the estimation error is high, i.e., $\sigma^2 = 1$. Similarly, with $(1 - \hat{\alpha})$, $P_1 = P$ and $P_2 = 0$ when the estimation error is small, while $P_1 = P_2 = \frac{P}{2}$ when the estimation error is high.

It is readily shown that, with these choices, we have the high SNR approximation of the rates

$$R_c = (1 - \alpha) \log P + O(1),$$

$$R_{pk} = \alpha \log P + O(1), \quad k = 1, 2,$$

$$R_\eta = 2(1 - \alpha) \log P + O(1),$$

$$R_{\text{mimo},k} = (2 - \alpha) \log P + O(1), \quad k = 1, 2,$$

from which we derive the symmetric DoF $d_{\text{sym}} = \frac{2+\alpha}{3}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Lapidoth, S. Shamai (Shitz), and M. A. Wigger, “On the capacity of fading MIMO broadcast channels with imperfect transmitter side-information,” in *Proc. 43rd Allerton Conference*, Sept. 28–30, 2005.
- [2] G. Caire, N. Jindal, M. Kobayashi, and N. Ravindran, “Multiuser MIMO achievable rates with downlink training and channel state feedback,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 2845–2866, June 2010.
- [3] M. A. Maddah-Ali and D. N. C. Tse, “Completely stale transmitter channel state information is still very useful,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 4418–4431, July 2012.
- [4] S. A. Jafar, “Interference Alignment: A New Look at Signal Dimensions in a Communication Network,” *Foundations and Trends in Communications and Information Theory*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–136, 2011.
- [5] T. Liu and P. Viswanath, “An extremal inequality motivated by multiterminal information-theoretic problems,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 1839–1851, May 2007.
- [6] H. Weingarten, Y. Steinberg, S. Shamai (Shitz), “The capacity region of the Gaussian multiple-input multiple-output broadcast channel,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 3936–3964, Sept. 2006.
- [7] T. Gou and S. A. Jafar, “Optimal use of current and outdated channel state information: Degrees of freedom of the MISO BC with mixed CSIT,” *IEEE Comm. Letter*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 1084–1087, July 2012.
- [8] M. Kobayashi, S. Yang, D. Gesbert, X. Yi, “On the degrees of freedom of time correlated MISO broadcast channel with delayed CSIT,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, Boston, USA, July 2012.
- [9] R. G. Gallager, “Capacity and coding for degraded broadcast channels,” *Probl. Peredachi Inf.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 3–14, 1974.
- [10] T. M. Cover and J. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*. New York: Wiley, 1991.
- [11] T. S. Han and K. Kobayashi, “A new achievable rate region for the interference channel,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 27, pp. 49–60, Jan. 1981.
- [12] L. Zheng and D. N. C. Tse, “Diversity and multiplexing: A fundamental tradeoff in multiple-antenna channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 1073–1096, May 2003.

Sheng Yang (M’07) received the B.E. degree in electrical engineering from Jiaotong University, Shanghai, China, in 2001, and both the engineer degree and the M.Sc. degree in electrical engineering from École Nationale Supérieure des Télécommunications (ENST), Paris, France, in 2004, respectively. From 2004 to 2007, he worked as teaching and research assistant in the Communications & Electronics department in ENST. During the same period, he completed his Ph.D., graduating in 2007 from Université de Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris VI). From October 2007 to November 2008, he was with Motorola Research Center in Gif-sur-Yvette, France, as a senior staff research engineer. Since December 2008, he has joined the Telecommunications department at SUPELEC where he is currently an assistant professor. His research interests include cooperative diversity schemes, wireless networks information theory, and coding/decoding techniques for multi-antenna communication systems.

Mari Kobayashi (M'06) received the B.E. degree in electrical engineering from Keio University, Yokohama, Japan, in 1999 and the M.S. degree in mobile radio and the Ph.D. degree from École Nationale Supérieure des Télécommunications, Paris, France, in 2000 and 2005, respectively. From November 2005 to March 2007, she was a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Centre Tecnològic de Telecomunicacions de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain. Since May 2007, she has been an Assistant Professor at Supélec, Gif-sur-Yvette, France. Her current research interests include multiple-input-multiple-output (MIMO) communication systems, multiuser communication theory.

David Gesbert (IEEE Fellow) is Professor and Head of the Mobile Communications Department, EURECOM, France. He obtained the Ph.D degree from Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Télécommunications, France, in 1997. From 1997 to 1999, he has been with the Information Systems Laboratory, Stanford University. In 1999, he was a founding engineer of Iospan Wireless Inc, San Jose, CA., a startup company pioneering MIMO-OFDM (now Intel). Between 2001 and 2003 he has been with the Department of Informatics, University of Oslo as an adjunct professor. D. Gesbert has published about 170 papers and several patents all in the area of signal processing, communications, and wireless networks.

D. Gesbert was a co-editor of several special issues on wireless networks and communications theory, for JSAC (2003, 2007, 2009), EURASIP Journal on Applied Signal Processing (2004, 2007), Wireless Communications Magazine (2006). He served on the IEEE Signal Processing for Communications Technical Committee, 2003-2008. He's an associate editor for IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications and the EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking. He authored or co-authored papers winning the 2004 IEEE Best Tutorial Paper Award (Communications Society) for a 2003 JSAC paper on MIMO systems, 2005 Best Paper (Young Author) Award for Signal Proc. Society journals, and the Best Paper Award for the 2004 ACM MSWiM workshop. He co-authored the book "Space time wireless communications: From parameter estimation to MIMO systems", Cambridge Press, 2006.

Xinping Yi (S'12) received his B.S. degree from Huazhong University of Science and Technology and M.Sc. degree from University of Electronic Science and Technology, China, both in Electrical Engineering. Currently, He is pursuing the Ph.D. degree at Mobile Communication Department, EURECOM, Sophia Antipolis, France. From 2009 to 2011, he was a Research Engineer in Huawei Technologies, Shenzhen, China. His current research interests include multiuser information theory and signal processing.